

## Peak Incident Management System

Call Reference	PC0223870	Call Logger	_Customer Call_ -- EDSC
Release	Targeted At -- HNG-X 08.82	Top Ref	PC0224126
Call Type	Live Incidents/Defects	Priority	B -- Business restricted
Contact	EDSC	Call Status	Pending -- Product Error Diagnosed
Target Date	22/03/2013	Effort (Man Days)	0
Summary	Branch 011458 has an unexplained discrepancy		
All References	Type	Value	
	DevIntRel-Director	Live Supp.Test	
	TRIOLE for Service	A2401368	
	Clone Call	PC0224126	
Collections	Name	User	Date
	RP-release_planning	Louise Barham	20-May-2013 14:48:07
	BIFApproved	Lorraine Elliott	25-Mar-2013 11:43:17
Impact Statement	User	Date	
	Anne Chambers	20-Mar-2013 15:10:25	
	This change would alert support teams to the existence of a system problem affecting branch accounts, rather than having to wait for it to be reported. Such a problem, affecting 14 branches, was not reported until 15 months after it first could have been noticed.		
<b>Progress Narrative</b>			
<p>Date: <b>25-Feb-2013 16:55:53</b> User: <b>_Customer Call_</b>  CALL PC0223870 opened  Details entered are:-  Summary: The Branch as an unexplained discrepancy  Call Type: L  Call Priority: C  Target Release: HNG-X R6.50  Routed to: EDSC - _Unassigned_</p>			
<p>Date: <b>25-Feb-2013 16:55:52</b> User: <b>_Customer Call_</b>  =====</p> <p>INCIDENT MANAGEMENT  Date/Time Raised: Feb 25 2013 4:51PM  Priority: C  Contact Name: Ibrahim at NBSC  Contact Phone: GRO  Originator: XXXXXX@TFS01  Originator's reference: A2401368  Product Serial No:  Product Site: 011458  =====</p> <p>Transfer Note: Transfer Group from 'POA-HSD IMT' to 'POA-FJ-PEAK'  :  The Branch as an unexplained discrepancy. They balanced and rolled trading period on 6 Feb, they have one stock unit AA and this was balanced with a loss of £39.57 which was transferred to local suspense however the figure that was</p>			

cleared out from local suspense was much higher £9839.45.

I have carried out transaction logs for all transactions from date range 31 Jan to 06 Feb. Branch has submitted copies of the final balance reports from TP 10 BP4 and TP10 BP 5 the balance report for TP10 BP5 shows discrepancy transferred of £39.57 and then discrepancy resolved £9839.45. The transaction log completed for all transaction does not show any other figures being entered into or removed from housekeeping/local suspense account.

Node 1

06/02/2013 16:50 to 16:51

AA TP 10 BP4/5

HAS001

----

Incident History:

----

2013-02-25 16:51:20 [ Richardson, Mark ]

INIT : Create a new request/incident/problem/change/issue

----

2013-02-25 16:54:19 [ Richardson, Mark ]

zneun\_en\_poa : Open Notification

----

2013-02-25 16:54:19 [ Richardson, Mark ]

zneut\_en\_poa : Transfer Notification

----

2013-02-25 16:54:54 [ Richardson, Mark ]

zneut\_en\_poa : Transfer Notification

Date:25-Feb-2013 16:59:22 User:Clive Turrell

Product General/Other/Misc -- Unknown General/Other/Misc (version unspecified) added.

Date:25-Feb-2013 17:02:16 User:Clive Turrell

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Anne Chambers  
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:25-Feb-2013 17:47:51 User:Anne Chambers

The call summary has been changed from:-

The Branch as an unexplained discrepancy

The call summary is now:-

Branch 011458 has an unexplained discrepancy

Date:26-Feb-2013 13:18:12 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

When they completed the balance on 6th Feb and cleared the loss from Local Suspense, the amount cleared was £9839.45 instead of the loss they had put into local suspense, which was £39.57.

This appears to be a consequence of something that happened during the previous TP rollover on 2nd Jan: a 'gain to local suspense' of £9799.88 was included in the DEF opening figures.

I don't think any of the local suspense products should ever appear in opening figures, however I have found 14 such lines (all prod 6295 Gain to LS, all different branches). Unfortunately all created Nov-Dec last year, so there is almost no remaining counter evidence.

Continuing to investigate cause and implications.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:26-Feb-2013 13:33:23 User:Kevin McKeown

The call Priority has been changed from C

The call Priority is now B

Date:26-Feb-2013 13:33:53 User:Anne Chambers

Evidence Added - BRSS extracts showing local suspense movements / opening bal

Date:26-Feb-2013 13:53:26 User:Anne Chambers

We only keep opening figures for 3 old trading periods, so can't be sure when problem started.

Date:26-Feb-2013 14:55:35 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

Asked Ibrahim at NBSC (GRO) if the suspense report from 2nd January is available - he'll obtain it and email to HSD IMT.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:26-Feb-2013 16:51:32 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

Suspense report for TP9 (2nd Jan 2013) received, which shows no anomaly. I thought it might show 9799.88- c/f, since that amount is b/f on the TP10 report, but it doesn't.

The branch also sent the suspense report for TP10 2012, with the comment that they had the same problem last year - and although it is a very faint copy, it appears to show 9799.88- b/f.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:26-Feb-2013 16:53:46 User:Anne Chambers

Evidence Added - Branch suspense reports

Date:26-Feb-2013 17:56:09 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

Have asked what the branch did about the problem last year.

Also checking what the archiving strategy has been for

BRDB\_RX\_SU\_OPENING\_BALANCE in the past, and when it changed.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:27-Feb-2013 16:18:08 User:Anne Chambers

Evidence File Updated - Updated notes / extracts etc

Date:27-Feb-2013 16:20:17 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

I have now found the cause of the problem: some data from autumn 2010 has been retained in table BRDB\_RX\_BTS\_DATA, for 14 separate branches. These branches will all have been affected by this problem late 2011 and late 2012, though in some cases the amounts involved are small.

Branch	Affected TP	AMOUNT
002647	9	-6.71
002840	9	140.61
010007	9	-0.01
011458	10	-9,799.88
012004	9	16.12
054011	9	3.34
101832	9	5.84
104937	9	-49.62
155025	9	-113.14
156715	9	11.55
211844	9	-41.77
243242	9	-0.51
266418	9	3,186.70
297611	9	160.92

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:27-Feb-2013 16:22:43 User:Anne Chambers

Still to be investigated:

- Exactly how did these records cause the observed effect?
- Why were the records not removed by the normal archiving process?
- What impact has the problem had on the branch accounts?
- What impact has the problem had on POLSAP?
- How do we remove the records to prevent future problems?
- Were there any affected branches which have since closed?
- There are 19 other branches which have old data in the affected table, but not relating to Local Suspense ? could this cause any problems with the branch accounts? (some may be temporarily closed).

Date:28-Feb-2013 14:06:00 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

Further investigations:

\*\* Exactly how did these records cause the observed effect?

The old data is picked up, along with the correct data, during the Branch Trading Statement production (at the end of the period BEFORE the problem is visible at the branch). The old opening figure (which may be for one or more of the Local Suspense products 6295-6298, associated with an unknown stock unit) gets converted during branch rollover, to prod 6295 Gain to Local Suspense (though the sign may be positive or negative), and written as an opening figure for the subsequent period, stock unit DEF.

At the end of the second period, this is included when the amount to be cleared from Local Suspense is calculated (when the last stock unit is rolled over), so the branch is forced to clear it.

\*\* How to identify the problem from branch reports:

Branch Trading Statement: the sum of the two Discrepancy Transferred lines does not match the total of the two Discrepancy Resolved Lines  
Suspense Account report: the B/Fwd figure on the report does not match the C/Fwd figure on the report for the previous TP.

\*\* Why were the records not removed by the normal archiving process? The records, created Autumn 2010, belonged to stock units that have since been deleted. Normally they would have been removed before the 'deleted stock unit' entry itself was removed from the list of stock units, but there were some teething problems with archiving and they were 'orphaned' and are now ignored by the archiving process.

\*\* How do we remove the records to prevent future problems? Once well away from the problem TP, eg once into TP 1, get the branches to recreate a stock unit with the same name as the problem one, then delete it again. Or we just delete them from the database under MSC.

\*\* Were there any affected branches which have since closed? I have checked branches closed within the last 90 days, all ok. For branches closed longer ago which might be under investigation, the suspense account reports and BTS could be checked (see above).

\*\* There are 19 other branches which have old data in the affected table, but not relating to Local Suspense ? could this cause any problems with the branch accounts?

I have checked very carefully and conclude that these extra lines have no ongoing impact on the branch accounts.

\*\* There is old data in some other tables that use the same archiving strategy - this doesn't affect the branch balancing in the same way, but what would happen if a stock unit with the same name was recreated?

\*\* Any corrective actions?

Local suspense should always be zero when the branch is rolled over - should this be checked and reported?

I think the archiving strategy is now ok, but this may need to be reviewed.

Still to do:

\*\* What impact has the problem had on the branch accounts?

\*\* What impact has the problem had on POLSAP?

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:28-Feb-2013 14:24:24 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

Correction:

\*\* Exactly how did these records cause the observed effect?

The old data is picked up, along with the correct data, during the Branch Trading Statement production (at the end of the period BEFORE the problem is visible at the branch). The \*\*\*\*old BTS data line\*\*\*\* (which may be for one or more of the Local Suspense products 6295-6298, associated with an unknown stock unit) gets converted during branch rollover, to prod 6295 Gain to Local Suspense (though the sign may be positive or negative), and written as an opening figure for the subsequent period, stock unit DEF.

At the end of the second period, this is included when the amount to be cleared

from Local Suspense is calculated (when the last stock unit is rolled over), so the branch is forced to clear it.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:28-Feb-2013 17:17:58 User:Anne Chambers

Evidence **File** Updated - Another update of notes / extracts etc

Date:28-Feb-2013 17:18:31 User:Anne Chambers

Evidence **Added** - Spreadsheet sent to POL

Date:06-Mar-2013 16:05:10 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

There was a conference call with POL (Laura Darby, Mark Wardle and others) on 28th Feb about this call, and the spreadsheet showing the impact of the problem on the 14 branches was sent to them by Steve Bansal. We are waiting to hear from Mark whether this is sufficient information for them to resolve the consequences on the branches and POLSAP.

We will then need to get the old data causing the problem removed from the database (before TP 9 - Oct-Nov 2013) and consider whether extra checks should be put in place to trap similar anomalies in the future.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:08-Mar-2013 13:37:01 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

POL will be arranging another conf call next week.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:08-Mar-2013 13:41:46 User:Anne Chambers

Cloning call so that we can get the old data removed....

Date:08-Mar-2013 13:41:56 User:Anne Chambers

Call has been cloned to Call:PC0224126 by User:Anne Chambers

Date:08-Mar-2013 15:21:37 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

Cloned call PC0224126 sent to development to get old records removed from BRDB.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:15-Mar-2013 11:10:18 User:Anne Chambers

Target Date/Time updated: new value is 22/03/2013 16:55

[Start of Response]



Following another conf call Thurs 14th March, more information has been sent to POL.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:15-Mar-2013 11:18:31 User:Anne Chambers

Evidence Added - email, timeline example, another spreadsheet sent to POL

Date:20-Mar-2013 14:56:34 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

Can we add an extra check into the branch balancing process so errors like this would be reported in future (similar to the event which is raised if the BTS Trading position is not zero)?

Possible checks are

- a) do the next TP's Opening Figures, generated for stock unit DEF, include any Local Suspense products? (raise event if they don't net to zero value)
- b) does the sum of the two Discrepancy Transferred lines on the BTS, for the Branch Total, equal the sum of the two Discrepancy Resolved lines? (raise event if not).

For the problem under investigation here, the first check would have identified a problem when branch 11458 rolled into TP 10, and the second check at the end of TP 10.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:20-Mar-2013 15:10:25 User:Anne Chambers

A new Business Impact has been added:

This change would alert support teams to the existence of a system problem affecting branch accounts, rather than having to wait for it to be reported. Such a problem, affecting 14 branches, was not reported until 15 months after it first could have been noticed.

Date:20-Mar-2013 15:20:28 User:Anne Chambers

The Call record has been transferred to the team: BIF

Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:26-Mar-2013 10:09:57 User:Gareth Jenkins

Routing Peak to GDC to add in alerts as requested by Anne Chambers in update timed at 2013-03-20 14:56:34.

Date:26-Mar-2013 10:11:20 User:Gareth Jenkins

The Call record has been transferred to the team: xCtr\_GDC

User:Gareth Jenkins Confirmed that this Incident may be passed to the external company with the attached evidence.

Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:26-Mar-2013 10:15:58 User:Ravindra Kumar

The Call record has been transferred to the team: xCtr\_BAC\_GDC

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:27-Mar-2013 13:20:55 User:Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

Analysis and Root cause:

Generally all Local suspense movement transactions are written during stock unit TP rollover (6295/6296), during last stock unit rollover, and also from the Housekeeping menu (6297/6298).

On office rollover, local suspense from branch opening figures and movements for all stock units are netted off, and should result in 0 value carried forward.

When Office rollover, the previous suspense opening figures and suspense movements for current trading period are summed, netted off, and written as new suspense opening figures to SU DEF.

In the present scenario, the previous local suspense movements for a deleted stockunit are retained in BRANCH\_BTS\_DATA. (i.e £9799.88). This Local suspense record was not cleared while next office rollover since SU was deleted.

After 205 days the stock unit was created with same name So sytem summed off old non-zero local suspense movements amount from BRANCH\_BTS\_DATA along with Ls movements from present trading period. (i.e £9799.88 + £39.57 = £9839.45).

Reproducing Steps:

1. Create a stock unit 'SU1' and attach to present user.
2. Carry out a local supense transaction by declaring cash £100 for SU1.
3. Rollover all stockunits to next TP.
4. Attach user to another stock unit and delete stockunit SU1.
5. Rollover Office to next TP. (Here system doesn't complain about LS record of SU1 since it was deleted.)
6. Change system date to after 205 days.
7. Carry out a local supense transaction by declaring stock £23 for present SU.
8. Create a stock unit with same name which is deleted 'SU1'.
9. Rollover office to next Tp.
10. Suspense Report and Office Trading statement shows total cleared amount for current TP is £123. (Evidence attached).

Date:27-Mar-2013 13:22:50 User:Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

Action placed on Team:xCtr\_BAC\_GDC, User:Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

Date:27-Mar-2013 13:25:45 User:Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Ravindra Kumar  
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:27-Mar-2013 13:26:16 User:Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

Please review.

Date:27-Mar-2013 13:36:56 User:Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

Evidence Added - [evidence](#)

Date:02-Apr-2013 11:37:15 User:Ravindra Kumar

Analysis is fine. Please put the fix impact template.

Date:02-Apr-2013 11:37:32 User:Ravindra Kumar

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune  
Progress was delivered to Consumer



Date:03-Apr-2013 15:08:49 User:Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

[Start of Response]

Product error diagnosed.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 41 -- Pending -- Product Error

Diagnosed

Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:16-Apr-2013 07:24:44 User:Sarita Pujari

Action has been removed from the call

Date:18-Apr-2013 08:34:22 User:Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT OF FIX:

SPECIFY THE HNG-X PLATFORMS IMPACTED:

Counter.

TECHNICAL SUMMARY:

This change will affect counter pdl files.

LIST OF KNOWN DIMENSIONS DESIGN PARTS AFFECTED BY THE CHANGE:

None

DEPENDENCIES:

None

DEPLOYMENT DETAIL:

None

DEV EFFORT IN MANDAYS:

2 days for Development + testing

IMPACT ON USER:

An Error prompt will be shown to the user when next TP opening figures of DEF SU contains any non zero Localsuspense movements.

Another error prompt will be shown when the sum of the two Discrepancy Transferred lines on the BTS, for the Branch Total, Not equal the sum of the two Discrepancy Resolved lines.

The purpose of these Error Events is to alert the support teams that something has occurred that shouldn't have done so that they can investigate it quickly.

IMPACT ON OPERATIONS:

Impact is medium as previous local suspense movements of a deleted SU are processing in present TP when same SU is created again.

User will be surprised with discrepancy of local suspense figures which is not for done for the current TP.

HAVE RELEVANT KELS BEEN CREATED OR UPDATED?

Yet to be created.

IMPACT ON TEST:

Explained testing steps above.

RISKS (of releasing and of not releasing proposed fix):

Risk is low since there is two events will be added.

Date:24-Apr-2013 13:46:20 User:Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

-----  
IMPACT ON USER:

An Error event will be generated when next TP opening figures of DEF SU conatins any non zero Localsuspense movements.

Another error event will be generated when the sum of the two Discrepancy Transferred lines on the BTS, for the Branch Total, Not equal the sum of the two Discrepancy Resolved lines.

The purpose of these Error Events is to alert the support teams that something has occurred that shouldn?t have done so that they can investigate it quickly.

Date:24-Apr-2013 13:46:47 User:Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

Action placed on Team:xCtr\_BAC\_GDC, User:Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

Date:24-Apr-2013 13:46:59 User:Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Ravindra Kumar  
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:24-Apr-2013 13:47:25 User:Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

Please Review.

Date:17-May-2013 09:32:37 User:Ravindra Kumar

Ok With Analysis.

Date:17-May-2013 09:32:48 User:Ravindra Kumar

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune  
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:17-May-2013 11:09:50 User:Ravindra Kumar

The call Target Release has been moved to Proposed For -- HNG-X 08.82

Date:17-May-2013 11:11:56 User:Ravindra Kumar

Action has been removed from the call

Date:17-May-2013 11:17:19 User:Ravindra Kumar

Action placed on Team:RelMngmntForum

Date:20-May-2013 14:48:07 User:Louise Barham

The call Target Release has been moved to Targeted At -- HNG-X 08.82

Date:20-May-2013 14:48:27 User:Louise Barham

Targeted in PTF as requested

Date:20-May-2013 14:48:32 User:Louise Barham

Action has been removed from the call

Date:19-Jun-2013 12:31:55 User:Jon Hulme

The design is to raise events on branch rollover if:

a) The next TP's Opening Figures, generated for stock unit DEF, include Local

Suspense products that don't net to zero value.

b) The sum of the two Discrepancy Transferred lines on the BTS, for the Branch Total, do not equal the sum of the two Discrepancy Resolved lines.

The design is to follow the same pattern as the TradingPositionNotEqualToZero error and event created when the BTS trading position is non zero (see btsManagementInfoSummarySection\_v2Template.vmxml, ReportingHelperBLO.java and AccountingReportBLO.pdl), i.e. error "0903.com.fujitsu.poa.ctrc.businesslogic.reporting.nonZeroTradingPosition" and event id 117.

So 2 new system errors to be logged at error level, and two new deferred events. The new events will not appear on the counter event log report.

Suggested system errors:

"0904.com.fujitsu.poa.ctrc.businesslogic.reporting.nonZeroLocalSuspenseBranchOpeningFigures"  
"0905.com.fujitsu.poa.ctrc.businesslogic.reporting.mismatchedBTSdiscrepancyTransferredandResolved"

Event ids:

124 "The branch local suspense opening figures for TP %TP% do not net to zero."

125 "The BTS branch discrepancy transferred totals do not match the branch discrepancy resolved totals."

The event id spreadsheet is now formally held in Dimensions as DES/APP/HLD/2255. Please can you update [http://10.182.7.102/doku/doku.php?id=appserv:reco\\_rdbusinessevent\\_190&s=record%20business%20event](http://10.182.7.102/doku/doku.php?id=appserv:reco_rdbusinessevent_190&s=record%20business%20event) to refer to this HLD - half way down the page it has a link to the old events spreadsheet in project web - think link should be removed and the reader referred to DES/APP/HLD/2255 in Dimensions.

Date:18-Jul-2013 15:42:09 User:Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

Evidence Added - [code patches](#)

Date:18-Jul-2013 15:42:32 User:Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

Action placed on Team:xCtr\_BAC\_GDC, User:Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

Date:18-Jul-2013 15:42:44 User:Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Venkata Peddapothula  
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:18-Jul-2013 15:43:06 User:Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune

Please review code patches.

Root Cause	None
Logger	_Customer Call_ -- EDSC
Subject Product	General/Other/Misc -- Unknown General/Other/Misc (version unspecified)
Assignee	Venkata Peddapothula -- xCtr_BAC_GDC
Last Progress	18-Jul-2013 15:43 -- Leela Dhanalakshmi Nune