

Printed by: 2500 TOMAS SVENSSON 667790

Subject: GGG-notes 9204 92-05-15

Notes from GGG-steering group meeting in Gent april 27-28 1992.

Participants: John Turner, Cliff Thompsson
Ronny Wester, Lars Åström, Hans Orrheim,
Tomas Svensson
Eddy Boone, Hubert Francet, Christer Pernblad,
Ivan Van Eenooce

The meeting in Gent was a steering group meeting for the GGG-project and the purpose was to present the project so far and make decisions for the continuation of the project. The meeting was very well hosted by Eddy and we had 2 full and productive days of work. The project was started almost one year ago and this was the third steering group meeting.

General notes:

Resp

- a longterm objective is to have similar services for our 3 datacenters, with some local amendments to some of the services due to different local requirements. We should develop a model for how to define a service which gives a clear definition of the service and what is included. TS
- there are complaints from both VEDA and VDNA that NEWS to the Volvo Data systems is not always in english TS
- the groups that we have created for the different sub-projects with members from VD, VEDA and VDNA are jointly responsible for the development within its area. The groups must together maintain a product development plan for the subproject that leads to a standardization between our datacenters. The plan should be updated yearly and should include plans, projects, evaluations of software, installation of new software and/or functions. The groups should improve the exchange of information regarding plans and activities at each site and we should reach a point where it is as normal to have contact with the colleagues at the other sites as to have contact with the colleagues at own site. Due to its size Volvo Data has a big responsibility in keeping VDNA and VEDA informed of activities at VD.

products must be costjustified by each datacenter. The alternative for this is that we make one total calculation for the 3 datacenters and that Volvo Data subsidizes products and equipment that can not be costjustified at VEDA or VDNA. The consequences of this are not analyzed and will not be because we agree that it is right that each datacenter must justify its investments. This of course also means that it will not always be possible to reach a fully standardized environment.

Common Platform:

- need to run a special project to define and decide on how to document and where to store the documentations in order to make it easy and possible for everybody, also at VEDA and VDNA, to find and print documents. TS
- Cliff described that it took VDNA more than 2000 hours to create a new LPAR for VMEA although MEXPACK was used. The 2510IF

Printed by: 2500 TOMAS SVENSSON 667790

Subject: GGG-notes 9204 92-05-15

reasons for this must be analyzed.

- An experience from VDNA was also that MEXPACK is a technical environment and doesn't include an operational environment (procedures, tools, etc) 2510IF
- VDNA has experienced NJE-problems. The problem is a result of breaking the NJE-rules. RW demanded a solution within 3 weeks. TS/CT
- VDNA needs assistance from VD to inform and educate VDNA-personel and customers in VICS. Today VICS is not fully accepted by VDNA or their customers and VD must assist in this work. 2520BC
- both VEDA and VDNA demands that work starts to define a common minimum GGG-standard for name-standards, JCL, output-classes, etc. TS
- E+ should not be used as a language when creating tools etc. We need to define languages supported and which could be used. TS
- the activity plan in the subproject specification should be updated to reflect this years activities. 2510IF

Databases:

- Volvo Data has installed a lot of different tools in the database-area. These tools are sometimes expensive and it will not be possible for VEDA and VDNA to costjustify these tools. We need to analyze the tools used and find out for how long these tools will be used. 2540PL
- the automation of IMS and DB2 is not fully clear to us. If it hasn't been done it is important that Perry and Håkan defines the strategy and tools for how to automate the dabaseproducts. PL
- we will try to create a model for how to costjustify investments in software, i.e. how to measure costs and revenue from the usage of a software. TS
- DBRC-installation at VDNA will be delayed by 6-9 months
- we will run a prestudy to find out what must be done and the resources needed to develop the tool JCLGEN as a GGG-tool. The prestudy should also propose responsible organization for the tool. Hubert is responsible for the prestudy, depts 2830 and 2120 should be involved. HF

Storage Management

- Lars Danielsson must look into the fears that Cliff has that HSM and DSS are not suitable and fast enough for VDNA. This will be done when Lars visits VDNA after this summer. LD
- VDNA needs more information about how VCOM is planned to be used for alias registration. LD

Operation and automation

Printed by: 2500 TOMAS SVENSSON 667790

Subject: GGG-notes 9204 92-05-15

- both VEDA and VDNA can't justify the cost for all software that is planned to be used for automation. The benefits from the products must be measured and proved at Volvo Data and the result can be used when justifying a product at VEDA and VDA. HR
- VDNA agrees with Volvo Datas platform for automation which will mean that OPS/MVS and AUTOMATE/MVS will be extalled. Due to shortage on resources at VDNA the timeplan that VD has suggested will not be possible to reach.
- automation-meeting that was planned to take place at Volvo Data in may must be postponed until september/october due to delays at VDNA. HR

Communications

- the communications subproject has been restructured and will now be divided in the following subprojects:
 1. SNA-Network
VD: Bo Olsson
VDNA: Brewster Evans
VEDA: Cris Vandervelde
 2. IP-Network
VD: Peter Håkansson
VDNA: Steve Morono
VEDA: No participants in the beginning (VTC, VCC in gbg)
 3. VCOM Network Services
VD: Per Ågren
VDNA: Brewster Evans
VEDA: Cris Vandervelde
 4. Basic Services Network (Multiplexor Net)
VD: Hans CJohansson
VDNA: Robert Eriksson
VEDA: Denolf Joost
 5. LAN
VD: Martin Särnberger
VDNA: Robert Eriksson
VEDA: Michel Ardens
 6. Network Management
VD: Bengt Rydberg
VDNA: Ron Casey
VEDA: Frank Moerman
 7. Network Accounting
VD: Hans Orrheim
VDNA: Cliff Thompson
VEDA: Christer Pernblad

Quality

- a product development plan must be developed by the group that defines how Infoman should be used for Problem and GS

Printed by: 2500 TOMAS SVENSSON 667790

Subject: GGG-notes 9204

92-05-15

Change. Should each datacenter have its own copy of the product or should one and only one system be used in common by the 3 datacenters?

- the group must define how to measure and represent availability and response times. Today the figures mean different things and are not comparable. GS

Accounting

- this subproject has been put on hold deliberately. Although all datacenters have similar problems within the accounting-area each datacenter has to continue working with budgets, product calculations, etc in its own way until a joint project is started. This will be done later this year when Volvo Data has made plans as a result of the 'EG-project'. TS

Access Control

- the security officer at Volvo Data, Sune Johansson, must be better informed about Volvo Datas global responsibilities and that this requires better information and documentation in english. This is also valid for the Security Committe. TS
- VD will inform VEDA and VDNA how Volvo Data handles authorization levels for operations and systems engineers. CJ
- VDNA experiences that it takes a very long time to grant access to different systems and applications run at Volvo Data. This question will be brought up at the security Committe because this is often due to administrative rules and procedures by our customers. The security committe must discuss this problem and try to find better procedures in order to decrease the time needed. CJ
- VDNA asks for a better consistency and documentation for the delivered rules with MEXPACK. CJ
- the scope for the subproject must be defined. Should all security issues be handled by this subproject or should they be handled by each subproject? E.g. encryption, disaster recovery, network security. TS

VOLVO
Volvo Data North America
A Division of Volvo North America Corporation
Greensboro, North Carolina

Volvo Data North America

MEXPACK Proposals

September 19, 1991

Source: TTGSFTD.MEXPACK(PROPOS3)

Postal address
7821 National Service Rd.
P.O. Box 28115
Greensboro, NC 27402-6115

Telephone
919-279-2037

Telefax
919-279-2659

Volvo Data North America MEXPACK Proposals

Volvo Data North America has identified specific needs concerning the MEXPACK distribution that would enable a smoother install process for the VDNA environment. Many of the points listed below are aimed at reducing the manpower required to install a MEXPACK system, as well as, simplify the maintenance and customization of an operating system or program product.

This proposal also addresses a need to reduce the amount of DASD required to support multiple Logical Partitions, by recommending a single set of MEXPACK volumes to be customized using PARMLIBS, PROCLIBS and program product install libraries. Eventually, given the appropriate packaging, MEXPACK installation should approach the VDNA goal of 2 man-days for a MEXPACK install.

Volvo Data North America recognizes the benefits of the MEXPACK concept and welcomes the opportunity to utilize the expertise of Volvo Data's technical support staff. To be able to install software tested in a comparable environment should favorably impact availability and the quality of Volvo Data North America's computer systems.

Volvo Data North America MEXPACK Proposals

Requirement #1 - Simplify distribution process for multiple LPAR environment at Volvo Data North America complex.

Proposal #1 - Provide one MEXPACK set of volumes with all inclusive program products applicable to all LPARS within the Volvo Data North America complex.

Benefits #1 - Achieve a maintainable operating system environment with the least possible number of persons. Also, reduce the possibility of errors that is inherent when a small staff maintains different operating systems using dissimilar procedures. Improve quality through standardization and simplification.

Requirement #2 - Have the capability to install maintenance on any production operating system and/or MEXPACK provided program product.

Proposal #2 - Distribute SMPE datasets for operating system and all program products installed using SMPE. Establish a naming standard for SMPE datasets distributed with MEXPACK. For example:

ZONE NAME	CSI Dataset Name	Function
GLOBAL	SMPE.GLOBAL.CSI	GLOBAL.CSI
SY1C1XT	SMPE.VSY1C1XT.CSI	TARGET.CSI on SY1C1X
SY1C1XD	SMPE.VSY1C1XD.CSI	DLIB.CSI on SY1C1X

VDNA application of maintenance would be used only in emergency situations in which maintenance could not be provided by Volvo Data in a timely manner, i.e., 6 hour time differential, during long vacation periods, etc.

Communication of fixes must be built into the above process so that maintenance, once installed by VDNA, would not be regressed when a new level of MEXPACK was distributed.

Benefits #2 - Ensure integrity of the operating system environment by providing a means of immediate resolution of errors.

Volvo Data North America MEXPACK Proposals (cont.)

Requirement #3 - Provide complete installation documentation for each operating system and program product distributed on the MEXPACK RESVOL. VDNA needs full disclosure concerning the installation and/or customization of each program product.

Proposal #3 - Include documentation to describe installation and customization of all MEXPACK supplied software. Also, any parameter source decks should be included on MEXPACK so VDNA can tune and/or customize the VDNA LPARs. This documentation, to be included on the RESVOL, is especially critical for non-IBM program products.

Benefits #3 - Reaffirms integrity of the operating system and provides the technical support staff with information required to meet quality and availability service agreements.

Requirement #4 - LPALIB should be distributed as close as possible to IBM distribution. Program products should be documented and distributed in such a manner to provide ease of installation in a multiple LPAR environment.

Proposal #4 - Product level LPALIB, LINKLIST and LOAD libraries should be used versus node level versions to allow customization at the LPAR level using the appropriate SYS1.PARMLIB members.

Datasets required for product customization should be pre-allocated on the RESVOL. All PROCs maintained by Volvo Data should be distributed in a PROC library on the RESVOL and cataloged in the MASTER catalog using the indirect VOLSER facility.

Symbolic parms on started task PROCS distributed with MEXPACK, should define the LPAR associated with a started task, i.e. node=C1. Defaults should be set so starting the started task without specifying a parm will result in a JCL error.

Benefits #4 - Allows for streamlined system operation.

Volvo Data North America MEXPACK Proposals (cont.)

Requirement #5 - Exits distributed by MEXPACK need to be completely documented.

Proposal #5 - Each exit distributed on MEXPACK should include a copy of it's source and a description of its purpose within the Volvo Data system. VDNA attempts to eliminate all exits that can be replaced with comparable functions provided within the operating system, i.e. replacing IEFU83/IEFU84 with SMFPRMxx in SYS1.PARMLIB to control SMF recording.

Benefits #5 Each exit must be evaluated to determine the effects it will have on each LPAR within the VDNA complex. Existing exits for VCNA, VGHT and VDNA should be re-addressed to reduce system entry points and standardize with Volvo Data exit usage.

Logic: "CP", Ings source.

Requirement #6 - Provide flexibility for DASD hardware acquisitions.

Proposal #6 - Remove limited address definitions associated with esoteric devices that in turn require EDT GENs when a volume is moved to a different address. Let SMS control pooling of volumes and the VATLIST parm define the manner in which a device comes online and with what associated characteristics.

Benefits #6 Reduce technical support interface requirements for the constantly changing hardware configurations within VDNA.

General Questions Concerning MEXPACK

- CC1) How is job accounting performed? Is ACTCAT involved? How?
Can this function be moved to ACF2?
- AW 2) What is VUADS and how is it used?
- AW 3) Why is SYS1.UADS still in use for the R101 system? Can it be
removed with the installation of ACF2 5.2?
- CC4) Is there a document to describe the Volvo Data SMF exits and
their connection to the accounting structure?
- NO 5) Is there a document to describe the Volvo Data SMF exits and
their connection to the quality reporting structure?
- OK 6) Will VDNA be given authority to view (read only) the VDNA
MEXPACK data within the Volvo Data environment?

yes
6

Recommended Program Products for VDNA MEXPACK

MVS SYSRES Products

Assembler H
Assembler XF
ACF/VTAM ??? - Check with Brew
ACF2 Base
ACF2 JES2
BTAM
C/370 Compiler
C/370 Specific Library
DF/DSS
DFHSM
DFP
DFSORT
EREP
GDDM
GDDM Graphics
HCF
ICFRU
ICKDSF
INFO Mgmt
INFO SYS
IOCP
ISPF/Dialog Manager
ISPF/PDF
JES2/SP
MLWS
MVS/SP
NETVIEW Base
NPM
OGL
OPC/A
Print Service Facility
PASCAL Library
PL/1
RMF
Subsystem Support Services
SDSF???? (IOF)
SMP/E
SU Bit String
TIOC
TSO/E ESA
VSCOBOL II
VSFORTRAN 2
3270 FTP TSO

Other Products

IMS
CICS
DB2
QMF (?)
HELP
FILEMON
VCOM
ZZ System
ABENDAID
SAS
SESAM
MEMO/base
MEMO/fax
MEMO/pc
TMS/CA-1
VPS
PMO/Qfetch
OMEGAMON II

Replies to Volvo Data North America MEXPACK proposals

91-10-03

Bert Christensson
Inge Forsberg

* answer most of these specific questions.

Summary

Volvo Data does not see MEXPACK as the perfect solution There are lot's of things that has be documented and taken care of. The 'Common Platform' in the GGG-project will focus on these changes. Therefor we intend to keep the VDNA proposals live and use it as input to 'Common Platform'

Proposal 1

Volvo Data does not use the method of having one set of software to be used by different LPARs and there are no plans to use this method.

We don't find the method of running a number LPARs on the same set of software as simple. It will instead be more confusing and harder for Tech Support and Operations. If we want to have the best possible quality we have found that it is better to isolate critical resources like DASD. It is more to loose on one single stop than to save on DASD when using this method.

If somebody by accident ^{sw-updates.} shutdowns one system the result will be all three system going down.

If you get a hardware failure on a shared device 3 systems will go down.

For the moment VD uses shared dasd and one set of software only for products that needs to be shared between LPARS. ie: Automatic Tape Library Control File

Number of the systems to be unique for each system. Have to reach the goal.

Proposal 2

The method to do maintenance for VDNA has been agreed upon together with Ed Deloye.

For every MEXPACK level a copy of the target and dlibs CSI's will be sent. When applying maintenace to the MEXPACK system in VT01, these ptf's and sample JCL are sent to Ed. Then VDNA can apply these ptf's on the VDNA systems.

If VDNA wants to apply another ptf they should first contact VD. An APPLY check can be run on the MEXPACK VT01 system.

Not tested on prod system.

Proposal 3 and 5

VD does not for the moment have all documentation for productinstallations and exits.

It is the intention in the GGG-project to go throu all products to see that all documentation necessary exists.

VD does not distribute source code. The reason for this is that VD needs to have the whole picture to be able to deliver the best softwarequality as possible. However if there are needs to change exits, VD are willing to discuss this and implement the changes needed. Concerning the IEFU83/IEFU84 exit, that exit does more things than cutting SMF-records. It is a vital part of Accounting. There are some cleanup to be made in the Volvo Data exits. The cleanup is planned but with no dates.

*CV must size him VG 117 all accounting with sle
pg VD std ins.*

Proposal 4

All datasets on the IPL-volume are node independent. IBM standard distribution is used. Exception is SYS1.ISPF datasets.

The MEXPACK concept assumes that the active SYS1.PARMLIB and SYS1.PROCLIB isn't located on the IPL volume. However it is up to the local installations who is responsible of their quality to use the the method they want. We would like to discuss this proposal further in the GGG-project.

*Anders
h11
rekommer
aktion*

Proposal 6

This should be handled by SMS, which will take away the needs for EDT-gens. VD will contact Storage Manager at VDNA to set up a mini SMS environment.

Issuer: 2510 INGE FORSBERG 031-667495

Subject: proposal svar

91-10-01

Inledning:

Våra svar på respektive 'proposal' är enbart relaterade till MEXPACK MVS, dvs dom produkter som finns på IPL-packen.

Några av frågorna tar upp punkter som berör IPL-packen, och som i och för sig är intressanta för en vidareutveckling av MEXPACK/GGG-samarbetet. Men vi ser det som viktigt att inte införa för många ändringar på en gång, utan vill först gå vidare med installation av MEXPACK med i stort sett nuvarande metod, för att sedan under GGG-projektet gå vidare med dom förändringar som kan tänkas förbättra samarbetet oss emellan.

Proposal 1.

En IPL-volymp med samtlig software för någon av dom tre nya LPAR byggs denna veckan. Mats och Ed har gått igenom vilka produkter som inkluderats.

Beträffande förslaget att köra 2 (eller så småningom 3) LPAR's från samma IPL-packe:

Vi gör inte så idag, och vi har inga planer på att göra det i framtiden. Vi anser att fördelarna med att ha ett så 'enkelt' och okomplicerat system som möjligt, uppväger nackdelarna med den extra kostnaden för disk.

Vi anser alltså inte att deras förslag är ett 'enkelt' alternativ, utan snarare att det komplicerar livet för både systemfolk och operatörer.

Dom stora nackdelarna (som vi ser det) är:

- ev. hw-problem drabbar 2 (eller 3) system i st.f. 1
- ev. hanteringsfel ('mänskliga faktorn') kan man aldrig helt gardera sig mot, och det är ännu värre att riva två eller tre system i stället för bara ett. Kan man täcka alla eventualiteter för att göra systemet helt 'Cliff-proof' ?

Om VDNA skulle välja att köra flera system från samma IPL-volymp, så har vi just nu följande punkter som behöver beaktas:

- Zap av high level qualifier i GDDM, ACF2 (module ACFFDR)
- DFSORT moduler i SYS1.LINKLIB/SYS1.LPALIB
- Lämplig hantering av MVSCP IODEF

Proposal 2.

Vi har kommit överens om en arbetsmetod för hur vi ska arbeta, tillsammans med Ed:

För varje ny MEXPACK-nivå (för närvarande bara 1-2 ggr/år), skickas kopia av smpe target- och dlib-csi'er med till VDNA. Vid ev. APPLY av PTF(er) på MEXPACK-systemet i VT01, skickas dessa plus exempeljcl och memo till Ed. På så sätt har VDNA möjlighet att hålla exakt samma status på sitt MEXPACK-system, som det som finns i VT01.

Om VDNA behöver lägga på maint, görs detta normalt först efter kontakt med VD Gbg, men ifall det är bråttom, och

Issuer: 2510 INGE FORSBERG 031-667495

Subject: proposal svar 91-10-01

vi inte är här, så kan VDNA köra en APPLY CHECK på MEXPACK-systemet i VT01, för att verifiera att PTF(erna) 'går på'.

I samband med att Volvo Data påbörjar arbete med ny (nästa) MEXPACK-nivå, kommer VDNA:s current-system inte att vara tillgängligt online (bara på tejp). Vi meddelar VDNA (Ed) när vi gör detta.

Undantag: Smp-information för JES2 och sdsf, är inkluderade i ovan nämnda target- och dlib-csi'er. Men eftersom JES2 inte körs från packen, och det ofta skiljer månader (eller halvår) mellan smp apply och distribution av färdigt JES2, så kan ovan beskrivna metod inte användas för JES2/sdsf (och dom ACF2-beroende JES2-exitarna). För dessa gäller att VD Gbg kontaktas, och hanterar apply, och nya laddmoduler.

Propsal 3 + 5.

Vi inser behovet från VDNA att få extra mycket dokumentation/information från VD Gbg, och vi ska göra vårt bästa för att förse dem med så mycket info som möjligt. Men dokumentation har inte varit prioriterat inom MEXPACK-arbetet, och inte heller efterfrågat från våra andra MEXPACK-kunder, så det kan fortfarande finnas brister här och där.

Vi har haft som princip att inte skicka source till dom enskilda MEXPACK-installationerna för att inte råka i konflikt med olika nivåer på centrala exitar o.dyl. I stället är vi alltid öppna för att inkludera alla önskemål i vår centrala kod. Detta gäller fortfarande för MEXPACK-leveransen, men i GGG-projektet kommer vi att göra ett fortsatt arbete för att identifiera alla komponenter, och se till att nödvändig information/dokumentation finns tillgänglig för alla berörda.
(För den som vet var man letar, så finns samtlig sourcekod med i smpsts'et.)

Propsal 4.

Alla datasetsnamn på IPL-volymer är redan nod-oberoende. IBM standard distributionssätt har använts. Undantag är SYS1.ISPF-dataseten där ISPF-komponenterna från ett antal produkter (se separat info i F1STC1.PROD.DOC) har kopierats till gemensamma bibliotek.
MEXPACK-konceptet förutsätter att dom aktiva SYS1.PARMLIB/SYS1.PROCLIB INTE ligger på IPL-packen. Ev. nödvändiga uppdateringar till SYS1.PARMLIB/SYS1.PROCLIB förmedlas genom memoinformation i samband med distribution av ny MEXPACK-nivå.
Tanken är också att varje MEXPACK-installation äger och tar helt ansvar för alla dataset som behövs för att garantera tillgänglighet och säkerhet i deras system. Volvo Data Gbg, skickar enbart memoinformation, samt ev. (i de fall det anses lämpligt) exempel på nya procedurer, parmlibmedlemmar o.dyl.
I det fall VDNA skulle vilja utnyttja gemensamma bibliotek (PARMLIB/PROCLIB) på IPL-volymer, för två eller flera LPAR's, enligt det förslag som nämns i Proposal 4, så är vi villiga att diskutera detta för att komma fram till

Issuer: 2510 INGE FORSBERG 031-667495

Subject: proposal svar 91-10-01

lämplig hantering, men vi ser det som ett steg i GGG-samarbetet, snarare än en punkt i MEXPACK-implementationen.

Proposal 6.

Anledningen till frågan är förmodligen mitt MEXPACK-dokument från i våras, som säger att esoteric names PP, MD, TS och WD måste finnas. Och skälet är alla standardprocedurer och clistor/rexx'ar från framförallt 2540 för IMS/CICS/DB2, men förmodligen även en del av våra egna, utnyttjar våra gamla pooler. Ev. även något beroende i VICS - minns inte just nu.

Pratade nyss med Lasse som tycker att lösningen är SMS. Om Vern Chanda har tid (och disk) för att sätta upp iallafall en liten SMS-miljö för att hantera dessa allokeringar, så borde vi kunna slippa edtgen'ar i C101.

Issuer: 2510 INGE FORSBERG 031-667495

Subject: GGG-möte 91-09-11

```

--- Received from VD.TS 667790 91-09-09 10.14
-> VD.BC BERT CHRISTENSSON 031-667506 2520
-> VD.INGE INGE FORSBERG 2510
-> VD.PPL PERRY LUNDQVIST 2540
-> VD.LD LARS DANIELSSON TEL.031-667479 2510
-> VD.2103HR HÅKAN ROBERTSSON 031-667130 2103
-> VD.HAS ARNE HASSELGREN 2202
-> VD.MIKLOS MIKLOS BAJZATH 8010
-> VD.8015GS GUNNAR SVENSSON 8015
-> VD.HH HENRIK HOLST 2502

```

Jag har bokat rum 18 för onsdagens GGG-möte. Jag har begärt namn från VEDA och VDNA till de olika delprojekten så att ni kan komma igång med samarbetet men jag har inte fått svar på detta än. Jag har heller inte fått till något projektbibliotek ännu men det ska bli under veckan. Som trigger inför en diskussion på onsdag om hur vi egentligen ska strukturera upp dokumentationen så får ni nedan Perrys förslag till delprojektbeskrivning för databas-projektet. Min tanke är alltså att ni ska ha börjat arbeta med projektspecifikationer och funderat på dokumentation så att ni har synpunkter på dokumentstruktur, verktyg, etc.

Ukod finns numera registrerad med förhoppningsvis självförklarande deluppdrag. Ukoden för projektet är 092507.

MVH/Tomas

```

--- Received from VD.2540PL 031-665190 91-09-06 09.50
-> VD.TS TOMAS SVENSSON 2500
-> VD.BC BERT CHRISTENSSON 031-667506 2520

```

Inför GGG-diskussionen, mitt förslag till subprojektbeskrivning:
/Perry

```

-> VD.TS TOMAS SVENSSON 2500
-> VD.LP LARS PLOMGREN 2540

-> VD.GA GÖSTA ANDERSSON 2540
-> VD.EVAF EVA FALK 2540
-> VD.VESNA VESNA STAUBER 031-667098 2540
-> VD.ANJO ANDERS JOHNSON 8210

-> VEDA.TN51136 HUBERT FRANCET FAX 091-515901 07600
-> VEDA.GVDS GEERT VAN DE STEEN FAX=515901 07600
-> VEDA.WILLIE WILLY VAN BUNDER FAX=515901 07600

-> VDNA.1068RC RONALD CASEY 001068
-> VDNA.1068LD LYNN DELACOUR 001068
-> VDNA.1068DN DAVID NIELDS 001068
-> VDNA.1068SM STEVE MORONO 001068

```

Project GGG, subproject DBDC

This is an attempt to briefly describe the current solutions of different areas within the CICS, IMS and DB2 environments, used at the data centers at Gent, Greensboro and Göteborg. The objective of this list is to use it as a base of further discussions in order to define, within each area, the common solution to be used at all the centers in the future. This work is to be based of the common platform and principles, eg name standard, to be defined in another subproject within the GGG project.

Issuer: 2510 INGE FORSBERG 031-667495

Subject: GGG-möte

91-09-11

The last, and obvious the longest step to take, is the real implementation of the common solutions at each data center. One important part of this is the specification, manufacturing, deliverance and implementation of the MEXPACK package for the three DBDC products.

The primary choice of solution within each area, is the one currently implemented in Göteborg. HOWEVER, different implementations at Gent or Greensboro are to be considered as a possible solution, should it be the best common one.

Further details about the DBDC systems at VD in Göteborg are to be found in the operating handbooks for CICS, DB2 (both not yet complete) and IMS.

The list of areas to begin with is the one following for IMS.
A similar list should be produced also for DB2 and CICS.

Each point of interest should include description, current use in Göteborg, program products included, and main differences in Gent and Greensboro. Later to be described is the common solution, the costs and work to be done to achieve this, as well as a time plan, for each data center.