

Message

From: Alisdair Cameron [GRO]
Sent: 27/06/2019 12:32:31
To: Kim Abbotts [GRO]; Rob Houghton [GRO]; Ben Foat [GRO]; Amanda Jones [GRO]; Martine Munby [GRO]
CC: Mark R Davies [GRO]; Patrick Bourke [GRO]; Julie Thomas [GRO]; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO]
Subject: RE: Another computer error

Very keen on widespread measured comms to say we have noticed this fixed it, these are where we have identified differences any concerns ring here etc thanks Al



Al Cameron
Interim Chief Executive

20 Finsbury Street
London
EC2Y 9AQ

[GRO]

From: Kim Abbotts [GRO]
Sent: 27 June 2019 12:25
To: Rob Houghton [GRO]; Alisdair Cameron [GRO]; Ben Foat [GRO]
Cc: Mark R Davies [GRO]; Patrick Bourke [GRO]; Julie Thomas [GRO]; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO]
Subject: RE: Another computer error

Hi Rob,
Answers below:

- 1) What's the worst case scenario here ie if they don't call and /or don't notice – **if they don't call and the control to pick them up fails, they would have a discrepancy for the difference.**
I have asked for a check to be done to see if we think that there are any that we feel haven't been spotted.
- 2) What additional controls/comms need to be established given this? – **I have a call tomorrow with Kate Kay to understand progress made so far around a solution. Control wise – I've spoken to Sean Farrow and he thinks the risk is well mitigated by the control, however, I think that we should be capturing the calls / letters that are being sent out by that team. Personally, I think that we should agree some comms to go out, I can ask Network Gateway to work with the project and Supply Chain to draft something which can then be reviewed by this group for suitability. We can also then better equip Branch Support and FSC to respond to any queries that may come in.**

Kim.

Kim Abbotts



Head of Branch and Customer Support Centre

1st Floor, South West,
Future Walk
1, West Bars,
Chesterfield,
S49 1PF.
Mobile [REDACTED]

From: Rob Houghton
Sent: 27 June 2019 11:12
To: Kim Abbotts [REDACTED]; Alisdair Cameron [REDACTED]; Ben Foat [REDACTED]
Cc: Mark R Davies [REDACTED]; Patrick Bourke [REDACTED]; Julie Thomas [REDACTED]; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Another computer error

For clarity and my ignorance. 1) What's the worst case scenario here ie if they don't call and /or don't notice and 2) what additional controls/comms need to be established given this?
R

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Kim Abbotts
Sent: Thursday, 27 June, 10:56
Subject: RE: Another computer error
To: Alisdair Cameron, Rob Houghton, Ben Foat
Cc: Mark R Davies, Patrick Bourke, Julie Thomas, Angela Van-Den-Bogerd

Hi Al,

As per action point below, I've done some digging, findings below:

- Kim, Can we find out what the problem is, if its widespread and how we resolve it. Can we identify?
- It is a known issue and is logged on the CWC – ELS incident log, reference ELS – 254, date added to the log 14th May 2019. The incident is still open, details below.
 - It appears that this is more branch impacting than the project initially realised / flagged.
 - Basically, the branch scans the pick list barcode and it brings up the incorrect value, see example on the incident log below.
 - I have been told that there are around 5 / 6 incidents per day and that they are mostly coin but it can affect notes as well. Prior to CWC, there would only be an occasional issue of this type.
 - There is a control in place in Supply chain, which monitors the value of rems sent out to branches against the value actually showing as a rem into the branch.
 - This duty will contact each branch where this happens with an emergency barcode number to input, which will then correct the difference. These calls are not logged. Where the branch does not answer, they are written to.
 - Sometimes the branch will call in instead and Supply chain will follow the same emergency barcode process.

- I have checked with FSC and since migration on the 25.01.2019, they have 552 entries against the emergency barcode reference number.
- I have spoken to Ben Cooke and he has given me the name of someone on the project to speak with, to establish progress on a solution.
- The project will be completing an issue management document to capture all the details.

Date Created

Location

Issue Summary

Detailed description of issue

Impact

Priority Level

Reported by

Reported to

Status

Assigned to

14/05/2019

Norwich Coin

Coin order associated with TU 397850035918 was £1140. However when the branch scanned the pick list barcode only £20 populated Horizon

Coin order associated with TU 397850035918 was £1140. However when the branch scanned the pick list barcode only £20 populated Horizon.

Branch: Lingwood, 5651360.

Service date: 8th May 2019

The branch has a £1120 surplus on Horizon - but not in cash

P3

Sean Farrow/ Fiona Greatorex

ELS

NEW

I am down in London today until around 3.45, if you would like to discuss, I can leave my meeting to accommodate.
Kim.

Kim Abbotts

Head of Branch and Customer Support Centre

1

st

Floor, South West,

Future Walk

1, West Bars,

Chesterfield,

S49 1PF.

Mobile - { GRO }

From: Alisdair Cameron

Sent: 24 June 2019 18:42

To: Rob Houghton { GRO }; Kim Abbotts { GRO }; Ben Foat { GRO }

Cc: Mark R Davies { GRO }; Patrick Bourke { GRO }; Julie Thomas { GRO }

Subject: FW: Another computer error

Spoke to Tim. I said nothing other than banalities with no comment on the case.

Contact contacted by a sub-postmaster. REM in, accepted by an assistant. Normal receipt print. Money to safe. Did cash dec. Found he was £20k gain. The receipt printed only for part of the REM. Reported it to the helpline. They have done nothing.

Not prepared to identify the Subpostmaster. Not the only one and "they" know that.

Kim, Can we find out what the problem is, if its widespread and how we resolve it. Can we identify?

Secondly, Mag stripe readers, bar code scanner, touch screens etc are not reporting accurately "prevalent", missing out first few characters. 2k facebook group of Pms with screen shots. Also shows data it shouldn't. Could have the same root cause. Rob can someone look into this – it cant be a secret of 2k postmasters are facebooking about it?

Ben. Seema Misra - read the transcript. Can I see it please.

Kind regards and thanks Al



Al Cameron

Interim Chief Executive

20 Finsbury Street

London

EC2Y 9AQ

GRO

From: Alisdair Cameron

Sent: 23 June 2019 11:45

To: Tim McCormack <GRO>

Subject: Re: Another computer error

Thanks Tim, I am going to struggle to call you today but would you have any time tomorrow after 6? Al

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Tim McCormack <GRO>

Sent: Sunday, June 23, 2019 11:18:39 AM

To: Alisdair Cameron

Subject: Re: Another computer error

Dear Al

Please call me Tim if you don't mind.

I am greatly encouraged by what you say with regard to criticism. I regard that as far more important than praise and as you say, when it is justified it can only lead to making things better.

The error in question is serious. Details of it are being treated as confidential within my circles and it is pretty certain that the media will be publishing something on it fairly soon. Breaking that confidence with the people I trust could have consequences I suppose - most notably that I will not be party to future disclosures.

However my interest in matters to do with Post Office will cease after the CCRC report back on the Seema Misra case, presumably with a return to the Appeal court so it doesn't matter too much I suppose. So perhaps we could have a quick chat and I will let you know what I have heard. I would really hope that you have been told all about it already but given the inaction of the Helpline and FSC in responding (the SPMR was told that it would take a week or so for the FSC to get in touch) I doubt it. As Paula pointed out when I first told her about Dalmellington her main concern was the lackadaisical response to what was a £24k loss. This is a similar amount!

Although I might pop out for a bit during the rest of the day, I finish working in a couple of minutes and can be contacted on GRO

Kind regards

Tim

From: Alisdair Cameron <GRO>
Sent: 23 June 2019 10:42
To: Tim McCormack
Subject: Re: Another computer error

Dear Mr McCormack,

Thank you so much for contacting me, I do appreciate it.

I agree we share an absolute focus on building a sustainable network for our customers and that must involve a closer partnership with Postmasters.

You will see that I am making very substantial changes in advisers and culture and I suspect there may not prove to be as much difference between us as you assume. Certainly I have no dislike of you and as I say repeatedly within PO, criticism, challenge and questioning should not be taken as attacks to be defended but as opportunities to do better.

If you are aware of any computer issue then I would be very grateful if you would share the detail with me so I can ensure it is investigated. In exchange I will happily sit down with you and explain what we find. Nothing is perfect and if there is an issue we are best off acknowledging and addressing it.

Kind regards

Al

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Tim McCormack GRO

Sent: Sunday, June 23, 2019 10:31 am

To: Alisdair Cameron

Subject: Another computer error

Dear Mr Cameron

I have no idea if you know of me or not but as was mentioned in Court, your predecessor certainly was and I believe she took me reasonably seriously. I can also be reasonably certain that she and I had a mutual dislike for each other and I would expect that to be the case with yourself. However all three of us must surely share a common purpose and that is to see a strong and profitable Post Office network run for the benefit of ALL its members, be they customers, subpostmasters, employees or indeed the government as the owner.

We obviously differ entirely in how that could and should be achieved and I make no apology for insisting that the first step would be to replace the entire management team that has led the network to this crisis point. Your team in the court room has stated that in so many words – if the claimants win it will be an existential risk to the company. I would interpret that risk as being more to do with the sustainability of the network given the bad publicity that will result and more people will be reluctant to take on a Post Office branch.

I have thought long and hard about bothering to write to you about the information I have to hand given that it will be of more use to the claimants than yourself but I think it is worthy of a last shot at convincing the CEO of Post Office Ltd that the people you rely on to provide you with the information you need to make decisions are at best ignorant of what is actually going on or perhaps more likely totally incompetent.

I don't know what they have brought to your attention recently but the single most important piece of information you should be dealing with right now is a new error in your computer systems that, as it stands, cannot be introduced into the current trial but should be. This error places the boot on the other foot so to speak and it is for POL to discover not SPMRs. It is not just the error that you should be concerned with it is the fact that your company has learned nothing from the past and the revelations in court. Nothing has changed and it won't as long as these people remain in a complete state of denial that the events that are unfolding now have occurred in the past and will occur again in the future. No amount of counter measures that Dr Worden has helpfully suggested might be in place can change the problem of the culture and ability of the people you should be able to trust.

The solution to all of this is perfectly simple. Second Sight was stopped from exploring further and finding the true extent of the problems inherent in your organisation. They need to be re-appointed to finish what they started and they need the support of someone who wants to discover the truth and who is willing to make the changes to prevent any re-occurrence.

Finally, consider this, and I must assume you have done so in the past, but do it again now. How could POL have prevented this trial? What steps should have been taken from the very start of the introduction of Horizon and how should the relationship between subpostmasters and POL have been handled? You need to answer these questions and implement the solutions to ensure that POL has no need to revisit these matters once again in the not too distant future. The people that are responsible for the current state of affairs are not part of the solution.

With the best of intentions

Yours sincerely
Tim McCormack

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: Finsbury Dials, 20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ.

“Post Office Limited is committed to protecting your privacy. Information about how we do this can be found on our website at www.postoffice.co.uk/privacy”