
From: Susan Clark
Sent: 21 January 2010 18:39
To: williamt[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Tomorrow's conference call

Willie

We'll talk this through with you on the call.

Susan

Susan Clark
Deputy Project Director - Tram
.....
tie limited
CityPoint
65 Haymarket Terr
Edinburgh EH12 5HD

Tel: +44 (0)131 622 8311
Fax: +44 (0)131 622 8301
Mobile: [REDACTED]
Email: susan.clark@tie.ltd.uk

Find out more about Edinburgh Trams online (click below):

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

From: William T Gillan [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]
Sent: 21 January 2010 15:07
To: Mike Heath; Susan Clark
Cc: 'Andrew Sloan'; 'Malcolm Hutchinson'
Subject: RE: Tomorrow's conference call

Susan

Following on from the Peer Group discussion this morning and Mike's subsequent note to you we wondered if it would be possible to see a list of all the DRPs to date, with an indication of their current status.

Speak to you tomorrow

Willie

> Message Received: Jan 21 2010, 01:13 PM
> From: "Mike Heath" <[REDACTED]>
> To: "'Susan Clark'" <Susan.Clark@tie.ltd.uk>
> Cc: "'Andrew Sloan'" <a.sloan@donaldsonassociates.com>, williamt@fsmail.net, "'Malcolm Hutchinson'" <[REDACTED]>
> 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
>
>

Enter your signature
William T Gillan