
From: David Powell
Sent: 27 February 2007 10:15
To: Matthew Crosse
Subject: FW: Core Engineering Group Meeting Actions

As requested

David

From: David Powell
Sent: 14 February 2007 19:07
To: Jim Harries (Transdev); 'Dorrington, Kim (Edinburgh Tram)'; 'Ennion, Bruce'; Douglas Leeming - TSS; Roger Jones (Transdev); Gavin Murray
Subject: Core Engineering Group Meeting Actions

I still have a number of open actions from the first meeting. Scope Definition and Integration into Procurement Process, Integration of SDS Design into Procurement Process and "Risk of Building Several Different Tramways" were my three actions. I see these as various facets of the same problem, accordingly, the proposed way forward presented below is intended to deal with all three points.

The Problem

We have a situation where it is difficult to see how the ER's, the PB design and the Infraco bidders' proposals relate to each other. As negotiations proceed, we need to achieve a mutually acceptable convergence between these workstreams, which will ultimately constitute the definitive scope of supply to which the Infraco will sign up.

Relationship between ER's & PB Design

I understand that Bruce and others within PB are currently preparing a report which will establish the relationship between the PB design and the ERs. This should give us a first fix in this area. I would suggest that we should review this once received and possibly expand the remit to see how this relates to the PB design information provided to bidders.

The forthcoming re-issue of the ERs should produce a re-refresh of this report to re-set the baseline.

Relationship between Infraco Bids and ER's

The initial bids give some insight into how the bidders meet some of the Employer's Requirements, but the picture provided is piecemeal and varies between the two bidders. The most effective way of closing any gap in understanding/interpretation is to ask each of the bidders to provide a full clause by clause commentary against the ERs. Given the forthcoming re-issue of the ERs, it would be sensible for this to be done against the new set of ERs.

This is a substantial exercise for each of the bidders and we would need to develop a framework which would

- Make this as simple as possible for the bidders
- Make the responses received unambiguous and easy to factor into our evaluation process.

I am sure that we could develop a suitable set of ground rules which would make this a robust and useful process. We will also need to consider how we will sell this to the bidders who will probably see this exercise as a burden.

Relationship between PB Design and Bids

Elements of the PB Preliminary design were provided to the Infraco bidders as part of the original ItN. The status of this documentation was not clearly set out and bidders were not invited to review much of what they received. Unsurprisingly, the visibility of the relationship between the two designs is not apparent in the Infraco bids.

The evolution of PB's design also means that elements of what has been provided to the bidders is becoming out of date.

I envisage that we would employ a number of approaches to bridging this gap:

1. Careful release of selected PB design information, with clear instructions as to its status and the required response from the bidders. This would be similar to the Supplementary Information Release process that we have (on the whole) successfully undertaken with the Tramcos
2. Ask the Infracos for a clear statement of what further design information they are expecting to receive from us. From this basis, develop an agreed plan with PB as to how this would be provided – we then need to ensure that this is delivered.
3. During the later stages of negotiation, organise a structured due diligence process between the Infraco(s) and PB's design.

If we can pursue all of these activities, we should be able to achieve convergence.

Please note that I haven't yet had the opportunity to talk this through with my colleagues and some of these thoughts sit outside my current remit, so please don't interpret any of this as tie's definitive position. It does however correspond with a number of emerging thought processes which are being developed, so hopefully we will find that it isn't massively out of kilter with my colleagues' plans. Once we have had the opportunity to discuss, I will table this with my colleagues.

Best Regards

David