

Message

From: Lesley J Sewell [GRO]
Sent: 29/06/2013 18:55:57
To: Simon Baker [GRO] Alwen Lyons [GRO]
CC: Gina Gould [GRO]
Subject: RE: Summary of Receipts Payments problems

Simon

A couple of comments:

Can we change the reference from Bug to fault.

Given what Andy has sent to us late Friday – were these branches disadvantaged – ie did they have to put their own money in and if so for how long? From his summary it wasn't clear to me.

And if they did have to put their own money in, at what point did we reimburse them and did we give them so sort of additional payment due to inconvenience.

Thx

Gina: Can you print a copy for my SS file. Thx

Lesley J Sewell
Chief Information Officer

148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

Direct: [GRO] **Postline** [GRO]
Mobile: [GRO] **Mobex** [GRO]
[GRO]

POST
OFFICE

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.

From: Simon Baker
Sent: 28 June 2013 17:36
To: Lesley J Sewell; Alwen Lyons
Cc: Simon Baker
Subject: Summary of Receipts Payments problems

Timeline

March 2010	First incidence occurred
Aug-Oct 2010	Bulk of incidents occurred
October 2010	Issue Fixed
March 2011	Letters sent to branches and corrections made

Problem Description

- The problem occurs as part of the process of moving Discrepancies into Local Suspense.
- There was a bug, introduced as part of HNG, that in certain circumstances meant that discrepancies were not properly cleared to Local Suspense.
- This means that the gain or loss remained, unresolved, within the discrepancy account.
- If the sub postmaster did not look at their Final Balance Report carefully, they would have been unaware of this issue.
- The impact would have been that in order to balance, sub postmasters would have to either put their own money in (a disadvantage to the sub postmaster) or taken money out (an advantage to the sub postmaster)
- This problem was automatically picked up by the system, which had been designed to flag up these type of discrepancies

Impact to sub postmasters

- In total 62 branches were impacted
- Out of these 17 were sub postmaster branches (not crowns or multiples) who were disadvantaged
- The amount they were disadvantaged by is shown below

222311	Sprotbrough	Mr John R Hardwick	-£115.60
135026	Little Thurrock	Mr James Thandi	-£88.77
308611	Bettws	Mr Kabal Singh	-£50.28
131824	Crewe Road North	Mr Ajaz Saber	-£48.35
170114	Herongate	Dr Lalani Wickramasekera	-£37.83
272434	West End (Haydock)	Mr Simon John Heaton	-£37.17
176410	Dalston	Mr Mark Stakim	-£29.41
138824	Penicuik	Mr W B McGinley	-£23.97
065114	East Hanningfield	Mr Ashraf Rahman	-£20.06
235642	Plasmarl	Ms Michaela Inta Iona Sviker	-£11.20
319504	Wellow storage site	Mr Roger Anthony Jacob	-£3.97
202340	Dronfield	Mr Nigel Gregory	-£3.65
056948	Westerham	Mr Manjit S Kailey	-£3.15
341349	Kepwick	Mrs Patricia Bentley	-£1.95
400207	Swadlincote	Tamworth Co-operative Society	-£1.62
436217	Valley Road	Mr Geoffrey Hallam	-£0.34
158618	Kington	Mr Paul Calverley	-£0.09

Why did it take so long to resolve?

- Priority and distinction from other service issues that were happening at the time of the HNG rollout
- Complexity of understanding the root cause
- Getting agreement and clarity on how best to communicate this to branches

Simon Baker Head of Business Change and Assurance

2nd Floor, 148 Old Street, London, EC1V 9HQ

GRO

postoffice.co.uk
[@postofficenews](https://twitter.com/postofficenews)

