From: Willie Gallagher
Sent: 13 September 2007 12:44
To: Reynolds, Steve
Subject: RE: DPD minutes 30 Aug

Steve

In paris.

Call me tomorrow.

willie

-----Original Message-----
From: "Reynolds, Steve" <ReynoldsS@pbworld.com>
To: "Willie.Gallagher@tie.ltd.uk" <Willie.Gallagher@tie.ltd.uk>
Sent: 13/09/07 12:24
Subject: RE: DPD minutes 30 Aug

Willie

Following receipt of your email I have carried out an investigation.
Rather than setting out the detailed findings in an email I believe it would be better if we could speak directly to review the conclusions I
have reached. Please could you let me know when would be most
convenient for a call?

Thanks and Regards - Steve

From: Willie Gallagher [mailto:Willie.Gallagher@tie.ltd.uk]
Sent: 11 September 2007 19:07
To: David Crawley; Reynolds, Steve; Matthew Crosse
Cc: Elliot Scott; Stewart McGarrity; Jim Harries (Transdev); Alastair Richards - TEL; Susan Clark; James.Papps@partnershipsuk.org.uk; Duncan Fraser - CEC; Miriam Thorne; Steven Bell; Geoff Gilbert; Trudi Craggs; Keith Rimmer; rebecca.andrew@edinburgh.gov.uk; NRenilson@LothianBuses.co.uk; WWCampbell@LothianBuses.co.uk; Graeme Bissett (external contact); Tony Glazebrook; Jim McEwan
Subject: RE: DPD minutes 30 Aug

My only comment is that I am waiting to see the deliverables for this week. At my meeting this morning, it did not look positive. We must achieve these milestone targets for the reviews, we are getting all the resources lined up and then not following through. Susan has an action to update me on Monday and I will take it from there.

Willie

From: David Crawley
Sent: 11 September 2007 17:33
To: Reynolds, Steve; Matthew Crosse
Cc: Elliot Scott; Willie Gallagher; Stewart McGarrity; Jim Harries (Transdev); Alastair Richards - TEL; Susan Clark; James.Papps@partnershipsuk.org.uk; Duncan Fraser - CEC; Miriam Thorne; Steven Bell; Geoff Gilbert; Trudi Craggs; Keith Rimmer; rebecca.andrew@edinburgh.gov.uk; NRenilson@LothianBuses.co.uk; WWCampbell@LothianBuses.co.uk; Graeme Bissett (external contact); Tony Glazebrook; Jim McEwan
Subject: RE: DPD minutes 30 Aug

Steve,

As these comments are ascribed to me I think I need to say two things:

(1) I agree that PB are now delivering - and have said so in all the forums you mention.

(2) Although the term 'excuse' is rather emotive, it farly represents a real concern within tie, and certainly with me, that we can easily fall back into a culture (of both tie and PB) of letter writing and demands for instruction before action. The original vision for the SDS contract was of a competent designer who would take the lead on everything from design to approvals and we have moved a long way away from that. We have begun the move back towards the original vision (recognising as we do that tie must also take on an active role). When we are there, concerns such as this will not apply. We are on our way, but it doesn't feel comfortable yet.

David

From: Reynolds, Steve [mailto:ReynoldsS@pbworld.com]
Sent: Tue 11/09/2007 15:57
To: Matthew Crosse
Cc: Elliot Scott; Willie Gallagher; Stewart McGarrity; Jim Harries (Transdev); Alastair Richards - TEL; Susan Clark; James.Papps@partnershipsuk.org.uk; Duncan Fraser - CEC; Miriam Thorne; Steven Bell; Geoff Gilbert; Trudi Craggs; Keith Rimmer; rebecca.andrew@edinburgh.gov.uk; NRenilson@LothianBuses.co.uk; WWCampbell@LothianBuses.co.uk; Graeme Bissett (external contact); Tony Glazebrook; David Crawley; Jim McEwan
Subject: RE: DPD minutes 30 Aug

Dear Matthew

As a consequence of my standing invitation to attend the DPD I have, as

usual, been provided with a copy of the Report on the last meeting: - the meeting I was unable to attend due to being on Annual leave. I have decided to write to you to express my concern over the minuting of item 6.2:-

"Decline in lack of progress has been arrested. DCr's view is that it will continue to improve providing we stay on top of SDS and give them no excuse not to deliver. "

I would suggest that this minute fails to report the very real achievements of the last three months. Looking back on the Critical Issues initiative from February through June it is clear that delays to programme resulted from the lack of timely decision making by some of the Stakeholders. During the same period SDS was working closely with Geoff Gilbert on the definition of the procurement programme and with the passing of each week the risk that the procurement programme could not be met was increasing. By mid-June the position had become serious so, working with David Crawley, SDS presented a strategy to the 21 June Critical Issues Meeting which was based on calling a halt to further optioneering and moving to complete the design on the basis of the best information available at the time. My follow-up letter to tie stated:-

"It is now twelve months since the SDS Preliminary Design was delivered and with the extended consultation on design options through the period since then it is our view that what has been developed is so close to optimum that there is nothing to be gained by delaying the completion of the detailed design while further possible refinements are investigated. In our view the major risk is not that the design may be 99% optimum rather than 100%; it is that further optioneering may delay completion of the programme to the point where cancellation of the scheme results."

The letter continued:-

"For the avoidance of doubt we understand that should it be decided subsequently to revisit the design, (other than for reasons of non-conformance with standards), the risk of programme prolongation and increased costs remains with tie. As we have already suggested, though, we believe the risk to tie of not proceeding on the agreed basis would be substantially higher."

Having proposed this approach, and with the buy-in of all parties under David Crawley's leadership, the delivery rate to tie of SDS design packages accelerated significantly. The first SDS programme release following the 21 June meeting was on 02 July. The accompanying chart shows actual delivery achievement for design packages, (from a total to be delivered of approximately 300), against the target set on that date, i.e. 10 weeks ago now. I submit that the chart presents a compelling argument for the close correlation between on-target SDS performance and

resolution of long outstanding Critical Issues.

Returning to the minute on item 6.2 I am disappointed at the implication that SDS requires someone to "stay on top of them" to enforce delivery in line with the programme. PB is committed to playing its full part in the delivery of a successful Tram Network. The events which I have outlined above provide but one example of the constructive approach we have taken to that end. It may be that the minute is simply intended to reinforce tie's role as overall programme manager for Tram, but I also infer from what has been written a criticism that PB is in some way looking for excuses not to deliver. I can imagine no scenario in which this would be in PB's interest. We pride ourselves on operating as efficiently as possible in a multi-disciplinary engineering environment and I can assure you that we would not spend time searching for excuses in the manner implied. Quite the opposite. It is worth adding that when problems have arisen which have been due to failure by PB we have been open and honest in our reporting of those events. The chart referred to above, for example, is based on weekly review of status conducted jointly and thoroughly with tie.

If PB were seeking excuses not to deliver it need look no further than items 6.3. 6.4, and 6.5 of the DPD Meeting Report. There is a certain irony in these items following immediately from item 6.2 since they highlight three issues which have been outstanding for some considerable time - since February in fact. Throughout that period SDS has been working diligently with tie and the other parties involved to facilitate closure.

Based on this assessment I would ask that you reconsider the wording of item 6.2 of the DPD Report. I am aware that by now the Report will have been presented to the Tram Project Board and whilst I have not copied this response to TPB out of respect for the formal communications policy I would ask that you convey my observations at an appropriate time.

During my time in Edinburgh I have sought to take a balanced view of the issues confronting us and beyond any personal or corporate issue over the tenor of the minutes my main concern is that all parties should recognise the underlying reasons for delays to date. That is essential if we are to look forward with confidence to the successful delivery of the Edinburgh Tram Network. I will close by reiterating PB's absolute commitment to working with you to deliver that goal

Sincerely

Stephen Reynolds

PB

SDS Project Director

From: Elliot Scott [mailto:Elliot.Scott@tie.ltd.uk]
Sent: 05 September 2007 11:43
To: Willie Gallagher; Matthew Crosse; Stewart McGarrity; Jim Harries (Transdev); Alastair Richards - TEL; Susan Clark; James.Papps@partnershipsuk.org.uk; Duncan Fraser; Miriam Thorne; Steven Bell; Geoff Gilbert; Trudi Craggs; Keith Rimmer; rebecca.andrew@edinburgh.gov.uk; NRenilson@LothianBuses.co.uk; WWCampbell@LothianBuses.co.uk; Elliot Scott; Graeme Bissett; Tony Glazebrook; David Crawley; Reynolds, Steve; Jim McEwan
Subject: DPD minutes 30 Aug

Hi all,

Sorry my previous email still had the track changes on!

Please find attached the minutes form the DPD on 30 Aug.

Can you please update me with any actions prior to the next meeting?

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Thanks

Elliot

Elliot Scott

Project Reporting Assistant

tie limited

Citypoint

65 Haymarket Terrace

Edinburgh EH12 5HD

Tel: +44([redacted]

Email: elliot.scott@tie.ltd.uk

<mailto:elliot.scott@elliot.scott@tie.ltd.uk>

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.

_____