| From: | Gavin Murray |
|---|---|
| **Sent:** | 16 October 2007 10:45 |
| **To:** | David Crawley |
| **Cc:** | Tony Glazebrook; Lindsay Murphy |
| **Subject:** | RE: Damian Sharp |

David
Thanks for this
As I noted on the phone yesterday there will be a few issues which will require care
1.      Damien may expect to come in with full responsibility to manage the SDS contract (rather than having to fit in as closely as you envisage)
2.      Damien has been on the Transport Scotland side of the desk for a long time managing the scope/cost of the project (approving financial release from the funder) and the interface with CEC (who now have responsibility for bringing the project to completion) may be delecate.

Additionally at the Due Diligence discussion with Ray dent this morning SDS once again noted that in the conclusion of the agreement with Infraco it would be good if **tie** were to do SDS the courtesy of bringing them fully and formally up to speed with everything (for example SDS were not provided a formal version of the Employers Requirement for a considerable time – and indeed may not yet have). I believe this is an element that Damien could deal with.
Regards
Gavin

---

**From:** David Crawley
**Sent:** 15 October 2007 13:29
**To:** Gavin Murray
**Subject:** FW: Damian Sharp

Gavin,

We discussed.

David

---

**From:** David Crawley
**Sent:** Thu 11/10/2007 15:26
**To:** Colin McLauchlan
**Cc:** Steven Bell; Tony Glazebrook
**Subject:** Damian Sharp

Colin,

You and Tony and I had a discussion about getting Damian started and these notes summarise that discussion.

Damian (as I understand it) is to focus on 'contract management' of the SDS programme. At present in terms of our relationship with SDS there are the following strands of activity:

1.  Receiving and progressing formal communications (each of which contains technical and contractual issues and each of which has implications for obligations on tie and SDS).
2.  Dealing with technical issues
3.  Receiving and understanding progress reports and taking action to maintain progress.

Currently Tony and I deal with all three.

**1** is dealt with by receipt of the communications (formal letters), determining action to be taken (technical and contractual), and arranging for it to be taken, sometimes within the engineering team and sometimes with others, including stakeholders such as CEC. Formal logging of communications and the replies is undertaken,

**2** is dealt with by Tony and myself, involving others as necessary including external parties.

**3** is dealt with by Tony and myself, and specific review is held weekly at the Friday critical Issues meeting which is designed to unblock problems (as distinct from allocating blame). It is a non-contractual forum deliberately designed to avoid conflict.

Tony and I operate to two top level objectives (1) manage SDS in compliance with their contract (2) ensure delivery of designs to programme. These objectives are somewhat in tension (as all good objectives are) as insistence on contract compliance can quickly lead to a cessation of progress if activity towards both objectives is not integrated and moderated. <u>I cannot stress too much how important this point is.</u>

With this in mind I suggest that Damian's activity becomes part of the extant processes (as distinct from some form of additional un-integrated monitoring activity) in order to be able to ensure that there is no loss of process and that the beneficial tension on objectives is maintained with everyone with some accountability for maintenance of progress despite any other conflicting demands.

I suggest:

- Damian picks up item 1 above, recognising that where technical issues arise Tony and I will pick them up, and recognising that he can devote more time to ensuring that contractual obligations (tie and SDS) are understood and followed through.
- Tony and I continue with items 2 and 3
- Damian becomes an integral part of the engineering team (his reporting line is no issue) sharing the overall objectives, and if he has additional responsibilities these must be couched in such a way that they do not cause loss of process elsewhere.
- Damian attends the critical issues forum to ensure good understanding of the issues of most import

All of this is of course subject to change control as our needs change, driven by the project moving from a design phase to a construction phase.

In terms of mobilising things once Damian arrives, I suggest that communication of Damian's role (to Damian and others) is done with Tony and myself involved to ensure commonality of message and its understanding.

I hope this helps. I would hope that we can all (those addressed in this note) discuss these points before further action is taken.

David