



Mr Nick Flew
Managing Director
Parsons Brinkerhoff (Europe)
6 Devonshire Square
London EC2M 4YE

Our Ref: INF CORR 5418

Date: 22nd June 2010

Dear Mr. Flew,

Edinburgh Tram Network

I wrote to you on 4th June 2010 on an urgent and important matter which I understand you are investigating. In the meantime we have been informed by the Consortium that we will be given fully assured and integrated design proposals for all of the Infraco Works by mid-July 2010. We would very much appreciate your confirmation that this will be achieved and whether or not the SDS Provider will be giving the requisite assurances for the design.

To assist you in responding to my inquiry I refer you to the attached letter dated 28th May 2009 reference 25.1.201.CBr.2707 from the Consortium to your Mr. Jason Chandler. In addition to those questions I posed in my previous letter I would ask that you explain why it has taken in excess of 12 months to integrate the Infraco Design with the SDS Design.

I look forward to receiving your early response.

Yours sincerely

Anthony Rush
Special Advisor to tie Limited
Signed in his absence.

Copies to:
David MacKay – Chairman tie Limited
Richard Jeffrey – CEO tie Limited
Ed Kitzman – BSC Consortium
Steven Reynolds – Parson Brinkerhoff (Manchester)

Citypoint Offices, 65 Haymarket Terrace, Edinburgh, EH12 5HD
Tel: +44 (0) 131 [REDACTED] Email: info@edinburghtrams.com Fax: +44 (0) 131 623 8601 Web: www.edinburghtrams.com

Registered in Scotland No: 230949 at City Chambers, High Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1Y. Edinburgh Trams is an operating name of tie Ltd.

CEC00303395_0001



Bilfinger Berger-Siemens-CAF Consortium

Our ref: 25.1.201.CBr.2707
Your ref:

BSC Consortium Office
9 Lochside Avenue
Edinburgh Park
Edinburgh
EH12 9DJ
United Kingdom

28th May 2009

Bilfinger Berger Civil, EDI	
Date Sent	28 MAY 2009 09:11
File Number	
Action	
Distribution	

Phone: +44 (0) 131 [REDACTED]

Parsons Brinckerhoff
CityPoint
65 Haymarket Terrace
Edinburgh
EH12 5HD

For the attention of Jason Chandler

Dear Sirs,

**Edinburgh Tram Network Infraco
Completion of Incomplete Design**

We refer to Design Management Review Meetings on 6th and 20th May 2009, and your email (Chandler – Brady) dated 11th May 2009, a copy of which is attached. We agreed on 20th May 2009 to respond to your email, setting out our position on completion of incomplete SDS Design, and to give you the opportunity to consider our views, before we seek to elevate the issue.

In simple terms, we believe there are some areas of Phase III work scope, required to be completed as part of your obligations under the SDS Agreement, which remain incomplete, and that you are required to complete them within the existing budget allocated to 'Balance to Complete' in Schedule 23 "SDS Novation Agreement", Appendix 4, Section 9. We acknowledge that there is a mechanism within Schedule 23 for resolving misalignment between your completed SDS Design and Infraco proposals (ref Clauses 4.7 and 4.8). However, where your design has been held in abeyance, either pending confirmation of Infraco proposals or for whatever other reason and you have therefore not expended the original Phase III design budget, we do not believe you are entitled to further instruction or additional payment to complete this design.

In general, the areas of design scope to which we refer are those where details of Infraco specified equipment or supplier design have to be provided to you to allow you to complete your design. Appendix 1 of this letter is a list of such areas currently identified.

Referring to your email of 11th May 2009:

1. You state:

"In the original plan for the project and the basis of the business case, we had planned to have a completed design to be passed to the Infraco at the point of Novation and this design would then be tailored to suit the component selection by the successful contractor. This has always been the aim in the development of the design with many of the approvals and consents for issues such as the depot building, systems elements such as OLE, tramstop equipment (shelters, passenger information displays, seating and like) and substations being subject to conditions that must be satisfied upon final selection of components. This is also the case where component selection drives the completion of the finalisation of the design such as the wheel lathe, lifting equipment, racking the in depot shed etc"

but then you go on to state:

"At no point in the original SDS Agreement does it state that SDS should revisit the design to incorporate the components selected by the successful Infraco. Added to this, at no point did the original SDS bid or post contract award design programme include for the detailed design for Infraco selected design components. This is also true of the pricing schedule."

We are unclear how you reach this conclusion since the first statement above appears to confirm the intent of the SDS Agreement was exactly that you were required to complete the design when provided with the necessary information by Infraco.

2. You state:

"BSC view that the original SDS Agreement between tie and SDS provided for a complete design for construction was discussed at meetings in the lead up to Novation which led to clarification by the rewriting of Clause 2.2, as detailed in the Novation contract Schedule 1 -- Scope of Services which states that 'Amend Paragraph 2.1.1 to include after 'all design' in the first line, to include the words ' other than Client Design', thus, at the time of Novation it was clear to BSC that the design was to be completed by BSC, and that SDS were not required to complete it within the Novated scope. This is reinforced by the fact that the SDS programme for completion of the core scope works does not include any revisit to the design for the inclusion of BSC component drive design."

Clause 2.1.1 of the SDS Agreement states:

The SDS provider shall undertake all design and produce the deliverables necessary to enable the Edinburgh Tram Network to be procured, constructed, tested and commissioned (taking account of the need to fully coordinate these activities, including with other physically-related projects, so as to minimise overall disruption) to meet the requirements of the Master Project Programme, and then operated and maintained.

We agree that the amendment to which you refer is correct, and concur that you are not required to "undertake Client Design". However we believe you are required to complete your own design when provided with the relevant Client Design information. In our view, the clause you cite does not contradict our view.

3. You refer to the provision of "additional service beyond that required by the SDS Agreement" where "Infraco complete the systems design with final component selections". As you are aware, the services to which you refer are associated with securing consents and approvals, and are not relevant to the completion of incomplete SDS Design.
4. You make a number of references to your programme for design completion and conclude that because it does not specify completion of the elements of incomplete design, that these elements are excluded from your scope. In our view, these elements are included within your obligation to complete and obtain approval for the relevant SDS Design packages. We do not accept your view, and request you to amend your programme accordingly.
5. You state that the table at Section 4, Appendix Part 4 of the Novation Agreement entitled 'Capabilities Split' does not constitute an agreed split of scope to complete. You have also referred to meetings at which this was discussed. We are not aware of any such Agreement in meetings. Our records from the pre-novation negotiation phase contain minutes of meetings, interchange of e-mails, and drafts of said table, all of which explicitly mention "Scope Split". The numerous comments and counter-comments produced in the above process also clearly show that the intention of this table was to be a scope split. We do not understand why the heading of the table changed from "Scope Split" to "Capability Split", as presented in the SDS Novation Agreement. We are of the view that the section of

Appendix Part 4 is self evidently a definition of scope split between SDS and BSC. We do not understand the relevance of your reference to Clause 7.3 of Appendix Part 4 in this regard.

You indicated in our meeting on 20th May 2009 that you wished to review a schedule of areas where we believe your obligation to complete presently incomplete design still applies. We have attached such a schedule, containing presently identified areas, as Appendix 1 to this letter. The scope of work is not particularly great, although it is all extremely critical to the programme.

We acknowledge that much of the work scope where Infracore proposals impact on your design, is to be dealt with under the process described in Clauses 4.7 – 4.8 of the SDS Novation Agreement, whereby you receive instructions and reimbursement for redesign. We hope that you will review your stance on the relatively limited scope of incomplete design which is outwith the scope of Clauses 4.7 – 4.8, and will confirm that you will progress these areas without further delay. In any case please respond urgently confirming your intentions so you and we may make any necessary arrangements to conclude the issue.

Yours faithfully,


M Foerder
Project Director
Bilfinger Berger Siemens CAF Consortium

cc: MBe, CBr, SRo

APPENDIX 1 – AS PER 27/5/09

SCHEDULE OF INCOMPLETE SDS DESIGN

Includes, but not limited to:

- Depot Building: structure, building works, accommodation areas, building services, Control Room (including Human Factors analysis).
- Depot Equipment: foundations, GA and RC details, utility supplies, building services, lighting, guarding, ducts, drainage.
- Tramstops: GA & RC details, paving and hard landscaping, incorporation of Infracore design equipment into general layout, access and visibility, provision for the physically impaired including DDA compliance, signage, lighting.
- Cable Infrastructure: off-street section, ducts for trams and traffic signalling, signage, ancillary power, lighting, radio system.
- Earthworks: drainage, cross sections.
- Consolidated Drawings: (combined services drawings).



RE: Notes of Design Management Review meeting with SDS, 6-6-09

Chandler, Jason to: Colin.Brady, Dolan, Alan

11/05/2009 19:22

"Berrozpe, Miguel"; Stefan.Rothhaus, Martin.Foerder, "David

Cc: "Steele", Baltazar.Ochoa, "Reynolds, Steve", "Dolan, Alan",

"Shudall, Kate"

History: This message has been replied to.

Colin,

Thank you for the minutes of the meeting. Given the importance of this issues raised and our completely differing views on the issues discussed at the meeting I thought it worth presenting the contractual basis of our views.

As stated in your minutes in a number of areas and as declared in the Novation Agreement, the SDS Design is incomplete, with many designs issued for construction pending the incorporation of post-novation information from the Infraco. What is important from our point of view is that rather than this being in some way an SDS failing or under performance, this was always the intention and was very clear to all of those involved in the preparation and signing of the contractual documents that form the basis of the Novation Agreement.

In the original plan for the project and the basis of the Business Case, we had planned to have a completed design to be passed to the Infraco at the point of Novation and this design would then be tailored to suit the component selection by the successful contractor. This has always been the aim in the development of the design with many of the approvals and consents for issues such as the Depot building, systems elements such as OLE, tramstop equipment (shelters, passenger information displays, seating and the like) and substations being subject to conditions that must be satisfied upon final selection of components. This is also the case where component selection drives the completion of the finalisation of the design such as the wheel lathe, lifting equipment, racking in the depot shed etc. This is clear in the original SDS agreement. At the meeting reference was made to clause 2.1. This clause must be read in its entirety and not only 2.1.1. For example, clause 2.1.8 states 'The SDS provider shall deliver designs and/or Technical Specifications which shall include;

2.1.8.2 specifications of sub systems functionality and technical requirements for the following E and M system components;

- * trams
- * tram track;
- * OLE
- * Depot Equipment
- * traction and auxiliary power supply network
- * signalling and control system

CEC00303395_0007

*
communication system
*
integrated fare collection system
*
security systems and Depot systems and associated maintenance
plant and equipment.

Clause 2.1.8.3 goes on to state that SDS are responsible for the infrastructure design to support the above E and M system components.

In clause 2.6.2 the contract states

2.6.2.2 produce procurement specifications and associated schedules for all E and M systems and sub-systems for the Edinburgh Tram Network

At no point in the original SDS agreement does it state that SDS should revisit the design to incorporate the components selected by the successful Infraco. Added to this, at no point did the original SDS Bid or post contract award Design Programme include for the detailed design for Infraco selected design components. This is also true of the pricing schedule.

BSC view that the original SDS Agreement between TIE and SDS provided for a complete design for construction was discussed at meetings in the lead up to novation which led to clarification by the re writing of clause 2.1, as detailed in the Novation contract Schedule 1 - Scope of Services which states that

'Amend paragraph 2.1.1 to include after 'all design' in the first line, to include the words 'other than Client Design',

thus, at the time of Novation it was clear to BSC that the design was to be completed by BSC, and that SDS were not required to complete it within the Novated scope. This is reinforced by the fact that the SDS programme for completion of the core scope works does not include any revisit to the design for the inclusion of BSC component driven design.

During the negotiation of the Novation Contract terms and Conditions BSC realised the extent of the design to be completed through component selection and made for provision for ongoing support by SDS through the Extended Construction Support Services. In Section 7.1 of the Novation Contract it states

'As a result of request from TIE and Infraco SDS will provide additional service beyond that required by the SDS Agreement during the construction phase of the project to support Infraco to secure approvals and consents for Client Design (as defined in the SDS agreement).

This will be where Infraco complete the systems design with final component selections and will be primarily;

- * OLE Design
- * Signalling and Comms
- * Passenger Information Displays
- * Tram Stop Furniture
- * Automatic Fare Collection equipment
- * CCTV equipment
- * Public Address equipment
- * Track Finishes
- * Substation buildings modifications
- * System wide security systems
- * Depot Equipment

The team will support Infraco with technical and prior approvals and will also support Infraco with their duty to discharge outstanding planning and prior approval conditions scheduled by the Approvals Authorities in the formal responses to the SDS prior approvals applications'.

In clause 7.3 it goes on to state that 'SDS Design Support Team will liaise with the Infraco, tie and SDS planners to inform the Infraco Project Planner of the progress of the Client design approvals and consents.' We have consistently attempted to do this but as stated in your minutes on programme, SDS still have not been able to fulfil this obligation due to the lack of a design programme being offered by BSC.

With regard to the "Capabilities Split" table of Appendix Part 4 to the SDS Novation Agreement, the table as included in the Novation Contract defines Capability and not scope. At one point during the negotiations it was called a 'Scope Split' but for clarity this title was removed as it was agreed that this was misleading as this table represents only an indicator as to whom would ultimately be best placed in terms of capability to undertake any work, should any arise, post novation. In no place in the contract, including the SDS programme, is there any suggestion that SDS are obliged to do any such work at our own cost or that by indicating capability in the table that there is any way inference that this was included in the Scope to complete. If SDS were requested to undertake such work this would be done through an instruction by BSC, and would be considered a change and would go through the normal change procedure.

As stated above any suggestion that BSC understood that the Capabilities Split was in fact a scope split and that SDS are in some way obliged to complete the component driven design is clearly not the case from Clause 7.3.

During our meeting Siemens accepted responsibility for the Client Design in the design of OLE, substations equipment, trackwork, telecomms and signalling nominated design subcontractors in the Infracore contract. There was no clear reason for Siemens not being responsible for the completion of other Client component selection driven design other than Siemens only has a "procurement department". It is clear that the selection of these components is not simply a procurement issue and is one that must be managed and coordinated with extreme care. It is the integration and Interfacing of the components and systems where the vast majority of the work that remains outstanding to complete the design resides.

There is clearly some way to go on the resolution of these issues. We do remain committed to supporting BSC through the delivery of the project and the fortnightly meeting is proving a vital part of this. I would be happy to arrange another meeting to discuss this topic in advance of the next Management meeting if required.

Regards,

Jason.

From: Colin.Brady@civil.bilfinger.co.uk [mailto:Colin.Brady@civil.bilfinger.co.uk]
Sent: Mon 11/05/2009 07:42
To: Chandler, Jason; Dolan, Alan
Cc: Berrozpe, Miguel; Stefan.Rotthaus@civil.bilfinger.co.uk; Martin.Foerder@civil.bilfinger.co.uk; David Steele; Baltazar.Ochoa@civil.bilfinger.co.uk
Subject: Notes of Design Management Review meeting with SDS, 6-5-09

(See attached file: SDS 6-5-09.doc)

CEC00303395_0010

Note next meeting, at 10:30 on Wednesday 20/5/09
Regards,

Colin Brady
Technical Director

Bilfinger Berger UK Limited
9 Lochside Avenue
Edinburgh
EH12 9DJ
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0) [REDACTED]
Fax: +44 (0) [REDACTED]
Email: colin.brady@civil.bilfinger.co.uk
Web: www.civil.bilfinger.co.uk

Bilfinger Berger UK Limited

Executive Management: Richard Walker (Chairman)
Michael Zillgens
Registered Office: 150 Aldersgate Street, London, EC1A 4EJ
Registered in England and Wales
Company No: 2418086

A Company of Bilfinger Berger Ingenieurbau GmbH.

The information contained in this message is confidential or protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete this message. Any unauthorised copying of this message or unauthorised distribution of the information contained herein is prohibited.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.

Bilfinger Berger (provided by Bilfinger Berger Civil UK Limited Business Systems) confirms that this email message has been swept by MIMESweeper for SMTP for the presence of computer viruses.

www.bilfinger.co.uk

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message; delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.

CEC00303395_0011



List of info required BDDI IFC

Baltazar Ochoa to: Chandler, Jason, Dolan, Alan

01/06/2009 18:03

Cc: Martin Foerder, Kevin Russell, Colin Brady, Stefan Rotthaus,
Simon Nesbitt, Martin Hutchinson

Jason, Alan,

Further to you conversations and e-mail exchange with Kevin and Colin, please find attached the list for the items that need clarification from BDDI to IFC.

Please note this list may is not exhaustive, but it reflects our short term needs. Items listed as priority 1 and 2 are particularly urgent.

We look forward to discuss the list and steps forward tomorrow.

Best regards,

Baltazar Ochoa
Change Management

Bilfinger Berger UK Limited
9 Lochside Avenue
Edinburgh
EH12 9DJ
United Kingdom



200905601 List Changes BDDI IFC.pdf

Tel: +44 (0) 131 [REDACTED]
Fax: +44 (0) 131 452 2518
Email: baltazar.ochoa@civil.bilfinger.co.uk
Web: www.bilfingerberger.co.uk

Bilfinger Berger UK Limited

Executive Management: Richard Walker (Chairman)
Michael Zillgens
Registered Office: 150 Aldersgate Street, London, EC1A 4EJ
Registered in England and Wales
Company No: 2418086

A Company of Bilfinger Berger Ingenieurbau GmbH.

The information contained in this message is confidential or protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete this message. Any unauthorised copying of this message or unauthorised distribution of the information contained herein is prohibited.

REASONS FOR DESIGN CHANGES BDDI-IFC

Item No.	Priority	INTC	Description	Status BDDI as per 31.05.09
1	1	104	IFC Drawing Change Baird Drive RTW	SDS provided general information. Further clarification by SDS required. Requested 26.05.09)
2	1	106	IFC Drawing Change Murrayfield Stadium RTW	SDS provided general information. Further clarification by SDS required
3	1	201	IFC Drawing Changes - Depot Access Bridge	Requested to SDS 19.05.09
4	1	262	IFC Drawing Changes - Section 5B - Track Drainage	
5	1	155	IFC Drawing changes Gogarburn RTWs 15A, 15C, 144D	SDS provided general information. Reasons for change to be re-issued once the extent of survey issue is known.
6	1	203a	IFC Drawing changes - Gogarburn Depot (foundations)	Requested to SDS 19.05.09
6	1	203b	IFC Drawing changes - Gogarburn Depot (structure)	Requested to SDS 19.05.09
6	1	203c	Hard Landscaping	
6	1	203d	Substation Building	
6	1	203e	New Chamber	
6	1	203f	Soil Nailing and Soil Reinforcement Works	
6	1	203g	Secondary Steelwork	
7	2	147	IFC Drawings Change Murrayfield Training Pitches Retaining Wall	SDS provided general information. Further clarification by SDS required
8	2	110	IFC Drawing Change South Gyle Access Bridge	
9	2	204	IFC Drawing changes - Roads , Streetlighting , Drainage Section 5B	
10	2	205	IFC Drawing changes - Roads , Streetlighting , Drainage Section 5C	
11	2	107	IFC Drawing Change Bankhead RTW	SDS provided general information. Further clarification by SDS required
12	2	230	IFC Drawing Changes - Tower Bridge Structure	
13	3	397	IFC Changes - Series 800 Earthworks Specification	
14	3	398	IFC Changes - Series 1700 Structural Concrete Specification	
15	3	408	IFC Changes - Ductwork Specification	
16	3	212	IFC Drawing changes - Roads and Street Lighting, Landscaping and Drainage Section 2A	
17	3	115	IFC Drawing Change Carricknowe Bridge	
18		160	IFC Drawing changes - Edinburgh Park Bridge	
19	3	314	IFC Drawing Changes - Section 7 Track Vertical and Horizontal Alignment Drawings	
20	3	315	IFC Drawing Changes - Drainage - Gogarburn to Airport.	
21	3	210	IFC Drawing changes - Road ,Street Lighting, Landscaping and Drainage Section 1B.	
22	4	199	IFC Drawing changes - Balgreen bridge S22a	
23	4	335	IFC Drawing Changes - Track Drainage Section 5C	
24	4	108	IFC Drawing Change Gyle Stop RTW	
25	4	148	IFC Drawing Change Balgreen Road Underbridge (S22b)	
26	4	374	IFC Drawing Changes - Soil Nailing and Reinforced Earth Treatment within Gogar Land fill area	
27	4	109	IFC Drawing Change Murrayfield Underpass	
28	5	202	IFC Drawing changes - Gogarburn Culverts 1 , 2 and 3	Requested to SDS 01.08.09
29	5	231	IFC Drawing Changes - Section 1C drainage	
30	5	233	IFC Drawing Changes - Section 1C lighting layout	
31	5	232	IFC Drawing Changes - Section 1C road design	



Revised - updated BDDI-IFC list
Baltazar Ochoa to; Chandier, Jason, Dolan, Alan
Cc: Simon Nesbitt

10/06/2009 14:48

Jason, Alan,

Further to my e-mail dated 01 June 2009 in regards to BSC's request for clarification on BDDI-IFC changes for some packages and our meeting held on 2 June 2009 to discuss the list attached to my e-mail referred to above, please find attached a copy of the revised list as per our meeting referred to above. This list that includes the packages for which we need clarification at this stage and the names of the persons that may be able to provide such clarification.

We understand our contact persons for dealing with BDDI-IFC clarification issues would be K Shudall and S Ney.

Best regards,

Baltazar Ochoa
Change Management



20090602 List Changes BDDI IFC r.1.pdf

Bilfinger Berger UK Limited
9 Lochside Avenue
Edinburgh
EH12 9DJ
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0) 131 [REDACTED]
Fax: +44 (0) 131 [REDACTED]
Email: baltazar.ochoa@civil.bilfinger.co.uk
Web: www.bilfingerberger.co.uk

Bilfinger Berger UK Limited

Executive Management: Richard Walker (Chairman)
Michael Zillgens
Registered Office: 150 Aldersgate Street, London, EC1A 4EJ
Registered in England and Wales
Company No: 2418086

A Company of Bilfinger Berger Ingenieurbau GmbH.

The information contained in this message is confidential or protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete this message. Any unauthorised copying of this message or unauthorised distribution of the information contained herein is prohibited.

CEC00303395_0014

REASONS FOR DESIGN CHANGES BDD-HFC

BSC/SDS meeting held on 02 June 2009

Item No.	Priority	INTC	Description	Status BDD as per 31.05.09	Contact Person SDS / SDM (Section Design Manager) / DTL (Design Team Leader)
1	1	104	IFC Drawing Change Baird Drive RTW	SDS provided general information. Further clarification by SDS required. Requested 28.05.09	K Shudall / Halcrow (Colin Walker)
2	1	108	IFC Drawing Change Murrayfield Stadium RTW	SDS provided general information. Further clarification by SDS required	K Shudall / Halcrow (Colin Walker)
3	1	201	IFC Drawing Changes - Depot Access Bridge	Requested to SDS 19.05.09	K Shudall / OLE Foundations: A Groves
4	1	282	IFC Drawing Changes - Section 5B - Track Drainage		K Shudall / C Cox
5	1	155	IFC Drawing changes Gogarburn RTWs 15A,15C, 144D	SDS provided general information. Reasons for change to be re-issued once the extent of survey issue is known.	K Shudall / Halcrow (Colin Walker)
6	1	203a	IFC Drawing changes - Gogarburn Depot (foundations)	Requested to SDS 19.05.09	Ian Brown / PB Structural team (Godelmia)
6	1	203b	IFC Drawing changes - Gogarburn Depot (structures)	Requested to SDS 19.05.09	Ian Brown / PB Structural team
6	1	203c	Hard Landscaping		Ian Brown
6	1	203d	Substation Building		Ian Brown
6	1	203e	New Chamber		Ian Brown / Halcrow
6	1	203f	Soil Nailing and Soil Reinforcement Works		Ian Brown / Halcrow
6	1	203g	Secondary Steelwork		Ian Brown / PB Structural team
7	2	147	IFC Drawings Change Murrayfield Training Pitches Retaining Wall	SDS provided general information. Further clarification by SDS required	K Shudall / Halcrow (Colin Walker)
8	2	110	IFC Drawing Change South Gyle Access Bridge		K Shudall / A Dolan
9	2	204	IFC Drawing changes - Roads, Streetlighting, Drainage Section 5B		K Shudall / Roads: Halcrow - St light: PB (Anthony Walsh) - Drainage: Halcrow
10	2	205	IFC Drawing changes - Roads, Streetlighting, Drainage Section 5C		K Shudall / Roads: Halcrow - St light: PB (Anthony Walsh) - Drainage: Halcrow
11	2	107	IFC Drawing Change Bantlehead RTW	SDS provided general information. Further clarification by SDS required	K Shudall / Halcrow (Colin Walker)
12	2	230	IFC Drawing Changes - Tower Bridge Structure		S Ney / Halcrow (Colin Walker)
13	3	397	IFC Changes - Series 600 Earthworks Specification		Halcrow K Maghlin - David Rayside
14	3	398	IFC Changes - Series 1700 Structural Concrete Specification		A Groves / Halcrow: Colin Walker
19	3	408	IFC Changes - Ductwork Specification		Mattell / A Dolan
16	3	212	IFC Drawing changes - Roads and Street Lighting, Landscaping and Drainage Section 2A		K Shudall / Roads: Halcrow - St light: PB (Anthony Walsh) - Drainage: Halcrow
17	3	160	IFC Drawing changes - Edinburgh Park Bridge		K Shudall / Halcrow (Colin Walker)
18	3	314	IFC Drawing Changes - Section 7 Track Vertical and Horizontal Alignment Drawings		K Shudall / C Cox (Survey info by Halcrow)
19	3	315	IFC Drawing Changes - Drainage - Gogarburn to Airport	Requested to SDS 01.05.09	K Shudall / Halcrow
20	3	210	IFC Drawing changes - Road, Street Lighting, Landscaping and Drainage Section 1B		S Ney / Roads: Halcrow - St light: PB (Anthony Walsh) - Drainage: Halcrow
21	4	199	IFC Drawing changes - Balgreen bridge S22a		K Shudall / A Groves
22	4	335	IFC Drawing Changes - Track Drainage Section 5C		K Shudall / C Cox
23	4	108	IFC Drawing Change Gyle Stop RTW		K Shudall / Ian Brown
24	4	148	IFC Drawing Change Balgreen Road Underbridge (S22b)		K Shudall / A Groves
25	4	374	IFC Drawing Changes - Soil Nailing and Reinforced Earth Treatment within Gogar Landfill area.		K Shudall / Halcrow
25	4	109	IFC Drawing Change Murrayfield Underpass		K Shudall / A Groves
27	5	112	IFC Drawing Change Haymarket Viaduct		
28	5	202	IFC Drawing changes - Gogarburn Culverts 1, 2 and 3	Requested to SDS 01.05.09	K Shudall / Halcrow (Colin Walker)
29	5	231	IFC Drawing Changes - Section 1C drainage		S Ney / Halcrow
30	5	233	IFC Drawing Changes - Section 1C lighting layout		S Ney / A Walsh
31	5	232	IFC Drawing Changes - Section 1C road design		S Ney / Halcrow
32			Trackform locations changed		C Cox
33			Depot footprint		



Fw: BDDI information
Kevin Russell to: Chandler, Jason

28/05/2009 11:51

Jason,

Could we please discuss this issue at your earliest convenience. There seems to be a misunderstanding among the parties. Please call me otherwise I will have to schedule a meeting for Tuesday after our 2-4pm meeting.

Regards,

Kevin Russell
P.Eng. Pr.Eng
Contract Manager

Bilfinger Berger UK Limited
9 Lochside Avenue
Edinburgh
EH12 9DJ
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0) [REDACTED]
Mobile: +44 (0) [REDACTED]
Fax: +44 (0) 131 452 2990
Email: kevin.russell@civil.bilfinger.co.uk
Web: www.bilfingerberger.co.uk

Bilfinger Berger UK Limited

Executive Management: Richard Walker; Chairman, Michael Zillgens
Registered Office: 150 Aldersgate Street, London, EC1A 4EJ
Registered in England and Wales
Company No: 2418086

A Company of Bilfinger Berger Ingenieurbau GmbH.

The information contained in this message is confidential or protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete this message. Any unauthorised copying of this message or unauthorised distribution of the information contained herein is prohibited.

----- Forwarded by Kevin Russell/Project Management/Civil/Bberger on 28/05/2009 11:39 -----

From: Simon Nesbitt/Design Management/Civil/Bberger
To: Kevin Russell/Project Management/Civil/Bberger@Bilfinger Berger UK
Cc: Baltazar Ochoa/Commercial Management/Civil/Bberger@Bilfinger Berger UK
Date: 26/05/2009 17:32
Subject: Fw: BDDI information

Kevin

FYI

Regards,

Simon P Nesbitt
Design Manager

CEC00303395_0016

Bilfinger Berger UK Limited
9 Lochside Avenue
Edinburgh
EH12 9DJ
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0) 131 [REDACTED]
Fax: +44 (0) 131 [REDACTED]
Email: simon.nesbitt@civil.bilfinger.co.uk
Web: www.civil.bilfinger.co.uk

Bilfinger Berger UK Limited

Executive Management: Richard Walker (Chairman)
Michael Zillgens
Registered Office: 150 Aldersgate Street, London, EC1A 4EJ
Registered in England and Wales
Company No: 2418086

A Company of Bilfinger Berger Ingenieurbau GmbH.

The information contained in this message is confidential or protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete this message. Any unauthorised copying of this message or unauthorised distribution of the information contained herein is prohibited.

----- Forwarded by Simon Nesbitt/Design Management/Civil/Bberger on 26/05/2009 17:30 -----

From: "Ney, Scott" <Ney@pbworld.com>
To: <Simon.Nesbitt@civil.bilfinger.co.uk>
Cc: "Shudall, Kate" <ShudallK@pbworld.com>, "Chandler, Jason" <ChandlerJ@pbworld.com>, "Dolan, Alan" <DolanA@pbworld.com>
Date: 26/05/2009 17:24
Subject: RE: BDDI information

Simon --

I have passed this along to Jason to resolve any commercial issues with Kevin Russell so that we can move this forward and help you out as soon as possible.

Will advise when details are available.

SMN

-----Original Message-----

From: Simon.Nesbitt@civil.bilfinger.co.uk [mailto:Simon.Nesbitt@civil.bilfinger.co.uk]
Sent: 26 May 2009 13:51
To: Ney, Scott
Cc: Shudall, Kate
Subject: Fw: BDDI information

Scott

Copy of email sent 20/5 FYI - please advise if you did not receive original email on 20/5 as there may have been an issue within BSC IT system which I will need to check.

CEC00303395_0017

Thanks
Simon

----- Forwarded by Simon Nesbitt/Design Management/Civil/Bberger on
26/05/2009 13:48 -----

|----->
| From: |
|----->

>-----
|----->
| Simon Nesbitt/Design Management/Civil/Bberger
|

>-----
|----->
| To: |
|----->

>-----
|----->
| "Ney, Scott" <Ney@pbworld.com>
|

>-----
|----->
| Cc: |
|----->

>-----
|----->
| Baltazar.Ochoa@civil.bilfinger.co.uk, kevin.russell@civil.bilfinger.uk,
"Shudall, Kate" <ShudallK@pbworld.com>,
| Stefan.Rotthaus@civil.bilfinger.co.uk
|

>-----
|----->
| Date: |
|----->

>-----
|----->
| 20/05/2009 21:04
|

>-----
|----->
| Subject: |
|----->

>-----
|----->
| RE: BDDI information
|

>-----
|----->
|

Scott

I have spoken to Kevin on this following your email.

Please proceed with the Depot BDDI - IFC Steelwork and Foundation issues as per my previous email. Kevin is reviewing the aforementioned list and all other issues will be included within this.

If you have any queries or require further information on the Depot issues, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Simon P Nesbitt
Design Manager

Bilfinger Berger UK Limited
9 Lochside Avenue
Edinburgh
EH12 9DJ
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0) 131 [REDACTED]
Fax: +44 (0) 131 452 2990
Email: simon.nesbitt@civil.bilfinger.co.uk
Web: www.civil.bilfinger.co.uk

Bilfinger Berger UK Limited

Executive Management: Richard Walker (Chairman) Michael Zillgens Registered
Office: 150 Aldersgate Street, London, EC1A 4EJ Registered in England and
Wales Company No: 2418086

A Company of Bilfinger Berger Ingenieurbau GmbH.

The information contained in this message is confidential or protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete this message. Any unauthorised copying of this message or unauthorised distribution of the information contained herein is prohibited.

|----->
| From: |
|----->

>-----
| "Ney, Scott" <Ney@pbworld.com>
|

>-----
|----->
| To: |
|----->

>-----
|----->
| <Simon.Nesbitt@civil.bilfinger.co.uk>
|

>-----
|----->
| Cc: |
|----->

>-----
|----->
| "Shudall, Kate" <ShudallK@pbworld.com>,
<kevin.russell@civil.bilfinger.uk>, <Baltazar.Ochoa@civil.bilfinger.co.uk>,
|
| <Stefan.Rotthaus@civil.bilfinger.co.uk>
|

>-----
|----->
| Date: |
|----->

>-----
|----->
| 20/05/2009 07:38
|

>-----
|----->
| Subject: |
|----->

>-----
|----->
| RE: BDDI information
|

>-----
|----->

Simon -

We had a chat with Kevin Russell and Martin Foerder after the monthly progress meeting yesterday on BDDI items, and the way forward.

Can you please confirm with Kevin that BSC still want to move forward with these in the manner below, or if they are to be included in the list that is coming over to us in the next few days.

Thanks.

SMN

-----Original Message-----

From: Simon.Nesbitt@civil.bilfinger.co.uk [mailto:Simon.Nesbitt@civil.bilfinger.co.uk]
Sent: 19 May 2009 22:27
To: Shudall, Kate
Cc: Baltazar.Ochoa@civil.bilfinger.co.uk; Clement, Gavin; Ney, Scott; Stefan.Rotthaus@civil.bilfinger.co.uk
Subject: Re: BDDI information

Kate

Further to your email below and today's Design Changes meeting in which each of the items was discussed, please would you advise when you will be in a position to discuss the following BDDI - IFC issues with BSC. We will need to agree a pre meeting time to discuss these issues prior to the main meeting with tie - either before 26/5 meeting or 3/6 meeting.

BDDI - IFC - Section 7 Culvert 1 and 3 - increase in size due to change in vertical alignment

BDDI - IFC - Depot Building - Steelwork increase

BDDI - IFC - Depot Foundation Slab increase in size

If you have any queries or require further information on any of these, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Simon P Nesbitt
Design Manager

Bilfinger Berger UK Limited
9 Lochside Avenue
Edinburgh
EH12 9DJ
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0) [REDACTED]
Fax: +44 (0) 131 452 2990
Email: simon.nesbitt@civil.bilfinger.co.uk
Web: www.civil.bilfinger.co.uk

Bilfinger Berger UK Limited

Executive Management: Richard Walker (Chairman) Michael Zillgens Registered
Office: 150 Aldersgate Street, London, EC1A 4EJ Registered in England and
Wales Company No: 2418086

A Company of Bilfinger Berger Ingenieurbau GmbH.

The information contained in this message is confidential or protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete this message. Any unauthorised copying of this message or unauthorised distribution of the information contained herein is prohibited.

From: "Shudall, Kate" <ShudallK@pbworld.com>
To: <Simon.Nesbitt@bilfinger.co.uk>
Cc: <Stefan.Rotthaus@civil.bilfinger.co.uk>, "Ney, Scott" <Ney@pbworld.com>, "Clement, Gavin" <ClementGa@pbworld.com>, <Baltazar.Ochoa@civil.bilfinger.co.uk>

CEC00303395_0021

Date: 18/05/2009 11:25

Subject: BDDI information

Simon,

As discussed, The BDDI information you require is being request in several different forums.

Sometimes we received letters asking for the information (see example attached). Regularly I receive emails from Baltazar (see below), and now we are also receiving requests via the Design Change Issues meeting.

Please ensure that from now on the information BSC require is sent to SDS in a consistent format, with sufficient time given for SDS to review and summarise the information you require, before discussions at meeting with tie. SDS also formally request that any topic to be discussed with tie, have a Pre meeting with SDS and BSC only, and that BSC present the information required, for your claim.

Please advise on how you intend to manage this process moving forward,

Many Thanks,
Kate

-----Original Message-----

From: Baltazar.Ochoa@civil.bilfinger.co.uk [mailto:Baltazar.Ochoa@civil.bilfinger.co.uk]
Sent: 18 May 2009 11:02
To: Shudall, Kate
Subject: INTC 111 Gogar Burn Bridge

Kate,

I hope you are doing very well.
Could you please help on the following?

1. The quantity of service ducts has increased from 12nr on the BDDI drawings to 20nr on the IFC drawings. Can you advise where the request to increase the number of ducts came from.
2. Foamed concrete has been introduced as a surround to the service ducts. Can you advise what the designers allowed for as a surround to the ducts at BDDI? Can you also advise why foamed concrete is now required?
3. There appears to be a revision to the design and make up of the run on slab resulting in the addition of a cementitious sub base. Can you provide clarification as to why this detail was amended.
4. The parapets have been amended from insitu concrete to precast concrete. Can you provide details of the reason for this change.

Best regards,

Baltazar Ochoa
Change Management

Bilfinger Berger UK Limited
9 Lochside Avenue
Edinburgh
EH12 9DJ
United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0) 131 [REDACTED]
Fax: +44 (0) 131 452 2518
Email: baltazar.ochoa@civil.bilfinger.co.uk
Web: www.bilfingerberger.co.uk

Bilfinger Berger UK Limited

Executive Management: Richard Walker (Chairman) Michael Zillgens Registered
Office: 150 Aldersgate Street, London, E1A 4EJ Registered in England and
Wales Company No: 2418086

A Company of Bilfinger Berger Ingenieurbau GmbH.

The information contained in this message is confidential or protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete this message. Any unauthorised copying of this message or unauthorised distribution of the information contained herein is prohibited.

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager.

Bilfinger Berger (provided by Bilfinger Berger Civil UK Limited Business Systems) confirms that this email message has been swept by MIMESweeper for SMTP for the presence of computer viruses.

www.bilfinger.co.uk

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies. [attachment "UKPB1-#94930-v1-Letter_from_BSC_re_Infraco_Notification_of_tie_Change_No_3_15_IFC_Drawings_-_Drainage_Sub-Section_7.PDF"

deleted by Simon Nesbitt/Design Management/Civil/Bberger]

**Bilfinger Berger – Siemens – CAF Consortium : Edinburgh Tram Network
Meeting Notes**

Subject	Design Management Review	Location	Project Office
Date	12/8/09	Time	
Attendees	Representing	Attendees	Representing
S Reynolds	SDS	M Berrozpe	BSC
J Chandler	SDS	C Brady	BSC
A Dolan	SDS	S Rotthaus	BSC
S Ney	SDS	B Ochoa	BSC
Distribution	Attendees	M Wilken	

		Action	Date
1	General		
1.1	<p>Update on notes of last meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Design Integration lead - Include in agenda of all future Design Management Review meetings to ensure any current issues are resolved promptly. ◦ Depot Design- There is a strong work interface with Siemens. From Siemens side, we confirm the responsible persons are Norbert Wunder (Depot/Workshop Equipment issues) and John Newton (all other systems such as COM, SCA, etc.). Any change to previously defined interfaces need to be notified to Robert Kraemer as well, as Interface Manager. Siemens will hereafter send all our requirements to BB who will issue them to SDS in the appropriate form. ◦ Depot Construction Priorities – ensure that Norbert Wunder is fully involved in resolution of priorities. BB representatives for Depot are Alastair Scott (Section Manager) and Jon Bird (Design manager) ◦ DKE – CBr confirmed to MBe that Reconciliation Schedule rev 5 is the correct source data for all pole locations on-street. ◦ DKE – delete word "Infraco" from section 5, 1st paragraph in last meeting notes. ◦ DKE -- differentiate platform edge location from DKE. It has been agreed with Tie to resolve this through the misalignment/development workshop process. ◦ SDS confirmed to MBe that all pole foundation levels are specified as a dimension relative to top of rail (it was clarified in the Guided Busway that this should be taken as top of 		

	lowest adjacent rail for centre poles between canted tracks).		
2	Schedule of Deliverables		
	ADo gave a brief overview of the response to BSC queries on the drawing register. A submission under covering letter is due tomorrow. BSC will process the submission when Ralf Honeck returns on 17/8/09.	RHo	w/c 17/8/09
3	Design Support		
	MBe asked SDS to identify possible track consultants to be engaged by Siemens on a direct hire basis, as required.	JCh	asap
	MBe agreed that a reasonable demobilisation period for Chris Pope was acceptable.	Note	
4	DKE Check		
	SDS estimate received.	Note	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDS to produce list of queries for CAF, prior to a meeting (if required). Also comment if telephone conference would assist) • SDS to confirm a speed profile is required for the DKE check • If required, BSC to confirm applicable speed profile • SDS to confirm, by reference to drawing numbers and revisions, current alignment to be used in check • SDS to provide programme, showing issue of report, and if possible issue of initial findings confirming number/location of clashes, if any 	ADo	asap
	BSC will issue instruction on receipt of above information. Instruction to be issued asap.	CBr	asap
5	Earthworks		
5.1	Existing drawings clarified/made consistent, as agreed in meeting on 16/7/09. Issue on 13/8/09	ADo	13/8/09
5.2	Revised vertical alignment in Section 7 SDS believe alignment drawings have been issued, both to check	SRO/ADo	asap

5.3	Review of drawings and design as required by Tie letter 1842. SDS/BSC to establish agreed position by 14/8/09.	CBr/JCh	14/8/09
5.4	Gogar Landfill SDS described current status of design review, which indicates likely solution will be piled trackslab. PB to confirm design status in w/c 17/8/09. Response to BSC letters 3233 and 3234 required.	JCh JCh	w/c 17/8 asap
6	Planning informatives		
6.1	CEC/Tie are increasingly concerned about lack of close out of informatives by BSC/SDS. BSC believe s design aspects of this to be phase 3 design scope. Typically, informatives require :- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ procurement based information ◦ Method Statements ◦ Design completion (eg landscaping) SDS pointed out that CEC had changed their requirements, for example landscaping at Shandwick Place, and BSC needed to be aware of the background.	Note BSC BSC SDS Note	
6.2	Meeting to be held urgently to agree how resolution of informatives is to be accelerated .	SRo/SNe	asap
7	Gogarburn Retaining Walls		
7.1	Query on accuracy of original survey has been passed to original designers (Halcrow). BSC require a timetable for response -- this to be agreed by 14/8/09	CBr/JCh	14/8/09
8	Trackform, Ground Improvement Slab		
8.1	Response to BSC letter 3155 required urgently (audit trail to current r.c slab solution) – date of response to be confirmed by 14/8/09	CBr/JCh	14/8/09
8.2	Tie wish to hold trackform meeting on Thursday 20/8/09, to review risk of not providing Ground Improvement layer with void spanning capability. SDS requested to attend. BSC to clarify meeting scope	ADo CBr	20/8/09 asap

..B

9	Trackslab Design at Obstructions		
9.1	MBe requested that development of any special trackform design at obstructions must include participation by Siemens/BAM. K Dieker is contact point.	All	ongoing
9.2	ADo described current state of design development of Crawley Tunnel crossing – proposal to infill tunnel locally unlikely to be accepted by Scottish Water. CBr reminded SDS that construction is due to commence in 1 st week of September.	Note	
9.3	MUDFA clashes – information awaited from Tie. CBr to raise with Tie at weekly management meeting.	CBr	17/8/09
10	Information Transfer Siemens – SDS		
10.1	ADo described some recent examples of inadequate quality control on information transfer by Siemens to SDS. Agreed that information transfer, in all directions, must be confirmed by formal notification in accordance with project procedures.	All	ongoing
10.3	MBe clarified that problem was also experienced with SDS information issue and that solution was better control by all parties (SDS, BB and Siemens)	All	ongoing
10.4	A particular area of concern for Siemens is that changes are initiated as a result of events, approver comments etc, without participation in the design process by Siemens engineers – i.e that a fait accompli is presented to Siemens, sometimes with significant consequences. It is necessary to improve communication within the design teams so that Siemens engineers are aware when need for a change is being considered, so they can participate fully in the process. To this end, the existing Change Control and design processes will be reviewed to establish effective procedures. SRO will lead this review, which will require input from SDS and Siemens. Report progress in next meeting.	Note SRO/ MWi/ ADo SRO	ongoing 26/8/09
11	Other Issues		
11.1	PSCC Meeting – J Dolan has cited Centro database as an acceptable:		

.../4

	example for a "Body of Evidence" structure. Joe Brown of PB has worked on the Centro database, and is available to assist on ETN. CBr has already had discussions with Tony Glazebrook of Tie on database structure and technology (eg a web based system), and will take this forward. John Riley also to be kept informed.	Note CBr	ongoing
11.2	Tram Arrestors – Decision reached in PSCC meeting to go forward with earth drag arrestors has apparently not been communicated properly to Siemens. JCh to provide latest documentation to Siemens (in accordance with QA procedures , as noted in 10.1 above)	JCh	ongoing
11.3	Gogar Tram-NR Interchange Initial meeting had 25 attendees - need a more focussed and effective working group (Tie have instructed design to proceed). Raise with tie in next weekly meeting.	CBr	17/8/09
11.4	Schedule and scope of meetings between BSC and SDS. This Design management Meeting is not intended to resolve design details, but frequently discusses deadlines for short term problem resolution. All attendees were requested to review current meeting pattern (all meetings between or involving SDS and BSC) and comment in next Design Management Meeting, whether current system is effective -- any duplication?, any meetings can be reduced/abolished?	All	26/8/09

**Bilfinger Berger – Siemens – CAF Consortium : Edinburgh Tram Network
Meeting Notes**

Subject	Design Management Review	Location	Project Office
Date	26/8/09	Time	
Attendees	Representing	Attendees	Representing
S Reynolds	SDS	M Berrozpe	BSC
J Chandler	SDS	M Wilken	BSC
A Dolan	SDS	C Brady	BSC
S Ney	SDS	S Rotthaus	BSC
		B Ochoa	BSC
Distribution	Attendees		

		Action	Date
1	Schedule of Deliverables		
1.1	<p>Drawing Register</p> <p>BSC are in the process of reviewing the register produced by SDS. Review of data for Section 1 (On-Street) shows close agreement on completion of Phase 3 drawings to IFC stage, at ~82%. However, of the 18% of drawings issued for approval but not yet IFC, over 50% have been issued for more than 6 months and 20% for more than 12 months. BSC review data was passed to SDS, who will investigate and report.</p>	ADo	ongoing
1.2	<p>MBE emphasised the need for drawing completion to be linked to construction priority. Rather than an analysis of how many weeks or months a design is overdue, prioritization should be given to how many weeks or days float (if any) remain before the missing design comes in the critical path of construction.</p> <p>CBr emphasised the need for all necessary input information to be provided to SDS to support production of drawings.</p> <p>MBE agrees, but requests the urgent enforcement of a structured "Rfi" methodology inside the Consortium (for all Rfis from/to SDS) and systematic associated inclusion in SDS reports to BSC. The reason is that a request for information in a normal SDS letter does not get automatically traced into any management information system, so information requests may inadvertently fall into oblivion.</p> <p>SDS agrees to establish an Request for Information systematic for all</p>	Note Note ADo	

	requests of information from BSC to SDS or vice versa,		
2	DKE Check		
	<p>Current Status Instruction expected from Tie this week, and will be passed to SDS on receipt.</p> <p>PB technician is confirming input data with CAF this week and will commence run on 7/9/09, to be complete within 4 weeks. Interim confirmation of situation on Ed Park bridge will be produced earlier.</p>	<p>CBr</p> <p>Note</p>	<p>asap</p>
3	Earthworks		
3.1	<p>Revised vertical alignment in section 7 Alignment drawings have been issued for IDC, earthworks drawings have not been issued because some inconsistencies need to be resolved. To be issued asap.</p>	JCh	asap
3.2	<p>Section 5/7 technical issues – Tie letter 1842 A response from BSC to Tie has been delayed by SDS failure to respond. This issue has now been notified by Tie as the subject of an audit, at which BSC and SDS will be represented. Response to the letter is still required</p>	<p>JCh</p> <p>JCh</p>	<p>w/c 31/8/09 asap</p>
3.3	<p>Gogar Landfill Alternative SDS have provided draft design report, confirming that preferred option is now track on r.c grillage on piles. Need to have presentation to / discussion with, Tie, to explain design status and get concurrence that this is the right way forward. Siemens/BAM need to participate, to confirm their view that ballasted track solution is not viable. SDS to advise designer availability for meeting. BSC to arrange meeting</p>	<p>JCh</p> <p>CBr</p>	<p>asap tba</p>
3.4	<p>Depot Slopes Meeting held with Tie and SDS, at which economy of soil nailing was questioned. BSC have written to SDS requesting review of a simple gravity retaining wall and slope combination; based on comparative</p>	SDS	ongoing

.../2

	reference pricing.		
3.5	Delay in issue of MX files SDS advised that issue of MX files has been delayed because of apparent inconsistencies between earthworks and drainage strings. Programme for issue is required urgently.	JCh	asap
4	Planning Informatives		
4.1	Meeting held to agree how resolution of informatives is to be accelerated. Review improved process and report in next meeting.	SRo/SNe	asap
5	Gogarburn Retaining Walls		
5.1	Query on accuracy of original survey has been passed to original designers (Halcrow). Response still outstanding.	JCh/JCh	asap
6	Trackform, Ground Improvement Slab		
6.1	Tie held a trackform meeting on Thursday 20/8/09, but review of risk of not providing Ground Improvement layer with void spanning capability did not take place. Apparently, Tie intend to conduct this internally. In the meeting Siemens tabled drawings showing a reinforced Rheda City trackslab, and undertook to provide a design proposal within two weeks. No meeting notes have been produced – BSC will write to confirm the above 2 actions.	CBR	asap
6.2	SDS commented their understanding that the Siemens/BAM concept with reinforced Rheda slab had been introduced during the pre-contract period and withdrawn by Siemens on technical grounds (stray current). Siemens is surprised by the statement above, and agrees to review pre contract situation, and ensure that introduction of this proposals does not have any unacceptable commercial consequences to BSC.	Note MBe	 ongoing
7	Revised Project Pricing		
7.1	BSC requested SDS assistance in providing available design information to support development of budget price for completion of	SRe/JCh	ongoing

Comment [MBE1]: Post-minute note: the Siemens' Infraco Proposal text description EXPLICITLY states that the Rheda City "track slab is concreted without joints and without reinforcement". The generic sketch for Rheda City shows no rebar. The generic sketch for Rheda Green shows rebar but it was removed from the legend.

The first offer of BAM (which was forwarded to tie) already included this statement, and also had numerous photos of the Rheda City construction process, all of them without rebar.

Nobody at Siemens remembers rebar having been removed from any stray current concerns. Quite the opposite, a longitudinal rebar would act as a better stray current collector, and avoid corrosion in surrounding structures or utilities. But longitudinal rebar was simply never there. Can SDS or BB provide any documentation proving otherwise?

...3

	Off-street works.		
8	Network Rail Structures		
8.1	BSC advised that detailed review of structures between Murrayfield Tramstop and Balgreen Road is likely to be the next area of scrutiny by Tie. A design workshop with Tie is required to confirm that all NR input and constraints have been accurately understood. This will not take place until the current short term issues have been resolved (audits, Off-Street pricing, etc)	Note	
9	Design Integration Lead		
	No issues		
10	Transmission of Information		
10.1	Letter from SDS on specific issues not now required.	Note	
10.2	SDS information requests to Siemens Will continue to be sent by letter but SDS will also maintain a tracker, for review in the weekly design meeting.	ADo	ongoing
10.3	MBe stated that the current internal distribution procedure and matrix was incomplete, as the latest version of the procedure (just distributed internally in BSC for release) did not identify any Siemens person in any of the defined distribution lists. For this reason, Siemens has not yet signed this last version of the procedure. MBe also explained that changes in the SDS Design are not reaching the Siemens design team in an efficient manner of distribution, nor are changes always traceable with respect to earlier version of the same documents. This is creating confusion and potentially errors and omissions in Siemens' own design as well as procurement. SRo did not agree with the statement. A separate meeting is required, attended by MBe, MWI, CBr and SRo to establish current procedures, determine if MBe criticism is valid and resolve the situation satisfactorily. MWI/SRo to arrange meeting. MBe proposes, as was done in the past SDS Management Meeting, to reassess all information distribution procedures between BSC and	SRo/MWI	ongoing

Comment [MBE2]: That's not what I remember. I think we agreed to install a systematic of numbered, traceable RfIs (which could be transmitted by letter, but the traceable item is the RfI). We also agreed to include the tracking table in the periodic SDS reports to BSC.

...A

	<p>SDS, and to incorporate a "designer-subscribers" mechanism to each design document or package, so that BEFORE undertaking any design changes, the corresponding lead designer FIRST consults the "subscribed" designers about the reason and potential scope of the change. This would enormously enhance the coordination and control of design changes, in all Design (Client as well as SDS).</p> <p>Post meeting note –since action to date is considered inadequate by MBe - Siemens are requested to establish and implement this system.</p>	MBe	ongoing
11	Review of Outstanding Actions from last Meeting (carried out post-meeting, due to lack of time)		
11.1	Item 2 : Closed		
11.2	Item 3 : Closed		
11.3	Item 4 : Speed profile not required, others closed (Item 2 in this mtg)		
11.4	Item 5.1 : Closed Item 5.2 : Closed Item 5.3 : Open, see Item 3 in this meeting Item 5.4 : Open, see Item 3.3 in this meeting		
11.5	Item 6.2 : Closed		
11.6	Item 7.1 : Open, see Item 5 in this meeting		
11.7	Item 8.1 : Closed Item 8.2 : Open, see Item 6 in this meeting		
11.8	Item 9.3 : Closed		
11.9	Item 10.4 : Open, see Item 10 in this meeting		
11.10	Item 11.1 : Open Item 11.2 : Open Item 11.3 : Open Item 11.4 – no changes required at present : Closed	CBr JCh CBr	ongoing ongoing ongoing
12	Other Issues		
	None		

**Bilfinger Berger – Siemens – CAF Consortium : Edinburgh Tram Network
Meeting Notes**

Subject	Design Management Review	Location	Project Office	
Date	26/8/09 → 9.9.09	Time		
Attendees	Representing	Attendees	Representing	
S Reynolds	SDS	M Wilken	BSC	
J Chandler	SDS	J Newton (p/t)	BSC	
A Dolan	SDS	C Brady	BSC	
S Ney	SDS	S Rotthaus	BSC	
		H Plate (p/t)	BSC	
Distribution	Attendees			

		Action	Date
1	Incorporation of BSC OLE Information into Civil Design		
1.1	Review of revised OLE layouts (incorporating final pole locations) has shown up some errors. BSC/Tie to resolve urgently. <i>SDS</i>	ADo/HPI	asap
1.2	<p>Pole location drawings are to be finalised by SDS (i.e through internal IDC) and then integrated with systems design (i.e including all available systems design input) for presentation to Consortium IDC. A detailed control log is required to ensure that where final pole positions have changed from the originally agreed position (from the Pole Reconciliation Schedule on-street or from Siemens identified locations off-street), that these locations are agreed by all concerned.</p> <p>Master schedule showing development of final locations to be "owned" by Gary Bromley but log of all changes up to Consortium IDC acceptance to be kept by SDS (Mike Coupe). BB staff (on-street-Ian Campbell, off-street-Holger Plate) will coordinate subsequent site input to pole location drawings with Siemens and SDS (i.e obstructions encountered by construction team which require pole location changes.</p> <p>Review status of this control system in 1 week</p>	SRo/ ADo/ JNe	16/9/09
2	TRO's		
	SDS (Halcrow) to respond urgently to Tie letter 2226. Updated drawings to be issued 16/9/09.	JCh JCh	asap 16/9/09

3	Gogar Interchange		
3.1	<p>SDS are progressing civil/building design, but Tie have not yet instructed the systems design. Clarify with Tie at weekly meeting.</p> <p>The existing design (eg drainage) shows works in the area of the interchange which will need to be moved if the interchange is instructed. Need to clarify if current workscope is to be amended to allow passive allowance for the interchange (i.e redesign drainage now) or continue with construction of existing design.</p>	CBr	14/9/09
		CBr	14/9/09
4	Extended Construction Support		
4.1	BSC concerned that full time structural engineer retained on ECS is not doing structural redesign when required by TQ, but that redesign requires an ATR. SDS to review and respond in next meeting	ADo	23/9/09
5	Earthworks Issues		
5.1	Revised vertical alignment in section 7 Earthworks drawings to be issued next week	ADo	w/c 14/9/09
5.2	Depot Slope SDS response tabled in meeting. BSC to review.	SRo	asap
5.3	<p>Gogar Landfill Alternative</p> <p>SDS have provided draft design report, confirming that preferred option is now track on r.c grillage on piles. Need to have presentation to / discussion with, Tie, to explain design status and get concurrence that this is the right way forward. Siemens/BAM need to participate, to confirm their view that ballasted track solution is not viable.</p> <p>SDS designer available for meeting any time. BSC to arrange meeting</p>	CBr	tba
5.4	<p>Delay in issue of MX files</p> <p>SDS advised that issue of MX files has been delayed because of apparent inconsistencies between earthworks and drainage strings. Will be issued within 2 weeks, review in next meeting.</p>	ADo	23/9/09

.../2

6	Gogarburn Retaining Walls		
6.1	Query on accuracy of original survey has been passed to original designers (Halcrow). Response still outstanding, JCh to confirm situation after meeting on 9/9/09.	JCh	9/9/09
7	Information for O&M		
7.1	BSC explained why SDS response on maintenance information for hydrobrakes is not considered sufficient (SDS letter no 0163, dated 1/9/09. SDS to review and respond more fully.	ADo	asap
8	Design Integration Lead		
	No issues		
9	Review of Outstanding Actions from last Meeting (carried out post-meeting, due to lack of time)		
9.1	Item 1.1 : Closed		
9.2	Item 1.2 : RFI system to be established	ADo	ongoing
9.3	Item 2 : DKE check in progress : closed		
9.4	Item 3.1 : Open, see item 5.1 in this meeting <i>each 7 days</i>	JCh	ongoing
	Item 3.2 : Closed		
	Item 3.3 : Open, see item 5.3 in this meeting <i>Gavin Laidell</i>	CBr	ongoing
	Item 3.4 : Open, see item 5.2 in this meeting <i>Depot stage</i>	CBr	ongoing
	Item 3.5 : Open, see item 5.4 in this meeting <i>My files</i>	JCh	ongoing
9.4	Item 4 : Closed		
9.5	Item 5 : Open, see item 6 in this meeting <i>Gogarburn Ret Walls</i>	JCh	asap
9.6	Item 6.1 : Closed		
	Item 6.2 : Closed		
9.7	Item 7 : Closed		
9.8	Item 10.2 : Open – same as item 1.2 above <i>RFI complete</i>	ADo	ongoing
	Item 10.2 : Open – meeting still required <i>Ops- MBe why?</i>	MW/SRo	ongoing
	Item 10.3 : Open – Siemens to implement coordination system <i>INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION</i>	MBe	ongoing
10	Other Issues		
10.1	Depot TQ's – BSC concerned about transmission time from SDS Godalming to site. SDS to review with Design Team leader	ADo	10/9/09

...3

10.2	SDS to respond to BSC letter 053462 on Edinburgh Park OLE plinths.	ADo	asap
10.3	Crawley Tunnel – need to select design solution (SDS drawings issued today). BSC internal action.	CBr / MBe/ KDi	asap
10.4	Lighting Design ADo to confirm design estimate (unchanged) SDS to confirm number of side and centre poles with lights (to 95% accuracy) to allow Siemens to progress procurement. Siemens letter 053651, dated 28/8/09 tabled in meeting, refers.	ADo ADo	asap w/c 14/9/09

...A

**Bilfinger Berger – Siemens – CAF Consortium : Edinburgh Tram Network
Meeting Notes**

Subject	Design Management Review	Location	Project Office
Date	23/9/09	Time	
Attendees	Representing	Attendees	Representing
A Dolan	SDS	M Wilken	BSC
S Ney	SDS	C Brady	BSC
		S Rotthaus	BSC
		R Honeck (p/t)	BSC
		K Dieker (p/t)	BSC
Distribution	Attendees		
	M Berrozpe		

		Action	Date
1	General : Corrections to Notes of Previous Meeting on 9/9/09		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date shown incorrectly as 26/8/09, should be 9/9/09 • Item 1.1, action by BSC/SDS, not BSC/Tie • 9.4, item 3.4, see item 5.2, not item 6 		
2	Drawing Register		
	A number of queries on drawing register clarification remain outstanding. RHo provided a set of copies of the queries. ADo confirmed all queries will be closed out by 25/9/09	ADo	25/9/09
3	ICF's and any Necessary Change Instructions		
	SDS referred to the recent issue of a number of Interface Control Forms (ICF's) and asked for clarification that Change Instructions would be forthcoming. SDS and BSC will both assess the ICF's and identify their own view of whether Instructions are necessary.	ADo SRo (FWi)	28/9/09 w/c 28/9
	These lists will be reviewed in a meeting next week and any necessary Chang Instructions identified.	SRo/ADo	w/c 28/9
4	OLE-Civil Interface Management		
4.1	Resolution of errors on OLE location drawings now in progress.	Note	
4.2	Interface Management process reviewed in meeting on 16/9/09 and revised flowchart issued.	Note	

5	TRO's		
	SDS (Halcrow) initial response to Tie letter 2226 received and forwarded to Tie. SDS to update response, in light of recent meetings, recording acknowledgement of changes by Tie, for BSC to forward to Tie.	JCh	asap
6	Gogar Landfill		
6.1	<p>Scope of agreements in previous meetings (~6 months ago) is now not agreed. Notwithstanding this, current action is as follows :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SDS confirm that soil nailing solution will provide earthworks platform suitable for ballasted track with higher than normal vertical alignment maintenance requirement (but not for slab track/green track). SDS to determine anticipated post-construction settlement forecasts. • Siemens to determine lateral movement maintenance requirement forecast for ballasted track in tight radius curves in this location. <p>Both issues to be discussed in a meeting with BAM on 29/9/09, to reach agreement on acceptability of soil-nailing/ballasted track solution or need for a structural solution on track maintenance grounds. This then to be presented to Tie.</p>	<p>SDS (ADo)</p> <p>Siemens (KDi)</p> <p>All</p>	<p>asap</p> <p>asap</p> <p>29/9/09</p>
7	Crawley Tunnel		
7.1	Need to resolve issue of vibration isolation shown on SDS drawing :- SDS to advise whether isolation is structural (i.e to protect existing tunnel) or to reduce ground transmitted noise and vibration. (post meeting note – SDS confirmed requirement is to prevent vibration damage to existing tunnel. Siemens to provide vibration impact data (eg ppv value) with soft track encasement, so SDS can assess remaining hazard, if any)	ADo	asap
7.2	Provide available information on steel tunnel rings and plates to Siemens.	ADo	asap
	Determine scope of bonding required (if any).	KDi/MWi	asap
7.3	Advise issue date for south (Airport direction) track crossing of		

.../2

	Crawley Tunnel	ADo	asap
8	Lighting Design		
8.1	90% Quantity Takeoff Data now available. SDS to transmit to Siemens (formal transmission) asap.	SNe	asap
8.2	Design timescale required.	SNe	asap
8.3	Design Instruction required.	BOc	asap
9	Design Integration Lead		
	No issues		
10	Review of Outstanding Actions from last Meeting		
9.1	Item 1.1 : Closed		
9.2	Item 1.2 : Closed		
9.3	Item 2 : Closed		
9.4	Item 3.1 : Open, letter to be sent	CBr	ongoing
9.5	Item 4 : Closed		
9.6	Item 5.1 Earthworks Drawings in Section 7 : Open Item 5.2 Depot Slope. SDS can produce revised design in 3 weeks from instruction. BSC to discuss with Tie. Item 5.3 – see item 6 in this meeting- closed Item 5.4 – MX files. Latest forecast is no submission for a further 4 weeks. BSC to take up separately with SDS.	ADo CBr CBr	2/10/09 asap asap
9.7	Item 6.1 : Gogarburn Retaining Walls -- open. BSC to take up separately with SDS	CBr	asap
9.8	Item 7 : Hydrobrake maintenance -- open. BSC to take up separately with SDS	CBr	asap
9.9	Item 10.1 Depot TQ's : SDS proposing additional Construction Support – Closed Item 10.2 – Response to BSC letter 053462 on Edinburgh Park Bridge OLE plinths – Open Item 10.3 – Crawley Tunnel, see item 7 in this meeting – closed Item 10.4 – Lighting Design, see item 8 in this meeting – closed	ADo	asap

.../3

10	Other Issues		
10.1	Additional Information requested in Audits BSC believe all or most information requested from SDS is still outstanding. SDS to provide copies of email transmissions of information. NSC to recheck what has been sent.	ADo CBr	asap asap
10.2	Assurance/Hazard Close-out Meeting with PSCC has been cancelled due to failure by SDS to meet agreed submission dates for Assurance documentation with hazard Close-Out. Timetable required for completion of this activity. BSC will send letter recording concern with situation.	JCh MWI/ (J Riley)	asap. asap

**Bilfinger Berger – Siemens – CAF Consortium : Edinburgh Tram Network
Meeting Notes**

Subject	Design Management Review	Location	Project Office
Date	21/10/09	Time	
Attendees	Representing	Attendees	Representing
J Chandler	SDS	C Brady	BSC
S Ney	SDS	S Rothhaus	BSC
		J Riley (by phone)	BSC
Distribution	Attendees M Berrozpe, M Wilken		

		Action	Date
1	Assurance and Hazard Close Out		
	<p>Recent BSC letters recording non achievement of agreed targets by SDS were discussed. In particular, timescales agreed at last Manchester meeting have not been met.</p> <p>SDS undertook to meet timescale identified in BSC letter of 19.10.09, as follows :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Meeting with (Halcrow) Design Team Leaders in Manchester on 10 and 11.11.09 to resolve hazard close out mitigation o 1 to 3.12.09, formal handover of hazard log, with agreed mitigations closed out, to BSC with PSCC present. <p>JRI will monitor progress and report weekly to M Wilken and C Brady.</p> <p>Siemens (MWi) had raised the issue, before this meeting, of close out of any further hazards which might be identified during the proposed civil design accelerated completion exercise. SDS intend to complete this exercise after the design work. JRI confirmed that the IDR process required to achieve design completion can proceed in advance of final hazard close-out, at risk of rework if required.</p>	<p>JCh</p> <p>JRI</p> <p>Note</p>	<p>1-3/12/09</p> <p>ongoing</p>
2	Halcrow Design Issues		
2.1	<p>Earthworks Settlement /Trackslab Interface</p> <p>JCH has instructed an independent review by PB, in view of Halcrow continuing failure to respond to queries about earthworks settlement under concrete trackslab. Submission date for review to be advised today.</p>	JCh	21/10/09
2.2	Gogar Landfill		

	Settlement data for Gogar landfill still awaited. SDS believe already sent by email, BSC have no record. SDS to resend asap.	JCh	asap
2.3	Gogarburn Retaining Walls SDS have failed to provide any substantiation for the claim that the riverbed position has changed. BSC repeated that they have issued an instruction to produce the necessary design, which confirms that if evidence of a change is produced it will be treated accordingly. SDS confirmed that completion of the design is in progress. Issue date to be advised.	JCh	asap
2.4	MX strings SDS believe that all MX strings affected by errors in drainage and earthworks data have now been corrected and reissued. This to be rechecked and confirmed with S Nesbitt.	SNe	asap
3	OLE-Civil Interface Management		
3.1	SDS expressed concern that Siemens are not working to current track alignment drawings. This to be checked with M Wilken/J Newton.	SRO	asap
4	Design Integration Lead		
	No issues		
5	Review of Outstanding Actions from last Meeting		
5.1	Item 2 :Response to queries not received, BSC to record by letter.	CBR	ongoing
5.2	Item 3 : Closed		
5.3	Item 6 : Open, see 2.2 above	JCh	asap
5.4	Item 7.1 : Information provided to SDS, SDS to analyse data	JCh	ongoing
	Item 7.2 : Data on tunnel rings not provided by SDS to Siemens	JCh	ongoing
5.5	Item 8 : Closed		
5.6	Item 9.6 (5.4) – Open, MX files, see 2.4 above	JCh	asap
5.7	Item 10.1 : Closed		
5.8	Item 10.2: Open, see 1.0 above	JCh	asap
6	Other Issues		
6.1	Tower Place bridge		

	SDS to respond to BSC letter no 3795 of 15/10/09	JCh	asap
6.2	Lindsay Road Vertical Alignment This is now being queried by Tie on cost grounds (utility diversions). SDS emphasised that the costs of roadworks if alignment is not changed were expected to exceed utility diversion costs.	Note	
6.3	South Gyle Access bridge SDS advised that Tie (R Bell) has approached them directly seeking to extend the scope of the current instructed options study. SDS refused, SDS to produce notes of discussion and forward to BSC under letter. BSC to write to on receipt of SDS letter Tie.	JCh CBr	asap asap
6.4	ECS/DS ~ Tie request to amend current scope. SDS advised that they wish to resolve outstanding commercial issues before making any new proposals. BSC advised SDS to respond formally asap.	JCh	asap
6.5	Depot Stabling Area Design IFC drawings not issued, construction is urgent. Long sections/cross sections and drainage/ducting details required urgently. SDS to advise issue dates to SRO urgently.	JCh	asap
6.6	BAA Flood Prevention. SDS draft submission reviewed by Tie – not acceptable. SDS to discuss with Alastair Scott and Simon Nesbitt urgently and transmit formal submission urgently.	SNe	asap

**Bilfinger Berger – Siemens – CAF Consortium : Edinburgh Tram Network
Meeting Notes**

Subject	Design Management Review	Location	Project Office
Date	4/11/09	Time	
Attendees	Representing	Attendees	Representing
J Chandler	SDS	C Brady S Nesbit	BSC BSC
Distribution	Attendees M Berrozpe, M Wilken		

		Action	Date
1	General		
	<p>It was agreed that since SDS are now co-located, this meeting is no longer required. This is thus the final session of this regular review meeting.</p> <p>(post meeting note : BB, Siemens and SDS will meet weekly as part of the Civil Design Completion management process).</p>		
1	Assurance and Hazard Close Out		
	<p>SDS confirmed they were on programme to meet timescale identified in BSC letter of 19.10.09, as follows :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting with (Halcrow) Design Team Leaders in Manchester on 10 and 11.11.09 to resolve hazard close out mitigation • 1 to 3.12.09, formal handover of hazard log, with agreed mitigations closed out, to BSC with PSCC present. <p>JRi will monitor progress and report weekly to M Wilken and C Brady.</p>	JCh JRi	1-3/12/09 ongoing
2	Halcrow Design Issues		
2.1	<p>Earthworks Settlement /Trackslab Interface</p> <p>JCh advised that scrutiny of earthworks design is essentially complete and settlement issues etc largely resolved to PB satisfaction.</p> <p>BSC to write, detailing exactly what trackform/earthworks issues require confirmation from SDS.</p> <p>SDS to respond confirming design is suitable and integrated.</p>	CBr JCh	asap asap

2.2	Gogar Landfill SDS to confirm design settlement figures (as other embankments or otherwise)	JCh	asap
	SDS to develop ballasted, tight radius corner trackwork detail, for discussion in w/c 16/11/09	JCh	13/11/09
	BSC to call further meeting to close out Gogar Landfill proposal, in w/c 16/11/09	CBr	16/11/09
2.3	Gogarburn Retaining Walls SDS now reporting issue of IFC drawings programmed for early January 2010	JCh	Jan 2010
	Draft drawings to be provided, to support discussions with BAA, by 9/11/09	JCh	9/11/09
2.4	MX strings All MX string data will be issued by 13/11/09.	JCh	13/11/09
2.5	Flood Mitigation at Airport BSC confirmed SDS are to complete this work urgently. If an instruction is agreed to be necessary (i.e work is outwith contract obligations), BSC will issue.	JCh	asap
		CBr	ongoing
3	OLE-Civil Interface Management		
3.1	SDS expressed concern that Siemens are not working to current track alignment drawings. This to be checked with M Wilken/J Newton.	SRo	asap
4	Design Integration Lead		
	No issues		
5	Review of Outstanding Actions from last Meeting		
5.1	Item 2 :Response to queries not received, BSC to record by letter.	CBr	ongoing
5.2	Item 3 : Closed		
5.3	Item 6 : Open, see 2.2 above	JCh	asap
5.4	Item 7.1 : Information provided to SDS, SDS to analyse data	JCh	ongoing
	Item 7.2 : Data on tunnel rings not provided by SDS to Siemens	JCh	ongoing

.../2

5.5	Item 8 : Closed		
5.6	Item 9.6 (5.4) – Open, MX files, see 2.4 above	JCh	asap
5.7	Item 10.1 : Closed		
5.8	Item 10.2: Open, see 1.0 above	JCh	asap
6	Other Issues		
6.1	Tower Place bridge SDS to respond to BSC letter no 3795 of 15/10/09	JCh	asap
6.2	Lindsay Road Vertical Alignment This is now being queried by Tie on cost grounds (utility diversions). SDS emphasised that the costs of roadworks if alignment is not changed were expected to exceed utility diversion costs.	Note	
6.3	South Gyle Access bridge SDS advised that Tie (R Bell) has approached them directly seeking to extend the scope of the current instructed options study. SDS refused. SDS to produce notes of discussion and forward to BSC under letter. BSC to write to on receipt of SDS letter Tie.	JCh CBr	asap asap
6.4	ECS/DS – Tie request to amend current scope. SDS advised that they wish to resolve outstanding commercial issues before making any new proposals. BSC advised SDS to respond formally asap.	JCh	asap
6.5	Depot Stabling Area Design IFC drawings not issued, construction is urgent: Long sections/cross sections and drainage/ducting details required urgently. SDS to advise issue dates to SRO urgently.	JCh	asap
6.6	BAA Flood Prevention SDS draft submission reviewed by Tie – not acceptable. SDS to discuss with Alastair Scott and Simon Nesbitt urgently and transmit formal submission urgently.	SNe	asap

.../3

