

10/1/14

On 1/3/2014 gain is (£23,161.20)

Andrew Winn

From: Jenkins Gareth GI [GRO]
Sent: 04 May 2012 10:00
To: Andrew Winn
Subject: RE: Branches affected by Receipts Payments and Discrepancies issue

Andy,

Sorry it has taken me so long to get back to you.

I've had a trawl back through my old emails and what I've found is the following:

1. Both these Branches were in the original list associated with the "Lost Discrepancy" issue we had 2010.
2. I've found a comment saying that the loss with 122946 was primarily due to a Migration Issue "w will be investigated separately". (Email to Emma Langfield cc to you on 5/1/11.)
3. Apparently on 4/8/10 the Branch rolled SU AA from TP 4 BP 4 into TP 4 BP 5 and also migrated th night. Looking in the Opening Figures table there are NO Opening Figures for TP 4 BP 5 (other th dummy zero cash line). This means that the Cash of £21,975.83 and Discrepancies of £45.82 plus Stock have been lost. If these two figures are added together we get the £22,020.65 Receipts Pa mismatch. I don't know if this information was passed to POL. There was also an email from Ste Parker to you on 5/1/11 mentioning this (but not all the detail).
4. I can also see that although 113459 was in the original list, it seems to have dropped off very ear This is because it wasn't in the original list from POL and also the precise symptoms in terms of e left behind were different. I can't find any trace of any further investigation of this in my emails.
5. Given that the discrepancy amounts in both cases was very large, I'd be surprised if they weren't properly investigated at the time, but they don't seem to be included in the lists relating to the " Discrepancy" investigation.

If you want this followed up further I suggest you raise it with the POL Problem Management team (Emr Langfield), who can get the Fujitsu Problem Management team to dig further.

Regards

Gareth

Gareth Jenkins
Distinguished Engineer
Business Applications Architect
Post Office Account

FUJITSU
Lovlace Road, Bracknell, Berkshire, RG12 8SN

Tel: [GRO] [GRO]
Mobile: [GRO] [GRO]
Mail: [GRO]
Web: <http://uk.fujitsu.com>

To: Jenkins Gareth GI
Subject: FW: Branches affected by Receipts Payments and Discrepancies issue

Hi Gareth

Going back to the dark ages here I'm afraid. We had the receipts and payments issue post HNGX roll out that I spent a lot of time on. There are a couple of branches that still seem to be outstanding 122946 & 113459 that are highlighted in red on the affected branches spreadsheet.

The RPM spreadsheet is the one that was used to resolve the branch discrepancies. The two branches are on there.

I seem to recall a couple of branches not fitting into the standard profile of all the other branches who had issues – so I'm assuming it was those. I can't find anything subsequently about them. Did these get investigated separately?

Thanks
Andy

GRO

From: Paul Dann
Sent: 05 October 2010 10:27
To: Emma Langfield; Andrew Winn; Antonio Jamasb; Mark Weaver; Dave Hulbert; Ian Trundell; Alan X Simpson; Karen J White
Subject: RE: Branches affected by Receipts Payments and Discrepancies issue

All

Please find attached analysis of POLFS for the affected branches, there are two branches that are not showing the amount as being stuck in discreps

Cheers
Paul

From: Emma Langfield
Sent: 04 October 2010 14:53
To: Andrew Winn; Paul Dann; Antonio Jamasb; Mark Weaver; Dave Hulbert; Ian Trundell; Alan X Simpson; I J White
Subject: FW: Branches affected by Receipts Payments and Discrepancies issue

Afternoon

Please see summary of issue attached as well as list of branches affected so far. I will be raising a conf call at 1600 this afternoon.

Kind regards
Emma

Live Service Team
Service Delivery
Post Office Limited

GRO

To: Emma Langfield
Cc: [REDACTED] GRO; Wright Mark; Woolgar Mike
Subject: Branches affected by Receipts Payments and Discrepancies issue

Emma,

Please can you pass this on to anybody in POL who needs it. I don't have a full list of who was on the call.

As promised on the call, I've tidied up the list of affected Branches and put them into the attached spreadsheet

<<Affected Branches.xls>>

I've also added in a further 11 Branches that raised events as part of last week's rollovers.

Some Branches in the list have not yet produced a BTS and so may not be aware of the problem (I've noted these in Col I).

I've also added in the absolute value of the lost discrepancy so as to produce totals in Row 56 as requested by Andy Winn.

Summary is:

- o 53 Rollovers affected
- o 2 Branches appear twice in the list (in one case it may be a duplicate of one error – this needs further investigation)
- o Net total is about £41K
- o Absolute total is about £46K
- o Only 4 cases where amount is over £1,000

Note that in many cases the affected SU is missing from the spreadsheet. We know how to find this out, but not yet done so in all cases. We will clearly need to do that if we are to attempt to fix the issue in Horizon.

Regards

Gareth

Gareth Jenkins

Distinguished Engineer

Applications Architect

Royal Mail Group Account

FUJITSU

Discrepancies raised Xmas eve - results of investigation

Page 1

Andrew Winn

From: Parker Steve ([redacted] GRO)
Sent: 05 January 2011 13:43
To: Andrew Winn; Duty Manager
Cc: [redacted] GRO
Subject: Discrepancies raised Xmas eve - results of investigation

Andy, Emma

These are the results of the investigations into the outstanding discrepancies.

Summary

Caused by action taken at branch – No further action being taken by RMGA

3 branches are accepting discrepancies again immediately after TP rollover (071939, 196230, 2967

1 branch closed without clearing final discrepancy (273311).

Known system problems – actions already in place

2 branches had two occurrences of the known R&P problem where discrepancies weren't carried forward (159632, 208020). These are explained on the spreadsheets previously sent to

[redacted] GRO

1 branch lost its opening figures due to delay completing rollover (412420). This has been previous raised with POSD in September which (I think) resulted in an auditor being sent into the site?

Other problem – Further action being taken by RMGA

1 branch (122946) had a problem during migration but appears to have had a receipts and payment mismatch subsequently which may not have been investigated. We have raised a new incident for site (Tfs 3421481 - PC0207483) and will progress.

Details

Discrepancies raised Xmas eve - results of investigation

Page 1

071939 Charvil

This branch created a new stock unit 01 on 24th August, in addition to AA which they had used for some time. For the next three months they did not keep the stock units properly in step, and had already accepted sizeable discrepancies a stock unit already in the new TP, before clearing and roll over the other stock unit in the older TP. They have now gone back to a single stock unit but are carrying forward a loss of around £909 (originally from August before new stock unit creation) which they accept again immediately after rollover, so discrepancy account never empty. I can provide further information if required.

122946 Oaktree

PC0202635 refers to a migration system problem at this branch, which aborted the migration and required remedial action. BTS after migration shows a large non-zero trading position. Needs further investigation into cause and consequences.

159632 Bassaleg

This branch had R&P mismatches in TP 4 (393.35) and TP 6 (-729.01) because the discrepancy was carried forward from one balance period to the next. If you add these together, you get -335.66, which is very close to the figure on the spreadsheet (-335.82). It's also what you get if you add up the numbers in pink on the 'all discrep' sheet for the branch. So I think this is all caused by the known problem.

196230 Thorney

The loss of £127.61 (accepted 20-27 Oct) was cleared to cash on 17th Nov at the end of TP 7, but immediately accepted again in TP 8. No problem.

208020 Moor Park

This branch had R&P mismatches in TP 6 (-33.82) and TP 6 (76.96) because the discrepancy was not carried forward from one balance period to the next. If you add these together, you get 43.14, the figure on the spreadsheet. So I think this is all caused by the known problem.

Discrepancies raised Xmas eve - results of investigation

Page

This branch closed on 27th August and the kit was removed soon afterwards. They rolled their stock unit into a new BP with a £2 gain, but did not do a final TP rollover and never cleared the discrepancy.

296715 Clare

On 5th Oct and 10th Nov, the branch accepted the discrepancy again immediately after TP rollover (loss 67p and gain 1.85 respectively). No problem.

412420 The Crescent

This branch had major problems because they rolled over some but not all stock units into a new branch and after 62 days some opening figures were lost. I believe an auditor went in to sort out the branch and there will be inconsistencies in POLFS data (we mentioned this at the time - late September - don't know if anything was done to try to get POLFS back in line).

-----Original Message-----

From: Parker Steve [GRO]
Sent: 04 January 2011 16:14
To: 'Andrew Winn'; Duty Manager
Cc: Stewart Mike
Subject: RE: ISSUE - Receipts & Payments mismatch

Andy / Emma

Just to let you know, I have not dropped this one in the post Xmas letter. Work has started on it today and I'll update you tomorrow on progress.

Steve

-----Original Message-----

From: Andrew Winn [GRO]
Sent: 24 December 2010 12:15
To: Parker Steve [GRO]
Cc: Duty Manager
Subject: RE: ISSUE - Receipts & Payments mismatch

Discrepancies raised Xmas eve - results of investigation

Page 4

The idea of branch trading is that discrepancies are resolved at branch trading. Therefore the discrepancy account for each branch clears down & roll over. We occasionally have had branches who have rolled their last stock unit and declared a new discrepancy on the same day. This is extremely rare and will in all probability be cleared out at the next branch trading roll over.

The additional branches identified may have a simple explanation as to why the value is there but it would feel extremely careless not to gain clarification that any other branches displaying the same characteristics: the R&P branches (which should not have discrepancy values rolling forward but do) are not a part of the same or a different problem.

We have tried to exclude any branch that has not had a further branch trading roll over since the problem has become apparent.

When I write to the impacted branches I want to be able to say that Fujit identified all impacted branches and have analysed each one to ensure that the corrective action POL need to take is correct. We would all look pretty silly if someone then told us that their "other branch" has a similar looking problem but no one has identified that!!!

With the current high profile on Horizon integrity I feel we need to understand what is happening at all these branches.

Cheers

Andy

-----Original Message-----

From: Parker Steve [redacted] **GRO**

Sent: 24 December 2010 11:56

To: Duty Manager; Wright Mark; [redacted] **GRO**; Jenkins Gareth; Woolgar Mike

Cc: Andrew Winn; Antonio Jambas

Subject: RE: ISSUE - Receipts & Payments mismatch

Emma,

I have to admit to being confused by your request

Discrepancies raised Xmas eve - results of investigation

Page :

these. Most of the branches you have identified here were not subject to that problem (except 159632 & 208020).

As you know, in general we do not investigate discrepancies as they are generally a PM issue. We are unable to do anything about it because we do not know what cash is in the PMs till etc.

Can you give me more detail please, in particular:

- a) Why are these discrepancies seen as something other than BAU
- b) What do P&BA mean by marooned or stuck

Thanks

Steve Parker

-----Original Message-----

From: emma.langfield@**GRO**
GRO On Behalf Of
GRO

Sent: 24 December 2010 11:10

To: Wright Mark; Stewart Mike; Jenkins Gareth GI; Woolgar Mike; Parker St
GRO

Cc: andrew.winn@**GRO**; antonio.jamast@**GRO**

Subject: ISSUE - Receipts & Payments mismatch

Morning

Please see below from Product and Branch Accounting. They have identified some branches where values appear marooned in the P&BA discrepancy account that either appear not to align to the values in the last Fujitsu spreadsheet or have not been identified as a part of this issue.

As we wish to communicate with the branches in the new year can Fujitsu have a look at both the discrepancies in values on the identified branches and have a look at why we are seeing stuck values at other branches.

Also we need to have the reproduced copies of the branches trading statements (as they would have looked) so the letter can direct them to

Discrepancies raised Xmas eve - results of investigation

Page 1

Many thanks

Emma

Live Service Team

Service Delivery

Post Office Limited



(See attached file: all discrep.XLS)

Royal Mail Group Limited registered in England and Wales registered number
4138203 registered office 3rd Floor, 100 Victoria Embankment, London, EC4
0HQ

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the
addressee only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use,
disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication

If you have received this in error, please contact the sender and then
delete this email from your system.

***** Rc
Mail Group Limited registered in England and Wales registered number 4138
registered office 3rd Floor, 100 Victoria Embankment, London, EC4Y 0HQ Th
email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee
only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use, disclose,
reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you