

Message

From: Gurney Bob [/O=ICL/OU=UKSOUTH FEL01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=GURNEYB]
Sent: 23/01/2004 17:58:45
To: Boardman Phil [/O=ICL/OU=EUR01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BOARDMANPK]
CC: Jenkins Gareth GI [/O=ICL/OU=ICL IT CONSULTANCY/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=GARETH.JENKINS]
Subject: RE: Impact Branch Trading Issues

Phil - shouldn't it get reported as an interim response to the first pat of action 56 so the workshop would then decide how it needs to be reflected in the process models/principles/etc. We will need to follow up with Clive to adjudicate if there is any difference in opinion expressed by Ruth. We also need to encourage Dave to chase people up so that we can get the actions closed down.

Regards

Bob Gurney
Fujitsu Services, Post Office Account

FUJITSU SERVICES

Forest Road, Feltham, Middx TW13 7E

Mob : [REDACTED] Internal: [REDACTED]

E-mail: bob.gurney@fujitsu.com

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: Boardman Phil
Sent: 23 January 2004 16:10
To: Gurney Bob; Jenkins Gareth GI
Subject: FW: Impact Branch Trading Issues
Importance: High

PSA, FYI

Need to understand how this (and comments like it) gets fed into the Requirements/Workshops processes.

Rgds, Phil B

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

From: dave.parnell [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 January 2004 15:09
To: Phil.Boardman [REDACTED]
Cc: ben.gildersleve [REDACTED]; alvin.west [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Impact Branch Trading Issues
Importance: High

for info...and we probably need to discuss

D

----- Forwarded by Dave Parnell/e/POSTOFFICE on 23/01/2004 15:07 -----

Clive
Read

To: Dave Parnell/[REDACTED]
cc: Sue M Harding [REDACTED]

23/01/2004 Subject: Re: Impact Branch Trading Issues
11:41

Dave

Below is Tony Marsh's view of the SAT issue, I think we need to clear this one quickly.

----- Forwarded by Clive Read/e/POSTOFFICE on 23/01/2004 11:40 -----

Tony Marsh 23/01/2004 10:04	To: Clive Read/e/ [GRO] cc: Ruth Holleran [GRO] Harding/g [GRO] Utting/e/ [GRO]	Sue M Tony R
---	--	---------------------

Subject: Re: Impact Branch Trading Issues


Clive

On point 1, the various thresholds were only recently introduced as part of my negotiations with NFSP to bring in the revised agents' losses policy. It was not a critical issue for either side and I am sure could be easily negotiated back out as part of the wider Impact negotiations, it can therefore fall.

On the suspense account issue, I'm afraid that I share the same beliefs as mine and other Ops reps, if there is no independent control and authorisation process for the use of suspense accounts then postings will rapidly increase to unacceptable levels. Irrespective of our aspirations for a simplified process to support commercially minded agents I believe that many of those of a more historic mindset will exploit the facility, creating a large parcel of manual work for someone, NBSC or retail line, to do to agree terms to reduce each individual posting.

Given that the overall project should simplify reconciliation and settlement significantly and should therefore mean that errors will be identified more rapidly and will be even more clearly the fault and responsibility of the agent, is there any reason to have a suspense facility at all? This might mean that in extreme cases the agent would need to contact the retail line or NBSC and negotiate a "loan" (at some level of interest?) to cover very high values of loss but in most cases the agent should be sufficiently capitalised to cover ordinary variations, particularly if the opportunity were offered to make losses good via credit card, thereby enabling them to tap into up to 56 days of interest free credit (a facility favoured by the NFSP despite my early misgivings.)

Tony

 Clive Read

Clive Read 22/01/2004 13:59	To: Ruth Holleran/ [GRO] Marsh/e/ [GRO] cc: Sue M Harding/ [GRO]	Tony
---	--	------

Subject: Impact Branch Trading Issues

Tony, Ruth

As you know we are currently in the middle of requirements workshops on the final phase of the Impact Programme. Although we have a scheduled Stakeholder meeting early in February, given tight timescales there are some emerging concerns which I think I need to flag up.

Yesterday I attended day 1 of the Branch Trading workshop, and there appeared to be some specific issues around the introduction of new processes and controls:

1. Suspense Account Threshold

The current assumed position is that a single threshold of £250 will be applied by Horizon below which variances cannot be placed into Suspense Account (as presented at Stakeholder Forum). This is a new system control which does not currently exist.

There is a requirement (from Operations reps) to introduce a number of different thresholds depending on Office type.(eg Community offices to be at a much lower level)

Although this could be accommodated I have a concern that this begins to add additional complexity both to the system build and subsequent operation. Given the aspiration to keep things simple, is this an absolute must-have or is it open to challenge?

2. Suspense Account Authorisation

The current assumed position is that subject to the threshold control above, the requirement to seek telephone authorisation for posting variances to Suspense would cease, on the understanding that improved timeliness and visibility of office liabilities (next day, single view of office cash and liability) would provide sufficient control (given that currently there is a 2 week lag between suspense postings and visibility of these centrally).

The Operations and Security view was that removal of this control would declare 'open season' on the use of Suspense postings, leading to loss of financial control, spiralling nonconformity etc....

Way Forward

While we can discuss and take a view on these issues in isolation, my preference is to assume that we can define new back-office controls which fully leverage the timeliness, accuracy and completeness of the new systems, and therefore challenge any (understandable) reluctance to 'give-up' controls that are already in place. The danger is that we spend significant amounts of time and money while not bringing about the fundamental changes the programme was given the mandate for.

I think this is an important position to take in our approach, to underline our objective to simplify and leverage new capability, but recognise the challenge is therefore to define a 'fit for purpose' control framework which tackles these fears head-on.

If this is an approach you endorse, I need :

- Your support and communication of this to your representatives on the programme working groups.
- Engagement on developing new fit-for-purpose controls with lead input from Finance

Please call if you'd like to discuss further

Clive Read
Chief Systems Architect
Post Office Ltd

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 and then delete this email from your system.
