



Change History Log: Comments for Pre-delivery version of EAI Production Architecture Performance Report III. This log contains comments from IV&V on the DRAFT version of this document, the changes described below have been made to the final version.

117.1.2c DRAFT EAI Production Architecture Performance Report III					
IV&V Requested Changes/Comments	Page	Author	Date	Change Made Y/N	Comment
The tables in section 2.2 are identical to the tables in Appendix B. Why is identical information presented twice?	6	Sinclair Stewart	11/10/03	Y	<p>This table had been added to the main document in the previous Report at the client's request.</p> <p>The tables in section 2.2 were removed from the document.</p>
Issue 1 - there is a completed date of 28-May-03, but last response is "This will continue to be an issue ...". If it is still an issue, why is it completed?	App A	Sinclair Stewart	11/10/03	N	<p>Issue 1 addresses the lack of an official approach to handling bad COD data. This issue was indeed resolved, as EAI assumed the responsibility. The final sentence simply notes that this will be a burden to EAI until all schools adopt the Common Record.</p>
Issue 88 - has a completed date of 15-Sep-03, but last response has date listed as July 27, 2003. Why are both 15-Sep-03 and July 27, 2003 shown? Why did it take from July to Sept to mark issue as resolved. Also there is a statement on 16-Apr-03 "... the issue is resolved". What is the correct date for the issue being completed and how was it actually resolved?	App A	Sinclair Stewart	11/10/03	Y	<p>This issue was resolved on July 27, as the last response indicates. The administrative task of actually marking the issue as 'resolved' in the tracking tool did not occur until September 15.</p> <p>The comment made on April 16th indicates that this issue was resolved for post-bus responses only, not all files. The overall issue was not resolved until the change was made for SAIG to COD traffic as well, which is mentioned in the final response. We have made this distinction more clear in the document.</p> <p>In Appendix A, the response on April 16th for Issue 88 was</p>

117.1.2c DRAFT EAI Production Architecture Performance Report III

IV&V Requested Changes/Comments	Page	Author	Date	Change Made Y/N	Comment
					clarified, changing from "The COD PBR fix was migrated to Production and the issue is resolved", to "The COD PBR fix was migrated to Production, resolving the post-bus response portion of the issue. However, the issue continues to affect incoming, SAIG to COD traffic."
Issue 100 - why did it take from 22-Nov-02 until 15-Sep-03 to get this issue resolved?	App A	Sinclair Stewart	11/10/03	N	Multiple failover tests were necessary to ensure that the issue was resolved. HPV2/HPV1 failover tests only take place once per quarter.
Issue 101 - why is there 0% complete (i.e., no progress) on this issue? An action item was assigned to EAI team a year ago on 11/18/02.	App A	Sinclair Stewart	11/10/03	Y	<p>Progress has been made on this issue, addressing the objectives from the December 3 comment. The issue has been closed.</p> <p>In Appendix A, Issue 101 was moved to "Resolved" from "In-Progress" status and to 100% from 0% based on updated information. The new response added on 11/12/03 states: "As stated in Part 1 of the previous response, we determined that instructions identifying EAI services and how they can be stopped and started would be sufficient. We have addressed Parts 1 and 2 by compiling this instruction set, and Part 3 has been addressed by an enhanced version of the script that forcibly shuts down MQSeries when necessary. This script is only installed as part of a full EAI code deployment, and EAI has installed it on each server opportunistically, as part of</p>



117.1.2c DRAFT EAI Production Architecture Performance Report III

IV&V Requested Changes/Comments	Page	Author	Date	Change Made Y/N	Comment
					regularly scheduled deployments. This approach will continue, and as such the issue will be closed."
Issue 109 - why is there 0% complete (i.e., no progress) on this issue from 25-Jun-03?	App A	Sinclair Stewart	11/10/03	Y	In Appendix A, Issue 109 was moved to "Resolved" from "In-Progress" status and to 100% from 0% based on updated information. The new response added on 11/12/03 states: "Roy Williams of TSYS has confirmed that by 9/1/03 (a few weeks after the RFMS Prior Award Year conversion on 8/16/03) COD was successfully sending data to NSLDS for all award years. They continue to do so, and this issue is resolved."
Issue 109 - 25-Jun-03 response states "COD must resume sending data to NSLDS ... on August 16, 2003". Did this occur?	App A	Sinclair Stewart	11/10/03	Y	COD has resumed sending all required data (09/01/03). In Appendix A, the new response added on 11/12/03 states: "Roy Williams of TSYS has confirmed that by 9/1/03 (a few weeks after the RFMS Prior Award Year conversion on 8/16/03) COD was successfully sending data to NSLDS for all award years. They continue to do so, and this issue is resolved."
Issue 113 - why is there 0% complete (i.e., no progress) on this issue? An action item was assigned to the EAI team a year ago on 11/18/02.	App A	Sinclair Stewart	11/10/03	Y	This issue was actually at 80% complete, not 0%, and was opened on August 11 th of this year. A Java upgrade and code change in production on 11/9/03 resolved the issue, and it has now been moved to 100%. In Appendix A, Issue 113 was moved to "Resolved" from "In-Progress" status and to 100% from 80% based on

117.1.2c DRAFT EAI Production Architecture Performance Report III

IV&V Requested Changes/Comments	Page	Author	Date	Change Made Y/N	Comment
					<p>updated information. The new response added on 11/12/03 states: "ECM VDCMP00005758 was implemented on 11/9 to resolve this issue in production. This involved a Java upgrade and a code change to the SAIG adapter. The hanging JVM issue has not occurred since, and this issue is closed."</p>
<p>Issue 113 - 27-Oct-03 response states "early-mid November". What is the actual date?</p>	App A	Sinclair Stewart	11/10/03	Y	<p>The upgrade was performed on 11/9/03.</p> <p>In Appendix A, Issue 113 was moved to "Resolved" from "Overdue" status and to 100% from 80% based on updated information. The new response added on 11/12/03 states: "ECM VDCMP00005758 was implemented on 11/9 to resolve this issue in production. This involved a Java upgrade and a code change to the SAIG adapter. The hanging JVM issue has not occurred since, and this issue is closed."</p>
<p>Issue 116 - How was the issue resolved and what was the cause.</p>	App A	Sinclair Stewart	11/10/03	Y	<p>In Appendix A, the new response added to Issue 116 on 11/12/03 states: "From Bill Pallis at the VDC: Cisco was contacted to investigate, and they found no problems with the network connections, configuration or code. The logs also showed no reason why the VDC router fell back to the back-up.</p> <p>The issue was closed as it appeared to be a transient problem, and has not occurred since."</p>
<p>Issue 124 - Is this issue still in progress?</p>	App A	Sinclair	11/10/03		<p>Mani Alalasundarum at the</p>



117.1.2c DRAFT EAI Production Architecture Performance Report III

IV&V Requested Changes/Comments	Page	Author	Date	Change Made Y/N	Comment
Last response was 8-Oct-03. Who has action(s) and what is action(s) to complete?		Stewart			VDC has taken several action items; once they are completed this issue can be closed. EAI has contacted him several times and awaits a response regarding these items.
Issue general - all completed issues should clearly indicate how issue was resolved (so same approach can be considered again if issue occurs again).	App A	Sinclair Stewart	11/10/03		<p>Completed issues 120, 121 and 126 do not include explicit resolutions, as they were all classified as transient issues and could not be reproduced. This has been noted in recent responses to each issue.</p> <p>In Appendix A, new responses were added to Issues 120, 121, and 126 on 11/12/03 stating: "This has been classified as a transient issue, and we have been unable to reproduce it. It has been closed for this reason, but will be re-opened if the issue occurs again."</p>
All incomplete issue should clearly indicate what remains to be done and who has action(s).	App A	Sinclair Stewart	11/10/03		The issue tracking tool assigns each open issue to one or more members of the EAI team. The only open issue is 124, and requires input from the VDC.