

Message

From: Jane MacLeod [GRO]
Sent: 28/11/2016 15:22:02
To: Alisdair Cameron [GRO]; Paula Vennells [GRO]
CC: Rodric Williams [GRO]; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO]
 [GRO] Thomas P Moran [GRO] Tom Wechsler
 [GRO] Rob Houghton [GRO] Mark R Davies
Subject: RE: Postmaster Litigation - Remote Access: extract from draft Letter to Freeths - LEGALLY PRIVILEGED - DO NOT FORWARD
Attachments: ATT89334 1.jpg

Thanks Al

I agree this is a difficult issue and believe it or not, these statements have been watered down already The purpose of the call at 5pm is to understand our QC's concerns as he is the one who is arguing for the stronger positioning.

**Jane MacLeod**

General Counsel
 Ground Floor
 20 Finsbury Street
 LONDON
 EC2Y 9AQ

Mobile number: [GRO]

From: Alisdair Cameron
Sent: 28 November 2016 15:04
To: Jane MacLeod [GRO]; Paula Vennells [GRO]
Cc: Rodric Williams [GRO]; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO]
 [GRO] Thomas P Moran [GRO] Tom Wechsler
 [GRO] Rob Houghton [GRO] Mark R Davies
Subject: RE: Postmaster Litigation - Remote Access: extract from draft Letter to Freeths - LEGALLY PRIVILEGED - DO NOT FORWARD

Thanks Jane. Strong letter. I paused and sucked my teeth on this para

1. At each stage, Post Office did its honest best to ascertain the position so to respond to the question it believed it was being asked. With the benefit of hindsight, some of Post Office's statements may have been incorrect in light of what has now been identified in relation to Fujitsu's administrator access (see below). However, Post Office refutes any suggestion that it ever made false statements deliberately or did so to mislead or deceive. The Post Office personnel responsible for those statements believed the statements when they were made. What was said reflected what they understood the position to be after making relevant enquiries.

For the avoidance of doubt, I am sure it is true, it just reads defensively and as a conspiracy theorist's wet dream? Happy to leave it with your best judgement but rather than making value statements about honesty, may have been incorrect, I did wonder if we would be better off simply saying..."We now understand the question more fully and would answer questions X and Y as follows: "Fujitsu can do X but there are rigorous controls of Y etc."

Only a thought and no need to change it if you disagree, I am not a lawyer!

Thanks Al

From: Jane MacLeod

Sent: 28 November 2016 13:50

To: Paula Vennells

Cc: Rodric Williams

GRO

Alisdair Cameron

GRO

; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd

GRO

GRO

; Thomas P Moran

GRO

Tom Wechsler

GRO

Rob Houghton

GRO

; Mark R Davies

GRO

Subject: Postmaster Litigation - Remote Access: extract from draft Letter to Freeths - LEGALLY PRIVILEGED - DO NOT FORWARD

Paula, Al

Attached is the current draft of the proposed wording regarding remote access that is to be included in a much longer, and largely procedural letter to be sent to Freeths later tomorrow. We have a further call with our QC at 5pm this evening to review this wording again with the team and Mark Davies is included on that. For reference the key statement made in the letter to Freeths in July, was as follows:

4. **"Administrator access to databases.** Database and server access and edit permission is provided, within strict controls (including logging user access), to a small, controlled number of specialist Fujitsu (not Post Office) administrators. As far as we are currently aware, privileged administrator access has not been used to alter branch transaction data. We are seeking further assurance from Fujitsu on this point."

Freeths have picked this up and therefore the new wording is designed to address their challenges.

Please let me have any comments asap

Jane

Jane MacLeod

General Counsel
Ground Floor

20 Finsbury Street
LONDON
EC2Y 9AQ

Mobile number:

GRO

<< OLE Object: Picture (Device Independent Bitmap) >>

<< File: _DOC_34439974(1)_RA comments on Response to Letter of Reply_ 27 November....docx >>