



## THE CHIEF FIRE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

The professional voice of the  
UK fire and rescue service

Your reference:

My Reference: OB/SPH

Shona Dunn  
Director of Fire & Resilience  
Communities & Local Government  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London  
SW1E 5DU

**Olaf Baars**  
**Senior Professional User – FiReControl Project**

Royal Berkshire Fire & Rescue Service  
Fire & Rescue Service Headquarters  
103 Dee Road  
Reading  
Berkshire  
RG30 4FS

Telephone: +44 (0) 118 932 2226  
Facsimile: +44 (0) 118 932 2101  
Email: baarso@rbfrs.co.uk

Wednesday 25 August 2010

Dear Shona,

You will no doubt be aware that the August meeting of LRDG was cancelled and instead, we met separately, in closed session with Roger Hargreaves and EADS to discuss their respective perceptions of where the project currently stands and when a clear way forward would emerge. Members of LRDG and the CFOA team are becoming increasingly concerned that, since the Minister's speech in Harrogate on 29 June, far from bringing "clarity and certainty" the project has fallen into total disarray with the greatest levels of confusion and uncertainty that have been experienced since the start of the project.

CFOA support for this project has always been conditional, based on the functionality and the performance of the system being better than, or at least as good as the systems that are currently operated by the FRS. The discussions based around the current contractual situation appear to raise the very real prospect that some FRS will be asked to initially accept a system that does not have full functionality with an intention to provide that functionality at a later date. CFOA's view and the view of the informal LRDG meeting was that this is not acceptable, no FRS should be asked to cut over to a system that does not fully deliver the functionality and performance that has been promised. We are concerned that, for the first time, there may be an emerging gap between the FiReControl system that the Government are willing to pay for and a system that the fire and rescue service would be prepared to accept. This is not a situation that we would wish to see at this stage of the project when so much time, effort and money has been invested over the years. We seek your assurance that you share our view and our commitment to deliver FiReControl as a complete package incorporating all the functionality necessary to satisfy CFOA's conditional support.

LRDG do not recognize the timetable that was announced by the Minister on the 29<sup>th</sup> June and do not consider this to be achievable for the delivery of a system that would meet the needs and expectations of the FRS. The current contractual impasse and lack of progress since July will inevitably lead to further delays in delivering this project, beyond even the cut over window of January to June 2012, that was developed in full partnership between CLG the FRS, and that all parties had been working to for months prior to the Minister's speech, confirmed in the paper BRF0783 presented to the June meeting of LRDG. This was a schedule that was perceived to be realistic, achievable and something that the FRS was comfortable with. Our focus remains on the delivery of a system that will provide benefits to the FRS and the communities that we serve, and have a strong desire to continue to support the development of the system. Within the regional and CFOA FiReControl teams there are resources, paid for from the public purse, that are currently under utilized. There is, within

these teams an eagerness to get on with system development and development of the WoW in a meaningful way. We would wish to reiterate our commitment to progress this work and we would like to actively explore the manner in which we could do so. Whilst recognizing your current commercial strategy, we do have a great concern over CLG's unwillingness to provide EADS with the WoW documentation to the extent that it has been developed to date, and again we would wish to explore with you how this can be progressed. Furthermore, we need to understand what more can be done to make progress with the CCN's and other outstanding issues, without which we believe may result in an unacceptable solution being delivered, leading to further delays in upgrading the solution to something that the FRS would be prepared to use.

You will be aware, from my email of 24 June, to which I am still to receive a response, that I have suspended meetings of the Assurance Board pending agreement between CLG and EADS on the Test Strategy and Master Test Plan against which the board can carry out the assurance function, the result being that there may be components of the solution that CLG and EADS will wish to roll out to the FRS that will not have the benefit of consideration by the Assurance Board. Regional and FRS teams will have to decide whether or not they wish to agree to this equipment being delivered without this level of assurance. It had been my hope that the matter could be quickly resolved and that no meetings would actually need to be cancelled. In reality, two meetings have already been cancelled with little or no evidence that we are moving any closer to an agreed position. The Assurance Board had pre-existing concerns that there was very little time in which to undertake the necessary assurance work, it is now absolutely clear that there is insufficient time in which to carry out the assurance function within the timeframe set out by the Minister. This will inevitably be a significant influence over FRA's decisions on whether or not it is safe to cut over to a FiReControl solution.

On a final note, whilst we regretfully accept that there is an increasing difference of views between CLG and EADS regarding the contract we find it unacceptable for CLG to filter information provided by EADS for meetings with the end user representatives, whether that is PDG or LRDG. We are quite capable of evaluating the two positions and drawing our own conclusions based on the information put before us from both parties. Referring to my recent discussions with Roger Hargreaves on this issue, I would be grateful if you would confirm your agreement to discussing contentious material with the CFOA chairman of the respective meetings in order to reach an agreement on the suitability, potential benefits and if appropriate, the means of sharing the information more widely. Notwithstanding that, we fully appreciate the problems that can be caused by the late submission of material by EADS.

Whilst we understand and share your frustration at EADS poor performance and failure to deliver anything against the important criteria of time cost and quality, I hope that you have gleaned from the issues raised in this letter the degree of concern currently felt by LRDG. We are eager to continue to work in a meaningful way to a schedule that is achievable and will deliver a system that lives up to our expectations. We understand your commercial strategy but, as an interested third party, see that this strategy has, thus far, achieved nothing but deliver a further deterioration in the commercial relationship and a greater degree of confusion and uncertainty that fundamentally undermines our confidence in this project being delivered.

I look forward to your response and working with you and your team to achieve a position from which the project can progress to successful completion.

Yours faithfully



Olaf Baars  
CFOA FiReControl Lead Officer  
Senior Professional User



Olaf Baars  
Royal Berkshire Fire & Rescue Service  
Fire & Rescue Service Headquarters  
103 Dee Road  
Reading  
Berkshire  
RG30 4FS

Shona Dunn  
Director of Fire & Resilience

**Department for Communities and Local  
Government**  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London SW1E 5DU

Tel: 0303 444 4166  
E-Mail: shona.dunn@communities.gsi.gov.uk

[www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

8 September 2010

Dear Olaf

Thank you for your letter of 25 August.

I know that you and LRDG colleagues have had a number of discussions recently with Roger Hargreaves and the FiReControl team about the current position on the FiReControl project. I recognise that there is currently a feeling of significant uncertainty in respect of the project and I share your wish to provide greater clarity on the status of the project and the rationale for the approach we are taking with our supplier, EADS. I am grateful therefore to be able to take this opportunity to set out the current position in detail and ensure that it is fully understood by all. I have addressed each of the points you have raised in turn below, although in a different order.

### **Schedule**

As you know, Ministers announced in June this year that the FiReControl project should proceed but only if it could be delivered to expected time, cost and quality standards. This means that:

- EADS must deliver the system in time for the UAT to start in the middle of January 2011 and complete the OAT1 by 1 June 2011;
- The system delivered on 1 June 2011 must meet the operational needs of the FRS as defined in the contract we have with EADS.

This does not mean that any FRS will be expected to go-live on 1 June 2011. You have expressed concerns about this date and I am happy to explain why it has been chosen.

31

In spring 2009, it became clear that the currently contracted date of 10 March 2010 for completing the UAT of the main system would not be achievable. We worked with EADS to draw up detailed proposals to change this contracted date. These proposals showed that the UAT would complete on 15 October 2010 and that go-live would take place in May 2011. The Minister's announcement to Parliament on 15 July 2009 was based on this agreement.

However, having developed and announced the change, EADS then informed us that Ericsson may not be able to deliver the Mobilisation and Resource Management System (MRMS) which sits at the heart of FiReControl. They asked us to help them explore the possibility of using an alternative MRMS supplier to deliver the project within the same proposed timescales for go-live. As a result of these serious delivery difficulties, CLG and the FRS worked hard with EADS to explore alternative ways of delivering the project. This resulted in the draft schedule to which you refer in your letter.

At all points during this period, CLG was clear with EADS that no alternative schedule could be agreed without a full understanding of, and agreement on, the wider implications of any change in respect of quality and cost. EADS consistently refused to address either of these points and consequently it was not possible to reach a formal agreement on the change. To do so in the absence of such information and agreements would have exposed CLG and consequently the FRS to serious risks, particularly in respect of cost escalation, and this was a risk we were not prepared to take.

This remains the case today and it is our determination to protect the tax payer and meet FRS operational needs which has driven our determination to hold EADS to their contractual obligations.



It is important to note that EADS have not yet said formally to us that they cannot deliver to the 1 June 2011 deadline. It is also important to remember that this date is not only broadly consistent with (indeed slightly more generous than) the delivery date most recently announced, but that it is also consistent with statements made frequently by Robin Southwell, Chief Executive of EADS UK in both formal and informal settings. Given this, it is difficult to see what reason we would have had for setting any other date. EADS must now state formally whether or not they can achieve the 1 June 2011 deadline and, if not, propose an alternative package. Ministers will then consider all their options but can only do so once this clarity is provided.

## **Quality**

Moving on, I can confirm that CLG is committed to ensuring the system EADS delivers is a complete package which incorporates all the functionality necessary to satisfy the needs of the FRS and meet CFOA's conditional support. Under our present plans the system will be delivered in two distinct phases. The first phase will complete at the end of the OAT1 (when the system has been installed and tested successfully in the first three control centres) and the second will complete before any FRS goes live. The second phase will include a small number of changes that we know are needed to meet the operational needs of the FRS, e.g. remote access,

PDA simulator, etc. I can assure you that no FRS will be asked to go-live until both phases of development have been completed and successfully tested to the satisfaction of the FRS.

I should say however that our assessment of EADS's ability to deliver the system is currently causing us concern. There are a number of reasons for this and I think for the sake of clarity it is important that I set these out in some detail:

- **System definition** – The system that EADS appears to be now developing is clearly inferior to the one they promised to supply when they signed the contract. The contract requires EADS to supply the system in a way which meets the requirements as described in a set of detailed documents called the solution. Both the requirements and the solution form part of the contract that CLG has with EADS. The solution describes the system and sets out how the requirements will be met – it forms a crucial part of the contract and is central to protecting FRS and CLG interests. It also defines the approach to designing and developing the system and the detailed arrangements for testing and training. During the first two years of the contract, EADS did not follow the contracted solution for the design and development of the system despite many requests from us to do so. As a result, they encountered (and continue to) significant problems, particularly in the management of the requirements, their suppliers and the development as a whole. They have now chosen to implement changes which have not been agreed or even explained to us or the FRS. This leaves us exposed.  
- **User involvement** – In 2009 the Solution Establishment Workshops were set up to try to help EADS get back on track. EADS then informed us that Ericsson may not be able to deliver the CoordCom MRMS application which sits at the heart of FiReControl. At around the same time EADS also informed us that they would not be able to deliver the required levels of availability and performance. As a result CLG and the FRS spent a significant period of time helping EADS to explore an alternative way of delivering the system. Despite this huge effort EADS have repeatedly declined to provide us with a description of the system they are now building or to propose a formal change to the contracted solution and the requirements. As a result we can not now be sure what EADS is developing and have no visibility on the extent to which it will meet the FRS needs as defined in the contract. We cannot continue to engage with EADS on this basis and must require them to remedy the situation.
- **Functionality** – The lack of information coming out of EADS is very worrying. For example we do not know how EADS is planning to deliver the functionality required for manual mobilisation, retained mobilisation, cross border mobilisation, mobilising thresholds, merging incident types, resource monitoring, request to speak, planned responses, dispatch groups and alerts, etc.
- **Resilience and reliability** – We are particularly concerned about the reliability of the system and how service will be maintained should the system fail. This is absolutely critical to FiReControl. EADS signed up to deliver a system that would be unavailable for no more than 32 seconds each year. It has now

transpired that the system EADS is developing could be down for hours each year and could place significant unplanned additional burdens on the RCCs and the FRS. This is of serious concern when we are considering a single national system.

- **Quality of delivery** – EADS continue to miss deadlines and supply deliverables which are unacceptable. Recent examples include:

– DCMT2 is late. It does not meet the requirements or the needs of the FRS. It contains unacceptable defects and does not capture all the data that it is required to capture (e.g. vehicle height and width data which means the system will not be able to calculate journey times accurately and propose the most appropriate vehicles to attend incidents). It has not been set up to enable users to create appliances and PDAs and the training materials are a long way short of being fit for purpose;

– MDT1A contains maps and information for dealing with chemical hazards which are out of date. We are still awaiting a plan from EADS to put these right;

– Station end equipment was due to be deployed in July, but has failed EADS accreditation and will not now be ready until November at the earliest;

– Delivery of the FRS API (Application Program Interfaces) continues to slip. The contract requires EADS to deliver the API 120 days after contract award. The most recent date proposed by EADS was August 2009, but the specifications delivered to date have been incomplete and the tools required to support its use have not been supplied;

– The most recent date for the System Requirements Review to complete was 25 May 2010, but it was not held until 5 August 2010 and was then given only a conditional pass;

– The most recent date for the System Design Review to complete was 27 July 2010. We now understand it may be held later this month.

### **Assurance and Testing**

I understand and indeed share CFOA's concerns about the lack of time that would currently be available for assurance activities and I understand entirely why you felt it necessary to suspend meetings of the Assurance Board until agreement has been reached with EADS on the test strategy. EADS agreed and is contracted to implement a rigorous and carefully defined approach to testing, which was specifically designed to ensure suppliers did not cut corners unsafely. EADS are required to follow the approach defined in the contract to ensure that CLG and the FRS have complete confidence that the system and other deliverables have been properly and fully tested before they are deployed into operational use.

EADS have advised us that they do not intend to hold a separate Factory Assurance Test, even though they are specifically required to do this. They have also advised us that they intend to perform the tests that they judge to be appropriate for the system, as opposed to the ones they are required to perform, which are clearly defined and measurable. While we are happy to consider alternatives that are equal to, or better than, the ones EADS are contracted to apply, we are not prepared to allow EADS to dictate an approach to testing which is not clearly defined, measurable and agreed. To do the latter is not an option as it introduces an unacceptable degree of risk for the FRS and the communities they serve. We do not feel that we can compromise on this and whilst I appreciate that this creates a pressure in this area I cannot see that softening our requirements would help. I can however reiterate my commitment that FRSs will not be asked to accept a system into service which has not been properly tested and assured.

### **Ways of Working (WoW) Documentation**

As you know EADS are contracted to design and develop the system in a way that provides for all key streams of activity to converge and complete in parallel so that the project is delivered in the shortest possible timescales. EADS have not done this. They have instead continued to focus on their own development work and have not provided us with design documentation for the system, even though they agreed (and are contracted) to provide this a long time ago. We and the FRS need this documentation to finalise the business processes, develop the WoWs and the tests for the UAT, and to assure ourselves that the system can be maintained and changed efficiently once it has gone live.

At the Lifecycle Architecture (LCA) Review in March 2009, EADS recognised that the design approach they had been following lacked definition and was not compliant with the contracted solution for the design and development of the system. The SEWs were designed to address this major shortcoming, but they did not achieve their objectives as they had to switch focus to exploring ways of delivering the system with an alternative MRMS supplier in the shortest possible timescales.

As a result the design documentation necessary to develop the WoWs was not produced and we now have very little information about the system EADS are developing. We know the system differs from the contracted solution and will not meet a number of the requirements. We have repeatedly asked EADS to provide a full description of the system they are planning to deliver and a formal proposal to change the contract. Until EADS have done this and the changes have been agreed and reflected in the contract, it would be counter-productive to supply the WoW documentation to EADS. It would do nothing to help remedy the current situation and, if anything, could make matters worse.

### **Communications**

I recognise that all of these difficulties are affecting the FRS ability to plan implementation and assurance activities. I appreciate that given the strongly commercial flavour of our current relationship with EADS it also makes for some uncomfortable meetings and interactions. I would ask you to bear with us in these and assist us in doing all we can to ensure that we protect the interests of the FRS.

We will of course seek to share as much information with you as possible at all times and to discuss with you how this information can be shared more widely where appropriate.

I appreciate your recognition that we are where we are because of EADS' poor performance and failure to deliver. I want to thank CFOA members for their continued commitment and hard work in pressing ahead with FiReControl despite these problems. I hope you will agree with me that, in view of the very serious deficiencies set out in this letter, it is important that CLG and CFOA stand together and hold EADS to account for their shortcomings, and that by doing so, ensure the FRS receives a control solution that meets their needs.

Shona Dunn  
Director of Fire & Resilience