

From: Jim Harries (Transdev)
Sent: 22 October 2006 14:23
To: Alastair Richards - TEL
Cc: Susan Clark; Andie Harper
Subject: FW: Employers Requirements sent out to Infraco
Attachments: Part 2.doc; Part 3.doc; Part 4.doc; Part 5.doc; Project Time Chainage Template.pdf; Part 1a.doc; Part 1b.doc

Alastair

Here they are with changes tracked as requested. If these really are the documents that have been sent out to Infraco, They are a very poor reflection on us all!

I have produced the following table to set out the contents of these files and what I have been able to review so far. Please have a look at the table:

Part	Page from	to	Reviewed by Transdev?	Approx number of comments
<i>File name "Part 1a"</i>				
Part 1, Functionality			Yes	4
Operations and Performance	7	30	Yes	15
System Acceptance	31	57	Yes. Very disappointing	176
<i>File name "Part 1b"</i> (but actually "Part 2")				
Part 2 -Prescribed Scope	58	112	Yes. Very disappointing	200
<i>File name "Part 2",</i> (but actually "Part 3 – Constraints")				
Non Functional	114	153	Yes	19
Structures and Civils	154	161	No	
Track	162	186	Yes	9
Tramstops	187	195	No	
Depot	196	215	No	
Roads & Utilities	216	223	No	
OLE & Pantograph	224	240	No	
Traction Power	241	266	No	
<i>File name "Part 3"</i>				
Supervisory, Control & Communications	268	337	Yes. Very disappointing	145
Tram	338	364	No	
Tram Maintenance	365	400	No	
Tram Testing and Commissioning	401	423	No	
<i>File name "Part 4"</i>				
Integrated Fare Collection	423	425	Yes. Very disappointing	3
Infrastructure Maintenance Plan	426	442	Yes. Very disappointing	110
Environment	443	450	Yes. Very disappointing	28
Third Party Agreements	451	452	Yes	3
<i>File name "Part 5"</i> Programme	453	492	No	
Total number of comments				700

In the time available, I have only reviewed parts of the documentation as set out above.

I have tried to focus on those parts of the document where I believe I may have most comments to make.

You will note from the above that the document is generally very disappointing, particularly where either

- The document has a significant proportion of "new" text, or
- A significant proportion of my previous comments seem to have been ignored.

The latter point is particularly frustrating.

Can you please:

1. let me know how you would like me to prioritise our review of the remaining Employer's Requirements that I have not reviewed, and
2. let me know the process by which the 700 or so comments that I have made will be closed out – a significant proportion of them need discussion with me as set out in the attached documents

It would be of particular value to tie and the project as a whole if the documents could be properly "signed off" by the various authors in the future prior to submitting them to me for review.

All the best
Jim Harries

Mobile [REDACTED]
City Point, 65 Haymarket Terrace, Edinburgh EH12 5HD

From: Alastair Richards - TEL [mailto:Alastair.Richards@tie.ltd.uk]
Sent: 10 October 2006 16:27
To: Jim Harries
Cc: Roger Jones; Douglas Leeming - TSS
Subject: FW: Employers Requirements sent out to Infraco

Jim,

Further to the last monthly meeting, please find attached the word versions of the employer's requirements, please markup with suggested improvements ready for issuing out in the next issue of documentation to the Infraco Bidders.

Regards,

Alastair

From: Douglas Leeming - TSS
Sent: Mon 09/10/2006 09:36
To: Alastair Richards - TEL
Cc: Trudi Craggs
Subject: RE: Employers Requirements sent out to Infraco

Alastair,

Apologies for the delay, I was on hols on Friday. Please find attached the Word version of the ERs. The document was broken up into these sections just to make it easier to handle and to share between the guys when re-formatting. The 'parts' have no bearing on the contents of the document other than indicating the order in which they should be re-assembled.

Douglas Leeming

From: Alastair Richards - TEL
Sent: Thu 05/10/2006 18:59
To: Douglas Leeming - TSS
Cc: Trudi Craggs
Subject: Employers Requirements sent out to Infraco

Douglas,

I have copied the cd's sent out to Infraco, with the employers requirements pdf, after the first 5 or so pages it seems to go to A5 size on an A4 page, and unless there is a function in Adobe that I do not know of this is going to make it awkward for Infraco's to print?

Also would it be possible to send me the word version, so that I can issue to Transdev to add tracked change comments for us to consider to be included in the next issue/update of documents to Infraco's.

Thanks,

Alastair.

`<HRsize=2 width="100%" align=center>`

The information transmitted is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail please notify the sender immediately at the email address above, and then delete it.

E-mails sent to and by our staff are monitored for operational and lawful business purposes including assessing compliance with our company rules and system performance. TIE reserves the right to monitor emails sent to or from addresses under its control.

No liability is accepted for any harm that may be caused to your systems or data by this e-mail. It is the recipient's responsibility to scan this e-mail and any attachments for computer viruses.

Senders and recipients of e-mail should be aware that under Scottish Freedom of Information legislation and the Data Protection legislation these contents may have to be disclosed to third parties in response to a request.

tie Limited registered in Scotland No. SC230949. Registered office - City Chambers, High Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1YT.