

To: Wilkerson Guy [GRO] Jenkins Gareth GI [GRO]
Cc: D'Alvarez Alan [GRO] Butts Geoff [GRO]
From: Thomas Penny [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=THOMASP]
Sent: Thur 24/06/2010 4:23:53 PM (UTC)
Subject: RE: Duplication of Transaction Records on ARQ Returns

Guy

Should I hold off advising my counterpart of this issue?

Kind regards
Penny

Penny Thomas
Security Analyst, Customer Services

Fujitsu Services Retail & Royal Mail Group Account
Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berks RG12 8SN

Tel: [GRO]
Mob: [GRO]
Fax: [GRO]
E-Mail: [GRO]
Web: <http://uk.fujitsu.com>

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: Wilkerson Guy
Sent: 24 June 2010 17:12
To: Jenkins Gareth GI; Thomas Penny
Cc: D'Alvarez Alan; Butts Geoff
Subject: RE: Duplication of Transaction Records on ARQ Returns
Importance: High

Gareth/Penny,

I think we need Alan D'Alvarez or Geoff Butts to look at this – I'd hate to have POL raise this as an issue with a HNG-X Acceptance Board on Tuesday.

Guy

From: Jenkins Gareth GI
Sent: 24 June 2010 17:03
To: Thomas Penny; Wilkerson Guy
Subject: RE: Duplication of Transaction Records on ARQ Returns

Penny,

No, that pretty well covers it. NB there is no guarantee that the duplicates are even complete sessions in which case the sum of all transaction may even be out.

In summary, any detailed analysis of the finances of a Branch which is done with duplicate transactions without realising that there are duplicates (and so removing them) will give incorrect results.

Regards

Gareth

Gareth Jenkins
Distinguished Engineer
Applications Architect
Royal Mail Group Account

FUJITSU

Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berkshire, RG12 8SN

Tel:

Mobile:

email:

Web:

GRO

<http://uk.fujitsu.com>



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: Thomas Penny
Sent: 24 June 2010 14:25
To: Wilkerson Guy
Cc: Jenkins Gareth GI
Subject: RE: Duplication of Transaction Records on ARQ Returns

Guy

These are original records which have been duplicated when copying to Audit Server. We are not suggesting that original records have been duplicated.

If analysis was undertaken on the audit data some transactions would be duplicated; both plus and minus (we hope!). Analysis on stock units could be out as TI would show duplicated transfers and equally would TO. Cash on hand analysis would also be out.

Gareth – is there anything else I need to add?

Penny

Penny Thomas
Security Analyst, Customer Services

Fujitsu Services Retail & Royal Mail Group Account
Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berks RG12 8SN

Tel:

Mob:

Fax:

E-Mail:

Web: <http://uk.fujitsu.com>

GRO

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: Wilkerson Guy
Sent: 24 June 2010 14:16
To: Thomas Penny
Subject: RE: Duplication of Transaction Records on ARQ Returns

Penny,

Would the additional transactions make any difference to the charges for a Sub-Postmaster?

Guy

From: Thomas Penny
Sent: 24 June 2010 12:39
To: Welsh Graham; Van Achte Gaetan; Munro Donna; Thompson Peter; Wilkerson Guy

Cc: Jenkins Gareth GI; Holmes Alan
Subject: FW: Duplication of Transaction Records on ARQ Returns
Importance: High

An update to my note sent yesterday.

More detailed analysis shows:-

| | |
|---|-----|
| Number of ARQs affected | 112 |
| Number of ARQs where 1 or 2 instances highlighted which indicates bona fide activity | 17 |
| Number of ARQs WIP | 7 |
| 12 ARQs where court action is known; number of cases | 2 |
| 8 ARQs returned where witness statement requested but not yet provided; number of cases | 3 |
| ARQs where no court activity is known | 76 |

Audit Development are currently working on a fix which is expected to be available Tuesday 29 June.

Gareth has suggested the following explanation for POL:-

With Horizon counters, the mechanism by which Data is audited has always worked on the principle that it is acceptable to audit the same data more than once – in particular if in doubt as to whether or not it has been previously audited successfully.

The Mechanism used on Horizon to retrieve the data took this into account and only presented one instance of such duplicate data in the ARQ extracts.

However it has recently been noticed that the HNG-X retrieval mechanism does not remove such duplicates and a quick scan of the ARQs provided to Post Office Ltd since the change to the new system indicates that about 35% of the ARQs might contain some duplicate data. A Peak has been raised to remove such duplicate data in the future. However until the fix is developed, tested and deployed, there is a possibility that data is duplicated.

The reliable way to identify a duplicate transaction is to use the <Num> attribute that is used to generate the unique sequence numbers. Unfortunately, this attribute is not currently included in the Excel version of ARQ data that has been passed to Post Office Ltd in the past. This will be included in all future ARQs until the problem is fixed.

Meanwhile all that can be done on existing ARQs is look for transactions that appear to be duplicates. Note that we have identified a scenario with Postal Services transactions where multiple, identical mails items are accepted (ie the Quantity button is set to greater than 1), but Postage Labels are printed for each individual item. This results in separate transactions being generated for each item, which are identical in the ARQ extracts (there is another minor difference in the raw data apart from the <Num> attribute, but this different attribute is not currently included in the ARQ extract).

I'd like to speak with my counterpart this afternoon, please could you give comments by return?

Kind regards
Penny

Penny Thomas
Security Analyst, Customer Services

Tel:
Mob:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Web:

GRO

<http://uk.fujitsu.com>

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: Thomas Penny

Sent: 23 June 2010 13:12

To: Welsh Graham; Van Achte Gaetan; Munro Donna; Thompson Peter

Cc: Jenkins Gareth GI; Holmes Alan

Subject: Duplication of Transaction Records on ARQ Returns

Importance: High

All

Please find attached an initial report on this problem.

Kind regards

Penny

Penny Thomas
Security Analyst, Customer Services

Fujitsu Services Retail & Royal Mail Group Account
Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berks RG12 8SN

Tel:
Mob:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Web:

GRO

<http://uk.fujitsu.com>

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.