

Message

From: Alwen Lyons [GRO]
on behalf of Alwen Lyons <[GRO]>
Sent: 29/01/2013 08:02:07
To: Susan Crichton [GRO]
Subject: Re: Issuance of TCs

Yes because in Rona head the sub postmaster if innocent doesn't know they have made a mistake eg not up a cheque through properly so they will carry on thinking they have balanced. Then later after the 42 days they get a TC transaction correction notice which they have to out through and then they are short and have no way if going back to check what they have done. Tracy Merritt the James A case got lots of £250 cheques from the local 'squire', my word not hers and he now says that some were never cashed.

So you are right not a Horizon issue but Ron's point is that if TCs come late and there was a horizon issue spm have no chance to look at the evidence.

Lets catch up later.

Thanks

Alwen

Alwen Lyons
Company Secretary

[GRO]

On 29 Jan 2013, at 07:46, "Susan Crichton" <[GRO]> wrote:

So is the argument that we didn't send the transaction correction through in time?

Sent from my iPad

On 28 Jan 2013, at 18:36, "Alwen Lyons" <[GRO]> wrote:

So the issue in Ron's head is around a 42 day time within which spm can interrogate the system by getting reports about their transactions and therefore know if there is an issue with horizon or its their cock up!

When they get a TC (transaction correction) through after this time they cannot see the transaction and have to accept it is right

Thanks

Alwen

Alwen Lyons
Company Secretary

[GRO]

Sent from Blackberry

From: Susan Crichton
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2013 06:27 PM
To: Alwen Lyons
Subject: Re: Issuance of TCs

But this is not Horizon... How do we box this off?

From: Ron Warmington [mailto:[GRO](#)]
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2013 05:32 PM
To: 'Ron Warmington' <[GRO](#)>; Simon Baker; 'Ian Henderson'
<[GRO](#)>; Susan Crichton; Alwen Lyons; Rod Ismay; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd
Subject: Issuance of TCs

Hello Rod/All: As just mentioned, I'm afraid we now have to seek information on the time it has taken to notify the SPMs (in our sample) about TCs.

The issue here is whether SPMs have been able to get to the bottom of a TC in the event that they have been unable to print out, or even to view on screen, the underlying transactions that went through (and in some cases were also reversed) on the day of the challenged transaction.

What we need to establish is: HOW MANY of the TCs (that were raised in the 32 cases that we now have in our sample) were notified to the SPMs AFTER 42 days had expired. To get that into perspective we need a list, covering every one of the 32 cases in our sample... and during the period in each case during which the shortfall can possibly have accumulated... showing:

- <!--[if !supportLists]--><![endif]-->The date that each TC was notified to the SPM,
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><![endif]-->the amount/value of that TC,
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><![endif]-->the nature of that TC (i.e. type of transaction that is being corrected),
- <!--[if !supportLists]--><![endif]-->the date that the underlying transaction (that was being corrected by that TC) was originally processed in the branch.

I appreciate this is no small request but could it be done?

Many thanks, Ron.

From: Ron Warmington [[GRO](#)]
Sent: 28 January 2013 17:14
To: 'Simon Baker'; 'Ian Henderson'; 'Susan Crichton'; 'Alwen Lyons'; 'Rod Ismay'; 'Angela Van-Den-Bogerd'
Subject: RE: 2nd Sight Weekly Update

This is principally for Rod...

Rod: I've followed up with Jo Hamilton and a few things emerged:

1. <!--[if !supportLists]--><![endif]-->JH thinks that the cheques she received from Mrs Hancock might have been up to 50% of all the cheques that she processed. This was in answer to my questioning as to why it might be that so many cheques drawn by one person (Mrs Hancock) on one bank (Barclays) and payable to one payee (usually 'cash' and handed over to JH in the Post Office) would all bounce or for some other reason fail to complete the cheque processing procedure. It would be easier to rationalise if ALL cheques sent in by JH had failed, wouldn't it? Any thought on that?
2. <!--[if !supportLists]--><![endif]-->JH has found that, in a session (number 1-725629-1) on 14th February 2005, she processed a receipt for a £250.00 cheque given to her by Mrs Hancock. The cheque number that JH at the time entered into Horizon was 204907. As you'll see, Mr Hancock's list of 14 cheques that never cleared includes cheque number 204908 dated (according to the cheque stub) 14th February 2005. I don't know whether there were two cheques (204907 AND 204908) or just one and, if there were two, why 204908 never cleared. It may be because of the 'dual cheque/cheque guarantee card' issue that you've already raised. Any thoughts?
3. <!--[if !supportLists]--><![endif]-->I get the sense that some (maybe most) of the TCs that JH received would have been outside the 42-day 'window' that we have all been discussing... but I've not pushed her on that point. If some or most TCs were notified after 42 days then POL might find it hard to assert that it has acted reasonably in its dealings with her in respect of TCs. I'm afraid this means that Ian and I are going to have to ask POL to gather the raw data on those TCs (to establish how many were notified more than 42 days after the transaction that was the subject of the TC). I'll shortly send out another email requesting that data, not only, I'm afraid, for the JH case but also for the 31 other cases in our sample.

Best regards, Ron.

From: Simon Baker [GRO]
Sent: 25 January 2013 16:20

To: Ron Warmington; Ian Henderson; Susan Crichton; Alwen Lyons; Rod Ismay; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd
Subject: 2nd Sight Weekly Update

All

Notes and actions from today's meeting below. Next meeting rescheduled to Monday 4th at 3pm.

Regards, Simon

Notes from 2nd sight meeting 25th January 2013

1. Cheques & Jo Hamilton: At that time could not cash more than one cheque per day if more than £250 per day. This could explain why some of the cheques "bounced". Also there was no cheque guarantee card number on the cheque. Ron thinks he can extrapolate what **may** have happened - will document.
2. Angela noted that you can produce a horizon log for the last 42 days.
3. Ron/Ian starting to go through the Alan Bate cases. Ron/Ian will do a spot review on these to determine which ones warrant further investigation. So far have 8 cases have been received from JFSA, Ron estimates there will be many more (maybe 20)

Actions:

1. Jo Hamilton & Cheques: Rod to send Ron a written explanation of what might of happened. Rod to send Rod the list of cheques from the bank.
2. Rod to determine the average time to turn around TCs.
3. Angela to get a log for the Armstrong case to understand what happened - can we determine how the transaction get reversed
4. Angela to determine the difference in printing transaction logs between the systems(old / new Horizon). We also need to determine if sub postmasters can go into the system understand the transactions behind the TC.
5. Angela to talk to Helen Rose to request the XML data when requesting Horizon data.
6. Ron to send out a write-up on Tracy Ann Merritt.
7. Alwen to contact Janet to see if it would be appropriate for Post Office to attend the JA meeting on the 25th March.

Simon Baker Head of Business Change and Assurance

<image001.png>

2nd Floor, 148 Old Street, London, EC1V 9HQ

GRO

GRO

postoffice.co.uk

@postofficenews

<image002.png>

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use, disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you have received this in error, please contact the sender by reply email and then delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540. Registered Office: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.
