

HORIZON PROJECT - ACCEPTANCE REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

Acceptance Specification	End to End	Reviewed By	Panel comprising Jeff Widdowson, Mark Burley, Ann Clarke, Dave Stevenson, Martin Box, Karen Rogers
Review Segment No.	1	Review Date	7 th June 1999; Pathway Responses J C C Dicks 9/6 and additions from Acceptance Review Meeting 11 June

Acc. Criterion	Criterion Description	Document Ref. No.	(P)ass/ (F)ail/ (D)efer	Justification
831/5-7	<p>(5) The POCL Interfaces documentation shall cover: data content in logical groupings, physical layouts, controls (including security), timings, volumes, technical interface specifications (initially options and constraints), configuration management, and contingency arrangements. Versions of the POCL Interfaces documentation containing the existing interfaces shall be made available to the CONTRACTOR within three (3) months after execution hereof.</p> <p>(6) The POCL Interfaces documentation shall not initially cover further potential interfaces in respect of:</p> <p>(a) EFTPOS;</p> <p>(b) reconciliation and exception reporting;</p> <p>(c) operational management information;</p>	<p>BP/IFS/006 POCL Interface Requirements For BA/POCL System 1.6 16/4/96 TI/IFS/001 Pathway to TIP Application Interface Specification 5.1c 17/2/98 BP/IFS/007 Reference Data to Pathway (Reference Data Project Application Interface Specification) 3.3c 2/2/98 LF/BRD/001 Business Requirements Definition - Logistics Feeder Service 1.0 20/5/98 AP/IFS/001 Pathway to HAPS Interface Specification 2.0 30/10/97</p>	<p>Condi tional pass</p>	<p>Clarification is required between the version numbers contained within the Acceptance Specification and The Acceptance Review Pack. There were also concerns re the content of the document (Reference 15) which is to be made available at the Acceptance Review.</p> <p><i>The versions referenced in the Acceptance Specification were those that were up to date at the time of issue of the Acceptance Specification. The versions supplied in the Acceptance Review Pack were the up-to-date versions available at that date where different. This applies to TI/IFS/001, and AP/IFS/001. These up-to date versions should be referenced.</i></p> <p><i>As stated in the References entry, BP/IFS/006 is only partly applicable. A paper copy of this document was also supplied to KR on 8/6.</i></p> <p><i>11/6 No further action.</i></p>

Hard copies (4 soft)
before / at / after AEM
ie. following Pool Panel
review & AEM

HORIZON PROJECT - ACCEPTANCE REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

Acc. Criterion	Criterion Description	Document Ref. No.	(P)ass/ (F)ail/ (D)efer	Justification
	(d) performance monitoring; (e) inspection of Transaction and Event logs for audit and security purposes; (f) transitional arrangements in relation to the automated payments / ALPS host; (g) transitional arrangements in relation to 'cash account processing'. (7) The detailed format of all interfaces shall be agreed by POCL.			

HORIZON PROJECT - ACCEPTANCE REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

Acc. Criterion	Criterion Description	Document Ref. No.	(P)ass/ (F)ail/ (D)efer	Justification
911/1-2	<p>(1) The Services shall maintain accounting and reporting integrity in the Services and Service Infrastructure, including any changes as defined in Schedule A05 [Change Control] of the AUTHORITIES' Agreement.</p> <p>(2) Such integrity shall cover implementation of changes, reverting to previous states (should this prove necessary, for example in fall-back and Recovery), co-existing before and after states (e.g. if simultaneous implementation does not occur) and reporting across change boundaries (e.g. using appropriate Reference Data versions for each part of a report).</p>	<p>VI/TSC/110 Pathway Release 2 Systems Management HLTP 1.0 30/1/98</p>	<p>Fail</p>	<p>Nowhere in the references can we find evidence that this criteria has been met. There were also concerns from the panel re the presentation which will be provided at the Acceptance Review</p> <p><i>The letter to Mary Reade was cited because it was the covering letter for a CCN providing an update by Pathway of the Requirement, Solutions and Service Definition Schedules. These updated the relevant parts of the Agreements for changes that had been agreed but for which the Authorities had not issued new texts. After the Acceptance Specification was published the Authorities rejected the CCN. For this reason the guidance notes stated the letter was no longer material.</i></p> <p><i>No new contract texts were forthcoming from the Authorities. Therefore to reference any changes (to accounting and reporting in this case) it is now necessary to look at the Change Control history. Accordingly this was provided as an additional document, see yellow rows. With the withdrawal of DSS the material CCNs to POCL are (probably) 228b, 259b, 264, 277b, 284, 400). Reports & Receipts document is (probably) the most important document as regards maintaining reporting integrity, and 277b and 400 are probably the most important as regards accounting.</i></p> <p><i>The report from (24) covers the first specific in (2) and the presentation (of which an advance copy was provided 8/6) the second</i></p>

HORIZON PROJECT - ACCEPTANCE REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

Acc. Criterion	Criterion Description	Document Ref. No.	(P)ass/ (F)ail/ (D)efer	Justification
				<p>11/6 (911/1) This issue is that POCL seek evidence of such integrity through access to the end-to-end design documentation. Reliance on the test results is not acceptable to POCL. ICL Pathway' position is that POCL do not have rights of access to design intellectual property. It was agreed that POCL and Pathway would refer the issue to their commercial authorities.</p> <p>Pathway's commercial authority's position is that POCL does not have such rights. The end-to end design has been provided under non-disclosure agreement to named individuals within POCL. These individuals may be asked if such a design exists and if it is satisfactory in their opinion. These individuals may not disclose the contents of such end-to end designs to others within POCL.</p> <p>11/6 (911/2) In the case of the first part the issue is that POCL seek evidence that the reversion works through access to the appropriate part of the systems management design. Reliance on the test results is not acceptable to POCL. ICL Pathway offered to provide the Low Level Test Scripts. See 911/1 above.</p> <p>In the case of the second part POCL will provide the presentation to the POCL panel.</p>

HORIZON PROJECT - ACCEPTANCE REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

Acc. Criterion	Criterion Description	Document Ref. No.	(P)ass/ (F)ail/ (D)efer	Justification
925/13	The performance of the End to End element of Integration Test. The overall objectives for E2E, in association with Model Office Rehearsal, centre on the bringing together of the IT functionality across all the participating systems, with the operational and business procedures, to form an overall business system. E2E and MOR activities are planned and scripted together, run on the same environment, and involve the same personnel. E2E forms a natural extension of DIT. It is run in parallel with, but separate from, MOR.	0720HL~1.DOC End to End Interface Testing High Level Test Plan, BA/POCL Nile Release 2.0 0.2 18/798 BPS Testco~1.xls End to End Interface Testing Test Report 7/10/98 tba	Fail	This criteria is rejected for a number of reasons:- There were the same concerns as criteria 911 with respect to the presentation which is to be made at the Acceptance Review. <i>An advance copy of the presentation was provided 8/6.</i> The Known Problem Register should be one of the referenced documents. <i>See below. The KPR is available for analysis.</i> What relevance has the letter J Dicks to Mary Reade ? <i>See above for explanation.</i> There a need to compare the contents of the closure report with the Known Problem Register. <i>PinICL entries 23013 (Closed), 19808 (NR2+) and elements of 23474 (NR2+) referred. [These references since checked.]</i> <i>11/6 Agreed that additional documentation will be cited in a revised Acceptance Review Pack: Known Problem Register, Model Office Testing Evaluation Report. With respect to the MOT report the following incidents (KPR PinICLs) are notified, all of which are Closed: 13/8 (22337), 21/10 (22870), 9/18 (22174), 9/22 (22186), 13/20 (22371), 16/7 (22536=23750), 21/3 (22783), 8/26 (22114), 8/42 (22144), 14/7 (22412), 14/9 (22411), 21/1 (22779), 6/1 (21955), 16/15 (22566), 22/8 (22947), 13/1 (22317), TIP700 (22250), TIP702 (22274). [These references since checked.]</i>

HORIZON PROJECT - ACCEPTANCE REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

Acc. Criterion	Criterion Description	Document Ref. No.	(P)ass/ (F)ail/ (D)efer	Justification
				<i>Copy of letter Pat Kelsey to Jim Morley 23/7/97 provided.</i>
928/1-2	<p>1. The CONTRACTOR shall provide to the AUTHORITY copies of the Service Architecture Design Document 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.</p> <p>2. The Service Architecture Design Document shall be updated to ensure information is always current.</p>	<p>CR/FSP/004 Service Architecture Design Document 4.0 30/9/97</p> <p>CR/FSP/004 Service Architecture Design Document 5.1 23/7/98</p>	Fail	<p>The panel has no reason to reject Acceptance Criteria 928/1. However, with respect to 928/2 there is no evidence from the references as to how this is to be done. More detail is required in the guidance notes to enable a fuller evaluation of this particular criteria</p> <p><i>The SADD was updated six times in order to arrive at the Version defining NR2, the Version under Acceptance. This is evidenced from section 0.1.1 of SADD 4.0 and the document history section 0.1.4.</i></p> <p><i>The later version of the SADD is also cited to show that it has been further maintained <u>in advance of</u> the target releases being defined and agreed.</i></p> <p><i>11/6 Agreed that Pathway will provide letter stating the process for future SADD updates.</i></p>
929/1	<p>From the start of use of the Card it shall be possible for an Authorised Person to be paid using a Card at his/her Nominated Post Office and, in accordance with the rules for Foreign Encashments:</p> <p>a) at any other automated post office Outlet;</p> <p>b) in any major post office.</p> <p><i>[DN: 929/2,3 are covered within the Rollout Acceptance Specification, IM/ACS/005.]</i></p>	<p>VI/REP/162 Version 1.0 6/4/99 Appendix D. Two PinICLs 17956 and 19179 are material, both on KPR.</p> <p>IM/PLA/010 and IM/PLA/11 show the rollout taking place between 23/8/99 and 5/2/01 and denoting major conurbations.</p> <p>See IM/STR/025 sections 3.4.1 and 3.4.4 in particular regarding major post offices.</p>	n/a	No longer applicable

HORIZON PROJECT - ACCEPTANCE REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

Acc. Criterion	Criterion Description	Document Ref. No.	(P)ass/ (F)ail/ (D)efer	Justification
938/3	The CONTRACTOR shall provide all Services to support the functional specification.	Not applicable No test.	n/a	The panel were of the opinion that this criteria is no longer applicable and therefore needs to be deleted. Can this be confirmed at the Acceptance Review ? <i>Yes</i> <i>11/6 POCL to seek contract guidance as to applicability of Requirement 938 in new contract. Pathway position is this was not and is not applicable to POCL.</i>
938/4-8	<p>(4) The CONTRACTOR shall ensure that any information supplied under the Data Protection Act 1984 is accurate and that assurances can be given as to the integrity of that information.</p> <p>(5) The CONTRACTOR shall deliver any information requested under the Data Protection Act 1984 to the requesting body, person or DSS as appropriate.</p> <p>OUTLINE SERVICE REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>The Data Protection Act 1984 became law from 11 November 1987. All subsequent alterations and reviews to this law shall be integrated and adhered to.</p>	<p>RS/POL/002 Pathway Security Policy (Section 10.2) 3.0 (3.4) 8/10/96</p> <p>Pathway Customer Service DPA Procedure</p>	n/a	<p>No longer applicable</p> <p><i>11/6 POCL to seek contract guidance as to applicability of Requirement 938 in new contract. Pathway position is this was not and is not applicable to POCL.</i></p>

HORIZON PROJECT - ACCEPTANCE REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

Acc. Criterion	Criterion Description	Document Ref. No.	(P)ass/ (F)ail/ (D)efer	Justification
	<p>(7)-The CONTRACTOR shall record all written requests for a data protection print from a Customer, representative or DSS within forty (40) days of receipt of the request, and deal with queries raised within a timescale to be agreed with the AUTHORITIES 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, such agreement not to be unreasonably withheld or delayed.</p> <p>(8)-All information provided under the Data Protection Act 1984 shall be available to facilitate inspection.</p> <p>Details of a request and response made under the Data Protection Act 1984 shall be retained consistent with the Data Protection Act 1984 requirements.</p>			

HORIZON PROJECT - ACCEPTANCE REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

950/1-9	<p>(1) The CONTRACTOR shall provide an overview document which describes and summarises the solutions they are proposing in response to the requirements documents sent to them. It shall be written in such a way that it logically links back to the requirements.</p> <p>(2) This document shall include aspects of the overall end to end solution which are not explicitly defined in the individual responses to requirements.</p> <p>(3) The document shall be text biased and not exceed 35 pages. It may be supported by annexes which could include flow diagrams of the technical solution and the support processes. It shall be provided on floppy diskette in Word 6 (12 point) format accompanied by three hard copies</p>	<p>Service Provider Solutions Document 2.0 14/5/96</p> <p>Service Provider Solutions Document 3.2 20/2/98</p>	<p>Fail</p> <p>Fail</p> <p>Defer</p>	<p>There is no logical link back to the requirements</p> <p><i>The document formed the Solution response to Requirement 950, see Solution Schedule AB05</i> <i>"[This requirement was to produce a solution overview for use post award.]"</i></p> <p><i>The final section of the document provides the logical link back to the requirements. "Further clarification may be gained from specific requirement responses to the functional specification prepared pursuant to Schedule B7 [the Requirements Schedule]." (Note: Schedule AB04 was formerly called Schedule B7).</i></p> <p><i>11/6 Agreed that SADD to be cited as additional document to cover responses contained in Functional Specification and carried forward to SADD.</i></p> <p>The panel should be specifically pointed to the relevant sections of the document.</p> <p><i>Sections 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.2.2; aspects of sections 5, 6, 7, 9; 10.4.</i></p> <p><i>11/6 Agreed that SADD to be cited as additional document to cover responses contained in Functional Specification and carried forward to SADD.</i></p> <p>ATM to confirm this with the Horizon Library</p> <p><i>11/6 Pathway provided copy of letter Pat Sedgwick to Liam Foley 8/5/96</i></p>
---------	---	---	--------------------------------------	--

HORIZON PROJECT - ACCEPTANCE REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

	<p>(4)-The format is to cover the following:</p> <p>DSS</p> <p>(5) This shall describe CMS and PAS and shall include the following topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Hardware proposed and sizing; (b) physical locations of central sites; (c) Software proposed; (d) network (including topology, protocols); (e) external interfaces (including CAPS and POCL systems); (f) resilience and availability; (g) security; (h) fallback and Recovery; (i) scalability. <p>POCL</p> <p>(6)-An end to end description of how the POCL Service Infrastructure shall operate covering all Outlets. This shall cover the solutions for OP, TMS, SM, APS, BES, EPOSS and OBCS and shall include the following topics:</p>		n/a	Not relevant
			n/a	No longer applicable
			Fail	<p>BES out. Some of the topics appear to be missing in the referenced documents ie. fallback and recovery</p> <p><i>A side by side set of references is provided.</i></p> <p><i>The specific fallback and recovery references are listed in (g) below</i></p>

HORIZON PROJECT - ACCEPTANCE REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

	<p>(a) Hardware proposed (with expected utilisation);</p> <p>(b) physical locations of central sites;</p> <p>(c) Software proposed (including operating system, middleware and Application Software);</p> <p>(d) Wide Area Network (including topology, protocols, message authentication);</p> <p>(e) security (including any key management);</p> <p>(f) external interfaces (including POCL and Client systems);</p> <p>(g) fallback and Recovery;</p> <p>(h) resilience and availability;</p> <p>(i) scalability;</p> <p>(j) system management.</p> <p><i>Technical Interfaces</i></p> <p>(7) A description of how all the components of the Service Infrastructure interact with each other and with other systems such as CAPS and Post Office Group accounting systems.</p>		<p>(a) 2.4, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 4.1</p> <p>(b) 2.3</p> <p>(c) 2.4 (UNIX, ORACLE7); 3.1, 4.1, 5.2 (NT); 3.1.2 (Eicon); 4.1 (Openview); 5.2, 6 (SMS)</p> <p>(d) 5.1, 5.1.2, 7.4</p> <p>(e) 7, 7.5</p> <p>(f) 8.1</p> <p>(g) Fallback (backup): 1.2 (General), 1.3 (Middleware), 2.1.1 (ACCs), 2.3 (Electricity), 3.1.1 (Counter), 4.2 (TMS), 5.1.1 (backbone), 10.1.2 (Helpdesk); Recovery: 1.2 (General), 1.3 (Middleware), 3.1.1 (Counter), 4.2 (TMS)</p> <p>(h) Resilience: 1.2 (BPS), 3.2.3.1.4 (BES), 5 (Network), 5.1.2 (ISDN); Availability: 5 (Network), 6 (General), 10.1.3 (Helpdesk)</p> <p>(i) 4.3 (TMS)</p> <p>(j) 6</p> <p>Pass</p> <p>There is a need to see that the OBCS interface is delivered. This is substantiated by the SADD</p> <p><i>11/6 Noted that the OBCS interface is described in Section 3.2.4</i></p>
--	--	--	--

HORIZON PROJECT - ACCEPTANCE REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

	<p><i>Benefit Payment Service</i></p> <p>(8) This shall draw together the specific solutions to CMS, PAS and BES into an integrated end to end picture of how the Benefit Payment Service shall work. This shall draw together the specific solutions to:</p> <p>(a) Card design; (b) responsibilities; (c) security; (d) fraud investigation; (e) contingency.</p>		n/a	No longer applicable
--	---	--	-----	----------------------

HORIZON PROJECT - ACCEPTANCE REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

	<p><i>Provision of Services</i></p> <p>(9) An end to end description of how the solutions shall be implemented and shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Roll Out through to Steady State Service; (b) migration of existing automation and services; (c) training and Documentation; (d) Customer education and marketing; (e) support Services, specifically help facilities. <p>(10)-The report shall be written at a level directed at Programme Team members who have a knowledge of the solution proposed.</p>		Fail	<p>The provision of services does not include anything on migration, documentation, marketing and support services</p> <p><i>The specific reference on Migration is at 3.2.5, documentation (workbooks and guides) at 9.1.1.3, marketing is at 9.2 and Support Services at 10.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) 9.1 (b) 3.2.5 (c) 9.1.1.3 (d) 9.2 (e) Support Services: 10; Help: 2.1(PMS), 2.2(CMS), 3.2.3.1.4(BES), 3.2.4(OBCS), 9.1.1.1/2 (Rollout), 9.1.1.3 (Training Mode), 10 (SIS), 10.1(PMS/CMS), 10.2(SIS).
			Defer	<p>This is not mentioned earlier</p> <p><i>The document was known to behave been received as very useful, readable and informative. This is evidenced by the fact that the Pathway were requested to update the first version for requirements notified after that and were not requested to make any changes in treatment appropriate to an audience having a different knowledge level.</i></p> <p><i>11/6 Pathway provided copy of letter Pat Sedgwick to Liam Foley 8/5/96</i></p>

HORIZON PROJECT - ACCEPTANCE REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

951/1-3	(1) The CONTRACTOR shall develop and maintain the Service Architecture Design Document, a document describing the design of the Service Architecture.	CR/FSP/004 Service Architecture Design Document 4.0 30/9/97	Condit ional Pass	Subject to Acceptance in other areas.
	(2) As a minimum the Service Architecture Design Document shall specify: (a) the major components, provided directly or sub-contracted, used in providing the Services; (b) the functionality within the major components; (c) the interfaces between the major components; (d) the Service Levels required across the interfaces to meet the objectives of the overall Services; (e) all the interfaces with the Service Environment and with other parties' computer systems	CR/FSP/004 Service Architecture Design Document 5.1 23/7/98	Condit ional Pass	Subject to Acceptance in other areas <i>11/6 subsection (e) added in column 2</i>

HORIZON PROJECT - ACCEPTANCE REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

	(3) The audience for the Service Architecture Design Document shall be technical staff within the AUTHORITIES. The Service Architecture Design Document shall be self contained, though it is expected that it references other documents to provide further levels of detail as appropriate. The level of detail within the Service Architecture Design Document shall be such that it gives a thorough background to the construction of the Services and the rationale for the approach. It is anticipated that the Service Architecture Design Document shall be between 200 and 400 pages in length.		Conditional Pass	11/6 section (3) added in column 2 as Conditional Pass
958/1-3	<p>The CONTRACTOR shall make the Software and Equipment available for the purpose of the DSS Operational Trial end to end testing to ensure the whole network of DSS Services and DSS Service Infrastructure from DSS feeder systems through PAS/CMS to the CAPS are able to work as a whole.</p> <p>The CONTRACTOR shall provide infrastructure and support services for the DSS testing environment</p> <p>The CONTRACTOR shall produce a testing strategy and plan to be agreed with DSS 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</p>		n/a	No longer applicable

HORIZON PROJECT - ACCEPTANCE REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

973/1	<p>The Services may, during the lifetime of the related agreements or at termination, need to be replaced or supplemented with services provided by other suppliers. It shall therefore be both technically and commercially viable for the Services to be replaced by and/ or interfaced to services from other suppliers. To support this, the CONTRACTOR shall declare all internal interfaces between separate Services within the overall Service Architecture (including those between PAS and CMS, PAS and the POCL Infrastructure Services, CMS and the POCL Infrastructure Services). For each interface the CONTRACTOR shall provide an interface specification covering the same properties and to the same level of detail as requirements 934 - 940 and 942</p>	<p>CR/FSP/004 Service Architecture Design Document 4.0 30/9/97</p> <p>CR/FSP/004 Service Architecture Design Document 5.1 23/7/98</p>	Fail	<p>Where does the evidence prove the technical and commercial viability and how does the SADD doc. provide the detail required in the last part</p> <p><i>The commercial viability for POCL cannot be evidenced by means of a Pathway Architecture Design. POCL commercial viability can only be proven by estimating the costs and revenues for a particular supplier, which, by definition, is not ICL Pathway, performing Service replacement(s). The Criterion does not require such evidence: the first sentences are statements of fact introducing and explaining the reason for the requirements in the sentence beginning: "To support this the CONTRACTOR shall ...". The technical viability is similarly partly a function of the capability of the supplier in question. That the Services are technically replaceable is evidenced by the Service separations. The Criterion is in two parts: first that the interfaces are declared in the SADD, and second that the level of specification is comparable with those in the referenced requirements.</i></p> <p><i>The interfaces are declared in SADD Appendix B – Interfaces and functionally elaborated in the appropriate sections in the body of the SADD. The Interface Principles and Service Boundaries are described in B.1. (Excluding DSS) the interfaces are declared: EPOSS B.3.1 (read to exclude BPS aspects); APS B.3.2; OBCS B.3.3.</i></p> <p><i>The level of detail provided is significantly greater than that provided in requirements 934-939 [940 no longer existed] and 942 when functional material, which is elaborated in the appropriate sections in the body of the SADD, is taken into account.. Note that none of these Requirements was a POCL one.</i></p> <p>11/6 No further action.</p>
-------	--	---	------	---

HORIZON PROJECT - ACCEPTANCE REVIEW COMMENT SHEET

Reviewer's Notes (if required):

- (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)