FUJ00001567

Document Title: APS Reconciliation & Incident Management

Document Type: Procedure

Release: N/A

Abstract: This document outlines the end-to-end reconciliation and incident management procedures required to investigate, report and resolve, APS reconciliation and business incidents.

Document Status: DRAFT

Originator & Dept: Richard Brunskill (MSU Manager, ICL Pathway)

Contributors: ICL Pathway: Jez Murray, John Moran, Michael King, PON:

Dave Salt, Glenys Latham

Reviewed By: ICL Pathway: Angela Shaw, Michael King, Mik Peach, Paul Westfield

PON: Dave Salt, Glenys Latham, Ann Clarke, Rabia Cody, Mark Reardon, Phil Norton, Paul Smith

Comments By: 09/07/01

Comments To: Originator

Distribution: ICL Pathway Document Management
Reviewers

0.0 Document Control

0.1 Document History

Version No.	Date	Reason for Issue	Associated CP/PinICL
0.1	07/02/01	Initial Draft	N/A
0.2	01/05/01	Second draft incorporating comments	N/A
0.3	23/05/01	Third draft incorporating PON comments	N/A
1.0	02/07/01	For approval	

0.2 Approval Authorities

Name	Position	Signature	Date
Paul Westfield	ICL Pathway Infrastructure Services Manager		
Ann A Clarke	PON / TP		
Rabia Cody	PON / BSM		

0.3 Associated Documents

Reference	Version	Date	Title	Source
1. CS/QMS/002	1.0	12/01/01	ICL CS Process Manual	PVCS
2. CS/PRO/099	1.1	31/03/00	Reporting on Non Polled Post Offices	PVCS
3. CS/PRO/111	1.0	16/10/00	TPS Reconciliation & Incident Management	PVCS
4. CS/TEM/022	1.0	26/01/01	Daily End-to-End APS Reconciliation Template	PVCS
5. Codified Agreement	2.0	31/10/00	Codified Agreement Sch G01	
6. AP/IFS/048	4.0	10/04/00	APS Host Operational Reconciliation Reports for CSR+	PVCS

0.4 Abbreviations/Definitions

Abbreviation	Definition
APS	Automated Payment Service
BIMS	Business Incident Management Service
BSM	Business Service Management (AP Service Provision Team – PON)
CTS	Client Transmission Summary
EPOSS	Electronic Point of Sale Service
HAPS	Host Automated Payment System
HSH	Horizon Systems Helpdesk
MER	Manual Error Report
MSU	Management Support Unit
PON	Post Office Network
PVCS	Pathway document management system
SIL	System Incident Log
SSC	System Support Centre
TIP	Transaction Information Processing
TP	Transaction Processing
TPS	Transaction Processing Service

0.5 Changes in this Version

Version	Changes
1.0	Composite comments and review comments included

0.6 Changes Expected

Changes

0.7 Table of Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION 5

2.0 SCOPE 6

3.0 APS RECONCILIATION REPORTS 7

3.1 REPORTS AVAILABLE TO PON FROM ICL PATHWAY CENTRAL SYSTEMS 7
3.1.1 APSS2133 – APS Daily Account Balancing Report 7
3.1.2 APSS2133b – The APS Client Summary Report 8
3.1.3 APSS2133c – The APS Delayed Transaction Report 8
3.1.4 APSS2136 – The Daily TPS / APS Transaction Summary Reconciliation Report 8
3.1.5 APSS2139 – The Daily APS Office Harvesting Report 9
3.2 DELIVERY TIMESCALE & MECHANISM FROM ICL PATHWAY TO PON 10

4.0 END-TO-END APS RECONCILIATION 11

4.1 DAILY END-TO-END APS RECONCILIATION REPORT 11
4.1.1 End-to-End APS Reconciliation Report – APSS2141 12
4.1.2 End-to-End APS Reconciliation Summary 13
4.1.3 Data Delivery Timescale & Mechanism 13
4.1.3.1 Delivery Mechanism 14

5.0 RECONCILIATION & INCIDENT HANDLING 14

5.1 INCIDENT CLASSIFICATION 14
5.1.1 APS Business Incidents 14
5.1.2 System Incidents 14
5.2 APS BUSINESS INCIDENT ORIGINATORS 15
5.3 GENERATION OF BUSINESS INCIDENTS 15
5.4 APS BUSINESS INCIDENTS 16
5.4.1 APS Reconciliation Report Errors 16
5.4.2 End-to-End APS Reconciliation Errors 16
5.4.3 Delayed Transactions 16
5.5 INCIDENT REPORTING 17
5.5.1 BIMS Reports / MER 17
5.5.1.1 Format & content of BIMS report / MER 17
5.5.1.2 Clearance & Closure Criteria 17
5.5.1.3 Report Distribution 18
5.5.2 System Incident Log 18
5.5.3 Reporting Timescales 18
5.5.4 Widespread Errors 19
5.5.5 Repairing Data 20

6.0 CLIENT MIGRATION 21

6.1 VARIABLE FILE TRANSFER 21
6.2 RECONCILIATION IN THE EVENT OF NON DELIVERY OF THE CTS TO PON 21
6.2.1 Clerical Reconciliation Example in the event of non delivery of CTS to PON 22
6.3 IMPACT OF CLIENT MIGRATION ON THE RECONCILIATION PROCESS 22

7.0 APPENDIX 23

1 - BIMS REPORT EXAMPLE 23

1.0 Introduction

The Automated Payment Service (APS) report set produced by ICL Pathway central systems and the End-to-End APS reconciliation prepared by ICL Pathway Management Support Unit (MSU), have been designed to enable APS transactions completed in the outlets to be reconciled to the outlet Cash Account and settlement to be made with Post Office Network (PON) clients.

ICL Pathway central systems will produce a daily suite of reports, (see section 3 for a full description of each report), which reconciles those values harvested by both the Transaction Processing Service (TPS) and APS harvesters. End-to-End APS reconciliation will be completed by ICL Pathway / MSU to provide a view from harvesting, through to PON / Transaction Information Processing (TIP) processing and PON client settlement.

In addition to those errors discovered by ICL Pathway within either the APS report set or the End-to-End APS reconciliation, others may be discovered by PON when reconciling data within it's central systems or relating to queries from PON clients. To initiate the Business Incident Management Service (BIMS) process, ICL Pathway or PON generate APS Business Incidents for one or more errors discovered.

The incident management process is generic for both Electronic Point of Sale Service (EPOSS) and APS incidents in the way that APS Business Incidents are raised, documented and progressed. It should be noted however, that where an APS incident **DOES NOT** affect client settlement or reconciliation within TIP, the provisions quoted within the Codified Agreement (CA) schedule G01, in respect of charges levied for Manual Error Reports (MER), **DO NOT** apply. Definition and charges for TPS related errors, subject to the provisions of CA schedule G01, where the incident has caused a reconciliation or settlement error within TIP are found in associated ICL Pathway document: 'CS/PRO/111: TPS Reconciliation & Incident Management'

2.0 Scope

This document sets out the reconciliation and incident management procedures to be adopted by ICL Pathway / MSU for dealing with APS reconciliation report distribution to PON, End-to-End APS reconciliation and with any associated APS Business Incidents which may arise, including:

- APS reconciliation report differences
- End-to-End APS reconciliation differences
- Delayed transactions
- Software faults affecting reconciliation and settlement
- PON client enquiries
- TPS Output file delivery failures

3.0 APS Reconciliation Reports

3.1 Reports Available to PON from ICL Pathway Central Systems

3.1.1 APSS2133 – APS Daily Account Balancing Report

1. **Opening Balance –** This figure identifies the APS delayed transactions that were not cleared from the previous day. This figure should be identical to the closing balance from the previous day's APSS2133 report.
2. **Pathway Harvested Transactions** – This figure should be identical for both TPS and APS harvesters and reflects the APS transactions harvested from the outlets.
3. **Transactions Received from HAPS** – This figure identifies all transactions received by ICL Pathway **FROM** PON / HAPS in relation to outlets who have not yet been migrated to the Horizon system, where transactions have been made using pre-Horizon system processes.
4. **Receipt Sub total** – This figure should equal the **Opening Balance + APS Pathway Harvested Transactions + Transactions Received From Host Automated Payment System (HAPS)** and equates to all transactions available for delivery today.
5. **APS Transactions Delivered to HAPS** – This figure identifies those transactions delivered to PON / HAPS
6. **APS Transactions Delivered to Clients** – This figure identifies those transactions delivered direct to PON / Clients
7. **APS Transactions Delivered To Manual** – This figure identifies those APS transactions which have been harvested by the APS harvester but have not been delivered to **HAPS / Clients** via the electronic stream and which PON will need to advise / adjust with the client manually. Notification will be made to PON via the BIMS process. Refer to APSS2133c – *The APS Delayed Transaction Report.*
8. **APS Transactions delivered to TIP** – This figure should be equal to **TPS Pathway Harvested Transactions**.
9. **Delivery Sub Total** – This figure should equal APS Transactions delivered to HAPS + APS Transactions Delivered To Clients + APS Transactions Delivered To Manual.
10. **Delayed APS Transactions** – This figure identifies APS delayed transactions not yet cleared. This figure should be identical to the opening balance on the next day's APSS2133 report.
11. ***Reconciliation Error*** – *This figure should always be zero. If this is not the case this will form the basis of an APS Business Incident and will be investigated via the BIMS process.*

3.1.2 APSS2133b – The APS Client Summary Report

This report is a sub-set of line 5 and 6 on report APSS2133. It identifies by client ID, all APS transactions that are available to be delivered to HAPS and clients. NB: This report identifies those transactions that have been harvested on this date irrespective of the delivery requirements of the specific client. It therefore does NOT equal the electronic Client Transaction Summary (CTS).

3.1.3 APSS2133c – The APS Delayed Transaction Report

1. This report is a breakdown of all Delayed APS Transactions. The grand total is equal to the Delayed APS Transactions, line 10 on report APSS2133.
2. Delayed transactions may be carried over on the report until they are resent or manually advised via the BIMS process – this involves an interaction by ICL Pathway using the APS Workstation. Any transactions that have been resent will appear as part of the APS Transactions delivered to HAPS / Clients, lines 5 or 6 of report APSS2133. Any transactions that have been manually advised will appear as part of the APS Transactions Delivered to Manual, line 7 of report APS2133.

3.1.4 APSS2136 – The Daily TPS / APS Transaction Summary Reconciliation Report

1. This is a 30-day rolling report, whereby if any transactions appear on this report they can remain for up to thirty days.

2. There are two difference categories described within this report:

   Difference '1':

   Shows any difference between transactions input at the outlet counter system and those delivered to PON / TIP or PON HAPS / Client. This difference can be accounted for with transactions which were not harvested by the TPS harvesters and not delivered to PON / TIP, or by the APS harvesters and not delivered to PON HAPS / Clients.

   Difference '2'

   Shows any difference in what was delivered by ICL Pathway to PON TIP and what was delivered by ICL Pathway to PON HAPS or Clients. This difference is always calculated as PON TIP less PON HAPS / Clients. If the PON TIP figure is lower than the PON HAPS / Client figure, (through harvester mismatches or harvester exceptions) the difference will be shown as a 'NEGATIVE'. If the PON HAPS / Client figure is lower than the PON TIP figure, the difference will be shown as 'POSTIVE'.

   If there are no mis-balances on this report between difference '1' and difference '2' then no data will be shown for that transaction date.

3.1.5 APSS2139 – The Daily APS Office Harvesting Report

This report shows the number of outlets harvested and any outlets not harvested. In principle it is very similar to the Non Polled offices Report. (See CS/PRO/099 Reporting on Non Polled Post Offices). However, where that report shows the number of days since the office last polled this report shows the number of working days since the office last harvested. It therefore does not include Sundays or any other day that the outlet was not trading. The most important check with this report is to establish that all the offices that appear are also on the Non-polled report. NB: This report also lists those outlets which have been closed.

3.2 Delivery Timescale & Mechanism from ICL Pathway to PON

The following reports are sent daily to PON / TP and PON / HAPS:

1. APSS2133 – The APS Daily Account Balancing Report
2. APSS2133b – The APS Client Summary Report
3. APSS2133c – The APS Delayed Transaction Report
4. APSS2136 – The Daily TPS / APS Transaction Reconciliation Summary Report
5. APSS2139 – The Daily APS Office Harvesting Report
6. APSS2141 - The End to End APS Reconciliation Report ***(PON / TP only)***

Where ICL Pathway is able to do so, as governed by e-mail availability, all reports will be made available to PON by 08.00hrs daily, on a Monday to Friday basis only. For example, on a Monday or the day after a bank holiday, reports will be delivered for all days having occurred since the delivery of the last set of reports.

Reports are initially sent to PON using the ICL Pathway account within the PON corporate mail system. Should the PON corporate mail system be unavailable to ICL Pathway, then ICL Corporate mail is used as an alternative. *NB: Due to the size of these reports, e.g. APSS2133b is often in excess of 100 pages, ICL Pathway are unable to resort to facsimile transmission should the corporate e mail service of either organisation be unavailable except in situations where any failure is deemed to be long term. In such cases, the Manager ICL Pathway /MSU will liaise with the Manager PON / TP & PON / Outlet Systems Group (BSM) to agree a contingency distribution.*

The distribution list is considered by both ICL Pathway and PON to be of a dynamic nature and therefore specific addressees are not covered within this document.

4.0 End-to-End APS Reconciliation

4.1 Daily End-to-End APS Reconciliation Report

The End-to-End APS reconciliation has been developed to reconcile all areas within the APS transaction process. The system derived report set produced by ICL Pathway, serves only to identify and reconcile the values harvested by the TPS and APS harvesters. There is no guarantee that those transactions, which were harvested, will be processed by PON / TIP or PON / HAPS / client within the reconciliation timescale identified within these reports. This is due to a variety of reasons, for example, TIP rejections at transmission file level, delayed transactions, software errors causing transaction errors after harvesting. The APS stream sent directly to HAPS or the PON clients is not expected to cause any problems with regard to file rejection.

The End-to-End APS reconciliation has been developed jointly between ICL Pathway and PON to ensure that a reconciliation is provided from harvesting through to processing at PON / TIP and the eventual PON client settlement. In other words:

- Harvested transactions for APS and TPS are reconciled
- TPS harvested transactions are reconciled against transactions processed by PON / TIP – taking into account file rejection and data repair / resends etc.
- APS harvested transactions are reconciled against transactions sent to HAPS and directly to PON clients.

In order to maintain an effective and timely End-to-End APS reconciliation, ICL Pathway are required to provide, in addition to the system derived APS reconciliation report set, APS transaction detail in respect of transmission and sub files rejected by PON / TIP. A variety of queries have been developed within ICL Pathway to identify the APS content of any files subsequently rejected and to track the re-send and repair process completed to ensure that these transactions are correctly accounted for.

4.1.1 End-to-End APS Reconciliation Report – APSS2141

Once all transaction rejections have been accounted for, ICL Pathway will prepare the daily End-to-End APS reconciliation report and forward this to PON TIP / TP. This reconciliation is completed in accordance with the following rules:

	No	Value	No	Value
Section 1: APS Harvested / TPS Harvested				
1. Transactions harvested by APS	From APSS2133			
2. Transactions harvested by TPS			From APSS2133	
3. APS transactions not harvested by TPS harvester **(*)**			Line 1 – Line 2	
4. APS transactions not harvested by APS harvester **(*)**	Line 2 – Line 1			
5. APS transactions harvested by TPS today but harvested by APS on: dd/mm/yyyy	Previous days report(s) Line 3 entries			
6. APS transactions harvested by APS today but harvested by TPS on: dd/mm/yyyy			Previous days report(s) Line 4 entries	
7. TOTAL	No	Value	No	Value
8. Difference				
Section 2: TIP Processed / TPS Harvested				
9. Transactions harvested by TPS			From APSS2133	
10. TIP rejections received today	Calculated by ICL Pathway			
11. TIP rejections returned today			Calculated by ICL Pathway	
12. Transactions processed by TIP	Calculated by TIP			
13. Transactions disregarded by TIP **(*)**	Calculated by ICL Pathway			
14. Transactions processed by TIP with incorrect accounting sense **(*)**	Calculated by ICL Pathway			
15. Transactions processed by TIP delivered on: dd/mm/yyyy			Calculated by ICL Pathway – TIP	
16. TOTAL	N0	Value	No	Value
17. Difference				
Section 3: APS Harvested / APS Processed				
18. B/Fwd: Delayed transactions not processed	From APSS2133			
19. Transactions harvested by APS	From APSS2133			
20. Transactions delivered to HAPS			From APSS2133	
21. Transactions delivered to Clients			From APSS2133	
22. Delayed transactions delivered to manual			From APSS2133	
23. C/Fwd: Delayed transactions not processed			From APSS2133	
24. TOTAL	No	Value	No	Value
25 Difference				

Note:

(*) Entries on these lines will generate a BIMS report.

4.1.2 End-to-End APS Reconciliation Summary

In addition to the End-to-End APS reconciliation report, ICL Pathway will provide an ongoing daily summary showing the reconciliation status for each day, i.e. whether or not the day reconciles in respect of PON / TIP processing.

Date	Difference in Transaction Count	Difference in Transaction Value	Reconciliation State Y/ N	Explanation of Difference
01/02/01	0	£0.00	Y	N/A
02/02/01	50	£500.00	N	Transactions not rejected

4.1.3 Data Delivery Timescale & Mechanism

In order to reconcile the TPS harvested transactions to those transactions processed by PON / TIP, PON / TIP will provide the volume and value of transactions processed for each day. This figure will relate to those transactions received and processed and will ignore any specific transaction dates. If the TIP derived figures are unavailable within the timescale defined below, ICL Pathway will delay the completion of APSS2141 until the final TIP processed figures are available.

To complete the End-to-End APS reconciliation, it is important that data is received and input into the spreadsheet in accordance with the following timescales:

Deliverable	Timescale	Responsibility
APS system derived reports (base data)	Harvesting day + ONE	ICL Pathway
TIP Processed figure for APS transactions	Harvesting day + THREE	PON / TIP
APS content of TIP rejected files	Harvesting day + THREE	ICL Pathway
APS content of resent rejections	Harvesting day + THREE	ICL Pathway
End-to-End APS reconciliation report available to PON	Harvesting day + FOUR	ICL Pathway

In the event that a reconciliation cannot be achieved by close of business on harvesting day + 4, the appropriate misbalance will be shown as a difference at line 19 of APS2141

4.1.3.1 Delivery Mechanism

Information flows between ICL Pathway and PON / TIP will conform to the following:

- TIP processing information will be delivered to ICL Pathway via e-mail
- The End-to-End APS Reconciliation report and the End-to-End APS reconciliation summary will be delivered to PON / TIP via PON corporate e-mail (ICL Pathway account). If this is not available, standard e-mail between the two organisations will be used as a contingency.

5.0 Reconciliation & Incident Handling

5.1 Incident Classification

5.1.1 APS Business Incidents

Relate to the 'Symptom' of an underlying cause – e.g. the effect of the system fault on the resulting reconciliation or settlement information sent to PON.

An APS Business Incident relates to one or more of the errors reported within the APS Report Set, the End-to-End APS reconciliation (section 4.0) or one or more of the reconciliation or settlement errors raised in accordance with this document by PON / TIP or TP. Refer to section 5.4 for a list of those APS Business Incident categories currently known and for which appropriate APS Business Incident reporting processes are set out in this document.

5.1.2 System Incidents

Relate to the underlying 'Cause'

System Incidents may be raised by ICL Pathway to cover file rejections, non-delivery of files, or failures in the delivery of the APS Report Set, where there is no associated APS Business Incident. In addition, following the creation of an APS Business Incident, ICL Pathway may raise an associated System Incident. System Incidents will be routed to the appropriate group within ICL Pathway, for investigation and resolution.

Where there are associated System Incidents and APS Business Incidents, their relationship can be either:

- one to one; or
- one to many, respectively.

5.2 APS Business Incident Originators

It is envisaged that APS Business Incidents will only be generated by the following groups within ICL Pathway and PON:

- ICL Pathway / MSU for errors reported via the APS Report Set & End-to-End APS reconciliation
- PON TIP / TP / Outlet Systems Group (BSM) for any other reconciliation or settlement error discovered by PON that has not been reported by ICL Pathway
- ICL Pathway / System Support Centre (SSC) for any system fault or data 'surgery' which is considered by ICL Pathway to have a reconciliation or settlement implication within PON.

Subject to agreement by the parties to the contrary, outlet calls to the Horizon System Helpdesk (HSH) will not generate APS Business Incidents. However calls from outlets will be monitored and if it is considered necessary by ICL Pathway, difficulties reported to the HSH will be elevated to APS Business Incident status.

5.3 Generation of Business Incidents

In line with the generic incident management policy agreed between ICL Pathway and PON, APS Business Incidents will only be recognised as such if generated by ICL Pathway or PON as appropriate, via the HSH. This ensures that the APS Business Incident is properly logged, enabling ICL Pathway / MSU to ensure that corrective information can be supplied and any underlying system fault can be rectified.

It is important that PON TIP / TP / BSM supply sufficient information to the HSH when generating an APS Business Incident to ensure the timescales for the resolution of APS Business Incidents referred to in section 5.4 can be achieved. Achievement of such timescales is dependent upon the following information being provided by PON TIP / TP / BSM when generating an APS Business Incident via the HSH:

- A valid 'PATH' code must be quoted, e.g. **'PATH040'** etc.
- Prefix all narrative with **'THIS IS A BUSINESS INCIDENT FOR MSU'**
- The valid incident category (see section 5.4), if one is applicable, should be quoted together with any other relevant detail, e.g. product Id, Cash Account lines etc.

NB: Where PON TIP / TP / BSM raise an APS Business Incident which may require a large amount of supporting information, summary detail only may be given to the HSH and the additional information sent via e-mail to ICL Pathway / MSU. (A current contact list will be made available to PON).

5.4 APS Business Incidents

5.4.1 APS Reconciliation Report Errors

Reconciliation errors within the APS reconciliation report set should be few and far between and, if they do occur, will be applicable to:

- APS / TPS harvesters running out of sync
- Software errors causing transactions not be harvested
- Unidentified differences classed as 'Reconciliation Errors' within APSS2133.

Where such differences occur, a BIMS report will be raised for each incident and referenced against the appropriate line within section 1 of APSS2141

5.4.2 End-to-End APS Reconciliation Errors

Reconciliation errors may occur when reconciling the TPS harvested transactions against those transactions received and processed by PON / TIP.
If, after accounting for all rejected and resent transactions, section 2 of APSS2141 fails to provided a zero difference, the process of resolution should be as follows:

- Issue an initial BIMS for the difference requesting PON / TIP verify the rejected, resent and processed figures supplied for the day in question. NB: This may be difficult if the rejection rate is particularly high on a given day and where there is in excess of 10 affected transmission files, ICL Pathway MSU manager and PON / TIP manager will discuss how to resolve the difference.
- If after verification, these figures prove to be correct, ICL Pathway / MSU will raise a System Incident to investigate any possible software errors or transaction discrepancies in the delivered total to PON / TIP. This will be tracked via the BIMS and System Incident Log (SIL) process.
- If after verification, corrections are required to the report, version 2 of APS2141 will be issued by MSU.

5.4.3 Delayed Transactions

Where transactions have been harvested by the APS harvester and have failed to be delivered to either HAPS or PON clients, they are referred to as Delayed Transactions. In normal circumstances, these transactions will be input by ICL Pathway into the APS data file via the APS secure workstation and will be received by PON / HAPS / client, 24 hours later. There may be occasions when transactions cannot be sent via the data file process and have to be delivered to 'Manual'. In such cases, full detail of the transaction is supplied via the BIMS MER route which is **NOT** chargeable under the provisions of CA schedule G01 as the incident refers only to the APS transaction stream and does not affect PON / TIP.
These transactions are highlighted within section 3 of the End-to-End APS reconciliation – APSS2141.

5.5 Incident Reporting

5.5.1 BIMS Reports / MER

BIMS has been designed to report the progress to resolution of an APS Business Incident to allow PON to complete an accurate reconciliation (within PON central systems) or settlement with their clients. For ease of identification and association with the corresponding HSH call, BIMS Report references will mimic the HSH reference. However they will be prefixed with a letter 'B', e.g. HSH ref.: E9912120011 = BIMS ref.: BE9912120011.

5.5.1.1 Format & content of BIMS report / MER

A BIMS Report will be issued for each APS Business Incident generated via the HSH. As part of that BIMS report, ICL Pathway will issue a MER for each error associated with the relevant APS Business Incident where it is necessary to do so to advising PON / TP of the transaction detail required to enable reconciliation or settlement to take place.

BIMS Reports / MER are designed to notify PON of the detail required to assist in the reconciliation or settlement process within PON. They communicate information concerning the resolution of the symptom of an underlying cause, not the cause itself. BIMS Reports / MER will not advise any detail as to the underlying 'Cause' of the problem if this is a result of a software error etc. This information is supplied via the SIL. Where a System Incident is generated to eradicate the cause of a particular problem, and there are one or more associated APS Business Incidents, cross-references will be supplied on the APS Business Incident BIMS Report / MER to allow tracking of the System Incident.

5.5.1.2 Clearance & Closure Criteria

ICL Pathway anticipates that it will provide information concerning APS Business Incidents to PON on a 'drip feed' basis, by issuing updated versions of the initial BIMS Report / MER.

A BIMS Report is 'Cleared' when ICL Pathway has provided the information required to be contained in the relevant BIMS Report as set out in section 5.5.1.1. The BIMS Report is then closed following agreement between PON / TP and ICL Pathway / MSU at the monthly Incident Management Review. Such agreement is subject only to fulfilment of the following conditions:

- If there is no associated System Incident, the BIMS Report is closed subject to the clearance criteria described above being met
- If there is an associated System Incident, the BIMS Report is closed subject to the successful closure of the System Incident by ICL Pathway.

PON will advise ICL Pathway via spreadsheet on a monthly basis at the monthly Incident Management Review of any payments it considers are payable to PON (as compensation for PON's costs in dealing with MER) and / or its charges for dealing with widespread errors. For the avoidance of doubt, **NO** charges are payable in respect of MER issued for APS incidents affecting the HAPS or Client transaction stream only.

If the parties disagree whether only the HAPS / Client transaction streams are affected, this will be initially discussed at the monthly Incident Management Review. The specific incidents will then be escalated via a 'Case Law Referral' form, to the Contract Administration Board for a final decision to be made.

5.5.1.3 Report Distribution

ICL Pathway will distribute APS BIMS Reports / MER within PON using the PON corporate e-mail network. In the event that this facility is temporarily unavailable, reports will be distributed via the ICL Pathway mail system.

BIMS Reports / MER distributed in accordance with this section will be deemed to have been issued to PON, and / or PON given notice of any errors described therein, at the time of transmission by mail.

An example of a BIMS Report / MER is shown in Appendix 1.

5.5.2 System Incident Log

The SIL is intended to track the progress to resolution of a System Incident generated to eradicate an underlying system fault. In practice, one system fault could lead to a number of symptoms generating APS Business Incidents. The SIL has been developed to remove the need to annotate each BIMS Report / MER associated with a particular system fault, with the detail required to ensure PON are fully advised as to the nature of this fault and how and when it is to be rectified. This information will be contained in the SIL.

5.5.3 Reporting Timescales

ICL Pathway / MSU will use reasonable endeavours to raise an initial BIMS Report (V1.0) relating to a new APS Business Incident within 24 hours of the notification of the incident. This will be made available in accordance with section 5.5.1.3, to the PON 'Incident Manager, Transaction Processing', on the same working day as the APS Business Incident is generated via the HSH, or in any event on the morning of the next working day. In the event of the APS Report Set not being available to CS / MSU

in time to enable any errors to be notified within this timescale, CS / MSU will contact the PON 'Incident Manager Transaction Processing' to agree a temporary extension to the timescale. This initial, incomplete, BIMS Report will serve to notify PON that a Business Incident has occurred and that the completed BIMS Report will be provided to PON within the agreed timescales.

ICL Pathway will use reasonable endeavours to ensure the final completed BIMS Report / MER, is made available in accordance with section 5.1.and is cleared within five working days from the date the APS Business Incident was generated via the HSH.

Where there is a need to correct APS / TPS Data Errors, (see CS/PRO/111 TPS Reconciliation & Incident Management, for a full description), ICL Pathway will use reasonable endeavours to deliver the corrected data file to PON TIP within five working days from the date the APS Business Incident was generated via the HSH. This may however, not always be practical due to the technicalities of creating a corrected data file if there is a high volume of data.

There is no strict timescale for the resolution of a System Incident as the time taken to develop a fix or correct erroneous reference data cannot be determined. Obviously however, ICL Pathway will give every System Incident the priority it deserves taking into account PON's requirement and would aim to deliver an initial analysis of the root cause within 5 working days and a final analysis and evidence of remedial action, within 10 working days. A System Incident will be closed by ICL Pathway once the relevant fix has been developed and tested, or a correction to the relevant erroneous reference data has been authorised or approved for release through the appropriate agreed procedures between ICL Pathway and PON. The SIL, advising the current status of System Incidents will be delivered to PON TIP / TP & PON / BSM at the end of each week. PON may telephone ICL Pathway / MSU at any time to receive an update as to the status of any System Incident documented on the SIL.

5.5.4 Widespread Errors

ICL Pathway will monitor 'trigger points', for example HSH calls and the APS Report set, which can alert of any likely potential or actual 'widespread' errors which may occur. This is generally agreed to be the case where at least 100 outlets are affected with the same problem. In such a case, the incident type will be closely monitored by ICL Pathway until volumes are such that the incident will then be raised as a problem and passed from ICL Pathway into the PON business community. This is action will be taken when at least 1000 outlets are affected by the same incident type.

Should this scenario occur, ICL Pathway Business Continuity Manager shall immediately notify PON Business Continuity Manager of the widespread error. Upon giving such notice the provisions of this document (other than this section) shall cease to apply to that particular widespread error. Instead, a recovery plan applicable to the specific nature of the error will be agreed by both parties.

5.5.5 Repairing Data

Data repair is not viable for PON HAPS / client stream transactions. Rejected transactions are not expected as neither have sophisticated file / transaction validation processes. Therefore the repair of PON / HAPS / client transactions is not discussed within this document.

Refer to ICL Pathway document CS/PRO/111 TPS Reconciliation & Incident Management for the repair criteria in relation to APS transactions affecting the TPS transaction stream.

6.0 Client Migration

6.1 Variable File Transfer

PON clients have the option of taking transaction delivery from ICL Pathway in accordance with their own processing requirements. *NB: Specific client requirements are described elsewhere for each client – this document is not intended to describe each in detail.*

APS transactions are harvested from the outlets on a seven-day basis and all are available for onward transmission on each day to the clients should they require it. However, some clients only require transactions to be delivered on a five day, or one day etc., per week basis. This has no impact upon the reconciliation between the actual client transmission and the Client Transaction Summary (CTS).

The (CTS) accurately identifies the volume and value of the 'normal' transactions (not reversed / reversing transactions) that have been delivered to the clients on a particular day in accordance with their specific requirements. It is important to note that the transactions actually delivered to PON clients as recorded on the CTS will differ from the value shown on APSS2133 within the Delivery Sub Total (9). This figure represents the values harvested from the outlets, which may, or may not yet have been delivered to PON clients in accordance with their requirements.

6.2 Reconciliation in the event of non delivery of the CTS to PON

PON / TP use the CTS as the basis for settlement with migrated clients. In the unlikely event that ICL Pathway fails to deliver the CTS file to PON or PON reject the file, PON / TP will need to use the APSS2133b to manually calculate settlements due. The CTS only reports normal transactions whereas the APSS2133b includes reversed / reversing transactions. Consequently PON / TP can only use the APSS2133b to calculate the value (not the volume) of the settlements due.

Settlement is time critical and ICL Pathway will ensure all the relevant system derived APS reconciliation reports are delivered on time to ensure that settlement can be made between PON and it's clients. In order to satisfy this requirement, ICL Pathway elected to make all reconciliation reports available by 08.00hrs as stated in section 3.2, on a daily basis.

NB: ICL Pathway is currently reviewing CTS reporting.

6.2.1 Clerical Reconciliation Example in the event of non delivery of CTS to PON

When using the APSS2133b report to calculate settlements due, PON / TP will need to take account of the individual clients file delivery pattern and settlement frequency, e.g. for clients who have elected to take five day delivery – Monday to Friday the Monday delivery will include transactions harvested on the Friday / Saturday and Sunday. For clients who have elected to take six day delivery – Monday to Saturday, the Monday delivery will include transactions harvested on the Saturday and Sunday.

6.3 Impact of Client Migration on the Reconciliation Process

It is not expected that client migration will have any adverse impact upon the established reconciliation processes now being employed by ICL Pathway.

Report APSS2133 already identifies transactions sent to both PON / HAPS and clients as separate entries, client migration will just see transaction delivery growing in favour of clients and reducing to HAPS.

However, the delivery of the CTS to PON is vital if settlement between PON and it's clients is to take place on a timely basis. Where this is not possible, contingency procedures are being developed to use the APS reports; APSS2133 and APSS2133b to provide a manual reconciliation to enable settlement to take place. This process has been described within section 6.2.1 above.

7.0 Appendix

1 - BIMS Report Example

BIMS Reference:	BE/0102010894				Final Update
Incident Type:	2	APS	Version: 3	Last Updated:	06/02/01 16:15:59
Incident Class:	0044	Transaction(s) polled by TIP but not by HAPS			
Originator:	PW-MSU	Transaction Date:	31-Jan-01	CAP: 4500	FAD:
Status:	0	Open		Exception Value:	£835.26

Other References		Transaction Liability			
PinICL Reference:		Provisional:		Final:	
Incident Xref:		Settlement Details			
TIP/TP/OSG Ref:		Transaction Settlement			
System Incident References			Settled Amount:		
	HSH:		Invoice Number:		
	PinICL:		Invoice Date:		
		Manual Error Report			
Incident History			Chargeable Errors:		
Date Received:	01-Feb-01		MER Set Amt:		
Date Cleared:	02-Feb-01		MER Inv No:		
Date Closed:			MER Inv Date:		

Actions					
Actions: Date & Time	01/02/01 13:28:47	Action Type	Describe Incident	Analyst	Mike King
	The APS Daily Account Balancing Report 2133 for processing date 31/01/01 shows 54 delayed transactions that have not been delivered to HAPS. Of these there are 26 which are being investigated under BE/0101230757, BE/0101261621, BE/0101290754 & BE/0101310689. There are also 28 new txns from FADs 152405 & 282226 and carry the error message Digital Signature Failiure. Please see attached spreadsheet E-0101310680 for details of value, volume, client and item ID.				
Actions: Date & Time	02/02/01 11:54:09	Action Type	Clear Incident	Analyst	Mike King
	These transactions were successfully resent on01/02/01. PON needs to take no further action with regard to these txns. This was cause by difficulties in migrating APS software on some countersat these FADs to CI4. 152405 & 282226 require swapping of base units which will be carried out this week. Once this done there should be no further reoccurance.				