

ICL Pathway

Quality Review Comment Sheet

Ref: PA/TEM/020  
Version: 3.0  
Date: 23-Jan-2001

**Section A** (To be completed by Document Controller)

<b>Document Title:</b>	Network Banking Management of Prosecution Support	<b>Item and Version Number:</b>	NB/PRO/003, Version 0.1
<b>Document Item Type:</b>	Procedure	<b>Relevant Release Number:</b>	N/A
<b>Document Date:</b>	11 <sup>th</sup> February 2002	<b>Deadline For Comment:</b>	Friday 22nd February 2002
<b>Document Originator:</b>	Jane Bailey		
<b>Comments To Go To:</b>	<b>Originator</b> (& Pathway Document Controller) (Note: Non Contract Controlled Documents – Originator Only, Contract Controlled Document – Originator & Pathway Document Controller)		<b>Comments received after this date will not necessarily be included</b>

**Section B** (To be completed by Reviewer of document)

<b>Reviewer Name:</b>	Jan Holmes	<b>Date of Review:</b>	12 <sup>th</sup> February 2002
-----------------------	------------	------------------------	--------------------------------

**Section C**

Please note that extra rows can be inserted to this table during completion.

No.	Page No.	Para No.	Error, Comment, Typo, Omission, General	Reviewers Comment Explanation	Impact: High/Medium/Negligible	Originators/Document Champions Response to reviewers comments
1.				I have a bit of a problem with the title and scope of this process. What are you proposing for non Network Banking prosecution support? Is there another process or do we anticipate zero non-NBS prosecutions? Are there any material differences in the approach to supporting NBS and non-NBS prosecutions?		
2.	7	1		I guess you've sort of dealt with it in the Introduction by suggesting that the approach is the same for all services but this process was defined specifically to meet NBS Requirements via Schedule N01.		
3.	7	1.1		Ah, the tangles we get ourselves in.		
4.	9	3.1		I can see them baulking at the rollover concept since they could conceivably rollover more than 'next years' allowance and potentially disallow themselves any current prosecutions.		
5.	9	3.2		Does not make it explicitly clear that 1 Record Query = 1 of the 500 allowed and that multiples RQs equals a faster usage of enquiries.		
6.	11	4.1		Are you proposing to provide the full service for each request or is this a sliding delivery based on reducing numbers?		
7.	11	4.1		Pulling Tivoli Event Logs, HSH files and Non-Polling reports are three separate retrievals from audit DLTs. And this is before you've pulled the banking transactions themselves from the TMS DLT.		
8.	16	7		Do you not have to produce the standard Witness Statement when you		

**ICL Pathway**

**Quality Review Comment Sheet**

Ref: PA/TEM/020  
Version: 3.0  
Date: 23-Jan-2001

				produce the initial audit data or are you working on the principle that you do not produce a Witness Statement until you are going down the Litigation Support branch.		
9.	18	7.2.2		You know that it is perfectly OK for an Outlet to be out of contact for up to 15 working days. The analysis of the NPR is merely an extra layer of confidence. If the Outlet is shown to have been out of contact it will be necessary to wheel out the standard explanation that this is OK. Probably a bit of boilerplate text required.		
10.	18	7.2.3		This is lining yourself up for a heap of work. Better I would have thought to analyse the Tivoli Event Logs only.		
11.	19	7.2.4		Isn't the 250 a number based on reducing requirements. This sentence appears to limit it to 250.		
12.	19	7.2.4.1		Graham, on 007007 Witness Statement, Tomy Utting advised me to remove any parts of the Statement that I did not personally know. Specifically it was some historical stuff about what existed in the Post Offices before Horizon. Have you still got this in your standard WS or is it removed?		
13.	20	7.4		What's that all about then?		
14.	22	8.1		Graham, I think if I were doing this I would separate the work into that which you could reasonably fix a duration on and that which you could not. For the fixed duration stuff you're on fairly safe ground when it comes to turnaround times and you can be more certain about what you can achieve. I wouldn't have any inclusive time to deal with that over which you have no control, ie Expert Witness stuff. My preference would be to declare this all outside the normal process and subject to a CR on a case by case basis.		
15.	22	8.2		Similarly attendance in Court.		
16.	34	10.4		Ref my comments 15 and 16 above. I would see the last three items as all falling under the additional CR. I'm not sure what you would achieve in a year if you only set 15 days aside for each one.		

**Nil returns are required**

*Sign this section when you receive the Originators response to your comments.*

I agree to the Originator comments and on inclusion of these comments, am satisfied that the document will meet my requirements.

Reviewers Name/Signature:

Date:

1. Reviewer - Complete columns 2-6 of Section C & return this form to the Originator (& Document Controller if Contract Controlled Document).
2. Originator - Complete column 7 of Section C and return to Reviewer
3. Reviewer - When agreement reached with Originator, sign off and return to Originator (& Document Controller if Contract Controlled Document)