
From: Callander, Gordon
Sent: 20 December 2007 15:06
To: Ennion, Bruce
Cc: Dolan, Alan; Chandler, Jason; Reynolds, Steve; Morris, John
Subject: RE: EMC & Related Issues

Bruce,

Before addressing the points in your email, I wish to review the history of this matter.

Over 18 months ago I first raised this interface issue and other than a couple of acknowledging emails and a five minutes chat in City Point over the following month, almost nothing happened until November 06. I was asked to produce a paper on the issue which I did, subsequently attending a meeting with **tie** (at which Simon was present) where the paper was discussed. During the research period whilst producing my paper, I visited Edinburgh Signalling Centre to review the signalling records there. As most of the ones I required were not present, copies were requested from Network Rail Records Group. Those records received as a result of that request are the ones on the CD issued recently to **tie**.

Through most of 2007, nothing was done on this matter and indeed Simon Price was stood down by PB's ET Team last summer. In spite of this, Simon spent some of his own time tying up various loose ends.

In November this year when this matter became the hot topic is now is, Simon did work on the EMC issues including that of the ETN traction current interference but without any formal instruction, scope or specified deliverables. All he received was a text message with a task number. This is hardly a clear definition of scope, budget and deliverables. Everything that Simon has produced in the last few months has been on his own initiative AND RISK as PB would have been quite within their rights to refuse payment of invoices. Simon has advised me that he has, in fact, not invoiced for all the time has spent on the various EMC Management Plans he has produced. In fact he has been strongly criticised for even considering compiling an EMC Risk Register and discussing that topic with Angus Park.

I would point out that we Engineers are regularly taken to task, quite rightly, by PB Senior Managers when we work outside of an agreed scope, work without instruction to proceed and exceed budget.

Whilst there may be many reasons for acquiring a copy of Network Rail's Asset Register, for use in compiling the information that David Bradley needs, it is of little benefit. What is required are the signalling records and electrification traction bonding records. With a major project underway at Waverley, there will be NO up to date records housed in the Network Rail Records Group until the as-built records are lodged with them at the end of the project. I am uncertain if the records for the recently completed work at Haymarket are now available in Buchanan House. There certainly has been insufficient time elapsed since the meeting Network Rail/**tie**/PB on 24th October to order and receive let alone extract information from currently held signalling record drawings.

As **tie** has employed David Bradley to look into the track circuit issue, I am not prepared to have my very busy signalling design staff act as "gophers" for Mr Bradley. Any record drawing received will be passed on.

With respect to the document issued by Simon this week, I would point out that the document was only instructed - by telephone - last Wednesday. The document is the best that could be done with the information currently available to Simon. If a comprehensively researched document is required, then sufficient time and budget must be provided. A delivery date of late February 08 would be realistic, subject to all the required information being available from Network Rail and their Contractor(s) early next month.

A site visit to check on track relay pin code or type is not necessary as that information is shown on the signalling records as it is a fundamental part of the installation design.

I have asked Simon for an estimate for the hours required for updating the document and once the budget for that work is agreed, then he can carry out the updates as requested.

I would also point out that although **tie** have invited Simon to the meeting of the 30th January, PB have not. Without an instruction to attend, Simon will not be there.


Regards,

Gordon Callander FIRSE

Head of Signalling & Systems

PB
46 George Street
Croydon U.K.
CR0 1PB

tel: 0 [REDACTED]
fax: 0 [REDACTED]
mob: 0 [REDACTED]

 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

From: Ennion, Bruce
Sent: 19 December 2007 10:52
To: Callander, Gordon
Cc: Dolan, Alan; Chandler, Jason; Reynolds, Steve
Subject: EMC & Related Issues

Gordon

Being a recipient of my Email to Simon you will have seen our serious disappointment with the quality and content of the urgently awaited, and now long overdue, Network Rail Asset Report.

We are increasingly very concerned at the performance, or lack of performance, in respect of this and other related issues and seek information from you in respect of a number of aspects in an attempt to protect PB (SDS) from ever increasing criticism from our client.

You are aware that **tie** have resorted to requesting SDS modelling work be carried out by David Bradley - see Colin Kerr Email 21.11.07 to Simon, Les Brunton and yourself.

See also attached copy of **tie** letter dated 22nd November 2007 the receipt of which I consider to be an embarrassment to a company of the standing of PB.

It should also be noted that **tie** are of the opinion such costs are down to the SDS account

<< File: UKPB1-#77570-v1-Letter_from_tie_re_EMCC_Outstanding_Issues_22_Nov_07.PDF >>

See also the last sentence in this **tie** letter

I seek your opinion as to the situation PB/SDS are currently faced with including your opinion of the following:-

- Have we been able to answer David's Bradley's questions or are there still outstanding issues - see his Email to Simon, Les Brunton and yourself dated 02.12.07 timed at 18.47Hrs.? See also Simons Email to Jon Yarker 14.12.07 timed at 15.14Hrs item 2 refers.
- What is the standing of the set of NR Drawings issued to **tie** and in turn David Bradley as a response to some of his questions?
- Bearing in mind Simons recent insistence that he is allocated a job number and has claimed he was unable to progress without one are you able to advise under which job number he attended the NR Meeting in Glasgow, visited NR following that meeting as was agreed by him at the meeting and has produced the miscellanea of EMC Documents to date?
- Have PB formally requested the RAR (now MIMS or ELIPSE0 within 3Km of the ETN as requested by Simon to Jon Yarker in his Email 14.12.07 timed at 15.14Hrs.If so when and by who to who?

- Have any arrangements been made for the further site visit mentioned in Simons Email - Item 5 refers?
-

As I am sure you will appreciate PB/SDS are now in a very difficult and potentially expensive position and I request you seek a progress report from Simon by return advising us where his two outstanding updated reports stand. These were declared essential weeks ago and the updates should not take more than a few minutes to accommodate for their immediate issue to tie.

Please also be advised that I have been instructed to seek estimates from others to contribute to the production of these urgently required and long outstanding matters. These will be the subject of discussion with you once we receive a response..

Regards

Bruce