



Lenton-Smith Colin

**GRO**

07/05/2003 07:33

To: "keith.k.baines" **GRO**  
 cc: Forrest Hilary <**GRO**>, "Keith Baines (E-mail)" <**GRO**>, "nicholas.samuel" <**GRO**>, Purewal Pam  
 Subject: RE: Charges for Changes to AP Client take-on and Token Verification services

Keith, thank you for accepting the new prices I proposed, and this is confirm that we have agreed to deal with this as part of the anomalies process.  
 Regards  
 Colin

-----Original Message-----

From: keith.k.baines **GRO**  
 Sent: Thursday, May 01, 2003 12:24 PM  
 To: Lenton-Smith Colin  
 Cc: Forrest Hilary; Keith Baines (E-mail); 'nicholas.samuel' **GRO**; Purewal Pam  
 Subject: Re: Charges for Changes to AP Client take-on and Token Verification services

Colin,  
 Post Office will agree to the new prices that you are proposing. However I suggest we do deal with this as part of the anomalies process. The reduction in man day rates was applied to relevant charges for all the other CCNs in the table but the charges from CCN 807 were not adjusted and there is no reason why this particular CCN should have been excluded. Therefore now that the new price is not in dispute I believe it can reasonable be dealt with in the omnibus CCN to clear up the agreed list of anomalies.  
 Regards,  
 Keith

Contract Manager  
 Post Office Ltd  
 IT Department  
 2nd Floor, Calthorpe House, 15-20 Phoenix Place, LONDON, WC1X 0DG  
 Phone: **GRO**, Fax: **GRO**, Mobile: **GRO**  
 External Email: keith.k.baines **GRO**

Lenton-Smith Colin  
**GRO**  
**GRO**  
 25/04/2003 09:11

>-----  
 -  
 ----|

To: "Keith Baines (E-mail)" <GRO>  
cc: "'nicholas.samuel@GRO'"  
GRO, Forrest Hilary  
GRO, Purewal Pam  
GRO  
Subject: Charges for Changes to AP Client take-on and Token  
Verification services

---

Keith,

I am responding to Nick Samuel's email to Pam Purewal of 22 April.

We have considered this issue again and do not consider it to be an "anomaly". The concept of "anomalies" was introduced to recognise mistakes and which both parties agree took place during the process of moving from the Codified Agreement to the new Agreement.

Our records show that the charges for Changes to AP Client take-on and Token Verification services (the "Services") in Annex C of Schedule 10 were introduced at version 4.0 of Schedule 10 (dated 11/11/02). These figures were presented on the basis of moving from T&M to fixed price charges and that is the basis upon which we checked and agreed them. The fixed price was calculated directly from the T&M charges in Schedule A12 of the Codified Agreement. The charges for the Services in Schedule 10 remained unchanged from version 4.0 of the schedule to the final agreed version.

We do not want to, nor do we think we should, set a precedent of re-opening approved CCNs particularly when they have actually been rolled in to the contract baseline. In the case of the CCN807 it was rolled in to v4.0 in June of 2002 and we have agreed 3 new contract baselines since then.

Whilst we do not consider the charges for the Services to be an anomaly, we are prepared to apply the principle in the letter from Liam Foley to Alan Barrie of 11 June 2002 to the charges. On that basis the offer below still stands but is our sole offer in this regard.

Client Take On Facility £2296.00 MINUS 25% =  
£1722.00

Client Take on (regression) Facility £919 MINUS 25% =  
£689.25 Total Reduction of £803.75

Both these rates would now be subject to the 2.9% uplift taking them to:

Client Take on Facility £1722.00 +2.9% RPI =  
£1771.94

Client Take on (regression) Facility £689.25 +2.9% RPI =  
£709.24 Revised Total: £2481.18

Please let me know whether Post Office wishes to accept this offer and I will arrange for a CCN to be raised to amend Schedule 10 accordingly.

Regards

Colin

Colin Lenton-Smith  
Director, Commercial and Finance  
Post Office Account

> Fujitsu Services  
> Forest Road, Feltham, Middlesex, TW13 7HJ  
> Tel: GRO INT: GRO  
> Fax: GRO INT: GRO  
>  
> Mailto:colin.lenton-smith@GRO  
>

This e-mail is only for the use of its intended recipient. Its contents are subject to a duty of confidence and may be privileged. Fujitsu Services does not guarantee that this e-mail has been intercepted and amended or that it is virus-free.