

**To:** 'Kevin Lenihan'[kevin.lenihan] GRO **Mark Underwood1**[mark.underwood1] GRO  
**Cc:** Lesley J Sewell[lesley.j.sewell] GRO **Patrick Bourke**[patrick.bourke] GRO **Parsons, Andrew**[andrew.parsons] GRO **Melanie Corfield**[melanie.corfield] GRO  
**From:** Newsome Pete[o=Exchange/ou=AdminGroup1/cn=Recipients/cn=Blagg-NewsomeP]  
**Sent:** Tue 4/7/2015 3:25:17 PM (UTC)  
**Subject:** | RE: URGENT ACTION : Second Sight assertions about editing data. URGENT

Kevin

I have started to pull together information so will hope to have something back tomorrow.

Pete

Pete Newsome  
Business Change Manager  
Post Office Account, Fujitsu UK&I

GRO  
E-Mail: [pete.newsome@uk.fujitsu.com](mailto:pete.newsome@uk.fujitsu.com) GRO  
Web: <http://uk.fujitsu.com>



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

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

---

**From:** Kevin Lenihan [mailto:[kevin.lenihan](mailto:kevin.lenihan)] GRO  
**Sent:** 07 April 2015 16:03  
**To:** Mark Underwood1; Newsome Pete  
**Cc:** Lesley J Sewell; Patrick Bourke; Parsons, Andrew; Melanie Corfield  
**Subject:** URGENT ACTION : Second Sight assertions about editing data. URGENT

Cc – FYI

Mark,

I was on a conference call with Pete at the time of your call but have subsequently spoken to him briefly about the below. I believe that James has now moved on though.

Pete – the note below and urgent response deadline from Mark refers. Can you respond to the questions asked in line with requested timeline please ? If there are problems fulfilling that request please advise.

Thanks,

Kevin

Kevin Lenihan | Senior Information Services Manager

---

2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, 148 Old Street, London EC1V 9HQ

GRO  
[kevin.lenihan](mailto:kevin.lenihan) GRO




---

**From:** Mark Underwood1  
**Sent:** 07 April 2015 14:25  
**To:** Kevin Lenihan; Davidson James; Newsome Pete  
**Cc:** Lesley J Sewell; Patrick Bourke; Parsons, Andrew; Melanie Corfield  
**Subject:** Second Sight assertions about editing data. URGENT.

Hi Kevin, James & Peter.

I tried to each of you a call but went through to voicemail. The below has come through from SS just now for which we need to reply with 24 hours.

Back in 2010, a bug was identified in Horizon which caused a receipts and payments mismatch issue (also known as the 76 Bug). Second Sight has been provided with POL / FJ documents about this issue and they have now highlighted a couple of paragraphs in those documents that indicate Post Office can alter branch data. Second Sight are not interested in the bug itself but rather the method by which Post Office could have edited branch data to resolve the bug.

An extract from a draft Second Sight report (where they make their allegations) and the two POL / FJ documents referred to therein are attached. The key extracts from the POL / FJ documents are below:

### **CORRECTING ACCOUNTS FOR "LOST" DISCREPANCIES**

#### ***"7. Fixing the Data for each Affected Branch***

*The data can be corrected by adjusting the appropriate Opening Figures and BTS Data that relates to the current TP. This will result in the Discrepancy needing to be processed when rolling over into the next TP."*

### **RECEIPTS/PAYMENTS MISMATCH ISSUE NOTES**

*"SOLUTION ONE- Alter the Horizon Branch figure at the counter to show the discrepancy. Fujitsu would have to manually write an entry value to the local branch account.*

*IMPACT - When the branch comes to complete next Trading Period they would have a discrepancy, which they would have to bring to account.*

*RISK- This has significant data integrity concerns and could lead to questions of "tampering" with the branch system and could generate questions around how the discrepancy was caused. This solution could have moral implications of Post Office' changing branch data without informing the branch."*

Please could FJ explain what is meant by *"The data can be corrected by adjusting the appropriate Opening Figures and BTS Data that relates to the current TP"* and *"Alter the Horizon Branch figure at the counter to show the discrepancy"*.

Please can you also explain:

1. How these alterations would be made?
2. Would they leave a detectable footprint?
3. The effect they would have on data integrity?
4. Whether the alterations would be visible to branches?
5. What course of action was taken in relation to the 76 Bug?

Mark Underwood  
Complaint Review and Mediation Scheme

**GRO**

---

\*\*\*\*\*  
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: Finsbury Dials, 20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ.

\*\*\*\*\*