From: david_mackay@

Sent: 09 February 2009 16:48

To: Andrew.Fitchie@dlapiper.com; Steven Bell; Stewart McGarrity; Dennis Murray

Cc: Joanne.Glover@dlapiper.com; Keith.Kilburn@dlapiper.com; Graeme Bissett (external

contact)

Subject: Re: BSC behaviour

Andrew,

Given the events of today your email makes even more interesting and indeed stimulating reading.

The senior team here will debate the foregoing further at our session tomorrow and we'll report back.

Thanks!

David

----Original Message----

From: Andrew.Fitchie@dlapiper.com

Date: 09/02/2009 16:14

To: "Steven Bell" < Steven Bell @tie.ltd.uk >, "Stewart

McGarrity" < Stewart. McGarrity@tie.ltd.uk>, "Dennis Murray" < Dennis. Murray@tie.ltd.uk>

Cc: "Glover, Joanne" < Joanne. Glover@dlapiper.com >, "Kilburn,

Keith"<Keith.Kilburn@dlapiper.com>, "Graeme Bissett"<raeme.bissett@

<david mackay@

Subj: BSC behaviour

Legally privileged and FOISA Exempt

Steven Dennis

I have been giving more thought to how tie could increase pressure on Bilfinger Berger in a situation where Siemens (and CAF) may be indifferent at the moment.

There is one move which might used to unseat BB UK Limited - the issue of a formal default notice as an ostensible precursor to a call on the BB AG/Siemens AG parent company guarantees (as opposed to the performance bond where **tie** would, conventionally, need to claim either terminal breach or breach causing serious demonstrable financial loss) on the basis that there are repeated breaches of contract which BB UK does not appear to be capable of remedying. Were such a notice to be issued, it ought to trigger internal and potentially external reporting duties on BB UK. The default notice would also be seen by Siemens AG.

Obviously, such a step all the way to a call would require very careful analysis (and preparation in terms of notification), but:

- there is no immediate downside for issuing the default notice, nor is there any requirement to
 pursue it to the point of call on the PCG, if the threat of tie doing so resulted in a more
 reasonable approach.
- the form of notice would cite the breaches of contract and it would not be immediately apparent to BSC whether the performance bond or the PCGs were going to be called
- there are no restrictions on what type of breach needs to be at issue, how many calls can be made or any consequence of withdrawing a call on the PCGs

- if a call is made and the result was a denial by BB AG that there had been any breach of contract, a dispute is crystallised.
- does Dr Kaisberg want a contract which he is charge of to have a PCG call showing
- I am not certain that Bilfinger Berger will have taken advice on performance security calls at this point - in which case there should be an unsettling effect

Lastly, I am acutely conscious of how hard it is at the moment for **tie** management to preserve effective working relationships with BSC and, as I understand matters, I consider that **tie** probably has done more than clients often do on that front. I am focused again on our advice on the need for **tie** to preserve rights legitimately by having in place the right documented contemporary audit trail on **tie's** view on the consequences of BSC's behaviour. Particularly important when DRP may be in the offing.

kind regards

Andrew Fitchie Partner, Finance & Projects
DLA Piper Scotland LLP
T: +44
M: +44
F: +44 (
Please consider the environment before printing my emai

This email is from DLA Piper Scotland LLP.

The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential to the intended recipient. They may not be disclosed to or used by or copied in any way by anyone other than the intended recipient. If this e mail is received in error, please contact DLA Piper Scotland LLP on +44 (0) §700 111111 quoting the name of the sender and the email address to which it has been sent and then delete it.

Please note that neither DLA Piper Scotland LLP nor the sender accepts any responsibility for viruses and it is your responsibility to scan or otherwise check this email and any attachments.

DLA Piper Scotland LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in Scotland (registered number S0300365), which provides services from offices in Scotland. A list of members is open for inspection at its registered office and principal place of business Rutland Square, Edinburgh, EH1 2AA. Partner denotes member of a limited liability partnership.

DLA Piper Scotland LLP is regulated by the Law Society of Scotland and is a member of DLA Piper, a global legal services organisation, the members of which are separate and distinct legal entities. For further information, please refer to www.dlapiper.com.

</BLOCKQUOTE

50% off Norton Security 2009 - http://www.tiscali.co.uk/security