

## Export

## Peak Incident Management System

Call Reference	PC0195561	Call Logger	_Customer Call_ -- EDSC
Release	Targeted At -- HNG-X 01.22.01	Top Ref	<u>2091569</u>
Call Type	Live Incidents/Defects	Priority	B -- Business restricted
Contact	EDSC	Call Status	Closed -- S/W Fix Available to Call Logger
Target Date	07/03/2010	Effort (Man Days)	0
Summary	FAD226542 pm was issued with 2 x 4000pds receipts		
All References	Type	Value	
	DevIntRel-Director	ITU SV&I	
	OCP	<u>OCP 25882</u>	
	TRIOLE for Service	<u>2091569</u>	
	SSCKEL	<u>KEL cardc262S</u>	
	SSCKEL	<u>KEL cardc262S</u>	
Collections	Name	User	Date
	PrescanCounter	Lorraine Elliott	15-Apr-2010 08:05:13

## Progress Narrative

Date:04-Mar-2010 12:50:40 User:\_Customer Call\_  
CALL PC0195561 opened  
Details entered are:-  
Summary:see call 2083169. pm was trying to transfer out 4000 pds. the...  
Call Type:L  
Call Priority:A  
Target Release:T86  
Routed to:EDSC - \_Unassigned\_

Date:04-Mar-2010 12:50:40 User:\_Customer Call\_

=====

INCIDENT MANAGEMENT  
Date/Time Raised: Mar 4 2010 12:33PM  
Priority: A  
Contact Name: caroline dickson  
Contact Phone: GRO  
Originator: XXXXXX@TFS01  
Originator's reference: 2091569  
Product Serial No:  
Product Site: 226542

=====

see call 2083169. pm was trying to transfer out 4000 pds. the system crashed. pm was issued with 2 x 4000pds receipts.

## Incident History:

---  
2010-03-04 12:33:39 [ Vasse, Anthony]  
INIT : create a new request/incident/problem/change/issue  
---  
2010-03-04 12:36:08 [ Vasse, Anthony]  
zneun\_en\_rmg : Open Notification  
---  
2010-03-04 12:36:08 [ Vasse, Anthony]  
zneut\_en\_rmg : Transfer Notification  
---  
2010-03-04 12:36:20 [ Vasse, Anthony]  
LOG : nbsc said that the error should have resolved itself overnight.  
---  
2010-03-04 12:36:41 [ Vasse, Anthony]  
FLD : FIELD='zcbflag' OLD='NO' NEW='YES'  
---  
2010-03-04 12:36:50 [ Vasse, Anthony]  
LOG : pm is horizon online.

username CDI001

Stock Unit BB individual

Transferring BB into MS shared main stock unit.

the transfer out receipt came up at 1506 on the 2/3  
pm got two receipts for 4000pds.  
they have the same session number on them.  
session 2-192266



message at bottom of receipt reads "this session may or may not have worked  
It will not be recovered. You will need to check its effect when you next log in. "

at 1615 pm logged into ms on the transfer screen.  
pm had two transfers at 4000pds each to complete.  
Both had the same session id.  
1-537246  
----

2010-03-04 12:41:59 [ Vasse, Anthony]  
FLD : FIELDD='category' OLD='RMGA.S Software.SD21 Reported software error' NEW='RMGA.S Software.SD22 HNG Migration Issue.CB3 HNG Migration issue'  
----

2010-03-04 12:42:04 [ Vasse, Anthony]  
LOG : pm transferred one amount back to stock unit bb.  
session id 1-537252 at 16:16  
transfer in slip for stock unit bb 2-192288

pm did a cash declaration in MS that was fine.  
pm did a cash declaration in BB. that was out by 4000 pounds. ( a loss of 4000 pds.)  
----

2010-03-04 12:45:34 [ Vasse, Anthony]  
LOG : pm is not sure what has happend with a 4000 pds transfer.  
pm is now showing a 4000pds loss in stock unit BB.  
Please see details.  
pm had a system crash when she was completing the transfer.  
----

2010-03-04 12:47:08 [ Vasse, Anthony]  
LOG : pm had a number of crashes yesterday " unable to contact the data center errors "

pm is not back in office until 1400 today.  
----

2010-03-04 12:49:32 [ Vasse, Anthony]  
TR : Transfer 'group' from 'HSH6' to 'PEAK'  
----

2010-03-04 12:49:32 [ Vasse, Anthony]  
zneut\_en\_rmg : Transfer Notification

---

Date:04-Mar-2010 12:59:33 User:Lorraine Elliott  
Product EPOSS & DeskTop -- Counter Common (version unspecified) added.

---

Date:04-Mar-2010 12:59:54 User:Lorraine Elliott  
The call summary has been changed from:-  
see call 2083169. pm was trying to tansfer out 4000 pds. the...  
The call summary is now:-  
FAD226542 pm was issued with 2 x 4000pds receipts

---

Date:04-Mar-2010 13:13:36 User:Lorraine Elliott  
The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Cheryl Card  
Progress was delivered to Consumer

---

Date:05-Mar-2010 16:58:10 User:Cheryl Card  
[Start of Response]  
On 02/03/10 on counter 2 at 15:04, the clerk attempted a Transfer Out of 4000.00 from stock unit BB to MS. Due to a system problem, the Transfer Out doubled up, so when the Transfer In was done on counter 1 at 16:15, it was for 8000.00. The branch now has a loss of 4000.00.

I phoned the PM and explained that the problem was under investigation. The PM would like to have it sorted out before she rolls into the next TP, which is due on Wed 17th March.  
[End of Response]  
Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation  
Response was delivered to Consumer

---

Date:09-Mar-2010 17:43:04 User:Anne Chambers  
KEL cardc2628 authorised

---

Date:10-Mar-2010 08:43:45 User:Cheryl Card  
[Start of Response]  
The PM attempted a Transfer Out of ?4000. The settlement request timed out and the PM was logged out. Two Transfer Out slips were printed, each with the following text at the bottom:  
This session may or may not have worked. It will not be recovered. You will need to check its effect when you next login.  
  
When the PM did the corresponding Transfer In, it was for ?8000 instead of the expected ?4000. The branch now has a loss of ?4000.  
  
The Transfer Reconciliation Report, printed by the clerk, contains:  
2-192266 BB MS 2 02-Mar 15:04 TO 8000.00-  
1-537246 BB MS 2 02-Mar 16:15 TI 8000.00

Relevant counter logs and database extracts are attached.  
[End of Response]  
Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation



Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:10-Mar-2010 08:44:53 User:Cheryl Card

Evidence Added - Database extract and logs for branch 226542 on 02/03/10

Date:10-Mar-2010 08:51:33 User:Cheryl Card

[Start of Response]

After discussion with Gareth Jenkins, the suggested correction is to negate the duplicate transfer out by writing 2 lines to the BRDB\_RX\_REP\_SESSION and BRDB\_RX\_EPOSS\_TRANSACTIONS tables, with:

- 1) Product 1, Quantity 1, Amount 4000.00, Counter mode id 7 (TI)
- 2) Product 6276, Quantity -1, Amount -4000.00, Counter mode id 7 (TI)

This should be done using the Transaction Correction tool. An OCP approved by POL will be needed.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:11-Mar-2010 11:35:17 User:Cheryl Card

[Start of Response]

I spoke to the PM yesterday about the proposed repair.

The source stock unit BB is down by 4000 and has not been used since the problem occurred. The destination stock unit MS has balanced correctly and has rolled into a new BP. Therefore I propose to make the correction by writing 2 additional records to both BRDB\_RX\_REP\_SESSION and BRDB\_RX\_EPOSS\_TRANSACTIONS to transfer out an additional 4000 from BB as follows:

- 1) Product 1, Mode 13 (TO), Amount 4000, Quantity 1
- 2) Product 6277, Mode 13, Amount -4000, Quantity -1

This reflects how they have handled it at the branch, and also matches the 2 records in the BRDB\_SU\_PENDING\_TRANSFER\_DET table.

The PM is waiting for me to do the repair, then they will roll the BB stock unit into a new BP this week (TP rollover is next week).

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:11-Mar-2010 15:22:14 User:Cheryl Card

[Start of Response]

Advised PM to print a balance snapshot. Ran the Transaction Correction tool (BRDBX015). Advised PM to print a balance snapshot again and she confirmed that it now looks correct. She will now balance and do 2 BP rollovers to catch up with the other stock units. Will keep call open until she has rolled into a new TP (17th March).

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:11-Mar-2010 17:26:59 User:Cheryl Card

Evidence Added - SQL updates and output from the TC tool

Date:12-Mar-2010 16:54:08 User:Cheryl Card

[Start of Response]

Checked the BRDB\_DAILY\_SUMMARY table, which would have been populated overnight, and this shows the Transfer Out of 4000.00 against products 1 and 6277 for stock unit BB.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:12-Mar-2010 17:25:00 User:Cheryl Card

The call Priority has been changed from A

The call Priority is now B

Date:12-Mar-2010 17:25:18 User:Cheryl Card

[Start of Response]

Reducing priority to B now that the repair has been successfully done.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:15-Mar-2010 12:29:40 User:Cheryl Card

[Start of Response]

On 02/03/10 between 15:03 and 15:06, on counter 2, the PM attempted to do a Transfer Out of 4000.00 cash from stock unit BB to MS. The settlement request timed out and the PM was logged out. Two Transfer Out slips were printed, each with the following text at the bottom:

This session may or may not have worked. It will not be recovered. You will need to check its effect when you next login.

BAL logs show 2 instances of:

RequestEvent... for BasketSettlementService/SettleTransferOut has timed out but is executing. Ignoring timeout



Two entries for 4000.00 were written to table BRDB\_SU\_PENDING\_TRANSFER\_DET, but only one entry should have been written. This caused the branch a loss of 4000.00 (which has now been corrected using the Transaction Correction tool).

Routing to 4th line for investigation into why the Transfer Out doubled up. Evidence (logs and database extract) attached.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:15-Mar-2010 12:29:50 User:Cheryl Card

The Call record has been transferred to the team: xCtr\_GDC

User:Cheryl Card Confirmed that this Incident may be passed to the external company with the attached evidence.

Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:15-Mar-2010 12:34:08 User:Suresh Chitikela

The Call record has been transferred to the team: xCtr\_CSM\_GDC

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Chaitanya Pothapragada

Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:15-Mar-2010 18:11:16 User:Steven Porter

[Start of Response]

This looks like it would need to go into HNGX R1 at some point, and could not wait for R2.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:17-Mar-2010 07:14:46 User:Chaitanya Pothapragada

[Start of Response]

When the BAL service is timed out, the data used to commit to the database before.

With the release of PC0194893 in CTR025\_10\_HOTFIX, which resolved the issue of a transaction committing data once a request has timed out. The fix will rollback the data.

We are trying to reproduce the issue in CTR024\_04\_HOTFIX to get the receipt twice and check the db if the transaction data is committed and check the same in CTR025\_10\_HOTFIX to find the transaction data not getting committed.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:17-Mar-2010 08:34:18 User:Chaitanya Pothapragada

[Start of Response]

Branch used to reproduce the issue : CTR024\_04\_HOTFIX

Steps to reproduce :

-----

Run the OSR in debug mode setting breakpoints.

Do the transfer out in counter and hit settle to hit the break point in OSR.

Let the request timeout.

MSG10010 will be displayed on CTR.

Hit Retry and let the request timeout for the second time.

Now hit Cancel on MSG10010.

This will print two transfer out receipt with same session id.

On successfully completing the printing of second receipt, ctr logs off.

I am able to produce two receipts for the same transfer out transaction and found the transaction details in brdb\_su\_pending\_transfer\_det and brdb\_su\_pending\_transfer.

After contacting OSR team, found that this issue is a duplicate of PC0194893.

PC0194893 went to release in CTR025\_10\_HOTFIX

Not able to reproduce the issue in CTR025\_10\_HOTFIX.

When BAL request is timedout, data is not committed to the database.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:17-Mar-2010 08:34:30 User:Chaitanya Pothapragada

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Suresh Chitikela

Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:17-Mar-2010 08:48:32 User:Suresh Chitikela

[Start of Response]

when the request timedout BAL used to commit the data to databse.This has been addressed as part of peak PC0194893.

analysis looks fine

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer



Date:17-Mar-2010 08:49:33 User:Suresh Chitikela  
Action placed on Team:xCtr\_OSr\_SME, User:Steven Porter

Date:17-Mar-2010 14:05:17 User:Martin Tonge

[Start of Response]

Not totally convinced you have re-created what occurred in live. You are running breakpoints on the settlement request. This is different to what occurred in live.

1: Settlement requests have journal entries and in your test scenario the second request would have failed because the first request would have committed a journal entry and you would have a duplicate entry.

2: In live one of the settlements would have failed because of the journal entry - if this was a genuine retry.

Can you check your testing and get the OSR message logs to show that you have recreated what occurred in live. My concern is that something else has occurred here. One thing that is bothering me is cash declaration on with respect to 2 different stock units.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:17-Mar-2010 14:19:54 User:Martin Tonge

[Start of Response]

Not totally convinced you have re-created this with what occurred in live.

Settlement requests have journal entries and in your test scenario the second request would have failed because the first request would have committed a journal entry and you would errored with a duplicate entry with the second request.

If as in live the retry was committed before the first request completed then the first request would have failed with a duplicate journal entry.

Can you check your testing and get the OSR message logs to demonstrate what happened. Although the DB was the trigger for this and the new OSR behaviour may avoid this issue - I'm not convinced we understand how the duplicate occurred.

Needs more analysis. Please ring if it will to discuss this one.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:17-Mar-2010 14:20:15 User:Martin Tonge

Action has been removed from the call

Date:18-Mar-2010 11:45:59 User:Chaitanya Pothapragada

[Start of Response]

I am working on this and will put my analysis here in a shortwhile.

As the fix is already released, I would like to request the priority of the issue be downgraded to C as we are trying to investigate the root cause only. Please let me know your thoughts on this.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:18-Mar-2010 11:46:35 User:Chaitanya Pothapragada

The Call record has been transferred to the team: xCtr\_OSr\_SME

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Martin Tonge

User:Chaitanya Pothapragada Confirmed that this Incident may be passed to the external company with the attached evidence.

Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:18-Mar-2010 13:17:54 User:Martin Tonge

[Start of Response]

What is missing from this Peek is an explanation of the events in terms of the requests, how they were ordered and when any was committed. Only then can we qualify the priority. The assumption is that we have a fix. The facts are -

1: A settlement request to timed.

2: A retry of request timeout occurred.

3: According to the DB entries both later succeeded.

Now unlike other reconcillation Peeks this stands out because only one of the requests are specific to settlement. They should have worked because there would have been a unique constraint violation on the journal entry of one of them and if we are not getting the correct data back from the DB. F/590/5



then this is still an issue!

So what next -

We can't reduce the priority unless we understand what is going on.

1: Need to look at the logs and work out the sequence of events.

2: If you have genuinely recreated this issue during test. We also need to work out the sequence of events and to determine why no exception was thrown.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:18-Mar-2010 13:18:05 User:Martin Tonge

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Martin Tonge

Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:18-Mar-2010 13:19:17 User:Martin Tonge

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Martin Tonge

Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:18-Mar-2010 13:19:32 User:Martin Tonge

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Martin Tonge

Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:18-Mar-2010 13:20:18 User:Martin Tonge

The Call record has been transferred to the team: xCtr\_CSM\_GDC

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Chaitanya Pothapragada

User:Martin Tonge Confirmed that this Incident may be passed to the external company with the attached evidence.

Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:18-Mar-2010 14:26:04 User:Chaitanya Pothapragada

[Start of Response]

Yes, the second request is failing and the first request is committing the data in db.

The below message is seen in the logs :

2010-03-18 10:01:01,296 UTC [settlement\_queue pool-13-thread-9] com.fujitsu.poa.bals.filters.MessageJournalFilter INFO [3407-2-VU-1809-19] - [3407]- Retry attempted for a request that already succeeded - BasketSettlementService/SettleTransferOut from counter[2] branch code[3407]. No further processing required

Please find attached the message logs.

When a transfer out is done to another SU, the data is committed in two tables, BRDB\_SU\_PENDING\_TRANSFER and BRDB\_SU\_PENDING\_TRANSFER\_DET , but here the duplicate row is added only in BRDB\_SU\_PENDING\_TRANSFER\_DET which contains the details of the transaction.

I am not able to get the duplicate row in BRDB\_SU\_PENDING\_TRANSFER\_DET in my testing.

I would like to request for more logs to investigate further as to how the duplicate row in BRDB\_SU\_PENDING\_TRANSFER\_DET is added in live.

i)Need OSR message log for the following request ids :

226542-2-XH-0215-2

226542-2-XH-0215-3

226542-2-XH-0215-4

226542-2-XH-0215-5.

ii)Also the "osr.log" file for the following OSR instances :

"lprpbal005:20560"

"lprpbal008:20560"

"lprpbal006:20560" for the day 02-MAR-2010 from 15:00 to 15:20 for the branch id "226542" and counter id "2".

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:18-Mar-2010 14:32:21 User:Chaitanya Pothapragada

[Start of Response]

Please provide the below information to proceed further on the issue :

i)Need OSR message log for the following request ids :

226542-2-XH-0215-2

226542-2-XH-0215-3

226542-2-XH-0215-4

226542-2-XH-0215-5.

ii)Also the "osr.log" file for the following OSR instances :

"lprpbal005:20560"

"lprpbal008:20560"

"lprpbal006:20560" for the day 02-MAR-2010 from 15:00 to 15:20 for the branch id "226542" and counter id "2".



iii) DB extract of BRDB\_SU\_PENDING\_TRANSFER\_DET including the full data of all the columns for the rows given below, which you have provided earlier.

Before it was BRDB\_SU\_PENDING\_TRANSFER\_DET:

INSERT TIMESTAMP PROD\_ID AMOUNT QUANTITY IS\_BUREAU

02-MAR-2010 15:08:22 1 4000 1 N

02-MAR-2010 15:08:31 1 4000 1 N

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:18-Mar-2010 14:33:37 User:Chaitanya Pothapragada

The Call record has been transferred to the team: EDSC

User:Chaitanya Pothapragada Confirmed that this Incident may be passed to the external company with the attached evidence.

Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:18-Mar-2010 15:47:48 User:Mark Wright

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Cheryl Card

Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:19-Mar-2010 14:16:06 User:Cheryl Card

Evidence Added - More evidence as requested

Date:19-Mar-2010 14:18:02 User:Cheryl Card

The Call record has been transferred to the team: xCtr\_CSM\_GDC

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Chaitanya Pothapragada

User:Cheryl Card Confirmed that this Incident may be passed to the external company with the attached evidence.

Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:24-Mar-2010 14:45:49 User:Chaitanya Pothapragada

[Start of Response]

Timeouts were the underlying cause of the issue and that there were long delays waiting on the DB to process the 4 requests.

In this case two of the requests were committed and two correctly detected that the transaction had already succeeded.

There is an issue with the 2 commits because this shouldn't have happened.

However the behaviour of the OSR from CTR25.07 onwards is to roll the transaction back on a timeout. In this scenario all the requests would have failed and no reconciliation is required.

We would like to find the root cause of the issue as to how the duplicate entry was committed in the db.

In consultation with FJ SME, request to kindly downgrade the priority to C.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:24-Mar-2010 15:30:48 User:Chaitanya Pothapragada

[Start of Response]

As per above, please downgrade the priority to C.

For further investigating the root cause of the issue, request to provide the below :

1. For branch accounting code = 226542, counter id = 2, JSN = 3192266

Please provide the message journal record(JOURNAL\_XML) in

BRDB\_RX\_MESSAGE\_JOURNAL.

Incase, if there are two records existing for the same JSN, pls provide both.

2. Also, provide the BAL request logs/message journal records for previous(3192265) and next(3192267) JSN requests

Thanks.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:24-Mar-2010 15:35:54 User:Chaitanya Pothapragada

The Call record has been transferred to the team: EDSC

User:Chaitanya Pothapragada Confirmed that this Incident may be passed to the external company with the attached evidence.

Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:24-Mar-2010 15:37:38 User:Cheryl Card

The call Priority has been changed from B

The call Priority is now C

Date:24-Mar-2010 15:50:00 User:Darran Avenell

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Cheryl Card



Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:25-Mar-2010 14:31:31 User: Customer Call

Voiced Cheryl Card (SSC) and advised on the latest update in the call she states she was going to check if it was the same thing that happend before.

POL are want to know why this has happend? - why does it keep happening? - can you advise on this.

Thanks

Date:25-Mar-2010 16:26:58 User: Cheryl Card

[Start of Response]

Have checked the logs and it does not appear to be a system error. Checked the buttonpress details in the PostOffieCounter log and this shows that the clerk:

Pressed Enter to select the transfer

Pressed Print to print the Transfer In slip

Pressed Enter to accept the transfer - which also prints the Transfer In slip.

I checked the relevant database tables and they look consistent. Phoned the PM to explain why the Transfer In slip was printed twice.

She maintains that the stock unit is now down by 182.00. I agreed to do further checks tomorrow.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:26-Mar-2010 11:56:43 User: Cheryl Card

[Start of Response]

A transaction to the value of 182.00 was done in stock unit OOH on counter 1, on 20/03/10 at 09:23. A Transfer Out of 182.00 from OOH to AA was done immediately afterwards.

The corresponding Transfer In of 182.00 was done on counter 2 at 09:24.

A Balance Snapshot for OOH was done on counter 1 at 09:27 showing zero cash. The PM has confirmed that this is as expected.

A Balance Snapshot for AA was done on counter 2 at 12:17 showing 3285.01 cash. The previous balance snapshot was done on a previous day. I phoned the PM and suggested she contact the NBSC to see if the transactions carried about between the 2 balance snapshots can be checked.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:27-Mar-2010 10:35:59 User: Cheryl Card

Evidence Added - Extracts from Journal and BAL logs

Date:27-Mar-2010 10:40:24 User: Cheryl Card

[Start of Response]

Extracts from Journal and BAL logs attached as requested by Chaitanya Pothapragada

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:27-Mar-2010 10:40:58 User: Cheryl Card

The Call record has been transferred to the team: xCtr\_CSM\_GDC

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Chaitanya Pothapragada

User:Cheryl Card Confirmed that this Incident may be passed to the external company with the attached evidence.

Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:14-Apr-2010 16:21:19 User: Chaitanya Pothapragada

[Start of Response]

Request to provide a few more logs to investigate the root cause of the issue.

PC0195561 is now routed to you.

We need osr.log for lprpb1005:20560 & lprpb1010:20559 from 15:04 to 15:10 for the day, 2010-03-02.

Also, please run the query below and provide us the result :

```
SELECT insert_timestamp
FROM brdb_rx_message_journal
WHERE branch_accounting_code = 226542
AND journal_seq_number = 3192266
```

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:14-Apr-2010 16:21:51 User: Chaitanya Pothapragada

The Call record has been transferred to the team: EDSC

User:Chaitanya Pothapragada Confirmed that this Incident may be passed to the external company with the attached evidence.

Progress was delivered to Consumer



Date:15-Apr-2010 12:35:50 User:Anne Chambers  
Evidence Added - OSRlog extracts

Date:15-Apr-2010 12:39:16 User:Anne Chambers  
[Start of Response]  
SELECT insert\_timestamp  
FROM brdb\_rx\_message\_journal  
WHERE branch\_accounting\_code = 226542  
AND journal\_seq\_number = 3192266

found nothing because the journal entries are not kept for long on the database. I've found the journal entry in the audit file but I can't see that it includes the brdb insert\_timestamp.

I ran a similar check on brdb\_rx\_rep\_session\_data; the insert timestamp of the 2 messages was 02-MAR-10 15:08:22.4782  
[End of Response]  
Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation  
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:15-Apr-2010 12:51:53 User:Lorraine Elliott  
The Call record has been transferred to the team: xCtr CSM GDC  
The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Chaitanya Pothapragada  
User:Lorraine Elliott Confirmed that this Incident may be passed to the external company with the attached evidence.  
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:22-Apr-2010 09:58:59 User:Cheryl Card  
The call Priority has been changed from C  
The call Priority is now B

Date:22-Apr-2010 10:00:46 User:Cheryl Card  
[Start of Response]  
Changing priority to B - since this involves a loss of 4000.00 cash and POL are now concerned that this problem may reoccur.  
[End of Response]  
Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation  
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:22-Apr-2010 15:35:54 User:Chaitanya Pothapragada  
[Start of Response]

I have gone through the counter logs, OSR logs and the DB dumps provided in the peak. Lets analyze this from the scratch.

Peak has been raised when a clerk attempted a Transfer Out of 4000.00 from stock unit BB to MS. Due to a system problem, the Transfer Out doubled up, so when the Transfer In was done on counter 1 at 16:15, it was for 8000.00. The branch now has a loss of 4000.00.

I checked the counter logs and analyzed that the request ?BasketSettlementService/SettleTransferOut? with request id 226542-2-XH-0215-2?(with JSN 3192266) has timed out. But note that in the BAL/OSR side this request was ignored by the time out monitor and continued to execute and hence updated the table.

Since in the counter side the request was timed out, PM has retried the same request 3 more times with request ids (226542-2-XH-0215-3, 226542-2-XH-0215-4, 226542-2-XH-0215-5).

Since the first request 226542-2-XH-0215-2, updated the DB tables, the following retries should fail in the Message Journal Filter itself. In this filter, system will check whether the JSN entry is already exists in the Journal table. Retried requests (226542-2-XH-0215-4 and 226542-2-XH-0215-5) were failed with the same reason, since there already exists journal record due to 226542-2-XH-0215-2.

But, I have noticed that the retried request with id ?226542-2-XH-0215-3? was ignored by time out monitor in the BAL side and continued to execute. But from the osr.log file and OSR message log, I couldn't find this request was failed due to the duplicate JSN record in the journal table (which was expected and the normal behavior of OSR), didn't happen in this case.

I have requested for the journal table dump, to check whether duplicate JSN entries exists in the table. But from the DB dump, I couldn't find any duplicates.

Even I have requested OSR logs for to investigate further. I didn't get any clue on the request 226542-2-XH-0215-3?. I could only able to see the following in the osr.log file.

2010-03-02 15:05:18,536 UTC lprpbal010:20559 [time\_out\_thread] com.fujitsu.poa.bal.osr.event.RequestEvent INFO [226542-2-XH-0215-3] - []- Event:com.fujitsu.poa.bal.osr.event.RequestEvent@5d0efe for BasketSettlementService/SettleTransferOut has timed out but is executing. Ignoring timeout-@@-

The OSR message log shows the following logs.

2010-03-02 15:04:48,280 UTC lprpbal010:20559 [httpWorkerThread-20559-9] message\_logger INFO [226542-2-XH-0215-3] - []- Request Received: Uri[BasketSettlementService/SettleTransferOut]: Request[user-agent: Jakarta Commons-HttpClient/3.0.1  
content-length: 1170  
retry: true  
timeout: 30000  
content-encoding: gzip  
host: vbal001:9000  
reqmessageid: 226542-2-XH-0215-3  
accept-encoding: gzip  
content-type: text/xml  
authorization-signature:  
calI7fBegQfO/WGkTGPz6PkwRN/xb+g7kWXhznZMoUfXluTYWCIPUMa9CrXzQhLZ0CkxOsTltN4c9ZRIuCRVTy5ipeGEbyR1MU8S/42aFCeZ9CUcTPo6t+Vzmg7V  
iYod4TU5RGg/8JVWdq7fZwgZbjuhlgFjjdNz4o=



[JSN:3192266]: Request length[5750]-@@-

2010-03-02 15:08:48,369 UTC lprpbal010:20559 [settlement\_queue pool-13-thread-37] message\_logger INFO [226542-2-XH-0215-3] - [226542] Request Complete: Status[Response Sent]: uri[BasketSettlementService/SettleTransferOut]: Response length[143] : Duration[240090]-@@-

I suspect there must be something gone wrong with this request i.e. 226542-2-XH-0215-3. But unfortunately no clue on this. I am not sure why this might have happened. Normally, since this is a retried one it should have failed at the Journal filter stage.

But from the DB dump, in the BRDB\_SU\_PENDING\_TRANSFER\_DET table we had 2 records as follows.

INSERT TIMESTAMP PROD ID AMOUNT QUANTITY IS BUREAU

02-MAR-2010 15:08:22 1 4000 1 N

02-MAR-2010 15:08:31 1 4000 1 N

So, we can see that the insert time stamp is different for these 2 records and hence it might have entered from 2 different requests.

I have no doubt that one of the records was inserted by the request id 226542-2-XH-0215-2?, which is the original request. But I am not sure how the second record was inserted. But I have doubt on the retried request 226542-2-XH-0215-3?, which didn't fail at the journal filter stage.

So, I would request you to suggest on this, since there wasn't any evidence which shows that 2 txn has happened and updated the tables.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:22-Apr-2010 15:50:33 User:Tyrone Cozens

The call Target Release has been moved to Targeted At -- HNG-X 01.22.01

Date:22-Apr-2010 15:50:42 User:Tyrone Cozens

[Start of Response]

Authorised for 01.22.01.00 as agreed in RMF

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 56 -- Pending -- Live Fix Authorised

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:23-Apr-2010 08:17:31 User:Chaitanya Pothapragada

Action placed on Team:xCtr\_OSR\_SME, User:Martin Tonge

Date:23-Apr-2010 08:32:25 User:Martin Tonge

[Start of Response]

I think we have done as much as we can on this one. In conclusion although we haven't been able to totally explain the behaviour, the risk of this type Peek occurring again has been minimised in live due to a change of behaviour in the BAL with respect to transactions. PC0194893 in CTR025\_10\_HOTFIX will not allow any timed out request to commit. The timeouts are essence of this Peek and the underlying cause.

This may now be marked as a duplicate of PC0194893.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 56 -- Pending -- Live Fix Authorised

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:23-Apr-2010 08:32:30 User:Martin Tonge

Action has been removed from the call

Date:23-Apr-2010 12:03:24 User:Chaitanya Pothapragada

[Start of Response]

duplicate of PC0194893

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 72 -- Final -- Duplicate Call

Routing to Call Logger following Final Progress update.

Response was delivered to Consumer

Defect cause updated to 40 -- General - User

Date:23-Apr-2010 15:09:05 User:Cheryl Card

[Start of Response]

I am sending this call back with Response Rejected.

Closing a call as 'Duplicate Call' results in a black mark against me. It basically means that I should not have sent the call over since the same problem has already been sent over in a previous call.

PC0195561 (duplicate transfer of 4000.00 cash) may have been caused by the same underlying fault as PC0194893 (banking reconciliation), however I could not have been reasonably expected to link the 2 calls and take the decision that it was not necessary to send PC0195561 over for further investigation.

Please close this call with category 'Advice After Investigation'

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 52 -- Pending -- Response Rejected

Response was delivered to Consumer



Date:23-Apr-2010 15:11:09 User:Cheryl Card  
The Call record has been transferred to the team: xCtr CSM GDC  
The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Chaitanya Pothapragada  
User:Cheryl Card Confirmed that this Incident may be passed to the external company with the attached evidence.  
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:26-Apr-2010 09:06:26 User:Steven Porter  
[Start of Response]  
Thus we need to ensure there is a KEL for this (either an existing one, or a new one), then return to SSC.  
  
[End of Response]  
Response code to call type L as Category 52 -- Pending -- Response Rejected  
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:26-Apr-2010 09:54:25 User:Chaitanya Pothapragada  
Action placed on Team:xCtr\_GDC, User:Suresh Chitikela

Date:26-Apr-2010 09:56:34 User:Chaitanya Pothapragada  
[Start of Response]  
Actioned to xctr\_gdc for visibility of the peak to GDC in future.  
[End of Response]  
Response code to call type L as Category 52 -- Pending -- Response Rejected  
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:26-Apr-2010 10:02:38 User:Chaitanya Pothapragada  
[Start of Response]  
PC0195561 covers the fix for this issue.  
[End of Response]  
Response code to call type L as Category 95 -- Final -- Advice after Investigation  
Routing to Call Logger following Final Progress update.  
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:26-Apr-2010 10:03:57 User:Chaitanya Pothapragada  
My above comment is incorrect.  
  
PC0194893 covers the fix for this issue.

Date:26-Apr-2010 11:42:41 User:Cheryl Card  
The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Cheryl Card  
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:04-May-2010 13:41:57 User:Cheryl Card  
[Start of Response]  
The problem was fixed in release BAL\_SRV\_OSR\_ROUTING\_0108 D048-D047 /  
BAL\_SRV\_OSR\_0108\_D056-D055, which went onto Live on 04/04/10. I have updated KEL cardc262S with this information. Call can now be closed.  
[End of Response]  
Response code to call type L as Category 60 -- Final -- S/W Fix Released to Call Logger  
Routing to Call Logger following Final Progress update.  
Service Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:04-May-2010 13:41:58 User:Cheryl Card  
CALL PC0195561 closed: Category 60 Type L

Date:04-May-2010 15:23:21 User:\_Customer Call\_  
Consumer XXXXXX@TFS01 has acknowledged the call closure

Root Cause	General - User
Logger	Customer Call -- EDSC
Subject Product	EPOSS & DeskTop -- Counter Common (version unspecified)
Assignee	_Customer Call_ -- EDSC
Last Progress	04-May-2010 15:23 -- _Customer Call_