

Message

From: Lesley J Sewell [GRO]
Sent: 15/07/2013 19:01:51
To: Paula Vennells [GRO]
CC: Kevin Gilliland [GRO]; Susan Crichton [GRO]; Chris M Day [GRO]
Subject: Re: Case Study.pdf

Paula

Apologies for the length of this email, as there are a number of challenges in this case.

I've been through the case study in detail and asked the teams a number of questions. I do also believe there are some opportunities for us as we do change the architecture - but these will not be quick fixes. One of the key technology asks from this particular case was for a report writing facility to interrogate transactions - this may be something which is not appropriate for all our sub postmasters, however we do need to ensure they have the right information to do their job.

In summary, some of the points raised and our current position:

1. The online help facility which replaced the 500 page manual was introduced in 2010 as part of HNGx. Although online it's not particularly user friendly, there is a new operational self help initiative which is yet to be rolled out - I have requested further details on our plans and we also need to consider if this is enough to support the network.
2. This particular case centres around transactions that may have been entered twice, in this case a giro transaction. We don't trap duplicate transaction at the point of sale, I will look into this as this could be a useful enhancement. However, the standard reporting would capture all transaction so that the sub postmaster has a vehicle to check transactions.
3. The case challenges what access the sub postmasters have to transactions logs to enable them to understand what transactions have taken place and resolve any issues. Currently they have access to previous transactions for 60 days. This may or may not be adequate and may or may not be user friendly. The service team have a number of sub postmaster contacts who they will contact to ask their view on use-ability, this may be another opportunity to enhance the system. A great opportunity to review as part of the Branch User Forum.
4. The sub postmasters do not have report-writing facilities on Horizon, reports are standard and prescribed. This is another opportunity to review the reports to ensure they are user friendly. The way in which Horizon is currently architected and the technology we have in the branches would not enable us to implement such a tool.
5. This particular case makes reference to the balancing process; as part of the process review we should look at frequency and use-ability. Through our normal bau processes and engagement with SPMRs we have a few enhancements planned to aid this process, however I'm sure there could be more that we could do. In addition, we should look at why only monthly balancing as this could be a contributory

factor; although this needs to be a Network call as I'm not aware of the history as to why it changed from weekly to monthly.

6. When a Postmaster rolls-over (balance period or trading period) this case stated that the previous weeks transaction data is lost - this is not the case, as per above point 3 the transactions are retained for the sub postmaster to view for 60 days.
7. For improvements to screen layouts and menu hierarchies there are a number of enhancements currently planned within Horizon releases. As part of the Branch User Forum we do need to understand if there are further improvements. Service Management currently engage with the NFSP to understand where there are potential improvements which can be made and Fujitsu have committed this year to £100k in terms of value for enhancements.
8. The case challenges the slowness of printers. We need to explore this further.
9. The case also challenges using the counter terminals to complete end of day activities. Moving this to a back office terminal is not something that can be easily achieved, however our "Horizon anywhere" project which we are planning to pilot early next year will solve this particular challenge.

In summary, since this particular case there are a number of activities which have changed and we have moved on, however there are a number of tactical activities which will move us forward even further. The longer term opportunity will be our "Horizon anywhere" project which will enable Horizon to be run on a normal PC and then will allow other opportunities such as report writing capabilities or simple applications to help the SPMRs as they run their business. This is a longer term solution but one which we are working towards.

Whilst we have a forum for small enhancements via the NFSP and Service Management this needs to be rolled into the more formal Branch User Forum which we have committed too and we will also need to consider what funding this group will have access too. I'll discuss with Susan as we define the structure for each of the activities going forward.

Regards Lesley

Sent from my iPad

On 14 Jul 2013, at 20:54, "Paula Vennells" <[redacted]@GRO> wrote:

Hi both, I do hope you have had a lovely weekend? And Lesley, that your house move has gone well?

Attached is a confidential case study, which I have been allowed to share to help us as we plan what to do to correct the issues raised in the Second Sight review. It is an old one but I would imagine that our reaction and support judging from a particular case Kevin and I have been working on over the weekend, might not have improved as much as we would have hoped.

It might be obvious to Kevin (possibly both of you) who the individual is but as it has been shared with me on a confidential basis to help us, I need to keep the name off it. The PO is named so it would be easy to work out, so you must not forward to anyone else without removing the name of the PO.

Susan C has a copy as does Alice.

It poses a number of questions.

- Lesley it will be important that you can answer whether HNGx can now provide all the information the Spmr was requesting; and as you change the IT architecture that this also improves info to the Spmr. (I don't imagine Alice would raise this at the Board, but it is possible, so worth checking.) Please can you confirm to me, Susan and Kevin.
- Kevin and Susan: just for you to consider as we respond. The list is long: tone of voice, help not available, escalation impossible, Network and Legal blocking any ability to discuss, contract questions, etc. please can Susan go through with a fine tooth comb and list all the issues. It will be fantastic when we can state that all this is fixed.
- Chris and Martin - copied to keep you up to date.

Thx all, Paula

Sent from my iPad

<Case Study.pdf>

Sent from my iPad