



Transport Edinburgh
Trams for Edinburgh
Lothian Buses

DPD Sub-committee March Report

Distribution:-

Willie Gallagher (DPD Chair)
Damian Sharp
Duncan Fraser
Neil Renilson
Matthew Crosse
Bill Campbell
Graeme Bissett
Stewart McGarrity
Steven Bell

Alastair Richards
Geoff Gilbert
Susan Clark
Trudi Craggs
Jim Harries
James Papps
Keith Rimmer
Miriam Thorne
Tony Glazebrook

Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| I. Minutes from Previous Meeting | 4 |
| II. Progress Report for March | |
| 1.0 Executive Summary | 12 |
| 2.0 Progress | 19 |
| 3.0 Headline Cost Report | 22 |
| 4.0 Time Schedule Report | 27 |
| 5.0 Risk & Opportunity | 29 |
| 6.0 HSQE & Resources | 33 |
| 7.0 Stakeholder & Communication | 36 |
| III. Appendices – <i>send as separate attachment</i> | |
| • Detailed Cost Report | |
| • Change Control | |
| • Milestone Schedule Summary | |
| • Risk | |
| • Stakeholder and Communications Strategy | |

Edinburgh Tram Network

Minutes

Design, Procurement and Delivery Sub-Committee

13 March 2007

tie offices - Verity House, Boardroom

| Directors Present: | In Attendance: |
|---|---|
| Willie Gallagher (DPD Chair) – WG Neil Renilson – NR Bill Campbell – BC | Matthew Crosse – MC Stewart McGarrity - SMcG Graeme Bissett –GB Steven Bell – SB Alastair Richards – AR Trudi Craggs – TC Susan Clark – SC Jim Harries - JH Tony Glazebrook - TG Steve Reynolds - SR Keith Rimmer – KR James Papps – JP Miriam Thorne – MT Duncan Fraser – DF Geoff Gilbert – GG Alasdair Sim – AS (partial) Mark Bourke – MB (partial) |

Apologies: Damian Sharp

| 1.0 | ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETING | Action |
|-----|---|--------|
| 1.1 | Previous minutes were accepted as read | |
| 1.2 | Previous actions were accepted as completed - verbal updates and exceptions are listed below: | |
| 1.3 | <u>Infraco</u> – DS stated that the bidders' request for an indemnity letter from TS cannot be provided without ministerial approval of the Business Case. Further, DS noted that this would take the form of a comfort letter rather than indemnifying the bidders. TS does however accept the principle that a comfort letter which states that funding is available, can be provided via CEC to the bidders, following ministerial approval. | DS |
| 1.4 | <u>Network Rail</u> - the draft lease had been received by Network Rail and progress was being made in setting up the agreement. TC/ SB to provide an update for the April DPD. | TC |
| 1.5 | <u>Network Rail Immunisation</u> – a review of likely impact of the issues on | SB |

| | | |
|------------|--|------------------------------------|
| | immunisation on programme and a risk analysis are underway – SB / TC to provide an update for the April DPD. | |
| 2.0 | Project Directors Report | |
| 2.1.1 | Progress | |
| 2.2 | MC presented a high level overview of the project delivery strategy. The strategic map included in the PD progress reports, represents the key elements of the “ ti etog to gether” strategy for project delivery. MC provided a clarification on individual items of the strategy, their current status and plans for progression. | |
| 2.3 | SB requested that the strategic map should be linked to the key project milestones to provide a feel for the timing of initiatives. | MC |
| 2.4 | WG raised the question how the focus on cost control and efficiency within the project was maintained within the strategy. It was noted that particularly control over expenditure on MUDFA as an emerging cost contract would require greater clarification. WG requested that the mechanisms for cost & efficiency control would be included on the Strategic Map. | done |
| 2.5 | MC confirmed that SC was leading on contract management and that procedures were being developed and implemented to provide appropriate control and monitoring of costs and efficiency. GG confirmed that the format for cost control on MUDFA had been established and was ready for implementation. | |
| 2.6 | Procurement | |
| 2.6.1 | GG provided an update on the current status of the Tramco and Infraco bids. | |
| 2.6.2 | <u>Tramco</u> : GG confirmed the selection of 2 preferred bidders. Any potential impact if these were not part of the current two Infraco consortia had been discussed in principle with the consortia and no negative feedback had been received to date. The procurement team was anticipating informing all Tramco bidders on the selection following the ministerial announcement on the DFBC. A meeting is to be scheduled for this purpose for the 21 March. | done |
| 2.6.3 | <u>Infraco</u> : GG confirmed that discussions with the bidders were progressing positively and that certain critical contractual issues had been resolved. He stated that the magnitude of issues outstanding is in line with expectations at this stage of the process and any significant issues would be raised through the new Tender evaluation sub-committee. Expectation is to move to the next phase of evaluation and negotiations in line with the current programme. | |
| 2.7 | Delivery | |
| 2.7.1 | SC provided an update on the progress within the delivery workstream. | |
| 2.7.2 | Project Management Plan as the framework for the management of the Tram project together with supporting detailed procedures and controls are now signed off & in the process of being rolled out across the project team. “Lunch and learn” sessions will be held to support the roll-out. | Done – first session has been held |

| | | |
|-------|--|--------------------------------|
| 2.7.3 | <u>MUDFA</u> : a programme review has been undertaken which allowed the logic to be linked to throughout the programme. Feedback from AMIS on this programme is expected by end March. Work orders for each of the 125 worksites to firm up costs are in progress. | |
| 2.7.4 | The new construction director for MUDFA, Graeme Barclay, will start on Monday 19 th Mar and that an offer has been made to a new commercial director for MUDFA. SC confirmed that she is confident that the MUDFA team will be fully resourced up by end of March. | |
| 2.7.5 | <u>Ingliston Park & Ride (temp)</u> : SC gave an update on the progress on the reference design which is expected by end of March, with tender returns in April and mobilisation anticipated in June. It was also confirmed that Borders Constructions had accepted the claims against them and are progressing resolution of recent flooding issues and high wind damage. | |
| 2.7.6 | <u>Invasive species</u> : SC confirmed that bids for the treatment of invasive species had been received by 12 Mar and were undergoing evaluation. Following the tender evaluation, an update would be provided at the April DPD and an application for funds would be brought to the TPB. | Paper to April TPB provided |
| 2.7.7 | <u>Advanced Works</u> : SC stated that detailed scope had been prepared and passed to AMIS. Feedback is expected within 2 weeks. The programme review based on the detailed scope will include assessing the impact on commitments made for the project and the risk arising to the advance works strategy from the late issue of the GVD notices. | |
| 2.7.8 | SC confirmed that the current proposals are not yet at max. height. She stated that discussions were ongoing with BAA and letters were to be written to request their feedback on a proposed design height of 750mm. | |
| | | |
| 2.8 | Key milestones – next period | |
| 2.8.1 | WG confirmed that TS was keen for the MUDFA trial to go ahead as programmed on 2 April. | |
| 2.8.2 | The DPD raised the question on the current status of the Functional Spec (FS). SC confirmed that any changes to the FS would be brought to the TPB for approval as it represents a change to the project baseline. WG requested a paper to the next DPD setting out the current status of the FS, the mechanism of keeping it up-to-date, and how the project will ensure its readiness for the next Gateway review. | TC |
| 2.9 | Key issues and Concerns | |
| 2.9.1 | <u>Land & Property</u> : questions were raised regarding asset ownership matters – TC and DF to discuss off-line. | TC/DF |
| 2.9.2 | <u>MUDFA</u> : AR questioned the impact of the delay in the ministerial announcement and subsequent delays of the land acquisitions on the MUDFA programme. SC confirmed the current reprioritisation is considering the impacts and that work at the Depot provides some flexibility for the programme. | |
| 2.9.3 | NR / BC stated they expected clearer understanding of the programme and impacts on bus by end of March. NR highlighted the risk of major disruptions arising from MUDFA. WG confirmed that a workshop would | |

| | | |
|---------|---|--|
| | be held to gain clearer understanding of the events that led to major disruptions on the 2 March. SC confirmed that traffic impacts form part of the incident management procedures which are being developed at present. | |
| 2.10 | HSQE report was taken as read – no matters arising. | |
| 2.11 | Risk | |
| 2.11.1 | WG requested that the risk summary report would list those risks which have changed from the previous month's primary risk register. Otherwise the new reporting format was welcomed by the DPD. | Done - Proposal included in April report |
| 2.11.2 | Risk 139 – Utilities diversion outline spec from plans: issue of late design addressed by the current reprioritisation – the risk is expected to move to amber in April. | SC Due May |
| 2.11.3 | Risk 164 – Assets uncovered during construction: detailed work orders to firm up estimates depend on SDS design – based on current progress, the risk is expected to move to amber in April. | SC Due May |
| 2.11.4 | Risk 279 – 3rd party consents: works is ongoing, all parties are now engaged & no further slippage is anticipated – the risk is expected to move to amber in April. | TC |
| 2.11.5 | Risk 271 – CEC approvals: most issues are now at amber, with Constitutions St. being the key outstanding item – the risk is expected to move to amber in April | TC |
| 2.11.6 | Risk 911 – Scottish Power tunnel at Leith Walk: topical surveys to be carried out 19/20 March, the results of which will indicate if the risk can move to amber. Resolution of the ownership issues is also to be progressed by the project manager | SC - ongoing |
| 2.11.7 | Risk 870 – delayed design information for Infracore: risk is being addressed by current design re-prioritisation. WG requested detailed update on the next DPD. A further paper will be presented to the next TPB which will cover the new process for SDS design output review – this process will include workflow prioritisation. | DCr/TG |
| 2.11.8 | Risk 282 – procurement including high level of risk transfer: this risk is shown as green reflecting the progress made in resolving issues in the procurement process. | GG |
| 2.11.9 | Risk 916 - CEC contribution of £45m: WG requested the risk to be removed as CEC have confirmed their commitment to provide £45m funding. Any potential contribution by CEC above £45m would represent an opportunity which should be recorded as such. | TS/ CEC |
| 2.11.10 | Risk Register- general: GB requested a paper outlining the process for preparing the Primary Risk Register, including details of the quality control process applied. Additionally, detail on the meaning of flags in the report was to be provided. | Done for March TPB |
| 2.11.11 | Risk Register – programme risks: SB requested greater detail to be brought to the DPD the current status of slippages and risks. MC confirmed this detail will be available once the current programme review & reprioritisation is completed. | MC |

| | | |
|------------|--|-----|
| 2.12 | Financial Report | |
| 2.12.1 | The finance report was taken as read, confirming current AFC at £592m. | |
| 2.12.2 | Final Business Case: SMcG explained that TS had confirmed that comments on the DFBC would be provided by 31 Mar. | |
| 2.12.3 | Potential Claims: SB queried whether the current budget would cover any anticipated claims. MC confirmed that early claims would be discussed on 16 Mar. SMcG confirmed that any accepted claims would be progressed through the established approval process. | |
| | | |
| 3.0 | Infraco / Tramco sub-committee | |
| 3.1 | GG presented the paper outlining arrangements for the proposed TPB sub-committee. WG requested that a 30 min slot would be added to the current TPB meeting where the any papers for approval could be presented to a limited TPB membership. The papers would be taken as read and they would receive formal approval. Membership of that group would be limited to DJM, WG, NR, BC, JS and senior representatives of TS/CEC. | |
| 3.2 | JP raised the question of what governance would apply to the process. WG confirmed that the proper performance of the approved board sub-committee together with the assurance from the project team that due processes were followed would satisfy the governance requirements. | |
| | | |
| 4.0 | Value Engineering | |
| 4.1 | GG presented the paper and confirmed that the current expected savings represent anticipated results from the bidder negotiations as well as scope changes. | |
| 4.2 | The question was raised on who has responsibility for realising the savings and how the current list would be edited down. GG confirmed that most of the savings relate to engineering solutions which would have to be resolved before being built into the bids. This included re-assessing previously discounted items such as ballasted track if new technological solutions could be found. | |
| 4.3 | MC confirmed that the VE savings are subject to the same governance as all other project changes. This includes assessment of any potential risk impacts. The process was lead by MC / GG, thus providing a link to the Infraco bid process. | |
| 4.4 | The DPD members were requested to update respective TPB members of the details of the VE exercise to focus the discussion at the TPB. | All |
| | | |
| 5.0 | TRO process | |
| 5.1 | General: KR provided an update on the current progress of the strategy. He confirmed that the project was still pressing for a change in the current legislation on public hearings and a meeting was arranged between AH and John Ewing for 16 Mar. | |
| 5.2 | KR stated that even though there may be little appetite within TS to progress any changes to the legislation pre-elections, promoting the | |

| | | |
|------------|--|--|
| | matter in June 08 (based on likely timescales for legislative changes), this was preferable to basing public hearings on designs which were not fully mature by the time of submission. Therefore current activities were focussing on laying the foundation to progress the matter post-election. | |
| 5.3 | KR confirmed that receiving design sign-off is critical in assessing whether the TRO strategy can work – KR to present the proposed TRO strategy to the April DPD. | Paper to April TPB |
| 5.4 | JRC / SDS modelling scope: AS presented the paper outlining the scope issues and project modelling requirements. The DPD recognised the need to undertake the work and recognised that the proposal to contract JRC for the work may result in a dispute with SDS. | |
| 5.5 | GB requested details on how firm the projected costs are. AS stated the change the current estimate of £385k would result in a net increase of £150k to the total JRC budget due to previous change requests already approved. The current quote related to a fixed number of modelling iterations, however AS remained confident this would cover the work necessary to support the TRO process as well as providing updates for the Final Business Case. | |
| 5.6 | AS also confirmed that the quote covered traffic modelling only – not design impact. MC stated that these impacts are part of the ongoing negotiations with SDS. | |
| 5.7 | Questions were raised whether further costs would arise from KR's work and wider area modelling. AS confirmed that the proposed budget increase would increase the £figures assumed in the DFBC as would any other costs arising. | |
| 5.8 | WG requested that a comprehensive analysis of the likely costs would be undertaken and the total to come to the TPB under the approved change process. Additionally, modelling & wider area impact assessments are to be part of the TRO strategy to be presented to the April TPB. | Done |
| 6.0 | Design Assurance | |
| 6.1 | TG presented the paper outlining the proposed key changes to the design approval process. SR confirmed that key elements of the new process are the introduction of stakeholders earlier into the approval process to allow better anticipation and resolution of issues. It further was confirmed that the proposal represents a tried and tested approach in the industry which sits well with international best practice. | |
| 6.2 | SB requested that the paper would be updated for the TPB to include details of the sign-off process by stakeholders. This was done | TG/MC |
| 6.3 | WG requested further assurance that the process works in practice, particularly given the history of design issues. An independent, 1time audit, led by SB, should be performed on the process – not the outputs. The programme is being developed currently. | TG/DCr/SB Audit programme being arranged |

| | | |
|------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 6.4 | AR requested that TEL would be included in the consultation process of changing the process in specific areas. Meeting set up for Messrs Richards/Glazebrook to discuss this on Tues 3 rd April. | TG/ AR |
| 6.5 | GB requested detail on the impact on the budget arising from the change – SMcG / MT to provide. | Included in progress report |
| | | |
| 7.0 | Critical Issues | |
| 7.1 | SR presented the current status of critical design issues. He confirmed that focus was given to avoid adding any new items to the established list. | |
| 7.2 | GB requested details of likely budget implications arising from the resolution of the critical issues. TC confirmed that most would be covered by the approved Charette changes as included in the DFBC, MC confirmed that any items not yet covered in the budget would go through the change process. It was confirmed that the critical issues should be grouped by indicative groups according to the criticality. | MC/ SR |
| 7.3 | BC presented updates on the design issues in relation to Foot of Leith Walk, Constitution Street, Haymarket and York Place. Progress was confirmed on all issues, although WG expressed his disappointment at the issue at York Place not having been recognised earlier. Updates on the papers to be provided | BC/TC |
| | | |
| 8.0 | Forth Ports (FP) Interface issues | |
| 8.1 | SC presented the paper outlining the current interface issues with FP and the requirements for FP to fund additional design and construction costs. | |
| 8.2 | NR raised concerns that the proposals had not been reviewed by TEL – WG confirmed that TEL approval would be required before the paper could be presented to the TPB for approval. | SC / BC/NR |
| 8.3 | SB raised concerns of potential risks arising from accepting FP's proposal which has not yet received outline planning consent. TC raised the concern that tie may be caught in the negotiations between FP and CEC while at the same time there was a programme imperative to progress the matter. TC to prepare a summary paper on the issues / risks and likely impacts of the issue of the April DPD. | TC |
| | | |
| 9.0 | OCIP update | |
| 9.1 | MB presented the update paper which outlined the proposal to commence the utility diversion under AMIS group insurance policy and deferring the start of the OCIP until Infraco award. GG confirmed that the current phase of negotiations with the Infraco bidders would not allow for sufficient detail to be released to the insurance providers to commence an effective OCIP. MB to update the paper for the likely costs impact for the TPB | MB |
| | | |

| | | |
|-------------|---|------|
| 10.0 | Stakeholder reporting | |
| 10.1 | A paper outlining the key issues in relation to the TS reporting requirements is to be presented to the TPB. | Done |
| | | |
| 11.0 | AOB | |
| 11.1 | SB provided a summary of the changes to CDM, particularly in relation to changes to client roles for tie and TEL. SB to prepare an outline paper fro the April DPD / TPB. | SB |

Prepared by: Miriam Thorne

Date: 20 Mar. 07

1.0 Executive Summary

1.1 Previous Period Update

1.1.1 Engineering

- SDS design is proceeding closely to the recently agreed revised programme. Preliminary design has now been accepted and detailed design is approx. 50% complete on average. Several critical design issues have been resolved in the period to enable progress to be maintained. However, continued focus on critical items resolution is required to avoid subsequent delay. To this end, further critical items resolution meetings are planned to the end of April.
- As a result of resolutions passed at recent TPB meetings, some work packages have been passed to Network Rail for their implementation (e.g. infrastructure system immunisation and equipment relocation), and handover meetings have been held to facilitate this. Contractual arrangements however, are not yet in place and conclusion of these are actively being sought.
- The design review process has been refined to capitalise upon the self-assurance processes which are inherently part of the SDS contract.
- The Project Safety Certification Committee is active and oversees system and operational safety issues, directly linking into statutory processes.

1.1.2 Traffic Management

- Significant progress has been made in discussions with the Scottish Executive. The aim is to change Scottish Traffic Order Regulations in relation to mandatory public hearings on TRO core measures for schemes which have already received Parliamentary Approval. If not changed, this could create a legal risk for the tram project. Confirmation was received during the period that the Scottish Executive are prepared to go out for consultation on an amendment to the Regulation.

1.1.3 Commercial and Procurement

- Infraco
Further information updates were provided to the bidders to support the return of Consolidated Proposals due back in Period 2. This information drop included more detailed design information on structures to assist in refining and reducing allowances for structures in the bids.
- Tramco
The number of bidders was reduced from 4 to 2, with Alstom and CAF being chosen. Evaluation and negotiations with the two bidders are continuing.

- **Advance Works**
Tenders were received for the treatment of invasive species. These are currently being evaluated but early indications are that the proposed methodology for treatment of invasive species may reduce the anticipated costs.

AMIS have provided proposals for the advance clearance of vegetation and removal of earth bunds work at the Gogar Depot. These proposals are currently being evaluated and a decision on the award of the contracts will be made in early Period 1.

- **OCIP**
A decision was taken during the period to delay the commencement of the OCIP into 07/08. The reason for this delay is the Insurers requirements for detailed project information which conflicts with the commercial sensitivity around the current stage of the Infraco Tender negotiations. The required information can be provided to the Insurers once the Infraco procurement has reached preferred bidder stage which will allow the OCIP to start prior to the main MUDFA works in the summer. The trial works under MUDFA are being covered under AMIS's global insurance cover.

1.1.4 Delivery

- **MUDFA**
The strategic MUDFA programme was updated to take account of the re-phasing for Phase 1b and the Statutory Utilities approvals.

Mobilisation for the works on the trial site on 02 April continued and a number of controls procedures were established and implemented to manage works orders and design progress.

- **Ingliston Park & Ride (temporary)**
Costs were obtained for these works from AMIS. These are currently being evaluated and subject to a Value for Money test before award of the works during Period 1.
- **Land & Property**
Following the ministerial announcement for funding, the 2nd GVD notices for the first tranche of land acquisitions were issued.

1.1.5 Finance & Business Case

- The ministerial announcement giving approval for the next stage of the project was received on 16th March. Following the announcement, the grant letter for

funding was issued by TS to CEC to allow the continued development and procurement of Phase 1a of the Edinburgh Tram Network, Advance Works, land acquisition and utilities diversions needed for that phase.

1.2 Key Issues for forthcoming period

1.2.2 Engineering

- Focus will be on the close-out of the remaining critical design issues.
- The self-assured design review process will continue to be refined and outputs will be monitored. Recent organisational rearrangement and imminent staff co-location will facilitate better liaison between CEC, TEL, Transdev and SDS. Close liaison is being maintained with all stakeholders to derive optimal designs that are acceptable, constructable and operable, and that will fit the desired streetscape design ethos.
- The Stray Current Working Party will commence operations shortly – its purpose being to interact with all of the affected utilities to plan effectively for corrosion-preventive measures for buried services or structures

1.2.3 Traffic Management

- A comprehensive strategy for the management of TRO's is being prepared and will be presented to the TPB in Period 1.
- Based on satisfactory progress of the re-calibration of the traffic model, a comprehensive first run populated with the key design features will be undertaken during Period 1, subject to sign off of the PD 2 stage Tram design as acceptable.

1.2.4 Commercial and Procurement

- Infraco
Discussions and negotiations will continue during Period 1 to support the return of Consolidated Proposals in Period 2.
- Tramco
No major milestone are planned for the period.
- Advance Works
A detailed procurement plan will be developed for the remaining Advance Works, advance piling works and other activities to relieve Infraco programme pressures.

1.2.5 Delivery

- MUDFA
The MUDFA trial dig is set to commence on 2nd April.
The re-phased Strategic programme to take account of the delay to Phase 1b will be agreed during the period.

- **Advance Works**
Contract award and mobilisation of activities to commence Advance Works at the Gogar Depot, Ingliston Park & Ride temporary extension, badger sett construction and invasive species eradication.
- **Land & Property**
Following the issue of the 2nd GVD notices, title to the first tranche of land acquisition will be taken on 24 April.

1.2.6 Finance & Business Case

- Comments on the DFBC were received from TS on the 03rd of April. These will be reviewed during the period to provide a response and action plan.

1.3 Cost

1.3.2 Financial status

| COWD in current month 06/07 | | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| | Month £k (Incremental) | Current Actual £k (Cumulative) | Previous Forecast £k (Cumulative) | Variance £k (Current minus previous) |
| Phase 1a | £2,825 | £30,431 | £31,417 | (£986) |
| Phase 1b | £ 520 | £ 1,047 | £ 1,047 | - |
| Phase 1a+1b | £3,345 | £31,478 | £32,464 | (£986) |
| AFC – Current Financial year position to Mar 07 | | | | |
| | Approved Budget £k | Current Forecast £k | Previous Forecast £k | Variance £k (Current minus previous) |
| Phase 1a | £42,994 | £30,431 | £31,417 | (£986) |
| Phase 1b | £ 1,047 | £ 1,047 | £ 1,047 | - |
| Phase 1a+1b | £44,041 | £31,478 | £32,464 | (£986) |
| AFC – Anticipated Final Cost | | | | |
| | Funding £k | Current Forecast £k | Previous Forecast £k | Variance £k (Current minus previous) |
| Phase 1a | £545,000 | £501,755 | £500,500 | £1,255 |
| Phase 1b | £0 | £ 92,000 | £ 92,000 | - |
| Phase 1a+1b | £545,000 | £593,755 | £592,500 | £1,255 |

*Approved Budget to end Mar 07, reflecting new Approved Funding Paper (Nov06)

Notes on Variances

- The current financial year end VOWD forecast has reduced to £31.5m. The variance against the budgeted figure is primarily due to the deferral of land purchase pending Ministerial endorsement of the grant funding for 07/08, the delay in taking out the OCIP for construction works and the deferral of the advanced payment for BT utility works.
- The current AFC for the scheme is £501.755m for Phase 1a and £593.755m for Phase 1a + 1b. This represents an increase of £1.255m, relating primarily to approved changes for CEC resource costs to support the development of the project and increased JRC modelling costs.
- Anticipated changes totalling £1.2m have been identified but are not included in the current AFC. Given the tight probity requirements in respect of the current major procurements, any changes to the AFC are reported against the AFC as detailed in the Draft Final Business Case (DFBC). The AFC will be updated and advised to the Board Procurement Sub Committee with the emerging evaluation and negotiation programme.

- Note:- Delivery of the AFC for Phase 1a within the Current Forecast is contingent on achieving negotiation and value engineering savings.

1.4 Health, Safety, Environment and Quality

1.4.2 Safety

- There have been **zero** accidents in the period. One safety alert was issued in relation to two **minor**, office-based accidents, which occurred in the previous period.
- Safety tours are continuing, these are currently primarily office-based. 7 unsafe conditions have been identified and are being addressed.
- A meeting with the HSE Inspector was held to discuss the MUDFA programme and further, regular meetings are being scheduled.

1.4.3 Quality

- No quality system audits were planned for this period. A draft audit schedule has been prepared and is being reviewed. This will be implemented from the next period.
- No non-conformance reports (NCRs) were raised in the period and there are no outstanding NCRs.
- The project management plans and procedures continue to be developed. An external audit is planned on the 5th March and all plans and procedures are to be in place prior to this.

1.4.4 Environment

- There were no environmental incidents in the period.
- There are no other environmental issues to report.

1.5 Stakeholder and Communication

- The Stakeholder and Communications strategies, as documented in the DFBC, are continuing to be delivered.
- During the previous period, residents and business packs were issued in relation to the MUDFA trial site and support will be provided during the trial dig in line with the conditions of the pre-election Purdah period.
- A tram helpline number was established and is now operational.

1.6 Approvals required

1.6.2 Items for information – papers submitted to TPB

- Value Engineering paper (To follow for special TPB)
- Risk Map for principal contracts

1.6.3 Decisions required from TPB

- Approval of the proposals for the process for settling the historic SDS commercial issues
- Resolution of project reporting timetable
- Approval of Depot Advance Works contract award
- Approval of Invasive Species contract award
- Decision on Ingliston P&R Phase2 affordability and Infraco interface

1.6.4 Decisions/ support required from TS

- Clarification of funding / process to achieve for funding for whole of 07/08
- Letter of comfort to Infraco bidders
- Confirmation of funding draw-down to permit confirmation of payment arrangements to bidders
- Resolution of the TS/CEC funding and risk sharing agreements

1.6.5 Decisions/ support required from CEC

- Resolution of the TS/CEC funding and risk sharing agreements

1.6.6 Decisions / support required from others n/a

2.0 Progress

2.1 General/Overall

- Land & Property acquisitions
Following ministerial approval on 16th March 2007 the GVD (General Vesting Declaration) notices were issued w/c 26th March for land take in Tranche 1 of Phase 1a.
- Network Rail (NR)
Discussions proceeding with NR with regard to Immunisation programme dates. Possession dates that are already booked have been shared with the Infracore bidders. Submissions for 2009 are due in June 2007.
- OCIP (Owner Controlled Insurance Policy)
A change in the commencement date for the OCIP was endorsed by the Tram Project Board.
AMIS will cover all MUDFA contract works (up to the point that OCIP is effected) under AMIS Group Insurances. This will include the MUDFA trial works and planned minor works associated with GI at Depot site and preparations for extended Ingliston Park & Ride.
The OCIP is intended to be put in place for the commencement of the 'main' MUDFA works which will now be early July. Current activities include further clarification of cover and policy wording with insurers as well as reviewing / developing an acceptable programme for the response to information requests by the insurers

2.2 Procurement Consultant

- General Management and Services during the preparation and negotiations leading to contract award.
 - Continued progress was made in recruiting directly employed personnel in accordance with the Project Resourcing plan.

2.3 Design

- System Design Services (All Preliminary and Detailed Design Informing Programme and Costs)
 - Parsons Brinckerhoff submitted version 13 of the Design schedule. This is currently being analysed for changes against the previous version.
 - AMIS delivered Version 4 of the MUDFA programme (Strategic Programme)

2.4 Financial/Funding/Procurement Strategy

- JRC Costs and Modelling.
 - Modelling continues with JRC due to submit Traffic Modelling Update report to tie (and approval from CEC) by 25th May.

2.5 Parliamentary Process/Approvals

This phase is now complete.

2.6 Procurement Construction Works

- Negotiations are ongoing with both Infraco bidders through a series of Technical/Programme and Commercial meetings. These support building of confidence that current Master programme is robust when compared to bidders submittals.
- Negotiations and Award of Contracts
 - Tramco – Ongoing: negotiation is now with the two approved bidders. Return of consolidated proposals awaited in early May to inform Infraco contract.
 - Infraco - Ongoing reviews with Infraco bidders with a view to reduce to preferred bidder.
 - Ingliston P&R Phase 2 – Expressions of Interest due back 12th April, Tender issue 27th April

2.7 Construction Works

- MUDFA (Utilities) construction schedule Rev.04 (Strategic Programme) reviewed and agreed with AMIS and Major Stakeholders (CEC/TEL) Friday 30th March.

2.8 Testing & Commissioning

This phase has not yet commenced

2.9 Handing Over and Service Operations

This phase has not yet commenced

2.10 Network Output Programme Interface (with Transport Scotland)

This phase has not yet commenced

2.11 Interface with other Projects

Close liaison with EARL continued. The period focussed on the development of unified approach to design and programme for utilities works at the Edinburgh Airport for Tram and EARL.

Discussions continued with Network Rail and TS to ensure programme alignment with the Airdrie – Bathgate project for the necessary immunisation works.

3.0 Headline Cost Report

3.1 Current Financial Year

| | COWD (YTD) | COWD YTD + f/cast to year end | Funding TS Authorised Current year |
|-------------|------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Phase 1a | £30,431m | £30,431m | £44,041m |
| Phase 1b | £1,047m | £1,047m | Incl above |
| Phase 1a+1b | £31,478m | £31,478m | £44,041m |

- The COWD is £12.6m less than the funding due to:
 1. The delay in ministerial announcement resulting in delay to issue of the GVD notices for land purchase – (£10.7m). Funding is to be rolled over into financial year 07/08.
 2. Deferral of the advance (initial) payment for utility diversion work by BT. This payment is now aligned to the re-phased utility programme, thus the payment will be made in June for work to be undertaken in July – (£1.2m)
 3. OCIP – The Owner Controlled Insurance Policy placement for MUDFA has been deferred to coincide with commencement of on street works (£0.9m)
 4. Other minor changes – (£0.3m)

3.2 Next Financial Year

| | Quarter 1 | Quarter 2 | Quarter 3 | Quarter 4 | Total FYF |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Phase 1a | £17.10m | £25.98m | £30.14m | £44.96m | £118.18m |
| Phase 1b | £0.90m | £0.21m | £0.10m | £0.21m | £1.42m |
| Phase 1a + 1b | £18.00m | £26.19m | £30.24m | £45.17m | £119.6m |

- The forecast for next year includes £20.2m in respect of land purchases. This includes £7.3m for land provided by CEC / s75
- The FYF forecast will be sensitive to the progress of the Infraco and Tramco procurements and hence the start date for Infraco physical works. For example a delay in the award of Infraco by say 4 months would result in a reduction in FYF of approximately £6.7m. The FYF will also be sensitive to the extent of Advance Works undertaken prior award of Infraco. An increase in the volume of this work would to a limited degree mitigate the reduction in FYF.

3.3 Total Project Anticipated Outturn versus Total Project Funding

| | FUNDING (Phase 1a) | | | Total COST (1a) (To Funders) |
|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------|---------------------------------|
| | TS | Other (CEC / s75) | Total | Promoter TOTAL AFC |
| Phase 1a | £500m | £45m ¹ | £545m | £501.8m |
| Phase 1b | £0m | £3.3m ³ | £3.3m | £ 92.0m ² |
| Phase 1a + 1b | £500m | £48.3m | £548.3m | £593.8m |

1. Includes £7.3m of CEC / s75 free issue land
2. Includes £2.5m of design costs for Phase 1b, to be expended against Phase 1a funding.
3. Represents £3.3m for CEC / s75 free issue land

Phase 1a AFC is higher than the DFBC Baseline of £500m due to two authorised change orders:-

1. CEC resources allocated to Tram Project - £0.8m
2. Additional JRC modelling for wide area impacts - £0.2m

The balance of £0.8m is due to rounding within the underlying baseline figures.

3.4 Change Control

The current change control position is summarised in the table below.

| | Phase 1a £m | Phase 1b £m | Phase 1a + 1b £m |
|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------|
| Project Baseline (DFBC) | 500.8 | 92.0 | 592.8 |
| Authorised Changes | 1.0 | - | 1.0 |
| Current AFC | 501.8 | 92.0 | 593.8 |
| Anticipated Changes | 1.2 | - | 1.2 |
| Potential AFC | 503.0 | 92.0 | 595.0 |

Note:- Anticipated Changes are not included in the AFC reported at 3.3 above.

Details of the Authorised Changes and Anticipated Changes are included in Appendix B.

A number of Anticipated Changes relate to items excluded from the Preliminary Design Stage Project Estimate Update following a review undertaken at that time. Inclusion of these items in the scheme will result in an increase in the AFC requiring either additional funding or increased savings through value engineering savings to maintain affordability.

It is proposed that these Anticipated Changes are reviewed in conjunction with the forthcoming recommendation for Value Engineering Package 1 savings. (See Opportunities)

3.5 Summary Breakdown

Original Estimate (including escalation) From DFBC

| | Base Cost | Risk | Opportunity | OB | (or)Contingency | Total |
|---------------|-----------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
| Phase 1a | £449.1m | £51.4m | £0 ¹ | £0 ² | £0 ³ | £500.5m |
| Phase 1b | £80.5m | £11.5m | £0 ¹ | £0 ² | £0 ³ | £ 92.0m |
| Phase 1a + 1b | £529.6m | £62.9m | £0 ¹ | £0 ² | £0 ³ | £592.5m |

Latest Estimate/AFC (including escalation)

| | Base Cost | Risk | Opportunity | OB | (or)Contingency | Total |
|---------------|-----------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------|
| Phase 1a | £450.4m | £51.4m | £0 ⁴ | £0 ² | £0 ³ | £501.8m |
| Phase 1b | £80.5m | £11.5m | £0 ⁴ | £0 ² | £0 ³ | £ 92.0m |
| Phase 1a + 1b | £530.9m | £62.9m | £0 ⁴ | £0 ² | £0 ³ | £593.8m |

Notes:-

1. Opportunities not identified at DFBC stage
2. OB included in Risk (QRA at P90 confidence level) as agreed with TS
3. Contingency included as part of Risk at present
4. Opportunities in Latest Estimate /AFC – Savings targeted through the current value engineering exercise and negotiation strategy to maintain affordability.
5. Includes Authorised Changes

4.0 Time Schedule Report

4.1 Key Milestones

Milestones taken from DFBC:

| Milestones | Date | Date |
|---|-------------|---------------|
| Approval of Draft Final Business Case by CEC | 21 Dec 06 | 21 Dec 06A ✓ |
| Approval of Draft Final Business Case by Transport Minister – approval and funding for utility diversions | 15 Feb 06 | 16 Mar 07A |
| TRO process commences | 13 March 07 | 17 Jul 07 |
| Tramco - complete initial evaluation/negotiation | 19 Mar 07 | 09 Mar 07A |
| MUDFA - completion of pre-construction period of MUDFA contract | 02 Apr 07 | 30 Mar 07A |
| MUDFA - commencement of utility diversions | Apr 07 | 02 Apr 07A |
| Infraco – return of stage 2 bids | 05 April 07 | 18 May 07 |
| Tramco - appointment of Preferred Bidder | 10 May 07 | TBA |
| Infraco - completion of evaluation/negotiation of bid | 10 May 07 | TBA |
| Infraco - appointment of Preferred Bidder. | 10 May 07 | TBA |
| Tramco/Infraco - facilitation of novation negotiation complete | 07 Jun 07 | TBA |
| Tramco/Infraco - final negotiation and appointment | 19 Jul 07 | TBA |
| Infraco - negotiation of Phase 1b complete. | 13 Sep 07 | 13 Sep 07 |
| Approval of Final Business Case by CEC and Transport Scotland – approval and funding for Infraco / Tramco | 27 Sep 07 | TBA |
| Tramco/Infraco - award following CEC/TS approval & cooling off period. | 11 Oct 07 | TBA |
| Construction commences on Phase 1a | 07 Dec 07 | TBA |
| TRO process complete | 17 July 08 | TBA |
| Construction commences on Phase 1b | 29 Jun 09 | ◆ 29 Jun 09 ✓ |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|------------|---------------|
| Construction complete Phase 1a | 08 July 10 | ◆08 July 10 ✓ |
| Operations commence Phase 1a | Dec 10 | ◆Dec 10 ✓ |
| Construction complete Phase 1b | 11 July 11 | ◆11 July 11 ✓ |
| Operations commence Phase 1b | Dec 11 | ◆Dec 11 ✓ |

◆Note that these dates will be subject to change following the programme re-prioritisation and reviews of bidders programmes are complete. Dates that are likely to be affected are flagged in red.

Note:- The Baseline Programme is that included within the Draft Final Business Case

Guidance for Completion:

Legend for colouring of Act/Fcast date text

- Green:** Act/Fcast date is ahead or in line with baseline
- Yellow:** Slight slippage – readily recoverable with action.
- Red:** Notable/significant slippage – difficult to recover, even with action.

4.2 Key issues affecting schedule

- The following are on schedule, consistent with the baseline:-
 - Award of contract for de-vegetation at Gogar Depot site to prevent bird nesting.
 - Award of contract for Depot Advance Works (Phase 1 Earthworks removal at Gogar Depot Site).
 - Commencement of Invasive Species Treatment
- The following are subject to the programme review referred to above:-
 - Award of Infraco/Tramco contracts
 - SGN Procurement of long-lead items
- TRO Statutory Process impacting Infraco on-street commencement. Mitigations are currently being developed.
- Network Rail Immunisation – see comments in 2.1 above.

4.3 12 week look ahead

- The critical milestones for the next 12 weeks are:-
 - The completion of principle design milestones necessary to support the procurement process.
 - The appointment of Infraco and Tramco Preferred bidders.
- The programme in respect of these critical milestones is currently being reviewed to bring realignment between the procurement and design programmes.

5.0 Risk and Opportunities

5.1 Review Project Risk Register

5.1.2 For further information see the Project Primary Risk Register and detailed Risk Report.

5.1.3 The principal changes in the risk position since last Period are:-

- Risks closed 0
- Risks added 5
(Risks 935, 938, 936, 946, 947)
- Red status risk treatment dates slipped 1
(Risk 917)

5.1.4 Details of the red status risks treatments are set out in the Risk Report. The significant items and the proposed recovery plans are:-

| Risk ID | Description | Reason for red treatment status | Proposed recovery plan |
|---------|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| 917 | STAKEHOLDER RISK Source and level of funding and risk allocation for Network Rail Immunisation Works has not been established. | Criticality of immunisation works | Appointment of Immunisation Works Manager. Establish risks retained by each party for liability; Issue instruction to Network Rail to undertake works; Agree Immunisation Project Milestones; Establish funding contributions and respective budgets from TS/ NR /CEC /Other Projects. |
| 139/164 | PROJECT RISK Uncertainty of Utilities location and consequently required diversion work/ unforeseen utility services within LoD / Unknown or abandoned assets or unforeseen/contaminated ground conditions affect scope of MUDFA work | Behind Programme | Review design information and re-measure during design workshops with Utility Companies and MUDFA works. Develop PC Sums into quantified estimates. |

| Risk ID | Description | Reason for red treatment status | Proposed recovery plan |
|----------------|--|--|--|
| 270 | STAKEHOLDER RISK Uncertainty about requirements for wider areas modelling and need and extent of construction works required on road network | Behind Programme | Undertake traffic modelling and scope wider area network changes required. |
| 271 | PROJECT RISK Failure to reach agreement with CEC on various approvals areas | Behind Programme | See also actions to recover design programme referred to earlier in the report |
| 279 | PROJECT RISK Third party consents including Network Rail, CEC Planning, CEC Roads Department, Historic Scotland, Building Fixing Owner consent is denied or delayed | Behind Programme | CEC Planning - mock application by SDS |
| 280 | PROJECT RISK SDS deliverables are considered to be below quality levels required or late in production | Behind Programme | Apply new Design Approval Process including SDS Design Assurance. Apply output based measure of design progress. |
| 870 | PROJECT RISK Infraco does not have detail to achieve contract close | Behind Programme | Programme behind reviewed and updated to align procurement and design output. |
| 946 | PROJECT RISK Vegetation clearance Gogar Depot not achieved on time | Criticality of works for programme | Agree costs and issue Works package order to AMIS |
| 947 | Delay to start of Phase One Advanced Works at Gogar Depot | Criticality of works for programme | Agree costs and issue Works package order to AMIS for Phase 1 works |

5.2 Risk Action Plan for next period

3 new stakeholder risks were added to the Primary Risk Register. They all relate to the Immunisation Works project and have been added due to the criticality of this work to the Tram project.

- Risk 935 addresses the risk that Network Rail does not deliver the Immunisation Works on time, resulting in a critical delay to the Tram project. The treatment status for this risk is to hold regular progress meetings with TS and to prioritise the development of relevant Tram sections with Network Rail. (Risk owner: Damian Sharp / Tony Glazebrook)
- Risk 936 is concerned with the flow of information between the tram project and Network Rail which could lead to delays and increased costs if incorrect information was received by Network Rail. This risk will be addressed by the development of a Project Execution Plan for the works including governance, which clearly defines **tie**'s role in the communications line and gains early agreement on the information requirements between SDS and Network Rail. The treatment plan is currently behind the scheduled due date of 31 March. (Risk owner: Damian Sharp/ Steven Bell))
- Risk 938 relates to the lack of adequate resource availability within TS to manage the Immunisation Works. A key action being taken forward by **tie** is the recruitment of an Immunisation Works Project Manager who will be seconded to TS. (Risk owner: Damian Sharp / Steven Bell)

Note: The current significance of Risks 936 and 938 is not high in relation to other risks on the Primary Risk Register and feature only because of the criticality of the Immunisation Works. Therefore these risks are likely to “fall-off” the Primary Risk Register (although remain on ARM) as their treatment plans become more established.

5.3 Cost Quantitative Risk Analysis

Note:- QRA updated each Period. Details are available for inspection on request.

5.4 Schedule Quantitative Risk Analysis

Note:- To be provided for future reports.

5.5 Review Project Opportunity Register

Opportunities to achieve savings have been identified from the Value Engineering Programme – Package 1. The potential total value of these opportunities ranges between £24m-£35m. As agreed at the Tram DPD sub committee details of the individual items will be reviewed separately at the DPD meetings but will not be enclosed with Reports.

5.6 Opportunity Action Plan for next period

It is proposed that following conclusion of the evaluation of the impacts on DFBC of each group of savings items a recommendation will be provided for consideration agreement with the Tram Project Board.

5.7 Optimism Bias (and/or Contingency)

Note:- Optimism Bias included in Risk.

6.0 Health, Safety, Environment, Quality & Resources

6.1 Safety

6.1.1 There have been **two** minor accidents reported this period. The Accident Frequency rate (AFR) for the project is **zero**. Summary table below;

| Ref. | Accident/Incident Summary |
|-------|---|
| AIRR5 | 14/02/2007 No time lost. SDS employees' trousers caught on broken key in protruding from locked cupboard causing trousers to rip and gash to buttock. Immediate Action: Key removed from cupboard. Further Action: Review of all accidents to date and submit report. Update: report received but revisions required. |
| AIRR6 | 08/02/2007 No time lost. SDS employee cut finger while looking through lever arch file on the metal shutter part. No further action. |

6.1.2 There have been **17,525** hours recorded for the period of which **977** were for site work.

6.1.3 There were no Safety Tours recorded for the period. Current status of previous actions are in the table below;

| No. | Item Description | Actioned | Status |
|-----|---|----------------|--------|
| 1 | Campbell Skinner to be given HR induction – this includes H&S induction for Citypoint. | Geoff Gilbert | Closed |
| | Issue notification reminder to project management of the requirement for all new staff to receive HR induction. | Heather Manson | Open |
| | Ensure reception notifies visitors of fire safety arrangements. | Heather Manson | Closed |
| 2 | Tables stacked in kitchen area to be replaced. | Heather Manson | Open |
| 3 | Wires to be made safe. | Heather Manson | Closed |
| 4 | Desks in corridor (Fire escape route) to be removed. | Heather Manson | Closed |
| 5 | IT cables in McAdam Room to be secured/tidied. | Seamus Healy | Open |
| 6 | Brunel Room to contain only eight chairs (maximum number of persons | | Closed |

| | | | |
|---|--|----------------|------|
| | for meeting). | | |
| 7 | Review storage of materials in SDS area. | Billy Johnston | Open |

6.1.4 No Safety Alerts was issued this period.

6.1.5 A meeting with the HSE Inspector allocated to the Tram project took place. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the current Construction (Design and Management) arrangements and the approach to the revised CDM 2007.

6.1.6 Notification has been sent to the HMRI confirming that the Edinburgh Tram Project shall follow the Railways and other Guided Transport Systems Regulations route for 'approval'.

6.1.7 Utility design hazard information has been provided by SDS for the MUDFA works. However, it is of a generic nature and is not site specific in terms of residual hazards. A workshop with SDS and AMIS chaired by the Planning Supervisor has been organised for Monday 12th March to address the issue.

6.2 Environment

6.2.1 There were no environmental incidents in the period.

6.2.3 Concerns had been received from the CEC Archaeologist regarding the lack of archaeological management arrangements for the MUDFA works. This has been discussed with the CEC Archaeologist for the MUDFA works and areas of archaeological interest have been agreed and levels of archaeological watching brief defined. On-going meetings have been arranged with the CEC archaeologist.

6.3 Quality

6.3.1 One quality system audit was planned for this period. It has not been undertaken this period due to other work and has been re-programmed for next period.

6.3.2 No non-conformance reports (NCRs) were raised in the period and there are no outstanding NCRs.

6.3.4 The Health, Safety and Quality Management Plan and Environmental Management Plan are ready for approval. Supporting procedures have been drafted and are under review.

6.3.5 An external audit is was undertaken on the 5th March to 9th March by Scott-Moncrieff. A report will be submitted in due course.

6.4 Resource Management

See commentary against 2.2 above – Procurement Consultant

7.0 Stakeholder and Communication

7.1 Stakeholder Strategy/Plan

The communication strategy documented in the draft Final Business Case continues to be delivered.

A stakeholder workshop was held on the 22nd January '07 and the outcomes of this workshop are being developed. These outcomes will be reported back and discussed at a stakeholder away day in May. This will be supported by a full stakeholder relations team which will be in place by the end of April.

7.2 Communication Strategy/Plan

The communication strategy documented in the draft Final Business Case continues to be delivered.

Whilst detail of approach and messaging is reviewed on an ongoing day to day basis the strategy will be reviewed each quarter, with the next review due in June. Review of the strategy will take place at the monthly Communications meeting which is attended by CEC, TS, TEL, tie, Media House and Weber Shandwick.

It is, at the time of writing, the pre election period therefore works on communication and PR activity are effectively halted. Planning for delivery as per the strategy in May is underway.

7.3 Communication & Stakeholder matters arising from previous period

7.3.1 MUDFA trial site:

The resident and business packs were issued by the tram helper on 27th March. 150 packs in total were issued. The approach to the trial site will be minimal and low key, with signage only at the site itself providing the customer helpline number and web address. As the trial is taking place through the pre election period there are set guidelines for Communication and PR activities. The Communications, Stakeholder and AMIS teams are aware of the guidelines and are prepared should they be approached or asked questions.

7.3.2 Resource:

Steve Gorry started with **tie** on 19 March. Steve will deliver the Customer interfaces, kpi's, protocol and journeys for **tie** and our partners and is currently meeting everyone involved. Additionally, Mike Connelly has been successful in recruiting two new members of staff for the stakeholder team, who will concentrate on business and community stakeholders. The new staff members are due to start work in April.

7.3.3 Correspondence flow

A paper was sent to partner organisations in March highlighting key decisions needing to be made on the approach to customer care preferred by each organisation. Response has now been received and with decisions made, Steve Gorry will work with the organisations to deliver the customer care package. A detailed report on the customer flow and kpi's will be included in next month's paper.

7.3.4 Customer Interaction Cycle

The four week stakeholder packs including documentation and language panels have been received. The letters that go with the packs will be printed separately with site specific information. We still await the proof of the 8 week newsletter which will be issued for comment and approval before going to print.

7.3.5 Helpline number

The tram helpline number is 0131 623 8726. The system is now in operation.

7.3.6 Mobile Information Centre

The Tram/Bus remains in the wings and will be launched at the same time as the MUDFA programme and the customer support, following the trial site.

7.3.7 Site information

AMIS has informed **tie** that they will not use debris netting at each site due to wind hazards. Based on this decision we will revert to the signs showing the trams for Edinburgh logo, phone number and web address which will be erected in multiple positions at each site.

7.4 Communication & Stakeholder action plan for next period

Communication:

The four week tram action plan is attached. Specifics include:

7.4.1 Wider area signage and communications

- Whilst formulating the traffic management plans for MUDFA, wider area signage and wider area communications have been considered.
- In order to continue to communicate openly, it is recommended that the wider area signage is clearly branded with the Trams for Edinburgh logo. The exact design of these signs will be the subject of discussion and approval of the partners; however it will almost certainly be a monochrome version of the Trams for Edinburgh logo.
- Again, during the tram project, we have tried to communicate openly with all stakeholders, and this should be continued with regard to contact with frontagers on major diversion routes. Businesses and residents will need to be informed that their street will be a diversion route for a temporary period, and the effect this

will have. It is recommended that a specific leaflet is produced for these areas, giving clear information about the changes and where more information can be obtained. This will also be discussed with and approved by partners.

7.4.2 Incident Management Response – Comms/Stakeholder

- As part of the overall HSQE actions, an incident management response plan has been developed. Communications and Stakeholder incident management response is also documented and the on call function is now in place. Approach to incidents shall be assessed on an incident by incident basis as follows:
 - Self-contained, i.e. something which affects the tram scheme but has little or no impact on the general public.
 - External Impact which do impact the general public, usually immediately.