DSS PFD SPECIAL PROJECT

NO. 7802 P.

RESTRICTED COMMERCIAL & POLICY

FAX COVER SHEET

To:	Paul Rich
FAX No:	GRO
Location:	
No of page	es (including this sheet): 4
From:	Sarah Graham
Date:	17 May 1999
Phone:	GRO
Fax:	GRO
Room 535 The Adelp	Adam Street

Message:

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED

17. MAY. 1999 17:45

DSS PFD SPECIAL PROJECT

NO. 7802 P. 2

1) Brief Commentary.
2) Has Mendely encirprated
24 tris into he offer. - Righmi

RESTRICTED - COMMERCIAL & POLICY

Alan Mawdsley HMT To:

Sarah Graham PFD Spec Proj From:

17 May 1999 Date:

Steve Robson HMT Copies:

> Peter Schofield HMT Sarah Mullen HMT David Sibbick DTI Paul Rich Post Office Vince Gaskell BA Proj Dir Ken Davenport BA/COBAP Ron Powell DSS/Sol

Jeff Triggs Slaughter & May Hamish Sandison Bird & Bird

BA/POCL AUTOMATION PROJECT: REVISED COUNTER-OFFER TO ICL

I confirm that from a DSS perspective, we are broadly content with the terms of the revised schedules. Our detailed comments are attached.

- However, from a wider Government perspective, I think I should flag up a number of concerns:
 - Schedule 2: revised proposals for ICL liability does leave the public sector significantly exposed - as Steve Robson recognised; should the system crash half way through its roll-out (say after 8,000 offices had been rolled-out), ICL could still qualify for nearly 50% of the sums due under the periodic payment arrangements, with no obvious redress for POCL/the public sector;
 - looking at the specific proposals on liability, we need to be clearer about the "fee retention" arrangements, to ensure that we preserve some redress for POCL/public sector should the system fail to work in practice (as happened with NIRS 2) - see more detailed comments attached;
 - on value for money/PAC scrutiny, however good value this option can be made to look in relation to termination, in practice we will be paying to ICL £817m for the platform, EPOSS and OBCS - as compared with about £870m for a complete system under the original contracts. This works out at about £20,000 per Post Office terminal for a five year period and looks very expensive.
- Happy to discuss any of this further, if that would help. 3.

MRS SARAH V GRAHAM **PFD Special Projects**

App/May/Mawdsley-17.05.99.doc

RESTRICTED - COMMERCIAL & POLICY

BA/POCL AUTOMATION PROJECT: REVISED OFFER TO PUT ICL

REVISED COUNTER-OFFER FOR HMG, 17 MAY 1999

Schedule 2 (Payment Schedule) A.

Agree to revised roll-out rate to be submitted by Paul Rich, to inform the number of Post Offices to be rolled-out at each milestone stage, but:

need to clarify the "fee retention" arrangements: what is meant by the "Core System Completion Date"; and when is it? We would like to see some "fee retention" arrangements until actual completion of roll-out - otherwise there is insufficient protection for the public sector, if the system does not work as it is rolled-out (a real risk, as we know well from NIRS 2!).

Draft list of issues B.

- Conditionality: confirmed that we should not move away from public sector position on conditionality: no way that we should accept unconditionality on a contract of this size and where there are so many issues unresolved.
- accept changes; but share HMG's concern to flag up the Milestones: additional risk that flows from limiting the milestones at which liquidated damages could be imposed.
- helpful to clarify at whose costs the BES code will be stripped BES code: out after NR2, if not POCL's (ICL had originally claimed that it would cost in the region £10m).
- Liquidated damages: content.
- Rights of Termination: retain ability to terminate if detailed contract not signed by agreed drop dead date.
- Transitional Arrangements: the DSS/BA assessment of the cost of transitional arrangements, is £30 per Card which suggests a cap of £1m. Helpful to clarify with ICL (a) this is what they intended to put in their proposal (rather than £10m); or if not, whether what other costs they envisage under these transitional arrangements.

App/May/Mawdsley-17.05.99.doc

17. MAY. 1999 17:46

DSS PFD SPECIAL PROJECT

NO. 7802 P. 4

Other: just to confirm that, on the understanding that OBCS is included in the overall payments to be made to ICL, it is not an issue now for this schedule. But it remains an issue between POCL and ourselves – and also for KPMG costings, if in practice ICL have charged heavily for this service – which POCL will then pass to DSS/BA: we have an obligation to pay for OBCS costs under contract "B", so we need to know what they will be!

SVG DSS 17 May 1999

App/May/Mawdsley-17.05.99.doc