(a) THE LONDON AMBULANCE SYSTEM (LAS) INITIALLY WENT WRONG AT 20/2
THE TENDER STAGE, WHEN A LOW BID WAS ACCEPTED, DESPITE
EVIDENCE THAT THE SUPPLIERS DID NOT APPRECIATE THE COMPLEXITY
OF THE SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS, AND CONSULTANTS HAD ESTIMATED FAR
HIGHER COSTS. IN CAPSA, THE DEVELOPMENT WORK WAS DONE
INTERNALLY, AND FEW PEOPLE APPRECIATED IN ADVANCE THE
POTENTIAL EXPENSE OF THE SOLUTION. CAPSA USED A
COTS PRODUCT (ALTHOUGH NOT A PARTICULARLY STABLE ONE),
AND INCURRED PROBLEMS IN TRYING TO ADAPT IT TO THE ARCANE
WORKINGS OF THE UNIVERSITY. LAS COMMISSIONED A BESPOKE
SYSTEM, BUT FAILED TO ENSURE THAT IT COULD HANDLE THE
ACTUAL TRANSACTION LOAD. CAPSA ALSO SUFFERED FROM
THIS PROBLEM. BOTH SYSTEMS REQUIRED VERY LENGTHY
AND EXPENSIVE REMEDIAL ACTIONS. (6)

(b) LAS ✱ LOAD TESTING, PERHAPS IN CONJUNCTION WITH PARALLEL
OPERATION. THIS WOULD HAVE IDENTIFIED PERFORMANCE
PROBLEMS, BUT POTENTIALLY WITH HIGH TESTING COSTS & IF
PARALLEL OPERATION WAS UNSAFE DUE TO DISRUPTION OF SERVICE
✱ REQUIREMENTS DEFINITION THAT INCLUDED PERFORMANCE
FACTORS — THESE COULD THEN BE USED AS THE BASIS FOR
VALIDATION. THERE WOULD BE NO REAL DISADVANTAGE — PERHAPS
ONLY AN EARLIER DISCOVERY OF THE PROBLEM (AND HENCE
LOWER COST OF RECTIFICATION).

CAPSA ✱ APPLICATION OF THE CAPABILITY MATURITY MODEL TO ASSESS
THE READINESS OF THE ORGANISATION TO UNDERTAKE SUCH A
LARGE PROJECT. THE DISADVANTAGE MIGHT BE CANCELLATION
OF THE WHOLE PROJECT
✱ MONITORING OF PROGRESS USING A METRIC SUCH AS
FUNCTION POINT ANALYSIS. WOULD HAVE SOME OVERHEAD
COST, BUT WOULD IDENTIFY RISK AND COST OVERRUN EARLIER
✱ MORE COMPLETE INVESTIGATION OF REQUIREMENTS BEFORE
CHOOSING SOLUTION. THIS MIGHT HAVE LED TO A BETTER
ASSESSMENT OF COSTS, BUT POTENTIALLY USERS MIGHT (14)
NEGOTIATE COMPROMISE MORE SUITED TO AVAILABLE PACKAGES

PART A   TWO MARKS FOR EACH COMPARISON OR CONTRAST, ASSUMING THAT SUITABLE ASPECTS OF THE PROJECTS ARE IDENTIFIED (3×2)

PART B   ANY PART OF THE COURSE COULD POTENTIALLY BE INTRODUCED HERE, BUT MUST BE RELATED IN SOME WAY TO A PROBLEM THAT WAS OBSERVED IN THE CASE STUDIES.

- 1 MARK PER TECHNIQUE
- 1 MARK PER ADVANTAGE
- 1 MARK PER DISADVANTAGE