

FAX TRANSMISSION

BIRD & BIRD

To: ICL
Atten/Ref: Jim Morley
Fax No: **GRO**
From: Hazel Grant
Client: BA/POCL
Matter: BA/POCL
Account No: BPOCL-1
Date: 16 October 1996



90 Feller Lane
London EC4A 1JP
Telephone
GRO
Facsimile
GRO
Telex
GRO Birds G
DX
119 London

Time:

Number of pages (including this page): 24

Note: This fax is intended for the named addressee only. It contains information which may be confidential and which may also be privileged. Unless you are the named addressee (or authorised to receive for the addressee) you may not copy or use it, or disclose it to anyone else. If you have received it in error please notify us immediately so that we can arrange for its return. To do so, or if you have any queries, please telephone 0171 415 6000.

Message:

Dear Jim

Please find attached draft minutes of the CNT meeting held on 10 October. I should be grateful if you would circulate these to Tony Oppenheim and Warren Spencer. Please note that the minutes are subject to both Pathway's and the Programme's comments.

Kind Regards

GRO

Hazel Grant

Copy: AEO
WS

JRM
17/10

Partners
D Harris
G E Camps
J R Parker
D M Caythwaite
T M Cook
R N Scott
P J Christie
P Smith
D W Byam-Cook
G J H Smith
C P Hickson
J R C Walker
D Ken
M Macdonald
D M C Stone
C W Ross
R S W Barry
S J Hubner
P D Quinn
H R Sandison
D H Ayem
R J Ward
R R Graham
C M Crashtwaite
N T Jenkins
R M Bickelstaff
S K Topping
T C C Tether
H E Pearson
V S Crook
T R D Assenson

Consultants
K T C Arnold
S N L Chalton
P J Dann

B&B/DRAFT/16 October 1996

NOTES OF CNT MEETING HELD ON 10TH OCTOBER 1996

Present:

Pat Kelsey	}	
Keith Baines)	
John Cook)	
Stuart Riley)	BA/POCL Programme

Tony Oppenheim	}	
Jim Morley)	
Warren Spencer	}	Pathway

Hamish Sandison)	
Peter Elliott)	
Hazel Grant	}	Bird & Bird

Agenda Item	Comment	Agreed Points and Action Points
------------------------	----------------	--

1	Minutes of the last Meeting
----------	------------------------------------

It was agreed that the minutes of the CNT meetings held on 19 September 1996 and 25 September 1996 were accurate and that no amendments were necessary.

Agreed

Minutes dated 25 September 1996

PROGRAMME ACTION POINTS

1. Change Control Notes. John Bennett has signed the CCNs for Live Trial and the Operational Trial Structure. The CCN in relation to the change of POCL signatories has not yet been issued. Tony Oppenheim confirmed that this was not contentious.

5. **Change to Roll Out Sequence.** Pathway's paper relating to this was tabled at the PDA on 9 October 1996. Tony Oppenheim briefly stated the content of his paper. The paper contained an impact statement suggesting that costs would be increased by £2.2 million. The PDA Board were not happy with this potential increase in costs and had asked its staff to revisit the whole question to remove constraints to try to limit the cost impact. The only constraint definitely to be retained would be to have four implementation teams (rather than three). In addition, there might be a relaxation in the coupling between site surveys, ISDN and post office implementation. As a result of this change in the constraints, Pathway suggested that the change in Roll Out Sequence could proceed without any financial impact. Tony Oppenheim was concerned to ensure that POCL and DSS agreed this method of proceeding since the lack of confirmation has caused Pathway real problems. For example, it is causing uncertainty with Pathway's Subcontractors. Pat Kelsey agreed to speak with Bruce McNevan to facilitate confirmation by POCL and DSS of the removal of constraints.

Tony Oppenheim confirmed that the start date for Roll Out is to remain 1 July 1997.

6. **Generic Acceptance Criteria.** Jim Morley has written to Pat Kelsey concerning this.

7. **Changes to Requirements.** Jim Morley has contacted Alan Fowler concerning requirements 511 and 906.

The Programme is to redraft service definitions to include a drafting note suggesting the insertion of further requirements. Pathway will then comment on the drafting note.

Pat Kelsey

/John Cook

DNS: Shall all demand before completion of drop down.
DONE

8. **Liquidated Damages/Guarantees.** This subject is no longer relevant given the 1 July start date.

ICL PATHWAY ACTION POINTS

1. **Agreements to Agree.** The list of Agreements to agree has now been sent by Jim Morley to Pat Kelsey. It was agreed that this would be discussed later in the meeting.

3. Implementation Requirements

- 3.1 **Releases.** It was agreed that this would be covered in a discussion of the agreements to agree.

BUT IT WASNT.

Pat Kelsey

- 3.2 **TIP.** Pat Kelsey has spoken to John Mcagher concerning this issue. TIP is subject to several specifications being discussed between the parties. Tony Oppenheim pointed out that the original CAR date was the 30 August. Although progress has been made the CAR is still late and therefore ^{Since functionality} may not be put into release one. Tony Oppenheim would like the TIP requirement agreed by the end of October. Pat Kelsey to discuss with colleagues.

Pat Kelsey

- 3.3 **Requirement 902.** Keith Baines has been working with POCL to agree benchmark times. At the moment, he is awaiting a Pathway document on a proposed alternative method of measuring times. Tony Oppenheim confirmed that the paper on measurement would be tabled before the next CNT meeting next week. Keith Baines and Tony Oppenheim agreed that this is extremely urgent and must be accurate. Tony Oppenheim pointed out the issue was the whole process of recording all the transaction times whereas the Agreement shows only a representative few. There are two issues arising from this.

11

- (i) First, for services excluding EPOSS, it is necessary to agree a representative transaction time. Account must be taken of parallel processing and other counter clerk work and interruptions.
- (ii) EPOSS services. This issue has been discussed in previous CNT meetings (i.e that the transaction time is presently y + 5 with no indication of the definition of y).

Keith Baines
and Tony
Oppenheim

Meeting to be set up next week. Document to be produced by Monday. CEN likely to be needed.

It was agreed that Keith Baines would deal with this issue with Tony Oppenheim. The issue can now be removed from the agenda although it should continue to be monitored by CNT.

4.1 Contracting Authorities' Responsibilities. Tony Oppenheim tabled a paper entitled "Top CARs". Tony Oppenheim emphasised that it would be necessary to galvanise the process of resolution of CARs. Some points on the Top CARs list are Pathway's actions. However, some Programme members are taking the resolution of CARs more seriously than others. Further problems are that difficult items are holding up the resolution of CARs. For example, while 80% might be agreed on one CAR with 20% outstanding, the 20% may be critical. Tony Oppenheim said that Pathway has stressed to Programme members that the CARs are time critical, however, there are problems in ensuring that DSS and POCL agree on the resolution of CARs.

The CNT then reviewed the paper and commented on some of the CARs:

4.1.1 CAR 933/2. Stuart Riley will facilitate agreement.

*Maybe some comment
Stuart Riley
for request
Most of 203 pay
MORT would
Penny Robinson
this a note.*

4.1.2 TIP, it was agreed would be dealt with as referred to above. Host AIP Technical interface was late. Agreed

4.1.3 Smart cards. These are to be included in Release 2 and are therefore not contentious. PPD was very late.

4.1.4 Requirement 895. Pathway will raise a CCN regarding reports. This has been agreed at working level.

4.1.5 [Security issue] Release 1 may not implement final agreement on these.

Tony Oppenheim's view was that most CARs were expected on 31 August and are one or two months late. ~~Therefore~~, Release 1 may not have the agreed content or may not be complete. Pat Kelsey agreed to share the paper with colleagues.

Stuart Riley pointed out that some items are awaiting Pathway actions and some Programme actions. Tony Oppenheim said that he had a more positive view of CARs now compared to one month ago.

There then followed discussion of ownership or sponsorship of CARs. Tony Oppenheim thought that there was not enough ownership of CARs. Pat Kelsey agreed to speak to the people responsible for CARs. Jim Morley agreed to assist.

Tony Oppenheim pointed out that there were key individuals necessary on both sides to resolve many outstanding issues. These key individuals were being stretched and therefore targets were difficult to hit. It may be necessary to invite a few individuals to the CNT to try to resolve these points.

Tony
Oppenheim
Jim Morley

Pat Kelsey

30th June. Catch
f Release 1.
~~Recommends to have~~
~~more done some~~
~~work meeting~~
~~tomorrow.~~
Feedback on
Monday.
PK

Pat Kelsey
and Jim
Morley

6. **Key Personnel.** The previous action date of 4 October had not been achieved. It was agreed that this would be actioned by Warren Spencer before 18 October.

Warren
Spencer

7. **Amendments to Solutions.** It was agreed that the previous action dated 17 October would be delayed to the close of business on 22 October (i.e. immediately before the next set of walk throughs).

Jim Morley

ENSURE RED LINED
COPY. Point of
SUBMISSION.

CONTRACT CHANGES

Hamish Sandison reported that the Programme is still considering internally the suggested changes to Change Control Process. Hamish Sandison's paper is not yet finalised but will follow the broad gist of the minutes of the meeting held on 19 September.

In the minutes of the CNT meeting held on 19 September it was suggested that the Change Control Process be presented to the PDA on 9 October. The Change Control Process Paper was not presented to the Board on that date since Peter Crahan wanted to deal with internal comments first. As the PDA Board will not meet again until the end of November and the change to the Change Control Process will need to be agreed before 15 November, it was agreed that this would need to be dealt with outside the PDA Board.

Agreed

Action?

what does
need to do
for CC.

Acceptance Process. This was an issue raised in the minutes of the CNT meeting held on 19 September. Pat Kelscy received internal comments on Jim Morley's papers but had not had an opportunity to review these. Pat Kelscy to discuss the internal comments with Jim Morley by the end of Friday 11 October.

Pat Kelscy

2 **Actions brought forward.**

Please see above.

3 **Drop Down Process**

Hamish Sandison introduced this item by suggesting that it would be helpful to look back at the last walkthrough and look forward to the next and come to consensus on the role of the dropdown process and what would be classified as successful completion of the process.

The AUTHORITIES' Agreement calls for transposition and extrapolation aimed mainly at developing service definitions. Other points and issues may arise during the drop down process but are not part of the process, for example, reference to extraneous referenced documents. The Programme's view was that the last walkthrough had been completed successfully. Hamish Sandison invited Pathway's view.

S.D. is a minority of the skills effort.

Tony Oppenheim responded by saying that there were many issues outstanding from the last walkthrough. For example, the CARs, agreements to agree and Peter Elliott's list of actions from the walkthroughs, although there was some overlap between these three areas. Pathway's view was more cautious over the completion of the last walkthrough.

There are requirements which are now out of date and need to be sorted out. Of the listed agreements to agree, approximately 75% will need to be completed. Some agreements to agree refer to a process which needs only guidelines but others are necessary for Roll Out or development and therefore need to be agreed in detail. These are necessary, irrespective of whether or not the drop down process has been completed.

Pat Kelsey said that the drop down process was necessary to enable the Authorities to award a contract based on requirements and solutions without service definitions. The drop down process is to complete service definitions. Other information may be needed for the business but not to define the Services. Tony Oppenheim responded by saying that the Service definitions needed clarification. Pat Kelsey pointed out that the Service definitions should be broad since this is a PFI project.

But SDS can't be complete when there are holes in the functionality.

Then why include elements of the FS at all after detailed commitments.

Hamish Sandison and Warren Spencer agreed that there was a difference between the legal consequences of failing to agree drop down issues and failing to agree other issues. The former gave Pathway rights of termination and compensation; the latter did not. Warren Spencer stated that Pathway's concern was that it could not hit a moving target. After successful completion of the drop down process, Pathway would lose its right to walk away and claim compensation. Without agreement on the further issues, Tony Oppenheim would not be able to confirm that the drop down process had been completed on 15 November 1996.

Warren Spencer and Tony Oppenheim argued that the contract assumed in the drop down process that the agreements to agree would be completed by the end of the drop down process. If this is not completed, then the drop down process will be delayed. Pathway will request a CCN for a 30 day extension and additional compensation. In order to progress this, and without the Programme agreeing Pathway's legal position, it was agreed that

the Programme could look on a "without prejudice" basis at the list of essential items for drop down, in Pathway's view, and what would be nice to have but not necessary.

There then followed a break in the meeting, after which Hamish Sandison restated the Programme's view of the contractual position. Under Clause 201.7 of the AUTHORITIES' Agreement, both parties must use reasonable endeavours to complete the drop down process. Drop down includes clarifying requirements, transposition and extrapolation. Clause 201.10 refers to clarifying requirements so as to provide agreed mechanisms for completing any agreements to agree. It is Bird & Bird's advice that it is not necessary to resolve all agreements to agree but only to have mechanisms in place. This has been done. If the agreements to agree have not been agreed by the date set for their agreement, this would not be a failure to drop down under the AUTHORITIES' Agreement. Therefore, Pathway would not have a right to refuse to complete the drop down process, nor any right to compensation or termination.

Warren Spencer and Tony Oppenheim responded by saying that the clarification and extrapolation must include resolving agreements to agree. Hamish Sandison and Warren Spencer agreed to disagree on this point.

There followed a without prejudice discussion concerning the issues which Pathway now wish to resolve before 15 November 1996. Pat Kelsey made an initial point that after the three day walk through in September she had believed that the walkthrough had been successful. It appeared that Pathway were going back on this agreement. Tony Oppenheim did not agree with this analysis. Although the walkthrough had been a success, he had, he said, sought to make it clear that time was of the essence to ensure that the action point matters were agreed. No progress had apparently been made over the last two weeks.

The CNT then considered the list of 24 documents prepared by Pathway. These fall into the following categories.
Went through meeting - (AUTHORITIES)

- (1) Four service design documents
- (2) Two security documents
- (3) Nine interface documents
- (4) Four process document
- (5) Two report documents
- (6) Three other documents

Some of the documents ^{are} needed for Release 1 and some for Release 2. Tony Oppenheim ^{gave} agreed to give Pat Kelscy a document containing the content list of Release 1. This document was discussed with John Meagher on 9 October.

~~Tony Oppenheim~~

There followed a discussion on the obligation to deliver Services where Services were not adequately defined. Hamish Sandison gave his view that it would not be possible for the Programme to require delivery of a specific item if that item had not been specified. For example, if music were required, the Programme could not then require Mozart but only music. Warren Spencer was not convinced by this argument. His concern was that there was no right to delay due to a failure to agree an agreement to agree.

*IM PRACTICAL TO
RENDER.
IF we believe
Punk is the standard
right. All else that
it is not "Music"*

Turning to the list of Controlled documents, Tony Oppenheim gave his views as follows:-

- (1) BA/POCL reports and receipts - necessary
- (2) BA/POCL style guide - this will only be necessary if POCL require it.
- (3) Security functional specification - necessary
- (4) SADD - done
- (5) TMS API - not necessary

Release 1

- (6) Reference Data Application Interface Specification - necessary
- (7) Reference Data Technical Interface Specification - necessary
- (8) Fraud Risk Management Service Design Specification - necessary
- (9) PPD Counters - necessary
- (10) PPD - Help Desk - necessary
- (11) BPS Security Statement - done
- (12) Information Note to accompany Card - necessary
- (13) CAPS Access Service High Level Design - necessary
- (14) CAPS to PAS /CMS Data Interface Definition - necessary
- (15) TIP Technical Interface Specification - necessary if POCL requires it.
- (16) BPS MIS Requirements Catalogue - necessary if POCL requires it
- (17) Service Interface Definition Document - probably necessary
- (18) POCL APS Generic Rules - necessary
- (19) Token Technology Specifications - not necessary
- (20) AP Client Specifications - not necessary
- (21) Pathway's Training of User Awareness Baseline Document - necessary
- (22) OBCS Business Process Rules - necessary
- (23) DSS Client Interface Specification - OBCS - necessary
- (24) OBCS Interface High Level Design - necessary.

Tony Oppenheim would like the status of these documents checked and those marked as necessary to be baselined by 15 November. Further amendments to the base lined documents may be necessary and agreed between the parties later.

CNT to
pursue

The CNT then reviewed the list of Agreements to Agree sent by Jim Morley to Pat Kelscy. See the marked up list for those agreements which still remain outstanding. Tony Oppenheim

pointed out that these may have been agreed "on the ground", however a process is needed to document the agreements to agree. Agreements to agree may have been resolved but they will have been done so in the process of meetings, the minutes of which will have the normal contractual exclusion preventing them from changing any provision of the Contract other than through Change Control.



The CNT then reviewed the outstanding list of issues from the three days of walkthroughs.

(1) DSS Agreements

1.1 PAS Service Definition (Schedule D1)

1.1.1 This issue was discussed between Pat Kelsey and Tony Oppenheim on the telephone. It was agreed that the Authorities should know where the service boundaries are and which characteristics are monitored. If the Authorities decide to terminate a service then they should receive 6 months of reports. Tony Oppenheim said that he did not think it would be possible to present six months of reports since the number of reports accrued within 6 months might be too many. Tony Oppenheim will consider how many reports he will be able to provide given the number of transactions completed each month. This will be reported by Tony Oppenheim to Pat Kelsey

Tony
Oppenheim

xx CFXx

1.1.2 There followed discussion relating to the temporary closure of post offices. Pat Kelsey has received internal comment on this issue. Tony Oppenheim said that he thought that this raised a *new requirement to state that a payment from a*

regarding notification

foreign Post Office during the closure of the normal Post Office should not be docked as a foreign encashment. There was no functionality to cover this at present and therefore, it may need to go into Release 2. Progress has been made on this issue. Both parties still need to resolve points.

*The New thing is: -
is allowing a foreign
Post Office to be used
for encashment?
--- what is the answer?*

Pat Kelsey/

Tony

Oppenheim

*TH 18/10/10
Resolved 1/22/10*

Tony

Oppenheim

John Rogers

1.1.3 Welsh or Bilingual receipts. Pathway will follow up the issue of a CCN.

1.1.4 Clarification regarding permanent agent collection and nominated Post Offices. Pat Kelsey will consider this internally and respond to Pathway.
Tony Oppenheim pointed this may not be available for Release 1.

Pat Kelsey

1.1.5 Foreign encashments. Pathway to follow up.
*Rules for foreign encashment?
change as a foreign even if
individual entitled not done*
1.1.6 Permanently closed Outlets. Pat Kelsey suggesting a working assumption that would allow a second alternative post office, which would not constitute a foreign encashment. Tony Oppenheim expressed some concern. Pat Kelsey is to progress this.

Tony

Oppenheim

*2770
det. Raise a
CCN.*

Pat Kelsey

Tony Hayward

1.1.7 Contingency payments. This is being discussed internally and should be resolved by the end of next week.

Pat Kelsey

*CCN to
Confirm the
Conclusion
PV*

1.1.8 Inconsistencies between this Schedule and SADD.
Pathway to action. *Just check it out*

Tony
Oppenheim

?
C/F
JCCD

1.2 PAS Service Levels (Schedule D8)

1.2.1 Filling the "how measured" column and a Change
Control. DSS to action.

Pat Kelsey
Steve
David
Vignali

1.3 DSS Service Definition (Schedule E1)

1.3.1 Internal Service Level Measurement. See
previous discussion.

1.3.2 Number of temporary tokens active. Pat Kelsey
assumed that customers may need more than one
at one time. Tokens should be valid for one
encashment session. There is a meeting to discuss
this on 16 October 1996.

Feedback on
Action? 21st October

1.3.3 Message on cards. Robin O'Connor has reported
that this requirement has been met. Tony
Oppenheim believes that a CCN is required. Pat
Kelsey is to check the same.

Pat Kelsey C/F

1.3.4 Audit trail of cards status. Pathway to raise CCN.

Tony
Oppenheim ?
C/F

1.3.5 End of customer interest. This is being discussed.

Keith STUART
Baines RILEY
Tony
Oppenheim

Tony

1.3.6 Royal Mail as Subcontractor. To be added to list of approved Subcontractors.

Oppenheim

*CCN needed
W/Spec*

1.3.7 Third PUN. Pat Kelsey suggesting that these are sent to a central delivery point. Tony Oppenheim will confirm.

Tony

Oppenheim

*Is this agreed
Somewhere?
OTO*

1.3.8 "Unsafe Address". Re. PUN Delivery. Pat Kelsey saying there was no intention to revive this.

1.3.9 Proxy card issue. Pathway to considering raising CCN.

1.3.10 Retention of signed part of Pun. Pathway to consider raising CCN.

Tony

Oppenheim

*AEO
MORT
Thursday
AEO
FRT
Thursday*

1.3.11 Validity of temporary token for one encashment or one encashment session. See above.

Tony

Oppenheim



1.3.12 Number of tokens per book. Pat Kelsey to consider.

Pat Kelsey

**** C/F ****

1.3.13 Service Levels for PAS/CMS Helpdesk. Pat Kelsey to consider and revert.

Pat Kelsey

*add die this
value to.*

1.4 CMS Service Levels (Schedule E8).

1.4.1 Filling "how measured" column under Change Control. See above.

1.4.2 Batch failure. This is covered in a letter dated 18 March 1996 to Liam Foley at Pathway. False rejection of an entire batch will count as one rejection. This is to be inserted into the appropriate Schedules.

John Cook

*as a result of batch
validation failure:
Woods
DY
TABCOO
John Cook*

(2) POCL Agreement

2.1 BES Service Definition (Schedule D1)

2.1.1 Confirmation of encashments when TIP not available. This is not a Pathway problem and is up to POCL to decide.

Agreed

2.1.2 Identification of signing agents. To be discussed between POCL and DSS.

Pat Kelsey

2.1.3 Requirement 788. This is a tidying up issue and not necessary now.

2.1.4 Identification of casual agents. This will be in the PPD Counters document and therefore is covered elsewhere.

2.1.5 Internal Service Level Measurement. See comments above.

2.1.6 Encashments when nominated Post Office closes. See above.

2.1.7 Requirement 798 and 867. Pat Kelsey to pursue.

Pat Kelsey

2.2 BES Service Levels (Schedule D8)

2.2.1 Issue of Schedule B8 (Fraud Management). In relation to EVP transactions. On times for transactions in Schedule B3. This is a joint action.

Tony
Oppenheim
and Pat

Signature
Don't

① Transit Times and
16
exclusion of EVP.

K:BBPOCL001MINUTES18OCT08.FHG
Korm Barros
Lansing with
AEO

② Transit Times
Issues
ISSUE

Tony Oppenheim and Pat Kelsey to progress and discuss at next CNT. Kelsey

2.2.2 Treatment of Manual/Automated elements of transaction times. See previous discussion.

2.3 APS Service Definition (Schedule E1)

2.3.1 Definition of "APS Client Service Type".

John Cook 3-1 JC
TABLOO

2.3.2 Requirement R890 wording revert to Version 5. This will be removed from the 5.3 Change Control notes.

Alan Fowler

—C/F—

2.3.3 Requirement 894. Agreement over management information. This has been covered in previous discussions regarding BA/POCL receipts and reports. Tony Oppenheim and Keith Baines to deal.

Tony Oppenheim and Keith Baines

Baines
Pattern to define reports in MIS

2.4 EPOSS Service Definition (Schedule F1)

2.4.1 Revision of Requirement 836. John Cook confirmed there was no need to change this Requirement.

2.4.2 Schedule A6 of the Authorities Agreement, relating to insertion of wording re. extent of EPOSS on Scorecard. Tony Oppenheim and Keith Baines agreed in principle, to draft.

Tony

Oppenheim/Keith Baines

In Progress?

2.4.3 Requirement 693 re. Receipt generation and duplicate receipts. Pat Kelsey is to raise CCN

Pat

Kelsey

CF

2.4.4 Requirement 818. It was agreed that the wording of Version 5 was acceptable. As per 2.3.2 above.

Alan
Fowler

A definition is required for reference data systems. This will have to be inserted by CCN.

Alan
Fowler

C/F

2.4.5 Requirement 818. Change to internal reporting structure. Dave Cook at Pathway and John Plowman at Programme to deal.

Dave Cook
and John
Plowman

For Progress

2.4.6 Requirement 838. Change from "do not impact" to "may not impact". Pathway to deal.

Tony
Oppenheim

CCN List

2.4.7 Requirement 805 and 816. EPOSS does not provide these functions. Pathway to raise CCN.

Tony
Oppenheim

*C/F -
Don't Cook
25/10/26.*

2.5 EPOSS Service Levels (Schedule F8).

2.5.1 Service Levels and Timing. Discussed above.

2.6 POCL Infrastructure Services (Schedule G1)

2.6.1 Definition of POCL Helpdesk. This is being drafted. Alan Fowler to send draft to Jim Morley.

Alan Fowler

→

2.6.2 OSR and two bar codes. John Cook to check the present understanding and paperwork. It appears this may have been already signed off in July.

John Cook

Reviewed

2.6.3 Inactivity timeout period. POCL to confirm that it is happy for Pathway to deal with this.

Pat Kelsey

- 2.6.4 Need to clarify references to reference data and TIP. Keith Baines to deal. Keith Baines
- 2.6.5 Record maintenance. Maintain should be changed to retain. A CCN is required. John Cooke
- 2.7 OBCS Service Definition (Schedule H1).
- 2.7.1 Outlets in which OBCS is required to be specified in the order for OBCS. Pat Kelsey to consider with Mick Javons. Pat Kelsey
- 2.7.2 Requirement 898. Change from "POCL Core day" to "day". Deal with as 2.3.2. Alan Fowler
- 2.7.3 Requirement 956 re. Order Book recall. Pathway to deal. Tony Oppenheim
- 2.7.4 Requirement 899 re. Archiving of Notices. Pathway to deal. Tony Oppenheim
- 2.7.5 Requirement 900 re. checking of Order Books. Pathway to deal. Tony Oppenheim
- 2.7.6 Requirement 901 re. treatment of Counterfeits. Pathway to deal. Tony Oppenheim
- 2.7.7 Transaction times - see discussion above.

5

Change Control

Hamish Sandison provided a table relating to Change Control. This had not yet been approved by BA/POCL. Hamish Sandison invited comments on the table of Change Control notes. Comments on both the format and the method of numbering Change Control notes were invited to be sent to Bird & Bird before the next CNT. Hamish Sandison suggested that the present numbering which resulted in each Agreement having its own separate numbering system for Change Control notes could be improved. It was suggested that Change Control become a regular agenda item.

Hamish Sandison suggested the changes from the three documents referred to above (the list of Agreements to agree, the Controlled documents list and the list of issues arising from the walkthrough) could be incorporated in one omnibus Change Control note.

Bird & Bird will incorporate the information thrown up by the three lists in the Change Control table.

Hamish
Sandison

The table will be amended to show in the action column the owners, from both sides, of each item.

Hamish
Sandison

Tony Oppenheim pointed out that a further CCN would need to be included to cover the increase in terminals. Keith Baines said that he expected the maximum number of terminals to be up to 41,000 rather than 40,000. In his opinion, it was likely that this change would be incorporated in an omnibus change to Schedule A6.

6

Next Meeting

The next CNT meeting is to be held at Feltham at 2 pm on Thursday 17 October 1996. The Programme will attend a pre-meeting at Feltham at 1 pm.

Minutes of this CNT meeting are to be provided by close of business on Monday 14 October 1996. It was agreed that the minutes would be issued first and the CCN table would follow as soon as possible thereafter.

7 Any other business

7.1 *Acceptance Criteria* papers.

Jim Morley had tabled documents in previous CNT meetings relating to the drafting of Acceptance Criteria Specifications. It was necessary for Jim Morley to obtain agreement in principle to his documents so that Acceptance Test Specifications could be drafted. At the moment, Pathway is producing Acceptance Specifications on the basis set out in Jim Morley's papers. Jim Morley either requires agreement to the principles so that Pathway can carry out the sifting of Acceptance Criteria to decide which ones can be tested or the Programme and Pathway must work together to sift the Criteria. Tony Oppenheim suggesting that a meeting should take place so that the process can be agreed and specifications already prepared can be discussed.

Pat Kelsy will consider with colleagues and speak to Jim Morley on Friday 11 October.

Jim Morley will be able to produce the ^{2nd} first Acceptance Specification for BES on Friday 11 October.

Although Jim Morley is happy with the Acceptance Specification there is a problem relating to the assignment of severity levels to the tests before the tests are carried out. Pathway would like to have severity levels assigned. However, the problem will be deciding on the type of failure. A failure could be severe or non-severe. Therefore, it is not practical to assign severity levels now.

^{1st Draft}
Tony Oppenheim provided the Programme with a paper on the ~~present method~~ of dealing with this issue. Tony Oppenheim invited comments from the Programme and Bird & Bird for the next CNT.

Bird & Bird
and
Programme

The BES Specification needs to be agreed by the 25 October 1996.

Programme

7.2 Drop Down

Warren Spencer then discussed an issue relating to drop down. Tony Oppenheim had gone through a large subset of the required items for Release 1. However, there remained a subset which will be outstanding once Release 1 had been agreed. Hamish Sandison had said that Pathway cannot be held liable for failure to meet something which has not been specified. Warren Spencer would like this confirmed in writing. Hamish will discuss this with Pat Kelsey.

Hamish
Sandison

Tony Oppenheim would like confirmation that the Release 1 content document is correct. This is especially the case since it does not deal with the Fraud Risk Management Policy or reporting since these are not agreed.

Pat Kelsey

Tony Oppenheim then discussed his concerns relating to the drop down process. Once the drop down process has become "with prejudice", the balance of risk transfers to Pathway. Pathway will have to pay for the infrastructure and then run the risk that Agreements to agree are not resolved which then results in a delay. There is agreement at the moment that CAPS will not be on line and smart cards will not be available in Release 1. However, this does not track the Requirement. The problem which concerned Tony Oppenheim is that the Contract does not plug this hole. Tony Oppenheim intends to deliver the remaining functions in Release

16-OCT-1996 20:37 FROM BIRD & BIRD

TO

901817304124

P.24/24

K:WBPOCT1601W01M01N01T00S0100CT00DE01J0G

23

Robert P. Ryan
at *Robert*

termination

② but needs confirmation that this delay will not result in