

**From:** "Matthew.Lenton" <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** Amy Prime <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** Andrew Parsons <[REDACTED]>, Jonathan Gribben  
<[REDACTED]>, Katie Simmonds <[REDACTED]>  
"pete.newsom" <[REDACTED]>  
"Torstein.O.Godeseth" <[REDACTED]>, <[REDACTED]>  
"ParkerSP" <[REDACTED]>, Lucy Bremner  
<[REDACTED]>

**Subject:** RE: KEL Disclosure

**Date:** Tue, 15 Oct 2019 17:07:26 +0000

**Importance:** Normal

**Attachments:** JavaScripts.zip; SP\_TIDY\_KELS.zip; Legacy\_KEL\_Duplicates.xlsx

**Embedded:** unnamed

**Inline-Images:** image001.png; image002.png; image003.png; image005.jpg; image007.jpg

---

Amy,

Please see responses added in italics to your email below. As noted in response to point 9, Pete Newsome and John Simpkins are available at 15:00 on Wednesday; please also include Steve Parker and myself on any invitation.

In addition to those responses, we believe that the existence of superseded / deprecated versions of KELs has been explained previously in the following ways:

The attached email from Feb 2019 "RE: Peaks / KELS...", explained both what deprecated means, and for which categories of KELs deprecated versions were available, it being clear from the explanation that it is a fairly complicated picture, in that deprecated versions are not available for all existing KELs. It is also implicit in the statement further down in that email chain where it is stated "*The KELs listed below are all deleted rather than deprecated or archived, and are therefore not retrievable*".

It is stated in SVM/SDM/PRO/0875 section 11.2.4, last bullet: "*All KELs have version numbers, it is always possible to view a previous version and highlight the differences between versions.*"

There is evidence in Mr Coyne's report of October 2018 that he read SVM/SDM/PRO/0875 as it is referenced in footnotes 32, 35, 238, and at least some of paragraphs 4.87 to 4.89 look likely to be based on section 11.2 of SVM/SDM/PRO/0875. Although he doesn't explicitly acknowledge the continuing existence of deprecated versions, paragraph 4.89 shows some understanding: "*Information on the KEL is updated by all levels of support as work to resolve the incident progresses. Any creation or update of a KEL must be authorised by SSC before it can be seen by all users.*"

We acknowledge that we were asked to check the EDQ, but noted that we were not specifically asked to comment on that section, but on other parts that were highlighted for our attention, and also note that we were given only a few hours to respond (10:20 am until 14:30 on the same day). From Michael Wharton's email of the 06-Dec-2017, it seems that the EDQ resulted at least in part from a phone call on 30-Nov-2017, and we have been unable to find any record of the previous work that went into producing it.

Matthew Lenton  
Document Manager

Post Office Account

**Fujitsu**

Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berkshire, RG12 8SN

Phone:

**GRO**

Email:

Web: <https://www.fujitsu.com/global/>

---

**From:** Amy Prime <[redacted] GRO [redacted]>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 15, 2019 9:16 AM  
**To:** Lenton, Matthew <[redacted] GRO [redacted]>  
**Cc:** Andrew Parsons <[redacted] GRO [redacted]>; Jonathan Gribben <[redacted] GRO [redacted]>  
[redacted] GRO >; Katie Simmonds <[redacted] GRO [redacted]>; Newsome, Pete  
[redacted] GRO >; Godeseth, Torstein <[redacted] GRO [redacted]>; Parker, Steve  
[redacted] GRO >; Lucy Bremner <[redacted] GRO [redacted]>  
**Subject:** KEL Disclosure

Matthew

We have received the attached letter from Freeths in relation to the disclosure of the previous versions of the KELs. So as Post Office can provide a response to this letter, please could you consider and provide a response to the following queries – given the importance of these documents to the Horizon Issues Trial, it would be appreciated if your responses are accurate and provide a detailed explanation where possible. If it would be helpful to have a call to discuss the below before you respond, please let me know.

**Scripts**

Please could you provide:

An explanation of the script(s) and/or methods by which FJ extracted the KELs disclosed in:

*[Matthew Lenton] The scripts are stand-alone Java classes.*

*They make use of some WIKI formatting functions taken from the internal SSC website which holds the KELs for the support teams to view.*

*They take two parameters:*

- 1. The database partition (the SSC website is used for more than just POA KELs and this controls which database we connect to)*
- 2. The output folder (where the KEL files are to be created)*

a. May 2018 (being KELs generated up to March 2018)



*[Matthew Lenton] The script used in May was named List\_ALL\_KELs.java (attached), this produced a list of the 'current' version of both Horizon and Horizon online KELs. This can be seen by the SQL command used:*

```
select * from [dbo].[kel_active] where status in ('Authorised','Deactivated') union all select * from
kel_active_HNGX where status in ('Authorised','Deactivated')";
```

*By retrieving the 'Authorised' and 'Deactivated' from the tow kel\_active tables we would get the latest version of each KEL.*

- b. January 2019 (being KELs generated from March to December 2018 **AND** deleted KELs)

*[Matthew Lenton] The script in January was called List\_Recent\_KELs.java (attached)*

*This is very similar to the script above, except it now takes a 3<sup>rd</sup> parameter which is the start date for the KELs creation, therefore the SQL query has changed to:*

```
select * from kel_active_HNGX where status in ('Authorised','Deactivated') and original_date >=
""+sDate+""
```

*Note, we are only using the Horizon Online KEL table now as there are no new Horizon legacy KELs and the parameter of the start date (sDate) is used to just list the recent KELs.*

*The script to list the deleted KELs was called List\_Deleted\_KELs.java and is very similar to the first script.*

*The main differences are the warning banner stating that this KEL was deleted and the SQL change:*

```
SELECT [kel_ref] ,[KEL_Reference] ,[title] ,[summary] ,[username] ,[fullname] ,[email] ,[original_date]
,[revision_date] ,[original_author] ,[revision_author] ,[release] ,[kel_type] ,[systemproduct] ,[branchcode]
,[servername] ,[symptoms] ,[problem] ,convert(varchar(max),[solution]) as [solution]
,convert(varchar(max),[solution2]) as [solution2] ,convert(varchar(max),[solution3]) as [solution3] ,
[keywords] ,[approved] ,[evidence] ,[status] ,[visibility] ,[powerhelp] as [call_ref] ,[peak] ,[version] ,[class]
,[external_kel] ,[RefType1] ,[RefValue1] ,[RefType2] ,[RefValue2] FROM [dbo].[kel_delete] union
SELECT [kel_ref] ,[KEL_Reference] ,[title] ,[summary] ,[username] ,[fullname] ,[email] ,[original_date]
,[revision_date] ,[original_author] ,[revision_author] ,[release] ,[kel_type] ,[systemproduct] ,[branchcode]
,[servername] ,[symptoms] ,[problem] ,convert(varchar(max),[solution]) as [solution]
,convert(varchar(max),[solution2]) as [solution2] ,convert(varchar(max),[solution3]) as [solution3] ,
[keywords] ,[approved] ,[evidence] ,[status] ,[visibility] ,[call_ref] ,[peak] ,[version] ,[class] ,[external_kel]
,[RefType1] ,[RefValue1] ,[RefType2] ,[RefValue2] FROM [dbo].[kel_delete_HNGX]
```

*The SQL was slightly more verbose because the two deleted tables had slightly different columns and this means that the wild-card select could not be used.*

If a script was used, please could you provide us with a copy of the scripts used in each of the above extractions (up to March 18, March 18 to Dec 18, and deleted KELs).

*[Matthew Lenton] Attachment: JavaScripts.zip*

We understand from Matthew's email (attached) that when Horizon moved from Horizon Legacy to Horizon Online only the current versions of the KELs were kept and migrated – please could you confirm:

- a. Where the documents were migrated from and to?

*[Matthew Lenton] When a KEL was identified for migration the current version was moved from the [kel\_active] table to the [kel\_active\_HNGX], this was a process controlled through the SSC website application. In order to stop people from migrating a KEL twice the KEL record(s) were deleted from the old table.*

- b. On migration, was a back-up taken of the non-migrated KELs?

*[Matthew Lenton] No.*

Please could you explain how version numbering operates.

*[Matthew Lenton] Versions start at 1 for the original KEL, when the KEL is updated the new version is put in a separate table. An authorise request is sent to the SSC team who review the changes and either authorise or reject the new version of the KEL.*

*If it is authorised the new version is inserted into the active table and the previous version is marked as deprecated.*

*When the SSC website hardware was hosted by the SSC and space was at more of a premium, we only maintained the last 3 versions of a KEL, older versions were deleted without a back-up.*

*When the SSC website was migrated to the ITG hosting this rule was relaxed and more versions of the KELs were kept.*

Is it possible to amend a KEL without generating a new version?*[Matthew Lenton] No, in order to update a KEL you would create a new version via the Website. In theory, with database access you could update the KEL directly via SQL, however only a few SSC staff have that privileged access, and in practice this does not happen.* Does each update create a new version?*[Matthew Lenton] Yes each update would generate a new version.* Is the version control automatically generated by the database when any change is made to a KEL, or is it necessary to generate a new version manually?*[Matthew Lenton] Versioning is done automatically with the SSC website.*

KEL JSimplins4251P (attached) was raised on 9 September 1999, and last updated on 20 Jan 2003 but is shown as being "Version 1". Please could you explain why there is a difference between the raised and last updated dates, but no subsequent versions have been generated? If a KEL has been updated since being raised, should it be Version 2? Is there any way to track what was updated on 20 Jan 2003?

*[Matthew Lenton] We believe that can happen for a couple of reasons, unfortunately the HORIZON legacy KELs do not have a history table, however the HORIZON online KELs do.*

**Example1 – Original rejected JayakumarA349T**

***Original Date: 2019-07-30 18:39:38.297***

***Revision Date: 2019-09-24 13:42:16.440***



*History:*

30/07/2019 18:39 Unauthorised (HNGX-Knowledge Base Information) KB "CRON 100 Error " created by Arunkumar Jayakumar

30/07/2019 18:39 Authorisation request sent to mike.croshaw (cc Arunkumar Jayakumar)

18/09/2019 15:41 Rejected by Mike Croshaw. Reason: Need more detail on this - where is the CRON 100 Error seen?

18/09/2019 15:41 No email address found for user JayakumarA (Arunkumar Jayakumar). Cannot send rejection message for KEL

24/09/2019 13:42 Version 1 (HNGX) generated by Arunkumar Jayakumar

24/09/2019 13:42 Version 1 AUTHORISED by Wayne Bragg

24/09/2019 13:42 KB exported to PostOfficeAccountDutyManager;sscdm;FC.IN.POA\_SMC;m;cheryl.card;john.simpkins

Example 2 – Not authorised by SSC until later MalipatilA649I

Original date: 2016-10-25 09:18:46.020

Revision date: 2017-07-31 14:11:51.767

*History:*

25/10/2016 09:18 Unauthorised (HNGX) KEL "Counter Keyboard Enter key Inactive When OSR Service is Unavailable" created by Anilkumar Malipatil

25/10/2016 09:18 Authorisation request sent to sudip.sur (cc anilkumar.malipatil)

31/07/2017 14:11 Version 1 (HNGX) generated by Anilkumar Malipatil

31/07/2017 14:11 Version 1 AUTHORISED by Mike Croshaw

The same query arises in relation to GMaxwell1574P, AChambers3558R and PCarroll2243R.

[Matthew Lenton] These are Horizon legacy KELs and we have no history for them.

When Mr Coyne attended Bracknell to view the KEL, was he informed that previous versions of the KELs were available and if so, was he given the opportunity to view previous versions of a KEL? [Matthew Lenton] The system demonstrated to Mr Coyne was the live system, so the "+ More details" link that leads to the list of previous versions would have been visible on the screen for each KEL that was viewed (noting that it is not visible or available on the exported versions of the KELs). Mark Wright believes that he would have explained and demonstrated this, since it was visible and he explained everything about how the system was used; as the meeting was not recorded however, he cannot state beyond any doubt that he did explain it, or that if he did, Mr Coyne understood it.

Alternatively, is it obvious when viewing the KEL system that previous versions are still accessible (for example, they are listed on a side pane)? [Matthew Lenton]

- *This screenshot shows the default view:*

- If the timestamps indicate the file was imported before 20:00, then check the subsequent entries for any non-successful activities. In this situation, it may be necessary to raise a call with SSC.

[+ More details](#)

- *Clicking on + More details reveals this further information including links to the previous versions:*

[+ More details](#)

**Type:** Knowledge Base Information  
**Title:** BRDB Operational Exception: Interface Feed encountered a total of n data exceptions  
**Summary:** BRDB Operational Exception: I Interface Feed encountered a total of n data exceptions for processing\_date: dd-MMM-yyyy - Investigation required (for details see BRDB\_HOST\_INTERFACE\_FEED\_EXCP).  
**Raised:** by Dave Allen on 23/01/2012  
**Last updated:** by Jaymie Lockley-Smith on 14/10/2019  
**Last reviewed:** by Piotr Nagajek on 11/10/2018  
**System product:** BranchDatabase  
**Status:** Authorised  
**Scope:** General Usage  
**External:** Shared to support teams via Email  
**Old TFS:** A14191147  
**Version:** 9

Other versions of this KEL:

[Version 8 \(Deprecated\) by Sunil Nellikkentavita on 12/12/2016](#) [View Changes](#)

[Version 7 \(Deprecated\) by Omkar Rangam on 23/01/2013](#) [View Changes](#)

[Version 6 \(Deprecated\) by Dave Allen on 04/01/2013](#) [View Changes](#)

[Version 5 \(Deprecated\) by Dave Allen on 30/07/2012](#) [View Changes](#)

Please could we arrange web conference demo to show WBD how new versions of a KEL are generated and how previous versions of the KELs are viewed? We can be available on Wednesday after 2pm, or on Thursday after 11am. **[Matthew Lenton] Pete Newsome and John Simpkins are available at 15:00 on Wednesday, please include Steve Parker and myself on any invitation.**

## Deletion of KELs

Matthew's email refers to a "housekeeping procedure" by which FJ deleted versions where the KEL had more than 3 versions - please could you explain how this procedure operated (for example, were these ad hoc deletions or was a policy followed)? **[Matthew Lenton] This was a scheduled daily task run by the database. I will attached the script to this email (attachment: SP\_TIDY\_KELS.ZIP).**

## Duplicates

Matthew's email refers to a "defect in the KEL system" which produced duplicate KELs. Please could further information be provided on why these duplicates exist and the reasons why they are believed to have been caused by a defect?



*[Matthew Lenton] The duplicates only exist in the Horizon legacy KEL table – there are no duplicates in the Horizon Online table. It affected 20 KELs with a total of 34 duplicates.*

*A list of these is attached (attachment: **Legacy\_KEL\_Duplicates.xlsx**).*

*Looking at the worst occurrence, RKing3454R version 5 has 10 instances, they are identical except the revision date:*

*2008-06-05 14:01:30.630*

*2008-06-05 14:01:40.537*

*2008-06-05 14:01:59.427*

*2008-06-05 14:02:21.210*

*2008-06-05 14:02:33.490*

*2008-06-05 14:02:46.990*

*2008-06-05 14:02:54.833*

*2008-06-05 14:03:11.663*

*These are all just seconds apart and it appears that the user was repeatedly trying to update the KEL but was receiving a failure on the SSC website.*

*The last duplicate was on 12-March-2009.*

*The first two I looked at (BSheldon1119J and MHall5726K) had a null entry for the Summary property, this is a mandatory field and would have should have cause the update to fail, instead it appears that a bug allowed the partial update to take place. I expect that the other occurrences are also missing mandatory (if difference) pieces of information .*

- . Have these documents been reviewed to confirm they are exact duplicates? If not, how did FJ learn that they were duplicates?

*[Matthew Lenton] Some of the duplicates are indeed different (MHall5726K adds some text to help SMC decide upon the ticket priority). We will look to extract these as individual documents in the same format as previously.*

Kind regards

Amy

**Amy Prime**

Associate

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP





[womblebonddickinson.com](http://womblebonddickinson.com)



**Please consider the environment! Do you need to print this email?**

The information in this e-mail and any attachments is confidential and may be legally privileged and protected by law. [matthew.lenton@womblebonddickinson.com](#) is only authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not [matthew.lenton@womblebonddickinson.com](#), please notify [amy.primrose@womblebonddickinson.com](#) as soon as possible and delete any copies. Unauthorised use, dissemination, distribution, publication or copying of this communication or attachments is prohibited and may be unlawful. Information about how we use personal data is in our [Privacy Policy](#) on our website.

Any files attached to this e-mail will have been checked by us with virus detection software before transmission. Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP accepts no liability for any loss or damage which may be caused by software viruses and you should carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment.

Content of this email which does not relate to the official business of Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP, is neither given nor endorsed by it.

This email is sent by Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP which is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC317661. Our registered office is 4 More London Riverside, London, SE1 2AU, where a list of members' names is open to inspection. We use the term partner to refer to a member of the LLP or an employee or consultant who is of equivalent standing. Our VAT registration number is GB123393627.

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP is a member of Womble Bond Dickinson (International) Limited, which consists of independent and autonomous law firms providing services in the US, the UK, and elsewhere around the world. Each Womble Bond Dickinson entity is a separate legal entity and is not responsible for the acts or omissions of, nor can bind or obligate, another Womble Bond Dickinson entity. Womble Bond Dickinson (International) Limited does not practice law. Please see [www.womblebonddickinson.com/legal](http://www.womblebonddickinson.com/legal) notices for further details.

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority

Unless otherwise stated, this email has been sent from Fujitsu Services Limited (registered in England No 96056); Fujitsu EMEA PLC (registered in England No 2216100) both with registered offices at: 22 Baker Street, London W1U 3BW; PFU (EMEA) Limited, (registered in England No 1578652) and Fujitsu Laboratories of Europe Limited (registered in England No. 4153469) both with registered offices at: Hayes Park Central, Hayes End Road, Hayes, Middlesex, UB4 8FE.

This email is only for the use of its intended recipient. Its contents are subject to a duty of confidence and may be privileged. Fujitsu does not guarantee that this email has not been intercepted and amended or that it is virus-free.