

**From:** Anthony de Garr Robinson [GRO]  
**To:** 'Andrew Parsons' [GRO], Amy Prime [GRO]  
[GRO], Simon Henderson [GRO]  
**Cc:** Jonathan Gribben [GRO]

**Subject:** RE: Stage 3 Disclosure - Project Zebra [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

**Date:** Thu, 26 Jul 2018 16:54:57 +0000

**Importance:** Normal

**Inline-Images:** image001.png; image002.png; image003.png

---

Dear Amy,

This is an awkward issue. If we get it wrong – either by claiming too much privilege or too little – it could be very damaging for the client.

Simon and I have had quite a long discussion and we are likely to conclude that privilege cannot be claimed over the whole of the Zebra Action Summary but the parts which repeat or summarise the contents of the Deloitte report can be redacted. However, we have identified a number of questions which should be answered before final conclusions can properly be drawn. Some are factual and some are legal.

As you anticipated, we need further information regarding the background to the Deloitte report and the Zebra Action Summary and would be grateful for clear instructions on the following points:

1. Is it definitely the case that the dominant purpose for which the Deloitte report was obtaining legal advice about or obtaining information in connection with the conduct of anticipated litigation? We ask because section 1 of the report records (amongst other things) that Deloitte were appointed to raise suggestions for potential improvements in the assurance provision for Horizon and the final section of the report contains 6 pages of recommendations to management to strengthen the quality and assurance in place over the Horizon system. What we are hoping to receive is factual instructions allowing us to be clear that the Deloitte report was not created for two equal purposes, one of which was anticipated litigation and the other was making Horizon more robust (compare the unsuccessful claim to privilege made in relation to the accident report in *Waugh v British Railways Board*).
2. Who produced the Zebra Action Summary, who was it produced for and for what purpose was it produced? To whom was it disseminated and what actions were taken as a result of it?
3. What was the source and purpose of the “recommended remediations” set out in the Zebra Action Summary. For example, were they recommendations produced by management of changes to be made in the systems around Horizon with a view to giving effect to recommendations of a more general nature made in the Deloitte report?
4. Were these “recommended remediations” actually implemented?

5. Who were the parties to the email you attached (Julie George, Lesley Sewell, Rod Ismay, David Mason, Malcolm Zack and Gina Gould) and why was the Zebra Action Summary sent to them? Were they part of the Post Office litigation team concerned with subpostmaster claims, for example, or were they management people responsible for deciding what improvements to make to the Horizon systems, or what?

With clear answers to these questions, and a bit of research from Simon, we can then take a final view. Should we pencil in a telecon on Monday afternoon?

Best wishes,

Tony

---

**From:** Andrew Parsons <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 26 July 2018 13:51  
**To:** Anthony de Garr Robinson [REDACTED]; Amy Prime [REDACTED]  
Simon Henderson [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Jonathan Gribben [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Stage 3 Disclosure - Project Zebra [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]  
**Sensitivity:** Private

Tony

Thanks. I can only give a second-hand answer to question 1, because I was not involved in the first Deloitte report. My understanding is that the report was produced on the recommendation of Linklaters and for the purpose of understanding Post Office's litigation risk if the mediation scheme collapsed. We will however speak to Rod to confirm this.

On question 2, we don't know the answer but I presume that there may be other similar documents out there. However we only need to disclose those documents that fall within our Model C disclosure classes and only after having conducted a reasonable search. So far, this is the only document on this nature that we have found. Note – there are several other documents about Zebra but these are reports by lawyers and so are privileged.

A

**Andrew Parsons**  
Partner  
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d:  
m:  
t:  
e:

GRO

[Stay informed: sign up to our e-alerts](#)



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



**From:** Anthony de Garr Robinson [[mailto:](#)

GRO

]  
**Sent:** 26 July 2018 13:30  
**To:** Amy Prime; Simon Henderson  
**Cc:** Jonathan Gribben; Andrew Parsons  
**Subject:** RE: Stage 3 Disclosure - Project Zebra [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]  
**Sensitivity:** Private

Thanks for your email, Amy.

Simon and I will be discussing this later today. In the meantime, there are a couple of questions you might be able to help me with.

First, the Deloitte report was marked "Privileged". Is this because the report was commissioned for the dominant purpose of obtaining legal advice about, or helping in the conduct of, anticipated litigation? Is it definitely the case that an equally important purpose was not (say) reducing the incidence or risk of undetected Horizon accounting errors in the future?

Second, am I right in thinking that there are lots of documents out there charting the steps taken to implement Deloitte's recommendations, that these steps included numerous changes that were made in Horizon and/or in the systems and processes supporting, improving or ensuring the proper use of Horizon and that some the relevant documents (at least) indicate that the relevant steps are being taken as a result of Deloitte's recommendations will have the relevant documents? Have these documents been / are they going to be disclosed and if not, why not?

Best wishes,

Tony

---

**From:** Amy Prime [

GRO

]  
**Sent:** 25 July 2018 21:34  
**To:** Anthony de Garr Robinson [

GRO

]; Simon Henderson [

GRO

]  
**Cc:** Jonathan Gribben <

GRO

>; Andrew Parsons <

GRO

>  
**Subject:** Stage 3 Disclosure - Project Zebra [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]  
**Sensitivity:** Private

Tony, Simon

In 2014 and as part of the Mediation Scheme, Linklaters produced a piece of advice for Post Office on the complaints made by SPMRs about Horizon. A copy of this advice is attached. Linklaters recommended that Deloitte undertake a review of the integrity of Horizon – this review is known as Project Zebra and a copy of Deloitte's report is also attached.

Whilst Deloitte's report itself is covered by privilege and the Cs do not know of the existence of this report, we have come across an ancillary document which followed on from the report and discusses how to implement the findings within the business. This document falls within one of the Stage 3 Disclosure Classes and we are concerned that we are not able to assert privilege over this document (or privilege would be limited to those sections which refer to the Deloitte Report directly). I have attached the email chain but the document of interest is the Zebra Action Summary attached to the email.

We would welcome your thoughts on whether privilege can be asserted over the Zebra Action Summary, if parts of the document can be redacted for privilege or if the full document needs to be disclosed.

If you require any further information about the background to this document please let me know.

Kind regards

Amy

**Amy Prime**  
Solicitor  
Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d:  
m:  
t:  
e:



[Stay informed: sign up to our e-alerts](#)

[womblebond dickinson.com](http://womblebond dickinson.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. arobinson GRO only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not arobinson GRO please notify amy.prince GRO 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.womblebond dickinson.com/legal](http://www.womblebond dickinson.com/legal) notices for further details.

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

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---

---

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.  
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>

---