

Project Delivery Group

Edinburgh, 19 January 2012

Attendees:

Vic Emery (Chair)	The City of Edinburgh Council	vicemery@
Eleanor Walker	The City of Edinburgh Council	eleanorwalker@
Colin Smith	The City of Edinburgh Council	csmith@hg-group.co.uk
Alan Coyle	The City of Edinburgh Council	Alan.coyle@edinburgh.gov.uk
Kelly Murphy	The City of Edinburgh Council	Kelly.murphy@edinburgh.gov.uk
Bob McCafferty	The City of Edinburgh Council	Bob.McCafferty@edinburgh.gov.uk
Gavin King	The City of Edinburgh Council	Gavin.king@edinburgh.gov.uk
Scott Noble	Transport Scotland	scott.noble@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk
Graham Porteous	Transport Scotland	graham.porteous@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk
Lucy Adamson	Transport Scotland	lucy.adamson@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk
Gary Easton	Turner and Townsend	Gary.easton@turntown.co.uk
Rob Leech	Turner and Townsend	Rob.leech@turntown.co.uk
Julian Weatherley	Turner and Townsend	julian.weatherley@turntown.co.uk
Shirley Mushet	Turner and Townsend	Shirley_Mushet/PM/Edi/TTGroup@turntown.co.uk
Alastair Richards	Turner and Townsend	Alastair.Richards@tie.ltd.uk

ACTION NOTE

	ITEM	ACTION OWNER	DEADLINE
1	INTRODUCTION		
	<p>Apologies were received from Andy Conway.</p> <p>Vic Emery brought the Group's attention to the further streamlining of the Project Delivery Group's agenda. This was to avoid, as much as possible, repetition with the previous tram briefing meeting.</p>		
2	PREVIOUS MINUTE		
	<p>The minute of the Project Delivery Group of 22 December 2011 was approved as a correct record.</p>		
3	ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS		
	<p>Refer to PDG Rolling Action List for updated action status.</p> <p>It was highlighted that Turner and Townsend were taking the disagreement over responsibility for works related to bustracker at bus stops with Bilfinger Berger to the Independent Certifier for a decision. This needed to be confirmed and submitted to Colin Smith for certification.</p> <p>Vic Emery highlighted that Haymarket was very untidy due to the tram works and if an improvement could be made to the</p>	RL	

ITEM	ACTION OWNER	DEADLINE
<p>area it would be a real benefit to the City and would improve the perception of the tram project with the public. Julian Weatherley explained that Turner and Townsend would investigate what could be done to improve the Haymarket area.</p> <p>A draft team newsletter was tabled. It was agreed, after a brief discussion, that this was to be a six weekly publication aimed at keeping in touch and informing Project staff.</p>	JW	
<hr/> 4 HEALTH AND SAFETY ISSUES		
<p>Julian Weatherley confirmed that there was no additional health and safety information than that presented in the earlier tram briefing.</p> <p>Vic Emery stated that he believed that there was still a cultural issue around Health & Safety and was not convinced that the wider population was taking Health and Safety seriously. Vic reiterated the importance of having Health and safety embedded in the culture of the Project. Julian Weatherley added that he believed BBS took health and safety very seriously and believed the wider team were also very supportive.</p>		
<hr/> 5 SOFT REPORT AND CLIENT DECISIONS REGISTER		
<p>Julian Weatherley, Rob Leech, Shirley Mushet and Alastair Richards highlighted successes, failures, opportunities and threats which had not been covered by the Tram Briefing meeting.</p> <p>The following areas were highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The improvement in relations between Turner and Townsend, BBS and CEC was continuing and meant Project changes were being resolved as they occurred.• Vic Emery raised concern over the On-Site works and the threat relating to critical planning / 3rd party approvals relating to OLE foundation / building fixings and the fact that they remained outstanding. Vic Emery emphasized that this responsibility sat 100% with CEC and it was important that the appropriate attention was given to clearing any outstanding items so CEC were not leaving themselves exposed and blamed for holding the project up.• Discussions were due to take place with Forth Ports on outstanding design issues and feed back would be		

Andy
Conway

ITEM	ACTION OWNER	DEADLINE
<p>reported at the next PDG meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• BBS were still required to provide a construction methodology to satisfy Network Rail on the level of vibrations along the Murrayfield Corridor. At the Tram Briefing it was highlighted that the use of a Network Rail non-approved contractor may be an issue. This was being investigated by Shirley Mushet.• The interface with Network Rail at Haymarket Station could be jeopardised by the slip in BBS's revised programme as BBS were refusing to sign up to the programme. Discussions were ongoing to find a solution to this and feedback would be provided at next PDG meeting.• The threat of potential bad winter weather was receding and there may be an opportunity to reschedule works on the Airport stretch and release some of the time contingency.• The maintenance contract with CAF for the trams was subject to exchange rate fluctuation and there could be the opportunity to save money in this area on current trends. Colin Smith to investigate and see how realistic this saving could be.• Insurance for the depot and associated assets was covered by Council wide Project insurance but Lothian Buses would take control of the depot on 25 January 2012 and would be responsible for security. An Operating Agreement had been devised for Lothian Buses and is expected to be signed off by next week. Alan Coyle noted that for future meetings, it would be appropriate for a member of Lothian Buses to be a member of the Project Delivery Group Meeting. Gavin King would contact Ian Craig on this issue and advise VRE.	SM	
	CS	
	GK	

Vic Emery stated that due to the value engineering work being carried out, the opportunities being realised and the positive progress being made on the project at large, a date needed to be discussed and agreed for when to re-align the programme to reflect the changes, savings, progress and new programme dates otherwise the current programme would shortly be invalid and senseless.

Colin Smith commented that hopefully an agreement could be sought at the next Principals meeting which would allow 'buy-in' from all the stakeholders and enable T&T to begin to determine a new programme to reflect the real status of the project. Colin Smith added that a major challenge and opportunity was to investigate and discuss the durations within the Project. He agreed that there was still a high

ITEM	ACTION OWNER	DEADLINE
<p>degree of project float for the Contractor and removing a proportion of this could bring forward completion dates. Colin Smith explained that BBS had recently confirmed that they were content to open up and discuss the durations in the Project and any changes could be built into a new Programme with altered Section and overall Project dates. Colin Smith confirmed that he would be continuing to pursue the discussion of these durations.</p>		
<p>Vic Emery stated that he was supportive of Colin Smith progressing these discussions and requested that this item be captured as an action observation so progress could be tracked at each PDG meeting.</p>	GK	
<p>Vic Emery further requested that a document be devised that detailed the realistic/expected dates for achieving milestone achievement versus the agreed contract dates.</p>	CS/JW	
<p>A number of threats had been identified with respect to the BAA Edinburgh Airport. It was reported that meetings would be held w/c 23rd January and if the situation had not improved then it was agreed that the issues would be escalated to Colin Smith. An update would be provided at next PDG Meeting.</p>		
<p>The open items on the Client Decisions Register had been covered in the Rolling Actions Log.</p>		

6 RED FLAG ITEMS

Although not identified as a Red Flag Item, Colin Smith wanted it noted that the teams were working well together and relations were continuing to improve and he believed that if there were to be a Public Enquiry in the 6 or 12 months then this would have a detrimental effect on the team and project. Vic Emery agreed but explained that Public Enquiries are usually conducted post project completion and any enquiry into the Tram Project is probably several years away although this was a Ministerial decision.

Red Flag item 2.1 DESIGN, CONSENTS & COMMERCIAL FORUM - General Update: The cost engineering report would be considered at the Tram Briefing on Tuesday 24 January 2012 and the Joint Project Forum on Wednesday 25 January 2012. Colin Smith explained that if approved this was only the start of the process and a meeting/workshop was necessary with Turner and Townsend to discuss how the measures should be taken forward.

Ongoing

ITEM	ACTION OWNER	DEADLINE
<p>Red Flag Item 5.0 DESIGN, CONSENTS & COMMERCIAL FORUM - Any Other Business: Colin Smith confirmed that he would be arranging a meeting with CAF, Siemens and Martin Ayers to ensure that the list of DAS could be signed off and allow the handover procedure to occur with a full audit trail behind it.</p>	CS/JW	
<p>Red Flag Item 1.3 PROGRAMME, RISK & OPPORTUNITY FORUM - Risk: Colin Smith raised a concern that BBS and Turner and Townsend seemed to be running separate risk registers brought about by changes in terminology and risk descriptions by Turner and Townsend. In response, BBS was refusing to participate and respond to the risk discussions. This was worrying as it meant there was a threat that the audit trail for risk items would be lost.</p>	Ongoing	
<p>Colin Smith proposed that the solution would be to continue with the 360 risk review template that has been used previously and consolidate the BBS/T&T risk registers into one Master document looking at all risk issues. Julian Weatherly agreed to work with Colin Smith to develop a suitable document but noted that risks, by definition, evolve and therefore the Master risk register would need to be a dynamic document which takes note of maturing risks. The group agreed with this. Colin Smith added that he believed that there was also some behavioural issues that needed to be addressed but was confident that this could be closed out at the next Control Meeting.</p>	CS/JW	
<p>7 TRAM VEHICLES AND SYSTEM TESTING AND COMMISSIONING – PROGRESS REPORT 20 JANUARY 2012</p>		
<p>Vic Emery highlighted the need for the Tram Integration Plan to be made public to the wider team for review. CS to distribute to the PDG attendee's.</p>	CS	
<p>Vic Emery stated that the tram testing and commissioning period still appeared too long and requested that a review be conducted to investigate why it was so long and what could be done to truncate it. It was noted that this should not be done at the expense of safety or quality.</p>	JW	
<p>Alastair Richards advised that the testing period at the end of the programme could be shortened if testing could take place earlier in off-street and on-street areas. Alan Coyle raised the possibility of using Dublin's tram system to provide on-street training. Alastair Richards would look into the possibility of this.</p>	AR	

ITEM	ACTION OWNER	DEADLINE
Alastair Richards confirmed that after Section C had been completed there was a 90 day period of shadow running which could be reduced to 45 days if testing had been completed prior to Section C completion. Alastair Richards to investigate the probability of achieving this.	AR	

8 AOCB

Nothing raised.

9 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday, 2 February 2012 at 9am in the City Chambers