

Programme Review - Brainstorm on Suggestions

1. TIP

Activity	Watchpoints	Benefits
Get part or all of TIP functionality from Pathway & consider outsourcing some or all of TP BU	Group IS Strategy Migration path Legacy systems Lose control of value chain	Releases scarce IT/Project resource Refocus on rest of programme/year 2000 Reduces cost

- Technically Pathway's architecture wouldn't preclude - they are running a large 'data warehouse' for the BA side (MIS/FRMS etc), and are developing 'data mining' functionality (CFM Dublin, Business Objects, Oracle etc).
- Obviously Pathway would need to grow current systems - processing/storage - but this would be extension of current architecture rather than new architecture.
- Currently TIP (ignoring HAPS and now ADS) acts as the single interface for data into POCL from Pathway => simple service boundary. Shifting TIP into Pathway would increase number of Pathway-POCL links (for back-end systems); presumably POCL will need access to data in TIP?
- POCL's design for some new products (eg NS) involves data to clients flowing via TIP (ie Counter-Pathway-TIP-Client), as against the AP model of direct Pathway-Client. Shifting TIP into Pathway could reduce the chain (improve performance/QoS etc) if the "value-added" component of TIP is needed in this flow.
- Could avoid the need for bulk transfer of transaction level data from Pathway to TIP (10Gb/night) but presumably still needs to be accessed by POCL?
- Where would RDP fit - would that be shifted to Pathway (could resolve some problems between Pathway and RDP, TIP and RDP)?
- Procurement rules - propriety of adding TIP to Pathway's scope without public tender?
- Pathway's record in delivery so far - would we want to increase reliance? What effect would extending Pathway's scope have on their ability to manage the current core products ("eye off the ball").
- What exactly do we want from TIP in the long run?

2. Decouple EPOS from Release 2

Activity	Watchpoints	Benefits
Uncouple EPOS from Release 2	Is this technically possible? Assumes that AP is more advanced than EPOS.	Release 2 quicker to market? Girobank/Bill Payment clients 😊 BA 😊

Why

Either

- we don't think Pathway can deliver contracted solution in the time - ie to de-risk Release 2
- or:
- we don't want what we've contracted for => we are going to change our business processes

Feasibility

- AP at the counter appears to be intergrated part of EPOSS - so using the EPOSS facilities for reports/receipts/settlement/ref data etc - more integrated than BES, for instance (historical reasons).
- But techncially possible to "do a BES" - make standalone AP, not dependent on EPOSS (apart from the shell), produce AP specific reports ecto feed manual in-office accounting (similar to APT). AP requirements should be easy to implement on the Riposte platform - gives you all the tools.
- Introducing this now may be too late to give payback - depends on how sceptical we are about EPOS - against latest plan would appear to be too late (development finishes end of year, it's now mid-Oct) but this could reduce risk
- Should this be followed as a parallel activity, as contingency against EPOS problems - but again danger of taking Pathway's eye off the ball (sub-contracted to Escher).
- Could use HAPS-type reference data (has a logic, if Pathway seen as another feed to HAPS alongside APT and AP/ECCO).
- Downstream issues - if you roll out non-EPOS version, how do you get EPOS on it later (training, migration etc)?

Desirability

- Lack of EPOS would preclude rollout into ECCO offices => problems for rollout of BA functionality, "holes" in coverage
- Unclear whether EPOS is part of critical path - Pathway claim that the gating item for Release 2 development is Oracle PAS/CMS functionality, not at the counter => removing EPOS may not speed up R2.

- Pathway replan (interim) currently showing all counter and central development to be finished by end-97 (including AP and EPOS)
- However, we (PDA and POCL) have had very little visibility of AP and EPOS development
 - joint working on AP in Autumn 96 with POCL, another demo of AP early summer 97
 - both products counter functionality shifted to Escher for 'completion' summer 97 (re-write?)
 - Early drop of EPOS from Escher has been demo'd to PDA - but not AP yet
 - Pathway claim central site (agent/oracle) functionality for AP and EPOS "on the shelf" ready
 - Lack of available design documentation on AP and EPOS
 - AP and EPOS dependent on POCL reference data - currently to be sourced from RDP and "enriched"
=> Pathway not flagging AP/EPOS as risk or critical path however we have little evidence to judge readiness
- Even if Pathway believe EPOS is "fit for purpose", is POCL going to agree - given POCL's uncertainty over what it really wants?
- AP mag/barcode should be much simpler than EPOS - so less risk of a mismatch, less room for debate
 - => although we don't have evidence that AP is more advanced than EPOS, gut feeling is that AP is far simpler and clear cut, EPOS is complex and less well defined -> greater risk.
- Question - what is POCL's business priority (ignoring ECCO constraint):
 - Automation of transactions (eg AP, BES, NS, Giro...)
 - Automation of accounting (eg EPOS and TIP)
- What does it actually give you - ability to handle AP mag/barcode in the 200 offices, but could you roll-out => commercials, what's in it for Pathway, etc. Rollout is dependent (currently) on acceptance, could we accept without such a major element of the service?
- Rollout may be de-risked - training for BES and APS far simpler than EPOS (may help hit beat rate is training/support seen as critical path).

3. Redesign EPOS

Activity	Watchpoints	Benefits
Re-design EPOS to better fit business requirements	Dependent on technical architecture	Can we get for "free" ADS, EFTPOS, EMU, Mails, MIS?

- Do we actually know what we want - what are the business requirements? Failed to specify over the past 3 years, how long would it take to specify now?
- Do we actually know what's going to be wrong with what we are getting (assuming we get what we've contracted for)?
- What is the inherent inflexibility ("the ECCO syndrome") that we think is a problem?
- Do we know what we - as POCL - actually want from (say) EMU? Liable to be rather more than what a till may want - eg are we to account for denominations, ONCH, SADADS etc.
- Escher have a Mails package already - it's their core business - so should be not be following the Post Office direction

Feasibility

- Could start a redesign - do we put EPOS on hold until we do, what effect on the rest of Horizon (esp rollout and acceptance) and on the commercials?
- If we know what functionality we want, Pathway could deliver on the Riposte platform - it provides the "toolkit".
- Riposte designed to be "fast time to market", good separation between infrastructure and applications - other PO's (eg An Post) have achieved very fast development times.
- We need to move to generic products so that we can get maximum re-use (and faster time to market)

What's not feasible

- Cannot just pick up a retail EPOS package and "drop" into place - although theoretically may be able to make fit technically, it would be a mismatch, high risk, unsupported etc - very high risk
- Retail EPOS packages suit retail - much of what we are trying to do isn't retail
- We'd lose much of what we gain through Riposte - high availability, high resilience, high security etc.
- Procurement/proberty aspects