
From: Andy Steel - TSS
Sent: 22 July 2007 09:18
To: Roger Jones; Matthew Crosse
Cc: Geoff Gilbert; Bob Dawson; Jim Harries (Transdev); David Crawley; Alastair Richards - TEL
Subject: RE: Bidder Meeting Thurs 19 July

Roger,

I have read your note. It was unfortunate that you, Jim, and Alastair were all working away from Edinburgh on Friday because I wanted to discuss several issues associated with the overall procurement process, of which VE in general and this meeting in particular were individual issues. Some of these arose out of Mathew's meeting with Geoff and David on Thursday pm.

Since there is a suggestion that TSS had not committed as much as they should for the record this is the TSS involvement in both in this meeting and VE on sStructures in general.

- There was an earlier VE Structures meeting with BBS, similarly arranged, which I chaired by default and conscious that the structures expertise on our side was effectively nil brought in Walter McQueen and Ken Mosley from SW. They duly produced a report now with David Crawley.
- You will recollect that at the Tramlines Presentation earlier in July the Tramlines PD asked that the Structures VE workshop be held after he had returned from holiday. (that was the same meeting where Tramlines produced the letter from the Procurement Team which the Technical Team knew nothing about and that had the effect of increasing prices)
- The VE responsibility for structures was given to David Crawley via the Jim McEwan overall leadership for VE. Therefore I have backed off on that particular work stream.
- Val was instructed to arrange this meeting for last week by Geoff. I told Val by E mail that she had to arrange it round the availability of David Crawley. That she did for last Thursday.
- Immediately Walter told her by E Mail that he could not make Thursday morning but could do the afternoon. That message was conveyed to David.
- I do not know why SDS only fielded Bruce (like us an M&E engineer) but I have expressed my views as to the commitment of SDS to VE elsewhere.
- I had promised to start the meeting in the event that David was late. In practice he was in the office by nine or very shortly thereafter. David appeared to be unaware of the meeting but agreed to attend.
- I then spent the next two hours (again under instructions as to priority from Geoff) preparing detailed comment for him on Roley Clarification Responses. These are the subject of a separate note to yourself.
- I have made arrangements with Walter for him to be available next week. However it will have to be formally confirmed when several senior managers in SW return from leave on Monday. I would hope that I can supplement it with some input from Ken Mosley if it is needed.

I have some business to sort out in Matlock first thing Monday morning. Provided it goes as planned I hope to be in Edinburgh by 1500. Meanwhile I am carrying on with other priorities. Expect another Note before the day is out.

Andy

From: Roger Jones [mailto:Roger.Jones@transdevplc.co.uk]
Sent: Fri 7/20/2007 3:28 PM
To: Matthew Crosse
Cc: Geoff Gilbert; Bob Dawson; Jim Harries (Transdev); David Crawley; Alastair Richards - TEL; Andy Steel - TSS
Subject: Bidder Meeting Thurs 19 July

Matthew,

I discussed the meeting with Scoop on VE/Structures yesterday with Jim and we agreed that your attention needs to be drawn to the issues that became clear in the meeting. I have summarised these in bulleted form.

Firstly, the issues that were apparent on our side are:

- There was no pre-meeting or apparent preparation.
- There was confusion over who was attending. The allocated chair was apparently not aware of the meeting and the attendance of the relevant structures person (Walter McQueen) had not been confirmed in advance. The actual attendance, after a delay of approaching 40min was therefore Campbell Skinner, David Crawley, who I believe had had no previous involvement with the Infraco process, Bruce Ennion (representing SDS in general, but with no specific/detailed knowledge of structures) and myself, probably on the basis that I've been involved more than most with the planning process, Tram Design Working Group etc, so I have background knowledge on the desires that have pushed the individual designs in particular directions.
- There seems to be a lack of systematic positive technical review of the proposals, aside from looking at the questions asked, particularly with respect to the civil side. They referred to technical proposals contained in their January bid that were still relevant.
- I am unclear on the complete situation, but I think that part of the difficulty might be that they have not made technical proposals against the SDS designs they have received, but rather responded in the BoQs.
- We do not seem to have a single comprehensive list of the information (SDS design) that has been issued to them, to know what they are responding to. If this single comprehensive list is held by the procurement team, there appears to be a lack of communication with our technical team. Also they referred to proposals contained in their January bid, which I don't think has had any "technical team" review.
- The upshot of all this is that it is not possible to carry out VE practically without a technical understanding of what is in their bid (and its cost) in the first place.

Secondly, points that were expressed by Scoop:

- Scoop did not seem very happy with the process.
- Scoop identified that there has been a great number of commercial and legal meetings but they identified a lack of engagement on the technical side. Their view appeared to be that a much better technical understanding was needed before the commercial/legal can be properly addressed. They were not meeting all the relevant people on our side and there was a lack of consistency in those they did meet.
- They also, by inference, were unhappy that discussions on pricing that had raised technical issues are clearly not being communicated to members of the technical team, who appeared ignorant of issues raised in other forums.
- Scoop complained about the lack of responses to TQs, going back to the earlier part of the process, in the latter part of 2006. This was expanded to answers that were inadequate in enabling them to firm up their bid.
- They also made general comments about the extended length of the whole process; and their concern about fair normalisation in **tie's** evaluation, amongst other things.
- They have received lots of stuff from us but often unclear what they are supposed to do with it. They do not necessarily get much that helps them refine/make less "finger in the air" their prices. They gave the example of a set of drawings (about drainage?) tabled by Bob Dawson as an aside to the meeting, which they said at the end of the meeting were of no assistance as they stood, requiring further detail. A further example quoted was the expectation of **tie** that additional roads information issued will allow firm prices for that area in the 7th August return. At present they believe their prices in this area are "flaky" (If I recall correctly).
- They identified that there were significant assumptions built in to their offer. They stated that these are principally contained within their response to the BoQs. They were concerned that they had not been "challenged" on these or been engaged at all in any technical discussion on the issues raised. Perhaps there is a problem that the technical people are not seeing these as they are regarded as "commercial". I do not think that the BoQs have been shared with the technical team.
- They also identified that the BoQs did not match up with the SDS design and that they had added significant sums, both in additional items and in increasing quantities in the BoQs as given, in their latest submission (to the tune of £25-30m) in order to reflect the design information which had been issued to them.

I believe the session was embarrassing for all concerned. From a technical viewpoint overall, the issues seem to be more concerned with the civil aspects than M&E. I understand David Crawley was going to be speaking with Geoff Gilbert and Matthew Crosse later during Thursday, and this was made clear to Scoop.

If there is anything that Jim and I can do to assist in resolving these issues, please ask. We are both most concerned that the bidders are losing confidence in us and believe that this is probably the most important matter for us all to address as a top priority.

Regards,

Roger

Roger Jones
Project Engineer, Transdev Edinburgh Tram
City Point, 65 Haymarket Terrace,
Edinburgh EH12 5HD

Office: 0 [REDACTED]
Mobile: 0 [REDACTED]

This email and its contents are intended for the named recipient(s) only, and it may contain information which may be confidential and/or privileged. If you have received this email in error, please notify us and delete the email and all attachments immediately. Any views or opinions expressed are those of the sender and do not necessarily represent those of Transdev PLC or its subsidiaries. Internet communications are not secure, and we do not accept responsibility for the contents of this message or for any changes which may have been made after it was sent. All outbound email is checked for viruses, however, we do not accept any liability if this email or any attachments are found to contain viruses or malicious code. We advise that all emails and attachments should be checked by the recipient prior to opening them. TRANSDEV PLC, Company No. 2749273, Registered in England and Wales.