

To: Bansal, Steve (BRA01); [redacted] **GRO**
Cc: SSC Duty Manager; [redacted] **GRO**; Parker, Steve; [redacted] **GRO**
From: Chambers, Anne O[O=FUJITSU EXCHANGE ORGANIZATION/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=48A275057EBF49749F84B3B4B75]
Sent: Thur 12/3/2015 11:22:18 AM (UTC)
Subject: Retrieval of .BLE Files: update 3/12/2015
[ble_summary_v2.xlsx](#)
[Duplicate_pouch_investigation.xlsx](#)

Steve,

Latest spreadsheet attached. I have now had a look at nearly all the output.

In summary:

- Since April 2011 there have been 44 duplicated pouches.
- I can't distinguish between user error and the system problem (though instances where there are just two identical pouches, and pouch_id not starting '90', are more likely to be user error).
- I've identified where some action appeared to be taken the same day which suggests they were aware of a problem. Where a housekeeping (HK) transaction took place, this was probably in anticipation of a Transaction Correction being issued later to remove the discrepancy. It might be possible to do further checks on the BLE data for these.
- Where no action was taken the same day, we could check other days BLE entries for the branch, or retrieve and check transaction data for the branches, or check for TCs as above.
- There was also at least one problem during migration which could result in the same pouch being remmed in more than once. The first set, highlighted in blue, was documented in KEL_acha4221Q / PC0195380, fixed around 19th April 2010. A check was run at the time looking for duplicate pouches so POL FSC could be informed via BIMS (and there should be Peaks covering these).
- I will now investigate the apparent duplicates between April 2010 and March 2011, which may have a different cause.

Anne.