
From: Lamb Helen[/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=ROBINSONH]
Sent: Wed 16/10/2013 2:47:55 PM (UTC)
To: Harvey Michael [GRO]
Cc: Newsome Pete [GRO]; Davidson James [GRO]; Bell Gavin [GRO]
Subject: | Re: CONFIDENTIAL - Second Sight and expert determination

Just spoken with Lesley, she didn't have a firm eta but is going to take a view and get back to us. My guess would be, she would be happy for us to push back on areas that don't make sense and maybe have a workshop to go through them.

Sent from my iPhone

On 16 Oct 2013, at 11:14, "Harvey Michael" [GRO] wrote:

All,

I have just got off the phone with Roderick from Post Office. It would appear that they are pressing ahead with wanting the Expert "view". They appear to have two persons in mind.

I have asked for the Terms of Reference for the Expert (and also the legal opinion from Cartwright King (this latter one I may not get)). Once I have them I will share and we will need a meeting to discuss what we do next. Given Lesley's initial concerns about this process it would be useful to understand where she is with this and whether she will support us if we push back / amend the terms?

I have also asked for the terms of reference for the Mediation Process.

Kind regards,

Mike

From: Harvey Michael
Sent: 19 September 2013 10:52
To: Newsome Pete; Davidson James; Bell Gavin
Cc: Lamb Helen
Subject: CONFIDENTIAL - Summary of meeting with Post Office

All,

Please find below my summary of the meeting that Helen and I had with Post Office regarding providing support with respect to the Mediation Process and others arising as a result of the Second Sight report.

Any questions, please give me a call. Otherwise at some stage we will need to discuss how what we need to do to deliver to their requirements.

Kind regards,

Mike

Attendees

Lesley Sewell
Susan Crichton

Helen Lamb
Mike Harvey

Andy Holt

		Internal Comment	Action
1	POL have implemented a mediation process for any claims/issues Sub-Postmasters may have with regard to claimed lost transactions/discrepancies	Note SC herself said that claims were limited to 7 years but that they were accepting those from earlier subject to determining what data they actually had.	AH to send ToR for Mediation Process (publicly available document)
2	The Mediation Process will have an independent chair and Sub-PMs will have access to external support funded by POL.		
3	This process is separate from the legal process		
4	POL require Fujitsu to assist this process by providing the data etc (as per current Horizon Prosecution support processes). However, it would be of value if we could provide explanatory reports too (pitched at the Sub-PMs technical level to explain the data etc. For example, if we say X could not happen because the two systems were running on separate Network Protocols, explain in layman's language what that means)	This could be something we ask for James' assistance with developing.	Fujitsu will develop this as requested as part of the mediation process. In order to gain consistency of approach we suggest that this is managed as a Project and it may be something that James Davidson could manage in order to ensure a good bridge between the technical and layman's explanations.
5	POL may be looking at improvements to their systems and aspects of the Horizon system, for example POL may want changes to the audit log/roll back process in order to make it easier for Sub-PM's to use/understanding	We need to ensure that we are clear that we have delivered the services and as such any changes are chargeable. AH indicated there are currently 12 or so changes they may request.	AH to liaise with Pete Newsome with respect to the changes that POL may request.
6	POL detailed that they have nearly completed a review of the Criminal Cases (about 150 so far). Of these they have flagged 9 as potentially having an issue in light of the Second Sight report.		
7	POL's criminal barrister from Cartwright King solicitors has flagged a discrepancy	I disagree that the Expert is "tainted" but	SC to determine whether she can share

	between the evidence given in court and the information provided as part of the Second Sight audit. This could mean that the relevant Expert is "tainted".	ultimately there is little point challenging it as we agree it may be a sensible time to transition to a new expert to ensure continuity of service	the report with Fujitsu (MH)
8	<p>POL looking for some means of providing an "independent" witness/expert with respect to future criminal cases. This may be an academic.</p> <p>MH pointed out concerns he had about how viable such an approach would be with respect to past transactions.</p>	<p>We need to remember this is all about data integrity and as such I am of the view that we remain best placed to provide the data and give a context/ explanation as to where it came from and any factors affecting it.</p> <p>POL have/are having conversations with Imperial College re the "academic".</p> <p>LS has concerns regarding the use of an academic / independent expert but for her it depends on sight of the ToR.</p>	<p>SC to share with MH the proposed ToR for an "independent expert" for our comment/review.</p> <p>SC indicated she may also request MH attend a call with Counsel on Friday afternoon</p>
9	POL flagged that Counsel is concerned regarding the change of data audit system. HL and MH explained that the process will be independently checked throughout the process and nothing will be done with POL's agreement	Note LS stated she did not have any concerns regarding this process	Once the paper's are completed, Fujitsu to present them to POL (including Counsel).

Michael Harvey

Commercial Director and Solicitor

Fujitsu

22 Baker Street, London W1U 3BW

Mob: **GRO**

Email: **GRO**

Web: <http://uk.fujitsu.com>



Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?