

Malcolm Hutchinson CB Ceng  
Rectory Cottage, Little Ann Road  
Little Ann  
Andover SP11 7SN  
5 January 2010

Richard Jeffrey  
Tie

**Dear Richard**

**Edinburgh Tram Peer Review**

Sorry that the combination of the snow and Flybe conspired to prevent me taking part in the Peer Review just before Christmas. I was informed of the key points by Mike on the phone at lunch time and at close of play. Subject to this restricted exposure to the facts presented and their debate the recommendations made appear to be sound and capable of being adopted as a start point of a major effort to rescue the project from its current unsatisfactory and undeliverable position. The fundamental issues appear to be:

- a) Putting a rescue effort in place to get the project on an affordable, acceptable and deliverable footing.
- b) Establishing an effective challenge and review capability to ensure that proposals are fully bought into by key stakeholder and funders.

In this context it is important that we put the Peer Review into perspective. The Independent Peer Review process for Edinburgh Tram emerged from the Gateway reviews required by the sponsor, Transport Scotland, as a pre-requisite to its approval of the Project and its funding. The Gateway reviews, held at key decision points in the projects development, considered evidence form all key stakeholders and made formal recommendations which were progressed by subsequent reviews and reported back to the sponsor.

Recently, the role of the Peer Review Team (PRT) has been less clear with reviews being sponsored by the management team and the style of review being limited to a commentary on presentations by the management team .These developments result in a review which is in effect management directed Consultancy and conflicts with the concept of an independent peer review as exemplified by the Gateway process.

I conclude from this that if you wish to use the peer review team members going forward, individuals should either be employed as either (but not both of):

- Management consultants on the Rescue effort at a) above.
- Or as part of the Challenge/Peer Review team at b) above.

I think that members of the Peer Review group have the potential to make a significant contribution in either of the above roles, and there is a case for putting a rigorous Gate 4 (contract award review) in place as part of the Rescue programme.

If I can be any help in this please give me a call.

Malcolm Hutchinson