

**IN THE MATTER OF  
THE POST OFFICE HORIZON IT INQUIRY**

---

**SUBMISSIONS ON BEHALF OF FUJITSU SERVICES LIMITED  
IN RESPONSE TO A RULE 9 REQUEST DATED 29 APRIL 2022**

---

1. These written submissions are made on behalf of Fujitsu Services Limited (“**Fujitsu**”) in response to a request for information provided by the Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry (the “**Inquiry**”) to Fujitsu on 29 April 2022 in accordance with Rule 9 of the Inquiry Rules 2006, in addition to supplemental requests from the Inquiry by emails dated 24 June 2022, 14 July 2022 and 26 July 2022, (the “**Requests**”).
2. The Requests followed disclosure of the following documents by Fujitsu to the Inquiry, all of which were created in the period 1 January 1995 to 31 December 2000 (the “**Relevant Period**”):
  - a) Data from the PinICL archive;
  - b) Data from the Peak database; and
  - c) Data from the “Known Error Log” (“**KEL**”).
3. The Requests seek explanations in relation to (i) the classifications used in the PinICL and KEL databases, what these represented and how they changed over time, (ii) specific references in PinICLs to “migrations” as the cause of errors identified, (iii) the meaning and usage of “CAP” numbers in PinICL records, and (iv) different departments within Fujitsu’s Horizon support teams. These are addressed separately below.

**BACKGROUND: PINICL AND PEAK SYSTEMS**

4. PinICL was the customised incident logging and resolution tracking system adopted for use by ICL Pathway Limited (“**ICL Pathway**”) to support the Horizon IT system during the period 1996 to 2003, prior to the introduction of the Peak system in 2003. ICL Pathway was the entity contracted to deliver the Horizon IT system during this period. Like the PinICL system, Peak is an incident and release management system and work allocation tool.
5. PinICL recorded (amongst other things) incidents:
  - a) identified by ICL Pathway in test systems;
  - b) identified by ICL Pathway during routine system monitoring;

- c) raised by Post Office Counters Limited (as it then was), some of which may have resulted from feedback received from sub-postmasters; and
  - d) resulting from certain calls made to the Horizon System Helpdesk by sub-postmasters, which were deemed necessary for escalation through ICL Pathway's incident management process.
6. PinICL was also used to record information relating to the release of new software to the Horizon IT system.
7. Each item logged on the PinICL system is referred to as a PinICL (collectively, "**PinICLs**").
8. In the Inquiry's email dated 24 June 2022, it was noted that some of the data disclosed by Fujitsu from the Peak database appeared to be duplicative of data contained in the PinICL archive, which had already been disclosed. Fujitsu understands that, while PinICLs that were still open when the Peak system was introduced in 2003 were migrated to the Peak system, it appears that some of these records have also been maintained in the PinICL archive. Fujitsu has identified approximately 13,442 documents disclosed to the Inquiry which appear to have been maintained in both the PinICL archive and the live Peak database. Details of these documents are set out in the "Schedule of PinICL and PEAK Versions" (FSL 01/1).
9. Where records have been maintained in both the PinICL archive and Peak database, Fujitsu suggests that the Inquiry refers to the version extracted from the Peak database. This is because:
- a) Peak is a live database, still currently in use, and will therefore capture any updates to the equivalent PinICL record between the time the record was migrated and the date on which the Peak database was extracted for the purposes of the Inquiry; and
  - b) records extracted from the Peak database also contain their attachments as family member documents, where available. No such attachments are readily available in relation to records held in the PinICL archive.

## **PINICL CLASSIFICATIONS**

***...Please can you provide an explanation of the following...The classifications that are used in the PinICLs, such as the call type codings, category codings, priority definitions, defect cause codings and target releases.***

10. The classifications used historically in the PinICL database are set out in the following documents, copies of which are enclosed with these submissions:
- a) "PinICL Reference Data Guides" (FSL 01/2 and FSL 01/3);
  - b) "PinICL Training Manuals" (FSL 01/4 and FSL 01/5);

- c) “PinICL Incident and Problem Management” process documents (FSL 01/6 to FSL 01/8); and
  - d) an “End to End Support” process document (FSL 01/9).
11. Further detail is also provided in an earlier draft of the PinICL Reference Data Guide entitled “PinICL User Guide” (FSL 01/10).
12. In order to assist the Inquiry’s reading of the documents and to demonstrate how the classifications listed in the Requests changed over time, enclosed with these submissions are the following:
- a) Appendix A to these submissions is a table setting out extracts from relevant sections of a number of the documents referred to above (see Table 1 of Appendix A). This table should be read in conjunction with the contemporaneous documents in full;
  - b) Table 2 of Appendix A is a summary of information drawn from the PinICL records themselves as at 8 November 2002, which Fujitsu has prepared to supplement the information in Table 1 of Appendix A; and
  - c) a “Schedule of PinICL Classifications” (FSL 01/11), further information in relation to which is set out below.

***Please provide a comprehensive record of what the following PinICL codes represented at different points in time...***

13. In addition to the information set out in Table 1 of Appendix A to these submissions, the Requests seek a comprehensive record of the meaning of certain PinICL classifications over time and the dates for which those meanings were valid. Fujitsu’s response for each of the PinICL codes specified in the Requests is set out below.

***...Call Type (AKA Type Coding)...***

14. Fujitsu does not believe that a central history of Call Type definitions exists. This is because (i) Fujitsu understands the table in PinICL which contained the Call Type definition was over-written upon each amendment to the definition, and (ii) the progress text recorded against each PinICL (i.e. the user readable history) does not record the Call Type description, simply the identifying letter.
15. For completeness, and to assist the Inquiry, a table of the single available archive for Call Type definitions is set out in the “Call Type” tab of the Schedule of PinICL Classifications (FSL 01/11).

***...Response Category (AKA Category Coding)...***

16. Similarly, Fujitsu understands that Response Category definitions were overwritten in the relevant table in PinICL when they were amended. However, for this classification, the text

of each definition was re-produced in full in the PinICL progress text. In order to assist the Inquiry, Fujitsu has parsed the progress text and identified instances when Response Category definitions appeared to change.

17. As noted in Section 15 of the PinICL Incident Management Process (FSL 01/8), Response Categories vary according to Call Type. The “Response Category” tab of the Schedule of PinICL Classifications (FSL 01/11) sets out, (i) the numerical value used for each of the Response Categories, (ii) the text definition of those values, (iii) which Call Type each definition was attributable to, and (iv) the first and last known dates these definitions appear to have been used.

***...Call Priority (AKA Priority Definitions)...***

18. As with the Call Type definitions, Fujitsu understands the table containing Call Priority definitions was overwritten upon each amendment and the progress text recorded against each PinICL included only the alphabetical identifier.
19. However, the progress text does record the relevant “Target Date” each time a Call Priority was entered. Fujitsu has therefore parsed the system calculated Target Date from the progress text and, in order to assist the Inquiry in relation to the Requests, set out the raw PinICL data relevant to Call Priorities (FSL 01/12). Fujitsu produced this data by, (i) taking the first Target Date from the progress text of each PinICL, (ii) comparing this to the timestamp that the relevant progress entry was created (Column D), and (iii) extracting the difference in hours (Column H). Column H aims to illustrate the definition of the Call Priorities attributable to each relevant PinICL. Fujitsu understands that PinICL did not include non-working days in Target Date calculations.

***...Defect Cause (AKA Root Cause Analysis).***

20. As with the classifications referred to above, Fujitsu understands that Defect Cause definitions were overwritten in the relevant table in PinICL when the definitions were amended. However, as with the Response Category, the text of each Defect Cause definition was re-produced in full in the PinICL progress text. Fujitsu has therefore parsed the progress text and identified instances when the Defect Cause definitions changed. The “Defect Cause” tab of the Schedule of PinICL Classifications (FSL 01/11) sets out the same information described in respect of the Response Category classification above, namely (i) the numerical value used for each Defect Cause, (ii) the text definition of those values, (iii) which Call Type each definition was attributable to, and (iv) the first and last known dates these definitions appear to have been used.

***Please confirm if it is possible to identify from the PinICL or Peak records which of the sources listed in paragraph 5 of these submissions raised the incident.***

21. Fujitsu notes that the Requests relate to documents created prior to 31 December 2000, which pre-date the introduction of the Peak system in 2003. These submissions therefore concern the PinICL system only.

22. When an incident was logged in the PinICL system, it would be allocated a Call Type. In most cases, it would be possible to identify from the Call Type which team raised the incident and, from that, which of the four sources referred to in paragraph 5 the PinICL relates to. However, it may not be possible to do this for every PinICL if the incident was raised by a team which did not have an allocated Call Type value.

***Please confirm what “Target Release” indicates and what would cause it to change during the course of a PinICL.***

23. When an incident was logged in the PinICL system, it was also allocated a Target Release value. Table 1 of Appendix A to these submissions sets out extracts from relevant documents regarding the Target Release classification, including the following extract from the PinICL Reference Data Guide (FSL 01/2):

*“For Live calls the Target Release field is initially set by a member of the SSC to the release on which the incident occurred. For all other Call types it is set to the system default of “Unknown”... As the project moves forward, old Target Release values become redundant and new values are introduced.”*

24. Fujitsu understands that the Target Release value was updated throughout the life of a PinICL if, for example:

- a) a defect was identified, in which case the Target Release field was updated to refer to the current proposed release that was to include the PinICL solution (see the “PinICL MIS Reporting Requirement”, (FSL 01/13)); or
- b) as stated above, old Target Release values became redundant as new releases were rolled out (see, the PinICL Reference Data Guide, FSL 01/2 and FSL 01/3).

***Please provide release dates for the Target Release codes set out in Table 2B of Appendix A.***

25. Table 2B of Appendix A sets out the relevant description for the different Target Release codes. However, Fujitsu does not hold a central record of historic releases and, accordingly, the actual release dates of each Target Release listed (if the releases were in fact rolled out) are not readily available. It may be possible to ascertain the actual release dates through a manual review of Release PinICLs (as noted in the “Call Type” tab of the Schedule of PinICL Classifications (FSL 01/11), Call Type R was largely attributable to Release PinICLs). Fujitsu notes that undertaking such a review would likely take a significant amount of time, but it would be content to do so, should this assist the Inquiry.
26. For the Inquiry’s information, the “Target Release” tab of the Schedule of PinICL Classifications (FSL 01/11) contains information relating to (i) the number of PinICLs attributable to each Target Release (PinICL Count Column), and (ii) the first and last known dates the Target Releases are referred to (First and Last Date columns).

**PINICL CONTENT**

*A number of PinICLs discuss “migrations” as the cause of errors identified. Please provide information regarding when a migration would be carried out.*

27. Fujitsu respectfully notes that it has not had reference to specific PinICLs of the type described by the Inquiry in this aspect of the Requests and, as far as Fujitsu is aware, the word “migration” did not have any one specific meaning during the Relevant Period. However, Fujitsu understands that the use of “migration” in PinICLs could refer to the following:
- a) branches moving to the Horizon IT system from previous systems during the pilots and national rollout of the Horizon IT system. An example of the data migration that took place when some branches moved to the Horizon IT system is set out in the document entitled “In Office Data Migration – CSR+” (FSL 01/14); or
  - b) the release of new or updated software, for example to add functionality to the Horizon IT system or in response to incidents recorded in the PinICL system, as set out in the “Pathway Release Policy” (FSL 01/15).

*References in the PinICLs to “CAP”, meaning Cash Accounting Period, often have a number associated with them, for example “CAP 25”. Please explain what these numbers represent, whether they are universal and, if so, provide a calendar that translates the numbers to relevant reporting periods.*

28. Fujitsu understands that, during the Relevant Period, Post Office branches operated on a weekly trading period (the “Cash Accounting Period” or “CAP”). The CAP numbers set out in a number of PinICL records represent the relevant weekly trading period within the financial year. As set out in the “Explanation of Local P.O Reconciliation and Administration” (FSL 01/16), these numbers were used universally by all branches, and their usage and calendar was set by Post Office Counters Limited. Fujitsu has enclosed with these submissions contemporaneous calendars of the CAP numbers used for the year 1999 (FSL 01/17 – 23).
29. Fujitsu notes that the “CAP” abbreviation was also used in reference to other terms during the Relevant Period, such as “Corrective Action Plan” or the CAPs system that was being developed by the Benefits Agency before they withdrew from the project.

**BACKGROUND: KEL**

30. The “Known Error Log” was a knowledge management tool used by both ICL Pathway and Fujitsu to explain how to deal with, or work around, issues that arose in the Horizon IT system. Each entry in the Known Error Log was referred to as a “KEL” (collectively, “KELs”). The term “Known Error Log” or “KEL” was replaced in around July 2019 by the term “Knowledge Base” or “KB”.
31. The content of the KEL database has changed over time, depending on the requirements of the support units utilising it. For example, if certain systems or services ceased to be

provided or were otherwise removed from the solution, KELs relating to those systems or services, which were then no longer relevant, may have been deleted to improve the functionality of the database. Fujitsu understands that all recoverable KELs for the relevant period have been provided to the Inquiry and, to the extent any KELs from this period have not been provided, this is because they are no longer recoverable.

## **KEL CLASSIFICATIONS**

***...Please can you provide an explanation of the following...The classifications that are used in KELs such as type codings, status definitions and visibility definitions.***

32. Unlike the PinICL database, which was only in place for a limited period of time, KELs have been in place in various forms for over 20 years. By way of background, until around July 2006, KELs were stored in a “flat-file” structure consisting of unformatted text files. From around July 2006 onwards, these KELs were then imported to the KEL database, which allowed for the KELs to be filtered and searched more easily. Given the passage of time, there is limited instructive documentation available in relation to KELs prior to this migration.
33. Guidance relating to the use of KELs is stored on a Fujitsu internal website for the Software Support Centre (“SSC”). This website has been in place from at least October 2006. Copies of the earliest identified “KEL User Guides” from the SSC website can be found at FSL 01/24 and FSL 01/25. “Notes” and “help” pages from later iterations of the SSC website also provide information relating to certain of the classifications listed. These “notes” and “help” pages are enclosed at FSL 01/26 to FSL 01/66.
34. Pages from the SSC’s current website, providing guidance on how the SSC can create, update and search the current KB database, are enclosed at FSL 01/67 to FSL 01/71.
35. To assist the Inquiry with its review of these pages and to illustrate the development of the classifications listed in the Requests over time, enclosed at Appendix B to these submissions are tables setting out extracts from relevant sections of the “notes” and “help” pages enclosed. As with Appendix A, Appendix B should be read in conjunction with the contemporaneous documents in full. An index setting out the relevant dates for each of the “notes” and “help” pages enclosed is also provided in Appendix C.
36. Given the extensive period that the KEL / KB database has been in place, Fujitsu has not in the time available been able to identify contemporaneous documents relating to all of the classifications listed in the Requests. Should Fujitsu identify any further documents relevant to the Requests, Fujitsu will produce these to the Inquiry by way of supplemental production.

## **ROLE OF SUPPORT TEAMS**

*Please explain the respective role of the various departments within Fujitsu's Horizon support teams.*

37. The table at Appendix D to these submissions refers to contemporaneous documents which contain explanations regarding the support teams identified by the Inquiry in the Requests, including (i) relevant extracts from these documents setting out the respective role of each team, (ii) whether each team constituted the first, second, third or fourth line of support, and (iii) descriptions of how incidents moved between the various teams. Copies of the relevant contemporaneous documents are also enclosed with these submissions.

**13 SEPTEMBER 2022**

**INDEX OF EXHIBITS**

	<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Document Description</b>	<b>Control No.</b>	<b>URN</b>
1.	FSL 01/1	Schedule of PinICL and PEAK Versions	POINQ0125746F	FUJ00119551
2.	FSL 01/2	PinICL Reference Data Guide (CM/MAN/005 - Version 1)	POINQ0104427F	FUJ00098256
3.	FSL 01/3	PinICL Reference Data Guide (CM/MAN/005 - Version 2)	POINQ0104429F	FUJ00098258
4.	FSL 01/4	PinICL Training Manual (CM/MAN/009 - Version 1)	POINQ0104428F	FUJ00098257
5.	FSL 01/5	PinICL Training Manual (CM/MAN/009 - Version 2)	POINQ0104430F	FUJ00098259
6.	FSL 01/6	PinICL Problem Management (PAPRO014 - Version 1)	POINQ0104422F	FUJ00098251
7.	FSL 01/7	PinICL Problem Management (PA/PRO/014 - Version 2)	POINQ0104423F	FUJ00098252
8.	FSL 01/8	PinICL Incident Management Process (PA/PRO/014 – Version 3)	POINQ0104424F	FUJ00098253
9.	FSL 01/9	End to End Support Process, Operational Level Agreement (CS/FSP/006 - Version 2)	POINQ0086068F	FUJ00079897
10.	FSL 01/10	Draft PinICL User Guide (CM/MAN/005 - Version 0.1)	POINQ0104426F	FUJ00098255
11.	FSL 01/11	Schedule of PinICL Classifications	POINQ0125747F	FUJ00119552
12.	FSL 01/12	PinICL data relevant to Call Priorities	POINQ0125748F	FUJ00119551
13.	FSL 01/13	PinICL MIS Reporting Requirement (CM/REQ/003 – Version 1)	POINQ0064668F	FUJ00058497
14.	FSL 01/14	In Office Data Migration – CSR+ (IM/STR/064 – Version 1)	POINQ0124374F	FUJ00118140
15.	FSL 01/15	Pathway Release Policy (PA/STR/003 – Version 5)	POINQ0124362F	FUJ00118128
16.	FSL 01/16	Explanation of Local P.O. Reconciliation and Administration (Version 1)	POINQ0085364F	FUJ00079193

	<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Document Description</b>	<b>Control No.</b>	<b>URN</b>
17.	FSL 01/17	Counter News	POINQ0124365F	FUJ00118131
18.	FSL 01/18	1999 CAP Calendar – Midlands Region	POINQ0124366F	FUJ00118132
19.	FSL 01/19	1999 CAP Calendar – North Thames & East Anglia	POINQ0124367F	FUJ00118133
20.	FSL 01/20	1999 CAP Calendar – North East	POINQ0124368F	FUJ00118134
21.	FSL 01/21	1999 CAP Calendar – Scotland & Northern Ireland	POINQ0124369F	FUJ00118135
22.	FSL 01/22	1999 CAP Calendar – South East	POINQ0124370F	FUJ00118136
23.	FSL 01/23	1999 CAP Calendar – South Wales and South East	POINQ0124371F	FUJ00118137
24.	FSL 01/24	KEL User Guide (KELUserGuide.html_revsn1)	POINQ0104432F	FUJ00098261
25.	FSL 01/25	KEL User Guide (KELUserGuide.html_revsn128)	POINQ0104433F	FUJ00098262
26.	FSL 01/26	Creating New KELs (createnotes.jsp_revision1363)	POINQ0104439F	FUJ00098268
27.	FSL 01/27	Creating New KELs (createnotes.jsp_revision1364)	POINQ0104440F	FUJ00098269
28.	FSL 01/28	Creating New KELs (createnotes.jsp_revision1365)	POINQ0104441F	FUJ00098270
29.	FSL 01/29	Creating New KELs (createnotes.jsp_revision1366)	POINQ0104442F	FUJ00098271
30.	FSL 01/30	Creating New KELs (createnotes.jsp_revision1409)	POINQ0104443F	FUJ00098272
31.	FSL 01/31	Creating New KELs (createnotes.jsp_revision1440)	POINQ0104444F	FUJ00098273
32.	FSL 01/32	Creating New KELs (createnotes.jsp_revision1792)	POINQ0104445F	FUJ00098274
33.	FSL 01/33	Creating New KELs (createnotes.jsp_revision1840)	POINQ0104446F	FUJ00098275
34.	FSL 01/34	Creating New KELs (createnotes.jsp_revision1990)	POINQ0104447F	FUJ00098276
35.	FSL 01/35	Creating New KELs (createnotes.jsp_revision1991)	POINQ0104448F	FUJ00098277

	<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Document Description</b>	<b>Control No.</b>	<b>URN</b>
36.	FSL 01/36	Creating New Knowledge Base articles (createnotes.jsp_revision2279)	POINQ0104449F	FUJ00098278
37.	FSL 01/37	Support Knowledge: Types (HELP117J - Version 1)	POINQ0104450F	FUJ00098279
38.	FSL 01/38	Support Knowledge: Types (HELP117J - Version 2)	POINQ0104451F	FUJ00098280
39.	FSL 01/39	Support Knowledge: Types (HELP117J - Version 3)	POINQ0104452F	FUJ00098281
40.	FSL 01/40	Support Knowledge: Types (HELP117J - Version 4)	POINQ0104453F	FUJ00098282
41.	FSL 01/41	Support Knowledge: Types (HELP117J - Version 5)	POINQ0104454F	FUJ00098283
42.	FSL 01/42	Support Knowledge: Types (HELP117J - Version 6)	POINQ0104455F	FUJ00098284
43.	FSL 01/43	Support Knowledge: Types (HELP117J - Version 7)	POINQ0104456F	FUJ00098285
44.	FSL 01/44	Support Knowledge: Lifecycle (HELP2148J - Version 1)	POINQ0104457F	FUJ00098286
45.	FSL 01/45	Support Knowledge: Lifecycle (HELP2148J - Version 2)	POINQ0104458F	FUJ00098287
46.	FSL 01/46	Support Knowledge: Lifecycle (HELP2148J - Version 3)	POINQ0104459F	FUJ00098288
47.	FSL 01/47	Support Knowledge: Lifecycle (HELP2148J - Version 4)	POINQ0104460F	FUJ00098289
48.	FSL 01/48	Creating New Knowledge Entries (HELP3653J - Version 1)	POINQ0104461F	FUJ00098290
49.	FSL 01/49	Creating New Knowledge Entries (HELP3653J - Version 2)	POINQ0104462F	FUJ00098291
50.	FSL 01/50	KEL Search Notes (HELP1940M - Version 1)	POINQ0104463F	FUJ00098292
51.	FSL 01/51	Creating New Knowledge Entries (HELP3653J - Version 3)	POINQ0104464F	FUJ00098293
52.	FSL 01/52	KEL Search Notes (HELP1940M - Version 2)	POINQ0104465F	FUJ00098294

	<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Document Description</b>	<b>Control No.</b>	<b>URN</b>
53.	FSL 01/53	Knowledge Base Search Notes (HELP1940M - Version 3)	POINQ0104466F	FUJ00098295
54.	FSL 01/54	Creating New Knowledge Entries (HELP3653J - Version 4)	POINQ0104467F	FUJ00098296
55.	FSL 01/55	Knowledge Base Search Notes (HELP1940M - Version 4)	POINQ0104468F	FUJ00098297
56.	FSL 01/56	Knowledge Base Search Notes (HELP1940M - Version 5)	POINQ0104469F	FUJ00098298
57.	FSL 01/57	Creating New Knowledge Entries (HELP3653J - Version 5)	POINQ0104470F	FUJ00098299
58.	FSL 01/58	Creating New Knowledge Entries (HELP3653J - Version 6)	POINQ0104471F	FUJ00098300
59.	FSL 01/59	Knowledge Base Search Notes (HELP1940M - Version 6)	POINQ0104472F	FUJ00098301
60.	FSL 01/60	Knowledge Base Entries: Use of Product (HELP4739N - Version 1)	POINQ0104473F	FUJ00098302
61.	FSL 01/61	Knowledge Base Entries: Use of Product (HELP4739N - Version 2)	POINQ0104474F	FUJ00098303
62.	FSL 01/62	Knowledge Base Entries: Use of Product (HELP4739N - Version 3)	POINQ0104475F	FUJ00098304
63.	FSL 01/63	Support Knowledge: Use of Product (HELP4739N - Version 4)	POINQ0104476F	FUJ00098305
64.	FSL 01/64	Support Knowledge: Use of Product (HELP4739N - Version 5)	POINQ0104477F	FUJ00098306
65.	FSL 01/65	Support Knowledge: Use of Product (HELP4739N - Version 6)	POINQ0104425F	FUJ00098254
66.	FSL 01/66	Support Knowledge: Use of Product (HELP4739N - Version 7)	POINQ0104431F	FUJ00098260
67.	FSL 01/67	Support Knowledge: Types (HELP117J)	POINQ0104434F	FUJ00098263

	<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Document Description</b>	<b>Control No.</b>	<b>URN</b>
68.	FSL 01/68	Knowledge Base Search Notes (HELP1940M)	POINQ0104435F	FUJ00098264
69.	FSL 01/69	Support Knowledge: Lifecycle (HELP2148J)	POINQ0104436F	FUJ00098265
70.	FSL 01/70	Creating New Knowledge Entries (HELP3653J)	POINQ0104437F	FUJ00098266
71.	FSL 01/71	Support Knowledge: Use of Product (HELP4739N)	POINQ0104438F	FUJ00098267
72.	FSL 01/72	Horizon Systems Helpdesk Processes and Procedures (CS/PRO/0048 – Version 1)	POINQ0086581F	FUJ00080410
73.	FSL 01/73	Horizon System Helpdesk Call Enquiry Matrix (CS/FSP/0002 – Version 1)	POINQ0086657F	FUJ00080486
74.	FSL 01/74	CS Support Services Operations Manual (CS/MAN/002 – Version 3)	POINQ0085987F	FUJ00079816
75.	FSL 01/75	Incident Management Process Definition (CS/PRD/074 – Version 1)	POINQ0086036F	FUJ00079865
76.	FSL 01/76	OTI Test Plan (ED/DOC/005 – Version 1)	POINQ0124361F	FUJ00118127
77.	FSL 01/77	EDSC Call Management (ED/PRD/0001 – Version 1)	POINQ0124360F	FUJ00118126
78.	FSL 01/78	PinICL Administration Functions (CM/PRD/016 – Version 2)	POINQ0124372F	FUJ00118138
79.	FSL 01/79	CS Infrastructure Services Operations Manual (CS/MAN/005 – Version 3)	POINQ0064674F	FUJ00058503
80.	FSL 01/80	Pathway Customer Service Audit (IA/REP/025 – Version 1)	POINQ0086854F	FUJ00080683

	<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Document Description</b>	<b>Control No.</b>	<b>URN</b>
81.	FSL 01/81	ICL Pathway Development Directorate Incident/Defect Management (DE/PRO/015 – Version 1)	POINQ0085994F	FUJ00079823

## APPENDIX A

## CLASSIFICATION DEFINITIONS FOR THE PINICL DATABASE

## 1. CLASSIFICATIONS AS DEFINED IN CONTEMPORANEOUS DOCUMENTS ENCLOSED

Classification	PinICL Incident Management Process, 30 January 1998 [FSL 01/7] <sup>1</sup>	Draft PinICL User Guide, 15 February 2000 [FSL 01/9]	PinICL Reference Data Guide, 17 November 2000 [FSL 01/1]	PinICL Training Manual, 5 February 2001 [FSL 01/3] <sup>2</sup>	PinICL Reference Data Guide, 18 February 2002 [FSL 01/2]
<b>Type Codings</b> [Section 7 of each document listed, unless otherwise stated]					
<b>A</b>	“Administrative use” <sup>3</sup> [Sections 13 and 15]	“Administrative use” <sup>4</sup>	-	-	-
<b>B</b>	-	“ <b>BIT (Business Integration Testing)</b> ”	-	-	“BTC <sup>5</sup> Bus. Int.” <sup>6</sup>
<b>C</b>	-	“ <b>Cloned call</b> ”	-	-	“Cloned calls – not used when logging new calls”
<b>D</b>	-	“ <b>DIT (Direct Interface Testing)</b> ”	-	-	-
<b>G</b>	-	“MIG (Migration Testing)”	-	-	“BTC Rel Mig”
<b>L</b>	“(Live) should only be used by SSC when the call is raised on operational software on behalf of a user” [Section 3]  “Live use error” [Section 13]	“ <b>Live use error</b> ”	“The Call Type is used to determine the phase of the product lifecycle in which the incident was found. E.g. Call Type ‘L’ is for Live Calls, and may only be used by SSC.”	-	“EDSC <sup>7</sup> (SSC)”
<b>M</b>	“Model Office raised by SIS” <sup>8</sup> [Section 13]	“MOT (Model Office Test)”	-	-	-
<b>N</b>	“Model Office raised by PDA” <sup>9</sup> [Section 13]	“MOR (Model Office Rehearsal)”	-	-	-
<b>P</b>	“Product error (error in product under test or in test data)” [Section 3, see also Section 13]	“ <b>Product error</b> ”	-	-	“Any other team not covered by this list”
<b>R</b>	“Release Notice Forum” [Section 13]	“Release Notice Forum”	-	“Release Management Forum” [Section 5.5.1]	“RelMngmntForum”
<b>S</b>	-	“ <b>ST (System Testing)</b> ”	-	-	“Any System Test team”
<b>T</b>	“Technical query (don’t know if error/usability etc.)” [Section 3, see also Section 13]	“Technical query”	-	-	-
<b>V</b>	-	“PERF (Performance Testing)”	-	-	“BTC IntgrtyVol”
<b>Y</b>	-	“Y2K (Year 2000 Testing)”	-	-	“SecurityPolicy”
<b>Z</b>	-	“Problem Management”	-	“Problem Management calls” [Section 5.5.1]	“Problem Mgt”
<b>Category Codings (referred to as “Response Category” in the guidance)</b> [Section 8 of each document listed, unless otherwise stated]					
<b>Open</b>	“The Team Leader (or nominee) validates the call (see section 3.1), checking details and priority level. • If the call is valid, click on Respond and select the TL Confirmed response category. (This changes the call status from Open to Pending.)”	As described in the PinICL Reference Data Guide dated 17 November 2000 [FSL 01/1]	“[N]ew Call”	-	As described in the PinICL Reference Data Guide dated 17 November 2000 [FSL 01/1]

<sup>1</sup> For earlier classifications, see also the equivalent sections in versions one and two of the PinICL Problem Management Process documents dating from 1997 [FSL 01/5 and FSL 01/6, respectively].<sup>2</sup> See also the equivalent sections in the PinICL Training Manual dated 19 February 2002 [FSL 01/4]<sup>3</sup> The type codings listed here in respect of the PinICL Incident Management Process dated 30 January 1998 [FSL 01/7] are said to be “the list of possible call types”, albeit “most users will use one of call types P and T” [Section 13]<sup>4</sup> The type codings listed here in respect of the Draft PinICL User Guide dated 15 February 2000 [FSL 01/9] reflect type codings described as being “used in today’s process” (see those definitions highlighted in bold text), in addition to equivalent type codings for those listed in the other documents set out in this Appendix A. This list is not exhaustive. For a more comprehensive list see Section 7<sup>5</sup> BTC: “Business & Technical Conformance; now known as PTU (Pathway Testing Unit)” [Section 0.4]<sup>6</sup> The type codings listed here in respect of the PinICL Reference Data Guide dated 18 February 2002 [FSL 01/2] are said to be “the main types that we use creating a new call” [Section 7]. This list is not exhaustive<sup>7</sup> EDSC: Not defined but understood to refer to the “European Development and Support Center”, “PinICL name for team now known as SSC.” [Section 0.4]<sup>8</sup> SIS: Not defined but understood to refer to the “Strategic Interface Service”<sup>9</sup> PDA: Not defined but understood to refer to the “Programme Delivery Authority”

Classification	PinICL Incident Management Process, 30 January 1998 [FSL 01/7] <sup>1</sup> [Section 3]	Draft PinICL User Guide, 15 February 2000 [FSL 01/9]	PinICL Reference Data Guide, 17 November 2000 [FSL 01/1]	PinICL Training Manual, 5 February 2001 [FSL 01/3] <sup>2</sup>	PinICL Reference Data Guide, 18 February 2002 [FSL 01/2]
<b>Pending</b>	"When you supply a Pending response, the call remains with you unless you Route the call elsewhere." [Section 15]	"[W]ork in progress" "[I]t stays with the user unless routed explicitly"	"[W]ork in progress" "...a Pending Response leaves the Call with the currently Assigned Team/Assignee"	"A Pending call remains with the current team unless you use the Route button" [Section 6]	As described in the PinICL Reference Data Guide dated 17 November 2000 [FSL 01/1]
<b>Final</b>	"If a call is transferred with Final status, the appropriate process for testing or accepting the response and closing the call needs to be followed." [Section 5]  "When you supply a Final response, the call automatically transfers to the originator (call logger)." [Section 15]	"[F]ix released" "[T]he call is routed back automatically to the originator"	"...a Final Response is routed back to the originator by the system"	"A Final call routes back automatically to the call logger – you have completed your work on the call and you expect the call logger to close the call." [Section 6]  "When a call is given a Response Category with status Final, the call routes back automatically to the call logger (or more strictly to the Contact – this may have been changed to reflect organisational changes)" [Section 7]	As described in the PinICL Reference Data Guide dated 17 November 2000 [FSL 01/1]
<b>Closed</b>	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Response Categories</b>	See Section 15 for the response categories available for different call types within the above statuses	See Section 8 for a "definitive list of all response categories" within the above statuses, with those most frequently used highlighted in bold and blue text	-	-	-
<b>Priority Definitions<sup>10</sup></b> [Section 6 of each document listed, unless otherwise stated]					
<b>A</b>	"Each call type has a set of priorities each with a target response time; this is the number of working days within which a response is expected... A Business stopped 1 day" [Section 3.6]  "The progress of 'A' Priority and Fast Track Calls must be monitored hourly by the Team Leader and progress narrative added within the required guidelines." [Section 7]	As described in the PinICL Reference Data Guide dated 17 November 2000 [FSL 01/1]	"Description: Programme Stopped Days to Fix: 1"  "Critical error which is stopping any progress on that particular rig, it cannot be worked around and will cause the test windows not to be met. It is only possible for there to be one priority 'A' Call on a rig at any time."	"Each call type has a set of priorities each with a target response time; this is the number of working days within which a response is expected... A Programme stopped 1 day"  Refers to the PinICL Reference Data Guide for more detail [Section 5.4]	As described in the PinICL Reference Data Guide dated 17 November 2000 [FSL 01/1]
<b>B</b>	"Each call type has a set of priorities each with a target response time; this is the number of working days within which a response is expected... B Progress stopped 3 days" [Section 3.6]	As described in the PinICL Reference Data Guide dated 17 November 2000 [FSL 01/1]	"Description: Progress Stopped Days to Fix: 3"  "Highly significant error that is stopping any further progress either on the rig or with the script being executed on the rig, e.g. the overnight schedule cannot run due to data errors."	As described in the PinICL Incident Management Process dated 30 January 1998 [FSL 01/7]  Refers to the PinICL Reference Data Guide for more detail [Section 5.4]	As described in the PinICL Reference Data Guide dated 17 November 2000 [FSL 01/1]
<b>C</b>	"Each call type has a set of priorities each with a target response time; this is the number of working days within which a response is expected... C Progress restricted 5 days" [Section 3.6]	"Description: Progress Restricted Days to Fix: 5"  "Error affecting how one aspect is working, can be either a data problem where invalid data is being written to the database, or a code error where the user is unable to use a particular client."	"Description: Progress Restricted Days to Fix: 5"  "An error which affects how one aspect is working. This can be either a data problem where invalid data is being written to the database or a code error where the user is unable to use a particular client."	As described in the PinICL Incident Management Process dated 30 January 1998 [FSL 01/7]  Refers to the PinICL Reference Data Guide for more detail [Section 5.4]	As described in the PinICL Reference Data Guide dated 17 November 2000 [FSL 01/1]
<b>D</b>	"Each call type has a set of priorities each with a target response time; this is the number of	As described in the PinICL Reference Data Guide dated 17 November 2000 [FSL 01/1]	"Description: Non-Urgent Days to Fix: 10"	As described in the PinICL Incident Management Process dated 30 January 1998 [FSL 01/7]	As described in the PinICL Reference Data Guide dated 17 November 2000 [FSL 01/1]

<sup>10</sup> See also Appendix B of the End to End Support Process, Operational Level Agreement dated 17 June 2003 [FSL 01/8] for information on the definition of call priorities.

Classification	PinICL Incident Management Process, 30 January 1998 [FSL 01/7] <sup>1</sup>	Draft PinICL User Guide, 15 February 2000 [FSL 01/9]	PinICL Reference Data Guide, 17 November 2000 [FSL 01/1]	PinICL Training Manual, 5 February 2001 [FSL 01/3] <sup>2</sup>	PinICL Reference Data Guide, 18 February 2002 [FSL 01/2]
	<i>working days within which a response is expected... D Non-Urgent 10 days</i> [Section 3.6]		<i>"Insignificant and usually cosmetic error, either a documentation error or spelling error on the system, which always has a work around."</i>	Refers to the PinICL Reference Data Guide for more detail [Section 5.4]	
<b>Defect Cause Codings (referred to as "Root Cause Analysis" in the guidance)</b> [Sections as stated]					
<b>See Table 2A Below</b>	-	<i>"A root cause value is mandatory for all new calls. The defect cause may change during the life cycle of the call as investigation matures and a better view of the problem is identified."</i> [Section 11]	<i>"The system will enforce use of this field in two circumstances. When the Call logger first routes the Call to another person or team, the system will insist on being supplied with a value. At this point, the most frequently used value will be "99 General – Unknown". When you close a Call, the system will not accept "99 General – Unknown" as a valid value."</i> [Section 11]	As described in the PinICL Reference Data Guide dated 17 November 2000 [FSL 01/1] [Section 5.5.2]	<i>"The Route Cause is specified on the same popup as Call Effort. When the Call logger first routes the Call to another person or team, the system will insist on being supplied with a value. At this point, the most frequently used value will be "99 General – Unknown". As the call is analysed, the value should be refined; often the most appropriate person to do this is the one who finds the reason for the Call. When the Call is closed, the system will not accept "99 General – Unknown" as a valid value."</i> [Section 12]
<b>Target Releases</b> [Section 3 of each document listed]					
<b>See Table 2B Below</b>	<i>"Select Target Release from the pull down menu - likely to be 'Release 2.0'"</i>	<i>"Target Release field should be used to identify the register allocated; in some cases, this is subdivided to indicate the release. Values are: CSR-CI2_2R, CSR-CI3, CSR-CI3_2, CSR-CI3_2R, CSR-CI3R (Increments) CSR-CI4 (CSR+) 3.0 (Beyond CSR) RODB 2.5, RODB 2.5p, RODB 2.6 (Roll Out Database) NFR (No Fix Required) UNKNOWN These releases comprise of the full Incident Management System"</i>	<i>"For Live Calls, the Target Release field is initially set by a member of the SSC to the release on which the incident occurred. For all other Call types it is set to the system default of "Unknown". The field may only be changed by people with Local Administrative capability (or greater). It is normally set to a value agreed between the members of the QFP<sup>11</sup>"</i>	-	<i>"For Live Calls, the Target Release field is provisionally set by a member of the SSC to the release on which the incident occurred. For all other Call types it is set to the system default of "Unknown". The field may only be changed by people with Local Administrative capability (or greater). It is normally set to a value agreed between the members of the QFP<sup>12</sup> or RMF<sup>13</sup> as appropriate"</i>

<sup>11</sup> QFP: "Quality Filtering Process (a group containing representation from the Delivery Streams, B&TC and Customer Services)" [Section 0.4]  
BT&C: "Business & Technical Conformance" [Section 0.4]

<sup>12</sup> QFP: "Quality Filtering Process (a group containing representation from the Delivery Units, PTU and Customer Services)" [Section 0.4]  
PTU: "Pathway Testing Unit" [Section 0.4]

<sup>13</sup> RMF: "Release Management Forum" [Section 0.4]

**2. CLASSIFICATIONS AS DEFINED IN PINICL RECORDS AS AT  
8 NOVEMBER 2002****A. Defect Cause Codings**

<b>Classification</b>	<b>Description</b>
1	Architecture - T.E.I
6	Design - Platform Design
7	Design - High Level Design
8	Design - System Outline
13	Development - Build Scripts
14	Development - Code
15	Development - Low Level Design
16	Development - Reference Data
21	Requirements
26	Integration - Build
31	Test - Test interpretation
32	Test - Script
33	Test - Data
38	General - Hardware Fault
39	General - User Knowledge
40	General - User
41	General - in Procedure
42	Gen - Outside Pathway Control
99	General - Unknown

**B. Target Releases**

Classification	Description
-1	Unknown
5	Future Unspecified
9	PinICL 4.20
10	R-Data
11	BI3_TRD
12	BI3S30_TRD
15	AP-Client
50	PIT_Build_BI2
51	PIT_Build_BI_2R
52	PIT_Build_BI_2S20
53	PIT_Build_BI_2S20R
54	PIT_Build_BI_3
55	PIT_Build_BI_3R
56	PIT_Build_BI_3S30
57	PIT_Build_BI_3S30R
58	PIT_Build_BI_3S40
59	PIT_Build_BI_3S40R
60	PIT_Build_BI_3S50
61	PIT_Build_BI_3S50R
70	OCMS 1.0
72	OCMS_Full
73	OCMS_Interim
74	OCMS_2
75	OCMS 0.1
76	M1Clone
77	MRB
78	MRA
80	RODB 2.6 Plus
84	RODB 2.6
86	RODB 2.5p
88	RODB 2.5
90	IGL
101	Release 0.7
108	M1Client
110	M1
120	NFR - No Fix Req'd
123	CSR-CI4L1
125	CSR-CI4U1
127	CSR-CI4P3
128	CSR-CI4P2
129	CSR-CI4P1
130	DTL - unknown
131	CSR-CI4RB
132	CSR-CI4RA
133	CSR-CI4R
134	CSR-CI3_2R

Classification	Description
135	CSR-CI3R
137	CSR-CI2_2R
139	CSR-CI2R
140	DDR - > 2
141	PDR - Unknown
142	3.0
143	PDR - > 2
146	CSR-CI4
148	PDR - 2.1
150	PDR - NR2
151	CSR
152	PDR - NR2/LT2
154	PDR - NR2/LT1
156	PDR - NR2/MOT
159	PDR - R1c/LT1
160	PDR - R1c
167	CSR-CI3_4
169	CSR-CI3_2
170	IR - unknown
172	IR - 3.0
173	IR - > 2
176	IR - CSR+
177	CSR-CI3
178	IR - 2.1
179	CSR-CI2
180	IR - NR2
181	IR - CSR
182	IR - NR2/LT2
184	IR - NR2/LT1
186	IR - NR2/MOT
189	IR - R1c/LT1
190	IR - R1c
201	Release 0.8
210	CI4M1R
220	CI4S10B
230	CI4S10A
240	CI4S10R
241	CI4S10R-Provisional
242	CI4S10R-Authorised
245	CI4S10
259	CI4S06R
260	CI4S06
266	CI4S04R
267	CI4S04
269	CI4S03R
270	CI4S03

Classification	Description
275	BI_1
276	BI_1R-Provisional
277	BI_1R-Authorised
280	BI_1S12
281	BI_1S11R-Provisional
282	BI_1S11R-Authorised
283	BI_1S11
285	BI_2
286	BI_2R-Provisional
287	BI_2R-Authorised
288	BI_2S20
289	BI_2S20R-Provisional
290	CSR-CI2_2
291	BI_2S20R-Authorised
295	BI_3
296	BI_3R-Provisional
297	BI_3R-Authorised
301	Release 0.9
305	BI_3S30
306	BI_3S30R-Provisional

Classification	Description
307	BI_3S30R-Authorised
311	BI_3S40
312	BI_3S40R-Provisional
313	BI_3S40R-Authorised
317	BI_3S50
318	BI_3S50R-Provisional
319	BI_3S50R-Authorised
401	Release 1.0
410	Release 1a
420	Release 1b
424	RODB
425	DPAG bid
430	Release 1c
440	Release 1d
450	Release 1e
501	Release 2R
510	Release 2.0
520	Release 2+
601	Release 3.0

## APPENDIX B

## KEL / KB CLASSIFICATIONS

## 1. TYPE CODINGS (KEL)

Classification	Creating New KELs (createnotes.jsp_revision1363) 16 October 2008 [FSL 01/12]	Creating New KELs (createnotes.jsp_revision1840) 22 July 2015 [FSL 01/19]	Creating New KELs (createnotes.jsp_revision1990) 27 November 2015 [FSL 01/20]
<b>Information</b>	<i>“This KEL is informative only and does not describe a known fault.”<sup>1</sup></i>	As described in the Creating New KELs page dated 16 October 2008 [FSL 01/12]	As described in the Creating New KELs page dated 16 October 2008 [FSL 01/12]
<b>Fault Fixed</b>	<i>“The fault described on this KEL is believed to be fixed in the live system.”<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>“The symptoms described on this KEL are believed to be resolved in the live system.”</i>	<i>“The symptoms described on this KEL are believed to be resolved.”<sup>3</sup></i>
<b>Unresolved</b>	<i>“The fault described on this KEL is not resolved yet.”<sup>4</sup></i>	<i>“The symptoms described on this KEL are not resolved yet.”<sup>5</sup></i>	As described in the Creating New KELs page dated 22 July 2015 [FSL 01/19]

<sup>1</sup> Further versions of this document contain a similar definition, see also: createnotes.jsp\_revision1364 [FSL 01/13]; createnotes.jsp\_revision1365 [FSL 01/14]; createnotes.jsp\_revision1366 [FSL 01/15]; createnotes.jsp\_revision1409 [FSL 01/16]; createnotes.jsp\_revision1440 [FSL 01/17]; createnotes.jsp\_revision1792 [FSL 01/18]; and createnotes.jsp\_revision1991 [FSL 01/21]

<sup>2</sup> Further versions of this document contain a similar definition, see also: createnotes.jsp\_revision1364 [FSL 01/13]; createnotes.jsp\_revision1365 [FSL 01/14]; createnotes.jsp\_revision1366 [FSL 01/15]; createnotes.jsp\_revision1409 [FSL 01/16]; createnotes.jsp\_revision1440 [FSL 01/17]; and createnotes.jsp\_revision1792 [FSL 01/18]

<sup>3</sup> Further versions of this document contain a similar definition, see also: createnotes.jsp\_revision1991 [FSL 01/21]

<sup>4</sup> Further versions of this document contain a similar definition, see also: as (2) above

<sup>5</sup> A further version of this document contains a similar definition, see also: createnotes.jsp\_revision1991 [FSL 01/21]

## 2. TYPE CODINGS (KB)

Classification	Support Knowledge: Types (HELP117J - Version 1) 15 July 2019 [FSL 01/23]	Support Knowledge: Types (HELP117J - Version 4) 16 July 2019 [FSL 01/26]	Creating new Knowledge Base articles (createnotes.jsp_revision2279) 23 July 2019 [FSL 01/22]
<b>Fault (KBF)</b>	<p><i>“A knowledge base entry which represents a fault in the system that requires a root cause fix and has the following qualities.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• System is not conforming to requirement.</i></li> <li><i>• FJ Incident is with (or will be with) the development group for root cause fix.</i></li> <li><i>• 3rd party issues also recorded with fix time expectation.</i></li> <li><i>• The KBF solution field may describe a work round until fix has been released</i></li> <li><i>• The KBF is updated with fix information (including effective date) when fix is deployed. Knowledge entry is then deprecated.”</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>“A knowledge base entry which represents a fault in the system that requires a root cause fix and has the following qualities.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• System is not conforming to requirement.</i></li> <li><i>• FJ Incident is with (or will be with) the a development group for root cause fix.</i></li> <li><i>• 3rd party issues may also be recorded on a KBF (with fix time expectation).</i></li> </ul> <p><i>You can expect a KBF entry to be subject to service review on a regular basis until the fix is deployed to live. Once the fix is deployed, the KBF is updated with fix information (including effective date) and then deprecated.</i></p> <p><i>It is important that the Peak field contains the reference to the Fault Peak being used for the development root cause fix.</i></p> <p><i>The KBF may also describe a work round required until the fix has been released.</i></p> <p><i>There is expected to be an active KBF entry for every unresolved fault</i></p>	<p><i>“The symptoms describe a known fault, this should reference the ticket that the correction is being persued on. Once the incident has been resolved this KBF will be deactivated”</i></p>

Classification	Support Knowledge: Types (HELP117J - Version 1) 15 July 2019 [FSL 01/23]	Support Knowledge: Types (HELP117J - Version 4) 16 July 2019 [FSL 01/26]	Creating new Knowledge Base articles (createnotes.jsp_revision2279) 23 July 2019 [FSL 01/22]
		<i>which impacts the end user of the service.”<sup>6</sup></i>	
<b>Action (KBA)</b>	<p><i>“A actionable knowledge base entry which documents a work round.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Contains troubleshooting information: see these symptoms take this action.</i></li> <li><i>The solution on this entry is actionable (e.g.by a support team, help desk or end user).</i></li> <li><i>Process definition is not an action in this context, so SMC entries are mainly KBI not KBA”</i></li> </ul>	<p><i>“A actionable knowledge base entry which documents a series of technical steps required to generate an outcome.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Symptoms: Contains a definition of the conditions needed for the action to be relevant i.e. see these symptoms take this action.</i></li> <li><i>Solution: The solution on this entry is actionable (e.g. by a support team, help desk or end user).</i></li> </ul> <p><i>The existence of a KBA means that there is no expectation that the symptoms will even have a root cause fix.”<sup>7</sup></i></p>	<i>“The symptoms and the appropriate action/workaround to implement”</i>
<b>Information (KBI)</b>	<p><i>“A knowledge base entry which represents information only. General A&amp;G</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Expect most SMC raised entries to be of this type</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Symptom / Problem / Solution format is not well suited to this kind of entry but we'll continue to maintain this</i></p>	<p><i>“A knowledge base entry which represents information only. General advise and guidance.</i></p> <p><i>Essentially, everything else. Symptom / Problem / Solution format is not well suited to this kind of entry but we'll continue to maintain KBI entries using these fields for</i></p>	<i>“This KB is informative only and will not require any action to take place.”</i>

<sup>6</sup> Further versions of this document contain a similar definition, see also: HELP117J - Version 2 [FSL 01/24]; HELP117J - Version 3 [FSL 01/25]; HELP117J - Version 5 [FSL 01/27]; HELP117J - Version 6 [FSL 01/28]; and HELP117J - Version 7 [FSL 01/29]

<sup>7</sup> Further versions of this document contain a similar definition, see also: HELP117J - Version 2 [FSL 01/24]; HELP117J - Version 3 [FSL 01/25]; HELP117J - Version 5 [FSL 01/27]; HELP117J - Version 6 [FSL 01/28]; and HELP117J - Version 7 [FSL 01/29]

Classification	Support Knowledge: Types (HELP117J - Version 1) 15 July 2019 [FSL 01/23]	Support Knowledge: Types (HELP117J - Version 4) 16 July 2019 [FSL 01/26]	Creating new Knowledge Base articles (createnotes.jsp_revision2279) 23 July 2019 [FSL 01/22]
	<i>way for compatibility. Expect this to change later as we move to Confluence.”</i>	<i>compatibility. Expect this to change later as we move to Confluence.</i>  <i>Expect most SMC raised (monitoring) entries to start as KBI. I don't consider the simple "if you see this event, ignore it" to be suitable as a KBA. If it is found that a monitored event leads to the generation of an incident and some action is needed by a later line of support, the entry can be turned into a KBA at that time.”<sup>8</sup></i>	

---

<sup>8</sup> Further versions of this document contain a similar definition, see also: HELP117J - Version 2 [FSL 01/24]; HELP117J - Version 3 [FSL 01/25]; HELP117J - Version 5 [FSL 01/27]; HELP117J - Version 6 [FSL 01/28]; and HELP117J - Version 7 [FSL 01/29]

### 3. STATUS DEFINITIONS

Classification <sup>9</sup>	KEL User Guide (KELUserGuide.html_revsion1) dated 11 October 2006 [FSL 01/10]	Support Knowledge: Lifecycle (HELP2148J - Version 1) 15 July 2019 [FSL 01/30]	Support Knowledge: Lifecycle (HELP2148J - Version 2) 16 July 2019 [FSL 01/31]	Support Knowledge: Lifecycle (HELP2148J - Version 3) 20 July 2020 [FSL 01/32]
<b>Unauthorised</b>	<i>“Status ( Authorised or Unauthorised)”<sup>10</sup></i>	-	-	-
<b>Authorised or Active</b>	<i>“Status ( Authorised or Unauthorised)”<sup>11</sup></i>	<i>“Entry is current and in use”<sup>12</sup></i>	As described in the Support Knowledge: Lifecycle page dated 15 July 2019	As described in the Support Knowledge: Lifecycle page dated 15 July 2019
<b>Deprecated</b>	-	<i>“Information is no longer current. Becomes a candidate for deletion later. e.g.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Fault has been fixed in version x</i></li> <li><i>Reference data induced fault. When fixed becomes a deprecated entry (because no longer current)</i></li> </ul> <i>When deprecated, the person updating is asked for a brief reason which is logged into the KBx history”<sup>13</sup></i>	-	-

<sup>9</sup> Although not referenced in the documents enclosed, it is understood that in circumstances where a new version of a KEL or KB is rejected, the classification “Rejected” may be used

<sup>10</sup> A further version of this document contains a similar definition, see also: KELUserGuide.html\_revsion128 [FSL 01/11]

<sup>11</sup> A further version of this document contains a similar definition, see also: KELUserGuide.html\_revsion128 [FSL 01/11]

<sup>12</sup> A further version of this document contains a similar definition, see also: HELP2148J - Version 3 [FSL 01/32]; and HELP2148J - Version 4 [FSL 01/33]

<sup>13</sup> Deprecated is understood to be an automated internal status used when a version of a KEL is superseded and becomes no longer searchable by the Fujitsu support, test and development teams. In this version of the HELP page, the term was attributed inadvertently to a description of the “Deactivated” status. This was corrected in HELP2148J - Version 2 [FSL 01/31]

Classification <sup>14</sup>	KEL User Guide (KELUserGuide.html_revsi on1) dated 11 October 2006 [FSL 01/10]	Support Knowledge: Lifecycle (HELP2148J - Version 1) 15 July 2019 [FSL 01/30]	Support Knowledge: Lifecycle (HELP2148J - Version 2) 16 July 2019 [FSL 01/31]	Support Knowledge: Lifecycle (HELP2148J - Version 3) 20 July 2020 [FSL 01/32]
<b>Deactivated</b>	-	-	<p><i>“Information is no longer current. Becomes a candidate for deletion later. e.g.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Fault has been fixed in version x</i></li> <li><i>• Reference data induced fault. When fixed becomes a deactivated entry (because no longer current)</i></li> </ul> <p><i>When deactivating, the person updating is asked for a brief reason which is logged into the KBx history.”</i></p>	<p><i>“Information is no longer current. Becomes a candidate for deletion later. e.g.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Fault has been fixed in version x</i></li> <li><i>• Reference data induced fault. When fixed becomes a deactivated entry (because no longer current)</i></li> </ul> <p><i>When deactivating, the person updating is asked for a brief reason which is logged into the KBx history.</i></p> <p><i>If the KB is SPM affecting it cannot be deactivated without authorisation from the service management team”<sup>15</sup></i></p>
<b>Deleted</b>	-	<p><i>“Information is no longer required. e.g. Facility/Server has been removed from service</i></p> <p><i>When deleted, the person updating is asked for a brief</i></p>	As described in the Support Knowledge: Lifecycle page dated 15 July 2019	As described in the Support Knowledge: Lifecycle page dated 15 July 2019

<sup>14</sup> Although not referenced in the documents enclosed, it is understood that, where a new version of a KEL or KB is rejected, the classification “Rejected” could be used

<sup>15</sup> A further version of this document contains a similar definition, see also: HELP2148J - Version 4 [FSL 01/33]

		<i>reason which is logged into the KBx history”<sup>16</sup></i>		
--	--	--	--	--

---

<sup>16</sup> A further version of this document contains a similar definition, see also: HELP2148J - Version 3 [FSL 01/32]; and HELP2148J - Version 4 [FSL 01/33]

#### 4. VISIBILITY

Classification	KEL User Guide (KELUserGuide.html_revsn1) dated 11 October 2006 [FSL 01/10]	Creating New Knowledge Entries (HELP3653J - Version 2) 16 July 2019 [FSL 01/35]
<b>H (High) – No longer in use<sup>17</sup></b>	<i>“Visibility ( High, Medium and Low )”<sup>18</sup></i>	-
<b>M (Medium) – No longer in use</b>	<i>“Visibility ( High, Medium and Low )”<sup>19</sup></i>	-
<b>L (Low) – No longer in use</b>	<i>“Visibility ( High, Medium and Low )”<sup>20</sup></i>	-
<b>Eventing Only</b>	-	<i>“Used by the SMC to allow their searches to be targeted at monitoring knowledge only.”<sup>21</sup></i>
<b>General Usage</b>	-	<i>“The default for any knowledge entry raised by a resolver group such as a 3LS team.”<sup>22</sup></i>

<sup>17</sup> See the Creating New KELs page (createnotes.jsp\_revision1363) dated 16 October 2008 [FSL 01/12], which states *“Once used to indicate how visible (or critical) a problem was perceived to be. At the moment – unused”*

<sup>18</sup> A further version of this document contains a similar definition, see also: KELUserGuide.html\_revsn128 [FSL 01/11]

<sup>19</sup> A further version of this document contains a similar definition, see also: KELUserGuide.html\_revsn128 [FSL 01/11]

<sup>20</sup> A further version of this document contains a similar definition, see also: KELUserGuide.html\_revsn128 [FSL 01/11]

<sup>21</sup> Further versions of this document contain a similar definition, see also: HELP3653J - Version 3 [FSL 01/37]; HELP3653J - Version 4 [FSL 01/40]; HELP3653J - Version 5 [FSL 01/43]; and HELP3653J - Version 6 [FSL 01/44]

<sup>22</sup> Further versions of this document contain a similar definition, see also: HELP3653J - Version 3 [FSL 01/37]; HELP3653J - Version 4 [FSL 01/40]; HELP3653J - Version 5 [FSL 01/43]; and HELP3653J - Version 6 [FSL 01/44]

**APPENDIX C****INDEX OF “NOTES” AND “HELP” PAGES ENCLOSED**

<b>Exhibit No.</b>	<b>Filename</b>	<b>Approximate Date Created</b>
FSL 01/10	KELUserGuide.html_revsn1.pdf	11/10/2006
FSL 01/11	KELUserGuide.html_revsn128.pdf	18/01/2007
FSL 01/12	createnotes.jsp_revision1363.pdf	16/10/2008
FSL 01/13	createnotes.jsp_revision1364.pdf	16/10/2008
FSL 01/14	createnotes.jsp_revision1365.pdf	16/10/2008
FSL 01/15	createnotes.jsp_revision1366.pdf	16/10/2008
FSL 01/16	createnotes.jsp_revision1409.pdf	15/05/2009
FSL 01/17	createnotes.jsp_revision1440.pdf	01/06/2010
FSL 01/18	createnotes.jsp_revision1792.pdf	20/04/2015
FSL 01/19	createnotes.jsp_revision1840.pdf	22/07/2015
FSL 01/20	createnotes.jsp_revision1990.pdf	27/11/2015
FSL 01/21	createnotes.jsp_revision1991.pdf	27/11/2015
FSL 01/22	createnotes.jsp_revision2279.pdf	23/07/2019
FSL 01/23	HELP117J - Version 1.pdf	15/07/2019
FSL 01/24	HELP117J - Version 2.pdf	16/07/2019
FSL 01/25	HELP117J - Version 3.pdf	16/07/2019
FSL 01/26	HELP117J - Version 4.pdf	16/07/2019
FSL 01/27	HELP117J - Version 5.pdf	16/07/2019
FSL 01/28	HELP117J - Version 6.pdf	20/07/2020
FSL 01/29	HELP117J - Version 7.pdf	12/07/2021

Exhibit No.	Filename	Approximate Date Created
FSL 01/30	HELP2148J - Version 1.pdf	15/07/2019
FSL 01/31	HELP2148J - Version 2.pdf	16/07/2019
FSL 01/32	HELP2148J - Version 3.pdf	20/07/2020
FSL 01/33	HELP2148J - Version 4.pdf	12/07/2021
FSL 01/34	HELP3653J - Version 1.pdf	15/07/2019
FSL 01/35	HELP3653J - Version 2.pdf	16/07/2019
FSL 01/36	HELP1940M - Version 1.pdf	18/08/2017
FSL 01/37	HELP3653J - Version 3.pdf	16/07/2019
FSL 01/38	HELP1940M - Version 2.pdf	13/08/2018
FSL 01/39	HELP1940M - Version 3.pdf	16/07/2019
FSL 01/40	HELP3653J - Version 4.pdf	16/07/2019
FSL 01/41	HELP1940M - Version 4.pdf	17/08/2020
FSL 01/42	HELP1940M - Version 5.pdf	25/01/2021
FSL 01/43	HELP3653J - Version 5.pdf	20/07/2020
FSL 01/44	HELP3653J - Version 6.pdf	12/07/2021
FSL 01/45	HELP1940M - Version 6.pdf	24/01/2022
FSL 01/46	HELP4739N - Version 1.pdf	08/08/2019
FSL 01/47	HELP4739N - Version 2.pdf	08/08/2019
FSL 01/48	HELP4739N - Version 3.pdf	08/08/2019
FSL 01/49	HELP4739N - Version 4.pdf	08/08/2019
FSL 01/50	HELP4739N - Version 5.pdf	17/08/2020
FSL 01/51	HELP4739N - Version 6.pdf	22/02/2021
FSL 01/52	HELP4739N - Version 7.pdf	31/01/2022

## APPENDIX D

Team	Department <sup>1</sup>	Line of Support	Description (and source, where available)
HSH	Horizon System Helpdesk	First	<p><i>“provides Post Office Counters Ltd outlet staff with a single point of contact for dealing with all problems relating to the Horizon system procedures and the Horizon system installed in outlets, and also for OBCS fallback encashments. Additionally it provides a single point of contact for technical interface queries from POCL (HAPS) staff via the NBSC helpdesk. Any calls received which are inappropriate to this helpdesk may be re-directed to the appropriate service point.”</i> (Horizon Systems Helpdesk Processes and Procedures, p.7, FSL 01/72).</p> <p><i>“provides first level support for all technical issues. The Horizon System Helpdesk staff will record details of the issue or request by ascertaining information from the customer regarding the nature and impact of the problem, the Horizon System Helpdesk operator will be able to resolve or diagnose the problem during this initial telephone conversation. Should the operator fail to resolve the problem at this time, he will route the incident onto a second line support unit and inform the customer what to expect and when.”</i> (Horizon System Helpdesk Call Enquiry Matrix, p.5, FSL 01/73).</p>
HIT	HSH Incident Team	First	The HSH Incident Team formed part of the HSH. However, Fujitsu has only seen references to this team in documents post-dating the period relevant to this Request.
SMC	System Management Centre	Second	<p><i>“On receipt of a call from the HSH, the SMC's first task is to determine whether or not the service call is a software code problem.</i></p> <p><i>If the service request call indicates a software problem which has been seen before, and for which a workaround is already available, the SMC follows its</i></p>

<sup>1</sup> A wide range of other teams were involved in the management of PinICLs and KELs, as demonstrated by ICL Pathway Development Directorate Incident/Defect Management, (FSL 01/81).

Team	Department <sup>1</sup>	Line of Support	Description (and source, where available)
			<p><i>own internal procedures to ensure that the workaround is passed to the customer.</i></p> <p><i>If the service request call indicates a software problem which has been seen before, and for which a workaround is not available, the SMC links the current call to the first call and does not pass the call to the SSC. This ensures that the SSC does not receive duplicate calls for the same problem.</i></p> <p><i>If the service call indicates a software problem that has not been seen before, the SMC follows its own internal procedures to pass the call to the SSC, providing information about the problem and Pathway's exposure, that is, the number of calls received and the potential number of counters that are affected. They also provide details about the software version installed on the platform.” (CS Support Services Operations Manual, p.12, FSL 01/74)</i></p>
SSC	System Support Centre	Third	<p><i>“On receipt of an incident PinICL the SSC investigate the incident. If on investigation the SSC determine that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• The incident was incorrectly routed, it is passed backed to the SMC to route to the appropriate support unit (Section 4.2.1.1).</i></li> <li><i>• The incident is a business incident, and not system related, it is routed through to the MSU (Section 4.3.2.1).</i></li> <li><i>• The incident is a reference data incident it is routed through to the Reference Data Team (Section 4.3.3.1).</i></li> <li><i>• The incident is a known error, it is passed backed to the SMC to deal with (Section 4.2.1.1).</i></li> <li><i>• The incident is already known, i.e. it is a duplicate incident, the SSC associate the duplicate PinICL to the original PinICL and close the duplicate PinICL. Go to Section 4.3.1.3 for the SSC closure process.</i></li> </ul>

Team	Department <sup>1</sup>	Line of Support	Description (and source, where available)
			<p><i>If none of the above apply, the incident is either resolved by the SSC or routed to 4th line support for resolution. However, a decision first has to be made as to whether a business incident is associated with the incident being dealt with. If so, the SSC will raise a new business incident with the HSH (Section 4.1.1).</i></p> <p><i>The SSC raise a KEL for incidents that they have not come across before and require further work and time before they are resolved. This is then used by the SMC to stop duplicate incidents being sent through to the SSC.</i></p> <p><i>If a workaround can be developed, it is added to the respective KEL to be used as required. If the workaround requires agreement from [POL], a Problem is raised to obtain the agreement.</i></p> <p><i>If the incident cannot be resolved by the SSC, it is passed to 4th line support (Section 4.4.1) for resolution. If the SSC can resolve the incident, the appropriate actions are taken until the incident is ready for closure (Section 4.3.1.3).” (Incident Management Process Definition, p.22, FSL 01/75)</i></p>
EDSC	European Development & Support Centre	Third	<p><i>“EDSC are organisationally positioned within ICL Pathway and are responsible for the provision of 3rd line software support.” (OTI Test Plan, p.3 FSL 01/ 76).</i></p> <p><i>“EDSC identify area of problem and call is directed to appropriate 4th line” (EDSC Call Management, p.5, FSL 01/77).</i></p> <p><i>“...This has been replaced by SSC. For technical reasons, the team in PinICL is still referred to by this abbreviation.” (PinICL Administration Functions, p.3, FSL 01/78)</i></p>

Team	Department <sup>1</sup>	Line of Support	Description (and source, where available)
MSU	Management Support Unit	Third	<p><i>“The Management Support Unit supports the ICL Pathway operation in the following areas:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Management Information Systems</i></li> <li>• <i>Information technology equipment</i></li> <li>• <i>EPOSS and APS transaction reconciliation</i></li> <li>• <i>Performance benchmarking”</i></li> </ul> <p>(CS Infrastructure Services Operations Manual, p.8, FSL 01/79. See sections 4.1 to 4.4 for further information on each of the above areas)</p>
MSU-Indt Mgt	Management Support Unit – Incident Management	Third	<p>For organisational purposes, “MSU Indt Mgt” was used in PinICL to route calls relating to reconciliation incidents to certain individuals within the MSU (classed as “incident management”). For more detail, see “<i>EPOSS and APS transaction reconciliation</i>”, section 4.3, CS Infrastructure Services Operations Manual, FSL 01/79.</p> <p>Reconciliation incidents were also referred to as Business Incidents, and vice versa, during the relevant period (see Pathway Customer Service Audit, FSL 01/80).</p>
QFP	Quality Filtering Process	Third	<p><i>“QFP Representatives are identified for each of the Delivery Units.</i></p> <p><i>QFP Administration maintains a list of these representatives.</i></p> <p><i>QFP Administration assigns Incidents to the QFP Representatives for analysis.</i></p> <p><i>The QFP Representatives are responsible for ensuring that either the Incident is recommended for closure or a potential product defect is identified.</i></p>

Team	Department <sup>1</sup>	Line of Support	Description (and source, where available)
			<p><i>If the Incident has been incorrectly assigned it is returned with a recommendation as to where it should go...</i></p> <p><i>“...If the QFP Representative believes this Incident or this Incident plus others reveals a design weakness then it can be escalated to the TDA as a Problem and progressed in accordance with the ICL Pathway Development Directorate Problem Management Process, PA/PRO/016...”</i></p> <p><i>“...The QFP Representative ensures that all solution components are identified and can be progressed satisfactorily. If appropriate, a workaround solution may be required for the current baseline as well as a longer-term solution or consequential work may be required in another Delivery Unit, which has to be worked on in parallel.</i></p> <p><i>Copy (Clone) PinICLs should be used for this task with a separate PinICL raised for each piece of work. The PinICL should be updated with a clear set of instructions so that the relationships are clear. The procedure for raising clone PinICLs is covered in the PinICL Reference Data Guide CM/MAN/005.</i></p> <p><i>Discussion with CS if a KEL entry is required or needs to be updated. The Procedure for updating/creating KELs is contained in the PinICL Reference Data Guide CM/MAN/005” (ICL Pathway Development Directorate Incident/Defect Management, p.13 – 19, FSL 01/81).</i></p>