

Export

Peak Incident Management System

Call Reference	PC0181609	Call Logger	Customer Call -- EDSC
Release	Reported In -- T86	Top Ref	1190216
Call Type	Live Incidents/Defects	Priority	C -- Non-critical
Contact	EDSC	Call Status	Closed -- Avoidance Action Supplied
Target Date	27/05/2009	Effort (Man Days)	0
Summary	FAD384238 Payment and receipt mismatch		
All References	Type	Value	
	SSCKEL	KEL obengc3120K	
	TRIOLE for Service	1190216	

Progress Narrative

Date:22-May-2009 12:53:53 User: Customer Call_
 CALL PC0181609 opened
 Details entered are:-
 Summary:Payment receipt mismatch Pm tried to reverse the transact...
 Call Type:L
 Call Priority:C
 Target Release:T86
 Routed to:EDSC - _Unassigned_

 INCIDENT MANAGEMENT
 Date/Time Raised: May 22 2009 12:33PM
 Priority: C
 Contact Name: Chris
 Contact Phone: [GRO]
 Originator: XXXXXX@TFS01
 Originator's reference: 1190216
 Product Serial No:
 Product Site: 384238

Payment receipt mismatch

Pm tried to reverse the transaction

pm has £12,500 Gain

Would not let her roll over as the £12,500 Gain
 Could not roll over to TP

Incident History:

2009-05-22 12:33:32 [Poulton, Claire]
 INIT : create a new request/incident/problem/change/issue

2009-05-22 12:35:57 [Poulton, Claire]
 zneut_en_rmg : Transfer Notification

2009-05-22 12:35:57 [Poulton, Claire]
 zneun_en_rmg : Open Notification

2009-05-22 12:36:04 [Poulton, Claire]
 LOG : Payment receipt mismatch

Pm tried to reverse the transaction it reversed the Bureau but not the cash

pm has £12,500 Gain

Would not let her roll over as the £12,500 Gain
 Could not roll over to TP

2009-05-22 12:37:08 [Poulton, Claire]
 LOG : Where is discrepancy - Cash £12,794, Transaction 14,550 euros

Full error message - Payment and receipts mismatch

What report shows discrepancy - Cash declaration

Time and date of report printed - 15/05/09 16:59, reversed - 16/05/09 15:32

Last rollover - 13/05/09 18:25 next one is 10/06/09

Key strokes - PM was trying to balance but this would not let her do this as the discrepancy

Stock unit - BCD trying to roll over to BP

2009-05-22 12:46:50 [Poulton, Claire]
LOG : Used kel - cardc2632N

2009-05-22 12:49:02 [Poulton, Claire]
LOG : +++ could peak please investigate +++

2009-05-22 12:53:09 [Poulton, Claire]
TR : Transfer 'assignee' from 'Poulton, Claire' to ''
Transfer 'group' from 'HSH2' to 'PEAK'

2009-05-22 12:53:09 [Poulton, Claire]
zneut_en_rmg : Transfer Notification

Date: **22-May-2009 13:09:13** User: **Lorraine Elliott**
Reference Added: SSCKEL cardc2632N

Date: **22-May-2009 13:09:32** User: **Lorraine Elliott**
Product EPOSS & DeskTop -- Unknown EPOSS&D-top (version unspecified) added.

Date: **22-May-2009 13:09:48** User: **Lorraine Elliott**
The call summary has been changed from:-
Payment receipt mismatch Pm tried to reverse the transact...
The call summary is now:-
FAD384238 Payment receipt mismatch

Date: **22-May-2009 13:09:51** User: **Lorraine Elliott**
The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Lina Kiang
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date: **22-May-2009 15:47:27** User: **Lina Kiang**
Reference Deleted: SSCKEL cardc2632N

Date: **22-May-2009 15:47:40** User: **Lina Kiang**
Reference Added: SSCKEL obengc3120K

Date: **22-May-2009 15:48:23** User: **Lina Kiang**
Evidence **Added** - FAD384238-mstore, IncompleteSummaries, HarvesterExceptions, AppLog

Date: **22-May-2009 15:52:39** User: **Lina Kiang**
Usually the MSU would have raised calls on this FAD since it appeared in 2 IncompleteSummaries and Harvester Exception reports dated 15/05/09 and 16/05/09. But since this was not done, this problem was not investigated and the exceptions are still sitting in the TRT waiting to be actioned.

These exceptions are related to bureau txns done on 15/05/09 15:59 Mode:SC £12079.46 worth of Euros (which is missing a settlement line) and a Mode:ER done on 16/05/09 14:30 (which has a cash settlement line). This gave the PM when SU:BDC eventually rolled into TP(2,2) on 20/05/09 a gain of £12079.71 and a payments and receipts difference of £12079.46.

I thought this might be a quick and easy call but it turned out not to be so since I am on leave next week I am routing this call to Anne who has dealt with a similar problem PC0175821 (KEL obengc3120K). Sorry, Anne - however unlike PC0175821, nothing has been done on the TRT and the MSU/POL/PM have not been informed so you are starting with a clean slate.

Date: **22-May-2009 15:52:51** User: **Lina Kiang**
The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Anne Chambers
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date: **26-May-2009 15:04:43** User: **Anne Chambers**
[Start of Response]
This may need a correction written on the counter, with POL's approval. Or possibly correcting the POLFS feed in such a way that they can issue a TC? Still thinking about it. Spoke to PM and explained what had happened (they scanned a set of pouches in reversal too quickly). Next TP rollover is 10th June. PM happy that cause is known and action will be taken.
[End of Response]
Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date: **29-May-2009 09:23:38** User: **Anne Chambers**
The call summary has been changed from:-
FAD384238 Payment receipt mismatch
The call summary is now:-
FAD384238 Payment and receipt mismatch

Date: **29-May-2009 10:09:42** User: Mail Manager

External Progress Update Received via Email.
Originator : "Chambers Anne O" <Anne.Chambers@GRO>
Arrival Date : 29 May 2009 08:39:52
Subject : FW: PC0181609: Branch 384238 Receipts and Payments mismatch

From: Chambers Anne O
Sent: 28 May 2009 14:59
To: Drake Claire
Cc: Jenkins Gareth GI
Subject: PC0181609: Branch 384238 Receipts and Payments mismatch

Claire,

As discussed - please send on (with attachment) to Mark Wardle via = BIMS.

Branch 384238 (Hanley WHS) had a problem on Friday 15th May, when two = currency pouches were reversed very close together. As a result, one = malformed Serve Customer transaction was written, for 13500 Euros. The = value was £12079.46. There was no corresponding settlement line hence = the session did not net to zero. The following day, the branch reversed = the transaction, and the reversal settled automatically to cash.

In this case we propose to resolve the effects of the problem by making = a correction to the data feed to POLFS at the data centre. This leaves = the branch with a large gain (due solely to the system problem) which = they Assign to Nominee, but on POLFS the Assigned gain will be negated = by our correction, hence centrally the figures are correct.

At the branch

The branch currency holding is correct, because the transaction was = reversed, but has caused a gain of £12079.46 (because the reversal = settled to cash whereas the original transaction had no settlement = whatsoever). The branch has since rolled the BDC stock unit into a new = balance period, accepting a gain of £12079.71 which includes a genuine = gain of 25p. The balance report shows a difference between Receipts and = Payments of £12079.46.

I have spoken to the Branch Manager and explained that there has been a = system problem, caused by rapidly scanning currency pouches when = reversing them. The next branch TP rollover is scheduled for 10th June.

We suggest that they continue as normal i.e. move the gain to Local = Suspense when the stock unit is rolled into the next TP on 10th June, = then clear Local Suspense using Assign to Nominee. This is their normal = process. It is important that they realise that any discrepancies apart = from the £12079.46 caused by this problem must be investigated and = resolved in the usual fashion. Any residual gain / loss can be Assigned = to Nominee as normal. Their Branch Trading Statement will show a Trading = Position of £12079.46 (normally zero).

I have not discussed this with the manager.

I have successfully completed a TP rollover for the branch on a test = system to confirm that the expected messages are generated and there are = no unexpected side-effects.

Data to be sent to POLFS

Since there are unharvested transactions for 15th and 16th May, nothing = from the branch for those days has yet been sent to POLFS.

Also, the data can only be sent if it nets to zero. This will not be = the case for 15th May where the settlement line was missing. We will = need to make a correction centrally so it nets to zero, otherwise it = cannot be sent.

The malformed SC and ER transactions will be repaired sufficiently to = be sent to POLMIS and POLFS.

An extra entry will be added to the POLFS data for 15th May:

Article NA00000017 account 531100 (Agents Debt in Customer Accounts) = value -£12079.46.

This will

(a) cause the transactions for 15th May to net to zero and thus be sent = to POLFS

(b) negate the entry generated at the branch for account 531100 when = they complete their TP rollover on 10th June.

(Additional clarification:

Currently TPS_POL_FS_Summaries_Incomp shows 15-May-2009 £0.00, = 16-May-2009 £12,079.46.

Unharvested transaction values are 15-May-2009 £12,079.46, 16th May = -£12,079.46

So once repaired via the TIP repair tool, TPS_POL_FS_Summaries_Incomp = will show 15-May-2009 £12,079.46, 16-May-2009 £0.00

Data for 16th May will be sent immediately because no longer any = harvester exception and nets to zero. Correction of -£12,079.46 will = be applied, by adding a new row to the TPS_POL_FS_Summaries_Incomp table = for 15th May, using the Assign to Nominee account.)

Action by Post Office Ltd
Post Office may want to handle further communication with the branch = regarding the next rollover (see above).

The branch reports will show a gain, Assigned to Nominee, which does = not exist on POLFS. No further action should be required on POLFS long = term, but between when the correction is made and 11th June, there will = be a negative gain of £12079.46 in account 531100.

The correction needs to be made at the data centre as soon as possible, = since no data for 15/16 May has yet been sent to POLFS for this branch. = Can Post Office confirm that they are happy for us to make this = correction to the POLFS feed, and let us know if they will be contacting = the branch or whether we should do so.

The attached spreadsheet shows the messages and accounts involved. I'm = happy to try to answer any further questions.

Anne.

Anne Chambers
Systems Support Centre, Royal Mail Group Account

Fujitsu
Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berkshire RG12 8SN
Tel: anne.chambers@gro.com or Internally anne.chambers@gro.com
Email: anne.chambers@gro.com
Web: <http://uk.fujitsu.com> <<http://uk.fujitsu.com/>>

Fujitsu Services Limited, Registered in England no 96056, Registered = Office: 22 Baker Street, London W1U 3BW.

This email is only for the use of its intended recipient. Its contents = are subject to a duty of confidence and may be privileged. Fujitsu does = not guarantee that this email has not been intercepted and amended or = that it is virus-free.

Added evidence item '384238.xls' from Email attachment

Date:01-Jun-2009 14:29:33 User: Claire Drake

[Start of Response]

OCR 22690 has been raised. Sending to EDSC for progression.

While returning call, please include file name in which outstanding data was sent to POLFS.

[End of Response]

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

Date:01-Jun-2009 14:33:41 User: Steve Parker

OCR 22690 Approved

Date:01-Jun-2009 16:06:06 User: Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

I have made the harvester corrections, but I want to make sure they have been processed as expected before making the final change to the incomplete summaries table.

[End of Response]

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

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:02-Jun-2009 13:48:05 User: Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

2 repaired transactions went to POL MIS in files W 135800.TP and W 136800.TP.

The data for 16th May was sent to POLFS in file IF20090601065.BLE.

The branch now has an entry on the Incomplete Summaries report for 15th May (because the correction means that day no longer nets to zero). I have made the database change to include an extra line for account 531100, as described above, so the data will be sent tonight.

[End of Response]

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

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:03-Jun-2009 09:19:19 User: Anne Chambers

OCR 22690 actioned

Date:03-Jun-2009 09:27:29 User: Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

In addition to data already sent and detailed above, the data for 15th May was sent to POLFS in file IF20090602065.BLE.

I understand that POL will contact the branch regarding the branch TP rollover. I will keep this call open until this has been completed so please return the call to me once BIMS activity completed. Thanks.

[End of Response]
Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:03-Jun-2009 09:27:40 User:Anne Chambers
The Call record has been transferred to the team: MSU-Indt Mgt
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:04-Jun-2009 13:54:28 User:Claire Drake
[Start of Response]
Thank you Anne.

I have issued the file details and other information to POL.

Returning call as requested.
[End of Response]
Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Date:04-Jun-2009 13:54:33 User:Claire Drake
The Call record has been transferred to the team: EDSC
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:04-Jun-2009 14:01:51 User:Lorraine Elliott
The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Anne Chambers
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:04-Jun-2009 18:16:35 User:Anne Chambers
Evidence **Added** - Details of corrections made

Date:05-Jun-2009 16:00:48 User:Anne Chambers
[Start of Response]
PM should be rolling into a new TP on Wednesday 10th June. If she rings in quoting this call ref and asking to speak to Anne at 3rd line, please let me know immediately via GRO
[End of Response]
Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:11-Jun-2009 09:55:27 User:Anne Chambers
[Start of Response]
PM has rolled over all the stock units but there was a bit of confusion and local suspense was initially cleared to cash. PM repeated the SU balance and this time cleared LS using Assign to Nominee. So on the balance report the amount transferred to and from suspense is twice what was expected. But overall everything is correct, and a gain of £11827.48 was assigned to nominee. The expected gain caused by the system problem was £12079.46, so in fact the branch seems to have had a loss of £151.98 in TP 2.

Office rollover not done yet. I phoned to reassure them that all looks ok, PM not available until 10:15.
[End of Response]
Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:11-Jun-2009 12:31:05 User:Anne Chambers
[Start of Response]
Yesterday I rewrote the Sessions object for user SWI001, changing the State from Active to Ended. Counter 5 was unusable and the user couldn't be detached from the stock unit. Nothing to do with the original problem, but was preventing SU BB balance, and hence the office balance from being completed.

All stock units and the office have now rolled over and the outcome is as predicted. Everything should now be consistent at the branch and on POL FS. PM appreciated the help given and is happy to close the call.
[End of Response]
Response code to call type L as Category 70 -- Final -- Avoidance Action Supplied
Routing to Call Logger following Final Progress update.
Service Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:11-Jun-2009 12:31:05 User:Anne Chambers
CALL PC0181609 closed: Category 70 Type L

Date:11-Jun-2009 12:31:05 User:Anne Chambers
Defect cause updated to 14 -- Development - Code

Date:11-Jun-2009 14:25:46 User:_Customer Call_
Consumer XXXXXX@TFS01 has acknowledged the call closure

Root Cause	Development - Code
Logger	_Customer Call_ -- EDSC
Subject Product	EPOSS & DeskTop -- Unknown EPOSS&D-top (version unspecified)
Assignee	_Customer Call_ -- EDSC
Last Progress	11-Jun-2009 14:25 -- _Customer Call_