Post & Go - Balancing & Accounting

Stakeholders

Network - Simon J Smith / Andrea Wallis / (Tom Pegler)

FSC - Paul Lebeter / Mark Wood

Mails Team - Julian King

Security - Claire Davies

Service Management - Richard Benton

Problem Management - Antonio Jamasb / David Overstreet

- Product Owner after being in branch for over 6 years, there is no Product Owner. We need to identify who is best placed to take this on.
 - JK advised that there is no formal owner for the Post & Go service but moving to the new self-serve provider, NCR, Network will be responsible for the machines but Product areas will be responsible for their products on the machine i.e. Mails team, Bill Payments etc. As such the associated actions will be picked up in the most appropriate work areas.
 - It was agreed that although no Product Owner identified for Post & Go, none is required to resolve the current issues set out below.
- Branches require a full set of official balancing and accounting instructions
 I have spoken to several branches who have stated they have never been provided with these.
 - o JK advised there are new instructions which were drafted but never formally signed off and distributed to branches following the introduction of Post & Go 2 around October/November 2011. These are still relevant. JK to send to RB who will distribute to the meeting attendees as stakeholders for comment and to make amendments as required. Once agreed, this will need to be submitted to the Communications team for inclusion as a Crown Focus article (there are also 4 non-Crown branches to consider also).
 - No comments received from any stakeholders and both FSC & Mails team agreed to sign off. RB to send operating instructions to SJS who will have two branches review and return to RB with any comments by 25/07/13.
- Confirmation from Network/FSC on the requirement of frequency of completing a full balance on each machine i.e. weekly/monthly and can branches print the Trading Report from the machine.
 - FSC preference would be for branches to complete a weekly balance (this being a full defund of cash on each machine) rather than monthly as any anomalies are easier to trace by week, however will abide by Network's decision. Network efficiency has taken hours out of the Crown branches and therefore the resource required to complete a full balance each week is not there. AS to consult with

- Network (Tom Pegler or cover as Tom on leave this week) as to their preference. Once agreed this will need including in the official balancing & accounting instructions.
- Discussed again the frequency of balancing, FSC preferring weekly for ease of use if identifying transaction discrepancies, whereas Network prefer monthly in line with current balancing procedures. However AW raised a risk for branches leaving it to monthly as identifying any discrepancies in monies in the machine would be more difficult to find. SJS to speak to Tom Pegler to discuss further.
- Some branches with multiple machines balance them as an overall collective figure rather than on an individual machine basis – is this a correct method, who has agreed this, does it fit with FSC/Audit/Security balancing instructions for other products.
 - A pilot is currently running (Alan Orpe, project manager?) where branches with multiple machines defund them and place the monies in a sealed bag to be sent to the Cash Centre to be counted, thereby reducing the amount of time required in branch to balance the P&G machines. This pilot is only running in a few branches (branches TBC) but if successful, would be rolled out to the estate. JS to speak to Alan to get more detail & RB to invite Alan to next call.
 - CD advised that the Cash Counting project at Birmingham & Derby City had been deemed successful. RB to contact Alan Orpe to confirm if this approach was to be adopted across the estate. If so, the operating instructions will need amending to reflect the new process. This has not stopped unexplained losses at Birmingham after adopting this process. CD also advised that TC's across 6 branches since the start of the financial year amount to approx. £20k and is being discussed at other security forums.

Branch process for reporting unable to print weekly Trading Report to Wincor – and subsequent Wincor actions.

- o Branches need to run a Trading Report weekly to prevent a build-up of data which in turn creates a software error due to the original specifications of the build. Branches were never informed to continue running these reports following the introduction of TA's approximately 2 ½ years ago. As such quite a number of branches have been unable to run them and this requires a Wincor engineer to complete a software rebuild on the machine to facilitate this happening. This is costing the Business, specifically Service Management, for each engineer visit to resolve these. The cost currently stands at over £7k for this work being carried out. Once agreed this will need including in the official balancing & accounting instructions.
- o RB submitted a Crown Focus article, published 28/06/13 which referred branches to run this. The volume of branches unable to do so has dropped significantly no new branches reported as being unable to run this report. RB to provide SIS,AW,PL & MW a copy of the article.
- Confirmation of the existing Transaction Acknowledgement (TA)process.

- The TA process needs to be re-issued with the balancing & accounting instructions as a reminder for branches. PL advised he will source the instructions to include in the communication to branches.
- PL to provide in time for next meeting
- Branch process for reporting TA mis-match against the daily report produced by Post & Go machine(s) – FSC/NBSC/Wincor helpdesk and subsequent actions required to investigate and reconcile.
 - FSC stated they receive calls & emails direct from branches about mis-matched or missing TA's, however FSC have no formal route to escalate these for investigation. Missing TA's can occur due to nonpolling of machines. CH in agreement that Wincor should be proactive regarding raising an automatic incident on eservices if the number of files harvested overnight differs from the estate size i.e. 260 machines should equate to 260 files which are packaged and sent via PODG to Fujitsu for onward processing. The TA process to be included in any communication to branches will need to instruct branches when and who to call in the event of non-receipt of a TA but should already be there. RB to check with Kendra Dickinson what is held by NBSC on Knowledge Base. CH to look into branches contacting Wincor HD direct about TA's however they currently do not have the processes or knowledge for answering, investigating & resolving such gueries and if this would be feasible. There is also the issue of mis-matched TA's whereby the totals from Daily Trading Report from the machine do not match the TA delivered back to branch by Fujitsu via the Horizon system. RB currently organising with Wincor (and will also require assistance from Fujitsu Services) a mini project involving 3 branches where this is occurring regularly causing discrepancies running into £000's. RB to contact Chesterfield CO to also take part as they do not appear to be experiencing these types of problems.
 - Further to the above MW will investigate all open items across P&G estate, branch by branch, and provide a summary of what the discrepancies are back to RB. AJ advised that a process exists between POL & Fujitsu Services for investigating data mismatches. AJ to provide details on name of process & how this currently works. MW advised after a quick search that there is approximately £42.5k in open items from missing debit card transactions since Oct 2012 (TBC) with over 100 branches affected (Old St have an outstanding £24.6k discrepancy).
 - RB to investigate with Wincor how long archived data is stored for before being deleted.
 - RB to meet with AJ &DO to discuss previous issue regarding missing TA's and the fix which was put in place & raising this issue as a problem to be managed by the Problem Management function.