Pjp comments added below

EPOSS RECONCILIATION and AI376

Actions agreed last week

<u>On us</u> by 24th January	<u>On them</u> by 24th January
1. We will complete mapping each of the 30 error types to the EPOSS Reconciliation matrix and make this available to POCL this week We will make appropriate experts available to further explain our analysis as necessary.	They will satisfy themselves that only 3 out of the 30 root causes of cash account discrepancies would not have been trapped by the accounting integrity control (AIC), and that appropriate processes have been identified to trap these in future: • One would now be trapped by the AIC following prevention of negatives by Oracle database constraints • One would be prevented by signage mapping rules now embedded in TPS • One (the 196/ 197 issue) will require business rule matching within the POCL domain (see Reference Data actions)
2. CS error fixing: we will declare to POCL the process controls in place for managing the risk of CS' introducing intervention errors.	
3. We will review the TIP Functional Spec. to identify any gaps in the Pathway solution.	They will provide technical assistance to us as appropriate. Further information to be provided on ECCO office method.
4. 378 type error (cash account fails): in addition to seeking to correct the underlying faults, we will install two error detection modules at the counter to • identify pointer failure and repair it wherever possible or otherwise cause the cash account to be redone by the postmaster, and • identify any zero value cash account and cause the cash account to be redone by the postmaster	
5. Cash account errors. There are two types of error: • It is as printed and signed by the	POCL BSM will consider requesting us to replace the screen instruction to call the help desk by one to abort the cash account and

postmaster (see para 6 below) • It is not as printed and signed (Oracle extraction error) We will transmit the first type because it accurately reflects what has happened and TIP therefore need to know. We should withhold the second, if caused by a Data Error, but no instances have occurred.	find the error (probably not for 24 January). Not permitting the cash account to be completed is another option, the fallback being a reference data download to unlock the constraint in the event of a pervasive (eg. primary mapping) error (para 6 below). (This is definitely not for 24 January.)
6. Receipts not equal to Payments. There are two causal factors: • Errors in reference data, most frequently absence of primary mappings • Migration carry forward errors at the outlet The first is always identified by the EPOSS Reconciliation facility (but the cash account is transmitted as para 5 above). The second is not identified.	The result from migrated offices will be no worse than would have occurred anyway under a manual cash account process. It is a one off legacy event. The mitigation lies in HFSO best practice at migration.