

Meeting: Industry Technical Forum
Venue: Business Showcase, Brindley Place,
 Birmingham
Date: 14th June 2005
Time: 10.30am

Attendees:

David Jones	ntl
Liam Brown	ntl
Shirley Lapierre	ntl
Lynne Ewington	Telewest
Jonathan Cocker	Telewest
Tony Franklin	BT Directories
Kathy Peatroy	BT Retail
Shaun Wilson	BT Retail
Steven Cairns	Kingston Communications
John Roberts	Kingston Communications
Janice Chan	Experian
Tim Perkins	Experian
John Lacey	Conduit
Steve Mackelden	BT Contact Head of Products & Services Development
Mark Johns	BT Contact Services Development Manager
Suzanne Mealings	BT Contact Project Manager
Paulette Moses	BT Contact Supplier Relationship Manager
Barry Haughton	BT Contact Sales Executive
Tim Handley	BT Contact Senior Business Support Manager
Peter Morgan	Project Director

Minutes: Martha Cheesewright BT Contact Project Support

1. Introductions

BT Contact welcomed all to the meeting.

2. ORS Update

BTC said that there would be no further work on ORS as the project had been suspended and that a formal notification letter would be issued to industry shortly.

Kingston enquired about the reasons for suspending ORS and BTC replied that the environment that ORS was to function in was subject to constant change which had made capturing requirements extremely difficult. BTC also made reference to the recent KPN ruling and the impact this would have on the permitted content of ORS.

Telewest asked whether ORS benefits would be incorporated in to OSIS. BTC replied that at the last ITF they had asked industry to identify the features they had expected to gain from ORS, and the operational/cost impact late delivery was likely to have on their company.

3. Action Point Review



N:\Business Ventures
 Contact\NNA\Techno

During discussions of AP03 and AP 0417/05/05 two further actions were raised.

AP 01 14/06/05-MaJ to issue terms of reference and information on Christian name abbreviations by cop 17th June 2005.

AP 02 14/06/05-MaJ to raise a CR on the LORS 2 abbreviations vet and make the change to this.

4. Terms of Reference

BTC stated that the ITF terms of reference had last been reviewed in December 2003. BTC said that there was a degree of ambiguity in the wording of these which was why they felt the need to revisit them.

BTC presented a revised terms of reference (see below) and asked for comments from the meeting attendees.



N:\Business Ventures
Contact\NNA\Techno

BTC said that they were happy to provide accommodation for all ITFs, but suggested that the chair person should rotate after three sessions, so that all organisations had responsibility for this at some point.

BTR commented that they would not expect the impact of licence amendments to be discussed at ITFs as this was more of a commercial consideration. BTC replied that licence amendments would only be discussed if they affected technical matters.

AP 03 14/06/05-BTC to determine items specific to OSIS development from the ITF terms of reference.

Kingston enquired about the proportion of Suppliers and Customers that attended ITF meetings and it was said that there was generally more upstream representatives in attendance. BTC said that they had tried to encourage industry as a whole to put forward items for debate at ITFs and to give their feedback on topics of discussion but that there had been little response. BTC expressed concern that this could somewhat decrease the value of meetings.

BTC explained that they had intended to propose that ITFs became quarterly meetings, but that they felt monthly forums were necessary while the current OSIS development phase took place.

AP 04 14/06/05-ITF terms of reference to be added to the BTC ITF web pages.

5. OSIS Development

BTC said that there had been a suggestion from downstream that daily update and MFC files be merged. BTC stated that this had been on the change register prior to the start of the ORS project and that ORS would have had the option to have merged or un-merged files BTC said that OSIS would not be able to offer the two options, and that industry as a whole would have to decide whether they wanted daily update files and MFC files merged.

AP 05 14/06/05-BTC to check whether the Change Management register is available on the web and if not make sure this is published.

BTC said that they would canvass opinion from downstream on this matter, adding that it might be possible to run MFC and update files on the same run number sequence. It was said that this

would be done as part of the requirements capture exercise once all suggested changes to OSIS had been received by BTC.

There was discussion of how the change management process would impact on OSIS development. BTC explained that not everyone would have to buy in to changes in future unless they were regulatory.

Kingston enquired whether BTC would be able to issue ultimatums to industry i.e would BTC be able to tell industry that if they did not reply by a given date they would be seen to agree/disagree to a change. BTC said that they might want industry to fund commercial changes and that therefore they could not assume that people had opted in to a change implementation and demand money from them.

BTR stated that there was a danger that people who wanted changes would simply not say this to avoid paying for them. BTC said that in theory funds would be re-distributed amongst those who had originally paid. BTR went on to say that they would want visibility of costs as soon as possible and that this would be difficult with the change management process BTC had in place.

BTC said that one Supplier had requested access to OSIS online on Sundays. BTC said that though they would not be able to guarantee the system's availability every Sunday as this was the day used for system outages, they did not believe that this would be too difficult to implement. BTC confirmed that this would not affect downstream who would still receive the same daily update files.

BTC outlined a request for the working day to be extended until 10pm. BTC explained that at present this would not be possible without major development, though it might be possible to extend the day beyond the current finishing time (6pm).

BTC said that the request for reports on ceases/defects on a Supplier by Supplier basis would be easy to introduce.

Telewest said that their main concerns were the rules on number portability, vets relaxation and the fact that ORS would have increased the time they spent working online. BTR said that they were concerned about the porting process as ORS would have improved this and BTC agreed that ORS would have made the porting of directory entries much easier.

AP 06 14/06/05-BTC to work with One IT to determine what OSIS can achieve in terms of improving number portability and report on this at the next ITF.

BTC said that their intention was to collect all the OSIS changes that industry wanted, assess how feasible these were and determine priorities. They would then report back to industry and produce CRDs to formalise the changes. BTC said that if a company wanted development solely for their own benefit they would not disclose details of this, but that if development was for industry as a whole details would be made public.

BTR asked whether BTC would offer technical support to help companies develop OSIS in ways that would only benefit them as individual organisations or whether such support would be restricted to the projects that benefited industry as a whole. BTC replied that they would probably have to devote their resource mainly to industry wide projects, but that it was likely they would support another organisation to work alongside them and offer support on individual projects.

AP 07 14/06/05-BTC to investigate who will provide technical support for company specific OSIS development projects.

AP 08 14/007/05- BTC to determine whether the One IT 90 day principle will apply to OSIS development.

BTR said that the OSIS development they would like to see related to dummy postcodes, partial address, auto loni on groups and problem reports. BTR said that there was a need to issue definite timeframes by which people had to give OSIS development input, otherwise it was likely that months would be spent just gathering requirements. BTC agreed and said that they wanted industry to produce their definitive lists of the OSIS development work they wanted for review at the July ITF.

AP 09 14/06/05-BTC to produce a process/timeline flow chart on OSIS development.

BTR asked where the funding for OSIS development would come from, stating that they had no budget reserved for this as they had been expecting the implementation of ORS. BTC said that if OSIS development was requested that replicated a benefit expected from ORS then BTC would have to pay for this.

AP 10 14/07/05-BTC to clarify the timeframes for new drops of OSIS development.

BTR asked whether the BTC would continue to involve industry in requirements capture and testing as they had done with ORS. BTC said that this had been a valuable element of ORS and that they were keen to continue with such activity.

6. Data Queries

BTC stated that ORS had been intended to introduce trouble tickets to deal with data queries. BTC went on to explain that downstream operators had encountered difficulty getting data queries resolved and that the expectation that these would be dealt with in 10 days was not formally recorded in Schedule 11, making it hard to enforce. As a result, BTC said that they had been working to improve their internal process for dealing with these.

A process diagram was shown to attendees and BTC explained the various swim lanes on it, saying that the top one represented downstream, the next one down Suppliers, the next one down the BTC Supply team and the bottom one Tim Handley. BTC stated that red represented critical DQs which were classified as those that affected a statutory body, the emergency services or customers whose status had been altered radically, e.g DE to XD and vice versa.

BTC said that they were currently working their way through entries that were affected by the LORS 2 NSEW vet.

BTC said that they were looking at how data queries could be resolved more quickly using a web interface at the front end and that they were having a call at the end of the week to discuss this further. BTC said that one of the main problems they were having was that everything needed to be checked by an individual, a problem that automation on ORS would resolve.

BTC said that they would publish the data queries process on their website as soon as possible.

AP 11 14/06/05-TH to publish the data queries process on the web.

It was said that the process would alter as OSIS development continued. BTR asked if the process would be rolled out to all licensees eventually and BTC replied that it would.

7. Change Management

BTC displayed the high level change management diagram, explaining that there were supplementary models which accompanied this.

It was said that the starting point for a CR could come from industry or from BTC. Once a CR was raised there would be an initial industry consultation. BTC said that there needed to be discussion of who would be involved in this as it was likely that Commercial representatives would have to be present as well as technical experts. For any regulatory changes dispute would be dealt with formally, possibly with the involvement of Ofcom.

BTC said that Chris Meakin was currently updating the change management process and would be issuing this to industry for agreement.

BTR stated that they might say at the start of the process that the change was too costly or was not feasible and would not want to produce a statement of requirements if this was how they felt. BTC explained that this was why they had a reject option at the start of the process.

Kingston asked BTC whether they anticipated that it would be them or industry who initiated the most changes. BTC replied that traditionally it had been them but that industry wise the majority of changes were initiated by upstream.

BTC said that there was a need to determine timeframes around change and BTR asked what BTC would expect back if industry agreed to provide a response within 28 days. BTC stated that they would want to know whether people wanted the change or not and to hear any comments people wished to make.

The 28 day response time was discussed and BTC explained that following this period they would want to know whether companies subscribed to a planned change or not and any comments they wished to make.

BTC explained that some elements of the change management process diagram appeared to run in parallel as earlier stages might have to be re-visited at a later date.

BTR asked whether a technical change for both upstream and downstream benefits would result in BTC asking for cost details. BTC replied that they would not as this was internal information but that a pricing review might result as a consequence.

BTR stated that they did not believe it was fair to share costs so that small businesses paid as much as large even though they would not benefit as much. BTC replied that costs were yet to be discussed and that talks on this would involve up and downstream in order to establish who should be charged.

After the presentation the general consensus was that the best way to test the change management process would be to run some CRs through it to establish whether there were any problem areas.

AP 12 14/06/05- BTC to report back to industry on the definitive owner of the change management process within their organisation.

BTC suggested that sub tasks be added to each of the boxes on the change management process diagram.

ITF

June

a wholesale

8. AOB

During these discussions two further actions arose.

AP 13 14/06/05- BTC to move ITF web pages from within the ORS section of their website.

AP 14 14/06/05- BTC Supply teams to contact all Suppliers to check that they have access to the BTC web pages and talk them through how to use these.

9. Summary of Ongoing/New Actions



N:\Business Ventures
Contact\NNA\Techno