DRN No: 148339 DRN027 ver2

Page 1 of 4		Document Review Notice (DRN)									
Page 1 of 4	Form Ref	Ref NR/L2/INI/02009/F0044			Issue Date	05/09/2015 Issue 8.0			8.0		
Project Number	: '	148339	Project Name:			Anglia LC Rec	Anglia LC Reduction Strategy Phase 1			1 & 2	
Project Manager: Natasha						Principal Contractor:	Mott MacDonald Group Ltd			o Ltd	
Deliverable Owner:			Donald Group Ltd			CEM Name:	Sue Tilbrook				
Submission Discipline: Other						CRE Name:					
Document Number: 367516/RF					16/RPT020		Revision No:			В	
Document Title:		Suffolk Sta Response			port & RSA	Designers	GRIP: 2			2	
NR DPE Name:	Andy Kenni	ng					CSM Significant: N				
Document Transmittal/Submission No: via email											
Date Received:		18-08-201	16 Date Return Requ								
REVIEWERS:-		DRN No:	148339 DRN027 ver2			DRN Date: 09-11-20				9-11-2016	
Name		Position			Discipline	Signature					
Andy Kenning		OPE	Signalling -						'Kenn	ing	
Natasha Davisor	<u> </u>	Project Ma	anager		Level Cros	sings					
Isaac Adjei	(Commerci	ial Manager Level Cros			sings					
DISTRIBUTION	LIST (of co	mpleted	review)	:-							
Name	Position				Action Required						
Jason Smith			Project Manager (Motts)				Manager response				
J Castle			Document approver (Motts)			tts)	Pro	vide resp	onse		
				1		_					
Document Deta		PD	F Source Data Two Dir cument Title: Suffolk Stage 1 Rsa Repo						Mod		
Number: 367516	6/Rpt015 &	_		Title:	Suffolk Sta	ge 1 Rsa Repoi	t & R	sa Desig	ners Re	sponse	
367516/Rpt020 Document URL:	·	Rej	oort.					Pov	rision: E	2	
DOCUMENT RE				Risk Re			iow I			etailed	
Overall DRN		Rejected					epte			Accepted	
Category		npliant to c	Accepted			with Amendments			Revise & Resub		
1	11011 0011	•	1			2					
•	of these dealer	0	work Ball	ie not h	<u>-</u>	ralidation of the sub		n nordoss	it infor fits	3	
	of these docun work Rail does					anuation of the sub	HISSIO	ii, iidi does	it inter titr	IESS IUF	
						th change control p					
•	•				•	corded and eviden		•		esubmission.	
	0	0 0			•	sibilities my comme requires the whole				and	
resubmitt	ted to address					orward shall be agre					
Project Engineer Overall DRN Category 2 acceptance with amendments requires the appropriate responses with additional information to be submitted to address the comments											
 Comment type 0 is used to capture comments if the submission is an overall DRN Category 0 											
 Comment types 2A, 2B, 3A and 3B require a written response & Comment type 4 is for information only 											
Comment type 5 is used to identify an aspect of a submission which shows a 'Safe by Design' feature Comment type 5 is used to identify an aspect of a submission which shows a 'Safe by Design' feature Comment type 5 is used to identify an aspect of a submission which shows a 'Safe by Design' feature											
For comments types 2 or 3 a suffix is added to the comment type: A) Quality of Supplier's submission or B) Client preference/changes.											
**Issued By: Andy Kenning				Sign	ature:	Andy Kenning		a D	ate:	09-11-2016	
						U		'			
DRN ACCEPTA			ED OUT	T ,		•					
**Closed By: An	dy Kenning			Sign	ature:	Andu Ker	าทเ้ทเ	2 D	ate:	09-11-2016	

DRN No: 148339 DRN027 ver2

Page 2 of 4	Document Review Notice (DRN)										
	Form Ref	NR/L2/INI/02009/F0044	Issue Date	05/09/2015	Issue	8.0					

Only to be signed by the Project Designated Project Engineer or person with such formally recorded delegated authority.

Review comments to be returned to Supplier via control process agreed between the Project Manager and Supplier.

Door	- 2 of 4	Document Review Notice (DRN)								DRN No: 148339 DRN027 ver2		
Page 3 of 4		Form Reference	NR/L2/INI/02009/F0044				Iss	Issue Date 05/09/2015		Issue	8.0	
Network Rail (NR)									Supplier		NR	
No	Commen	nts		Ву	Туре	Integration Activity	Comment Accepted			Ву	Response Accepted	
1	the previo now have saying Su expected versioned full audit h be receivi	me that the RSA reports reports produced in 2 reports with differer ffolk RSA Stage1 reports to learn the GRIP1 reports to learn that way there whistory visible to reade the GRIP1 & 2 report the GRIP1 & 2 report	n GRIP1 and we not numbers both ort. I would have have been up ould have been a rs. I believe NR will onse Report' that	AK	4		Yes	of RSAs reported. groupings reported contempored ifferent is the discretiself to the not revision looking a albeit son the same to consolid RSA were reports. The do not consolidate consider acceptable and industrial the Designation of the GRIP	was to undertake the new round which we have done and It is normal for RSAs (including s) done at different times to be separately and braneously. This is because staff may have been involved and ete structure of the report lends his. In the second report we were not the previous RSA but were to new sites and alternatives, the may have been in proximity to level crossing. There is no need idate old reports into new ones. To help the reader we had a table upfront to explain which the included in each of the two of the contract and amending CAF antain a requirement to the into a single report. We our RSA reporting to be le and fully in line with guidance stry norms. In was to undertake the new round and the new round and the new round and the new round and the new reports. We our RSA reporting to be le and fully in line with guidance stry norms. In was to undertake the new round and the new report in the new round and the new round an	JAS	Yes	
2	version B. on the rep report. Wh report to v	t references the previous to the previous of the control of the co	aware of version A comments on the p version the	AK	3A		Yes	arose as revision v NR. Only previous for issue 367516/F amended also beer	an error in the document and a second internal MM only was produced prior to issue to 1 audit report (Rev A) for the Grip 1 RSAs has been produced to Network Rail. Report ref RPT014 (RSA) has been I (to Rev B)to reflect this. This has a changed in the Designer's e document	SJT	Yes	

Page 4 of 4 Form Reference NR/L2/INI/02009/F		Document Review Notice (D							DRN No:	148339 DF	RN027 ver2	
		F0044			l	ssue Date 05/09/2015		Issue	8.0			
	Network Rail (NR)							NR				
No	No Comments			Ву	Туре	Integration Activity	Comme		es	Ву	Response Accepted	4
3	The report does not acknowledge that the project has moved on and some crossings have been removed from the project. The fact that they are still referenced in this report could confuse the reader. Other reports that have been up versioned have simply stated that the crossing has been removed from the project. The Designers Response Report must take this into account and make it clear which level crossings are being taken forward.		AK	3A		Yes	options collive documents options controlled trail and herationale. All crossing remain in solution herations of the solution heration and the solution and the so	is intended to be a record of the considered at the time and is not a ment to be updated as the project es. Having a record of alternative considered provides a robust audit nelps demonstrate the design and in Suffolk that were audited the project. Where a particular has been discounted due to a ty issue, this has been noted in	ST/JS	Yes		

Yes

ΑK

4

To Perform Spelling Check on the Protected Form Click Here:

however due to the protracted delivery of the

DRN should be issued separately.

This DRN was planned to be issued at the same time as the one for the Designers Response DRN

Designers Response Report, it was felt that this

the Designer's Response document

367516/RPT015 Rev B

Noted. The Designer's response document will be issued at the same time as this

response and the amended RSA report ref

SJT

Yes

END

^{*} Click in the last Cell (Column) to add a new row after the selected cell or to delete the selected row