

---

**From:** Reynolds, Steve  
**Sent:** 16 May 2007 12:39  
**To:** Ayres, Greg  
**Subject:** RE: Supplier performance survey results

"When things go wrong all aspects of what we do go under the microscope, they see more and pile on more pressure and then it gets worse! That is how projects are."

Very much the hang-dog attitude that got us into such a mess on Edinburgh. New structure; some new people; much better career development required.

Steve

Stephen C Reynolds  
Director

PB  
Manchester Technology Centre  
Oxford Road, Manchester, M1 7ED

Direct +44 (0) [REDACTED]  
Mobile +44 (0) [REDACTED]  
Fax +44 (0) [REDACTED]

---

**From:** Ayres, Greg  
**Sent:** 16 May 2007 09:51  
**To:** Reynolds, Steve; Dicksbury, Bob  
**Subject:** FW: Supplier performance survey results

Not the kind of email that would stand us in good stead in court....

---

**From:** Jenkins, Mike  
**Sent:** 15 May 2007 17:53  
**To:** Luscombe, David; Mason, John  
**Cc:** Atkins, Chris; Cluett, Chris; Ayres, Greg; Kydd, Peter  
**Subject:** RE: Supplier performance survey results

Gents,

Whilst I agree that John should seek more feedback, these results are consistent with our performance!

From the data it is fairly obvious that they have a pool of 6 respondees; hence the 17%. In Rail we have 3 large projects (excl ELL) ie Tunnel Cooling Project, Independent Engineering Review and Programme Assurance Office each of whom would have given a mixed response. I guess the others would include East London Transit but am not aware of the others. Each has problems and issues which we have struggled to address and if I were the client I would not be very complementary. When things go wrong all aspects of what we do go under the microscope, they see more and pile on more pressure and then it gets worse! That is how projects are.

A quick glance shows that our worst score was Delivery to Milestones/ Deadlines (66% very poor and the rest adequate), followed closely by Cost Certainty/ Delivering to Budget and Business Compliance ( both had 33% very poor). These are the same issues we have targeted in the BU and we are seeing some progress, albeit slow. Looking for the positive side, we scored just 5 "Very Goods" out of a possible 72. One in each of Responsiveness, Quality of Output, and Understanding Client Needs and two in Capability,etc. I believe this may reflect some of the good work done on TCP and PAO but generally we are perceived as not responsive, and the quality of our output is not as great as it could be and we know why.

Whilst I believe we need to address the "poor" scores, the more concerning thing is that we scored quite a large number of "Goods" but unlike our competitors, we struggled to turn them into "Very Goods" which has a knock on effect on many of our scores including Value for Money and our overall score. In the Rail Industry the company which is most like PB is Mott MacDonald; their score of 4.4 means they probably scored "very good" or "good" for all the questions.

There are plenty of excuses why our scores are low. For many months we have said we could put more people on all our TfL projects and as we struggle to recruitment more staff, we continue to try to get more out of the limited number of people we have to put on these jobs. On the TCP - because we don't have enough senior Mechanical and Electrical Engineers we struggle to produce what our client desires. We therefore are not responsive when extra work comes, our product suffers as we try to be as we spread our project teams too thinly lowering client perception, and yet on many aspects we are seen as doing a good job.

I haven't got a magic wand, but I do think that if we honestly self scored our projects we would come up with results like this ourselves. Using the same model as Gallup's Q12 ie organisations which score a higher percentage of "Very good" scores are more predisposed to perform well in the future despite other low scores, we should be looking at how to correct some of the poor scores but just as importantly how do we make those projects that are doing OK become great projects. If we don't focus on this, we will start to be perceived as an average company. This will greatly influence client selection in the future and will be difficult to overcome.

Hope my observations are of some worth,  
Mike

---

**From:** Luscombe, David  
**Sent:** Tue 15/05/2007 15:03  
**To:** Mason, John; Ayres, Greg  
**Cc:** Atkins, Chris; Cluett, Chris; Jenkins, Mike  
**Subject:** RE: Supplier performance survey results

John  
This is an appalling result. How come we did not know that they felt like this about us.

Kind Regards  
David  
David Luscombe  
Director of Communities

PB  
Europe & Africa

T: [REDACTED] M: [REDACTED] E: Luscombeda@pbworld.com W: www.pbworld.com/ea

-----Original Message-----  
From: Mason, John  
Sent: 15 May 2007 14:44  
To: Ayres, Greg  
Cc: Atkins, Chris; Cluett, Chris; Jenkins, Mike; Luscombe, David  
Subject: FW: Supplier performance survey results

Greg,

This is the report forward by TfL on PB's "performance" in 2006.

The report is flawed on a number of levels and I am seeing Jon Smith my counterpart in TfL on a one to one basis tomorrow to discuss PB's concern about the potential messages it sends, particularly when measured against our evident success elsewhere eg ELL (the survey excludes London Rail). Subject to the feedback I get from Jon we will then have to decide what further action, if any, needs to be taken.

The basis of the report has not been shared but it is reasonable to conclude that the projects reviewed in LUL/ST were Highways/Rail and possibly Buildings related although their value, timing and scope is subject to the "confidential" nature of the survey and has not been shared with us.

Given the nature of the survey I suggested we don't make the situation worse by circulating further than this group until we've agreed on the way forward.

How TfL Procurement see this as contributing to improving supply chain relations or performance is a mystery to me, when they refuse to share the basis of the data so that we can assess any shortcomings or challenge any views expressed.

Regards, John

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

From: Atkins, Chris  
Sent: 04 May 2007 12:59  
To: Mason, John  
Subject: Fw: Supplier performance survey results

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

From: Nagra Cynthia <CynthiaNagra@tfl.gov.uk>  
To: Atkins, Chris  
Sent: Fri May 04 12:23:24 2007  
Subject: FW: Supplier performance survey results

Dear Christopher,

Thank you for meeting recently with Giuseppe Carella. We trust you found the session both informative and actionable.

As Giuseppe mentioned in your meeting, I have attached the performance results, the slides Giuseppe used and the template for the actions on which he would like you to report back on.

<<Parsons Brinckerhoff Ltd\_pdf.pdf>> <<Supplier Performance - Best In Class.pdf>> <<Multi02042007.ppt>> <<Template Supplier Assessment Action Plan For TfL v1.doc>>

Please send your response to: giuseppecarella@tfl.gov.uk.

Best regards

Cynthia

Cynthia Nagra | Administrative Officer  
Policy, Strategy & Best Practice | Group Services | Transport for London

3rd Floor, Windsor House, 42-50 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0TL

T: [REDACTED] E: cynthianagra@tfl.gov.uk

\*\*\*\*\*

The contents of the e-mail and any transmitted files are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. Transport for London hereby exclude any warranty and any liability as to the quality or accuracy of the contents of this email and any attached transmitted files. If you are not the intended recipient be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this email is strictly prohibited.

If you have received this email in error please notify [postmaster@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:postmaster@tfl.gov.uk).

This footnote also confirms that this email message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.

\*\*\*\*\*