

This document is issued by ICL Pathway in response to the document from Horizon received on 16/12/98 concerning the POCL Infrastructure Acceptance Specification. This document continues the comment / response cycle with respect to version 1.4 of the Acceptance Specification. Please note that version 1.5 has been issued and version 1.6 is in preparation following agreements reached, most recently at the review meeting of 16/12/98.

Dave Cooke

ICL Pathway Acceptance Test Manager - POCL Infrastructure  
17/12/98

No.	Para No.	Authors/Document Champions Comment Explanation	Initial response	ICL Pathway response
1.	Gen.	The solutions are all contained in the relevant POCL, DSS and Joint schedules.	Where is the technical solution documented?	This is contained in the SADD and the Technical Environment Description.
2.	Gen.	This approach was agreed between ICL Pathway and the PDA as the way to identify functional discreteness for the purposes of Acceptance testing. However, ICL Pathway wholly support the view that each criterion must be considered within the original business context of the Requirement.	Noted.	No action
3.	Gen.	Acceptance is a single activity as defined in the Authorities Agreement Schedule A07. On-going service monitoring is managed by the Horizon Service Review Forum.	Who - specifically - is represented on this Forum?	This is a Horizon Programme managed forum. The ICL Pathway Director of Customer Services attends together with a number of his service managers.
4.	Gen.	POCL, DSS and ICL Pathway have already completed the Direct Interface Test phase which is concerned with file exchanges between ICL Pathway and the AUTHORITIES.	This does not address the comment, i.e. what about failure and contingency where data cannot be passed across an interface or where it fails during transmission?	Which criterion is this comment related to ? The resilience of the infrastructure is covered in 467/2 & 4. As stated, local arrangements will be agreed between ICL Pathway When

Nothing contained herein shall be deemed or construed as affecting existing contractual obligations or creating new contractual obligations between ICL Pathway, the DSS and / or POCL.

				electronic data transfer is not available due to circumstances outside of ICL Pathways control then the <i>force majeure</i> clause 605 in Clauses Joint v8.0 will apply.
5.	Gen.	Requirement 830 is the main requirement concerned with Contingency. This is included within the Security Acceptance Specification and includes references to various contingency procedures.	In light of this the Security ATS will need to be examined to ascertain sufficient coverage of this attribute which was envisaged to be contained within this ATS - this may result in new comments on the Security ATS.	Noted
6.	Gen.	<p>Given the complexities of the Service and system environments within ICL Pathway, DSS and POCL, the numbers of types of failures that may have a business impact is probably incalculable.</p> <p>POCL's own Acceptance Test Managers are better placed to assess the business impact of Service failure and the adequacy of the recovery and contingency procedures within their own area of specialisation. ICL Pathway do not feel able to comment on the commercial implications to POCL or their Clients, particularly when the various Service Level Agreements recognise that Service operation of less than 100% may be a reality for periods of time.</p>	Noted that the Authorities anticipated a sub-100% availability. Due to the complexity, the Authorities anticipate a greater need for analysis rather than using the complexity as a reason to omit analysis of failure. Not every failure is anticipated to be covered but the impacts on the infrastructure, e.g. a Network Interface Card, ethernet connector, ethernet cable, in-outlet hub failure etc, would all result in a node becoming isolated. Treatment of this isolation would be expected to be covered.	<p>Which criterion is this comment related to ?</p> <p>There is no obligation on ICL Pathway to conduct an external impact analysis of potential infrastructure failure events, whether complex or not.</p> <p>ICL Pathway and POCL have agreed the procedures to be followed in the event of equipment failure in an outlet and these are recorded in the various PPDs.</p> <p>In the particular instance mentioned, an isolated node would be detected and appropriate warnings would be displayed to the user (criterion 953/2).</p>
7.	Gen.	This issue has been addressed in correspondence to Bob Booth of	We, POCL, need to see this correspondence, until which the	No action

Nothing contained herein shall be deemed or construed as affecting existing contractual obligations or creating new contractual obligations between ICL Pathway, the DSS and / or POCL.

		2/12/1998.	original comment remains, i.e. this spec cannot be signed off whilst the OPS/TMS boundary issue is still under discussion unless an agreed caveat is provided.	
8.	Gen.	This will be agreed as part of the programme planning activity for NR2+.	Noted.	No action
9.	467/ 2	Formally the boundary between OPS and TMS is defined as a programmatic API with well-defined success or failure events. These tests provide POCL with further evidence of the qualities of the data transfer mechanisms between an outlet and the ICL Pathway data-centre. Since mid-stream failures will most typically occur within the British Telecom exchanges or in the physical cables running to an outlet, it not clear what practical tests ICL Pathway could perform.	The “formally” commencement of the response pre-judges the outcome of the correspondence on this matter. Notwithstanding that, the test environment can relatively easily simulate a line loss (example chosen) by unplugging the ISDN cable for example. Comment therefore re-iterated.	Test (a) covers the loss of the ISDN line.
10.	467/ 4	As in 467/2, the absence of an alternate telecomms route can only occur if the physical circuits and exchanges offered by British Telecom and Energis cease to be available at the point when they are invoked. This event is considered to be extremely rare, but should it occur, the Service Managers from the affected organisations would agree a pragmatic approach to data exchange.	As point 9. Plus, it should be noted that the criterion is “network or node” which allows some resilience to be within Pathways control (e.g. correspondence servers)	The proposed tests cover failure to network or node.
11.	467/ 5	Genuinely lost transactions, as distinct from incomplete transactions, will be treated as an error and managed by the	It is not acceptable to have any lost / incomplete transactions in the technical solution. We require	ICL Pathway does not plan to have lost/incomplete transactions within the technical solution. The previous

Nothing contained herein shall be deemed or construed as affecting existing contractual obligations or creating new contractual obligations between ICL Pathway, the DSS and / or POCL.

		Service Management fault resolution process.	confirmation of this.	comment was intended to reassure the Authorities that should any operational incident occur which subsequently resulted in lost/incomplete transactions then the incident would be treated as an error and resolved.
12.	472/1	<p>This criterion is concerned with the accuracy of data capture, not of the resilience of the counter infrastructure. This is covered in 472/4.</p> <p>On the specific points, a failure of a counter printer would not prevent transactions being performed. In a multi-counter outlet, a hard disc failure would cause the counter PC to fail. A LAN failure would not prevent the counter PC from performing transactions, but certain Services may inhibit certain transactions when the counter PC is in this disconnected state.</p>	<p>This comment, is I believe, similar in thrust to point 11. and linked to the area surrounding the application interface to the wires and boxes layer of the infrastructure.</p> <p>The response indicates that the LAN failure impacts the services available and it is this behaviour that the comment is aimed at.</p> <p>It is questioning whether a printer failure would "freeze" the application, e.g. would it wait for the printer to time-out and "hang" for the printer configured time-out count etc.</p>	<p>The application interface to the "wires and boxes" is an abstracted logical interface which is provided by the Riposte Peripheral Broker. This is provided against various criteria (e.g. 570/1)</p> <p>There is no discernible delay to the counter application if the local counter printer is unavailable.</p>
13.	472/3	This criterion is not concerned with access to any captured transaction or other data. If a particular Service has a Requirement to access previously captured information, e.g. EPOSS reversals, then this facility will be tested in that particular Acceptance specification. The general facilities available to POCL Auditors are covered in the Audit Acceptance Specification, criterion 816/1 covers Outlet events.	Noted.	No action
14.	472/	Smart Cards are not used by any of the	Smart cards are used by POLO.	The correct use of the POLO card is

Nothing contained herein shall be deemed or construed as affecting existing contractual obligations or creating new contractual obligations between ICL Pathway, the DSS and / or POCL.

	4	<p>Services at Release 2. Test 10.3.1.1 is performed on a two-counter configuration where failure of the LAN cable is equivalent to a LAN Hub failure in a larger outlet. In both of these situations a counter no longer has connection to the LAN. Tests 10.4.3.1/ 2 do test the failure of the touch screen facility as opposed to the monitor / display.</p> <p>If the monitor / display has failed the counter system cannot be used.</p>	<p>A LAN hub is different as is an inter-hub failure leaving groups of nodes talking to each other; indeed a 2 position outlet is special as failure of the LAN is handled differently as the nodes can both continue to serve full function (I believe this is the current proposal) whereas in 2+ nodes, if a node cannot see another node it can only perform basic EPOSS (again my belief).</p> <p>Please clarify (f) to be failure of touch sensitivity and add failure of video output.</p>	<p>covered in criterion 473/5 &amp; 6.</p> <p>Criterion 953/2 covers the 2 and &gt;2 counter failure scenarios.</p> <p>Test (f) is ??????????</p>
15.	476/4	Tests AC01 to AC03 will be added which show the auto-configuration processes for new single and multi-counter outlets.	Noted. As per usual caveat, review of subsequent documentation will ascertain whether the criterion is met.	No action
16.	476/5/6	Following the SD series of tests a variety of transactions are performed to ensure the counter system is left in a usable state.	The comment was targeted at data already held - not at new data added. Therefore comment re-iterated.	This was understood. A new software release will use previously held data (e.g. reference data).
17.	537/2	This criterion is concerned with software distribution not roll-out. See response to comment 15 for auto-configuration tests. It would of course be impossible for roll-out to all outlets to be included in the Acceptance phase, since the Authorities require the completion of Acceptance as the pre-cursor to starting national roll-out.	There appears to be confusion in the term "roll-out". I interpret this to be the distribution to one outlet, a group or all outlets when there is an existing population of outlets. Please reconsider in this light, i.e. how is it rolled out to one, a group or all outlets? Also how do the outlets know they have received the update which may be required in the case of a fix.	<p>Criterion 537/2 is concerned with the distribution of software to outlets. Other criteria (559/3) require that all outlets are capable of supporting all of the contracted Services, and consequently Software releases will be to all outlets.</p> <p>Product availability within an outlet is controlled by POCL via their reference data.</p>
18.	538/	The use of GMT as the standard for all	The issue of time has still not been	No action

Nothing contained herein shall be deemed or construed as affecting existing contractual obligations or creating new contractual obligations between ICL Pathway, the DSS and / or POCL.



	1	timestamps within Horizon is stated in the TED section 12.7.10. This will be added to the review documents.	agreed and should therefore be treated as a caveat as with other Acceptance specs.	
19.	541/ 1	This comment is not understood.	I interpret the comment to be that an indication of how quickly TMS can be scaled is sought. Being scaleable to an extra 5% capacity but taking 4 years to achieve this is unlikely to satisfy the criterion.	ICL Pathway would welcome the opportunity to significantly increase the capacity of the infrastructure to accommodate increased business volumes. The speed by which this could occur will not be a limiting factor in supporting such growth, providing that the expected partnership between ICL Pathway and POCL identifies and plans for such growth. It is expected that significant enhancements to infrastructure could take place every other Release.
20.	558/ 2	The timeliness of transactions performed at the counter is covered in criterion 558/1. Any failure to meet such times will be managed via Service Level Agreement management. The technical mechanisms and designs used to meet such service measures are contained within the ICL Pathway Service and Risk boundary.	Noted.	No action.
21.	559/ 3	This comment is not understood. OPS is the counter systems environment which clearly supports the Services.	The tests are about capacity whereas criterion relates to 'support for transactions' which involves more than capacity. Comment therefore re-iterated.	What else is expected?
22.	921/ 1	Confirmed. Any data captured as part of a transaction when the secure time-out is activated will be retained when the session	Noted.	No action.

Nothing contained herein shall be deemed or construed as affecting existing contractual obligations or creating new contractual obligations between ICL Pathway, the DSS and / or POCL.

		is re-activated.		
23.	468/ 1	We are unclear how the comment relates to the criterion. ICL Pathway will provide a fault resolution service for OPS as described in the test condition and always with the agreement of the Post Master. Where particular circumstances exist in an outlet the Post Master and the Horizon System Help Desk will agree a mutually acceptable approach.	I interpret the comment to be, what is done to ensure that the 8 nodes in a 9 node outlet are not impacted when the ninth node is being rectified.	Nothing. The architecture is such that a failed counter PC can simply be removed and replaced. Recovery is then automatic.
24.	469/ 2	The criterion calls for technical documentation for OPS to be provided. ICL Pathway does not believe that design philosophies or support services fall into this category, particularly since the focus of this Requirement is the external procurement of applications.  No failures are quoted in this criterion or in the underlying Requirement.  POCL are better placed to understand the transaction volumes expected in outlets. There are no requirements on ICL Pathway to retain and analyse management information on outlet transactions, although it may be possible to provide such information if requested.	Disagree. Would expect the documentation to be such that "the external procurement of applications" would integrate successfully with other elements. Therefore the areas covered are reasonable, as would the provision of volumetric / performance data to allow such procurements to be designed to play to the strengths and growable areas of the solution and not introduce difficulties that such information could negate.	Please explain your concerns.
25.	470/ 1	Please see the response to comment 24.	See 24.	As above.
26.	474	The Declaration of Conformity will refer to the standards quoted in this Requirement	Noted.	No action.

Nothing contained herein shall be deemed or construed as affecting existing contractual obligations or creating new contractual obligations between ICL Pathway, the DSS and / or POCL.

		and any later versions of any mandatory standards.		
27.	475	These criteria do not call for Usability tests.	Disagree. E.g. 475/3 "intuitive and easy to use" would, from the Authorities comment, be satisfied by a Usability trial, not document review.	As previously stated, there is no requirement for ICL Pathway to run Usability trials as part of Acceptance.  However POCL will be aware that an EPOSS Usability Study was completed earlier this year with very satisfactory results.
28.	476/1	Now included.	A new version of this spec has not yet been seen with this included.	Contained in version 1.6.
29.	476/2	External interfaces have been satisfactorily tested during the Direct Interface Test phase. The details are contained in the Horizon Programme closure report PCL/TST/CLR/001/V2_0 v2.0 28/08/98.	Noted. However there is ongoing fault fixing and development. It may be the E2E, MOT closure reports and monitoring of events in Live Trial may also need to be cited with the DIT closure as the resolution of this criterion.	No action
30.	477/1	As described in the test condition.	Noted.	No action
31.	478/3	Confirmed.	Noted.	No action
32.	536/1	The Style Guide is not concerned with the operation of the peripherals or input devices. These are all covered in the two referenced documents.	Disagree. The "easy to use" can only be met if the HCI that utilises the peripherals is well constructed. The Style Guide must therefore be included as a reference.	
33.	537/1	The agenda and scope of the Horizon Service Review Forum is set by POCL.	Noted.	No action
34.	555/1	No since there is no requirement for OPS to read track 3.	Noted.	No action
35.	557/			

Nothing contained herein shall be deemed or construed as affecting existing contractual obligations or creating new contractual obligations between ICL Pathway, the DSS and / or POCL.



	2	Confirmed.	Noted.	No action
36.	822/ 1	Agreed.	Noted.	No action
37.	827/ 3	It has been agreed that this criterion will be moved to Later Acceptance.	Noted - pending point 8.	No action
38.	869/ 3	This criterion is concerned with performance requirements and tolerances in four specific areas. Disaster recovery and contingency are not mentioned.	We believe that disaster recovery and contingency should be covered. Comment re-iterated.	AS previously stated, disaster recovery and contingency are not contained in the text of this criterion.
39.	463/ 6	This criterion will be met by the completion of an A2A whose timetable for completion is separately managed by ICL Pathway and POCL.	Noted.	No action.
40.	469/ 1	ICL Pathway have previously reached agreement with the POCL Acceptance Test Manager that this criterion should be deferred, since it is understood that POCL have no intention of externally procuring applications during the life of NR2.	Whilst POCL may, at this point in time, have no intention of externally procuring applications during NR2, this criterion should either be addressed or formally recorded in the NR2 Release Contents Description which would then need to be approved. Comment re-iterated.	ICL Pathway has previously offered a comprehensive range of documents to assist POCL in external procurements. However when discussing the practical value of a general documentation set without any business or functional context it was agreed that this criterion should be deferred. There is a strong association between this criterion and 463/6 (already deferred) which identifies the need for joint marketing plans.
41.	470/ 2	ICL Pathway have previously reached agreement with the POCL Acceptance Test Manager that this criterion should be deferred, since it is understood that POCL have no intention of externally procuring applications during the life of NR2.	Whilst POCL may, at this point in time, have no intention of externally procuring applications during NR2, this criterion should either be addressed or formally recorded in the NR2 Release Contents Description which would then need to be approved. Comment re-	ICL Pathway has previously offered a comprehensive range of documents to assist POCL in external procurements. However when discussing the practical value of a general documentation set without any business or functional context it was agreed that this criterion

Nothing contained herein shall be deemed or construed as affecting existing contractual obligations or creating new contractual obligations between ICL Pathway, the DSS and / or POCL.

			iterated.	should be deferred. There is a strong association between this criterion and 463/6 (already deferred) which identifies the need for joint marketing plans.
42.	473/1	ICL Pathway is unaware of any Requirement to support remote user access to OPS.	Criterion 473/1 proposes this possibility. Whilst POCL may, at this point in time, have no intention of supporting remote user access during NR2, this criterion should either be addressed or formally recorded in the NR2 Release Contents Description which would then need to be approved. Comment re-iterated.	
43.	538/2	ICL Pathway have been advised that the business context for enabling transactions to operate in local and universal time is to support the method of operation used by utility meters which do not make daylight saving time adjustments. Support for these types of transactions is included in NR2+ with the introduction of APS Smart Tokens.	Disagree. This criterion should either be addressed or formally recorded in the NR2 Release Contents Description which would then need to be approved. Comment re-iterated.	

Nothing contained herein shall be deemed or construed as affecting existing contractual obligations or creating new contractual obligations between ICL Pathway, the DSS and / or POCL.