

Project Brief – APPENDIX A

Project Name: Installation of mercury abatement equipment	Programme / Strategy: Capital Works programme
Project Sponsor: Portchester Crematorium Joint Committee	Project Manager: To be determined
Date: September 2008	Version: 1.2

Project Objectives (What?):

1. Installation of mercury abatement equipment on all cremators, that satisfies the provisions of Process Guidance Note 5/2(4) and Air Quality note AQ1 (05).
2. To commence abating mercury prior to the DEFRA deadline of 31st December 2012.
3. To achieve installation within available resources, as determined by the Treasurer to the JC.

Project Outcomes (Why?):

1. To improve air quality, by abating mercury emissions from Portchester Crematorium.

Project Deliverables (How?):

1. Approval to proceed with the project from the Joint Committee, including taking into account any views that might be expressed should the committee's decision be the subject of a subsequent scrutiny review by a constituent authority..
2. A contract with a Consultant to oversee the project
3. A separate set of tender documents for the premises and equipment required.
4. Planning permission for the proposed extension.
5. A contract to extend the existing crematorium building in order to house the abatement equipment.
6. A contract to supply and install abatement equipment.

Project Brief – APPENDIX A

7. Successful completion of the building works, in line with agreed cost, quality and timescales
8. Successful installation of the abatement equipment to all cremators, within agreed cost, quality and timescales.

Project Scope (what the project will include):

1. An extended building to house the abatement equipment.
2. Installation of abatement equipment to all cremators.

Project Exclusions

1. The project will not seek to improve facilities at the crematorium, only improve the quality of emissions.

Project Constraints

1. The project must not exceed the budget made available to it by the Joint committee.
2. The spending profile of the project must not result in expenditure exceeding resources during the life of the project.
3. There is a limited pool of contractors with the specialist knowledge, experience and expertise to undertake the installation of the additional plant and equipment.
4. The tender process must be conducted in a way that minimises the risk of any specialist contractor perceiving that they are in a disadvantaged position.
5. The works should be completed by the end of 2012 at the latest.
6. The building extension works should not impinge on areas where ashes have been buried.
7. The work programme should not have an adverse impact on the ability of the Registrar to accept cremations during the project period. This will require work to be carried out outside of normal operating hours.
8. The work should not result in a detrimental experience for crematorium visitors/users.

Project Brief – APPENDIX A**Project Assumptions**

1. The finances will be available at the appropriate time.
2. The constituent authorities, through their membership of the Joint Committee, accept the need and endorse the project.
3. That demand for cremations during the project period does not exceed “normal” levels.
4. That a competitive market exists to supply and maintain equipment that is compatible with existing equipment.
5. That capacity exists within the supplier market to undertake the works within the desired timescales.
6. That a transparent and open tender process can be established.
7. That the work programme can be undertaken without impacting on the normal operations of the crematorium, or give rise to an unacceptable experience for users/visitors.
8. That a clear project organisation can be established and that sufficient expertise exists to fulfil the necessary roles within the team structure.

Measures of Project Success

Type	Performance Measure	Target
Project Mgt	The project is completed on time	30/9/10
	The project is complete within budget	£2m
	The project is completed to an acceptable standard.	30/9/10
Technical	The building is sufficient to house the abatement equipment.	31/12/09
	The cremators continue to provide the same capacity (measured as cremations per day).	TBA
Organisation	Crematorium emissions comply with process guidance notes.	30/9/10
Stakeholders	Customer satisfaction is maintained.	No complaints received over life of project

Project Manager Signature:**Project Sponsor Signature:**

PROJECT RISK REGISTER SUMMARY (Per V.1.1)

	Risk category (before mitigating action is taken)	Risk category (after mitigating action is taken)
Substantial (red) risks	3	0
Moderate (amber) risks	8	2
Tolerable (green) risks	21	30
Total risks identified	32	32

Substantial risks are those which have a critical impact on the ability of the project to deliver the stated outcomes in the project brief. Moderate risks have a lesser impact on the project goals, but still require attention in order to reduce them to a tolerable level.

The “substantial risks” that have been identified concern

- The total cost of the works exceeding the available budget
- The availability of resources becoming available to meet the project cost, in line with the stated work programme
- The arrangements with the PCJC consultants (Parker Torrington) do not extend to include this project.

A full risk register and risk reduction action plan is produced to underpin this project brief, and is monitored on a regular basis.

19 September 2008

W:\BTS\Portchester Crematorium\crematorium\Crematorium reports\Mercury Abatement Project Brief-appendix A.doc

APPENDIX B

Portchester Crematorium – Installation of Mercury Abatement Project - Proposed Establishment of a Project Board

1. Purpose

To explain the arrangements for directing and managing the Mercury Abatement Project to ensure its success.

2. Key Role of the Joint Committee

The Joint Committee will be responsible for the strategic decision making in respect of the project, and for receiving quarterly reports on progress from a Project Board, and taking any strategic decisions accordingly.

3. Key Roles of the Project Board

The day-to-day responsibility for managing the project will be that of a specifically appointed Project Manager, reporting to the Project Board.

The Project Board has 3 **Key Roles** representing the business, users and the supplier interests of the project –

- Business representative – owns the business case and is looking for value;
- User representative – wants a product that the end users are happy with;
- Supplier Representative – responsible for ensuring that the product is technically sound.

The **Key Responsibilities** of the Board would be -

- Overall directional decision making, unless requiring a strategic decision from the Joint Committee;
- Resource commitment within the budget available

The **Key Processes** for the Project Board will be event driven, such as –

- Ensuring that the project is in a fit state to begin;
- Monitoring progress and taking decisions;
- Ensuring that the project delivers its Business Case.

The success of the process will depend to a large extent on establishing appropriate project controls in the first instance.

4. Starting/Initiating the Project

Although it will be the Joint Committee that takes the ultimate decision to proceed (or otherwise) with the project, it will be upon a recommendation from the Project Board.

As part of these steps the Board (and the Joint Committee) will need to understand the implications of the project, especially in terms of time, cost and resources required.

The steps that will need to be taken as part of authorising the project include –

- Authorising or accepting the Project Brief
- Appointing the Project Manager
- Agreeing the appropriate project controls
- Approving the Project Initiation Document (PID)
- Authorising the Project to begin.

In defining the appropriate project controls, the Project Manager will be given terms of reference by which the Board/Joint Committee wants the project controlled. These terms of reference will define the agreed tolerances for time, cost, quality and scope for the project. If the project is forecast to exceed these tolerances at any time, then the Project Manager must bring this to the attention of the Board.

5. Managing the Project

It is normal in projects for the Project Board to be kept updated on progress on a regular basis by means of a Project Highlights Report. This allows the Board to monitor progress and raise any concerns they may have with the Project Manager. The Project Highlights Report should provide a high-level view of the status of the project focussing on time, cost and quality criteria. It should also provide a view of the risks identified for the project and how these are being managed.

Should the project be forecast to exceed its defined tolerances the Project Manager must raise an exception report to the Project Board. It would then be for the Project Board to decide how to deal with the forecast deviation and approve (or recommend to the Joint Committee) any changes to the project as a consequence.

6. Board Membership

It is suggested that membership of the Board could comprise –

- Engineer and Surveyor to the Joint Committee
- Treasurer to the Joint Committee
- Clerk to the Joint Committee
- Registrar and Manager

- David Pointon, Head of Procurement, Portsmouth City Council
- A member of the Joint Committee

7. Recommendations

- (1) That the arrangements set out above for the establishment of a project review board and its membership be approved, and the respective roles and responsibilities be noted and agreed.**
- (2) That the Joint Committee appoints a member to serve on the project review board.**

Project Name:	PCJC Mercury Abatement	Register Date:	6th May 08	Register Version:	1.1
----------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------	--------------------------	------------

Id	Project Risk	Gross Prob	Gross Impact	Gross Risk Category	Proposed Risk Reduction Actions	Who Responsible	Target Date	Net Prob	Net Impact	Net Risk Rating	Fallback Plan
1	Total cost of the works exceeds budget available	4	4	2	Draw up specification of work to reflect financial restrictions, ensure evaluation criteria are appropriately weighted in favour of lowest cost for a given level of quality and timeline, proactive project mgt and reporting	ALL	TBC	3	4	3	Defer work programme until resources are secured. Consider fee increases, constituent authority contributions temporarily reduced, short term borrowing, defer other works
2	Budget does not become available in line with work programme.	4	4	2	Draw up work programme in line with budget plan, identify other work that could be deferred, gain approval for short term borrowing (if required)	ALL	TBC	3	4	3	Use borrowing approvals, increase future years fees
3	Terms of PT contract do not extend to include this project, leading to commercial/legal challenge.	4	4	2	Check arrangements with PT. Establish a contract with PT for remainder of agreement. Seek expressions of interest then tender the "consultants" role, contact other local crematoria to establish their arrangements.	TG	TBC	1	1	5	Defer work programme until contract is established with the chosen consultant.
4	Tender process not robust (or transparency open to challenge)	3	5	3	Process to be documented and agreed by Joint Cttee, Specification to be put together with PCC procurement expertise involved, ensure all criteria are generic (not supplier focussed).	TG	TBC	1	5	4	Put project on hold in order to establish suitably robust processes.
5	Tender evaluation process for abatement equipment inappropriately weighted in favour of a particular tenderer.	3	5	3	Process to be documented and agreed by Joint Cttee, Specification to be put together with PCC procurement expertise involved, ensure all criteria are generic (not supplier focussed).	TG	TBC	1	5	4	Consider re-tendering contract
6	Building works or installation of equipment disrupting existing operations (loss of income, loss of reputation, etc)	3	4	3	Contract to require out of hrs working. M&R to agree working patterns on site. Consider engaging FT to comment on buildability issues in relation to cremator capacity.	TG/JC	TBC	2	4	4	Divert cremations to neighbouring facilities
7	Consultants (PT) not acting in the whole interest of the PCJC	3	4	3	Ensure Consultants are aware of all aspects of the project, involve Consultants in project board meetings, obtain Consultants sign up to project brief	TG	TBC	2	3	4	Suspend contract, consider re-letting
8	Roles and responsibilities within the "project organisation" not clear	3	4	3	Establish formal roles and get parties involved to accept responsibilities up front. Share role profiles across the project team.	ALL	TBC	2	4	4	n/a
9	Demands for similar work on the suppliers in the market clash with PCJC project timeline.	3	3	3	Carry out procurement process as soon as practicable to secure a window for the work to be undertaken, include work period within contract.	TG	TBC	2	3	4	Re-consider finance plan
10	Demand for cremations exceeds capacity during project period, resulting in time/cost overruns.	3	3	3	Monitor throughput at the Crem and wider health issues as they emerge. Agree pattern of shift working with operatives should this be necessary.	JC	TBC	3	2	4	n/a

11	Project outcomes, project brief and subsequent specifications lack clarity and impact upon the success of the project	3	3	3	Involve all key stakeholders when establishing project framework.	ALL	TBC	2	3	4	Re-visit project outcomes and seek approval to change
12	Construction Co. and Abatement supplier not communicating effectively.	3	2	4	Have clear project mgt arrangements in place, share timetables and method statements with all parties	TG	TBC	2	2	4	Consider suspending contract
13	Increased pressure from constituent authorities to increase annual contribution, and reduce funds available for project.	3	2	4	Be clear about project purpose when communicating with LA's	ALL	TBC	2	2	4	Consider regular progress reports
14	Politically unacceptable to increase fees in order to meet the cost of the project.	3	2	4	Be clear up front how the project will be funded.	AW	TBC	2	2	4	Consider regular progress reports
15	Project timeline runs beyond the 2012 deadline.	3	2	4	Monitor progress, consult with DEFRA if likely to overrun	TG	TBC	2	2	4	n/a
16	Incompatible abatement equipment with existing cremators (achievement of objectives, consequential costs)	2	4	4	Abatement suppliers to guarantee compatibility with existing cremators. Clear spec within tender document. Consider req't of long term bond for remedial works.	TG	TBC	1	4	5	n/a
17	Building works to house the abatement equipment disrupts existing operations (loss of income, loss of reputation, etc)	2	4	4	Contract to require out of hrs working. M&R to agree working patterns on site	TG/JC	TBC	1	4	5	n/a
29	Building not constructed in accordance with contract documents	2	4	4	Plans to be signed off by contractor, close inspection of work as it progresses, variations to be signed off by all relevant parties.	TG	TBC	1	4	5	Liquidated damages in building contract to cover costs.
31	Specialist plant does not meet the required standards (per AG note 5 and latest process guidance from DEFRA).	2	4	4	Selection criteria to require evidence of satisfactory operation, put in place a bond to cover abortive costs, structure payment profile to minimise financial loss by PCJC.	TG	TBC	1	4	5	n/a
18	Provider of abatement equipment not available in future, to maintain systems	2	3	4	Ensure adequate pre qualification checks are carried out. Do not select equipment unless proven in the market.	TG	TBC	1	3	5	n/a
19	PCJC project timeline conflicts with major works at neighbouring crematoria.	2	3	4	Communicate with other Crematoria when putting together work plans	JC	TBC	1	3	5	Consider deferring works
20	Construction and installation works require the Crematorium to close, or divert cremations to neighbouring crematoria.	2	3	4	Ensure contractor is insured against this and consequential loss to PCJC, communicate with other Crematoria when putting together work plans	JC	TBC	1	3	5	Divert cremations to neighbouring facilities
30	Building contractor or supplier cease trading during the contract	2	3	4	Ensure adequate pre qualification checks are carried out. Put in place a bond to cover abortive costs, structure payment profile to minimise financial loss by PCJC.	TG	TBC	1	3	5	n/a

21	Abatement equipment does not fit within the extended building	1	5	4	Abatement suppliers to sign off building design, prior to start on site	TG	TBC	1	5	4	Re-build facility, accept another tender, client bears risk, delay project until they have the confidence to sign off
22	Planning application refused, or unreasonable/expensive conditions attached.	1	5	4	Pre application discussions held with planners, application in line with local planning guidance.	TG	TBC	1	5	4	Re-design plans
23	Project does not result in credits from CAMEO	3	1	5	Do not place reliance on CAMEO receipts to finance the project.	AW	TBC	1	1	5	n/a
24	Incorrect installation of abatement equipment (achievement of objectives, consequential costs)	1	4	5	Abatement suppliers to guarantee compatibility with existing cremators. Clear spec within tender document. Consider req't of long term bond for remedial works.	TG	TBC	1	4	5	Re-install equipment
25	Failure to co-ordinate building works and installation of abatement equipment	1	4	5	PT to agree time line jointly with reps	TG	TBC	1	4	5	n/a
26	PCJC become less supportive of the project (due to change of PCJC membership), e.g. due to success criteria, cost of the project).	1	4	5	Regular progress reports	TG	TBC	1	4	5	Re-visit project outcomes and seek approval to change if appropriate
27	Constituent authorities unsupportive of project (via Scrutiny function)	1	4	5	Regular progress reports	ALL	TBC	1	4	5	Re-visit project outcomes and seek approval to change if appropriate
28	Misunderstandings between PCJC, builder and installations (e.g. due to language, etc).	1	4	5	Agree communication lines at point of engagement.	TG	TBC	1	4	5	n/a
32	Other stakeholders not co-operating or able to work within demands of the project (e.g. FT, energy supplier, etc)	1	4	5	Consult with key stakeholders in advance of the project, seek assurance that co-operation will be forthcoming over life of project.	TG	TBC	1	3	5	Consider deferring project in line with other stakeholder requirements.

Version Date Amended

v.1 6th May 08

v.1.1 16th June 08

[Go Back](#)

RISK RATING

RED = SUBSTANTIAL:

Insufficient control measures in place to avoid a critical effect on ability to deliver Corporate or Departmental services. Issues should be addressed within 6 months.

AMBER = MODERATE:

Some control measures in place but efforts should be made to implement the full range to prevent adverse effects on Corporate or Departmental service delivery. Issues should be addressed within 12 months.

GREEN = TOLERABLE:

No additional controls required at this time. Existing risks to Corporate and Departmental service delivery appear to be controlled so far as is reasonably practicable. Continue to monitor to ensure controls remain effective.

er
ths.

ull range to
should be

partmental
ntinue to

This list is not exhaustive but contains some of the elements you should consider

POLICIES & PROCEDURES	HUMAN RESOURCES
Corporate Strategies Corporate Aims Policies Contingency Plans Procedural Notes Corporate working Groups	Staffing Levels & Skills Training & Development Employee Supervision Communication Systems Work Structuring
SUPPLIER ARRANGEMENTS	MONITORING PROCESSES
Contract Terms Standby Arrangements Insurance Arrangements	Testing Compliance Checking Reports Standards Quality Assurance
APPROPRIATE RESOURCES	<u>Go Back</u>
IT Finance Budgetary Control Properties Equipment	

Probability	Impact	Combined	Category
1	1	11	5
1	2	12	5
1	3	13	5
1	4	14	5
1	5	15	4
2	1	21	5
2	2	22	4
2	3	23	4
2	4	24	4
2	5	25	3
3	1	31	5
3	2	32	4
3	3	33	3
3	4	34	3
3	5	35	3
4	1	41	5
4	2	42	4
4	3	43	3
4	4	44	2
4	5	45	1
5	1	51	4
5	2	52	3
5	3	53	3
5	4	54	1
5	5	55	1

		1	2	3	4	5	
		4	3	3	1	1	
Impact	VH	4	3	3	1	1	5
	H	5	4	3	2	1	4
	M	5	4	3	3	3	3
	L	5	4	4	4	3	2
	VL	5	5	5	5	4	1
		VL	L	M	H	VH	
		Probability					