



Thomas Penny

From: Thomas Penny
Sent: 12 August 2008 17:44
To: Jenkins Gareth GI; Holmes Alan; Meek Steven; Sewell Peter (FEL01)
Subject: FW: Branch 141832 Craigpark

Attachments: View KEL dsed5628Q.htm; PC0152376.htm; PC0152421.htm

Hi All

Pete has asked me send a note to set up a meeting to discuss this issue.

Can everyone make 10.00, Thursday 14 August?

I've sought out relevant Peaks and KEL and attach.

Kind regards
Penny



View KEL d5628Q.htm (37 KB) PC0152376.htm (59 KB) PC0152421.htm (47 KB)

From: Sewell Peter (FEL01)
Sent: 12 August 2008 14:41
To: Holmes Alan; Thomas Penny
Subject: FW: Branch 141832 Craigpark

Alan
Can we set up a meeting please, Gareth has raised a potential issue with events which might require a change in our ARQ process.
See below, don't know if you are aware of thos already.

Pete

Pete Sewell
Security Operations Manager

Fujitsu Services Royal Mail Group Account

LOVELACE ROAD,
BRACKNELL,
BERKS
RG12 8SN

Tel:
Mobile
Fax



E-Mail [GRO](mailto:GRO@fujitsu.com)
Web <http://uk.fujitsu.com>

Fujitsu Services Registered in England no 96056,
Registered Office 22 Baker Street,
London W1U 3BW

This e-mail is only for the use of its intended recipient. Its contents are confidential and may be privileged. Fujitsu Services does not guarantee that this e-mail has not been intercepted and amended or that it is virus free.

From: Jenkins Gareth GI
Sent: 11 August 2008 15:15
To: Sewell Peter (FEL01)
Cc: Stewart Mike; Peach Mik
Subject: FW: Branch 141832 Craigpark

Pete,

Over the last couple of years we've had a couple of cases where EOD (which runs at 19:00) interferes with transactions being written at the counter. If this happens, then there is an Event written to the NT event Log.

Given we only have a couple of instances, and a fix is as likely to cause further problems, then we're reluctant to make a change to Horizon. However if Horizon data is being used in evidence for the prosecution of a Postmaster, it is probably wise to also check to see if any such events were produced during the period in question. Is this something that can / should be built into the ARQ process?

Regards

Gareth

Gareth Jenkins
Distinguished Engineer
Applications Architect
Royal Mail Group Account

FUJITSU
Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berkshire, RG12 8SN

Tel:
Mobile:
email:
Web:

<http://uk.fujitsu.com>

GRO



Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Fujitsu Services Limited, Registered in England no 96056, Registered Office 22 Baker Street, London, W1U 3BW

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

From: Jenkins Gareth GI
Sent: 11 August 2008 15:11
To: Peach Mik
Cc: Drake Claire; Card Cheryl; Chambers Anne O; Stewart Mike; Budworth John
Subject: RE: Branch 141832 Craigpark

Mik,

As discussed, I am still uneasy about this, but I agree that it is probably safer to leave things as they are.

I've discussed this with Mike and I'll mention this to Pete Sewell so that he can ensure that if we are providing evidence for an ARQ that we also check on relevant events.

Regards

Gareth

Gareth Jenkins
Distinguished Engineer
Applications Architect
Royal Mail Group Account

FUJITSU
Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berkshire, RG12 8SN

Tel:
Mobile:
email:
Web:

<http://uk.fujitsu.com>

GRO



Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Fujitsu Services Limited, Registered in England no 96056, Registered Office 22 Baker Street, London, W1U 3BW

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

From: Peach Mik
Sent: 11 August 2008 14:41
To: Jenkins Gareth GI
Cc: Drake Claire; Card Cheryl; Chambers Anne O; Stewart Mike; Budworth John
Subject: RE: Branch 141832 Craigpark

Gareth,

OK - I understand that you don't want this to be left un-fixed...

On the basis of the evidence that we have - there are 35 errors per week (inside the 7-8pm Wednesday window) and two in 35*52(weeks) = 1820 are known to have caused a discrepancy.

- a) SSC staff spending lots of time monitoring these events for 1-2 per year is simply not cost-effective
- b) Fixing the underlying problem of holding the "lock" for too long is feasible - from PC0152376 BUT
- c) I would want some assurance that making this change to the live estate, to resolve 2 reported issues, is NOT going to have a knock-on effect anywhere else....

I know that this is a difficult request - but I don't like changing Horizon at this stage - and I would like to be convinced that it is necessary, and that we wont make things worse..

Regards
Mik

Expanded

File

Call

Conference

Options

Peak Incident Management System

[back to detail](#)

[print](#)

Call Reference	PC0152376	Call Logger	_Customer Call_ -- EDSC
Release	Proposed For -- T80	Top Ref	82747
Call Type	Live use error	Priority	B -- Business restricted
Contact	EDSC	Call Status	Closed -- Avoidance Action Supplied
Target Date	10/01/2008	Effort (Man Days)	2.00
Summary	FAD005948 BM stock unit was rolled over it was forced to clear the local suspense account		
All References	Type	Value	
	TRIOLE for Service	82747	
	Clone Call	PC0152421	
	SSCKEL	KEL dsed5628Q	

Progress Narrative

Date:20-Dec-2007 12:35:19 User: _Customer Call_

CALL PC0152376 opened

Details entered are:-

Summary:Ibrahim from the NBSC has asked that an issue be i

Call Type:L

Call Priority:B

Target Release:T70

Routed to:EDSC - _Unassigned_

=====
Date/Time Raised: Dec 20 2007 11:53AM

Priority: B

Contact Name: Ibrahim_Kizildag - NBSC

Contact Phone: **GRO**

Originator: XXXXXX@TFS01

Originator's reference: 82747

Product Serial No:

Product Site: 005948
=====

Ibrahim from the NBSC has asked that an issue be investigated by our software team regarding discrepancies still showing when the MIS stock unit is rolled to clear the local suspense account.

Incident History:

2007-12-20 11:53:19 [Brooks, Katrina]

INIT : create a new request/incident/problem/change/issue

2007-12-20 12:01:32 [Brooks, Katrina]

LOG : The following information has been sent to me via Email from Ibrahim @ NBSC

On Wednesday 12/12 the BM stock unit had a gain of £465.73. As this stock unit rolled over it was forced to clear local suspense £1083.76- . The gain of £465.73 did not go to local suspense and is not included in the £1083.76-. This was not the last stock unit to roll over. The last stock unit to roll over was MIS at 10:20 on 13/12. This stock unit had no discrepancies. MIS is a

IRRELEVANT

12/08/2008

correction stock unit and was not inactive as it is rolled every BP.

The suspense account and final balances corroborate the above as the office has sent us copies.

The Trading statement agrees with the suspense account and that BM stock cleared suspense but did not send its gain to suspense. The Trading position line should always show zero. Under the BM stock column it shows £465.73-.

I have had a trial done on BM stock to see if this is showing the £465.73 but it is not.

2007-12-20 12:02:28 [Brooks, Katrina]

LOG : I contacted the PO to gain more details but the pm was on the other phone. I was asked to call back in 15 mins.

2007-12-20 12:04:59 [Brooks, Katrina]

LOG : Ibrahim stated that this might be the same issue for branch code 003020 (incident number 76918).

2007-12-20 12:25:58 [Brooks, Katrina]

LOG : I have spoken to the PM for more details:

SU - BM that has the problem

MISC SU is one they use to roll over the office.

User name JBA001

Have rolled into TP9

Node 1

2007-12-20 12:33:53 [Brooks, Katrina]

LOG : Ibrahim from the NBSC states that this might be related to Branch Code 003020 (76918) that I have sent back across for investigation.

2007-12-20 12:37:31 [Brooks, Katrina]

LOG : Can you please investigate as to why when the BM stock unit was rolled over it was forced to clear the local suspense account. This was not the last stock unit to be rolled over.

Thanks

2007-12-20 12:38:11 [Brooks, Katrina]

TR : Transfer 'group' from 'HSH7' to 'PEAK'

Date:20-Dec-2007 12:41:36 User:Lorraine Elliott

The call summary has been changed from:-

Ibrahim from the NBSC has asked that an issue be i

The call summary is now:-

FAD005948 BM stock unit was rolled over it was forced to clear the local suspense account

Date:20-Dec-2007 12:41:51 User:Lorraine Elliott

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

Date:20-Dec-2007 12:42:07 User:Lorraine Elliott

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: David Seddon

Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:21-Dec-2007 13:46:12 User:David Seddon
Cloning call so original can be passed to development for further investigation and clone can be passed to MSU for reconciliation purposes.

Date:21-Dec-2007 13:46:19 User:David Seddon
Call has been cloned to Call:PC0152421 by User:David Seddon

Date:21-Dec-2007 13:50:29 User:David Seddon
Evidence Added - 005948 - Complete Messagestore

Date:21-Dec-2007 13:51:13 User:David Seddon
Evidence Added - Subscription Groups

Date:21-Dec-2007 13:52:39 User:David Seddon
Evidence Added - 005948 Ctrl Event/Audit/TuneableTrace logs

Date:21-Dec-2007 14:55:20 User:David Seddon
[Start of Response]
Stockunit BM was being rolled over on counter 1 at the same time that the various EOD of day processes were being run in the background around 7pm. It was during the CABSPProcess that the following message was written to the audit log...

SU:fPostTxnsToLocalSuspense (:-1056374781) Timeout occurred waiting for lock. (0xC1090003) CreateMessageEx: RiposteCreateMessageEx call failed.

The messages that should have posted the £465.73 gain in stockunit BM to local suspense failed to be written. Consequently, when local suspense was cleared (written off to P&L in this case) the £465.73 wasn't taken into account and this resulted in the -£465.73 trading position seen on the Branch Trading Statement.

Routing call to development to investigate further and improve the error handling so that following the failure to write messages the system doesn't carry on regardless.

[End of Response]

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

Date:21-Dec-2007 15:01:22 User:David Seddon
[Start of Response]
It is not believed that there will be any ongoing impact of this problem at the branch and the branch is not personally out of pocket given that losses were written off to P&L. However, there is an impact on POLFS which will need to be corrected. The detail for this is contained in call PC0152421 which has been passed to the MSU for onward progression to POL.

[End of Response]

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

Date:21-Dec-2007 15:01:29 User:David Seddon
The Call record has been transferred to the team: QFP
Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:02-Jan-2008 08:29:51 User:Lionel Higman

IRRELEVANT

12/08/2008

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Mark Scardifield
Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:02-Jan-2008 09:51:02 User:Mark Scardifield

The Call record has been transferred to the team: EPOSS-Dev
The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Gerald Barnes
Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:02-Jan-2008 13:17:58 User:Gerald Barnes

Target Date/Time updated: new value is 10/01/2008 12:35
Development Cost updated: new cost is 2 (Man Days)

[Start of Response]

The fact that EPOSS code is not resilient to errors is endemic. There seems little point fixing it in this one particular case because there will be many others to catch you out. For example when I tried to balance with CABSPProcess running I found that declaring cash failed with the same sort of error message!

It may be worth passing on the general message to the HNGx team that in many cases code should always try and exit gracefully after an error and not just blunder on regardless.

This is a perfect example of why. Had the balancing code exited gracefully then if the user had tried again after CABSPProcess had finished working then all would have been well.

For the time being I propose a much cheaper solution than re-writing a lot of EPOSS error handling.

The problem is that because of a previous PEAK (PC0140715) CABSPProcess writes out messages atomically. It does a StartTransaction quite early on (which creates the lock), then initiates writing lots of transactions with CreateMessage and persistent objects with PutObject and finally really writes them with a call to EndTransaction (which ends the lock). If something else tries to write a transaction whilst CABSPProcess has things locked then it will time out after 10 seconds. Hence if CABSPProcess takes more than 10 seconds to run you could get this sort of problem. In this case CABSPProcess took 33 seconds to run which gives a significant window of opportunity for this sort of problem to occur. I suggest addressing this matter directly by having CABSPProcess store all that it wants to write out to a collection and then only really write it out at the very end. In this way the system will be locked for less than 10 seconds and there will be no possibility of this sort of problem.

FIX IMPACT

Complete Forecast Date and Development (man days) fields below this text box. Include a brief statement for each of the headings below these instructions. On return to Details window Set Target Release Type to "Proposed for" and Target Release to that proposed.

To the Developer:

- (1) Put yourself in the shoes of people downstream and provide information that they are likely to need to process this fix. eg the testing and rollout costs may add significantly to the COST of the fix
- (2) Check that the statements are still accurate post-implementation

IMPACT ON DEVELOPMENT:

Effort in mandays.

2 man days

There will be an expectation at RMF that this approximates to the timescale for

IRRELEVANT

12/08/2008

delivery so if there are reasons why this might not be the case please note them here.

IMPACT ON TEST:

What independent test coverage does development recommend?

This will often be about the level of regression testing required.

Just some independent tests that CABSPProcess is still producing the same results as before.

IMPACT ON USER:

Benefit of making the fix.

It will no longer matter if CABSPProcess is running when the user tries to do many sorts of different things, balancing included.

What does the user have to do to get this problem?

Do anything which involves writing a transaction whilst CABSPProcess is running (after 19:00) when CABSPProcess has sufficient work to do so that it takes more than 10 seconds to run (so probably on the larger offices).

How does it affect them when it occurs?

Whatever is being tried on the counter at this time can potentially fail.

IMPACT ON OPERATIONS:

Benefit of fix that may not visible to end user.

Less support calls.

RISKS (of releasing and of not releasing proposed fix):

What live problems will there be if we do not issue this fix?

Problems will continue to occur if the counter is being used whilst CABSPProcess is running in those cases when it takes more than 10 seconds to run.

What are the risks of this fix having unexpected interactions with other areas?

None.

Is this a high-risk area in which changes have caused problems in the past?

Yes. However the fix proposed is self contained and is considered unlikely to cause any problems.

Should we consider a pilot rollout and of what sort?

I think a pilot is well worth while in all cases. However as stated before I do not consider this a dangerous fix.

LIST OF LIKELY DELIVERABLES:

CABSPProcess

LIST OF THE ABOVE ALREADY DELIVERED FOR THE PROPOSED RELEASE:

None

LIST OF THE ABOVE ALREADY DELIVERED TO A RELEASE LATER THAN THAT PROPOSED:

None

IRRELEVANT

12/08/2008

LIST OF THE ABOVE LIKELY TO BE REDELIVERED INTO THE PROPOSED OR A LATER RELEASE:

None

ANYTHING ELSE THAT SHOULD BE KNOWN ABOUT THIS CHANGE:

Nothing

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 55 -- Pending -- Live Fix Impact Supplied

Date:02-Jan-2008 13:20:43 User:Gerald Barnes

The call Target Release has been moved to Proposed For -- T70

Date:02-Jan-2008 13:21:40 User:Gerald Barnes

[Start of Response]

I have put proposed for T70. However I think it really wants to be T80. There is no T80 option at the moment.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 55 -- Pending -- Live Fix Impact Supplied.

Date:02-Jan-2008 13:23:17 User:Gerald Barnes

The Call record has been transferred to the team: RelMngmntForum
Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:08-Jan-2008 15:19:29 User:John Boston

The call Target Release has been moved to Proposed For -- T80

Date:10-Jan-2008 14:31:17 User:Tyrone Cozens

[Start of Response]

Routing to EDSC for KEL and close.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 68 -- Final -- Administrative Response

Routing to Call Logger following Final Progress update.

Date:10-Jan-2008 14:39:30 User:Lorraine Elliott

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: David Seddon
Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:10-Jan-2008 15:58:49 User:David Seddon

Reference Added: SCKEL dsed5628Q

Date:10-Jan-2008 16:06:12 User:David Seddon

[Start of Response]

It has been decided that no fix will be carried out for the time being given the rarity of the problem. Should the problem become more prevalent then the need for a fix will be reviewed once again. In the meantime KEL dsed5628Q has been created to cover the problem.

With regard to this instance of the problem we have already passed details and corrective actions necessary on to Post Office Limited by means of a BIM issued by the MSU (PC0152421). Therefore no further action is necessary and this call

can simply be closed.
 [End of Response]
 Response code to call type L as Category 70 -- Final -- Avoidance Action Supplied
 Routing to Call Logger following Final Progress update.
 Service Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:10-Jan-2008 16:06:13 User:David Seddon
 CALL PC0152376 closed: Category 70 Type L

Date:10-Jan-2008 16:06:12 User:David Seddon
 Defect cause updated to 14 -- Development - Code

Date:10-Jan-2008 16:14:50 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	10-Jan-2008 16:14 -- Customer Call

[back to detail](#) [print](#)

Class: HORIZON
Title: Stockunit loss / gain not sent to local suspense
Summary: Stockunit loss / gain not sent to local suspense when stockunit was rolled during CABSPProcess
Raised by: Dave Seddon
Email: david.seddon@GRO
Raised on: 10/01/2008
Release: S70
Last updated: 01/08/2008
Last updated by: Anne Chambers
KEL type: Unresolved
System product: EPOSS
Branch code: None
Server name:
Keywords: local suspense suspense bts non zero
Status: Authorised
Visibility: Medium
Peak: PC0152376
TfS: 82747
Version: 4

Symptoms

When a stockunit was rolled over at 7pm the loss/gain for that stockunit was not sent to local suspense and consequently when local suspense was cleared this loss/gain was not included. The value of this loss/gain was shown on the trading position line on the branch trading statement which would always be zero if there was no problem.

In the counter application event log the following pair of events were written at 7pm in between events that showed the CABSPProcess was running...

Source: Riposte

Text: An unexpected error occurred while attempting to modify an entry in the run map. Timeout occurred waiting for lock.

Source: EPOSSStockUnit

Text: Warning Messaeg: Unexpected error executing fPostTxnsToLocalSuspense - see audit log for details.

In the counter audit log the following was written at the time...

SU:fPostTxnsToLocalSuspense (:-1056374781) Timeout occurred waiting for lock. (0xC1090003) CreateMessageEx: RiposteCreateMessageEx call failed.

Problem

IRRELEVANT

12/08/2008

The problem is that because of a previous Peak, PC0140715, CABSPProcess writes out messages atomically. It does a StartTransaction quite early on (which creates the lock), then initiates writing lots of transactions with CreateMessage and persistent objects with PutObject and finally really writes them with a call to EndTransaction (which ends the lock). If something else tries to write a transaction whilst CABSPProcess has things locked then it will time out after 10 seconds. Hence if CABSPProcess takes more than 10 seconds to run you could get this sort of problem. In the first case seen, PC0152376, the CABSPProcess took 33 seconds to run which gave a significant window of opportunity for this sort of problem to occur.

Note: The CABSPProcess only runs on the gateway counter so the problems seen will not occur on slave counters.

Solution

No fix planned for Horizon given the relative rarity of the problem. However, should the problem start occurring more often then the need for a fix should be reviewed. Add any cases to list below.

MSU will need to be informed of what has gone wrong and what we believe needs to be done to correct matters. We need to look at impact on counter as well as the impact on POLFS. See PC0152421 as an example of what was done in one particular case but be aware that corrective actions in particular will not always be the same and these will need to be looked at on a case by case basis.

List of cases seen...

Date Peak Reference

12/12/2007 PC0152376 - problem with local suspense
05/03/2008 PC0155120 - DEF did not rollover auto with the Office
27/12/2007 PC158102 - problem with local suspense

Evidence

Event log Audit log Messagstore

Other versions of this HORIZON KEL:

Version 2 (Deprecated)

Version 3 (Deprecated)

Expanded

File

Call

Conference

Options

Peak Incident Management System

Call Reference	PC0152421	Call Logger	David Seddon -- EDSC
Release	Reported In -- T70	Top Ref	82747
Call Type	Cloned call	Priority	B -- Progress stopped
Contact	David Seddon	Call Status	Closed -- Administrative Response
Target Date	24/12/2007	Effort (Man Days)	0
Summary	FAD005948 BM stock unit was rolled over it was forced to clear the local suspense account		
All References	Type	Value	
	TRIOLE for Service	82747	
	Clone Master	PC0152376	

Progress Narrative

Date:21-Dec-2007 13:46:19 User:David Seddon
 CALL PC0152421 opened
 Details entered are:-
 Summary:FAD005948 BM stock unit was rolled over it was forced to clear the local suspense account
 Call Type:C
 Call Priority:B
 Target Release:T70
 Routed to:EDSC - David Seddon

Date:20-Dec-2007 12:35:19 User:_Customer Call_
 CALL PC0152376 opened
 Details entered are:-
 Summary:Ibrahim from the NBSC has asked that an issue be i
 Call Type:L
 Call Priority:B
 Target Release:T70
 Routed to:EDSC - _Unassigned_

 Date/Time Raised: Dec 20 2007 11:53AM
 Priority: B
 Contact Name: Ibrahim Kizildag - NBSC
 Contact Phone:
 Originator: XXXXXX@TFS01
 Originator's reference: 82747
 Product Serial No:
 Product Site: 005948

Ibrahim from the NBSC has asked that an issue be investigated by our software team regarding discrepancies still showing when the MIS stock unit is rolled to clear the local suspense account.

 Incident History:

 2007-12-20 11:53:19 [Brooks, Katrina]
 INIT : create a new request/incident/problem/change/issue

2007-12-20 12:01:32 [Brooks, Katrina]

LOG : The following information has been sent to me via Email from Ibrahim @ NBSC

On Wednesday 12/12 the BM stock unit had a gain of £465.73. As this stock unit rolled over it was forced to clear local suspense £1083.76- . The gain of £465.73 did not go to local suspense and is not included in the £1083.76-. This was not the last stock unit to roll over. The last stock unit to roll over was MIS at 10:20 on 13/12. This stock unit had no discrepancies. MIS is a correction stock unit and was not inactive as it is rolled every BP.

The suspense account and final balances corroborate the above as the office has sent us copies.

The Trading statement agrees with the suspense account and that BM stock cleared suspense but did not send its gain to suspense. The Trading position line should always show zero. Under the BM stock column it shows £465.73-.

I have had a trial done on BM stock to see if this is showing the £465.73 but it is not.

2007-12-20 12:02:28 [Brooks, Katrina]

LOG : I contacted the PO to gain more details but the pm was on the other phone. I was asked to call back in 15 mins.

2007-12-20 12:04:59 [Brooks, Katrina]

LOG : Ibrahim stated that this might be the same issue for branch code 003020 (incident number 76918).

2007-12-20 12:25:58 [Brooks, Katrina]

LOG : I have spoken to the PM for more details:

SU - BM that has the problem

MISC SU is one they use to roll over the office.

User name JBA001

Have rolled into TP9

Node 1

2007-12-20 12:33:53 [Brooks, Katrina]

LOG : Ibrahim from the NBSC states that this might be related to Branch Code 003020 (76918) that I have sent back across for investigation.

2007-12-20 12:37:31 [Brooks, Katrina]

LOG : Can you please investigate as to why when the BM stock unit was rolled over it was forced to clear the local suspense account. This was not the last stock unit to be rolled over.

Thanks

2007-12-20 12:38:11 [Brooks, Katrina]

TR : Transfer 'group' from 'HSH7' to 'PEAK'

Date:20-Dec-2007 12:41:36 User:Lorraine Elliott

The call summary has been changed from:-

Ibrahim from the NBSC has asked that an issue be i

The call summary is now:-

FAD005948 BM stock unit was rolled over it was forced to clear the local suspense account

IRRELEVANT

12/08/2008

Date:20-Dec-2007 12:41:51 User:Lorraine Elliott
Product EPOSS & DeskTop -- Counter Common (version unspecified) added.

Date:20-Dec-2007 12:42:07 User:Lorraine Elliott
The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: David Seddon
Progress was delivered to Provider

Date:21-Dec-2007 13:46:12 User:David Seddon
Cloning call so original can be passed to development for further investigation
and clone can be passed to MSU for reconcilation purposes.

Date:21-Dec-2007 13:46:19 User:David Seddon
Call cloned from original call:PC0152376 by User:David Seddon

Date:21-Dec-2007 13:46:31 User:David Seddon
The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Anne Chambers

Date:21-Dec-2007 14:44:26 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

Local suspense had to be cleared from stock unit BM because it was the last
active stock unit (MIS had not been rolled over, but was marked as inactive
because it hadn't been used during the balance period).

The stock unit was being balanced at 7pm at night, and, at the point where the
stock unit gain should have been written to local suspense, there was some
contention with the End Of Day processes which were running in the background,
and the messages were not written.

This is very unusual (we have never seen it before, and it is not an area that
has changed recently). A call PC0152376 has been sent to development to
investigate why this happened and how it can be avoided in future.

At the branch, the loss for TP 8 was £465.73 bigger than it should have been.
The loss (£1083.76) was written off to P&L. As I understand it, this means the
branch is not personally out of pocket, and there is no need to attempt to
correct anything at the branch. The BTS shows a trading position of -£465.73.

There is no carried forward impact on the branch accounts from this problem.

There is however an impact on POLFS, since £465.73 (the gain which wasn't
shifted to local suspense and then cleared) is still held in article Z064 /
account 539590. I think this needs to be moved (journalised?) to write-off P&L
article AABQ / account 250503.

MSU, please inform POL of this problem via BIMS. I'm happy to discuss further
or provide additional information, for example the BTS, if required.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type C as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under
Investigation

Date:21-Dec-2007 14:45:14 User:Anne Chambers
The Call record has been transferred to the team: MSU-Indt Mgt

Date:03-Jan-2008 12:04:28 User:Claire Drake
[Start of Response]

Thank you Anne. Final BIMS issued to POL. Leaving call open for 24 hours in case of any further queries from Jane Smith et al.
[End of Response]
Response code to call type C as Category 68 -- Final -- Administrative Response
Routing to Call Logger following Final Progress update.

Date:03-Jan-2008 13:52:15 User:David Seddon
Defect cause updated to 7 : Design - High Level Design

Date:03-Jan-2008 13:52:18 User:David Seddon
CALL PC0152421 closed: Category 68 Type C

Root Cause	Design - High Level Design
Logger	David Seddon -- EDSC
Subject Product	EPOSS & DeskTop -- Counter Common (version unspecified)
Assignee	David Seddon -- EDSC
Last Progress	03-Jan-2008 13:52 -- David Seddon

[back to detail](#)[print](#)