

To : Colin Lenton-Smith
From : Jan Holmes
Date : 23rd April 2003
Subject : **RECENT DWP PROSECUTION**

Original request was received 28th January 2003 from Graham Ward (POL) and was for 9 assorted weeks of data from 5 Outlets. Of the 9 weeks 3 had already expired under normal data retention policy and the rest were due to expire shortly thereafter.

At the time there was a significant existing workload of ARQs including one that was receiving attention from POL (Hurst Lane).

FS were asked to provide a quote for this work as POL wanted to work outside the existing contract SLAs to deliver this to DWP. We suggested (strongly) that what POL should be doing is to engage with DWP, establish the DWP requirements, add them to their own and then engage with us to ramp-up our capability in line with the contract provisions. POL have chosen not to follow that suggestion.

Estimate sent 11th February 2003 at 3 elapsed weeks assuming work was placed at top of priorities.

On 25th February 2003 GW sent re-request asking for 6 assorted weeks from 4 Outlets. Of the 6 weeks 1 had already expired under normal data retention policy.

Jane Bailey produced standard Witness Statement to cover extractions that were eventually despatched to POL within agreed timescales (by email) on 1st April 2003.

On 8th April 2003 further request received for 3 extra days over 2 Outlets. These were eventually despatched 16th April 2003. At this point POL were being chased by DWP, who we believe were being hassled by the Judge, about delivery timescales and 'deleted data' resulting in me having to produce a separate Witness Statement sent to POL on 10th April 2003.

On 17th April 2003 I was requested to conduct a special analysis of the User Accounts that were active in 7 Outlets from National Rollout, including the provision of a further Witness Statement. This is estimated at 5 mandays work due for delivery 1st May 2003.

Today, we have received another request (not DWP) to provide an estimate for extracting 8 weeks worth of data by tomorrow - it seems that POL felt they did not need it but the Defence Counsel has requested it and the judge wants it now. The judge has also raised questions about why FS store and manage the data the way we do. Graham Ward has said that if a technical answer is required then somebody from FS (me) will have to go before the judge to explain. This is not a problem but symptomatic of the problem we face with POL Investigations and their inability to manage their activities, their solicitors and the Courts.

Graham ward assures me that he has tried to raise this within POL but to no avail and welcomes any initiative we can take to move this forward through POL Commercial.

Jan Holmes