

File - Acceptance
ICL Pathway

Acceptance Proposal
Acceptance Incident 412

412
Ref: CR/ACD/412
Version: 0.1
Date: 08/09/99

Document Title: Acceptance Proposal for Acceptance Incident 412

Document Type: Acceptance Proposal

Abstract: This document contains ICL Pathway's proposal in respect of Acceptance Incident 412.

Document Status: Issued

Author & Dept: Dave Cooke - ICL Pathway Customer Requirements

Reviewed By: John Dicks - Director Customer Requirements

Stephen Muchow - Director Customer Service

Distribution:	ICL Pathway	POCL	Expert
	ICL Reviewers	John Meagher	Peter Copping
	Tony Oppenheim	Keith Baines	
	ICL Pathway Library		

ICL Pathway

Acceptance Proposal
Acceptance Incident 412Ref: CR/ACD/412
Version: 0.1
Date: 08/09/99**0 Document control****0.1 Document history**

Version	Date	Reason
0.1	08/09/99	First Issue

0.2 Approval authorities

Name	Position	Signature	Date
J H Bennett	Managing Director		
J C C Dicks	Customer Requirements Director		
S Muchow	Customer Services Director		

0.3 Associated documents

	Reference	Date	Vers	Title	Source
1.	CS/PRO/031	21/10/97	1.0	MIS Report Production and Scheduling	ICL Pathway

0.4 Abbreviations

ICL Pathway

Acceptance Proposal
Acceptance Incident 412Ref: CR/ACD/412
Version: 0.1
Date: 08/09/99

0.5 Table of content

1	PURPOSE	4
2	SUMMARY	4
3	CRITERIA	4
4	POCL POSITION	4
5	PATHWAY POSITION	5
5.1	AD-HOC REPORTING	5
5.2	SERVICE REVIEW BOOK	6
5.2.1	<i>Benchmark Transaction time summaries</i>	7
5.2.2	<i>OBCS transaction times</i>	7
5.2.3	<i>Fall back transactions</i>	7
5.3	TRANSACTION VOLUMES	8

1 Purpose

This document is provided to address the questions and concerns expressed in AI 412 and to propose the basis of its Clearance. This AI relates to ICL Pathway's responsiveness in dealing with requests for ad-hoc reports, the method of calculation used in the July Service Review Book and the ability of ICL Pathway to generate counts of transaction volumes associated with SLA calculations.

The structure of this document follows these three areas of concern.

In addition the response to a particular ad-hoc report request referenced in the AI is also addressed by this document.

2 Summary

- Ad-Hoc Reporting - ICL Pathway accepts that the response to the particular ad-hoc request referred to in this AI was delayed, but that the overall process is operating correctly.
- July Service Review Book - The Transaction Time service level calculations are based on the previously agreed mean benchmark transaction time. At this time no adjustments were made for fall-back transactions since the values for the various categories of fall back transaction time are still in the process of being agreed with POCL.
- Transaction volume counting - ICL Pathway is able to count the various classes of transactions and the overall transaction volumes are published via the ICL Pathway Customer Services Web page.

3 Criteria

No criterion is mentioned in the AI.

4 POCL position

POCL's position is represented in the AI text as:

- ICL Pathway has not responded to an ad-hoc request issued on 22/07/99 associated with the July Service Review Book
- ICL Pathway has refused to respond to three previous ad-hoc requests
- ICL Pathway is unable to count transaction volumes
- "if this data was not available it would not have been possible to report that they had passed the service levels - this calls into question the veracity of their service reporting."

5 Pathway position

The response to this AI is split into three areas to address the various concerns and questions raised by POCL.

5.1 Ad-Hoc Reporting

ICL Pathway accepts that there has been some delay in dealing with the ad-hoc request of 22/7/99. POCL has since provided evidence that it was actually submitted on 23/7/99 by email, but the intended ICL Pathway recipient did not receive it. Section 2 of this AI response provides the response to this request.

The AI also states that ICL Pathway has refused to provide responses to three previous ad-hoc requests. This is not the case and ICL Pathway believes that POCL were advised why it was not possible to respond to these requests.

The three requests are believed to be:

Date	Ad-Hoc request Description	Reason
25/06/99	Information of every call to HSH since start of NR2 to present	The volume of information that this would have generated would be considerable and in a form that would make any subsequent analysis difficult. The planned introduction of on-line access to Powerhelp for POCL was believed to be a more appropriate way of meeting this request.
06/07/99	Incidents raised at HSH relating to non-application or desktop specific messages e.g. "out of virtual memory", "virtual memory loss".	It was explained to POCL that the Horizon system does record failures of this type. Such information is now available by inspection of the call closure text via Powerhelp.

ICL Pathway

Acceptance Proposal
Acceptance Incident 412Ref: CR/ACD/412
Version: 0.1
Date: 08/09/99

Date	Ad-Hoc request Description	Reason
06/07/99	Incidents raised at HSH relating to "lockups" and "screen freezes".	<p>It was explained to POCL that the Horizon system does record failures of this type.</p> <p>Such information is now available by inspection of the call closure text via Powerhelp.</p>

The ad-hoc request process (CS/PRO/031 - MIS Report Production and Scheduling) has been in operation for some considerable time, and the procedure for submission was discussed and revised at the July Service Review forum. Many ad-hoc requests have been and continue to be issued and ICL Pathway believes the responses provided are to POCL's satisfaction.

ICL Pathway will normally provide ad hoc reports in accordance with R914 within three POCL Core Working Days where the information required is readily available in the form sought. Where such information is not readily available, as in these cases, ICL Pathway will agree with POCL the most appropriate way of addressing the particular request.

5.2 Service Review Book

The particular request mentioned in the AI, dated 23/07/99, requests:

"Transaction Services and transaction times for EPOSS, OBCS and APS for July showing the underlying data / calculations used to show they passed these SLAs".

The calculation of transaction time service levels for OBCS, APS and EPOSS is specified in Schedules H08, E08 and F08 respectively. These in turn refer to the Benchmark Counter Transaction Times documents CR/PRP/011, CR/PRP/013 and CR/PRP/014 all at version 1 and agreed with POCL as Contract Controlled Documents.

These documents state that, with the exception of OBCS foreign transactions, all other transactions times are to be based on the set of benchmark figures contained in each document and not based on actual transaction time measurement. In all cases the weighted mean transaction time of these benchmark figures is within the target transaction time (see 2.1) and accordingly the Service Review Book for July and previous months will show this as achieved using a green entry against the various Transaction Services.

5.2.1 Benchmark Transaction time summaries

The following is reproduced from the summaries of the above transaction time documents.

Service	Mean Benchmark transaction time	Mean Maximum transaction time
OBCS	26.02 secs	27.01 secs
APS	18.80 secs	20.27 secs
EPOSS	22.90 secs	23.13 secs

5.2.2 OBCS transaction times

In the case of OBCS foreign transactions, comprising 6% of the total OBCS transactions, the variable element is the ISDN communications time. The measured benchmark figure for this is 5.4 seconds.

The actual mean time for the last three months, and the corresponding actual mean transaction times are: -

Month	ISDN time	Actual Mean Transaction time	Target Mean Transaction time
June	5.39	26.02	27.01
July	5.66	26.03	27.01
August	4.71	25.98	27.01

5.2.3 Fall back transactions

The service level calculations for all of the transaction types described in the Service Level Schedules also have to be adjusted by the number of transactions conducted in various forms of fall back. This will take place when the individual fallback transaction time figures have been agreed with POCL and this activity is being managed by Jan Ambrose (ICL Pathway) and Pavittar Sandhu (POCL). A proposal from ICL Pathway was made on 3/8/99 and final comments are awaited from POCL.

When these figures are agreed and the relevant Contract Schedules updated, the SLA calculations will then take account of any adjustments required for fall-back.

At present, however, transaction volumes are not required in order to calculate the transaction time SLAs because the values of the fall-back transactions times have not yet been agreed.

ICL Pathway

Acceptance Proposal
Acceptance Incident 412Ref: CR/ACD/412
Version: 0.1
Date: 08/09/99

5.3 Transaction Volumes

POCL has expressed concerns over the ability of ICL Pathway to calculate transaction volumes, particularly in the context of transaction time SLA calculations. The above explanation covers why transaction volumes are not currently required.

The particular meeting referred to in the AI (9/7/99 - Liz Blackburn, Graham Wingrove et al.) was not concerned with overall transaction counting, but with particular aspects of EPOSS transaction aggregation.

Transaction volumes for APS, OBCS and EPOSS are provided as part of the vital statistics information available on the ICL Pathway Customer Services Web page.

These overall totals are broken down into the transaction types required by the Service Level Contract Schedules and will be used in future SLA calculations, subject to agreement of the fallback times. Once this is in place POCL may request a detailed breakdown of the transaction volumes that underpin entries in the Service Review Book.