
From: Andy Steel - TSS
Sent: 24 July 2008 09:51
To: Tony Glazebrook
Cc: David Crawley
Subject: RE: DAS packs - tie reviews

Noted but I rather feel it is going to take more than one phone call to sort this out. There are of course other parties to be consulted anyway.

In the meantime please will you confirm that the first package shown on V34 (Section 1B Foot of the Walk to Macdonald Road) will be available for inspection on 31 July. That will be an appropriate place to start.

Andy

From: Tony Glazebrook
Sent: Thursday, July 24, 2008 9:38 AM
To: Andy Steel - TSS
Cc: David Crawley
Subject: RE: DAS packs - tie reviews

Hi Andy,

I have agreed with David that the three of us will have a teleconf next week on the process and content for the forthcoming first formal design review on 19th August for route section 1D. I suggest that we can discuss this during that session.

Cheers,

Tony

From: Andy Steel - TSS
Sent: 23 July 2008 16:33
To: Tony Glazebrook; Gavin Murray
Cc: David Crawley
Subject: RE: DAS packs - tie reviews

Tony,

I have a more fundamental problem. Not only do we have to assure the design in its entirety (which is different from doing 100%) but we have to ensure in the process that the Evidence File is properly populated in such a fashion that it both meets the requirements of ROGS (and other safety related legislation such as CDM) and gives the confidence to both tie management and the ICP that this tramway can proceed through all of its stages to opening for revenue service.

In the process we have to do our best that this process does not add any significant risk or impediment to the construction programme (or indeed the current prior approvals).

I have a problem squaring the circle on these related issues.

We have a construction programme which requires a considerable amount of design now. Equally I have seen drawings labelled "Issued for Construction" which in their entirety cannot be. On the other hand we have a programme for Design Assured Packages which stretches through to April 2009. The project, the Evidence File or the ICP cannot wait that long.

Therefore I believe our concentration should be on getting the Evidence File populated.

The Evidence File can very broadly be split into three areas.

- What might be called HMRI issues. Broadly these covers those areas which the HMRI would have concentrated on had they still been in the progressive "no objection" to approval regime. These centre very much round RSP2 and Section 2 of that publication (Integration of the Tramway) in particular. However the other sections need consideration as well
- What further might be called the CDM issues. These more concern construction and residual risks.
- Outputs of a process audit regime.

Of these the first is what directly concerns the ICP.

Therefore I would make the suggestion that we have to start with a trawl through the complete alignment from Newhaven to the Airport (Granton as well since the design is there) for integration issues and to highlight the remaining areas/systems where there are residual risks to be assessed. I do not propose to develop the detail here but I know that Roger Jones for one has a comprehensive list.

Associated with this a comprehensive programme from BBS of the M&E Deliverables (including track) is required. I would hope that in effect we had assured the majority of this in the preferred bidder stage. However it has to be formalised.

Only by taking this approach will we keep the ICP on-side and at the same time protect tie against refusal to give a "no objection" at a later date.

Please can we discuss very urgently when you return

Andy

From: Tony Glazebrook
Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2008 3:39 PM
To: Gavin Murray
Cc: Andy Steel - TSS; David Crawley
Subject: RE: DAS packs - tie reviews

Hi Gavin

I have ***appended*** below . . .

Cheers,

Tony

From: Gavin Murray
Sent: 23 July 2008 14:28
To: Tony Glazebrook
Cc: Andy Steel - TSS
Subject: RE: DAS packs - tie reviews

Tony

I've had a niggling concern about this email and in discussion with Andy Steele this afternoon I have finally put a finger on my concern.

In bullet point one of the note below you state 'If an approval has been gained'
This raises the question of what 'approval' is being referred to. I read it to mean Prior Approval from the Planning Authority and Technical Approval from the Council as Roads Authority. Was this your meaning?
What this does not allow for is Council Approval as Promoter nor tie approval as either promoters agent or as reviewer for compliance with other compliances such as the Railway Inspectorate (given that SDS will not have had sign off from the Independent Competent Person prior to submission of their Design Assured Packages). **When SDS submit their DAS, it will have to be accompanied by sufficient proof of design verity and safety. This will drive what docs are needed during the review. My concern is specifically to avoid reopening doors for reviews of already reviewed stuff through which streams of preferential engineering suggestions will flow.**

I have a real concern that the SDS design as it currently stands does not have sufficient information to enable Belfinger Berger Siemens to build it in a manner which the ICP would sign off, and this is not an issue which Council are considering in their role as either Planning or Road authority. **When SDS submit their DAS, it will have to be accompanied by sufficient proof of design verity and safety.**

I realise that SDS to assure that their design is fit for purpose and to obtain the approvals however I am nervous that SDS are trying to smooth an easy ride through the Final Design Sign off by tie which will muddy the waters in eighteen months / two years when we are trying to get the system open and the ICP digs his heels in. Whilst SDS may not wish everyone to have another chance to propose change to with their design if it is a competent design it should stand up on its own and the designer should be able to argue why their solution is most appropriate. **When SDS submit their DAS, it will have to be accompanied by sufficient proof of design verity and safety.**

A further concern I have relates to the second Bullet where we appear to be giving SDS the chance to give a list of how they respond to earlier comments. Experience to date suggests that such statement have not necessarily been borne out in practice (i.e. a listing saying 'updated on drawing' which on review of the drawing one finds that no change has been made) **We will do a sample check!**

Happy to discuss.
Regards
Gavin

From: Tony Glazebrook
Sent: 14 July 2008 16:56
To: David Crawley; Kirsty Wilson; Gavin Murray; Lindsay Murphy
Cc: Chandler, Jason; tonyglazebrook@[REDACTED]
Subject: DAS packs - tie reviews

Hi folks,

Herewith latest (today) dates – highlighted with my selection of pax to review.

Will follow previously agreed DAS principles except that:

- If an approval has been gained and is free of comment then SDS will just say so and will NOT resubmit all the docs within that element for yet more comment!
- If an approval has been gained with comments then SDS will list/categorise their responses to those comments and will NOT resubmit all the docs within that element for yet more comment.
- If an approval is reqd but has not been gained then they will submit that element for review.

Cheers,

Tony