
From: Davidson James[/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=DAVIDSONJ2]
Sent: Wed 23/07/2014 8:29:41 AM (UTC)
To: Bell Gavin [REDACTED] GRO
Cc: Harvey Michael [REDACTED] GRO
Subject: | FW: ICL initial review and requests.docx
Attachment: ICL initial review and requests.docx

Gavin,

I need to escalate to you the need for an exec level meeting with Post Office to discuss the Imperial College London study, the draft terms of reference of which is enclosed. Andy Holt was trying to set up a meeting with Chris Aujard and Lesley for a meeting this week but I haven't been able to get hold of Lesley and there has been no reply to Andy's note sent to Chris last Friday.

The key points for me are;

- The document suggests that Post Office see Horizon as 'defective' and that they have 'lost confidence' in the system. Is this really the case or, what I suspect, down to the lack of capability in the legal department to properly frame and set a meaningful terms of reference for ICL
- What are the exam questions being set?
- What is the required scope – our view appears to be very different to POL's as set out in various meetings and documents since January this year
- What is the required vehicle to engage, POL should be raising a CR for us to impact etc
- How will teams work together and to what level is engagement required – is this just a document review or will workshops and input be required from Fujitsu SME's (I assume yes).

My overriding concern is that the framing of the discussion with ICL has already sent POL down a path from the start point that there are issues. This flies in the face of all findings to date and is not in line with statements that POL are looking for assurance that nothing more can be done to make a good system, even better. There is also no join up between all the areas of assurance undertaken by POL and time and again, the same information is requested and provided. There appears to be no one that has the vision to understand how all the pieces of the assurance jigsaw (PCI, IAS 3402, ISO 27001, Deloittes, Second Sight!) provide them with a multitude of assurance points that can be utilised before another study is kicked off.

I have a number of suggestions for how this can be approached but we need the right level of engagement to get this discussion going. One of the themes I have heard a lot recently is that POL cannot be seen to influence the outcome of the ICL study by setting a terms of reference that may be perceived to be bias under questioning. The issue here is that this has lead to a dogmatic and unworkable approach to agreeing a suitable terms of reference.

Will catch you tomorrow or Friday to discuss further.

Regards,

James Davidson

Post Office

Fujitsu

Lovelace Road, Bracknell, RG12 8SN

Mob: [REDACTED] GRO

Email: [REDACTED] GRO

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: Andy Holt [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 July 2014 13:47
To: Davidson James; Newsome Pete
Subject: ICL initial review and requests.docx

James/Pete

See extract from ICL document I have just received. I have only taken out their estimates for doing this work.

Can you review and tell me where you have documents that cover the asks so we can agree on the best approach. If you think they are PO docs just let me know, I will review the list as well.

Can we have a call on Thursday to review approach so I can go back to them. Once we have sorted the above I think it is worth a meeting to run through the approach.

Regards

Andy

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.
