

## Export

## Peak Incident Management System

Call Reference	PC0209755	Call Logger	Steve Parker -- EDSC
Release	Reported In -- HNG-X R4	Top Ref	<u>3827143</u>
Call Type	Live Incidents/Defects	Priority	C -- Non-critical
Contact	Steve Parker	Call Status	Closed -- Advice after Investigation
Target Date	20/04/2011	Effort (Man Days)	0
Summary	FAD 010320 (Huddersfield)		
All References	Type	Value	
	SSCKEL	<u>KEL allend1645P</u>	
	DevIntRel-Director	Live Supp.Test	
	SSCKEL	<u>KEL allend1645P</u>	
	TRIOLE for Service	<u>3827143</u>	

## Progress Narrative

Date:15-Apr-2011 16:51:56 User:Steve Parker

CALL PC0209755 opened

Details entered are:-

Summary:FAD 010320 (Huddersfield)

Call Type:L

Call Priority:C

Target Release:HNG-X R4

Routed to:EDSC - \_Unassigned\_

Date:15-Apr-2011 16:51:56 User:Steve Parker

[Start of Response]

POL has a discrepancy with a post master regarding a transaction in Huddersfield for TPoS. The branch thought that they was settling the transaction below to debit card but it has been 'automatically settled to cash'. Branch thinks that that something went wrong with the pinpad - debit card txn declined but the branch didn't notice.

Branch: Huddersfield 0103209

Date time: 22/03/2011 : 12.13

Transaction No: 7-671886-2.

Product: 540 euros

£ Value £471.27 with sell margin £28.63.

User: CHA002

Stock unit: BUR

This was not noticed until the next day when they balanced and they then pulled off a transaction log and noticed the cash payment. A TFS call for this was logged on the day after the transaction (23/03) and NBSC and HSD both told the PM that it was user error.

It has now been raised again via TPoS introduction managers - Fujitsu Release managers etc. To provide a sanity check please retrieve the counter log for node 7 on this date and see if we can add anything?

Info back to be please - I'll discuss with Adam Bowe.

[End of Response]

Response code to call Live Incidents/Defects(L) as Potential Problem Identified(38)

Date:18-Apr-2011 08:09:18 User:Lorraine Elliott

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Dave Allen

Date:18-Apr-2011 12:31:04 User:Dave Allen

Have replicated this scenario on the SSC reference system:

Immediately after selecting "Sell Euros", MSG90092 "Transaction Prompt" appears; this states "Transactions paid for using a debit or credit card will require mandatory ID"

- I note that this isn't shown in the POC log for the Huddersfield incident.

Subsequently, the Clerk selected Method of Payment = "Debit Card", whereupon MSG10802 requests entry of the first 4 digits of the card's PAN (the "Debit Card Prefix")

After entering the debit card prefix, MSG10800 "Clerk Instructions" appears; this states "Do you wish to flag this transaction as suspicious for anti-money laundering purposes? If you select "Yes", you must also complete and submit form P4677".

- the PM answered "No" to this.

After entering the Customer's name and ID (passport) details, the Clerk is returned to the home screen which shows the "Total Due From Customer" = £500.00 - as would be expected.

At this point there is nothing to stop the Clerk settling to Fast Cash, even though "Debit Card" had been selected earlier in the dialogue.

The POC log confirms that "Fast Cash" was indeed selected at this point.

There is no evidence in the POC log of any PinPad interaction at any time during this session,  
no evidence of any Banking dialogue in the counter message log,  
and no evidence of the session being settled "automatically" in some way, rather than by action of the Clerk.

The counter logs can't show us whether or not the Clerk actually took £500 cash from the Customer, in exchange for 540 Euros.

Conclusion: the Clerk selected Debit Card as the method of payment early in the dialogue, but settled to Fast Cash at the end of the Session.

Date:18-Apr-2011 12:35:15 User:Dave Allen  
Routing call to Steve Parker.

Date:18-Apr-2011 12:35:25 User:Dave Allen  
The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Steve Parker

Date:24-Jun-2011 13:41:08 User:John Simpkins  
Should this just be fed back as User error or is it worth passing through development for a comment.  
  
Either way a KEL is required for this.

Date:24-Jun-2011 14:17:36 User:John Simpkins  
KEL allendl645P authorised

Date:24-Jun-2011 14:18:42 User:John Simpkins  
[Start of Response]  
KEL allendl645P created and authorised for this.  
[End of Response]  
Response code to call type L as Category 95 -- Final -- Advice after Investigation  
Routing to Call Logger following Final Progress update.  
Defect cause updated to 40 -- General - User

Date:24-Jun-2011 14:18:56 User:John Simpkins  
CALL PC0209755 closed: Category 95 Type L

Root Cause	General - User
Logger	Steve Parker -- EDSC
Subject Product	General/Other/Misc -- TPOS (version unspecified)
Assignee	Steve Parker -- EDSC
Last Progress	24-Jun-2011 14:18 -- John Simpkins