

TfGM - Gateway Review Panel

Scheme: **SEMMMS Relief Road**

Head of PMS:

Stage: **3a**

Project Manager: **SMBC**

SUMMARY SHEET

Date of Review: **5th July 2012**

Overall Score	2	Some medium issues exist and the Business Case is not fully compliant, however a qualified approval is recommended	1	No issues of note with the business case Rework not required Recommendation: Clear Approval
Review Panel Chairman Comments		<p>The documentation for SEMMMS suggested that its current stage of development was between TfGM's PMP Gateway 2 and 3a. Gateway 2 was considered to be a retrograde step and so in order to accelerate the process the decision was made to submit at 3a with an expectation that areas of development would be identified.</p> <p>This review was based on the documentation provided by Stockport Council, while the information in the submission appeared to have a good breadth of coverage across all project areas it lacked some depth in detail. Further discussion with the Stockport project team would certainly highlight where improvements could be made. Making these improvements would allow the business case to be strengthened and the GRP score reduced.</p>	2	Some medium issues exist BC not fully compliant with requirements Some rework may be advisable Recommendation: Qualified Approval
			3	Medium / Significant issues exist BC not fully compliant with requirements Rework advisable Recommendation: Rework Required
			4	Major / Critical issues exist BC not compliant. Major rework required. Recommendation: Clear Rejection

Review Issues and Recommendations

Issue	Recommendation
1 Costing - Limited information provided to date on future revenue costs. Requires additional future work.	Further work and quantification on ongoing revenue maintenance and renewals costs required
2 Land acquisition - Without the land agents report and a firm plan on how the acquisition will be conducted it is difficult to quantify if the timescales are realistic and the risk apportioned is appropriate.	More development required on the land acquisition strategy to secure possessions, including modelling risk to cover multiple scenarios.
3 Due to SEMMMS being developed in isolation from the PMP there are some areas of the project that are less well developed than the average TfGM project. These specific areas are detailed in the GRP Summary Report sections	Action the various recommendations from the GRP Summary Report (VfM & Appraisal, Procurement, Legal and Evaluation).

Strategic Alignment	1	There are no issues and risks to note associated with the project's strategic alignment. SEMMMS objectives are commensurate with the LTP's objectives of supporting international connectivity, improving ground access to the airport and using transport systems to stimulate economic growth.
Governance	2	Judging on the documentation provided it appears as if there is still some medium issues to overcome in defining the people, functions and processes by which this project will be delivered, however, given the stage of the project these can be readily addressed.
VfM & Appraisal	3	Due to revised scope of scheme, all economic appraisal work is being re-done. Results due by mid-Sept. SMBC expect a similar result for the revised scope scheme.
Benefits Management	1	The Benefits Realisation Plan is clear, concise and demonstrates a logical method for identifying, baselining and monitoring the Scheme Specific Objectives
Finance & Funding	2	Based on due diligence work performed by EC Harris on behalf of TfGM on the project costs, and on the basis that the Ringway Road Highway Works have been funded separately from LTP and Prudential Borrowings (as approved by GMCA in May 2011), the revised cost analysis based on EC Harris's work is within the £290 million of funding available. Lower scores have been given for the elements relating to future revenue and renewals costs where additional future work is required to quantify costs.
Risk Management	2	We've found that the principles of risk management being undertaken by the project reflect best practice; but the identification and assessment of the risks need to be addressed, so a robust contingency allowance can be estimated and mitigation strategy be established.
Schedule & Resources	2	Some medium issues exist. This section is not fully compliant. Rework is advised. Recommendation: Qualified Approval
Procurement & Contract Management	3	It is recommended that further work is done to focus on completing and agreeing the procurement strategy with focus on: a single procurement bundle, the target price; how risk allocation, and whether or not the advantages of ECI can be achieved in other ways that provide a greater level of price certainty and value for money.
Stakeholder Management	2	SMBC were able to outline a broad approach to stakeholder engagement which reflected the TfGM approach. They have sought to be proactive, and have tried to incorporate stakeholder feedback into design to prevent problems.
Design & Engineering	1	Some minor issues with regards to Actual Design to be adopted and material specification which would be addressed at future Gateways and through ongoing development
Health & Safety	3	The documents reviewed contain virtually no reference to how H&S is being managed through the project life cycle. However after meeting with the project team it is evident that work has been undertaken but not described or included in the documentation.
Legal	3	The main risks to this project are land acquisition and planning. Stockport need to work to ensure that these issues are identified in terms of legal process and progressed with allowance made for the same in the programme and budget.
Deliver Strategy	1	At this stage, it is to be expected that the Delivery Strategy is not developed to any great degree. Strategies presented in the Benefits Realisation Plan, PID, Procurement Strategy and Project Management Plan all indicate to their being a common understand of how to transition to BAU, and it is anticipated that this will be further developed prior to the next Gateway Review
Transition/Integration		n/a - Not relevant at this stage of the project
Evaluation & Monitoring	3	A detailed programme of activity proposed but, at present, not costed. Evaluation plan would benefit considerably from specification of scheme-specific DfT and local evaluation objectives, in terms of the focus and scale of monitoring & evaluation activity.
Overall Rating	2	

TfGM - Gateway Review Panel

Scheme: **SEMMMS Relief Road**

Specialist Reviewer **David McGovern**

Stage: **3a**

Project Manager **SMBC**

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

Date of Review **5th July 2012**

Overall Rating for STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT	1	<i>From a Strategic perspective there are no issues and risks to note.</i>	1	No issues of note with this business case section Rework not required Recommendation: Clear Approval
Specialist Reviewer Comments		<i>Add comment here</i>	2	Some medium issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework may be advisable Recommendation: Qualified Approval
			3	Medium / Significant issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework advisable Recommendation: Qualified Rejection
			4	Major / Critical issues exist This section is not compliant. Major rework required. Recommendation: Rejection

Review Issues and Recommendations

Issue	Recommendation
1 <i>Add issue here</i>	<i>Add recommendation here</i>
2 <i>Add issue here</i>	<i>Add recommendation here</i>
3 <i>Add issue here</i>	<i>Add recommendation here</i>

Detailed Checklist

Item	Status	Comments
1 Background - Explain the origin of the project idea and the context in which it was developed. Who mandated its development? How was this option chosen?	Requirements Met	<i>The project has been a long term aspiration of TfGM and AGMA.</i>
2 Description - Clearly describe the scope of the project in terms of the tangible output that will be delivered.	Requirements Met	<i>It is clear what the output is.</i>
3 Objectives - Clearly describe the objectives of the project. Use the SMART model to validate how the output can be achieved.	Requirements Met	<i>No comments.</i>
4 Strategic Alignment - To which KBP does this project best contribute? Explain why this project addresses the chosen KBP.	Requirements Met	<i>The project reflects TfGM priorities in relation to the overall delivery of our business plan as it supports the Greater Manchester Strategy and is specifically referred to as part of Key Business Priority 3.</i>
5 Assumptions - In the early stages clearly state all assumptions required to progress the project.	Requirements Met	<i>Outlined in the document.</i>
6 Interdependencies & Interfaces - Does the proposed project interface with any other piece of work underway. Seek efficiencies and synergies where possible.	Requirements Met	<i>Outlined in the document.</i>

TfGM - Gateway Review Panel

Scheme: SEMMMS Relief Road	Specialist Reviewer Stephen Chapman
Stage: 3a	Project Manager SMBC
GOVERNANCE	Date of Review 5th July 2012

Overall Rating for GOVERNANCE	2	From the documentation provided it appears as if there is still some issues to overcome in defining the people, functions and processes by which this project will be further developed and delivered.	1	No issues of note with this business case section Rework not required Recommendation: Clear Approval
Specialist Reviewer Comments		As this project is to be delivered by three local authorities (led by Stockport) the nature of how it should be governed is quite complex. As the project is already underway it would be expected that areas such as approvals, decision making, processes and procedures and roles and responsibilities are well defined by this stage. Some specific issues are stated below and recommendations for areas of improvement.	2	Some medium issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework may be advisable Recommendation: Qualified Approval
			3	Medium / Significant issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework: advisable Recommendation: Qualified Rejection
			4	Major / Critical issues exist This section is not compliant. Major rework required. Recommendation: Rejection

Review Issues and Recommendations

Issue	Recommendation
1 Approvals/Delegated Authority does not seem to have been formally handed to Stockport to manage the project.	A Delivery Agreement/SLA/Contract could be designed, circulated and aged to clarify how decisions will be made and what levels of escalation will be used within the project organisation. This should also acknowledge how decision making external to the project organisation will be managed (DfT/GMCA/Airport etc).
2 As this project is being jointly delivered by three separate authorities there are obvious questions regarding who's governance framework will be used, it is not clearly identified in the submission.	Considering the project is underway, there has been a significant amount of design work already completed and procurement activity will soon commence a decision should be made as soon as possible about which governance framework will be used going forward for the SEMMMS project. This will also need to be agreed and approved by all parties.
3 This is a high profile, high cost project and will certainly be subject to audit at some stage during its lifecycle and possibly afterwards. Whilst it states in the submission that audit requirements will be satisfied it stops short of listing which standards the project is being managed in accordance with.	Create an assurance plan that allows project information controlled and archived periodically using an information management plan that would facilitate the retrieval of information when required. Work with audit bodies to best understand points at which information will need to be presented for audit. These actions should appear in the cost and resource plans.
4 It is acknowledged that there is a need to provide reporting, the documentation suggests that this is yet to be decided and the Project Controls Manager hasn't been engaged.	A Project Controls function should be engaged as soon as possible to define how the project will present information to board members, decide on the metrics used for the checks and balances and begin providing information that will allow efficient monitoring and control of the project.
5 Some key roles are missing from the roles & responsibilities section and costs don't seem to be accounted for.	Add TfGM support as well as a dedicated Risk Manager, Project Controls Manager and Finance Manager to the project team.

Detailed Checklist

Item	Status	Comments
1 PMP/ProgMP - Has the correct procedure/route been selected to govern the project?	Requirements Met	Although this is not a TfGM project it will be subject to the same internal standards. As a result of this it has been decided that it will be a Route 5 project following the Project Management Procedures (PMP).
2 Gateway Review Process (GRP) - Is there a clear understanding of TfGM's approvals process? Have submission dates been built into the schedule?	Requirements Met	Submission dates have been built into the schedule for the PMP Gateway Review and appear to be realistic at this stage.
3 Strategies & Plans - Is there a clear understanding of the PM's responsibility to devise a plan to each aspect of the project from TfGM's strategies.	Requirements Partially Met	As this project is delivered by a three separate councils it is to be expected that there are no corporate strategies quoted. However, individual plans should be well advanced. Although there seems to be a plan for most aspects of the project the detail is insufficient for project of this size.

TfGM - Gateway Review Panel

Scheme: **Semms Road Scheme**

Specialist Reviewer **Ian Palmer**

Stage: **3a**

Project Manager **SMBC**

VFM & APPRAISAL

Date of Review **15th Aug 2012**

Overall Rating for VFM & APPRAISAL	3	Due to revised scope of scheme, all economic appraisal work is being re-done. Results due by mid-Sept. SMBC expect a similar result for the revised scope scheme.	1	No issues of note with this business case section Rework not required Recommendation: Clear Approval
Specialist Reviewer Comments		The previous scheme appraisal was produced with a robust set of modelling tools. The BCR for the previous scheme was 4.65. SMBC expect a similar result for the revised scope scheme.	2	Some medium issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework may be advisable Recommendation: Qualified Approval
			3	Medium / Significant issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework advisable Recommendation: Qualified Rejection
			4	Major / Critical issues exist This section is not compliant. Major rework required. Recommendation: Rejection

Review Issues and Recommendations

Issue	Recommendation
1 Analysis in the economic case is not supporting the strategic case for the scheme	Agreed that TfGM will work with SMBC and Atkins to ensure the strategic and economic cases complement each other in the revised MSBC submission to DfT.
2 BCR of 18 is incorrectly calculated and is misleading. I also think the quoted 11,000 jobs is incorrect.	Agreed that this will not appear in the revised economic appraisal
3 Add issue here	Add recommendation here

Detailed Checklist

Item	Status	Comments
1 Options Analysis (AST) - Analysis of how this project came to be preferred option and which lower cost alternatives were considered.	Not Applicable	tbc pending the revised submission
2 Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) - Is the BCR robust and does it represent value for money? Clear explanation of the method to be used to assess benefits and how the BCR was derived.	Not Applicable	tbc pending the revised submission
3 Gross Value Added (GVA) - GVA assessment appears to be robust, and shows strong impact on GVA / employment?	Not Applicable	tbc pending the revised submission
4 Economic Appraisal Overview - Define the 'do-nothing' and 'do-minimum' options. Explain how the preferred option was decided. Present the findings in a Summary Appraisal Table (AST).	Not Applicable	tbc pending the revised submission
5 Supporting material - Any additional supporting material (metrics, statements, impacts, WebTAG guidance, baseline validation, environmental assessment).	Not Applicable	tbc pending the revised submission

TfGM - Gateway Review Panel

Scheme: SEMMMS Relief Road	Specialist Reviewer EC Harris
Stage: 3a	Project Manager SMBC
BENEFITS REALISATION	Date of Review 02/07/2012

Overall Rating for BENEFITS REALISATION	<div style="background-color: #2e8b57; color: white; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;">1</div> <i>The Benefits Realisation Plan is clear, concise and demonstrates a logical method for identifying, baselining and monitoring the Scheme Specific Objectives</i>	<div style="background-color: #2e8b57; color: white; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;">1</div> No issues of note with this business case section Rework not required Recommendation: Clear Approval
Specialist Reviewer Comments	<i>As is expected, at this stage the Benefits Realisation Plan does not address detail below the high level strategic objectives, and does not address any specific benefits for individual areas / organisations which would be developed in the next stage and in the approach to Public Inquiry. At this stage, the benefits realisation plan presents a concise and practical approach to the measurement of projects benefits.</i>	<div style="background-color: #ffff00; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;">2</div> Some medium issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework may be advisable Recommendation: Qualified Approval
		<div style="background-color: #ffa500; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;">3</div> Medium / Significant issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework advisable Recommendation: Qualified Rejection
		<div style="background-color: #ff0000; color: white; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;">4</div> Major / Critical issues exist This section is not compliant. Major rework required. Recommendation: Rejection

Review Issues and Recommendations

Issue	Recommendation
1	
2	
3	

Detailed Checklist

Item	Status	Comments
1 Outline Benefits - Describe the anticipated financial and non-financial benefits, including an explanation of the current baseline state.	Requirements Partially Met	<i>The Benefits Realisation Plan is centred around the 3 Local Authorities. It addresses the 6 key Scheme Objectives. The 2 key issues here are whether there are specific detailed benefits within the various commitments of the business case. Additionally, a mechanism for incorporating benefits which are emphasised or developed as part of the Public Inquiry would be needed. It would be expected that this level of detail would be developed as the project continues</i>
2 Benefit Profiling - Define the measures that will be used to assess benefits, attach a quantitative unit where possible.	Requirements Met	<i>The Benefits Realisation Plan stipulates a methodology that, notwithstanding the above comments, describes an effective way of collating this data. At this stage, the method is described at high level, and as the scheme progresses, it would be expected that the detail would be developed</i>
3 Benefit Mapping - Create a benefit map that indicates how each of the anticipated benefits follows from the project output to strategic objective.	Requirements Met	<i>The strategy contains a mapping table which links Issues to Scheme Specific Objective to WebTAG Impact Classifications. Again, at this stage the problems this addresses do not contain specifics and detail, which would be developed as the project progresses</i>
4 Benefit Integration - As part of the transition of project output into BAU explain what steps will need to be taken to integrate the project output into a new capability.	Requirements Met	<i>Insofar as progression to BAU requires specific actions, a mitigation measures plan is identified and referred to within the Benefits Realisation Model. Other than that, given the level of detail presented at present, a detailed transition to BAU would not be expected at this time.</i>
5 Benefit Appraisal - Define how statements and assessment in benefits appraisal are correct, supportable and understandable.	Requirements Met	<i>At this stage, the high level nature of the benefits are expressed as resolution of issues affecting the are. This is acceptable at this stage, and it would be expected that more detail would be generated as the project progresses towards Public Inquiry</i>

TfGM - Gateway Review Panel

Scheme: **SEMMMS A6 to Manchester Airport**

Specialist Reviewer **David Daughney**

Stage: **Gateway 3A**

Project Manager **SMBC**

FINANCE & FUNDING

Date of Review 15/08/2012

Overall Rating for FINANCE & FUNDING	2	Based on due diligence work performed by EC Harris on behalf of TfGM on the project costs, and on the basis that the Ringway Road Highway Works have been funded separately from LTP and Prudential Borrowings (as approved by GMCA in May 2011), the revised cost analysis based on EC Harris's work is within the £290 million of funding available. Lower scores have been given for the elements relating to future revenue and renewals costs where additional future work is required to quantify costs.	1	No issues of note with this business case section Rework not required Recommendation: Clear Approval
Specialist Reviewer Comments		EC Harris has reviewed the cost plans in detail and, after applying adjustments where considered appropriate, in particular for project risk; additional construction costs; and applying an appropriate allowance for indexation, the resultant costs for the A6 to Ringway Road works is between £285 – £290 million. This is to be funded from the following sources: DfT £165 million, Borrowings / Earn Back / Remaining LTP £125 million.	2	Some medium issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework may be advisable Recommendation: Qualified Approval
			3	Medium / Significant issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework advisable Recommendation: Qualified Rejection
			4	Major / Critical issues exist This section is not compliant. Major rework required. Recommendation: Rejection

Review Issues and Recommendations

Issue	Recommendation
1 Further work and quantification on ongoing revenue maintenance and renewals costs required	Add recommendation here
2 Add issue here	Add recommendation here
3 Add issue here	Add recommendation here

Detailed Checklist

Item	Status	Comments
1 Funding - Has a source been identified to fund the project? This should include details of revenue as well as capital expenditure.	Requirements Partially Met	Revised capital costs per EC Harris due diligence analysis is within funding available of £290 million. The EC Harris report notes that further work is required in certain areas to finalise costs however the revised costings provide for a commercially robust project. Additional work required on future revenue and renewals costs.
2 Affordability - Demonstrate how the overall project appears affordable against expected funding arrangements.	Requirements Partially Met	Revised capital costs are within the funding sources available as noted above. Additional work required on future revenue and renewals costs and funding.
3 Key data - Have all the required tables been completed appropriately, including prices, costs and format.	Not Applicable	
4 Capital Costs (CAPEX) - Are all capital costs fully scoped, clearly stated, robust and within expectations?	Requirements met	Robust costing analysis performed by EC Harris. Report notes some questions to be resolved however that the revised costs (as noted above) 'would provide for a commercially robust project'.
5 Revenue Costs (OPEX) - Are all revenue costs fully scoped, clearly stated, robust and within expectations?	Requirements Not Met	Limited information provided to date on future revenue costs. Requires additional future work.
6 Contingency - Is the contingency fully scoped, committed to the project, clearly stated, appears to be appropriate level and treatment?	Requirements met	Appropriate contingencies applied as per EC Harris report and within the funding envelope
7 Renewals - Are the renewals fully scoped, clearly stated, appear robust, in appropriate cost base, and within expectations?	Requirements Not Met	Limited information provided to date on future renewals costs. Requires additional future work.

TfGM - Gateway Review Panel

Scheme: SEMMMS Relief Road	Specialist Reviewer EC Harris
Stage: 3a	Project Manager SMBC
RISK MANAGEMENT	Date of Review 02 July 2012

Overall Rating for RISK MANAGEMENT	2	<p><i>We've found that the principles of risk management being undertaken by the project reflect best practice; but the identification and assessment of the risks need to be addressed, so a robust contingency allowance can be estimated and mitigation strategy be established.</i></p>	1	<p>No issues of note with this business case section Rework not required</p> <p>Recommendation: Clear Approval</p>
Specialist Reviewer Comments		<p><i>Our findings are detailed below against the following items:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk Management Approach • Reporting / Escalation • Register • Scoring • QRA • Contingency <p><i>It is recommended that the following issues are addressed to provide greater robustness to the risk management strategy and budget estimate.</i></p>	2	<p>Some medium issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework may be advisable</p> <p>Recommendation: Qualified Approval</p>
			3	<p>Medium / Significant issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework advisable</p> <p>Recommendation: Qualified Rejection</p>
			4	<p>Major / Critical issues exist This section is not compliant. Major rework required.</p> <p>Recommendation: Rejection</p>

Review Issues and Recommendations

Issue	Recommendation
1 Risk registers not sufficiently robust for both assessment and management purposes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed review of risk registers to include items identified as being deficient; ensuring robust and timely mitigation measures and assessments (likelihood & impact) are agreed by all parties • Detailed assessment of the schedule risks (and undertake a Schedule QRA) and ensure robust and timely mitigation measures and cost assessment of the schedule risks; for inclusion with risk register & Cost QRA
2 Assessment of allowance for Contingency (incl risk & OB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update Cost QRA to take risk register updates (as identified in 1 above) • Alignment of confidence values between land risk and construction risk or presentation of a strategy to support methodology • Separation of construction risk into contractor risk, client risk and sponsor risk (assuming SMBC are the client and TfGM are the sponsor) • Agreement by parties for the correct application of OB; moving towards less reliance upon OB and a greater reliance upon risk identification and quantification.
3 Contingency Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Risk Management Plan should be updated to detail how the contingency will be managed by the funding parties; and how that interfaces with the Project Change Management

Detailed Checklist

Item	Status	Comments
1 Risk Management Approach - Is the risk management plan appropriate and robust? Does it comply with TfGM guidance? Has an outline risk register been provided?	Requirements Partially Met	<p>The Risk Management Plan (RMP) is appropriate and robust; and reflects industry best practice. The RMP has been subject to an independent review in January 2012; which found it to be fit-for-purpose.</p> <p>Detailed risk registers (Land Costs & Project) have been provided.</p> <p>The RMP doesn't address the issue of Contingency Management i.e. who owns and manages the</p>
2 Reporting/Escalation - Are arrangements for reporting and escalating risks to the Programme board are in place?	Requirements Met	<p>Within the RMP reporting arrangements to the Project Board and responsibilities are clearly defined.</p>
3 Register - Appears to cover all material foreseeable risks, no obvious key risks missing and all required fields complete (risk owners, mitigations, scoring etc.).	Requirements Partially Met	<p>Of the risks identified and captured within the risk registers; the majority of the required fields have been completed. But there are number of issues with the information contained with the registers. These are listed in detail within the substantiation to these findings</p>
4 Scoring - Have recognised scoring and mitigation measures been used? Are risks appropriately mitigated, scored and valued?	Requirements Partially Met	<p>The Risk Management Plan contains a recognisable scoring matrix for the qualitative assessment of the risks (i.e. probability and impact - time, cost & quality); this matrix has been used within the risk registers only to assess the risk on a pre-mitigation basis; therefore unable understand or demonstrate what effect any mitigation measure would have.</p> <p>Within the Lands Cost Risk Register only 5 of the 19 risks have mitigation measures identified</p>
5 QRA - Are all key risks on the register are quantified appropriately within the QRA, and QRA can be substantiated against the risk register?	Requirements Partially Met	<p>The risks identified and contained within the registers have been quantified, save for the comments detailed in 3 & 4 above.</p> <p>The outputs of the Cost QRAs reflect the quantification of the risks contained within the registers. Different confidence levels have been used on the Land Costs QRA (P50 - Pre-mitigation Quantification) and Project QRA (P80 - Post mitigation Quantification); alignment of confidence values between land risk and construction risk, or presentation of a strategy to support methodology is required.</p>
6 Contingency - QRA and overall contingency (including OB where necessary) are broadly appropriate for the stage of project development?	Requirements Partially Met	<p>Following a review of the contingency allowances (for Land Costs risk, Project risk and Optimism Bias); we believe that the current risk allowance is lower than what we would normally see for a project at this stage, but the 44% allowance for OB is too high.</p> <p>So due to the issues identified above these allowances should be subject to a detailed re-assessment; this re-assessment should also address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of OB: agreement by parties for the correct application and calculation of OB; less reliance upon OB and a greater reliance upon risk identification and quantification. • Understand on the ownership of the risks between the funding parties, and who should manage the contingency allowances; so separation of construction risk into contractor risk, client risk and sponsor risk (assuming SMBC are the client and TfGM are the sponsor)

TfGM - Gateway Review Panel

Scheme: **SEMMMS Relief Road**

Stage: **3a**

Specialist Reviewer **Julian McCormick**

Project Manager **SMBC**

SCHEDULE

Date of Review **4th July 2012**

Overall Rating for SCHEDULE	2	Some medium issues exist. This section is not fully compliant. Rework is advised. Recommendation: Qualified Approval	1	No issues of note with this business case section Rework not required Recommendation: Clear Approval
Specialist Reviewer Comments		The schedule lack detail however it does give a high level representation of the critical path. The overall duration is deemed optimistic and challenging for a scheme of this complexity	2	Some medium issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework may be advisable Recommendation: Qualified Approval
		With respect to approvals, stakeholder interfaces and design productions, the submission timetable seems tight and does not address Statutory undertakers and Network Rail interfaces. Timescales for the Inquiry are optimistic, as is the allowance for the issue of the inspectors report, both of which are on the critical path and propose a significant risk to meeting the proposed completion date as these are not within the control of either client or the contractor. Timescales for consultation are deemed appropriate however it is not clear what assumptions have been made with regard to the land acquisition.	3	Medium / Significant issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework advisable Recommendation: Qualified Rejection
		The construction period is 24months which is deemed sufficient for the size and complexity of the scheme however it is not clearly understood why the schedule differs from the contractor consultant report produced by Balfours. This report details the sequencing of the major sections of the works. The schedule however shows a parallel overlapping of environmental mitigation measures with construction which gives a 3 month time saving over the contract duration, long lead items such as fabrication of major steel structures, reserving/ordering of large plant for bridge lifts will reduce this and these impacts should be considered further. On this basis the over all scheme duration could be 3-6 months short for this stage in the project. It is recommended that further review is carried out during the next phase to illustrate the achievability of the durations in question.	4	Major / Critical issues exist This section is not compliant. Major rework required. Recommendation: Rejection

Review Issues and Recommendations

Issue	Recommendation
1 Level of detail of the schedule	The schedule highlights the critical path in adequate detail, but does not cover any secondary paths that may become critical. It lacks detail related to the engagement with Network Rail and Statutory Undertakers. These are normally areas of concern and most schedules take these into account as it can have an impact on the start of construction.
2 Construction period	The period allowed for Construction and Environmental measure in the schedule is three months shorter than allowed by Balfours in their assessment. This may be the difference between the Optimistic and Pessimistic. Further information would be required to understand this fully
3 Statutory Diversions	Identify and incorporate critical diversions
4 Inspectors Report and Inquiry	Further consideration of timescales report can take up to 6 months
5 Design Approvals	Design approvals and interfaces have not been identified, HA, NR, TfGM

Detailed Checklist

Item	Status	Comments
1 Resources - Does the project have provision for sufficiently skilled resources to progress the project to its next Gateway.	Requirements Partially Met	QS and Commercial Management not disclosed, Co-ordinator role with Network Rail and Highways agency not identified. Definition of Roles and resources are adequate for size and nature of project. Major structures, 9 off, are to be built in the same time frame. Are there sufficient resources/suitable contractors to do the works. This may not be the most cost effective usage of resources /materials
2 Deliverables - Have each of the deliverables been stated with a realistic timeframe for delivery?	Requirements Partially Met	At Final Business case - Gateway 3a it is expected that a detailed delivery plan would form part of the submission. The schedule submitted is only high level, as such we can not conclude that all deliverables have been considered. It has been assumed that since the balfour report includes all major items the construction phase is based on the Balfour report. It is recommended that the delivery plan is submitted for the next review. Immediate timescales for internal approvals are behind schedule which may impact on the ability to submit the case in time. The time to present this will depend on how far advanced the current design/scoping has progressed. There is a difference between the Schedule and the Programme management plan, documents need aligning.
3 Schedule - Has a detailed schedule (TfGM/Contractor) been provided in appropriate format and required level of detail?	Requirements Partially Met	Overall schedule is based around what is deemed an appropriate critical path. More detail would be required to meet the requirements of TfGM. The schedule would normally have been produced using Primavera P6, though this is not a mandatory requirement. The planning team could consider bringing forward the Environmental mitigation, possibly by engaging early. Overlapping Environmental work with the major structure construction period. Balfours assessment indicates a period of 24 months for construction with 9 months for Environmental mitigation. Engagement with Statutory Undertakes is required early in the schedule, late diversions in some areas will hold up construction. These critical diversions should be identified in the programme where applicable. The schedule shows an overall period of 28 month for construction with Environmental mitigation taking 5 months, but overlapping with construction by 3 month. based on balfours time initial assessment and construction plan three month longer period for Environmental mitigation/Construction. In addition there are long lead items relating to the main structures which require a fabrication period
4 Completeness - Is the schedule complete with major GRP gateways/activities/milestones and achievable?	Requirements Met	Schedule covers Gateways 3a, 3b and 4. Also covers submission to exec board and DfT for Business Case approval. Covers the overall period from current status to handover Gateway 6. Covers all stage approval gateways, insufficient detail to substantiate.
5 Logic - Does the logic appear robust? Are timings, sequence, dependencies and critical path are sensible and appropriately linked?	Requirements Met	The critical path is shown through Public consultation period, Planning and CPO, DfT approval of scheme, the Public Inquiry process, Award of construction contract, and the construction period. Logic follows an established process and the time frame, with the exception of construction (Noted above).
6 Schedule Risk - Have major risks to achievement of the schedule have been fed in to the risk register (and QRA if appropriate)?	Requirements Met	Review the total period for Environment mitigation and overlap to construction Major Stakeholder impact. Check if SUs have any impact on schedule. A major rail possession will be required and timing will be in the hands of Network Rail. (Refer to recommendation regards interfaces)
7 Costs - Is the schedule properly cost/resource loaded (and matches the finance section)?	Requirements Not Met	No evidence of the schedule being cost loaded. More detail would be useful in assessing the costs. Overall cost profile lines up with the draft schedule. Start of major spending lines up with start on site, although spending on Land does not line up with the CPO process.

TFGM - Gateway Review Panel

Scheme:	Specialist Reviewer
Stage:	Project Manager
PROCUREMENT & CONTRACT MANAGEMENT	Date of Review

Overall Rating for PROCUREMENT & CONTRACT MANAGEMENT	3 Add summary here	1 No issues of note with this business case section. Rework not required. Recommendation: Clear Approval
Specialist Reviewer Comments	<p>Proposed Procurement Strategy</p> <p>The proposed Procurement Strategy is a 2 phase ECI. A contractor will be selected for phase 1 and 2 following an OJEU level procurement based on an outline design. During phase 1 the contractor will provide construction planning and estimating advice, provide evidence and support at the Public Inquiry, and will develop the preliminary design as necessary for these tasks. During Phase 2 the contractor (and its designer) will undertake detailed design and construction. If required by the Client, the Contractor may be instructed to carry out early detailed design during Phase 1. A target price will be negotiated before phase 2; the construction phase.</p> <p>Selection will be based on technical and commercial evaluation. The commercial evaluation is likely to be based on hourly rates and estimated number of hours for phase 1 and % fee rates for phase 2. Within approximately 15-20 weeks of the start of phase 1 an Initial Target Cost will be agreed which will be tested against the client estimate of construction costs. Provided that the Initial Target Cost (ITC) is agreed and within budget the contractor will go on to develop the preliminary design to resolve potential issues that could be raised at the Public Inquiry, and to seek value engineering savings before the end of phase 1.</p> <p>At the end of phase 1 a Final Target Cost (FTC) will be agreed based on the preliminary design (and any early detailed design that the Client may have instructed to that point). There may be an incentive payment where the FTC is lower than the ITC. If a target cost cannot be agreed, at either ITC or FTC, the client is able to return to the market.</p> <p>During Phase 2 (as construction progresses) the actual cost of construction will be compared against the target cost and a gain/pain share mechanism will apply.</p> <p>It is assumed that the full scheme will be procured as a single contract.</p> <p>Comments</p> <p>The proposed approach has the advantages of contractor input to the public enquiry and design and will allow buildability advice to be included. There are concerns that, at the point that the ITC and FTC are agreed, there is a reduced (or no) incentive to provide the most economically advantageous price/position for the client. It is not clear how this will be managed and achieved.</p> <p>The aim of cost certainty will not be achieved until the end of phase 1 and that is subject to how the gain/pain share mechanism is developed and how risks are allocated, priced and managed. I assume that the schedule, as it currently stands, would not accommodate a re-tendering exercise at the end of phase 1 if we are unable to agree a rate that is demonstrably value for money. Furthermore it is not clear how late client design changes will be managed.</p> <p>I understand that the alternative bundling strategies have been considered and the single contract is the preferred approach. The Procurement Strategy document does not explain this and it is therefore not possible to comment.</p> <p>Proposed Way Forward</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Procurement Strategy is still being developed. It is recommended that Stockport and TFGM work together to focus on completing and agreeing the procurement strategy with focus on: understanding the rationale for a single procurement bundle; how and when the target price will be agreed and managed; how risk will be allocated, priced and managed; and whether or not the advantages of ECI can be achieved in other ways that provide a greater level of comfort around price certainty and value for money.</p> <p>In addition to this we should jointly develop a governance approach that details TFGM's role and sign off of key points e.g agreed Procurement Strategy, agreed shortlist, supplier selection.</p>	2 Some medium issues exist. This section is not fully compliant. Rework may be advisable. Recommendation: Qualified Approval
		3 Medium / significant issues exist. This section is not fully compliant. Rework is advisable. Recommendation: Qualified Rejection
		4 Major / Critical issues exist. This section is not compliant. Major rework required. Recommendation: Rejection

Review Issues and Recommendations

Issue	Recommendation
1 Agreed procurement strategy	Develop a process over next few weeks to finalise and agree the Procurement Strategy
2 Governance	Develop a governance methodology that articulates TFGM's role particularly around sign off of procurement strategy; shortlist and supplier selection
3 Schedule	Adjust schedule to include standstill period; allow sufficient time for tender evaluation and accommodate governance requirements

Detailed Checklist

Item	Status	Comments
1 Compliance - Is the proposed procurement strategy and route compliant with legal and organisational requirements?	Requirements Partially Met	The proposed procurement route is compliant with legal requirements other than the current schedule allows 4 weeks for evaluation of the tenders, governance and standstill period. This has been discussed with Stockport and will be adjusted. Timescales will also need to be adjusted to ensure there is adequate time for Stockport's governance and TFGM's governance particularly around sign off of the final procurement strategy, sign off of the shortlist and sign off of the supplier selection. There is a slight risk that the selection may be challenged given Balfour Beatty's engagement under a PSC to provide initial advice. This risk can be mitigated by ensuring that sufficient time and access to information is given to all bidders to allow them to compete on an equal footing.
2 Value for Money - Is the proposed procurement strategy and route likely to maximise value for money?	Requirements Partially Met	Stockport and TFGM need to undertake further work to refine and agree the procurement strategy to ensure that value for money is maximized through an appropriate level of competitive pressure at later stages in the process. The current proposed strategy of a 2 stage ECI will result in selection of a contractor based on % fees against a client estimated construction cost. This will result in a more collaborative approach with contractor input to the design and support during the public enquiry stage. However it minimises the contractor's incentive to agree/facilitate the 'best' target price. Furthermore, price certainty will not be gained until late in the process.
3 Deliverability - Is the proposed procurement strategy and route deliverable?	Requirements Partially Met	Subject to sufficient time being built into the schedule to cover governance requirements the strategy is deliverable.
4 Contracting Strategy - Is the proposed contracting strategy robust, represent value for money and deliverable?	Requirements Partially Met	The proposed approach will transfer the majority of risks to the contractor (excluding SU) with joint responsibility for managing and mitigating the risks. The costs associated with these risks will be built into the target price with any removal or non-realisation of risks will benefit the target price and therefore the benefits will be shared between client and contractor. Before the contracting strategy is finalised there should be agreement between TFGM and Stockport on how risks will be allocated; how they will be quantified before inclusion in a target price and how they will be managed.
		The Procurement Strategy assumes that the scheme will be delivered as one procurement bundle. I understand that alternative bundling strategies have been considered and that the preferred approach is included in the draft Procurement Strategy document. Without an understanding of why a single procurement bundle is the preferred approach I am unable to comment on its validity.
5 Contract Management - Are there robust arrangements in place for ongoing contract management?	Not Applicable	This will be developed at the appropriate time in the process

TfGM - Gateway Review Panel

Scheme: SEMMMS	Specialist Reviewer Adam Patterson
Stage:	Project Manager
STAKEHOLDER MANAGEMENT	Date of Review 04-Jul-12

Overall Rating for STAKEHOLDER MANAGEMENT	2	In the time allowed, SMBC were able to outline a broad approach to stakeholder engagement which reflected the TfGM approach. They have sought to be proactive, and have tried to incorporate stakeholder feedback into design to prevent problems.	1	No issues of note with this business case section Rework: not required Recommendation: Clear Approval
Specialist Reviewer Comments		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * SMBC says scheme has political support in SMBC, MCC and CEC. Also has TfGMC / GMCA support. * Have identified major stakeholders who will affect implementation (Network Rail, golf courses, etc) * Appear to have high level engagement at appropriate levels for stakeholders cited * Will be consulting in more detail in Sept, and then again in Feb - just need to be able to ensure that they can turn this detail round * Need to ensure project and comms teams work closely * Need more detail to say whether stakeholder engagement / comms activity is adequately resourced (human and financial) * Have enlisted agency to handle inbound calls and emails 	2	Some medium issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework may be advisable Recommendation: Qualified Approval
			3	Medium / Significant issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework advisable Recommendation: Qualified Rejection
			4	Major / Critical issues exist This section is not compliant. Major rework required. Recommendation: Rejection

Review Issues and Recommendations

Issue	Recommendation
1 Ensure strong working link between workstream and comms teams	Resource comms team to support project of this scale
2 No agreed comms and engagement strategy	Articulate comms and engagement strategy
3 Possible public confusion around scheme and consultation	Clearly define what will be achieved by each stage of consultation

Detailed Checklist

Item	Status	Comments
1 Ownership - Have clear accountabilities and responsibilities been set out at the very outset of the project and are all incumbents in agreement?	Requirements Partially Met	SMBC agreed how to work with stakeholders, but not sure if this has been set out.
2 Identification - Does the list of identified stakeholders and their interest in the project appear complete and accurate?	Requirements Met	Yes, from information available in time given
3 Engagement Strategy - Is the proposed stakeholder engagement strategy robust and sensible?	Requirements Partially Met	Focus on delivery, so no articulated strategy. However, direction of travel is consistent with TfGM approach
4 Engagement Process - Have systems and processes been put in place to manage the engagement strategy?	Requirements Partially Met	Yes, good project working. Need to engage comms fully though.
5 Communications Plan - Are appropriate timebased plan in place for proactive communications and media enquiries? Does this plan incorporate a feedback mechanism?	Requirements Not Met	No plan agreed as focus on delivery. No feedback mechanism in place, although advice offered from TfGM with regards to phone / email lines
6 Mandatory Signatures - All TfGM projects have a responsibility to consult with internal departments (EQIA, Energy Resource Requirements, Environmental Impact, Data Protection Act 1998).	Not Applicable	Not sure if SMBC have equivalent sign off process

TfGM - Gateway Review Panel

Scheme: SEMMMS Relief Road	Specialist Reviewer EC Harris
Stage: 3a	Project Manager SMBC
DESIGN & ENGINEERING	Date of Review 02/07/2012

Overall Rating for DESIGN & ENGINEERING	1 Some minor issues with regards to Actual Design to be adopted and material specification which would be addressed at future Gateways and through ongoing development	1 No issues of note with this business case section Rework not required Recommendation: Clear Approval
Specialist Reviewer Comments	With regards to the General arrangement and DRAFT design of this project the design is adequate and consideration of the required technical specifications have been undertaken. However the design is not detailed enough to carry out analysis of the material specifications etc. All existing recommendations should be monitored against any changes made to IAN, DMRB or other equivalent documents. The scheme is buildable and meets all outline requirements of the client contained within the outline business case.	2 Some medium issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework may be advisable Recommendation: Qualified Approval
		3 Medium / Significant issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework advisable Recommendation: Qualified Rejection
		4 Major / Critical issues exist This section is not compliant. Major rework required. Recommendation: Rejection

Review Issues and Recommendations

Issue	Recommendation
1 <i>Material Specification</i>	There is a requirement to specify the lifespan/loading of the pavement to ensure the correct materials can be specified within a detailed design
2 <i>Embankment CBR</i>	Review the minimum CBR requirements for Embankments in accordance with IAN73/06
3	

Detailed Checklist

Item	Status	Comments
1 Cost Plan - Is the design consistent with the cost allowance? Does the cost plan appear complete and costings appropriate and supportable for the proposed design?	Requirements Partially Met	Certain issues have been identified where the drawings have been quantified and suitably priced, however there are implied measures and site specific issues which may affect price. This is subject of a separate Commercial Due Diligence Review
2 Client Requirements - Does the proposed design demonstrably deliver the key objectives of the project and comply with the key client/stakeholder requirements?	Requirements Met	The Clients requirements have been listed within the DFT business case. All of these requirements are fulfilled within the documentation which has been reviewed and within the designs which have been submitted.
3 Deliverability - Is there evidence that the proposed design is buildable, deliverable, achievable within schedule and will the final product be usable and maintainable?	Requirements Met	By reviewing the alignments, preliminary drawings and documentation provided the scheme appears to be buildable and deliverable without any major departure from standards with regards to design. The final product will be usable and maintainable in accordance with current standards. However some of the materials which have been costed may have an impact on the long term performance therefore maintenance regime to be employed.
4 Health & Safety - Does the proposed design demonstrably take account of health and safety requirements and minimises health and safety risks to an appropriate level?	Requirements Met	All items appear to be designed in accordance with current best practice, Interim Advice Note (IAN) and referenced to standards
5 Legislative Compliance - Does the design comply with corporate and legislative requirements?	Requirements Met	All items appear to be designed in accordance with current best practice, Interim Advice Note (IAN) and referenced to standards
6 Conditions - Does the proposed design comply with any planning or funding conditions imposed?	Requirements Met	In general, the scheme is buildable for the current funding arrangements which are subject of ongoing discussion. Planning is still to be sought as is Public Inquiry, therefore we would expect to see development of the design and mitigation measures to address this
7 Completeness & Consistency - Is the overall design complete and are all elements co-ordinated and consistent?	Requirements Partially Met	In line with the development of the scheme, at this stage, the current proposal does not include detailed design elements, it is more in line with a preliminary design and build project with Geotechnical reports and alignments etc. As the design progresses through the various gateway reviews, we would expect to see development of, design life considerations (agreed with ultimate Highway Authorities), material specifications etc.

TfGM - Gateway Review Panel

Scheme: SEMMMS Relief Road	Specialist Reviewer Chris Thorpe
Stage: 3a	Project Manager SMBC
HEALTH & SAFETY	Date of Review 02/07/2012

Overall Rating for HEALTH & SAFETY	3	<i>Medium / Significant issues exist, This section is not fully compliant and rework is advisable.</i>	1	No issues of note with this business case section Rework not required Recommendation: Clear Approval
Specialist Reviewer Comments		<i>The documents reviewed contain virtually no reference to how H&S is being managed through the project life cycle. However after meeting with the project team it is evident that work has been undertaken but not described or included in the documentation.</i>	2	Some medium issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework may be advisable Recommendation: Qualified Approval
			3	Medium / Significant issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework advisable Recommendation: Qualified Rejection
			4	Major / Critical issues exist This section is not compliant. Major rework required. Recommendation: Rejection

Review Issues and Recommendations

Issue	Recommendation
1 No description on how hazard identification has taken place or mitigated during the project life cycle.	Include section on Hazard Identification and responsibility for mitigation e.g. Designer.
2 No description on how CDM is being managed..	Include CDM Strategy including specific roles and responsibilities.
3 No description on the process to ensure that competent suppliers/contractors are appointed.	Include the process being adopted.
4 No description of how corporate governance will be undertaken during the project life cycle.	Include the process being adopted.
5 No clear roles and responsibilities stated for the project team	Review project organisation and determine specific responsibilities by position e.g. Project Manager. It is not obvious how the project team will be supported by H&S competent persons.

Detailed Checklist

Item	Status	Comments
1 Approach - Has a suitable Health & Safety plan been developed?	Requirements Not Met	No evidence or reference to a H&S Plan.
2 Legislative - Have all relevant SHE legislation been considered in the project development (such as site waste, biodiversity, contaminated land, pollution, environmental surveys)?	Requirements Not Met	No reference to H&S Legislation.
3 CDM - Has a CDMC been engaged?	Requirements Partially Met	No description of how H&S CDM strategy has been developed or implemented. It should be clearly set out who is taking the client responsibilities due to different streams of funding.
4 Reporting - Is a suitable and compliant reporting process in place to record and report incidents?	Requirements Partially Met	No reference or description of the reporting process for accidents, incidents or performance management.

TfGM - Gateway Review Panel

Scheme: SEMMMS Relief Road Stage: 3a	Specialist Reviewer Joanna Maddocks/Des Gardner Project Manager SMBC
LEGAL	Date of Review

Overall Rating for LEGAL	3	The main risks to this project are land acquisition and planning. TfGM and Stockport to work together to ensure that these issues are identified in terms of legal process. are progressed and allowance made for the same in the programme and budget.	1	No issues of note with this business case section Rework not required Recommendation: Clear Approval
Specialist Reviewer Comments	See recommendations below		2	Some medium issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework may be advisable Recommendation: Qualified Approval
			3	Medium / Significant issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework advisable Recommendation: Qualified Rejection
			4	Major / Critical issues exist This section is not compliant. Major rework required. Recommendation: Rejection

Review Issues and Recommendations

Issue	Recommendation
1 Before current funding was secured the original proposal was for this Scheme to be sponsored and advanced by Stockport Borough Council. However, since DfT funding was secured the GMCA and TfGM has been asked to oversee this project in order to control cost and minimise the risk of overspend. This is important because the DfT funding is to be provided to the GMCA. The DfT funding is fixed and any overspend As a local authority Stockport Borough Council need to obtain the powers to progress the scheme. There are two statutory routes which might apply to this project and enable Stockport Borough Council to obtain the necessary powers (being s10 of the Highways Act 180 or the Planning Act 2008). Under the current law it is imperative that Stockport follow the correct statutory route. Stockport Borough Council's legal	TfGM, Stockport Borough Council, Manchester City Council and Cheshire East Council to consider and produce recommendations for governance and project delivery structure followed by round table meeting to discuss and agree a procedure and process for delivery of the Scheme.
2 Stockport Council are the Highway Authority for roads (other than trunk roads) within their administrative area. This enable Stockport Council to apply for planning and obtain CPO in respect of land within their administrative area required for the Scheme. However, in order to ensure the successful execution of this scheme Stockport Borough Council require the acquisition of land which falls within the	TfGM legal to be provided with a copy of the legal advice from Stockport Borough Council so that this can be considered by the joint project board.
3	TfGM legal to be provide with a copy of the draft s8 Agreement from Stockport Borough Council confuring the necessary powers to Stockport Borough Council on progress the planning and CPOs.
4 Preparatory works for planning and compulsory purchase orders are underway.	Stockport Borough Council to provide TfGM with copies of current planning proposals and land identified as requiring acquisition.
5 Full environmental assessment has been undertaken by Stockport Borough Council,	TfGM to review and come to a view as to whether this identifies any additional risks to the scheme and how these can be mitigated. TfGM further understands that Stockport Borough Council have completed a draft Environmental Statement which should be reviewed by TfGM. The environmental review should include consideration of where the scheme requires acquisition of public open spaces. TfGM understands that Stockport Borough Council have made provision for the purchase of land to compensate for the public open space that will
6 Programme review and programme risks (including financial risk around land acquisition)	The need to obtain planning and CPOS could present significant timing and programming issues. Stockport Borough Council and TfGM need to identify and consider whether enough time has been allowed in the programme to allow for these risks. In particular, high risk sites such as Sale Golf Club to be identified and specifically addressed in the programme. The allowance for land aquisition costs in the budget to be reviewed as part of this exercise.

Detailed Checklist

Item	Status	Comments
1 Approvals & Consents - Have all necessary powers and consents been fully approved	Requirements Not Met	Grant of Planning Permission - This has not been obtained by Stockport Borough Council. Stockport Council intend to go out to a "Pre-Public Consultation" where they will publish possible options for the SEMMMS Route and consult the public on their views of the given routes. After this pre-public consultation Stockport will decide on the route. Planning application will then be progressed. There is a significant amount of work and thus time/programming risk associated with this issue - Compulsory Purchase Orders - Stockport Borough Council have identified the land which needs to be obtained in order to enable the Scheme to be progressed. Stockport Borough Council will try to acquire the land required by agreement but have identified parcels of land which they believe will need a CPO. Draft orders have been produced, so Stockport should be in a good position to progress once planning issues resolved but TfGM and Stockport need to ensure that sufficient time
2 Conditions - Are there any conditions to the powers and consents and do they pose any additional risks.	Requirements Partially Met	Environmental Impacts of scheme need to be assessed - full environment impact assessment have been carried out. No significant additional risks have been identified. TfGM should review and check the same.
3 References - Have contractor references been received?	Requirements Met	No applicable at this stage. Procurement strategy to be review in light of possible changes to project structure and TfGM to feed into this as necessary.
4 Insurance - Are all warranties, bonds and insurances confirmed and agreed by all parties	Not Applicable	No applicable at this stage.

TfGM - Gateway Review Panel

Scheme: SEMMMS Relief Road	Specialist Reviewer EC Harris
Stage: 3a	Project Manager SMBC
DELIVERY STRATEGY	Date of Review 02/07/2012

Overall Rating for DELIVERY STRATEGY	1 At this stage, it is to be expected that the Delivery Strategy is not developed to any great degree. Strategies presented in the Benefits Realisation Plan, PID, Procurement Strategy and Project Management Plan all indicate to their being a common understand of how to transition to BAU, and it is anticipated that this will be further developed prior to the next Gateway Review	1	No issues of note with this business case section Rework not required Recommendation: Clear Approval
Specialist Reviewer Comments	Add comment here	2	Some medium issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework may be advisable Recommendation: Qualified Approval
		3	Medium / Significant issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework advisable Recommendation: Qualified Rejection
		4	Major / Critical issues exist This section is not compliant. Major rework required. Recommendation: Rejection

Review Issues and Recommendations

Issue	Recommendation
1 Add issue here	Add recommendation here
2 Add issue here	Add recommendation here
3 Add issue here	Add recommendation here

Detailed Checklist

Item	Status	Comments
1 Critical Success Factors - Clearly describe all factors that must be present for the project to succeed.	Not Applicable	Add comments here
2 Key Delivery Challenges - Have all delivery challenges been articulated and has a robust overall delivery strategy been put in place to address them?	Not Applicable	Add comments here
3 Integration - Is a strategy in place to address integration/transition issues and maximise synergies in transferring to BAU?	Not Applicable	Add comments here
4 Overall Consistency - Are delivery arrangements well integrated and consistent with one another (risk, procurement, schedule, governance...)	Not Applicable	Add comments here

TfGM - Gateway Review Panel

Scheme:	Specialist Reviewer
Stage:	Project Manager
TRANSITION	Date of Review

Overall Rating for TRANSITION	<i>Add summary here</i>	1	No issues of note with this business case section Rework not required Recommendation: Clear Approval
Specialist Reviewer Comments	Not required at this stage of the project	2	Some medium issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework may be advisable Recommendation: Qualified Approval
		3	Medium / Significant issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework advisable Recommendation: Qualified Rejection
		4	Major / Critical issues exist This section is not compliant. Major rework required. Recommendation: Rejection

Review Issues and Recommendations

Issue	Recommendation
1 <i>Add issue here</i>	<i>Add recommendation here</i>
2 <i>Add issue here</i>	<i>Add recommendation here</i>
3 <i>Add issue here</i>	<i>Add recommendation here</i>

Detailed Checklist

Item	Status	Comments
1 Inspection - Has a final inspection been carried out and all defects rectified in accordance with the contract?		<i>Add comments here</i>
2 Financial Close Out - Have all accounts been agreed and closed and is a SAP report included in the submission as evidence?		<i>Add comments here</i>
3 Post Implementation Review (PIR) - Has a Post Implementation Review (PIR) taken place and all outstanding actions recorded?		<i>Add comments here</i>
4 Training - Has all required training been planned or carried out?		<i>Add comments here</i>
5 Maintenance - Have long term management plans been put in place for maintenance of the new facility? This includes TfGM Infrastructure and Operations.		<i>Add comments here</i>

TfGM - Gateway Review Panel

Scheme: **SEMMMS Relief Road**

Specialist Reviewer **Tom Sansom**

Stage: **3a**

Project Manager **SMBC**

EVALUATION & MONITORING

Date of Review

05-Jul-12

Overall Rating for EVALUATION & MONITORING	3	<i>An detailed programme of activity proposed but, at present, not costed. Evaluation plan would benefit considerably from specification of scheme-specific DfT and local evaluation objectives, in terms of the focus and scale of monitoring & evaluation activity.</i>	1	No issues of note with this business case section Rework not required Recommendation: Clear Approval
Specialist Reviewer Comments		<i>It is clear that much thought has gone into defining the, as-yet uncosted, outline scheme evaluation plan. While it is challenging to define national evaluation objectives in circumstances where DfT has yet to issue final guidance on the evaluation of local major schemes (the current evaluation plan makes reference to draft guidance), there is scope for making progress in defining local evaluation objectives (which will go beyond a restatement of scheme objectives and could include an examination of Earn Back issues).</i>	2	Some medium issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework may be advisable Recommendation: Qualified Approval
			3	Medium / Significant issues exist This section is not fully compliant Rework: advisable Recommendation: Qualified Rejection
			4	Major / Critical issues exist This section is not compliant. Major rework required. Recommendation: Rejection

Review Issues and Recommendations

Issue	Recommendation
1 Clear definition of national and local evaluation objectives.	Evaluation activity would benefit considerably from being focused around specified national and local evaluation objectives, i.e. exactly what DfT and the promoting authorities wish to learn from monitoring and evaluation activity.
2 Costing of the programme of monitoring and evaluation work to be delivered.	Monitoring and evaluation costs need to be explicitly identified to ensure credibility of the proposals.
3 Clear distinction from benefits realisation activity.	Benefits realisation and monitoring & evaluation activities should be separately defined. At the moment they are merged and there is limited text on benefits realisation.

Detailed Checklist

Item	Status	Comments
1 Prioritisation - Have the benefits been prioritised in terms of impact. This will inform the structure of the evaluation.	Requirements Partially Met	Some degree of prioritisation is apparent in the scaling of activity. Further prioritisation would be beneficial, both in respect of national and local evaluation objectives and in terms of the relative scale of traditional scheme benefits (e.g. journey time savings).
2 Cost - Has an appropriate budget been set aside to cover the costs of the evaluation exercise? This should be proportional to the structure of the evaluation required.	Requirements Not Met	Despite an extensive programme of monitoring & evaluation work being set out in some detail (Appendix J), no associated cost has been identified. This apparent lack of explicit cost allocation raises questions over the credibility of evaluation plans.
3 Approach - Are the desired outcomes of the evaluation exercise in line with the suggested approach?	Requirements Partially Met	The approaches are generally robust. Perhaps the main exception is in terms of economic impacts, likely to emerge as a key area when evaluation objectives are clearly defined.
4 Timescale - Has adequate time been allowed to conduct the evaluation?	Requirements Met	Timeframe clearly specified (before, 1 year and 5 years after) and appropriate for a scheme of this scale.
5 Measures/Units/Types - Have measures/units/types been identified that will be evaluated upon project completion (transport, economic, VfM, social or environmental impacts)?	Requirements Met	For most outcomes, suitable measures are identified.
6 Data - Has all the appropriate data been captured and baselined to allow for comparison in the evaluation?	Requirements Met	Not at this stage but this is envisaged as an important part of the pre-construction activities.
7 Legal - Has a legal condition been included to allow TfGM to access operational data after handover?	Not Applicable	In general this checklist item is not relevant. The evaluation, however, does rely on access to data from bus operators in relation to journey time performance, but it is not clear whether bus operators have been approached at this time.
8 Process - Has a pre-defined process been put in place to evaluate the management of the project for Lessons Learnt?	Requirements Partially Met	Some stakeholder engagement envisaged on "lessons learned" but otherwise any process evaluation of issues surrounding development & delivery of the scheme is absent.



A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road

DRAFT Gateway Review 3A Action Paper
1007/2.56/131



January 2013



A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road

DRAFT Gateway Review 3A Action Paper

1007/2.56/131

January 2013

Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council

Stockport Council
Fred Perry House
Stockport
SK1 3XE

Issue and revision record

Revision	Date	Originator	Checker	Approver	Description
0.1	14.01.2013	J Roberts	G Martin	J McMahon	First Draft

Content

Chapter	Title	Page
1.	Executive Summary	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Core Findings	2
1.3	Core Actions / Responses	2
2.	Summary of Actions	6
2.1	Introduction	6
2.2	Governance	6
2.3	Value for Money and Appraisal	6
2.4	Benefits Realisation	6
2.5	Finance and Funding	7
2.6	Risk Management	7
2.7	Schedule	7
2.8	Procurement & Contract Management	8
2.9	Stakeholder Management	8
2.10	Design and Engineering	8
2.11	Health and Safety	8
2.12	Legal	9
2.13	Evaluation and Monitoring	9

1. Executive Summary

1.1 Introduction

During June 2012, TfGM provided project assurance services for the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road. To tie in with the submission of the Major Scheme Business Case to the Department for Transport (DfT), submitted November 2012, it was agreed that TfGM Project Management Procedures (PMP) Gateway 3A, Full Business Case would be the most appropriate review gateway for the scheme. This aligns with the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Project Control Framework as stipulated in the scheme Quality Plan.

The TfGM gateway review team acknowledged in their findings that the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road was strictly between gateways 2 and 3A. Applying gateway 2 to the scheme was agreed to be a retrograde step and so gateway 3A was applied with an expectation that areas of development would be identified. This is considered to be the case in the Health and Safety section and Evaluation and Monitoring section which will be progressed in line with the programme whilst falling short of the 3A requirements.

The gateway review panel considered 15 subject areas scoring each section between 1 and 4. With a score of 1 indicating no issues of note were found whilst a score of 4 indicates Major/Critical issues were found.

The purpose of this report is to highlight the issues that have been raised through gateway 3A and documents the actions that have and will be undertaken to address them. Reference should be made to Appendix A where the detailed findings of all 15 subject areas are listed. Where there are no issues raised in certain subject areas the SEMMMS project team will continue to apply the appropriate procedures and methodologies to continue with and develop the good working practices.

1.2 Core Findings

Overall the project scored a 2, indicating that based on the information reviewed some 'medium' issues exist.

Topic Area	Score
Strategic Alignment	1
Governance	2
Value for Money (VFM) & Appraisal	3
Benefits Realisation	1
Finance & Funding	2
Risk Management	2
Schedule	2
Procurement & Contract Management	3
Stakeholder Management	2
Design & Engineering	1
Health & Safety	3
Legal	3
Delivery Strategy	1
Transition	N/A
Evaluation & Monitoring	3
Overall Rating	2

1.3 Core Actions / Responses

Of the topic areas that scored a 3 indicating that *"Medium / Significant issues exist, business case not fully compliant with requirements, rework advisable"* the following core actions / responses are recommended by the Project Management Team.

Value for Money & Appraisal:

Issue raised by Gateway Review Panel (GRP)	Response
GRP suggested that the analysis in the economic case is not supporting the strategic case for the scheme.	Following the review, TfGM and SEMMMS team worked together to ensure this issue was resolved prior to submission of a MSBC approved by all relevant parties.

Procurement & Contract Management

Issue raised by GRP	Response
GRP suggested that the procurement strategy be developed.	Following the review, TfGM and SEMMMS team worked together to finalise and agree the procurement strategy as a Staged ECI broadly following the Welsh Assembly model. The procurement strategy was approved by all relevant parties and formed part of the MSBC submission.
Adjust schedule to include standstill period; allow sufficient time for tender evaluation and accommodate governance requirements.	Project Team has since increased the time allocated to review the tender documentation. Further appraisal of the time required for PQQ has now meant the procurement activities are removed from the critical path.
Concern that with the proposed procurement strategy there is minimal incentive for the Contractor's to agree/facilitate the 'best' target price.	Procurement strategy requires the Contractor to produce an Initial Target Cost (ITC) soon after appointment. The Contractor will then be incentivised to reduce this ITC before a Final Target Cost is agreed prior to construction. This way early sight of the Target Cost is gained and early value engineering is promoted and indeed paid for via the incentivisation mechanism, providing overall cost savings for the scheme. Updated procurement strategy was approved by all relevant parties and formed part of the MSBC submission.
Concern over risk allocation in the final contract and the validity of procuring the scheme as a single contract.	Under the proposed procurement strategy the proposed NEC3 contract conditions will be applied, the Client is able to produce a specific risk register, clearly stating which risks will remain with the Client. This risk register will need to be reviewed and agreed by Project Board including TfGM. With regards procuring as a single contract, the Project Team consider this to be the best strategy to deliver best value, cost certainty and programme certainty by allowing an experienced contractor to control as much of the works as possible.

Health and Safety

Issue raised by GRP	Response
Concerns raised over general level of documentation of H&S issues.	Acknowledged by the Project Team that H&S documentation needs to be developed over the next phase of project development. Whilst from the Gateway Review Panel it was acknowledged that the SEMMMS project team is applying appropriate consideration and practices in developing the scheme, this has not been documented. Clear actions for the next phase include: drafting a health and safety file; producing detailed pre-construction health and safety information prior to tender phase; review of preferred route design to ensure H&S issues are identified and documented effectively; revise Project Management Plan to ensure roles and responsibilities with regards H&S are incorporated and ensure that the tendering process rewards Contractors that can demonstrate an excellent health and safety and culture.

Legal

Issue raised by GRP	Response
General concern over the level of legal review required by and provided by GRP legal team on behalf of the project.	Currently, legal checks are provided by SMBC Legal on behalf of the project team. It is recommended that the Project Board consider the current governance structure and section 8 agreement to ensure they are content with this arrangement. With reference to the recommendation for involvement by GRP Legal, TfGM has now been brought onto the Project Board as well as the previous representation on the Chief Executive's Project Board. With this involvement in the governance, TfGM will be part of the decision making process on appropriate legal resource and representation as part of the project team – to be raised at Project Board.

Evaluation and Monitoring

Issue raised by GRP	Response
<p>Evaluations activity would benefit considerably from being focused around specified national and local evaluation objectives, i.e. exactly what DfT and the promoting authorities wish to learn from monitoring and evaluation activity.</p>	<p>Evaluate Benefits Realisation Plan (BRP) against national and local evaluation objectives has been developed for purposes of MSBC programme entry submission. The BRP requires to be further developed prior to next gateway review.</p>
<p>Monitoring and evaluation costs need to be explicitly identified to ensure credibility of the proposals.</p>	<p>Acknowledged although considered to be a small percentage of the overall budget and therefore comfortable with level of costing carried out to date. Project team to consider and include specific allocation within the scheme budget for evaluation activities.</p>
<p>Benefits realisation and monitoring & evaluation activities should be separately defined. At the moment they are merged and there is limited text on benefits realisation.</p>	<p>Evaluate BRP with a view to separately defining benefits realisation and monitoring in next revision prior to the next gateway review.</p>

2. Summary of Actions

2.1 Introduction

Whilst the executive summary serves to highlight the key areas of concern and development, this section will cover each of the actions going forward.

2.2 Governance

- GRP recognised the importance of gaining a universal agreement between the authorities for future decision making. Section 8 agreement to be finalised and signed off by each partner prior to the start of the tendering process.
- GRP recommend that a Project Controls function is developed with the metrics used for the checks and balances as presented to the Project Board confirmed. A full quality control process is currently in place, with economics, key risks and issues regularly presented to Project Board. PMT are to consider the need for more specific Project Controls function and recommend to the Board mechanism for the next stage of the project.
- GRP suggest that the Strategies and Plans are insufficient in detail for a project of this size. Communication needed with TfGM prior to the next gateway review to ensure level of detail recommended is understood. Currently deemed sufficient by the PMT and Project Board.

2.3 Value for Money and Appraisal

- GRP recommended that the analysis in the economic case was not supporting the strategic case for the scheme. Following the review and prior to the submission of the Major Scheme Business Case, Atkins liaised with TfGM and ensured that all suggesting for improvement were explored and adopted where appropriate.

2.4 Benefits Realisation

- GRP recommend that the Benefits Realisation Plan (BRP) be developed as the project progresses to incorporate any specific benefits within the MSBC over and above the 6 core scheme objectives as well as incorporating any benefits defined in the lead up to the Public Inquiry. This is acknowledged and Atkins or another should be commissioned to review the Benefits Realisation Plan prior to the next gateway review.
- Project to develop BRP to include how the benefit will be measured post project completion as well as developing the detail included in the benefits mapping. This should include how the statements and assessment in the benefits appraisal are correct, supportable and understandable.
- Review and develop the strategy to Business As Usual (BAU) in terms of the handover into maintenance and management of the scheme. This is to be developed in time for the next GRP.

2.5 Finance and Funding

- GRP make recommendations to explore and clarify the future revenue and renewal costs associated with the scheme. These are included in a broad sense within the economic analysis of the scheme, however, further work is needed to ensure the scheme fulfils requirements of the Project Board. This will be developed and agreed between the 3 promoting authorities prior to the next Gateway Review.

2.6 Risk Management

- General recommendations to increase the detail evidenced in the risk register. This is acknowledged and will be actioned by the PMT.
- Specific recommendation to carry out a Schedule QRA. Action with the PMT to investigate the value of implementing this at this stage of the project lifecycle. PMT to explore and recommend to the project board when the most appropriate time would be to carry this out. Schedule risks currently included within the risk register through specific time related risks.
- Recommendation made to align risk confidence between lands and project risk register. Following the gateway review and prior to the issue of the MSBC, this was achieved through ensuring the Project Risk confidence as well as the Land Risk confidence were both quoted as the pre-mitigation P50 value in line with DfT requirements. Action on the PMT to assess when the project should develop the risk allowance to a post-mitigation P80 value. PMT to consider with the Project Director and through further liaison with TfGM the potential convergence with TfGM methodologies with regards risk management and to ensure that this in alignment with DfT requirements.
- Review of risk management plan to ensure clarity on how contingency budget will be managed going forward including how financial draw down will be facilitated as required.
- GRP recommended that the risk allowance be increased and the optimum bias be decreased. Over detailed discussions, post review and prior to submission of the business case this was agreed and actioned.

2.7 Schedule

- Recommendation to include, in more detail, the scheduling impacts of the approvals and engagement with Network Rail and Statutory Undertakers. This is agreed and the PMT will action this as soon as possible. The Project Team are in continuous liaison with Network Rail and Stats companies and part of the next level of engagement will be to ensure there is a full understanding of the time impact of gaining approvals and that this is reflected in the project schedule.
- Recommendation to incorporate more detail within the construction element of the schedule. This has since been actioned by the Project Team incorporating the work carried out by Balfour Beatty, as part of their Professional Services Contract commission,

as well as including more recently gathered project knowledge in line with scheme development.

- Recommendation to review the cost profiling against the schedule. This is acknowledged and has been agreed since the review, with the PMT having worked up a detailed cost profile in line with the scheme schedule. This will continue to be developed.

2.8 Procurement & Contract Management

- The majority of the findings were in relation to TfGM's buy in to the procurement strategy (staged ECI) with development of detail of the strategy to demonstrate applicability, best value and risk in relation to this scheme. Since the review TfGM and the project team have worked together in developing knowledge and detail associated with the proposed procurement strategy and how the strategy is best applied for the delivery of this scheme. This has resulted in TfGM agreement and subsequent Project Board approvals to the procurement strategy, being a staged ECI approach.
- Risk allocation to be developed prior to tender process and agreed by all parties. This is a necessary part of the development of the NEC suite of documents and will be in place prior to the next gateway review.

2.9 Stakeholder Management

- Majority of the feedback concerned the early stage of the communications strategy. This has since been developed. Action with the communications team to ensure this strategy covers all future periods of the project prior to the next gateway review.

2.10 Design and Engineering

- All aspects agreed to be fully compliant with expectations at this stage. Design team to develop design to ensure future maintenance requirements are explored and incorporated where appropriate and/or covered into the contract information for consideration at detailed design stage by the ECI Contractor/Designer.

2.11 Health and Safety

- Following the confirmation of the preferred route, the Design Manager will progress the health and safety documentation. Recommended that a first draft of the Health and Safety File is completed prior to tender stage.
- The project team is to develop a documented strategy on how the CDM-C will continue to be engaged throughout the project lifecycle.
- Investigate and review how health and safety considerations can be formally recorded within the project information. Ensure that, in the lead up to the tender, all available health and safety information is documented and presented to the Contractor on appointment.

2.12 Legal

- The majority of the recommendations concerned the legal review process. The GRP reviewer recommended that all documentation be reviewed by TfGM legal to ensure compliance. This contradicts the understanding of the current project governance and it is recommended that, once agreed with all parties, the Section 8 agreement is reviewed and confirmed by Project Board (including TfGM representative). This will ensure TfGM are comfortable with the current legal arrangements, mainly being that legal review and guidance be provided by SMBC on behalf of the promoting authorities, with SMBC Legal involving the other 2 promoting authorities as appropriate and in line with the Section 8 agreement.

2.13 Evaluation and Monitoring

- Project Team to evaluate the Benefits Realisation Plan (BRP) against national and local evaluation objectives prior to the next gateway review.
- Evaluate BRP with a view to separately defining benefits realisation and monitoring in next revision prior to the next gateway review.
- Project team to review the evaluation process of the economic benefits prior to the next gateway review.
- Project team to review data capture requirements pre-construction and set out plan with costs of what additional data is required.
- Project Team to include within the scheme budget or identify source of funding to cover the costs associated with the evaluation period post implementation.
- Project team to consider options with regards "Lessons Learnt" of the management of the scheme and, where appropriate and applicable, incorporate these into BRP

A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road
Gateway 3A Action Paper

Appendices

Appendix A. Detailed Response Record

xiii

(available on request)

Appendix A. Detailed Response Record

Gateway Review 3A Issue/Action Log

Section	Issue Number	Issue raised by Gateway Review Panel (GRP)	Recommendation made by Gateway Review Panel	Current Score	A6 to Manchester Airport Project Team Response	A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Action	Owner	Date to Be Completed By
Strategic Alignment	N/A	None	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Governance	1	Approvals/Delegated Authority does not seem to have been formally handed to Stockport to manage the project	A Delivery Agreement/SLA/Contract could be designed, circulated and agreed to clarify how decisions will be made and what levels of escalation will be used within the project organisation. This should also acknowledge how decision making external to the project organisation will be managed (DIT/GMCA/Airport etc.).	2	Approvals and delegated authority has been formally handed to SMBC. The Management Plan clearly sets out what levels of escalations will be used. The governance structure has been agreed at Project Board level. MCC, CEC, SMBC represented at each level of governance. Section 8 agreement is currently being formalised.	Section 8 agreement to be signed off by each local authority. Overall project governance structure to be reviewed and confirmed prior to progresses to the procurement of the scheme.	SRO / Project Board	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Governance	2	As this project is being jointly delivered by three separate authorities there are obvious questions regarding who's governance framework will be used. It is not clearly identified in the submission.	Considering the project is underway, there has been a significant amount of design work already completed and procurement activity will soon commence a decision should be made as soon as possible about which governance framework will be used going forward for the SEMMMS project. This will also be agreed and approved by all parties.	2	Approvals and delegated authority has been formally handed to SMBC. The Management Plan clearly sets out what levels of escalations will be used. The governance structure has been agreed at Project Board level. MCC, CEC, SMBC represented at each level of governance. Section 8 agreement is currently being formalised.	Section 8 agreement to be signed off by each local authority. Overall project governance structure to be reviewed and confirmed prior to progresses to the procurement of the scheme.	SRO / Project Board	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Governance	3	This is a high profile, high cost project and will certainly be subject to audit at some stage during its lifecycle and possibly afterwards. Whilst it states in the submission that audit requirements will be satisfied it stops short of listing which standards the project is being managed in accordance with.	Create an assurance plan that allows project information controlled and archived periodically using an information management plan that would facilitate the retrieval of information when required. Work with audit bodies to best understand points of which information will need to be presented for audit. These audits should appear in the cost and resource plans.	2	SMBC is a quality assured council and it's systems and processes by which SEMMMS is in compliance are subject to regular audits. Each consultant employed on the scheme is also QA assured and is required to undertake their own audit processes. Project Assurance is undertaken by the TIGM GRIP review process. It is agreed that a audit process specifically for the project could be considered.	Review current audit practices and consider recommendations to Project Board for project specific audit process.	PM	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Governance	4	It is acknowledged that there is a need to provide reporting, the documentation suggest that this is yet to be decided and the Project Controls Manager hasn't been engaged.	A Project Controls function should be engaged as soon as possible to define how the project will present information to board members, decide on the metrics used for the checks and balances and begin providing information that will allow efficient monitoring and control of the project.	2	Section 3.5 on Page 5 of the Management Plan states that the role of Project Controls Manager will be undertaken by the Assistant Project Manager. A clear configuration management plan is in place and active. The project reporting to Project Board is carried out on a monthly basis with the content of the reporting agreed by the Project Board. This includes reporting on all aspects of Project Controls including budget and programme.	Review current configuration management / project controls. Review reporting to the Project Board to ensure compliance continues.	PM	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Governance	5	Some key roles are missing from the roles and responsibilities section and costs don't seem to be accounted for.	Add TIGM support as well as a dedicated Risk Manager, Project Controls Manager, and Finance Manager to the Project Team.	2	Risk Manager and Project Controls Manager role undertaken by the Assistant Project Manager (Section 3.5 on Page 5 of the Management Plan). Finance Manager referenced in section 3.3 page 4 of the Management Plan. Finance Manager is required to be a member of SMBC to enable sign off of key financial decisions. This role is undertaken by Martin Rigby. Costs for these roles are fully accounted for in the forward preparation cost forecasting.	Name Martin Rigby as the Finance Manager within the Management Plan.	APM	Prior to the issue of the MSBC to the DIT (Complete).
Governance	1	PMP/ProgMP - Has the correct procedure/route been selected to govern the project?	Although this is not a TIGM project it will be subject to the same internal standards. As a result of this it has been decided that it will be a Route 5 project following the Project Management Procedures (PMP).	1	If the scheme were to follow the same internal standards of a TIGM project this, under the current governance structure, would be a decision for the Project Board and ultimately for the Senior Responsible Owner.	Request that TIGM GRP supply description of PMP requirements of a Route 5 project for clarity and consideration. SEMMMS Project Team to review the internal standards of the PMP of TIGM.	TIGM GRP	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Governance	2	Gateway Review Process (GRP) - Is this a clear understanding of TIGM's approvals process? Have submission dates been built into the schedule?	Submission dates have been built into the schedule for the PMP Gateway Review and appear to be realistic at this stage.	1	Submission dates based on information transferred on the GRP from TIGM to date.	No Action	N/A	N/A
Governance	3	Strategies & Plans - is there a clear understanding of the PM's responsibility to devise a plan to each aspect of the project from TIGM's strategies.	As this project is delivered by three separate councils it is expected that there are no corporate strategies quoted. However, individual plans should be well advanced. Although there seems to be a plan for most aspects of the project the detail is insufficient for project of this size.	2	Plans produced to levels of detail deemed sufficient by the Project Director and SRO at this stage of the scheme.	Request that TIGM GRP supply description of PMP requirements of a Route 5 project for clarity and consideration. SEMMMS Project Team to review the internal standards of the PMP of TIGM.	TIGM GRP	Prior to the next gateway review.
VFM & Appraisal	1	Analysis in the economic case is not supporting the strategic case for the scheme	Agreed that TIGM will work with SMBC and Atkins to ensure the strategic economic cases complement each other in the revised MSBC submission to DIT	3	Continue liaison with TIGM representatives.	Atkins completed dialogue with TIGM prior to submission of the business case and ensured all suggestions are considered and included as necessary.	Atkins	Prior to the issue of the MSBC to the DIT (Complete).
VFM & Appraisal	2	BCR of 18 is incorrectly calculated and is misleading. I also think the quoted 11,000 jobs is incorrect.	Agreed that this will not appear in the revised economic appraisal.	3	Atkins to provide response	This was removed following the gateway review and prior to the submission of MSBC.	Atkins	Prior to the issue of the MSBC to the DIT (Complete).
Benefits Realisation	1	Outline Benefits - Describe the anticipated financial and non-financial benefits, including an explanation of the current baseline state.	The Benefits Realisation Plan is centred around the 3 Local Authorities. It addresses the 6 key Scheme Objectives. The 2 key issues here are whether there are specific detailed benefits within the various commitments of the business case. Additionally, a mechanism for incorporating benefits which are emphasised or developed as part of the Public Inquiry would be needed. It would be expected that this level of detail would be developed as the project continues.	2	Accepted - BRP should be reviewed at each gateway and, where required be revised to include any additional/further detail of the benefits that the scheme will be aiming to achieve.	Commission Atkins or similar to update the BRP at prior to the next gateway.	Atkins	Prior to the next gateway review.

Section	Issue Number	Issue raised by Gateway Review Panel (GRP)	Recommendation made by Gateway Review Panel	Current Score	A6 to Manchester Airport Project Team Response	A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Action	Owner	Date to Be Completed By
Benefits Realisation	2	Benefit Profiling - Define the measures that will be used to assess benefits, attached a quantitative unit where possible.	The Benefits Realisation Plan stipulates a methodology that, notwithstanding the above comments, describes an effective way of collating this data. At this stage, the method is described at high level, and as the scheme progresses, it would be expected that the detail would be developed.	1	Accepted	Quantitative benefits analysis to be reviewed and detail to be added prior to the next gateway review	Atkins	Prior to the next gateway review.
Benefits Realisation	3	Benefits Mapping - Create a benefit map that indicates how each of the anticipated benefits follows from the project output to strategic objective.	The strategy contains a mapping table which links issues to Scheme Specific Objective to WebTAG Impact Classifications. Again, at this stage the problems this addresses do not contain specifics and detail, which would be developed as the project progresses.	1	Accepted	Produce more specific information regarding the mapping.	Atkins	Prior to the next gateway review.
Benefits Realisation	4	As part of the transition of project output into BAU explain what steps will need to be taken to integrate the project output into a new capability.	Insofar as progression to BAU required specific actions, a mitigation measures plan is identified and referred to within the Benefits Realisation Model. Other than that, given the level of detail presented at present, a detailed transition to BAU would not be expected at this time.	1	Accepted	Review and produce detailed transition to BAU as required prior to the next GRP.	Atkins	Prior to the next gateway review.
Benefits Realisation	5	Benefit Appraisal - Define how statements and assessment in benefits appraisal are correct, supportable and understandable.	At this stage, the high level nature of the benefits are expressed as resolution of issues affecting the area. This is acceptable at this stage, and it would be expected that more detail would be generated as the project progresses towards Public Inquiry.	1	Accepted	Review section of the BRP in the lead up to the Public Inquiry.	Atkins	Prior to the next gateway review.
Finance and Funding	1	Further work and quantification on on-going revenue maintenance and renewals costs required.	No recommendation	2	On going revenue and maintenance costs are outside the scope of the project.	No action suggested by the project team.	-	N/A
Finance and Funding	1	Funding - Has a source been identified to fund the project? This should include details of revenue as well as capital expenditure.	Revised capital costs per EC Harris due diligence analysis is within funding available of £290m. The EC Harris report note that further work is required in certain areas to finalise costs however the revised costings provide for a commercially robust project. Additional work required on future revenue and renewals costs.	2	Revenue and Renewal This is outside the scope of the project and will become the responsibility of the highways authority to which the scheme will be handed over to.	Investigate with TIGM if specific actions are required on the future revenue and renewal costs prior to the next GRP.	PM	Prior to the next gateway review.
Finance and Funding	2	Affordability - Demonstrate how the overall project appears affordable against expected funding arrangements.	Revised capital costs are within the funding sources available as noted above. Additional work required on future revenue and renewals costs and funding.	2	as above	as above	PM	Prior to the next gateway review.
Finance and Funding	4	Capital Costs (CAPEX) - Are all capital costs fully scoped, clearly stated, robust and within expectations?	Robust costing analysis performed by EC Harris. Report notes some questions to be resolved however that the revised costs (as noted above) 'would provide for a commercially robust project'.	1	EC Harris performed a due diligence exercise on the robust costing of the scheme carried out by Corderoy.	No further actions as comments raised by EC Harris discussed in detail.	N/A	N/A
Finance and Funding	5	Revenue Costs (OPEX) Are all revenue costs fully scoped, clearly stated robust and within expectations.	Limited information provided to date on future revenue costs. Requires additional future work.	4	Outside the scope of the project.	Investigate with TIGM if specific actions are required on the future revenue and renewal costs prior to the next GRP.	PM	Prior to the next gateway review.
Finance and Funding	6	Contingency - Is the contingency fully scoped, committed to the project, clearly stated, appears to be appropriate level and treatment?	Appropriate contingencies applied as per EC Harris report and within the funding envelope.	1	Acknowledged.	No action	N/A	N/A
Finance and Funding	7	Renewals - Are the renewals fully scoped, clearly stated, appear robust, in appropriate cost base, and within expectations.	Limited information provided to date on future renewals costs. Requires additional future work.	4	Renewals are not within the scope of this project.	Investigate with TIGM if specific actions are required on the future revenue and renewal costs prior to the next GRP.	PM	Prior to the next gateway review.
Risk Management	1	Risk registers not sufficiently robust for both assessment and management purposes.	1) Detailed review of risk registers to include items identified as being deficient; ensuring robust and timely mitigation measures and assessments (likelihood & impact) are agreed by all parties. 2) Detailed assessment of the schedule risks (and undertake a Schedule QRA) and ensure robust and timely mitigation measures and cost assessment of the schedule risks; for inclusion with risk register and & Cost QRA.	2	Risk Management process has been subject to an independent review. Deemed as sufficient for this stage of the project. Acknowledges that carrying out a schedule QRA could add value to the project.	Review the need for a Schedule QRA. Continue to develop mitigation measures and continue to share risks with all those working on the project to ensure all are aware of the risk ownership.	APM	Prior to the next gateway review.
Risk Management	2	Assessment of allowance for Contingency (inc. risk and OB)	1) Update Cost QRA to take risk register updates (as identified above) 2) Alignment of confidence values between land risk and construction risk or presentation of a strategy to support methodology. 3) Separation of construction risk into contractor risk, client risk and sponsor risk (assuming SMBC are the client and TIGM are the sponsor). 4) Agreement by parties for the correct application of OB; moving towards less reliance upon OB and a greater reliance upon risk identification and quantification.	2	1) Costed risk register will continue to be updated to add further detail to the mitigation measures in line with the risk management plan. 2) Project Risk has now been realigned to use the P50 value in agreement with the lands risk register and in accordance with DfT guidance. 3) Risks already separated. 4) Project has now moved to include 27% OB down from 44% OB due to recognition of the risk management activities already taken place.	1) Continue to review costed risk register and develop (and cost as necessary) mitigation measures. 2) No further action required 3) Review allocation of risk between parties. 4) No further action required.	APM	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Risk Management	3	Contingency Management	The Risk Management Plan should be updated to detail how contingency will be managed by the funding parties; and how that interfaces with the Project Change Management.	2	Agreed.	Review risk management plan	APM	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.

Section	Issue Number	Issue raised by Gateway Review Panel (GRP)	Recommendation made by Gateway Review Panel	Current Score	A6 to Manchester Airport Project Team Response	A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Action	Owner	Date to Be Completed By
Risk Management	1	Risk Management Approach - Is the risk management plan appropriate and robust? Does it comply with TIGM guidance? Has an outline risk register been provided?	The Risk Management Plan (RMP) is appropriate and robust; and reflects industry best practice. The RMP has been subject to an independent review in January 2012; which found it to be fit-for- purpose. Detailed risk registers (Land Costs & Project) have been provided. The RMP doesn't address the issue of Contingency Management i.e. who owns and manages the...	2	Agreed. The risk management plan is based on a Highways Agency approach - chosen as best practice for the construction of a major highway. If the project is to be judged in future against the TIGM guidance, the project would benefit from having sight of this guidance so that a review of it's acceptability for the project can be undertaken and, where appropriate, the guidance followed.	Seek clarity from TIGM on the issues relating to Contingency Management as well on TIGM Risk Management guidance in general for review.	APM	Prior to the next gateway review.
Risk Management	2	Reporting/Escalation - Are arrangements for reporting and escalating risks to the Programme board are in place?	Within the RMP reporting arrangements to the PrB and responsibilities are clearly defined.	1	Agreed	No action required	N/A	N/A
Risk Management	3	Register - Appears to cover all material foreseeable risks, no obvious key risks missing and all required fields complete (risk owners, mitigations, scoring etc.)	Of the risk identified and captured within the risk registers; the majority of the required fields have been completed. But there are a number of issues with the information contained within the registers. There are listed in detail within the substantiation to these findings.	2	Acknowledged	Seek further information from TIGM on the detail referred to.	APM	Prior to the issue of the MSBC to the DIT (Complete).
Risk Management	4	Scoring - Have recognised scoring and mitigation measures been used? Are risks appropriately mitigated, scored and valued.	The RMP contains a recognisable scoring matrix for the qualitative assessment of the risk (i.e. probability and impact - time, cost and quality); this matrix has been used within the risk registers only to assess the risk on a pre-mitigation basis; therefore unable to understand or demonstrate what effect any mitigation measure would have. Within the Lands Cost Risk Register only 5 of 19 risk have mitigation measures identified.	2	Acknowledged. Since review, Project Risk has been taken back to the pre-mitigation case removing the confusion mentioned.	Review the Project Risk Register/Mitigation Measures and seek to develop the register to create a post mitigation risk register. For the lands risk register, undertake a full review of risks and mitigation measures.	APM	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Risk Management	5	QRA - Are all key risks on the register are quantified appropriately within the QRA, and QRA can be substantiated against the risk register?	The risk identified and contained within the registers have been quantified, save for the comments detailed in 3 & 4 above. The outputs of the Cost QRAs reflect the quantification of the risks contained within the registers. Different confidence levels have been used on the Lands Costs QRA (P50 - Pre-Mitigation Quantification) and Project QRA (P80 - Post mitigation Quantification); alignment of confidence values between land risk and construction risk, or presentation of a strategy to support methodology is required.	2	Acknowledged - Since review Project Risk is now presented in P50 pre-mitigation and hence alignment can be confirmed.	No further action.	N/A	N/A
Risk Management	6	Contingency - QRA and overall contingency (including OB where necessary) are broadly appropriate for the stage of project development?	Following a review of the contingency allowances (for Land Costs risk, Project risk and Optimism Bias); we believe that the current risk allowance is lower than what we would normally see for a project of this stage, but the 44% OB is too high. So due to the Issues	2	Acknowledged - Through discussion with TIGM Risk Allowance has been reviewed and increased a paper written to justify the change in OB from 44% to 27%.	No further action.	N/A	N/A
Schedule	1	Level of detail of the schedule	The schedule highlights the critical path in adequate detail, but does not cover any secondary path that's may become critical. It lacks detail related to the engagement with Network Rail and Statutory Undertakers. These are normally areas of concern and most schedules take these into account as it can have an impact on the start of construction.	2	Acknowledged - it should also be understood that the schedule presented is only intended to give a high level programme. This is backed up by more detailed schedules for each work stream.	Review each work stream programme and ensure this, and the high level programme, takes account of suitable NR and SU engagement times.	APM	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Schedule	2	Construction Period	The period allowed for Construction and Environmental measure in the schedule is three months shorter than that allowed by Belfour's in their assessment. This may be the difference between the Optimistic and Pessimistic. Further information would be required to understand this fully.	2		Review construction schedule against BB schedule.	APM	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Schedule	3	Statutory Diversions	Identify and incorporate critical diversions	2		Review construction schedule and incorporate stats diversions on appointment of the Contractor.	APM	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Schedule	4	Inspectors Report and Inquiry	Further consideration of timescales report can take up to 6 months	2	In total the timescale allocated to receiving the inspectors report and getting SoS agreement is 6 months. This is deemed to be sufficient at this stage.	No further action required.	N/A	N/A
Schedule	5	Design Approvals	Design approvals and interfaces have not been identified, HA, NR, TIGM	2	Governance arrangements need to first be confirmed before changes in the design approvals are programmed in. The project programme allows for approvals from Local Authorities which is the current understanding of the project governance.	Review and confirm the scheme governance. Following confirmation, review programme to include further design approvals as required.	PrB	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.

Section	Issue Number	Issue raised by Gateway Review Panel (GRP)	Recommendation made by Gateway Review Panel	Current Score	A6 to Manchester Airport Project Team Response	A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Action	Owner	Date to Be Completed By
Schedule	1	Resources - Does the project have provision for sufficiently skilled resources to progress the project to its next gateway.	QS and Commercial Management not disclosed. Co-ordinator role with Network Rail and Highways agency not identified. Definition of Roles and resources are adequate for size and nature of project. Major structures, 9 of, are to be built in the same time frame. Are there sufficient resources/suitable contractors to do the works. This may not be the most cost effective usage of resources/materials.	2	QS and Commercial Management provided in two forms. Specialist QS advice is regularly sourced through Corderoys and has been for a number of years. Financial Management is provided by SMBC based project Finance Manager, Martin Rigby. This is a requirement of the governance as all payments of suppliers is carried out through SMBC payment systems. NR coordination is being carried out by the Design Manager - Naz Huda. HA Co-ordination is currently only required for land transfer and this is being carried out at Project Board level by the Project Director, Jim McMahon and at Project Level by the Project Manager, Graham Martin. Construction programme based on advice by Balfour Beatty. Market testing to date suggests that sufficient resource is available.	Review management structure leading up to appointment of Contractor. Review construction programme on appointment of the Contractor. Continue to liaise with NR and the HA.	All	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Schedule	2	Deliverables - Have each of the deliverable been stated with a realistic timeframe for delivery?	At Final Business Case - Gateway 3a it is expected that a detailed delivery plan would form part of the submission. It has been assumed that since the Balfour report includes all major items the construction phase is based on the Balfour report. It is recommended that the delivery plan is submitted for the next review. Immediate timescales for internal approvals are behind schedule which may impact on the ability to submit the case in time. The time to present this will depend on how far advanced the current design/scoping has progressed. There is a difference between the Schedule and the Project management plan, documents need aligning.	2	MSBC now issued. Schedule submitted to be based on the timescales set out in the current programme.	Review schedule and Project Management Plan prior to issue with MSBC to insure they align.	APM	Prior to the issue of the MSBC to the DIT (Complete).
Schedule	3	Has a detailed schedule (TIGM/Contractor) been provided in appropriate format and required level of detail?	Overall schedule is based around what is deemed an appropriate critical path. More detail would be required to meet the requirements of TIGM. The schedule would normally have been produced using Primavera P6, though this is not a mandatory requirement. The planning team could consider bringing forward the Environmental mitigation, possibly by engaging early. Overlapping Environmental work with the major structure construction period. Balfours assessment indicates a period of 24 months for construction with 9 months for Environmental Mitigation. Engagement with Statutory Undertakers is required early in the schedule, late diversions in some areas will hold up construction. These critical diversions should be identified in the programme where applicable. The schedule shows an overall period of 28 month for construction with Environmental mitigation taking 5 months, but overlapping with construction by 3 months. Based on Balfours time initial assessment and construction plan three month longer period for Environmental mitigation/Construction. In addition there are long lead items relations to the main structures which require a fabrication period.	2	Acknowledged that in the lead up to an appointment of a Principle Contractor further detail will be required within the schedule. With regards Environmental Mitigation, acknowledged that this needs to be lengthened and more detail added. The project team are currently investigating the potential to bring forward the Environmental Mitigation, carrying out, where possible, survey and clearing activities by agreement with land owners.	Continue to review programme with regards early Environmental Mitigation. Continue to liaise with SU companies and programme in diversions on appointment of Principle Contractor.	APM	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Schedule	4	Completeness - is the schedule complete with major GRP gateways/activities/milestones and achievable?	Schedule covers Gateways 3a, 3b and 4. Also covers submission to exec board and DIT for Business Case approval. Covers the overall period from current status to handover Gateway 6. Covers all stage approval gateways, insufficient detail to substantiate.	1	Acknowledged	No further action required.	N/A	N/A
Schedule	5	Logic - Does the logic appear robust? Are timings, sequence, dependencies and critical path are sensible and appropriately linked.	The critical path is shown through Public consultation period, Planning and CPO, DIT approval of scheme, the Public Inquiry process, Award of construction contract, and the construction period. Logic follows an established process and the time frame, with the exception of construction (Noted above).	1	Acknowledged	No further action required.	N/A	N/A
Schedule	6	Schedule Risk - Have major risks to achievement of the schedule have been fed in to the risk register (and QRA if appropriate)?	Review the total period for Environment mitigation and overlap to construction Major Stakeholder impact. Check if SUs have any impact on schedule. A major rail possession will be required and timing will be in the hands of Network Rail (Refer to recommendation regards interfaces).	1	Accepted - It should be noted that full liaison is in place with NR with conversations under way to agree required possessions.	Review schedule in line with comments. Review SU diversions and incorporate discussions to date into the schedule with regards NR possessions.	APM/DM	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Schedule	7	Costs - Is the schedule properly cost/resource loaded (and matches the finance section)?	No evidence of the schedule being cost loaded. More detail would be useful in assessing the costs. Overall cost profile lines up with the draft schedule. Start of major spending lines up with start on site, although spending on Land does not line up with the CPO process.	4	Acknowledged. Cost profiling has been carried out outside of but is reflective and tied to the programme.	Review costing mechanism with programme going forward. Review spending on land and CPO process.	APM	Review prior to next gateway review

Section	Issue Number	Issue raised by Gateway Review Panel (GRP)	Recommendation made by Gateway Review Panel	Current Score	A6 to Manchester Airport Project Team Response	A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Action	Owner	Date to Be Completed By
Procurement & Contract Management	1	Agreed procurement Strategy	Develop a process over the next few weeks to finalise and agree the Procurement Strategy	3	Acknowledged. Since receipt of the GRP findings SEMMMS Project Team has progressed discussions with TIGM to further review the preferred procurement strategy of a staged ECI.	TIGM to review information and confirm Staged ECI as preferred procurement route or otherwise.	PM	Prior to the issue of the MSBC to the DfT (Complete).
Procurement & Contract Management	2	Governance	Develop a governance methodology that articulates TIGM's role particularly around sign off of procurement strategy; shortlist and supplier selection.	3	Agreed - governance strategy to be confirmed between all parties.	Confirm governance strategy	PD/PM/TIGM	Review prior to next gateway review
Procurement & Contract Management	3	Schedule	Adjust schedule to include standstill period; allow sufficient time for tender evaluation and accommodate governance requirements.	3	Acknowledged. Tender review period extended. Governance requirements to be confirmed.	On confirmation of governance requirements, review schedule to ensure sufficient time has been accounted for.	PM	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Procurement & Contract Management	1	Compliance - Is the proposed procurement strategy and route compliant with legal and organisational requirements?	The proposed procurement route is compliant with legal requirements other than the current schedule allows for 4 weeks for evaluation of the tenders, governance and standstill period. This has been discussed with Stockport and will be adjusted. Timescales will also need to be adjusted to ensure there is adequate time for Stockport's governance and TIGM's governance particularly around sign off of the final procurement strategy, sign off of the shortlist and sign off of the supplier selection. There is a slight risk that the selection may be challenged given Balfour Beatty's engagement under a PSC to provide initial advice. This risk can be mitigated by ensuring sufficient time and access to information is given to all bidders to allow them to compete on an equal footing.	2	Evaluation of tenders including LA approval has now been extended to 12 weeks. Risk to selection being challenged has been mitigated by only supplying BB with selected information. All parties will be able to access the same information during tender.	No further action proposed.	N/A	N/A
Procurement & Contract Management	2	Value for Money - Is the proposed procurement strategy and route likely to maximise value for money.	Stockport and TIGM need to undertake further work to refine and agree the procurement strategy to ensure that value for money is maximised through an appropriate level of competitive pressure at later stages in the process. The current proposed strategy of a 2 stage ECI will result in selection of a contractor based on % fees against a client estimated construction cost. This will result in a more collaborative approach with contractor input to the design and support for the public inquiry stage. However it minimises the contractor's incentive to agree/facilitate the 'best' target price. Furthermore, price certainty will not be gained until late in the process.	3	Procurement strategy document developed on the back of the GRP review. A process of incentivisation will serve to reward the contractor at an early stage for reducing the Target Cost between appointment and Final Target Cost prior to the start of construction.	No further action proposed.	N/A	N/A
Procurement & Contract Management	3	Deliverability - is the proposed procurement strategy and route are deliverable?	Subject to sufficient time being built into the schedule to cover governance requirements the strategy is deliverable.	2	Acknowledged	Review programme to ensure sufficient time allowed for executive decisions at key decision points.	APM	Prior to the issue of the MSBC to the DfT (Complete).
Procurement & Contract Management	4	Contracting Strategy - is the proposed contracting strategy robust, represent value for money and deliverable?	The proposed approach will transfer the majority of risks to the contractor (excluding SU) with joint responsibility for managing and mitigating the risks. The costs associated with these risks will be built into the target price with any removal or non-realisation of risk will benefit the target price and therefore benefits will be shared between the client and contractor. Before the contracting strategy is finalised there should be agreement between TIGM and Stockport on how risks will be allocated; how they will be quantified before inclusion in the target price and how they will be managed. The Procurement Strategy assumes that the scheme will be delivered as one procurement bundle. I understand that alternative bundling strategies have been considered and that the preferred approach is included in the draft Procurement Strategy document. Without an understanding of why a single procurement bundle is the preferred approach I am unable to comment on its validity.	3	Since the review the contracting strategy has been agreed with TIGM including the strategy the let the works as a single contract.	Prior to contract award, Project Board (including TIGM presence) to review and confirm agreement with risk allocation.	Project Board	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Procurement & Contract Management	5	Contract Management - Are there robust arrangements in place for on-going contract management	This will be developed at the appropriate time in the process.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Stakeholder Management	1	Ensure strong working link between work stream and comms teams.	Resource comms team to support project of this scale.	2	Agreed. Comms consultant appointed to supplement comms teams.	No further action.	N/A	N/A
Stakeholder Management	2	No agreed comms and engagement strategy	Articulate comms and engagement strategy	2	Agreed. communications strategy now completed for up to end of public consultation.	No further action.	N/A	N/A
Stakeholder Management	3	Possible public confusion around scheme and consultation	Clearly define what will be achieved by each stage of consultation.	2	Agreed	Develop comms strategy to cover post public consultation activity.	Communications Team	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Stakeholder Management	1	Ownership - Have clear accountabilities and responsibilities been set out at the very outset of the project and are all incumbents in agreement?	SMBC agreed how to work with stakeholders, but not sure if this has been set out	2	This has been fully set out up to the end of public consultation.	Comms strategy to be developed up to end of construction.	Communications Team	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.

Section	Issue Number	Issue raised by Gateway Review Panel (GRP)	Recommendation made by Gateway Review Panel	Current Score	A6 to Manchester Airport Project Team Response	A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Action	Owner	Date to Be Completed By
Stakeholder Management	2	Identification - Does the list of identified stakeholders and their interest in the project appear complete and accurate?	Yes, from information available in time given	1	Acknowledged	Further review of list of stakeholders to ensure this takes into account those post Public Consultation	Communications Team	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Stakeholder Management	3	Engagement Strategy - Is the proposed stakeholder engagement strategy robust and sensible?	Focus on delivery, so no articulated strategy. However, direction of travel is consistent with TIGM approach.	2	Comms strategy fully developed since review.	No further action	N/A	N/A
Stakeholder Management	4	Engagement Process - Have systems and processes been put in place to manage the engagement strategy?	Yes, good project working. Need to engage comms fully though.	2	Acknowledged that this has been developed since review.	Look to continue to arrange regular comms meeting post public consultation to ensure close communication is continued.	Comms/ PM	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Stakeholder Management	5	Communications Plan - Are appropriate time-based plan in place for proactive communications and media enquiries? Does this plan incorporate a feedback mechanism?	No plan agreed as focus on delivery. No feedback mechanism in place, although advice offered from TIGM with regards phone/email lines.	4	Plan now fully developed in preparation for the public consultation phase.	Continue this throughout project future.	Comms	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Stakeholder Management	6	Mandatory Signatures - All TIGM projects have a responsibility to consult with internal departments (EQIA, Energy Resource Requirements, Environmental Impact, Data Protection Act 1998).	Not sure if SMBC have equivalent sign off process.	N/A	Requirement fulfilled through integrated involvement of SMBC comms.	No further action	N/A	N/A
Design & Engineering	1	Material Specification	There is a requirement to specify the lifespan/loading of the pavement to ensure the correct materials can be specified within a detailed design.	1	Acknowledged, although this will be agreed during the design development in Stage 1 of the ECI contract.	Design Manager to specify the lifespan/loading of the pavement prior to detailed design.	Design Manager	Prior to the tender stage of the ECI Contractor
Design & Engineering	2	Embankment CBR	Review the minimum CBR requirements for Embankments in accordance with IAN73/06	1	Acknowledged	Design Team to review against standard.	Design Manager	Prior to the tender stage of the ECI Contractor
Design & Engineering	1	Cost Plan - Is the design is consistent with the cost allowance? Does the cost plan appear complete and costings appropriate and supportable for the proposed design?	Certain issues have been identified where the drawings have been quantified and suitably priced, however there are implied measures and site specific issues which may affect price. This is subject of a separate Commercial Due Diligence Review.	2	Commercial due diligence completed with full agreement between TIGM and the Project Team reached.	No further actions.	N/A	N/A
Design & Engineering	2	Client Requirements - Does the proposed design demonstrably deliver the key objectives of the project and comply with the key client/stakeholder requirements?	The Clients requirements have been listed within the DIT business case. All of these requirements are fulfilled within the documentation which has been reviewed and within	1	Acknowledged	No further actions.	N/A	N/A
Design & Engineering	3	Deliverability - Is there evidence that the proposed design is buildable, deliverable, achievable within schedule and will the final product be usable and maintainable?	By reviewing the alignments, preliminary drawings and documentation provided the scheme appears to be buildable and deliverable without any major departure from standards with regards to design. The final product will be usable and maintainable in accordance with current standards. However, some of the materials which have been costed may have an impact on the long term performance therefore maintenance regime to be employed.	1	Acknowledged although without specification on which materials may have an impact it is hard to prescribe a specific action.	Design team to liaise with the future maintaining highways authorities to ensure maintenance requirements are developed prior to the commencement of detailed design.	Design Manager	Prior to the appointment of the Staged ECI Contractor.
Design & Engineering	4	Health & Safety - Does the proposed design demonstrably take account of health and safety requirements and minimises health and safety risks to an appropriate level?	All items appear to be design in accordance with current best practice, Interim Advice Note (IAN) and referenced to standards.	1	Acknowledged	No further actions.	N/A	N/A
Design & Engineering	5	Deliverability - Is there evidence that the proposed design is buildable, deliverable, achievable within schedule and will the final product be usable and maintainable?	All items appear to be design in accordance with current best practice, Interim Advice Note (IAN) and referenced to standards.	1	Acknowledged	No further actions.	N/A	N/A
Design & Engineering	6	Deliverability - Is there evidence that the proposed design is buildable, deliverable, achievable within schedule and will the final product be usable and maintainable?	In general, the scheme is buildable for the current funding arrangements which are subject of on-going discussion. Planning is still to be sought as is Public Inquiry, therefore we would expect to see development of the design and mitigation measures to address this.	1	Agreed.	No further actions.	N/A	N/A
Design & Engineering	7	Completeness & Consistency - Is the overall design complete and are all elements co-ordinated and consistent?	In line with the development of the scheme, at this stage, the current proposal does not included detailed design elements, it is more in line with a preliminary design and build project with Geotechnical reports and alignments etc. As the design progresses through the various gateway reviews, we would expect to see development of, design life considerations (agreed with ultimate Highway Authorities), material specifications etc.	2	Agreed	Design Manager to include review of designing for maintenance.	Design Manager	Prior to the tender stage of the ECI Contractor
Health and Safety	1	No description on how hazard identification has taken place or mitigated during the project life cycle.	Include section on Hazard Identification and responsibility for mitigation e.g. Designer.	3	Acknowledged	Following the selection of a preferred route, the design manager is to consider drafting of the first draft of the health and safety file. This can feed into the pre-construction information to be included in the tender phase. Acknowledged that some form of formal record of the health and safety issues considered at prelim design to be produced.	Design Manager	Prior to the tender stage of the ECI Contractor

Section	Issue Number	Issue raised by Gateway Review Panel (GRP)	Recommendation made by Gateway Review Panel	Current Score	A6 to Manchester Airport Project Team Response	A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Action	Owner	Date to Be Completed By
Health and Safety	2	No description on how CDM is being managed.	Include CDM strategy including specific roles and responsibilities.	3	Acknowledged	CDM-C to continue to be engaged post selection of the preferred route and a CDM strategy to be developed for reference.	PM	Prior to the tender stage of the ECI Contractor
Health and Safety	3	No description on the process to ensure that competent suppliers/contractors are appointed.	Include the process being adopted.	3	Acknowledged	Current practices and aspirations for future practices to be recorded in a H&S File/Strategy	Design Manager	Prior to the tender stage of the ECI Contractor
Health and Safety	4	No description of how corporate governance will be undertaken during the project life-cycle.	Include the process being adopted.	3	Disagree - Full corporate governance recorded in the Management Plan.	No further action.	N/A	N/A
Health and Safety	5	No clear roles and responsibilities stated for the project team.	Review project organisation and determine specific responsibilities by position e.g. Project Manager. It is not obvious how the project team will be supported by H&S competent persons.	3	CDM-C clearly stated on the organisation chart.	Look to formalise how health and safety will be managed in future and ensure the roles and responsibilities in the management plan clearly state where H&S responsibilities lie.	PMT/DT	Prior to the tender stage of the ECI Contractor
Health and Safety	1	Approach - Has a suitable Health and Safety Plan Been Developed	No evidence or reference to a H&S Plan	4	Acknowledged.	Review Product Matrix and ensure it is clear at what project stage a Health and Safety Plan is started.	PMT/DT	Prior to the tender stage of the ECI Contractor
Health and Safety	2	Legislative - Have all relevant SHE legislation been considered in the project development (such as site waste, biodiversity, contaminated land, pollution, environmental surveys)?	No reference to H&S Legislation	4	Acknowledged.	Review design standards report, technical approvals report etc. to ensure H&S legislation is referenced and adhered to. Further engage with the CDM-C to ensure obligations are met in the next project stage.	Design Manager	Prior to the tender stage of the ECI Contractor
Health and Safety	3	CDM - Has a CDM-C been engaged.	No description of how H&S CDM strategy has been developed or implemented. It should be clearly set out who is taking the client responsibilities due to different streams of funding.	2	CDM-C has been appointed and engaged and involved in project development. Acknowledged that this relationship needs to be better documented in the next project stage.	Ensure relationship between the project team and the CDM-C is documented within the Project Initiation Documentation.	PMT	Prior to the tender stage of the ECI Contractor
Health and Safety	4	Reporting - Is a suitable and compliant reporting process in place to record and report incidents?	No reference or description of the reporting process for accidents, incidents or performance management.	2	Risk management process clearly defined in the risk management plan. Acknowledge this needs to be tailored to support Health and Safety issues. Accidents, incidents will be managed by the Contractor on appointment. Any works carried out on site in the preparation stages are subject to the Health and Safety policies and procedures of the supplier organisation.	Ensure that the health and safety requirements are an integral part of the tender process for the main contractor. Incentivise good health and safety practices and encourage a zero tolerance attitude during construction.	PMT	Prior to the tender stage of the ECI Contractor
Legal	1	Before current funding was secured the original proposal was for this Scheme to be sponsored and advanced by Stockport Borough Council. However, since DfT funding was secured the GMCA and TIGM has been asked to oversee this project in order to control cost and minimise the risk of overspend, this is important because the DfT funding is to be provided to the GMCA. The DfT funding is fixed and any overspend...	TIGM, Stockport Borough Council, Manchester City Council and Cheshire East Council to consider and produce recommendations for governance and project delivery structure followed by round table meeting to discuss and agree a procedure and process for delivery of the scheme.	3	TIGM management since added to the Project Board and Chief Executive's Steering Committee.	No further action	N/A	N/A
Legal	2	As a local authority, Stockport Borough Council need to obtain the powers to progress the scheme. There are two statutory routes which might apply to this project and enable Stockport Borough Council to obtain the necessary powers (being S10 of the Highways Act 1980 or the Planning Act 2008). Under the current law it is imperative that Stockport follow the correct statutory route. SMBC's legal....	TIGM legal to be provided with a copy of the legal advice from Stockport Borough Council so that this can be considered by the joint project board.	3	This information could have been requested at the gateway review and provided at the time but was not requested.	SMBC legal to provide statement to the Project Board for review.	SMBC Legal.	Prior to the tender stage of the ECI Contractor
Legal	3	Stockport Council are the Highway Authority for roads (other than trunk roads) within their administrative area. This enables Stockport Council to apply for planning and obtain CPO in respect of land within the administrative area required for the Scheme. However, in order to ensure the successful execution of this scheme Stockport Borough Council require the acquisition of land which falls within the...	TIGM legal to be provided with a copy of the draft s8 Agreement from SMBC confusing the necessary powers to SMBC on progress the planning and CPO.	3	This information could have been presented at the gateway review but was not requested.	Draft s8 agreement to be issued to the Project Board. TIGM Project Board member to issue to TIGM legal as required.	TIGM Board Member.	Prior to the tender stage of the ECI Contractor
Legal	4	Preparatory works for planning and compulsory purchase order are underway.	SMBC to provide TIGM with copies of current planning proposals and land identified as requiring acquisition.	3	This information could have been presented at the gateway review but was not requested. SMBC legal are providing the legal check of the planning proposals and CPO on behalf of the three promoting authorities for the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Project Team. It is not clear why TIGM legal check of this work is required as part of the GRP review.	TIGM Board member to confirm and agree with the project board and subsequently the project team if this information is required.	TIGM Board Member.	Prior to the tender stage of the ECI Contractor

Section	Issue Number	Issue raised by Gateway Review Panel (GRP)	Recommendation made by Gateway Review Panel	Current Score	A6 to Manchester Airport Project Team Response	A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Action	Owner	Date to Be Completed By
Legal	5	Full environmental assessment has been undertaken by SMBC.	TIGM to review and come to a view as to whether this identifies any additional risks to the scheme and how these can be mitigated. TIGM further understands that SBC have completed a draft ES which should be review by TIGM. The environmental review should include consideration of where the scheme requires acquisition of public open spaces. TIGM understands that SMBC have made provision for the purchase of land to compensate for the public open space that will...	3	This information could have been presented at the gateway review but was not requested. It is unclear why TIGM would need to provide this review and what value this would add over and above the review being made by SMBC, CEC and MCC.	TIGM Board member to confirm and agree with the project board and subsequently the project team if this information is required.	TIGM Board Member.	Prior to the tender stage of the ECI Contractor
Legal	6	Programme review and programme risks (including financial risk around land acquisition).	The need to obtain planning and CPO could present significant timing and programming issues. SMBC and TIGM need to identify and consider whether enough time has been allowed in the programme to allow for these risks. In particular, high risk sites such as Sale Golf Club to be identified and specifically addressed in the programme. The allowance for land acquisition costs in the budget to be review as part of this exercise.	3	This information could have been presented at the gateway review but was not requested. It is unclear why TIGM would need to provide this review and what value this would add over and above the review being made by SMBC, CEC and MCC. All land acquisition procedures have been fully included in the programme. Assuming the reviewer is referring to <u>Styal</u> golf club and not <u>Sale</u> (which is unaffected by the scheme), the project team is and has been progressing with early discussions with not only Styal but all four golf clubs affected by the scheme. The project team has made excellent progress on all these issues. Following a cost benefit analysis at Styal a programme of early accommodations works is currently being progressed with a view to mitigate the impact of the road before the main construction of the scheme.	No further action.	N/A	N/A
Legal	1	Approvals & Consents - Have all necessary powers and consents been fully approved	Grant of planning permission - This has not been obtained by SMBC. SMBC intend to go out to a "Pre-Public Consultation" where they will publish options for the SEMMMS Route and consult for the SEMMMS Route and consult the public on their views of the given routes. After this pre-public consultation SMBC will decide on the route. Planning application will then be progressed. There is a significant amount of work and thus time/programming risk associated with this issue - ...	4	Acknowledge but unclear why this represents "consents not fully met". Full consents programmed for after this review in line with best practice and correct procedures.	No further actions	N/A	N/A
Legal	1A	Approvals & Consents - Have all necessary powers and consents been fully approved	Compulsory Purchase Orders - SMBC have identified the land which needs to be obtained in order to enable the Scheme to be progressed. SMBC will try to acquire the land required by agreement but have identified parcels of land which they believe will need a CPO. Draft orders have been produced, so Stockport should be in a good position to progress once planning issues resolved but TIGM and Stockport need to ensure that sufficient time...	2	Understood and acknowledged. Not clear why this is not "No Issues" score as reviewer recognises that significant prep. work carried out prior to land acquisition. The land acquisition process remains on programme.	No further actions	N/A	N/A
Legal	2	Conditions - Are there any conditions to the powers and consents and do they pose any additional risks.	Environmental impacts of scheme need to be assessed - full environmental impact assessment have been carried out. No significant additional risks have been identified. TIGM should review and check the same.	1	Agreed at Project Board level including representative from TIGM that no further legal checks required on these issues by TIGM. Acknowledged that reviewer has found good practice in the environmental impact assessment procedures carried out to date. This work will be completed/updated post selection of a preferred route and in the lead up to the submission of a planning application.	No further action.	N/A	N/A
Legal	3	References - Have contractor references been received?	Not applicable at this stage. Procurement strategy to be reviewed in light of possible changes to project structure and TIGM to feed into this as necessary.	N/A	Acknowledged	No further action	N/A	N/A
Legal	4	Insurance - Are all warranties, bonds and insurances confirmed and agreed by all parties?	Not applicable at this stage.	N/A	Acknowledged	No further action	N/A	N/A
Delivery Strategy	1	Critical Success Factors - Clearly describe all factors that must be present for the project to succeed.	At this stage, it is to be expected that the Delivery Strategy is not developed to any great degree. Strategies presented in the Benefits Realisation Plan, PID, Procurement Strategy and Project Management Plan all indicate to their being a common understand of how to transition to BAU, and it is anticipated that this will be further developed prior to the next Gateway Review.	1	Acknowledged	No further action	N/A	N/A
Delivery Strategy	2	Key Delivery Challenges - Have all delivery challenges been articulated and has a robust overall delivery strategy been put in place to address them?		1			N/A	N/A
Delivery Strategy	3	Integration - Is a strategy in place to address integration/transition issues and maximise synergies in transferring to BAU?		1			N/A	N/A
Delivery Strategy	4	Overall Consistency - Are delivery arrangements well integrated and consistent with one another (risk, procurement, schedule, governance...)		1			N/A	N/A
Transition	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Section	Issue Number	Issue raised by Gateway Review Panel (GRP)	Recommendation made by Gateway Review Panel	Current Score	A6 to Manchester Airport Project Team Response	A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Action	Owner	Date to Be Completed By
Evaluation & Monitoring	1	Clear definition of national and local evaluation objectives.	Evaluations activity would benefit considerably from being focused around specified nation and local evaluation objectives, i.e. exactly what DfT and the promoting authorities wish to learn from monitoring and evaluation activity.	3	Acknowledged	Evaluate Benefits Realisation Plan (BRP) against national and local evaluation objectives prior to next gateway review.	SMBC / Atkins	Review prior to next gateway review
Evaluation & Monitoring	2	Costing of the programme of monitoring and evaluation work to be delivered.	Monitoring and evaluation costs need to be explicitly identified to ensure credibility of the proposals.	3	Acknowledged although considered to be a small percentage of the overall budget and therefore comfortable with level of costing carried out to date.	Project team to consider and include in budget explicit budget for evaluation activities.	SMBC / Atkins	Review prior to next gateway review
Evaluation & Monitoring	3	Clear distinction from benefits realisation activity.	Benefits realisation and monitoring & evaluation activities should be separately defined. At the moment they are merged and there is limited text on benefits realisation.	3	Acknowledged	Evaluate BRP with a view to separately defining benefits realisation and monitoring in next revision prior to the next gateway review.	SMBC / Atkins	Review prior to next gateway review
Evaluation & Monitoring	1	Prioritisation - Have the benefits been prioritised in terms of impact. This will inform the structure of the evaluation.	Some degree of prioritisation is apparent in the scaling of activity. Further prioritisation would be beneficial, both in respect of national and local evaluation objectives and in terms of the relative scale of traditional scheme benefits (e.g. journey time savings).	2	Acknowledged	Evaluate BRP with a view to address prioritisation issues prior to the next gateway review.	SMBC / Atkins	Review prior to next gateway review
Evaluation & Monitoring	2	Cost - Has an appropriate budget been set aside to cover the costs of the evaluation exercise? This should be proportional to the structure of the evaluation required.	Despite an extensive programme of monitoring & evaluation work being set out in some detail (Appendix J), no associated cost has been identified. This apparent lack of explicit cost allocation raises questions over the credibility of the evaluation plans.	4	Acknowledged although considered to be a small percentage of the overall budget and therefore comfortable with level of costing carried out to date.	Project team to consider and include in budget explicit budget for evaluation activities.	SMBC / Atkins	Review prior to next gateway review
Evaluation & Monitoring	3	Approach - Are the desired outcomes of the evaluation exercise in line with the suggested approach?	The approaches are generally robust. Perhaps the main exception is in terms of economic impacts, likely to emerge as a key area when evaluation objectives are clearly defined.	2	Acknowledged	Project team to review the evaluation process of the economic benefits prior to the next gateway review.	SMBC / Atkins	Review prior to next gateway review
Evaluation & Monitoring	4	Timescale - Has adequate time been allowed to conduct the evaluation?	Timescale clearly specified (before, 1 year and 5 years after) and appropriate for a scheme of this scale.	1	Acknowledged	No further actions	N/A	N/A
Evaluation & Monitoring	5	Measures/Units/types - Have measures/units/types been identified that will be evaluated upon project completion (transport, economic, VIM, social or environmental impacts)?	For most outcomes, suitable measures are identified.	1	Acknowledged	No further actions	N/A	N/A
Evaluation & Monitoring	6	Data - Has all the appropriate data been captured and baselined to allow for comparison in the evaluation?	Not at this stage but this is envisaged as an important part of the pre-construction activities.	1	Acknowledged	Project team to review data capture requirements pre-construction and set out plan with costs of what additional data is required.	SMBC / Atkins	Review prior to next gateway review
Evaluation & Monitoring	7	Legal - Has a legal condition been included to allow TIGM to access operational data after handover?	In general this checklist is not relevant. The evaluation, however, does rely on access to data from bus operators in relation to journey time performance, but it is not clear whether bus operators have been approached at this time.	N/A	Acknowledged - should be understood that SMBC, CEC and MCC will be the Highway Maintaining Authorities.	Accepted as not relevant, however, project team to review with TIGM what, if any, operational data may be required.	PM/TIGM	Review prior to next gateway review
Evaluation & Monitoring	8	Process - Has a pre-defined process been put in place to evaluate the management of the project for Lessons Learnt?	Some stakeholder engagement envisaged on "lessons learned" but otherwise any process evaluation of issues surrounding development & delivery of the scheme is absent.	2	Acknowledged - although understood that the Gateway Review Process will provide an element of this review process.	Project team to consider options with regards "Lessons Learnt" of the management of the scheme and, where appropriate and applicable, incorporate these into BRP.	PM	Review prior to next gateway review

SEMMMS 3a Review (re-visit) - Issue/Action Log

Section	Ref	Issue	Recommendation	Score (July 12)	Project Team Response	Project Team Action	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Score (Sept 13)
Strategic Alignment	SA	None	None	1	N/A	N/A		No response needed.	1
Governance	G1	Approvals/Delegated Authority does not seem to have been formally handed to Stockport to manage the project	A Delivery Agreement/SLA/Contract could be designed, circulated and agreed to clarify how decisions will be made and what levels of escalation will be used within the project organisation. This should also acknowledge how decision making external to the project organisation will be managed (DfT/GMCA/Airport etc.).	2	Approvals and delegated authority has been formally handed to SMBC. The Management Plan clearly sets out what levels of escalations will used. The governance structure has been agreed at Project Board level. MCC, CEC, SMBC represented at each level of governance. Section 8 agreement is currently be formalised.	Section 8 agreement to be signed off by each local authority. Overall project governance structure to be reviewed and confirmed prior to progresses to the procurement of the scheme.	Stephen Chapman	A Section 8 agreement has been drafted and presented for this review. However, this was in draft for in the January review, it has yet to be signed off.	2
	G2	As this project is being jointly delivered by three separate authorities there are obvious questions regarding who's governance framework will be used. It is not clearly identified in the submission.	Considering the project is underway, there has been a significant amount of design work already completed and procurement activity will soon commence a decision should be made as soon as possible about which governance framework will be used going forward for the SEMMMS project. This will also be agreed and approved by all parties.	2	Approvals and delegated authority has been formally handed to SMBC. The Management Plan clearly sets out what levels of escalations will used. The governance structure has been agreed at Project Board level. MCC, CEC, SMBC represented at each level of governance. Section 8 agreement is currently be formalised.	Section 8 agreement to be signed off by each local authority. Overall project governance structure to be reviewed and confirmed prior to progresses to the procurement of the scheme.	Stephen Chapman	A Section 8 agreement has been drafted and presented for this review. However, this was in draft for in the January review, it has yet to be signed off.	2
	G3	This is a high profile, high cost project and will certainly be subject to audit at some stage during its lifestyle and possibly afterwards. Whilst it states in the submission that audit requirements will be satisfied it stops short of listing which standards the project is being managed in accordance with.	Create an assurance plan that allows project information controlled and archived periodically using an information management plan that would facilitate the retrieval of information when required. Work with audit bodies to best understand points of which information will need to be presented for audit. These audits should appear in the cost and resource plans.	2	SMBC is a quality assured council and it's systems and processes by which SEMMMS is in compliance are subject to regular audits. Each consultant employed on the scheme is also QA assured and is required to undertake their own audit processes. Project Assurance is undertaken by the TfGM GRIP review process. It is agreed that a audit process specifically for the project could be considered.	Review current audit practices and consider recommendations to Project Board for project specific audit process.	Stephen Chapman	No additional information has been provided regarding the a review of audit practices.	2
	G4	It is acknowledged that there is a need to provide reporting, the documentation suggest that this is yet to be decided and the Project Controls Manager hasn't been engaged.	A Project Controls function should be engaged as soon as possible to define how the project will present information to board members, decide on the metrics used for the checks and balances and begin providing information that will allow efficient monitoring and control of the project.	2	Section 3.5 on Page 5 of the Management Plan states that the role of Project Controls Manager will be undertaken by the Assistant Project Manager. A clear configuration management plan is in place and active. The project reporting to Project Board is carried out on a monthly basis with the content of the reporting agreed by the Project Board. This includes reporting on all aspects of Project Controls including budget and programme.	Review current configuration management / project controls. Review reporting to the Project Board to ensure compliance continues.	Stephen Chapman	The project still does not appear to have sufficient provision for monitoring of costs, the schedule or risks on a regular basis (monthly).	2
	G5	Some key roles are missing from the roles and responsibilities section and costs don't seems to be accounted for.	Add TfGM support as well as a dedicated Risk Manager, Project Controls Manager, and Finance Manager to the Project Team.	2	Risk Manager and Project Controls Manager role undertaken by the Assistant Project Manager (Section 3.5 on Page 5 of the Management Plan). Finance Manager referenced in section 3.3 page 4 of the Management Plan. Finance Manager is required to be a member of SMBC to enable sign off of key financial decisions. This role is undertaken by Martin Rigby. Costs for these roles are fully accounted for in the forward preparation cost forecasting.	Name Martin Rigby as the Finance Manager within the Management Plan.	Stephen Chapman	A risk management specialist is still not present in the project organisation, nor are there any visible forms of project controls.	2
	G6	PMP/ProgMP - Has the correct procedure/route been selected to govern the project?	Although this is not a TfGM project it will be subject to the same internal standards. As a result of this it has been decided that it will be a Route 5 project following the Project Management Procedures (PMP).	1	If the scheme were to follow the same internal standards of a TfGM project this, under the current governance structure, would be a decision for the Project Board and ultimately for the Senior Responsible Owner.	Request that TfGM GRP supply description of PMP requirements of a Route 5 project for clarity and consideration. SEMMMS Project Team to review the internal standards of the PMP of TfGM.	Stephen Chapman	No response needed.	1
	G7	Gateway Review Process (GRP) - Is this a clear understanding of TfGM's approvals process? Have submission dates been built into the schedule?	Submission dates have been built into the schedule for the PMP Gateway Review and appear to be realistic at this stage.	1	Submission dates based on information transferred on the GRP from TfGM to date.	No Action	Stephen Chapman	No response needed.	1
	G8	Strategies & Plans - is there a clear understanding of the PM's responsibility to devise a plan to each aspect of the project from TfGM's strategies.	As this project is delivered by three separate councils it is expected that there are no corporate strategies quoted. However, individual plans should be well advanced. Although there seems to be a plan for most aspects of the project the detail is insufficient for project of this size.	2	Plans produced to levels of detail deemed sufficient by the Project Director and SRO at this stage of the scheme.	Request that TfGM GRP supply description of PMP requirements of a Route 5 project for clarity and consideration. SEMMMS Project Team to review the internal standards of the PMP of TfGM.	Stephen Chapman	GRP criteria is not relevant for the development of detailed delivery plans.	2
	VfM1	Analysis in the economic case is not supporting the strategic case for the scheme	Agreed that TfGM will work with SMBC and Atkins to ensure the strategic economic cases complement each other in the revised MSBC submission to DfT	3	Continue liaison with TfGM representatives.	Atkins completed dialogue with TfGM prior to submission of the business case and ensured all suggestions are considered and included as necessary.	Ian Palmer	This issue has been dealt with	1
	VfM2	BCR of 18 is incorrectly calculated and is misleading. I also think the quoted 11,000 jobs is incorrect.	Agreed that this will not appear in the revised economic appraisal.	3	Atkins to provide response	This was removed following the gateway review and prior to the submission of MSBC.	Ian Palmer	This issue has been dealt with	1

Section	Ref	Issue	Recommendation	Score (July 12)	Project Team Response	Project Team Action	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Score (Sept 13)
VFM & Appraisal	VfM3			n/a			Ian Palmer	DfT have placed a conditional on PE approval that "SMBC should ensure that the variable demand modelling for the scheme is appropriate and a range of sensitivities are carried out (e.g. may consider recalibrating the variable demand model based on peak hour generalised cost from the traffic assignment model and revise the economic appraisal, as well as employing a range of sensitivity tests of alternative reasonable assumptions). This should address the uncertainty in the scheme benefits related to the demand model methodology." A response is required from SMBC.	4
	VfM4			n/a			Ian Palmer	DfT have placed a conditional on PE approval that "xi. SMBC should update the forecast uncertainty logs for the scheme to ensure appropriate assumptions are made (for example, assumptions about which road, public transport and Local Sustainable Transport Fund schemes are included in the forecast year Do-Minimum and Do-Something scenarios)." A response is required from SMBC.	4
	VfM5			n/a			Ian Palmer	DfT have placed a conditional on PE approval that "SMBC should review the need for the Public Transport model and enhance/update as appropriate." A response is required from SMBC.	4
Benefits Realisation	BR1	Outline Benefits - Describe the anticipated financial and non-financial benefits, including an explanation of the current baseline state.	The Benefits Realisation Plan is centred around the 3 Local Authorities. It addresses the 6 key Scheme Objectives. The 2 key issues here are whether there are specific detailed benefits within the various commitments of the business case. Additionally, a mechanism for incorporating benefits which are emphasised or developed as part of the Public Inquiry would be needed. It would be expected that this level of detail would be developed as the project continues.	2	Accepted - BRP should be reviewed at each gateway and, where required be revised to include any additional/further detail of the benefits that the scheme will be aiming to achieve.	Commission Atkins or similar to update the BRP at prior to the next gateway.	Stephen Chapman	Update of BRP carried out in May 2012. Recommendation not actioned, therefore it is still applicable. Specific benefits are not sufficiently clearly and individually defined to allow adequate tracking throughout the long duration of the project. The concern being that detail may be lost before evaluation.	3
	BR2	Benefit Profiling - Define the measures that will be used to assess benefits, attached a quantitative unit where possible.	The Benefits Realisation Plan stipulates a methodology that, notwithstanding the above comments, describes an effective way of collating this data. At this stage, the method is described at high level, and as the scheme progresses, it would be expected that the detail would be developed.	1	Accepted	Quantitative benefits analysis to be reviewed and detail to be added prior to the next gateway review	Stephen Chapman	No response needed.	1
	BR3	Benefits Mapping - Create a benefit map that indicates how each of the anticipated benefits follows from the project output to strategic objective.	The strategy contains a mapping table which links issues to Scheme Specific Objective to WebTAG Impact Classifications. Again, at this stage the problems this addresses do not contain specifics and detail, which would be developed as the project progresses.	1	Accepted	Produce more specific information regarding the mapping.	Stephen Chapman	No response needed.	1
	BR4	As part of the transition of project output into BAU explain what steps will need to be taken to integrate the project output into a new capability.	Insofar as progression to BAU required specific actions, a mitigation measures plan is identified and referred to within the Benefits Realisation Model. Other than that, given the level of detail presented at present, a detailed transition to BAU would not be expected at this time.	1	Accepted	Review and produce detailed transition to BAU as required prior to the next GRP.	Stephen Chapman	No response needed.	1
	BR5	Benefit Appraisal - Define how statements and assessment in benefits appraisal are correct, supportable and understandable.	At this stage, the high level nature of the benefits are expressed as resolution of issues affecting the area. This is acceptable at this stage, and it would be expected that more detail would be generated as the project progresses towards Public Inquiry.	1	Accepted	Review section of the BRP in the lead up to the Public Inquiry.	Stephen Chapman	No response needed.	1
	FF1	Further work and quantification on on-going revenue maintenance and renewals costs required.	No recommendation	2	On going revenue and maintenance costs are outside the scope of the project.	No action suggested by the project team.	Dave Daughney	No response needed.	1
	FF2	Funding - Has a source been identified to fund the project? This should include details of revenue as well as capital expenditure.	Revised capital costs per EC Harris due diligence analysis is within funding available of £290m. The EC Harris report note that further work is required in certain areas to finalise costs however the revised costings provide for a commercially robust project. Additional work required on future revenue and renewals costs.	2	Revenue and Renewal This is outside the scope of the project and will become the responsibility of the highways authority to which the scheme will be handed over to.	Investigate with TfGM if specific actions are required on the future revenue and renewal costs prior to the next GRP.	Dave Daughney	No investigation has taken place and there is no further information presented to address Renewals.	2
	FF3	Affordability - Demonstrate how the overall project appears affordable against expected funding arrangements.	Revised capital costs are within the funding sources available as noted above. Additional work required on future revenue and renewals costs and funding.	2	As above	As above	Dave Daughney	As above	2

Section	Ref	Issue	Recommendation	Score (July 12)	Project Team Response	Project Team Action	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Score (Sept 13)
Finance and Funding	FF4	Capital Costs (CAPEX) - Are all capital costs fully scoped, clearly stated, robust and within expectations?	Robust costing analysis performed by EC Harris. Report notes some questions to be resolved however that the revised costs (as noted above) 'would provide for a commercially robust project'.	1	EC Harris performed a due diligence exercise on the robust costing of the scheme carried out by Corderoy.	No further actions as comments raised by EC Harris discussed in detail.	Dave Daughney	No response needed.	1
	FF5	Revenue Costs (OPEX) Are all revenue costs fully scoped, clearly stated robust and within expectations.	Limited information provided to date on future revenue costs. Requires additional future work.	4	Outside the scope of the project.	Investigate with TfGM if specific actions are required on the future revenue and renewal costs prior to the next GRP.	Dave Daughney	No investigation has taken place and there is no further information presented to address OPEX costs.	4
	FF6	Contingency - Is the contingency fully scoped, committed to the project, clearly stated, appears to be appropriate level and treatment?	Appropriate contingencies applied as per EC Harris report and within the funding envelope.	1	Acknowledged.	No action	Dave Daughney	No response needed.	1
	FF7	Renewals - Are the renewals fully scoped, clearly stated, appear robust, in appropriate cost base, and within expectations.	Limited information provided to date on future renewals costs. Requires additional future work.	4	Renewals are not within the scope of this project.	Investigate with TfGM if specific actions are required on the future revenue and renewal costs prior to the next GRP.	Dave Daughney	No investigation has taken place and there is no further information presented to address Renewals.	4
Risk Management	RM1	Risk registers not sufficiently robust for both assessment and management purposes.	1) Detailed review of risk registers to include items identified as being deficient; ensuring robust and timely mitigation measures and assessments (likelihood & impact) are agreed by all parties. 2) Detailed assessment of the schedule risks (and undertake a Schedule QRA) and ensure robust and timely mitigation measures and cost assessment of the schedule risks; for inclusion with risk register and & Cost QRA.	2	Risk Management process has been subject to an independent review. Deemed as sufficient for this stage of the project. Acknowledges that carrying out a schedule QRA could add value to the project.	Review the need for a Schedule QRA. Continue to develop mitigation measures and continue to share risks with all those working on the project to ensure all are aware of the risk ownership.	EC Harris	Risk is due to be updated during the tender consolidation period post award of preferred bidder. Actions raised are to identify risks that may be mitigated through the tender process and review budget. Schedule risk has not been undertaken as yet. Review of suitability during next period	2
	RM2	Assessment of allowance for Contingency (inc. risk and OB)	1) Update Cost QRA to take risk register updates (as identified above) 2) Alignment of confidence values between land risk and construction risk or presentation of a strategy to support methodology. 3) Separation of construction risk into contractor risk, client risk and sponsor risk (assuming SMBC are the client and TfGM are the sponsor). 4) Agreement by parties for the correct application of OB; moving towards less reliance upon OB and a greater reliance upon risk identification and quantification.	2	1) Costed risk register will continue to be updated to add further detail to the mitigation measures in line with the risk management plan. 2) Project Risk has now been realigned to use the P50 value in agreement with the lands risk register and in accordance with DfT guidance. 3) Risks already separated. 4) Project has now moved to include 27% OB down from 44% OB due to recognition of the risk management activities already taken place.	1) Continue to review costed risk register and develop (and cost as necessary) mitigation measures. 2) No further action required 3) Review allocation of risk between parties. 4) No further action required.	EC Harris	Risks are now allocated to risk owners and identified as strategic or project. This will be developed further during the initial development period however will require some commercial input.	1
	RM3	Contingency Management	The Risk Management Plan should be updated to detail how contingency will be managed by the funding parties; and how that interfaces with the Project Change Management.	2	Agreed.	Review risk management plan	EC Harris	This has been done and needs continual developing as the design and scope develops	1
	RM4	Risk Management Approach - Is the risk management plan appropriate and robust? Does it comply with TfGM guidance? Has an outline risk register been provided?	The Risk Management Plan (RMP) is appropriate and robust; and reflects industry best practice. The RMP has been subject to an independent review in January 2012; which found it to be fit-for- purpose. Detailed risk registers (Land Costs & Project) have been provided. The RMP doesn't address the issue of Contingency Management i.e. who owns and manages	2	Agreed. The risk management plan is based on a Highways Agency approach - chosen as best practice for the construction of a major highway. If the project is to be judged in future against the TfGM guidance, the project would benefit from having sight of this guidance so that a review of it's acceptability for the project can be undertaken and, where appropriate, the guidance followed.	Seek clarity from TfGM on the issues relating to Contingency Management as well as on TfGM Risk Management guidance in general for review.	EC Harris	Internal discussion required regarding the use and level of OB to be maintained going forward.	1
	RM5	Reporting/Escalation - Are arrangements for reporting and escalating risks to the Programme board are in place?	Within the RMP reporting arrangements to the PrB and responsibilities are clearly defined.	1	Agreed	No action required	EC Harris	No Further Comment	1
	RM6	Register - Appears to cover all material foreseeable risks, no obvious key risks missing and all required fields complete (risk owners, mitigations, scoring etc.)	Of the risk identified and captured within the risk registers; the majority of the required fields have been completed. But there are a number of issues with the information contained within the registers. There are listed In detail within the substantiation to these findings.	2	Acknowledged	Seek further information from TfGM on the detail referred to.	EC Harris	Risk register has been developed and maintained throughout the last 12 months. Reflective of stage of contract and current risks. Track change log has been kept to evidence the development of the risk register.	1
	RM7	Scoring - Have recognised scoring and mitigation measures been used? Are risks appropriately mitigated, scored and valued.	The RMP contains a recognisable scoring matrix for the qualitative assessment of the risk (i.e. probability and impact - time, cost and quality); this matric has been used within the risk registers only to assess the risk on a pre-mitigation basis; therefore unable to understand or demonstrate what effect any mitigation measure would have. Within the Lands Cost Risk Register only 5 of 19 risk have mitigation measures identified.	2	Acknowledged. Since review, Project Risk has been taken back to the pre-mitigation case removing the confusion mentioned.	Review the Project Risk Register/Mitigation Measures and seek to develop the register to create a post mitigation risk register. For the lands risk register, undertake a full review of risks and mitigation measures.	EC Harris	Pre-mitigation values used. Land risk is still somewhat vague, however this has been identified as an area for development over the next period. Otherwise approach is best practice	1

Section	Ref	Issue	Recommendation	Score (July 12)	Project Team Response	Project Team Action	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Score (Sept 13)
	RM8	QRA - Are all key risks on the register are quantified appropriately within the QRA, and QRA can be substantiated against the risk register?	The risk identified and contained within the registers have been quantified, save for the comments detailed in 3 & 4 above. The outputs of the Cost QRAs reflect the quantification of the risks contained within the registers. Different confidence levels have been used on the Lands Costs QRA (P50 - Pre-Mitigation Quantification) and Project QRA (P80 - Post mitigation Quantification); alignment of confidence values between land risk and construction risk, or presentation of a strategy to support methodology is required.	2	Acknowledged - Since review Project Risk is now presented in P50 pre-mitigation and hence alignment can be confirmed.	No further action.	EC Harris	P50 Pre-mitigation evidenced within submitted documentation	1
	RM9	Contingency - QRA and overall contingency (including OB where necessary) are broadly appropriate for the stage of project development?	Following a review of the contingency allowances (for Land Costs risk, Project risk and Optimism Bias); we believe that the current risk allowance is lower than what we would normally see for a project of this stage, but the 44% OB is too high. So due to the Issues	2	Acknowledged - Through discussion with TfGM Risk Allowance has been reviewed and increased a paper written to justify the change in OB from 44% to 27%.	No further action.	EC Harris	Save for comments regarding TfGM's approach, no further action	1
	S1	Level of detail of the schedule	The schedule highlights the critical path in adequate detail, but does not cover any secondary path that's may become critical. It lacks detail related to the engagement with Network Rail and Statutory Undertakers. These are normally areas of concern and most schedules take these into account as it can have an impact on the start of construction.	2	Acknowledged - it should also be understood that the schedule presented is only intended to give a high level programme. This is backed up by more detailed schedules for each work stream.	Review each work stream programme and ensure this, and the high level programme, takes account of suitable NR and SU engagement times.	Alf Gwilym	Ensure continuous review of schedule takes place.	2
	S2	Construction Period	The period allowed for Construction and Environmental measure in the schedule is three months shorter than that allowed by Belfour's in their assessment. This may be the difference between the Optimistic and Pessimistic. Further information would be required to understand this fully.	2		Review construction schedule against BB schedule.	Alf Gwilym	Ensure continuous review of schedule takes place.	2
	S3	Statutory Diversions	Identify and incorporate critical diversions	2		Review construction schedule and incorporate stats diversions on appointment of the Contractor.	Alf Gwilym	Ensure continuous review of schedule takes place.	2
	S4	Inspectors Report and Inquiry	Further consideration of timescales report can take up to 6 months	2	In total the timescale allocated to receiving the inspectors report and getting SoS agreement is 6 months. This is deemed to be sufficient at this stage.	No further action required.	Alf Gwilym	No further action required.	2
	S5	Design Approvals	Design approvals and interfaces have not been identified, HA, NR, TfGM	2	Governance arrangements need to first be confirmed before changes in the design approvals are programmed in. The project programme allows for approvals from Local Authorities which is the current understanding of the project governance.	Review and confirm the scheme governance. Following confirmation, review programme to include further design approvals as required.	Alf Gwilym	See above comments (G1&2)	2
	S6	Resources - Does the project have provision for sufficiently skilled resources to progress the project to its next gateway.	QS and Commercial Management not disclosed, Co-ordinator role with Network Rail and Highways agency not identified. Definition of Roles and resources are adequate for size and nature of project. Major structures, 9 of, are to be built in the same time frame. Are there sufficient resources/suitable contractors to do the works. This may not be the most cost effective usage of resources/materials.	2	QS and Commercial Management provided in two forms. Specialist QS advice is regularly sourced through Corderoys and has been for a number of years. Financial Management is provided by SMBC based project Finance Manger, Martin Rigby. This is a requirement of the governance as all payments of suppliers is carried out through SMBC payment systems. NR coordination is being carried out by the Design Manager - Naz Huda. HA Co-ordination is currently required for land transfer and key stakeholder engagement and is being led by the Project Director, Jim McMahon. Construction programme based on advice by Balfour Beatty. Market testing to date suggests that sufficient resource is available.	Review management structure leading up to appointment of Contractor. Review construction programme on appointment of the Contractor. Continue to liaise with NR and the HA.	Alf Gwilym	Provide a refreshed project org structure post contract award.	2

Section	Ref	Issue	Recommendation	Score (July 12)	Project Team Response	Project Team Action	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Score (Sept 13)
Schedule	S7	Deliverables - Have each of the deliverable been stated with a realistic timeframe for delivery?	At Final Business Case - Gateway 3a it is expected that a detailed delivery plan would form part of the submission. It has been assumed that since the Balfour report includes all major items the construction phase is based on the Balfour report. It is recommended that the delivery plan is submitted for the next review. Immediate timescales for internal approvals are behind schedule which may impact on the ability to submit the case in time. The time to present this will depend on how far advanced the current design/scoping has progressed. There is a difference between the Schedule and the Project management plan, documents need aligning.	2	MSBC now issued. Schedule submitted to be based on the timescales set out in the current programme.	Review schedule and Project Management Plan prior to issue with MSBC to insure they align.	Alf Gwilym	Level of detail of the schedule unchanged from previous submission, this should increase as the design develops. Major structures within the works have not been identified, since these are a fundamental element in the construction period, in particular the rail crossings. Terminal Float (contingency on time) has not been identified within the schedule.	2
	S8	Has a detailed schedule (TfGM/Contractor) been provided in appropriate format and required level of detail?	Overall schedule is based around what is deemed an appropriate critical path. More detail would be required to meet the requirements of TfGM. The schedule would normally have been produced using Primavera P6, though this is not a mandatory requirement. The planning team could consider bringing forward the Environmental mitigation, possibly by engaging early. Overlapping Environmental work with the major structure construction period. Balfours assessment indicates a period of 24 months for construction with 9 months for Environmental Mitigation. Engagement with Statutory Undertakers is required early in the schedule, late diversions in some areas will hold up construction. These critical diversions should be identified in the programme where applicable. The schedule shows an overall period of 28 month for construction with Environmental mitigation taking 5 months, but overlapping with construction by 3 months. Based on Balfours time initial assessment and construction plan three month longer period for Environmental mitigation/Construction. In addition there are long lead items relations to the main structures which require a fabrication period.	2	Acknowledged that in the lead up to an appointment of a Principle Contractor further detail will be required within the schedule. With regards Environmental Mitigation, acknowledged that this needs to be lengthened and more detail added. The project team are currently investigating the potential to bring forward the Environmental Mitigation, carrying out, where possible, survey and clearing activities by agreement with land owners.	Continue to review programme with regards early Environmental Mitigation. Continue to liaise with SU companies and programme in diversions on appointment of Principle Contractor.	Alf Gwilym	Schedule for construction, main works, has been reduced from the original submission of 120 weeks to 102, whilst the end date has slipped from 09-Mar-17 to 01-Jun-17. Nothing to has been done to substantiate the reduction in time	3
	S9	Completeness - is the schedule complete with major GRP gateways/activities/milestones and achievable?	Schedule covers Gateways 3a, 3b and 4. Also covers submission to exec board and DfT for Business Case approval. Covers the overall period from current status to handover Gateway 6. Covers all stage approval gateways, insufficient detail to substantiate.	1	Acknowledged	No further action required.	Alf Gwilym		1
	S10	Logic - Does the logic appear robust? Are timings, sequence, dependencies and critical path are sensible and appropriately linked.	The critical path is shown through Public consultation period, Planning and CPO, DfT approval of scheme, the Public Inquiry process, Award of construction contract, and the construction period. Logic follows an established process and the time frame, with the exception of construction (Noted above).	1	Acknowledged	No further action required.	Alf Gwilym	Granting of Planning permission, as time been allowed in the schedule for SMBC strategy (line 90) Total time - Resolving Planning issues - Maximum time for CPO could exceed the overall schedule for construction. Status for this line should be raised to RED	4
	S11	Schedule Risk - Have major risks to achievement of the schedule have been fed in to the risk register (and QRA if appropriate)?	Review the total period for Environment mitigation and overlap to construction Major Stakeholder impact. Check if SUs have any impact on schedule. A major rail possession will be required and timing will be in the hands of Network Rail (Refer to recommendation regards interfaces).	1	Accepted - It should be noted that full liaison is in place with NR with conversations under way to agree required possessions.	Review schedule in line with comments. Review SU diversions and incorporate discussions to date into the schedule with regards NR possessions.	Alf Gwilym		1
	S12	Costs - Is the schedule properly cost/resource loaded (and matches the finance section)?	No evidence of the schedule being cost loaded. More detail would be useful in assessing the costs. Overall cost profile lines up with the draft schedule. Start of major spending lines up with start on site, although spending on Land does not line up with the CPO process.	4	Acknowledged. Cost profiling re Land has been carried out outside of CPO process with early acquisitions being sought and is reflective and tied to the programme.	Review costing mechanism with programme going forward. Review spending on land and CPO process.	Alf Gwilym	Breakdown of cost inline with schedule not available	4
	PCM1	Agreed procurement Strategy	Develop a process over the next few weeks to finalise and agree the Procurement Strategy	3	Acknowledged. Since receipt of the GRP findings SEMMMS Project Team has progressed discussions with TfGM to further review the preferred procurement strategy of a staged ECI.	TfGM to review information and confirm Staged ECI as preferred procurement route or otherwise.	Hilary Moules	The procurement approach has been approved by the SEMMMS board.	1
	PCM2	Governance	Develop a governance methodology that articulates TfGM's role particularly around sign off of procurement strategy; shortlist and supplier selection.	3	Agreed - governance strategy to be confirmed between all parties (procurement strategy singed off by TfGM).	Confirm governance strategy	Hilary Moules	The procurement approach has been approved by the SEMMMS board.	1

Section	Ref	Issue	Recommendation	Score (July 12)	Project Team Response	Project Team Action	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Score (Sept 13)
Procurement & Contract Management	PCM3	Schedule	Adjust schedule to include standstill period; allow sufficient time for tender evaluation and accommodate governance requirements.	3	Acknowledged. Tender review period extended. Governance requirements to be confirmed.	On confirmation of governance requirements, review schedule to ensure sufficient time has been accounted for.	Hilary Moules	Tender evaluation period has been extended to 12 weeks. It is assumed that this is sufficient to accommodate Stockport's internal governance. Score revised	2
	PCM4	Compliance - Is the proposed procurement strategy and route compliant with legal and organisational requirements?	The proposed procurement route is compliant with legal requirements other than the current schedule allows for 4 weeks for evaluation of the tenders, governance and standstill period. This has been discussed with Stockport and will be adjusted. Timescales will also need to be adjusted to ensure there is adequate time for Stockport's governance and TfGM's governance particularly around sign off of the final procurement strategy, sign off of the shortlist and sign off of the supplier selection. There is a slight risk that the selection may be challenged given Balfour Beatty's engagement under a PSC to provide initial advice. This risk can be mitigated by ensuring sufficient time and access to information is given to all bidders to allow them to compete on an equal footing.	2	Evaluation of tenders including LA approval has now been extended to 12 weeks. Risk to selection being challenged has been mitigated by only supplying BB with selected information. All parties will be able to access the same information during tender.	No further action proposed.	Hilary Moules	It's not clear what " <i>Risk to selection being challenged has been mitigated by only supplying BB with selected information</i> " actually means. How long did the tenderers have to respond and was this sufficient to allow the other tenderers time to develop as good an understanding of the scheme as BB? [Comment from Bill Edwards "Tenders were issued to the four tenderers on 14th May 2013 and returned on 6th August 2013. All four tenders were of a high quality and there was no evidence that BB had gained any advantage from their previous work"]. On the basis of Bill's response I am happy to positively adjust the score	1
	PCM5	Value for Money - Is the proposed procurement strategy and route likely to maximise value for money.	Stockport and TfGM need to undertake further work to refine and agree the procurement strategy to ensure that value for money is maximised through an appropriate level of competitive pressure at later stages in the process. The current proposed strategy of a 2 stage ECI will result in selection of a contractor based on % fees against a client estimated construction cost. This will result in a more collaborative approach with contractor input to the design and support for the public inquiry stage. However it minimises the contractor's incentive to agree/facilitate the 'best' target price. Furthermore, price certainty will not be	3	Procurement strategy document developed on the back of the GRP review. A process of incentivisation will serve to reward the contractor at an early stage for reducing the Target Cost between appointment and Final Target Cost prior to the start of construction.	No further action proposed.	Hilary Moules	Approach noted. Is the gainshare/painshare subject to an overall cap/collar? [Comments from Bill Edwards: "There are three phases to the contract:- Design development is an NEC Professional Services Contract Option C target price - There is no cap on the pain share where if the cost is greater than 120% the client takes 60%. Key Stage 4 -Statutory process - is a NEC Professional Services Contract Option E - This is a time and materials contract as the scope if the work is undefined. Key Stage 6 - Construction - is a NEC Engineering	3
	PCM6	Deliverability - is the proposed procurement strategy and route are deliverable?	Subject to sufficient time being built into the schedule to cover governance requirements the strategy is deliverable.	2	Acknowledged	Review programme to ensure sufficient time allowed for executive decisions at key decision points.	Hilary Moules	No comment at this stage	2
	PCM7	Contracting Strategy - is the proposed contracting strategy robust, represent value for money and deliverable?	The proposed approach will transfer the majority of risks to the contractor (excluding SU) with joint responsibility for managing and mitigating the risks. The costs associated with these risks will be built into the target price with any removal or non-realisation of risk will benefit the target price and therefore benefits will be shared between the client and contractor. Before the contracting strategy is finalised there should be agreement between TfGM and Stockport on how risks will be allocated; how they will be quantified before inclusion in the target price and how they will be managed. The Procurement Strategy assumes that the scheme will be delivered as one procurement bundle. I understand that alternative funding strategies have been considered and that the preferred approach is included in the draft Procurement Strategy document. Without an understanding of why a single procurement bundle is the preferred approach I am unable to comment on it's validity.	3	Since the review the contracting strategy has been agreed with TfGM including the strategy the let the works as a single contract.	Prior to contract award, Project Board (including TfGM presence) to review and confirm agreement with risk allocation.	Hilary Moules	There has been no formal agreement of the contracting strategy between TfGM and SMBC.	2
	PCM8	Contract Management - Are there robust arrangements are in place for on-going contract management	This will be developed at the appropriate time in the process.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Hilary Moules	The contract management approach should be sufficiently developed at this stage [Comment from Bill Edwards "These are currently being developed by me - but will follow establish principles used on HA and WG major projects"]. Minor reservations	2
	SM1	Ensure strong working link between work stream and comms teams.	Resource comms team to support project of this scale.	2	Agreed. Comms consultant appointed to supplement comms teams.	No further action.	Adam Patterson	Consultant used to help through consultation successfully. Needs to work with contractor when appointed to ensure working relationship during next stage of scheme	2
	SM2	No agreed comms and engagement strategy	Articulate comms and engagement strategy	2	Agreed, communications strategy now completed for up to end of public consultation.	No further action.	Adam Patterson	Strategy successful during consultation,. But needs input of contractor to finalise comms strategy for design/build element.	2
	SM3	Possible public confusion around scheme and consultation	Clearly define what will be achieved by each stage of consultation.	2	Agreed	Develop comms strategy to cover post public consultation activity.	Adam Patterson	Achieved	1

Section	Ref	Issue	Recommendation	Score (July 12)	Project Team Response	Project Team Action	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Score (Sept 13)
Stakeholder Management	SM4	Ownership - Have clear accountabilities and responsibilities been set out at the very outset of the project and are all incumbents in agreement?	SMBC agreed how to work with stakeholders, but not sure if this has been set out	2	This has been fully set out up to the end of public consultation.	Comms strategy to be developed up to end of construction.	Adam Patterson	Needs updating once contractor is appointed	2
	SM5	Identification - Does the list of identified stakeholders and their interest in the project appear complete and accurate?	Yes, from information available in time given	1	Acknowledged	Further review of list of stakeholders to ensure this takes into account those post Public Consultation	Adam Patterson	In place, although will need updating as scheme progresses	1
	SM6	Engagement Strategy - Is the proposed stakeholder engagement strategy robust and sensible?	Focus on delivery, so no articulated strategy. However, direction of travel is consistent with TfGM approach.	2	Comms strategy fully developed since review.	No further action	Adam Patterson	In place, although will need updating as scheme progresses	1
	SM7	Engagement Process - Have systems and processes been put in place to manage the engagement strategy?	Yes, good project working. Need to engage comms fully though.	2	Acknowledged that this has been developed since review.	Look to continue to arrange regular comms meeting post public consultation to ensure close communication is continued.	Adam Patterson	Achieved, but integration with contractor will be needed for next stage	2
	SM8	Communications Plan - Are appropriate time-based plan in place for proactive communications and media enquiries? Does this plan incorporate a feedback mechanism?	No plan agreed as focus on delivery. No feedback mechanism in place, although advice offered from TfGM with regards phone/email lines.	4	Plan now fully developed in preparation for the public consultation phase.	Continue this throughout project future.	Adam Patterson	Comms plan delivered for consultation stage, but will need to be updated when contractor is appointed to ensure that comms activity is linked to project milestones	2
	SM9	Mandatory Signatures - All TfGM projects have a responsibility to consult with internal departments (EQIA, Energy Resource Requirements, Environmental Impact, Data Protection Act 1998).	Not sure if SMBC have equivalent sign off process.	N/A	Requirement fulfilled through integrated involvement of SMBC comms.	No further action	Adam Patterson	n/a	n/a
Design & Engineering	DE1	Material Specification	There is a requirement to specify the lifespan/loading of the pavement to ensure the correct materials can be specified within a detailed design.	1	Acknowledged, although this will be agreed during the design development in Stage 1 of the ECI contract.	Design Manager to specify the lifespan/loading of the pavement prior to detailed design.	EC Harris	Bridge design has been significantly developed, especially around the rail bridges. Design responsibility for the majority of the scheme will sit the contractor.	1
	DE2	Embankment CBR	Review the minimum CBR requirements for Embankments in accordance with IAN73/06	1	Acknowledged	Design Team to review against standard.	EC Harris	Complete - no further comment	1
	DE3	Cost Plan - Is the design is consistent with the cost allowance? Does the cost plan appear complete and costings appropriate and supportable for the proposed design?	Certain issues have been identified where the drawings have been quantified and suitably priced, however there are implied measures and site specific issues which may affect price. This is subject of a separate Commercial Due Diligence Review.	2	Commercial due diligence completed with full agreement between TfGM and the Project Team reached.	No further actions.	EC Harris	There are still aspects of the scheme that sit outside of the tendered price. 1. There are a number of issues that have arisen during the tender process which will be subject to a Compensation Event. Commercial support will be required in agreeing this within the framework of the tender. 2. Costs associated with Statutory Authorities, Network Rail and Bramhall Oil Terminal sit outside of the tendered price. These costs will need close commercial monitoring to avoid any overspend. 3. Land, Preparation Costs, Risk Drawn Down and Indexation all require review post award to confirm budget. However currently the project is forecasting delivery within the original budget.	2
	DE4	Client Requirements - Does the proposed design demonstrably deliver the key objectives of the project and comply with the key client/stakeholder requirements?	The Clients requirements have been listed within the DfT business case. All of theses requirements are fulfilled within the documentation which has been reviewed and within	1	Acknowledged	No further actions.	EC Harris	No further comment at this time	1
	DE5	Deliverability - Is there evidence that the proposed design is buildable, deliverable, achievable within schedule and will the final product be usable and maintainable?	By reviewing the alignments, preliminary drawings and documentation provided the scheme appears to be buildable and deliverable without any major departure from standards with regards to design. The final product will be usable and maintainable in accordance with current standards. However, some of the materials which have been costed may have an impact on the long term performance therefore maintenance regime to be employed.	1	Acknowledged although without specification on which materials may have an impact it is hard to prescribe a specific action.	Design team to liaise with the future maintaining highways authorities to ensure maintenance requirements are developed prior to the commencement of detailed design.	EC Harris	Action is on-going.	1
	DE6	Health & Safety - Does the proposed design demonstrably take account of health and safety requirements and minimises health and safety risks to an appropriate level?	All items appear to be design in accordance with current best practice, Interim Advice Note (IAN) and referenced to standards.	1	Acknowledged	No further actions.	EC Harris	No further comment at this time	1
	DE7	Deliverability - Is there evidence that the proposed design is buildable, deliverable, achievable within schedule and will the final product be usable and maintainable?	All items appear to be design in accordance with current best practice, Interim Advice Note (IAN) and referenced to standards.	1	Acknowledged	No further actions.	EC Harris	No further comment at this time	1
	DE8	Deliverability - Is there evidence that the proposed design is buildable, deliverable, achievable within schedule and will the final product be usable and maintainable?	In general, the scheme is buildable for the current funding arrangements which are subject of on-going discussion. Planning is still to be sought as is Public Inquiry, therefore we would expect to see development of the design and mitigation measures to address this.	1	Agreed.	No further actions.	EC Harris	No further comment at this time	1

Section	Ref	Issue	Recommendation	Score (July 12)	Project Team Response	Project Team Action	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Score (Sept 13)
	DE9	Completeness & Consistency - Is the overall design complete and are all elements co-ordinated and consistent?	In line with the development of the scheme, at this stage, the current proposal does not included detailed design elements, it is more in line with a preliminary design and build project with Geotechnical reports and alignments etc. As the design progresses through the various gateway reviews, we would expect to see development of, design life considerations (agreed with ultimate Highway Authorities), material specifications etc.	2	Agreed	Design Manager to include review of designing for maintenance.	EC Harris	Design has been developed further than many ECI contracts. The development of the design is a function of the development period. Therefore no further comment at this time.	1
Health and Safety	HS1	No description on how hazard identification has taken place or mitigated during the project life cycle.	Include section on Hazard Identification and responsibility for mitigation e.g. Designer.	3	Acknowledged	Following the selection of a preferred route, the design manager is to consider drafting of the first draft of the health and safety file. This can feed into the pre-construction information to be included in the tender phase. Acknowledged that some form of formal record of the health and safety issues considered at prelim design to be produced.	Chris Thorpe	Now in place and subject to ongoing management routines.	1
	HS2	No description on how CDM is being managed.	Include CDM strategy including specific roles and responsibilities.	3	Acknowledged	CDM-C to continue to be engaged post selection of the preferred route and a CDM strategy to be developed for reference.	Chris Thorpe	CDMc appointed and integral to the team.	1
	HS3	No description on the process to ensure that competent suppliers/contractors are appointed.	Include the process being adopted.	3	Acknowledged	Current practices and aspirations for future practices to be recorded in a H&S File/Strategy	Chris Thorpe	Ongoing.	2
	HS4	No description of how corporate governance will be undertaken during the project life-cycle.	Include the process being adopted.	3	Disagree - Full corporate governance recorded in the Management Plan.	No further action.	Chris Thorpe	Could be strenghtened.	3
	HS5	No clear roles and responsibilities stated for the project team.	Review project organisation and determine specific responsibilities by position e.g. Project Manager. It is not obvious how the project team will be supported by H&S competent persons.	3	CDM-C clearly stated on the organisation chart.	Look to formalise how health and safety will be managed in future and ensure the roles and responsibilities in the management plan clearly state where H&S responsibilities lie.	Chris Thorpe	This is beyond CDMc and consideration should be given to how the project team get advice strategic advice when necessary. Consider responsibilities during incident/accident escalation.	2
	HS6	Approach - Has a suitable Health and Safety Plan Been Developed	No evidence or reference to a H&S Plan	4	Acknowledged.	Review Product Matrix and ensure it is clear at what project stage a Health and Safety Plan is started.	Chris Thorpe	Complete.	1
	HS7	Legislative - Have all relevant SHE legislation been considered in the project development (such as site waste, biodiversity, contaminated land, pollution, environmental surveys)?	No reference to H&S Legislation	4	Acknowledged.	Review design standards report, technical approvals report etc. to ensure H&S legislation is referenced and adhered to. Further engage with the CDM-C to ensure obligations are met in the next project stage.	Chris Thorpe	Ongoing.	2
	HS8	CDM - Has a CDM-C been engaged.	No description of how H&S CDM strategy has been developed or implemented. It should be clearly set out who is taking the client responsibilities due to different streams of funding.	2	CDM-C has been appointed and engaged and involved in project development. Acknowledged that this relationship needs to be better documented in the next project stage.	Ensure relationship between the project team and the CDM-C is documented within the Project Initiation Documentation.	Chris Thorpe	Complete.	1
	HS9	Reporting - Is a suitable and compliant reporting process in place to record and report incidents?	No reference or description of the reporting process for accidents, incidents or performance management.	2	Risk management process clearly defined in the risk management plan. Acknowledge this needs to be tailored to support Health and Safety issues. Accidents, incidents will be managed by the Contractor on appointment. Any works carried out on site in the preparation stages are subject to the Health and Safety policies and procedures of the supplier organisation.	Ensure that the health and safety requirements are an integral part of the tender process for the main contractor. Incentivise good health and safety practices and encourage a zero tolerance attitude during construction.	Chris Thorpe	Consider escalation and response process.	2
	L1	Before current funding was secured the original proposal was for this Scheme to be sponsored and advanced by Stockport Borough Council. However, since DfT funding was secured the GMCA and TfGM has been asked to oversee this project in order to control cost and minimise the risk of overspend. this is important because the DfT funding is to be provided to the GMCA. The DfT funding is fixed and any overspend...	TfGM, Stockport Borough Council, Manchester City Council and Cheshire East Council to consider and produce recommendations for governance and project delivery structure followed by round table meeting to discuss and agree a procedure and process for delivery of the scheme.	3	TfGM management since added to the Project Board and Chief Executive's Steering Committee.	No further action	Des Gardner	The legal agreement under which GMCA will fund SCC is not yet in place. GMCA has recently requested TfGM to prepare the first draft of the agreement but this has not been done pending clarification of TfGM's role in the governance arrangements. The structure of the agreement will be based on other funding agreements currently being negotiated by the parties for LSTF and therefore, once the principles of the governance arrangements have been agreed it will be a relatively straightforward matter to produce an initial draft. Similarly the balance of risks between the parties and management of programme contingency have also been discussed between senior finance officers although detailed negotiation is required to finalise the arrangement.	4
	L2	As a local authority, Stockport Borough Council need to obtain the powers to progress the scheme. There are two statutory routes which might apply to this project and enable Stockport Borough Council to obtain the necessary powers (being S10 of the Highways Act 1980 or the Planning Act 2008). Under the current law it is imperative that Stockport follow the correct statutory route. SMBC's legal....	TfGM legal to be provided with a copy of the legal advice from Stockport Borough Council so that this can be considered by the joint project board.	3	This information was not requested at the gateway review.	SMBC legal to provide statement to the Project Board for review.	Des Gardner	A paper has been received setting out the position in relation to various legal issues. The statement describes the SMBC legal team's engagement in the process to date which has focussed on the agreement between Highway Authorities and supporting the procurement process. In addition to the funding agreement referred to above, the paper does not indicate the extent to which SMBC legal are engaged in the development of the NEC suite of documents for the contract and land acquisition processes (including any CPO processes).	3

Section	Ref	Issue	Recommendation	Score (July 12)	Project Team Response	Project Team Action	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Score (Sept 13)
Legal	L3	Stockport Council are the Highway Authority for roads (other than trunk roads) within their administrative area. This enables Stockport Council to apply for planning and obtain CPO in respect of land within the administrative area required for the Scheme. However, in order to ensure the successful execution of this scheme Stockport Borough Council require the acquisition of land which falls within the...	TfGM legal to be provided with a copy of the draft s8 Agreement from SMBC confusing the necessary powers to SMBC on progress the planning and CPO.	3	This information was not requested at the gateway review.	Draft s8 agreement to be issued to the Project Board. TfGM Project Board member to issue to TfGM legal as required.	Des Gardner	Draft agreement has been supplied together with confirmation that terms have been settled with MCC. Final negotiations with Cheshire East to be concluded. The agreement delegates the necessary powers to SMBC from the other highway authorities to acquire the land and design and build the new road. Terms of the agreement reflect that SMBC (and the GMTF) bear the cost risk of all the activities. MCC and Cheshire East do, however, have the right of approval to all material issues in relation to the design and construction of the road.	2
	L4	Preparatory works for planning and compulsory purchase order are underway.	SMBC to provide TfGM with copies of current planning proposals and land identified as requiring acquisition.	3	This information was not requested at the gateway review. SMBC legal are providing the legal check of the planning proposals and CPO on behalf of the three promoting authorities for the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road Project Team. It is not clear why TfGM legal check of this work is required as part of the GRP review,	TfGM Board member to confirm and agree with the project board and subsequently the project team if this information is required.	Des Gardner	This information was not included in the position statement received for the purposes of this review.	3
	L5	Full environmental assessment has been undertaken by SMBC.	TfGM to review and come to a view as to whether this identifies any additional risks to the scheme and how these can be mitigated. TfGM further understands that SBC have completed a draft ES which should be review by TfGM. The environmental review should include consideration of where the scheme requires acquisition of public open spaces. TfGM understands that SMBC have made provision for the purchase of land to compensate for the public open space that will...	3	This information was not requested at the gateway review. It is unclear why TfGM would need to provide this review and what value this would add over and above the review being made by the SEMMMS project team on the environmental activities being progressed.	TfGM Board member to confirm and agree with the project board and subsequently the project team if this information is required.	Des Gardner	This information was not included in the legal position statement.	3
	L6	Programme review and programme risks (including financial risk around land acquisition).	The need to obtain planning and CPO could present significant timing and programming issues. SMBC and TfGM need to identify and consider whether enough time has been allowed in the programme to allow for these risks. In particular, high risk sites such as Sale Golf Club to be identified and <u>specifically</u> addressed in the programme. The allowance for land acquisition costs in the budget to be review as part of this exercise.	3	This information was note requested at the gateway review. It is unclear why TfGM would need to provide this review and what value this would add over and above the review being made by the SEMMMS project team. All land acquisition procedures have been fully included in the programme. <u>Styal</u> golf club (<u>Sale</u> is unaffected by the scheme), the project team is and has been progressing with early discussions with not only Styal but all four golf clubs affected by the scheme. The project team has made excellent progress on all these issues. Following a cost benefit analysis at Styal a programme of early accommodations works is currently being progressed with a view to mitigate the impact of the road before the main construction of the scheme.	No further action.	Des Gardner	The statutory process to CPO the land is included in the programme which shows that the Order will be made in November 2013 and the public inquiry expected to be held in June 2014. The legal position statement does not make reference to this work although it is assumed that SMBC Legal and/or specialist legal advisers are involved in the drafting of the Orders and the development of the case for the CPO. Confirmation of this should be sought from SMBC's legal team.	3
	L7	Approvals & Consents - Have all necessary powers and consents been fully approved	Grant of planning permission - This has not been obtained by SMBC. SMBC intend to go out to a "Pre-Public Consultation" where they will publish options for the SEMMMS Route and consult for the SEMMMS Route and consult the public on their views of the given routes. After this pre-public consultation SMBC will decide on the route. Planning application will then be progressed. There is a significant amount of work and thus time/programming risk associated with this issue - ...	4	Acknowledge but unclear why this represents "consents not fully met". Full consents programmed for after this review in line with best practice and correct procedures.	No further actions	Des Gardner	The programme shows that the consents are expected shortly from all three authorities.	2
	L8	Approvals & Consents - Have all necessary powers and consents been fully approved	Compulsory Purchase Orders - SMBC have identified the land which needs to be obtained in order to enable the Scheme to be progressed. SMBC will try to acquire the land required by agreement but have identified parcels of land which they belief will needs a CPO. Draft orders have been produced, so Stockport should be in a good position to progress once planning issues resolved but TfGM and Stockport need to ensure that sufficient time...	2	Understood and acknowledged. Not clear why this is not "No Issues" score as reviewer recognises that significant prep. work carried out prior to land acquisition. The land acquisition process remains on programme.	No further actions	Des Gardner	As discussed above the programme for CPO commences later this year. No information received about current status of or legal support to land acquisition programme	3
	L9	Conditions - Are there any conditions to the powers and consents and do they pose any additional risks.	Environmental impacts of scheme need to be assessed - full environmental impact assessment have been carried out. No significant additional risks have been identified. TfGM should review and check the same.	1	Agreed at Project Board level including representative from TfGM that no further legal checks required on these issues by TfGM. Acknowledged that reviewer has found good practice in the environmental impact assessment procedures carried out to date. This work will be completed/updated post selection of a preferred route and in the lead up to the submission of a planning application.	No further action.	Des Gardner	no further information received in view of advanced position as per previous exercise	1

Section	Ref	Issue	Recommendation	Score (July 12)	Project Team Response	Project Team Action	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Score (Sept 13)
	L10	References - Have contractor references been received?	Not applicable at this stage. Procurement strategy to be reviewed in light of possible changes to project structure and TfGM to feed into this as necessary.	N/A	Acknowledged	No further action	Des Gardner	In relation to procurement strategy, ECI under the NEC suite of documents has the potential to yield significant benefits in terms of design development and delivery of the scheme. The contractual drafting around the preconstruction phase should describe clearly the stages of the work to be undertaken and any hold points/approvals required before proceeding to next phase. The information provided indicates SMBC's legal team are engaged in the process which is essential to ensure the final contract governs the risks and opportunities arising as a result of ECI and the subsequent delivery.	3
	L11	Insurance - Are all warranties, bonds and insurances confirmed and agreed by all parties?	Not applicable at this stage.	N/A	Acknowledged	No further action	Des Gardner	Not applicable at this stage	n/a
Delivery Strategy	DS1	Critical Success Factors - Clearly describe all factors that must be present for the project to succeed.	At this stage, it is to be expected that the Delivery Strategy is not developed to any great degree. Strategies presented in the Benefits Realisation Plan, PID, Procurement Strategy and Project Management Plan all indicate to their being a common understand of how to transition to BAU, and it is anticipated that this will be further developed prior to the next Gateway Review.	1	Acknowledged	No further action	EC Harris	The Benefits Realisation Plan has been developed as part of the Business Case. Upon cursory review this document address the Delivery Strategy in some depth. It is apparent from the team that the key drivers for the scheme are well known. The scheme has been subject to 2 public Inquiries and full planning conditions, therefore the key drivers are evidenced as being met legislatively	1
	DS2	Key Delivery Challenges - Have all delivery challenges been articulated and has a robust overall delivery strategy been put in place to address them?		1			EC Harris		1
	DS3	Integration - Is a strategy in place to address integration/transition issues and maximise synergies in transferring to BAU?		1			EC Harris		1
	DS4	Overall Consistency - Are delivery arrangements well integrated and consistent with one another (risk, procurement, schedule, governance...)		1			EC Harris		1
Transition	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Evaluation & Monitoring	EM1	Clear definition of national and local evaluation objectives.	Evaluations activity would benefit considerably from being focused around specified nation and local evaluation objectives, i.e. exactly what DfT and the promoting authorities wish to learn from monitoring and evaluation activity.	3	Acknowledged	Evaluate Benefits Realisation Plan (BRP) against national and local evaluation objectives prior to next gateway review.	Tom Sansom	This appears to have been actioned.	1
	EM2	Costing of the programme of monitoring and evaluation work to be delivered.	Monitoring and evaluation costs need to be explicitly identified to ensure credibility of the proposals.	3	Acknowledged although considered to be a small percentage of the overall budget and therefore comfortable with level of costing carried out to date.	Project team to consider and include in budget explicit budget for evaluation activities.	Tom Sansom	The legal agreement under which GMCA will fund SMBC is not yet in place. GMCA has recently requested TfGM to prepare the first draft of the agreement but this has not been done pending clarification of TfGM's role in the governance arrangements. The structure of the agreement will be based on other funding agreements currently being negotiated by the parties and therefore, once the principles of the governance arrangements have been agreed it will be a relatively straightforward matter to produce an initial draft. Similarly the balance of risks between the parties and management of programme contingency have also been discussed between senior finance officers although detailed negotiation is required to finalise the arrangement.	3
	EM3	Clear distinction from benefits realisation activity.	Benefits realisation and monitoring & evaluation activities should be separately defined. At the moment they are merged and there is limited text on benefits realisation.	3	Acknowledged	Evaluate BRP with a view to separately defining benefits realisation and monitoring in next revision prior to the next gateway review.	Tom Sansom	More an issue for benefit realisation reviewer - no further comments.	1
	EM4	Prioritisation - Have the benefits been prioritised in terms of impact. This will inform the structure of the evaluation.	Some degree of prioritisation is apparent in the scaling of activity. Further prioritisation would be beneficial, both in respect of national and local evaluation objectives and in terms of the relative scale of traditional scheme benefits (e.g. journey time savings).	2	Acknowledged	Evaluate BRP with a view to address prioritisation issues prior to the next gateway review.	Tom Sansom	Activity in different areas appears to be proportionate to relative scale of benefits.	1
	EM5	Cost - Has an appropriate budget been set aside to cover the costs of the evaluation exercise? This should be proportional to the structure of the evaluation required.	Despite an extensive programme of monitoring & evaluation work being set out in some detail (Appendix J), no associated cost has been identified. This apparent lack of explicit cost allocation raises questions over the credibility of the evaluation plans.	4	Acknowledged although considered to be a small percentage of the overall budget and therefore comfortable with level of costing carried out to date.	Project team to consider and include in budget explicit budget for evaluation activities.	Tom Sansom	See above comments.	3
	EM6	Approach - Are the desired outcomes of the evaluation exercise in line with the suggested approach?	The approaches are generally robust. Perhaps the main exception is in terms of economic impacts, likely to emerge as a key area when evaluation objectives are clearly defined.	2	Acknowledged	Project team to review the evaluation process of the economic benefits prior to the next gateway review.	Tom Sansom	A wide range of activity is proposed, reflecting the importance of this category of impact.	1
	EM7	Timescale - Has adequate time been allowed to conduct the evaluation?	Timescale clearly specified (before, 1 year and 5 years after) and appropriate for a scheme of this scale.	1	Acknowledged	No further actions	Tom Sansom	No further comment at this time	1

Section	Ref	Issue	Recommendation	Score (July 12)	Project Team Response	Project Team Action	Reviewer	Reviewer Comments	Score (Sept 13)
	EM8	Measures/Units/Types - Have measures/units/types been identified that will be evaluated upon project completion (transport, economic, VfM, social or environmental impacts)?	For most outcomes, suitable measures are identified.	1	Acknowledged	No further actions	Tom Sansom	No further comment at this time	1
	EM9	Data - Has all the appropriate data been captured and baselined to allow for comparison in the evaluation?	Not at this stage but this is envisaged as an important part of the pre-construction activities.	1	Acknowledged	Project team to review data capture requirements pre-construction and set out plan with costs of what additional data is required.	Tom Sansom	No further comment at this time	1
	EM10	Legal - Has a legal condition been included to allow TfGM to access operational data after handover?	In general this checklist is not relevant. The evaluation, however, does rely on access to data from bus operators in relation to journey time performance, but it is not clear whether bus operators have been approached at this time.	N/A	Acknowledged - should be understood that SMBC, CEC and MCC will be the Highway Maintaining Authorities.	Accepted as not relevant, however, project team to review with TfGM what, if any, operational data may be required.	Tom Sansom	Not generally applicable, though further discussion with TfGM bus colleagues may be beneficial at an early stage in relation to acquiring bus operator data.	1
	EM11	Process - Has a pre-defined process been put in place to evaluate the management of the project for Lessons Learnt?	Some stakeholder engagement envisaged on "lessons learned" but otherwise any process evaluation of issues surrounding development & delivery of the scheme is absent.	2	Acknowledged - although understood that the Gateway Review Process will provide an element of this review process.	Project team to consider options with regards "Lessons Learnt" of the management of the scheme and, where appropriate and applicable, incorporate these into BRP.	Tom Sansom	Now built in to process reviews envisaged.	1