Martin Donohoe [Martin.Donohoe@scottwilson.com]
26 April 2007 11:30
David Crawley
Tony Glazebrook; Geoff Gilbert; Jim Harries (Transdev); Gavin Murray; David Powell;
Roger Jones (Transdev)
[SPAM] Employers requirements
Review of Employers Requirements.doc
Low

David,

As per my discussion yesterday with Tony, I have briefly reviewed the first two sections of the ER with David Powell and below is a

<u>limited list</u> of the high level issues that concern me about its current state. To be blunt - it urgently requires some work!

General Suitability of Current Contractual Employers Requirements

The current weaknesses are:

• The document requires more structure and integration of the associated contracts.

(it primarily addresses design, all maintenance and "issues" relating to the functioning lets say five years after opening of this "going concern" i.e. the transport firm, are a separate afterthought)

- Not enough high level, performance based & measurable requirements (Many measurements are contained in the detailed test section but these high level items are essential in order to construct a fit for purpose defence if the employers requirements are flawed at the detail level or fit for purpose attack if the contractor has failed in his design, maintenance obligations).
- A lack of attention to the 5 W's, (in essence, we have in many areas a collection of facts an figures but no instruction to the

contractor as to what we expect him to do with them. It is critical that at the end of every section we are crystal clear as to what we are asking for and understand what it is likely to cost. All "information" should be referred to rather than repeated

understand what it is likely to cost. All "information" should be referred to, rather than repeated in this document).

• There is an implicit assumption that the contractor will do a good job, provide at all stages of the project best practice documentation and use best practice management techniques, without any prompting by the client.

After consideration of what is best practice, we should specifically ask the contractor to ensure that the <u>minimum management documentation</u> is created for submission to tie / available for review by tie. The goal would be that if the contractor failed / withdrew for whatever reason then another could pick up where he left off with the minimum of fuss.

From my point of view i.e. Procurement & VE, it is essential that at a high level, <u>tie itself</u> understands what it wants to achieve and therefore the robustness of this section is key to limiting scope creep and obtaining value for money so if

robustness of this section is key to limiting scope creep and obtaining value for money so if you have no objection I propose the following:

I shall get my colleague Jonathan Brake (who works beside me in Birmingham) to work with our entire team :

- put together a structure for the ER's (straw man first then work with GG/JH/DP/RJ/ AR/ TC/ JP ... to refine)
- work on inserting the high level text needed to create the fit for purpose arguments

- identify the key high level performance requirements and their stakeholder eg Transport Scotland, Operator, CEC ... so that we know who wants (owns) which section in the ER. This is essential to manage change control and VE compromises etc.
- List what Management Documents we wish the Infraco to create, submit or maintain available for review
- Commence integrating the Maintanance requirements / contracts into the overall ER's
- Square all changes and clarifications with the projects commercial build up

There are more items to solve but I want to get us to a baseline ASAP before tackling the more subtle items, in particular how we gently include these new sections to the bidders without incurring cost and perhaps extract bidder cost by introducing greater clarity.

Regards

Martin Donohoe

PS attached file relates to detailed errors /issues in the pages reviewed, I have not seen but am aware that Roger & Jim have compiled a long list of ER errors that need to be addressed

From: Tony Glazebrook [mailto:Tony.Glazebrook@tie.ltd.uk]
Sent: 25 April 2007 15:32
To: David Crawley; Jim Harries (Transdev); Gavin Murray
Cc: Martin Donohoe - TSS
Subject: Employers requirements

Just to advise you that since "Engineering" is the designated owner of this doc, Martin and I have today agreed a process whereby this doc gets put right, for subsequent interaction with the Infraco bidders to ensure that what actually gets built is rather closer to what everyone actually needs

Visit our web site at www.scottwilson.com

Privilege and Confidentiality Notice.

This e-mail and any attachments to it are intended only for the party to whom they are addressed. They may contain privileged and/or confidential information. If you have received this transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete any digital copies and destroy any paper copies.

Thank you.

The ultimate parent company of the Scott Wilson Group is Scott Wilson Group plc. Registered in England No. 5639381 Registered Office: Scott House, Basing View, Basingstoke, Hampshire, RG21 4JG

This e-mail has been scanned for all viruses by Star. The service is powered by MessageLabs. For more information on a proactive anti-virus service working around the clock, around the globe, visit: http://www.star.net.uk

The information transmitted is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail please notify the sender immediately at the email address above, and then delete it.

E-mails sent to and by our staff are monitored for operational and lawful business purposes including assessing compliance with our company rules and system

performance. TIE reserves the right to monitor emails sent to or from addresses under its control.

No liability is accepted for any harm that may be caused to your systems or data by this e-mail. It is the recipient's responsibility to scan this e-mail and any attachments for computer viruses.

Senders and recipients of e-mail should be aware that under Scottish Freedom of Information legislation and the Data Protection legislation these contents may have to be disclosed to third parties in response to a request.

tie Limited registered in Scotland No. SC230949. Registered office - City Chambers, High Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1YT.