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# NB518:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question | Answers |
| Are you satisfied with the technical output and choises of the system? | * Design: I am satisfied with the final output despite the restrictions and drawbacks caused by international sanctions. |
| Rules requirements : Easy/hard? Everything fulfilled? Issues with class worth mentioning? | * Design: Rule requirements did not cause problems. No issues with Class nor with Flag Rules |
| Material (purchase, logistics, budget) : Your experience and feedback? | * Design: We had 2 issues that had an impact on material availability and affected the initial budget. #1 - Rising costs due to the global shortage of semiconductors had a negative impact during an ongoing project. Something not easy to foresee. #2 - International sanctions struck badly the normal, well-known material supplier chain. Time-consuming efforts had to be performed to fix the issues. |
| Drawings (schedule, comments received, changes..) : Lessons learned? | * Design: Wrong decisions were made at the beginning of the project. A reliable TK-contractor that had built the Passenger Public areas in 2 previous vessels was put aside and an incompetent contractor was chosen to work on the last vessel of the series. This was the worst action I have ever seen in my 30+ years working at the Yard. My first reaction was that the Yard was digging its own grave. First dismay came when we learned that the electrical design work was omitted from the contract. That was a huge red flag. The contractor had no responsible designer for the task. The Yard did not have the capacity to handle the work with its own personnel but had to hire a company from Croatia - on behalf of the TK-contractor, and for the TK-contractor. It was emphasized that this Croatian company is working for the TK-contractor, and they had to coordinate the design work with them (not the Yard). This never happened. The Yard had to teach the Croatians nearly everything. After the initial design work was done, the Croatians retired from their responsibilities, as it was stated in their contract. There was no-one responsible for the follow-ups and the changes that always come up during the building phase. I hope the costs of the extra tasks were estimated/calculated by the project's lead decision makers. Lessons to be learned: #1 - The first and paramount lesson is that a TK-contractor MUST have their own electrical designer(s) who is(are) responsible for the electrical design of the TK areas during the whole project - from the start to the end.  #2 - The second lesson is that it is never a good idea to change a TK-contractor during a building series of vessels. There will doubtfully be any savings. |
| Communication (internal and external), Co-operation with different parties (In own team, other design teams, subcontractors, production, suppliers, TK.. ) | * Design: Communication depended a lot on your own activity. In my opinion communication has improved between team workers, production, and suppliers. This last TK-contractor was the worst case during my career at the Yard's design dpt. , although they had individual on-site supervisors among their personnel that understood the issues and could commendably tackle them. A light amid the darkness. |
| Comparison to NB516-517 - did we learn? | * Design: The 2 first vessels were difficult, but the last one feels like a total mess because of the new TK. As stated earlier, it is a very risky idea to change a competent contractor in the middle of a building series. The building areas under the responsibility of the Yard have gone with no issues and can be regarded as successful. |
| Other comments? | * Design: I sincerely hope that the above-mentioned mistakes will never occur again. This Shipyard has built many vessels with success, and I believe that the decades long trend will continue if lessons are learned. The cheapest is never the best nor will it turn out to be cheap in the end. |