

**From:** "Parsons, Andrew" [GRO]  
**To:** "Gribben, Jonathan" [GRO]  
**Subject:** FW: Deloitte Preliminary Report  
**Date:** Thu, 14 Jul 2016 10:39:02 +0000  
**Importance:** Normal  
**Inline-Images:** image001.jpg; image002.jpg; image003.jpg

---

FYI

## Andrew Parsons

Partner

*Bond Dickinson*

Direct:

Mobile:

**GRO**

Follow Bond Dickinson:



[www.bonddickinson.com](http://www.bonddickinson.com)

---

**From:** Parsons, Andrew  
**Sent:** 13 July 2016 16:41  
**To:** Jane MacLeod [GRO]; Rodric Williams [GRO]; Patrick Bourke [GRO]  
**Cc:** Mark Underwood1 [GRO]; Loraine, Paul; Porter, Tom  
**Subject:** Deloitte Preliminary Report [BD-4A.FID26859284]

Jane, Rodric, Patrick.

Before tomorrow's Steering Group meeting, I wanted to give you a heads up on the "remote access" issues that have been revealed through Deloitte's preliminary report.

## Background

Deloitte has identified that a small number of Super-users at FJ have the ability to delete and edit transactions from the Branch Database (**BRDB**). The BRDB is the central server on which all branch transactions are recorded before being passed to other servers (such as the Audit Store). This access is subject to strict controls and Deloitte's current understanding is that it would not be possible to delete or edit transactions without leaving a footprint in the audit trail. They also believe that (i) this type of access is not unusual and (ii) the likelihood of someone actually making such changes is extremely low. This Super-user access is a separate, yet more extensive, process to the Balancing Transaction process we previously knew about.

What is unclear, at present, is how any changes to the BRDB could impact on branch accounts and whether they could (theoretically) cause a loss to postmasters.

## Issue

The immediate concern is that this means that Post Office's historic statements about not being able to edit or delete transactions appear, at least on face value, to have been materially incorrect. This therefore may bring into play:

- (i) The allegations of deceit in that Post Office has made false statements;
- (ii) A basis for unwinding the settled cases; and
- (iii) The possibility for some Claimants to extend their limitation deadline on the grounds that Post Office has concealed a material fact.

To be clear, I am not saying at this stage that the above points now have merit: rather it is now likely that these will be live matters that we are going to have to deal with through the litigation.

## Actions

No actions required from you at this stage as we are still investigating the matter. I just wanted to give you a heads up that this may be discussed at tomorrow's Steering Group.

In the meantime, BD are:

- (i) Working with Tony to understand the legal effects of this and how to address this in the LOR; and
- (ii) Drawing up a list of consequential points that we need Deloitte to investigate (which unfortunately will likely mean more Deloitte costs).

Once we have a much clearer picture, we may wish to seek Brian Altman's advice on whether this issue causes any concerns from a criminal law / disclosure perspective. We may also need to give consideration to whether to inform the CCRC.

Any questions, please do say. I will likely come over to FD for about 15:30 tomorrow so happy to discuss before the meeting at 4pm if that would be useful.

Kind regards  
Andy

**Andrew Parsons**

Partner

*Bond Dickinson*

Direct:

Mobile:

**GRO**

Follow Bond Dickinson:



[www.bonddickinson.com](http://www.bonddickinson.com)