

---

**From:** Tony Glazebrook  
**Sent:** 11 December 2007 12:13  
**To:** David Crawley  
**Subject:** FW: SDS Design/Infraco Proposals/Employer's Requirements

---

**From:** Andy Steel - TSS  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 11, 2007 12:08:16 PM  
**To:** Tony Glazebrook; Roger Jones (Transdev)  
**Subject:** FW: SDS Design/Infraco Proposals/Employer's Requirements  
**Auto forwarded by a Rule**

Guys,

Here is Giblets Espistle to the Germans with my response to it! I should say that subsequently Geoff told me that Matthew had indeed spoken to BBS along these lines.

Andy

---

**From:** Andy Steel - TSS  
**Sent:** Thu 12/6/2007 8:30 AM  
**To:** Geoff Gilbert  
**Subject:** RE: SDS Design/Infraco Proposals/Employer's Requirements

Geoff,

I agree that what is below reflects our meeting discussions.

However Siemens technical have separately told me that Matthew has instructed BBS to strip out the engineering costs from their bid on the basis that they will use the SDS design.

Is this just an attempt to flush out the 100% figure or we sending mixed messages?

Andy

PS For the record I would guess the BBS figure would be in the range £3-5m

Andy

---

**From:** Geoff Gilbert  
**Sent:** Tue 12/4/2007 7:13 PM  
**To:** Richard Walker  
**Cc:** Flynn, Michael (Siemens TS); Susan Clark; Andy Steel - TSS; Toby Kliskey - TSS; David Crawley; Damian Sharp  
**Subject:** SDS Design/Infraco Proposals/Employer's Requirements

Richard

Further to our discussion we propose the following steps to bring about an expeditious alignment of the above:-

1. BBS to advise the elements of system for which SDS design is not required. We believe that this applies principally to the systems. BBS have put forward technical proposals for various systems. SDS have produced specifications of varying levels of detail and system architecture drawings which are different and conflict with the BBS proposals. There seems little mileage in SDS revisiting their designs in these areas. BBS need to consider the extent and scope of ongoing SDS support they require to integrate their designs

TIE00039468\_0001

into the design for the whole Network, designs required to obtain planning (prior) approvals to the extent they relate to systems, ongoing performance modelling support required and the like.

2. The revised scope of designs to be agreed with SDS (This then to be added into the novation plan)
3. BBS to concurrently agree the alignment of their proposals with the Employer's Requirements (we await your fully marked up ERs and compliance matrix)
4. Once item 2 is settled SDS are to review and confirm alignment of their remaining design with the Employer's Requirements
5. BBS to identify any aspects of the remaining SDS design which do not align with their technical proposals. Tie to then decide on the course of action and instruct accordingly.

The above supplements the draft Novation Plan I circulated yesterday.

If this approach is adopted it will enable SDS to confirm to BBS that their designs conform to the Employer's Requirements.

Please can you review and confirm your agreement to this approach tomorrow. Also please provide the output from item 1 by cob Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> Dec so that we can move this forward with confidence.

Regards

Geoff Gilbert - Project Commercial Director  
TRAM Project

**tie** Limited  
Citypoint  
65 Haymarket Terrace  
Edinburgh EH12 5HD

tel [REDACTED]  
mo [REDACTED]