

Janet

To: Simon Rilot

*please speak**about this.***GRO**CC: Catherine Fraser
Gail Morley
Sue Harding
Ruth Holleran
David Parnell
Janet Topham
Chris Young

From: Peter Jones

Date: 7/10/98

Subject: MO & E2E Testing Issues

I feel it necessary to write to you again as you appear unhappy with these types of concerns being raised at the weekly testing meetings or in other meetings.

I know we have a different perspective about what the status of the systems should be by this stage of testing, and you may be getting a great deal of benefit from the current phases in terms of being able to key transactions into the system, but there is still a number of key areas which are vital and remain unproven. We are leaving it very late to identify basic errors let alone more complex one's and then the required test phases in which to prove them as being fixed.

My concerns are around the usual one's (which I will expand later in this document) I have raised many times before with you and are genuine concerns in view of the date of 18/12 (end of MO & E2E testing) looming ever closer.

Migration: You took the decision to remove migration from E2E testing, in view of that, please can you confirm all the elements of reconciliation (as documented in my previous letters to you) required to be proven during migration are being covered. I am aware that the migration phase during MOR2 did have some problems but due to extra or missing files we are currently unable to give a factual view from our perspective. I am aware that no cash accounts balanced for the week involved, which may or may not be due to migration problems.

Transactions: In view of your decision on migration I understand that the detailed checking of outputs to detailed expected results would also be carried out throughout MO to ensure the integrity of migration was fully proven. We are having a great deal of difficulty in checking the files sent to us as the files we have accepted differ from the scripts by upto 75%. Please can you assure me that the differences are being fully identified to ensure that it is not the system creating these differences. The large number of differences between script and expected results are either being classed as

user input error or expected transaction records not reflecting the script . Please can you inform me what improvement activities are being put in place to ensure more accuracy in terms of carrying out the agreed scripts. As you will be aware operator error was a major issue during DIT.

Rejected / Missing Files: The testing plans are all based on reconciliation being carried out circa the day after or within a short time frame in order to then reset the environments for the next run. We are rejecting a large number of files as per the interface for a number of reasons some of which are concerning and then the files are not being rectified and returned in a timely manner . I would hope that the Pathway systems processes and procedures are being tested to handle rejected files and would expect that they should be dealt with on the same or next day. It appears to us that they only know there are rejected files when we raise a PinICL. There are still files outstanding from E2E first pass which finished some 3weeks ago. MOR2 is nearly complete in terms of run days yet we are still waiting for files rejected on the first day. We are currently awaiting 25 files covering cash accounts and transactions for each of the MOR2 days. Which as you will appreciate means we cannot reconcile any days including the migration situation. As per plan we will have to commence preparation of the resetting the environments for MOR 3 and will therefore be unable to accept these files after Friday 9th Oct. Even if we were to get and accept these files we would have a major task in trying to untangle them all and reconcile the information prior to the commencement of E2E 2nd pass and MOR 3. As occurred in previous phases we also received files for dates pre data centre migration which should not be possible.

Model office / Operational Running: During the planning phases everyone was most insistent that the systems should run as if "live" which in TIP's case means we should receive files during a scheduled window of 8pm to 3am. I can understand and support this theory as it allows us to test that the schedules operate correctly and allows us to replicate live running. As you will be aware due to previous problems Pathway asked us to change our operational schedules and extend the window to 3pm to 3am which we obliged despite this a number of days are still arriving outside this extended window eg: 6am which then are not processed until 3pm. Please can you inform me when we should request the schedules to be reset to the proposed live running and therefore test this area correctly.

Cash accounts: I am aware that in the grand scheme of things you do not consider this area to be a major issue. As you know I consider it vital . We have yet to see a valid cash account in either MO or E2E. Please can you confirm that your team are identifying and logging all the errors on cash accounts and when we can expect to have balanced accounts. It is not until you have basic accounts balanced that you can start to look for the more complex errors.

Reference Data: Another key area, to me, to be proven is that the systems (Pathway and Tip) must remain in line when Ref Data updates are applied it is unclear and mixed messages are being given about if Pathway are applying the change drops as per the script. Examples have occurred during MOR2 which suggest not e.g. a product being sellable after it has expired, files being rejected for invalid Org unit version number. Please can you inform me if or when Pathway intend to fully apply the agreed change drops.

On another subject I feel that when a PinICL is raised but Pathway say it is fixed and will be proven in a later test phase it should not be closed and if required identified in the categories as perhaps "Fixed awaiting retest" my reasons being the current process gives a distorted view on the number that are being cleared / fixed and also would remove the chance for some not to be re-tested.

If you do not intend to reply to the issues please can you tell me how and with whom these should be raised and progressed.

Peter Jones

Tel Direct GRO