

16 NOV 1999

-2233

Electronic *memo*

To Min Burdett/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
cc Ruth Holleran/POCL/POSTOFFICE, Keith K
Baines/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, David
Pye/RM_Consulting/RM/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, John
Meagher/POCL/POSTOFFICE, Martin Box/POCL/POSTOFFICE

Hard Copy To
Hard Copy cc

From Graeme Seedall/POCL/POSTOFFICE
Date 16/11/99 12:38

Subject Fwd: Re: Fwd: Re: Requirements for continuing with roll-out 

Min,

Please see attached e-mail from Martin.

Can I add:


- Assurance that all known errors *would* have been trapped by the feature prior to 24.09.99 and between 24.11.99 and 14.02.99
- Completion of the end to end reference data review such that an agreed interface is re-instated. Allied to this, the introduction of the "Item Transaction Mode" feature during CSR+.
- A consolidated set of acceptance criteria which draws on *existing contractual requirements* (albeit that failure to comply will not allow us to unilaterally suspend roll out or withdraw from the contract). Specifically, but not exclusively, Requirements 818 (EPOSS data integrity maintained throughout reference data changes) & 891 (end to end reconciliation)
- Clarification of clause 3.6.5 of CCN 562 which requires both parties to review the nature of the solution for error rates in excess of 20 per week (particularly from a commercial perspective).

I hope all the above is enough base data for you to pull together a more graceful set of "requirements". Sorry about the raw state of it - I'm sure you'll be sympathetic given the time constraints. Please call me if you require further clarification of any point. I'm in Feltham this afternoon at the End to End reference data workshop.

Regards,
Graeme

Post Office Network
TMT
Business Integrity Manager

Post Line: STD Phone: Mobile:
External eMail:

To Ruth Holleran/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
cc Graeme Seedall/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
Hard Copy To
Hard Copy cc
From Martin Box/POCL/POSTOFFICE
Date 16/11/99 12:12
Subject Re: Fwd: Re: Requirements for continuing with roll-out 

Ruth

My views on AI376:-

For POCL to move forward on this with any sense of real assurance, I suggest at least the following must be undertaken. As Pathway have failed some of the criteria, within negotiations of what we do next, we must consider the following which I believe would protect POCL's interests:-

1. The HLD for the EPOSS/TIP reconciliation check to be baselined to a position where both Pathway and POCL are happy. Currently, there are inconsistencies scattered throughout the document (version 0.7). These inconsistencies must be cleared up. There are also potential gaps. Examples here are where Pathway have stated that the new controls will not pick up certain discrepancies. Real examples being (i) The giro change problem would have been missed, (ii) receipts & payments differences would not be explicitly reported (including migration week). Additionally, when challenged on data corruption, Pathway could not answer whether the new controls would pick up the differences. There is also no mention within the HLD of the impact on the TIP interface. Another serious gap that requires closure. If this document is not baselined, POCL will not be in a position to measure how successful the implementation of the new controls will be, whether or not we have Acceptance Criteria in place.
2. Real evidence that new processes and procedures are being put in place by Pathway to manage this new service. As of yet, Pathway have not shared any of this work with POCL, although the plan states that they would/will. This is obviously important and is again key when trying to make progress.
3. ALL root causes to be picked up by the new controls. CCN560 states only new root causes to be picked up by the new controls. POCL must be insistent on getting analysis for all root causes from Pathway. A separate document detailing all root causes from the commencement of live trial to date and stating where in the process the differences would be picked up would be a sensible way forward. This would give POCL some level of assurance that the new controls are doing what they should be doing. Also to be included in such a document, would be other potential causes not yet stumbled across, e.g. data corruption.
4. Targets. Keith is stating that the contract needs to change to "adjust" the Pathway targets. If this is the case, I would think that that the contract must also be changed to include wording around the suggestions above in 1 & 3. By doing this, Pathway gain and POCL gain. By just doing what Keith is suggesting, Pathway gain, POCL lose.
5. Extend TIP checks. It looks likely that the TIP checks will require extension. POCL would require payment to therefore do these checks in OPTIP (development costs also). We should get Pathway to pay for this as the new controls don't appear to be picking up all of the differences. Perhaps we could negotiate a new one off payment to cover the initial set up costs in OPTIP and then POCL pay for the day to day running costs. Or if ITIP checks are to be extended, then get Pathway to pay for these until we are satisfied. End point for

this would probably be around 31st May 2000.

6. SLA. Within any new wording of an updated contract, agreement needs to be reached that an SLA needs to be put in place around reconciliation, accounting and data quality. By doing this, Pathway would therefore deliver a quality product, rather than just delivering something to a pre. determined timescale.


I have not mentioned testing in the above. However, depending on what happens with at least 1, 2 & 3 above, will depend on the impact these will have on testing.

Finally, assuming that roll out is likely to continue in January, then POCL needs to get as much out of Pathway in the form of an agreement/side agreement/new CCN etc. as we possibly can. By negotiating some or all of the above with Pathway, this will certainly help.

Hope the above helps. Happy to discuss.

Martin


To Martin Box/POCL/POSTOFFICE, Graeme Seedall/POCL/POSTOFFICE

To Martin Box/POCL/POSTOFFICE, Graeme Seedall/POCL/POSTOFFICE
cc
Hard Copy To
Hard Copy cc
From Ruth Holleran/POCL/POSTOFFICE
Date 16/11/99 08:41
Subject Fwd: Re: Requirements for continuing with roll-out 

Both

For comment please i.e. what else do we require please.

Ruth

To Min Burdett/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
cc Meagher/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Ruth
Holleran/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
Hard Copy To
Hard Copy cc
From Keith K Baines/POCL/POSTOFFICE
Date 15/11/99 18:13
Subject Re: Requirements for continuing with roll-out 

Min,
I think a two part approach is needed. The first is to institute continuing monitoring of the "service level" type criteria beyond the initial period:

AI 298 - if the level is above the threshold, we should continue monitoring to provide input to a decision in January. I recall that Pathway said that the monitoring imposed additional work on them and were keen to have it stop asap. I still think, though that we should go for monitoring through to mid December, on the same basis as at present, with a new criterion of achieving the target level over a 4 week period.

AI 408 - because of the water-bed effect (if you push it down in one place, it pops up in

another!) we need to continue monitoring all the service levels that were relevant to this AI, not just the ones that Pathway failed on first time round. Again, I think we should extend the monitoring period to mid December, and look for 4 out of 6 weeks in the last 6 weeks of that period. Part of the requirement is a satisfactory method of measuring script conformance - probably based on taping of calls - which pathway agree with us as the basis both for the roll-out decision and for ongoing measurement of this service level - it's now part of the ongoing SLAs, not a temporary measurement during the current review period.

AI 376 - error levels. I have concerns about the current error levels. If we have the integrity control, they may not get our accounts qualified, but they represent a significant extra workload to correct them, especially if they are ones that Pathway would only identify after they came across the interface (have we any analysis of which would be trapped by the daily checks and which only by the weekly ones?). We need to continue monitoring through to January as originally agreed for criteria i to iii. We should change the contract to exclude the first few weeks, since otherwise the target has already been failed - a clean approach would be to exclude all the weeks that count towards the first review point, though no doubt Pathway would like to keep the last (0.4%) week!

I am not convinced that we can extend the timescale for criterion iv, the analysis to show all causes found pre-24 November would be trapped by the integrity control. However, what we do need to do is have Pathway's analysis and if there are errors that would not be trapped (as initial John Dicks feedback suggests), and that these are not errors excluded by CCN562 (which pathway logically could not be expected to detect because they are self-consistent errors), then Pathway need to develop an approach to modifying the integrity control so that it would trap them; either in its initial form, or in a form that would be deployed before the TIP checking is turned off. (We may want paying to retain the TIP checks)

AI 376 - New interface - We need pathway to extend the Logical Design information that is contractually controlled to cover those areas that our experts say need to be subject to our agreement - mainly interface and operational procedures, I believe. We should not extend it to include processes that are internal to ICL pathway operations where they do not manifest themselves at the interfaces and are below the level of the existing documentation, but Pathway may need to show that design info. to our experts - possibly under NDA - to meet criterion iv - i.e. to show POCL that their integrity control will trap all error type previously seen.

Part of an agreed way forwards should be the scope of extra docs to be provided (either stand-alone or as additions to the Logical Design) and plans for development of operational procedures. We should consider whether we need an audit of Pathway progress in developing the integrity control (bring back Peter Copping to do it, possibly - it could be included in the review of readiness for roll-out that PA are doing.)

Keith.

To Sue M Harding/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, John Meagher/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POST

To Sue M Harding/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, John
Meagher/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Andrew
Radka/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Keith K
Baines/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
cc Ruth Holleran/POCL/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
Hard Copy To
Hard Copy cc
From Min Burdett/POCL/POSTOFFICE
Date 15/11/99 15:39

Subject Requirements for continuing with roll-out

Folks

Following on from today's Acceptance Checkpoint Pre-meet, we now need to gather together our requirements for given Pathway's position on the current criteria. Please could you send me your views (copied to John Meagher and Tony Houghton):

- Andy focussing on 408. (Judging from the discussions we've just had your response will be around what we want them to do to address their shortfalls on th 20 seconds/80% SL and extending the monitoring using the new methodology for the compliance on scripts.)
- Sue (and Ruth) focussing on 376. (It seems that the current criteria are not giving us the leverage we need on the new design - what do we want?)
- John 298.
- Keith. Your view on them all would be helpful.

Dave Miller has spoken to Christou and has said we will get him our views by close of play tomorrow. Therefore, can I have your response (again, sent to myself, John Meagher and Tony Houghton) by 10:00 tomorrow. We will then issue a consolidated version for review by early afternoon.

Min