

Mr Wylie SSA (NI)
Mr Austin ICL Pathway
Mr Bennett ICL Pathway
Mr McCorkell CAPS
Ms Rego POCL
Mr stott PDA

From: Pat Dugdale BA/POCL
Date: 19 July 1996
cc: Mr Johnson
Mrs Kelsey
Mr King
Mr McNiven
Mr Riley
Mr Robinson
Mr Stocker

Notes of PDA Board Meeting 10.7.96

1. Please find enclosed a copy of the notes of the PDA Board meeting on 10.7.96.
2. A summary of action points is included as the final page. For actions assigned to Mr Stott, I have nominated PDA colleagues to take forward.
3. The next Board meeting is on 13 August starting at 1.00pm in Terminal House.
4. Please call if you have any queries.

Pat Dugdale
BA/POCL Programme
3rd Floor Terminal House

Tel:
Fax:

GRO

BA/POCL PROGRAMME DELIVERY AUTHORITY BOARD

Note of Meeting on 10 July 1996 at ICL Pathway

Present: Mr A Wylie SSA(NI) (Chairman)
Mr T Austin ICL Pathway
Mr J Bennett ICL Pathway
Mr G McCorkell BA CAPS
Ms M Rego POCL
Mr A Stott PDA
Mrs P Dugdale PDA (Secretary)

1. Matters arising from meeting 11.6.96

- 1.1 It was reported that ICL Pathway had not received the copy of the Programme Initiation Document (PID) promised at the last meeting. Agreed that the current draft, minus any commercial sensitivities, would be sent to Mr Bennett.

Action 1 - Mr Stott to arrange for PID to be sent to ICL Pathway.

- 1.2 The June meeting note should have referred to the need for liaison on change control. It was confirmed that liaison was ongoing in relation to changes in contractual and requirements areas and that Mr Godeseth from PDA was working on ICL Pathway proposals for the overall change control process.

- 1.3 It was confirmed that PDA and ICL Pathway had exchanged organisation charts as agreed at last meeting. Mr Wylie asked for copies.

Action 2 - Mr Stott to arrange for PDA and ICL Pathway organisation charts to be sent to Mr Wylie.

2. Progress Reports

- 2.1 Mr Stott reported the following main developments:

2.1.1 He and Mr Bennett now meet at approximately weekly intervals to discuss issues and progress, a process that was working well.

- 2 -

- 2.1.2 The legal review had led to some additions/amendments to Requirements. Various additional dates were being considered for reasons of contractual certainty but were not considered a problem. Some other significant changes were being "parked" until progress, eg in roll out plans, allowed them to be addressed. In some cases it was unclear whether a new Requirement had emerged or simply proper articulation of something already implied. It had been agreed that the Functional Specification (FS) would act as the touchstone and change control process applied to anything confirmed as new. The target was to clear issues from the procurement arena to the strands which would progress the work by early w/c 15/7.
- 2.1.3 PDA and ICL Pathway were working together to develop change control process. Developing a template and a more partnership orientated approach to impact assessment were necessary next steps. It was confirmed in discussion that there was a need to review the number of change control boards and the role of the joint board, to avoid a "chicken and egg" situation.
- 2.1.4 On testing, a workshop had agreed a timetable and follow-up actions by the end of next week. There would probably be formal change control thereafter.
- 2.1.5 Other issues were to be dealt with under subsequent agenda items and it was confirmed that otherwise there were no major issues for the Board to address or refer to the Programme Steering Group (PSG).
- 2.2 Mr Bennett confirmed the progress described and raised the following issues.
 - 2.2.1 It had become evident that the work required on contracts during the 90 day drop down period was not going to be achieved to time. The task should be approached in a different way, using project work such as the FS to progress contractual matters. It was confirmed that the contract provides for an extension of the 90 day period and that none of the parties intended to allow delay in this area to impact on progress elsewhere. The PDA were seeking to streamline the task by cross referencing to other documentation and by reducing, for example, the number of schedules.

- 3 -

2.2.2 There was evidence of tensions between the various parties and it seemed clear that a good teamworking position had not yet been reached. Two of the causes of this which could be worked on were discussed, viz:-

2.2.3 The parties were still negotiating on three major change requests (IGL, early 97 plans and national roll out) which were a distraction and meant the absence of a shared baseline. It was agreed that IGL decisions should be made as soon as possible and the early 97 position agreed by the end of July. It was confirmed that the early 97 analysis should contain sufficient of a national roll out impact assessment to enable business benefits to be judged.

Action 3 - Mr Stott to arrange for IGL and early '97 issues to be pursued to resolution.

2.2.4 Change control discipline was needed. A conclusive meeting did not necessarily mean that a change had been agreed and due process, ie impact assessment and formal change control, should subsequently be followed. The need for careful control, especially in an aggressive timetable situation, was accepted but it was also recognised that activities were progressing in parallel rather than sequence.

Action 4 - Mr Stott to arrange for the agreed change control process to be deployed.

2.3 Mr McCorkell confirmed that CAPS remained confident of achieving delivery but they were concerned about uncertainty as to the baseline and synchronisation of releases.

2.3.1 It was reported that availability of benefit systems for weekend testing was a potential issue because of competing demands in BA. Approval of a baseline plan of requirements was to be sought from the BA Management Team and any change to that baseline could create difficulty.

2.3.2 A number of business issues (eg alternative payees, foreign encashment and temporary tokens) needed urgent resolution for IGL and beyond and there appeared to be some uncertainty as to where responsibility for making decisions rested. It was confirmed that PDA is the decision making authority and that such topics should be raised in the IGL issues log where they would be assigned an owner and resolved.

- 4 -

Action 5 - Mr Stott to ensure issues resolution process in place and operating effectively.

- 2.4 Ms Rego reported that POCL efforts were currently concentrated on Authorities' Responsibilities and confirming deliverables and their due dates. A key coordinator had been appointed to manage the various POCL projects and Counters were just beginning consultation with other clients as a first step in the process of establishing their potential requirements.

2.4.1 EPOSS was the main outstanding issue for POCL and work is currently underway with PDA and ICL Pathway to resolve.

2.4.2 It was reported that a separate Reference Data Project (previously integral to TIP) had been set up. It was noted that it would be helpful to know as soon as possible what data (ie format, data definitions etc) ICL Pathway would need.

Action 6 - Mr Bennett to arrange for ICL Pathway data needs to be advised.

3. Functional Specification (Paper 2/96)

- 3.1 Mr Johnson presented this report of progress, lessons learned and next steps.
- 3.2 It was confirmed that there were about 100 FS issues to be cleared. Other issues relevant to SLAs, CARS etc were being taken forward separately.
- 3.3 The Board noted the report and expressed their appreciation to the responsible team for a job well done. It was a good example and lessons learned should be taken forward.

4. Project Initiation Document (Paper 3/96)

- 4.1 Mr Pereira presented this report, explaining the PID context and the PRINCE implementation process, which the Board noted. A final version would be available after the end of July and would be presented to the PDA Board for sign off at its next meeting.

Action 7 - Mr Stott to arrange for revised PID to be tabled at next Board Meeting.

- 5 -

5. PDA Mobilisation and Resourcing

- 5.1 Mr Pereira present this report, summarising the background, current structure and next steps. It was reported that the usual difficulty was being experienced in recruiting good quality staff and that Board members' help may be needed. It was also reported that accommodation was a problem being addressed because Terminal House premises were insufficient.
- 5.2 It was confirmed that a POCL budget had been allocated and spending was probably slightly above profile. No BA budget allocation had yet been made. The chairman asked for quarterly reports of spend against profile. It was also agreed that the sponsors needed to decide how to apportion costs between them.

Action 8 - Mr Stott to submit proposals for the apportionment of costs to sponsor members of the committee (for clearance by correspondence) and arrange for quarterly finance reports.

6. Integrated Master Plan (Papers 4/96 and 5/96)

- 6.1 The Board noted the progress reported in paper 4/96 on the development of early 1997 plans.
- 6.2 Mr Evans presented the master plan report which explained the process so far followed and planned for next steps and sought the Board's agreement to the plan format.
- 6.3 It was confirmed that the Board's role was to monitor progress on key milestones and only to see more detailed plans in areas where they were steering action. They would however want to be assured that there was a system and process in place which enabled the PDA to monitor fully. It was confirmed that a future version of the plan would include tasks, time taken and resources (but not the latter for sub contractors) and that handshake milestones were used to monitor inter relationships between sponsor strategic milestones. Dependencies should be flagged.
- 6.4 The Board noted the process, agreed the structure and format and endorsed the process for completion and sign-off of the plan.

Action 9 - Mr Stott to arrange submission of the plan to PSC 23/7 and a further version to the next Board for sign off.

- 6 -

7. National Roll Out Strategy (Paper 6/96)

- 7.1 The Board noted this paper which reflected work in hand to rationalise roll out plans. ICL Pathway were to provide a revised outline plan by end w/c 15/7 and there should be an agreed approach available by the end of the month which sponsors and ICL Pathway could develop into a detailed plan. The SSA(NI) position would be picked up during this process. Pilot planning would need to progress rather more rapidly.
- 7.2 POCL were concerned to ensure that there was a fall back plan for use in the event that full functionality (specifically EPOSS) was not available. There was also concern about the impact of tight timescales, for example on user acceptance testing.

8. Step 1 Plan (Paper 7/96)

- 8.1 Mr Stocker described the plan, progress to date, current actions and the organisation in place to support this.
- 8.2 This plan needed urgent sign-off. Both CAPS and ICL Pathway had comments to feed in, there were business issues unresolved and differences in products eg the CAPS interface. It was intended to progress all these in the coming 2.5 weeks.
- 8.3 POCL had indicated that they wanted the foreign encashment facility (for 2 payments in 26) available during IGL at every post office, not just the 1500 main POs, because of their concern about quality of service and the views of the Federation. They recognised that this would have a training and communication cost. BA would insist on POCL bearing the fraud risk in this circumstance.
- Action 10 - Ms Rego to confirm POCL's position on foreign encashments during IGL.
- 8.4 The suggestion that there be a second tranche during IGL to take the number of POs up to 30 had received no supporters. ICL Pathway had concerns about customer/transaction volumes and their disaster resilience as numbers increased. There was no project gain but there would be a diversion of effort and focus. There was also increased risk of adverse publicity and thus customer resistance.
- 8.5 In order to ensure that all outstanding issues were cleared timeously, Mr Stott was empowered to secure all party agreement. It should be made clear that sign-up was to solutions/work rounds for IGL only. It was however essential that in reaching agreement it was recognised that:

- 7 -

- i) security was vital to protect Public Expenditure
- ii) doors should not be opened which it could later prove impossible to close eg with a generous policy option
- iii) given the stage at which the Programme stood in relation to IGL, it would be preferable to avoid solutions that required too much of the computers
- iv) if a clerical solution is sought, it should build on existing standard processes and not invent exceptions to the exceptions.

8.6 Mr Stott was authorised to approach any dissenting party's Board member in an attempt to broker a solution. Reference to the full Board was not expected and should only be done in the last resort.

Action 11 - Mr Stocker to report progress to Board members on 26 July.

9. Date of Next Meeting

9.1 The next meeting will be on Tuesday 13 August starting at 1pm in Terminal House.

ACTION POINTS

- Action 1 - Mr Stott to arrange for PID to be sent to ICL
(Mr Robinson) Pathway.
- Action 2 - Mr Stott to arrange for PDA and ICL Pathway
(Mr Robinson) organisation charts to be sent to Mr Wylie.
- Action 3 - Mr Stott to arrange for IGL and early '97 issues
(Mr Stocker/
Mr McNiven) to be pursued to resolution.
- Action 4 - Mr Stott to arrange for the agreed change control
(Mr Robinson) process to be deployed.
- Action 5 - Mr Stott to ensure issues resolution process in
(Mr Stocker) place and operating effectively.
- Action 6 - Mr Bennett to arrange for ICL Pathway data needs
to be advised.
- Action 7 - Mr Stott to arrange for revised PID to be tabled
(Mr Robinson) at next Board Meeting.
- Action 8 - Mr Stott to submit proposals for the
(Mr Riley) apportionment of costs to sponsor members of the
committee (for clearance by correspondence) and
arrange for quarterly finance reports.
- Action 9 - Mr Stott to arrange submission of the plan to PSC
(Mr Robinson) 23/7 and a further version to the next Board for
sign off.
- Action 10 - Ms Rego to confirm POCL's position on foreign
encashments during IGL.
- Action 11 - Mr Stocker to report progress to Board members on
26 July.