Tony Glazebrook From:

24 December 2007 14:23 Sent:

David Crawley To:

FW: Design Review - Systems and Comms Subject:

From: Jim Harries[SMTP:JIM.HARRIES@TRANSDEVPLC.CO.UK]

Sent: 24 December 2007 14:23:09 To: Tony Glazebrook; Damian Sharp

Cc: Andy Steel - TSS; Kirsty Wilson; Roger Jones (Transdev);

Alastair Richards - TEL

Subject: RE: Design Review - Systems and Comms

Auto forwarded by a Rule

Tony and Damian

Just to support Roger's thinking.

Given that

- 1. BBS's offer is not aligned to SDS's design in respect of Systems and Comms,
- 2. tie is amending the ERs such that BBS's design is compliant with the ERs, and
- 3. SDS's design is not fully aligned with this version of the ERs,

we need proper direction from tie on how to address SDS's design.

Without this direction, we risk:

- 1. Wasting precious time for SDS, Tie, TSS, CEC and Transdev
- 2. Wasting CEC's money
- 3. Generating confusion and the consequential potential for future "Changes" with both SDS and BBS, and
- 4. Procuring a system that does not work effectively.

I think we need to "park" all of SDS's work on this subject, and constrain SDS's work to the Civil Engineering interfaces of this design.

We should get BBS to take the design responsibility for Systems and Comms.

This would need to be an instruction from tie to SDS and/or BBS. It is a matter that needs joined up thinking across the project. There are other aspects of the design that need similar consideration (power, OLE, and track form come to mind).

All the best Jim Harries

Email jim.harries@transdevplc.co.uk, mobile 079 work 0131

Transdev Edinburgh Tram, 1st Floor, Citypoint, 65 Haymarket Terrace, Edinburgh EH12 5HD

From: Roger Jones

Sent: 24 December 2007 10:22

To: Kirsty Wilson; Jim Harries; andy.steel@tie.ltd.uk; Tony Glazebrook

Cc: Damian Sharp Subject: Design Review

Kirsty,

There was a design review invite for Systems and Comms on 17th Jan. In trying to respond, the email has disappeared.

I am likely to not be in Edinburgh that day.

Jim,

Do you wish to take any more interest in this at all?

Andy,

Perhaps we should discuss which bits we want to comment on, in the knowledge of the Siemens proposals?

Tony,

See above. Perhaps we need to be discriminatory in what we comment on. We will not have time to review all in any case. I rather suspect that SDS have in any case exceeded the originally-intended brief (but not clearly understood by all parties) in the level of detail supplied.

Regards,

Roger

Roger Jones Project Engineer, Transdev Edinburgh Tram City Point, 65 Haymarket Terrace, Edinburgh EH12 5HD

Office: 0131 Mobile: 079!

This email and its contents are intended for the named recipient(s) only, and it may contain information which may be confidential and/or privileged. If you have received this email in error, please notify us and delete the email and all attachments immediately. Any views or opinions expressed are those of the sender and do not necessarily represent those of Transdev PLC or its subsidiaries. Internet communications are not secure, and we do not accept responsibility for the contents of this message or for any changes which may have been made after it was sent. All outbound email is checked for viruses, however, we do not accept any liability if this email or any attachments are found to contain viruses or malicious code. We advise that all emails and attachments should be checked by the recipient prior to opening them. TRANSDEV PLC, Company No. 2749273, Registered in England and Wales.