

Ref:	<b>139797</b>
Version:	1.1
Date:	June 2015

# Appendix K

## DRN Comments



## Document Review Notice

**DRN No: 139797-MP2-CIV01-SB-20001**

<b>Project Number:</b> 139797		<b>Project Name:</b> MetroWest Phase 2	
<b>Project Manager:</b> Rachel Leighfield Finch		<b>Principal Contractor:</b> URS	
<b>Engineering Deliverable Owner:</b> URS		<b>CEM Name:</b> Steve Turner	
<b>Submission Discipline:</b> Building Civils		<b>CRE Name:</b> Steve Turner	
<b>Document Number:</b>			<b>Revision</b>
<b>Document Title:</b> MetroWest Phase 2 GRIP Stage 2 - Feasibility Report			0.02
<b>Document Transmittal/Submission No:</b>			
<b>Date Received:</b> 15/01/15		<b>Date Return Required:</b> 06/02/15	
<b>REVIEWERS:-</b>		<b>DRN No:</b> 139797-MP2-CIV01-SB-20001	<b>DRN Date:</b> 30/01/15
<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Discipline</b>	<b>Signature</b>
Steve Baker	PE	Buildings Civils - (Lead)	Steve Baker
<b>DISTRIBUTION LIST (of completed review):-</b>			
<b>Name</b>		<b>Position</b>	<b>Action Required</b>
Rachel Leighfield Finch		PM	Information
Western And Wales Drn Collation		TO	
<b>Document Type under DRN:</b>		<b>PDF</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Source Data</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
		<b>Two Dimensional</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Model</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>DOCUMENT REVIEW:-</b>		<b>Risk Review Level:</b>	
<b>Overall DRN Category</b>	<b>Rejected</b> Non-compliant to contract	<b>Accepted</b>	<b>Accepted</b> with Amendments
			<b>Not Accepted</b> Revise & Resubmit
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
			<b>3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The acceptance of these documents by Network Rail shall not be deemed as validation of the submission and nor does it infer their fitness for purpose. Network Rail does not accept any liability for the submission.</li> <li>➤ Any changes to the documents should be undertaken in accordance with your organisation's approved change control procedures. Such variations must be formally recorded and evidence should accompany any resubmission.</li> <li>➤ Without relieving the originating organisation of their contractual responsibilities my comments are as follows:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall DRN Category 0 rejected and a category 3 non acceptance requires the whole document(s) to be revised and resubmitted to address the comments. Prior to any re-work a way forward shall be agreed between supplier and the Designated Project Engineer</li> <li>• Overall DRN Category 2 acceptance with amendments requires the appropriate responses with additional information to be submitted to address the comments</li> <li>• Comment types 2A, 2B, 3A and 3B require a written response &amp; Comment type 4 is for information only</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ 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.</li> </ul>			
<b>**Issued By:</b>	Steve Baker	<b>Signature:</b>	Steve Baker
		<b>Date:</b>	30/01/15
<b>DRN ACCEPTANCE AND/OR CLOSED OUT (including Supplier's responses):-</b>			
<b>**Closed By:</b>	Steve Baker	<b>Signature:</b>	Steve Baker
		<b>Date:</b>	13/02/15
<p><b>**</b> 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.</p>			

Network Rail (NR)				Supplier		NR	
No	Comments	By	Type	Comment Accepted	Responses	By	Response Accepted *
1	<p>Drawing CV-DRG-0001 P01</p> <p>Waiting shelters - confirm adequate clearances are provided to waiting shelters from edge of platforms (i.e. &gt;2.5m).</p> <p>Footbridge clearances - confirm footbridge clearance has been designed to allow for future electrification (5.1m) and that ramp and stair arrangements are designed accordingly.</p> <p>Lighting strategy to footbridge/ramps to be agreed at GRIP 3 (lighting column currently shown at midspan of footbridge).</p>	SB	2A	Yes	<p>All waiting shelters and benches are located greater than 2.5 m from the platform edge. Note will be added to drawing.</p> <p>Footbridge ramps/stairs have been designed to allow for electrification clearances greater than 5.1m.</p> <p>Agreed column will be deleted.</p>	ST	Yes
2	<p>Drawing CV-DRG-0002 P01</p> <p>Confirm adequate space has been allowed to accommodate the buffer stop.</p> <p>Lighting strategy to be developed at GRIP 3/4 and locations of columns to be co-ordinated to limit interference with pedestrian desire lines.</p>	SB	2A	Yes	<p>A clearance zone of 20 m has been provided behind the buffer stop, will be noted on drawing.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	ST	Yes
3	<p>Drawing CV-DRG-0003 P01</p> <p>Footbridge clearances - confirm footbridge clearance has been designed to allow for future electrification (5.1m) and that ramp and stair arrangements are designed accordingly (co-ordinate with North Filton arrangement).</p> <p>Lighting strategy to be developed at GRIP 3/4 and locations of columns to be co-ordinated to limit interference with footways and cycle stand locations.</p> <p>Waiting shelters - confirm adequate clearances are provided to waiting shelters from edge of platforms (i.e. &gt;2.5m).</p>	SB	2A	Yes	<p>Footbridge ramps/stairs have been designed to allow for electrification clearances greater than 5.1m.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>All waiting shelters and benches are located greater than 2.5 m from the platform edge. Note will be added to drawing.</p>	ST	Yes
4	<p>Drawing CV-DRG-0004 P01</p> <p>Layout to be adjusted such that platform alignment does not clash with adjacent car park footway.</p> <p>Waiting shelters - confirm adequate clearances are provided to waiting shelters from edge of platforms (i.e. &gt;2.5m).</p>	SB	2A	Yes	<p>Drawing amended.</p> <p>All waiting shelters and benches are located greater than 2.5 m from the platform edge. Note will be added to drawing.</p>	ST	Yes

## Document Review Notice

Network Rail (NR)				Supplier			NR
No	Comments	By	Type	Comment Accepted	Responses	By	Response Accepted *
	>2.5m). Proposed vehicle servicing strategy of adjacent food store to be developed at GRIP 3 and co-ordinated with car park layout. Confirm adequate space has been allowed for the buffer stop.				Agreed. A clearance zone of 20 m has been provided behind the buffer stop, will be noted on drawing.		
5	Drawing CV-DRG-0005 P01 Waiting shelters - confirm waiting shelters can be accommodated under the stair/ramp in terms of height. Note that adequate clearance needs to be provided to waiting shelters from platform edge. Footbridge clearances - confirm footbridge clearance has been designed to allow for future electrification (5.1m) and that ramp and stair arrangements are designed accordingly.	SB	2A	Yes	Location of shelters adjusted to ensure sufficient height clearance and clearance to platform edge, note added to drawing. Footbridge ramps have been designed to allow for electrification clearances greater than 5.1m.	ST	Yes
6	CRE Signatures - ensure that the appointed CRE has signed all documents and drawings relevant to that discipline.	SB	2A	Yes	All documents will be signed by relevant CRE's prior to formal issue.	ST	Yes
7	Utilities - provide confirmation that there are no major existing services located within the footprint of the proposed developments.	SB	2A	Yes	The buried services records show that there are no major buried services in the vicinity of the proposed developments.	ST	Yes
8	Hard and soft landscaping - hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatment proposals to be developed during GRIP 3/4.	SB	4	Yes	Noted	ST	Yes

END

<b>Project Number:</b>	139797	<b>Project Name:</b>	MetroWest Phase 2
<b>Project Manager:</b>	Rachel Leighfield Finch	<b>Principal Contractor:</b>	URS
<b>Engineering Deliverable Owner:</b>	URS	<b>CEM Name:</b>	Steve Turner
<b>Submission Discipline:</b>	Electrification Plant	<b>CRE Name:</b>	Chris Spellman
<b>Document Number:</b>	<b>Document Title:</b>		<b>Revision</b>
	MetroWest Phase 2 GRIP Stage 2 - Feasibility Report		0.02

**Document Transmittal/Submission No:**

<b>Date Received:</b>	15/01/15	<b>Date Return Required:</b>	11/02/15
<b>REVIEWERS:-</b>	<b>DRN No:</b> 139797-MP2-EPY01-RH-20001	<b>DRN Date:</b>	04/02/15

Name	Position	Discipline	Signature
		- (Lead)	
Rasheed Hameed	PE	Electrification & Plant	Rasheed Hameed
Chumina Odinye	PE	Electrification & Plant	Chuma Odinye

**DISTRIBUTION LIST (of completed review):-**

Name	Position	Action Required
Rachel Leighfield Finch	PM	Information
Western And Wales Drn Collation	TO	

<b>Document Type under DRN:</b>	PDF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Source Data <input type="checkbox"/>	Two Dimensional <input type="checkbox"/>	Model <input type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------	---	--------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------

DOCUMENT REVIEW:-			Risk Review Level:	Key Features
Overall DRN Category	Rejected Non-compliant to contract	Accepted	Accepted with Amendments	Not Accepted Revise & Resubmit
<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>

- The acceptance of these documents by Network Rail shall not be deemed as validation of the submission and nor does it infer their fitness for purpose. Network Rail does not accept any liability for the submission.
- Any changes to the documents should be undertaken in accordance with your organisation's approved change control procedures. Such variations must be formally recorded and evidence should accompany any resubmission.
- Without relieving the originating organisation of their contractual responsibilities my comments are as follows:
  - Overall DRN Category 0 rejected and a category 3 non acceptance requires the whole document(s) to be revised and resubmitted to address the comments. Prior to any re-work a way forward shall be agreed between supplier and the Designated Project Engineer
  - Overall DRN Category 2 acceptance with amendments requires the appropriate responses with additional information to be submitted to address the comments
  - Comment types 2A, 2B, 3A and 3B require a written response & Comment type 4 is for information only
- 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.

<b>**Issued By:</b> Steve Baker	<b>Signature:</b> Steve Baker	<b>Date:</b> 04/02/15
---------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------

**DRN ACCEPTANCE AND/OR CLOSED OUT (including Supplier's responses):-**

<b>**Closed By:</b> Steve Baker	<b>Signature:</b> Steve Baker	<b>Date:</b> 13/02/15
---------------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------

**\*\*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.**

Network Rail (NR)				Supplier			NR
No	Comments	By	Type	Comment Accepted	Responses	By	Response Accepted *
01	9.1 Ashley Down Station There are no E&P and M&E options mentioned for this station.	RH/CO	2A	Yes	This was outside the remit of our works.	CAS	Yes
02	9.2 Constable Road Station There are no E&P and M&E options mentioned for this station.	RH/CO	2A	Yes	This was outside the remit of our works.	CAS	Yes
03	9.3 North Filton - Electrical/Utilities 1. It is not sufficient to just state that "some measures will need to be put in place to deter damage and vandalism", options to achieve this should be outlined. 2. It is stated here that "the luminaires are shown to be 5m above the platform and are at 10m spacings". Are these based on existing lighting or are they derived from calculations and assumptions? Options on how to provide a compliant platform lighting system, including the type of light source and controls should be presented here.	RH/CO	2A	Yes	1. The clause will be removed since the station and car park area will be covered by CCTV along with suitable fencing to be put in place with warning signs to state CCTV is in operation. These measures are highlighted in the other disciplines text. 2. This is based on typical lighting installations for stations and the rule of thumb used by the lighting manufacturers to achieve a good level of lighting. IF we state how the future stages of the project is to achieve the lighting requirements highlighted we would be limiting the designer at the next stage and should their options be open on how they best achieve the desired lighting levels. We referenced standards that need to be complied with along with the illuminance levels that need to be achieved..	CAS	Yes
04	9.4 Henbury Station Option 2A - Electrical/Utilities 1. It is not sufficient to just state that "some measures will need to be put in place to deter damage and vandalism", options to achieve this should be outlined. 2. Options on how to provide a compliant platform lighting system, including the type of light source and	RH/CO	2A	Yes	1. The clause will be removed since the station and car park area will be covered by CCTV along with suitable fencing to be put in place with warning signs to state CCTV is in operation. These measures are highlighted in the other disciplines text. 2. This is based on typical lighting installations for stations and the rule of thumb used by the lighting manufacturers to achieve a good level of lighting. IF	CAS	Yes

Network Rail (NR)				Supplier		NR	
No	Comments	By	Type	Comment Accepted	Responses	By	Response Accepted *
	controls, should be presented here. 3. If the assumption that the waiting shelters are made from transparent material turns out to be otherwise, what are the options of providing compliant lighting in these shelters?				we state how the future stages of the project is to achieve the lighting requirements highlighted we would be limiting the designer at the next stage and should their options be open on how they best achieve the desired lighting levels. We referenced standards that need to be complied with along with the illuminance levels that need to be achieved.  3. This is a standard item of station platform furniture and it is unlikely that the shelter will not be transparent. A clause can be inserted to say that at the Form A stage the shelter construction will need to be investigated and if opaque materials are used the shelter will need to be lit to the same lighting levels as the platform. This could be achieved with a pre-wired shelter construction or by installing lighting in the shelter and controlled by the platform lighting controller.		
05	Henbury Station Option 2B - Electrical/Utilities  1. It is not sufficient to just state that "some measures will need to be put in place to deter damage and vandalism", options to achieve this should be outlined. 2. It is stated here that "the luminaires are shown to be 5m above the platform and are at 10m spacings". Are these based on existing lighting or are they derived from calculations and assumptions? Options on how to provide a compliant platform lighting system, including the type of light source and controls should be presented here. 3. If the assumption that the waiting shelters are made from transparent material turns out to be otherwise, what are the options of providing compliant lighting in these shelters?	RH/CO	2A	Yes	1. The clause will be removed since the station and car park area will be covered by CCTV along with suitable fencing to be put in place with warning signs to state CCTV is in operation. These measures are highlighted in the other disciplines text. 2. This is based on typical lighting installations for stations and the rule of thumb used by the lighting manufacturers to achieve a good level of lighting. IF we state how the future stages of the project is to achieve the lighting requirements highlighted we would be limiting the designer at the next stage and should their options be open on how they best achieve the desired lighting levels. We referenced standards that need to be complied with along with the illuminance levels that need to be achieved. 3. This is a standard item of station platform furniture and it is unlikely that the shelter will not be transparent. A clause can be inserted to say that at	CAS	Yes

Network Rail (NR)				Supplier		NR	
No	Comments	By	Type	Comment Accepted	Responses	By	Response Accepted
06	<p>9.4 Henbury Station Options 1A &amp; 2A - Points Heating and Signalling Power Supplies</p> <p>1. The options to use either 100W/m, 150W/m and 200W/m strips to provide heating to points should be stated here to be further developed in GRIP 3. Depending on the option adopted a three phase DNO supply and control cubicle may not be required.</p> <p>2. Paragraph 4 contains conflicting information. It is stated to investigate the PSP at Avonmouth to determine if spare capacity exists for the increased signalling power load, and at the same time stating that the existing existing signalling power supply network has enough spare capacity to cater for the increased load.</p> <p>3. The assertion that signalling power supply could be derived directly from points heating or station DNO is not true. Signalling power supplies should only be in accordance with NR/SP/ELP/27243 and other standards relevant to signalling power supplies.</p>	RH/CO	2A	Yes	<p>the Form A stage the shelter construction will need to be investigated and if opaque materials are used the shelter will need to be lit to the same lighting levels as the platform. This could be achieved with a pre-wired shelter construction or by installing lighting in the shelter and controlled by the platform lighting controller.</p> <p>1. The use of the different strip power ratings will be included along with a reference to the points heating standards that will need to be adhered to.</p> <p>2. It does not conflict, the statement is that we anticipate that the signalling system has sufficient capacity for the increased load since signalling power supply systems are typically installed with a 20% spare capacity.</p> <p>3. Agreed that the system would need to comply with the appropriate standards but the standard itself does not preclude the use of a DNO supply that feeds a signalling PSP and other equipment such as points heating. The DNO Generic Technical Workscope does not allow a combined station/PSP supply so the clause will be amended to reflect this.</p>	CAS	Yes
07	<p>9.6 Yate</p> <p>Options to provide heating to the new points added to provide turnback facility are not included in the report.</p>	RH/CO	2A	Yes	<p>Some words will be included to highlight the works necessary to provide heating to the additional points to be installed at site.</p>	CAS	Yes

\* Click in the last Cell (Column) to add a new row, after the selected cell or to delete the selected row





# Document Review Notice

Network Rail (NR)				Supplier		NR	
No	Comments	By	Type	Comment Accepted	Responses	By	Response Accepted
							*

END

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

<b>Project Number:</b>	139797	<b>Project Name:</b>	MetroWest Phase 2	
<b>Project Manager:</b>	Rachel Leighfield Finch	<b>Principal Contractor:</b>	URS	
<b>Engineering Deliverable Owner:</b>	URS	<b>CEM Name:</b>	Steve Turner	
<b>Submission Discipline:</b>	Track	<b>CRE Name:</b>	Peter Hillier	
<b>Document Number:</b>	<b>Document Title:</b>			<b>Revision</b>
	MetroWest Phase 2 GRIP Stage 2 - Feasibility Report			0.02
<b>Document Transmittal/Submission No:</b>				
<b>Date Received:</b>	15/01/15	<b>Date Return Required:</b>	06/02/15	
<b>REVIEWERS:-</b>	<b>DRN No:</b>	139797-MP2-PWY01-JT-20001	<b>DRN Date:</b>	30/01/15
<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Discipline</b>	<b>Signature</b>	
		- (Lead)		
Julian Thompson	PE	Track	Julian Thompson	
<b>DISTRIBUTION LIST (of completed review):-</b>				
<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Action Required</b>		
Rachel Leighfield Finch	PM	Information		
Western And Wales Drn Collation	TO			
<b>Document Type under DRN:</b>	<b>PDF</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Source Data</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Two Dimensional</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Model</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>DOCUMENT REVIEW:-</b>			<b>Risk Review Level:</b>	Detailed
<b>Overall DRN Category</b>	<b>Rejected</b> Non-compliant to contract	<b>Accepted</b>	<b>Accepted</b> with Amendments	<b>Not Accepted</b> Revise & Resubmit
<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The acceptance of these documents by Network Rail shall not be deemed as validation of the submission and nor does it infer their fitness for purpose. Network Rail does not accept any liability for the submission.</li> <li>➤ Any changes to the documents should be undertaken in accordance with your organisation's approved change control procedures. Such variations must be formally recorded and evidence should accompany any resubmission.</li> <li>➤ Without relieving the originating organisation of their contractual responsibilities my comments are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall DRN Category 0 rejected and a category 3 non acceptance requires the whole document(s) to be revised and resubmitted to address the comments. Prior to any re-work a way forward shall be agreed between supplier and the Designated Project Engineer</li> <li>• Overall DRN Category 2 acceptance with amendments requires the appropriate responses with additional information to be submitted to address the comments</li> <li>• Comment types 2A, 2B, 3A and 3B require a written response &amp; Comment type 4 is for information only</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ 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.</li> </ul>				
<b>**Issued By:</b>	Steve Baker	<b>Signature:</b>	Steve Baker	<b>Date:</b> 30/01/15
<b>DRN ACCEPTANCE AND/OR CLOSED OUT (including Supplier's responses):-</b>				
<b>**Closed By:</b>	Steve Baker	<b>Signature:</b>	Steve Baker	<b>Date:</b> 13/02/15
<p>**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.</p>				



## Document Review Notice

DRN No: 139797-MP2-PWY01-JT-20001

Network Rail (NR)				Supplier		NR	
No	Comments	By	Type	Comment Accepted	Responses	By	Response Accepted
1	Subsequent submissions to show Overrun Risk Zone for terminus platforms.	JT	4	Yes	Noted	ST	Yes
<div style="border: 1px solid black; height: 100px; width: 100%;"></div>							

**END**

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

<b>Project Number:</b>	139797	<b>Project Name:</b>	MetroWest Phase 2		
<b>Project Manager:</b>	Rachel Leighfield Finch		<b>Principal Contractor:</b>	URS	
<b>Engineering Deliverable Owner:</b>	URS		<b>CEM Name:</b>	Steve Turner	
<b>Submission Discipline:</b>	Telecommunications		<b>CRE Name:</b>	Peter Froggatt	
<b>Document Number:</b>	<b>Document Title:</b>			<b>Revision</b>	
	MetroWest Phase 2 GRIP Stage 2 - Feasibility Report			0.02	
<b>Document Transmittal/Submission No:</b>					
<b>Date Received:</b>	15/01/15		<b>Date Return Required:</b>	06/02/15	
<b>REVIEWERS:-</b>	<b>DRN No:</b>	139797-MP2-TEL01-TC-20001		<b>DRN Date:</b>	30/01/15
<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Discipline</b>	<b>Signature</b>		
		- (Lead)			
Tom Coxon	PE	Telecommunications	Tom Coxon		
<b>DISTRIBUTION LIST (of completed review):-</b>					
<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Action Required</b>			
Rachel Leighfield Finch	PM	Information			
Western And Wales DRN Collation		TO			
<b>Document Type under DRN:</b>	<b>PDF</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Source Data</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Two Dimensional</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Model</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>DOCUMENT REVIEW:-</b>			<b>Risk Review Level:</b>	Detailed	
<b>Overall DRN Category</b>	<b>Rejected</b> Non-compliant to contract	<b>Accepted</b>	<b>Accepted</b> with Amendments	<b>Not Accepted</b> Revise & Resubmit	
<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The acceptance of these documents by Network Rail shall not be deemed as validation of the submission and nor does it infer their fitness for purpose. Network Rail does not accept any liability for the submission.</li> <li>➤ Any changes to the documents should be undertaken in accordance with your organisation's approved change control procedures. Such variations must be formally recorded and evidence should accompany any resubmission.</li> <li>➤ Without relieving the originating organisation of their contractual responsibilities my comments are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall DRN Category 0 rejected and a category 3 non acceptance requires the whole document(s) to be revised and resubmitted to address the comments. Prior to any re-work a way forward shall be agreed between supplier and the Designated Project Engineer</li> <li>• Overall DRN Category 2 acceptance with amendments requires the appropriate responses with additional information to be submitted to address the comments</li> <li>• Comment types 2A, 2B, 3A and 3B require a written response &amp; Comment type 4 is for information only</li> </ul> </li> <li>➤ 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.</li> </ul>					
<b>**Issued By:</b>	Steve Baker	<b>Signature:</b>	Steve Baker	<b>Date:</b>	30/01/15
<b>DRN ACCEPTANCE AND/OR CLOSED OUT (including Supplier's responses):-</b>					
<b>**Closed By:</b>	Steve Baker	<b>Signature:</b>	Steve Baker	<b>Date:</b>	13/02/15
<p>** 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.</p>					



## Document Review Notice

DRN No: 139797-MP2-TEL01-TC-20001

Network Rail (NR)							Supplier		NR	
No	Comments	TC	4	Yes	By	Type	Comment Accepted	Responses	By	Response Accepted *
1	Currently CCTV monitoring is done by First Great Western.	TC	4	Yes	Noted			ST		Yes
2	Coverage drawings are required for GRIP 4 to understand coverage, minimise camera numbers where possible, aqs currently the number seems high.	TC	4	Yes	Noted			ST		Yes
3	Ambient noise detectors should be thought about at stations where sound levels could be a problem for local residents etc.	TC	4	Yes	Noted			ST		Yes
4	PA system should be OLE immunised including audio loop systems.	TC	4	Yes	Noted			ST		Yes
5	Look at wireless CIS screens as an option where cost is reduced for ducting etc.	TC	4	Yes	Noted			ST		Yes
6	All external cabinets should be IP65 rated, internal should be IP65 and cables glanded etc. where required for entry.	TC	4	Yes	Noted			ST		Yes
7	FTNX/FTN should be used as the primary connectivity system where possible, as opposed to 3 <sup>rd</sup> party.	TC	4	Yes	Noted			ST		Yes
8	The Flat Tool for assessing SPT requirement should be commenced at GRIP 4, the output of which should be provided to NRT for assessment, until confirmation is given all SPTs should be assumed to be required as per normal design standards.	TC	4	Yes	Noted			ST		Yes
9	Signalling changes to GSM-R births shall be included and a change notice submitted (PAN	TC	4	Yes	Noted			ST		Yes

NR/L2/INI/02009/F0044

Issue Date: 03/05/2013

Version 6.0

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



## Document Review Notice

DRN No: 139797-MP2-TEL01-TC-20001

Network Rail (NR)				Supplier			NR
No	Comments	By	Type	Comment Accepted	Responses	By	Response Accepted *
61).							
10	Concentrator type, spare capacity, and uplift shall be included for new telecoms requirements. Which panels will be affected and what is currently in use?	4	Yes	Noted	ST		Yes
11	Telecoms equipment on stations should be installed on dedicated poles where required. Sharing a pole with other disciplines will require the agreement of that discipline's RAM.	4	Yes	Noted	ST		Yes

**END**

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