

From: Bernadette O'Donnell[CN=Bernadette O'Donnell/OU=e/O=POSTOFFICE]
Sent: Sun 30/11/2003 9:09:55 PM (UTC)
To: Graeme Seedall[CN=Graeme Seedall/OU=e/O=POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE]
Cc: Sue Stewart[] Les Henderson[CN=Les Henderson/OU=e/O=POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE]
Subject: Re: IRF actions

Graeme
I had a conference with Keith and Jeremy last Wednesday and we got all this sorted. The detail has been document and will be going out (if it hasn't gone out already) for review and sign off.
Bernie

Sue Stewart
Sent by: Rebecca
Goddard
28/11/2003 16:17

To: Bernadette O'Donnell/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
cc: Speck/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
Subject: Re: IRF actions

FYI

Service Supplier Manager
Post Office Ltd
Operations

Dearne House, Cortonwood Business Park, Cortonwood Drive, Barnsley, S73 0TB

Postline: [] STD Phone: [] Fax: [] Mobex: [] Mobile: []
External Email: []

Graeme Seedall
28/11/2003 00:01

To: Sue Stewart/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
cc: Keith Lawless/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Alan Orpe/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
Subject: Re: IRF actions

Sue,

Thanks for your reply. Looks like we all share the same opinion on best approach, so we'll formalise it through a document which describes how E Top Ups operational service management will work, to be handed over from project into business as usual.

The same will apply on Bureau (FRTS) when the time comes.

Regards

Graeme Seedall
IT Directorate
Post Office Ltd

Mobile: []
e-mail: []

Sue Stewart
Sent by: Rebecca
Goddard

To: Graeme Seedall/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
cc: Dave Hulbert/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE

25/11/2003 15:57

Orpe/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Dawn Patmore/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
Ijaz Bhatti/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Hugh Stacey/e/POSTOFFICE@
Woodrow/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Liz J Tuddenham/e/POSTOFFICE@
O'Donnell/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Kevin Lenihan/e/POSTOFFICE
Subject: Re: IRF actions

Graeme

Liz has passed this to me as I will be covering [GRO] In respect of ETU I discussed Service Review with Jeremy Woodrow some months ago and we thought the best approach would be the same as what you have suggested ie. joint meetings for contract and operational review as the service probably doesn't warrant a full SRM itself. (This is the approach we currently have with streamline for the debit card service which works quite well). I agree that other services as and when they come on board should be managed in a similar way and would expect that this would be part of the handover into NS via Kevin Lenihan's team. For ETU I understand Keith Lawless is already progressing this with Bernadette O'Donnell. Don't know if you have had any views from anyone else but I would be interested to see them if you have.

Regards
Sue

Service Supplier Manager
Post Office Ltd
Operations

Dearne House, Cortonwood Business Park, Cortonwood Drive, Barnsley, S73 0TB

Postline: [GRO] STD Phone: [GRO] Fax: [GRO] Mobex: [GRO] Mobile: [GRO]
External Email: [GRO]

Liz J Tuddenham
18/11/2003 21:24

To: Sue Stewart/e/POSTOFFICE@PO
cc:
Subject: Re: IRF actions

----- Forwarded by Liz J Tuddenham/e/POSTOFFICE on 18/11/2003 21:23 -----

Graeme Seedall
18/11/2003 14:44

To: Richard Ashcroft/e/POSTOFFICE
cc: Dave Hulbert/POCL/POSTOFFICE
Orpe/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Dawn Patmore/e/POSTOFFICE@P
Lawless/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Ijaz Bhatti/e/POSTOFFICE@PO
Stacey/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Jeremy Woodrow/e/POSTOFFICE
Tuddenham/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
Subject: Re: IRF actions

Thanks Rich,

One thing I didn't cover off in the original e-mail is Service Review. We need to be able to describe how this works in the paper (item iii on my original mail).

There are a couple of options: Link them to Contracts Review or do end to end service review with suppliers, including clients in a supply role (or both). As you know, these contracts are managed out of the category teams in S&M and simply supported by technical schedules, service definitions, OLAs etc, against which the actual operational service is managed and assessed. As the relationships are so strongly positioned in S&M, my suggestion would be to link the operational service review for these clients with the contract reviews, dealing with the client in both customer and supplier roles in one place, leaving other supplier management (Fujitsu and Prism) where it is.

Copy recipients - your views please. If it's more complicated than I realise maybe we should meet to discuss?

Regards

Graeme Seedall
IT Directorate
Post Office Ltd

Mobile: GRO
e-mail: GRO

Richard Ashcroft
18/11/2003 10:35

To: Graeme Seedall/e/POSTOFFICE
cc: Dave Hulbert/POCL/POSTOFFICE
Subject: Re: IRF actions

Graeme
Good news to date on S50. Approach below sounds sensible. Key for me is that Service Continuity (Dave H's team for which I work) has an understanding of the current/likely issues with the new services such that the chances of us being surprised are reduced once it has rolled out. I will talk with Dave H and Dean Bush (Product Support) and get back to you, hopefully before the end of the year!
Regards
Rich

Graeme Seedall
17/11/2003 21:11

To: Richard Ashcroft/e/POSTOFFICE
cc: Dave Hulbert/POCL/POSTOFFICE
Lenihan/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, S50 Project Managers, John Bru
Bhatti/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
Subject: Re: IRF actions

Hi Richard.

Bet your glad to get back to your day job. Not sure if 2 months is a record - but it's still pretty impressive! Anyway, you'll be glad to know we got authorisation for go-live and ETU is up and running. The next big thing is go live of DVL this Thursday. So we have started hand over and closure on ETU and, providence allowing, the same will apply to DVL next week.

I don't think the second action still applies.

On the first action there are a number of things that hopefully take care of it:

- i. There is a "Deferred PinICL list" for S50 which explains the outstanding faults in business terms (we used to call it the Known Problem Register). A new version has just come out with a few additions from RVT and LRDP, also an explanation of the planned action. After checking it tomorrow I'll make sure it goes through formal document control - who in your part of the organisation should "own" it?
- i. There is a design log for each product which contains not just PinICLs and their workarounds but known design flaws, missing requirements etc. Obviously it's pretty short for ETU and DVL but will be more substantial for Bureau. It's our intention to hand these over to "BAU" as a sister document to the design baseline documentation (BPDs). I think the documents should be controlled through the "Operational Baseline" (a managed service from PRISM) and "owned" by the Product Support team on behalf of the product owner. From what I can gather Product Support now sits with Dave whereas product ownership (and change authorisation) clearly still sits in Sales and Marketing.
- i. We intend to produce a paper that describes the ongoing management of the products in a steady state environment. We are just planning this out for ETU, it won't be a thick document, just a central reference point to ensure all management, monitoring and measurement processes are set up before the project closes.

Please give me a call if you have any further issues or queries. Happy to meet if you think we need to. Copy recipients please feel free to comment.

Regards

Graeme Seedall
IT Directorate
Post Office Ltd

Mobile: [GRO]
e-mail: [GRO]

Richard Ashcroft

17/11/2003 14:08

To: Graeme Seedall/e/POSTOFFICE@
cc: Kevin Lenihan/e/POSTOFFICE@
Hulbert/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
Subject: Re: IRF actions

Graeme

Apologies for the very very late response - is 2 months a record? Reasons for delays are obvious...

I think the way we make the transition from Projects/Releases into Network support needs to involve a physical hand over of Known Problems into Network Support Problem Management such that we can understand, manage and perhaps ultimately close these off. This is something that we can set up as a check step once a Project is making the transition into Business as usual but which should really be part of an overall handover into Network Support and not just to Problem Management. This is something I believe Kevin Lenihan is working on but in the interim, do you wish to get together to start increasing awareness on this? Happy to try to fit in with your diary on that..

When it comes to Industrial Action, we took a Business wide look at what was happening and what could be impacted. I think that is probably the best way of dealing with this due to the unpredictable nature of Industrial Action in terms of where it occurs, what it effects and for how long. Does this sound sensible?

Regards

Richard Ashcroft
Resolution Manager
Service Continuity
Post Office Ltd

[GRO]
[GRO]

Graeme Seedall

19/09/2003 14:36

To: Richard Ashcroft/e/POSTOFFICE@
cc: Peter G Jones/e/POSTOFFICE@P
Subject: IRF actions

Hi Richard,

[GRO] this morning!

A couple of things came up at IRF yesterday:

Some existing defects have been unearthed as a result of S50 testing - they will need to be added to the known error log. There will also be some unfixed defects on the new services (such as Bureau). We should get a fairly definitive view of the outstanding PinICLs at the end of testing next Friday - there would normally be a review to go through them. Would you like to be present at the review or shall we just send you on the list?

We have been asked to ensure that contingency for strike action is built into product implementation plans - ca you provide me with some information about what the business operational plans have in them? For example would we be allowed to launch a new product during such a period of duress?

Regards

Graeme Seedall
IT Directorate
Post Office Ltd

Mobile:

e-mail: