

---

**From:** Mike Heath [mike@mgheath.co.uk]  
**Sent:** 21 January 2010 13:13  
**To:** Susan Clark  
**Cc:** 'Andrew Sloan'; williamt@[REDACTED] 'Malcolm Hutchinson'  
**Subject:** Tomorrow's conference call

Susan,

We have had an extensive discussion today so that we can concentrate our efforts on giving the best value to tomorrow.

I trust you have seen Malcolm's note to Richard about the Peer review process and our concerns about its direction. We do need to thrash out tomorrow how our involvement in this process is to be documented to your Board and whether that would import personal liability to us individually and collectively.

We have registered concerns that we have been commenting on information provided by Tie management without any way of establishing its scope or veracity. This process crystallises these concerns.

I put this to you as an example just to help clarify the methodology. If we believe that evidence is wrong or is insufficient or a conclusion has been drawn that is questionable how will that be presented by Tie management to the TPB, since, as you know, previous reports have been caveated by Tie management? As an example would it be possible to see in advance the paper that went to the January Board that triggered the process that you are starting on?

From our first trawl through your note we would observe

1. that there needs to be a separate work stream on risk associated with the options,
2. there also needs to be a task to set out the current position on costs/ risks/programme which would provide the background to why the Board is considering the matter when it does ( this may be part of the January paper).
3. that more emphasis needs to be placed (compared with current drafting) on looking forward to system integration and testing/commissioning aspects and any issues that might arise from them within the contract arrangements you have now, as there is no point in fixing one problem when that fix might limit the solution to another.
4. that confidentiality of this project and its leadership might be usefully more closely defined whereas it looks like management by committee.

We will major on design issues and their consequences tomorrow as these seem to us to be critical to understanding the scope of the problem and its solution.

Hope this helps. Look forward to your note on logistics for tomorrow.

Any questions give me a call.

Mike