

Export

Peak Incident Management System

Call Reference	PC0164429	Call Logger	David Seddon -- EDSC
Release	Targeted At -- T86	Top Ref	FSTK_2_0_WP29300
Call Type	Cloned call	Priority	B -- Progress stopped
Contact	David Seddon	Call Status	Closed -- S/W Fix Available to Call Logger
Target Date	26/09/2008	Effort (Man Days)	2.00
Summary	FAD005948 BM stock unit was rolled over it was forced to clear the local suspense account		
All References	Type	Value	
	SSCKEL	<u>KEL dsed5628Q</u>	
	TRIOLE for Service	<u>82747</u>	
	Fast Track Fix	<u>FSTK_2_0_WP29300</u>	
	Work Package	<u>PWY_WP_29300</u>	
	Release PEAK	<u>PC0165710</u>	
	Clone Call	<u>PC0152421</u>	
	Clone Master	<u>PC0152376</u>	

Progress Narrative

Date:05-Sep-2008 12:56:52 User:David Seddon
 CALL PC0164429 opened
 Details entered are:-
 Summary:FAD005948 BM stock unit was rolled over it was forced to clear the local suspense account
 Call Type:C
 Call Priority:B
 Target Release:T80
 Routed to:EDSC - David Seddon

Date:20-Dec-2007 12:35:19 User:Customer Call
 CALL PC0152376 opened
 Details entered are:-
 Summary:Ibrahim from the NBSC has asked that an issue be i
 Call Type:L
 Call Priority:B
 Target Release:T70
 Routed to:EDSC - Unassigned

Date/Time Raised: Dec 20 2007 11:53AM
 Priority: B
 Contact Name: Ibrahim Kizildag - NBSC
 Contact Phone: GRO
 Originator: XXXXXX@TFS01
 Originator's reference: 82747
 Product Serial No:
 Product Site: 005948

Ibrahim from the NBSC has asked that an issue be investigated by our software team regarding discrepancies still showing when the MIS stock unit is rolled to clear the local suspense account.

Incident History:

2007-12-20 11:53:19 [Brooks, Katrina]
 INIT : create a new request/incident/problem/change/issue

2007-12-20 12:01:32 [Brooks, Katrina]
 LOG : The following information has been sent to me via Email from Ibrahim @ NBSC

On Wednesday 12/12 the BM stock unit had a gain of £465.73. As this stock unit rolled over it was forced to clear local suspense £1083.76-. The gain of £465.73 did not go to local suspense and is not included in the £1083.76-. This was not the last stock unit to roll over. The last stock unit to roll over was MIS at 10:20 on 13/12. This stock unit had no discrepancies. MIS is a correction stock unit and was not inactive as it is rolled every BP.

The suspense account and final balances corroborate the above as the office has sent us copies.

The Trading statement agrees with the suspense account and that BM stock cleared suspense but did not send its gain to suspense. The Trading position line should always show zero. Under the BM stock column it shows £465.73-.

I have had a trial done on BM stock to see if this is showing the £465.73 but it is not.

2007-12-20 12:02:28 [Brooks, Katrina]
 LOG : I contacted the PO to gain more details but the pm was on the other phone. I was asked to call back in 15 mins.

2007-12-20 12:04:59 [Brooks, Katrina]
 LOG : Ibrahim stated that this might be the same issue for branch code 003020 (incident number 76918).

 2007-12-20 12:25:58 [Brooks, Katrina]
 LOG : I have spoken to the PM for more details:

SU - BM that has the problem
 MISC SU is one they use to roll over the office.
 User name JBA
 Have rolled into TP9
 Node 1

 2007-12-20 12:33:53 [Brooks, Katrina]
 LOG : Ibrahim from the NBSC states that this might be related to Branch Code 003020 (76918) that I have sent back across for investigation.

 2007-12-20 12:37:31 [Brooks, Katrina]
 LOG : Can you please investigate as to why when the BM stock unit was rolled over it was forced to clear the local suspense account. This was not the last stock unit to be rolled over.

Thanks

 2007-12-20 12:38:11 [Brooks, Katrina]
 TR : Transfer 'group' from 'HSH7' to 'PEAK'

Date:20-Dec-2007 12:41:36 User:Lorraine Guiblin

The call summary has been changed from:-
 Ibrahim from the NBSC has asked that an issue be i
 The call summary is now:-
 FAD005948 BM stock unit was rolled over it was forced to clear the local suspense account

Date:20-Dec-2007 12:41:51 User:Lorraine Guiblin

Product EPOSS & DeskTop -- Counter Common (version unspecified) added.

Date:20-Dec-2007 12:42:07 User:Lorraine Guiblin

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: David Seddon
 Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:21-Dec-2007 13:46:12 User:David Seddon

Cloning call so original can be passed to development for further investigation and clone can be passed to MSU for reconcilaiton purposes.

Date:21-Dec-2007 13:46:19 User:David Seddon

Call has been cloned to Call:PC0152421 by User:David Seddon

Date:21-Dec-2007 13:50:29 User:David Seddon

Evidence Added - 005948 - Complete Messagestore

Date:21-Dec-2007 13:51:13 User:David Seddon

Evidence Added - Subscription Groups

Date:21-Dec-2007 13:52:39 User:David Seddon

Evidence Added - 005948 Ctrl Event/Audit/TunableTrace logs

Date:21-Dec-2007 14:55:20 User:David Seddon

[Start of Response]

Stockunit BM was being rolled over on counter 1 at the same time that the various EOD of day processes were being run in the background around 7pm. It was during the CABSPProcess that the following message was written to the audit log...

SU:fPostTxnsToLocalSuspense (:-1056374781) Timeout occurred waiting for lock. (0xC1090003) CreateMessageEx:
 RiposteCreateMessageEx call failed.

The messages that should have posted the £465.73 gain in stockunit BM to local suspense failed to be written. Consequently, when local suspense was cleared (written off to P&L in this case) the £465.73 wasn't taken into account and this resulted in the - £465.73 trading position seen on the Branch Trading Statement.

Routing call to development to investigate further and improve the error handling so that following the failure to write messages the system doesn't carry on regardless.

[End of Response]

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

Date:21-Dec-2007 15:01:22 User:David Seddon

[Start of Response]

It is not believed that there will be any ongoing impact of this problem at the branch and the branch is not personally out of

pocket given that losses were written off to P&L. However, there is an impact on POLFS which will need to be corrected. The detail for this is contained in call PC0152421 which has been passed to the MSU for onward progression to POL.

[End of Response]

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

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:21-Dec-2007 15:01:29 User:**David Seddon**

The Call record has been transferred to the team: QFP

Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:02-Jan-2008 08:29:51 User:**Lionel Higman**

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Mark Scardifield

Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:02-Jan-2008 09:51:02 User:**Mark Scardifield**

The Call record has been transferred to the team: EPOSS-Dev

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Gerald Barnes

Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:02-Jan-2008 13:17:58 User:**Gerald Barnes**

Target Date/Time updated: new value is 10/01/2008 12:35

Development Cost updated: new cost is 2 (Man Days)

[Start of Response]

The fact that EPOSS code is not resilient to errors is endemic. There seems little point fixing it in this one particular case because there will be many others to catch you out. For example when I tried to balance with CABSPProcess running I found that declaring cash failed with the same sort of error message!

It may be worth passing on the general message to the HNGx team that in many cases code should always try and exit gracefully after an error and not just blunder on regardless.

This is a perfect example of why. Had the balancing code exited gracefully then if the user had tried again after CABSPProcess had finished working then all would have been well.

For the time being I propose a much cheaper solution then re-writing a lot of EPOSS error handling.

The problem is that because of a previous PEAK (PC0140715) CABSPProcess writes out messages atomically. It does a StartTransaction quite early on (which creates the lock), then initiates writing lots of transactions with CreateMessage and persistent objects with PutObject and finally really writes them with a call to EndTransaction (which ends the lock). If something else tries to write a transaction whilst CABSPProcess has things locked then it will time out after 10 seconds. Hence if CABSPProcess takes more than 10 seconds to run you could get this sort of problem. In this case CABSPProcess took 33 seconds to run which gives a significant window of opportunity for this sort of problem to occur. I suggest addressing this matter directly by having CABSPProcess store all that it wants to write out to a collection and then only really write it out at the very end. In this way the system will be locked for less than 10 seconds and there will be no possibility of this sort of problem.

FIX IMPACT

Complete Forecast Date and Development (man days) fields below this text box.

Include a brief statement for each of the headings below these instructions.

On return to Details window Set Target Release Type to "Proposed for" and Target Release to that proposed.

To the Developer:

(1) Put yourself in the shoes of people downstream and provide information that they are likely to need to process this fix. eg the testing and rollout costs may add significantly to the COST of the fix

(2) Check that the statements are still accurate post-implementation

IMPACT ON DEVELOPMENT:

Effort in mandays.

2 man days

There will be an expectation at RMF that this approximates to the timescale for delivery so if there are reasons why this might not be the case please note them here.

IMPACT ON TEST:

What independent test coverage does development recommend?

This will often be about the level of regression testing required.

Just some independent tests that CABSPProcess is still producing the same results as before.

IMPACT ON USER:

Benefit of making the fix.

It will no longer matter if CABSPProcess is running when the user tries to do many sorts of different things, balancing included.

What does the user have to do to get this problem?

Do anything which involves writing a transaction whilst CABSPProcess is running (after 19:00) when CABSPProcess has sufficient work to do so that it takes more than 10 seconds to run (so probably on the larger offices).

How does it affect them when it occurs?

Whatever is being tried on the counter at this time can potentially fail.

IMPACT ON OPERATIONS:

Benefit of fix that may not visible to end user.

Less support calls.

RISKS (of releasing and of not releasing proposed fix):

What live problems will there be if we do not issue this fix?

Problems will continue to occur if the counter is being used whilst CABSPProcess is running in those cases when it takes more than 10 seconds to run.

What are the risks of this fix having unexpected interactions with other areas?

None.

Is this a high-risk area in which changes have caused problems in the past?

Yes. However the fix proposed is self contained and is considered unlikely to cause any problems.

Should we consider a pilot rollout and of what sort?

I think a pilot is well worth while in all cases. However as stated before I do not consider this a dangerous fix.

LIST OF LIKELY DELIVERABLES:

CABSPProcess

LIST OF THE ABOVE ALREADY DELIVERED FOR THE PROPOSED RELEASE:

None

LIST OF THE ABOVE ALREADY DELIVERED TO A RELEASE LATER THAN THAT PROPOSED:

None

LIST OF THE ABOVE LIKELY TO BE REDELIVERED INTO THE PROPOSED OR A LATER RELEASE:

None

ANYTHING ELSE THAT SHOULD BE KNOWN ABOUT THIS CHANGE:

Nothing

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 55 -- Pending -- Live Fix Impact Supplied

Date:02-Jan-2008 13:20:43 User:Gerald Barnes

The call Target Release has been moved to Proposed For -- T70

Date:02-Jan-2008 13:21:40 User:Gerald Barnes

[Start of Response]

I have put proposed for T70. However I think it really wants to be T80. There is no T80 option at the moment.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 55 -- Pending -- Live Fix Impact Supplied

Date:02-Jan-2008 13:23:17 User:Gerald Barnes

The Call record has been transferred to the team: RelMngmntForum

Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:08-Jan-2008 15:19:29 User:John Boston

The call Target Release has been moved to Proposed For -- T80

Date:10-Jan-2008 14:31:17 User:Tyrone Cozens

[Start of Response]

Routing to EDSC for KEL and close.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 68 -- Final -- Administrative Response

Routing to Call Logger following Final Progress update.

Date:10-Jan-2008 14:39:30 User:Lorraine Guiblin

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: David Seddon

Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:10-Jan-2008 15:58:49 User:David Seddon

Reference Added: SSCKEL dsed5628Q

Date:10-Jan-2008 16:06:12 User:David Seddon

[Start of Response]

It has been decided that no fix will be carried out for the time being given the rarity of the problem. Should the problem become more prevalent then the need for a fix will be reviewed once again. In the meantime KEL dsed5628Q has been created to cover the problem.

With regard to this instance of the problem we have already passed details and corrective actions necessary on to Post Office Limited by means of a BIM issued by the MSU (PC0152421). Therefore no further action is necessary and this call can simply be closed.

[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:10-Jan-2008 16:06:13 User:David Seddon

CALL PC0152376 closed: Category 70 Type L

Date:10-Jan-2008 16:06:12 User:David Seddon

Defect cause updated to 14 -- Development - Code

Date:10-Jan-2008 16:14:50 User:Customer Call

Consumer XXXXXX@TFS01 has acknowledged the call closure

Date:05-Sep-2008 12:56:52 User:David Seddon

Call cloned from original call:PC0152376 by User:David Seddon

Date:05-Sep-2008 12:57:17 User:David Seddon

The Call record has been transferred to the team: EPOSS-Dev

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Gerald Barnes

Date:05-Sep-2008 13:31:08 User:Gerald Barnes

I have developed a fix for this and attach the source and a ReadMe.txt for it in the zip file attached as evidence labelled "Work on fix so far".

Date:05-Sep-2008 13:32:03 User:Gerald Barnes

Evidence Added - Work on fix so far

Date:05-Sep-2008 15:06:01 User:Gerald Barnes

Target Date/Time updated: new value is 26/09/2008 12:56

Development Cost updated: new cost is 2 (Man Days)

[Start of Response]

I proposed a fix for this before - see "Date:2008-01-02 13:17:58 User:Gerald Barnes". At the time it was rejected. However after further investigation it has been decided that this needs to go to RMF again - see an email from Gareth Jenkins attached as evidence labelled "Email from Gareth". I also attach a report I have written showing the sorts of problems that can potentially occur if the problem is not fixed as evidence labelled "Report on Potential problems".

FIX IMPACT

Complete Forecast Date and Development (man days) fields below this text box.

Include a brief statement for each of the headings below these instructions.

On return to Details window Set Target Release Type to "Proposed for" and Target Release to that proposed.

To the Developer:

(1) Put yourself in the shoes of people downstream and provide information that they are likely to need to process this fix. eg the testing and rollout costs may add significantly to the COST of the fix

(2) Check that the statements are still accurate post-implementation

IMPACT ON DEVELOPMENT:

Effort in mandays.

2 man days

There will be an expectation at RMF that this approximates to the timescale for delivery so if there are reasons why this might not be the case please note them here.

IMPACT ON TEST:

What independent test coverage does development recommend?

This will often be about the level of regression testing required.

Just some independent tests that CABSProcess is still producing the same results as before.

IMPACT ON USER:

Benefit of making the fix.

It will no longer matter if CABSProcess is running when the user tries to do many sorts of different things, balancing included.

What does the user have to do to get this problem?

Do anything which involves writing a transaction whilst CABSProcess is running (after 19:00 on node 1) when CABSProcess has sufficient work to do so that it takes more than 10 seconds to run (so probably on the larger offices).

How does it affect them when it occurs?

Whatever is being tried on the counter at this time can potentially fail.

IMPACT ON OPERATIONS:

Benefit of fix that may not visible to end user.

Less support calls.

RISKS (of releasing and of not releasing proposed fix):

What live problems will there be if we do not issue this fix?

Problems will continue to occur if the counter is being used whilst CABSPProcess is running in those cases when it takes more than 10 seconds to run.

What are the risks of this fix having unexpected interactions with other areas?

None.

Is this a high-risk area in which changes have caused problems in the past?

Yes. However the fix proposed is self contained and is considered unlikely to cause any problems.

Should we consider a pilot rollout and of what sort?

I think a pilot is well worth while in all cases. However as stated before I do not consider this a dangerous fix. The simplest sort of pilot is required. Test it out on 100 officess for a month and then if there are no problems release it everywhere.

LIST OF LIKELY DELIVERABLES:

CABSPProcess

LIST OF THE ABOVE ALREADY DELIVERED FOR THE PROPOSED RELEASE:

None

LIST OF THE ABOVE ALREADY DELIVERED TO A RELEASE LATER THAN THAT PROPOSED:

None

LIST OF THE ABOVE LIKELY TO BE REDELIVERED INTO THE PROPOSED OR A LATER RELEASE:

None

ANYTHING ELSE THAT SHOULD BE KNOWN ABOUT THIS CHANGE:

Nothing

[End of Response]

Response code to call type C as Category 42 -- Pending -- Product Error Diagnosed
Hours spent since call received: 7.5 hours

Date:05-Sep-2008 15:09:12 User:Gerald Barnes

Evidence **Added** - Email from Gareth

Date:05-Sep-2008 15:10:19 User:Gerald Barnes

Evidence **Added** - Report on Potential problems

Date:05-Sep-2008 15:12:53 User:Gerald Barnes

The call Target Release has been moved to Proposed For -- T86

Date:05-Sep-2008 15:13:20 User:Gerald Barnes

The Call record has been transferred to the team: RelMngmntForum

Date:10-Sep-2008 11:05:53 User:John Budworth

The call Target Release has been moved to Targeted At -- T86

Date:10-Sep-2008 11:12:39 User:John Budworth

[Start of Response]

Targeted at T86 outside of formal RMF after discussions and emails with Mik Peach, Sheila Bamber and Steve Evans. As Gerald Barnes is on leave until the 23rd of September the LFS delivery is not expected until Friday 26th earliest. Testing to be scheduled for 2 weeks commencing October 1st with live deployment to commence Thursday 16th of October. These are guide dates only.

Routing to EPOSS-Dev.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type C as Category 56 -- Pending -- Live Fix Authorised

Date:10-Sep-2008 11:12:57 User:John Budworth

The Call record has been transferred to the team: EPOSS-Dev

Date:12-Sep-2008 16:33:27 User:Steve Evans

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Gerald Barnes

Date:12-Sep-2008 16:33:40 User:Steve Evans

[Start of Response]

Gerald, please fix ASAP.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type C as Category 56 -- Pending -- Live Fix Authorised

Date:24-Sep-2008 18:27:33 User:Gerald Barnes

[Start of Response]

The fix is in source safe. Only one file had to be modified and that was modMainEx.bas. However, as per our coding standards, '/* comments were separately stripped from modMainEx.bas (in an earlier version) and clsProcessWorkingDay.cls.

The test plan is added as evidence labelled test plan "Test Plan" and the test results to which it refers are added as evidence labelled "Test Results".

[End of Response]

Response code to call type C as Category 56 -- Pending -- Live Fix Authorised

Hours spent since call received: 7.5 hours

Date:24-Sep-2008 18:28:35 User:Gerald Barnes

Evidence Added - Test Plan

Date:24-Sep-2008 18:29:07 User:Gerald Barnes

Evidence Added - Test Results

Date:25-Sep-2008 14:30:10 User:Mike Coon

[Start of Response]

EPOSS-DEV Solution Review

A viable and comprehensive local Unit Test Plan which is sufficient to test the solution, has been attached (UTPXXXXXX.doc) - Present; as is a Report.

I am satisfied that the proposed solution has been;

-Agreed with and underwritten by Design (NA) (N/A as no design authority)

-Implemented according to this agreement in the proposed fix for this fault.

...MJC has checked the code.

Notes:

Only comment is that the "With mtypeTransaction Handle" clauses are ignored and the type name re-iterated in new lines of code (which is perfectly safe) and that some of the old comments about writing of transactions and use of StartTransaction() are now rendered inaccurate.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type C as Category 56 -- Pending -- Live Fix Authorised

Date:25-Sep-2008 14:31:02 User:Mike Coon

[Start of Response]

EPOSS-DEV Solution Review

A viable and comprehensive local Unit Test Plan which is sufficient to test the solution, has been attached (UTPXXXXXX.doc) - Present; as is a Report.

I am satisfied that the proposed solution has been;

-Agreed with and underwritten by Design (NA) (N/A as no design authority)

-Implemented according to this agreement in the proposed fix for this fault.

...MJC has checked the code.

Notes:

Only comment is that the "With mtypeTransaction Handle" clauses are ignored and the type name re-iterated in new lines of code (which is perfectly safe) and that some of the old comments about writing of transactions and use of StartTransaction() are now rendered inaccurate.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type C as Category 56 -- Pending -- Live Fix Authorised

Date:25-Sep-2008 14:44:20 User:Gerald Barnes

[Start of Response]

Fixed by a new release of CABSPProcess.exe.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type C as Category 46 -- Pending -- Product Error Fixed

Date:25-Sep-2008 14:44:34 User:Gerald Barnes

The Call record has been transferred to the team: EPOSS-Rel

Date:26-Sep-2008 11:46:29 User:Gerald Barnes

[Start of Response]

Link tested OK. I heavily populated a message store with £1570 worth of transactions. I then advanced the system clock to 19:00 and started an automatic tool to transact £130 worth of transactions in a continuous process. I logged on after everything had completed and saw that the cash level was £1700 so that nothing had been missed. I looked at the transactions written and could see that 4 complete transaction had been written whilst CABSPProcess had been running between 19:01:36 and 19:02:18.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type C as Category 46 -- Pending -- Product Error Fixed

Date:26-Sep-2008 12:47:11 User:Phil Budd

[Start of Response]

EPOSS-DEV Reference Data Notification

After final unit testing, all Reference Data to be released through EPOSS-DEV and associated with this fix must be itemised and dependencies explained.

If this PEAK is for a Reference Data fix, the changed Reference Data should then be attached to the PEAK as evidence.

Issues affecting MIGRATION and possible subsequent REGRESSION OF the Reference Data element of the FIX should also be discussed.

(To be completed by the developer)

This fix is code only (Y) [If Y, skip rest]

[End of Response]

Response code to call type C as Category 46 -- Pending -- Product Error Fixed

Date:26-Sep-2008 12:50:44 User:Phil Budd

[Start of Response]

EPOSS-REL HANDOVER QUALITY AUDIT CHECKLIST

Prior to formal Handover to the Testing function, an audit of required processes should be completed.

(To be completed by the release-builder)

1. Design/Solution Documentation attached or In-Line (Y)
2. EPOSS-DEV Solution Review complete (Y)
3. EPOSS-DEV Unit Test Notification complete (UTP attached)
4. EPOSS-DEV Reference Data Notification complete (Y)
5. Reference Data change attached (NA)

I am satisfied that the proposed solution has been processed correctly (Y)

Notes: Fix issued at release level T86i1 via work package 29300

[End of Response]

Response code to call type C as Category 48 -- Pending -- Fix Released to PIT

Date:26-Sep-2008 12:50:59 User:Phil Budd

Reference Added: Work Package PWY_WP_29300

Date:26-Sep-2008 12:51:10 User:Phil Budd

TOP Reference set to: Work Package PWY_WP_29300

Date:26-Sep-2008 12:51:44 User:Phil Budd

The Call record has been transferred to the team: Dev-Int-Rel

Date:29-Sep-2008 14:30:50 User:Tyrone Cozens

Reference Added: Release PEAK PC0165710

Date:29-Sep-2008 15:13:36 User:PIT Automated User

Reference Added: Fast Track Fix FSTK_2_0_WP29300 (TOP Reference)

Date:29-Sep-2008 15:16:00 User:Arun Singh

The Call record has been transferred to the team: EDSC

Date:29-Sep-2008 16:16:12 User:Joe Harrison

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: David Seddon

Date:30-Sep-2008 10:38:44 User:Cheryll Card

The Call record has been transferred to the team: Live Supp.Test

Date:30-Sep-2008 10:39:31 User:**John Budworth**

Product DevIntRel-Director -- Live Supp.Test (version unspecified) added.

Date:04-Nov-2008 11:55:22 User:**John Budworth**

[Start of Response]

WP29300 being delivered to live via Tivoli Product LFS_COUNTER 44_1.

LST testing completed.

Pilot completed.

Roll out to the estate authorise and almost completed (41 counters outstanding).

Routing to call logger for closure.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type C as Category 60 -- Final -- S/W Fix Released to Call Logger

Routing to Call Logger following Final Progress update.

Date:04-Nov-2008 15:24:27 User:**David Seddon**

[Start of Response]

Fix to CABSPProcess delivered. Closing call.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type C as Category 60 -- Final -- S/W Fix Released to Call Logger

Routing to Call Logger following Final Progress update.

Date:04-Nov-2008 15:24:36 User:**David Seddon**

CALL PC0164429 closed: Category 60 Type C

Root Cause Development - Code

Logger David Seddon -- EDSC

Subject Product EPOSS & DeskTop -- Counter Common (version unspecified)

Assignee David Seddon -- EDSC

Last Progress 04-Nov-2008 15:24 -- David Seddon