

There's a Peak in my stack...

A checklist guide for Peak stack owners (and support specialists updating Peaks)

- * Should this be in my stack? If not, then route it to the right Assigned Team
- * Is the Peak assigned to the correct person (not off sick, still on POA)? If not, then reassign it
- * Is it a potential Live Defect? If so, add the ##LiveAffectingDefect Collection
- * If it is a potential Live Defect, what needs doing to progress it to Defect Identified or to qualify it as NOT a Live Defect?
- * If it is a Live Defect, it should be Call Type "L" or "#" – so change it if needed
- * If it is Call Type "# - Defect Identified", is it bonded to POL's SNOW – if so, it needs to be cloned and then closed (it is ok if it is only bonded to TfsNow)
- * Is it, or could it be, branch impacting – if so, add the HDR-Fin or HDR-Exp Collection
- * If it has a HDR-* Collection – is it being treated as high priority – regardless of Priority field value?
- * If it has a HDR-* Collection – is the Impact tab up to date and all fields well worded so that POL will understand it (see HDR examples below)?
- * If it does not have a HDR-* Collection – is the Impact tab up to date and all fields well worded so that POA colleagues will understand it (see non-HDR examples below)?
- * Is the Workaround Reference added with Yes selected where a suitable workaround is in place?
- * Has anything changed that would mean the ##LiveAffectingDefect or HDR-* Collections are no longer correct and should be removed? If so, remove them
- * If it is Defect Identified, when will it be taken to BIF? Set the BIF Action
- * If it is Defect Identified, and has been approved at BIF, when will it be taken to PTF? Set the PTF Action
- * If it is Defect Identified, and has been Targeted in PTF, when will work start to create the required fix?
- * Is the Response Category correct?
- * Is the Product and Product Group correct?
- * When was it last updated – and is that an acceptable timespan?
- * Have discussions taken place over email or in meetings that should be added to the Peak to ensure a full record is available?
- * How long is it since the Peak was raised – and is that acceptable or does a review need doing?
- * Do the latest updates read well and make sense? If not, change them and coach the creator
- * Is it clear who (specifically) is expected to take the next action? If not, make it clear and notify the person expected to act
- * If you are waiting for someone external to your team to take action – challenge them to make progress
- * Peaks with the following Response Categories that have the ##LiveAffectingDefect Collection should be Call Type "#" as a fix is needed. Change it if necessary

41 -- Pending -- Product Error Diagnosed
 42 -- Pending -- Documentation Error Diagnosed
- * Peaks that are Status "F" should have an accurate Root Cause added before being closed. Make sure it is updated
- * Peaks recently closed with any of the following Response Categories are deemed to have been No Fault Found with no fix action needed. Is this correct? If not, have the Peaks re-opened and corrected

58 -- Final – Documentation Fix Available to Call
 Logger
 62 -- Final – No fault in product
 63 -- Final -- Programme Approved – No Fix
 Required
 64 -- Final – Published Known Error
 66 -- Final -- Enhancement Request
 68 -- Final -- Administrative Response
 70 -- Final – Avoidance Action Required
 72 -- Final -- Duplicate Call
 94 -- Final -- Advice and guidance given
 95 -- Final -- Advice after Investigation
 96 -- Final -- Insufficient evidence
 97 -- Final -- Unspecified insufficient evidence
 98 -- Final -- User error
 100 -- Final -- Route call to TfS
 120 -- Final -- Cloned to create Defect Peak
 200 -- Final -- Call withdrawn by user

There's an Incident in my TfsNow Assignment Group...

A checklist guide for TfsNow Assignment Group owners (and support specialists updating TfsNow Incidents)

- * Should this be in my Assignment Group? If not, then route it to the right Assignment Group
- * Is the Incident assigned to the correct person (not off sick, still on POA)? If not, then reassign it
- * Is the Summary field a clear description that others will understand?
- * If the Incident is not bonded to POL ServiceNow, does it have the right Open category?
- * Is it a potential Live Defect? If so, add the LiveAffectingDefect CI
- * If it is a potential Live Defect, what needs doing to progress it to a confirmed defect or to qualify it as NOT a Live Defect?
- * Should POL be aware? If so, the Incident will need to be logged by MAC with the required specific Categories so it can be bonded to POL ServiceNow so POL can be kept updated with progress
- * Is it, or could it be, branch impacting – if so, ensure MAC are asked to add the HDR-Fin or HDR-Exp CI
- * If it has a HDR-* CI – is it being treated as high priority – regardless of Priority field value?
- * If it has a HDR-* CI – is a recent entry in the “Additional comments (Customer visible)” field up to date and well worded so that POL will understand it?
- * Is the State field correctly set?
- * Is a workaround available (this will show in the Peak – if applicable – as the Workaround Reference will be set to Yes)? If so, make sure that the “Additional comments (Customer visible)” field clearly states this – especially if this Incident is bonded to POL ServiceNow
- * Has anything changed that would mean the ##LiveAffectingDefect or HDR-* CIs are no longer correct and should be removed? If so, remove them
- * If it is a confirmed defect, when will the resolution action be taken e.g. is it linked to a TfsNow Change?
- * When was it last updated – and is that an acceptable timespan?
- * Have discussions taken place over email or in meetings that should be added to the Incident to ensure a full record is available?
- * How long is it since the Incident was raised – and is that acceptable or does a review need doing?
- * Do the latest updates read well and make sense? If not, change them and coach the creator
- * If the Incident is bonded to POL ServiceNow, does the latest update to the “Additional comments (Customer visible)” field make it clear to POL what the status is? If not, add an update that does
- * Is it clear who (specifically) is expected to take the next action? If not, make it clear and notify the person expected to act
- * If you are waiting for someone external to your team to take action – challenge them to make progress
- * Is the Incident Suspended as no further Fujitsu action is needed? If so, and after 10 working days have elapsed, the Incident should be closed
- * If the Incident is being closed, ensure it has the right Closure code and has the correct minimum dataset added (as per local work instructions):
 - Line of Summary
 - Root Cause
 - Resolution
 - Internal/External
 - Fujitsu SME
 - POL Stakeholder
- * Incidents recently closed should be checked. If they were closed with no action required by Fujitsu, does the Incident clearly state that? If they were closed following action taken by Fujitsu, does the Incident clearly state that?

There's an Incident in my TfSNow Assignment Group...

A checklist guide for TfSNow Assignment Group owners (and support specialists updating TfSNow Incidents)

HDR Impact Tab – Example 1:

HORIZON DEFECT REVIEW FORUM - DEFECT SUMMARY	
Document Classification: Fujitsu Confidential - Commercial-in-Confidence	
Document Owner: Fujitsu	
Date of Issue: 05/04/2022	
POL Problem Reference	
Fujitsu Reference	PC0295579
Date first logged at HDR (dd/mm/yyyy)	29/07/2021
Fujitsu Title	CBB-5906 - PBSIL socket management needs refinement to prevent delay after EFT_END Y
POL Title	PBSIL needs refinement to prevent delay after a transaction end
Description	The current socket handling between PBSIL and Ingenico means that sockets are being opened by PBSIL before point of use, and may therefore be timed out by C3. This can result in the counter hanging and also results in unnecessary socket activity and confusing logging of socket timeouts.
Branch Financial Impact or Experience (Fujitsu HDR-Fin/HDR-Exp)	Experience
Branch impact described	The current transaction would not complete and the counter would hang. The clerk would need to restart the counter (power off/on) and the recovery process completed automatically following the restart. No receipt will have been printed and so no transaction has taken place as far as the branch is concerned.
Defect Confirmed (or still under investigation)	Yes
How found	LST testing on R70.40 Ctr. See PEAK PC0295854. There were 2 issues found as a result of PEAK PC0295854. This represents the fix dealing with sockets being opened by PBSIL before point of use. PC0299875: Reported as an incident by the branch to POL IT DSD Team.
When found	30/06/2021
When it dates back to (when could it have started happening)	R70.40
Branches affected	Any PBS branches with R70.40 installed
Frequency of occurrence	This issue was raised during LST testing of R70.40; only one instance reported so far in LIVE - see PEAK PC0299739.
Root cause	Ingenico have advised Fujitsu to follow a different approach to socket handling to that supplied in their documentation. This has been implemented, but now requires another change. PBSIL currently "resets" sockets with C3 on receipt of an EFT_END (i.e. closes the socket, and then opens a socket). It only needs to close the socket, and open a socket when needed (i.e. when starting a new conversation with C3).
Is it detected/monitored	No
Workaround	No
Workaround description	N/A
Fix required	PBSIL should only open sockets to C3 at point of use.
Status update	Status update: A fix has been identified (in conjunction with Ingenico); PBSIL will only open a socket to C3 at point of use. Fix implemented and tested.
Next action	BIF & PTF done; Fix completed and tested (see body of PEAK for details and associated Jira). Fix will be released as part of R71.20.
Target Release Number	Targeted At HNG-X 71.20 (TMC Counter Follow On Release)
Target Release date (latest estimate)	TBC
External Dependencies	None

There's an Incident in my TfSNow Assignment Group...

A checklist guide for TfSNow Assignment Group owners (and support specialists updating TfSNow Incidents)

HDR Impact Tab – Example 2:

HORIZON DEFECT REVIEW FORUM - DEFECT SUMMARY	
Document Classification: Fujitsu Confidential - Commercial-in-Confidence	
Document Owner: Fujitsu	
Date of Issue: 05/04/2022	
POL Problem Reference	
Fujitsu Reference	PC0297878
Date first logged at HDR (dd/mm/yyyy)	
Fujitsu Title	PBS LST:R71.10 - Transactions with Qty < 0 which appear to have failed
POL Title	
Description	<p>When a PBS banking or payment transaction is performed, if the transaction is declined (internal status DECLINED or UNDO) then the quantity of the resulting transaction should be set to zero.</p> <p>The defect is that if such a declined transaction, with internal status UNDO, is not completed and settled successfully, counter recovery incorrectly sets the quantity to one. This has no impact on the branch accounts, but it is thought be important as the Postmaster should not be remunerated for any declined plastic transactions, including those with internal status UNDO. No customer impact, but there is an impact to the postmaster/clerk owing to remunerated for additional transactions that are not completed.</p>
Branch Financial Impact or Experience (Fujitsu HDR-Fin/HDR-Exp)	Experience
Branch impact described	This has no financial impact on the branch accounts as the transaction will not be recorded, however this may impact positively on branch remuneration.
Defect Confirmed (or still under investigation)	Yes
How found	Detected by Fujitsu support when investigating issues with the UNDO process.
When found	28/10/2021
When it dates back to (when could it have started happening)	July 2021 - PBS Roll Out
Branches affected	All PBS branches
Frequency of occurrence	Unknown. Believed to be infrequent.
Root cause	When a PBS banking or payment transaction is performed, if the transaction is declined with internal status UNDO, is not completed and settled successfully, counter recovery incorrectly sets the quantity to one.
Is it detected/monitored	No
Workaround	No
Workaround description	N/A
Fix required	Counter code change required.
Status update	Fix is known and will be incorporated into 72.20.
Next action	Awaiting for the release process for 72.20 to be initiated.
Target Release Number	Targeted At HNG-X 72.20 (Counter Release)
Target Release date (latest estimate)	29/05/2022
External Dependencies	None

There's an Incident in my TfSNow Assignment Group...

A checklist guide for TfSNow Assignment Group owners (and support specialists updating TfSNow Incidents)

Non-HDR Impact Tab – Example 1:

LIVE AFFECTING DEFECT - DEFECT SUMMARY	
Document Classification: Fujitsu Confidential - Commercial-in-Confidence	
Document Owner: Fujitsu	
Date of Issue: 01/06/2022	
Fujitsu Reference	PC0298772
Fujitsu Title	LST:RELIND - Counter improvement: detection of corrupt Counter software
Description	Files on Counter disks can become corrupted. This can go undetected, and lead to errors within the CBA. This PEAK proposes introducing a mechanism to detect such corruptions.
How found	A small number of Counters have been detected as "corrupted" during reviews of HORice reports, particularly when monitoring new CBA rollout.
When found	23/12/2021
When it dates back to (when could it have started happening)	HNGA initial release
Frequency of occurrence	Likely to be rare, but hard to predict as this is not explicitly monitored - hence this PEAK!
Root cause	EUC hardware
Is it detected/monitored	No
Workaround	No
Workaround description	N/A
Describe Fix required	Proposal and options to discussed and agreed. Likely to involve a start-up/runtime check within the CBA to ensure that all binary files are uncorrupted. Any corruptions would result in an alert which POL can view via HORice, say. Alternatives to be discussed internally and with POL.
Status update	Proposal/options to be drafted.
Next action	Review with 4LS next week - 06/06/2022 - to review 1) Do Fujitsu counter alerts 2) Will DXC monitor this
Target Release Number	Proposed For HNG-X 72.30 (Counter Release)
Target Release date (latest estimate)	TBC
TfSNow Changes	
Operational Change Date	
External Dependencies	POL - review/options/approval

There's an Incident in my TfSNow Assignment Group...*A checklist guide for TfSNow Assignment Group owners (and support specialists updating TfSNow Incidents)*

Non-HDR Impact Tab – Example 2:

LIVE AFFECTING DEFECT - DEFECT SUMMARY	
Document Classification: Fujitsu Confidential - Commercial-in-Confidence	
Document Owner: Fujitsu	
Date of Issue: 01/06/2022	
Fujitsu Reference	PC0290147
Fujitsu Title	LST:REL IND - PDL coercion to numbers is flawed
Description	A number of potential logical issues in the Counter's PDL (Process Definition Language) "parser/interpreter" can lead to the masking of errors. This could lead to unknown problems.
How found	Development reviews
When found	01/09/2020
When it dates back to (when could it have started happening)	HNGX- Release 1
Frequency of occurrence	None (tentatively)
Root cause	Cause identified as JEXL 3rd party library used to support PDL processing in the Counter.
Is it detected/monitored	No - but this change will introduce alerting
Workaround	No
Workaround description	N/A
Describe Fix required	Changes to the PDL "parser/interpreter" on the Counter (part of the CBA) to make the "parser/interpreter" much stricter, particularly in data type conversion. There maybe a range of options available to fix the issue, but waiting investigations to conclude and require subsequent review with Post Office. Counter (CBA) change plus reference data. POL refdata.
Status update	Fujitsu Dev have identified potential issues in a subset of counter transactions (PDL) e.g. AP-ADC transactions. An assessment team has been mobilised to determine the impact. There is no indication/evidence of an impact in the live environment at this time. Considerable analysis by Dev has been completed. The investigations will take at least 10 working days and include SV&I regression testing, before we are in a position to provide an update.
Next action	Update following analysis. Agreed in a meeting (26/05) with Steve Bansal to delay in reporting this issue until after the analysis is completed. Next review date 09/06 or 10/06
Target Release Number	Proposed For HNG-X 72.30 (Counter Release)
Target Release date (latest estimate)	TBC
TfSNow Changes	
Operational Change Date	
External Dependencies	POL - Reference Data