Message				
From:	Parsons, Andrew	GRO []	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	
Sent:	21/07/2016 17:56:46			
To:	Mark R Davies (GRO ; Rodric V	Villiams[GRO
CC:	Angela Van-Den-Bogerd	GRO	; Thomas F	Moran
	GRO	; Patrick Bourke	GRO	; Rob Houghton
	GRO	; Tom Wechsler	GRO	Nick Sambridge
		; Jane MacLeod	OINO	; Mark Underwood _{gro}
	GRO		[DD 44 EID260E026	
Subject:	RE: Remote Access wording	- subject to litigation privilege	e [BD-4A.FID2685928	4]
Mark - I'm I	nappy with your suggestion.			
		e there are definitely users	at FJ who have thi	s access (confirmed by Deloitte).
Andy				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
s a sory				
Database a	nd server access and edit per	rmission can be is provided	, within strict contr	ols, to a small, controlled numbe
	·	***************************************		are continuing as to whether th
	orm of access could be used	-		_
•			, ,	
Andrew P	'arsons			
Partner				
Boul	Dickinson			
Direct: Mobile:	GRO			
Follow Bond D	ickinson:			
www.bon	ddickinson.com			
Erom: Mar	k P Davies [mailto:			
	k R Davies [mailto:[uly 2016 18:36	GKU		
To: Rodric	•			
I O I NOUTIC				
Cc: Parson		Bogerd: Thomas P Moran: P	atrick Bourke: Rob	Houghton: Tom Wechsler: Nick
	s, Andrew; Angela Van-Den-E		atrick Bourke; Rob	Houghton; Tom Wechsler; Nick
Sambridge;	s, Andrew; Angela Van-Den-E Jane MacLeod; Mark Underv	vood		
Sambridge;	s, Andrew; Angela Van-Den-E	vood		
Sambridge; Subject: R	s, Andrew; Angela Van-Den-E Jane MacLeod; Mark Underv e: Remote Access wording -	vood subject to litigation privileg	e [BD-4A.FID26859	284]
Sambridge; Subject: R Would it he	s, Andrew; Angela Van-Den-E Jane MacLeod; Mark Underv e: Remote Access wording - elp to include "whether this p	vood subject to litigation privileg particular form of access" ir	e [BD-4A.FID26859 final sentence wh	0284] ich emphasises that we've never
Sambridge; Subject: R Would it he	s, Andrew; Angela Van-Den-E Jane MacLeod; Mark Underv e: Remote Access wording -	vood subject to litigation privileg particular form of access" ir	e [BD-4A.FID26859 final sentence wh	0284] ich emphasises that we've never
Sambridge; Subject: R Would it he	s, Andrew; Angela Van-Den-E Jane MacLeod; Mark Underv Le: Remote Access wording - elp to include "whether this p en asked about super users b	vood subject to litigation privileg particular form of access" ir	e [BD-4A.FID26859 final sentence wh	0284] ich emphasises that we've never
Sambridge; Subject: R Would it he actually be	s, Andrew; Angela Van-Den-E Jane MacLeod; Mark Underv de: Remote Access wording - elp to include "whether this p en asked about super users b miss call.	vood subject to litigation privileg particular form of access" ir	e [BD-4A.FID26859 final sentence wh	0284] ich emphasises that we've never
Sambridge; Subject: R Would it he actually be So sorry to Mark Davie	s, Andrew; Angela Van-Den-E Jane MacLeod; Mark Underv de: Remote Access wording - elp to include "whether this p en asked about super users b miss call.	vood subject to litigation privileg subject to litigation privileg particular form of access" in out are going over and beyo	e [BD-4A.FID26859 final sentence wh	0284] ich emphasises that we've never
Sambridge; Subject: R Would it he actually be So sorry to Mark Davie	s, Andrew; Angela Van-Den-E Jane MacLeod; Mark Underv le: Remote Access wording - elp to include "whether this p en asked about super users b miss call.	vood subject to litigation privileg subject to litigation privileg particular form of access" in out are going over and beyo	e [BD-4A.FID26859 final sentence wh	0284] ich emphasises that we've never
Sambridge; Subject: R Would it he actually be So sorry to Mark Davie Communication	s, Andrew; Angela Van-Den-E Jane MacLeod; Mark Underv le: Remote Access wording - elp to include "whether this p en asked about super users b miss call.	vood subject to litigation privileg subject to litigation privileg particular form of access" in out are going over and beyon	e [BD-4A.FID26859 final sentence wh	0284] ich emphasises that we've never

All – this is the wording we have just discussed for para. 1.3.4:

Database and server access and edit permission can be provided, within strict controls, to a small, controlled number of specialist Fujitsu personnel. Use of these permissions is logged but rare. Enquiries are continuing as to whether this access could be used to affect a branch's accounts, and if so, whether this has happened.

From: Parsons, Andrew [mailto: GRO

Sent: 21 July 2016 18:02

To: Mark R Davies; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd

Cc: Thomas P Moran; Rodric Williams; Patrick Bourke; Rob Houghton; Tom Wechsler; Nick Sambridge;

Jane MacLeod; Mark Underwood

Subject: RE: Remote Access wording - subject to litigation privilege [BD-4A.FID26859284]

All

In case it helps, please find attached an amended version including Rob's comments earlier.

Kind regards Andy

Andrew Parsons

Partner

Bond Dickinson

Mobile: U

Follow Bond Dickinson:

<image002.jpg>

www.bonddickinson.com

From: Parsons, Andrew Sent: 21 July 2016 15:02

To: 'Mark R Davies'; 'Angela Van-Den-Bogerd'

Cc: 'Thomas P Moran'; 'Rodric Williams'; 'Patrick_Bourke'; 'Rob Houghton'; 'Tom Wechsler'; 'Nick

Sambridge'; 'Jane MacLeod'; 'Mark Underwoodero

Subject: RE: Remote Access wording - subject to litigation privilege [BD-4A.FID26859284]

Mark

In response to your question in the other email thread about seeing everything we have said about "remote access", we don't have a central log of everything POL has said on remote access. However, the language used in the email referenced below (attached again) is reflective of the language used by POL towards the end of the Scheme.

We have also previously compiled POL's comments on this topic that were made in individual case reports (see attached), which gives a flavour of the responses given. This should however be treated with caution as these responses span a two year period and POL's understanding of the situation changed over time.

One of the tasks we could do (albeit this will need to be after the LOR has been sent) is to compile a complete chronology of what POL was told and what POL has said on this topic. One to discuss on our call later.

Kind regards Andy

Andrew Parsons

Partner

Bond Dickinson

Direct: Mobile GRO

Follow Bond Dickinson:

<image002.jpg>

www.bonddickinson.com

From: Parsons, Andrew Sent: 21 July 2016 14:49

To: 'Mark R Davies'; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd

Cc: Thomas P Moran; Rodric Williams; Patrick Bourke; Rob Houghton; Tom Wechsler; Nick Sambridge;

Jane MacLeod; Mark Underwood GRO

Subject: RE: Remote Access wording - subject to litigation privilege [BD-4A.FID26859284]

Quote from SS' Report:

"This ability to directly amend branch records is something that Post Office has consistently denied was possible. This recently discovered evidence appears to confirm, that in 2010 at least, it was possible for Fujitsu / Post Office to directly amend branch data without the knowledge of the relevant Subpostmaster.

14.16. In commenting on a draft of this report Post of Office told us that the references to "amend" and "correct" in the documents mentioned above, are not strictly correct as neither Post Office nor Fujitsu have the ability to directly change or delete existing records. All that can be done is that additional records can be added by Post Office / Fujitsu without the consent (and possibly the knowledge) of the relevant Subpostmaster. This will, however, have the effect of altering balances at the branch, as both debit and credit entries can be made.

14.17. Post Office also told us:

"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).

The language used in the documents produced by Post Office / Fujitsu and to which you refer is unfortunate colloquial shorthand used by those working on the Horizon system. I can see how it could be read to suggest that Post Office was "altering" branch data but the above explains why this is not the case."

- 14.18. This is not something that we have been able to test or validate.
- 14.19. Clearly, the fact that such an ability exists, is not necessarily evidence that such 'amendments' were actually made. This is not something that we have been able to investigate.

This section of the Report was based on the attached email sent to Second Sight. Kind regards Andy **Andrew Parsons** Partner Direct: Mobile: Follow Bond Dickinson: www.bonddickinson.com From: Mark R Davies [mailto: **GRO** Sent: 21 July 2016 14:36 To: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd Cc: Parsons, Andrew; Thomas P Moran; Rodric Williams; Patrick Bourke; Rob Houghton; Tom Wechsler; Nick Sambridge; Jane MacLeod; Mark Underwood **Subject:** Re: Remote Access wording - subject to litigation privilege [BD-4A.FID26859284] Exactly - it's hard to assess this without seeing what we've previously said Mark Davies Communications and Corporate Affairs Director **GRO** On 21 Jul 2016, at 14:33, Angela Van-Den-Bogerd GRO _wrote: Thanks Andy

Would you please circulate the extract "The use of balancing transactions was explained to Second Sight and is referenced in its Part Two Report at paragraph 14.16." so that we can see what was referenced at the time.

Thanks Angela



Angela Van Den Bogerd

Director of Support Services

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

M: 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.

reply e	mail and destroy all copies of the original message.
Sent: 2 To: The Davies; Underv	Parsons, Andrew [mailto: GRO 1 July 2016 14:05 Demas P Moran; Rodric Williams; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Patrick Bourke; Mark R Rob Houghton; Tom Wechsler; Nick Sambridge; Jane MacLeod; Mark Wood t: Remote Access wording - subject to litigation privilege [BD-4A.FID26859284]
All	
	find attached the proposed wording on the remote access issue – for discussion call at 6pm today.
Three	points to bear in mind when reviewing:
1.	In light of comments yesterday, we've provided a slightly longer explanation so to hopefully present this issue in a better light.
2.	Tony agrees with the current wording but has reiterated the importance of dealing with this point candidly, even if that does cause some short-term pain.
3.	We do not yet have a 100% clear picture on some of the technical and operation issues on this topic. We therefore need to be careful not to overstate our case. This draft wording will also need to be run past Deloitte / FJ.
Kind re Andy	gards
Andre Partne	w Parsons er
Box	d Dickinson
Direct: Mobile:	GRO
Follow Bo	ond Dickinson:
<image(< td=""><td>002.jpg></td></image(<>	002.jpg>
www.l	<u>bonddickinson.com</u>
Please	consider the environment! Do you need to print this email?
den-boger bogerd	nation in this e-mail and any attachments is confidential and may be legally privileged and protected by law, angela.van- d GRO only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not angela.van-den- GRO please notify andrew.parsons GRO as soon as possible and delete any copies, sed use disceptination distribution rubbleation or copying of this communication or attachments is prohibited and may

Any files attached to this e-mail will have been checked by us with virus detection software before transmission. Bond Dickinson LLP accepts no liability for any loss or damage which may be caused by software viruses and you should carry out your own virus

be unlawful.

checks before opening any attachment.

Content of this email which does not relate to the official business of Bond Dickinson LLP, is neither given nor endorsed by it.

This email is sent by Bond Dickinson LLP which is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC317661. Our registered office is 4 More London Riverside, London, SE1 2AU, where a list of members' names is open to inspection. We use the term partner to refer to a member of the LLP, or an employee or consultant who is of equivalent standing. Our VAT registration number is GB123393627.

Bond Dickinson LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority.

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.