
From: Susan Clark
Sent: 26 October 2006 10:39
To: Alasdair Slessor
Subject: RE: Review of SDS Utility Preliminary Drawings

Alasdair

Are you happy that the meeting re Infraco/Mudfa interface goes ahead without you?

Susan

Susan Clark
Delivery Director - Tram
.....
tie limited
Verity House
19 Haymarket Yards
Edinburgh EH12 5BH

Tel: +4 [REDACTED]
Fax: +44 [REDACTED]
Mobile: +44 [REDACTED]
Email: susan.clark@tie.ltd.uk

-----Original Message-----

From: Alasdair Slessor
Sent: 26 October 2006 10:08
To: Ailsa McGregor
Cc: Susan Clark; Allan.Hill
Subject: RE: Review of SDS Utility Preliminary Drawings

Ailsa,

I'm off ill today.
Desperate for meeting as design problems now critical.
alignment of deliverables irrelevant
Meeting for tomorrow please make sure andie and Susan are available,as this has major
impact to project.

Alasdair

-----Original Message-----

From: "Ailsa McGregor" <Ailsa.McGregor@tie.ltd.uk>
To: "Andie Harper" <Andie.Harper@tie.ltd.uk>
Cc: "Alasdair Slessor" <Alasdair.Slessor@tie.ltd.uk>; "Susan Clark" <Susan.Clark@tie.ltd.uk>; "John Low - TSS" <John.Low@tie.ltd.uk>; "Trudi Craggs" <Trudi.Craggs@tie.ltd.uk>; "Douglas Leeming - TSS" <Douglas.Leeming@tie.ltd.uk>; "Gavin Murray" <Gavin.Murray@tie.ltd.uk>; "Allan Hill - TSS" <Allan.Hill@tie.ltd.uk>
Sent: 25/10/06 21:03
Subject: RE: Review of SDS Utility Preliminary Drawings

Andie,

Further to our detailed discussions today regarding the Mudfa contract and the lack of alignment with the SDS contract and the SDS deliverables it is absolutely clear that we need another meeting with all parties to resolve these issues.

I propose a meeting is set up for this Thursday afternoon to resolve this.

Regards,

Ailsa

From: Allan Hill - TSS
Sent: 25 October 2006 17:34
To: Ailsa McGregor
Cc: Alasdair Slessor; Susan Clark; John Low - TSS
Subject: Review of SDS Utility Preliminary Drawings

Ailsa,

Further to our meetings on the 16th and 17th of October, I wish to respond to your comments about the acceptance of the SDS Preliminary Utility Drawings and the competence of TSS in reviewing the Utility drawings. I do wish to specifically respond to your adverse remarks in front of SDS at the meeting on the 17th October when you suggested that TSS's review of the drawings in 3 months did not compare to that of McAlpines which they did in a day.

The Utilities team received the Utilities Preliminary Drawings during the week beginning 3 July in batches as the drawings were booked into the system. We were asked by Gavin Murray to review and comment. No guidance was given on the scope of the review, we therefore used our professional judgement taking into consideration what we considered would be expected in preliminary drawings and what was expected from SDS as regards their deliverables.

An initial report was sent to Gavin Murray on the 12 July, see attached. In this we state " To allow a full assessment of the preliminary design, as a minimum the schedules should be substantially complete and the drawings should show a first pass of proposed diverted locations - recognising that some information will be slow to develop, I'd suggest looking for a figure of around 75% completion of the schedules as a benchmark." This minimal information was not forthcoming. The report highlighted deficiencies in a number of areas.

A further report was issued on 27 July 2006, which reviews the drawings against the Roads and Utilities Requirements Specifications. Again deficiencies were highlighted.

At no time have the tie Utilities team accepted these drawings as Preliminary Drawings. Many of them were far from the standard we would expect.

As you can see, the Utilities team responded timeously on this matter and we have received no adverse comments from Gavin or requests for further input. Having 3 months to accept or reject was news to me and to the Utilities team.

As we move into Detailed Design, if there are issues with the reviewing procedures then we need to address them asap. So that we ensure that we meet your requirements for the management of the SDS Contract, can you please confirm what the reviewing requirements will be for Detailed Design.

Regards

Allan