Message

From:	Jenkins Gareth GI	IRRELEVANT		
Sent:	9/21/1999 12:13:11 PM			
To:	'John Pope' GRO	Steve Warwick GRO	Robson Stephan	

IRRELEVANT Donato Roger IRRELEVANT

IRRELEVANT ; Hemingway Phil IRRELEVANT

IRRELEVANT

CC:	Peter Jeram GRO Alan Ward GRO
Subject:	RE: URGENT:RE: EPOSS Reconciliation Design Version 0.7

Steve / John,

I'm happy with the approach that you are proposing to my major comments. NB Alan is on leave until 29/9/99.

I have a few detailed points on the paper, but I don't think any of them are of great significance in terms of affecting what we agree with the customer :-

1)   4.2.1: I believe that further thought is required as to exactly how we ensure that we provide full resilience in the EOD processing, and in particular that we handle the case of a failure during the EOD processing. Clearly use of Riposte Transactions will help, but we also need to bear in mind that to fit in with the CSR+ architecture, the HarvestTrailer and the other "totals" will have to be in separate Riposte transactions. I suggest that this is discussed separately, but that for now we just say "we will ensure that this is sorted" (which is in effect what you've said) and rely on not being asked to spell out the detail yet (or ever)!

2)   4.3.2: If we are sticking with separate totals for Daily Transactions and Cash account reconciliation, then I see no need to harvest the Cash Account Total Lines, since these are only used by the counter End of CAP processing. They are not needed by TPS (only the exceptions are - which are covered separately in 4.3.5).

3)   4.3.4: I see no purpose in passing the transaction date and transaction Time as an explicit column in the table. We have already proved that we can't rely on such fields always being present. Their values will always be available from the Detailed message content (which probably does need to be included). Anne Mohan has already circulated a proposal from the Agent team as to what these exceptions should look like.

4)   4.6.2: Again I don't think we should include Transaction Time explicitly.

In section 6 you seem to have ignored the comments I made on the previous version of this. Why? In particular

5)   6 1: If a Slave node is not running at "public" EOD time, then no Public EOD marker will be written until the following day. You will only get a "late" EOD if the Gateway is down.

6)   6 5: Rebuilding a slave node will prevent EOD running on the gateway.

7)   6 6: This relates to my earlier comments on Riposte transactions. Also please note that if the EOD service fails during the day it will not be restarted until 3am the following day and hence not write EOD markers that day.

Regards

Gareth

email: Gareth.Jenkins GRO
Internal Phone: GRO
External Phone: GRO
External Mobile Phone:
Internal Mobile Phone: GRO

ICL
Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berkshire, RG12 8SN
Website : http://www.icl.com

International Computers Limited, Registered in England no 96056,
Registered Office 26, Finsbury Square, London, EC2A 1SL

> -----Original Message-----
> From: John Pope [GRO   ]
> Sent: 21 September 1999 09:53
> To: Steve Warwick; Stephan Robson; Gareth.Jenkins **GRO**
> Roger Donato;
> Phil Hemingway
> Cc: Peter Jeram; Alan Ward
> Subject: URGENT:RE: EPOSS Reconciliation Design Version 0.7
>
>
> Steve,
>
> thanks for the update. WOULD OTHER RECIPENTS PLEASE NOTE
> THAT WE NEED TO SEND
> THIS TO POCL THIS AM. PLEASE MAKE TIME TO READ IT and notify any
> inconsistencies or ambiguites to myself and Steve asap.
>
> On the point of Gareth's suggestion of changing to a single
> set of daily control
> totals I agree this needs wider review. It is clearly very
> urgent that we
> resolve this design issue, and it should in my view be dealt
> with by a decision
> conference (physical or virtual) involving Alan Ward and
> representatives from
> counter, agent and host, to be held asap.
>
> John
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Warwick Steve (TO fel0152)
> Sent: 20 September 1999 19:44
> To: Robson Stephan (TO fel0152); Gareth Jenkins GI
> Gareth.Jenkins[GRO   ] Donato Roger (TO fel0152); Hemingway
> Phil (TO fel0152); Pope John
> Subject: EPOSS Reconciliation Design Version 0.7
>
>
> John,
>
> Please find attached the electronic copy of the updated
> version of the
> Reconciliation design document. I have incorporated the
> comments from POCL and
>
> s many of Gareth's comments as I felt able to at present. I
> have not amended
> the document yet to reflect a potential significant change in
> direction which
> Gareth and I discussed earlier this afternoon. Given the
> delicate nature of
> gaining POCL's agreement to the document and the potential
> development impact of
>
> change of this nature at this time, I think that there will
> need to be a
> programme-wide view taken as to whether we should risk such a
> change at the
> present time.
>
> Rgds,
>
> Steve
>
>
> **** DOCUMENT TYPE INFORMATION ****
> ***********************************
>
> Mail has the following body parts:
>
> Body 1 : # 118#   PIDES002.DOC 20.09.1999 18:15 286720
>