

---

**From:** Reynolds, Steve  
**Sent:** 08 May 2007 10:11  
**To:** Tony Glazebrook  
**Cc:** David Crawley; Chandler, Jason  
**Subject:** RE: Design Assurance implementation

Tony

Thank you for the clarification. From now on deliverables will be provided as self-assured packages

Steve

Stephen C Reynolds  
Director

PB  
Manchester Technology Centre  
Oxford Road, Manchester, M1 7ED

Direct +44 (0) [REDACTED]  
Mobile +44 (0) [REDACTED]  
Fax +44 (0) [REDACTED]

---

**From:** Tony Glazebrook [mailto:Tony.Glazebrook@tie.ltd.uk]  
**Sent:** 03 May 2007 13:23  
**To:** Reynolds, Steve  
**Cc:** David Crawley; Susan Clark; Ailsa McGregor; Geoff Gilbert; Matthew Crosse; Andy Steel - TSS; steel\_andy@tie.ltd.uk; Chandler, Jason; Dolan, Alan; Trudi Craggs; Jim Harries (Transdev)  
**Subject:** RE: Design Assurance implementation

Hi Steve,

For the avoidance of doubt, and ref note 4 in David's email below:

As we agreed at the SDS progress meeting on 24<sup>th</sup> April 2007, you are no longer to submit disparate design details for review. Designs are to be grouped into self-assured packages to a programme supplied by you asap.

The point that David is making is that, exceptionally and because of external process necessity, some key elements might be absent when packaging up for review; an obvious example being TTRO's. However, that should not be used as a reason for precluding the submission of an otherwise completed, self-assured package for review. Such a gap shall, of course, need to be clearly identified, together with a note that explains the process and timescale for ultimate completion.

Best regards,

Tony Glazebrook

---

**From:** David Crawley  
**Sent:** 01 May 2007 16:56  
**To:** Susan Clark  
**Cc:** Tony Glazebrook  
**Subject:** FW: Design Assurance implementation

Susan,

In getting a cost from TSS on design review I need to acquire the answer to item 1 below from SDS. Once I have this TSS need to turn this into a programme and associated cost – see penultimate paragraph. Andy Steel is progressing the itemised issues below with SDS on my behalf.

David

---

**From:** David Crawley  
**Sent:** 26 April 2007 18:30  
**To:** 'Reynolds, Steve'  
**Cc:** 'steel\_andy@' Geoff Gilbert; Tony Glazebrook; Ailsa McGregor  
**Subject:** Design Assurance implementation

Steve, -To confirm our conversation today I have produced the notes below.

(Andy, -This is for your information and to inform the TSS comments below.)

I had a useful visit to the PB offices in Birmingham yesterday which confirmed, as best as can be done in a short visit, that you have in place all the building blocks required to deliver design assurance as specified in my note to you of 11 April 2007 (the system has 11/4 logged but the letter date is 13/4 - see link <https://wss.tie.ltd.uk/tram/development/Correspondence/DEV-COR-246.pdf>) or attached documents for the letter). It is clear that those I spoke to understood what was required.

The overall concept is that you will deliver design 'packages' containing logically grouped designs (in order to address interdependencies) and will add a covering statement which provides competent assurance that the design is fit for purpose. This will cover the issues identified in the checklist in the attachment and is intended to add value by ensuring that reviewers have a summary of important issues with the supporting evidence to inform their review. To deliver this in practice requires some supporting actions.

1. An important consideration in implementing this way of working is to understand what the details of the design deliverable packages will be. At present there are a large number of design elements to be completed against your programme. These elements require packaging to ensure that they appear together with associated elements (e.g. track and roads together). I need to make available to TSS an indication of how many top level packages are relevant to the detailed design stage. For example, there may be, say, 60 top level packages, each consisting of up to 5 asset groups, with each asset group containing up to 30 design drawings.
2. The base data for the design packages is also relevant to the production of the progress 'dashboard' as detailed in the attachment.
3. To cover the assurance checklist issues requires a simple pro-forma to accompany design packages in which you should indicate for each item whether or not assurance is being 'claimed' Where it is, a reference to the location of the supporting evidence should be provided. Where it is not, statements of the issues giving rise to this should be provided. I understand that Martin Conroy is already engaged on this activity. This checklist will follow final production of the Design Verification Statement (DVS) which is part of your existing processes.
4. Notwithstanding the need to package inter-dependent designs for review, designs should still be submitted to the extant programme as individual items even though their status cannot be confirmed until after receipt of the design assurance information.
5. No change is proposed to payment against the extant schedule noting that the 20% retention could be released on successful completion of the design assurance checklist associated with the groupings of designs. This is for final agreement with Geoff Gilbert.
6. No change will be made to any current meetings or consultation processes.

**I hope that we can get to a point where everything is substantially in place to deliver in the new format by Monday 7 May, and certainly not later than Monday 14 May.**

In order to demonstrate successful implementation it is likely that we will subject each design package to significant scrutiny in the first instance. There will also be audits of both process and product to confirm that confidence is well placed. When confidence has been established there will be the presumption of self-assurance with effort focused only on issues where there is no claim for an item being assured or on high risk items.

TSS will be asked to construct a review programme around these concepts which offers competent assurance to **tie** that we are receiving assured designs which are fit for purpose and which represent value for money. TSS will also work in support of **tie** in designing and conducting the audit programmes and in defining high risk items requiring detailed review.

I would be grateful for your comments and confirmation of each of these points and also a formal reply to my attached letter of 11 April.

Many thanks,

David

---

The information transmitted is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail please notify the sender immediately at the email address above, and then delete it.

E-mails sent to and by our staff are monitored for operational and lawful business purposes including assessing compliance with our company rules and system performance. TIE reserves the right to monitor emails sent to or from addresses under its control.

No liability is accepted for any harm that may be caused to your systems or data by this e-mail. It is the recipient's responsibility to scan this e-mail and any attachments for computer viruses.

Senders and recipients of e-mail should be aware that under Scottish Freedom of Information legislation and the Data Protection legislation these contents may have to be disclosed to third parties in response to a request.

tie Limited registered in Scotland No. SC230949. Registered office - City Chambers, High Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1YT.

---