
From: David Crawley
Sent: 19 February 2008 23:06
To: Tony Glazebrook
Cc: Roger Jones - Transdev; Andy Steel - TSS; Alastair Richards - TEL; Gavin Murray; Neil Wood - Transdev; Damian Sharp
Subject: RE: Design Management Plan V5.0

Dear All,

To confirm. The original concept (in March 2007) was that a percentage of the 19 design assured sub-section packages would go through a review process similar to the next generation of design review about to start. In practice this would affect about 10% of the total number of drawings but only after completion of the assurance processes. If the assurance statements provided the expected evidence it would have been possible to stop at this point because the evidence to do so would have been available. Then the programme slipped massively and made this pointless as there would be nothing to review until about now. At this point we substituted 10% of designs (not yet assured) in a slice through as many packages as we could to get a representative feel for how design processes were progressing and to feed what was found back into IDC (as shown in the Design Management Plan).

It was not intended that the 10% of unassured designs would be enough to leave the remaining 90% but would be enough to inform us how well SDS design processes were working (e.g. IDR and IDC) and was expedient in making the best use we could of delivery much later than originally anticipated (at something like V7).

I suggest that each of the 19 design assured packages now needs to be reviewed at the covering design assurance statement level with about half reviewed in detail beneath this. This takes us back to something like the original processes envisaged a year ago. This number would be less if we had had an unflawed set of designs so far.

I hope this helps your discussion - as I am still connected to email etc I could not help but notice this and am interested in the outcome in terms of where things then go with John Dolan.

David

From: Tony Glazebrook
Sent: Tue 19/02/2008 19:01
To: David Crawley
Subject: FW: Design Management Plan V5.0

From: Andy Steel - TSS
Sent: 19 February 2008 19:01:15
To: Tony Glazebrook; Roger Jones - Transdev
Cc: Alastair Richards - TEL; Damian Sharp; Gavin Murray; Neil Wood - Transdev
Subject: RE: Design Management Plan V5.0
Auto forwarded by a Rule

Tony,

I am not sure I have seen V5.0 of the Design Management Plan.

However can I remind you of earlier discussions with David Crawley when the Design Review process was set up.

The original concept was that the initial packages would be reviewed in detail. Only if they were satisfied with the quality of the deliverables would the review be reduced to a sample. The sample would in principle amount to 10% of the total delivered to tie. As an output check a later package was also to be reviewed in detail to ensure that there had been no back-sliding etc.

CEC01424691_0001

In practice this approach has never been practical because of the repeated failure of SDS to deliver even one complete package. (it is now 9 months since they submitted the "exemplar" package!) Further whilst the Thursday sessions have been useful the quality of what has been submitted has been at best been variable.

In any statistical sense in my opinion this would not give the required level of confidence to accept the remaining 90% unreviewed. I doubt our council friends would even go that far!

Clearly we with the imminent novation of the SDS contract and the requirement for BBS to submit detail design for the M+E elements we are entering into a new situation.

Therefore I support your suggestion of a meeting. Do you intend to put out a draft agenda?

Andy

From: Tony Glazebrook
Sent: Tue 2/19/2008 9:12 AM
To: Roger Jones - Transdev
Cc: Alastair Richards - TEL; Damian Sharp; Andy Steel - TSS; Gavin Murray; Neil Wood - Transdev
Subject: RE: Design Management Plan V5.0

Hi Roger,

We can't deal with this issue through emails. I'll set up a meeting very soon to go through these issues.

Cheers,

Tony

From: Roger Jones [mailto:Roger.Jones@transdevplc.co.uk]
Sent: 18 February 2008 16:10
To: Tony Glazebrook
Cc: Alastair Richards - TEL; Damian Sharp; Andy Steel - TSS; Gavin Murray; Neil Wood - Transdev
Subject: Design Management Plan V5.0

Tony,

We have received by copy of email to Damian Sharp on 13th February a copy of V5.0 of the Design Management Plan. Presumably this will be revised again upon SDS novation to be in line with Schedule 14 of the Infraco Agreement. We note that this Schedule is to have appended to it, at Part B, a submittal programme, that will presumably supersede the current SDS programme of submittals. Any assured packages received before novation will be reviewed against the criteria as you set out in your email, but does the process need to be revisited in detail with Infraco thereafter?

Listening to David Crawley at the last of the "old-style" design reviews last week, we understand that a nominal 10% of the submissions will be subject to the review process. Is there a current understanding of what the complete list is and which items will be so treated? David also intimated that all drawings and documents will be issued to **tie** and would be available for review in respect of specific issues. We believe there are a limited range of issues throughout the scheme that we would wish to understand (e.g. placement of signals and point indicators) and comment on and /or agree, together with certain areas where a deeper understanding of a complete design element will be required (e.g. the depot, the tram cab). We trust there will be sufficient flexibility in the process to allow this. Hopefully, we will continue to be involved in all relevant ongoing design development, and this will allow the final issued designs to be agreed without significant comment.

As we move forward into Infraco implementation, the design process will be managed ever more with a view to supporting and not delaying the actual manufacture and construction programmes so timely involvement and review with assume even greater significance. We are ready to play our part in this. Could you explain how BBS will be managing the interface to **tie** for this part of the process, in

order to ensure that the programme is maintained without compromising the quality of the design to be constructed?

Regards,
Roger

Roger Jones
Project Engineer, Transdev Edinburgh Tram
City Point, 65 Haymarket Terrace,
Edinburgh EH12 5HD

Office: 01
Mobile: 0

This email and its contents are intended for the named recipient(s) only, and it may contain information which may be confidential and/or privileged. If you have received this email in error, please notify us and delete the email and all attachments immediately. Any views or opinions expressed are those of the sender and do not necessarily represent those of Transdev PLC or its subsidiaries. Internet communications are not secure, and we do not accept responsibility for the contents of this message or for any changes which may have been made after it was sent. All outbound email is checked for viruses, however, we do not accept any liability if this email or any attachments are found to contain viruses or malicious code. We advise that all emails and attachments should be checked by the recipient prior to opening them. TRANSDEV PLC, Company No. 2749273, Registered in England and Wales.