

To: Davidson James [REDACTED] GRO
From: Simpkins John [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=SIMPKINSJ]
Sent: Thur 5/15/2014 9:24:05 AM (UTC)
Subject: FW: Branch Database and Change Management Additional Questions

James, we did not discuss timescales but I have just been asked by Leighton for some more details before a 10:30 meeting today. These are to the best of my knowledge:

Question 1 about the TXN_CORR_TOOL_JOURNAL table.

- How does this process operate and who has the ability to be able to perform this e.g. POL and/or Fujitsu?; and

The normal support route is used to identify when a fix is required, either from a branch raised incident or estate monitors that alert support staff.

A TfS incident would be raised with evidence.

This would be transferred to the SSC as a Peak because they support the applications.

The SSC would investigate with evidence from the support branch database and then liaise 4th line development (evidence and progress would be recorded on the Peak).

4th line development would generate the required scripts using a test system to make the correction.

An MSC (or OCP/TfS) would be raised for permission to run the support tool on the live branch database (BRDBX015).

The SSC would run the script using the support tool against the live estate.

- What monitoring is performed over the table TXN_CORR_TOOL_JOURNAL?

The Support tool is written to run under the SSC (read only role) role and connects internally as the APPSUP role (write permission).

All changes are written to the AUDIT logs.

The output from the support tool is captured and recorded on the Peak.

I can find just one recorded use of this tool:

Date: 03/03/2010

TfS: 20156

Peak: PC0195561

OCP: 25882

Branch: 226542

Question 2 about JOURNAL_SEQ_DENSE_SET_CHECK_ENABLED setting.

- Can we see evidence to demonstrate that this parameter is currently set to "True"?; and

I ran this query against the live BRDB (node 1) today at 09:47

```
1 select * from brdb_system_parameters
2* where parameter_name = 'JOURNAL_SEQ_DENSE_SET_CHECK_ENABLED'
```

These are the results:

PARAMETER_NAME: JOURNAL_SEQ_DENSE_SET_CHECK_ENABLED

VERSION_NUMBER: 1

INSERT_TIMESTAMP: 05-OCT-09 04.06.30.0639 AM

START_DATE: 05-OCT-09

PARAMETER_DESCRIPTION: Indicates whether sequence checking is required in BRDBC002

PARAMETER_TYPE: I

PARAMETER_NUMBER:

END_DATE:

PARAMETER_DATE:

UPDATE_TIMESTAMP:

PARAMETER_TEXT:

This indicates that this parameter has not been changed since created on 05-Oct-2009

- Who has access to be able to amend this parameter and is any proactive monitoring performed to ensure that it is not altered?

As this is in the database it would require write permission to update the parameter.

This would require access to the APPSUP role which may be granted to the SSC under MSC. Any change to this role is audited.

I am unaware of any proactive monitoring of these values.

Regards

John

From: Davidson James
Sent: 14 May 2014 16:38
To: Simpkins John
Subject: FW: Branch Database and Change Management Additional Questions

James Davidson

Post Office

Fujitsu

Lovelace Road, Bracknell, RG12 8SN

Mob:

Email:

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



Fujitsu is proud to partner with [Shelter](#), the housing and homeless charity

Reshaping ICT, Reshaping Business in partnership with [FT.com](#)



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

From: Hodgkinson, Sean (UK - Manchester);
Sent: 14 May 2014 16:11
To: Davidson James
Cc: Dave M King; Jane E Smith; Rod Ismay
Subject: RE: Branch Database and Change Management Additional Questions

James,

I have been provided with your contact details by my colleague, Mark Westbrook, as somebody who may be able to assist with technical queries we have in relation to the Branch Database.

Please could you review the email trail below, and advise whether this is something you can assist with?

Kind regards,
Sean

Sean Hodgkinson

Deloitte LLP

Mobile:

www.deloitte.co.uk

From: Dave M King;
Sent: 14 May 2014 11:49
To: Hodgkinson, Sean (UK - Manchester); Jane E Smith; Rod Ismay

Cc: Rodric Williams
Subject: RE: Branch Database and Change Management Additional Questions

Sean

I've had a chat with Jane and I believe the only way we will be able to resolve this is if you get confirmation from Fujitsu of whether this has ever been done and what the process is (POL have no direct access to the database). If corrections are needed, "we" insert a transaction to correct the situation following a reconciliation process rather than make direct changes to any transaction in the database.

I am in a similar position with the audit trail question

I believe you have a contact in Fujitsu who can confirm directly?

Thanks

Dave King | Senior Technical Security Assurance Manager

2nd Floor, 1 Future Walk, Chesterfield, S49 1PF

GRO



From: Hodgkinson, Sean (UK - Manchester) **GRO**
Sent: 13 May 2014 19:27
To: Jane E Smith; Rod Ismay; Dave M King
Subject: Branch Database and Change Management Additional Questions

All,

Following review of the technical design document in relation to the Branch Database, I had a couple of queries that I was hoping you may be able to help with. If not, please could you direct me toward somebody who may be able to assist:

1) Balancing Transactions

Section 5.6.2 describes back end database amendment process which is included by design:

Inserting Balancing Transactions

There is a requirement that the SSC will have ability to insert balancing transactions into the persistent objects of the Branch Database. There are reasons for SSC having to do so e.g. to rectify erroneous accounting data that may have been logged as a result of a bug in the Counter / BAL.

SSC will have privileges of only inserting balancing / correcting transactions to relevant tables in the database. SSC will not have any privileges to update or delete records in the database.

Any writes by the SSC to BRDB must be audited. The mechanism for inserting a correction record must ensure that the auditing of that action performed must be atomic. There also needs a level of obfuscation to ensure that the audit mechanism is robust.

The above-mentioned requirements suggest that there is a need for a correction tool to be delivered which performs the correction, audits it and saves both changes.

A simple low-cost solution for the tool is to provide a Linux shell based utility, which calls a PL/SQL package to perform the changes. The package will allow inserts to the following transactional tables in the Branch Database Live schema with the exception of the Message Journal. All inserts will be audited in the table BRDB_TXN_CORR_TOOL_JOURNAL.

From the above we wish to clarify, with evidence where possible:

- How does this process operate and who has the ability to be able to perform this e.g. POL and/or Fujitsu?; and
- What monitoring is performed over the table TXN_CORR_TOOL_JOURNAL?

2) Audit Store File Generation – Optional Parameter

Section 7.2.2.8 on page 122 describes how:

As records are being written to the audit files, the process must optionally be able to monitor if the set of Journal-Sequence-Numbers for a node in a Branch is dense. The check should only be performed when the value of mandatory System-Parameter 'JOURNAL_SEQ_DENSE_SET_CHECK_ENABLED' is "TRUE". When a missing journal entry is encountered, a message should be written on standard output along the lines of "...records between sequence numbers M and N are missing...". Once the list of auditable messages for a node is completed, an Operational exception should be raised to indicate the count of missing sequence numbers. Duplicate records are not possible due to the primary key on this table.

- Can we see evidence to demonstrate that this parameter is currently set to "True"?; and
- Who has access to be able to amend this parameter and is any proactive monitoring performed to ensure that it is not altered?

Jane - Per our conversation earlier this morning, have you been able to locate any of the documents to support the 'Client File Receiving Project' 2012? As discussed we'd like to see evidence to demonstrate that the correct plans, approval and testing was performed before the change was applied to live, so would expect evidence such as:

- Business plans and requirements;
- Steering group minutes;
- Approvals at each stage of development, testing and final go live;
- Evidence of any testing performed during the development life cycle; and
- Post go-live review to ensure business requirements were met and any residual risks were adequately documented.

If any of you have any questions in relation to the queries raised, please feel free to give me a call.

Kind regards,
Sean

Sean Hodgkinson

Senior Consultant | Audit Advisory

Deloitte LLP

PO Box 500, 2 Hardman Street, Manchester, M60 2AT, United Kingdom

Tel/Direct: **GRO** | Mobile: **GRO**

GRO | www.deloitte.co.uk

Please consider the environment before printing.

UK Futures

How can UK business drive growth?
<http://www.deloitte.co.uk/ukfutures>

IMPORTANT NOTICE

This communication is from Deloitte LLP, a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC303675. Its registered office is 2, New Street Square, London EC4A 3BZ, United Kingdom. Deloitte LLP is the United Kingdom member firm of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited ("DTTL"), a UK private company limited by guarantee, whose member firms are legally separate and independent entities. Please see www.deloitte.co.uk/about for a detailed description of the legal structure of DTTL and its member firms.

This communication contains information which is confidential and may also be privileged. It is for the exclusive use of the intended recipient(s). If you are not the intended recipient(s), please (1) notify it.security.uk@deloitte.co.uk **GRO** by forwarding this email and delete all copies from your system and (2) note that disclosure, distribution, copying or use of this communication is strictly prohibited. Email communications cannot be guaranteed to be secure or free from error or viruses. All emails sent to or from a Deloitte UK email account are securely archived and stored by an external supplier within the European Union.

To the extent permitted by law, Deloitte LLP does not accept any liability for use of or reliance on the contents of this email by any person save by the intended recipient(s) to the extent agreed in a Deloitte LLP engagement contract.

Opinions, conclusions and other information in this email which have not been delivered by way of the business of Deloitte LLP are neither given nor endorsed by it.

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: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.
