

## Message

**From:** Melanie Corfield [GRO]  
**Sent:** 01/02/2015 14:34:16  
**To:** Mark Underwood1 [GRO]; Parsons, Andrew [/O=BOND PEARCE/OU=First Administrative Group/cn=Recipients/cn=ap6]; Rodric Williams [GRO]  
**Subject:** Re: Remote access [BD-4A.FID20472253]

Yep. At one time our line was simply there is no remote access but for most people I think that sounded unlikely given you have to have for support etc. It has a different meaning for different people. I completely agree re showing contempt about the allegations on this subject! It's a prime example actually of our rigor in investigating allegations that are in the realms of fantasy (not suggesting she says it quite like that....)

Anyway, I think I understand the entire IT system now and can now decipher FJ emails, which is going some.....

Me!  
 Mel Corfield  
 Communications Team  
 Mobile [GRO]

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

**From:** Mark Underwood1  
**Sent:** Sunday, February 01, 2015 02:22 PM  
**To:** Melanie Corfield; 'andrew.parsons' [GRO]; [GRO]; Rodric Williams  
**Subject:** RE: Remote access [BD-4A.FID20472253]

It comes back to Andy's point about the question being wrong.

"access" can mean view - and of course we can view accounts remotely - in the same way everyone views their banking transactions remotely / from their home / at work etc

the question is can transactions be edited remotely - to which the answer is no.

once a transaction is in, it cannot be removed or edited in anyway - all that can happen is for additional transactions be put in to correct mistakes - all of which are visible to the SPMR.

If PV and MD are still confused - I would just send them the below extract from the paper as I think it makes it quite clear what can and cannot be done.

alternatively, we treat any questions about RA with the contempt they deserve - why on earth would PO have a secret bunker in Bracknell accessing SPMR's accounts??

## Issue

This question often phrased by Applicants and Second Sight is:

"Can Post Office remotely access Horizon?"

Phrasing the question in this way does not address the issue that is of concern to Second Sight and Applicants. It refers generically to "Horizon" but more particularly is about the transaction data recorded by Horizon. Also, the word "access" means the ability to read transaction data without editing it - Post Office / Fujitsu has always been able to access transaction data however it is the alleged capacity of Post Office / Fujitsu to edit transaction data that appears to be of concern. Finally, it has always been known that Post Office can post additional, correcting transactions to a branch's accounts but only in ways that are visible to Subpostmasters (i.e. Transaction Corrections and Transaction Acknowledgements) - it is the potential for any hidden method of editing data that is of concern.

Thus, this paper addresses the question:

Can Post Office or Fujitsu edit transaction data without the knowledge of a Subpostmaster?"

In summary, Post Office confirms that neither it nor Fujitsu can edit transaction data without the knowledge of a Subpostmaster.

---

**From:** Melanie Corfield  
**Sent:** 01 February 2015 13:56  
**To:** Mark Underwood1; 'andrew.parsons' [GRO]; Rodric Williams  
**Subject:** Re: Remote access [BD-4A.FID20472253]

Thanks. That is all fine. The key points remain and that nothing happens without postmasters knowing including this rare process.

Our current lines in the briefing are all correct - I will give Mark D additional on this for Paula as they are both confused and thought we could say there is no remote access at all. But she should swerve anything on this swiftly back to the fact of there is no evidence anyway of any tampering - Horizon is and was working as it should.

Have a good Sunday!

Me!  
 Mel Corfield

Communications Team  
Mobile **GRO**

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

From: Mark Underwood1  
Sent: Sunday, February 01, 2015 12:40 PM  
To: Parsons, Andrew **GRO**; Melanie Corfield; Rodric Williams  
Subject: RE: Remote access [BD-4A.FID20472253]

Hi all, How about the below?

"The use of this process is strictly controlled by Post Office. When the Balancing Transaction Process is used, it leaves clear and identifiable audit trail and is done so with full knowledge and consent of the Subpostmaster of the affected branch."

In terms of the paper on remote access. Though the attached is a final draft, Patrick was happy with it but stated it may just require a bit a very minor tweaking. This has not yet been done, but if the above line does not suffice, I can ask James Davidson from FJ to answer the remaining questions (bottom of P2) in respect of the BTP and then we should good to go?

Let me know

Mark

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

From: Parsons, Andrew **GRO**  
Sent: 01 February 2015 11:53  
To: Melanie Corfield; Rodric Williams  
Cc: Mark Underwood1  
Subject: RE: Remote access [BD-4A.FID20472253]

Me1

Sorry - we've never got any clarity of this point. The reality is that use of the manual balancing process is so rare that there is no protocol for its use.

FSC / Rod Ismay would say that it would only be invoked after discussion with the SPMR and after trying all other methods of resolution. There would therefore have been an ongoing dialogue with the SPMR tailored to the particular circumstances before any transaction was injected into their accounts.

Mark (cc'd) I presume we haven't had anything further on this from FJ?

I think the best we could say would be something like... "The use of the balancing transaction process is so rare that it would only be used following a full discussion with the Subpostmaster involved."

Kind regards  
Andy

Andrew Parsons  
Managing Associate

Direct: **GRO**  
Mobile: **GRO**  
Fax: **GRO**

Follow Bond Dickinson:

[www.bond dickinson.com](http://www.bond dickinson.com)

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

From: Melanie Corfield **GRO**  
Sent: 31 January 2015 19:20  
To: Rodric Williams; Parsons, Andrew  
Subject: Re: Remote access

I just need something that says exceptional circumstances of, for example, xxxx. Postmaster would know, strict protocols and guess what it has only ever been used once in a pilot etc. :)). Couple of lines really.

Thanks  
Mel Corfield  
Communications Team  
Mobile **GRO**

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

From: Rodric Williams  
Sent: Saturday, January 31, 2015 01:05 PM  
To: Melanie Corfield; 'andrew.parsons@bond-dickinson.com' [GRO] [GRO]  
Subject: Re: Remote access

Andy - do you have an answer for Mel?

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

From: Melanie Corfield  
Sent: Saturday, January 31, 2015 12:16 PM  
To: Rodric Williams  
Subject: Remote access

Hello  
Have you got your paper on this handy?  
One more Q on it:  
What would be the circumstances for PO adding a transaction (we did so once since 2010 using functionality)? I know v rare, strict authority but would we need to ever do this?

Let me know when you can. Not urgent today.

Mel  
Mel Corfield  
Communications Team  
Mobile [GRO]

\*\*\*\*\*

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 by reply email and then delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540. Registered Office: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.

\*\*\*\*\*

<br />  
<br />  
<font color="#99CC00" size="2"><b> Please consider the environment! Do you need to print this email?</b></font> <p> </p><hr /> <p> <font color="#666666" size="1"> The information in this e-mail and any attachments is confidential and may be legally privileged and protected by law. mark.underwood@bond-dickinson.com [GRO] only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not mark.underwood@bond-dickinson.com [GRO], please notify andrew.parsons@bond-dickinson.com [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.<br /> Any files attached to this e-mail will have been checked by us with virus detection software before transmission. Bond Dickinson 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.<br /> Content of this email which does not relate to the official business of Bond Dickinson LLP, is neither given nor endorsed by it.<br /> This email is sent for and on behalf of Bond Dickinson LLP which is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC317661. Our registered office is St Ann's Wharf, 112 Quayside, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE1 3DX, 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.<br /> Bond Dickinson LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority.</font>  
</p>

\*\*\*\*\*

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 by reply email and then delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540. Registered Office: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.

\*\*\*\*\*