

28 OCT 1999

-224-1

## Electronic memo



То

Chris French/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE

CC

Naresh Mohindra/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Keith K Baines/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Ruth Holleran/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Mark Stocks/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Andrew Simpkins/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Jeremy Folkes/ITS/POSG/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE

Hard Copy To Hard Copy cc

From

John Meagher/POCL/POSTOFFICE

Date

28/10/99 16:08

Subject

Reference Data

Chris

At yesterday's Delivery Meting the Pathway progress report identified a number of reference data concerns with respect to:

- "the quality of Reference Data supplied by POCL and the errors being made"
- "the ability of the RDS system to produce incremental data for SIP16"
- "the total number of PinICLs outstanding on POCL"

We agreed at the meeting to action the appropriate people to progress these individual concerns, however, Pathway advised that, in addition to the above, they had a major concern with a fundamental aspect of the reference data design and their ability to support it. They indicated that this concern if not addressed could become rollout limiting.

I agreed to discuss this with Pathway outside the meeting with a view to understanding and addressing their concern. I met with Steve Muchow, Mike Coombs and John Dicks and noted the following in addition to the concerns above:

- Pathway are concerned with POCL not maintaining the agreed lead-times between receipt of data (notification of change) and activation of data (implementation of change).
- Pathway are waiting for a Reference Data business rules document which is in development by Geoff Darby and would welcome the earliest delivery of the document.
- However, the most significant issue for Pathway is that the current design (agreed by all)
  for the provision of data changes from Post Office to Pathway results in the delivery of large
  volumes of data which contain no actual change for Pathway.

Again, I have ensured that the first two bullets above are being pursued but the third bullet is considerably more important. My enquiries to-date suggest that Pathway have recently become aware through the empirical evidence of live running that the volume of reference data changes is far greater that they anticipated and possibly greater than they have the ability to manage. I have asked Mike Coombs to document the exact problems that Pathway are experiencing and the associated risks they are facing. On receipt of this information I will convene a session to explore the options available.



Whilst clearly there is risk here for all, my inclination is to position this as follows: The Post Office are complying with the agreed design. Pathway have discovered that they may have undersized their system. If our investigations confirm these two assertions then either Pathway can increase the size of their system and/or redesign how they process received data or POCL can redesign and implement a change to our Reference Data system which will reduce the volume of non applicable data that is passed to Pathway. Given that the design oversight would appear to be on Pathway's side, we would probably suggest that Pathway raise a change request which we could impact for cost and time

I will keep you informed.

John