

**To:** Holmes Alan[Alan.Holmes@GRO]  
**From:** Hulme Jon[/o=Exchange/ou=AdminGroup1/cn=Recipients/cn=HulmeJ]  
**Sent:** Tue 8/4/2015 4:16:38 PM (UTC)  
**Subject:** FW: Making Good discrepancy by Cheque

Ideas discussed:

1. Does it really happen – could it be handled by a non-Horizon rem-out process?
2. Don't allow make good to cheque – could be a problem if the amount is large.
3. Can't transact cheque in new TP and branch would not be all square in previous TP.
4. Thought about cheque listing working off last cut-off irrespective of TP, not pleasant and Rem was still be outstanding in old TP (but presumably that is how it is at the moment).
5. Thought about make good to cash, then change cash to cheque somehow in next TP – doesn't sound very nice, don't want to encourage clerk to do this.
6. Andy Winn suggesting resolving prior to rollover, but Housekeeping clear loss from local suspense settles to cash not cheque (via ModeParameters).
7. Could abort rollover when make good needed and make them do it manually (same problem as not cheque make good option on Housekeeping, so could add a button to do this on Housekeeping).
8. Could abort after making good and force them to rem out manually.
9. Could rem out cheque automatically once it has been accepted, just prior to rollover. Not sure how easy/hard that is code wise.

Jon

---

**From:** Peter Prior-Mills [mailto:peter.GRO]  
**Sent:** 04 August 2015 15:47  
**To:** Hulme Jon <GRO>  
**Cc:** Dave Ireland <GRO>  
**Subject:** FW: Making Good discrepancy by Cheque

Hi Jon,

It seems we may have a problem around the "settle to cheque" function at TP rollover as you predicted in your earlier mail (extract used below).

I think that we need to look at viable options around this, although there are a limited number of occasions where this happens we need to stop the problem so that we can eventually remove the old manual Rem out and Cut off processes currently hidden under the "NBSC use only" button.

Do you want to have a call to discuss this first?

Regards,



**Peter Prior-Mills**

Lean Consultant / Business Analyst

PO Box 634  
Chichester,  
PO19 9HJ

GRO

---

**From:** Sarah Hulse  
**Sent:** 04 August 2015 09:57  
**To:** Andrew Winn; Peter Prior-Mills  
**Cc:** Paul I Smith; Maria L Hutchinson; Anne Allaker; Ibrahim Kizildag; Dave Ireland; Michelle Stevens  
**Subject:** Making Good discrepancy by Cheque

Hi All

Has a resolution been put in place for branches that will make good by cheque when correcting discrepancies on TP rollovers?

Below is the last communication we received regarding the issue

*Kind Regards*

Sarah Hulse

---

ESG Team NBSC Helpline,  
Ground Floor South Wing, Dearne House, Cortonwood Drive, S73 0UF

GRO

GRO

POST  
OFFICE

---

**From:** Andrew Winn

**Sent:** 19 June 2015 15:16

**To:** Peter Prior-Mills

**Cc:** Paul I Smith; Maria L Hutchinson; Sarah Hulse; Anne Allaker; Ibrahim Kizildag; Dave Ireland; Michelle Stevens

**Subject:** RE: CRO pilot branches

Hi Peter

Technically the branch cannot be in the next trading period when they press make good cheque as that clears the misbalance from the current trading period. The branch trading report will show the cheque value on it to make it balance. I would have thought it would be possible to redirect the branch around if the option is selected but I may be trying to spend next year's IT budget here.

Branches can clear losses from Local Suspense to cash immediately prior to rolling. That might be an option to add the make good cheque option here to enable the mandatory rem out to kick in at that point?

Cheers

Andy

---

**From:** Peter Prior-Mills

**Sent:** 19 June 2015 14:58

**To:** Andrew Winn

**Cc:** Paul I Smith; Maria L Hutchinson; Sarah Hulse; Anne Allaker; Ibrahim Kizildag; Dave Ireland; Michelle Stevens

**Subject:** RE: CRO pilot branches

Sorry Andy,

Our mails crossed over.

The CRO process is mandatory at balancing, this was always part of the requirements catalogue. The practice of remitting out cheques at this point and cutting the report off has always been in the guidance on HOL help to cover those branches where the postal despatch occurs before the end of day and additional cheque payments may occur prior to balancing.

Your suggested sequence hits a problem at TP rollover, as described by Jon Hulme:

Towards the end of the balancing process, the clerk can clear a loss from local suspense via product 6489 "Make good to cheque", which is recorded as a product 2 "Cheque". If this happens, the cheque is accepted, but will not appear on the subsequent Cheque Listing report since the stock unit is now in a new Trading Period. The report ignores cheques from the previous Trading Period.

All this is unchanged behaviour; what is different with the new Cheque Rem Out process is that because it doesn't appear on the report it cannot be remitted out using the automatic process.

Thus the "cheque" would be stuck in the old TP and the stock unit would be in the new TP.

If we look at the alternatives I am sure we can find a workable solution for the longer term, given that removing the manual entry of cheque value was one of the original objectives of the change I don't think leaving the old manual process on the system is a viable option.

Regards,



**Peter Prior-Mills**

Lean Consultant / Business Analyst

PO Box 634

Chichester,

PO19 9HJ

**GRO**

---

**From:** Andrew Winn

**Sent:** 19 June 2015 14:27

**To:** Peter Prior-Mills

**Cc:** Paul I Smith; Maria L Hutchinson; Sarah Hulse; Anne Allaker; Ibrahim Kizildag; Dave Ireland; Michelle Stevens

**Subject:** FW: CRO pilot branches

Hi Peter

Coming back into this a bit late but I strongly do not want branches recording things that have not happened i.e. make good cash with no cash added.

If as I've been told the new solution enforces any cheque values to be remmed out prior to branch trading then to my mind the make good cheque option remains valid:-

1. Branch goes through mandatory processes including remming out cheque holdings.
2. Proceeds to roll and chooses to make good loss by cheque.
3. Branch has cheque stock so is unable to roll.
4. Cheque is remmed out.
5. Branch then rolls with no discrepancy to resolve.

Puts another layer in for the branch but marginal extra effort and accounting is accurate – if they actually put a cheque in and despatch!

Again playing catch up but I'm not clear if the mandatory rem out applies to TP only or BPs as well. I think making BP remms mandatory would be a mistake and discourage branches from doing what is a recommended but optional process.

Andy

---

**From:** Paul I Smith

**Sent:** 19 June 2015 14:10

**To:** Andrew Winn

**Subject:** FW: CRO pilot branches

For info. We are looking for alternative ways to work already :S

Regards,



**Paul Smith**

Finance Analyst/B&PA Team1 Leader,  
Fire Precautions/FSC H&S/Car Parking  
Finance Service Centre

PO Ltd,  
No.1 Future Walk,  
Chesterfield,  
S49 1PF

GRO

GRO

---

**From:** Peter Prior-Mills  
**Sent:** 19 June 2015 13:46  
**To:** Sarah Hulse; Maria L Hutchinson; Paul I Smith; Ibrahim Kizildag  
**Cc:** Dave Ireland; Anne Allaker  
**Subject:** RE: CRO pilot branches

Thanks Sarah,

That sounds like a plausible solution to me, does anyone else have a view on this?

I know that Crowns and multiples are not currently allowed to settle to cheque in this way, so in a sense we would be standardising the approach across the network. Does anyone know if there are other necessary circumstances in which a branch would need to settle to cheque rather than to cash?

Regards,



**Peter Prior-Mills**

Lean Consultant / Business Analyst

PO Box 634  
Chichester,  
PO19 9HJ

GRO

---

**From:** Sarah Hulse  
**Sent:** 19 June 2015 13:40  
**To:** Peter Prior-Mills; Maria L Hutchinson; Paul I Smith; Ibrahim Kizildag  
**Cc:** Dave Ireland; Anne Allaker  
**Subject:** RE: CRO pilot branches

Hi

What about disabling the make good cheque function altogether and only have make good cash. If an office wishes to use a cheque, then they add this into adjust stock after balancing?...just a thought!

*Kind Regards*

Sarah Hulse

---

ESG Team NBSC Helpline,  
Ground Floor South Wing, Dearne House, Cortonwood Drive, S73 0UF

GRO

GRO

POST  
OFFICE

---

**From:** Peter Prior-Mills  
**Sent:** 19 June 2015 13:33  
**To:** Sarah Hulse; Maria L Hutchinson; Paul I Smith; Ibrahim Kizildag  
**Cc:** Dave Ireland; Anne Allaker  
**Subject:** FW: CRO pilot branches

Sorry, this extra update arrived just after I had sent the previous mail to you...

I guess we need to have a think about how this situation might best be handled in the future. We don't really want the old manual process left around permanently. Perhaps we should have a conference call next week once the pilot branches are live

Regards,



**Peter Prior-Mills**

Lean Consultant / Business Analyst

PO Box 634

Chichester,

PO19 9HJ

GRO

---

**From:** Hulme Jon [<mailto:Jon.Hulme@> GRO]  
**Sent:** 19 June 2015 13:26  
**To:** Peter Prior-Mills  
**Cc:** Dave Ireland; Holmes Alan; Kay Alastair  
**Subject:** RE: CRO pilot branches

So the "unwind" process would be to use the manual button to rem out . However this would lead to a negative value on the Cheque Listing report, and so they should also cut-off the report with the negative balance to get back to an all square position.

Of course, if they had accepted cheques in the new TP prior to doing this (quite likely), then similarly they are going to need to use manual buttons to Rem Out the correct amount, and then cut-off.

Kind regards,  
Jon

---

**From:** Hulme Jon  
**Sent:** 19 June 2015 13:12  
**To:** 'Peter Prior-Mills'  
**Cc:** Dave Ireland; Holmes Alan; Kay Alastair  
**Subject:** RE: CRO pilot branches

Hi Peter,

Yes, this is a good spot.

Towards the end of the balancing process, the clerk can clear a loss from local suspense via product 6489 "Make good to cheque", which is recorded as a product 2 "Cheque". If this happen, the cheque is accepted, but will not appear on the subsequent Cheque Listing report since the stock unit is now in a new Trading Period. The report ignores cheques from the previous Trading Period.

All this is unchanged behaviour; what is different with the new Cheque Rem Out process is that because it doesn't appear on the report it cannot be remitted out using the automatic process. The clerk would have to use the manual rem out button.

Having said all that, I'm not sure that Post Office allow branches to make good to cheque.

The options available to the clerk come from products that are part of product group 6480 (clear loss from local suspense). This group contains the product in question which is 6489 "Make good to cheque", but this product is disabled by default and so would not appear. I'm not sure which branches, if any, that Post Office enable this product in. That is a question for the POL Ref Data team.

Kind regards,  
Jon

---

**From:** Peter Prior-Mills (GRO)  
**Sent:** 19 June 2015 09:46  
**To:** Hulme Jon  
**Cc:** Dave Ireland  
**Subject:** FW: CRO pilot branches

Hi Jon,

Can you have a think about the point raised below and let me know if it looks like it may be an issue for us or not? If the situation is as described then we need to understand how to correctly unwind things for a branch.

Regards,



**Peter Prior-Mills**

Lean Consultant / Business Analyst

PO Box 634

Chichester,

PO19 9HJ

GRO

---

**From:** Sarah Hulse  
**Sent:** 18 June 2015 13:43  
**To:** Peter Prior-Mills  
**Cc:** Ibrahim Kizildag  
**Subject:** FW: CRO pilot branches

Good Afternoon Peter

I have thought of a possible issue following on from our meeting this morning

When a branch is balancing and making good a discrepancy, they have an option for making good by cheque. When this button is selected, it adds the cheque on to the cheque line. As far as I am aware this process doesn't also add the figure on to the cheque listing. I am thinking this may create a problem as branches will print or preview the cheque listing, not see the cheque and will try to adjust stock but the cheque will already be there.

*Kind Regards*

Sarah Hulse

---

ESG Team NBSC Helpline,  
Ground Floor South Wing, Dearne House, Cortonwood Drive, S73 0UF

GRO

GRO

POST  
OFFICE

---

**From:** ESG

**Sent:** 18 June 2015 13:28

**To:** Annette Caddick; Carole Clements; Irene Barnard; Kevin Jarosz; Louise Liptrott; Malcolm Laver; Paul J Mann; Paul X Taylor; Sarah Hulse; Sarah Swales

**Subject:** FW: CRO pilot branches

Please see attached.

Kind Regards

Annette Caddick | NBSC ESG

---

Dearne House, Cortonwood, Barnsley, S73 0UF

GRO

GRO

POST  
OFFICE

---

**From:** Ibrahim Kizildag

**Sent:** 18 June 2015 13:23

**To:** POL Core Info Management Team

**Cc:** ESG

**Subject:** FW: CRO pilot branches

Hi All;

Please see attached list, this is the pilot list for the new cheque remittances procedure.

Kind Regards;

Ibrahim Kizildag Team Leader

---

NBSC  
Dearne House  
Cortonwood Drive  
Brampton  
Barnsley  
S73 0UF  
Phone Number;

GRO

GRO

@

GRO

POST  
OFFICE

---

**From:** Peter Prior-Mills

**Sent:** 18 June 2015 12:39

**To:** Ibrahim Kizildag; Paul I Smith

**Cc:** Anne Allaker

**Subject:** CRO pilot branches

Please see attached list...

Regards,



**Peter Prior-Mills**

Lean Consultant / Business Analyst

PO Box 634

Chichester,

PO19 9HJ

**GRO**

\*\*\*\*\*

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: Finsbury Dials, 20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ.

\*\*\*\*\*

Unless otherwise stated, this email has been sent from Fujitsu Services Limited, from Fujitsu (FTS) Limited, or from Fujitsu Telecommunications Europe Limited, together "Fujitsu".

This email is only for the use of its intended recipient. Its contents are subject to a duty of confidence and may be privileged. Fujitsu does not guarantee that this email has not been intercepted and amended or that it is virus-free.

Fujitsu Services Limited, registered in England No 96056, registered office 22 Baker Street, London W1U 3BW.

Fujitsu (FTS) Limited, registered in England No 03808613, registered office 22 Baker Street, London W1U 3BW.

PFU Imaging Solutions Europe Limited, registered in England No 1578652, registered office Hayes Park Central, Hayes End Road, Hayes, Middlesex, UB4 8FE.

Fujitsu Telecommunications Europe Limited, registered in England No 2548187, registered office Solihull Parkway, Birmingham Business Park, Birmingham, B37 7YU.

\*\*\*\*\*

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: Finsbury Dials, 20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ.

\*\*\*\*\*