

**From:** "Parsons, Andrew" </O=BOND PEARCE/OU=FIRST ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=AP6>

**To:** "Rodric Williams (GRO)" <GRO>

**Subject:** BT process questions.

**Date:** Fri, 27 Mar 2015 14:20:19 +0000

**Importance:** Normal

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

---

Rodric

I've reviewed Simon's questions. I'm confident that Deloitte do not know the answers to these questions because I've asked them previously. We will need to go to Fujitsu to get these answers.

FJ get very reluctant about providing information when there is possible legal risk in the frame. To avoid this, we may want to pose this as a general information gathering exercise rather than as result of CK's advice.

I've set out below an email that could go to Fujitsu for your approval.

I suggest that we remove the questions highlighted in yellow. First, these questions are about legal risk which will make FJ nervous. Secondly, I'm not sure that FJ will understand these questions. They simply provide raw data to POL, how POL discloses that data to expert witnesses is a prosecution matter, not a technical matter. We can however draw out these questions more subtly on the con call I propose in the email.

A

---

James

A few months back we had a conference call (with Belinda Crowe and Mark Underwood) to discuss the "remote access" questions that were being posed by Second Sight. You may recall that this turned principally on questions about data integrity and the Balancing Transaction process. Unfortunately we still haven't quite closed down this avenue of enquiry and there are a few outstanding questions on the Balancing Transaction process on which I should be grateful for your help in answering.

The questions are below. I would be grateful if you could let me know when you might be around next week for a quick conference call (with me and Post Office) to discuss these? I am around all week except Wednesday afternoon.

Kind regards  
Andy

1. Is or would the use of the Balancing Transaction function, or any effect thereby achieved, be visible:
  - a) to an affected SPMR either:
    - i. upon the immediate occasion of its use; or
    - ii. at some point after use, *e.g.* by notification, appearance on Horizon, in branch accounts *etc.*
  - b) an auditor when conducting a branch audit?
  - c) when data is provided to or obtained by a prosecution expert witness?
  - d) when data is disclosed to a defence expert, for any purpose?
  - e) in the final audit trail?

- ii. How and in what circumstances may the Balancing Transaction function be utilised?
- iii. Who may use the Balancing Transaction function, in terms of authority, access, *etc.*?
- iv. What measures, controls or processes are in place to routinely monitor centrally initiated Balancing Transactions, and to check and reconcile data sources?
- v. Similarly, what measures, controls or processes are in place to prevent any unauthorised use of the Balancing Transaction function? **Here we note the reference in the Deloitte Report to „fake“ transactions;**
- vi. What records are maintained of any use of the Balancing Transaction function?
- vii. Is POL/Fujitsu sure that the Balancing Transaction function has only been used on a single occasion since 1<sup>st</sup> January 2010? And if not, why not?

**Andrew Parsons**  
Managing Associate

*Bond Dickinson*

Direct:   
Mobile:  
Fax:

Follow Bond Dickinson:



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