
From: Holmes Jan R[/O=ICL/OU=UKSOUTH FEL01/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=HOLMESJ]
Sent: Mon 11/02/2002 3:31:51 PM (UTC)
To: 'rashpal.dhesi'; [GRO]
Cc: Hooper Graham J; [GRO]
'HilaryS'; [GRO]
Subject: RE: Data Centre Report - POL Distribution

Rashpal,

OK, now let's try and get this back on an even keel.

Both Graham and I were taken aback at the draft report that you presented for comment. It wasn't just the content, concentrating as it did on security related issues, but the proposed distribution to what Graham and I felt were inappropriate addressees for the level of detail in the report. I agree that we had discussed a report and I did acknowledge this in my email reply of 26th October. However, I stand by my statement that I believed the report was to be limited to matters relating to the broken audit trail and distribution within Consignia Internal Audit. Clearly a difference in expectations that brings us to where we are now.

I have no objection to you providing a high level overview of what was covered, even to the extent that you identify that a number of shortcomings in operational control were identified and acknowledged by ISD. I know that you were not claiming any credit for the work but what I objected to was the wholesale copying of text from our report being distributed around very senior positions in the Post Office, and even your external auditors. As I said in my first email, you offered no audit opinion to allow readers to put the recommendations into perspective. If you read your report without that context it makes for bleak reading and presents a far worse picture than actually exists.

I realise the shortened report that I sent back does not provide useful input to your management but strictly speaking it does deal with the specific area of interest that was the subject of your attendance.

In order to move this forward I suggest the following compromise. You can identify, in broad terms, the areas where operational shortcomings were observed and recommendations made. Because of the low level of many of these recommendations I do not see any benefit in reporting them in detail. In all there were 41 separate recommendations made spread between the Data Centres and Belfast Operations Centre. I can tell you that as of today 26 are closed and most should be completed by the end of this month.

I appreciate that you waited for our report rather than report immediately on what you saw and I realise that you have to be able to show some output for the time you spent. In this instance I would ask that you consider the impact that your original report could have on Pathway if it is not placed in context for the readers.

I hope you can agree to this proposal and look forward to a revised draft report in due course.

Regards,

Jan

-----Original Message-----

From: rashpal.dhesi; [GRO]
Sent: 08 February 2002 15:48
To: Holmes Jan R
Cc: hilary.stewart; [GRO]
Subject: Re: Data Centre Report - POL Distribution

Thanks for your note. I did say at the time that all audit time allocated in the plan requires an output and whether it would be ok to produce a memo/report. I believe that you agreed this approach on your return e:mail of 26/10/01. I would see Mike Hannon the main recipient of this output and all the other customers are included as part of our normal reporting requirements.

The provision of details to POL of the work undertaken was intended to provide a high level overview of the element covered, and it was noted in paragraph 1.3 that this was not the entire review so any assumptions as to the adequacy of control would be ill judged. At no time have I claimed credit for this work, but tried to show that all improvement opportunities were being actioned in the appropriate manner by your organisation from which our management could take assurance.

In the interest of our open relationship this report has not been discussed with anyone outside Audit. The reason why the report was sent to you first, was to get your views as to the accuracy and level of details. As you said at the time, having seen your processes I could have reported it immediately drawing my own conclusions but this approach was never taken or intended, in order to foster a open relationship.

I have been surprised by your reaction to the report. I did not think that there were any issues that would reflect badly on your organisation. The suggested replacement report provides no value in reporting this to management.

I will be out early part of next week, but available after that if you wish to discuss further.

Thanks
Rashpal

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 and then delete this email from your system.