

Export

Peak Incident Management System

Call Reference	PC0197797	Call Logger	Customer Call -- EDSC
Release	Reported In -- HNG-X 01.00	Top Ref	2240422
Call Type	HNG-X Data Centre Raised Incidents/Defects	Priority	B -- Progress Stopped
Contact	EDSC	Call Status	Closed -- Fixed at Future Release
Target Date	18/04/2010	Effort (Man Days)	0
Summary	Several HNGX branches - Local Suspense errors		
All References	Type	Value	
	TRIOLE for Service	2240422	
	Clone Call	PC0198077	
	DevIntRel-Director	ITU SV&I	
Collections	Name	User	Date
	PrescanCounter	Lorraine Elliott	15-Apr-2010 14:18:19

Progress Narrative

Date:15-Apr-2010 14:14:56 User:_Customer Call_

CALL PC0197797 opened
Details entered are:-
Summary:Ibrahim @ NBSC has reported... On 14/03/2010 office carri...
Call Type:J
Call Priority:B
Target Release:HNG-X 01.00
Routed to:EDSC - _Unassigned_

Date:15-Apr-2010 14:14:56 User:_Customer Call_

=====

INCIDENT MANAGEMENT
Date/Time Raised: Apr 15 2010 2:07PM
Priority: B
Contact Name: Ibrahim @ NBSC
Contact Phone: GRO
Originator: XXXXXX@TFS01
Originator's reference: 2240422
Product Serial No:
Product Site: 351217

=====

Ibrahim @ NBSC has reported...

On 14/03/2010 office carried out Trading Period balance for period 12. The spmr balanced AA and ended up with a discrepancy of £167.17.

Incident History:

2010-04-15 14:07:56 [White, Martin]
INIT : create a new request/incident/problem/change/issue

2010-04-15 14:11:16 [White, Martin]
zneun_en_rmg : Open Notification

2010-04-15 14:11:39 [White, Martin]
LOG : Office is on Horizon On Line.

On 14/03/2010 office carried out Trading Period balance for period 12. The spmr balanced AA and ended up with a discrepancy of £167.17. The was cleared from local suspense as normal and the spmr selected to make good cash. At this point the system printed out a final balance report for TP12 with the cash figure amended and nil discrepancy. Normally the system would then come up with a message to confirm rollover, but instead went back to the screen asking how the discrepancy was going to be made good. Again the spmr selected cash and this time a final balance report showing TP01 was produced, again showing nil discrepancy but the cash figure had risen by £167.17. All the rest of the transactions in receipts and payments were still showing. The spmr says that again instead of allowing him to confirm the rollover, it again went back to the screen asking how the discrepancy was to be made good. Again cash was selected and another final balance report produce, this time with the cash figure showing £334.34 more cash than it should have done. At this point the spmr managed to get out of the screen (he cannot remember how).

2010-04-15 14:11:48 [White, Martin]
FLD : FIELD='zcbflag' OLD='NO' NEW='YES'

2010-04-15 14:11:53 [White, Martin]
LOG : On logging on 15/04/2010 the spmr produced a balance snapshot that showed nil discrepancy and again the inflated cash figure. The spmr had logged a couple of incidents with NBSC, and was referred to HSD, reference 2238224. The spmr was bounced back to NBSC as a balancing error rather than a system problem.

2010-04-15 14:12:48 [White, Martin]
LOG : Can this issue be investigated further and the office contacted about dealing with the issue raised. The office is currently

in Trading Period 01, balance period 01 and are open to the public. The spmr is called Robin, and the contact number is 01572 823301.

2010-04-15 14:13:06 [White, Martin]
LOG : Branch - Uppingham SPSO
FAD - 351217
Date - 14/03/2010
Stock unit - AA
User - RBR002
Node 3
Value £167.17

2010-04-15 14:13:23 [White, Martin]
LOG : Can you please investigate this problem? NBSC second line completed their investigation and they cannot find a user error.

2010-04-15 14:13:59 [White, Martin]
zneut_en_rmg : Transfer Notification

2010-04-15 14:14:00 [White, Martin]
TR : Transfer group from '' to 'PEAK'

Date:15-Apr-2010 14:17:58 User:Lorraine Elliott

The call summary has been changed from:-
Ibrahim @ NBSC has reported... On 14/03/2010 office carri...
The call summary is now:-
FAD351217 discrepancy of £167.17

Date:15-Apr-2010 14:18:08 User:Lorraine Elliott

Product EPOSS & DeskTop -- Counter Common (version unspecified) added.

Date:19-Apr-2010 17:27:46 User:Anne Chambers

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Anne Chambers
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:19-Apr-2010 17:30:56 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]
I think that the date of the problem was 14th April, not 14th March as recorded above - if it is April, I stand some chance of finding some useful evidence...
[End of Response]
Response code to call type J as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:21-Apr-2010 10:18:57 User: Customer Call_

The date is supposed to be 14/04/10

NBSC has just advised that another office had a similar problem, although the discrepancy has now been sorted out. Details of the site and problem are below for information...

Office - Hucclecote SPSO
FAD - 186523
Date - 15/04/2010
Stock unit - OOH
Office rolling from TP12 to TP01

Office was dealing with the discrepancy in the office following the TP rollover, and selected settle centrally. The office reports that nothing happened and they ended up doing this a further 2 times before they could proceed. This has resulted in the office settling the loss centrally 3 times. This showed as such as the total on the final balance. The Trading Statement and suspense account seemed to be correct though. On Monday 19th April the office reported they showed a cash gain of double the original loss and after further investigation a suspense account was produced that showed 2 clear loss from local suspense entries. We have now cleared this by clearing gain from local suspense, which should clear the gain in the office.

Date:22-Apr-2010 11:26:12 User: Customer Call_

The solution we thought we had for Hucclecote SPSO, FAD 186523, has not resolved the problem, but has actually doubled the discrepancy. The original figures in suspense were clear loss from local suspense in OOH su of £998.81 which was the original loss in the for the branch and this shows twice. We have entered a clear gain from local suspense but has doubled the discrepancy that was showing on AA su from £1997.62 to £3995.24.

Date:22-Apr-2010 11:27:14 User: Customer Call_

We have now also got a similar issue with Kingsbury Road SPSO, FAD 277201, who also had problems when clearing a gain of £235.52 from the trading period balance done on 15/04/2010 in OOH su. They have ended up now with 3 clear gain from local suspense entries on the suspense account for £235.52 from 15/04/2010 on OOH su. The office reports again they had problems when pressing the assign to nominee icon and ended up pressing it several times to get the rollover complete. The suspense account and Trading Statement from the 15/04/2010 show correct. This office reports there does not seem to be any related cash discrepancy in the branch.

Date:22-Apr-2010 12:31:14 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]
Looking first at 351217 Uppingham...14 Apr, counter 3, SU AA. Times UTC

17:08 Print trial balance report. Shows net loss £167.17

17:14 Final balance report
Cash 60834.12
Receipts section: Short Resolved 167.17
Payments section: Short Transferred 167.17

17:15 Final balance report
Cash 61001.29
Receipts section: Short Resolved 334.34
Payments section: Short Transferred 167.17

17:19 Final balance report
Cash 61168.46
Receipts section: Short Resolved 501.51
Payments section: Short Transferred 167.17

Checking on BRDB, I can see three pairs of 'Clear loss from LS' / cash.

The balance report saved for reprint is the correct one (produced at 17:14).
The Suspense account and BTS are correct, and only show the single LS clearance.

The cash figure for the next period in the opening balance table is 60834.12 (again as on the correct balance report) - does this mean there is no long term effect on the branch figures? I suspect though there will be an effect within POLFS and they may need to make some adjustment between the Cleared from LS account and cash.

Investigations continue.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type J as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date: **22-Apr-2010 13:05:15** User: **Anne Chambers**

[Start of Response]

The two extra LS clearances, and their cash settlement, are in the new TP/BP - so there will be a knock-on effect at the branch. NBSC tried to clear Hucclecote SPSO, FAD 186523, via Housekeeping, which seems sensible, but apparently it hasn't worked as expected. I'll look at that branch too.

I can't yet see anything obvious in the counter logs to indicate why the system apparently went back to the wrong screen twice and forced them to clear LS again.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type J as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date: **22-Apr-2010 14:13:22** User: **Anne Chambers**

[Start of Response]

I'm going to clone this call and send the clone to development for investigation of the underlying cause, while keeping the original call to work out what needs to be done to get the branches straight.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type J as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date: **22-Apr-2010 14:13:26** User: **Anne Chambers**

Call has been cloned to Call: PC0198077 by User: Anne Chambers

Date: **22-Apr-2010 17:36:42** User: **Anne Chambers**

[Start of Response]

PC0198077 sent to development.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type J as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date: **23-Apr-2010 10:24:27** User: **Anne Chambers**

[Start of Response]

Branches covered so far by this call:

351217
186523
277201

Also branch 203418 - more details on PC0197769

And I have heard that 164205 is also affected - but no open call at the moment.

I may try to see if I can spot any others.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type J as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date: **23-Apr-2010 10:26:25** User: **Anne Chambers**

[Start of Response]

Peak for 203418 is actually PC0198066.
[End of Response]
Response code to call type J as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:23-Apr-2010 11:01:44 User:Anne Chambers
The call summary has been changed from:-
FAD351217 discrepancy of £167.17
The call summary is now:-
Several HNGX branches - Local Suspense errors

Date:27-Apr-2010 17:35:29 User:Anne Chambers
[Start of Response]
186523 Hucclecote:
I think the solution applied at this branch should resolve the effects of this problem. In stock unit AA, the Clear Gain from LS, which automatically settled to cash, is causing a discrepancy of +1997.62.

To sort out the effects of the problem fully, when rolling AA into the next TP, move the gain of £1997.62 from AA to local suspense. Then when rolling over the final stock unit, Clear loss from LS, settling Assign to Nominee.

This will negate the amount which has already incorrectly been posted to the Assign to Nominee account.

BUT AA is currently showing a discrepancy of around £3990, not £1997.62. This extra gain first showed on Monday 19th April (or possibly Sat 17th?)

When cash was declared for AA at the end of Saturday 17th trading, there was a gain of just over £1000. They redeclared, reducing the declaration by £1000 exactly.
At the end of Monday 19th trading the variance was £1952.32. I can understand why they thought this must be connected with the £1997.62, but it isn't.

[End of Response]
Response code to call type J as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:27-Apr-2010 17:41:34 User:Anne Chambers
[Start of Response]
Passing call back to IMT - can you send the update about Hucclecote to Ibrahim please? I have not contacted the branch but they may need some help trying to identify the cause of the additional gain. I can't see anything out of the ordinary and it isn't connected with the system problem.

I am still looking at other branches which were affected by the same problem, and will put together a spreadsheet to show the amounts etc involved.

I'm happy to discuss with Ibrahim if necessary.
[End of Response]
Response code to call type J as Category 95 -- Final -- Advice after Investigation
Routing to Call Logger following Final Progress update.
Service Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:27-Apr-2010 17:41:34 User:Anne Chambers
CALL PC0197797 closed: Category 95 Type J

Date:27-Apr-2010 17:41:34 User:Anne Chambers
Defect cause updated to 14 -- Development - Code

Date:28-Apr-2010 08:13:15 User:_Customer Call_
Consumer XXXXXX@TFS01 has acknowledged the call closure

Date:28-Apr-2010 13:43:08 User:_Customer Call_
CALL PC0197797 reopened by _Customer Call_

Date:28-Apr-2010 13:43:08 User:_Customer Call_
Ibrahim @ NBSC has reported...

On 14/03/2010 office carried out Trading Period balance for period 12. The spmr balanced AA and ended up with a discrepancy of £167.17.

Incident History:

2010-04-15 14:07:56 [White, Martin]
INIT : create a new request/incident/problem/change/issue

2010-04-15 14:11:16 [White, Martin]
zneun_en_rmg : Open Notification

2010-04-15 14:11:39 [White, Martin]
LOG : Office is on Horizon On Line.

On 14/03/2010 office carried out Trading Period balance for period 12. The spmr balanced AA and ended up with a discrepancy of £167.17. The was cleared from local suspense as normal and the spmr selected to make good cash. At this point the system printed out a final balance report for TP12 with the cash figure amended and nil discrepancy. Normally the system would then come up with a message to confirm rollover, but instead went back to the screen asking how the discrepancy was going to be made good. Again the spmr selected cash and this time a final balance report showing TP01 was produced, again showing nil discrepancy but the cash figure had risen by £167.17. All the rest of the transactions in receipts and payments were still showing. The spmr says that again instead of allowing him to confirm the rollover, it again went back to the screen asking how the discrepancy was to be made good. Again cash was selected and another final balance report produce, this time with the cash figure showing £334.34 more cash than it should have done. At this point the spmr managed to get out of the screen (he cannot remember how).

2010-04-15 14:11:48 [White, Martin]
FLD : FIELD='zcbflag' OLD='NO' NEW='YES'

2010-04-15 14:11:53 [White, Martin]
LOG : On logging on 15/04/2010 the spmr produced a balance snapshot that showed nil discrepancy and again the inflated cash figure. The spmr had logged a couple of incidents with NBSC, and was referred to HSD, reference 2238224. The spmr was bounced back to NBSC as a balancing error rather than a system problem.

2010-04-15 14:12:48 [White, Martin]
LOG : Can this issue be investigated further and the office contacted about dealing with the issue raised. The office is currently in Trading Period 01, balance period 01 and are open to the public. The spmr is called Robin, and the contact number is [IRRELEVANT]
[IRRELEVANT]

2010-04-15 14:13:06 [White, Martin]
LOG : Branch - Uppinghom SPSO
FAD - 351217
Date - 14/03/2010
Stock unit - AA
User - RBR002
Node 3
Value £167.17

2010-04-15 14:13:23 [White, Martin]
LOG : Can you please investigate this problem? NBSC second line completed their investigation and they cannot find a user error.

2010-04-15 14:13:59 [White, Martin]
zneut_en_rmg : Transfer Notification

2010-04-15 14:14:00 [White, Martin]
TR : Transfer group from '' to 'PEAK'

2010-04-15 14:15:30 [White, Martin]
LOG : NBSC ref. H22764154

2010-04-15 14:15:42 [POWebService, 01]
zneun_en_rmg : Open Notification

2010-04-15 14:15:42 [POWebService, 01]
ST : Status changed from 'New' to 'Open'

2010-04-15 14:15:44 [OTI]
OTIACKINFO : Provider Ref: PC0197797

2010-04-19 17:28:39 [OTI]
OTIPSTU : Update by Anne Chambers:Call routed to Team:EDSC Member:Anne Chambers

2010-04-19 17:32:05 [OTI]
OTIPSTU : Update by Anne Chambers:Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation:I think that the date of the problem was 14th April, not 14th March as recorded above - if it is April, I stand some chance of finding some useful evidence...

2010-04-21 10:13:31 [White, Martin]
OTIADD : The date is supposed to be 14/04/10

NBSC has just advised that another office had a similar problem, although the discrepancy has now been sorted out. Details of the site and problem are below for information...

Office - Hucclecote SPSO
FAD - 186523
Date - 15/04/2010
Stock unit - OOH
Office rolling from TP12 to TP01

Office was dealing with the discrepancy in the office following the TP rollover, and selected settle centrally. The office reports that nothing happened and they ended up doing this a further 2 times before they could proceed. This has resulted in the office settling the loss centrally 3 times. This showed as such as the total on the final balance. The Trading Statement and suspense account seemed to be correct though. On Monday 19th April the office reported they showed a cash gain of double the original loss and after further investigation a suspense account was produced that showed 2 clear loss from local suspense entries. We have now cleared this by clearing gain from local suspense, which should clear the gain in the office.

2010-04-22 11:24:27 [White, Martin]
OTIADD : The solution we thought we had for Hucclecote SPSO, FAD 186523, has not resolved the problem, but has actually doubled the discrepancy. The original figures in suspense were clear loss from local suspense in OOH su of £998.81 which was the original loss in the for the branch and this shows twice. We have entered a clear gain from local suspense but has doubled the discrepancy that was showing on AA su from £1997.62 to £3995.24.

2010-04-22 11:25:27 [White, Martin]
OTIADD : We have now also got a similar issue with Kingsbury Road SPSO, FAD 277201, who also had problems when clearing a gain of

£235.52 from the trading period balance done on 15/04/2010 in OOH su. They have ended up now with 3 clear gain from local suspense entries on the suspense account for £235.52 from 15/04/2010 on OOH su. The office reports again they had problems when pressing the assign to nominee icon and ended up pressing it several times to get the rollover complete. The suspense account and Trading Statement from the 15/04/2010 show correct. This office reports there does not seem to be any related cash discrepancy in the branch.

2010-04-22 12:32:18 [OTI]

OTIPSTU : Update by Anne Chambers:Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation:Looking first at 351217 Uppingham...14 Apr, counter 3, SU AA. Times UTC

17:08 Print trial balance report. Shows net loss £167.17

17:14 Final balance report

Cash 60834.12

Receipts section:Short Resolved 167.17

Payments section: Short Transferred 167.17

17:15 Final balance report

Cash 61001.29

Receipts section:Short Resolved 334.34

Payments section: Short Transferred 167.17

17:19 Final balance report

Cash 61168.46

Receipts section:Short Resolved 501.51

Payments section: Short Transferred 167.17

Checking on BRDB, I can see three pairs of 'Clear loss from LS'/ cash.

The balance report saved for reprint is the correct one (produced at 17:14).

The Suspense account and BTS are correct, and only show the single LS clearance.

The cash figure for the next period in the opening_balance table is 60834.12 (again as on the correct balance report) - does this mean there is no long term effect on the branch figures? I suspect though there will be an effect within POLFS and they may need to make some adjustment between the Cleared from LS account and cash.

Investigations continue.

2010-

04-22 13:06:03 [OTI]

OTIPSTU : Update by Anne Chambers:Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation:The two extra LS clearances, and their cash settlement, are in the new TP/BP - so there will be a knock-on effect at the branch. NBSC tried to clear Hucclecote SPSO, FAD 186523, via Housekeeping, which seems sensible, but apparently it hasn't worked as expected. I'll look at that branch too.

I can't yet see anything obvious in the counter logs to indicate why the system apparently went back to the wrong screen twice and forced them to clear LS again.

2010-04-22 14:14:22 [OTI]

OTIPSTU : Update by Anne Chambers:Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation:I'm going to clone this call and send the clone to development for investigation of the underlying cause, while keeping the original call to work out what needs to be done to get the branches straight.

2010-04-22 17:37:37 [OTI]

OTIPSTU : Update by Anne Chambers:Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation:PC0198077 sent to development.

2010-04-23 10:25:16 [OTI]

OTIPSTU : Update by Anne Chambers:Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation:Branches covered so far by this call:

351217

186523

277201

Also branch 203418 - more details on PC0197769

And I have heard that 164205 is also affected - but no open call at the moment.

I may try to see if I can spot any others.

2010-04-23 10:27:26 [OTI]

OTIPSTU : Update by Anne Chambers:Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation:Peak for 203418 is actually PC0198066.

2010-04-27 17:36:07 [OTI]

OTIPSTU : Update by Anne Chambers:Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation:186523 Hucclecote:

I think the solution applied at this branch should resolve the effects of this problem. In stock unit AA, the Clear Gain from LS, which automatically settled to cash, is causing a discrepancy of +1997.62.

To sort out the effects of the problem fully, when rolling AA into the next TP, move the gain of £1997.62 from AA to local suspense. Then when rolling over the final stock unit, Clear loss from LS, settling Assign to Nominee.

This will negate the amount which has already incorrectly been posted to the Assign to Nominee account.

BUT AA is currently showing a discrepancy of around £3990, not £1997.62. This extra gain first showed on Monday 19th April (or possibly Sat 17th?)

When cash was declared for AA at the end of Saturday 17th trading, there was a gain of just over £1000. They redeclared, reducing the declaration by £1000 exactly.

At the end of Monday 19th trading the variance was £1952.32. I can understand why they thought this must be connected with the £1997.62, but it isn't.

2010-04-27 17:42:38 [OTI]

OTIRES : Provider Ref: PC0197797

Resolution Details: Update by Anne Chambers:Category 95 -- Final -- Advice after Investigation:Passing call back to IMT - can you send the update about Hucclecote to Ibrahim please? I have not contacted the branch but they may need some help trying to identify

the cause of the additional gain. I can't see anything out of the ordinary and it isn't connected with the system problem.

I am still looking at other branches which were affected by the same problem, and will put together a spreadsheet to show the amounts etc involved.

I'm happy to discuss with Ibrahim if necessary.

2010-04-27 17:42:38 [POWebService, 01]
RE : Status changed from 'Open' to 'Resolved'

2010-04-27 17:42:38 [POWebService, 01]
zneur_en_rmg : Resolution Notification

2010-04-28 08:11:56 [Thind, Sukhdeep]
zneut_en_rmg : Transfer Notification

2010-04-28 08:11:56 [Thind, Sukhdeep]
TR : Transfer group from 'PEAK' to 'HSD IMT'

2010-04-28 13:42:07 [White, Martin]
TR : Transfer group from 'HSD IMT' to 'PEAK'

2010-04-28 13:42:07 [White, Martin]
ST : Status changed from 'Resolved' to 'Work In Progress'

2010-04-28 13:42:07 [White, Martin]
zneut_en_rmg : Transfer Notification

Date:28-Apr-2010 13:43:09 User:Customer Call_
Please assign to Anne Chambers as agreed.

Date:28-Apr-2010 14:43:11 User:Lorraine Elliott
The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Anne Chambers
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:28-Apr-2010 17:39:06 User:Anne Chambers
[Start of Response]

There was an intermittent system problem which affected some branches completing TP rollovers between 7th and 15th April. The problem is understood; it is no longer happening and the root cause is being addressed.

When the last stock unit was rolled over, the branch cleared Local Suspense and pressed Confirm to complete the stock unit rollover. They were then returned to the screen asking how the discrepancy was to be cleared. If they again selected an option, this wrote another transaction pair to clear local suspense (this time in the new Trading Period).

33 branches have been affected by this problem, clearing local suspense between 1 and 4 times in the new period.

The attached spreadsheet shows the branches, the amounts and the settlement product used for clearance.

In general, if they clear Local Suspense at the end of the current period using the same method (e.g. Assign to Nominee, Cash) as they used last period, there will be no lasting effect. The problem will not cause them a discrepancy (though it may look as if it has done so) and the Assign to Nominee etc accounts in POLFS will be correct.

For branches where it is currently causing a cash discrepancy, where they cleared LS to cash (make good), this could be resolved immediately by using the Housekeeping function to clear losses / gains from LS.

Where branches chose more than one settlement option while going round the loop (marked in blue on the spreadsheet), they should use the Housekeeping function before the next TP rollover, to clear the loss/gain from LS that was settled to cash. Then the remainder should be settled to Assign to Nominee or whatever during the TP rollover. If they have a new loss/gain and this is not the appropriate settlement product, they may need additional help.

MSU, please pass this information to Post Office with the attached spreadsheet. Please let POL know that NBSC have already been involved with some of the branches (certainly those highlighted in yellow) - Ibrahim raised this call in the first place and has already been sent an update about Hucclecote.

[End of Response]
Response code to call type J as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:28-Apr-2010 18:24:03 User:Anne Chambers
Evidence Added - Spreadsheet of affected branches

Date:28-Apr-2010 18:24:16 User:Anne Chambers
The Call record has been transferred to the team: MSU-Indt Mgt
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:29-Apr-2010 14:33:51 User:Joanne Ball
Thanks.

Final BIMS issued to POL.

Returning call to SSC for closure.

Date:29-Apr-2010 14:34:00 User:Joanne Ball

The Call record has been transferred to the team: EDSC
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:30-Apr-2010 09:07:32 User:Anne Chambers

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Anne Chambers
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:30-Apr-2010 09:17:32 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

Information about all branches affected by this problem has been sent to POL via BIMS - I have told them that NBSC have already been involved with some of the branches.

PC0198077 is with development for further investigation / fix (though the root cause is almost certainly a known problem, which is no longer happening and which will be fixed at a future release.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type J as Category 74 -- Final -- Fixed at Future Release

Routing to Call Logger following Final Progress update.

Service Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:30-Apr-2010 09:17:32 User:Anne Chambers

CALL PC0197797 closed: Category 74 Type J

Date:30-Apr-2010 11:19:17 User:_Customer Call_

Consumer XXXXXX@TFS01 has acknowledged the call closure

Root Cause

Development - Code

Logger

Customer Call -- EDSC

Subject Product

EPOSS & DeskTop -- Counter Common (version unspecified)

Assignee

Customer Call -- EDSC

Last Progress

30-Apr-2010 11:19 -- _Customer Call_