To:	Peter Jones	Copy:	Catherine Fraser
			Gail Morley
			Sue Harding
			Ruth Holleran
			David Parnell
			Janet Topham
			Simon Rilot

From: Chris Young   Date: 8 October 1998

Subject:	MO & E2E Testing Issues

Peter

Thank you for copying me in to your memo to Simon Rilot, I will attempt to respond to each of your areas of concern.

Migration

I have read your previous letter regarding this area, and can confirm that all but one of the elements of reconciliation that you highlighted have been exercised during MOR2, with varying degrees of success.

We have been unable to test end of cash account week where ITIP has only had part of the weeks transactions, because we were unable to produce a balanced cash account during MOR2. However, the test has been planned and is due to be run in MOR3. As you mention, there were some problems encountered during migration that affected cash account production, and they fell into the following 3 areas:

i)   During Miman and MiECCO some stock values were not migrated correctly, resulting in those products being omitted from the subsequent stock unit balance/cash account.

ii)   During MiECCO some stock quantities were not migrated correctly, i.e. fixed value items were incorrectly migrated with a quantity of 1, with a value not equal to default selling price.

iii)   During MiMam and MiECCO some reference data mapping issues were identified i.e. ECCO products report to different Horizon products.

All occurrences of the above were reported to Pathway as incidents and raised as PinICLs.

These problems, combined with known difficulties in Cash Account production, resulted in ineffectual validation of the migration process.

1

Transactions

I can confirm that each days planned transactions were provided to ITIP from test day 6, although admittedly, clean day for day running was not possible until test day 13.
A large number of script errors were encountered during MOR2 as a result of the need to control expected results. Originally the test scripts had been designed to accomplish procedural testing only and did not contain the functional detail required for rigid expected results. As you are aware, the decision to focus data integrity onto MOR2 was taken very late and did not allow time for any necessary amendment to the scripts. There were also a number of occasions when unscripted activities (including transactions) were required in order to put the stock units into a position where a cash account could be produced.

It is hoped that much of this re-work will be in place for MOR3.

It has also proved difficult to control operator error during MO, as the operators consist of real counter clerks rather than experienced testers. Although the operators are supervised, it is impossible to monitor their every action, and indeed would be seen as negative to the objectives of procedural testing. I see this as a problem that will potentially remain during MOR3, therefore I would like to forward the following proposal for your consideration in order to tighten up this area.

At present we are attempting to carry out a strict control of expected results across 7 test offices incorporating approximately 50 stock units, which is proving difficult for the Horizon test team to manage, and time consuming for ITIP staff to reconcile.

I would like to propose that we concentrate future MO data integrity testing on 2 specific offices (e.g. 1 x 1c and 1 x NR2) and run the other 5 as originally intended i.e. looser expected results. This will allow full monitoring of operators, possibly using experienced testers, and lighten the burden in terms of numbers of transactions to be reconciled.

I would also like to remind you that E2E cycle 2 will be carrying out full data integrity checking, albeit without data centre migration, using test scripts designed with rigid expected results.

I would appreciate your thoughts on the above.

Rejected/Missing Files

I understand that file transfers were being somewhat 'hand cranked' during MOR2, therefore it is doubtful that Pathway were exercising procedures to handle rejected files. Pathway have confirmed that they will be running FTMS during MOR3 which should overcome these problems. I will ask Simon Palladino to contact you regarding files outstanding from E2E and MOR2, and seek his confirmation that Pathway system processes and procedures will be tested during future test phases.

2

Model Office/Operational Running

Again, I shall speak to Simon Palladino regarding resetting to 'live' schedules.

Cash Accounts

A total of 9 incidents (displayed below) were raised against the cash account during MOR2, however they were only observed and checked where obvious, e.g. incorrect totals etc. It is assumed that a full mapping exercise including checking back to original transaction detail has been carried out prior to MO and E2E during a functional test phase.

Issue	Resolution	Incident	Status	Comment
'Method Of Object' problem prevents production of Cash Account reports.	Printer driver configuration problem	PC0014379 E-9810010075	Pending	Solution with Pathway for re-test
System allows roll over after production of cash account snap shot	Fixed for MOR3 build	PC0016604 E-9810010127	Pending	Solution with Pathway, awaiting re-test in MOR3.
Table 2(a) - Discrepancies not populating	Due to new C/A structure implemented for MOR2	PC0016143 E-9809220009	Pending	Awaiting retest by · Pathway and in MOR3
Table 12 - Parcel traffic not populated	Duplicate of PC0010552. Unsure of resolution	PC0016399 E-9809270011	Closed	Problem could be due to Cash Account mappings.
Table 10 (g) - Non-Accounting data not populated	Fixed for MOR3 build	PC0016398 E-9809270010	Closed	Solution with Pathway, awaiting re-test in MOR3
Requirement for 2 copies of Cash Account to be produced	C/A production rules implemented for MOR3	PC0016397 E-9809270009	Closed	Solution with Pathway, awaiting re-test in MOR3
Payments Table - CHEC figure displayed as negative	Duplicate of PC0013984. Unsure of resolution	PC0016242 E-9809220143	Closed	Awaiting retest in MOR3
Receipts Table - Instant Win figure displayed as negative	Duplicate of PC0013985. Unsure of resolution	PC0016183 E-9809220142	Closed	Awaiting retest in MOR3
Payments Table - 'Benefit' Line spelt incorrectly	Info. added to PC0015315. Unsure of resolution	PC0016192 E-9809220140	Closed	Awaiting retest in MOR3

It is expected that these PinICLs, together with a number of cash account PinICLs from MOR1 will be resolved and included in the MOR3 baseline, allowing a balanced cash account to be produced.

Reference Data

Reference data change drops were not applied as per script during MOR2, but they were applied, which is an improvement on MOR1. It is assumed that they will be applied on expected days during MOR3 and E2E cycle 2.

PinICLs

An objective of Model Office Testing is to exercise the live Helpdesk procedures including incident reporting and monitoring. This includes implementation and testing of Pathway Helpdesk Service Level Agreements, as part of the testing of the SLA the Helpdesk are obliged to provide regular updates on all outstanding open calls. The frequency of the update depends upon the category of the call, but can range from every 4 hours for high category incidents to once a day for lower categories. This could potentially involve the Borough site receiving over 150 update calls a day, which is completely unmanageable. It was therefore agreed with Pathway that if an incident is resolved, or a fix has been identified and tested in another test phase, the Helpdesk call will be closed but identified as awaiting retest in MOR3, allowing the test team to concentrate on incidents undergoing analysis. Any PinICL resulting from the Helpdesk call may be closed or remain open.

All PinICLs awaiting retest in MOR3 will be included in the MOR3 Release Notes, and the Horizon Test Team have recorded all open incidents, including those that Pathway have closed, to ensure that they are retested.

I hope that this addresses all of your issues, I am happy to discuss any further concerns.

Regards

Chris Young
Horizon Model Office Test Manager

☎ **GRO**

4