

Message

From: clive.read [GRO]
Sent: 15/03/2004 14:17:35
To: Boardman Phil [GRO]
CC: 'john.dutton [GRO]'; 'tony.r.utting [GRO]'; Jenkins Gareth GI [GRO]; Clive Read (E-mail) [GRO]; 'David Parnell (E-mail) [GRO]'; Gurney Bob [GRO]; 'ben.gildersleve [GRO]'
Subject: RE: Reporting Requirements

Phil

I agree that we must keep this as simple as possible.

Reading the original e-mails this appears to agree with your proposal. ie we need to :

- > Support production of a cutoff BTS within a reporting period
- > Be able to raise a Transaction Correction to rectify any handover situation, still within period
- > Continue to produce BTS to normal calendar

Clive Read
Chief Systems Architect
Post Office Ltd

[GRO]

Boardman Phil [GRO]

Boardman Phil
[GRO]
12/03/2004 12:29

To: Gurney Bob [GRO]
"ben.gildersleve [GRO]
[GRO]
cc: "john.dutton [GRO]
[GRO]
"tony.r.utting [GRO]
[GRO]; Jenkins Gareth GI [GRO]
"Clive Read (E-mail)" [GRO]
[GRO]; "David Parnell (E-mail)" [GRO]
[GRO]
Subject: RE: Reporting Requirements

Bob/Ben

I had always thought that the purpose of interim "trading statements" was for local management purposes (I am including Retail Line as local here) so that they can impose better (i.e. more frequent) control on/over the branch accounts.

To this end I had always imagined that these interim "trading statements" wouldn't actually be trading statements (i.e. the branch wouldn't actually roll-over into the next trading period). I had envisaged the notion that when requested to produce one of these interim "trading statements" that the procedure would be something like:

- all, except one (the managers), stock units would balance and roll-over into a new balance period
- the last stock unit would balance as if they were balancing for the trading period end but roll over into a new balance period (Since the requirements for rolling over into a new balance period are now different to those for rolling over into a new trading statement period, this might involve the manager reviewing the Office Snapshot report (and other reports) and making some adjusting transaction within his stock unit to manually correct for any make good and local suspense transactions that may not have happened, but would have been forced to have happened had the other stock units rolled into a new trading statement period)
- produce an office snapshot report to show the balance of the branch overall at that point (Note: local procedures would have to be implemented to ensure that the stock units had not carried out further trading between rolling over balance periods and the office snapshot report being produced. This way the office snapshot will be the sum of the balances)
- The manager will be expected to have printed out the office snapshot and stored it, along with the balance period balances to comprise his interim "trading statement", the event that the office snapshot was produced will have been stored and will be printable on the user events log (its in the definition of the user events log already ... is there a requirement to add these to the events passed to MI?) . If he/she wished, the RLM can come and see the events log see that the interim "trading statements" were produced, and review them on paper.

I think by appropriate writing of office procedures (something like the procedure above), the procedure for producing interim "trading statement" could be written using the functionality already specified in the CD.

If we wanted to take this a bit further we could define a new report, with the format of the trading statement but based on the office snapshot data (i.e. all data available between the last trading statement being produced and the current time), have an event for that report being produced and the retail line can manage its production as the interim "trading statement".

I think that the alternative of having branches rolling over into the next period (and possibly the next and the next) before the calendar is expecting them to places a whole new set of requirements that we haven't yet discussed ... do you really want to be in the situation where a "badly behaving" branch, where the RLM has gone in and asked them to do weekly "trading statements" for 3 months (13 weeks), they do that and keep their noses clean for that period, then afterwards are not reminded to do any trading statements for another 11 months while the system waits for them to come near the end of period 14?

The CD has requirements to simplify (remove actually) the functionality around extending CAPs, if we are not careful here we might get ourselves into specifying a whole new set of requirements to implement some even more complicated functionality.

Rgds, Phil

-----Original Message-----

From: Gurney Bob

Sent: 12 March 2004 09:48

To: ben.gilderslev; GRO

Cc: Gurney Bob; john.dutton; GRO; 'tony.r.utting'; GRO; Jenkins Gareth GI; Boardman

Phil; Clive Read (E-mail); David Parnell (E-mail)
Subject: RE: Reporting Requirements

Ben

I responded to Tony's query through the attached email whilst you were on leave. My current understanding is that there isn't a requirement for an additional "interim" Branch Trading Statement report. If there is a need to establish the trading status of a branch mid-period then I understand it will be done through balancing all SUs and producing a BTS, i.e. roll-over to a new trading period as is done currently with the Cash Account. If an informal view of the branch trading status is required then the existing Office Snapshot report provides that facility.

If I have incorrectly understood the requirement, please advise.

As a result of last week's correspondence, we have raised a related question that is currently with Clive/Dave concerning how these "additional" trading periods are required to be handled.

Regards

Bob Gurney
Fujitsu Services, Post Office Account

FUJITSU SERVICES

Forest Road, Feltham, Middx TW13 7EJ

Mob: [redacted] GRO

E-mail: [redacted] GRO

Web: <<http://uk.fujitsu.com>>

Fujitsu Services Limited, Registered in England no 96056, Registered Office 26, Finsbury Square, London, EC2A 1SL

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.

-----Original Message-----

From: tony.r.utting [redacted] GRO

Sent: 11 March 2004 15:01

To: ben.gildersleve [redacted] GRO

Cc: Gurney Bob; john.dutton [redacted] GRO

Subject: RE: Reporting Requirements

I think we are talking about the same issue.

As with so many of these things, we are not interested in telling ops what to do, as long as we have the capacity to cut off at any given point in time and produce a balance.

I am presuming that your angle is that of the new postmaster, who is not interested in what his predecessor did and only wants to his the fruits of his own labour reflected in his trading statement.

Tony U.

Inactive hide details for Ben GildersleveBen Gildersleve

[IMAGE][IMAGE]

**Ben
Gildersleve**

11/03/2004
13:39

Bob/Tony

Not sure where this is, but I've had a quick chat with John about it.

My view is that in situations where Audit/Security want to close down a branch and put a relief Spmr in, but don't want to see any activity from the previous agent on a Trading statement. I would see some sort of transaction correction to correct whatever the issue is, then the relief can continue to the end of the current period and complete the Branch Trading statement. This way we wouldn't have to do anything with the reports, it could be something handled centrally.

My understanding of this is there would be some sort of discrepancy in the accounts of the outgoing Spmr. This is why they would be suspended, and it is this discrepancy that we do not want to relief to manage. This sort of situation may arise for transferring a Branch from one Subby to another, albeit with smaller values of discrepancies hopefully.

If my understanding is wring, or this situation has already been resolved let me know.

Ben

Post Office Ltd

Registered in England and Wales number: 2154540 Registered Office: 80-86 Old Street LONDON EC1V 9NN.

Inactive hide details for John DuttonJohn Dutton

[IMAGE][IMAGE]

**John
Dutton**

04/03/2004
12:50

Ben

Just to keep you up to date with correspondence.

John

John Dutton

Transformational Change Manager

Mobex: **GRO**

[IMAGE]

To: Gurney Bob

GRO

cc: John Dutton/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE, Tony R Utting/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE

Subject: RE: Reporting Requirements Tony R Utting

[IMAGE]

To: Ben Gildersleve/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE

cc:

Subject: RE: Reporting Requirements

Mobile [GRO]

External Email john.dutton [GRO]

----- Forwarded by John Dutton/e/POSTOFFICE on 04/03/2004 12:49 -----

[IMAGE][IMAGE]

**Tony R
Utting**

04/03/2004
09:14

[IMAGE]

To: Gurney Bob [GRO] John
Dutton/e/POSTOFFICE@POSTOFFICE
cc:
Subject: RE: Reporting Requirements John Dutton

I am a little unsure about the query around interim trading statements.

In the case of an investigation, we would need to be able to go into an office and complete a full office balance which in the absence of a cash account would mean a Trading Statement would be required to provide a full office view.

If we then close the office down having removed an offender and the Retail Line replace the subpostmaster and this happened mid period, then the office would need to produce another Trading statement as usual at the end of the trading period.

I am not sure that the second Trading statement would need to have the data from the first included in this case, but we would need to be able to produce two statements within the same period.

I believe we also discussed doing something similar for office where there was a large variance, in order that the postmaster was able to get a view of his office situation after checking his stock and cash, but this could be achieved through balancing all of the individual stocks and then doing an office snapshot presumably.

If I am confused and have got this all wrong please let me know.

Regards

Tony Utting

Inactive hide details for Gurney Bob [GRO]
[GRO]

[IMAGE][IMAGE]

Gurney Bob
[GRO]

01/03/2004 19:03

[IMAGE]

To: john.dutton [GRO]
cc: Gurney Bob
[GRO]
"Clive Read (POL)"
[GRO] "Dave
Parnell (POL)"

GRO
Boardman Phil
GRO
"Tony Utting (POL)"
GRO
"ben.gildersleve" GRO
GRO
Jenkins Gareth GI
GRO
Reynolds Bill
GRO
Subject: RE: Reporting Requirements

John

Whilst Ben is on leave this week, I understand that the arrangements are that we should direct these IMPACT branch related requirement questions to you for guidance.

1. Horizon Events to be Accessible via POL Sales MIS

We are trying to tie down exactly which branch "events" Horizon needs to pass to the POL MI System for the purpose of central reporting (Item 3.1 on the current Issues list). In the attached email, Gareth has summarised:

- * which events are currently passed to OPTip and which will therefore be available to MI
- * the events that Horizon currently records that aren't passed to OPTip and which will therefore not be passed to MI unless there is specific requirement
- * new events associated with the IMPACT R3 requirement which it is understood should be passed to MI

Please could you review the attached and confirm whether there is a requirement to pass any additional events to MI other than those indicated above.

2. Branch Reporting

2.1 Reporting on "Previous" Trading Periods

Ben's email below confirms the requirement to be able to produce reprints of the following reports relating to the previous trading period:

- * Stock Unit Balance: Reprint
- * Cash Account: Reprint
- * Office Weekly Counters Revenue Schedule: Reprint
- * Office Weekly Inland Revenue Tax Credits P5589: Reprint
- * Office Weekly P&A P2311MA: Reprint

- * Office Weekly Redeemed Savings Stamps Summary: Reprint
- * Track and Trace Manifest: Reprint
- * Office Cash Variance Report: Reprint

We understand that these are the only reports that are required that relate to a "previous" trading period. We are currently investigating how we can cost effectively meet this requirement given that the underlying transaction data will no longer be available to re-create the reports. (Note for David/Clive: The reprint for previous period facility was not included in our costing submission for the business case).

Ben added the Cash Variance Report to Gareth's list of existing reports that have the reprint option. Whereas the original list of reports seem to relate to particular periods, the Cash Variance Report can be produced at any time and so the question of which report should be reprinted arises. Should it be the position at the end of the previous trading period?

The second question relates to the period which the original reports relate to. Once we move to a monthly Branch Trading Statement, what period is intended? Do the current weekly reports relate to a calendar, a Cash Account week or, in the future, a Monthly Trading Period? If it's weekly, when should we assume the start of week occurs? Please clarify.

2.2 Requirement to produce "Interim" Branch Trading Statement within a Trading Period

Ben has indicated that the requirement is to be able to produce an interim Branch Trading Statement at any time within a trading period. The problem is that the information from which the statement is produced and the associated process assumes that the Stock Units have previously been balanced. Currently there isn't a facility to produce an interim Cash Account report and the Office Snapshot is provided for this purpose. In view of the complexities/practicalities of meeting this requirement, please could you consider whether the Office Snapshot report would provide sufficient information to meet the intended requirement. If not, we need guidance on how an interim report should be constructed. Please advise.

Regards

Bob Gurney
Fujitsu Services, Post Office Account

FUJITSU SERVICES

Forest Road, Feltham, Middx TW13 7EJ

Mob :

E-mail:

Web: <<http://uk.fujitsu.com> <<http://services.fujitsu.com/>> >

Fujitsu Services Limited, Registered in England no 96056, Registered Office

26, Finsbury Square, London, EC2A 1SL

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.

-----Original Message-----

From: ben.gildersleve [GRO]

[GRO]

Sent: 27 February 2004 11:38

To: Jenkins Gareth GI

Cc: 'Ben Gildersleve (POL)'; Gurney Bob; 'Clive Read (POL)'; 'Dave Parnell (POL)'; Boardman Phil; 'Tony Utting (POL)'; john.dutton [GRO]

Subject: Re: Reporting Requirements

Gareth

My requirements are to keep all the reports below with re print facilities, except perhaps the redeemed savings stamps, depending on what happens with the remittance transaction for dockets and vouchers. Also, I assume the Cash Account reprint will become the Branch Trading statement reprint? I would also like copies of the Cash Variance report to be available as well. You've picked out the reports with reprint in their title, but are there any others? I've checked with John and he can't think of any.

I would like reports to be available from Period 1, until the end of Period 2. Then when the Branch rolls into Period 3, the reports for Period 1 become unavailable.

I would like the reports to be available quickly and easily, so whichever is the best solution to do this is fine with me. If the idea of storing the report itself is the best for speed of production, but is hugely expensive then come back. I'm sure Dave and Clive will have a view on this.

If you want to check anything today come back to me, but next week while I'm off can direct your queries to John please.

Ben

Post Office Ltd

Registered in England and Wales number: 2154540 Registered Office: 80-86 Old Street LONDON EC1V 9NN.

Inactive hide details for Jenkins Gareth GI "

src="cid:875110518@01032004-207a" width=16>Jenkins Gareth GI

[GRO]

Jenkins Gareth GI [GRO]

26/02/2004 16:28

To: "Ben Gildersleve (POL)" [GRO]
cc: Gurney Bob [GRO], Boardman Phil [GRO], "Dave Parnell (POL)" [GRO], "Clive Read (POL)" [GRO], "Tony Utting (POL)" [GRO]

Subject: Reporting Requirements

Ben,

Following our conversation.

You have indicated that there is a requirement to reprint old reports, so we potentially need to either store the raw data for a sufficient time to do this, or change the mechanism by which we produce reprints such that we store the original report and reprint the report rather than regenerate it. It is proposed that we do the latter.

* Which reports need to support this? The following list gives all the Horizon reports which have "reprint" in their title:

- * Stock Unit Balance: Reprint
- * Cash Account: Reprint
- * Office Weekly Counters Revenue Schedule: Reprint
- * Office Weekly Inland Revenue Tax Credits P5589: Reprint
- * Office Weekly P&A P2311MA: Reprint
- * Office Weekly Redeemed Savings Stamps Summary: Reprint
- * Track and Trace Manifest: Reprint
- * How long we need to maintain such reports (ie 1, 2 or 3 Branch Trading periods or preferably number of days from when report first produced)

I've copied this to Tony in case he has any input to the requirements here from the security viewpoint.

Note for Dave and Clive: No changes in this area were originally forecast,

so these are all "extras".

Regards

Gareth

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.

Gareth Jenkins
Distinguished Engineer
Applications TDA
Post Office Account

Fujitsu Services
Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berkshire, RG12 8SN
Tel: [REDACTED] GRO
Mobile: [REDACTED] GRO
email: [REDACTED] GRO
Web: <http://uk.fujitsu.com> <<http://uk.fujitsu.com>>

Fujitsu Services Limited, Registered in England no 96056, Registered Office
26, Finsbury Square, London, EC2A 1SL

***** 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 and then delete this email from your system. *****

Message-ID: <753F1E41ACB9D51190C00090277218D802B66823@WWMESSD206>

From: Jenkins Gareth G [REDACTED] GRO
To: "Daniel Hawthorne (POL - Parity)" [REDACTED] GRO "Clive Read (POL)" [REDACTED] GRO
Cc: "Dave Parnell (POL)" [REDACTED] GRO Gurney Bob [REDACTED] GRO
Subject: Horizon Events

Date: Fri, 27 Feb 2004 10:35:38 -0000
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Mailer: Internet Mail Service (5.5.2653.19)

Content-Type: multipart/mixed; boundary="----_=_NextPart_002_01C3FFBF.E98BB730"

All,

I've put together a note on events generated within Horizon and those currently sent to OPTIP.

<<events.doc>>

I'd appreciate some feedback as to what is required from the MIS system for inclusion in the CD so that we can include the necessary work in the S80 developments.

Regards

Gareth

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.

Gareth Jenkins
Distinguished Engineer
Applications TDA
Post Office Account

Fujitsu Services
Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berkshire, RG12 8SN
Tel: [REDACTED] **GRO**
Mobile: [REDACTED] **GRO**
email: [REDACTED] **GRO**
Web: <http://uk.fujitsu.com>

Fujitsu Services Limited, Registered in England no 96056, Registered Office
26, Finsbury Square, London, EC2A 1SL

>>>> C.htm attachment was removed from this email <<<<

>>>> graycol.gif attachment was removed from this email <<<<

>>>> ecblank.gif attachment was removed from this email <<<<

>>>> C1.htm attachment was removed from this email <<<<

>>>> events.doc attachment was removed from this email <<<<

***** 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 and then delete this email from your system.

>>>> graycol.gif attachment was removed from this email <<<<

>>>> ecblank.gif attachment was removed from this email <<<<

>>>> doclink.gif attachment was removed from this email <<<<

***** 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 and then delete this email from your system.
