
To: Thomas Penny [GRO]
Subject: FW: Gaerwen Fad code 160604

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

From: Craig Richard
Sent: 17 October 2005 16:01
To: Moronfolu Oddette S
Cc: Pinder Brian; Sewell Peter (FEL01); Lowther Neneh
Subject: RE: Gaerwen Fad code 160604

Oddette,
the original email makes reference to an audit. To answer your question definitively I'd need to know what data they are auditing that defines a "nil transaction". Is it zero transaction values in the R or A messages? Or are they auditing data in some host database or log? This matters because for example, the counter doesn't send up an amount value in the R message for "Withdraw to limit", but that may be represented as a zero value in a log or database field. The same might be true for Change PIN and Balance Enquiry.

All banking transactions are approved on-line with the acquirer. The acquirer may decline for reasons other than incorrect PIN entry (for example a stolen/cancelled card was used). These other reasons might also cause a nil transaction.

Nil transactions could also be caused by errors in PIN Pad, counter, agents or host code depending on what constitutes a "nil transaction". This cannot be determined without access to the appropriate system logs. I understand that it is not felt to be appropriate at this stage for those logs to be examined by development staff. I'd recommend however that counter logs are harvested now before potential evidence is lost.

Regards,
Ric.

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

From: Moronfolu Oddette S
Sent: 17 October 2005 13:51
To: Craig Richard
Cc: Pinder Brian; Sewell Peter (FEL01); Lowther Neneh
Subject: FW: Gaerwen Fad code 160604

Hi Ric,

Can you have a look at this?

They really need to know if there is anything else that could have caused the nil transactions.

Many Thanks,
Oddette

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

From: Lowther Neneh
Sent: 17 October 2005 13:22
To: Moronfolu Oddette S
Subject: FW: Gaerwen Fad code 160604

Hi, Odette,

Could you advise us on this please.

I'm on a course tomorrow so hoping Penny would pick it up.

Kind regards,

Neneh

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

From: Pinder Brian
Sent: 14 October 2005 17:09
To: Thomas Penny; Lowther Neneh; Dunks Andy; Membery William; Sewell Peter (FEL01)
Subject: FW: Gaerwen Fad code 160604

All

Obviously this has not come our way yet, but meanwhile any thoughts comments?
I guess we just wait for an ARQ, but do we (security) have anything in our arsenal, to go back to Graham with at all?

Regds Brian

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

From: graham.c.ward@postoffice.co.uk [GRO]
Sent: 14 October 2005 16:15
To: Fujitsu@postoffice.co.uk [GRO]
Cc: diane.matthews@postoffice.co.uk [GRO]; charles.leighton@postoffice.co.uk [GRO]
Subject: Re: Gaerwen Fad code 160604

All

The e mail below from one of our investigators says it all
is there a check that can be made to ensure there are / were no serious errors on the system at this Post Office. We already have details of calls made to the helpdesk (see spreadsheet below), which do not highlight anything obvious are there general error type reports that will tell you when there is a problem with the system, which the Post Office may not necessarily be aware of, particularly in relation to the highlighted paragraph....have there been similar problems elsewhere ?
(I've heard of Tivoli event logs..... could these be relevant ?)

This case is in it's early stages, but if it were to proceed to a prosecution, we'd likely need a statement which outlines how you can confirm that there were no operating errors with this office's system. I haven't submitted an ARQ yet but can do so if you feel it's needed.

Happy to discuss if needs be

Regards

Graham

Casework Manager
Post Office Ltd Investigation Team

PO BOX 1, CROYDON, CR9 1WN

Postline: N/A, STD Phone: [GRO] Fax: [GRO] VoiceMail:
N/A, Mobex: [GRO] Mobile: [GRO] External Email: graham.c.ward@postoffice.co.uk [GRO]

(Charles - can you offer your thoughts)

----- Forwarded by Graham C Ward/e/POSTOFFICE on 14/10/2005 14:39 -----

Diane Matthews
To: Graham C Ward/e/POSTOFFICE [GRO]
14/10/2005 14:37 cc:
Subject: Re: Gaerwen Fad code 160604

Graham,

Just to clarify, the Subpostmaster has not made any calls to HSH or NBSC prior to yesterdays audit, and is now voicing his concerns over the nil transactions on card account/on line banking transactions.

I believe there are at least 2 scenarios where a nil value will be recorded. These are

If a customer places a card into the pinpad and enters an incorrect pin number, the system will decline the transaction and request the customer to remove their card. This transaction was undertaken at the branch using a Post Office card account operated by the auditor. The report was printed with a nil value showing

If a customer places a POCA card into the pinpad, enters a correct PIN and asks to withdraw cash, if there are no funds in the account, the transaction will be declined and the customer requested to remover their card. The summary would again show a nil value against the transaction

Please can you check any other possibilities of nil values on these types of transactions with Fujitsu.

Also as the Subpostmaster is blaming the system on his losses, please could we check there are no problems with the Horizon kit at the branch.

To confirm, the branch will remain closed until we are happy that the Horizon system is fully operational.

Thanks

Diane

Investigation Manager
Post Office Ltd

POL Capacity
Management Info To: Paul Dawkins/e/POSTOFFICE
Sent by: Jay cc: Andrew Harley/e/POSTOFFICE GRO
O'Laogun Subject: Re: Gaerwen Fad code 160604(Document link: POL Capacity Management Info)

14/10/2005 11:15

(See attached file: fad 160604 calls.xls)

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.
