ICL Pathway Memorandum

To:	Bob Booth
CC:	John Dicks
From:	Dave Cooke
Date:	02/12/1998
Re:	POCL Infrastructure Acceptance Specification

Bob,

Thank you for the meeting of 24th November and your follow up meeting notes and actions. I can confirm that the action points agree with my notes.

The status of the POCL Infrastructure Acceptance Spec is now as follows: -

1. All your category 4 comments were discussed at our review. No changes to the AS were required.

2. All the actions relating to your category 3 comments have been applied to the AS. Some points of clarification :-

   a) Action13 / Criterion 472/3 - The Audit Acceptance specification is already cited as the reference document.

   a) Action 17 / Criterion 478/3 - I have added "FTMS Configurations for Pathway TPS and POCL TIP links at Release 2" rather then the generic TIS as this document gives a precise definition of the TMS/TPS to TIP interface.

   a) Action 29 / Criterion 953/2 - I hope to advise an appropriate test tomorrow.

   a) Action 30 / Section 7 - This information will be included in the Low Level Test Scripts and will be separately supplied.

   a) Action 31 / Section 10 - This section would normally contain an extract from the High Level Test Plans that link the Business Thread / HLTP references to the individual test conditions. However in the case of these technical tests the references given in each criterion are the

actual test conditions. This section is not required for this AS.

3. All of your category 2 issues have been addressed as follows :-

    a) Action 5 & 6 / Criterion 476/2 & 3 - I believe adherence to the Release Authorisation Processes will satisfy these criterion. For Release 2 these are described in the Horizon document " Release Authorisation of the NR2 (Child Benefit) Release". Part of this process requires the ICL Pathway Customer Services Director to confirm that the testing activities and release preparation activities have been completed.

    a) Action 7 / Criterion 478/8 - I have added this criterion to the Review section with the referenced document "FTMS Resilience and Recovery Strategy for Release 2". This describes the automatic retry mechanisms. I have also added some additional tests to demonstrate the use of the "Compaq Recovery Option" which shows the automatic cut-over between the primary and secondary file transfer PC.

    a) Action 8 / Criterion 480/2 - I can advise you that version 2 of the BPS Agents document contains very detailed information on data items transferred between TMS / PAS and TMS / CMS. Please note that the document reference is now BS/DES/001.

4. Concerning your category 1 issues: -

    a) Action1 - Technical vs Business.

You advise that concern has been expressed at the predominantly technical nature of the tests, which do not take account of the business implications of the various failure conditions that are tested. This is quite intentional and is indeed necessary since the Contract specifically separates POCL Infrastructure into its own set of contract schedules (POCL Agreement Schedule G01 etc.) as distinct from the business oriented Services of APS, EPOSS etc. The Service Definition for POCL Infrastructure essentially requires that an infrastructure is created which exhibits a set of Service Qualities (e.g. security, integrity, performance etc.) sufficient to meet the needs of the business functions required by APS, BES, EPOSS etc.

It is these basic Service Qualities that are tested within the POCL Infrastructure Acceptance Specification as required by the various criteria. However the business impacts of a failure, and in particular the recovery processes and associated Service Levels can only be considered within a particular business context. Where appropriate these will be included in other Acceptance Specifications (e.g. correct use of Help Desk procedures for BES, fall back processing for APS etc.).

On the particular comment against 472/2 the original comment could have been phrased as "Each Service will have its own set of requirements or procedures for dealing with *the consequences of* infrastructure failure .....".

July 13, 1999

ICL Pathway does not consider it appropriate to allow an external verification of application design against infrastructure capability since this is completely within ICL Pathway's Service and Risk boundaries.

Measurement of ICL Pathway's ability to deliver the required Services will be the various service levels. There will of course be regular reviews to address and control the on-going management and operation of the services via the Horizon Service Review Forum.

> a) Action 2 - TMS / OPS Boundary

ICL Pathway contends that the architectural and service boundary is between the counter applications, desktop and physical counter peripheral environment, and the middleware used to support data transfer from these environments to POCL and POCL Clients. This approach provides a clean separation of functionality and enables an OPS/TMS API to be defined.

This position is supported by the Service Definition for POCL Infrastructure (POCL Agreement G01) which provides a clear statement on the scope and role of TMS.

3.2   Overview

3.2.1   The TMS shall provide the interworking between the Outlets and the CONTRACTOR's central processing sites. TMS shall be provided using both the Outlet and the correspondence server Equipment, presenting interfaces to POCL Client systems or POCL systems. Such interfaces shall be implemented using TMS Agents, which are specified in paragraph 3.4.1. [4.1.4.2.1]

3.2.2   The role of TMS shall be to provide a secure and resilient messaging and journalling service which shall support the transfer of data between OPS and POCL Client services, and the POCL Services. [4.1.4.2.1]

4.2.2.2   Once a Transaction has been completed at a Counter Position, TMS shall commit the full Transaction details to that Counter Position PC's message store. The Transaction details shall simultaneously be automatically replicated to all other PCs in the Outlet so that the data are securely captured. In addition, the CONTRACTOR shall automatically replicate Transaction details to a remote server at which TMS is provided. [S467]

As you know additional Acceptance Criteria can be drawn from Contract Schedules and I can include some / all of the above paragraphs if you wish.

I believe that the above obligations support the position taken by ICL Pathway

and the statements made in the SADD. In keeping with a number of other parts of the overall contract there is an administrative task to harmonise text to remove any ambiguities.

a) Action 3 / Criterion 478/11

When considering this criterion, I think it is important to address it in the context of the entire Requirement 478, rather than in this abbreviated form. R478 requires that TMS can support two forms of data transfer, Files and Messages. When originally written I am sure you would agree that the term "Message" was not intended to mean the form of Riposte message now used in the ICL Pathway solution. The meaning of Data File and Message are as defined in POCL Agreement Schedule A01 - Interpretations. The ICL Pathway Solution recognised these two forms and the different business contexts where they would be used.

In particular sections 5.1 and 5.2 of the ICL Pathway Solution (POCL Agreement A16 - Solutions) speculated on the potential use of a Messaging service between an outlet and a Client and how it might be managed. As you will know none of the Services at Release 2 have a requirement for such a service.

In addition since Requirement 471, which concerns the provision of a Messaging facility within OPS has been moved to Later Acceptance, I propose that Criterion 478/9, 10, 11 (which call for support for such facilities within TMS) should also be moved to Later Acceptance.

a) Action 4 / Criterion 478/14

As you speculate within your comment sheet, issues concerning the capacity and timeliness of events within the infrastructure are within the ICL Pathway Service and Risk boundary. The criterion calls for the qualities of security, completeness, accuracy and robustness to be demonstrated and the declared tests will do that.

On the issues you raise in your comment sheet: -

Overloading

POCL and BA have declared that the Workload Brief or later issues of the Workload Compendium have no contractual status and so we have no basis to determine what levels of "overload" might be suitable. Part of the risk that ICL Pathway has accepted is to make a judgement on what this might be.

Re-Tries

In terms of re-tries, this only has relevance within a particular business context, as discussed above in 4(a). The operation of the infrastructure is the

responsibility of ICL Pathway and a combination of automatic re-try facilities and manual intervention procedures will be used.

Links to Host Agents

A number of Harvester and Loader Agents will be used during the running of these tests.

Links to SMS

Although strictly speaking the information passed to SMS is neither a Data File nor a Message, I have added the tests EV01 to EV07 which concern the resilience testing of the loss of connection between the Tivoli Agent and Tivoli management system.

I trust that these changes are satisfactory and that we can now move to approval of the Acceptance Specification which is now at version 1.5.

Please contact me if you need to discuss any of the issues covered above.

Regards,

Dave Cooke