

ONE TOUCH SWITCH OPERATIONS FORUM

MEETING #12 SUMMARY

DATE	24 th October 2024
TIME	1400 - 1600
LOCATION	TEAMS online meeting
CHAIRPERSONS	Richard Warner (OTA2) / Joan Whitehead (TOTSCo)
MEMBERS PRESENT	Richard Warner, Joan Whitehead, Badar Sheikh (TOTSCo), Thomas Fisher (TalkTalk), Samantha McDaid (SKY), Matthew Lewis (Vodafone), Melanie Buckley (VMO2), Michael Dorrington (ZEN), Marcel Horst (CWP), Michelle Shaw (TOTSCo), Georgina Cena (CWP), Sangeeta Roy (iconective), Richard Steele (CTO, TOTSCo), John Leach (TalkTalk), Karthigeyan Balra (Vodafone)
MEMBERS ABSENT	Jennifer Phillips (TalkTalk), Nandini Vittal Rao (VMO2), Victoria O'Day (TalkTalk), Caitríona O'Dwyer (Sonalake), Satya Chadalawada (iconectiv), Austin Lane (F&W Networks), Robert Patterson (BT), Alex Bloor (Andrews & Arnold), Cristian Nita (LXS Consulting), Sumna Usmani (TOTSCo), John (Jack) Abbotts (OTA2 and Co-Chair of Industry Process Group for OTS), Tom Merritt (TOTSCo and Co-Chair of Industry Process Group for OTS), Vincent Owolawi (Lit Fibre), Anthony McMahon (BT), James Wood (Three)

AGENDA ITEMS

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

ACTION UPDATE

CP CURRENT MEASURES

TOTSCO UPDATE AND DATA

- Reasons for contacts
- CP to CP Usage
- Early life update

OTS OPERATIONAL PROCESSES

- CP to CP Comms progress update
- CP Incident/CP Outage Management progress update
- Other processes - CP Change etc

REVIEW OF OTS OPS FORUM

AOB

CLOSE

MINUTES

AGENDA ITEM	1. ACTION UPDATE
DISCUSSION POINT	3/9: JW - TOTSCo to publish Change Pipeline. Any planned change will be implemented with notice of 30/60/90+ days. Will also publish changes that are

	<p>under consideration. ONGOING – Will bring examples to share at Ops Forum #14.</p> <p>4/9: MS - To remind FM Maps at the next MAP review call to only raise one ticket for an issue affecting all their Brands. ONGOING – Discussions are continuing.</p> <p>6/9: Forum Members to email their concerns about TOTSCo test environment capability to JW and RW. CLOSED - replaced by Action 10/12</p> <p>1/10: JW to add SLA information into the Customer & Onboarding slide. ONGOING – New discussion topic for next Ops Forum to understand SLA requirements. TOTSCo will bring list of SLAs from User Agreements and any other relevant documents.</p> <p>3/10: RW & JW to speak with Forum Members individually. ONGOING</p> <p>4/10: SM to forward information on the Mobile industry delegate model. ONGOING</p> <p>1/11: Forum Members to define CP Problem Statement for Hub Test environment requirements, then TOTSCo will provide response with suggested solutions. CLOSED - replaced by Action 10/12</p> <p>2/11: DN: David to attend the next meeting to discuss ongoing testing strategy. CLOSED. Covered in agenda later in meeting, Richard Steele attended in DN's place.</p> <p>3/11: TM/JW to report on trigger discrepancies and improvement opportunities. CLOSED. See New Actions 3/12 & 4/12</p> <p>4/11: SM to write high level email about their experience and learnings in using the CP-to-CP tool. CLOSED – Sent to RW and JW.</p> <p>5/11: BS/KB: TOTSCo to update Service Manual with Outage Calendar details. ONGOING – Will be published 25/10.</p> <p>6/11: MH to create a detailed document on his proposal for an API for the CP to CP Tool. ONGOING</p>
CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATION	-
ACTION	<p>NEW ACTION 1/12: JW - Unable to see selected reason in messages from CP-to-CP tool. TOTSCo to investigate.</p> <p>NEW ACTION 2/12: FORUM - To review CP to CP message reason list.</p>

AGENDA ITEM	2. CP CURRENT MEASURES
DISCUSSION POINT	<p>Lengthy discussion around Completed Switch daily volume graph. Discussed what occurred on 17/10. Forum questioned on the impact to them. Response was that it wasn't noticed by anyone.</p> <p>Further discussion on the new slide, Trigger Request vs Trigger Confirmation. Request for Trigger failure information since Operations are more interested in understanding and investigating problems. Suggestion to show no response to match request data and anonymised information of performance by other CPs, allowing CP's to see industry averages to compare their own performance against and help drive improvement. It was pointed out that industry average performance may not be sufficient e.g. current match success rates.</p> <p>It was felt that provision and use of 'Assist' URLs should be far more widespread and would help improve matching. One member suggested that they should be a mandatory requirement and that it was unfair to CPs who had provided Assist</p>

	URL's. It was acknowledged that a solution is needed for CPs who do not allow their agents to access external websites.
CONCLUSION/ RECOMMENDATION	
ACTION	<p>NEW ACTION 3/12: TM – To share advice from IPG on Trigger discrepancies.</p> <p>NEW ACTION 4/12: JW – To see how and if reports can be produced on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Weekly volumes and %'s of failures messages of all types (i.e. Match Failure, Order Failure, Order Update Failure, Order Trigger Failure and Order Cancellation Failure) — also top five failure codes for each message type with %. B) and weekly volumes and %'s of 'No Responses (from destination CP)' and 'unable to process' by message type. <p>This would be to provide general figures across all hub users in the same way that Order and Match Success graphs are provided on the TOTSCo website.</p>

AGENDA ITEM

3. TOTSCo Operation Performance

DISCUSSION POINT	<p>JW explained latest performance graphs. Noted that latency has slightly increased since Go-Live however is well within SLA. Discussion on the scale of the Latency lines. Information is relevant but needs to be shown in different scale as it gets 'lost' compared to the message volume bars.</p> <p>Availability was 100%.</p> <p>Breakdown of CP/Brand/MAP numbers was given.</p> <p>Service stats were discussed.</p> <p>Discussion on MAPs. How to identify CPs that are with MAPs and how to communicate with them.</p> <p>Possible issues around CPs using Technical and Insource MAPs. TOTSCo explained that CPs would communicate directly. For CPs with fully managed MAPs then it is more likely to be MAP who will handle CP to CP comms.</p> <p>MH gave a detailed explanation on how they (CWP) work. Stressed that their process is not the same across all MAPs.</p> <p>TOTSCo mentioned that the Service Desk are fully aware of which CPs are with which MAPs.</p> <p>A possible problem was raised with the CP reports available with the TOTSCo ticketing capability. It may be that it only reports on web raised tickets not Service Desk raised tickets.</p>
CONCLUSION/ RECOMMENDATION	Stable environment.
ACTION	NEW ACTION 5/12: JW to look at the Latency diagram and see if it can be better presented.

NEW ACTION 6/12: ALL - to share examples of CP/MAP interaction issues.

NEW ACTION 7/12: JW to check if Ticket reporting includes both Web raised tickets and Service Desk raised tickets.

AGENDA ITEM

4. OTS OPERATIONAL PROCESSES

<p>DISCUSSION POINT</p>	<p><u>CP to CP Communications Tool:</u></p> <p>General discussion on the CP to CP tool. There are now 61 registered brands. The current version is an MVP and TOTSCo are looking for CP views on possible improvements, subject to change approval and business case.</p> <p><u>Outage Calendar/CP Incidents/CP Outages:</u></p> <p>General discussion on the Outage Calendar and how it is working. Some members thought that TOTSCo planned outage impacts could be described better.</p> <p>Discussion on the planned Outage on the 25th as this was CP impacting. Concerns raised that if messages are stopped for any length of time during anytime of the day then this has massive business impact. Especially after the closing of the NOT+ process. Members asked about a secondary Hub backup environment. TOTSCo responded that the Hub architecture has been built to achieve stated levels of availability and resilience.</p>
<p>CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATION</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>ACTION</p>	<p>NEW ACTION 8/12: MB to write and share with Forum members Change Request (CR) for improvements to the CP-to-CP tool.</p> <p>NEW ACTION 9/12: JW to check on wording of Outages notifications.</p>

AGENDA ITEM

5. REVIEW OF OTS OPS FORUM

<p>DISCUSSION POINT</p>	
<p>CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATION</p>	<p>It was agreed that we will continue to review the objective of the Forum going forward, whilst in parallel TOTSCO are reviewing their regular engagements with industry</p>
<p>ACTION</p>	<p>NO ACTION</p>

AGENDA ITEM

6. AOB

<p>DISCUSSION POINT</p>	<p>Discussion held on TOTSCo Hub Test capabilities with Richard Steele (CTO) who attended in place of David Norbury (DN). Some members were concerned that the current capabilities (Hub Simulator and Hub Integration test environments) require any CPs who is making changes to find a "Buddy" to test with. The two</p>
--------------------------------	---

	<p>challenges are: 1) finding another CP is not easy and 2) only testing with one other CPs solution is not necessarily fully representative of other CP solutions. TOTSCo said that they had considered entering into some sort of agreement with some of the test models that CPs/MAPs had developed, however there were issues with endorsing any particular model and potential commercial challenges.</p> <p>It was agreed that members should write a requirement in a Change Request that TOTSCo can consider.</p>
<p>CONCLUSION/ RECOMMENDATION</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>ACTION</p>	<p>NEW ACTION 10/12: MD to write requirements document for Testing and share this with Forum members before submitting to TOTSCo.</p>

Glossary

OTS = One Touch Switch

CP = Communications Provider

OTA2 = Office of the Telecommunications Adjudicator

TOTSCo = The One Touch Switching Company Ltd