



POSTMASTER SUPPORT POLICIES

**Investigation reports from
Postmaster Accounting Dispute
Resolution Policy**

Version – V1.3

1.1. Tier 2 Checklist

Tier 2 - Investigation Details			
Tier 2 Case Handler:		Date picked up:	
Branch Name:		Branch Code:	
Reference Number:		Current Discrepancy:	
Branch Contact:		Contact Number:	
Email Address:		Stock Unit(s) involved:	
Date Discrepancy appeared:		Date case escalated to Tier 3 (if applicable)?	
Was discrepancy found?			

Activity/Action Type	Completed (Y/N) If no, give reason.	Key Findings: These must include specific details such as dates, times, Trading Periods, Balance Periods, names, user IDs etc.
Review Tier 1 Investigation & familiarise with discrepancy issue whilst reviewing (If not enough detail or process has not been followed, inform Team Leader to pass back)		Dynamics case reference number.
Contact the Branch, introduce yourself as Case Handler & obtain/capture any relevant initial information from the postmaster		Include details of conversation here and any associated evidence provided. Conversation should be with operator unless otherwise instructed by the operator. Record name and position of the person spoken to.
Has the discrepancy been settled? If so how & when? Ensure that the discrepancy has been blocked by the Postmaster Account Support Team Postmasteraccount <u> </u> GRO		By what method: Date/Trading Period/User ID:
Review any possible related previous cases on Dynamics		Relevant details of previous cases to include reference numbers from Dynamics.
Check if the Branch have raised any incidents with the IT Digital Service Desk relating to any system issues		Detail any specific findings here if they could be relevant to the investigation.
Check HORice to establish the last time the Branch balanced without any problems". Also check the last time they completed a Balance Period and are they being done regularly.		Details of branch balancing results reviewed to include dates and findings.
Check latest Known Error Log (KEL) to ensure the discrepancy is not		Include details here of any findings.

related to a KEL (check both closed and active ones)		
--	--	--

HORice Review Provide details of what HORice data was reviewed to include timeline.	Completed (Y/N) If no, give reason.	Attach a copy of the HORice report, copying and pasting the data under each section below.
Checked where the discrepancy is (Cash, currency or stock)		Cash/Currency/Stock (Trading Period/Balance Period). Value (£):
Checked stock & cash remittances		Embed copy of HORice report here
Checked stock adjustments		
Checked reversals new & existing		
Checked transfers		
Checked miskeys		
Checked non sales (housekeeping/suspense account enquiries)		
Check duplicate transactions		
Check trading statements		
Check any transactions left in the basket		
Check if there are any zero transactions that should have a value		
Check any cash variance		
Check recoveries – roll forward or roll back		
Check for any Transaction Corrections		
Check for any Transaction Acknowledgements		

Findings Overview
<i>Note: This section is to provide Case handlers' findings including any supportive material/data embedded documents.</i> <i>Summary and brief overview of findings in chronological order, to include outcome of investigation:</i> <i>1. Was the discrepancy found?</i> <i>2. Does a Transaction Correction need raising?</i> <i>3. Training need identified & raised with training team (if required)?</i> <i>4. Escalation to another team if further investigation is required (such as Postmaster Account Support Team)?</i>

1.2. Postmaster Information Pack

Document (Case Review Analyst to delete as appropriate)	Comments (including any detail to support the postmaster in reviewing the data)
<i>Horizon Data Source - Session Data</i>	
<i>Horizon Data Source - Branch Declaration Events</i>	
<i>Horizon Data Source - Report events</i>	
<i>Horizon Data Source - Branch Trading statement(s)</i>	
<i>List of registered assistants and Smart ID usernames/associated users</i>	
<i>Credence data (if applicable) - transactional reports (last 3 months)</i>	
<i>ARQ (Audit Recovery Query) data (if applicable)</i>	
<i>Core Finance System (CFS) - including suspense account</i>	
<i>Transaction Corrections detail.</i>	
<i>Branch Support Centre Call logs</i>	
<i>Cash Management Call Logs</i>	
<i>IT call logs</i>	
<i>Product Specific Data- (for example ATM Electronic Journals/Lottery Evidence)</i>	
<i>Any additional detail</i>	

1.3. Case Investigation Report

Case Investigation Report

Case Investigation Details	
Branch Name & Branch Code:	
Case Reference Number:	
Postmaster Name:	
Legal Entity Contracted with:	
Branch Format:	
Former/Current:	
Disputed Amount:	

Executive Summary
<i>Note: This section is to provide an overview of the case, key points and the conclusion. This section should be in bullet point format (where possible).</i>

Analyst Recommendation			
Recommendation:	<i>Note: Recommendation to be completed by Analyst.</i>		
Value (If Applicable):			
Investigating Officer:		Date:	

Authorising Manager Comments			
Comments:	<i>Note: Comments to be completed by Manager.</i>		
Authorising Manager:		Date:	

Case Overview
<i>Note: This section to include a brief overview of the dispute received; for example:</i> <i>This dispute case was raised by the postmaster in January 2021. It relates to a £650 discrepancy which was settled centrally on the 5th December 2020. The case has been investigated by Tier 2; however, the postmaster would like the case investigating further.</i>

Investigation Overview
<i>Note: Within this section the dispute should be broken down into sections to investigate. For example:</i> <i>The postmaster raised there was a £650 discrepancy, however this can be broken down into the following points to be investigated:</i> <u><i>Point 1 – The postmaster states there was an initial discrepancy of £250 on the 25th November 2020.</i></u> <i>Investigation findings against this point. This can include images or copies of transactional information, which will assist in explaining the investigation to the claimant and internal colleagues.</i> <u><i>Point 2 – The postmaster states there was a 2nd discrepancy on £400 on the 30th November 2020.</i></u> <i>Investigation findings against this point. This can include images or copies of transactional information, which will assist in explaining the investigation to the claimant and internal colleagues.</i>

Investigation Conclusion
<i>Note: This section is to finalise the findings of the Investigation Overview section into a conclusion on the case.</i>

Additional Case Findings

Note: This can be findings which do not specifically relate to the case, but are appropriate to send on to a different team in the business; for example the branch are processing reversals for small value transactions to cash, which could highlight the branch taking retail transactions at the Post Office counter. This would be something to feedback to the Area Manager.

Additional Support Required

Note: This section can contain any support which is recommended as being required. For example; It is recommended that the branch is provided additional training and support around cash declarations and lottery accounting. This additional training would then need to be requested by the analyst.

Business Improvements

Note: This section is to note any potential business improvements which have been raised through the investigation.

Case Evidence Log

[illegible]

CIR– Investigation Checklist

General Case Checklist items:				
Data Downloads for Discrepancies:				
Session Data	☐			
Report Events	☐			
Trading Period Data	☐			
Core Finance System Data	☐			
Transaction Corrections (if applicable)	☐			
Ensure these are completed at earliest opportunity, to avoid risk of losing data.				
Document	Checked	Not Checked	N/A	Comments
Review other completed cases (Tier 2, Dispute Team, Contracts etc.)	☐	☐	☐	
Check Customer Line Items (on the Core Finance System/CFS) relating to the claim - arrange for this to be blocked	☐	☐	☐	
Check if a Fujitsu branch specific check will be required	☐	☐	☐	<i>Note: Required for branches claiming Horizon issues.</i>
Obtain list of registered assistants and Smart ID usernames/associated users	☐	☐	☐	
Credence data (if applicable)– transactional reports (last 3 months)	☐	☐	☐	
HORice Data Sources - Including Session Data, Branch Declaration Events, Report events, Smart ID	☐	☐	☐	

data and Branch Trading statement				
ARQ (Audit Recovery Query) data (if applicable)	☐	☐	☐	
Core Finance System (CFS) – including suspense account	☐	☐	☐	
Check for Transaction Corrections.	☐	☐	☐	
Review Audit paperwork.	☐	☐	☐	
Checked issue against Peaks/Known error logs (Kels).	☐	☐	☐	
Relevant Branch Support Centre Call logs reviewed/listened to.	☐	☐	☐	
Cloud Documentation Checked.	☐	☐	☐	
IT call logs requested and reviewed (when applicable)	☐	☐	☐	
Training and Intervention information checked - including post appointment support and Branch Contact File (BCF).	☐	☐	☐	
Product Specific Data- inc. ATM Electronic Journals/Lottery Evidence etc..	☐	☐	☐	
Dynamics Case Logs.	☐	☐	☐	

Dispute policy checklist				
The alleged shortfall has been properly, fully and fairly investigated in a timely manner	☐	☐	☐	
The shortfall represents a genuine loss to Post Office properly attributable to the postmaster	☐	☐	☐	
A review of the Horizon system has been undertaken to ensure that it was not a contributory factor to the discrepancy	☐	☐	☐	
Any action (or inaction) by Post Office Limited has not been a contributory factor that led directly to the shortfall	☐	☐	☐	
The shortfall has been caused through the postmaster's negligence, carelessness or error and/or the shortfall has been caused by the negligence, carelessness or error of their Assistant(s)	☐	☐	☐	