
From: Graeme Bissett [graeme.bissett@██████████]
Sent: 09 April 2006 16:33
To: 'Ian Kendall'
Cc: 'Michael Howell'; 'James Papps'; 'Stewart McGarrity'; Fitchie, Andrew
Subject: Tram - various key matters

Ian, I'm responding on a number of emails from last week – briefly here because you, Michael and me are together tomorrow 12 noon. The areas I'd like to cover tomorrow and then feeding into Tuesday's session are :

Readiness review

1. TOR :
 - a. Assessment should apply also to Tramco as the two are closely linked
 - b. Should outline criteria for assessing questions 1 (release of ITN) and 2 (team readiness)
 - c. Scope excludes the TEL viability dimension – maybe they haven't focussed on its importance but I'd suggest they are alerted to it and make their own decision on work required by them
 - d. Does the scope adequately address the approach to containing, negotiating down or otherwise engineering out cost ?
 - e. What about interface with MUDFA ?
2. What knowledge of this review do 1) CEC and 2) TS have and how is their involvement & review of output being organised ?
3. Perceived weaknesses in governance – do we understand what's of concern to PUK ?
4. How does this review fit with other external / peer reviews programmed ?

Overall revised programme (“25 May”)

1. There are a number of inter-related activities and approvals in the very short term. The revised programme, including the revised approach to contractor involvement, arguably warrants a revision to the OBC and is presumably also the basis on which the readiness review should be performed. How are we coordinating 1) OBC review by CEC ; 2) OBC review by TS/KPMG ; 3) ITN detailed document review by CEC ; 4) as 3 by TS/KPMG ; 5) Readiness review ; 6) Infracore related amends to DPOFA ; 7) resolution of TEL / Tram team debate on design issues which affect the ITN. 3,4, 5 and 7 were not anticipated as being precursors to ITN issue, now they are critical-path – is there a detailed programme coordinating all of this and who is in charge of it day to day ? Another feature which will cause difficulty is version control over documents being reviewed by so many people simultaneously – how is this being managed ? I see the timetable in the DLA paper, but it does not seem to hit all the details adequately, probably not intended to do so. It also refers to a “tie Project Board” – we should try to get the terminology sorted.
2. Is MUDFA now expected to be signed by end June ? What is process for review and approval by all relevant parties ?

3. Might be worth keeping the land & property workstream visible on a high level programme like this ?
4. Afraid I'm not clear what the substance of line 20 is, appears critical so can we discuss ? Is this the "early contractor involvement" described in Andrew's other paper ? The logic of the contractor involvement looks sensible to a layman like me, but what do you anticipate to be the contractors' reaction, bearing in mind existing lack of widespread enthusiasm ? Does this also offer an antidote to the risk arising from progressive delivery of tram design information into the tender process ?
5. What does this revised process, including contractor involvement, do to the cost estimates (aggregate rather than timing) which are set out in OBC ?
6. Are the approval processes for dealing with TTROs, TROs, tram vehicle design / look (including eg advertising), CEC planner issues, full Council communication / involvement all adequately programmed at a more detailed level ? ie the issues which are most likely to cause further delay, no doubt I've missed a few.
7. Need to bear in mind concurrent publication of the Business Plan, programmes to be aligned so far as possible presumably now around the 25 May timetable.
8. What actions to manage market perception of delay ?
9. How do these documents relate to the traffic light document we looked at last week – presumably they will be brought together into governing document (s) which people will be working to ?
10. Latest views on PQQ outcome and the related issue of resistance to Tramco novation ?

Design issues and governance /decisions

I've seen several apparently conflicting documents about this including Keith's comments, Bill Campbell's comments, Neil Renilson's comments and the original draft letter from you to David Hutcheson. I appreciate that this is a very detailed and technically challenging process, but it does strike me that there is in fact underlying broad agreement on the process : there needs to be a baseline set of assumptions (tram optimised or similar) against which some key testing is performed, notably the effect on total TEL financial viability and the wider transport (PT and car) implications. It is not obvious to me that – in principle – a baseline of maximising tram speed (the existing letter) is any more or less appropriate than a baseline of minimising impact on buses (Neil's proposal) IF the baseline is a place to start and subsequent iteration will highlight deficiencies in the baseline proposition in the wider TEL context. In practice, you will want to start where the collective experience suggests the end result is likely to emerge, to minimise spurious iterations.

If we can get to the most sensible baseline, present the iteration process and ensure full visibility and involvement of all relevant parties then we might get past these concerns. This has to be a key objective for Tuesday.

Roll-over funding and 2006-7 funding

Stewart has been progressing and I'll bring you up to date when we meet, to the extent you're not already. May be a need to press for early resolution of the funding for the TEL backfill, including LB MD.

TEL / tie roles

As for funding.

Tram team organisation

Are we discussing tomorrow or have you / MH already agreed on this ? If the latter, I'd appreciate a sight of the proposal.

Agenda for 11/4

I don't want to shoot for the moon, but do we want to have the overall approach to DPOFA renegotiation and separately the approach to safety management also in view ?

Regards

Graeme

Graeme Bissett

m : 