

To: Keith Avis[Keith.Avis@ofgem.gov.uk]; Luis Castro[Luis.Castro@ofgem.gov.uk]; Lindsay Goater[Lindsay.Goater@ofgem.gov.uk]; Peter Rice[Peter.Rice@ofgem.gov.uk]
Cc: Rita Chohan[Rita.Chohan@ofgem.gov.uk]; Paul Heigl[Paul.Heigl@ofgem.gov.uk]; Andy Luckhurst[Andy.Luckhurst@ofgem.gov.uk]
From: Richard Kayan
Sent: 2012-08-31T17:01:38Z
Importance: Normal
Subject: Re: RHI IT Solutions Paperx
Received: 2012-08-31T17:01:40Z

Keith,

Thanks.

I would prefer that section 1.2 is rephrased as follows to avoid any ambiguity or scope for future misunderstanding:

'IT have agreed that the cost of the release would be £143,000 – as set in the original Feasibility Study. This is on the strict condition, as per the original feasibility study, that the release contains all required functionality (i.e. Is not staggered or staged releases), and is a joint release with the GB RHI release, and that the release costs of this release are incurred to GB RHI (The NI RHI, as a result, simply 'piggy-backing' on a GB RHI release that would in any case be taking place). If a joint release is not possible, the costs for a separate NI RHI release will be £179k.

IT have also agreed to a contingency of 33% (£47,000). This reduced contingency (Which, following best practice, would normally only be offered on agreed detailed requirements) is offered on the basis that should there be an unforeseen change in requirements, or the scope of the requirements, once full details are specified, pushes the requirements to the highest complexity levels, requiring funding beyond the 33% level, it will be necessary to undertake an analysis of the scope of the work underpinning IT delivery and take decisions on descoping lower priority features that are not absolutely essential (To avoid any ambiguity in the latter stages of the project, the lower priority, 'nice-to-have' features, totalling 67% of the volume of work will be agreed up-front, prior to detailed requirements starting, so that any de-scoping decisions that subsequently need to take place can be taken rapidly as required by the Business Owner).'

I believe this unambiguity will help us all in the long-run, as it will help to avoid any potential for future misunderstanding or fractious Project Board meetings. I realise the above may come across as very 'formal' and 'contractual', so happy for some rewording to take place, as long as the context is not lost in any rewording.

Please let me know if you need any further clarification or information.

Regards,

Richard
Sent from my Blackberry device

From: Keith Avis
Sent: Friday, August 31, 2012 04:55 PM
To: Keith Avis; Luis Castro; Richard Kayan; Lindsay Goater; Peter Rice
Cc: Rita Chohan; Paul Heigl
Subject: RE: RHI IT Solutions Paperx

All

Further to a discussion with Luis, I have slightly tweaked the earlier version, and would be grateful if you could offer comments on the attached please.

Many thanks
Keith

From: Keith Avis
Sent: 31 August 2012 16:33
To: Luis Castro; Richard Kayan; Lindsay Goater; Peter Rice
Cc: Rita Chohan; Paul Heigl
Subject: RHI IT Solutions Paperx

Luis, Richard

Attached is the draft paper to consider following our discussion earlier today. Happy to pick up on any comment and work them in Monday morning. Also grateful if Lindsay and Peter could review and offer comments. Sorry for timeline, but grateful for comments asap Monday morning please.

Rgds
Received from OFGEM on 11.05.2017
Annotated by RHI Inquiry

