



CH-0009 Bernard-Pennecon/North & South Dams27 January 2016, 5:10pm

1.0 Meeting Agreements & Actions

Attendees:

EY Team

- Tim Calver
- Sam Wolyneic
- Emiliano Mancini
- Chris Congram
- Thieu Hue Lam

Component 1 Team

- Steve Pellerin
- Scott O'Brien
- Carlos Fernandez
- Ed Bush
- Pat Hussey
- Anthony Embury
- Grant Horwood (North south dam)
- Mike Harris (Contracts Manager – Contracts 30-32 and 7-9)

1.1 Discussion topics

These topics were discussed at the meeting:

Questions	Responses
Any questions to ensure we are clear on type and scope of contract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key component is to get bridge in place • Critical path is the diversion of river in Summer 2016 • North dam to finish is 2017 • Schedule milestone for Coffe Dam is Aug 2016 (70m), Ponds is Oct 2016 (25m) • Fixed price contract
<p>What is the status of work under the contract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we don't have an up to date report, what is the latest status and how do we get this data • What changes have been agreed to scope (materiality, how many requests) • What is progress against plan by E,P & C • What is performance against plan for underlying metrics • What is the cost performance (this will depend on contract type) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong team overlooking mixed design, hence strong performance • The second critical path item is the north dam (for the contract) <p>Metric measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burn of labour hours against plan • BC owns the mix design, same with Astaldi
<p>How has the contractor got to this status point</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the 'story' of the contract performance • What has the trend been against the above • What are the reasons for under/over performance and what is being done about them • Where have you had to focus your effort in managing contractor performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geotechnical risk <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ need the bridge in place to remove the cofferdams ○ there is sig geotechnical risk • Cannot be done during winter, must be done in one run. • Early progress is tracking to baseline • Major dependency from Andritz if not performing will have to be done in the next season • This is the only major contract that would be impacted

Questions	Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the evidence of contractor response to performance issues raised 	
<p>What is the forecast for completion in your plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this based on the contractors forecast from the report or do you have a different planning assumption • What are the key assumptions behind this forecast • What is the evidence base for these assumptions (e.g. past performance) • What are the risks to delivering this forecast performance • How will you manage the contractor to deliver this performance 	
<p>Contractor commercial position</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any penalties/consequences to date for the contractor of performance • Any claims/positioning for future claims • Is the contractor making money • What is the contractors commercial approach expected to be for the balance of the contract • What are the pain points for the contractor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A series of unit price elements with a carved out labour element with risk & reward with no cap - similar structure to Astaldi • Labour component is about a 7th of contract value, whereas Astaldi is about half • No LD's • Primary dependency is the completion of the spillway • Penalty for this should be noted in the mitigations for the risk register item relating to the diversion • No material claims, no change requests • No growth provisions are held against contract, largely held at the asset level

1.2 Actions, follow ups, and open issues

These actions were agreed to at this meeting:

Description	Responsible	Status	Target date	Closed date