

SDS

Utility Diversion Design

Issues

There are several issues with SDS, they will be categorised and then broken down into their individual elements.

Categories

Contractual

Delivery

Content

Contractual

Issues which are clearly within the scope of the SDS contract but which have not been carried out by SDS within their contract include;

Dilapidation surveys, Building and Cellar surveys, Ground Investigation surveys, Management of unidentified diversions, all necessary redesigns.

Provision of C4 cost schedules

Provision of Bill of Quantities

All Sewer surveys

Design of all utility diversions. (SDS are currently designing Scottish Water diversions, all others ScottishPower, SGN, BT Openreach etc are all being designed by the appropriate SUC). Ultimately they will all issue an invoice for this work. It is therefore distinctly possible that tie may pay for this service twice.

There has been a major problem in persuading SDS of their contractual obligations regarding on site TQ's. This situation remains to be resolved a temporary solution currently operating. The implementation of their on-site rep will alleviate the problem somewhat, but will not remove the tardiness SDS have in responding from their HO.

Delivery

The attached Graph shows the position of SDS delivery against target. It also shows SDS forecast for delivery.

Although adjustments have been made to the original program, SDS continues to under perform in terms of their delivery. There are problems with the alignment in sections 1a, 1b, 1c and 1d and in some cases this has held up delivery. However SDS have been reluctant to work flexibly and to deliver areas where alignment has been fixed.

At the time of writing, only 3 plates in section 1a have been delivered in full. In section 1b work was programmed to begin on 6th august on plates 27-31. To date full issue of the works program has not been possible due to the late delivery of Scottish Water and SGN design. (SGN approval). In their reports SDS have blamed the failure to deliver IFC drawings on the dilatory response from the SUC's to their request for approvals. The reality of this is that the standard of work produced has been unacceptable to the SUC's. This is evidenced by the 9th revision of the water design in section 1b plates 27-31 alone.

Although work on line two appears to be of a higher standard, in section 5a again construction is delayed due to the late delivery of a complete design package.

Work on the Constitution Street design commenced during November 2006. This can be shown from minutes of a meeting held then. However until tie began to press for design proposals in late July 2007, no further work had been carried out. This work area although now ongoing is unlikely to be delivered on time.

Section 1c plates 42-44 were delivered to Amis to have thumbnail sketches produced for the water design. Amis were unable to complete this task, as the design was not capable of being built and consequently deemed to be impractical. Investigation showed that the designers had insufficient information available to complete the design. Tie instigated a program to first of all dig trial trenches and later enter the Crawley tunnel to verify the quantity and position of utility apparatus. This work ought to have been undertaken by SDS prior to producing a design. SDS it seems were prepared to produce a design, based on data which was clearly lacking in definition and content. This type of behaviour could be considered as incompetent when taking cognisance of both the H&S and commercial risks associated with lack of endeavour to provide/ obtain reasonable information to inform the design.

Content

Clearly the IFC drawings and schedule should contain all information to allow the utilities diversion contractor to carry out his work. Should the situation on site prove to be different from that shown on the drawing then the Technical Question process should be initiated.

Section 1a plates 13-15 delivered six weeks behind schedule produced 32 Technical questions prior to the contractor commencing on site works

To date none of the IFC drawings have been accompanied by C4 estimates, bill of quantities or residual risk register.

It has become clear that SDS will not produce C4 estimates. Similarly they deny being responsible for the production of bill of quantities.

The residual risk register has been produced, generally some days after the delivery of IFC drawings. The content of the register is a major area of concern to tie. It has been known for some time that there are obstructions and voids. SDS has taken no action to mitigate the risk associated with in particular, the void areas.

As has previously in been mentioned in this report the standard of work produced when SDS produce the design rather than co-ordinate others design is embarrassing to tie as it is to SDS senior management. The response from, in particular Scottish Water, is direct and forthright.