

Construction Sector Transparency Initiative (CoST)

Assurance Team Report

Brandon Primary School Project Durham County Council

September 2010



Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements.....	2
1. Summary	3
2. Introduction	4
2.1 Background	4
2.2 Objectives of the pilot study	4
2.3 Work carried out on the pilot study.....	5
2.4 The Brandon Primary School Project.....	6
3. Validation and analysis of documents.....	8
3.1 Durham County Council procedures	8
3.2 Project identification and budget	9
3.3 Project outturn costs.....	9
Appendix 1: Glossary	13
Appendix 2: Material Project Information.....	15
Appendix 3: Schedule of documents disclosed	16

Acknowledgements

This CoST Assurance Team Report has been prepared by Bob Crease of the Dispute Resolution Joint Venture on behalf of the UK CoST Multi-Stakeholder Group (MSG).

Members of the Assurance Team are:

Richard Bayfield FICE FCI Arb, Independent Consultant
Peter Cousins MICE FCI Arb, Independent Consultant
Robert Crease FICE FCI Arb, Director, Robert J. Crease & Co. Limited
Peter Higgins FICE FCI Arb, Director, pdConsult Ltd

Members of the MSG are:

Bob McKittrick, Chairman
Rachel Chandler, Costain and the Civil Engineering Contractors Association
Noel Foley, Happold Consulting and the Association for Consultancy and Engineering
Malcolm Hankey, Civic Trust Awards
Chandrashekhar Krishnan, Transparency International UK
Sarah Bloom, the Department for International Development
Simon Morrow, the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors
Doug Sinclair, Highways Agency
John Tracey-White, the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors

Observers to the MSG are:

Rob Hall, Environment Agency
Andrew Savage, Broadland Housing Association
Colin Wilby, Durham County Council

The Secretariat for the MSG are:

Salima Hernandez, Institution of Civil Engineers
John Hawkins, Institution of Civil Engineers and CoST International Secretariat

Finally, thank you to the following individuals who provided the information for this report:

Paul Hopson, Project Management Team Leader, Durham County Council
Colin Wilby, Principal Project Procurement Officer, Durham County Council
Bob Kelly, Project Sponsor, Durham County Council (seconded from Turner & Townsend)
Naomi Atherton, Project Manager, Turner & Townsend
Paul McNally, Associate, Red Box Architecture

Note

This material has been funded by UKaid from the Department for International Development; however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the department's official policies.

1. Summary

- 1.1 The Brandon Primary School Project is being procured by Durham County Council (the Council) to replace old school buildings serving the village of Brandon, County Durham. In order to achieve economies of scale, the intention was to combine the project with a similar one at Esh Winning, another village nearby.
- 1.2 At the date of this report, the projects were undergoing design development with a view to inviting tenders for a main contract for detailed design and construction of the school in the autumn of 2010. The overall plan for Brandon was to complete construction works in February 2012 and to complete both the demolition of the old buildings and the landscaping of the school grounds by October of that year.
- 1.3 The focus of this study has therefore been on the award of contracts for design and project supervision, on the early stages of design development and on planning for the main contract.
- 1.4 There were some instances when the Council's personnel did not provide the further information which we requested in order to verify some of the statements made. However, in our opinion sufficient contextual information was available to enable us to complete this report in a proportionate manner.
- 1.5 We noted that the Council was undergoing the aftermath of a significant re-organisation at the time of this study, with changes of key personnel, vacancies and office relocation.
- 1.6 The contract for a lead designer was awarded to Red Box Design Group (Red Box) following a competitive tendering process involving companies who had previously qualified to bid for such works under a framework arrangement administered by the Council. That contract was originally intended to include project management as part of its scope; however, the council also required pre-construction contract management services due to a lack of internal project management resource and decided to change the scope of services in order to contract separately with a project management organisation. This was done to ensure a robust and consistent project management approach.
- 1.7 The Council also decided to add cost management services to the scope of the project management contract, which was awarded by negotiation with Turner & Townsend. Turner & Townsend was one of the firms on a framework arrangement for providing such services administered by the Office of Government Commerce (OGC), which was then an office of H.M. Treasury and is now an office of the Cabinet Office. The Council decided that the OGC framework arrangement provided a better alignment with the required services than any of the similar arrangements administered by the Council.
- 1.8 We saw no evidence of contemporary cost reporting, as the plan was only to start this at the commencement of the construction phase. Emerging issues were resulting in charges in excess of agreed schedules for lump sum instalments, in respect of both claims and charges agreed to be made on the basis of time spent. However, so far such expenditure was contained within both the budget and the overall forecast fee levels. The overall estimated project cost was being maintained within the Council's budget, subject to the Council's formal approval of engineering economies and the removal of swimming pool refurbishments from the project's scope.
- 1.9 The processes whereby the design and project and cost management services were procured and managed were, in our opinion, satisfactory from the perspective of transparency. The design and management of the project were progressing towards achieving the Council's objectives in ways which in our opinion were consistent with normal construction industry practice.

2. Introduction

2.1 Background

- 2.1.1 The Construction Sector Transparency Initiative (CoST) is an international multi-stakeholder programme designed to increase the accountability of public sector organisations and construction companies for their construction projects. It will do this by disclosing information at all stages of the construction project cycle, from the initial identification of the project to the final completion.
- 2.1.2 It is, however, recognised that the disclosure of this information may not be sufficient on its own to achieve greater accountability. This is because some of the information is likely to be complex and not easily intelligible to the general public. For example, there are many reasons for time and cost overruns on construction projects. To ensure that the information that is released is both accurate and available in a form that can easily be understood by stakeholders it has been verified and interpreted by experts appointed for this purpose -- the assurance team.
- 2.1.3 Eight projects have been identified by the UK Multi-Stakeholder Group (MSG) to form a pilot study of operation of this initiative, in the UK. The MSG has divided the 'CoST projects' into two groups of four projects referred to as Group A and Group B. The Brandon Primary School Project is one of the chosen Group A projects.
- 2.1.4 The Institution of Civil Engineers (ICE) is managing the pilot on behalf of the MSG. The MSG directs the implementation of the UK pilot. It consists of representatives from government, the private sector and civil society.
- 2.1.5 The assurance team appointed by the MSG for this pilot study comprises four senior construction industry specialists, working together to obtain and assess information and provide reports. This report has been prepared by Bob Crease, the team member who carried out the Brandon information review.
- 2.1.6 We have included at Appendix 1 a glossary of terms used in the report where they have a particular technical meaning in relation to construction.

2.2 Objectives of the pilot study

- 2.2.1 The UK pilot has four objectives:

- to learn lessons to help in the development of CoST
- to learn lessons on improving transparency
- to gain an improved understanding of construction project costs amongst public sector clients
- to learn and share lessons on the management and control of publicly-funded construction projects.

2.2.2 On each of the projects in the pilot study, the assurance team has been appointed to carry out the following tasks:

- collect the project information
- verify the accuracy and completeness of the information
- report on the extent and accuracy of the information which has been released
- on Group B projects only, analyse the information and make informed judgements about the cost and quality of the project
- on Group B projects only, report on the findings regarding the cost and quality of the project and highlighting any outstanding questions.

2.3 Work carried out on the pilot study

- 2.3.1 The remit given to the assurance team was to study projects in varying degrees of depth, depending upon whether the project in question had been identified by the ICE as Category A or B. The assurance team was not required to subject Category A projects to the analysis and verification that was to be applied to Category B projects. Brandon was a Category A project.
- 2.3.2 Initially, we held a meeting with the Council's project management team for the scheme to explain the objectives and procedures for this pilot study. Subsequently, we held a workshop with the project sponsor, the Council's procurement officer and Red Box's team leader to explain what information was needed and how it would be used. Other members of the Council's team and Turner & Townsend's project staff were invited to the workshop but were unable to attend. We also visited the site.
- 2.3.3 The CoST International Secretariat had prepared a standard list of material project information to be used on all pilot projects, and we could adapt to this into a set of schedules to suit the individual pilot contracts. The International Secretariat had prepared two lists of disclosures of material project information: the first list of disclosures would be requested for both Group A and Group B projects; a second list of further disclosures would be requested for Group B projects. The further disclosures would provide the information that was required to meet the additional Group B objectives. Jointly with the project team, we reviewed how this information could best be produced to minimise additional work for the project team. The completed schedule for Brandon is set out in Appendix 2.
- 2.3.4 We provided a copy of the applicable schedule to project team members. Jointly with the project team, we reviewed how this information could best be produced to minimise additional work for the project team. The completed schedule for Brandon is set out in Appendix 2.
- 2.3.5 We assisted the ICE in setting up a computerised data store to receive and store this information, and in establishing the arrangements for providing access to the data store. At the workshop, we explained how this data store would operate and how access to information and other material would be controlled. We explained how the disclosed information would be used, and what access team members would have to review and comment on reports before publication. This briefing was summarised later to people who were not able to attend the workshop, and their attention was drawn to guidance notes that we had prepared to assist in the use of the data store.
- 2.3.6 The Council provided the documents by electronic transfer to the data store.
- 2.3.7 We reviewed the information disclosed in two phases, and for each phase held a further meeting, telephone conversations and e-mail correspondence with the Council and project

team personnel to clarify certain matters, to verify the accuracy and completeness of information, and to obtain further understanding of how the project was managed. There were some instances when the Council's personnel did not provide the further information which we requested in order to verify some of the statements made. However, in our opinion sufficient contextual information was available to enable us to complete this report in a proportionate manner.

- 2.3.8 The information disclosed to us is listed in Appendix 3.
- 2.3.9 In writing this report, we have taken into account information supplied to us up to 2 August 2010, which we designated as the cut-off date.

2.4 The Brandon Primary School Project

- 2.4.1 The Brandon project is a scheme promoted by the Council aimed at replacing the existing buildings, sports areas, playgrounds and other facilities at Brandon Primary School and refurbishing the swimming pool on the site. A day-care centre was added to the design brief. The Council has appointed consultants to design, manage and provide information on the project and to prepare tenders for, and assist in the letting and management of, a contract for the detailed design and construction of the new school.
- 2.4.2 The Brandon Project is almost identical to a project to be undertaken at Esh Winning Primary School, and the scope of the contracts under consideration in this report covers the works at both schools. The decision to combine the two projects into one management endeavour was taken in the interests of economies of scale. The risk of budget cuts to the procurement of the design and construction contract was recognised in the procurement strategy produced in April 2010.
- 2.4.3 The Brandon Project is thus at an early stage in terms of the overall design and construction process, and the plan current at the date of this report was to award the contract for detailed design and construction in November 2010.
- 2.4.4 The Council has undergone a Local Government Reorganisation exercise in which seven district councils and the county council have become a new Unitary Authority. In addition to this the Council was also managing an internal reorganisation and as a result had a number of vacancies in its organisation. In order to assist its permanent staff during this period, the council appointed Turner & Townsend to provide a person to act as project sponsor for the Esh Winning and Brandon projects. This person's role was to co-ordinate the activities of the various Council departments and act as a single point of contact with the equivalent persons in the project consultants' organisations. The appointment of Turner & Townsend to provide these services was outside the scope of this study but it is worthy of note that the appointment of Turner & Townsend to provide other services relating to the projects, as briefly described below, took place before that person's deployment.
- 2.4.5 Turner & Townsend's project manager has also been deployed, part-time, onto other duties on behalf of the Council, but, again, in a way that is managed openly and avoids potential conflicts of interest.
- 2.4.6 Red Box was appointed as the lead designer for the Brandon Project (and the Esh Winning Project). The scope of the services which Red Box was to provide included the engagement and supervision of a number of specialist sub-consultants, including one which was to provide project management services. Turner & Townsend was the company which participated in Red Box's bid and which was going to provide those project management services.
- 2.4.7 The Council decided to omit the project management services from Red Box's scope of services and instead to enter into a direct contract with Turner & Townsend in order to maintain momentum and continuity. The Council also added cost management services to Turner & Townsend's contract's scope.

- 2.4.8 Whilst Red Box engaged a number of other sub-consultants, it was found not to be necessary to involve them in this study, as sufficient validation was able to be obtained from Red Box and Turner & Townsend.

3. Validation and analysis of documents

3.1 Durham County Council procedures

- 3.1.1 It is necessary to set out the Council's procedures for awarding and managing contracts in order to understand the status of documents disclosed by them.
- 3.1.2 The Council's practice was periodically to appoint consultants to various panels covering specific types of potential work for a fixed period of time, but without any obligation to contract any work. Such appointments took place after the completion of pre-qualification processes, which are outside the scope of this study. Such panels, taken as a whole, are sometimes referred to as a framework. When the Council required a piece of work to be undertaken, they could call for those consultants on the appropriate panel to express an interest, whereupon the Council would normally invite tenders from those who responded positively. If there were reasons why a particular consultant should be chosen, there would be no competition; instead the cost and time for the work would be discussed and agreed between the council and the consultant in question.
- 3.1.3 In addition to the frameworks which it administered itself, the Council also had access to frameworks established by the OGC, which also had a practice of providing (for a fee) model forms of contract for the engagement of consultants using the OGC frameworks. These arrangements operated in similar ways to those described in the previous paragraph, and both arrangements were regarded as compliant with the Public Contracts Regulations 2006.
- 3.1.4 The stages referred to in the titles of various documents cited in this report refer to the stages of project development identified by the Royal Institute of British Architects, and are accepted as an industry-standard way of describing outputs which are due as progress is made.
- 3.1.5 The Council provided us with access to a number of documents which they had generated, most of which did not show a version number, date or authorisation details on the documents themselves. The Council were unable to show us a quality management procedure which they used for document control. Owing to these factors, we were not able to conclude from those documents when read in isolation that they were the definitive versions. With one exception, the information contained in them was consistent with the other documents we saw regarding the Brandon Project.
- 3.1.6 The exception was the version of the Client's Design Brief which was included in the Stage A/B Feasibility Report, which was stated to be version 4 and received on 9 November 2009, whereas we were also given "Controlled formal revision 3" which was dated 19 April 2010. The latter document was consistent with the version of the Client's Design Brief for Esh Winning dated 14 April 2010, and we have drawn the conclusion that the numbering system changed. With this one observation, we have no reason to believe that the documents provided to us were inaccurate.
- 3.1.7 The deployment of Turner & Townsend employees within the Council's organisation, as described in paragraphs 2.4.4 and 2.4.5 above was recognised by all concerned as creating a potential conflict of interest. Such arrangements are commonplace in an industry where skilled personnel can be in short supply. This aspect was outside our scope and we have therefore not studied it in detail, but we have noted that the potential conflict of interest was recognised and managed in an open manner.
- 3.1.8 Value engineering is a common practice in the construction industry, whereby designers and contractors are encouraged to find alternative ways of meeting clients' expectations at lower cost than would result if the clients' specifications were precisely followed.

3.1.9 We consider that we have seen sufficient information to substantiate the procedures employed by the Council on the Brandon Project adequately for the purposes of this study.

3.2 Project identification and budget

3.2.1 The schedule of material project information which the Council was expected to disclose under the pilot study is set out in Appendix 2. The schedule was completed by the Council stating either the information required or identifying the documents which contained the information required. We have added answers “Not yet applicable”, “Not applicable” and “Not yet known” where such answers were appropriate but where the relevant boxes were left blank or answered in abbreviations.

3.2.2 A detailed schedule of the documents disclosed, with a description of their purpose, is included at Appendix 3.

3.2.3 The following documents have been provided in relation to the project identification and budget.

- The Council's Project Estimate dated 4 June 2009
- The Council's Draft Design Brief disclosed to us in the Stage A/B Feasibility Report
- Stage A/B Feasibility Report prepared by Red Box to show how the Design Brief had been addressed by the design development to date and how the estimated costs compared to the Council's estimate and to provide a master programme
- Revised Design Brief dated 19 April 2010

3.2.4 The Stage A/B Feasibility Report stated that the Council had confirmed that there were no issues affecting the funds and that the monies for this scheme were in place and thus ring-fenced.

3.2.5 We did not see the original target dates set by the Council. Whilst the project team's continuing reliance on the Stage A/B Feasibility Report implies that the Council had accepted the target dates shown in that report, we cannot tell whether they met the Council's original plan. Neither did we see an initial project risk register produced by the Council at the outset.

3.2.6 A review of the management of risks and opportunities does not feature in the list of Material Project information which we are required to review, but it is noteworthy that it is an important activity towards the achievement of value for money, especially at this stage in a project. The Council has not been able to show us any records of discussions which took place at the appraisal stage, except for the project estimates which make an allowance for risk based in part on the average costs of previous, similar schemes, and in part by a review by experienced officers. The project team has produced a risk register taking into account the developments to the design to date.

3.2.7 Notwithstanding the observations in paragraphs 3.2.5 and 3.2.6, we consider that the information provided is accurate and adequate to identify the project scope and budget.

3.3 Project outturn costs.

3.3.1 Several documents have been provided to establish payments made and forecast future costs to completion of the project.

- A fee schedule for Red Box commencing in January 2010
- A fee schedule for Turner & Townsend commencing in December 2009
- E-mails from Red Box and Turner & Townsend representatives confirming that fee instalments were being paid in accordance with the respective schedules as stated by the Council's representatives and recorded by us in notes of discussions
- Progress reports from the lead designer and the project manager
- A cost report included within the Stage A/B Feasibility Study
- The Stage D Cost Plan
- Invoices from Red Box and Turner & Townsend rendered in accordance with agreed draw-down schedules
- Invoices from Red Box for additional costs together with additional material clarifying the basis of the claims
- A letter from Turner & Townsend requesting the payment of additional costs together with additional material clarifying the basis of the claim
- E-mails from and to Council officers clarifying the basis for payments in addition to the draw-down schedules

- 3.3.2 The commentary in the Feasibility Report stated that the benchmark cost, in terms of cost per square metre of gross internal floor area, cited in the estimate was under pressure following design development to date. Possible action plans to recover the benchmark cost position were noted in the report and have been pursued.
- 3.3.3 A revised Design Brief was issued on 19 April 2010 which called for the construction of a day-care centre which had not been included in the original scope. The Stage C Cost Plan, issued on 16 March 2010, was not disclosed to us, but we noted from the Project Manager's report in April 2010 that the final cost that was predicted in that Cost Plan was to be £800,000 over budget. Actions to return the outturn to below budget level were noted and pursued in preparation for the Stage D Cost Plan.
- 3.3.4 The Stage D Cost Plan includes provision for a number of risks and contingencies, and has taken advantage of a number of value engineering opportunities to bring the cost plan back to budget after having absorbed increases which arose during the development of the design. In particular, the proposals included the deletion of refurbishments to the swimming pool and, as at the date of this report, were subject to the Council's approval. We have been advised that the Council has agreed to the value engineering proposals, the deletion of the swimming pool refurbishments and the Stage D Cost Plan. We have seen indirect written evidence that this is the case, and we understand that formal agreement is to be recorded at an imminent review meeting.
- 3.3.5 Payments under the Red Box and Turner & Townsend contracts were made in accordance with the respective draw-down schedules for lump sum instalments. Red Box has billed for time charges, and emerging issues have resulted in claims by both Red Box and Turner & Townsend for payments over and above those draw-down schedules. So far the costs are contained both within the budget allocation for, and the forecast costs of, the consultants' work. We noted that the plan was for cost reporting to start at the commencement of the construction phase.
- 3.3.6 The forecast of the project's final cost is well-understood, given the actions that have been taken or proposed to keep the outturn costs within budget and a level of contingency remains

within the Cost Plan. We are not expected to offer an opinion on the adequacy of the contingency.

- 3.3.7 A table showing the project cost forecasts and budgets reported at various stages is set out below. Whilst the overall predicted cost has not changed, the design continues to be developed to reflect the emerging understanding of costs, risks and opportunities as the detail has been produced and discussions with end-users and other stakeholders have take place. The Council, the lead designer and project manager are content that, with their state of knowledge at the cut-off date, the overall project remains affordable within the Council's budget.

4 June 2009	18 January 2010	16 March 2010	17 June 2010
Council's Indicative Estimate	Stage A/B Feasibility Report	Stage C Cost Plan	Stage D Cost Plan
£7,168,000	£7,164,000	£7,968,000	£7,057,000

Appendices

1. Glossary
2. Material Project Information
3. Schedule of documents disclosed

Appendix 1: Glossary

Accountability: CoST's aim is to enhance the accountability of procuring bodies and construction companies for the cost and quality of public-sector construction projects. The core accountability concept is to 'get what you pay for'. The 'you' in this context applies equally to national governments, affected stakeholders and to the wider public.

Audit: A review of procedures to establish whether work has been carried out as anticipated.

Benchmarking: Comparison of performance against other organisations or providers of similar services, particularly those recognised as undertaking best practice.

Budget: An amount of money allocated to a project or scheme

Compensation event: An event at the risk of the Employer, which may change the programme or price for the project if it occurs.

Competitive Tendering: Awarding contracts by the process of seeking competing bids from more than one contractor.

Computerised data store: A centrally located computer on which information is stored and made available to those who have been given access to it.

Construction Sector Transparency (CoST) Initiative: An international multi-stakeholder initiative designed to increase transparency and accountability in the construction sector.

Consultant: An organisation or individual who has made a contract to provide services.

Contract: A binding agreement made between two or more parties, which is intended to be legally enforceable.

Contract Documents: Documents incorporated in the enforceable agreement between the Procuring Entity and the contractor, including contract conditions, specification, pricing document, form of tender and the successful tenderers' responses (including method statements), and other relevant documents expressed to be contract documents (such as correspondence, etc.)

Contractor: An organisation or individual who has made a contract to undertake works, supply goods or provide services.

Contract period: An arrangement for the supply of works, goods or services established for a fixed period of time.

Cost estimate: A cost estimate prepared by the buyer of works, goods or services which provides a benchmark or a basis for evaluation and/or negotiation when tenders/offers are received from tenderers. It also serves as an instrument of project planning and budgeting.

Employer: In the context of the CoST initiative, the Procuring Entity awarding construction and consultancy contracts for the project.

Feasibility study: An evaluation of a proposed project to determine the difficulty and likely success and benefits of implementing the project.

Framework Agreement: An arrangement under which a Procuring Entity establishes with a provider of goods, works or services, the terms under which contracts subsequently can be entered into or called off (within the limits of the agreement when particular needs arise).

Material Project Information (MPI): MPI in this context is intended to indicate that information disclosed on a project is sufficient to enable stakeholders to make informed judgements about the cost and quality of the infrastructure concerned.

Offer: An offer can be the positive answer issued by a tenderer in response to a tender invitation, or an announcement to deliver goods, carry out works and/or services to every buyer or a specific buyer without a specific request or invitation to tender. It also refers to an expression of readiness by a tenderer to enter into a contract.

Procurement: The process of acquiring goods, works and services, covering acquisition from third parties and from in-house providers. The process spans the whole life cycle from identification of needs, through to the end of a services contract or the end of the useful life of an asset.

Procuring Entities (PEs – also referred as clients and contracting authorities): The State, regional or local authorities, bodies governed by public law or associations formed by one or several of such authorities that procure works, goods and services with full or part public funding.

Programme: The projected timing of activities required under the contract.

Quality Management System: Procedures and practices for controlling the quality of the work carried out.

Quotation: A proposed price and programme for work.

Supervision contract: A contract with a consultant to oversee the performance of the contractor on the construction work, to give a level of reassurance to the Employer about the quality of the work.

Specification: Is an essential part of the design, and states how the work should be executed to ensure that it meets the designer's assumptions.

Tender: An official written offer to an invitation that contains a cost proposal to perform the works, services or supplies required, and is provided in response to a tendering exercise. This normally involves the submission of the offer in a sealed envelope to a specified address by a specified time and date.

Tender Documents: Documents provided to prospective tenderers when they are invited to tender and that form the basis on which tenders are submitted, including instructions to tenderers, contract conditions, specification, pricing document, form of tender and tenderers responses.

Tender Evaluation: Detailed assessment and comparison of contractor, supplier or service provider offers, against lowest cost or most economically advantageous (cost and quality based) criteria.

Transparency: In the context of the CoST initiative transparency relates to the disclosure of material project information on construction projects.

Value for Money: The optimum combination of whole-life cost and quality to meet the PEs and user's requirement.

Appendix 2: Material Project Information

Stage of project cycle	List of MPI to be disclosed	Project name: Brandon Primary School Procuring Entity: Durham County Council
Project identification	Project purpose	Replacement Primary School
	Location	Brandon Primary School, Carr Avenue, Brandon, County Durham, DH7 8NL
	Intended Beneficiaries	Local Community
	Specification	New Build 390 place school with 26 place nursery
Tender process (main contract for works)	List of tenderers	OJEU Restricted Procedure – Notice to be placed June/July 2010
	Tender evaluation report	Not yet applicable
Contract award (main contract for works)	Name of main contractor	Not yet known
	Contract price	Not yet known
	Contract scope of work	Not yet known
	Contract programme	Not yet known
Contract Execution (main contract for works)	Individual changes to the contract which affect the price with reasons	Not yet applicable
	Individual changes to the contract which affect the programme, with reasons	Not yet applicable
	Details of any re-award of main contract	Not yet applicable
Post contract completion details (main contract for works)	Actual contract price	Not yet applicable
	Total payments made	Not yet applicable
	Actual contract scope of work	Not yet applicable
	Actual contract programme	Not yet applicable
Documents to be disclosed		Disclosure status
Feasibility study		Yes
Financing agreement		Not applicable
Project evaluation reports (on completion and on-going)		Yes

Appendix 3: Schedule of documents disclosed

Document title	Subject of document
Definition and budget for project	
Brandon Primary School Estimate	The Council's estimate
New Build Brandon Primary School Draft Design Brief (Appendix to Stage A/B Feasibility Report)	Client Brief by the Council's Children & Young Persons Department
Brandon Primary School Replacement Project Stage A/B Feasibility Report	Feasibility report by Red Box dated 18 January 2010 seeking agreement to Stage A/B plans to meet original Design Brief and the Council's estimate
Project Directory – PM 18077 Revision 2 – 1 February 2010 (abridged version in Stage A/B Feasibility Report)	Contact details of participants
Cost Management Report (included in Stage A/B Feasibility Report)	Cost Manager's estimate
Brandon & Esh Winning Primary School Master Programme Rev 02 (18 January 2010) (Appendix to Stage A/B Feasibility Report)	Cost Manager's programme
New Build Brandon Primary School Design Brief Controlled formal revision 3, 19 April 2010	Revised Client Brief by the Council's Children & Young Persons Department
Brandon Risk Register July 2010	Risk register identifying risks, allocating responsibility for mitigation
Project outturn cost	
Monthly Client Report No. 1, February 2010	Project Manager's report to Client. Appendices not completed and no contemporary cost report included
Progress Report: Brandon & Esh Winning Primary Schools Project Team Meeting No. 12, 10 February 2010	Progress report on design issues
Brandon & Esh Winning Schools: M&E Services Report No. 4, 10 February 2010	Progress report on M&E design issues
Brandon & Esh Winning Schools: M&E Services Report No. 5, 24 February 2010	Progress report on M&E design issues
Progress Report: Brandon & Esh Winning Primary Schools Project Team Meeting No. 13, 24 February 2010	Progress report on design issues
Progress Report 19 March 2010	Project Manager's internal progress report
Brandon & Esh Winning Primary School Master Programme Rev 05 (19 March 2010)	Cost Manager's programme
Esh Winning Primary School Replacement Project Stage A/B Feasibility Report	Feasibility report by Red Box dated 30 March 2010 mentions Cost Report for Stage C for Brandon
Monthly Client Report No. 2, April 2010	Project Manager's report to Client. Appendices not

Document title	Subject of document
	completed and no contemporary cost report included
Progress Report 29 April 2010	Project Manager's internal progress report
Brandon & Esh Winning Primary Schools: TTCM Information Received Register	Project Manager's internal register of drawings received to 27 April 2010
Brandon & Esh Winning Primary Schools: TTCM Information Issued Register	Project Manager's internal register of information issued to 29 April 2010
Brandon & Esh Winning Primary School Master Programme Rev 06 (4 May 2010)	Cost Manager's programme
Turner & Townsend letter dated 18 May 2010 seeking additional fees for whole-life costing work	Claim for additional payments
Turner & Townsend Invoice no. 000514508 dated 21 May 2010	Invoice for services rendered in accordance with draw-down schedule
Red Box Invoice no. 2023 dated 31 May 2010	Invoice for services rendered in accordance with draw-down schedule
Stage D Cost Plan Revision 1 June 2010	Outturn costs
Minutes of Esh Winning and Brandon Client Progress Meeting dated 2 June 2010	Project manager's notes of Client review meeting
Turner & Townsend Invoice no. 000515114 dated 15 June 2010	Invoice for services rendered in accordance with draw-down schedule
Minutes of Esh Winning and Brandon Client Progress Meeting dated 16 June 2010	Project manager's notes of Client review meeting
Red Box Invoice no. 2043 dated 28 June 2010	Invoice for services rendered in accordance with draw-down schedule
Minutes of Esh Winning and Brandon Client Progress Meeting dated 1 July 2010	Project manager's notes of Client review meeting
E-mail chain from sub-consultant via channels to Council officer, last transmission dated 7 July 2010 timed at 1109	Clarification of Red Box claim for additional sub-consultants' work on environmental assessments
Monthly Client Report No. 3, July 2010	Project Manager's report to Client. Appendices not completed and no contemporary cost report included.
Red Box Invoice no. 2044 dated 16 June 2010	Invoice for additional sub-consultants' services
Minutes of Esh Winning and Brandon Client Progress Meeting dated 1 July 2010	Project manager's notes of Client review meeting
E-mail chain from Turner & Townsend to Council officers, last transmission dated 7 July 2010 timed at 1035	Clarification of position relating to Turner & Townsend letter of 18 May 2010 (cited above)
Red Box Invoice no. 2046 dated 15 July 2010	Invoice for price adjustment formula agreed to

Document title	Subject of document
	cover inflation on time charges. Refers to time charges for which invoices have not been disclosed.
Turner & Townsend Invoice no. 000516000 dated 23 July 2010	Invoice for services rendered in accordance with draw-down schedule
Further copy of abstract from Red Box letter dated 23 June 2009	Clarification of agreed basis for time-charging
E-mail from Council officer dated 2 August 2010 with attachments	Clarification of circumstances behind Red Box invoice no. 2044, cited above



CoST UK Secretariat
Institution of Civil Engineers
1 Great George Street
London SW1P 3AA

CoST@ice.org.uk

DRE JV