

SDS Internal notes.

At the request of Jason and Steve I attended a meeting with **tie** and BBS yesterday (Wednesday 2<sup>nd</sup> April) at which the objective appeared to be to provide BBS with the opportunity to elaborate on a concern they had previously expressed to **tie** in respect of their Construction Programme and to seek ways to ensure SDS are able to 'drip feed' elements of their Infrastructure design to BBS in advance any of the necessary SDS Design Assurance processes.

### **Attendees**

Tony Glazebrook, Susan Clarke, Stephen Bell (Part time) - **tie**

Scott Mc Fadzen. Daniel Goedecke, Roland Bruckmann - BBS/Siemens

Sinead Scott – Transdev.

Bruce Ennion - SDS.

### **Comments & Observations** – *Not in any order or sequence.*

1. During the meeting BBS made a number of references to their review and commentary on the **tie** Design Management Plan apparently provided to **tie** which apparently included a BBS suggested flow chart covering Design Review Activities. This documentation was retained at the other side of the table and not seen by me nor, I understand, has it been offered to SDS for comment even though it reflects proposals for the review of 'Designs'
2. BBS did emphasise that their proposals submitted to and being considered by **tie** did not reflect the BBS acknowledged need for SDS to carry out their own review of their designs as part of the SDS Quality Control Procedures.
3. BBS advised the meeting that they believe circumstances had changed as the result of the present procurement situation. BBS believe that the original **tie** proposal was to produce 'design' in advance of 'construction' however in order for BBS to achieve the requirements of the **tie** construction programme it would now be necessary for 'design' to progress in parallel with 'construction'.

BBS are also concerned that 90% of the SDS 'design' may be held pending the completion of the last 10% and the associated SDS Assurance process.

345 SDS design elements but only 35 SDS Deliverables

SDS responded by pointing out that the implications of incorporating this last 10% may have an impact of the earlier 90% and this was a matter of ownership of risk.

On a number of occasions SDS emphasised that their SDS Infrastructure design was progressing based upon the SDS interpretation of the requirements **tie** desired and had reviewed.

4. Both SDS and BBS emphasised to **tie** as to the implications of the early release of information should subsequent design warrant changes in the information issued. Somebody must be responsible and BBS proposed that this can only be **tie**.

BBS want **tie** to 'stand behind' SDS design information released early to BBS.

5. BBS also emphasised to **tie** that they consider **tie** have responsibilities resulting from the application of the **tie** Design Review process and that BBS would not be responsible for any changes in **ties** requirements once **tie** have carried out a design review. **ties** response was that they are not intending to review all elements of the works. BBS repeated their understanding and remained of the opinion whether **tie** chose to review or not however during subsequent discussion BBS accepted that any error or non-compliance with the ER's would be their responsibility.
6. Susan Clarke then used the example of the Haymarket Viaduct as a location where she considered SDS could issue elements of their detail design in advance of their Design Assurance. SDS responded by confirming to the meeting that a number of elements of 'design' are the responsibility of BBS/Siemens in as much as they are responsible for the design of the Systems. It follows that SDS are unable to assure the Substation elements of their Haymarket design until they are able to see that their proposals will meet the requirements of the systems and equipment to be contained therein. In simple terms SDS are responsible for the design of the Infrastructure.

Similar examples include tramstop where BBS are providing the tramstop shelters and tramstop furniture.

Susan responded by asking when SDS would be advising of their requirements and SDS answered by confirming with Susan that SDS had informed **tie** as information was included as result of their review of the ER's and more recently as the result of their review of the BBS/Siemens bid. Later in the meeting Stephen Bell acknowledged this and confirmed with the meeting that Andy Steel was at that moment reviewing the SDS documentation.

- 7 SDS pointed out the implications to the planning and approval process that could impact on progress resulting in changes to their ongoing Infrastructure Design which as mentioned earlier in the discussions, reflected the SDS understanding of **ties** requirements. Should BBS offer different elements e.g. Tramstop shelters etc then this could impact on the approval processes. Stephen Bell confirmed that SDS had received prior approval of certain 'generic designs' and it is anticipated that the planners would treat any minor change as an amendment which would not therefore warrant the full approval process.
- 8 BBS consider that they need to work closely with SDS to review the situation and agree a way forward. SDS asked if there was a process to enable BBS and SDS to meet independently and Stephen Bell confirmed that they should so do and that there was no need for **tie** to be present
- 9 Transdev raised concerns about the **tie** design review process and the possible loss of opportunity for Transdev to comment. Tony Glazebrook advised that **tie** did not intend to look at all 18 SDS Design Assurance Statements but would choose between 4 and 6 using TSS to review in full whilst recognising that **tie** have 20 days to do so. **tie\*** (DC & TG) had reviewed their process and carried out a re-evaluation of TSS resources resulting in an agreement with SDS on Self assurance.

**tie** (TG) confirmed that they are to review their Design Review Process in the light of the discussions and the documentation and commentary provided by BBS.

**tie** (Susan Clarke) advised the meeting that whatever was agreed it must not introduce a constraint in the overall process.

## **Actions**

- SDS & BBS to be provided with a copy of the **tie** spread sheet 'Issue for Construction status @ V2' to review together. **tie** confirmed this was an informal copy as the contents were to be discussed at a **tie**/SDS Programme meeting later in the day
- SDS and BBS to meet to discuss what is required by when.
- **tie** (TG) to redraft the **tie** Design Management
- **tie** to determine and advise how elements of the 'design' can be issued for construction prior to the SDS Design Assurance Activities.

**B H T Ennion**