

From Andrew Simkins,

13 AUG 1999 - 862

Management Resolution Pre-Meeting
12th August 1999

Review of CF's Summary

There is a clear failure to meet conditions

298 definite high

376 is high but may not be supported by Copping given rectification plan

How to proceed ? Possible way forward

- not fail and impose 3 month delay
- but get sorted with an extension of 4 to 6 weeks

JM - 4 to 6 weeks will not be enough to deal with the stability issue

KB - would not go into full NRO but need to proceed with recognition of contract

What are Pathway constraints at this stage ?

Contract currently constrains options - Pathway need Fujitsu agreement to change this

Therefore failure would require full retest - do we want this ? Not in our interest to do everything again

1. Stability issue

- Not an acceptable position
- Root and branch review required - 2months but the solution is likely to be incremental
- Need a proposal to be reviewed and agreed
- What is the hurdle for stability - need to define this in relation to industry standards
- We have some ECCO/ALPS data - need to agree how this should be used

2. TIP issue

Cure requires a Pathway fix plus a control on the Pathway side to meet Requirement 891

We believe we need this control but can we insist on this type of control under the contract ?

This is not exactly clear, but the requirement does give strong support to reconciliation controls

Further work required to articulate our contractual requirement

From the contract it does not appear that this new reconciliation can be claimed as a specific requirement as it has not been directly specified for the interface

Proposed Approach

- We want evidence of current and new fix - the workaround and the root cause solution
- We will need some time to observe this - preferably full cash account cycle for the root fix from 18th August - further work needed to confirm this requirement Action : RH
- Also we need assurance that problem will not reoccur - we need to be convinced that there is a solution that will allow monitoring of this reconciliation and that there is a reporting that demonstrates it is satisfactory
- External auditors say this problem could lead to a qualification of the accounts - although we do need to reach a financial estimate of the likely scale of errors

3. Training issue

- Pathway have gone a long way to resolve the training course (with the help of removal of BES)
- The course is as good as we can get it within contractual conditions
- But the requirement is that the Pathway solution must take account of users different abilities
- We have however changed the role of the HFSO to support training and to help produce the first balance (100% support now planned)
- Without this support we could not be confident that outlets would produce an accurate balance
- The issue therefore is that the Pathway solution does not enable users to produce a first balance unaided

Likely Points for Debate:

- There is still evidence from Help desks that new course is inadequate
- Pathway may claim that the course is adequate giving the optimum mix within the contractual requirement
- There is evidence that ECCO people can cope much better than manual offices - this supports the argument for a more streamered approach as stated in the requirement
- Pathway may still claim an agreed rectification plan has been delivered
- The criteria for the new course under LT2 were not fully met as documented in BMC's detailed note

BMC proposed that POCL position is to ask for a further response, especially as POCL are paying the cost of HFSOs and Help Desk support

But are we trying to redefine the Acceptance Incident ? This focused on the training course. This may lead to a compromise on this incident.

We should review our position after the meeting with Pathway.

View on NRO

If we agree to go ahead on rollout this will be seen by the lawyers as a constructive acceptance
What if we interpreted it as an increase in the numbers in the Live Trial ? This would fall into a contractual redefinition of Live Trial and NRO.

The steer from the Board is not to accept a sub-standard system.

We should therefore not enter into adding additional offices merely to maintain rollout plans pre-Acceptance. We may do this however if there were good Live Trial reasons for this, including considerations of cost and of required rectification plans.

High and Medium Severity Incidents after Meeting on 11th

No	PWY	POCL
342	Low	Med
361	Low	Med
371	Low	Med
376	Low	High
378	Low	Med
410	None	Low
411	None	Low/None
211	None	Medium
394	None	Closed
218	None	High
372	None	Med
368	Low	Med
391	Low	Med
390	Low	Med
395	Low	Low
298	Low	High (now includes 300)
301	None	Closed
314	None	Med
369	None	Med/High
384	None	Low
408	Low	Med