
From: Butts Geoff [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BUTTSG]
Sent: Mon 15/02/2010 11:58:42 AM (UTC)
To: Jenkins Gareth GI [Gareth.Jenkins; GRO]
Subject: | FW: Track 2 Data Solution
Attachment: PSO_FSL_CRO1762_FS.doc
Attachment: REQCUSFSR0001 v0.3.doc
Attachment: Eliminating Track II from historical Audit log.rtf

FYI.

Regards,

Geoff

Geoff Butts,

Programme Manager, HNG-X Release 1,

Royal Mail Account

Practitioner, P&PM Academy

FUJITSU

Mob: GRO or Internally GRO
E-mail: geoff.butts@fujitsu.com GRO
Web: <http://uk.fujitsu.com>

Fujitsu Services Limited, Registered in England no 96056, Registered Office 22 Baker Street, London, W1U 3BW

This e-mail is only for the use of its intended recipient. Its contents are subject to a duty of confidence and may be privileged. Fujitsu Services does not guarantee that this e-mail has not been intercepted and amended or that it is virus-free.

From: Kirkham Suzie
Sent: 11 February 2010 17:14
To: Butts Geoff; Clark Jason; Welsh Graham; Lillywhite Tom; Worrell Jeremy; Prenovost Jean-Philippe
Cc: D'Alvarez Alan
Subject: RE: Track 2 Data Solution

Geoff

The CR you refer to and as attached asked for the following change

"Fujitsu are requested to document a proposal that addresses how Track II data can be removed from the Historical Audit logs. The solution must consider the impact on prosecution cases and how we can "prove beyond reasonable doubt" the data can continue to be used as evidence in court"

I have attached both the CR and a copy of Jim Sweetings document.

The response has not been submitted to POL due to the outstanding query around the second half of the requirement - the position with prosecution cases. We have sought legal advice (Jean Pierre Prenovost who works for David Jones in our Legal Department) has been in discussion with POL legal (Hugh Fleminton). The general position is that if we remove the Track 2 data from the Historical log we will not be able to state that the data is a correct and true record of the electronically generated data as it has been changed in some way at a later date. This would mean we could not state that we can "prove beyond reasonable doubt" the data can continue to be used as evidence in court" This therefore raises a question over the integrity of the data.

I have also attached an email JP sent to David Gray on this issue. JP has been in further discussion with Hugh today to try and resolve this issue

Jean Pierre – please can you send some words that we can insert into our technical response that clarifies our legal position so that the technical document can be submitted.

Kind regards

Suzie

Suzie Kirkham

Account Manager
Royal Mail Group

FUJITSU

Lovell Road, Bracknell, Berks RG12 8SN
Tel: **GRO** Internal: **GRO**
Mob: **GRO**

Fax: **GRO** Internal: **GRO**

E-mail: suzie.kirkham@royalmail.com **GRO**
Web: <http://uk.fujitsu.com>

Fujitsu Services Limited, Registered in England no 96056, Registered Office 22 Baker Street, London, W1U 3BW

This e-mail is only for the use of its intended recipient. Its contents are subject to a duty of confidence and may be privileged. Fujitsu does not guarantee that this e-mail has not been intercepted and amended or that it is virus-free

From: Butts Geoff
Sent: 11 February 2010 16:52
To: Clark Jason; Welsh Graham; Kirkham Suzie; Lillywhite Tom; Worrell Jeremy
Cc: D'Alvarez Alan
Subject: Track 2 Data Solution
Importance: High

All,

I was given an action from the HNG-X Release 1 Joint Progress Meeting to chase up the completion of a CT to send to Post Office for our proposal on Track 2 Data.

Ian Trundell has requested that this CT (in draft form if necessary) is sent to him and copied to Mark Burley by end of play, Monday 15/02/10. Jason is working on this. I understand the solution that Jim has described so far proposes a solution in 3 stages comprising:-

1. Proof of Concept to sanitise audit data
2. Proof of Concept to store the sanitised audit data

3. Development of the full solution

I understand the total cost of the Proof of Concept is to be capped at £50k and the full solution an estimated additional £250k (to be confirmed by the PoC).

Ian's assumption is that the Post Office legal team will approve the principle that "sanitised" or "obfuscated" data with an audit trail of how it got to this position from the raw data is admissible evidence for legal cases, although he has yet to receive formal feedback. Is Fujitsu's legal team supportive of this approach? If not, then it sounds as though our overall solution needs to be revised and the CT will be invalid.

I want to ensure that we are joined up, so please advise if anything I've stated is incorrect.

Thanks.

Regards,

Geoff

Geoff Butts,

Programme Manager, HNG-X Release 1,

Royal Mail Account

Practitioner, P&PM Academy

FUJITSU

Mob: [GRO] or Internally [GRO]
E-mail: geoff.butts@fujitsu.com [GRO]
Web: <http://uk.fujitsu.com>

Fujitsu Services Limited, Registered in England no 96056, Registered Office 22 Baker Street, London, W1U 3BW

This e-mail is only for the use of its intended recipient. Its contents are subject to a duty of confidence and may be privileged. Fujitsu Services does not guarantee that this e-mail has not been intercepted and amended or that it is virus-free.