

Export

## Peak Incident Management System

Call Reference	PC0224126	Call Logger	Deleted User -- EDSC
Release	Reported In -- HNG-X R6.50	Top Ref	PC0223870
Call Type	Cloned call	Priority	B -- Progress stopped
Contact	Deleted Contact	Call Status	Closed -- Avoidance Action Supplied
Target Date	26/04/2013	Effort (Man Days)	0
Summary	Branch 011458 has an unexplained discrepancy - old BTS_DATA recs		
All References	Type	Value	
	QFP Review	QFP RC	
	DevIntRel-Director	Live Supp.Test	
	Clone Master	PC0223870	
	DevIntRel-Director	Live Supp.Test	
	MSC	043J0378913	
	TRIOLE for Service	A2401368	

## Progress Narrative

Date:08-Mar-2013 13:41:56 User:Anne Chambers

CALL PC0224126 opened

Details entered are:-

Summary:Branch 011458 has an unexplained discrepancy

Call Type:C

Call Priority:B

Target Release:HNG-X R6.50

Routed to:EDSC - Anne Chambers

Date:25-Feb-2013 16:55:53 User:\_Customer Call\_

CALL PC0223870 opened

Details entered are:-

Summary:The Branch as an unexplained discrepancy

Call Type:L

Call Priority:C

Target Release:HNG-X R6.50

Routed to:EDSC - \_Unassigned\_

Date:25-Feb-2013 16:55:52 User:\_Customer Call\_

=====

INCIDENT MANAGEMENT

Date/Time Raised: Feb 25 2013 4:51PM

Priority: C

Contact Name: Ibrahim at NBSC

Contact Phone: GRO

Originator: XXXXXX@TFS01

Originator's reference: A2401368

Product Serial No:

Product Site: 011458

=====

Transfer Note: Transfer Group from 'POA-HSD IMT' to 'POA-FJ-PEAK'

:

The Branch as an unexplained discrepancy. They balanced and rolled trading period on 6 Feb, they have one stock unit AA and this was balanced with a loss of £39.57 which was transferred to local suspense however the figure that was cleared out from local suspense was much higher £9839.45.

I have carried out transaction logs for all transactions from date range 31 Jan to 06 Feb. Branch has submitted copies of the final balance reports from TP 10 BP4 and TP10 BP 5 the balance report for TP10 BP5 shows discrepancy transferred of £39.57 and then discrepancy resolved £9839.45. The transaction log completed for all transaction does not show any other figures being entered into or removed from housekeeping/local suspense account.

Node 1

06/02/2013 16:50 to 16:51

AA TP 10 BP4/5

HAS001

---

Incident History:

---

2013-02-25 16:51:20 [ Richardson, Mark ]

INIT : Create a new request/incident/problem/change/issue

---



2013-02-25 16:54:19 [ Richardson, Mark ]  
zneun\_en\_poa : Open Notification  
---

2013-02-25 16:54:19 [ Richardson, Mark ]  
zneut\_en\_poa : Transfer Notification  
---

2013-02-25 16:54:54 [ Richardson, Mark ]  
zneut\_en\_poa : Transfer Notification

Date:25-Feb-2013 16:59:22 User:Clive Turrell  
Product General/Other/Misc -- Unknown General/Other/Misc (version unspecified) added.

Date:25-Feb-2013 17:02:16 User:Clive Turrell  
The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Anne Chambers  
Progress was delivered to Consumer

Date:25-Feb-2013 17:47:51 User:Anne Chambers  
The call summary has been changed from:-  
The Branch as an unexplained discrepancy  
The call summary is now:-  
Branch 011458 has an unexplained discrepancy

Date:26-Feb-2013 13:18:12 User:Anne Chambers  
[Start of Response]  
When they completed the balance on 6th Feb and cleared the loss from Local Suspense, the amount cleared was £9839.45 instead of the loss they had put into local suspense, which was £39.57.

This appears to be a consequence of something that happened during the previous TP rollover on 2nd Jan: a 'gain to local suspense' of £9799.88 was included in the DEF opening figures.

I don't think any of the local suspense products should ever appear in opening figures, however I have found 14 such lines (all prod 6295 Gain to LS, all different branches). Unfortunately all created Nov-Dec last year, so there is almost no remaining counter evidence.

Continuing to investigate cause and implications.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation  
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:26-Feb-2013 13:33:23 User:Kevin McKeown  
The call Priority has been changed from C  
The call Priority is now B

Date:26-Feb-2013 13:33:53 User:Anne Chambers  
Evidence Added - [BRSS extracts showing local suspense movements / opening bal](#)

Date:26-Feb-2013 13:53:26 User:Anne Chambers  
We only keep opening figures for 3 old trading periods, so can't be sure when problem started.

Date:26-Feb-2013 14:55:35 User:Anne Chambers  
[Start of Response]  
Asked Ibrahim at NBSC GRO if the suspense report from 2nd January is available - he'll obtain it and email to HSD IMT.  
[End of Response]  
Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation  
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:26-Feb-2013 16:51:32 User:Anne Chambers  
[Start of Response]  
Suspense report for TP9 (2nd Jan 2013) received, which shows no anomaly. I thought it might show 9799.88- c/f, since that amount is b/f on the TP10 report, but it doesn't.

The branch also sent the suspense report for TP10 2012, with the comment that they had the same problem last year - and although it is a very faint copy, it appears to show 9799.88- b/f.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation  
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:26-Feb-2013 16:53:46 User:Anne Chambers  
Evidence Added - [Branch suspense reports](#)

Date:26-Feb-2013 17:56:09 User:Anne Chambers  
[Start of Response]  
Have asked what the branch did about the problem last year.  
Also checking what the archiving strategy has been for BRDB\_RX\_SU\_OPENING\_BALANCE in the past, and when it changed.



[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation  
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:27-Feb-2013 16:18:08 User:Anne Chambers

Evidence File Updated - Updated notes / extracts etc

Date:27-Feb-2013 16:20:17 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

I have now found the cause of the problem: some data from autumn 2010 has been retained in table BRDB\_RX\_BTS\_DATA, for 14 separate branches. These branches will all have been affected by this problem late 2011 and late 2012, though in some cases the amounts involved are small.

Branch	Affected TP	AMOUNT
--------	-------------	--------

002647	9	-6.71
002840	9	140.61
010007	9	-0.01
011458	10	-9,799.88
012004	9	16.12
054011	9	3.34
101832	9	5.84
104937	9	-49.62
155025	9	-113.14
156715	9	11.55
211844	9	-41.77
243242	9	-0.51
266418	9	3,186.70
297611	9	160.92

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation  
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:27-Feb-2013 16:22:43 User:Anne Chambers

Still to be investigated:

- Exactly how did these records cause the observed effect?
- Why were the records not removed by the normal archiving process?
- What impact has the problem had on the branch accounts?
- What impact has the problem had on POLSAP?
- How do we remove the records to prevent future problems?
- Were there any affected branches which have since closed?
- There are 19 other branches which have old data in the affected table, but not relating to Local Suspense ? could this cause any problems with the branch accounts? (some may be temporarily closed).

Date:28-Feb-2013 14:06:00 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

Further investigations:

\*\* Exactly how did these records cause the observed effect?

The old data is picked up, along with the correct data, during the Branch Trading Statement production (at the end of the period BEFORE the problem is visible at the branch). The old opening figure (which may be for one or more of the Local Suspense products 6295-6298, associated with an unknown stock unit) gets converted during branch rollover, to prod 6295 Gain to Local Suspense (though the sign may be positive or negative), and written as an opening figure for the subsequent period, stock unit DEF.

At the end of the second period, this is included when the amount to be cleared from Local Suspense is calculated (when the last stock unit is rolled over), so the branch is forced to clear it.

\*\* How to identify the problem from branch reports:

Branch Trading Statement: the sum of the two Discrepancy Transferred lines does not match the total of the two Discrepancy Resolved Lines

Suspense Account report: the B/Fwd figure on the report does not match the C/Fwd figure on the report for the previous TP.

\*\* Why were the records not removed by the normal archiving process? The records, created Autumn 2010, belonged to stock units that have since been deleted. Normally they would have been removed before the 'deleted stock unit' entry itself was removed from the list of stock units, but there were some teething problems with archiving and they were 'orphaned' and are now ignored by the archiving process.

\*\* How do we remove the records to prevent future problems? Once well away from the problem TP, eg once into TP 1, get the branches to recreate a stock unit with the same name as the problem one, then delete it again. Or we just delete them from the database under MSC.

\*\* Were there any affected branches which have since closed? I have checked branches closed within the last 90 days, all ok. For branches closed longer ago which might be under investigation, the suspense account reports and BTS could be checked (see above).

\*\* There are 19 other branches which have old data in the affected table, but not relating to Local Suspense ? could this cause any problems with the branch accounts?

I have checked very carefully and conclude that these extra lines have no ongoing impact on the branch accounts.

\*\* There is old data in some other tables that use the same archiving strategy - this doesn't affect the branch balancing in the same way, but what would happen if a stock unit with the same name was recreated?



\*\* Any corrective actions?

Local suspense should always be zero when the branch is rolled over - should this be checked and reported?  
I think the archiving strategy is now ok, but this may need to be reviewed.

Still to do:

\*\* What impact has the problem had on the branch accounts?  
\*\* What impact has the problem had on POLSAP?

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation  
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:28-Feb-2013 14:24:24 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

Correction:

\*\* Exactly how did these records cause the observed effect?

The old data is picked up, along with the correct data, during the Branch Trading Statement production (at the end of the period BEFORE the problem is visible at the branch). The \*\*\*\*old BTS data line\*\*\*\* (which may be for one or more of the Local Suspense products 6295-6298, associated with an unknown stock unit) gets converted during branch rollover, to prod 6295 Gain to Local Suspense (though the sign may be positive or negative), and written as an opening figure for the subsequent period, stock unit DEF.

At the end of the second period, this is included when the amount to be cleared from Local Suspense is calculated (when the last stock unit is rolled over), so the branch is forced to clear it.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation  
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:28-Feb-2013 17:17:58 User:Anne Chambers

Evidence File Updated - Another update of notes / extracts etc

Date:28-Feb-2013 17:18:31 User:Anne Chambers

Evidence Added - Spreadsheet sent to POL

Date:06-Mar-2013 16:05:10 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

There was a conference call with POL (Laura Darby, Mark Wardle and others) on 28th Feb about this call, and the spreadsheet showing the impact of the problem on the 14 branches was sent to them by Steve Bansal. We are waiting to hear from Mark whether this is sufficient information for them to resolve the consequences on the branches and POLSAP.

We will then need to get the old data causing the problem removed from the database (before TP 9 - Oct-Nov 2013) and consider whether extra checks should be put in place to trap similar anomalies in the future.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation  
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:08-Mar-2013 13:37:01 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

POL will be arranging another conf call next week.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type L as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation  
Response was delivered to Consumer

Date:08-Mar-2013 13:41:46 User:Anne Chambers

Cloning call so that we can get the old data removed....

Date:08-Mar-2013 13:41:56 User:Anne Chambers

Call cloned from original call:PC0223870 by User:Anne Chambers

Date:08-Mar-2013 14:54:35 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

There are records in table BRDB\_RX\_BTS\_DATA, created Autumn 2010, belonging to stock units that have since been deleted. Normally they would have been removed before the 'deleted stock unit' entry itself was removed from the list of stock units, but there were some teething problems with archiving and they were 'orphaned' and are now ignored by the archiving process.

There are also some old records in BRDB\_SU\_OPENING\_BALANCE for the same reason.

Additional notes and extracts attached.

Please provide script and get MSC raised to remove old data belonging to non-existent stock units from these tables, and consider whether any changes are needed to the archiving strategy to prevent this happening again.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type C as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation



Date:08-Mar-2013 15:18:51 User:Anne Chambers  
The call summary has been changed from:-  
Branch 011458 has an unexplained discrepancy  
The call summary is now:-  
Branch 011458 has an unexplained discrepancy - old BTS\_DATA recs

Date:08-Mar-2013 15:19:29 User:Anne Chambers  
Evidence Added - [Additional notes re archiving](#)

Date:08-Mar-2013 15:19:54 User:Anne Chambers  
The Call record has been transferred to the team: BDB-Host-Dev

Date:11-Mar-2013 09:49:47 User:Vijesh Pandya  
Reference Added: QFP Review QFP RC

Date:13-Mar-2013 09:47:23 User:Anne Chambers  
We need to make sure a copy of the records being removed is kept somewhere in case there are questions to be answered about any of the affected branches' accounts.

Date:21-Mar-2013 16:02:39 User:Steve Goddard  
The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Wing Pang

Date:27-Mar-2013 13:59:43 User:Wing Pang  
The extract which Anne done shows that all the records that we want deleted were inserted in 2010. We need to delete ONLY the old records in BRDB\_RX\_BTS\_DATA and BRDB\_SU\_OPENING\_BALANCE;ie those inserted before 01-JAN-2011.  
Operation:

1) copy of the records being removed

```
CREATE TABLE OPS$BRDB.SAV_BRDB_RX_BTS_DATA
AS
SELECT * from OPS$BRDB.BRDB_RX_BTS_DATA
WHERE trunc(insert_timestamp) < TO_DATE('20110101','YYYYMMDD');
```

```
CREATE TABLE OPS$BRDB.SAV_BRDB_SU_OPENING_BALANCE
AS
SELECT * from OPS$BRDB.SAV_BRDB_SU_OPENING_BALANCE
WHERE trunc(insert_timestamp) < TO_DATE('20110101','YYYYMMDD');
```

2) get the number of records in SAV\_BRDB\_RX\_BTS\_DATA and SAV\_BRDB\_SU\_OPENING\_BALANCE

```
select count(*) from OPS$BRDB.SAV_BRDB_RX_BTS_DATA;
select count(*) from OPS$BRDB.SAV_BRDB_SU_OPENING_BALANCE;
```

3) delete records

```
DELETE FROM OPS$BRDB.SAV_BRDB_RX_BTS_DATA
WHERE trunc(insert_timestamp) < TO_DATE('20110101','YYYYMMDD');
```

```
DELETE FROM OPS$BRDB.SAV_BRDB_SU_OPENING_BALANCE
WHERE trunc(insert_timestamp) < TO_DATE('20110101','YYYYMMDD');
```

4) commit if nos of deleted records = nos of records in sav table

Date:10-Apr-2013 08:44:08 User:Gareth Seemungal  
Peer review alteration:

The extract which Anne done shows that all the records that we want deleted were inserted in 2010. We need to delete ONLY the old records in BRDB\_RX\_BTS\_DATA and BRDB\_SU\_OPENING\_BALANCE;ie those inserted before 01-JAN-2011.  
Operation:

1) copy of the records being removed

```
CREATE TABLE OPS$BRDB.SAV_BRDB_RX_BTS_DATA
AS
SELECT * from OPS$BRDB.BRDB RX BTS DATA
WHERE trunc(insert_timestamp) < TO_DATE('20110101','YYYYMMDD');
```



```
CREATE TABLE OPS$BRDB.SAV_BRDB_SU_OPENING_BALANCE
AS
SELECT * from OPS$BRDB.SAV_BRDB_SU_OPENING_BALANCE
WHERE trunc(insert_timestamp) < TO_DATE('20110101','YYYYMMDD');
```

2) get the number of records in SAV\_BRDB\_RX\_BTS\_DATA and  
SAV\_BRDB\_SU\_OPENING\_BALANCE

```
SELECT COUNT(*) FROM OPS$BRDB.SAV_BRDB_RX_BTS_DATA;
SELECT COUNT(*) FROM OPS$BRDB.SAV_BRDB_SU_OPENING_BALANCE;
```

3) delete records

```
DELETE FROM OPS$BRDB.BRDB_RX_BTS_DATA
WHERE trunc(insert_timestamp) < TO_DATE('20110101','YYYYMMDD');
```

```
DELETE FROM OPS$BRDB.BRDB_SU_OPENING_BALANCE
WHERE trunc(insert_timestamp) < TO_DATE('20110101','YYYYMMDD');
```

4) commit if nos of deleted records = nos of records in sav table

Date:10-Apr-2013 08:50:55 User:Wing Pang

The Call record has been transferred to the team: EDSC

Date:10-Apr-2013 09:14:41 User:Mike Croshaw

The Call record has been assigned to the Team Member: Anne Chambers

Date:15-Apr-2013 15:40:01 User:\_Mail Manager\_

Date:24-Apr-2013 14:03:50 User:Anne Chambers

Target Date/Time updated: new value is 26/04/2013 13:41

[Start of Response]

MSC 043J0378913 raised to remove recs from BRDB - Thurs 25th April.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type C as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Date:24-Apr-2013 14:04:03 User:Anne Chambers

Reference Added: MSC 043J0378913

Date:25-Apr-2013 11:02:46 User:Anne Chambers

Evidence Added - Removal of records from BRDB

Date:25-Apr-2013 11:57:37 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

Records have been removed, details attached. Witnessed by Dave Seddon.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type C as Category 40 -- Pending -- Incident Under Investigation

Date:25-Apr-2013 16:07:27 User:Anne Chambers

[Start of Response]

Closing call.

[End of Response]

Response code to call type C as Category 70 -- Final -- Avoidance Action Supplied

Routing to Call Logger following Final Progress update.

Defect cause updated to 14 -- Development - Code

Date:25-Apr-2013 16:08:40 User:Anne Chambers

CALL PC0224126 closed: Category 70 Type C

Root Cause

Development - Code

Logger

Deleted User -- EDSC

Subject Product

General/Other/Misc -- Unknown (version unspecified)

Assignee

Deleted User -- EDSC

Last Progress

25-Apr-2013 16:08 -- Anne Chambers