

---

**From:** Duncan Fraser  
**Sent:** 02 August 2007 22:50  
**To:** Rebecca Andrew  
**Cc:** Andy Conway; Andrew Holmes  
**Subject:** RE: Feedback from DPD 2nd August 2007

1. This was an omission by tie. In the risk register they assumed that the hearing was a delay. The fact is that the Hearing procedure is a legal requirement as and until the Minister changes the law.

5. This is a good example of risk transfer which currently is open ended. GB discussed today with DS but I believe made little progress. What we need to know is what is the financial exposure. Can you follow up with GB.

10. Further to my earlier email I am seeking to get a better understand of what the risks are what tie have allowed for them and therefore give eus an estimate for headroom in the budget. This need to be benchmarked against other schemes such as Dublin and Nottingham- can you seek advice from GB.

11. We are in a difficult position. The delays have accumulated to the programme and now we are be pressured because the tie programme of delayed is a £2,5m cost per four weeks. If read literally we are now accountable for the delay and also for an unrealistic programme, which was confirmed today as have no float- unrealistic!!! This requires to be raised at the TAB by Donald I suggest.

12. This is complex and need unravelling. What is approved and by whom and when. If the risk now sits with CEC do we need to reconsider at TPB then seek approval from CEC or is this delegated????

---

**From:** Rebecca Andrew  
**Sent:** Thu 02/08/2007 13:49  
**To:** Sheila Dove; Duncan Fraser  
**Subject:** RE: Feedback from DPD 2nd August 2007

Duncan,

BT have not released my DPD papers yet, so my comments are only based on your note. My comments are as follows:

1) Why is the TRO hearing programmed, but not budgeted? This doesn't make sense. I know we are hoping not to have a hearing, but we need a contingency plan in place if one is required. £1m unbudgeted and not included in risk, is not satisfactory.

5) I don't know where tie got the idea that TS were funding this.....I understood that TS had planned to do the works, but to deduct the associated costs from the grant they paid out. How much is involved? I am concerned that there may be other costs that tie are ignoring. Any ideas how we can check this?

10) Letter of comfort. I'll draft something for Donald's signature. Not sure how much comfort we can give without confirmation of Transport Scotland Grant.

11) I agree that more contingency needs to be built into the programme for this. In general, I have some concerns over the lack of contingency in the programme and the budget.

12) I'll await the paper revised paper. At least it looks as though mobilisation is now after CEC approval, which is later than Miriam's programme suggested. tie will need to make sure they have a clear argument that members will accept. Pressure will also have to be put on TS for approval of funding.

Call me if you need to discuss.

Rebecca

Rebecca Andrew | (Acting) Principal Finance Manager | Financial Services | The City of Edinburgh Council | Waverley Court, Level 2:5, 4 East Market Street, Edinburgh, EH8 8BG | Tel 0131 [REDACTED]  
[rebecca.andrew@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:rebecca.andrew@edinburgh.gov.uk) | [www.edinburgh.gov.uk](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk)

---

**From:** Sheila Dove  
**Sent:** 02 August 2007 12:31  
**To:** Rebecca Andrew  
**Subject:** Feedback from DPD 2nd August 2007  
**Importance:** High

Rebecca,

Please see attached a copy of the Feedback from the DPD today for your information and comment before Duncan sends this to Andrew.

Regards

***Sheila***

Sheila Dove  
(Temp) Secretary  
***On behalf of Duncan Fraser***  
***Tram Co-ordination Manager***

0131 [REDACTED]