
From: David Crawley [David.Crawley@tie.ltd.uk]
Sent: 26 November 2007 14:04
To: Reynolds, Steve
Subject: Programme insights
Attachments: SDS Design for Infraco

Steve,

This note deals with the related issues of:

- Programme of Prior Approvals,
- Programme of Technical Approvals
- Programme of Consents
- Design Deliverables Tracker and progress reporting

Some specific issue are listed against each, with additional commentary on the overall management process.

Programme of Prior Approvals

The programme of Prior Approvals is, according to CEC, "working well". However, you will be aware that over the months, particularly during the original 'critical issues' phase, as slippage has occurred in the delivery of designs so has slippage occurred in the Prior Approvals associated with them. In an attempt to preserve the end-date, the Prior Approvals programme has become compressed requiring many items to be tackled simultaneously. Despite this CEC seem content that they are coping although there are other aspects of the Prior Approvals programme which seem problematic as presented.

Each formal Prior Approval is preceded by an Informal Consultation period (also notionally 8 weeks in length). The gap between the Informal Consultation and the formal Prior Approval element in some cases seems very large (i.e. time is being wasted) and is increasing. The reason for this is not clear.

What is the reason?

Programme of Technical Approvals

tie do not have direct sight of the Technical Approvals programme which SDS are working to with CEC. Technical Approvals are something which CEC are not content with and naturally they look to **tie** to resolve the problem. Whereas it is sensible for SDS and CEC to work together directly in order that SDS can deliver an 'approved' design, tie need to understand how the Technical Approvals other elements of the programme related. This is not clear.

Please provide a programme of Technical Approvals consistent with other activities in the Master Programme.

Programme of Consents

There is a requirement to gain consents across a variety of issues which as a minimum include:

- Consents for the permanent scheme
- Traffic Regulation Orders [TROs]
- Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders [TTROs]
- Network Rail
- Discharge Consents (water)
- Building Warrants
- Building Fixings for overhead line
- Other consents related to design

It is not clear to **tie** (from the Master Programme) what the programme for gaining such consents is.

Please provide a programme of consents consistent with other activities in the Master Programme.

Design Deliverables Tracker and progress reporting

For two periods running we have seen programme slippage in excess of 1000 days. At the last Critical Issues meeting we discussed some of the background to this and the view expressed was that this may not be 'mission critical' and that the issues were well understood.

There are two issues:

1. It is worth noting that prior to the publication of each tracker we appear to have no insight that significant slippage is about to occur. If there is this insight it is not communicated unambiguously to **tie**. Whereas we are all aware (from the Critical Issues meeting) what the current issues are, gaining meaningful insight into them in terms of broad quantum and cause seems difficult, as does providing forecasts with each tracker.
2. When each Master Programme version is issued we appear to be presented with a fait accompli – a programme which has emerged from some analysis and action which is not visible to **tie** which purports to represent the impact of issues arising.

It is clear that if we are to feel comfortable with the assertion that the current emerging delays are not 'mission-critical' we need more transparent insights than we have, and we need to accompany them with meaningful forecasts.

By way of example, attached to this note (email) is a schedule of deliverables where the IFC date for the designs is past, or close to, the planned construction date. Eventually BBS will have to redefine their construction programme to be compatible, but it is not clear what threat this may represent to overall programme achievement.

How can we gain more meaningful insights into programme revisions, their underlying causes and the creation of meaningful forecasts?

Management Reporting

A theme through all the above points is the impression created that programme revisions are treated mechanistically and that what we receive by way of programme revision is what emerges from changing certain specified programme elements but keeping all other programme dependencies and elements unchanged.

What is not obvious to **tie** is where management thinking may have been applied to each programme revision to mitigate any adverse impact of events. Programme revisions do not feel like 'management forecasts'.

How can we achieve genuine management forecasts?

I hope we can discuss and agree resolution of these issues soon.

David

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.
