

To: John Meagher

From: Derek Selwood
Date: 2 October 1996

ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA

Copy: Pat Kelsey
John Cook
Colin Oudot
John Murray
Michael Purchase
Gary Palmer

1. You asked me to review the Acceptance Criteria document which accompanied the letter of 20 September from Jim Morley of ICL Pathway. Since I am out this afternoon and tomorrow on Lessons Learned work, I am letting you have my thoughts so far.

2. Before reading the Acceptance Criteria, it is useful to read the following documents, which are currently Pathway internal rather than shared Pathway/PDA:

- a. Standard for documenting Acceptance Specifications
- b. Standard for Specifying Acceptance Criteria
- c. Standard for Raising and Progressing Acceptance Incidents

3. As I mentioned at your management meeting yesterday, my first concern was the sight of a timetable (last page of paper 2.b) that quoted this Friday (4 October) as the date for BA/POCL to agree the Criteria for CMS, PAS and Helpdesk). As agreed, I have told Pat Kelsey that:

a. the date is unachievable (119 pages, some 1200 Criteria);

b. in any event, I would have thought the timetable was constructed before agreement of the new approach to testing. This envisages a period of joint PDA/Pathway joint testing in December and January prior to the PDA Final Test in February (which is when I would expect the Criteria to 'bite'). Whilst I could understand Pathway's keenness to get things tied down before they run out of development time, I could not see that it must be done by 4 October.

4. Pat spoke briefly to Tony Oppenheim of Pathway yesterday. He agreed that the dates for commenting on the detail could move somewhat, given the new testing approach, but said that Pathway are very keen to get our reaction to the principles adopted. I fully take Pat's point that we shouldn't expose ourselves to a position of Pathway saying "We can't fulfil obligation 'x' because you didn't do 'y' sufficiently swiftly".

The Pathway approach to specifying criteria

5. The approach Pathway have adopted (see example Requirement 696 and Criteria 696-1 to 696-9 attached) is simply to break down the total statement of Requirement into a number of parts and (broadly) parrot the words back to us in the form of a number of criteria.

6. I don't have a problem with the principle of that. Requirements always take precedence, and should therefore be our starting point, and the criterion for a requirement 'Do x' is, put simply, 'x is done'. However, what this then does is expose the lack of detail in the Requirements which, if we simply sign up to the corresponding criteria, leaves the way open to Pathway to claim satisfaction of criteria in a (minimalist) way that we had not envisaged or intended.

7. For example, with thanks to John Cook for the original thought, consider the requirement 'I want to work in a room with a window', the criterion for which would be: 'The room supplied for working has a window'. But what about:

- a. The window size;
- b. The window glass (clear/opaque);
- c. The ability to open the window (or lack of it);
- d. The distance from the desk to the window

and so on.

8. So in our random selection of Requirement and Criteria 696:

1. Format of report to be agreed
2. Is the statement sufficient as it stands, or does it need more detail?
3. 9 raise the same kind of questions.

(And why has 'must' in the contract been watered down to 'should' in the Criteria?)

9. It may be that some of the missing detail has been worked through in, for instance, the Functional Specification and the discussions between the PM team and Pathway. But I'm sure we still have a lot to do, and in any event how do we ensure that the Requirements schedule faithfully reflects all this detail?

10. As far as I can judge, the criteria reflect the Requirements as specified in the 15 May contract. This is as per 3(c) of paper 2.b, i.e. no Changes are recognised unless they are contractually authorised. There is now a 'legalised' version of the Requirements schedule yet to formally pass through Change Control, but it is probably not a bad idea to start with the baseline contract and then change the Criteria as the Requirements change.

11. The approach of tackling the whole Requirement document assures comprehensiveness, but we also need Pathway to address:

a. the functionality included in Release 1 (another reason for pressing them on this now that they have admitted it will be less than 100%); and

b. the scope of each Acceptance Test.

Untestable Criteria

12. Jim Morley's letter draws attention to the fact that the principle of achieving complete coverage of Criteria against Requirements has produced some untestable Criteria. I think he has a valid point (although I don't understand his final bullet) and agree that these will need to be combed out.

Non-functional Criteria

13. I haven't checked on whether all the Requirements addressed by the Criteria are 'ours', but if they are not then the non-PM ones need to be clearly allocated to the appropriate parts of the PDA.

The Way Ahead

14. I think that, unless anyone can shed some blinding light of inspiration on a topic that has been decidedly murky for the past few months, the Pathway approach represents the best starting point.

15. However, there are a number of issues raised by the production of the Criteria. The Morley letter details some, I have detailed others above and recipients of this note need to consider whether there are more.

16. I think we need a meeting of Product Management, Procurement and Integrate/Test to talk the issues through, to ensure that we have our act together before then talking to Pathway. All this needs to be done as soon as is practical given the Pathway pressure and the work that has to be done in any event (in re-writing if we don't accept the Pathway approach, or in enhancing if we do).

17. You will wish to consider the stage at which you ask Colin Oudot and John Murray to start their teams working on a systematic review of the Criteria. Given the pressures that people are under already and the scale of the review task, you will obviously be seeking broad agreement from recipients that the Pathway approach is the one to be followed before embarking on this.

GRO

Derek Selwood
2 October 1996

Requirement	696	Release	spr 7
		No	
Programme	POCL	Subject	POCL Applications (EPOSS)
Grouping	Applications	Heading	Systems - design

Requirement Description:
Reporting

EPOSS must allow production of a daily report that will show, at office level the cash holdings by individual denomination of bank note and coin. The format of the report will be agreed by POCL and the Contractor.

EPOSS must support the summarisation of daily and weekly transaction vouchers at stock unit level.

EPOSS must support a reporting facility to print on Client cut sheet stationary where the client requires it (such as Girobank daily summaries).

Girobank is only a current example - we need to keep the flexibility to print on other cut sheets e.g. Tax Discs / cheques in due course.

The format of all styles of receipts will be agreed by POCL and the Contractor. A bilingual Welsh/English version is required.

EPOSS must allow production of duplicate receipts and they must be marked as such.

EPOSS must support the summarisation of daily and weekly transaction vouchers at stock unit level.

EPOSS must support a reporting facility to print on Client cut sheet stationary to support Girobank and the Postmaster's daily Record (PDR) summarisation.

EPOSS must support reporting by journal/tally roll and on A4 sheets to predefined Client requirements at both stock unit and office levels.

EPOSS must allow reporting to be previewed on screen.

Acceptance Criteria

20-Sep-96

Requirement Id: 695 **Criterion No:** 4 **Test:** EPOS**Criterion Description:** The CONTRACTOR shall be aware that Stock Units are individual units of accountability which contain Stock (fixed price Stock Items, Customer and Client specific Tokens, retail Stock Items, cash and Transaction Vouchers for a POCL Outlet Accounting Period

Requirement Id: 695 **Criterion No:** 5 **Test:** EPOS**Criterion Description:** EPOSS shall allow a User or group of Users to be accountable for a Stock Unit, so that each Outlet has at least one Stock Unit, but there can be other Stock Units, effectively operating independently

Requirement Id: 695 **Criterion No:** 6 **Test:** EPOS**Criterion Description:** Each Stock Unit can in turn be tied to both a User or group of Users or a single Till or group of Tills.

Requirement Id: 695 **Criterion No:** 7 **Test:** EPOS**Criterion Description:** EPOSS shall allow each Stock Unit to be Balanced individually. The Stock Unit may be Balanced more than once within a POCL Outlet Accounting Period. Cash and Stock Items shall be entered by denomination or Stock Item level. This applies whether or not multiple Tills are linked to a single Stock Unit

Requirement Id: 695 **Criterion No:** 8 **Test:** EPOS**Criterion Description:** At the end of the POCL Outlet Accounting Period an Outlet Balance is struck with the details provided by the Balanced Stock Units

Requirement Id: 695 **Criterion No:** 9 **Test:** EPOS**Criterion Description:** An Outlet brings to account manual voucher Transactions including Transaction Vouchers, automated voucher Transactions including Transaction Vouchers, reports the Suspense Account position and the Stock and cash totals within the approved Cash Account format

Requirement Id: 695 **Criterion No:** 10 **Test:** EPOS**Criterion Description:** The cycle is repeated in the new POCL Outlet Accounting Period with an Outlet Balance brought forward value that includes the Stock and cash in hand, Suspense Account and loss and gain position from the previous POCL Outlet Accounting Period

Requirement Id: 695 **Criterion No:** 11 **Test:** EPOS**Criterion Description:** EPOSS shall provide a secure mechanism for controlling access to a Stock Unit

Requirement Id: 696 **Criterion No:** 1 **Test:** EPOS**Criterion Description:** EPOSS shall allow production of a daily Report that shows, at Outlet level, the cash holdings by individual denomination of bank note and coin. The format of the report shall be agreed by POCL and the CONTRACTOR by a date consistent with the project plan agreed by the parties, such that the date does not adversely impact contractual milestones as defined in Clause 605.1 of the Authorities Agreement.

Requirement Id: 696 **Criterion No:** 2 **Test:** EPOS**Criterion Description:** EPOSS shall support the summarisation of daily and weekly Transaction Vouchers at Stock Unit level.

20-Sep-96

Acceptance Criteria**Requirement Id:** 696 **Criterion No:** 3 **Test:** EPOS**Criterion Description:** EPOSS shall support a reporting facility to print on Client cut sheet stationery where the Client requires it (including without limitation Girobank daily summaries).**Requirement Id:** 696 **Criterion No:** 4 **Test:** EPOS**Criterion Description:** The CONTRACTOR shall be aware that Girobank is only an example - POCL needs to keep the flexibility to print on other cut sheets e.g. tax discs/cheques in due course**Requirement Id:** 696 **Criterion No:** 5 **Test:** EPOS**Criterion Description:** The format of all styles of receipts shall be agreed by POCL and the CONTRACTOR by a date consistent with the project plan agreed by the parties, such that the date does not adversely impact contractual milestones as defined in Clause 605.1 of the Authorities Agreement . A bilingual Welsh/English version is required in designated Outlets**Requirement Id:** 696 **Criterion No:** 6 **Test:** EPOS**Criterion Description:** EPOSS shall allow production of duplicate receipts and they shall be marked as such**Requirement Id:** 696 **Criterion No:** 7 **Test:** EPOS**Criterion Description:** EPOSS shall support a reporting facility to print on Client cut sheet stationery to support Girobank and the Postmaster's Daily Record (PDR) summarisation**Requirement Id:** 696 **Criterion No:** 8 **Test:** EPOS**Criterion Description:** EPOSS shall support reporting by journal/tally roll and on A4 sheets to Client requirements at both Stock Unit and Outlet levels, with the format to be agreed by a date consistent with the project plan agreed by the parties, such that the date does not adversely impact contractual milestones as defined in Clause 605.1 of the Authorities Agreement.**Requirement Id:** 696 **Criterion No:** 9 **Test:** EPOS**Criterion Description:** EPOSS shall allow reporting to be previewed on screen**Requirement Id:** 697 **Criterion No:** 1 **Test:** Audit**Criterion Description:** The CONTRACTOR and his sub-contractors shall keep or cause to be kept Records (including financial records) of all Services, covering materials and Services provided, timesheet records, contracts let to sub-contractors and Charges levied to the AUTHORITIES. These Records shall not be more detailed than those held by the CONTRACTOR for its own audit purposes**Requirement Id:** 697 **Criterion No:** 2 **Test:** Audit**Criterion Description:** The CONTRACTOR shall permit the AUTHORITIES or AUTHORITIES' representatives (including those bodies listed in paragraph 2.1 of Schedule A03 of the AUTHORITIES' Agreement) unrestricted access to the Records for the purpose of auditing and reporting on the performance, including charging and accounting aspects, of the Services**Requirement Id:** 697 **Criterion No:** 3 **Test:** Audit**Criterion Description:** DSS shall have the right of access to inspect the DSS Services and POCL shall have the right of access to inspect the POCL Services. The AUTHORITIES may appoint an independent auditor to examine areas that are mutually commercially sensitive