

JASPERS

CFPM Workshops

Attendance and
Feedback Report

July 2010

Ove Arup & Partners Ltd

The Arup Campus, Blythe Gate, Blythe Valley Park, Solihull, West Midlands. B90 8AE
Tel +44 (0)121 213 3000 Fax +44 (0)121 213 3001
www.arup.com

This report takes into account the particular instructions and requirements of our client.

It is not intended for and should not be relied upon by any third party and no responsibility is undertaken to any third party

Job number 207156-05

Job title	CFPM Workshops	Job number	207156-05
-----------	----------------	------------	-----------

Document title	Attendance and Feedback Report	File reference	
----------------	--------------------------------	----------------	--

Document ref

Revision	Date	Filename	Attendance and Feedback Report.docx		
Draft 1	10/06/10	Description	First draft		
			Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
		Name	Deborah Corrie	Peter Burgess	Peter Burgess
		Signature			
Draft 2	08/07/10	Filename	Second Draft		
		Description			
			Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
		Name	Deborah Corrie	Peter Burgess	Peter Burgess
		Signature			
		Filename			
		Description			
			Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
		Name			
		Signature			
		Filename			
		Description			
			Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by
		Name			
		Signature			

Issue Document Verification with Document

Contents

	Page
1 Workshops	1
1.1 Dates, Trainers and Venues	1
2 Attendance List	2
2.1 Attendees at each workshop	2
3 Presentation Material	6
3.1 Material for each workshop	6
4 Feedback Questionnaire Summary	8
4.1 Introduction	8
4.2 Administrative Arrangements	8
4.3 Workshop Expectations	8
4.4 Workshop Objectives	8
4.5 Relevance of the Course to Current Work Requirements	8
4.6 Recommend the Course	8
4.7 Skills of the Trainer	8
4.8 Mix of Trainer Input and Attendee Contribution	8
4.9 Programme of Characteristics	9
4.10 Valuable Aspects of the Course	9
4.11 Potential Improvements to the Course	10
4.12 Actions Intend to Implement in the Work Place	10
4.13 Other Comments	11

Appendices

1 Workshops

1.1 Dates, Trainers and Venues

A series of eight CFPM Workshops have been held to date on Risk Management, Value Engineering and The Use of Price Adjustment Clause (PAC). The workshops were held in Bucharest, Riga, Warsaw, Sofia and Vienna.

The workshop dates / details, the corresponding trainers and locations are included in **Table 1.1**.

Table 1.1 Workshop Details

Date	Trainer (s)	Workshop	Location
19/05/10	Mike Jefferyes & Alex Finlayson	VE	Bucharest
20/05/10	David Crosthwaite	PAC	Bucharest
25/05/10	Rob Davies & John Snell	RM	Riga
26/05/10	Mike Jefferyes & Alex Finlayson	VE	Riga
27/05/10	Rob Davies & John Snell	RM	Warsaw
03/06/10	David Crosthwaite	PAC	Sofia
04/06/10	Rob Davies & John Snell	RM	Sofia
23/06/10	Rob Davies & Peter Burgess	RM	Vienna

*VE – Value Engineering, PAC – Price Adjustment Clause, RM – Risk Management.

2 Attendance List

The workshops attracted a variety of professionals from various beneficiaries and organisations, as can be seen from the attendance tables included within this section.

2.1 Attendees at each workshop

Table 2.1 Bucharest Value Engineering

	Attendee	Country	Organisation
1	Mircea Kiritescu	RO	Projects Directorate CNCF CFRSA
2	Madalina Dorobantu	RO	Projects Directorate CNCF CFRSA
3	Viviana Comes	RO	RHCHHR
4	Nicoleta Rusu	RO	RHCHHR
5	Liliana Barna	RO	MTI AM POST
6	Cristina Dobranici	RO	MTI AM POST
7	Vicentia Voicu	RO	MTI AM POST

Table 2.2 Bucharest PAC

	Attendee	Country	Organisation
1	Mircea Kiritescu	RO	Projects Directorate CNCF CFRSA
2	Liliana Barna	RO	MTI AM POST
3	Viviana Comes	RO	RHCHHR
4	Nicoleta Rusu	RO	RHCHHR
5	Vicentia Voicu	RO	MTI AM POST
6	Cristina Dobranici	RO	MTI AM POST

Table 2.3 Riga Risk Management

	Attendee	Country	Organisation
1	Martins Krauklis	LV	JSC Latvian Railway
2	Ilja Korago	LV	JSC Latvian Railway
3	Ilona Malina	LV	JSC Latvian Railway
4	Zane Banga	LV	JSC Latvian Railway
5	Marite Straustina	LV	JSC Latvian State Roads
6	Maris Alksnis	LV	JSC Latvian State Roads
7	Inga France	LV	Riga Freeport Authority
8	Albertas Aruna	LTH	Head of Strategic Planning and Projects Quality Unit
9	Aurelija Meskauskaite	LTH	Head of Cohesion Fund Road Unit
10	Renata Karveliēne	LTH	Chief specialist of Cohesion Fund Road Unit
11	Andrius Navickas	LTH	Head of Cohesion Fund Railway Unit
12	Andrius Vysniavskas	LTH	Head of Project Management Department - Railways
13	Andrius Montrimas	LTH	Deputy Head of Investment Division - Railways
14	Sandra Makuniene	LTH	Chief specialist of Planning Division - Roads
15	Kastytis Grigas	LTH	Deputy Head of Investment Division - Roads
16	Vidas Evieys	LTH	Railways
18	Michel Gaspard		EIB

Table 2.4 Riga Value Engineering

	Attendee	Country	Organisation
1	Martins Krauklis	LV	JSC Latvian Railway
2	Ilja Korago	LV	JSC Latvian Railway
3	Ilona Malina	LV	JSC Latvian Railway
4	Ruta Sile	LV	JSC "Latvian Railway"
5	Gundars Kains	LV	JSC "Latvian State Roads"
6	Andis Berzins	LV	JSC "Latvian State Roads"
7	Inga France	LV	Riga Freeport Authority
8	Aurelija Meskauskaite	LTH	Head of Cohesion Fund Road Unit
9	Renata Karveliēne	LTH	Chief specialist of Cohesion Fund Road Unit
10	Andrius Navickas	LTH	Head of Cohesion Fund Railway Unit
11	Andrius Vysniauskas	LTH	Head of Project Management Department
12	Andrius Montrimas	LTH	Deputy Head of Investment Division
13	Sandra Makuniene	LTH	Chief Specialist of Planning Division
14	Kastytis Grigas	LTH	Deputy Head of Investment Division
15	Michel Gaspard		EIB
16	Vidas Zvinys	LTH	Lithuania - Rail
17	Albertas Aruna	LTH	Rail - Head of Financial Control & Planning Transport Investment Directorate
18	Janis Smits	LV	Latvian State Roads

Table 2.5 Warsaw Risk Management

	Attendee	Country	Organisation
1	Lukasz Piekarski	PL	Head of Unit MRD
2	Robert Abramowski	PL	Chief Specialist MRD
3	Anna Homa	PL	MI Specialist
4	Sławomir Kaźmierczak	PL	Deputy Director PLK Rail
5	Marcin Lipiński	PL	Chief Specialist Rail
6	Jarosław Kopyłowski	PL	Representatives of Centre for EU Transport Projects
7	Piotr Zawadzki	PL	Chief Specialist Representatives of Centre for EU Transport Projects
8	Patrizia Fagiani		EIB
9	Malgorzata Mokrzańska		EIB
10	Maurits Van Der Hoofd		EIB
11	Robert Kietlins		EIB

Table 2.6 Sofia PAC

	Attendee	Country	Organisation
1	Valentin Ignatov	BUL	Chief Expert MA of OPT Transport
2	Silvyia Georgieva	BUL	Strategic Development and Infrastructure Railways
3	Nikoleta Stoyanova	BUL	NRIC Railways
4	Svetlana Dermendzhieva	BUL	Economist ITC

Table 2.7 Sofia Risk Management

	Attendee	Country	Organisation
1	Florina Marin	RO	European Projects Directorate within CN CFR SA
2	Bianca Dragomirescu	RO	European Projects Directorate within CN CFR SA
3	Ruxandra Lupitu	RO	CN CFR SA Railway
4	Daniel Dragan	RO	Motorway and National Road
5	Andreea Olteanu	RO	Motorway and National Road
6	Dana Dragan	RO	Ministry of Transport
7	Ms Nikoleta Stoyanova	BUL	NRIC Railways
8	Mr. Valentin Ignatov	BUL	Ministry of Transport
9	Cristina Dobranici	RO	Ministry of Transport
10	Svetlana Dermendzhieva	BUL	Economist ITC
11	Paul Berglia	RO	Ministry of Transport
12	Silvia Georgieva	BUL	NRIC

Tabel 2.8 Vienna Risk Management

	Attendee	Country	Organisation
1	Tomas Cocek	CZ	Project Manager SFDI
2	Miloslav Linhart	CZ	Economist SFDI
3	Martin Sklenar	CZ	IBR Consulting
4	Borut Zlicar	SI	
5	Ahac Kabal	SI	
6	Michal Kokes	CZ	Ministry of Transport
7	Radek Lintyner	CZ	Ministry of Transport
8	Jana Vrhovnik	SI	DARS
9	Miklavz Cepon	SI	DARS
10	Ines Stanesic	SI	DARS
11	Alenka Kosic	SI	DARS
12	Tomas Brazdil	CZ	RSD
13	Alena Zemankova	CZ	RSD
14	Marko Kristl		EIB
15	Joachim Schneiderf		EIB
16	Fernando Maldonado		EIB
17	Beata Hermanska	SK	Roads
18	Adela Torbikova	SK	Roads
19	Eva Keseghova	SK	Roads
20	Jaroslav Micek	SK	Roads
21	Michal Lehocky		Head of EU Funds RIA
22	Francesco Angelini		Jaspers Economist

*RO = Romania, BUL = Bulgaria, LV = Latvia, LTH = Lithuania, POL = Poland, Slovenia = SI, Slovakia = SK and Czech Republic CZ.

3 Presentation Material

3.1 Material for each workshop

3.1.1 Risk Management

The purpose of the Risk Management Workshop was to understand the benefits of project risk management and to discuss and practice applying recognised project risk management techniques. The workshop included the following:

- Risk Management Benefits and Process;
- Risk Identification;
- Qualitative Risk Assessment;
- Quantitative Risk Assessment;
- Decision Trees;
- Monte Carlo Simulation;
- Optimism Bias;
- Risk Response Planning;
- Implementing Risk Management Systems; and
- Case Study Activities and Good Practice Guides.

3.1.2 Value Engineering

Value Engineering (VE) is a structured and disciplined, team-centred problem solving technique to ensure the optimum balance between performance, cost and time. The VE process can help in any situation where choices must be made. It is of greatest benefit for important or "difficult" decisions where improvement and innovation are sought, where there are several stakeholders, each with their own goals and priorities, and where the best value decisions must be made and demonstrated.

This VE Workshop, delivered by Arup and Davis Langdon, provided an overview of the latest methods, tools and processes available to the Highways and Railway industry sectors. The one day workshop, which included interactive case studies and provided delegates with an up to date overview of the current EU best practice relating to Value Engineering.

The key benefits of attending were:

- To gain the most up-to-date training from leading experts in the Value Engineering field ;
- Obtain detailed course notes for future reference; and
- Learn from real projects where value engineering was applied or should have been applied.

The workshop was tailored for those who wished to improve their knowledge in this important topic. The event was the perfect platform for attendees to progress their knowledge base and empower them within their organisation.

3.1.3 PAC

This PAC workshop, delivered by Arup and Davis Langdon provided an overview of the application of PACs in highways and rail contracts. This half-day workshop provided delegates with the current EU best practice regarding price adjustment methodology.

The workshop was tailored for those who wished to improve their knowledge of PACs and provided information in terms of:

- Difference between price adjustment methods;
- Current best practice;
- Favoured approach for EIB funded projects;
- Worked example of PAC methodology; and
- An understanding of when, how and for what PACs should be considered.

The key benefits of attending were:

This workshop provided users with a thorough understanding of the application of PACs in current conditions of contract with a view to providing a fair allocation of risk and promoting improved competition in road and rail infrastructure projects.

4 Feedback Questionnaire Summary

4.1 Introduction

All attendees were asked to complete a feedback questionnaire on each of the workshops they attended. The results of the feedback questionnaires have been input into excel and analysed. The results are discussed within this section.

4.2 Administrative Arrangements

4.2.1 Joining Instructions, Accommodation and Venue Location

Attendees were asked whether they thought the joining instructions, accommodation and venue location were adequate or inadequate. 98.6% of attendees stated the joining instructions were adequate. 100% of attendees stated the accommodation was adequate and 98.4% of attendees stated that the venue was adequate.

4.3 Workshop Expectations

Attendees were asked whether the workshop they attended exceeded their expectations, met their expectations or did not meet their expectations. 20% of attendees said the workshop they attended exceeded their expectations, 78.6% stated the workshop they attended met their expectations. 1.4% attendees stated the workshop they attended did not meet their expectations.

4.4 Workshop Objectives

Attendees were asked how well the workshop met their objectives. 17.4% of attendees stated the workshop exceeded their objectives, 79.7% stated the workshop achieved their objectives and 2.9% of attendees stated the workshop did not meet their objectives. This latter figure accounted for only two attendees, and the corresponding workshops were the Bucharest PAC and Warsaw Risk Management.

4.5 Relevance of the Course to Current Work Requirements

Attendees were asked how relevant the workshop was to their current work requirements. 31.4% of attendees stated the workshop was very relevant, 62.9% stated the workshop was relevant and 5.7% stated it was not relevant to their current work requirements.

4.6 Recommend the Course

Attendees were asked would they recommend the workshop they attended to their colleagues. 70% of attendees said they would definitely recommend the workshop they attended to colleagues. 28.6% of attendees stated they would possibly recommend the workshop they attended to colleagues and only 1.4% of attendees stated they would not recommend the workshop they attended to colleagues.

4.7 Skills of the Trainer

Attendees were asked; how did they rate the skills of the trainer(s). 85.1% of attendees stated their trainer(s) were excellent. 14.9% stated their trainer(s) were average and no attendee believed their trainer(s) were below average.

4.8 Mix of Trainer Input and Attendee Contribution

Attendees were asked if they felt the mix of the trainer's input and their contribution was effective.

4.8.1 Overall

50% of attendees stated the overall mix was very effective. 50% of attendees stated the overall mix was satisfactory. No attendee believed the overall mix of the trainer's input and their contribution was ineffective.

4.8.2 Trainer's Input

95.7% of attendees believed the trainer's input was just right. 2.9% stated the trainer's input was too much and 1.4% believed the trainer's input was too little.

4.8.3 Attendee Contribution

70.1% of attendees stated their contribution to the workshop was just right. 9% believed their contribution was too much and 20.9% stated their contribution to the workshop wasn't enough.

4.9 Programme of Characteristics

Attendees were asked how they rated the programme characteristics.

4.9.1 Pace

89.7% of attendees thought the pace of the workshop was just right. 8.8% stated the workshop was too fast and 1.5% believed the workshop was too slow.

4.9.2 Duration

82.6% of attendees stated the workshop duration was just right. 8.7% believed the workshop was too long and 8.7% thought the workshop was too short.

4.9.3 Complexity

83.8% of attendees thought the complexity of the workshop they attended was just right. 7.4% thought it was too simple and 8.8% thought it was too complex.

4.10 Valuable Aspects of the Course

Attendees were asked which aspects of the course were most valuable and why. This question on the feedback forms allowed a free text answer. The key areas of feedback for which aspects of the course were most valuable are stated below:

- Various attendees stated the QRA objectives in Risk Management workshop were highly valuable;
- One attendee believed the FIDIC 13.8 clause mentioned in PAC course was most valuable to them;
- The activities and the case studies in the Risk Management workshops were a huge hit with numerous attendees, stating they were valuable to them;
- Several attendees stated the 'Defining Risk Management and Assessing it' was most valuable to them;
- Some attendees like the interactive discussions and the exchanging experience part of the course;
- Good feedback was also written on the general presentation on Value Engineering Methods and Techniques;
- Some attendees stated the key and most valuable aspect for them was the function analysis in Value Engineering workshop;
- One attendee stated the cost reduction and team building aspects were most valuable to them as in their workplace delays have been experienced in projects due to different understandings among stakeholders;
- One attendee believed the risk response action in the Risk Management workshop was most valuable to them;

- The A4.4 to A4.6 and overview of risk management process was also noted to be important;
- The structure of Risk Management workshop was noted to be good and helped attendees to easily get familiar with the subject;
- The exercises given in the PAC workshop were seen to be valuable by a number of attendees;
- The quantitative risk assessment in Risk Management workshop was said to be valuable by a few attendees; and
- The risk analysis in the Risk Management workshops was also mentioned to be beneficial to attendees.

4.11 Potential Improvements to the Course

Attendees were asked could any of the courses be improved. This question on the feedback forms allowed a free text answer. The key areas of feedback on how the workshops may be improved are stated below.

- By including more real examples of practice in the PAC workshop;
- More explanation in the Risk Management workshop on how software specialised or probably more equal solutions;
- In Risk Management workshop provision of more detail on how QRA works;
- More case studies in the Risk Management workshop would be beneficial;
- Additional exercises in the Risk Management workshop;
- The pace of the Value Engineering workshop could be slower;
- The use of more case studies in the Value Engineering workshop that are consistent with the working environment of participants may help more;
- The Value Engineering workshop should only consider examples that could link more closely to the Value Engineering methodology;
- Shortening the group working sessions in the Risk Management workshop may help;
- A few attendees stated the Risk Management workshop may be improved if trainer's submitted not only common, theoretical examples but more practice. The course is too hypothetical, it needs more practice to be more effective;
- The Risk Management workshop may benefit from including one or two case studies from the participants countries, not the UK;
- The PAC course may be improved by the inclusion of more economic exercises;
- The Risk Management workshop should be lengthened and include real risks in specific projects; and
- The Risk Management workshop could possibly include cases in the public sector and be more general and adjusted to attendee scope of responsibility.

4.12 Actions Intend to Implement in the Work Place

Attendees were asked what specific actions they intended to implement, as a result of the workshop they attended, when they return to work. This question on the feedback forms allowed a free text answer. The key areas of feedback on what actions attendees intend to implement when they return to work are stated below.

- To discuss the 13.8 FIDC provisions from the PAC workshop with colleagues;

- QRA update risks – road company manual;
- To discuss risk analysis with colleagues and to try and convince beneficiaries and their consultants to improve their risk analysis;
- Very good proposal could be given out to Final Beneficiaries to use the Value Engineering tool for project optimal solution to prevent unnecessary cost;
- Recommend systematic use of Value Engineering methods to some project promoters;
- Have sessions of team building to obtain common understanding and clear definition of project objectives at an early stage;
- To try and use Value Engineering testing to prepare projects in an effort to maintain their basic functions, but at the same time reducing the cost of the projects;
- Aim to improve risk responsive planning;
- Presentation of standard risk evaluation, good for project managers, correction or procedures guide;
- To pay more attention to analysing feasibility studies and other documents;
- Prepare / make lists of fixes, occurrences and probability;
- Better evaluation of projects;
- Application of issues and structures in development and verification of feasibility studies;
- To push consultants to properly use Risk Management in their feasibility studies;
- To organise training for the beneficiaries; and
- Maintain the risk identification and identify protection measures.

4.13 Other Comments

There were few additional comments given on the feedback forms. Many of the attendees in this section of the form said thank you to the trainers and the organisers, and stated the trainers did a good job and provided interesting workshops.

