

Privileged



Alan Bates & others v Post Office Limited

Bug 28

Drop and Go Bug

Summary

- The Peak PC0260269 identified by the experts relates to an issue in branch involving a Drop and Go transaction timing out in branch, but displaying as and recording as being successful in the branch accounts. This particular instance of the issue involved the branch re-attempting the same Drop and Go transaction.
- Reconciliation between the Horizon feed and the Accenture CDP system identified that only one top-up had been received by Accenture CDP but two were being shown in the Horizon Batch Feed. The second Horizon transaction matched the CDP transaction, confirming the problem was with the first transaction.

[Q for FJ and POL: does this mean that Horizon incorrectly displayed the success message and allowed the clerk to settle the transaction? Would this not have been caught by any sort of mismatch reporting as there would have been a difference between branch accounts and Accenture data?]

[Q for FJ: FJ identified Peak PC0237234 as being a further instance of this and being raised in 2018 – is this the correct reference as this Peak appears to have been closed in 2014]

- **Dates:**
 - 05-Jul-2017: PC0260269 and KEL cardc235Q opened as a result of the SPM complaint relating to a duplicate Drop and Go transaction appearing in the branch account.
 - 05-Jul-2017: Counter log and message log extracts obtained by FJ – potential issue relating to either (1) script or (2) user error identified.
 - 05-Jul-2017: call passed to ATOS and closed, KEL mirroring this and confirming that any future calls should be routed to ATOS.
- **What happened?**
 - The clerk initiated a Drop and Go transaction for £100 which failed due to timeouts, but then a success message was displayed
 - The clerk settled the transaction and handed the customer £100
 - The customer checked their balance and stated that the top up had not been processed
 - The clerk performed another Drop and Go transaction that was successful
- **How was it spotted?**
 - The SPM reported the issue and Peak PC0260269 and KEL cardc235Q being raised
- **How was it fixed?**
 - [WBD- TBC once liaised with ATOS]
- **Possible conclusions:**
 - [WBD- TBC once liaised with ATOS]
- **Impact on Subpostmasters?**

- The customer paid £100, but the branch account was debited £200, resulting in a £100 shortfall to the branch.

[Q for POL – do we know if a TC was issued to correct the shortfall?]

- **Relevant Documents**

- Peaks: PC0260269 and PC0237234
- KEL: cardc235Q

- **Notes for Counsel**

- Coyne in JS2 [D1/2/25-26] correctly summarises that the customer was credited with £100 but the branch was debited with £200.
[WBD to respond to this point with analysis once confirmation received that a TC/ some other sort of resolution happened to correct £100 shortfall]
- Dr Worden in JS2 [D1/2/25-26] notes that this would have been very visible on the counter and that the script issue would have been easily fixed. [
WBD to update once had ATOS' comments but unclear if easily fixed as FJ have indicated there has been a 2018 occurrence of the issue]