

---

**From:** Andrew Daley [GRO]  
**Sent:** Mon 05/07/2010 9:51:00 AM (UTC)  
**To:** Christopher G. Knight [GRO]; Helen Dickinsor [GRO]; Paul Whitake [GRO]; Robert Daily [GRO]; Sharron L Jennings [GRO]; Steve Bradshaw [GRO]; Suzanne Winter [GRO]  
**Subject:** FW: Duplication of Transaction Records in ARQ Returns  
**Attachment:** pic12843.gif  
**Attachment:** ARQ Report.xls  
**Attachment:** Detailed process for removal of duplicate transactions.doc

FYI

---

**From:** Jane M Owen  
**Sent:** 02 July 2010 16:30  
**To:** Jason G Collins; Andrew Daley  
**Cc:** Mark Dinsdale  
**Subject:** Fw: Duplication of Transaction Records in ARQ Returns

Dear Both  
Please see email below from Penny Thomas.

Mark, Alan Simpson and myself have had a conference call today to look at potential problems that this is likely to cause. Firstly the suggested workaround will need to be put to our Legal Team and until that has been agreed any further ARQ requests, including those which have already been submitted, will be suspended.

There are 2 cases currently with the court - West Byfleet and Porters Avenue and I will speak to Lisa and Jon about these as we need to know what in the way of ARQs and the corresponding statements have been presented to court. In addition I have identified the following offices from the casework spreadsheet as ones that potentially could have already had information presented to the court. Could you please confirm whether or not this is the case and also whether there are any that I have missed as Fujitsu will need to take corrective action.

Riverhead 130/948 New Cheltenham 263/511  
Fleetville 113/033  
Carryduff 186/704  
Kirkoswald 250/410  
Addiscombe Exchange 055/013  
Tudor Parade 189/116  
Sidcup 134/014  
Stourbridge 150/208  
Tresco 386/555  
Essex Road 201/004  
Rainford 300/434  
Rinkfield 252/418  
Castleton 234/424  
Melsonby 279/309

I realise that this is a lot to digest but if you need to speak to me for any clarification before you forward to

your teams then please give me a ring. Also can you let me know if you think of any further problems that this could cause.

Regards

Jane

---

Jane Owen  
**Security Team Advisor**  
**Security Team, Post Office Ltd**



---

Royal Mail, Clippers House, 3rd Floor, Clippers Quay, SALFORD. M50 3NW

GRO Postline: GRO  
GRO Mobex: GRO  
GRO

Post Office HR Help



**Confidential Information:**

*This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorised review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please contact me by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.*

----- Forwarded by Jane M Owen/e/POSTOFFICE on 02/07/2010 14:31 -----

**Thomas Penny**

<GRO>

30/06/2010 13:33

To: Sue Lowther/e/POSTOFFICE, Mark Dinsdale/e/POSTOFFICE, Jane M Owen/e/POSTOFFICE  
cc:  
Subject: Duplication of Transaction Records in ARQ Returns

Sue/Mark/Jane

We have identified that a number of recent ARQ returns contain duplicated transaction records.

With Horizon counters, the mechanism by which Data is audited has always worked on the principle that it is acceptable to audit the same data more than once – in particular if in doubt as to whether or not it has been previously audited successfully.

The Mechanism used on Horizon to retrieve the data took this into account and only presented one instance of such duplicate data in the ARQ extracts.

However it has recently been noticed that the HNG-X retrieval mechanism does not remove such duplicates and a quick scan of the ARQs provided to Post Office Ltd since the change to the new system indicates that about 35% of the ARQs might contain some duplicate data. A Peak has been raised to enhance the extraction toolset and remove such duplicate data in the future. However until the fix is developed, tested and deployed, there is a possibility that data is duplicated.

The reliable way to identify a duplicate transaction is to use the <Num> attribute that is used to generate the unique sequence numbers. This attribute is not currently included in the Excel version of ARQ data that has been passed to Post Office Ltd in the past. This will be included in all future ARQs until the problem is fixed. A workaround, using the <NUM> attribute is suggested, and a detailed process is attached.

Note that we have identified a scenario with Postal Services transactions where multiple, identical mails items are accepted (ie the Quantity button is set to greater than 1), but Postage Labels are printed for each individual item. This results in separate transactions being generated for each item, which are identical in the ARQ extracts (there is another minor difference in the raw data apart from the <Num> attribute, but this different attribute is not currently included in the ARQ extract).

I've put together a spreadsheet detailing affected ARQs, which is also attached.

Mark/Jane I've tried to call you both this morning but I understand you are both tied up. Please call and we can discuss.

Kind regards  
Penny/Tom

**Penny Thomas Tom Lillywhite**  
**Security Analyst, Customer Services Principal Security Consultant**

**Information & Security Services**

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

E-mail: [tom.lillywhite](mailto:tom.lillywhite@fujitsu.com) **GRO**

Tel: **GRO** / **GRO** Tel: **GRO**  
Mob: **GRO** Mob: **GRO**  
Fax: **GRO**  
E-Mail: **GRO**  
Web: <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.**

*(See attached file: Detailed process for removal of duplicate transactions.doc)(See attached file: ARQ Report.xls)*