| | Α | В | С | D | Е | F | G | Н |
|----------|---|---|------------|---|---------|---|------------|----------|
| 1 | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | INFRACO NEGOTIATION SUMMARY POSITION | | | | | | |
| 3 | | Date:- 13/12/07 | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | Baseline | | Current | | Difference | Comments |
| 5 | | | £m | | £m | | £m | |
| 6 | | Fixed Elements | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | Core contract sum - firm price | 159.12 | | 159.12 | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | Provisional elements taken into firm | 0 | | 0.00 | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | | VE taken into firm price | 0 | | -6.70 | | | |
| 13 | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | | Total firm price | 159.12 | | 152.42 | | -6.70 | |
| 15 | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | Provisional elements | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | | Remaining provisional elements | 49.58 | | 49.58 | | 0.00 | |
| 19 | | | 47.00 | | 47.00 | | 0.00 | |
| 20 | | Remaining normalisations still provisional | 17.80 | | 17.80 | 1 | 0.00 | |
| 21 | | Total Pravisional | 67.00 | | 67.00 | | 0.00 | |
| 22 | | Total Provisional | 67.38 | | 67.38 | | 0.00 | |
| 23 24 | | Anticipated Infraco contract sum (Final Deal) | 226.50 | | 219.81 | | -6.70 | |
| 25 | | Anticipated milaco contract sum (Final Deal) | 220.50 | | 213.01 | | -0.70 | |
| 26 | | Remaining Identified VE | -13.535032 | | -16.14 | | -2.61 | |
| 27 | | Tremaining recruited VL | -13.333032 | | - 10.14 | | -2.01 | |
| 28 | | Changes as current cost report | 2.40 | | 2.40 | | | |
| 29 | | Changes as carrent cost report | 2.40 | | 2.70 | | | |
| 30 | | Current Estimated cost | 215.37 | | 206.06 | | -9.30 | |
| 31 | | | 2.3.07 | | | | 3.00 | |
| _ ` ' | | | | | | | | |

| | Α | В | С | D | E | F | G | Н |
|----|---|-------------------------------------|--------|---|--------|---|-------|---------------------------------|
| 32 | | Budget for Infraco Contract | 206.84 | | 206.84 | | | |
| 33 | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | | Difference with budget | 8.53 | | -0.78 | | -9.30 | £8.5m is essentially VE to find |
| 35 | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | | Negotiation allowance for firm deal | | | 10.00 | | | |
| 37 | | | | | | | | |
| 38 | | Difference with deal allowance | | | 10.78 | | | |

| ليبا | A | В | С | ETN Anti | ipated⊡Cost S | umma r y | G | Н | | J | K | L | М | N | 0 | Р | Q | R |
|--|--|--|--------------|---------------------|---|----------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|------------------------|-----------------|--|------------------------|--------------|--|
| 4 | ltem . | Prelims | Trackform - | Depot | Structures - | Highways | Tramstops | Buildings | Supervisory & | OLE | Tramstop | Trams | Reduction as | Reduction for | Traction | System | Network Rail | Total |
| - | | | System | | Superstructure | | | _ | Comms | | Equipment | | BBS letter 11/10/07 | taking CAF into | Power | Wide | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 11/10/07 | BBS Consortia | | | | |
| 3 | iase irm rovisional | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | im | 72,437,757 | 43,918,161 | 18,686,351 | | | | 3,275,180 | 5,296,482 | 14,974,462 | 1,513,587 | 1,018,910 | -1,000,000 | -1,000,000 | | | | 159,120,8 |
| 6 7 | rovisional | 3,000,000 | | | 31,415,121 | 11,893,955 | 3,270,376 | | | | | | | | | | | 49,579,4 |
| 8 | ub-total Base | 75,437,757 | 43,918,161 | 18,686,351 | 31,415,121 | 11,893,955 | 3,270,376 | 3,275,180 | 5,296,482 | 14,974,462 | 1,513,587 | 1,018,910 | -1,000,000 | -1,000,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 208,700,3 |
| 9 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | |
| 11 | lormalisation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | irm | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | fove item from Provisional below | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | love item from Provisional below ub-total - Firm Normalisation | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 17 | rovisional | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | rovision of pumped surface water outfall system at A8 underpass | | | 100,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 100,0 |
| 20 21 | pares not included in Price | | | | | | | | | 174,762 | | | | | | | | 174,7 |
| 22 | cottish Power Connections to Depot and IPR elocation of Ancient Monuments | 53,700 | | | | | | | | 750,000 | | | | | | | | 750,0 53,7 |
| 23 | elecation of Ansiert Monumerts CTV centeres CTV centeres CTV centeres | | 750,000 | | | | | | 1,000,000 | | | | | | | | | 1,000,0 750,0 |
| 25 | allowance for Infline bulling unversions created agreement of the control of the | | 405,755 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 405,7 |
| 26 | raliast | | 300,000 | | | | | | | | -184.900 | | | | | | | 300,0 -184,9 |
| 28 | harrette Changes (20% in 2nd drop) | | | | | 6,340,324 | | | | | -104,900 | | | | | | | 6,340,3 |
| 29 | Illowance for minor utility diversions cross-control diversions cross-c | | | | | 5,900,576 319.343 | | | | | | | | | | | | 5,900,5 319.3 |
| 31 | lains Power Connection to street lights and traffic signals | + | | | | 319,343 115,287 | | | | | - | | | | | | | 319,34 115,21 |
| 32 | djust for Network Rail Possessions support | | | | 755,307 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 755,30 |
| 33 34 | algreen Road - new structure reqd 23 Carrick Knowe Wildening | t | <u> </u> | | 750,000 139,956 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 750,00 139,98 |
| 35 | eith Walk substation demolition | | | | 55,662 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 55,66 |
| 36 37 | dditional Crew Relief Facilities at Haymarket tructure S18 allowance for anticipated works | | | | 49,950 27,500 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 49,99 27,56 |
| 38 | ub-total - Provisional Normalisation | 53,700 | 1,455,755 | 100,000 | 1,778,375 | 12,675,531 | 0 | 0 | 1,000,000 | 924,762 | -184,900 | 0 | (| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17,803,2 |
| 39 40 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | |
| 41 | alue Engineering | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 42 43 | irm | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | IR Immunisation - ensure design of immunisation is based on minimum safe propagation distance (e.g. <100m). Project budget previously very | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 45 | onservative. rovision of combined incoming and return cabinet. | | | | | | | | | -42,000 | | | | - | | | -4,700,000 | -4,700,00 -42.00 |
| 46 | dinburgh Park Bridge - 7 span to 2 , utilise steel beams in lieu of concrete Edinburgh Park Viaduct | | | | -270,000 | | | | | 42,000 | | | | | | | | -270,0 |
| 47 | 8 Underpass various initiatives | | | | -85,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | -85,0 |
| ~ | iption to lease UPS provision from Supplier rather than purchase | | | | 00,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 48 | ationalising spares supplied with the Infraco bid | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -300,000 | | -300,0 |
| - [| autorialising spares supplied that the infrace old | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 49 50 | M Integration including shared resources and co-location. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -300,000 -1,000,000 | | -300,00 -1,000,00 |
| 51 | fove item from Provisional below | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 52 | ub-total - Firm Value Engineering | - | 0 | 0 | -355,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -42,000 | 0 | 0 | | | 0 | -1,600,000 | -4,700,000 | -6,697,0 |
| 54 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 55 56 | rovisional elete depot pumping station/storm tanks by utilising existing gravity system. | | | -193,526 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -193,5 |
| 57 | lepot - Build part now with provision to expand in the future/reduce size of car park facilities | | | -230,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -230,0 |
| 58 50 | telete under floor lift plant and utilise mobile jacks. Incl mobile future proofing. | | | -250,000 -27,500 | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | -250,00 -27,50 |
| 60 | sepot - delet spit vehicle accommodation system - requirement dependant on fram vehicle selection spot - Track Maintenance Equipment - rationalise scope requirement and consider renting spot - deleten on one pewement (inner) | | | -27,500 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -27,50 |
| 61 62 | lepot - deletion of one pavement (inner) . lepot - delete requirement for concrete apron to security fence | 1 | - | -36,000 -6,080 | | | | | | | - | | | | - | | | -36,0i |
| 63 | sepot - delete requirement for concrete apron to security fence sepot - delete compressed air system, utilise 1 or 2 local /mobile compressors | | | -54,400 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -54,4 |
| - 1 | consolidated VE items 7, 10, 11, 19 which results from changes to initial Depot design driven by proximity to BAA runway and EARL decision. | | | -3,181,264 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | -3,181,2 |
| 64 65 66 | elete standby generator and substitute with hardstanding and power connection for portable generator. | | | -250,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -250,0 |
| 66 | taterial recovery and reprocessing (Infraco); 2 options - reconstituted planings & Type 1R reduce Kerb and associated re-instatement of pavement | | | | | -500,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | -500,0 |
| 67 | | | | | | -100,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | -100,0 |
| | educe drainage run from guideway | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| -] | | 1 | | | | -100,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | -100,00 |
| 68 | | | | 1 | | | | | | -336,000 | | | | | 1 | | | -336,0 |
| 68 69 | werthead Contact system - Switchgear - rationalise specification - considered "quite onerous" If E_Category connot with in Sertings 5 to 7 - perfect tribility wire with category in segregated sertings | | | | | | | | | U | | | | | - | | | |
| 68 69 70 | ILE - Catenary opportunity in Sections 5 to 7 - replace trolley wire with catenary on segregated sections. (alue Engineering/ de-risked pricing approach developed for the final designs for all structures, particularly substructures and foundations (where not | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| 68 69 70 | ILE - Catenary opportunity in Sections 5 to 7 - replace trolley wire with catenary on segregated sections. alua Engineering' de-risked pricing approach developed for the final designs for all structures, particularly substructures and foundations (where not oppose the final designs for all structures). | | | | -2,000,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | -2,000,00 |
| 68 69 70 71 72 | LE - Catenary opportunity in Sections 5 to 7 - replace trolley wire with catenary on segregated sections. ablace Engineering' de-risked pricing approach developed for the final designs for all structures, particularly substructures and foundations (where not overad below) dinburgh Park Bridge - 7 span to 2 , utilise steel beams in lieu of concrete Edinburgh Park Viriaduct arrichove Bridge Parapet - down grade from P6 / P5 to N2 (reduced cost of parapet plus knock on effect on deck design/cost) | | | | -2,000,000 -1,200,000 -85,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | -2,000,00 -1,200,00 -85,00 |
| 68 69 70 71 72 | ILE - Catenary opportunity in Sections 5 to 7 - replace trolley wire with catenary on segregated sections. (alue Engineering/ de-risked pricing approach developed for the final designs for all structures, particularly substructures and foundations (where not | | | | -1,200,000 -85,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | -1,200,00 -85,00 |
| 58 59 70 71 72 73 | LE - Catenary opportunity in Sections 5 to 7 - replace trolley were with catenary on segregated sections. also Engineering' de-tisked princing approach developed for the final designs for all structures, particularly substructures and foundations (where not owered below) drinking her Bridge - 7 span to 2 , utilise steel beams in lieu of concrete Edinburgh Park Viaduot. arricknowe Bridge Paraget - down grade from P6 / P5 to N2 (reduced cost of paraget plus knock on effect on deck design/cost) 8 Underpass various initiatives. | | | | -1,200,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | -1,200,00 -85,00 -765,00 |
| 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 | LE - Catenary opportunity in Sections 5 to 7 - replace trolley were with catenary on segregated sections. also Engineering' de-tisked princing approach developed for the final designs for all structures, particularly substructures and foundations (where not owered below) drinking her Bridge - 7 span to 2 , utilise steel beams in lieu of concrete Edinburgh Park Viaduot. arricknowe Bridge Paraget - down grade from P6 / P5 to N2 (reduced cost of paraget plus knock on effect on deck design/cost) 8 Underpass various initiatives. | | | | -1,200,000 -85,000 -765,000 -1,375,000 -150,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | -1,200,00 -85,00 -765,00 -1,375,00 -150,00 |
| 58 59 70 71 72 73 | LE - Catenary opportunity in Sections 5 to 7 - replace trolley were with catenary on segregated sections. also Engineering' de-tisked princing approach developed for the final designs for all structures, particularly substructures and foundations (where not owered below) drinking her Bridge - 7 span to 2 , utilise steel beams in lieu of concrete Edinburgh Park Viaduot. arricknowe Bridge Paraget - down grade from P6 / P5 to N2 (reduced cost of paraget plus knock on effect on deck design/cost) 8 Underpass various initiatives. | | | | -1,200,000 -85,000 -765,000 -1,375,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | -1,200,00 -85,00 -765,00 -1,375,00 -150,00 -250,00 |
| 58 59 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 | LE - Catenary opportunity in Sections 5 to 7 - replace trolley were with catenary on segregated sections. able Engineering 'de-risked pricing approach developed for the final designs for all structures, particularly substructures and foundations (where not overad below) diriburgh Park Bridge - 7 span to 2, utilise steel beams in lieu of concrete Edinburgh Park Vladuct arrichnove Bridge Parapet - down grade from P8 / P5 to N2 (reduced cost of parapet plus knock on effect on deck design/cost) 8 Underpass various initiatives | | | | -1,200,000 -85,000 -765,000 -1,375,000 -150,000 -250,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | -1,200,0 -85,0 -765,0 -1,375,0 -150,0 -250,0 |
| 770 771 772 773 774 775 776 | ILE - Catenary opportunity in Sections 5 to 7 - replace trolley were with catenary on segregated sections. also Engineering's de-tisked princing approach developed for the final designs for all structures, particularly substructures and foundations (where not owned below) dributing in Park Birdge - 7 span to 2 , utilise steel beams in lieu of concrete Edinburgh Park Viaduct arricknowe Birdge Parapet - down grade from P6 / P5 to N2 (reduced cost of parapet plus knock on effect on deck design/cost) 8 Underpass various initiatives obsetum Siter Viaduct various initiatives vater of Leith various initiatives ight maintenance walkway structures - delete or reduce ussel of Bridge pling changes | | | | -1,200,000 -85,000 -765,000 -1,375,000 -150,000 -250,000 -100,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | -1,200,0 -85,0 -765,0 -1,375,0 -150,0 -250,0 -100,0 |
| 771 772 773 774 775 776 777 778 | LE - Catenary opportunity in Sections 5 to 7 - replace trolley were with catenary on segregated sections. also Engineering' de-risked princing approach developed for the final designs for all structures, particularly substructures and foundations (where not owned below) dimburgh Park Bridge - 7 span to 2 _ utilise steel beams in lieu of concrete Edinburgh Park Visiduct arricknowe Bridge Parapet - down grade from P6 / P5 to N2 (reduced cost of parapet plus knock on effect on deck design/cost) 8 Underpass various initiatives oseburn Street viaduct various initiatives vater of Leith various initiatives light maintenance velikivary structures - delete or reduce ussel of Bridge ping changes lass 7 material conversion - signaling & Comms - fewer CCTV cameras. | | | | -1,200,000 -85,000 -765,000 -1,375,000 -150,000 -250,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | -1,200,0i -85,0i -765,0i -1,375,0i -150,0i -250,0i -100,0i |
| 58 59 70 71 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 | LE - Catenary opportunity in Sections 5 to 7 - replace trolley were with catenary on segregated sections. LE - Catenary opportunity in Sections 5 to 7 - replace trolley were with catenary on segregated sections. Jovered below) dinburgh Park Ridge - 7 span to 2, utilise steel beams in lieu of concrete Edinburgh Park Viaduot. dinburgh Park Ridge - 7 span to 2, utilise steel beams in lieu of concrete Edinburgh Park Viaduot. dinburgh Park Ridge - 7 span to 2, utilise steel beams in lieu of concrete Edinburgh Park Viaduot. dinburgh Park Park Park Park Viaduot. dinburgh Park Park Park Viaduot. displaced with Viaduot vanous initiatives. vater of Leith vanous initiatives. just maintenance walkway structures - delete or reduce. Just Park Park Park Park Park Park Park Park | | | | -1,200,000 -85,000 -765,000 -1,375,000 -150,000 -250,000 -100,000 | | | | -100,000 | | | | | | | | | -1,200,0i -85,0i -765,0i -1,375,0i -150,0i -250,0i -100,0i |
| 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 | LE - Catenary opportunity in Sections 5 to 7 - replace trolley were with catenary on segregated sections. also Engineering' de-risked princing approach developed for the final designs for all structures, particularly substructures and foundations (where not owned below) dimburgh Park Bridge - 7 span to 2 _ utilise steel beams in lieu of concrete Edinburgh Park Visiduct arricknowe Bridge Parapet - down grade from P6 / P5 to N2 (reduced cost of parapet plus knock on effect on deck design/cost) 8 Underpass various initiatives oseburn Street viaduct various initiatives vater of Leith various initiatives light maintenance velikivary structures - delete or reduce ussel of Bridge ping changes lass 7 material conversion - signaling & Comms - fewer CCTV cameras. | | | | -1,200,000 -85,000 -765,000 -1,375,000 -150,000 -250,000 -100,000 | | | | -100,000 -100,000 -50,000 | | | | | | | | | -1,200,0 |

| A | В | С | ETN Antic | ipated⊩Cost S | umma r y | G | Н | | J | K | L | M | N | 0 | Р | Q | R |
|---|------------|-----------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| ltem | Prelims | Trackform - System | Depot | Structures - Superstructure | Highways | Tramstops | Buildings | Supervisory & | OLE | Tramstop Equipment | Trams | Reduction as BBS letter | Reduction for taking CAF into | Traction Power | System Wide | Network Rail | Total |
| 2 | | oyuto | | ouper structure | | | | 56////// | | Equipment | | 11/10/07 | BBS Consortia | | | | |
| 35 UPS - reduce capacity from 4hrs to 3hrs | | | | | | | | -50,000 | | | | | | | | | -50,000 |
| 86 Reduce nr of Signalised Pedestrian Xings. | | | | | | | | ? | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| 87 Optimise the work site lengths wherever practical to ensure efficient construction outputs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -300,000 | | -300,000 -100,000 |
| 88 Accept more disruption over shorter period to maximise efficiency of construction operations - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -100,000 | | -100,000 |
| Remove spare capacity from OTN | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 89 (linked to item 69) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -180,000 | | -180,000 |
| 90 Noise attenuation (outside of Roseburn Corridor) 3,650m of fencing | | -50,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -50,000 -2,000,000 |
| 91 Trackform - changing embedded to ballast rail. Ballasted track adjacent to NwkRail | | -2,000,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -2,000,000 |
| 92 Track installation install in strips. | | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 0 |
| 93 Reduce ballasted track thickness from 300 to 200mm | | -300,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -300,000 |
| 94 11Kv Traction Power feeds to sub stations including any network reinforcement required (separate VE 104). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ? | | | 0 |
| 95 Power supply - Russell Rd TPH - equipment for future upgrade to substation to be supplied when needed i.e. don't supply transformer rectifier now. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ? | | | |
| 96 Power Supply (up to passenger operation) - possible over allowance in DFBC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -300,000 | | | -300,000 |
| 97 Other unidentified VE items | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | -1,000,000 | | -1,000,000 |
| 98 Sub-total - Provisional Value Engineering | 0 | -2,350,000 | -4,256,270 | -6,225,000 | -700,000 | 0 | 0 | -394,500 | -336,000 | 0 | 0 | (| 0 | -300,000 | -1,580,000 | 0 | -16,141,770 |
| 99 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 101 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 102 Total Anticipated Value | 75,491,457 | 43,023,916 | 14,530,081 | 26,613,496 | 23,869,486 | 3,270,376 | 3,275,180 | 5,901,982 | 15,521,224 | 1,328,687 | 1,018,910 | -1,000,000 | -1,000,000 | -300,000 | -3,180,000 | -4,700,000 | 203,664,794 |

| | АВ | С | D | E | F | G | Н | ı | J | K | L | M |
|----------------|---|-------|-------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|---|--|
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | EDINBURGH TRAM NETWORK | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | BBS POSITION AS AT 12/12/07 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | PHASE 1A | | | | | | | | BBS | | | |
| 6 | | | | PROVI | SIONAL | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | NOTES | BASE | NORM | PROV SUMS/QIAU NTS | TOTAL PROV | TOTAL | Provisional - of Total | BBS proposed adjustments | Total | | Comment |
| 8 | PRELIMS | | 72,437,757 | 53,700 | 3,000,000 | 3,053,700 | 75,491,457 | 1.35% | | 75,491,457 | + | |
| 9 | TRACK FORM - System | | 28,134,417 | 1,455,755 | 0 | 1,455,755 | 29,590,172 | 0.64% | | 29,590,172 | | |
| 10 | TRACK FORM - Earthworks | 3. | 15,783,744 | .,,. | - | 0 | 15,783,744 | | | 16,783,744 | | Speculative - as BBS have not measured - suspect they think no real risk in Quants |
| 11 | DEPOT | | 18,686,351 | 100,000 | 0 | 100,000 | 18,786,351 | 0.04% | | 18,786,351 | | |
| 12 | STRUCTURES - Superstructure | 1. | | 1,778,375 | 31,415,121 | 33,193,496 | 33,193,496 | 14.65% | 1,750,000 | 34,943,496 | | £750k in normalisations |
| 13 | STRUCTURES - Substructure | 3. | | | | | | 0.00% | | 0 | | |
| 14 | HIGHWAYS | | 0 | 12,675,531 | 11,893,955 | 24,569,486 | 24,569,486 | 10.85% | 500,000 | 25,069,486 | | £5m in normalisations |
| 15 | TRAFFIC SIGNALS - CIVIL | | | | | | | | 1,777,000 | 1,777,000 | | |
| 16 | TRAMSTOPS | 2. | | -184,900 | 3,270,376 | 3,085,476 | 3,085,476 | 1.36% | | 3,085,476 | | |
| 17 | BUILDINGS | | 3,275,180 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,275,180 | 0.00% | | 3,275,180 | | |
| 18 | SUPERVISORY & COMMS | | 5,296,482 | 1,000,000 | 0 | 1,000,000 | 6,296,482 | 0.44% | | 6,296,482 | | |
| 19 | OLE | | 14,974,462 | 924,762 | 0 | 924,762 | 15,899,224 | 0.41% | | 15,899,224 | | |
| 20 | TRAMSTOP EQUIPMENT | | 1,513,587 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,513,587 | 0.00% | 2,300,000 | 3,813,587 | | Attributed to changed surface finish - I'm sure that this isn't as extensive as this |
| 21 | TRAMS | | 1,018,910 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,018,910 | 0.00% | | 1,018,910 | | |
| 22 | HARD & SOFT LANSCAPING | | | | | | | | 500,000 | 500,000 | | Reasonable allowance |
| 23 | NOISE & VIBRATION | | | | | | | | 300,000 | 300,000 | | This is just a negotiating figure - don't believe there is any real issue |
| 24 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | | 0 | | |
| 25 | ADJUSTMENTS | | | | | | 0 | 0.00% | | 0 | | |
| 26 | Reduction as BBS letter 11/10/07 | | -1,000,000 | | | | -1,000,000 | 0.00% | | -1,000,000 | | |
| 27 | Reduction for taking CAF into BBS Consortia | 4. | -1,000,000 | | | | -1,000,000 | 0.00% | | -1,000,000 | | |
| 28 29 30 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | | 0 | | |
| 32 | | | 159,120,890 | 17,803,222 | 49,579,452 | 67,382,674 | 226,503,564 | 29.75% | 8,127,000 | 234,630,564 | | |
| 33 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | Changes | | | | | | | | | | | |

| A | В | С | D | Е | F | G | Н | I | J | K | L | M N |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------|----------|---------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------------|-------------|----------|--------------------------|---|
| ii | • | • | BB | SINFRACC | CONTRACT COST | REPORT | | | | | | • |
| 2 DATE:- 13/12/07 | | | | 1 | | IXE. OIXI | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | At Preferred Bidder | | | Current Position | | | Variance | Comment |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| INFRACO | | | | | | | | | | % | | |
| 7 | | Firm Elements of bid | | | 159,120,890 | | 70.25% | 193,806,387 | | 84.67% | 34,685,497 | Current position is that 85% of the price is firm |
| 8 | | Provisional | | | 49,579,452 | | 21.89% | 14,893,955 | | 6.51% | (34,685,497) | |
| 9 | | Confirmed normalisations | | | 0 | | 0.00% | | | 0.00% | Ó | |
| 0 | | | | | | 208,700,000 | | | 208,700,342 | | (342) | |
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | Infraco Normalisation | | | 17,803,222 | | 7.86% | 17,803,222 | | 7.78% | 0 | |
| 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | Other Changes (See appended Sheet) | | | | | | 2,397,089 | | 1.05% | 2,397,089 | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | Deal premium | | | | | | 0 | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 Infraco Bids normalised | | | | | | 226,503,564 | 100.00% | | 228,900,653 | 100.00% | 2,397,089 | |
| 19 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | | | | | - | | D1 00#4#7 D1 |
| 21 Value Engineering | | | | | | | | | | | | Based on 26/11/07 Report |
| 22 | Infraco items - Identified | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | Banked (category 2) | | | (3,077,480) | | | (2,906,995) | | | 170,485 | N |
| 24 | | To go (category 3 & 4) | | | (16,588,567) | | | (10,628,037) | | | 5,960,530 | Now includes £2.5m NR Immunisation saving |
| 26 | Infraco items - To Find | | | - | (19,666,047) | | | (13,535,032) (8,631,015) | | | 6,131,015 (8,631,015) | 60.6 |
| 27 | Intraco items - 10 Find | | | | - " | | | (8,631,015) | | | (8,631,015) | £8.6m of further VE savings to find to maintain £498m |
| | | | | - | | 000 007 547 | | | 000 704 000 | | | |
| 28 Anticipated Infraco contract sum (Final Deal) | | | | | | 206,837,517 | | | 206,734,606 | | | |
| 29 | | | | - | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | Non-Infraco items - Identified | _ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | Non-initaco items - idendiled | Banked (category 5) | | | (2,755,600) | | | (3,278,600) | | | (523,000) | |
| 33 | | To go (category 6) | | | (7,530,500) | | | (4,428,250) | | | 3,102,250 | Now excludes £2.5m NR Immunisation saving |
| 34 | | TO go (category 6) | | | (10,286,100) | | | (7,706,850) | | | 2,579,250 | Now excludes £2.5III NR IIIIIIIIIIIIIsation saving |
| 35 | Non-Infraco items - To find | | | | (10,200,100) | | | (79,250) | | | (79,250) | |
| 36 | Non-illiaco itema - To lina | | | | + | 196,551,417 | | (13,230) | 198,948,506 | | (73,200) | |
| 27 | | | | | | 100,001,417 | | | 100,040,000 | | | |
| NE included in Project Estimate | | | | | (29,952,147) | | | | | | | |
| 30 | | | | | (20,002,111) | | | | | | | |
| 40 Non-Infraco items | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 41 | | Non-Infrastructure works | | | 16,502,332 | | | 16,502,332 | | | 0 | |
| 42 | | Advance works by others | | | .5,502,002 | | | ,,. | | | 0 | |
| 43 | | , | Depot excavation | | 4,754,041 | | | 4,754,041 | | | 0 | |
| 44 | | | Minor contracts | | 332,000 | | | 332,000 | | | 0 | |
| 45 | | | | | 21,588,373 | | | 21,588,373 | | | | |
| 46 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 47 | | Non Infraco Changes | | | | | | | | | | |
| 48 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S Contingency | | | | | 4,442,000 | | | 2,044,911 | | | (2,397,089) | |
| 50 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 51 | | | | .1 | . J | L | <u> </u> | | L | <u> </u> | | [<u>] </u> |
| 7 Total £ included in Infrace Budget Line | | | | | | 222,581,790 | | | 222,581,790 | | Ω | |
| 53 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 Risk Altowance for Procurement Phase | | | | | | 14,478,390 | | | 14,470,390 | | Ø | |
| 55 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56 Total | | | | | | 237,952,180 | | | 237,052,180 | | 0 | |
| 57 | | | | T | 1 | | 1 | | | | 1 | |

| A | В | С | D | Е | F | G | Н | I | J |
|----|---|-------|-------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|-------------|---------------------------|--|
| 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | EDINBURGH TRAM NETWORK | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | PROVISIONAL ELEMENTS BASELINE | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | PHASE 1A | | | | | | BE | S | |
| 6 | | | | PROVIS | | | | | |
| 7 | | NOTES | BASE | NORM | PROV SUMS/QIAUN TS | TOTAL PROV | TOTAL | Provisional - of Total | Comment |
| 8 | PRELIMS | | 72,437,757 | 53,700 | 3,000,000 | 3,053,700 | 75,491,457 | 1.35% | |
| 9 | TRACK FORM - System | | 43,918,161 | 1,455,755 | 0 | 1,455,755 | 45,373,916 | 0.64% | |
| 10 | TRACK FORM - Earthworks | 3. | ,, | .,, | | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | |
| 11 | DEPOT | | 18,686,351 | 100,000 | 0 | 100,000 | 18,786,351 | 0.04% | |
| 12 | STRUCTURES - Superstructure | 1. | | 1,778,375 | 31,415,121 | 33,193,496 | 33,193,496 | | Maximum - figures to be firmed up within this amount |
| 13 | STRUCTURES - Substructure | 3. | | | | | | 0.00% | |
| 14 | HIGHWAYS | | 0 | 12,675,531 | 11,893,955 | 24,569,486 | 24,569,486 | 10.85% | |
| 15 | TRAMSTOPS | 2. | | -184,900 | 3,270,376 | 3,085,476 | 3,085,476 | 1.36% | |
| 16 | BUILDINGS | | 3,275,180 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,275,180 | 0.00% | |
| 17 | SUPERVISORY & COMMS | | 5,296,482 | 1,000,000 | 0 | 1,000,000 | 6,296,482 | 0.44% | |
| 18 | OLE | | 14,974,462 | 924,762 | 0 | 924,762 | 15,899,224 | 0.41% | |
| 19 | TRAMSTOP EQUIPMENT | | 1,513,587 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,513,587 | 0.00% | |
| 20 | TRAMS | | 1,018,910 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,018,910 | 0.00% | |
| 21 | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | |
| 22 | ADJUSTMENTS | | | | | | 0 | 0.00% | |
| 23 | Reduction as BBS letter 11/10/07 | | -1,000,000 | | | | -1,000,000 | 0.00% | |
| 24 | Reduction for taking CAF into BBS Consortia | 4. | -1,000,000 | | | | -1,000,000 | 0.00% | |
| 25 | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | |
| 26 | | | 159,120,890 | 17,803,222 | 49,579,452 | 67,382,674 | 226,503,564 | 29.75% | |
| 27 | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | | | 208,700,342 | | |
| 29 | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | NOTES | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | Structures allowance considered a reliable maximum figure | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | 2. Tramstops allowance considered a reliable maximum figure although final designs not yet provided | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | 3. Earthworks dependent on ground investigation works or confirmation of sections | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | 4. Unconditional as advised by BBS | | | | | | | | |

| | Α | В | С | D | E | F | G | Н | 1 | J |
|----------|---|---|-------|-------------|------------|--------------------------|------------|-------------|---------------------------|--|
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | EDINBURGH TRAM NETWORK | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | PROVISIONAL ELEMENTS STATUS | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | DATE:- 13/12/07 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | PHASE 1A | | | | | | В | BS | |
| 6 | | | | | | SIONAL | | | | |
| 7 | | | NOTES | BASE | NORM | PROV SUMS/QIAUN TS | TOTAL PROV | TOTAL | Provisional - of Total | Comment |
| 8 | | PRELIMS | | 72,437,757 | 53,700 | 3,000,000 | 3,053,700 | 75,491,457 | 1.35% | |
| 9 | T | TRACK FORM - System | | 43,918,161 | 1,455,755 | 0 | 1,455,755 | 45,373,916 | 0.64% | |
| 10 | T | TRACK FORM - Earthworks | 3. | | | | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | |
| 11 | T | DEPOT | | 18,686,351 | 100,000 | 0 | 100,000 | 18,786,351 | 0.04% | |
| 12 | | STRUCTURES - Superstructure | 1. | 31,415,121 | 1,778,375 | | 1,778,375 | 33,193,496 | 0.79% | Maximum - figures to be firmed up within this amount |
| 13 | T | STRUCTURES - Substructure | 3. | | | | | | 0.00% | |
| 14 | | HIGHWAYS | | 0 | 12,675,531 | 11,893,955 | 24,569,486 | 24,569,486 | 10.85% | |
| 15 | T | TRAMSTOPS | 2. | 3,270,376 | -184,900 | | -184,900 | 3,085,476 | -0.08% | |
| 16 | T | BUILDINGS | | 3,275,180 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,275,180 | 0.00% | |
| 17 | | SUPERVISORY & COMMS | | 5,296,482 | 1,000,000 | 0 | 1,000,000 | 6,296,482 | 0.44% | |
| 18 | | OLE | | 14,974,462 | 924,762 | 0 | 924,762 | 15,899,224 | 0.41% | |
| 19 | | TRAMSTOP EQUIPMENT | | 1,513,587 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,513,587 | 0.00% | |
| 20 | | TRAMS | | 1,018,910 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,018,910 | 0.00% | |
| 21 | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | |
| 22 | | ADJUSTMENTS | | | | | | 0 | 0.00% | |
| 23 | Ī | Reduction as BBS letter 11/10/07 | | -1,000,000 | | | | -1,000,000 | 0.00% | |
| 24 | | Reduction for taking CAF into BBS Consortia | 4. | -1,000,000 | | | | -1,000,000 | 0.00% | |
| 25 | | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | |
| 25 26 | | | | 193,806,387 | 17,803,222 | 14,893,955 | 32,697,177 | 226,503,564 | 14.44% | |
| 27 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 29 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 | | NOTES | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | | Structures allowance considered a reliable maximum figure | | | | | | | | |
| 32 | | 2. Tramstops allowance considered a reliable maximum figure although final designs not yet provided | | | | | | | | |
| 33 | | 3. Earthworks dependent on ground investigation works or confirmation of sections | | | | | | | | |
| 34 | | 4. Unconditional as advised by BBS | | | | | | | | |

| | Α | В | С | D | E |
|----------|---|---------------------------------------|-----------|------|-------------|
| 1 | | BBS INFRACO CONTRACT COST REPORT | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | | DATE:- 13/12/07 | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 5 | | Description | Add | Omit | Implemented |
| 6 | | | £ | £ | Anticipated |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | | Inclusion of Maintenance Mobilisation | 1,397,089 | | Α |
| 9 | 2 | Revised work at EAL | 1,000,000 | | A |
| 10 | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | |
| 21 22 | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | |
| 29 | | Total | 2,397,089 | 0 | |
| 30 | | 1 9301 | 2,557,560 | | |
| 31 | | Net Change | 2,397,089 | | |

| | Α | В | С | D | E |
|----------|---|----------------------------------|-----|------|-------------|
| 1 | | BBS INFRACO CONTRACT COST REPORT | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | | DATE:- 13/12/07 | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 5 | | Description | Add | Omit | Implemented |
| 6 | | | £ | £ | Anticipated |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | 1 | | | | |
| 9 | 2 | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | |
| 18 19 | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | |
| 29 | | Total | 0 | 0 | |
| 30 | | | | | |
| 31 | | Net Change | 0 | | |

| | Α | В | С | D | E |
|----------|-----|---|------------|------------|---|
| 1 | | NFRACO RISK ALLOWANCE STATUS REPORT | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | | DATE:- 13/12/07 | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 5 | ID | Risk Description | Baseline | Current | |
| 6 | | | £ | £ | |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | 48 | Two stage tender pricing does not achieve price certainty for works at first stage. | 5,344,000 | 5,344,000 | |
| 9 | 870 | SDS Designs are late and do not provide detail Infraco requires | 3,790,890 | 3,790,890 | |
| 10 | 952 | Scope of works relating to Wide Area Modelling (WAM) have not been agreed with SDS because they consider this to be out with the scope of their contract. | 1,906,540 | 1,906,540 | |
| 11 | 47 | Poor design and review processes; cumbersome approvals process; reiterative design/approvals process. | 1,356,510 | 1,356,510 | |
| 12 | 70 | SDS does not provide its defined deliverables (technical specs) in accordance with the SDS contract. Infraco Proposals not fully considered. | 1,203,690 | 1,203,690 | |
| 13 | 178 | Procurement Strategy novates SDS to InfraCo after Detailed Design; Limited input on buidability from Infraco. | 401,050 | 401,050 | |
| 14 | 132 | Realignment of existing road geometry required | 213,710 | 213,710 | |
| 15 | 172 | Area of possible contamination and unstable ground (unlicensed tip) has been highlighted during desk study immediately to east of Gogar Burn - investigation for CERT project indicates that this consists of building rubble and domestic waste. | 254,000 | 254,000 | |
| 16 | | | | 0 | |
| 17 | | | | 0 | |
| 18 | | | | 0 | |
| 19 | | | | 0 | |
| 20 | | | | 0 | |
| 21 | | | | 0 | |
| 22 | | | | 0 | |
| 23 | - | | | 0 | |
| 24 | | | | 0 | |
| 25 | | | | 0 | |
| 26 27 | | | | 0 | |
| 28 | - | | | 0 | |
| 28 | | Total | 14 470 200 | 14 470 200 | |
| ∠9 | | Total | 14,470,390 | 14,470,390 | |