
From: Colin McLauchlan
Sent: 27 July 2007 14:55
To: Stewart McGarrity; Matthew Crosse; Susan Clark
Cc: Miriam Thorne; Pat Diamond; Colin McLauchlan; Seamus Healy
Subject: RE: CEC resources

What happened to the planned 8-10?

Found out even FULL TIME COMMS person only here 1 to 2 days a week and had everything spoon fed to her before - doesn't even attend CEC related meetings as expected tie to brief her....that's ended!

Agree wit Stewarts sentiments and happy to be the bull in china shop to get some sense in the numbers and need therefore

Colin

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

From: "Stewart McGarrity" <Stewart.McGarrity@tie.ltd.uk>
To: "Matthew Crosse" <Matthew.Crosse@tie.ltd.uk>; "Susan Clark" <Susan.Clark@tie.ltd.uk>
Cc: "Miriam Thorne" <Miriam.Thorne@tie.ltd.uk>; "Pat Diamond" <Pat.Diamond@tie.ltd.uk>; "Colin McLauchlan" <Colin.McLauchlan@tie.ltd.uk>; "Seamus Healy" <Seamus.Healy@tie.ltd.uk>
Sent: 27/07/07 14:12
Subject: CEC resources

Matthew / Susan,

I started this email as yet another moan about cost control and accountability and then lost the will to go through with it as I've barked up this particular tree till I'm hoarse.

Attached is the Period 3 PM report on CEC Resource Cost - presumably you heard this at the PD review session earlier this week. The comments are incredibly negative and this does feel like a report from part of the team. Do they really not have an approvals programme they can use to plan their resourcing?

The costs we actually pay for are hard to get your mind round as they are by and large the costs of backfilling staff rather than the people who are actually supposed to present at Citypoint helping us out. Of the persons listed in the report as additional resources employed (Table1) only one of them is set up as a user on the Citypoint network. These additional resources cost us nearly £100k in periods 1 to 3 0708 alone (see the "detailed analysis" spreadsheet) The big questions as ever is what did the project get for the money, who is verifying the backfilling costs are accurate and, most importantly, who is validating that the persons freed up by these backfilling resources, as listed on Table 2 of the PM report, are delivering value - they are seldom here at Citypoint unless its just a huge coincidence that the desks are empty when I'm across there.

There is a another issue here - TEL (David) agreed as part of the Efficiency Review that the recharges of staff costs from LB would no longer take place. I think we will still be

paying for David and Alastair of course. However Neil was onto the fact that CEC are still charging us backfilling costs like a shot. The best result here would be for CEC to swallow all staff costs and for all future costs against this line item to be eliminated on the Tram budget. One for you to progress with Andrew Holmes with Willie and David's support?

You will have seen my previous emails about their farcical ICT planning. Seamus tells me that they now wish to bring in their own network which will be linked via an expensive comms link back to CEC's network. Apart from anything else do they think that the cost of this setup can be passed onto the tram project? There was nothing wrong with the ICT setup we have provided for them except it didn't give them access to the CEC network?

It seems only right that at a time we have scrutinised all tie employed resources and peoples jobs have been made redundant in the process, we must for good order and decency be challenging these soft external costs. I don't think we ever bottomed out the future TSS involvement during the Efficiency Review either.

Miriam and Pat will keep up the challenge on this while I am away.

Yours grumpily,

Stewart

Stewart McGarrity

Finance & Performance Director

tie Limited

