

From: Thomas Penny [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=THOMASP]
Sent: Tue 16/11/2010 10:48:54 AM (UTC)
To: Parker Steve (PostOfficeAccount) [GRO] Honey Stuart [GRO] Evans Steve (BRA01) [GRO] Jenkins Gareth G [GRO] Porter Steven [GRO] Munro Donna [GRO]
Cc: Turner Ian T [GRO] Allen Graham (BRA01) [GRO] Thompson Peter [GRO] Bansal Steve (BRA01) [GRO] Spurgeon Adam [GRO] Barnes Gerald [GRO] Mansfield Andrew [GRO]
Subject: | FW: PC0204310 - Duplicate JSN detected
Attachment: ARQ Analysis.xls

All

The analysis we have conducted (covering receipts over the last 4 months) reflects the bulk of ARQ requests cover the period 6-18 months prior to the request month; although we do receive a number of requests for the 6 months immediately preceding the request month and some for earlier timeframes. Analysis attached (note: November only covers one-third of normal quota).

We anticipate that by the May 11 the bulk of the requests we receive will be for HNG-X records covering the timeframe January to December 10. Indeed, from February 11 the bulk of our requests may consist of HNG-X records.

We have no way of anticipating how many duplicates will be identified in the transaction records (for those specified in PC0204310 there are already considerable occurrences reported) or where we will need to duplicate the process and run a slow ARQ.

We will need to run 2 additional spreadsheets for each retrieval request incorporating the JSN number for each record. A macro will then be run to identify whether duplicates exist. Where duplicate records are present and relate to audit records being copied twice a new slow retrieval must be opened. At the 'files selection point' duplicated files will need removing manually and then the retrieval completed.

Where duplicates are identified relating to the PC0204310 we will need to check the duplicate against the known error log and identify whether this occurrence is known or a new occurrence. New occurrences will need investigation prior to return to POL.

Therefore, for all retrievals we will need to include additional spreadsheets and a checking process. The proposed fix under PC0205805 will completely remove the requirement for duplicating spreadsheets and the checking process as the application will report any duplication of files.

PC025806 reports the occurrence of gaps/overlaps and is a basic requirement.

Running additional reports, using a macro and manually checking spreadsheets will increase significantly the time to complete a retrieval; I estimate that an additional 20 minutes will be required to complete each ARQ, and that will require an additional 3 working days per month to be found. Additional work requirements are already being placed on the Prosecution Support Team in the form of supporting Reconciliation and there is a possibility we will be more than stretched to fulfil our required ARQ return timeframes. These changes will alleviate unnecessary pressure on the team and should be implemented at the earliest opportunity.

Kind regards
Penny

Penny Thomas

Security Analyst, Customer Services
Fujitsu Services Retail & Royal Mail Group Account
Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berks RG12 8SN

Tel:
Mob:
Fax:
E-Mail:
Web:

GRO

<http://uk.fujitsu.com>

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.

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

From: Selwyn Sarah
Sent: 12 November 2010 12:16
To: Thomas Penny; Bains Rajbinder; Parker Steve (PostOfficeAccount)
Subject: FW: PC0204310 - Duplicate JSN detected

Penny and Raj,
thank you both for your analysis of the business impact of running the workaround fixes for detection of JSNs in HNG-X audit.

Penny, the permanent fixes to the Audit Workstation for JSN detection and analysis will be supplied in rel 4.37 (the Release 4 Audit maintenance slot) which is currently expected to be out of LST on 04/05/2011. There is no live data predicted yet for rel 4.37 but usually this would follow within a few days. You should expect to be running the workaround solution until May 2011.

Steve,

I assume that the counter data/BRDB extracts on any data produced:
- from the start of Branch Migration (17/12/2009) - even though majority of FADs not migrated until June to Sept 2010 we had 600 odd between Dec 2009 to end March 2010.
- up to the point at which the fixes have both been introduced into Live for scenarios described in MithyanthaJ1937S (targeted rel 03.20 sometime shortly after 23/12/2011) and maxwellg5213L (not yet fixed - so not targeted for release)
May have duplicate records in them. Therefore anytime that Penny and Raj are run audit queries during this time frame they may get warnings of duplicates.

Not sure how you want to handle this. Is it practical for SSC to generate and maintain a spreadsheet of known (and explained) duplicate JSNs instances (FAD/COUNTER/JSN/DATE etc) attached to a KEL so that when Penny and Raj are notified of duplicate JSN by the Audit Workstation they can check against the known list (which have already been checked and explained) and only raise a call which ends up with SSC if have new JSN instances? It is whatever causes as little work ongoing for both Prosecution Support Team and the SSC but we must check each new JSN instance in case it is a genuine problem and I suppose we must be able to tag any JSN in the evidence provided to the Post Office as known and explained.

Regards,
Sarah

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

From: Selwyn Sarah
Sent: 08 November 2010 17:05
To: Parker Steve (PostOfficeAccount); Honey Stuart; Evans Steve (BRA01); Jenkins Gareth GI; Porter Steven
Cc: Turner Ian T; Allen Graham (BRA01); Thompson Peter; Bansal Steve (BRA01); Spurgeon Adam; Barnes Gerald; Thomas Penny; Mansfield Andrew
Subject: RE: PC0204310 - Duplicate JSN detected

Steve,

I agree with your approach as long as any JSN duplicates that match the criteria described in maxwellg5213L are still investigated urgently as you describe below in item 4. Is there any other type of message that can possibly be raised in OSR logs that relates to duplicate JSNs (other than the one quoted in the MithyanthaJ1937S KEL) which might be missed?

What has not been highlighted below is the additional effort that the existence of duplicates places on the Litigation Support Team. Until the two fixes related to the PEAKs described below are delivered to live Penny and team will need to run the macro provided as a workaround against every spreadsheet generated by the Fast ARQ method to determine if there are any duplicate spreadsheet rows present (these rows do not include JSN). If there are duplicates present then Penny and team run one of the Slow ARQ queries which have been modified to include JSN in order to determine if the 'duplicate' is a true duplicate.

The PEAKs that resolve the above issues by stopping a fast ARQ if there are duplicates detected, which negates the need to run the spreadsheet macro if there are no duplicates present, and then automatically highlighting any duplicates in a spreadsheet are PC0205805 and PC0205806 respectively and unfortunately are not targeted until Rel 4.37 (approx April 2011). Penny and team will need to continue manually running the workaround macro until at least April next year. The resolution to PC0204310 delivered 3.20 early next year should reduce JSN duplicates in any HNG-X audit analysed but the macro will still need to be run until rel 4.37 just in case the audit being analysed is HNG-X audit from rel 1 up to 4.37. Given the relationship between the three PEAKs described here (and ease of test etc) would it possible to get the PC0205805 and PC0205806 PEAKs also targeted to 4.20?

Regards,
Sarah

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

From: Parker Steve (PostOfficeAccount)
Sent: 04 November 2010 07:36
To: Honey Stuart; Evans Steve (BRA01); Jenkins Gareth GI; Porter Steven
Cc: Turner Ian T; Allen Graham (BRA01); Thompson Peter; Bansal Steve (BRA01); Selwyn Sarah; Spurgeon Adam
Subject: RE: PC0204310 - Duplicate JSN detected

Stuart,

I agree that Sarah's views on this will be very relevant GRO If she disagrees with this approach then we will have to bring the patch forward but I need to stop the flow of support calls now.

Steve

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

From: Honey Stuart
Sent: 03 November 2010 17:55
To: Evans Steve (BRA01); Jenkins Gareth GI; Parker Steve (PostOfficeAccount); Porter Steven
Cc: Turner Ian T; Allen Graham (BRA01); Thompson Peter; Bansal Steve (BRA01); Selwyn Sarah; Spurgeon Adam
Subject: RE: PC0204310 - Duplicate JSN detected

Hi,

My only comment would be can we wait for Sarah's view on this

GRO

GRO

Sarah has taken over Audit Architecture and design from Alan Holmes and would be good to have her view on this before a final decision is made.

Cheers,

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

From: Evans Steve (BRA01)
Sent: 03 November 2010 17:22
To: Jenkins Gareth GI; Parker Steve (PostOfficeAccount); Porter Steven; Honey Stuart
Cc: Turner Ian T; Allen Graham (BRA01); Thompson Peter; Bansal Steve (BRA01)
Subject: RE: PC0204310 - Duplicate JSN detected

I agree with Gareth.

Critically, if the impact is not on Audit, and mostly with SSC, who are willing to live with it then the risk can be avoided.

There is another risk around the ignore approach as Steve states.
However given Steve's second point below, it is a lot of effort to escape that.

Steve

Stephen A Evans

Tel: [GRO] or Internally [GRO]
Mob: [GRO] or Internally [GRO]

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.

Before printing, think about the environment*

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

From: Jenkins Gareth GI
Sent: 03 November 2010 17:00
To: Parker Steve (PostOfficeAccount); Porter Steven; Holmes Alan; Honey Stuart; Evans Steve (BRA01)
Cc: Turner Ian T; Allen Graham (BRA01); Thompson Peter; Bansal Steve (BRA01)
Subject: RE: PC0204310 - Duplicate JSN detected

Steve,

I agree with your analysis and your proposed pragmatic approach.

Regards

Gareth

Gareth Jenkins
Distinguished Engineer
Business 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.

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

From: Parker Steve (PostOfficeAccount)
Sent: 03 November 2010 16:33
To: Porter Steven; Jenkins Gareth GI; Holmes Alan; Honey Stuart; Evans Steve (BRA01)
Cc: Turner Ian T; Allen Graham (BRA01); Thompson Peter; Bansal Steve (BRA01)
Subject: FW: PC0204310 - Duplicate JSN detected

It will be difficult to get the right technical people together on this one for a face to face discussion. My take on it is:

1) Risk to support is large: It is impossible for support to check all the duplicate JSN events to ensure they are the same issues as described on:

IRRELEVANT

2) The 100 (approx) incidents that support have checked all fall into the scenarios described in MithyanthaJ1937S. These are all safe to ignore.

3) We risk other parts of the programme by trying to force through the fix for PC0204310

4) Risk to audit is very small. Should a true duplicate JSN slip through then it will be noticed by a failure as described in maxwellg5213L (fail in BRDBC002, _DB_SRV#BRDB_AUD_FEED). Such incidents will still need to be investigated urgently.

Pragmatic approach, given the above, is to ignore all Duplicate JSN messages in BAL logs until PC0204310 is resolved (3.20 Early next year). There is a small risk that by ignoring this event we will be missing a issue that needs investigation.

Unless anyone wants to disagree with me I'll take this to CS management tomorrow afternoon.

Steve

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

From: Turner Ian T
Sent: 03 November 2010 12:44
To: Parker Steve (PostOfficeAccount); Budworth John; Lywood Pat; Cozens Tyrone TJS; Jepson Mark; Payne Sarah; Bansal Steve (BRA01)
Cc: Evans Steve (BRA01); Porter Steven; Ascott Mark MA; Jenkins Gareth GI; Richardson Debbie DB; Thompson Peter; Allen Graham (BRA01)
Subject: RE: PC0204310 - Duplicate JSN detected

Who is making the decision on if we hotfix or not based on the evidence?

The business impact seems to be restricted to impact on SSC workload, I have not seen any other impact?

Do we need a call set up for an emergency RMF?

Thanks

Regards

Ian

Ian T Turner
Applications Division

Fujitsu

Mob : **GRO**

E-mail: **GRO**

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

From: Parker Steve (PostOfficeAccount)
Sent: 03 November 2010 09:16
To: Turner Ian T; Budworth John; Lywood Pat; Cozens Tyrone TJS; Jepson Mark; Payne Sarah; Allen Graham (BRA01)
Cc: Evans Steve (BRA01); Porter Steven; Ascott Mark MA; Bansal Steve (BRA01); Jenkins Gareth GI; Richardson Debbie DB
Subject: RE: PC0204310 - Duplicate JSN detected

Ian,

I agree, all are MithyanthaJ1937S and Yes, these can be ignored ONCE IDENTIFIED

And that's the rub. Under current development guidelines we have to examine every one to make sure they are just related to the two scenarios on the KEL.

I would be equally happy with a change of emphasis that says we can ignore these incidents until the fix has been delivered. We must have checked something in the order of 100 examples already and not found any that do not fit MithyanthaJ1937S

Steve

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

From: Turner Ian T
Sent: 03 November 2010 07:49
To: Budworth John; Lywood Pat; Parker Steve (PostOfficeAccount); Cozens Tyrone TJS; Jepson Mark; Payne Sarah; Allen Graham (BRA01)
Cc: Evans Steve (BRA01); Porter Steven; Ascott Mark MA; Bansal Steve (BRA01); Jenkins Gareth GI; Richardson Debbie DB
Subject: RE: PC0204310 - Duplicate JSN detected
Importance: High

John,

I will have a delivery timeline available later today.

My concern here though is, feedback from Gareth Jenkins in the attached mail trail is:

"Duplicates that match MithyanthaJ1937S are not serious and so can be ignored provided they match the criteria outlined in the KEL. We need to review the KEL once we have the fix in at 3.20 (early next year). These issues can occur due to BAL /Network issues as is implied below."

And the investigation Steve Parker did in the mail trail showed all these were related to KEL MithyanthaJ1937S.

So why is there such a large support impact?

Also this is still a B priority peak. I don't see any evidence that this as a showstopper for the service which is what I am constantly being told is the logic for a hotfx release?

I do understand the increased workload on SSC.

Graham,

I think this needs endorsement from Management prayers if we need this as a hotfix.

Regards

Ian

Ian T Turner
Applications Division

Fujitsu

Mob : GRO

E-mail: GRO

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

From: Budworth John
Sent: 02 November 2010 17:40
To: Lywood Pat; Parker Steve (PostOfficeAccount); Cozens Tyrone TJS; Jepson Mark; Payne Sarah; Turner Ian T
Cc: Evans Steve (BRA01); Porter Steven; Ascott Mark MA; Bansal Steve (BRA01)
Subject: RE: PC0204310 - Duplicate JSN detected

Ian,

On the assumption that this is BAL only do we have a view as to when development can deliver if required now?

Mark A,

Can we accommodate another BAL upgrade in LST prior to the freeze?

Mark/Sarah,

Do we have a deployment window for the BAL prior to the freeze?

As agreed at the recent hot fix targeting meeting I assume this should be targeted at R3 as per the BAL upgrade that has just gone live?

JB

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

From: Lywood Pat
Sent: 02 November 2010 17:18
To: Parker Steve (PostOfficeAccount); Cozens Tyrone TJS; Jepson Mark; Budworth John
Cc: Evans Steve (BRA01); Turner Ian T; Porter Steven; Ascott Mark MA; Bansal Steve (BRA01)
Subject: RE: PC0204310 - Duplicate JSN detected

No issue from me on this one - probably just need to get people together to agree target and delivery.

Cheers

Pat
Service Implementation Manager

FUJITSU

Mob : GRO Internal: GRO

E-mail: GRO
Web: <<http://uk.fujitsu.com>>

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

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

From: Parker Steve (PostOfficeAccount)
Sent: 02 November 2010 16:34
To: Cozens Tyrone TJS; Jepson Mark
Cc: Evans Steve (BRA01); Turner Ian T; Porter Steven; Ascott Mark MA; Bansal Steve (BRA01); Lywood Pat
Subject: PC0204310 - Duplicate JSN detected

IRRELEVANT

I need to get this Peak re-targeted as a hot fix. Support are currently seeing an average of 30 calls / week on this issue. Given its current target of 03.20 (not due until early next year) this will result in approx 300 support incidents before resolution representing 100 MD effort at 3rd line.

NOTE: I don't think the incidence of the problem has increased. The efficiency of raising support incidents has! Since each one can only be checked by the SSC then all the load ends up on 3rd line support.

Steve