DAJOILOS Memorandum Paul Rich To: Bob Peaple, Wendy Powney, John Meagher, Jeremy Roulk cc: From: Basil Shall 10/01/1996 Date: Flash Report - Urgent!! - Supplier Requirements Subject: Paul, **Summary of Issues** As you know, Wendy and I are working with John and Jeremy on the Strategic Concurrence Process. We had our first Supplier visit yesterday (with Cardlink) and it became quite cles that our requirements process is lacking in 3 major areas. Reconciliation / Role of TIP Office Balance / Cash accounting process Interfaces with the TMS The suppliers (Cardlink in particular) have capability in these areas, which has not been properly harnessed. John and Jeremy have done an excellent job (with no formal requirements) in keeping the supplier options open, but they are reaching a critical point of 'freezing' designs, and going firm on a single option. If we don't give them the direction (which they are desparately seeking) they are very likely to choose an option which is not in M WI WORDY, our best interests. Could you raise these at your Cluster Group Meeting 22 Issues in more detail: Reconcilitaion / Role of TIP Affected area Implication Issue POCL will have to rely on Commercial An early commercial the BA or the service 'must-have' supported by provider for accurate Charterhouse, was to ensure information for settlement. that the service provider did not control the 'end to end' There is no generic client product. reconciliation capabilty

This was to ensure that the

service provider could not cut

POCL out of the transaction

provided by the supplier.

authorisation product will

Each new on-line

require a 'bespoke'

Issue

chain.

Apparently we have agreed (through the TIP project ??) that reconciliation between the TMS and PAS will be done by the service provider, who will then inform POCL of the result of the reconcilition.

Affected area

Implication

reconciliation process which will cost us an appropriate sum of money

- The benefit of continuing with the current TIP1 project becomes questionable, as a major element of their scope is now taken by the service provider.
- Service providers could cut POCL out of the transaction process in due course.(e.g by offering it through Petrol Stations at end of contract)

Office balance / Cash Accounting Process

Issue

outlets.

We appear to have specified that the existing cash accounting process (including Relationship with stock units) will continue to be the way we control our

Service providers are incurring the cost of changing standard retail software to meet our cash accounting processes which may not be required in the future.

Affected area

Financial Control

Agents

Implication

- Dave Smith is currently reviewing the way in which we account for Outlets. The result is this work is urgently needed prior to the ITT going out. Otherwise we may be trapped into continuing with the existing cash account process, and losing the benefits of a more flexible approach.
- The new Accounting and Distribution Systems require a different set of information, and different controls to those imposed by the cash account. These may not be supported.

Interfaces with the TMS

Issue	Affected area	Implications
The interfaces with the TMS	Commercial	 Additional interfaces

Issue

Affected area

Implications

have not been fully specified.

TIP

This is primarily as a result of the 2 issues highlighted above, and possibly the way in which the requirements have been filtered into the suppliers (i.e. not as a complete set)

Distribution IS Strategic Concurrence will be required unless our requirements are cleared before the ITT is issued. These will become expensive.

- The Business Case
 Benefits of TIP and
 Distribution (and
 therefore their design)
 are dependent upon
 the right interfaces
 being place from
 TMS. These are being
 jeopardised.
- The IS Strategy will be compromised if the appropriate information / interfaces are not available.