From:	James, Gareth (UK	(- Manchester)	GRO	
Sent:	Fri 18/07/2014 10:4			
То:	Julie George	GRO	Rodric Williams	GRO
Cc:	Westbrook, Mark (JK - Manchester)	GRO	
Subject:	RE: Zebra - Key Po			-
key outcome her stand-alone non-	e, which is the response pa	aper (if Rod can con ow you're both busy	e notes below (in hindsight, i firm that extracting informat / knocking on holidays so if	ion from section 6 into a
Speak soon				
Gareth				
UK Futures How can UK busi www.deloitte.co				
Street Square, London E	EC4A 3BZ, United Kingdom. Deloitte L hose member firms are legally separ	LP is the United Kingdom m	-	OC303675. Its registered office is 2, New u Limited ("DTTL"), a UK private company for a detailed description of the legal
intended recipient(s), pl distribution, copying or	lease (1) notify it.security.uk GR use of this communication is strictly	O by forwarding this prohibited. Email communi	ed. It is for the exclusive use of the inten email and delete all copies from your sys cations cannot be guaranteed to be secu an external supplier within the Europear	tem and (2) note that disclosure, are or free from error or viruses. All
	d by law, Deloitte LLP does not accept nt agreed in a Deloitte LLP engagemen		liance on the contents of this email by a	ny person save by the intended
Opinions, conclusions a	nd other information in this email wh	nich have not been delivere	d by way of the business of Deloitte LLP a	are neither given nor endorsed by it.
Sent: 02 July 20				
To: Julie George	<u> </u>	GRO	Rod Ismay - Post Offic	e Ltd
GRO Cc: Westbrook, N	Malcolm Zacl Mark (UK - Manchester)	<		

ΑII,

Subject: Zebra - Key Points from the Meeting

Thanks for your time today. Notes that Mark and I took away on what we heard from you are below, which hopefully will be helpful to get the response paper started. Do let us know if you'd like any further supportive help on this.

Gareth

Actions

- 1. Deloitte to reflect Rod (W) feedback on v16, then provide editable version of the document so that section 6 text can be extracted to help shape the response paper.
- 2. Rod (W) to confirm if Section 6 also needs re-shaping into a standalone, non-privileged deliverable (eg: Sparrow references removed).
- 3. Julie to have discussion with David on Section C recommendations.
- 4. Gareth and Mark to progress meeting with relevant members of POL in relation to Section B. Julie to be invited if not already.

Thoughts on Individual Sections:

A1 – Detailed review of balancing transactions use – Rodric keen to progress work on this. Focused piece on a particular area of risk aiming to identify underlying root causes that can trigger the need for these, and procedures in place for initiating, approving, performing, monitoring them. To potentially include identification and testing of key controls (and how assurance sustained).

A2 – Verification work over key Horizon Features – Features identified in the Board report proposed as a 'minimum baseline' that needs testing validation. Workshop could be organised to (a) decide if any additional key features should be added (eg: 3 way system reconciliation activities in Fujitsu / matters relating to Centera hardware); (b) agree how items are best tested, and by whom (c) produce a testing plan / roadmap. It was agreed that different parties could perform this work, short term and longer term (eg: internal audit / Deloitte / via ISAE 3402).

A3 – Analytic testing on Audit Store Data – Three stage approach likely most appropriate – (1) Discovery exercise by Deloitte SMEs, looking at feasibility of data extraction and handling with Fujitsu and helping put some cost estimates to stage (2) and (3); (2) performing a pilot on a small extract of data (3 months?), exploring what scope POL could achieve and what is likely to add most value / be most insightful (from various perspective – Sparrow; Future System; Ongoing Risk/Control monitoring); (3) Scaling up over full 6 year data history – added benefit that this helps provide insight over the pre HGN-X processing environment, as year 5 and 6 of the data will be from pre 2010 (old Horizon system). This will help provide evidence that assertions re: the 'pre' world not being that different from the 'current' world can be formally supported.

A4 – FSC Process documentation + system reconciliation activities - Rod (I) saw significant validity in this area, and value in documentation for future system too supported by Julie. Rod was not convinced by the need to look at manual reconciliation controls between systems, as reliance should be placed on IT operations. See A2 above on discovery/testing of this key control.

B1 – Agreement that most of the A and C activities above and below have value from a future system perspective and matters need to be joined up to deliver this 'through and into' the project team. In particular the future system project needs to consider future system assurance requirements, and how the IT Assurance needs of POL are best setup (organisationally and scope wise). A meeting with the project team is progressing into diaries.

Section C – Not discussed at great length as David Mason needs engaging. Recognition to consider the principles of a "Head of Assurance", who role it is to bring together all sources of assurance across POL's risk landscape into a single, holistic picture for senior management. Page 33 matters to be picked up offline by David and Julie. Some discussion around C3 and how this marries up to A2 and A3 – though recognition that all aspects of "A" actions have implications for future, sustained assurance provision. Also query of how aspects of continuous / ongoing monitoring link into Project Horace (sp?) and other endeavours in the business to better analytically monitor / alert to key risks.