From: Thomas Penny[/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=THOMASP] Sent: Tue 12/08/2008 4:43:43 PM (UTC) Jenkins Gareth GI GRO To:]; Holmes Alan[; Sewell Peter (FEL01)[GRO **GRO** Meek Steven FW: Branch 141832 Craigpark Subject: Attachment: View KEL dsed5628Q.htm PC0152376.htm Attachment: PC0152421.htm Attachment: Hi All Pete has asked me send a note to set up a meeting to discuss this issue. Can everyone make 10.00, Thursday 14 August? I've sought out relevant Peaks and KEL and attach. Kind regards Penny Sewell Peter (FEL01) From: 12 August 2008 14:41 Sent: Holmes Alan; Thomas Penny To: Subject: FW: Branch 141832 Craigpark Alan Can we set up a meeting please, Gareth has raised a potential issue with events which might require a change in our ARQ process. See below, don't know if you are aware of thos already. Pete Pete Sewell Security Operations Manager Fujitsu Services Royal Mail Group Account LOVELACE ROAD, BRACKNELL, **BERKS RG12 8SN** Tel: GRO Mobile **GRO** Fax **GRO** E-Mail Web http://uk.fujitsu.com

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

This e-mail is only for the use of its intended recipient. Its contents are confidential and may be privileged. Fujitsu Services does not guarantee that this e-mail has not been intercepted and amended ot that it is virus free.

 From:
 Jenkins Gareth GI

 Sent:
 11 August 2008 15:15

 To:
 Sewell Peter (FEL01)

 Cc:
 Stewart Mike; Peach Mik

 Subject:
 FW: Branch 141832 Craigpark

Pete,

Over the last couple of years we've had a couple of cases where EOD (which runs at 19:00) interferes with transactions being written at the counter. If this happens, then there is an Event written to the NT event Log.

Given we only have a couple of instances, and a fix is as likely to cause further problems, then we're reluctant to make a change to Horizon. However if Horizon data is being used in evidence for the prosecution of a Postmaster, it is probably wise to also check to see if any such events were produced during the period in question. Is this something that can / should be built into the ARQ process?

Regards

Gareth

Gareth Jenkins Distinguished Engineer Applications Architect Royal Mail Group Account

FUJITSU

Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berkshire, RG12 8SN

Tel:

Mobile:
email:

Web:

GRO
Internal:

GRO
Mtp://uk.fujitsu.com

GRO



Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

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

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

From: Jenkins Gareth GI Sent: 11 August 2008 15:11

To: Peach Mik

Cc: Drake Claire; Card Cheryl; Chambers Anne O; Stewart Mike; Budworth John

Subject: RE: Branch 141832 Craigpark

Mik,

As discussed, I am still uneasy about this, but I agree that it is probably safer to leave things as they are.

I've discussed this with Mike and I'll mention this to Pete Sewell so that he can ensure that if we are providing evidence for an ARQ that we also check on relevant events.

Regards

Gareth

Gareth Jenkins Distinguished Engineer Applications Architect Royal Mail Group Account

FUJITSU

Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berkshire, RG12 8SN





Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

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

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

From: Peach Mik

Sent: 11 August 2008 14:41 **To:** Jenkins Gareth GI

Cc: Drake Claire; Card Cheryl; Chambers Anne O; Stewart Mike; Budworth John

Subject: RE: Branch 141832 Craigpark

Gareth,

OK - I understand that you don't want this to be left un-fixed...

On the basis of the evidence that we have - there are 35 errors per week (inside the 7-8pm Wednesday window) and two in 35*52(weeks) = 1820 are known to have caused a discrepancy.

- a) SSC staff spending lots of time monitoring these events for 1-2 per year is simply not cost-effective
- b) Fixing the underlying problem of holding the "lock" for too long is feasible from PC0152376 BUT
- c) I would want some assurance that making this change to the live estate, to resolve 2 reported issues, is NOT going to have a knock-on effect anywhere else....

I know that this is a difficult request - but I don't like changing Horizon at this stage - and I would like to be convinced that it is necessary, and that we wont make things worse..

Regards Mik