

Export

Peak Incident Management System

Call Reference	PC0158102	Call Logger	Customer Call -- EDSC
Release	Reported In -- T80	Top Ref	248887
Call Type	Live Incidents	Priority	B -- Business restricted
Contact	EDSC	Call Status	Closed -- Advice after Investigation
Target Date	09/05/2008	Effort (Man Days)	0
Summary	Branch 141832 - Query from POL re BTS for periods 9 & 10 2007		

Progress Narrative

Date:06-May-2008 14:38:02 User:_Customer Call_

CALL PC0158102 opened

Details entered are:-

Summary:This is a business incident for Claire Drake.

Call Type:L

Call Priority:B

Target Release:T80

Routed to:EDSC - _Unassigned_

=====

Date/Time Raised: May 6 2008 2:28PM

Priority: B

Contact Name: Jane Smith

Contact Phone: [REDACTED] GRO

Originator: XXXXXX@TFS01

Originator's reference: 248887

Product Serial No:

Product Site: POL FS

=====

This is a business incident for Claire Drake. The branch is 141832. The amount is £1888.73. The date is 12/07.

Incident History:

2008-05-06 14:28:49 [Scott, Andy]

INIT : create a new request/incident/problem/change/issue

2008-05-06 14:38:45 [Scott, Andy]

zneut_en_rm : Transfer Notification

2008-05-06 14:39:46 [Scott, Andy]

zneut_en_rm : Transfer Notification

2008-05-06 14:39:46 [Scott, Andy]

TR : Transfer 'group' from 'SMC1' to 'PEAK'

Date:06-May-2008 14:47:01 User:Lorraine Guiblin

Product General/Other/Misc -- Unknown General/Other/Misc (version unspecified) added.

Date:06-May-2008 14:47:15 User:Lorraine Guiblin

The Call record has been transferred to the team: MSU-Indt Mgt

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Claire Drake

Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:15-May-2008 15:54:10 User:Claire Drake

[Start of Response]

I have spoken to Mark Wardle at POL as I am unable to progress this call until I have the full information that is usually sent by Jane Smith when she logs the call.

[End of Response]

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

Date:15-May-2008 16:09:44 User:Claire Drake

[Start of Response]

As noted above, the information e-mail from Jane wasn't received. I have the following information from Andrew Winn at POL.

Please can the following be investigated:

We have discovered that Craigpark (141832) has a problem in their POLFS discrepancy account. The branch's trading statements for periods 9 & 10

2007 show a figure of £1,888.73, whereas i believe this should always be zero.

I am particularly concerned, not so much that Fujitsu have not identified this branch (on my records), but because the branch has experienced significant discrepancies at each branch trading from period 10 up to the last branch trading on 1/5/08 (but no evidence of recent losses prior to that). The net branch debt now stands at nearly £24K and the subpostmaster is now desperate - and questioning the integrity of Horizon.

As a matter of urgency we need to establish if the branch has experienced a similar problem to others we are aware of, following the EPOSS software load. We also need to understand if, unlike other branches (as far as we are aware), the subsequent losses have been generated, in part or full, by the Horizon functionality.

A request for investigation has already been raised last week by Jane Smith. She is now on leave. It may be Claire Drake who is her Fujitsu contact. This was simply a standard enquiry at the time, but we are now potentially looking at branch closure if we cannot resolve swiftly.

Forwarding call to EDSC for investigation.

[End of Response]

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

Date:15-May-2008 16:10:45 User:Claire Drake

The call summary has been changed from:-

This is a business incident for Claire Drake.

The call summary is now:-

Branch 141832 - Query from POL re BTS for periods 9 & 10 2007

Date:15-May-2008 16:14:17 User:Claire Drake

[Start of Response]

Initial BIMs issued to POL.....

[End of Response]

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

Date:15-May-2008 16:14:33 User:Claire Drake

The Call record has been transferred to the team: EDSC

Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:15-May-2008 16:28:45 User:Anne Chambers

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Anne Chambers

Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:16-May-2008 09:16:50 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

Interim response emailed to Claire Drake:

No calls have been raised for this branch as a result of its appearance on any Horizon reconciliation reports in the last 9 months, nor has the postmaster reported any system problems when balancing. Hence we were not aware that they had any problem, which is why you have not been notified about it.

I can confirm that the non-zero trading position on the BTS was not caused by the known issues last autumn or earlier this year - the checks made at the time should have identified this branch if that had been the cause, and the balance reports etc do not show the signs associated with those problems. The branch did not have a receipts and payments mismatch on any stock unit rollover.

So my investigation has to start from first principles. So long after the event, the only information readily available to me are the balance reports and branch trading statements from the last year, which you may also have. From these, I can see that?

TP 2 to TP 8: branch appears to have had a shortage each month (apart from TP4), ranging from £312.50 to £4197.60. These shortages were not settled centrally.

TP 9: branch accepted a loss of £1888.73, which was moved into local suspense on 27th December, but somehow not cleared. The system should not have allowed the stock unit to be rolled over. The loss shows on the balance report but not on the BTS. This is the cause of the non-zero trading position in TP 9. I need to retrieve data from the audit servers to confirm what happened, which will take several days.

TP 10: it is highly likely that the £1888.73 non-zero trading position is a consequence of an error in the opening figures written at the end of TP 9. You can see from the Branch Trading Statements that the TP 10 Cash B Fwd is £1888.73 more than the TP 9 Cash C Fwd.

In addition there was a shortage of £3264.06, which was settled centrally. Until I have the archived data I am not sure whether this includes the loss from the previous period or not.

TP 11 to TP 1: significant losses, settled centrally. No anomalies on the Branch Trading Statements.

My conclusion at this stage is that the branch appears to have had losses for some time, from well before the system problem on 27th December. There is nothing to suggest that any system problem has caused the losses, although the TP 9/10 figures need to be investigated further to understand the impact of that problem. It would not have had any impact beyond TP 10.

I will follow up this final point, but in the absence of any other specifically-reported issues with the system in general, cannot investigate further into the cause of the losses. If this aspect is to be pursued, I think a separate call should be raised via the Post Office / Fujitsu security teams.

[End of Response]

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

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:16-May-2008 09:24:40 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

To investigate the system problem fully, I need the messagestore for branch 141832 from 19th December 2007 to 23rd January 2008.

Can you extract it from the audit servers please.

[End of Response]

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

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:16-May-2008 09:25:01 User:Anne Chambers

The Call record has been transferred to the team: Security Ops

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Penny Thomas

Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:20-May-2008 09:10:50 User:Penny Thomas

Evidence Added - Messagestore 19 Dec 07 to 23 Jan 08

Date:20-May-2008 09:11:28 User:Penny Thomas

The Call record has been transferred to the team: EDSC

Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:20-May-2008 09:21:03 User:Lorraine Guiblin

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Anne Chambers

Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:27-May-2008 18:32:53 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

Cause of problem on 27th December:

There was contention between the balancing process, when it tried to write the accumulated loss into local suspense, and the end of day processes running at 7pm.

Evidence that this happened:

a) counter messages show that the clerk accepted a discrepancy for the BP of £705.48. There was a carried forward loss of £1183.25 from earlier BPs.

b) at the point where I expected to see messages writing the loss to local suspense, and then local suspense being cleared, there was an NT event indicating a lock problem on the messagestore. We have seen such events cause problems once or twice before (the effect depends on precisely what is happening at the time; frequently it is benign).

c) the missing local suspense / clearance messages resulted in a non-zero trading position on the BTS for TP 9

As a result, the total loss for TP 9 of £1888.73 was not cleared in any way. At the branch it effectively vanished. On POLFS it remains in the discrepancy account.

I made some additional checks which confirm that the losses recorded in TP 10 match the difference between the cash transactions recorded on the system and the cash declared at the end of each week. The loss from TP 9 was not carried forward into the next TP.

The non-zero trading position on the TP10 BTS is caused by the cash on hand B Fwd line (which is actually calculated and saved at the point of the previous TP rollover) being £1888.73 higher than the C Fwd value on the previous report. This value is not used anywhere else in the balancing process. The B/F figure on the TP 10 BP 1 balance report shows that the correct value was used there.

I have checked whether the same problem could have caused other problems at this branch:

1. In the last year, no other non-zero trading positions.
2. Receipts and payments match on all the balance reports.
3. since last August, the NT event has occurred at this branch twice, once on 27th Dec and then on 13th Feb.

I checked this second instance thoroughly and am satisfied that it did not cause any financial error. It occurred while the counter was at an earlier point in the balancing process. The discrepancy of £2223.48 (loss) in TP 11 BP 3 was the difference between the cash transactions recorded on the system and the declared cash for the week. This was not a TP rollover, so local suspense was not affected.

[End of Response]

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

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:27-May-2008 18:33:13 User:Anne Chambers

The Call record has been transferred to the team: MSU-Indt Mgt

Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:28-May-2008 14:47:19 User:Claire Drake

[Start of Response]

Thank you Anne. I have issued the final BIMS to POL. Returning call to EDSC for closure.

[End of Response]

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

Date:28-May-2008 14:47:25 User:Claire Drake The Call record has been transferred to the team: EDSC Progress was delivered to Provider	
Date:28-May-2008 15:06:27 User:Clive Turrell Defect cause updated to 41: General - in Procedure	
Date:28-May-2008 15:06:37 User:Clive Turrell [Start of Response] . [End of Response] Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation Response was delivered to Consumer	
Date:28-May-2008 15:07:54 User:Clive Turrell [Start of Response] Can this call please now be closed [End of Response] Response code to call type L as Category 95 -- Final -- Advice after Investigation Routing to Call Logger following Final Progress update. Service Response was delivered to Consumer	
Date:28-May-2008 15:07:54 User:Clive Turrell CALL PC0158102 closed: Category 95 Type L	
Date:29-May-2008 08:00:23 User:_Customer Call_ Consumer XXXXXX@TFS01 has acknowledged the call closure	
Date:02-Jun-2008 11:38:38 User:Anne Chambers Evidence Added - <u>Further query and response</u>	
Date:01-Aug-2008 15:31:08 User:Anne Chambers Evidence Added - <u>Another response 26th June</u>	
Date:01-Sep-2008 14:31:12 User:Anne Chambers Evidence Added - <u>Reports etc</u>	
Date:01-Sep-2008 14:32:07 User:Anne Chambers Evidence Added - <u>attempt to explain non-zero trading positions</u>	
Root Cause	General - in Procedure
Logger	_Customer Call_ -- EDSC
Subject Product	General/Other/Misc -- Unknown General/Other/Misc (version unspecified)
Assignee	_Customer Call_ -- EDSC
Last Progress	01-Sep-2008 14:32 -- Anne Chambers