

---

**From:** Mark Underwood1 [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thur 20/11/2014 10:47:36 AM (UTC)  
**To:** Tom Wechsler [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Patrick Bourke [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Remote access - papers and plan  
**Attachment:** \_DOC\_28614498(2)\_Horizon data.DOCX  
**Attachment:** Once a transaction is recorded in a Branch.docx

**GRO**

Hi Tom,

Note drafted to get my mind straight and to try and agree a process to push this to conclusion.

I have attached two docs:

- 1) A paper produced by AP with my proposed track changes. PB envisages this as the all-encompassing paper, that going forward we can refer to in response to claims in, for example, draft CRRs of transactions mysteriously appearing in SPMRs accounts.
- 2) A much shorter bulleted high level list of what can / cannot be done with regards to remote access. To be used in, for example public rebuttals.

Whenever we have spoken to FJ about this issue, they seem puzzled as to why we are so concerned citing 'data integrity' However I think we are now of the opinion it is a semantics issue. By 'data integrity' FJ are, I think, referring to 'audit trail' – in that, whatever is done leaves a clear and identifiable audit trail behind it and thus – if there is no 'remote access car' in the branch's data – it simply did not happen. This therefore allows us to prove the negative.

On a call – FJ confirmed they already had downloaded all the branch data available for the 150 scheme cases and performed searches for any such 'scars'.

As such, everything appears to be golden. We just need FJ to confirm this once and for all.

In terms of process, I would think it seems sensible to:

- 1) Send the attached papers to AP for his approval – particularly as I have changed his paper in parts. We also need to incorporate any changes Andy Holt sent AP.
- 2) Then, with the below disclaimer (crafted by AP) – send to FJ to answer the questions posed in the attached

**"This draft document, and any communications or other documents associated with it, are confidential, privileged and prepared in contemplation of litigation. They must be kept confidential and not disclosed to any other person."**

- 3) Send to SS for their approval as they are quoted as agreeing AP's paper (or remove that reference as, although nice to have, we don't need their approval)
- 4) Finalise

Once you have digested – lets catch up

Mark

Mark Underwood  
Initial Complaint and Mediation Scheme

**GRO**