
From: Roger Jones [Roger.Jones@transdevplc.co.uk]
Sent: 12 June 2007 15:20
To: Gavin Murray; Martin Donohoe (Scott Wilson); Lesley McCourt; Ennion, Bruce
Cc: Jim Harries (Transdev); David Powell; Alastair Richards - TEL
Subject: FW: Transdev Review of 4th Infraco Information Release on 30th March (or 5th April?), excluding Part 3
Attachments: Information Release 280307, reviewed by Transdev on 25 April 2007, part 3 to follow.zip

All,

Please find attached our review as issued of Parts 1 and 2 of the ERs version 2.4/2.4, as discussed at this morning's meeting.

Regards,
Roger

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

Office: 
Mobile: 

From: Jim Harries
Sent: 25 April 2007 12:33
To: Geoff Gilbert; david.powell@tie.ltd.uk; Martin Donohoe; Matthew Crosse (Matthew.Crosse@tie.ltd.uk); Susan Clark
Cc: Alastair Richards - TEL; Trudi Craggs; 'David Crawley'; Tony.glazebrook@tie.ltd.uk
Subject: Transdev Review of 4th Infraco Information Release on 30th March (or 5th April?), excluding Part 3

Fellow team members

We have now concluded our review of the Infraco 4th Information Release on 30th March (or 5th April?), (with the exception of Part 3), that has been issued to the Infraco bidders. This review is presented here.

We are concerned that, yet again, very poor quality information has been released to Infraco bidders with insufficient checks prior to its release. Our reviews of previous Infraco documentation releases are summarised below, and the emails referenced below are available on request:

Documentation	Transdev's response
Employer's Requirements in ItN	Email from Jim Harries to Alastair Richards "FW: Employers Requirements sent out to Infraco", dated 22 Oct 06, and Email from Jim Harries to Alastair Richards "Transdev comments on Employers Requirements sent out to Infraco" dated 27 Oct 07. A total of 814 comments.
Infraco 2 nd release	Email from Jim Harries to Susan Clark "FW: ITN second release 21 Nov 2006" dated 21 Nov 2006. A total of about 85 comments.
Infraco 3 rd release	Transdev are not aware of the contents of this package and has not reviewed it.

We have not attempted to establish how much of our previous reviews of the Infraco documentation releases have been addressed in the 4th release, due to resource availability and priorities.

In our review of the Infraco 4th Information Release, our review of Part 3 has commenced and will be issued later.

Our review of the remainder of the Infraco 4th Information Release is based on the files that were handed on a CD to Jim Harries by Val Clementson on about 11th April. The review consists of:

- A table that identifies the key issues
- A table that summarises the number of comments that we make in each section of the document, and
- Detailed comments that are presented as tracked changes in the Word files

The tables referenced above follow, and the Word files are attached to this email.

Key Issues

Key Issue in Outline	Reference (note that our review of Part 3 is not included)	Importance
The documentation cannot have been checked prior to issue to Infraco, and ownership of the documentation within tie is not clear to us.	All	H
A set of generic presentational issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate paragraph numbering • some page numbering missing • about half of all cross references are wrong • contents sheet has document numbers and no descriptions that explains what they are • confusing file names • inconsistent documentation control • Part 2, as issued to Infraco, contains electronic "comments" • Poor structure, headings missing 	All	H
Consistency of terminology and definitions throughout the suite of documents. Many issues identified.	All	H
There are many instances of internal conflicts within the package and inappropriate duplication of information. It is the large number of these instances that is of particular concern.	All	H
Infrastructure Maintenance and Tram Maintenance must start prior to driver training.	Information Release and Employer's Requirements	H
Alignment of service patterns is needed.	Part 1a, Part 1d and Information release	H
Lack of clarity on Infraco obligations in terms of run times, road traffic delays and testing.	Part 1a	H
Performance regime concept is unachievable (in Transdev's view).	Part 1a	H
Almost all of this Part 1c places obligations on Tramco. Unclear of its relevance, unless already an obligation on Tramco. If it is, then surely Infraco are aware through tie issuing Infraco with the Tramco documentation.	Part 1c	H
System Acceptance Testing needs a rewrite as it is so flawed, and actually undeliverable in some respects.	Part 1d	H
Conflicts with DPOFA, particularly on cleaning, maintenance and training.	Part 1e	H
Lots of requirements on Tram maintenance. Same comment as for Part 1c.	Part 1e	H
Incorrect statements about the responsibilities of the Operator in respect of Testing and Commissioning. This will let Infraco completely off the hook! See 3.2.32 in Part 2.	Part 2	H
Dates on documentation: 30 March or 5 April. Confusing.	All	M

Key Issue in Outline	Reference (note that our review of Part 3 is not included)	Importance
ROTS/ROGS, and HMRI references all need making both consistent and correct in their context.	All	M
The complete range of elements that make up the total project are unevenly described. Inconsistent and variable level of detail from different authors within the package is evident. This reflects a lack of overall editorial ownership and understanding.	Information Release and Scope in particular	M
Still not aligned to what SDS is doing. Novation risk will fall on tie. There is the separate issue of alignment with the Functional Specification.	All	H
Muddled thinking on Asset Register, Maintenance Manuals and Maintenance Management systems.	Part 1e	M
We wonder to what extent Transdev's previous comments on this section have been considered by tie.	Part 2	M
Transdev has identified several areas that require further detailed checking. Some of these relate to the scope split between the various parties (Infraco, Tramco, Transdev, tie and others). These areas need to be identified, resolved and incorporated into the contract alignment process. Time and resource constraints limited the depth of the checking in these and other areas.	All	M

Number of Comments

Document	Approximate number of comments
Information Release	52
Index	4
Infraco ROGS Info 20070330	4
"Phase 1a Scope Statement Regarding Inclusion for the Phase 1"	5
Part M1a	
Bit before part 1a starts	13
Part 1a	52
Part 1b	3
Part 1c	1
Part 1d	200
Part 1e	300
Part M1b	Part 2
	200
Total Comments (excluding Part 3)	834

All the best
Jim Harries

Mobile [REDACTED]
City Point, 65 Haymarket Terrace, Edinburgh EH12 5HD

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.