



BA/POCL Stage 3 - Demonstrator Stream
POCL Infrastructure Demonstrator Strand

Summary of Demonstrator Activities
October 1995-January 1996

Jeremy Folkes
BA/POCL Programme
 **GRO**

1. Introduction

This paper documents the *POCL Infrastructure Demonstrator Strand*, as part of the overall Demonstrator Stream of Stage 3 of the BA/POCL Programme.

The paper first outlines the structure and organisation of the strand and the general philosophy followed during the life of the strand. This is followed by an appendix per service provider, in which their general style is described, together with a list of meetings attended.

2. Background

The *POCL Infrastructure Demonstrator Strand* was conceived at the time of the BA/POCL Stage 3 re-organisation in October 1995, and ran as one of 6 strands up to the formal closure of the Demonstrator in January 1996, and the subsequent mutation into the Assessment phase by the strand leaders.

A period of planning, culminating in the Demonstrator Stream awayday on 17th October 1995, preceded the demonstrator activities as outlined in this note.

It should be noted that the original demonstrator plan (pre-October 1995) did not contain an *Infrastructure Strand* per se; this area would have been partly covered by the *Design Assurance Strand*, and partly by slices of other strands. Unlike a number of the other strands, which were a natural evolution from one or more of the old pre-reorganisation strands (eg *Applications*, *BPS* etc), the *Infrastructure Strand* enjoyed the dubious advantage of starting in October from a clean sheet.

3. Objectives of the Demonstrator Stream

The objectives of the demonstrator, as defined by the team and in *STAGE 3 - RE-PLANNING DOCUMENT* (v1.2 25th October 1995), were as follows:

- to clarify the requirements with the three service providers and ensure they have a valid understanding of these requirements
- to identify deficiencies in the requirements and to feed these back into the BA/POCL requirements team for resolution
- to explore and understand the service providers solutions and to identify issues and risks associated with these solutions and then feeding these into the Service Providers Risk Register (SPRR)
- to provide a forum through which service providers may reduce risks on the SPRR
- to assess the service providers solutions as input to the overall evaluation process
- to provide confidence to the sponsors in the service providers solutions

3. Organisation of the Strand

The overall strand leader was Jeremy Folkes, ably assisted by Steve Grayston and Bob Booth¹. Steve Grayston handled the Supporting Services Area within the strand, whilst Jeremy Folkes and Bob Booth handled the Technical Infrastructure Area.

The strand reported to Michael Berg (Stream Leader) and Tony Johnson (Deputy Director).

4. Scope of the Strand

The initial scope of the *Infrastructure Strand* was derived from the functional parts of three draft contract schedule groups - OPS (office platform service), TMS (transaction management service) and SMS (system management service). A list of eight high level areas was identified and these were shown within the overall "*Scope of Strands*" table given to service providers at the introductory, cross strand meeting.

This high level scope was further developed by the *Infrastructure Strand* into the "topic list", reproduced below. The list was intended to give the service providers an outline of the areas that we wished to investigate and as a checklist for review during the Demonstrator process, but was not intended to be exhaustive or restrictive, should other issues arise. In particular, the emphasis on particular topics differed across the three service providers, depending on their solutions and the related risks.

The topic list was walked through with each service provider during the first POCL Infrastructure Demonstrator Strand meeting, to ensure that they had a sound understanding of the areas we wished to cover. No significance was attached to the order of topics; indeed flexibility was offered to the service providers as to the order of coverage of the topics (to fit in with other activities, availability of staff and documentation, etc).

¹ Bob Booth joined the BA/POCL programme a couple of weeks into the life of the strand.

The topics included in the list were as follows:

4.1 Technical Infrastructure Area

Office Platform:

- hardware
- actual specification
- input devices
- printing capability
- standards/health and safety/EMC etc
- environmental friendliness
- number of configurations
- suitability for range of offices
- appearance/robustness
- bespoke hardware
- operating system
- local area network (hardware, cabling and software)
- middleware/4QL/database packages etc
- performance/capacity
- availability/resilience/recovery
- security
- technology refresh/reviews/upgradability/future-proofing

Wide Area Network:

- technology/architecture
- performance
- availability/resilience
- security
- coverage

TMS:

- links to other systems
- resilience (incl multiple sites, inter-site links etc)
- scalability/performance

System Management (SM):

- software/data release/downloading
- configuration management
- user administration/access control (including to OP)
- remote diagnosis
- office churn/changes

4.2 Support Services Area

Support Services:

- Helpdesk for POCL staff
- Second line support/fault management
- Field support (repair, swapout, remote sites etc)
- Upgrades

4.3 HCI Area

HCI was an area which existed as an explicit strand in the pre-replan Demonstrator organisation, and therefore at the time of the Stage 3 Replan, work was already underway, under the auspices of that strand, with a firm of outside HCI specialists (EFD Total Systems Consultants Ltd) to evaluate the three suppliers HCI.

Although HCI was originally included in the topic list for the Infrastructure Strand, it became clear at an early stage that it made more sense for this existing activities to continue in their current form, and HCI was therefore excluded from the scope of work for the Infrastructure Strand.

However, for historical reasons, the assessment scorings for HCI have still been included as one topic under Infrastructure, although the scorings were done by the Demonstrator Strand Leaders as a group, rather than by this strand.

Notional responsibility for liaison with the HCI activities was taken by Michael Berg.

5. Approach

5.1 Demonstrator Meetings

The demonstrator process was based around a series of full day meetings with each service provider, with each strand being allocated a specific day of each week for each supplier (for Infrastructure this was IBM Tuesday, Pathway Wednesday, CardLink Thursday) as part of the planning at the Introductory meetings.

Meetings were generally held at the service providers main offices, although some were located at specific sub-contractors sites if this facilitated specific demonstrations or the availability of staff or equipment. In addition, a two week period in December 1995 was reserved for "site visits", with this being used for a combination of reference site visits and presentations/discussions with overseas sub-contractors.

The general format of each meeting with the service providers was as follows:

- discussion of service provider queries on requirements, with feedback from the programme where available
- review of risks
- sessions on specific topics (planned in advance)
- review of service provider documents
- review of outstanding actions
- planning of agenda for following week

As a general rule the two areas held separate meetings with the suppliers (although generally on the same days), although certain meetings were combined, in particular those at the start and end of the stage. If meetings were held on the same site, opportunity was taken during the day for a brief shared session to handle any significant issues.

5.2 Requirements Queries

Each meeting gave the service provider the opportunity to pose requirements queries to the team. Where the team were able to give a “steer” as to the likely answer, this was provided, but all queries were logged and passed to the Requirements Team via the Risk Register Team. The responses from the Requirements Team was generally “steer agreed”, or in some cases to raise an issue with the sponsors. Any responses were fed back to service providers at the first available opportunity.

Although it was originally intended that the demonstrator team would handle queries on issued requirements, the opportunity did not exist as main part of the demonstrator phase had ended before many of the formal requirements had been issues. Instead, many queries were handled directly with the Requirements Team as part of their meetings on Solutions with the service providers.

5.3 Risk Register

The content of the Service Providers Risk Register was generally reviewed at each meeting. This included both risks *inherited* from before the start of the Demonstrator (such as those raised at the original Rugby evaluation), as well as those raised as a result of demonstrator activities. Service providers were generally warned in advance of the intention to raise a risk through the RAP, and where a paper was required to be able to recommend the clearance or reduction of a risk, this was discussed and planned with the Service Provider.

Feedback on the actual state of the SPRR, including formal clearance, was handled directly with the Service Providers by the Risk Register Team back in Terminal House.

The SPRR files, including the register itself and an audit trail of actions and decisions on each risk are available for reference from Alan Fowler, the Risk Register Manager.

6. Documentation

Detailed notes from each demonstrator meeting were taken in real time by the BA/POCL attendees, either on paper or directly onto portable computer, with these notes being subsequently (usually same evening) turned into the *Meeting Reports* which were filed in the Demonstrator records (and are also available now on the BA/POCL file server). Copies of the meeting reports were also passed to the other interested strand leaders, with copies to Tony Johnson and to the Supplier Liaison Manager (SLM) team.

Requirements and other queries from the service providers, together with any steer given by the Demonstrator team, were documented in tabular form in the notes. These queries were faxed into the programme after each meeting, from where they were handled (by the Service Provider Risk Register team)

Where meetings (in particular site visits) were shared with other strands, the meetings were generally only written up by the mutually agreed "lead" strand, although the notes were reviewed by the other party.

7. Reporting

Reporting of demonstrator activities back to the programme took two main forms:

- notes from demonstrator meetings were copied to Tony Johnson, with other ad-hoc reporting to Michael Berg and Tony Johnson by telephone or fax as required.
- Verbal reporting at weekly "Thursday evening" demonstrator strand leader meetings (generally in hotels in West or Central London).

8. Relationship with the Assessment Phase

The Demonstration Phase led into the Phase 3 Assessment Phase, with the strand leaders basing much of their assessment activities on the knowledge gained during the Demonstrator. The juxtaposition of the demonstrator and requirements/solution activities, and the subsequent drift (post-demonstrator) of the service providers solutions did have some obvious impact on the validity of this knowledge. The assessment therefore had to be supplemented by the *relatively sterile* examination of individual solution responses, which did not include the same opportunity for detailed exploration of the solutions as occurred during the demonstrator proper.

The audit trail and other documentation for the assessment process, including the scoring mechanism and actual scores at each iteration, is held by Michael Berg (Assessment Stream Leader).

9. Constraints and Lessons Learnt

There were a number of constraints, which, despite the best efforts by all concerned (both BA/POCL and suppliers), may have had an adverse effect upon the efficacy of the demonstrator phase. These are listed here for future reference.

- the demonstrator phase started at the same time as the requirements phase, and the two ran in parallel. Although the general outline of the requirements were known (from the SSR, and from the early work on contract schedules in September 1995), many of the formal requirements were not agreed and issues until well into the demonstrator - and indeed, many were not issued until *after* the formal end of the demonstrator.
- the timescale for the demonstrator was actually somewhat shorter than that for the requirements - as the requirements (and solutions) activity continued right up to the issue of the ITT. Although the ITT date and its associated activities were effectively *slipped* by two months, the demonstrator continued to its original timescales, and this further aggravated the problems with parallel running.
- due to the compressed timescales and the workload during the demonstrator period, there was insufficient opportunity for “cross-strand” discussion on the content of the solutions. This led to some confusion where aspects of a solution affected multiple areas, and where the service provider was changing their solution.
- there was a conflict between the service providers work on preparation of formal solutions (against a very aggressive timescale) and their work for the preparation of documentation for the demonstrator. This impacted the quality of the outputs being produced by the service providers for demonstrator purposes.
- the demonstrator was brought to a halt about 6 weeks before ITT, with the majority of detailed activity completed by the start of December - almost 3 months before the issue of the ITT. As there was there was no “design freeze” by the service providers (neither during the demonstrator or up to the ITT), there was significant solution drift in certain key areas during the last 2 months.
- by the time of the ITT (and ITR) responses, the solutions had shown further drift from those which had been demonstrated by the service providers and had therefore been evaluated by the demo team.

A. CardLink

A.1 Technical Infrastructure Area

A.1.1 Style

Meetings with CardLink were generally held within the boardroom at their ShowCase in London, although one meeting was held at the premises of their network supplier, BT MNS, in Apsley.

CardLink provided typed agendas for each meetings, based on discussions from the previous week. They would have generally prepared a number of formal presentations for each meeting, with corresponding handouts and papers being available. Action points, both on CardLink and programme staff, would be tracked from week to week on their minutes from the meeting, which were generally circulated to the demonstrator staff in advance.

Demonstrations of equipment were performed in the boardroom, with access being available to the ShowCase if required.

The meetings were generally attended by a fairly large number of CardLink staff; key individuals were Khan Busby and Mark Harrison, abetted by a junior member of staff to take notes, and (at times) Tim Hyde as Client Manager. Specialists for particular area were generally on hand and contributed both to presentations and to on-going discussions - these included individuals like Yvo Dubous (network and modelling) and John McSherry (hardware) from CardLink, as well as staff from consortium companies such as Datafit.

CardLink were generally happy to produce papers in response to specific queries or risks, although this enthusiasm did drop at one stage towards the end of the main demonstrator phase. Papers were produced to good quality, with evidence internally reviewed before formal issue, although they were also prepared to let us have "draft" copies for early comment if requested.

A.1.2 Meetings

Meeting Reference	Date	Location	Purpose/Main Topics
Introductory	18/10/95	CardLink Southwark	Introductory cross-strand planning meeting
CLK/JFO/001	23/10/95	CardLink Southwark	Opening meeting. Scene setting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> requirements queries Office Platform hardware
CLK/JFO/002	2/11/95	CardLink Southwark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office Platform hardware
CLK/JFO/003	9/11/95	CardLink Southwark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Network (suitability of TermLink) Counter Architecture
CLK/JFO/004	17/11/95	CardLink Southwark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Network sizing and modelling System Management
CLK/JFO/005	23/11/95	CardLink Southwark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TMS Overview Datafit Presentation & Overview

CLK/JFO/006	30/11/95	BT MNS Apsley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide Area Network (BT MNS) • TMS
Cross strand	1/12/96	CardLink Southwark	Cross strand day
Site visit ²	14/12/95 15/12/95	CardLink Southwark Alders Intl Copenhagen	Presentation by Alders International, prior to site visit Alders International, Copenhagen Airport - Datafit reference site.
Cross strand	21/12/95	CardLink Southwark	Cross strand day
CLK/JFO/007	10/1/96	CardLink Southwark	Closing meeting. Main topics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equipment (esp ALPS and APPU) • Counter Security and Resilience paper • Network proposals (including packet radio) • Failures in office

Jeremy Folkes attended three meetings with CardLink under the Design Assurance demo strand, prior to the Demonstrator reorganisation - an introductory meeting on 30/8/95 and two substantive meetings on 19/9/95 and 10/10/95. These meetings included discussion on a number of issues of relevance to the POCL Infrastructure Strand, including in particular the Wide Area Network, modelling, software distribution and response times. The notes related to these meetings are held within the documentation for the End-to-End Strand.

Jeremy Folkes (as a member of the CCIG Working Group and the Security Review Panel) also attended the CCIG Demonstrator meeting with CardLink on 2nd October, again prior to the Demonstrator re-organisation.

A.2 Support Services Area

A.2.1 Style

Steve Grayston's main contacts within the Cardlink consortium were Celia Chernin and Nigel Smith.

Cardlink always appeared to be well organised - agendas were prepared for each meeting; papers and reference documents were produced to time and without fuss; questions were answered in a full and frank manner; and site visits were well conducted and informative.

A.2.2 Meetings

Meeting Reference	Date	Location	Purpose/Main Topics
CLK/SGR/001	23/10/95	Cardlink Southwark	Initial meeting / overview of process / risks. (J Folkes also attended for BA/POCL)
CLK/SGR/002	27/10/95	Cardlink Southwark	Outline discussion about processes and areas for discussion in terms of POCL support service provision.
CLK/SGR/003	02/11/95	Cardlink Southwark	Provision of assumption details used in solution / 'walk through' of support area / discussion of aspects of support service solution.

² Joint visit with POCL Applications Strand. Documented by John Meagher.

BA/POCL Demonstrator

POCL Infrastructure Strand

CLK/SGR/004	09/11/95	Cardlink Southwark	Discussion about aspects of schedules C(OP)3/C(TMS)3 / 'out of hours' calls / structure of Help Desk solution / communication links.
CLK/SGR/005	17/11/95	Cardlink Southwark	Questions and clarifications relating to solution / position of current POCL infrastructure assets / data & security within support service area / escalation / maintenance.
CLK/SGR/006	23/11/95	Cardlink Southwark	Clarifications of solution / Welsh Language Act / 'tone' phone coverage in Network.
CLK/SGR/007	30/11/95	Cardlink Southwark	Update of assumptions information / Papers discussed and requested / clarification of issues arising from proposal.
CLK/SGR/008	07/12/95	Unisys Milton Keynes	Site visit - engineer management, current customer Help Desk support operations / warehousing - logistics management / areas to be utilised for BA/POCL support / data centre.
CLK/SGR/009	10/01/96	Cardlink Southwark	Clarification of outstanding POCL infrastructure issues / office equipment failure scenarios / risks. (J Folkes / B Booth also present from BA/POCL)

B. IBM

B.1 Technical Infrastructure Area

B.1.1 Style

Meetings were generally held in a conference room at IBM's offices at Bedfont Lakes.

The meetings were only attended by a minimum possible number of IBM staff - the core IBM attendee was Richard Hopkins (who was the designated liaison contact for both of the POCL strand), joined in later meetings by a junior member of staff to take notes. This single point of contact was extremely effective, except for one meeting where Richard dropped out at the last minute; in this case, the lack of continuity was very noticeable.

IBM produced a draft agenda, presented at the start of each meeting on an overhead projector, based on discussions from the preceding week, and although no minutes were circulated, action points were reviewed at each meeting. IBM already presented their view of outstanding risks as part of each meeting.

Meetings varied from fairly low key discussions with Richard Hopkins, to more formal presentations by specialists from IBM and their consortium members (eg Thorn SSI, Logica). These presentations were usually followed by a wider discussion, giving IBM the chance to pose questions.

IBM were happy to produce papers, which were generally of a high standard and showed evidence of review before issue. Some papers were updated a number of times during the demonstrator as their thinking progressed; this gave some confidence that the papers were actually being used "in-house" and were not just for external use.

B.1.2 Meetings

Meeting Reference	Date	Location	Purpose/Main Topics
Introductory	20/10/95	Terminal House	Introductory cross-strand planning meeting
IBM/JFO/001	31/10/95 ³	IBM Bedfont Lakes	Opening meeting, scene setting. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Requirement queries
IBM/JFO/002	7/11/95	IBM Bedfont Lakes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Failure scenarios• Resilience in the office• Software distribution overview
IBM/JFO/003	14/11/95	IBM Bedfont Lakes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Network Overview• System Management• TMS Functional Spec Review
IBM/JFO/004	21/11/95	IBM Bedfont Lakes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Office Platform Hardware• TMS Performance Modelling• Review of Systems Management

³ First IBM POCL Infrastructure meeting postponed one week due to sickness

IBM/JFO/005	28/11/95	IBM Bedfont Lakes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OS/2 • StorePlace DDS • Watermark Readers
IBM/ISDN-D/001	14/12/95	BT Milton Gate London	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BT ISDN-D
Cross strand	4/12/95	IBM Bedfont Lakes	Cross Strand Day
Site Visit ⁴	7/12/95 8/12/95	Raleigh, NC USA Woolworths, NY USA	IBM StorePlace and PostPlace presentations Reference site visit to Woolworths (first user of StorePlace)
Cross strand	19/12/95	IBM Bedfont Lakes	Cross Strand Day
IBM/JFO/006	12/1/96	(am): Racal Chineham (pm) IBM Bedfont	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide Area Network (ISDN-D), involvement of Racal as the D channel VASS. Closing meeting, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two tier solution

B.2 Support Services Strand

B.2.1 Style

The initial point of contact was outlined to be Barry Pilkington, however, this responsibility was passed to Tony Mancell. Steve Grayston was unable to meet with any representative from the IBM consortium with regard to POCL support services until well into the Demonstrator phase. Following the escalation of the matter a meeting was arranged. It appeared that IBM were under resourced in this area and had not, initially, considered it as an area of particular importance.

Once Tony Mancell had been established as the contact point a series of meetings were conducted. As a significant amount of Stage 3 time had elapsed the meetings, especially the early ones, were a case of 'catching up'.

Site visits were made to the FDR facility, IBM NCMC, and an IBM Service Point. These were well conducted with relevant representatives the IBM consortium present to answer questions.

Papers and reference documents were produced when requested. Clarifications and discussions in general were open.

⁴ Joint visit with POCL Applications Strand. Documentation compiled by John Meagher.

B.2.2 Meetings

Meeting Reference	Date	Location	Purpose/Main Topics
IBM/SGR/001	26/10/95	IBM Bedfont Lakes	Processes / discussion about Applications aspects of solution / CLI / 'tone' phone coverage in Network.
IBM/SGR/002	31/10/95	IBM Bedfont Lakes	Discussion about technical aspects of IBM solution / risks / processes for future meetings. (J Folkes also attended for BA/POCL)
IBM/SGR/003	28/11/95	FDR Basildon	Site visit - overview of FDR position in consortium / tour of facility / area to be utilised for support of BA/POCL automation / questions arising from solution.
IBM/SGR/004	21/12/95	IBM Bedfont Lakes	Roll out plans & interaction with support / maintenance / escalation / customer satisfaction / IBM service centres.
IBM/SGR/005	12/01/96	IBM Bedfont Lakes	Clarification of outstanding POCL Infrastructure issues / office equipment failure scenarios / software distribution / Racal-BT relationship within solution. (J Folkes / B Booth also present from BA/POCL)
IBM/SGR/006	16/01/96	IBM National Call Management Centre, Havant. IBM Service Point & Parts Bank, Winchester.	Site visits - demonstrated capability and processes in dealing with engineer activity / approach to customer support / current support service operations / communications links / dual site - back up capability.

C. Pathway

C.1 Technical Infrastructure Area

C.1.1 Style

Meetings with Pathway took place in the meeting rooms at their offices in Feltham. Unlike the other two suppliers, the meetings were fronted by sales orientated rather than technically orientated staff - initially Liam Foley, and then Martin Johnston - and these representatives also took the notes/actions from the meetings.

Numbers at the meetings varied, but core members of the team included Dave Cooke, David Hollingsworth, with other staff such as Tony Hayward (network) becoming involved as the demonstrator progressed. Other people were brought in at other times, however it was not always clear as to their roles and responsibilities (eg An Post representatives). More specialist staff, including key individuals from Escher were available for parts of certain meetings.

The meetings were characterised by less structure and less evidence of preparation than with the other two suppliers. Some presentations were given, however these were fairly informal with very few prepared slides, with diagrams drawn on a flipchart when required.

Papers were initially hard to extract from Pathway, and although this problem did ease up to a certain extent during the demonstrator (especially when queries were raised via the Risk Register), a significant amount of chasing was required to clear the outstanding documentation at the end of the phase. Papers themselves varied in quality and detail, with less evidence of internal review prior to issue.

Towards the end of the demonstrator phase, Pathway started taking a fairly robust attitude on risks, with the appearance of their Risk Director (Martin Bennett) at the start and finish of each meeting to check on the status of risks and actions. Although Martin took a fairly aggressive attitude towards the demonstrator team, his prime *raison d'être* seemed to be to ensure that the Pathway staff produced suitable responses. Despite this additional focus, adequate risk responses were still difficult to obtain, and a number of risks required repeated iterations of responses before clearance could be recommended.

In the cross stream meetings, Pathway again took a more sales-orientated approach, with less solution content than with the other two suppliers. This was evidenced by the demonstration of the somewhat irrelevant Household Budgeting Scheme, and of demonstrating putting demo team photos on cards, rather than showing a prototype of their solution to genuine requirements.

C.1.2 Meetings

Meeting Reference	Date	Location	Purpose/Main Topics
-------------------	------	----------	---------------------

Introductory	19/10/95	Terminal House	Introductory cross-strand planning meeting
PWY/JFO/001	1/11/95 ⁵	Pathway Feltham	Opening meeting. Scene setting. • Requirements queries
Site visit	3/11/95	An Post Dublin	Cross strand site visit to An Post, including visit to two Post Offices.
PWY/JFO/002	8/11/95	Pathway Feltham	• Riposte (including Mike Murphy)
PWY/JFO/003	15/11/95	Pathway Feltham	• Network Overview • System Management Overview
PWY/JFO/004	22/11/95	Pathway Feltham	• System Management • Riposte Architecture Document • TMS sizing and scalability
PWY/JFO/005	28/11/95	Pathway Feltham	• Low volume post offices • BT ISDN-B • System Management paper • Riposte
Cross strand	5/12/95	Pathway Feltham	Cross strand day
PWY/JFO/006 ⁶	11/12/95 12/12/95	Escher Cambridge MA	• Riposte
Cross strand	20/12/95	ICL Bracknell	Cross strand day
PWY/JFO/007	11/1/96		Closing meeting • Wide Area Network/Communications • Failure in the office

Jeremy Folkes attended two meetings with Pathway under the Design Assurance Demo Strand prior to the Demonstrator reorganisation - introductory meeting on 31/8/95, together with a short planning meeting on 26/9/95. However, due to late arrival of planning documents from Pathway, no substantive work had taken place with them on Design Assurance before the Demonstrator reorganisation.

12.2 Support Services Area

12.2.1 Style

Stephen Muchow was the Pathway consortium representative who dealt with the POCL support service aspect.

The impression was given that the methodology by which the procurement was being conducted was unnecessary and time consuming / costly. Meetings were conducted in a more ad hoc manner. Papers and reference documents were not easy to obtain and, when received, were less comprehensive than anticipated. Discussions, although fruitful, were less flowing than expected.

A site visit was made to the ICL Sorbus facility at Havant. This was well conducted with appropriate consortium personnel available for questions / information.

12.2.2 Meetings

⁵ First Pathway POCL Infrastructure meeting postponed one week due to sickness

⁶ Joint meeting with End-to-End Strand. Documentation compiled by POCL Infrastructure.

Meeting Reference	Date	Location	Purpose/Main Topics
PWY/SGR/001	25/10/95	Pathway Feltham	Overview of Pathway Help Desk solution / staffing level estimations / risk 27.
PWY/SGR/002	01/11/95	Pathway Feltham	Help Desk staffing assumptions / Help Desk staff training / identification of callers / service management tools / dual site / call categorisation / call follow up / 'out of hours' cover / Help Desk database / security / SSR call response requirement / second line support / remote access tools / change control.
PWY/SGR/003	08/11/95	Pathway Feltham	Roll out timescales / Pathway Help Desk data retention / format of trial / remote locations / training / capability of POCL 'users' to deal with technology.
PWY/SGR/004	22/11/95	Pathway Feltham	Processes for 'user' access to support services / Papers / consumables / call volumes / 'tone' phone coverage in Network / POCL infrastructure utilisation / failed equipment processes & responsibilities / new service support.
PWY/SGR/005	29/11/95	Pathway Feltham	Pathway test strategy / system management / PMS-CMS operations from Bootle & Wigan centres / data centre resilience.
PWY/SGR/006	13/12/95	Pathway HQ, Feltham	Queries re requirements / Pathway process plans / Papers discussed / POCL infrastructure usage.
PWY/SGR/007	11.01.96	Pathway Feltham	Clarification of outstanding POCL Infrastructure issues / risks / request for Papers / office equipment failure scenarios / ACD interconnectivity / engineer communications. (J Folkes / B Booth also present from BA/POCL but not at sub meeting undertaken for POCL Help Desk issues)
PWY/SGR/008	18.01.96	ICL Sorbus Kent	Engineer management / processes & management approach / to provision of customer Help Desk support / customer satisfaction / staff motivation / areas to be utilised for BA/POCL support service.