

Witness Name: Steve Bansal

Statement No.: WITN0477_01

Exhibits: Nil

Dated: 9 August 2022

POST OFFICE HORIZON IT INQUIRY

FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF *STEVE BANSAL*

I, *MR STEVE BANSAL*, will say as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. I am currently a Senior Service Delivery Manager at Fujitsu Services Limited ("**Fujitsu**"), a position I have held since October 2014.
2. This witness statement is made on behalf of Fujitsu to assist the Post Office IT Inquiry with the matters set out in the Rule 9 Request provided to Fujitsu on 11 March 2022 (the "**Request**"), to the extent I have direct knowledge of such matters.
3. The topics set out in the Inquiry's Request of which I have knowledge relate to events that took place more than a decade ago. These topics principally relate to training and testing. I have tried to recall these events to the best of my ability. However, given the length of time, there may be certain matters where my recollection is more limited.

BACKGROUND

4. I started as a contractor for Peritas Limited ("**Peritas**") in October 1997 as an instructor, working to develop the education and selection of end-user trainers for the

Pathway project. At the time, Peritas was a subsidiary of ICL Pathway Limited (“**ICL Pathway**”).

5. While at Peritas, I conducted training for various projects including Pathway. Given the events I discuss in this statement happened around 25 years ago, I cannot say with complete certainty which aspects of the training I delivered related solely to Pathway. I have drafted this witness statement to the best of my knowledge.
6. I conducted training for what was going to be the initial rollout of Pathway terminals. I am unsure of the version of Pathway that sub-postmasters were trained on at that point in time or even if that version was ever rolled out. There was an agreed Peritas training plan that all the trainers followed to ensure continuity. During the single training session (which I believe lasted for a couple of hours), I recall demonstrating to the sub-postmasters how the system worked and answering any questions that the attendees had during the training. I cannot remember any specific technical question that the attendees raised, but I would have answered any I could within the session or asked the attendees to write down their questions and have someone from the Peritas office answer the question.
7. After the training sessions sub-postmasters signed a form to confirm they had taken part and completed the training. I am not able to remember the content of the training or level of detail but I recall asking the attendees if they understood and felt comfortable with the training they had received and that they could also add any feedback to the feedback sheet.
8. I also received five-days of training from Post Office Limited (“**Post Office**”). This training was based in Weston-super-Mare and was provided by a Post Office trainer,

whose name I do not remember (the “**POL Training**”). The POL Training was provided to a number of Peritas trainers, possibly 6 to 8 individuals. My understanding was that the POL Training was aimed at providing a flavour of the activities undertaken by sub-postmasters in the branches and allow us to appreciate the manual tasks and form filling required and better support the sub-postmasters.

9. The rollout was put on hold for around a year. I do not recall if, following the training, attendees received any new counter terminals and whether the training I delivered was actually implemented. While I cannot comment on why this happened, I believe that the initial training materials that the Peritas team and I drafted were I believe replaced as the old materials possibly became obsolete or enhanced following developments from the system that came a year later. I never saw the content of the later training material so am unable to comment on which aspects of the training in particular may have possibly become obsolete.
10. It was during this period of delay that I joined the testing team of ICL Pathway as a contractor around April 1998, carrying out both functional and non-functional testing.
11. I left ICL Pathway from 2002 - 2007 and rejoined Fujitsu as a contractor. When I rejoined, I started in the test team and later moved to the service team as a problem manager in around 2010, when I became a full-time employee.

CASH ACCOUNT

12. During the POL Training, I recall learning how sub-postmasters completed the paper-based process and cash account that was used before migrating to Horizon. I believe this was done so trainers could better understand the sub-postmasters' point-of-view

while migrating to Horizon. However, I do not recall having any experience of working with the "Cash Account" software.

TESTING

13. In relation to question 26, I understand that testing was conducted in Fujitsu's office in Feltham. There was a secured location dedicated to the Pathway project which had a number of test environments, such as functional and non-functional test rigs. Functional testing included doing things such as completing a basket, selling a stamp, or making sure the receipt printed out. Non-functional testing included making sure the data was stored properly and populated around the systems.

14. As the training was being paused, I moved from being a trainer to the test environment in April 1998 as a trainee tester. I was not told why or for how long the training would be paused for. Testing was carried out by going through the end-to-end testing lifecycle, following documented processes and templates. The end-to-end testing lifecycle involved:

- a. test planning - covering who would run the test, what testing and when to run it;
- b. test design - covering the test specifications and generation of test plan;
- c. test execution - performing and recording results of the tests; and
- d. test result analysis - comparing the results of the tests with the expected results and further analysis.

15. Teams were dedicated to the various types of testing and test environments. As I recall, there was development testing, which included the unit testing (software testing focused on components of the software) and then Component Integration

Testing (“**CIT**”) (testing interactions between the software components). This was followed by Integration testing (testing of software modules together) and would then move into System Validation and Integration (“**SV&I**”) and live systems testing (“**LST**”) for functional testing such as, Unit test (testing of small/single software modules), Smoke test (testing stability ready for next phase), Regression test (testing existing code has not been impacted by changes in code) and non-functional testing such as, Failover (testing ability to move functions), Disaster Recovery (testing continuation of operations following a serious interruption to service), Performance (testing speed, responsiveness and stability), and Volume (testing large volumes of data).

16. I was not involved in the entire end-to-end test lifecycle but would only be involved in the aspects that were relevant to my role at the time. In my role as trainee tester, I was given scripts to run in order to test the equipment and/or counter. I would then record the result of the test and feed the results back to the Fujitsu test manager. It is my understanding that the Fujitsu test manager would communicate the results of the tests with the relevant Post Office test manager.

17. Although I was new to testing at the time, with hindsight, the testing process seemed thorough from what I can remember. For example, there were regular reviews, which would highlight any areas that required further work, retesting and/or rescripting. When I ran the scripted tests that were assigned to me by my manager, I recorded those that passed, those that deferred (not able to run at the time) and those that failed, along with the results of each test. Where and when required, I gathered and recorded as much evidence as I could to support any failed tests. In some cases, I would consult with the Fujitsu test team or test manager and occasionally request

support from the developer. Once any issues were resolved and deployed for testing, the deferred or failed script would be run again, possibly by another member of the test team or myself.

CONSULTATION WITH END USERS

18. As a trainer, we sought feedback from sub-postmasters in relation to the training they received. Once we had completed the training, the sub-postmaster would complete two forms. The first would state that the sub-postmaster had received the training, which they would sign to confirm this. The second was a feedback form, inviting the sub-postmasters to provide feedback on the trainers, which may have included feedback on the system, as well as any outstanding questions for Peritas. All feedback sheets and forms were sent back to Peritas in Stockport for processing.
19. I was not made aware of who (if anyone) contacted attendees post-training. I did, from time to time, receive feedback reviews from my Peritas manager at the time, which collated comments from sub-postmasters in respect of training. I also read the feedback forms and requested feedback directly from the attendees, as it was important to me that the training had been received and understood. I do not remember exactly the content or number of areas covered on the feedback form, but believe it covered areas such as course content, delivery of the training, speed of delivery of the training, physical environment of the training session, and overall duration of the training. I believe the course changed following feedback. For example, I think we were asked to pause more to allow attendees more time to relax

and become more familiar with the terminal screen and to check that the sub-postmasters understood the training.

20. I'm not able to comment if end users were sufficiently involved in the requirements definition, design or acceptance testing as I had limited exposure or involvement outside of my role at the time. What I can say is that over time Post Office have introduced their own test teams and within those Post Office teams have been sub-postmasters. I also believe that Post Office held demonstrations and sought feedback from the National Federation of Sub-postmasters. This is from memory and I have no specific dates or names for this.

21. During my time with Peritas as a trainer I was based in Stockport and, to my knowledge, the training team and I had no interaction with any system teams.

22. During my time with the test team, I was based in Feltham with a machine with restricted access. However interaction with the Fujitsu system teams was very good. The teams were always engaging, keen to discuss and understand issues first-hand.

Statement of Truth

I believe the content of this statement to be true.

Signed:

GRO

Dated:

9/8/2022