

CAPS Live Trial Management and Evaluation

Business Unit Plans

DRAFT CRITERIA AND ASSOCIATED METRICS

i) Operability of the end-to-end process in live conditions,

e.g. through:

- No. of errors in customer payments
- Impact on customer waiting time
- No. of customer complaints
- No. of errors in cash account
- No. of calls to Horizon Service Help Desk, ITSA Service Help Desk, POCL Regional helpdesk and COLS
- No. of security & fraud incidents
- Amount of manual intervention required in card payment process
- Case tracking

i) Efficacy of Customer Communication

e.g. through:

- Analysis of customer complaints (e.g. via District Offices, ChB Centre)
- Analysis of call volumes and types to PCHL

i) Efficacy of Staff Training & Supporting Products

e.g. through:

- Impact on performance levels / targets
- Analysis of calls to help desks
- Usability of procedures and guides
- Requirements for additional field support
- User error / business incidents

i) Effectiveness of Implementation Approach

e.g. through:

- POCL:
 - Planned vs. actual rollout times for counter upgrades (at small volumes)
 - Attendance rates at training and feedback from trainees
 - Delivery of all supporting products
- BA:
 - Completion of training
 - Delivery of supporting products
 - Completion of preparatory activity
- ITSA / Pathway / POCL:
 - Delivery of Technical Implementation Plan

i) Robustness of IT systems

e.g. through:

- System stability :
 - system availability and response times
 - impact, severity and volume of Live Problems
- Interface stability to and from Pathway systems:
 - ITIP
 - Reference Data
 - CAPS:

- performance of CAPS Access Service (CAS)
 - payment 'stop' requests
- i) *Accounting & Reconciliation Integrity*
e.g. through:
- Volume of reconciliation errors & comparison with current error rates and SLAs
 - Analysis of error types
 - Time taken to reconcile
 - Demonstrable proof that Pathway and POCL hold identical data in terms of cash balances and settlements, and that the invoicing process accurately reflects the cost of the services provided
- i) *Efficacy and adequacy of Service Management arrangements*
e.g. through:
- Interaction between helpdesks (inc. Horizon Service Help Desk, COLS and DLA)
 - calls tracking / incident 'bounce' between helpdesks
 - management of problem resolution
 - Customer satisfaction (via District Offices, PCHL, HSHD, Communications Team activity, etc.)
- i) *Efficacy of Contingency and Business Continuity Arrangements* (in the event of system or process failure) e.g. through:
- Efficacy of technical recovery procedures
 - Efficacy of Temporary Authorised Procedures
 - Integrity of information following recovery / post-incident reviews
- i) *Reference Data Integrity*
e.g. through:
- analysis of reference data flows
 - operational interface reviews.
- x) *Cost/Benefit Analysis of Live Service*
e.g. through:
- Analysis of variation against original proposals for:
 - service provision
 - implementation arrangements
 - end-to-end processing (e.g. through requirement to use authorised temporary procedures)..

CAPS Live Trial Management and Evaluation

Business Unit Plans

DRAFT CRITERIA AND ASSOCIATED METRICS

i) Operability of the end-to-end process in live conditions,

e.g. through:

- No. of errors in customer payments
- Impact on customer waiting time
- No. of customer complaints
- No. of errors in cash account
- No. of calls to Horizon Service Help Desk, ITSA Service Help Desk, POCL Regional helpdesk and COLS
- No. of security & fraud incidents
- Amount of manual intervention required in card payment process
- Case tracking

i) Efficacy of Customer Communication

e.g. through:

- Analysis of customer complaints (e.g. via District Offices, ChB Centre)
- Analysis of call volumes and types to PCHL

i) Efficacy of Staff Training & Supporting Products

e.g. through:

- Impact on performance levels / targets
- Analysis of calls to help desks
- Usability of procedures and guides
- Requirements for additional field support
- User error / business incidents

i) Effectiveness of Implementation Approach

e.g. through:

- POCL:
 - Planned vs. actual rollout times for counter upgrades (at small volumes)
 - Attendance rates at training and feedback from trainees
 - Delivery of all supporting products
- BA:
 - Completion of training
 - Delivery of supporting products
 - Completion of preparatory activity
- ITSA / Pathway / POCL:
 - Delivery of Technical Implementation Plan

i) Robustness of IT systems

e.g. through:

- System stability :
 - system availability and response times
 - impact, severity and volume of Live Problems
- Interface stability to and from Pathway systems:
 - ITIP
 - Reference Data
 - CAPS:

- performance of CAPS Access Service (CAS)
 - payment 'stop' requests
- i) ***Accounting & Reconciliation Integrity***
e.g. through:
- Volume of reconciliation errors & comparison with current error rates and SLAs
 - Analysis of error types
 - Time taken to reconcile
 - Demonstrable proof that Pathway and POCL hold identical data in terms of cash balances and settlements, and that the invoicing process accurately reflects the cost of the services provided
- i) ***Efficacy and adequacy of Service Management arrangements***
e.g. through:
- Interaction between helpdesks (inc. Horizon Service Help Desk, COLS and DLA)
 - calls tracking / incident 'bounce' between helpdesks
 - management of problem resolution
 - Customer satisfaction (via District Offices, PCHL, HSHD, Communications Team activity, etc.)
- i) ***Efficacy of Contingency and Business Continuity Arrangements*** (in the event of system or process failure) e.g. through:
- Efficacy of technical recovery procedures
 - Efficacy of Temporary Authorised Procedures
 - Integrity of information following recovery / post-incident reviews
- i) ***Reference Data Integrity***
e.g. through:
- analysis of reference data flows
 - operational interface reviews.
- x) ***Cost/Benefit Analysis of Live Service***
e.g. through:
- Analysis of variation against original proposals for:
 - service provision
 - implementation arrangements
 - end-to-end processing (e.g. through requirement to use authorised temporary procedures)..



To: Vince Gaskell
PET Members
AWG Members
(See following page for full
Distribution List)

From: Mark Jennings

cc: Richard Burrill

Date: 13 April, 1999

ISSUE: Pre-Live Trial Progress Reporting

RECEIVED

TIMING: Immediate

16 APR 1998

ACTION: For Information

S RILEY

Please find attached the first pre-Live Trial progress report. This document will be issued weekly (on Tuesdays) until the start of Live Trial on a date to be agreed.

Information contained in the report will come from the following sources:

- Horizon/POCL (Rod Stocker) - Installation updates
- Steve Chandler and Katherine Crame - COLS
- Robert Irvine - Business Conversion (Bulk Loads)
- Nicola Milburn - Operability (Baseline Data Gathering)
- Robin Niblock - CAPS Technical Implementation

ACTION REQUIRED

For information only.

Mark Jennings

Ext: **GRO**



Distribution:

Vince Gaskell
PET Members
AWG Members
Seals of Approval Holders
BDMT Members

Steve Chandler
Tim Cutts
Steve Lewis
Damian Murphy
Robin Niblock
Frank Dent
Graham Patterson
Dave Fowler
Claire Hall-Moore
Cheryl Fielder
John Peacham
Ian Johnson
Maragret Moore
Robert Irvine
Dave Musson
Peter Beuster
David Ashbridge
Hadley Balwin
Lesley Finnegan
Les Hodson
Sally Poynter
Joanne Adamczyk
Lynne Hepple
Debbie Bell



Pre-Live Trial Progress Report

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Date: Tuesday, 13 April, 1999 | Period: 4 -13 April, 1999 |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|

| 1. Progress this period: | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ref. | Date | Event/Action | Progress | Impact on Plan |
| 1.1 | 4/4/99 | PO Migration Rehearsal (Low Simonside, South Tyneside) | The PO migration rehearsal failed. 3 problem areas were cited: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hardware • Configuration parameters • Reference Data | None. Possible escalation of risk associated with Pathway NR 2 rollout |
| 1.2 | 7/4/99 | Live Trial RAB | Although the decision at the Release Authorisation Board did not unanimously support start of Live Trial on 10/5/99, implementation activity continues and is being supported by all three organisations. The BA position remains that a further run of Model Office and End to End should take place before the start of Live Trial. Negotiations continue. | |
| 1.3 | 11/4/99 | PO Migration (Low Simonside, South Tyneside) | Migration completed successfully at 18.00. | |
| 1.4 | 12/4/99 | 4 volunteer encashments at Low Simonside | Completed successfully at 08.30. | |
| 1.5 | 12/4/99 | PO Migration (West Boldon, South Tyneside) | Postponed for 24 hours due to a problem with downloading reference data. | No long term impact - Horizon will use 1 day 'firebreak' (13/4/99) to return to schedule. No further 'firebreaks' planned. |



Pre-Live Trial Progress Report

| 2. Planned next period: 14 - 20 April, 1999 | | | |
|------------------------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Ref. | Date | Event/Action | Comments |
| 2.1 | 14/4/99 | PO Migration (Barnwood, Gloucester) | |
| 2.2 | 14/4/99 | Validation of Low Simonside and West Boldon Cash Accounts | Key test for further migrations. |
| 2.3 | 15/4/99 | PO Migration | Northumbria, 2 Post Offices. |
| 2.4 | 16/4/99 | PO Migration | Bristol Brunel, 2 Post Offices. |
| 2.5 | 19/4/99 | PO Migration | Gloucester, 2 Post Offices; Northumbria, 4 Post Offices. Migration of these and future outlets is dependent upon the validation of the Cash Accounts produced by the first two migrated outlets (item 2.2 above). |
| 2.6 | 19/4/99 | CBC Baseline Data Gathering commences | |
| 2.7 | 19/4/99 | PDr Bulk Load (PSCS 2) | |

| 3. Issues: | |
|------------|-------------------------------|
| Ref. | Issue |
| 3.1 | See ref. 1.2, Live Trial RAB. |

KEEP FOR REFERENCE.

Alison 53542
Kason 1

has AWC Addresses.

BA Acceptance Working Group No 7 - Agenda

Date: 30 March 1999
Time: 9.30 am - 16.00 pm
Location: Conference Room, Holborn House, Preston

| | | |
|----------|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Members: | Paul Wootton ? | COBAP (Chair) |
| | Paul Hanson <i>not (opt)</i> | CAPS |
| | Pat Kelsey ? | JCT <i>Training Contract Team</i> |
| | (<i>kind</i>) Darryl Dixon ✓ | BA Security |
| | Carol Jepmond ✓ | CAPS |
| | (<i>transferable</i>) Paul Marshall ✓ | BA Audit |
| | Jackie Laughton ✓ | CAPS - <i>Business Delivery</i> |
| | (<i>Accounting</i>) Chris Malone ? | BAB <i>Banking Accounting Branch</i> |
| | Damon Lawrenson ✓ | BAB PAAG <i>Programme Accounting Group</i> |
| | (<i>Accounting</i>) * Richard Harvey ✓ | BA BAB <i>Banking Accounting Branch</i> |
| | Vernon Mantle ✓ | CISITM <i>Corporate IS/IT Management</i> |
| | Parry Jenkins <i>not</i> | CAPS |
| | Dave White ✓ | DOFO rep - <i>Team Business Manager</i> |
| | Adrian Jones ✓ | DEFE |
| | Alison Mason X | CAPS (Minutes) |

| | | |
|---------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Others: | Richard Bennett X | CAPS |
| | Steve Clouston | CAPS - COBAP |
| | Graham Robinson | CAPS |
| | Martin Smith | DSS Audit |
| | John ... | POEL (From 10:30) <i>Project Helpdesk Manager</i> |

| | | |
|------------|-------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| Apologies: | Stuart Riley ✓ | CAPS |
| | Christine Lowry ✓ | CAPS |
| | Tony Grimshaw ✓ | CAPS |
| | Adrian Jones X | DfEE <i>Dept for Education & Employment</i> |
| | Derek Pilling ✓ | DOFO South rep <i>Director of Field Operations</i> |

- Agenda:
- 9:15 - 9:30 Coffee
 - 1. 9:30- 9:35 Introduction (PW)
 - 2. 9:35 - 9:50 Update (PH)
 - 3. 9:50- 10:30 AWG - Revised Terms of Reference (JP) - Paper 7.1
 - 4. 10:30 - 10:35 Minutes of last meeting
 - 5. 10:35 - 11:00 Action points from last meeting
 - 11:00 - 11:15 Coffee
 - 6. 11:15 - 12:00 Live Trial Activities (CJ)
 - 7. 12:00 - 12:30 Update on Acceptance Specifications and Acceptance Reviews (PW)
 - 12:30 - 13:00 Lunch

Acceptance Working Group

Paul Wootton

Paul Hanson

Carol Jepmond

Jackie Laughton

Richard Harvey

Vernon Mantle

Dave White

Pat Kelsey

Dave Fowler

Steve Chandler

Chris Malone
Damon Lawrenson

Martin Croft

Stuart Riley

Tony Grimshaw

Adrian Jones

Derek Pilling

Geoff Robinson

Steph Fowler

GRO

BDMT

Paul Hanson

Jackie Laughton

Stuart Riley

Craig Lewis

Pat Kelsey

Tony Grimshaw

Paul Wootton





CAPS FBS Release Assurance

RELEASE AUTHORISATION FORUM
CAPS Pathway NR2 ChB Live Trial
MEETING NO. 5

Date: 12/4/99
Venue: B0704D Longbenton
Time: 11.00am
Attendees: Carol Jepmond (CAPS Release Authorisation Manager)
Damian Murphy (CAPS Implementation)
Sally Poynter (Technical Implementation)
Ian Stevenson (Horizon)
Peter Rogers (CAPS RDD)
Steve Chandler (CAPS COLS)
Debbie Bell (CAPS Release Assurance)
Copies: Stuart Riley (CAPS Commercial)
Colin Gallovay (CAPS RDD)
Darryl Dixon (BA Security)

RECEIVED
15 APR 1999
S RILEY

Introduction

Carol Jepmond opened the meeting by welcoming attendees. Carol briefly explained the agenda before beginning with item one.

1. Update from the RAB Meeting 7/4/99

Whilst the decision to proceed with implementation activities did not receive unanimous support, all parties are supporting the implementation activities.

BA have stated that further testing is required, however, Pathway and POCL have again disagreed with this course of action. Negotiations are continuing.

Pathway and POCL can, therefore, continue with this current action but only up to the Data Centre migration weekend as they require BA support at this point.

2. Current Status of Events

Recent and future events status are as follows:

- a) Rehearsal migration at Low Simonside PO on 4/4/99. Problems arose resulting the rehearsal being unsuccessful.

- b) Final RAB took place 7/4/99. (See part 2 for update)
- c) Further migration of Low Simonside took place 11/4/99 and was successful. Four volunteer payments were made on the morning of the 12th April. There is a further need to ensure the encashments are correct. New Boldon PO is also scheduled for migration 12/4/99.

3. Live Trial Risk Assessment

(see attached copy of the Live Trial Risk Assessment document - copy for non attendees)

Forum members were taken through the risk assessment matrix for Live Trial by Carol Jepmond. The matrix was divided into 4 headings. Contractual, Delay, Disruption and Instability and also Data Validity.

The assessment indicates whether the risk is:

- High The decision is unacceptable for BA
- Medium BA can potentially live with the risk, however, it will result in a need to change the decision making process.
- Low BA consider this an acceptable risk.

This document provides initial thoughts regarding the risks presented by Live Trial. It is recognised that the document does not allot responsibility for any action taken, however, this will be done when the risks and action have been agreed.

Action Point 5.1 Forum members to review the Risk Assessment document by lunchtime Friday 16th April and send any comments to Debbie Bell (E mail BELL DEBBIE CAPS PA).

**** Please note that each copy of the document is controlled and commercial in confidence and must not be copied to anyone else.**

The table below provides an explanation of the risk cross references in the Live Trial Risk Assessment Document.

| RISK | ASSESSMENT OF RISK |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1.1 Contract with Pathway not signed. | If the Pathway contract is not baselined then we do not what the contract basis is for Live Trial resulting in uncertainty of responsibility. |
| 1.2 Single stage Acceptance process not supported by BA approach. | The initial Pathway contract worked on the assumption that there would only be a need for one Live Trial, however, following a change to the plan we have decoupled ChB and Multi Benefits. BA are, therefore looking for some sort of acceptance for each of these stages as well as for NR2. |
| 1.3 Exit process for Live Trial unclear. | The exit process describes the process by which we agree when Live Trial has finished and when we are ready to move onto the next stage. |
| 1.4 Sponsors unable to agree on acceptance criteria results. | This concerns the eventuality that BA and POCL disagree over findings during Live Trial. |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2.1 Completion of migration of existing 202 Post Offices delayed. | The migration is due to be finished 5/4/99. If the migration is delayed for any reason it would result in the delay of the Data Centre migration. POCL and Pathway have indicated, however, that if the POs did not fully migrate we could still continue with the Data Centre migration and pay customers clerically. |
| 2.2 Data Centre migration delay. | Migration is scheduled for 8/9th May. 15/16th May can only be used if absolutely necessary as those 2 days are scheduled for the Yr 2000 power down. The 12/13th June is scheduled as the next available contingency weekend. It is unclear what slippage will result if the 15/16th May weekend is used. |
| 2.3 Rollout of additional POs delayed. | The additional 104 POs will rollout from 17th May for 3 weeks. There is an expected lag of 4 weeks for existing customers coming through the system. Any delay in this rollout would add to the lag time. |
| 3.1 Products unstable at the start of Live Trial. | Unstable products would result in evaluation problems. |
| 3.2 Inability to stabilise after 1c migration. | There is some concern over the impact on evaluation of POs were unable to stabilise following the Data Centre migration. |
| 3.3 Changes to products introduced during Live Trial. | <p>Items on the KPR which result in introducing system fixes would then require changes to products. This may result in the change in the evaluation basis.</p> <p>Peter Rogers informed the group that the KPR document has now been baselined but not formally signed off. Fix dates have been given.</p> <p>Action point 5.2 Carol Jepmond to clarify the forthcoming Pathway releases particularly the one scheduled for July 1999.</p> <p>Action Point 5.3 Peter Rogers to provide Carol Jepmond with a copy of the KPR document.</p> |
| 3.4 Impact of other work programmes during Live Trial | This risk refers to other issues happening in the field eg/ ChB R16 |
| 3.5 State of readiness of supporting products. | Concerns surround the state of business products eg/ POCL procedures have not yet been signed off. |
| 3.6 Introduction of CAPS Release 3.5 | Release 3.5 could potentially have an impact on the field following go-live. |
| 3.7 Occurrence of a contingency scenario during Live Trial. | Although the likelihood of this happening is low, its impact must be considered as there is potential for a large delay and hence a gap in the evaluation process. |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 4.1 Live Trial environment/products insufficiently representative of planned environment products for NRO. | There is a need to identify the products that differ between Live Trial and National Roll out, so that the basis for evaluation is clear. |
| 4.2 Low level of Card transactions. | See also section 4 Volume Work. Do the low number of card volumes coming through the system up to the end of Live Trial mean that we don't have enough information to base an evaluation on? |
| 4.3 Data gathering strategy fails to deliver full range of information required. | What would happen if the cases coming through the system do not equate to those expected. Do Pathway have to prove it all works properly or do BA have to prove to Pathway that it doesn't work before action is taken? |
| 4.4 Insufficient 'real' evaluation time. | How much evaluation time do we need to see stable products? |

4. Volumes Work

(See attached copy of the Live Trial Transaction Volume Projections - copy for non attendees)

Please note that this is still commercial in confidence and should not be circulated more widely.

Carol provided a more detailed explanation of one of the Live Trial risks i.e. the anticipated volume of card transactions during Live Trial. The graph on page 3 highlights the fact that up to the end of Live Trial we experience only a limited volume of card transactions and concern has been raised that we may not see enough of the different types of cases resulting in an invalid evaluation.

6. Next Meeting

I can confirm the following provisional dates, times and venue for the next Release Authorisation forums:

| | | |
|----------|------|------------------------------|
| 23 April | 2pm | GRO Conference Room) |
| 10 May | 2pm | |
| 25 May | 11am | |

If you are unable to attend any of these forum and are unable to send a deputy would you please contact Debbie Bell as soon as possible.

SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS

- Action Point 5.1** **Forum members to review the Risk Assessment document by lunchtime Friday 16th April and send any comments to Debbie Bell (E mail BELL DEBBIE CAPS PA).**
- Action point 5.2** **Carol Jepmond to clarify the forthcoming Pathway releases particularly the one scheduled for July 1999.**
- Action Point 5.3** **Peter Rogers to provide Carol Jepmond with a copy of the KPR document.**