



Jon Thompson

GRO

GRO

28/04/2010 09:30

To: Jon.P.Thompson@

GRO

cc:

Subject: HNG\_X.HNG\_X\_Release\_1 - Defect #13566 - SV&I R2D3 PAFLite  
- Changing service during a mails txn causes postcode previously input to be retained and un-amendable.

**Defect ID** SV&I R2D3 PAFLite - Changing service during a mails txn causes  
: 13566 postcode previously input to be retained and un-amendable.

**Description**

**Test Instance:** [1]FUNC\_RL2\_PL\_T037\_Mails txn is performed where the service selected has a Address Capture setting of L. But clerk elects to change the service at the final service confirmation screen 40. The new service selected has a Address Capture setting of O.

Changing service during a mails txn causes postcode previously input to be retained and un-amendable, and also displays the last address captured at the top of the screen.

Please see attached zip file containing screenshot and counter logs.

**Steps taken:**

1. Select Post Mail Item and enter item weight as 20g. Tab and <Enter>.
2. Select Express 10 service.
3. Enter a valid postcode (e.g. RG8 8NG).
4. Accept message and <enter> to continue without entering a VOG or selecting an add-on service.
5. Scan Express 10 barcode (e.g. XWB14618902GB).
6. Select Change Service" on the final summary screen.
7. Select Express 48 service (or SD 9).

The postcode field is not displayed because the ref data setting for PostcodeReq for Express 48 (and RM services) is "N". The postcode previously entered is then carried through into the PAFLite screen and may not be amended. In addition, the address captured previously through PAF heavy/not Lite is displayed at the top of the screen.

**Comments**

Andrea Arnold <arnolda>, 15/04/2010 10:26:44: Please route to Martin Day in dev.

Peak User <PEAK>, 15/04/2010 10:35:09:  
PEAK Created Successfully

Peak User <DayM>, 15/04/2010 11:57:24:

I don't believe this is a fault. If the clerk enters the postcode either on the criteria screen or subsequently, it shouldn't be cleared down if they then change the service. The system doesn't make any assumptions about where the postcode was entered i.e pre or post service selection screen. The same would be true for fields such as weight. For fields such as the value of goods, that can only be entered post 'Service selection screen' then these should be cleared down if the service is changed.

Andrea Arnold <arnolda>, 15/04/2010 15:11:53: But you still have the issue that the PAF validated address captured initially is displayed on the PAFLite screen but is not selectable?

Peak User <DayM>, 20/04/2010 13:27:32:

The address at the top is not supposed to be selectable as it is history text generated by the normal PAF step. This is standard behaviour of normal PAF in that the history text will be added to the screen and therefore visible on other screens. It happens to be included onto the screen for PAF lite and not the other Postal Services screens, because PAF Lite is an included use case. I think we need a good reason to override this standard behaviour, as this history text may be useful information to the clerk. If this answer is sufficient, then I suggest this peak is closed as no fault. However, if there shouldn't be history text, then ensuring that the history text generated from normal PAF does not appear on the PAF lite screen is not straight forward. It would require a change to the normal PAF use case (Acquire Address Details) and this can't be resolved through modifying PAF Lite. The 'Acquire Address Details' would need to suppress the adding of the history text. However, other use cases are also calling this use case such as APADC which require the history text. The solution would require modification to 'Acquire Address Details' such that a parameter is passed in e.g. noHistoryOutput. Such a flag is available for calling use cases to use for manual address capture. The address details would then added to the history for non-postal services use cases and not for Postal Services (Source and Destination address capture). It needs to be investigated if this approach is actually a fix or a change to the use case. Can you therefore discuss with POL as to whether this is likely scenario to happen and whether it should be addressed or not? ~~~~DO NOT DELETE THIS LINE!!! Add comments below this! ~~~~

Andrea Arnold <arnolda>, 22/04/2010 11:57:22: Thanks Martin. Steve - can you get the Business

requirement please?

Jon Thompson <thompsonj>, 23/04/2010 14:55:44:  
Steve Wiseall has mailed Andrew Perkins for guidance (22/04/2010)

**Defect Details**

<b>Defect ID</b>	13566
<b>Status</b>	Further Information Required
<b>Assigned To</b>	wisealls
<b>Product</b>	CP0388 - PAF Lite
<b>Reproducible</b>	Y
<b>Severity</b>	2 - Medium
<b>Priority</b>	2 - Medium
<b>Detected By</b>	arnolda
<b>Detected on Date</b>	2010-04-15
<b>Counter Version</b>	202.00
<b>Test Rig</b>	R2SV&I - Release 2 SV&I
<b>PEAK Status</b>	Final
<b>Business Impact</b>	Visible
<b>Detected In</b>	R2SV&I Cycle 3
<b>Response Description</b>	Advice after Investigation
<b>Response Category</b>	95
<b>Test Type</b>	Functional
<b>Send To Peak</b>	Y
<b>PEAK Reference</b>	PC0197771
<b>OTI Path</b>	Path201
<b>Modified</b>	2010-04-23 14:56:44
<b>Control DB</b>	QC
<b>PEAK Delivery Info</b>	Reported In - R2SV&I Cycle 3