
From: Mark Underwood1 [GRO]
Sent: Sun 23/08/2015 7:52:42 AM (UTC)
To: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO]; Lorraine Lynch [GRO]; Ward, Alexandra [GRO]
Cc: Steve Allchorn [GRO]; Melanie Corfield [GRO]
Subject: RE: Transcript of Panorama

Hi Angela,

If this is raised, I think we need to bring it back to the specifics of JoD's case as it is a mediation of the problems she has encountered rather than SPMs more generally. That said, it may be useful to begin with the following (I think the 4th bullet is key)

- Over the past three years, through exhaustive investigations and independent reviews, we have been determined to find out if there were, as initially alleged, faults with our computer system that caused cash to go missing from a small number of Post Office branches.
- We set up an independent enquiry and, when that failed to find anything wrong with the system, established a scheme to enable people to put forward individual complaints, providing financial support so that they could obtain independent professional advice to do so.
- This work has provided overwhelming evidence that demonstrates it was not the computer system or any illicit external 'tampering' with it that was responsible for missing money in any of the branches investigated.
- Second Sight, has not identified any transaction caused by a technical fault in Horizon which resulted in a postmaster wrongly being held responsible for a loss. Without this, there is no evidence to support any of the broad allegations about Horizon, but there is overwhelming evidence that the losses complained of were caused by user actions, including deliberate dishonest conduct.

Does this help?

Mark
Mark Underwood
Complaint Review and Mediation Scheme
[GRO]

From: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd
Sent: 21 August 2015 16:46
To: Mark Underwood1; Lorraine Lynch; Ward, Alexandra
Cc: Steve Allchorn; Melanie Corfield
Subject: RE: Transcript of Panorama

Mark,

There is another part of RR & JS discussion that is relevant:

JS: *Some people have been ruined financially. People have gone to prison. Is it possible that suffering could have been caused because there are problems in the Horizon system?*

RR: Yes, it is possible.

Any further comments/positioning on the above please?

Thanks,
Angela



Confidential Information:

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorised review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please contact me by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: Mark Underwood1
Sent: 21 August 2015 15:31
To: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Lorraine Lynch; Ward, Alexandra
Cc: Steve Allchorn; Melanie Corfield
Subject: RE: Transcript of Panorama

Hi,

With thanks to Mel for obtaining the large part of the below information from Peter Newsome...

Looking at the transcript, I think the below is the key sentence from RR. He states:

“RR: We went in through the backdoor and made changes. Sometimes you would be putting several lines of code in at a time. If we hadn’t done that then the counters would have stopped working”.

What RR is actually talking about here is, I think, open to interpretation.

What we do know about RR is that he:

- worked in 3rd / 4th line support on the 6th floor for a couple of years in the early 2000’s;
- worked on ‘estate management’ rather than the accountancy side;
- left Fujitsu on good terms as he had become disillusioned with IT to become a chiropractor in the Bracknell area.

What we know about Horizon pre- 2010 is:

- It was a ‘dial up’ system (encrypted) and Fujitsu application software specialists could access the system remotely, as you would expect them to be able to do as part of any standard IT support function, but the system did not allow remote agents to manipulate branch transactions. These remote agents perform tasks like examining diagnostic information not transmitted to the central servers and modifying application functionality on behalf of the subpostmaster that is not part of the standard interface e.g. forcing the counter to re-download its personality and product set data.

- Remote agents could not 'work' the terminals as there was no functionality for this
- Every access was logged and so there is an auditable footprint where records are still within the retention period

JS interpreted RR's statement to be in relation to financial records. The reality is that, given the above- RR's role would have involved putting in codes for various and numerous reasons - updating, maintaining etc - but this would have had nothing to do with branch transactions.

This in mind, I think our initial reply should be that, RR was actually referring to providing support rather than editing transactional records.

As included in our Scheme report:

It is also possible for Fujitsu to view branch data in order to provide support and conduct maintenance but this does not allow access to any functionality that could be used to edit recorded transaction data. Having reviewed all the cases, no-one (including all the Applicants and Second Sight) has been able to identify a specific transaction that did not originate in branch.

A number of different explanations were found for the 'unknown' transactions:

- The transaction was conducted by the Applicant but they could not remember the transaction. Every input into Horizon is logged against the unique identity of the user. Each user ID is personal to that user and protected with a password that must not be shared. Where the transaction data was available, the Post Office was able to identify the user entering the questioned transactions. In some cases, this was the Applicant (where the Applicant had confirmed that their password was secure).
- The transaction was entered using the Applicant's user ID but the Applicant had shared their password with other staff members. In these cases, the most likely explanation is that a staff member had conducted the transaction without the Applicant's knowledge.
- A staff member had conducted the transaction with their own user ID without the Applicant's knowledge (albeit that a postmaster is able to determine this himself by accessing the branch records available through Horizon).
- The entries correlated to periods when relief or temporary postmasters were running a branch.
- The entries were conducted by Post Office staff conducting audits of branches and who had logged on to the branch terminals with the Applicant's full knowledge but these entries were determined not to affect the branch's accounting position.

If, it is then asserted that RR was referring altering financial records or the Balancing transaction Process, I think our lines should be similar to:

- As we have always said, Horizon does not have functionality that allows Post Office or Fujitsu to edit or delete the transactions recorded by branches
- It has however always been possible for Post Office to correct errors in and/or update a branch's accounts. This is most commonly done by way of a transaction correction however it could also be by way of a balancing transaction or transaction acknowledgement.
- A Post Office employee could also, in special circumstances, log on to a branch terminal locally (i.e. by being physically in a branch) using a new User ID and password and then conduct transactions (though

these would register against that unique User ID).

- All of the above processes for correcting / updating a branch's accounts have similar features. All of them involve inputting a new transaction into the branch's records (not editing or removing any previous transactions) and all are shown transparently in the branch transaction records available to Subpostmasters (as well as in the master ARQ data).
- We have never made the BTP a secret. In fact we reference it in both our published Scheme Report and our Reply to Second Sight's Part Two Report.

Does this give you what you need?

Mark Underwood
Complaint Review and Mediation Scheme

GRO

From: Mark Underwood1
Sent: 21 August 2015 12:11
To: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Lorraine Lynch; Ward, Alexandra
Cc: Steve Allchorn
Subject: RE: Transcript of Panorama

Hi Angela, understood – leave it with me

Mark

Mark Underwood
Complaint Review and Mediation Scheme

GRO

From: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd
Sent: 21 August 2015 12:05
To: Mark Underwood1; Lorraine Lynch; Ward, Alexandra
Cc: Steve Allchorn
Subject: RE: Transcript of Panorama

Mark,

Would you also provide our (PO) response to what Richard Rolls' said on the programme. I expect this to be a key discussion point on Monday and I'd like to have a robust response/explanation of the mention of going in by the back door and altering the coding - I need a lay person's explanation on what this actually means.

Thanks,
Angela

POST
OFFICE

SWYDDFAR
POST

Angela Van Den Bogerd
Head of Support Services

1st Floor, Ty Brwydran,
Atlantic Close, Llansamlet
Swansea SA7 9FJ

M:
L:

GRO

Confidential Information:

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorised review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please contact me by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: Mark Underwood1
Sent: 21 August 2015 11:29
To: Lorraine Lynch; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Ward, Alexandra
Cc: Steve Allchorn
Subject: RE: Transcript of Panorama

Angela & Lex,

With reference to the below – please see attached

Mark

Mark Underwood
Complaint Review and Mediation Scheme

GRO

From: Lorraine Lynch
Sent: 21 August 2015 11:08
To: Mark Underwood1
Cc: Steve Allchorn
Subject: Transcript of Panorama

Mark

Would you be able to send the transcript of Monday night's Panorama to Angela and Lex Ward (BD) please. They are mediating M005 on Monday and her mediation statement has mentioned the programme.

L

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 by reply email and then delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540. Registered Office: Finsbury Dials, 20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ.
