
From: Ron Warmington[**GRO**]
Sent: Fri 26/07/2013 10:18:16 AM (UTC)
To: Simon Baker[**GRO**]; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd[**GRO**];
[**GRO**]; Rod Ismay[**GRO**];
irh@[**GRO**]; Holt[**GRO**] Andy
Subject: FW: p.s. review 21.

All: Could someone please forward this email to Andy Winn, whose email address I don't have seem to have?

This is the email from Jenny O'Dell that represents the "where we are right now" on SR021. As I said, I'd hoped that, by spelling out what she was meant to have been doing, she would be able to shed some light on the entries that she passed... and that she would yield up a clue as to what might have triggered those 9 SANs that aggregated to £6,892.23. Her incoming July 1st email has given us no such clue I'm afraid.

As agreed on today's call, this is a case that might be capable of being settled with the simple and inexpensive 'pre-mediation' process... or certainly is likely to be settled through mediation if an earlier meeting failed to close it down.

I will contact JOD to take this forward.

Thanks for today's helpful call.

Ron Warmington CFE, FCA

Director

2nd Sight Support Services Ltd

Tythe Farm

Maugersbury

Cheltenham

Gloucestershire

GL54 1HR

Phone:

GRO

Mobile:

Email:

GRO

Website: www.secondsightsupport.co.uk

-----Original Message-----

From: jennyodell@

GRO

Sent: Monday, July 01, 2013 11:55 AM

To: Ron Warmington

Subject: RE: p.s. review 21.

>Dear Ron,

I don't understand what exactly you are asking me, am I thick or what?

I don't know what Saps or Sans is, or overages (can guess that that is more than something) I wouldn't know what to do, to do a sap, san or overage. All I did was move stamps from declaration two to declaration one, and specials from specials to normal.

This is what I did every month not just on November 4th.

If this does not answer your question, then perhaps talking to you on the phone might be best than trying to write it down, did ring you this morning to do so and left a message.

I hope this makes sense.

Regards

Jenny O'Dell

Simon/Jenny:

>

> I do understand the whole business about SPMRs operating away from

> Standard Operating Procedure and moving special stamps in blocks into

> ordinary 1st class stamps in an effort to make their own life (and

> maybe their assistants' lives) easier... so that can all just hit the

> ordinary 1st class sale icon whenever they sell either plain or fancy.

> I obviously also understand that, in doing that, they could end up

> with offsetting overages and shortfalls between the two stocks of

> stamps... and that the right way to clear those offsetting differences

> is to pass A PAIR OF Stock Adjustments of identical value. So far so

> good... But Jenny O'Dell says that, at 09:04 hrs, she only passed the

> Positive Stock Adjustment Entries (4 SAPs, 15,576 stamps, £5,577.93).

- > I'm not clear why she didn't enter Negative Stock Adjustments (SANs)
- > for the same number of stamps and that same value of
- > £5,577.93 AT THE SAME TIME. Wouldn't that be the correct way to do this?
- >
- > What Jenny says happened is that LATER (at 12:22 hrs), there appeared
- > (though she says she didn't see these at the time) the 9 SANs
- > aggregating to
- > £6,892.23 (an aggregate that is different by an amount of £1,314.30
- > from the
- > £5,577.93 figure). If Jenny had entered those 9 SANs (as the offset
- > to the earlier 4 SAPs) that would, by my reckoning, have generated a
- > real stock SHORTFALL in the branch of that £1,314.30. But Jenny says
- > she didn't enter
- > ANY SANs at all. If she had been selling the plain and special stamps
- > for
- > ages and had ALREADY BUILT UP A MASSIVE NEGATIVE STOCK POSITION (in
- > ordinary 1st class stamps)... that SHORTAGE in ordinary stamps ought
- > then to have been offset by an OVERAGE in Special Stamps (the system
- > would have thought Jenny had more special Christmas stamps than she
- > really had because it had not been told that she'd been selling lots
- > of them!). So... she ought, at that point, to have had an equal and
- > offsetting OVERAGE in her real stock of Special stamps. All that
- > brings us back to the need to pass EQUAL AND OFFSETTING SAPs and SANs
- > on the two stamp stock lines. Correct?
- >

> So... This is for you Jenny: Can you please Jenny shed a bit more light on
> what you had been doing and whether you had that offsetting and equal
> discrepancy in Special and Ordinary 1st class stamps. If you can
> correct any other elements of the above description, and help us all
> to understand what happened, that would be great.

>

> Thanks and regards,

>

>

> Ron Warmington, CFE, FCA

> Director

> 2nd Sight Support Services Ltd

> Tythe Farm

> Mangersbury

> Cheltenham

> Gloucestershire

> GL54 1HR

>

> Phone:

GRO

> Mobile:

> Email:

GRO

> Website: www.secondsightsupport.co.uk

> <<http://www.secondsightsupport.co.uk/>>

>

>

>

>

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Simon Baker [GRO]

> Sent: Thursday, June 27, 2013 9:59 AM

> To: Ron Warmington

> Cc: [irh@GRO](#); Lesley J Sewell; Alwen Lyons

> Subject: RE: p.s. review 21.

>

> Ron

>

> To respond to the question about shortfalls, on 4th November 2009,

> Jenny O'Dell balanced and rolled her Stock Unit and Branch into a New

> Trading Period and hence produced (and presumably signed) a Branch

> Trading Statement showing her Cash and Stock Levels. This Balancing

> Process indicated that there was no Discrepancy and everything

> Balanced perfectly to the nearest penny.

>

> There is no evidence to suggest that adjusting stamp stock levels

> created a loss for this sub postmaster.

>

> As a secondary point, the audit trail shows that Jenny O'Dell used

> Stock Adjustment functionality (and not the Stock Declaration

> function) to handle the moving of stamp stock between Special and
> Ordinary. This is contrary to her email, but could be down to
> confusion as to terminology.

>

> Regards, Simon

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Ron Warmington [GRO]

> Sent: 23 June 2013 15:21

> To: Simon Baker

> Cc: [irh@](#) [GRO]

> Subject: FW: p.s. review 21.

>

> FYI re SR021

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: [jennyodell@](#) [GRO]

> [<mailto:jennyodell@>] [GRO]

> Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 11:58 AM

> To: Ron Warmington

> Subject: Re: p.s. review 21.

>

>>Hi Ron,

> I forgot to say that there was approx. just over £6,000.00 shortfall

> in cash on the 4th November 2009, I cannot be more specific as I

> cannot find my cash declaration slip, where I would have written the
> amount on, for that day in my box, so at the end of POL review where
> it says no discrepancies there was.
> I hope this makes sense.
> Regards,
> Jenny
> Jenny: Any chance you could look at and comment on POL's response to
> Spot
>> Review 21?
>>
>>
>>
>> Thanks,
>>
>>
>>
>> Ron Warmington, CFE, FCA
>>
>> Director
>>
>> 2nd Sight Support Services Ltd
>>
>> Tythe Farm
>>
>> Maugersbury

>>

>> Cheltenham

>>

>> Gloucestershire

>>

>> GL54 1HR

>>

>>

>>

>> Phone:

GRO

>>

>> Mobile:

>>

>> Email:

GRO

>>

GRO

>>

>> Website: <<http://www.secondsightsupport.co.uk/>>

>> www.secondsightsupport.co.uk

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>>

>> This email has been scanned by iomartcloud.

>> <http://www.iomartcloud.com/>

>>

>>

>

>

>

>

>

>

> *****

> 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.

>

> *****

>

>

>

> _____

> This email has been scanned by iomartcloud.

> <http://www.iomartcloud.com/>

>

>