

---

**From:** Ennion, Bruce  
**Sent:** 31 October 2007 15:10  
**To:** Reynolds, Steve  
**Subject:** RE: Email to tie on the Conduct of the BBS Meetings

**Steve**

Whilst SDS have an obligation to support the **tie** procurement process the total lack of procurement feedback from **tie** can only to the detriment of the project.

This takes many forms and the lack of a **tie** approved documented management system covering the Due Diligence process has resulted in a fire brigade approach to the whole DD process so far which has involved SDS in a degree of inefficient working. This has been further demonstrated by events over the last few days.

I believe the lack of a **tie** formally approved documented procedures has also resulted in **tie** having to do a significant amount of additional work. It has been seen by the bidders that **tie** have not adopted a integrated approach and the lack of internal communication within **tie** has been commented upon by one of the bidders during DD and post tender meetings.

Confusion as to who has issued what and when, where the Employers Requirements stand and how they relate to the SDS documentation submitted to the bidders has also been commented upon during the Infraco Bidding process.

SDS have written on more than one occasion requesting that **tie** establish such a DD procedure and that all DD meetings are formally minuted. SDS have received very few minutes of Infraco Meetings nor Due Diligence Meetings hence there appears to be little of an auditable procurement trail and certainly little DD trail.

As you correctly point out there is a significant difference between 'Scope Changes' and Value Engineering' and I would suggest **tie** have to protect themselves by ensuring that the scope remains as is however they achieve better value or they may expose themselves to comments from the unsuccessful party who may not have been given the opportunity to respond to changes in scope.

I attended the 'VE' meeting yesterday to listen to a replay of two earlier meetings chaired by **tie** with the same bidder which I have to say ended in the same result

I suggest that one important thing is that SDS must insist that they have an agenda and documented clear unambiguous questions (*not subject headings as had been experienced in the past*) from the preferred bidder prior to any further discussions or meetings. I understand this has been agreed for the Structures meeting which has arranged to take place in Birmingham however it will be 'interesting' to see if these are forthcoming.

If not then I suggest SDS and **tie** risk yet another non productive replay whilst the clock ticks.

Regards

**Bruce**

---

**From:** Reynolds, Steve  
**Sent:** 31 October 2007 12:50  
**To:** Dolan, Alan; Ney, Scott; Shudall, Kate; Clement, Gavin; Ennion, Bruce; Simmons, David  
**Cc:** Chandler, Jason  
**Subject:** Email to tie on the Conduct of the BBS Meetings

<< Message: Meetings with BBS >>

I have sent the above email to Matthew in an attempt to instigate some better control of the BBS meetings process. I am very concerned over the way this will go if nothing is done to change the process and would welcome your views ahead of any session I may have with Matthew in advance of any collective session between us and tie

Thanks - Steve