
From: Reynolds, Steve
Sent: 21 January 2008 08:48
To: Chandler, Jason
Subject: Where we are

Jason

As much for my benefit as anything else I thought I'd try and get my thoughts straight after Friday's events. I'm in two minds on the Susan Clarke outburst. I found it very disturbing; totally unprofessional; and also completely wide of the mark from any project management point of view. What to do about it? You've seen my email to Damian which is supposed to draw a line by making sure tie understands our position re design issues vs. Forth Ports Agreement and so on. And part of me thinks we'll be out of here working for BBS before much longer. But I still have this nagging doubt that we should be taking this further. Point 1 - you're due an apology. Point 2 - The project will suffer if her views are allowed any sort of influence and that we can't afford.....

On the other issues I feel that tie is completely disorganised and a number of very key issues are just being allowed to float.

The ERs is one thing. The more I see of the way things have developed the more I think we should be stating our formal position - conformance of the SDS design to version 1.2 of the ERs - and stating more forcefully to tie the problem of dealing with version 3.2. They have developed 3.2 and they should be the one instructing change to us. That also leaves tie with the problem of any inadequacies as far as the approval bodies are concerned and stops us accepting any hidden requirements that we haven't had time to flush out.

OR..... offer an ER Review service and do the job properly over, say, four weeks given the need to check ER verification (with the stakeholders); ER consistency (between all the ERs); SDS design conformance; and BBS offer compliance. Not sure.... Your views very welcome. Just thinking about it now though perhaps the solution for the first line in the sand with Matthew is here. SDS design conformance is secondary to whether tie has managed to compile a consistent set of requirements which can be verified as those needed by the stakeholders. Assurance on those points from tie should be the first step before we get to take a view on SDS design conformance.

Then there was the fiasco that was the CI Meeting on Friday. Quite apart from how we proceed with Ms Clarke the way David started that meeting was as if it were a race to the finish line with no vision of how to secure real progress. As you said in our first break-out getting to IDC is not the issue - getting to IDC with a design that can be expected to be approved subsequently is the real objective. I was frankly dismayed that so many of the things we talked about were the same as the issues on the table 6 months ago. As you suggested, it would appear that Lindsay has achieved little if anything in the intervening period. And where does that leave us? A design that may not be approved; a letter from early July telling tie that the consequences of failure to secure approval in the future would be down to them; but a client now clearly unable to secure any sort of resolution on these key outstanding issues. What should we do? Especially with novation upon us and these very issues likely to be the major cause of construction programme disruption. And tie seemingly devoid of ideas or even common understanding at their management team level. Probably I need to alert Willie.

So, problems with Matthew and the ERs. Problems with Dave and the Critical Issues. Problems with Susan C full stop.

Maybe a meeting with Damian & Steven Bell would be a better first step - Wednesday?

Meanwhile BBS and novation are still out there as unresolved issues too. But there my mind is clearer - we just need to press on getting the deliverables over the line and getting paid. Both of those initiatives under our control and working well. Team wind down and cost to complete are the other things to focus on here. Plus whether a harder attitude on our latest prolongation claim should be adopted.

I'll give you a call and we can review our options.