

---

**From:** Sharp DP (Damian)  
**Sent:** 01 March 2007 00:24  
**To:** Reeve W (Bill)  
**Cc:** Spence M (Matthew); Davis L (Lorna)  
**Subject:** Trams advert

Bill

We discussed that this had been raised at the tie board and Monday and agreed there without you knowing that there had been a previous discussion at the Tram Project Board.

I am comfortable with the advert and the lines to take given by tie and CEC. I would have preferred to know so that we could have been on the front foot with this.

This is not a big issue and when less tired I would be amused rather than peeved but there is a more significant set of issues surrounding this relatively trivial issue. These amount to several systems failures which could be more of a problem in relation to other issues.

Dealing first with our own system failures:

- I didn't do a note following last week's TPB and should have – pressure of time has been particularly bad but we will pay the price if I don't
- You didn't tell us this had been agreed at the tie board – no doubt you have had the same problems as I

We have both made good resolutions and will continue to try to abide by them but need to reflect on ways of making it easier to keep them.

Turning to some project system failures:

- tie were obliged to tell us about anything they are giving to the press and did not – yet again they have not kept to the communications protocol
- an issue was taken to the tie board that had been considered by the Tram Project Board – this is a clear breach of the governance agreed for the tram project and is why we were so insistent that the TPB could not be a sub-committee of either the tie or the TEL boards. Quite simply the tie board does not have any decision-making role in the tram project other than in instructing/advising its representative on any issues that come back to it. Clearly the board hasn't grasped this.
- different information was given to the TPB and tie board – at the TPB we were told that utilities diversions were programmed for early April so there was no need for any notices to issue this week – they could have waited until next week – yet it would appear that the tie board thought there was potential advantage in publishing the notice because it might allow diversions in March
- incomplete information was given to the tie board – my understanding is that TTROs require both general notices in the press and specific notices to the affected frontagers. We are assured that the letters to frontagers were not sent and so the 28-day clock has not actually started ticking.

If we had such a cumulative systems failure in future then there might be a significant risk exposure so we need to tackle all of these as part of the governance workstream.

So I have decided to view this as a cheap opportunity to tackle these issues and will discuss with Matthew how we reflect this in the governance paper.

Damian