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START Thinking and KEEP Thinking
Introduction:

CEDA’S CHECKLIST FOR SUCCESSFUL DREDGING MANAGEMENT

CEDA’s Dredging Management Commission (DMC) was established to initiate and facilitate discussions and innovations from the dredging community on the management of dredging works in the broadest sense. This document – the first product of our new commission – is a generic but comprehensive checklist to help identify and avoid problems, with dredging projects at an early project stage, and to benefit all parties involved. The checklist should not be seen as exhaustive – its aim is to inspire project players to keep thinking.

As we know, we learn the most from our own mistakes and therefore, in an ideal world, the same mistake shouldn’t be made twice... With that in mind, we decided to ask CEDA members about their own experiences on the things that have gone wrong in their projects. We wanted to know what happened, when and why. In particular, we wanted to know how it could have been avoided.

With dredging projects, as we also know, it’s not uncommon for the same issues to be experienced differently by different parties. CEDA’s rich member composition offered an excellent opportunity to capture those differences and we took full advantage of it to fulfil our remit. By highlighting them, this document aims to help the various players get a better understanding of each other’s perspectives and therefore come to mutually beneficial solutions.

We are grateful for our members’ honesty, which has allowed us to collect some valuable inputs, and collate them into an undoubtedly interesting checklist of possible project ‘booby traps’ for you. Forewarned is forearmed. Enjoy!

The CEDA Checklist for Successful Dredging Management is an organic document. We intend to update it based on further input from CEDA members and we would like to encourage you to help us in extending this list. Please send your suggestion for further topics and/or subtopics, as well as explanations, to the CEDA Secretariat (ceda@dredging.org) and we’ll get back to you.
START Thinking and KEEP Thinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Subtopics</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Parties involved</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCOPE OF WORKS</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
<td>It is essential that the Owner, with assistance as necessary, properly identifies and defines the scope of works. This needs to be sufficiently developed prior to entering into contract (to a level dependant upon procurement method). Special attention needs to be paid to clearly define the boundaries of the scope of works (notably what is and is not included) and other factors such as setting the limits as to acceptable working criteria (e.g. resedimentation/turbidity levels).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUIREMENTS</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>Must be fixed before start of design phase. Owner must carefully consider what type of specifications are best for the project. Owner must endeavour to ensure requirements are complete (including requirements from other stakeholders who must be consulted at an early stage). Must avoid contradictions/discrepancies (e.g. between norms/standards and custom specifications). Take care requirements are realistic and feasible (e.g. unachievable tolerances, unrealistic time frames).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functional requirements</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>Need to be fit-for-purpose. Find right balance in high/low level detailing of expectations (Owner can benefit from leaving more freedom of choice to Contractors).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lifetime requirements</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Often overlooked. Owner needs to consider CAPEX/OPEX division. Sometimes there are requirements, regarding after-delivery situation, that need to be considered during execution of the project. Consideration should be given to different lifetime-deprivations: technical, commercial, economical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical requirements /</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Project faces a risk if technical specifications not detailed enough. Parties must find the right balance between detail and sufficiency of specifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>specifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTERNATIVES</td>
<td>Location (e.g. site selection,</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>Broad consideration should be given to all aspects. Thinking about alternatives can bring efficiencies and considerable savings, in respect of time and money, in later stages of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY</td>
<td>alternative routes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size / lay-out</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time span</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economics / funding</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>