

Message

From: Rodric Williams [REDACTED] **GRO**
on behalf of Rodric Williams [REDACTED] **GRO**
Sent: 06/02/2018 16:56:54
To: Paul Loraine [REDACTED] **GRO**
CC: Matthews, Gavin [REDACTED] **GRO** Andrew Parsons
Subject: FW: Post Office Limited - Update
Attachments: CCRC-#2078925-v1-CCRC_review_-_Seema_Misra_-_selected_entries_from_transaction_logs_.XLS

Paul – please see the latest email for the CCRC below.

As we have discussed, can you please prepare a draft response for me, engaging your other colleagues as may be appropriate given your imminent departure.

Thanks, Rod

From: TrentM [REDACTED] **GRO**
Sent: 05 February 2018 12:53
To: Rodric Williams [REDACTED] **GRO**
Subject: RE: Post Office Limited - Update

Dear Rodric,

I hope you are well. I write further to our very useful telephone conversation on 12/01/2018. I think you were going to send me a follow-up email after that (a written reply to my email of 05/12/2017 below), but I haven't received anything yet. I'd be grateful if you could send, when you get a chance.

In the meantime, I have some additional queries which I'd be grateful for your help on. Having been through the transaction logs for the Misra case, there are a number of transactions which we would like POL to comment upon. I have attached to this email some spreadsheets which illustrate the transactions in question (if you don't have the relevant original transaction logs easily accessible, let me know and I can send those too).

Firstly, and on a more general note, the Misra transaction logs contain a number of instances where there are two transactions for exactly the same amount at the same time and date. The possibility has been discussed that one of the two entries might be a 'duplicate' which did not in fact occur. However, the CCRC observes that almost all of the identified examples relate to transactions where cash was being placed into pouches and then remitted back to POL. On the assumption that only 1 pouch was in fact remitted back to POL, the CCRC has considered whether this scenario could cause a shortfall in the branch in question on an audit of the cash held. So, for example:

If a duplicate remittance of a cash pouch was recorded in Horizon as two £5,000 transactions (this would be recorded in the transaction log as two negative entries of £5,000), POL would have expected to receive two pouches of £5,000. If POL in fact only received one pouch, then the SPMR would be expected to have a pouch of £5,000 in branch.

The question arises as to whether this scenario produces a £5,000 shortfall in the branch. The CCRC's understanding is that it does not. If an audit of the branch took place at that time, the expectation would be that both sums of money have left the branch, and so there would be a shortfall of cash in branch. The CCRC's understanding is that if POL were expecting two pouches in the above scenario and only received one, POL would issue a Transaction Correction for £5,000. If the SPMR accepted such a Transaction Correction, there would then be a shortfall in the branch accounts.

Q1. Can you let us know whether or not you consider our above analysis to be correct?

Q2. Sheet 1 of the attachment to this email (at lines 50-55) contains two identical entries for £10,000 cash remittances. They are both made up of the same component parts (sums of £8000 and £2000), are both entered at exactly the same time 12:26 and 17 seconds on 27/09/2007, and both have the same transaction ID number. We have not been able to identify a Transaction Correction in the log which corresponds to these two entries. Please can POL comment on:

a) Whether the component entries for £8000 and £2000 relate to denominations of banknote? Is the CCRC correct in its understanding that there were 400 x £20 notes and 200 x £10 notes in each of these entries?
b) How it is that both of the entries for £10,000 occur at the same time and have the same transaction ID? Is it possible for separate transactions to have the same transaction ID?
c) Does POL retain any records of either or both of these £10,000 cash pouches being scanned in as received by POL?
d) In all of the circumstances, might this be an example of a computer-generated 'duplicate'? Or does POL consider that these were indeed separate transactions and separate sums of money?

Q3. Sheet 2 of the attachment to this email (at lines 42-46) contains two identical entries for remittances into the branch of foreign exchange, each valued at £7,806.15. Both entries are timed at 10:03 and 6 seconds on 12 June 2007. Please can POL comment on:

- a) The foreign exchange relates to a remittance of Euros. The CCRC understands that £7,806.15 would have amounted to approximately 11,570 Euros in June 2007 (on an exchange rate of 0.67). Does POL consider there is anything out of the ordinary about a Forex remittance in an uneven amount of this kind?
- b) Is there any way of POL being confident that there were in fact two deliveries of foreign exchange in this amount at the same date and time or, in all of the circumstances, might this be an example of a computer-generated 'duplicate'?

Q4. Sheets 1 and 3 of the attachment to this email contain examples of transaction corrections for relatively large sums of money.

- a) On sheet 1 (at line 60) there is a TC for £19,260, and on sheet 3 (at line 98) there is a TC for £27,000. For each of these TC's can POL please confirm whether the branch was being told, "the cash that you have sent to POL is short by this amount", or alternatively "the cash that you have sent to POL is x amount too much"?
- b) On sheet 3 (at lines 88-91) there are also two TCs for £15,000 which appear to cancel each other out. Can POL explain what was happening in those TCs?

Many thanks for your help with this. Please let me know if it would help to discuss any part of this email.

Kind regards,

Miles

Miles Trent
Case Review Manager
Criminal Cases Review Commission
Tel GRO

From: TrentM
Sent: 20 December 2017 15:15
To: 'Rodric Williams'
Subject: FW: Post Office Limited - Update

Dear Rodric,

I hope you are well. This is just a quick message, further to my below email.

I am on leave after today (back in on 2nd Jan), but could we pick up on matters early in the New Year? It would be good if we could arrange the Fujitsu visit at some point in January or early February.

I hope you have a good Christmas and New Year.

Kind regards,

Miles

Miles Trent
Case Review Manager
Criminal Cases Review Commission

Tel: **GRO**

From: TrentM
Sent: 05 December 2017 13:25
To: 'Rodric Williams'
Subject: RE: Post Office Limited - Update

Dear Rodric,

Sorry for the delay getting back to you on the below. I had planned to reply much sooner, but it has been a hectic period at this end. I have now had a chance to discuss the various points with my CCRC colleagues, and we can respond as follows:

1. Grant Thornton questions

We note that the reports are no longer available. As matters stand we do not wish to attempt to recreate the reports using codes from the transaction data, thank you.

In discussion with Grant Thornton, however, two other questions have emerged which I don't think you and I have discussed before -

- i. [Arising from paragraph 1.6 of GT's questions document – copy re-attached for your reference] If we were to provide details of a specific transaction correction would POL be able to provide contemporaneous supporting evidence that was provided to the SPMR at the time the transaction correction was issued? (we recognise that in Ms Misra's case the transaction corrections would be approximately 12 years ago – could you confirm how long such supporting evidence is retained?)
- ii. POL's written reply to GT's questions referred a number of times to event codes, but there are no event codes on the copy of the Misra branch Event Log that we have (see attached extract). Is any other data available in connection with the Misra Event Log? – i.e. might a version exist which does display the event codes?

2. KEL

Thanks for looking into this. We understand what you say, and that it appears that it will be difficult to search for / identify issues in the KEL which might have related to Ms Misra's branch. However, in the interests of completeness, we would like to take you up on your offer of having supervised access to the KEL at Fujitsu's premises (with an appropriate non-disclosure agreement in place). This is because a number of the written submissions which we have received in these cases have made reference to the KEL, and we believe that a visit to view the KEL will help us to better understand the nature of the database and, in broad terms, how it works. A better informed understanding of the KEL will inevitably help the CCRC when pulling together our reasoning / making decisions in these cases. Would it possible to arrange a visit for some time in January?

3. Misra – docs AM08 and AM09

Thank you for the better quality versions of these, which I have forwarded to Grant Thornton. Obviously, if typed versions become available that would be even better, many thanks.

4. Other live points

Transaction logs – Noted, many thanks for this information.

Later applications – Thanks for the confirmation. On a connected issue, we have recently begun work on two new applications: Hutchings (our ref 00660/2017) and O'Connell (our ref 00761/2017). I understand that section 17 notices have recently been sent out to you on those cases. As confirmed before, we don't need POL to carry out an extensive trawl for electronic files/drives on these newer applications, although we will need the investigations and prosecution files to be preserved. In addition, the CRM on those two cases has asked whether the core prosecution files and any mediation materials could be added to the data room for those two cases. Would that cause particular difficulties? I'm happy to discuss this further.

5. Report by Jonathan Swift QC

Many thanks for this, and for your explanation of the relevant chronology. At present we would like to make follow-up requests for materials arising out of paragraphs 108 and 111 of Mr Swift QC's report, namely:

- i. Any advice(s) received from counsel (whether from Brian Altman QC or another) about "*whether the bringing of a charge without sufficient evidence to provide a realistic prospect of conviction could be said, under the criminal law, to cast doubt upon the safety of the conviction of a defendant who has pleaded guilty*"
- ii. Paragraph 111 states "...*We have seen the detailed legal advice provided by Brian Altman QC, dated 31 October 2013, on this topic and asked POL for a formal letter explaining how it was responding to the recommendations made by Mr Altman QC. POL provided us that letter on 18 December 2015, along with a detailed Prosecution Policy for England and Wales which is to be submitted to the Board for approval on 22 January 2016.*" We have previously been provided with Mr Altman QC's advice dated 15 October 2013 (attached). Is that the same advice, or is there a second document? If so we would be grateful to obtain a copy. We would also like to obtain copies of the other documents referred to at paragraph 111.

I will arrange for S17 notices to go out to you this week in connection with the Swift QC advice and the other documents arising. We also note that S25 CAA 1995 is invoked in relation to all of these documents.

Thanks for your continued help on these cases. Please let me know if it would help to discuss any part of this email.

Kind regards,

Miles

Miles Trent
Case Review Manager
Criminal Cases Review Commission
Tel: GRO

From: Rodric Williams GRO
Sent: 15 November 2017 17:02
To: TrentM
Subject: RE: Post Office Limited - Update

Dear Miles

I provide an update on the various points below.

1. Grant Thornton questions

For 1.3.2 and 1.8, the reports are no longer available and do not appear in the prosecution files against Misra. It may be possible to recreate these reports using the codes from the transaction data. If you want us to try to do this, please let me know and we will have a more detailed look into this with Fujitsu to see what it involves and whether it can be done.

For 1.9 regarding the bank totals receipts, these were not in the prosecution files, and the branch was only required to retain them for 2 years. Bank of Ireland would have had these originally, but given the length of time that has passed we consider it unlikely that they would still have them. These figures are not available on Horizon data as this is not part of the accounting process for balancing the ATM on Horizon. Essentially, the primary figures for the ATM balance on Horizon are: starting cash (which is via a Rem in or transfer in), daily dispensed figures, retracts/ transaction failures, and cash on hand.

2. KEL

We have asked Fujitsu whether it is possible to address your follow up request, but there are a number of issues which make this complex and potentially not possible. The KEL is not a document but a live database, and it cannot be downloaded or printed, and so could only be inspected at Fujitsu's premises rather than provided separately. The KEL is

also not recorded on a branch-by-branch basis and therefore any information about Misra (if any exists) is not readily accessible/identifiable, if it is accessible/identifiable at all.

As mentioned above, the KEL is a live and evolving database, so even if there are any potentially relevant entries, they may no longer be held. The date range you have mentioned is also very wide and old (more than 12 years ago) and we are informed this data has been archived and has therefore lost its context and may not be complete. Fujitsu has also told us that since the data is not recorded by branch, there is no easy way of analysing the data either by branch or by type, and this is made more challenging where data has been archived, as it would have been with the date range you have mentioned.

Fujitsu is nonetheless happy to let you have supervised access to the KEL at its premises provided an appropriate Non-Disclosure Agreement is in place. Please let me know if you would like to do this and we will make arrangements with Fujitsu.

3. Misra

On the back of your request we went back to the substantial original files and specifically searched for AM08 and AM09. These files were located in the data room as having already been uploaded, and we hold the originals. We attach further scans which are slightly better than those originally supplied, although the originals are clearer still. To enable you to have legible copies, we are copy typing them and are happy to make the originals available for inspection at Womble Bond Dickinson's offices in Bristol.

4. Other live points

Transaction logs - The JSONs are not shown in the Session IDs or Transaction IDs. The session ID is not based on JSON, so any gaps in session ID does not imply any gap in JSONs. Typically where Fujitsu submit data in support of a prosecution, it is in the form of an Excel spreadsheet which often has a sheet labelled "Summary" and then one or more sheets containing transaction data. Fujitsu informs us that the completeness of the sequence of JSONs for each ARQ is confirmed on the Summary sheet in the spreadsheet.

The data that Fujitsu provide in the ARQ spreadsheets to support a prosecution shows what has been done at the terminals in a branch for a given period and any other data from the audit log would be supplementary.

The JSONs are not intended for use by the branch and the data is therefore not available to the branch.

Broughton/McDonald – thank you for confirming.

8 later applications – we have asked POL Security/RMG and Cartwright King to retain any further files that may be identified.

5. Additional point re 04/03/2016 letter from Post Office Limited Chairman, Tim Parker

The review undertaken by Jonathan Swift QC and Christopher Knight was undertaken directly for Post Office's (then incoming) Chairman, who on taking office wanted an independent assessment of what Post Office had done to date in response to the postmaster/Horizon challenges so that he could determine whether any further action should be taken.

I attach a copy of the report, which as you will see made 8 recommendations.

Work was commissioned on all 8 of the Review's recommendation. While some of that work was relatively straightforward (for example Bond Dickinson LLP produced a report on recommendation 7), a significant portion of it has been complex and time consuming. The Review work also commenced before the Group Litigation began, such that work on it effectively stopped for the purposes of the Review, but is being undertaken in connection with the Group Litigation (for example Deloitte's work on the audit store and suspense accounts, which is ongoing).

If there are any materials arising out of the Swift Report that you would like to see, please let me know. I would also be grateful if you could please send me a s.17 request in respect of those materials, and also for the attached Review. Please treat this email as formal notice under s.25 of the Criminal Appeal Act 1995 that the Review, and any documents arising out of it which you may now request, should not be disclosed without our prior consent.

I hope this has been helpful. As ever, I am happy to discuss this further as you may require.

Kind regards, Rodric



Rodric Williams
Head of Legal - Dispute Resolution & Brand
20 Finsbury Street
London EC2Y 9AQ
T: [REDACTED] GRO
E: [REDACTED] GRO

From: TrentM [REDACTED] GRO
Sent: 29 September 2017 15:48
To: Rodric Williams [REDACTED] GRO
Subject: RE: Post Office Limited - Update

Dear Rodric,

Further to our telephone conversation on Tuesday, I write with a further update on some of the points below.

1. Grant Thornton questions

I have supplied Grant Thornton with POL's written reply. I haven't heard any detailed feedback as yet, but they have expressed an interest in the point that you and I discussed briefly on Tuesday, namely, are the reports/documents which are referred to in the written reply (e.g. paragraphs 1.3.2, 1.8 and 1.9) still available for Ms Misra's indictment period and post office branch (June 2005-January 2008 at West Byfleet). Or, if the original reports are not, could they be reconstructed from source data now? I raise this point for information at the moment, as I intend to discuss it further with Grant Thornton in the coming weeks.

2. KEL

Thanks for the information on this. I'm afraid we have a follow up query – is it possible to search for KELs dating from the time of Ms Misra's indictment period? If so, we would be grateful if we could be provided with / given access to all KELs raised or updated in the period June 2005-January 2008. In making this request we remain mindful of paragraph 50(4) of the Post Office's Defence and Counterclaim to the Group Action. However, we believe that this KEL data - if still in existence – is information which we will need to review before we can resolve the applications to the CCRC.

3. Misra

Many thanks for the information on opening hours, and for AM10. We will wait to hear further regarding AM08 and AM09, thanks.

4. Other live points

- We will wait to hear further regarding transaction logs, thanks.
- Regarding the Broughton/McDonald document, we have now discussed at this end. In view of the significant technical difficulties you are facing, we have decided to attempt to address the relevant issues in that case using other documents at our disposal. As matters stand, therefore, efforts to retrieve this document can be suspended. We will let you know if we need to revisit the issue later in our review.
- Regarding electronic documents in the more recent 8 applications to the CCRC, we have now discussed at this end. All that we require for the time being is confirmation that the investigation and prosecution files for those cases (be they in hard copy or electronic) are preserved and will not be destroyed. Does that save POL some of the electronic trawl / extraction exercise you refer to? If I have misunderstood this point in any way, I'm happy to discuss on the phone.

5. Additional point re 04/03/2016 letter from Post Office Limited Chairman, Tim Parker.

In the course of our enquiries we have used S17 CAA 1995 to secure material from UKGI (formally Dept for BIS). Among the materials was the attached letter from Tim Parker to Baroness Neville-Rolfe, dated 4 March 2016. Mr Parker refers to an internal review undertaken with the assistance of Jonathan Swift QC and Christopher Knight or counsel. I don't recall having read about this review before (unless I am missing something?), and would be grateful for further information on this, including any report(s) ultimately produced. Could we discuss when you have a moment? Point of interest to our review might include:

- Reference to taking advice from counsel on the over-charging argument (Theft / False accounting) – bottom of page 2.
- Reference to potential for analysis of transaction logs - second paragraph on page 3.
- The instruction of independent experts to examine "unmatched balances in Post Office's general suspense account" etc – bottom of page 3.

Many thanks for your help.

Kind regards,

Miles

Miles Trent
Case Review Manager
Criminal Cases Review Commission
Tel: GRO

From: Rodric Williams **GRO**
Sent: 24 September 2017 23:27
To: TrentM
Subject: Post Office Limited - Update

Dear Miles,

Further to our recent communications, including our telephone conversation on 22 September 2017, I provide in this email a general update on the status of various live matters concerning your investigation. I hope it is useful and please do let me know if there is anything you want to follow up.

1. Grant Thornton questions

Please find attached our response to Grant Thornton's questions, which we hope is of some assistance. Please treat our response as confidential, and ensure that it is not disclosed without our prior consent to anyone other than the Grant Thornton team assisting the CCRC's investigations. To the extent Grant Thornton have follow-up questions, we are of course happy to help with those.

2. KEL

We have now received answers from Fujitsu to your questions on the KEL. Your questions are in black and Fujistu's responses are in red below.

- Paragraph 50(4) of the defence refers to the KEL as a "document" in the singular, am I right in thinking it exists as a single document rather than multiple different logs? The KEL is a single database which changes with new KELs being added, changed, and removed on a regular basis.
- In terms of scale, in your email of 13/11/2016 you referred to "thousands of entries" and "voluminous entries" in the KEL, is it possible to say how many pages the document runs to? Fujitsu has confirmed that the KEL currently runs to 3973 KELs.
- In your email of 13/11/2016 you stated: "We have asked Fujitsu for some random examples of these entries, and will provide these to you in due course". I don't think we have received any examples to date. I would be grateful if we could see some sample pages, as this would give us a clearer idea of the kind of information the KEL contains, and whether further analysis of the document is likely to be of any relevance to our review. Examples copied at the bottom of this email.

3. MISRA

My records suggest there were two outstanding points on Misra: (1) can POL confirm the opening hours for the indictment period (2005-2008)?; and (2) are there any further Branch Trading Statements for Misra other than December 2007-January 2008?

On point 1, please see the attached "Office Transfer" document dated 15 June 2005 which shows that the opening hours were stated as being 9am-5.30pm Monday to Friday and 9am-1pm on Saturday.

On point 2, we have located on the data room the attached list of exhibits and statements. This list refers to branch trading statements covering the following periods: (1) November 2006-December 2006 (Exhibit AM08); (2) May 2007-June 2007 (Exhibit AM09); and (3) November 2007-December 2007 (AM10). I see from past correspondence that you already have access to the BTS covering December 2007 to January 2008.

We have located AM08, AM09 and AM10 on the data room (please see attached) but unfortunately only one of the three documents – AM10 – is legible. We are making enquiries to track down better quality versions of AM08 and AM09 and will let you know as soon as we have any news on this.

4. OTHER LIVE POINTS

- Your queries on transaction logs are currently with Fujitsu and we will update you as soon as we have a response.
- Broughton /McDonald document – technical issues are still preventing us from accessing the relevant EFC. We appreciate this issue has been live for some time. Please be assured we are still trying to gain access to the document, but the difficulties we are experiencing are an unfortunate consequence of trying to retrieve historic documentation.
- A search has been carried out for hard copy documents relating to Rubbina Shaheen and I can now confirm that Post Office does not hold any hard copy files for this case. Electronic materials for this case are already available on the data room.
- You will see from the attached tracker that we have completed our document collation process (subject to your thoughts on the point below) but we will, of course keep the position under review. To the extent we become aware of further documents on any of the cases, we will make those documents available to you on the data room.
- With respect to electronic documents generally, you may recall that the original extraction of electronic documents was done in and around June/July 2015. Since that extraction was carried out, 8 further applications have been made to the CCRC: Hedges, Holmes, Trousdale, Shaheen, Joshi, Owen, Parekh and Warren. The original extraction included a large volume of electronic documents relating to these 8 further cases, which information has already been made available to you on the data room. Given this, and our understanding that your current focus is on the earlier cases, we had not proposed to undertake a further exercise of seeking to identify (and if relevant extracting) any additional electronic files/drives for these newer cases. Please however let us know if you would like us to take a different approach.

I trust this has been helpful. We remain available to discuss any aspect of this with you further as you may require.

Kind regards, Rodric

PM is getting a system error when trying to produce a despatch report

A despatch report has not been produced and cut off daily so the number of records that are meant to appear in it have grown to the point that the counter is unable to process them.

Symptoms

The PM is unable to print or preview a despatch report as a system error is reported to them sometime after pressing the print or preview button.
On Counter: M02000025, SystemError - Error Code: 0291 (or 0993) has occurred.

Problem

A despatch report has not been produced and cut off daily so the number of records that are supposed to appear in the report are growing by the day. The message log on the counter shows that these have been retained at the counter but it would seem that the counter business application is unable to process them given that a java.lang.OutOfMemoryError error is logged at the time.

Solution

[M025](#) [S025](#) [S025](#)

The problem is caused by the office not following the Post Office procedure for not producing a cut off despatch report on a regular basis. The business system is working as per agreed design.

SAC:
SAC: resolving the issue by 11/03/2016. Then close the incident as "User error" so that it is referred back to SAC as a business issue during monthly reporting.

Customer Reporting Team (CRT): should review OutOfMemoryError incidents caused during despatch report printing as these cut off errors be investigated as code caused by individual offices.

Evidence

PostOfficeCounterLog

1. More details

REB: type: [Information](#)
Title: [PM is getting a system error when trying to produce a despatch report](#)
Summary: [A despatch report has not been produced and cut off daily so the number of records that are meant to appear in it have grown to the point that the counter is unable to process them](#)
Released: by Dave Seddon on 20/03/2016
Last updated: by Steve Parker on 28/03/2016
Releases: [M025](#)
System products: [CustomerReporting](#)
Additional Search Words: [despatch](#) [despatch not working](#) [Printing](#) [0291](#) [0993](#)
Status: [Authorised](#)
Visibility: [Medium](#)
PMID: [PC02000025](#)
SAC FRS: [T2153996](#)
Version: [1.0](#)

Other versions of this REB:

Version 1.7 (Depreciated) by Lisa King on 02/03/2016

[View Changes](#)

Version 1.6 (Depreciated) by Steve Parker on 02/03/2016

[View Changes](#)

Version 1.5 (Depreciated) by Steve Parker on 20/03/2016

[View Changes](#)

PM states that AE1 transaction keeps registering as a zero value which is unexpected

As part of the transaction the PM is asked if transaction is zero value and if they select Yes a zero value is registered.

Symptoms

PM is carrying out an AE1 transaction, namely a S&P transaction. But they have stated that it keeps being registered as a zero value transaction. They are expected & to be registered as a E110 transaction.

Problem

As part of the transaction the PM is asked if the transaction is zero value and is given the option to select Yes or No. If Yes is selected the transaction is registered as being zero value, which is what happened in this instance. If No is selected the PM is asked to enter the amount displayed on the barcode label. Note that at the end of the transaction the PM is asked to confirm that the amount of the transaction matches the price from the label. Then pressed Continue rather than using their to correct the amount.

Solution

[M025](#) [S025](#) [S025](#)

When asked if the transaction is zero value the PM must correctly select Yes or No.

1. More details

REB: type: [Information](#)
Title: [PM states that AE1 transaction keeps registering as a zero value which is unexpected](#)
Summary: [As part of the transaction the PM is asked if transaction is zero value and if they select Yes a zero value is registered.](#)
Released: by Dave Seddon on 20/03/2016
Last updated: on 20/03/2016
Releases: [M025](#)
System products: [PM05-Counter\(327\)](#)
Additional Search Words: [S&P](#) [Barcode](#) [AE1](#)
Status: [Authorised](#)
Visibility: [Medium](#)
PMID: [PC02000025](#)
SAC FRS: [A100000254](#)
Version: [1](#)

IOException URL: Error in postcodeanywhere service																															
IOException URL: Error in postcodeanywhere service - Error in postcodeanywhere service																															
Symptoms																															
URL: /error/postcodeanywhere/service/mvc/home/error/error.jsp please review carefully.																															
Server Status: UNKNOWN Status of Documentation: DOCUMENTED Severity: Critical																															
Alert level: 1 (Major) - Error in postcodeanywhere service - [2008-07-20 10:09:30] - Error during postcodeanywhere service - [2008-07-20 10:09:30] - Check logs for detail esp application.log Alert level: 3 (Moderate) - Error in postcodeanywhere service - [2008-07-20 10:09:30] - Error during postcodeanywhere service - [2008-07-20 10:09:30] - Check logs for detail esp application.log Alert level: 5 (Low) - Error in postcodeanywhere service - [2008-07-20 10:09:30] - Error during postcodeanywhere service - [2008-07-20 10:09:30] - Check logs for detail esp application.log Alert level: 7 (Info) - Error in postcodeanywhere service - [2008-07-20 10:09:30] - Error during postcodeanywhere service - [2008-07-20 10:09:30] - Check logs for detail esp application.log Alert level: 9 (Debug) - Error in postcodeanywhere service - [2008-07-20 10:09:30] - Error during postcodeanywhere service - [2008-07-20 10:09:30] - Check logs for detail esp application.log Alert level: 11 (Trace) - Error in postcodeanywhere service - [2008-07-20 10:09:30] - Error during postcodeanywhere service - [2008-07-20 10:09:30] - Check logs for detail esp application.log																															
Problem																															
This alert is issued when 2008 unable to connect to postcodeanywhere service. The reasons could be either postcodeanywhere is down or slower response than normal or internal transient issue has forced reconnections. Probably See: Open issue																															
Solution																															
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Access</td> <td>Sync</td> <td>SSC</td> </tr> </table> SSNC Address Please check whether the PostCodeAnywhere service is under maintenance or otherwise having issues. If the PostCodeAnywhere service is confirmed as up and the errors are continuing then: For Alert level 2 and 3: Review if IP is used with 2008, and follow normal escalation protocol of testing. See also T7554-04202027505 For Alert level 2, 3 and 5 Look for a clear event which will be as highlighted below, shows alert 3 and 4 trigger together correctly. If clear alert found ignore. If no clear alert issue a P0 and inform 2008 and follow normal escalation protocol of testing. Clear Alerts: Postcodeanywhere service is unavailable - 0.0000353009 is measured 0.0000353009 is measured - 0.00 - For alert 5: Alert 0.0000353009, please follow R001, access 1.8.3982 in Release. For more info refer T7554-042089075741.339719334C39777240		Access	Sync	SSC																											
Access	Sync	SSC																													
Evidence																															
Error Text: Data, Error, Server Name																															
4. More details																															
<table border="1"> <tr> <th>Key: Type</th> <th>Information</th> </tr> <tr> <td>URLs:</td> <td>2008 received URL: Error in postcodeanywhere service</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Timestamp:</td> <td>2008-07-20 10:09:30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Remarks:</td> <td>by Admin Review on 2008-07-20 10:09:30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Last updated:</td> <td>by Admin Review on 2008-07-20 10:09:30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source:</td> <td>2008</td> </tr> <tr> <td>System product:</td> <td>Color Line Reference Code (2008)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Source version:</td> <td>UNKNOWN</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Additional Search Keys for URL: Error in postcodeanywhere, URL, Check log, See</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Actions:</td> <td>Authorized</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Workability:</td> <td>Normal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>External:</td> <td>WebSphere supports beans outside J2EE</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WAM:</td> <td>9023344660</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TPS:</td> <td>891396209</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Workbox:</td> <td>S</td> </tr> </table> Other instances of this URL: Version 4 (Depreciated) by Aman Sharma on 24/08/2018 View Changes Version 3 (Depreciated) by Mark Wright on 02/07/2018 View Changes Version 2 (Depreciated) by Romana Review on 27/05/2018 View Changes Version 1 (Depreciated) by Aman Sharma on 24/08/2018 View Changes		Key: Type	Information	URLs:	2008 received URL: Error in postcodeanywhere service	Timestamp:	2008-07-20 10:09:30	Remarks:	by Admin Review on 2008-07-20 10:09:30	Last updated:	by Admin Review on 2008-07-20 10:09:30	Source:	2008	System product:	Color Line Reference Code (2008)	Source version:	UNKNOWN	Additional Search Keys for URL: Error in postcodeanywhere, URL, Check log, See		Actions:	Authorized	Workability:	Normal	External:	WebSphere supports beans outside J2EE	WAM:	9023344660	TPS:	891396209	Workbox:	S
Key: Type	Information																														
URLs:	2008 received URL: Error in postcodeanywhere service																														
Timestamp:	2008-07-20 10:09:30																														
Remarks:	by Admin Review on 2008-07-20 10:09:30																														
Last updated:	by Admin Review on 2008-07-20 10:09:30																														
Source:	2008																														
System product:	Color Line Reference Code (2008)																														
Source version:	UNKNOWN																														
Additional Search Keys for URL: Error in postcodeanywhere, URL, Check log, See																															
Actions:	Authorized																														
Workability:	Normal																														
External:	WebSphere supports beans outside J2EE																														
WAM:	9023344660																														
TPS:	891396209																														
Workbox:	S																														



2017 Winner of the Global Postal Award for Customer Experience

Rodric Williams

Head of Legal - Dispute Resolution & Brand
20 Finsbury Street

London EC2Y 9AQ
To: GRO
Ee: 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

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security cloud service.

For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

The Criminal Cases Review Commission

5 St Philip's Place

Birmingham

B3 2PW

Telephone: GRO

Fax: GRO

The information contained in this e-mail and any files transmitted with it is confidential and is intended for the use of the person(s) or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or any action taken in reliance on it is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please return it immediately to the sender by replying to it and then delete the message from your computer.

We may monitor the content of e-mails sent and received via our network for the purposes of ensuring compliance with policies and procedures.

Viruses: Although we have taken steps to ensure that this e-mail and attachments are free from any virus we advise that in keeping with good computing practice the recipient should ensure they are actually virus free.

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

The Criminal Cases Review Commission

5 St Philip's Place

Birmingham

B3 2PW

Telephone: GRO

Fax: GRO

The information contained in this e-mail and any files transmitted with it is confidential and is intended for the use of the person(s) or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication, any disclosure, copying, distribution, or any action taken in reliance on it is prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please return it immediately to the sender by replying to it and then delete the message from your computer.

We may monitor the content of e-mails sent and received via our network for the purposes of ensuring compliance with policies and procedures.

Viruses: Although we have taken steps to ensure that this e-mail and attachments are free from any virus we advise that in keeping with good computing practice the recipient should ensure they are actually virus free.