ICL Pathway	**Acceptance Resolution Plan** **Acceptance Incident 376**	Ref: CR/ACD/376 Version: 0.9 Date: 23/9/99

Document Title: Acceptance Resolution Plan for Acceptance Incident 376

Document Type: Acceptance Resolution Plan

Abstract: This document contains ICL Pathway's Resolution Plan in respect of Acceptance Incident 376.

Status: Issued

Distribution:

Expert:
Peter Copping

ICL Pathway:
P John Pope

Library

POCL:
Calum Craig

John Meagher
Min Burdett
Jeff Austin

Author: J C C Dicks

Comments to: Pathway list

Comments by: 23/9/99

ICL Pathway	**Acceptance Resolution Plan** **Acceptance Incident 376**	Ref: CR/ACD/376 Version: 0.9 Date: 23/9/99

0 0 Document control

1 0.1 Document history

Version	Date	Reason
0.1	20/8/98	Initial draft for comments
0.2	24/8/99	Version for Expert and workshop 26/8
0.3	4/9/99	Version for Expert and workshop 6/9
0.4	10/9/99	Version includes an addendum resolving actions from 9/9 workshop. For Expert and workshop 13/9 as Resolution Plan.
0.5	16/9/99	Version documenting final agreed Resolution Plan.
0.6	16/9/99	Further version minor changes, observation period described
0.7	22/9/99	To include agreed closure criteria
0.8	22/9/99	Updates agreed during drafting of Schedule 2 Part A of the second supplementary agreement
0.9	23/9/99	Further updates arising from drafting of Schedule 2 Part A of the second supplementary agreement

0 0.2 Approval authorities

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

0 0.3 Associated documents

Reference	Vers	Title	Source
		TIP Incident Status Report	Pathway
	0.7	Logical Design for EPOSS/TIP Reconciliation Controls	Pathway
		Ceasing of Non-Core Products at Outlets	Pathway
CS/PRD/065	0.3	Process For Removing Products From Outlets At CSR	Pathway

0.4 Abbreviations

AIS   Application Interface Specification

CSR   Core System Release

CSR+   Core System Release – Plus (the release after CSR)

EPOS   Electronic Point of Sale

EPOSS   EPOS Service

TIP   Transaction Information Processing

TMS   Transaction Management Service

TPS   TIP Processing System – the Pathway host layer for the TIP stream

ICL Pathway	Acceptance Resolution Plan	Ref:	CR/ACD/376
	Acceptance Incident 376	Version:	0.9
		Date:	23/9/99

0   0.5   Table of content

ICL Pathway	**Acceptance Resolution Plan**	Ref: CR/ACD/376
	Acceptance Incident 376	Version: 0.9
		Date: 23/9/99

1   Purpose

This document sets out ICL Pathway's proposal that Acceptance Incident 376, currently categorised as Medium by Pathway and High by POCL, should be recategorised by POCL as Medium, and that the Resolution Plan is satisfactory and should be agreed.

2   Summary

Pathway contends that there are Clearance Actions that address the three remaining issues defined by POCL.

The issue relates to not passing records to TIP because of harvester exceptions caused by missing functions in counter code. ICL Pathway has taken measures to both stop known occurrences and to ensure that any unforeseen occurrences are reported both to TIP and to ICL Pathway development.

The occurrence of a functionally unrelated incident considered under this Acceptance Incident, the omission of records from the counter cash account, concerned only voucher products. This omission is in process of elimination. In addition procedures have been tightened to minimise the risk of product withdrawals causing operational difficulties at the counter.

Furthermore, additional reconciliation features that confirm the integrity of data passing to TIP have been proposed.

3   Criteria

Criterion 831/1 is cited: "The Contractor shall support interface from TMS and Outlets to Transaction Information Processing (TIP).

4   POCL position

Based upon the minutes of the Acceptance Board Meeting of 18 August 1999, POCL contended that:

"the plan is still immature".

"the proposal not to deliver the additional controls until March 2000 is not acceptable".

"the latest analysis performed on Incident 410 ... has revealed further unresolved deficiencies and the workaround for these is not agreed".

ICL
Pathway

Acceptance Resolution Plan

Acceptance Incident 376

Ref: CR/ACD/376
Version: 0.9
Date: 23/9/99

5   Pathway position

5.1   Background

During the Live Trial, and since, incidents have occurred that, in POCL's view, constitute a potential threat to the integrity of their accounts. These are tracked in AI376, *TIP Acceptance Incident Status*, and associated Root Cause Analysis.

5.2   Maturity of plan

The elements of the resolution plan are defined as activities within the integrated Acceptance Resolution Plan (currently version 0.9, 16/9/99).

The Pathway proposal in this area has now been expanded into the High Level Design document *Logical Design for EPOSS/TIP Reconciliation Controls*. The joint working group has reviewed this in detail. This document provides a description of how Pathway will provide additional reconciliation between the Cash Account produced in the outlet and the transactions sent to TIP. It contains detailed proposals for enhancements to counter processing, harvesting and the TPS Host.

5.3   Delivery of additional controls

Clearance action:

The document *Logical Design for EPOSS/TIP Reconciliation Controls*, Version 0.7, 20/9/99 has been agreed and the enhancements will be in service by 31/12/99.

5.3.1   Ongoing Analysis And Review Of Incidents

ICL Pathway will continue to analyse new incidents and will issue periodic updates of the TIP Incident Status Report. This report will be reviewed jointly fortnightly or as required.

ICL Pathway's objective is to eliminate the root causes of such incidents as are described in Section 2 above, while providing a clear method of communicating rare error corrections.

5.3.2   Development Of Additional Reconciliation Controls

Additional controls through the introduction of reconciliation will be developed as described in the document *Logical Design for EPOSS/TIP Reconciliation Controls*.

POCL's requirement to have continued visibility of the functionality of the solution will be met by re-issues of the above-mentioned document. Should

**ICL
Pathway**

Acceptance Resolution Plan

Acceptance Incident 376

Ref: CR/ACD/376
Version: 0.9
Date: 23/9/99

low level design affect any area within the high level design, then the Logical Design document will be updated and re-issued to POCL.

Pathway is currently providing Harvester exception reporting and will continue to do so until the additional Reconciliation Controls have entered service.

POCL is concerned regarding assurance of testing plans and testing activities. ICL Pathway will issue the High Level Test Plans (HLTPs) to POCL for the additional reconciliation controls and will also issue the corresponding Test Reports, both for comment. POCL will provide such comments in a single batch for each of the HLTPs and Test Reports within two weeks of their provision to POCL. In addition, POCL may witness testing. The testing strategy to be adopted for this Plan will be documented and provided to POCL.

5.3.3 Additional Reconciliation Procedures

POCL has observed that joint procedures for dealing with reconciliation incidents need to be developed. ICL Pathway recognises the need for such procedures and will work jointly with POCL to develop them.   It is agreed that these procedures will embrace the following five points:

1.   POCL will accept manual error corrections of either transaction record errors or cash account stream record errors up to an aggregate level of 50 per week

        The original concept was replacement of missing transactions, because we don't in practise get transaction wrong, we either send them or we don't. The extension to include cash account records could open us up to the claim that a cash account stream record is wrong if the cash account line is wrong because, for example, we have not bought a product to account. We must resist this, and argue that the sash account stream is correct if is corresponds to the printed cash account, even if that is wrong.

2.   Above this level Pathway will fix errors and (re)submit the data electronically to the TIP interface, unless agreed otherwise by POCL.

        This wording was added to v0.7 pursuant to agreements reached by Tony O. The wording in v0.6 referred to us exceeding an average of 50 reconciliation errors per week over a 13 week period before we would undertake anything other than manual correction of errors.

3.   Manual error reports are to include a full specification of the repaired transaction data, such that the data would pass the integrity checks if resubmitted. Where it is necessary to make a judgement about a repair, such judgement will be declared explicitly by Pathway. Data is to be presented in a suitable format for POCL to key into a POCL data input facility.

4.   The delay between the occurrence of an error (or where applicable its later detection) and the notification of the correction to POCL (either

manually in accordance with (1) above or electronically in accordance with (2) above) shall not exceed five working days.

Hopefully clause 3.2 of the supplemental agreement means that we have to use only reasonable endeavours to hit 5 days. The last major issue took about 3 weeks to resolve.

5. Pathway is to pay POCL liquidated damages of £100 per transaction error correction submitted manually.

This still refers only to transactions, so RED reports of Cash Account errors would avoid a penalty. However I believe this clause to be superseded by para 3.6.10 of the supplemental agreement.

The Contractor shall test the procedure described in sub paragraph (2) above prior to the implementation of the additional reconciliation controls and POCL shall assist and witness the attainment of the outcome.

The above procedures shall be introduced at the same time as the additional reconciliation controls referred to in paragraph 5.3.2 above

The testing was originally restricted to testing the new software and, after argument, the procedures for sending reconciliation reports to TIP. We now need to find a way to test our ability to electronically repair both transaction and cash account stream, and send or re-send to TIP. We need to work out what scenarios to test, and whether to test them we need facilities to repair records. We could produce such facilities, but we are paying TIP to do it!

5.4   Core to non-core (AI410)

Clearance action:

The document, *Ceasing of Non-Core Products at Outlets,* is agreed and ICL Pathway will implement the defined functions for CSR+.

5.4.1 The position at CSR

Refinement to product management procedures at CSR:

AI 410, although related to AI 376 through the generality of reconciliation of the Cash Account and the TIP stream, is in fact the reverse condition: a record that was not incorporated in the Cash Account was received by TIP.

This condition was caused by ceasing a product at an outlet by changing it from a Core product (transacted at all outlets) to Non-core (transacted at only a subset). This resulted in "end dating" the Item Reference Data at an outlet that

had not received replacement non-core reference data but had transacted the product earlier in the week. EPOSS did not include transactions in the Cash Account that had occurred immediately before the product was end-dated at the outlet.

It had been agreed, for CSR, that Operational Business Change procedures would screen out cases of Item Reference Data being end-dated, the outlet would not be able to perform housekeeping functions such as remitting out remaining inventory in any case. The agreed process for removal from sale is by use of changes to the Menu Hierarchy.

Unfortunately neither POCL nor Pathway staff involved had realised that changing a product from Core to Non core would result in just such a cessation. Procedure documentation has now been amended to make this case explicit.

ICL Pathway is introducing a change to ensure that all transactions for end-dated products appear in the cash account. This will provide full accounting integrity.

The parties shall carry out the procedures described in the document *Process For Removing Products From Outlets At CSR*, Version 0.3. These procedures will be revisited if experience so indicates.

Introduction of an enhanced proposal for item transaction modes at CSR+:

A feature, Item Transaction Mode, is scheduled for introduction at CSR+ and will provide a comprehensive means of controlling the classes of transaction that can be applied to products. However, in the course of considering these issues it was further realised that no provision at CSR+ in interfaces and designs had been made for the particular case of end-dating Non-core products in individual outlets.

This issue, ceasing Non-core products at individual outlets at CSR+, has been addressed in the document *Ceasing of Non-Core Products at Outlets*, which was published on 24/8/99, and which POCL has confirmed is acceptable.

6   Closure Criteria

The closure criteria agreed between the parties are:

1. That there will be an Observation Period of six weeks starting 1st October 1999.

2. During the Observation Period there will be no reoccurrence of previously fixed faults

3. During the Observation Period not more that 0.6% of Cash Accounts sent to TIP will be found by TIP not to reconcile to the Cash Account derived by TIP from the transaction stream due to Pathway processing error.

4. During the Observation Period Pathway will analyse all new incidents within 10 working days, and report these analyses to TIP using the established TIP Incident Status format.   The 10 days starts from the time TIP log the incident on the Pathway helpdesk. The analysis is to include an expected fix implementation date. For incidents that cannot be reproduced the result of analysis may be to implement diagnostic code.

5. There will be a period of parallel running of the Pathway and TIP reconciliation process during which the Pathway solution must find at least all those reconciliation failures correctly reported by TIP.