

Determine that only the latest revisions of applicable Drawings and SDS Specs are ‘available at the point of use’ and being used by the teams.

Generally: There is a problem when searching [in BIW] for ‘latest issue’ of drawings and specs from SDS. Example; Structural Concrete Spec latest ‘Rev’ is ‘V12’, but when searching for ‘latest issue’ of this spec it comes up with ‘Rev 7’ (V7). In other words it finds the latest issue by date, and not by latest revision which is what we all want. Normally the latest issue and date would be one and the same, but not in this case.

How did this happen?: The reason for this is that SDS have recently been uploading [into BIW] ‘superseded’ (old versions) documents which they never [**but should have**] uploaded previously. This has thrown the searching status of some [estimated] 300 Drawings and SDS Specs out of sync. Chey states that this can be rectified by ‘running a script’ for each document, but only once all outstanding historical documents have been uploaded and SDS have informed us as such.

Concern: The danger here is that Contractors could inadvertently use/work to the wrong (superseded) documents/information. An NCR should be raised on SDS (Jason Chandler) – agreed? If so, then Chey would need to provide DR with a summary of the 300 [approx] ‘superseded’ and late [to be uploaded] documents.

Corrective Actions: In the longer term Chey can correct [on SDS’s behalf] this situation by ‘running scripts’, but in the shorter term all Contractor staff needs to be aware of this and when searching for latest revisions they need to open the document, then from the drop-down window (Version) they will be able to view all (including latest version) and select it accordingly – for printing or download. Chey can send out a memo to this effect.

Preventative Actions: Kick SDS’s arses.

Farrans: have a girl called Fiona who regularly checks the homepage of BIW for newly issued documents, prints them out, files in Project folders, and destroys/removes superseded versions/revisions. [hard-copy] Drawing and Spec folders where in evidence. They would however like BSC DC to provide transmittals listing all new / revised documents.

Crummock: are not keen is using BIW as the source for obtaining the latest issue of drawings and specs from SDS. They have asked BSC DC to provide transmittals listing all new / revised documents (which they will sign for) instead. The question is; should BSC make special arrangements for Crummock (or any other) or not? Crummock also claim that they are not being informed of any new / revised documents (in their homepage) by BSC DC.

Expanded: as with Farrans, Expanded regularly check their homepage of BIW for newly issued documents, print them out, file in Project folders, and destroy/remove superseded versions/revisions. [hard-copy] Drawing and Spec folders where in evidence.

Conclusions: Unformed processes for issuing, distribution and receiving documents needs to be clarified, understood by all, and instructed by BSC. SDS needs to put measures in place to rectify and improve their issuing and distribution of documents.

Jim, do you concur that we should issue this NCR to SDS? If you need any more info, Chey will provide it to you.

Jim, Chey mentions that you asked her to ‘put on hold’ the issue of issuing document transmittals to Sub-Contractors – as a back-up to BIW issue and distribution. Will you now give her the go-ahead to do this? Rebecca will do likewise for QHSE Documents.

Determine how records are maintained for each section – at each site office? Are they scanned into BIW and issued and distributed to involved parties for information and checking?

Generally: To-date no records whatsoever are being uploaded into BIW [CDM] File Structure. This should be done by all Contractors (BSC & Sub-Contractors) and SDS continuously – to make the monitoring of records, periodic milestone checking, and final handover easier. Sub-Contractors were not really aware of this requirement.

Farrans: Original Documentation & Records are being filed and maintained satisfactorily.

Crummock: Original Documentation & Records are being filed, although some are being given to BSC staff to fill-in and maintain. Responsibilities of either party need to be clarified and improved.

Expanded: Original Documentation & Records are being filed and maintained satisfactorily.

Conclusions: All Contractors need to understand why we want to do this, and BSC need to instruct all Contractors & SDS to adhere to this system.

Jim, will you be instructing all Contractors to do this, i.e. upload continuously, because otherwise I don’t think that they will?

Determine what the arrangements are for notifying BSC, tie and SDS of inspections and tests and what records there are in place to verify that notifications have been given.

Generally: After Contractors use of the issued 10 No. ITPs over the past couple of months, it is clear that they need amended / improved in terms of format, SDS indicated involvement, omissions, additions, etc.

Farrans: have ‘Notification’ forms filed which they forward to BSC, who in turn forward to tie and SDS. BSC also have ‘Notification’ forms filed.

Crummock: point out that they are required [as indicated in the ITP – Kerbs] to give notification to SDS far too often. DR agrees, but points out that Bob Bell of tie insisted on this – even though we are not contractually obliged to go along with it. Crummock are not using ‘Notification’ forms and so have no documented proof to fall back on. This needs to be improved.

Expanded: have ‘Notification’ forms filed which they forward to BSC, who in turn forward to tie and SDS. BSC also have ‘Notification’ forms filed.

Conclusions: DR to arrange an ITP workshop for all Contractors for mid-Feb 2009 to resolve and revise current ITPs. Tie’s comments also to be addressed at the same time. DR & JD need to sit with tie and SDS to resolve [excessive] notification issue.

Jim, do you concur that we should arrange an ITP Workshop for mid-Feb 2009?
Jim, do agree that we should arrange a meeting with SDS and tie about SDS’s involvement in the ITPs – before the ITP workshop?

Determine that all records indicated in relevant issued ITPs (as well as completed ITPs) are being filled-in and signed-off to show self-verification and verification of work completion.

Generally: most ITP records are being completed satisfactorily, but not necessarily the ITPs, i.e. some confusion on how many ITPs have to be completed for, e.g. each structure, section, etc. Needs to be clarified by proposing to BSC in a case-by-case scenario; also to be agreed with tie as they are the ones who will receive the handed over [at Contracts end] records.

Farrans: have not been completing the inspection forms [as indicated in the approved ITP] for earthworks classification and removal, and therefore have no historical record of what type, where from, where to, etc.

Farrans received type 6N psd test results (2) which failed the spec, but NCR was not raised to flag-up problem and track resolution until closure.

However, ITPs were in general being filled-in correctly and records filed and maintained satisfactorily.

Crummock: Due to tie restrictions and discussion of other issues, ITP records were not checked. It was stated that copies of ITP records are being given to BSC staff to deal with. Responsibilities of either party need to be clarified and improved.

Expanded: ITPs are filled-in correctly and records filed, maintained satisfactorily.

Conclusions: A reminder to all that NCRs must be raised via BIW for all non-conformities encountered, and that all ITP forms must be completed as per the approved ITP unless an alternative similar form of recording info is used (but must firstly be agreed with the BSC Quality Manager).

Jim, do you concur with my conclusions – just above?
