
From: David Crawley
Sent: 12 September 2008 08:23
To: Tony Glazebrook
Subject: FW: Letter to cover issuLindsay Murphye of Operational design review

Tony ... Lindsay still seems agitated! Is what she says consistent with what you want to do?

David

From: Lindsay Murphy
Sent: 10 September 2008 10:06
To: Gavin Murray; David Crawley; Tony Glazebrook
Cc: Colin Kerr; Neil Wood - Transdev; Damian Sharp
Subject: RE: Letter to cover issuLindsay Murphye of Operational design review

Guys,
third attempt at typing this...
The letter is addressed to Colin Brady.
It is up to BSC to provide the information and comfort level we need for assurance.
It suits them to allow SDS to issue through them incomplete design for technical approval
It suits us in some ways as something is better than nothing and at least we can start. If something changes then it has to go through technical approval again.
The other good thing about using the TA batch is it gives CEC visibility of the process and we are issuing our comments with a joint view.

The issues of the overall DA process are significant. The operational review is designed to sit spooned in beside it. It is our process to give Transdev comfort that if they get what is on the drawings they will be able to operate the system within the parameters that they have been set by TEL. By default if we can do that we will comply with many but not all of our other obligations.

The DA process was set out as the 5% check. As with any audit you must, if the audit fails, then dig deeper.
The operational review has been underway for a few weeks now and sits with the TA process which is great because it gives CEC the Tram driver's eye view. We need to let BSC see the outcomes so as they can address the concerns/issues.

- 1) is the letter ok?
- 2) Can we have 2 sit downs or at least have an Agenda that makes clear the difference in the processes
- 3) Who goes and When

Kindest Regards
Lindsay

From: Gavin Murray
Sent: 10 September 2008 08:21
To: David Crawley; Tony Glazebrook
Cc: Lindsay Murphy; Colin Kerr; Neil Wood - Transdev; Damian Sharp
Subject: RE: Letter to cover issuLindsay Murphye of Operational design review

David, Tony

Thanks for this input. I recognise what you are saying and agree that it is a very valid point, however some of the issues which have been identified are pretty basic and really make you question the SDS Inter Disciplinary Review and check processes (IDR & IDC) for example when IFC stop drawings are being issued which are clearly not consistent with the roads plans which have been submitted for technical approval.

Unfortunately although SDS gave a very good speech about their QA procedures (about a year into the project) and how the design would be 'right first time every time' we have yet to see the evidence. Additionally subsequent to Kim Dorrington leaving Edinburgh we have had no visibility of any SDS IDR or IDC and I fear any that what is being implemented now could be too little too late.

We need to get comfort that the final SDS design work is consistent and provides the system we need in a safe manner.

TIE00038406_0001

Regards
Gavin

From: David Crawley
Sent: 09 September 2008 23:50
To: Gavin Murray; Tony Glazebrook
Cc: Lindsay Murphy; Colin Kerr; Neil Wood - Transdev; Damian Sharp
Subject: RE: Letter to cover issuLindsay Murphye of Operational design review

Dear All,

I suggest I have a conversation with Steve Reynolds on this as part of generating some understanding in SDS (there is of course very good understanding in SDS but there are other pressures which make it appear that this may not be the case - see below). Tony - please give me a call to discuss.

A complicating feature we must not forget is that even if the SDS DAS packages were in some way 'perfect' we would still not have sufficient to say that the design is 'assured' - this is because late delivery and the need to place the construction contract means that the detailed design is not in fact detailed enough, and that even if the full scope expected originally (at the start of the project) of SDS had been delivered, BSC would still have some design to do - e.g. SDS track design really means identification of the alignment and the envelope inside which the actual track design must fit.

The fact that BSC have detailed design to do means that this too must be accompanied by assurance. SDS know this and may choose to say that 'shortcomings' in their own design cannot be addressed outside of the need for BSC to complete the overall detailed design. In short, SDS may not be willing to change anything substantial whatever the apparent need and may expect BSC to deal with it. If this is correct it may be simpler to take the same view as I believe SDS may have and get BSC agreement to do just that - we need a competent and assured design whether SDS or BSC deliver it.

David

From: Gavin Murray
Sent: 09 September 2008 15:58
To: Tony Glazebrook; David Crawley
Cc: Lindsay Murphy; Colin Kerr; Neil Wood - Transdev; Damian Sharp
Subject: RE: Letter to cover issuLindsay Murphye of Operational design review
Tony

Thanks.

I would not however that the design team here have real concerns about the quality and operability of the SDS design. As we have been seeing IFC packages being issued to BSC which are either incomplete or incompatible with ongoing design. For example Stop plans are incompatible with the Roads drawings (I would note that I have heard informal concerns from BSC over this also). It is hard to equate the issue of Construction Plans with the SDS stance on Assured Package delivery. If they can't provide it to us until 'complete' how are they managing to give it to the contractor?

Winding the clock back we had long debates regarding how we would review packages of SDS design which were incomplete which is how we came to the Design Assured submission sign off. From there we undertook informal reviews, however we are still to see any evidence of the comments which were made in those (indeed I understand from Council that their review of the formal technical review submissions has shown many of these have yet to be auctioned - hence the 1200+ comments).

Additionally the Design packages being submitted to Council appear to be consistently lacking in information (see attached). This is partly why I included the post meeting notes to the initial Design Assurance Statement meeting to which SDS took exception (see attached).

I am concerned that SDS are made to recognise that we/tie are not happy with / confident in what is being delivered.

My suggestion that our letter not be confrontational was driven by the fact that I do not want the outcomes of the operational review to be lost by the designer taking exception to the comments being made. As such I feel that the issue of Design Assurance and Quality of Design needs to be taken up separately and certainly at a higher level than Lindsay and I.

This is one of the issues I wanted to discuss with you today. Perhaps we could have a discussion when you are in the office.

Regards
Gavin

From: Tony Glazebrook
Sent: 09 September 2008 15:21
To: Gavin Murray; David Crawley
Cc: Lindsay Murphy; Colin Kerr; Neil Wood - Transdev; Damian Sharp
Subject: RE: Letter to cover issuLindsay Murphye of Operational design review

TIE00038406_0002

Hi Gavin.

I have exactly this course of action in hand already with SDS/BSC.

We think along similar lines!

Cheers,

Tony

-----Original Message-----

From: "Gavin Murray" <Gavin.Murray@tie.ltd.uk>

To: "Tony Glazebrook" <Tony.Glazebrook@tie.ltd.uk>; "David Crawley" <David.Crawley@tie.ltd.uk>

Cc: "Lindsay Murphy" <Lindsay.Murphy@tie.ltd.uk>; "Colin Kerr" <Colin.Kerr@tie.ltd.uk>; "Neil Wood - Transdev" <neil.wood@transdevplc.co.uk>; "Damian Sharp" <Damian.Sharp@tie.ltd.uk>

Sent: 09/09/08 15:14

Subject: RE: Letter to cover issue Lindsay Murphye of Operational design review

Tony, David

Noting the SDS letter expressing concern over my post meeting notes to the Design Assurance Statement Review meeting I think that we will find SDS resistant to any further attempts to 'influence' their design. As such I think that Lindsay's advice regarding delivery of this letter by hand is vital. Indeed I would go further and say that it needs to be one of you who undertakes this (probably with Lindsay or I and one of the Transdev staff also attending).

Similarly you may wish to reconsider the phrase "in the absence of timely design assurance packs" as it could be confrontational. Additionally, I think it is important that we stick to referencing SDS rather than PB.

I trust that these comments are of assistance.

Regards

Gavin

From: Lindsay Murphy

Sent: 09 September 2008 11:34

To: Tony Glazebrook; Gavin Murray; Colin Kerr; David Crawley; Neil Wood - Transdev; Alastair Richards - TEL; Damian Sharp

Cc: Kirsty Wilson

Subject: Letter to cover issue of Operational design review

All,
Please find attached Draft – comments welcome.
Suggested is hand delivery and a sit down with Jason/Alan and the Panel to help them understand where we are coming from. Representation from BSC has to be included in that .

Regards

Lindsay

[cid:image001.jpg@01C9131D.4C75FCF0]

TIE00038406_0003

Lindsay Murphy
Project Manager

tie limited
CityPoint
1st Floor
65 Haymarket Terrace
Edinburgh
EH12 5HD

Tel: +44 (0)131 6 [REDACTED]
Fax: +44 (0)131 [REDACTED]
Business Mobile: [REDACTED] 87
Own Mobile: +4 [REDACTED]
e-mail: Lindsay.Murphy@tie.ltd.uk<mailto:Lindsay.Murphy@tie.ltd.uk>
Web: www.tie.ltd.uk<<http://www.tie.ltd.uk/>>

delivering transport projects