
From: Reynolds, Steve
Sent: 16 June 2007 11:51
To: Ayres, Greg
Subject: RE: Matthews chocolates

A pretty comprehensive summary, with the overlapping points in sync with my weekly report just sent in parallel. I need to bring you up to speed with a meeting with CEC Friday afternoon which showed the very real need for focus on CEC on traffic modelling if we're to unlock the programme.

I'm working with David this morning

Talk soon

Steve

Stephen C Reynolds
Director

PB
>Manchester Technology Centre
>Oxford Road, Manchester, M1 7ED
>
>Direct +44 (0) [REDACTED]
Mobile +44 (0) [REDACTED]
>Fax +44 (0) [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Ayres, Greg
Sent: 15 June 2007 16:44
To: Reynolds, Steve
Subject: RE: Matthews chocolates

Steve, based on yesterday's meeting:

1. There are 3 major manifestations of the "new era" controls and reporting,
 - A. Dashboard report co developed with Crawley B. Self Assurance system for completed design C. The Issues Resolution Reporting process,(Critical Issues List) weekly meetings and ownership focus
 2. The latter item is still not working optimally, as noted as yesterday's meeting, but that said the bar charts indicate a downward slope of aggregate issues (as reported weekly). Third party issues are still problematic; Forth Ports RFU etc. Willie has agreed that Crawley should summarise the 3P elements of the Critical Issues List for Willie's follow up with key leadership of 3P's; RFU, BAA etc. We need to keep Willie on message here.
 3. The first issue of the Dashboard report - designed for Tie and TEL Board consumption, convincing the project purse holders, and the SNP, did not show improvement in schedule slippage. The "daylight" between program version 14 and actual has not lessened, and has even expanded somewhat. There was discussion and agreement with tie that this is caused to some degree by the lack of CIL (c above) resolution in multiple areas. Crawley wants to analyse the daylight in future reporting, between tie changes, CIL and (residually) SDS inefficiency. There was some discussion over early reporting re - base lining through the adoption of v16, but there are time and boundary limits to this joint (tie, sds)strategy to manage the message to the recipients.

PBH00025674_0001

3a COMPLETE - self certified packages are KEY

1. to take credit and get the tie, tel Board on side
2. Make Willie, Matthew look good
3. Improve PB's cash flow

note: we need help and cooperation from Matthew, and Dave to manage Geoff Gilbert on tie's definition of complete -he is wooden, see below - so that we can get the WIP down significantly.

4. It was generally agreed that Tel and CEC are not at the (CIL) table, see Willie to do's above.

5. CLAIM: the prolongation was acknowledged as well presented and worthy of consideration. Gilbert is taking legal advice We were asked not to run the FINAL through doc control until after the Audit Scotland report is submitted to Cabinet mid next week. We need to submit next Friday. We confirmed that there is currently two additional months to submit, beyond April 9. The VO log is receiving weekly attention between John McNicholls and Gilbert.

6. To - go costs: We need , as per my note below, to develop a split proposal to complete the design. You have confirmed that the management team budget is complete (Jason has provided a copy), but I see no progress on design breakdown, focusing on certainty versus unquantifiable areas of the design and those areas that fall between. What is the plan to do this based on your design meetings this week? Can we expect this in the near future? The other component (alluded to by Gilbert, possibly auto - suggested by our previous meeting with Matthew) is the design which we can throw over to Infraco (yet get paid for). This brings us to the next point - which needs review of the Tie Business Case documentation and independent scrutiny of the dialogue between tie, Transport Scotland and DfT.

6. NOVATION; We discussed the lack of consistence between a no claims culture going forward, and the contractual option of PB being novated to the infraco. We would want a quid pro quo waiver of the contract condition. Gilbert insists that the novation clause is still a condition precedent of the enabling legislation and funding. This needs to be flushed out. What do you recommend?

I think this covers the main points. When is our next meeting with Matthew?

Regards

Greg

-----Original Message-----

From: Reynolds, Steve

Sent: 14 June 2007 08:18

To: Ayres, Greg

Subject: RE: Matthews chocolates

To go is dependent upon all the issues we have laid before tie so this shouldn't be a problem. This is the area of work which has received significant attention over the last month with David Crawley and the basis for the analysis presented to the DPD.

Steve

Stephen C Reynolds
Director

PB
>Manchester Technology Centre

PBH00025674_0002

>Oxford Road, Manchester, M1 7ED

>

>Direct +44 (0) [REDACTED]

Mobile +44 (0) [REDACTED]

>Fax +44 (0) [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Ayres, Greg

Sent: 14 June 2007 06:31

To: Reynolds, Steve

Subject: Matthews chocolates

Steve, to meaningfully progress the position today we do need the outline of the proposal to tie which identifies the areas of certainty, doubt, etc along the lines discussed in my recent emails. In developing the togo estimate, Andreas Rothe concerns etc, I would anticipate that we should have a roughed out scheme, even if we do not commit to numbers today.

See you at 9 hopefully

Rgds

Greg

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld