POL00024876

Message

From: Parsons, Andrew [GRO]
Sent: 21/07/2016 17:56:46
To: Mark R Davies [GRO]; Rodric Williams [GRO]
CC: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO]; Thomas P Moran [GRO]; Patrick Bourke [GRO]; Rob Houghton [GRO]; Tom Wechsler [GRO]; Nick Sambridge [GRO]; Jane MacLeod [GRO]; Mark Underwood [GRO]
Subject: RE: Remote Access wording - subject to litigation privilege [BD-4A.FID26859284]

Mark - I'm happy with your suggestion.

All - Slight tweak in yellow below because there are definitely users at FJ who have this access (confirmed by Deloitte).

Andy

Database and server access and edit permission ~~can be~~ is 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 particular form of access could be used to affect a branch's accounts, and if so, whether this has happened.

Andrew Parsons
Partner

Bond Dickinson

Direct:
Mobile: GRO

Follow Bond Dickinson:

www.bonddickinson.com

From: Mark R Davies [mailto: GRO]
Sent: 21 July 2016 18:36
To: Rodric Williams
Cc: Parsons, Andrew; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Thomas P Moran; 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]

Would it help to include "whether this particular form of access" in final sentence which emphasises that we've never actually been asked about super users but are going over and beyond to establish position?

So sorry to miss call.

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
GRO

On 21 Jul 2016, at 18:30, Rodric Williams [GRO] wrote:

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

POL00024876

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 GRO
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

Direct:
Mobile: GRO

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 Underwood GRO
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.

POL00024876

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.

POL00024876

This section of the Report was based on the attached email sent to Second Sight.

Kind regards
Andy

Andrew Parsons
Partner

Bond Dickinson

Direct:
Mobile: GRO

Follow Bond Dickinson:

<image002.jpg>

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 GRO
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

POST OFFICE
SWYDDFA'R POST

Angela Van Den Bogerd
Director of Support Services

1st Floor, Ty Brwydran,
Atlantic Close, Llansamlet
Swansea SA7 9FJ
M:
L: GRO

POL00024876

From: Parsons, Andrew [mailto: GRO
Sent: 21 July 2016 14:05
To: Thomas P Moran; Rodric Williams; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Patrick Bourke; Mark R Davies; Rob Houghton; Tom Wechsler; Nick Sambridge; Jane MacLeod; Mark Underwood
Subject: Remote Access wording - subject to litigation privilege [BD-4A.FID26859284]

All

Please find attached the proposed wording on the remote access issue – for discussion on our 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 regards
Andy

Andrew Parsons
Partner

Bond Dickinson

Direct:
Mobile: GRO

Follow Bond Dickinson:

<image002.jpg>

www.bonddickinson.com

POL00024876

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.