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Technical Paper Guidelines

* Technical Papers are 3-5000 words and document the approach taken by Crossrail on delivering a particular element of the project. They are different from Case Studies in that they are not an analysis of what was done and do not seek to make recommendations for future projects and programmes. However, these papers should add to the body of knowledge on major projects.
* Papers should be 3-5000 words + 200 word abstract.
* The abstract should introduce the paper and summarise the key points.
* The paper should be a fairly formal style. Text should be UK English in the third person and should be readily understandable by a Professional person. Avoid use of colloquialisms.
* If appropriate, the paper should be one-third diagrams/graphs/photos/drawings and two-thirds text.
* Speculative material must be clearly identified as such.
* Do not refer to the names of individuals, organisations, products or services unless it is essential to understanding your submission (and then only the first time). Do not gratuitously compliment or be derogatory in any way about any person or organisation.
* Make text as short and concise as possible, excluding anything that is not directly relevant to the subject. Include any associated safety, environmental or ethical issues.
* If you or your organisation is not under contract with Crossrail Limited : obtain the Intellectual Property User Agreement by contacting learninglegacy@crossrail.co.uk and complete, sign and return it to licence use of the paper as part of the learning legacy.

**Checklist**

Once the paper is drafted please review with the points below in mind:

* Does the abstract provide an adequate overview? Challenge faced, approach, key success/failure factors, intended audience
* Does it contribute to the body of knowledge? The last section should state what the learning legacy is and how the paper adds to the body of knowledge on major projects.
* Is the context for the paper clear? Is it clear why it is considered a learning legacy? Questions to consider: Why this approach? Was learning transferred from other projects? Compare approach/outcomes, what is new? Have external influences been referred to?
* Will it make sense to a person with no prior Crossrail project knowledge? Ensure it is not too Crossrail-centric and provides background where necessary
* Is it consistently written in the third person?
* Is there supporting documentation that needs to be explained, added or referred to? If referring to internal Crossrail documents make sure they can be shared as supporting documents within the learning legacy
* Are all appropriate references included?