
From: Reynolds, Steve
Sent: 14 June 2007 09:35
To: McNicholls, John
Subject: FW: Engineering worries

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: Reynolds, Steve
Sent: 13 June 2007 15:11
To: Matthew Crosse
Subject: RE: Engineering worries

Matthew

Thank-you for your email. I have now checked on the points you raise and would like to respond as follows, but confirm that if the issues need further discussion the meeting with Greg tomorrow would present a good opportunity.

- On your point 1 I can assure you that PB is working diligently to ensure the design deliverables are to a consistently good quality, with recent visits by me and Jason to our design teams around the country to ensure effective communications across the team.
- With regard to timing, clearly PB can only commit to meeting delivery dates on the basis that all information required to progress each of the tasks is available. As was reported at last week's DPD, virtually all of the slippage on programme through the period in question, i.e as reported on Version 15 of the SDS programme, can be explained by delays in decision making by others. Whilst PB will continue to work closely with TIE to ensure as far as possible that all parties understand the importance of making timely decisions and the consequences of failure to do so on the programme, it must be appreciated that the successful completion of the project depends on all parties; not just on PB. It still seems that delay to completion of design programme activities is judged by many to be due solely to under-performance on PB's part. In reality of course successful completion of the project depends on everyone working together to ensure the design programme is not inhibited through lengthy debate and repeated changes of requirements. People have to understand that this is the environment that PB has been working in for some time now and my team has worked long and hard to accommodate the design of many options in an attempt to keep the programme moving forward. In this context I believe the title of your email "Engineering Worries" presents too narrow a view which could easily move the focus away from where the real problems are. Right now the urgent need is to work with the other stakeholders to build on the good work already done via the Critical Issues initiative. Since that initiative has been active since early February it would be fair to conclude that all parties should have been aware that the programme is being delayed and the reasons have been discussed at length. What last week's DPD did, perhaps for the first time, was to show through the detailed reporting mechanism of the dashboard exactly how serious are the consequences of continued failure to meet reasonable dates for resolution of the remaining issues. As you are aware I am working with David Crawley to address this

particular concern with the stakeholders with a view to building on the clear message from the DPD that these remaining issues have to be closed out rapidly.

- With regard to recovery of the programme, and assuming the unlocking of the Critical Issues currently holding up design, I am confident as we discussed recently that the PB effort required can still be delivered in the required timeframe. I have resources available and Monday's review with the designers confirmed that priorities alongside other work commitments can be met. Clearly, though, the earlier we can start each activity the more confidence we can have in delivering as per programme. Although most of the recent slippage can, in my view, be attributed to the Critical Issues I can assure you that I am keeping a close eye on the other areas to ensure that progress is maintained. Once again I am confident that PB has sufficient resource flexibility currently to meet TIE's requirements
- On the issue of programme dates, unfortunately Jason was off sick last Thursday and Friday so the dates to Geoff were delayed. I can only apologise for this but note that constructive discussion took place between Tom and Carla yesterday in advance of the issue of Version 16.
- With regard to Jason's forthcoming annual leave, Jason has discussed this I understand with Tony and arrived at an acceptable agreement. Whilst Jason will be on leave we have other key staff returning from leave and we have the priorities established to ensure people work effectively in Jason's absence
- Perhaps the most surprising item on your email is item 5 relating to Employers' Requirements. When it became clear some three months ago that TIE had issued to the Bidders Employers' Requirements which were inconsistent with those developed by PB /SDS it was obvious that an exercise needed to be executed rapidly to establish the differences between the two documents. This exercise was complicated by the fact that TIE had omitted to maintain a track-change record of the document development. Nevertheless PB worked hard to turn round a review within a fortnight and this was submitted to TIE to action, (with several hundred differences identified). Since submission of that document PB has received no formal instruction from TIE and I understand that changes are still being made to the requirements - again without a controlled track-change approach to these further revisions. I don't believe PB could say with any confidence what Version 2.4 as referred to in your email contains. If instructions are received to take on board the changes which are now being contemplated the possibility clearly exists that changes will be required to completed designs. Hence, I would like us to explore this matter further to make sure we arrive at a common level of understanding. Less importantly from an overall project standpoint I should make the point that it appears once again that PB is being criticised quite unreasonably for inefficiencies which are actually within the TIE organisation.
- On the subject of the first floor space, yes, I can confirm that should it be required we would be able to use the space for extra design resource. As ever we would have to review the pros and cons with a possible negative being disruption as a result of moving a design team from its home facilities. But, yes, we will look at the options constructively. A good example of where we are doing this now is the move to accommodate some staff in City Point in response to a request by Keith Rimmer for SDS to co-locate our resources with those of TIE for the preparation of TRO applications.
- On the response to the JRC letter, my apologies for no reply having been provided. We will now attend to this as a matter of urgency.

I've limited the circulation on this one Matthew since I'd rather you and I were in agreement on these important topics before sharing any matters arising with the wider audience. I am determined to work with you personally and with TIE

as an organisation to deliver the benefits of PB's experience and expertise to ensure project success. In passing I and everyone else on the PB team would be saddened to see the project cancelled as a result of the current political upheaval. But what I would ask is that you use your authority as the holder of the Master Programme to ensure that others do not hide behind the easy option of blaming PB for problems which are outwith the remit of the SDS Design Contract. If we can achieve that we can genuinely lay claim to being part of an integrated team

Best regards - Steve

Stephen C Reynolds
Director

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

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

From: Matthew Crosse [mailto:Matthew.Crosse@tie.ltd.uk]
Sent: 13 June 2007 10:10
To: Reynolds, Steve
Cc: David Crawley; Tony Glazebrook; Geoff Gilbert; Susan Clark
Subject: Engineering worries

Steve

At the DPD yesterday a number of issues were raised which I thought we ought to potentially look at tomorrow and with Greg if necessary.

1. Ensuring the 1st detailed design package is on time and of good quality
2. Getting to the bottom of the programme 'start' slippage (non critical issues causes) and certainty that we can recover (see 6 below too).
3. Concern that after the last programme meeting (you and I were at) Geoff didn't get the support from Jason needed to finalise.
4. Tony G raised a concern that Jason/Carla are out for 2 weeks and that the programme support might be at risk
5. SDS are not working to the Employers Requirements vers 2.4 (ones they helped tom create!).
6. Could you use some of the 1st floor space now available to blitz with some extra design resource?
7. I don't think we got a response to the JRC letter of 10th April (COJ008) attached. We need this closing because we have told the Board about it and the paper work needs to be in place and JRC have started work.

Matthew

tie limited
Citypoint
65 Haymarket Terrace
Edinburgh
EH12 5HD
P: +44 (0) [REDACTED]
F: +44 (0) [REDACTED]
M: +44 (0) [REDACTED]

E: matthew.crosse@tie.ltd.uk
W: www.tramsforedinburgh.com

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.
