

	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**

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

		Action	Date
<b>1</b>	<b>Schedule of Deliverables</b>		
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 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,		
<b>2</b>	<b>DKE Check</b>		
	Current Status Instruction expected from Tie this week, and will be passed to SDS on receipt.	<b>CBr</b>	<b>asap</b>
	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.	<b>Note</b>	
<b>3</b>	<b>Earthworks</b>		
<b>3.1</b>	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	<b>JCh</b>	<b>asap</b>
<b>3.2</b>	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	<b>JCh</b>  <b>JCh</b>	<b>w/c</b> <b>31/8/09</b> <b>asap</b>
<b>3.3</b>	Gogar Landfill Alternative SDS have provided draft design report, confirming that preferred option is now track on r.o 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	<b>JCh</b> <b>CBr</b>	<b>asap</b> <b>tba</b>
<b>3.4</b>	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	<b>SDS</b>	<b>ongoing</b>

...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	<b>Planning Informatives</b>		
4.1	Meeting held to agree how resolution of informatives is to be accelerated. Review improved process and report in next meeting.	SRa/SNe	asap
5	<b>Gogarburn Retaining Walls</b>		
5.1	Query on accuracy of original survey has been passed to original designers (Halcrow). Response still outstanding.	JCh/JCh	asap
6	<b>Trackform, Ground Improvement Slab</b>		
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	<b>Revised Project Pricing</b>		
7.1	BSC requested SDS assistance in providing available design information to support development of budget price for completion of	SRa/JCh	ongoing

**Comment [MBE1]:** Post-remote note. The Siemens' Infraco Proposal last description EXP1 (CUT) V states that the Rheda City "track slab is concrete without reinforcement 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 BH provide any documentation proving otherwise?

	Off-street works.		
8	<b>Network Rail Structures</b>		
8.1	BSC advised that detailed review of structures between Murrayfield Tramstop and Baigreen 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	<b>Design Integration Lead</b>		
	No issues		
10	<b>Transmission of Information</b>		
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 latest 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.

	<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	<b>Review of Outstanding Actions from last Meeting</b> (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	<b>Other Issues</b>		
	None		





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

<b>Subject</b>	Design Management Review	<b>Location</b>	Project Office
<b>Date</b>	20/8/09 = 9.2.09	<b>Time</b>	
<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Representing</b>
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
<b>Distribution</b>	Attendees		

		Action	Date
1	<b>Incorporation of BSC OLE Information into Civil Design</b>		
1.1	Review of revised OLE layouts (incorporating final pole locations) has shown up some errors. BSC/Tie to resolve urgently. <i>SDS</i>	A Do/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	<b>TRO's</b>		
	SDS (Halcrow) to respond urgently to Tie letter 2226. Updated drawings to be issued 16/9/09.	JCh JCh	asap 16/9/09

<b>3</b>	<b>Gogar Interchange</b>		
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
<b>4</b>	<b>Extended Construction Support</b>		
4.1	BSC concerned that full time structural engineer retained on ECS is not doing structural redesign when required by TG, but that redesign requires an ATR. SDS to review and respond in next meeting	ADo	23/9/09
<b>5</b>	<b>Earthworks Issues</b>		
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 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 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

6	<b>Gogarburn Retaining Walls</b>		
6.1	Query on accuracy of original survey has been passed to original designers (Haicrow). Response still outstanding, JCh to confirm situation after meeting on 9/9/09.	JCh	9/9/09
7	<b>Information for O&amp;M</b>		
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	<b>Design Integration Lead</b>		
	No issues		
9	<b>Review of Outstanding Actions from last Meeting</b> (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>cont 7 days</i>	JCh	ongoing
	Item 3.2 : Closed		
	Item 3.3 : Open, see item 5.3 in this meeting <i>Case 10/2/09</i>	CBr	ongoing
	Item 3.4 : Open, see item 5.2 in this meeting <i>5-2, Design slow</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 Retaining 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 system</i>	ADo	ongoing
	Item 10.2 : Open – meeting still required <i>Open meeting?</i>	MW/SR	ongoing
	Item 10.3 : Open – Siemens to implement coordination system <i>INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION</i>	MBe	ongoing
10	<b>Other Issues</b>		
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

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

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

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

		Action	Date
1	<b>General : Corrections to Notes of Previous Meeting on 9/9/09</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Date shown incorrectly as 26/8/09, should be 9/9/09</li> <li>• Item 1.1, action by BSC/SDS, not BSC/Tie</li> <li>• 9.4, item 3.4, see item 5.2, not item 6</li> </ul>		
2	<b>Drawing Register</b>  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	<b>ICF's and any Necessary Change Instructions</b>  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.  These lists will be reviewed in a meeting next week and any necessary Chang Instructions identified.	ADo SRo (FWI)	28/9/09 w/c 28/9
4	<b>OLE-Civil Interface Management</b>		
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	Scope of agreements in previous meetings (~6 months ago) is now not agreed. Notwithstanding this, current action is as follows :- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Siemens to determine lateral movement maintenance requirement forecast for ballasted track in light radius curves in this location.</li> </ul> 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.	SDS (ADo) Siemens (KDi) All	asap asap 29/9/09
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.  Determine scope of bonding required (if any).	ADo KDi/MWi	asap asap
7.3	Advise issue date for south (Airport direction) track crossing of		

.../2

	Crawley Tunnel	ADo	asap
<b>8</b>	<b>Lighting Design</b>		
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.	BQc	asap
<b>9</b>	<b>Design Integration Lead</b>		
	No issues		
<b>10</b>	<b>Review of Outstanding Actions from last Meeting</b>		
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		
<b>9.6</b>	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.	ABo CBr	2/10/09 asap
<b>9.7</b>	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	<b>Other Issues</b>		
10.1	<p>Additional Information requested in Audits</p> <p>BSC believe all or most information requested from SDS is still outstanding. SDS to provide copies of email transmissions of information.</p> <p>NSC to recheck what has been sent.</p>	<p>ADo</p> <p>CBr</p>	<p>asap</p> <p>asap</p>
10.2	<p>Assurance/Hazard Close-out</p> <p>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.</p> <p>BSC will send letter recording concern with situation.</p>	<p>JCh</p> <p>MWi/ (J Riley)</p>	<p>asap.</p> <p>asap</p>



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

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

		Action	Date
1	<p><b>Assurance and Hazard Close Out</b></p> <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"> <li>Meeting with (Halcrow) Design Team Leaders in Manchester on 10 and 11.11.09 to resolve hazard close out mitigation</li> <li>1 to 3.12.09, formal handover of hazard log, with agreed mitigations closed out, to BSC with PSSC present.</li> </ul> <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	<p><b>Halcrow Design Issues</b></p>		
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	<b>OLE-Civil Interface Management</b>		
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	<b>Design Integration Lead</b>		
	No issues		
5	<b>Review of Outstanding Actions from last Meeting</b>		
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 Item 7.2 : Data on tunnel rings not provided by SDS to Siemens	JCh JCh	ongoing 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	<b>Other issues</b>		
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 SPro 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**

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

		Action	Date
1	<b>General</b>		
	<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	<b>Assurance and Hazard Close Out</b>		
	<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"> <li>• Meeting with (Halcrow) Design Team Leaders in Manchester on 10 and 11.11.09 to resolve hazard close out mitigation</li> <li>• 1 to 3.12.09, formal handover of hazard log, with agreed mitigations closed out, to BSC with PSCC present.</li> </ul>	JCh	1-3/12/09
	JRI will monitor progress and report weekly to M Wilken and C Brady.	JRI	ongoing
2	<b>Halcrow Design Issues</b>		
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	asap
		JCh	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 CBr	asap ongoing
3	<b>OLE-Civil Interface Management</b>		
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	<b>Design Integration Lead</b>		
	No issues		
5	<b>Review of Outstanding Actions from last Meeting</b>		
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
<b>6</b>	<b>Other Issues</b>		
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

