N O T E

FROM: ANDREW LAZENBY   UORM/132   TEL: 3474

TO: DAVID WATSON   UORM/13   DATE: 28 OCTOBER 1992
      TIM HANNAGAN   UORM/133

SHORTLIST SELECTION RATIONALE

Extensive research was conducted on this Project by TWH between 1991 and up until September 1992. In this time, exploratory meetings were conducted with up to 35 different companies ranging over promotions agencies, suppliers of hardware and management agencies who would put the technology and the promotion together.

At September 1992 it was decided that the time was ripe to "get involved" and set up a formal feasibility study. Hence, from the total list, six suppliers were selected, given a formal brief by TWH and AJL and then given the opportunity to pitch. After their pitch, two of the groups were short-listed for further development. The other four were rejected, as follows:-

Concept Systems: + A competent technologicial approach and extremely strong technological solution, using Fortronic hardware.

+ Proposed a Phase Implementation of first magtape technology and then smartcard later when the price had come down and competition demanded.

- No promotional know-how.

- No perceived difference for the customer and no leapfrog lock-out.

- Above all, the personnel are "used car salesmen"; would have a credibility gap with Shell management.

NB: Possibility of using the Fortronic technology independently.

STH: + Track record of use with Shell Belgium.

+ Neat and easy solution, meeting the brief.

- Very low tech solution, with high wastage of cards and a stone-aged printer.

- It would not be perceived as anything like as advanced as current competitor offerings.

- Not really more than a replacement for paper vouchers.

\DW4\DATA\F6\AL6.DOC/CB

McQuordales: - Did no more than establish credentials. These will probably be able to produce a tolerable solution but will need a great deal of further Shell time and resources simply to get to the same position as the other five groups.

- Individuals would be very difficult to work with: very irritating.

AT & T Istel: + AT & T are keen to get into this market and are willing to throw money in.

+ Cheap solution with very quick start-up.

- Will be perceived as no different to current competitor offerings.

- Large degree of work by <u>Shell</u> to adapt all tills to make this system work. High degree of scepticism as to whether this will work.

- **System to be run by AT & T => they gain from the databasing and polling.**

- Suspicion over their competence and knowledge of the promotional element.