1	Friday, 28 July 2023	1		2023. Do you have a copy of that in front of
2	(10.00 am)	2		you?
3	MR BLAKE: Good morning, sir. Can you see and hear	3		Yes, it's on my screen.
4	me?	4	Q.	Thank you. For the purpose of the transcript
5	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: When I unmute myself I can	5		it's WITN04600200.
6	confirm both.	6		If I could ask you to turn to the final
7	MR BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. This morning	7		page, page 8, is that your signature?
8	we're going to hear from Mr Jan Holmes, who is	8	Α.	Yes, it is.
9	appearing remotely from abroad.	9	Q.	Is that statement true to the best of your
10	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes.	10		knowledge and belief?
11	MR BLAKE: Can Mr Holmes be sworn, please?	11		Yes, it is.
12	JAN ROBERT HOLMES (affirmed)	12	Q.	Then there is another statement, a third
13	Questioned by MR BLAKE	13		statement, dated 16 May 2023, that's
14	MR BLAKE: Thank you very much, can you give your	14		WITN04600300. Can I ask you to turn to the
15	full name please.	15		final page of that statement, please.
16	A. Yes, it's Jan Robert Holmes.	16		Yeah.
17	Q. Thank you Mr Holmes. Thank you very much also	17	Q.	That's page 14. Is that your signature at the
18	for returning today. You appeared during our	18		end?
19	Phase 2 of this Inquiry and you gave a witness	19	Α.	Yes, it is.
20	statement in Phase 2. I'm not going to bring it	20	Q.	Is that statement true to the best of your
21	up on screen but, for the transcript, it's	21		knowledge and belief?
22	WITN04600100.	22		Yes, it is.
23	You have since then produced two further	23	Q.	
24	statements and I'm just going to take you to	24		through your career history, so I'm not going to
25	those. The first of them is dated 27 January	25		repeat that, save to say you were the Audit 2
1	Manager at ICL from 1997. There was a brief	1		this document for a long time but let's just
2	period where you went out of that role in	2		have a look at the first paragraph. It says
3	2000/2001, but you returned in 2001 and I think	3		there in the report:
4	you stayed at ICL until 2008; is that correct?	4		"It is clear that senior members of the
5	A. Yes, that's correct.	5		Taskforce are extremely concerned about the
6	Q. Thank you. I'm going to begin with	6		quality of code in the EPOSS product. Earlier
7	a whistlestop tour of some of the documents that	7		this year the EPOSS code was re-engineered by
8	we looked at in Phase 2, just to refresh your	8		Escher and the expectation is that the work
9	memory of some early incidents relating to	9		carried out in Boston was to a high standard and
10	Horizon. Can we start by looking at	10		of good quality. Since then many hundreds of
11	FUJ00080690. This is a document that will be	11		PinICL fixes have been applied to the code and
12	familiar to many people in this room, it's the	12		the fear is that code decay will, assuming it
13	report of the EPOSS PinICL Taskforce, of	13		hasn't already, cause the product to become
14	autumn which took place in autumn 1998.	14		unstable. This presents a situation where there
15	I think you'll recall that in the top right-hand	15		is no guarantee that a PinICL fix or additional
16	corner it seems as though you refreshed your	16		functionality can be made without adversely
17	memory in some way or had cause to look at the	17		affect another part of the system."
18	document in May 2001 as well.	18		Then it goes on to say:
19	A. Yes.	19		" a more worrying concern from the
20	Q. That's a document that you wrote. If we scroll	20		Programme's perspective should be reliance on
21	down we can see your name there.	21		the EPOSS product for its current state as
22	A. Yes, with David McDonnell as well.	22		a basis for planning and delivery."
23	Q. With David McDonnell. Absolutely. Let's look	23		If we scroll down to the next paragraph, it
24	at page 7 of that report. As I say, the	24		says there:
25	contents will be familiar, so we won't stay on 3	25		"Lack of code reviews in the development and 4
	÷			•

(1) Pages 1 - 4

1		fix process has resulted in poor workmanship and
2		bad code."
3		If we go on to page 17, there is a section
4		that I think was written significantly by
5		Mr McDonnell. If we scroll down, it's a section
6		on existing code.
7	Α.	Yes.
8	Q.	Just to refresh your memory, it says there:
9		"Although parts of the EPOSS code are well
10		written, significant sections are a combination
11		of poor technical design, bad programming and
12		ill thought out bug fixes."
13		If we scroll over the page, you'll remember
14		those comments:
15		"Whoever wrote this code clearly has no
16		understanding of elementary mathematics or the
17		most basic rules of programming."
18		Mr McDonnell's subsequent evidence to the
19		Inquiry was that the EPOSS Development team was,
20		in his words, like the Wild West and was the
21		joke of the building. I can't recall, did you
22		see Mr McDonnell's evidence on that?
23	_	Yes, I did.
24 25	Q.	Yes. Another document that I will refresh your
25		memory with is the CSR+ development audit
		J. J
,		
1		occasion to WITN04600104, that's the schedule of
2		corrective actions. We're now in May 2000 and,
3 4		if we look at page 9, it addresses the
4 5		recommendation to redesign and rewrite the EPOSS
		system.
6 7		If we scroll over the page to page 10, you'll recall that entry on 10 May 2000 which
7 8		
8 9		says: "As discussed this should be closed.
9 10		Effectively as a management team we have
10		accepted the ongoing cost of maintenance rather
12		than the cost of a rewrite. Rewrites of the
12		product will only be considered if we need to
13		reopen the code to introduce significant changes
14		in functionality. We will continue to monitor
16		the code quality based on product defects as we
17		progress through the final passes of testing and
18		the introduction of the modified CI4 codeset
19		into live usage in the network. PJ, can we make
20		sure that it is specifically covered in our
21		reviews of the B&TC cycles?"
22		That recommendation was closed. Thank you
23		that can come down.
24	Α.	Yeah.
25	Q.	So just to recap the developments over that
		7

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q.	<text><text><text><text></text></text></text></text>
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 21 20 21 22 23 24 25	A. Q.	<text><text><text></text></text></text>

5

1		that I'm reporting in the CSR audit report are
2		simply numbers. They're not an analysis of what
3		those defects were. So I can't say what areas
4	~	of EPOSS were actually affected by those bugs.
5	Q.	But you have been told by, for example,
6		Mr McDonnell that the code is of poor quality?
7	A.	Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah.
8	Q.	I think there was also reference to code decay
9 10	•	and things like that with PinICL fixes?
10	Α.	Well, in that context, what I was meaning was
11 12		that the more you tinker with something, the more likely you are to introduce a problem, and
12		that's the same with anything, whether it's
14		software, a car, decorating. You know, if you
14		fiddle about with stuff, it's likely to start
16		going wrong, you know, which is the "do it right
17		first time" principle.
18		So yeah, that was a concern but that was, if
19		you like, trying to raise a risk in people's
20		minds that this could happen if we carry on
21		carried on working in that manner.
22	Q.	C C
23		imperfections in the system and that there were
24		attempts to fix those imperfections but attempts
25		to fix the imperfections themselves could cause
		9
1		about non-EPOSS PinICLs", I mean, can they not
1 2		about non-EPOSS PinICLs", I mean, can they not be broadly applied, that they were concerns you
		-
2	А.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you
2 3	A.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product?
2 3 4	A.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the
2 3 4 5	A.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because
2 3 4 5 6	A.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because we were looking at live defects there. The CSR+
2 3 4 5 6 7	А.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because we were looking at live defects there. The CSR+ activity, unless I'm vastly mistaken, the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Α.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because we were looking at live defects there. The CSR+ activity, unless I'm vastly mistaken, the development, the PinICLs were test PinICLs that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because we were looking at live defects there. The CSR+ activity, unless I'm vastly mistaken, the development, the PinICLs were test PinICLs that were produced during testing cycles.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because we were looking at live defects there. The CSR+ activity, unless I'm vastly mistaken, the development, the PinICLs were test PinICLs that were produced during testing cycles. Unless I've misunderstood my own report, you
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	A.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because we were looking at live defects there. The CSR+ activity, unless I'm vastly mistaken, the development, the PinICLs were test PinICLs that were produced during testing cycles. Unless I've misunderstood my own report, you know, I don't know if those PinICLs that I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because we were looking at live defects there. The CSR+ activity, unless I'm vastly mistaken, the development, the PinICLs were test PinICLs that were produced during testing cycles. Unless I've misunderstood my own report, you know, I don't know if those PinICLs that I'm counting there were live or whether they were the results of test. So after 1998/1999 into 2000, you weren't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because we were looking at live defects there. The CSR+ activity, unless I'm vastly mistaken, the development, the PinICLs were test PinICLs that were produced during testing cycles. Unless I've misunderstood my own report, you know, I don't know if those PinICLs that I'm counting there were live or whether they were the results of test.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because we were looking at live defects there. The CSR+ activity, unless I'm vastly mistaken, the development, the PinICLs were test PinICLs that were produced during testing cycles. Unless I've misunderstood my own report, you know, I don't know if those PinICLs that I'm counting there were live or whether they were the results of test. So after 1998/1999 into 2000, you weren't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because we were looking at live defects there. The CSR+ activity, unless I'm vastly mistaken, the development, the PinICLs were test PinICLs that were produced during testing cycles. Unless I've misunderstood my own report, you know, I don't know if those PinICLs that I'm counting there were live or whether they were the results of test. So after 1998/1999 into 2000, you weren't concerned about the Horizon System?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because we were looking at live defects there. The CSR+ activity, unless I'm vastly mistaken, the development, the PinICLs were test PinICLs that were produced during testing cycles. Unless I've misunderstood my own report, you know, I don't know if those PinICLs that I'm counting there were live or whether they were the results of test. So after 1998/1999 into 2000, you weren't concerned about the Horizon System? Well, only insofar as I'd identified all of these PinICLs and defects that were still arising a year after the Taskforce had tried
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because we were looking at live defects there. The CSR+ activity, unless I'm vastly mistaken, the development, the PinICLs were test PinICLs that were produced during testing cycles. Unless I've misunderstood my own report, you know, I don't know if those PinICLs that I'm counting there were live or whether they were the results of test. So after 1998/1999 into 2000, you weren't concerned about the Horizon System? Well, only insofar as I'd identified all of these PinICLs and defects that were still arising a year after the Taskforce had tried to not put a stop to it, that would be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because we were looking at live defects there. The CSR+ activity, unless I'm vastly mistaken, the development, the PinICLs were test PinICLs that were produced during testing cycles. Unless I've misunderstood my own report, you know, I don't know if those PinICLs that I'm counting there were live or whether they were the results of test. So after 1998/1999 into 2000, you weren't concerned about the Horizon System? Well, only insofar as I'd identified all of these PinICLs and defects that were still arising a year after the Taskforce had tried to not put a stop to it, that would be virtually impossible, but to try to reduce the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because we were looking at live defects there. The CSR+ activity, unless I'm vastly mistaken, the development, the PinICLs were test PinICLs that were produced during testing cycles. Unless I've misunderstood my own report, you know, I don't know if those PinICLs that I'm counting there were live or whether they were the results of test. So after 1998/1999 into 2000, you weren't concerned about the Horizon System? Well, only insofar as I'd identified all of these PinICLs and defects that were still arising a year after the Taskforce had tried to not put a stop to it, that would be virtually impossible, but to try to reduce the number to, you know, a manageable figure.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because we were looking at live defects there. The CSR+ activity, unless I'm vastly mistaken, the development, the PinICLs were test PinICLs that were produced during testing cycles. Unless I've misunderstood my own report, you know, I don't know if those PinICLs that I'm counting there were live or whether they were the results of test. So after 1998/1999 into 2000, you weren't concerned about the Horizon System? Well, only insofar as I'd identified all of these PinICLs and defects that were still arising a year after the Taskforce had tried to not put a stop to it, that would be virtually impossible, but to try to reduce the number to, you know, a manageable figure. Well, let's move on and look at some specific
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because we were looking at live defects there. The CSR+ activity, unless I'm vastly mistaken, the development, the PinICLs were test PinICLs that were produced during testing cycles. Unless I've misunderstood my own report, you know, I don't know if those PinICLs that I'm counting there were live or whether they were the results of test. So after 1998/1999 into 2000, you weren't concerned about the Horizon System? Well, only insofar as I'd identified all of these PinICLs and defects that were still arising a year after the Taskforce had tried to not put a stop to it, that would be virtually impossible, but to try to reduce the number to, you know, a manageable figure. Well, let's move on and look at some specific instances that then crop up in 2000 and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because we were looking at live defects there. The CSR+ activity, unless I'm vastly mistaken, the development, the PinICLs were test PinICLs that were produced during testing cycles. Unless I've misunderstood my own report, you know, I don't know if those PinICLs that I'm counting there were live or whether they were the results of test. So after 1998/1999 into 2000, you weren't concerned about the Horizon System? Well, only insofar as I'd identified all of these PinICLs and defects that were still arising a year after the Taskforce had tried to not put a stop to it, that would be virtually impossible, but to try to reduce the number to, you know, a manageable figure. Well, let's move on and look at some specific instances that then crop up in 2000 and thereafter. On the screen at the moment we have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	be broadly applied, that they were concerns you had relating to the EPOSS product? Well, the EPOSS taskforce was looking at the baseline that was in place at the time, because we were looking at live defects there. The CSR+ activity, unless I'm vastly mistaken, the development, the PinICLs were test PinICLs that were produced during testing cycles. Unless I've misunderstood my own report, you know, I don't know if those PinICLs that I'm counting there were live or whether they were the results of test. So after 1998/1999 into 2000, you weren't concerned about the Horizon System? Well, only insofar as I'd identified all of these PinICLs and defects that were still arising a year after the Taskforce had tried to not put a stop to it, that would be virtually impossible, but to try to reduce the number to, you know, a manageable figure. Well, let's move on and look at some specific instances that then crop up in 2000 and

- 1 other problems?
- 2 **A.** Well, yes, that essentially is what I meant by
 - the "code decay" comment.Q. Yes. Can we now look at FUJ00059075, please?A. Can I just say something here? Again, I don't
- 6 know whether I've got the timings and the
 - baselines in my head correctly but CSR+ was
- 8 a new revised baseline and, at that time,
- 9 whatever was running at the outlets would have
- 10 been a different baseline anyway. So whether
- 11 they had the same defects and issues in them,
- 12 I don't know. I wouldn't know.
- 13 Q. You wouldn't know because you didn't make
 14 enquiries about the ongoing impact of changes to
 15 Horizon?
- 16 **A.** No, because in conducting the audit, I was
- 17 looking at the way the work was being done,
- 18 right, and I was using numbers to demonstrate
- 19 where there would seem to be still issues but
- 20 I can't equate CSR+ development audit back to
- whatever baseline was in place at Cleveleys atthat time.
- 23 **Q.** So comments in late 1999 about "the figures
- 24 indicate that problems facing EPOSS during the
- 25 taskforce period have not diminished concerns 10

1	Log. This is November 2000, or is raised by
2	Anne Chambers in November 2000, so that is the
3	time of a particular incident in
4	Mrs Wolstenholme's case.
5	If we look at that is described as
6	follows, it says "Critical event on counter",
7	and then it gives the message, and it says,
8	"Sometimes a storm of these events occurs", and
9	refers to another Known Error Log. If we look
10	at the bottom, the final sentence under
11	"Problem", it refers to another KEL and it says:
12	"[It] is with development for problems
13	balancing while these events are occurring."
14	I'm going to take you to a couple more. If
15	we look at FUJ00059141, this is the same Known
16	Error Log but it says it's version 2. If we
17	look at the problem there, it says:
18	"Possibly caused by an outstanding lock on
19	the run table, which is cleared subsequently
20	when ClearDesk runs. The problem is known to
21	have affected at least 129 counters."
22	If we now look at FUJ00086680. This is
23	a PEAK. It's one that we've looked at
24	previously in this Inquiry. It's a "Master Call
25	for Phantom Transactions". It begins on
	12

1		17 April 2001, and I'll just read you a few
2		entries within that PEAK. If we look about
3		halfway down, 14 April. It says, near the
4		bottom of this page:
5		"The system seems to lose transactions and
6		PM is concerned that for every transaction that
7		error he notices there is the probability that
8		there are ones he misses, leading to
9		discrepancies. The PM is at present finding the
10		whole scenario very stressful and is suffering
11		sleepless nights due to these problems. In the
12		light of what has gone on the PM is prepared to
13		break his contractual obligations with POCL and
14		refuse to pay any more discrepancies and will
15		take legal action if required."
16		If we scroll down that page, it says:
17		"As I was on the phone to the PM, he advised
18		that three First Class stamps that were on the
19		screen just 'dropped off'. PM had 3 First Class
20		stamps, and other stamps for 30p. When the
21		other stamps 30p went on, the First Class stamps
22		disappeared. They have since put the 3 First
23		Class stamps again. The first transaction (that
24		disappeared) was put on as 2 First Class
25		stamps", et cetera.
		13
1	A.	Well, based on what I've seen just there, then
2	Α.	yes. That's clear, isn't it?
2 3	A. Q.	yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns
2 3 4		yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system.
2 3 4 5		yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202.
2 3 4 5 6		yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202. We're now on 21 August 2003, and we are looking
2 3 4 5 6 7		yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202. We're now on 21 August 2003, and we are looking at the Cleveleys case. You, by that stage, had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8		yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202. We're now on 21 August 2003, and we are looking at the Cleveleys case. You, by that stage, had been contacted by Jim Cruise about the Cleveleys
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202. We're now on 21 August 2003, and we are looking at the Cleveleys case. You, by that stage, had been contacted by Jim Cruise about the Cleveleys case, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A.	yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202. We're now on 21 August 2003, and we are looking at the Cleveleys case. You, by that stage, had been contacted by Jim Cruise about the Cleveleys case, and Yeah.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	 yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202. We're now on 21 August 2003, and we are looking at the Cleveleys case. You, by that stage, had been contacted by Jim Cruise about the Cleveleys case, and Yeah. your answer to Mr Cruise is as follows in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A.	 yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202. We're now on 21 August 2003, and we are looking at the Cleveleys case. You, by that stage, had been contacted by Jim Cruise about the Cleveleys case, and Yeah. your answer to Mr Cruise is as follows in relation to what you call the easy stuff. You
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	 yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202. We're now on 21 August 2003, and we are looking at the Cleveleys case. You, by that stage, had been contacted by Jim Cruise about the Cleveleys case, and Yeah. your answer to Mr Cruise is as follows in relation to what you call the easy stuff. You say:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13	Q. A.	 yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202. We're now on 21 August 2003, and we are looking at the Cleveleys case. You, by that stage, had been contacted by Jim Cruise about the Cleveleys case, and Yeah. your answer to Mr Cruise is as follows in relation to what you call the easy stuff. You say: "1. We will have no record of any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A.	 yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202. We're now on 21 August 2003, and we are looking at the Cleveleys case. You, by that stage, had been contacted by Jim Cruise about the Cleveleys case, and Yeah. your answer to Mr Cruise is as follows in relation to what you call the easy stuff. You say: "1. We will have no record of any transaction data from Cleveleys dated before
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	 yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202. We're now on 21 August 2003, and we are looking at the Cleveleys case. You, by that stage, had been contacted by Jim Cruise about the Cleveleys case, and Yeah. your answer to Mr Cruise is as follows in relation to what you call the easy stuff. You say: "1. We will have no record of any transaction data from Cleveleys dated before November 2000 in the central audit archive since
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	 yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202. We're now on 21 August 2003, and we are looking at the Cleveleys case. You, by that stage, had been contacted by Jim Cruise about the Cleveleys case, and Yeah. your answer to Mr Cruise is as follows in relation to what you call the easy stuff. You say: "1. We will have no record of any transaction data from Cleveleys dated before November 2000 in the central audit archive since this was automatically deleted 18 months from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A.	 yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202. We're now on 21 August 2003, and we are looking at the Cleveleys case. You, by that stage, had been contacted by Jim Cruise about the Cleveleys case, and Yeah. your answer to Mr Cruise is as follows in relation to what you call the easy stuff. You say: "1. We will have no record of any transaction data from Cleveleys dated before November 2000 in the central audit archive since this was automatically deleted 18 months from the date that it is written. So, if 30 November
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A.	 yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202. We're now on 21 August 2003, and we are looking at the Cleveleys case. You, by that stage, had been contacted by Jim Cruise about the Cleveleys case, and Yeah. your answer to Mr Cruise is as follows in relation to what you call the easy stuff. You say: "1. We will have no record of any transaction data from Cleveleys dated before November 2000 in the central audit archive since this was automatically deleted 18 months from the date that it is written. So, if 30 November 2000 was the last active day for the Counter
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A.	 yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202. We're now on 21 August 2003, and we are looking at the Cleveleys case. You, by that stage, had been contacted by Jim Cruise about the Cleveleys case, and Yeah. your answer to Mr Cruise is as follows in relation to what you call the easy stuff. You say: "1. We will have no record of any transaction data from Cleveleys dated before November 2000 in the central audit archive since this was automatically deleted 18 months from the date that it is written. So, if 30 November 2000 was the last active day for the Counter that data would have been deleted on or about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A.	 yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202. We're now on 21 August 2003, and we are looking at the Cleveleys case. You, by that stage, had been contacted by Jim Cruise about the Cleveleys case, and Yeah. your answer to Mr Cruise is as follows in relation to what you call the easy stuff. You say: "1. We will have no record of any transaction data from Cleveleys dated before November 2000 in the central audit archive since this was automatically deleted 18 months from the date that it is written. So, if 30 November 2000 was the last active day for the Counter that data would have been deleted on or about 30 May 2002."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A.	 yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202. We're now on 21 August 2003, and we are looking at the Cleveleys case. You, by that stage, had been contacted by Jim Cruise about the Cleveleys case, and Yeah. your answer to Mr Cruise is as follows in relation to what you call the easy stuff. You say: "1. We will have no record of any transaction data from Cleveleys dated before November 2000 in the central audit archive since this was automatically deleted 18 months from the date that it is written. So, if 30 November 2000 was the last active day for the Counter that data would have been deleted on or about 30 May 2002." Then you say, second:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A.	 yes. That's clear, isn't it? Yes, combined, of course, with earlier concerns about the EPOSS system. I'm going to now take you to WITN04600202. We're now on 21 August 2003, and we are looking at the Cleveleys case. You, by that stage, had been contacted by Jim Cruise about the Cleveleys case, and Yeah. your answer to Mr Cruise is as follows in relation to what you call the easy stuff. You say: "1. We will have no record of any transaction data from Cleveleys dated before November 2000 in the central audit archive since this was automatically deleted 18 months from the date that it is written. So, if 30 November 2000 was the last active day for the Counter that data would have been deleted on or about 30 May 2002."

25 Now, that number 2, that was wrong, wasn't 15

1	If we go to page 4, about halfway down, it
2	says, 1 May 2001:
3	"PM feels that the system is unreliable. PM
4	cannot trust this system."
5	If we go over the next page, 2 May:
6	"PM called in because the screen has crashed
7	during his balance he has got the blue stop
8	screen error."
9	If we go down towards the bottom of the
10	page, 4 May, it says:
11	"Ki Barnes has called in. I am unsure what
12	to do with this call now. Romec have been to
13	site and state that they have actually seen the
14	phantom transactions, so it is not just the PM's
15	word now. They have fitted suppressors to the
16	kit but the PM is still having problems. As yet
17	there has been no recurrence to the phantom
18	transactions but there still may be problems",
19	et cetera.
20	Thank you, that can come down.
21	Would you accept that post-rollout there
22	were issues affecting balancing or transactions
23	or counters of some subpostmasters in these
24	kinds of logs and logs that you would have had
25	access to?

14

it? 1 Yeah, I mean, what I'm referring to there is the 2 Α. 3 formal audit records that are maintained that were then stored on the audit system and deleted 4 after 18 months. And, as you rightly say, 5 6 subsequently, an -- what I referred to and what 7 Jason Coyne referred to as an unregulated source of data was found and located. But they were 8 9 not the formal audit data that would have been 10 submitted, had it been requested to a court 11 case. Personally, I wouldn't necessarily place 12 reliance on it, since it wasn't formally captured in the audit record. 13 14 Q. So you wouldn't place reliance on the Helpdesk 15 logs that were, in fact, ultimately provided to 16 the expert, Mr Coyne? 17 A. Well, from -- I think from a legal perspective, 18 we -- I wouldn't know where they came from. You know, they weren't captured at the point of 19 20 origin, at the time to origin, and they weren't 21 stored securely so they probably were the same 22 as what was captured on the audit record. 23 Q. Did you say weren't or were? 24 A. No, they probably were the same, but I can't 25 vouch for that.

 1 Q. If number 2 was wrong, could you be sure that number 1 also wasn't wrong? 3 A. Also wasn't wrong? Um, no number 1 was correct because the transaction data would have been deleted 18 months after it was written. So it wouldn't be there. And 2 as I said, 2 refers to the Helpdesk logs that were captured as part of the audit archive. They would have been deleted, as well, after 18 months. So 10 Q. But 2 was found? 11 A. No, no, no. 12 Q. Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? 13 A. An unregulated set of records that were the Helpdesk logs were located after the event, after they were deleted from the audit archive. 13 Q. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? 14 A. Not I no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. 14 Detween when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. 14 So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: 15 "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." 14 Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? 14 Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. 16 Did you understand the implications of that? 17 Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? 18 No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. 15 It is was there the expert was approved by the court. 24 A. Yeah. But the parties being presumably 	number 1 also wasn't wrong? 2 A. Also wasn't wrong? Um, no number 1 was correct 3 because the transaction data would have been 4 deleted 18 months after 14 was written. So it 5 wouldn't be there. And 2 as I said, 2 refers 6 to the Helpdesk logs that were captured as part 7 of the audit archive. They would have been 8 deleted, as well, after 18 months. So 9 But 2 was found? 10 A. No, no, no. 11 Q Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? 12 A. An unregulated set of records that were the 13 Helpdesk logs were located after the event, 14 after they were deleted from the audit archive. 15 Q 2. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent 16 for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record 17 of the transaction data? 18 A A Not to my knowledge, no. 19 Q 2. Not to my knowledge, no. 19 Q A A how it worked, no, I don't think they would have 23 been, 24 A 3. Wight they have been available? 10					
 A. Also wasn't wrong? Um, on number 1 was correct because the transaction data would have been deleted 18 months after it was written. So it wouldn't be there. And 2 as I said, 2 refers to the Helpdesk logs that were captured as part of the audit archive. They would have been deleted, as well, after 18 months. So Q. But 2 was found? A. No, no, no. Q. Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? A. An unregulated set of records that were the Helpdesk logs were located after the event, after they were deleted from the audit archive. Q. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? A. Not to my knowledge, no. Q. Might they have been available? A. Not to my knowledge, no. Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 Detween when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It is ays there the expert was approved by the Court. 	 Also wasn't wrong? Um, no number 1 was correct because the transaction data would have been deleted 18 months after it was written. So it to the Helpdesk logs that were captured as part of the audit archive. They would have been deleted, as well, after 18 months. So But 2 was found? No, no, no, Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? An unregulated set of records that were the after they were deleted from the audit archive. Q Or an unregulated set of records that were the after they were deleted from the audit archive. Q Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? A Not my knowledge, no. Q Might they have been available? Not I no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated Why is it that you were able to find unregulated Why is it that you were able to find unregulated So five look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: The County Court instructed the parties giointly to commission a report from an expert bid you understand the implications of that? Did you understand the implications of that? It says there the expert was approved by the Court. Yeah. But the parties being presumably Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not 	1	Q.	If number 2 was wrong, could you be sure that	1	
 because the transaction data would have been deleted 18 months after it was written. So it wouldn't be there. And 2 as I said, 2 refers to the Helpdesk logs that were captured as part of the audit archive. They would have been deleted, as well, after 18 months. So 0. But 2 was found? 1. A. No, no, no. 2. Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? 3. A nu unregulated set of records that were the Helpdesk logs were located after the event, after they were deleted from the audit archive. 6. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? 4. Not to my knowledge, no. 20. Might they have been available? 4. Not to my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. 20. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? 4. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. 10. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? 4. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involv	because the transaction data would have been 4 deleted 18 months after it was written. So it 5 wouldn't be there. And 2 as I said, 2 refers 6 to the Helpdesk logs that were captured as part 7 of the audit archive. They would have been 8 deleted, as well, after 18 months. So 9 D. But 2 was found? 10 A. No, no, no. 11 Q. Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? 12 A. An unregulated set of records that were the 13 Helpdesk logs were located after the event, 14 after they were deleted from the audit archive. 15 Q. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent 16 for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record 17 of the transaction data? 18 A. Not to my knowledge, no. 19 Q. Not - L - no, I don't think they would have 21 been, based on my knowledge of the system and 22 how it worked, no, I don't think they would have 23 been. 24 0 10 have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, 2 and us getting involved through Jim Cr			5		
 deleted 18 months after it was written. So it wouldn't be there. And 2 as I said, 2 refers to the Helpdesk logs that were captured as part of the audit archive. They would have been deleted, as well, after 18 months. So 0. But 2 was found? 1. A. No, no, no. 2. Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? 3. A nurregulated set of records that were the Helpdesk logs were located after the event, after they were deleted from the audit archive. 0. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? 4. Not to my knowledge, no. 0. Might they have been available? A. Not - I no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. 2. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was app	deleted 18 months after it was written. So it 5 wouldn't be there. And 2 as I said, 2 refers 6 to the Helpdesk logs that were captured as part 7 of the audit archive. They would have been 8 deleted, as well, after 18 months. So 9 2. But 2 was found? 10 A. No, no, no. 11 Q 2. Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? 12 A. An unregulated set of records that were the 13 Helpdesk logs were located after the event, 14 after they were deleted from the audit archive. 15 Q. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent 16 for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record 17 of the transaction data? 18 A. Not to my knowledge, no. 19 Q. Not to my knowledge of the system and 22 how it worked, no, I don't think they would have 23 been, based on my knowledge of the system and 22 17 17 between when all these problems were supposed to 1 how it worked, no, I don't think they would have 23 icert of help. And it was linked, I think, 4		Α.	-		Α
 wouldn't be there. And 2 as I said. 2 refers to the Helpdesk logs that were captured as part of the audit archive. They would have been deleted, as well, after 18 months. So Q. But 2 was found? A. No, no, no. Q. Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? A. An unregulated set of records that were the Helpdesk logs were located after the event, after they were deleted from the audit archive. Q. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? A. Not to my knowledge, no. Q. Might they have been available? A. Not - I- no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated to the production of Jason Coyne's expert request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	wouldn't be there. And 2 as I said, 2 refers 6 to the Helpdesk logs that were captured as part 7 of the audit archive. They would have been 8 deleted, as well, after 18 months. So 9 2. But 2 was found? 10 2. No, no, no. 11 Q 2. Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? 12 3. An unregulated set of records that were the 13 Helpdesk logs were located after the event, 14 after they were deleted from the audit archive. 15 Q. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent 16 for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record 17 of the transaction data? 18 A. Not to my knowledge, no. 19 Q. Mot - I- no, I don't think they would have 21 been, based on my knowledge of the system and 22 how it worked, no, I don't think they would have 23 been. 24 0. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 26 17 17 between when all these problems were supposed to 1 have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, 2 Q					
 to the Helpdesk logs that were captured as part of the audit archive. They would have been deleted, as well, after 18 months. So Q. But 2 was found? A. No, no, no. Q. Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? A. An unregulated set of records that were the Helpdesk logs were located after the event, after they were deleted from the audit archive. Q. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? A. Not to my knowledge, no. Q. Might they have been available? A. Not - I no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	to the Helpdesk logs that were captured as part of the audit archive. They would have been deleted, as well, after 18 months. So 9 But 2 was found? A No, no, no. 10 Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? A An unregulated set of records that were the Helpdesk logs were located after the event, after they were deleted from the audit archive. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? Not to my knowledge, no. Might they have been available? Not - L - no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred - or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? Weil, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Did you understand the implications of that? Did yo					
 of the audit archive. They would have been deleted, as well, after 18 months. So Q. But 2 was found? A. No, no, no. Q. Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? A. An unregulated set of records that were the Helpdesk logs were located after the event, after they were deleted from the audit archive. Q. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? A. Not to my knowledge, no. Q. Might they have been available? A. Not - I no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? M. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	of the audit archive. They would have been 8 deleted, as well, after 18 months. So 9 2. But 2 was found? 10 A. No, no, no. 11 Q 2. Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? 12 A. An unregulated version of 2 was found? 12 A. An unregulated version of 2 was found? 14 A. An unregulated version of 2 was found? 14 A. An unregulated version of 2 was found? 15 Q. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent 16 for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record 17 of the transaction data? 18 A. Not to my knowledge, no. 19 Q. Mas an attempt made to look for the system and 22 how it worked, no, I don't think they would have 21 been, based on my knowledge of the system and 22 how it worked, no, I don't think they would have 23 been. 24 Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 25 17 17 between when all these problems were supposed to 1 have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, 2 Q and u			,		
 9 deleted, as well, after 18 months. So 10 Q. But 2 was found? 11 A. No, no, no. 12 Q. Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? 13 A. An unregulated set of records that were the 14 Helpdesk logs were located after the event, 15 after they were deleted from the audit archive. 10 Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent 17 for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record 18 of the transaction data? 19 A. Not or my knowledge, no. 20 Q. Might they have been available? 21 A. Not I- no, I don't think they would have 22 been, based on my knowledge of the system and 23 how it worked, no, I don't think they would have 24 been. 29 Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 1 between when all these problems were supposed to 2 have occurred - or when they occurred in 2000, 3 and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's 4 request for help. And it was linked, I think, 5 to the production of Jason Coyne's expert 6 report. 7 Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's 8 currently on our screen, it says: 9 "The County Court instructed the parties 19 jointly to commission a report from an expert 11 approved by the Court." 12 Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? 14 Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' 15 letter. 16 Q. Did you understand the implications of that? 17 Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? 14 No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to 1 appoint. But it would appear not. 22 Q. It says there the expert was approved by the 23 Court. 	deleted, as well, after 18 months. So 9 but 2 was found? 10 A. No, no, no. 11 Q 2. Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? 12 A. An unregulated set of records that were the 13 Helpdesk logs were located after the event, 14 A after they were deleted from the audit archive. 15 Q D. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent 16 for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record 17 of the transaction data? 18 A. Not to my knowledge, no. 19 Q A. Not - I no, I don't think they would have 21 been, based on my knowledge of the system and 22 A how it worked, no, I don't think they would have 23 17 between when all these problems were supposed to 1 have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, 2 Q and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's 3 3 request for help. And it was linked, I think, 4 to the production of Jason Coyne's expert 5 A A report. 6 Q Q A So if we look at the third p					
 10 Q. But 2 was found? 11 A. No, no, no. 12 Q. Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? 13 A. An unregulated set of records that were the Helpdesk logs were located after the event, after they were deleted from the audit archive. 10 Q. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? 19 A. Not to my knowledge, no. 20 Q. Might they have been available? 21 A. Not to my knowledge, no. 20 Q. Might they have been available? 21 A. Not I no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. 20 Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 1 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. 1 Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: 9 The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." 12 Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? 14 A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. 16 Q. Did you understand the implications of that? 17 Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? 19 A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. 20 A. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	2. But 2 was found? 10 A. No, no, no. 11 Q A. No, no, no. 11 Q A. An unregulated version of 2 was found? 12 A. An unregulated set of records that were the 13 Helpdesk logs were located after the event, 14 A after they were deleted from the audit archive. 15 Q Q. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent 16 17 of the transaction data? 18 A A. Not to my knowledge, no. 19 Q D. Might they have been available? 20 4 Not - I - no, I don't think they would have 21 21 been, based on my knowledge of the system and 22 A how it worked, no, I don't think they would have 23 24 Detween when all these problems were supposed to 1 1 have occurred - or when they occurred in 2000, 2 Q and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's 3 3 request for help. And it was linked, I think, 4 10 to the production of Jason Coyne's expert 5 A report.			-		
 11 A. No, no, no. 12 Q. Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? 13 A. An unregulated set of records that were the Helpdesk logs were located after the event, after they were deleted from the audit archive. 10 Q. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? 14 A. Not to my knowledge, no. 19 A. Not to my knowledge, no. 10 Q. Might they have been available? 11 A. Not I- no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. 12 Detween when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. 10 So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: 11 "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." 12 Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? 14 A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. 16 Did you understand the implications of that? 17 Did you know what a jointly instructed expert 18 was? 19 A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. 20 A. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	 No, no, no. Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? An unregulated set of records that were the Helpdesk logs were located after the event, after they were deleted from the audit archive. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? Not to my knowledge, no. Might they have been available? Not - I no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and been, based on my knowledge of the system and been, on I don't think they would have been. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated Why is it that you were able to find unregulated Why is it that you were able to find unregulated were courred - or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert pointly to commission a report from an expert Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? No, because I just assumed, rather, that we was? No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Was botsenholme and Post Office. We were not 					
 Q. Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? A. An unregulated set of records that were the Helpdesk logs were located after the event, after they were deleted from the audit archive. Q. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? A. Not to my knowledge, no. Q. Might they have been available? A. Not I no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, beccause I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	2. Or an unregulated version of 2 was found? 12 A. An unregulated set of records that were the 13 Helpdesk logs were located after the event, 14 after they were deleted from the audit archive. 15 Q. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent 16 for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record 17 of the transaction data? 18 A. Not to my knowledge, no. 19 Q. Might they have been available? 20 A. Not - I no, I don't think they would have 21 been, based on my knowledge of the system and 22 how it worked, no, I don't think they would have 23 been. 24 Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 25 17 17 between when all these problems were supposed to 1 have occurred - or when they occurred in 2000, 2 Q and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's 3 3 request for help. And it was linked, I think, 4 4 to the production of Jason Coyne's expert 5 A. So if we look at the third paragraph that's 7 7 10 currently on ou					_
 A. An unregulated set of records that were the Helpdesk logs were located after the event, after they were deleted from the audit archive. Q. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? A. Not to my knowledge, no. Q. Might they have been available? A. Not I- no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated been. Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? M. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	 An unregulated set of records that were the Helpdesk logs were located after the event, after they were deleted from the audit archive. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? Not on my knowledge, no. Might they have been available? Not I- no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated Why is it that you were able to find unregulated Why is it that you were able to find unregulated were occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you understand the implications of that? Did you understand the implications of that? Did you what a jointly instructed expert tays there the expert was approved by the tays there the					Q
 Helpdesk logs were located after the event, after they were deleted from the audit archive. Q. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? A. Not to my knowledge, no. Q. Might they have been available? A. Not - I no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	Helpdesk logs were located after the event, 14 A after they were deleted from the audit archive. 15 Q Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent 16 for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record 17 of the transaction data? 18 A A. Not to my knowledge, no. 19 Q A. Not to my knowledge, no. 19 Q A. Not - I no, I don't think they would have 21 been, based on my knowledge of the system and 22 A. Not worked, no, I don't think they would have 23 been. 24 Detween, when all these problems were supposed to 1 have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, 2 Q and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's 3 request for help. And it was linked, I think, 4 to the production of Jason Coyne's expert 5 A report. 6 Q Q 2 3 7 currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties 9 9 9 9 10 4 4 12 4 4 12 4 4 12 4 4 14 14 14			-		
 after they were deleted from the audit archive. Q. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? A. Not to my knowledge, no. Q. Might they have been available? A. Not - I- no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? M. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	after they were deleted from the audit archive. 15 Q Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent 16 for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record 17 of the transaction data? 18 A. Not to my knowledge, no. 19 Q Might they have been available? 20 A. Not to my knowledge of the system and 22 how it worked, no, I don't think they would have 23 been, based on my knowledge of the system and 24 how it worked, no, I don't think they would have 23 been. 24 Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 25 17 17 between when all these problems were supposed to 1 have occurred - or when they occurred in 2000, 2 and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's 3 request for help. And it was linked, I think, 4 to the production of Jason Coyne's expert 5 A So if we look at the third paragraph that's 7 currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties 9 jointly to commission a report from an expert 10 12		Α.			
 16 Q. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? 19 A. Not to my knowledge, no. 20 Q. Might they have been available? 21 A. Not - I- no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. 25 Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 1 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: 9 "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." 12 Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? 4. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. 16 Q. Did you understand the implications of that? 17 Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? 19 A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. 2. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	 2. Was an attempt made to look for the equivalent for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? 4. Not to my knowledge, no. 20 2. Might they have been available? 20 4. Not - I- no, I don't think they would have 21 been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have 23 been. 24 2. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 25 2. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 between when all these problems were supposed to 1 have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's 3 request for help. And it was linked, I think, 4 to the production of Jason Coyne's expert 5 A So if we look at the third paragraph that's 7 currently on our screen, it says: 8 "The County Court instructed the parties 9 jointly to commission a report from an expert 30 approved by the Court." Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' 14 letter. bid you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert 17 A No, because I just assumed, rather, that we 19 would be involved in that decision who to 20 appoint. But it would appear not. A Yeah. But the parties being presumably 24 Q Yeah. But the parties being presumably 24 Q Yeah. But the parties being presumably 25 					
 for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record of the transaction data? A. Not to my knowledge, no. Q. Might they have been available? A. Not - I no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	for number 1, so some sort of unregulated record 17 of the transaction data? 18 A. Not to my knowledge, no. 19 D. Might they have been available? 20 A. Not I no, I don't think they would have 21 been, based on my knowledge of the system and 22 how it worked, no, I don't think they would have 23 been, based on my knowledge of the system and 22 how it worked, no, I don't think they would have 23 been. 24 D. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 25 17 17 between when all these problems were supposed to 1 have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, 2 and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's 3 request for help. And it was linked, I think, 4 to the production of Jason Coyne's expert 5 A. So if we look at the third paragraph that's 7 currently on our screen, it says: 8 "The County Court." 11 Pausing there. Did you understand that the 12 expert was jointly instructed? 13 Well, only insofar as it's in Keith B		~			Q
 of the transaction data? A. Not to my knowledge, no. Q. Might they have been available? A. Not I no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	of the transaction data? 18 A A. Not to my knowledge, no. 19 Q D. Might they have been available? 20 A. Not I no, I don't think they would have 21 been, based on my knowledge of the system and 22 how it worked, no, I don't think they would have 23 been. 24 Deen. 24 Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 25 17 17 between when all these problems were supposed to 1 have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, 2 Q and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's 3 3 request for help. And it was linked, I think, 4 4 to the production of Jason Coyne's expert 5 A report. 6 Q 2. So if we look at the third paragraph that's 7 7 currently on our screen, it says: 8 "The County Court instructed the parties 9 jointly to commission a report from an expert 10 approved by the Court." 11 Pausing there. Did you understand that the 12 12		Q.			
 A. Not to my knowledge, no. Q. Might they have been available? A. Not I no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	 A. Not to my knowledge, no. Might they have been available? A. Not I no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. 24 A. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert Mo because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. Yeah. But the parties being presumably Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not 			-		
 Q. Might they have been available? A. Not I no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	 Might they have been available? Not I no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we was? No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Yeah. But the parties being presumably Mer Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not 					
 A. Not I no, I don't think they would have been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	A. Not I no, I don't think they would have 21 been, based on my knowledge of the system and 22 how it worked, no, I don't think they would have 23 been. 24 2. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 25 17 17 between when all these problems were supposed to 1 have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, 2 and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's 3 request for help. And it was linked, I think, 4 to the production of Jason Coyne's expert 5 A. report. 6 Q Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's 7 7 currently on our screen, it says: 8 "The County Court instructed the parties 9 jointly to commission a report from an expert 10 approved by the Court." 11 Pausing there. Did you understand that the 12 expert was jointly instructed? 13 A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' 14 14 14 letter. 15 16 20 20 20 20 Did you understand the implications of that? 16<					Q
 been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	been, based on my knowledge of the system and how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been.23a.Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 1725between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert5Ac.So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court."11Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed?13A.Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter.14Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was?17A.No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not.21D.Lit says there the expert was approved by the Court.22A.Yeah. But the parties being presumably Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25			C		
 how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been. Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court." 	how it worked, no, I don't think they would have been.23 24Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17251717between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert5AAcurrently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court."10Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed?13AWell, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' Did you understand the implications of that?16Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was?17ANo, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not.21AYeah. But the parties being presumably Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25		А.	-		
 24 been. 25 Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 1 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. 7 Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: 9 "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." 12 Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? 14 A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. 16 Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? 19 A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. 12 Q. It says there the expert was approved by the 23 Court. 	been.242. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17251717between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert6QASo if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: The County Court instructed the parties8"The County Court instructed the parties9jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court."11Pausing there. Did you understand that the letter.12A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter.14Did you understand the implications of that?16Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was?17A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not.21D. It says there the expert was approved by the Court.21A. Yeah. But the parties being presumably Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25A. Yeah. Sut the parties being presumably24					A
 25 Q. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 17 1 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. 7 Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: 9 "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." 12 Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? 14 A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. 16 Q. Did you understand the implications of that? 17 Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? 9 A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. 12 Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	2. Why is it that you were able to find unregulated 25 17 17 between when all these problems were supposed to 1 have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, 2 and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's 3 request for help. And it was linked, I think, 4 to the production of Jason Coyne's expert 5 report. 6 Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's 7 currently on our screen, it says: 8 "The County Court instructed the parties 9 jointly to commission a report from an expert 10 approved by the Court." 11 Pausing there. Did you understand that the 12 expert was jointly instructed? 13 A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' 14 letter. 15 Did you understand the implications of that? 16 Did you know what a jointly instructed expert 17 was? 18 A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we 19 would be involved in that decision who to 20 appoint. But it would appear not. 21			-		
 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	17between when all these problems were supposed to1have occurred or when they occurred in 2000,2and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's3request for help. And it was linked, I think,4to the production of Jason Coyne's expert5A6QSo if we look at the third paragraph that'scurrently on our screen, it says:8"The County Court instructed the parties9jointly to commission a report from an expert10approved by the Court."11Pausing there. Did you understand that the12expert was jointly instructed?13A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines'14letter.15Did you understand the implications of that?16Did you know what a jointly instructed expert17Was?18A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we19would be involved in that decision who to20appoint. But it would appear not.21A. Yeah. But the parties being presumably24Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25		~			
 between when all these problems were supposed to have occurred or when they occurred in 2000, and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	between when all these problems were supposed to1have occurred or when they occurred in 2000,2and us getting involved through Jim Cruise's3request for help. And it was linked, I think,4to the production of Jason Coyne's expert5A6QSo if we look at the third paragraph that'scurrently on our screen, it says:7"The County Court instructed the parties9jointly to commission a report from an expert10approved by the Court."11Pausing there. Did you understand that the12expert was jointly instructed?13A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines'14letter.15Did you understand the implications of that?16Did you know what a jointly instructed expert17Maxs?18A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we19would be involved in that decision who to20appoint. But it would appear not.21Q. It says there the expert was approved by the22Court.23A. Yeah. But the parties being presumably24Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25	25	Q.		25	
 request for help. And it was linked, I think, to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	request for help. And it was linked, I think,4to the production of Jason Coyne's expert5Afreport.CSo if we look at the third paragraph that's7currently on our screen, it says:8"The County Court instructed the parties9jointly to commission a report from an expert10approved by the Court."11Pausing there. Did you understand that the12expert was jointly instructed?13A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines'14letter.15Did you understand the implications of that?16Did you know what a jointly instructed expert17Was?18A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we19would be involved in that decision who to20appoint. But it would appear not.21D. It says there the expert was approved by the22Court.23A. Yeah. But the parties being presumably24Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25A	2		have occurred or when they occurred in 2000,	2	Q
 to the production of Jason Coyne's expert report. Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	to the production of Jason Coyne's expert5Areport.6Q2. So if we look at the third paragraph that's7currently on our screen, it says:8"The County Court instructed the parties9jointly to commission a report from an expert10approved by the Court."11Pausing there. Did you understand that the12expert was jointly instructed?13A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines'14letter.15Did you understand the implications of that?16Did you know what a jointly instructed expert17A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we19would be involved in that decision who to20appoint. But it would appear not.21Q. It says there the expert was approved by the22Court.23A. Yeah. But the parties being presumably24Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25A					
 6 report. 7 Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's 8 currently on our screen, it says: 9 "The County Court instructed the parties 10 jointly to commission a report from an expert 11 approved by the Court." 12 Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? 14 A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' 15 letter. 16 Q. Did you understand the implications of that? 17 Did you know what a jointly instructed expert 18 was? 19 A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. 22 Q. It says there the expert was approved by the 23 Court. 	report.6Q Q . So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: "The County Court instructed the parties9jointly to commission a report from an expert10approved by the Court."11Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed?13 A . Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter.14 D id you understand the implications of that?16 D id you know what a jointly instructed expert was?17 A . No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not.21 Q . It says there the expert was approved by the Court.23 A . Yeah. But the parties being presumably Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25 A Yeak25 A	5			5	Α
 7 Q. So if we look at the third paragraph that's currently on our screen, it says: 9 "The County Court instructed the parties 10 jointly to commission a report from an expert 11 approved by the Court." 12 Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? 14 A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. 16 Q. Did you understand the implications of that? 17 Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? 19 A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. 22 Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	D.So if we look at the third paragraph that's7currently on our screen, it says:8"The County Court instructed the parties9jointly to commission a report from an expert10approved by the Court."11Pausing there. Did you understand that the12expert was jointly instructed?13A.Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines'14letter.15Did you understand the implications of that?16Did you know what a jointly instructed expert17Was?18A.No, because I just assumed, rather, that we19would be involved in that decision who to20appoint. But it would appear not.21Court.23A.Yeah. But the parties being presumably24Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25A					-
 8 currently on our screen, it says: 9 "The County Court instructed the parties 10 jointly to commission a report from an expert 11 approved by the Court." 12 Pausing there. Did you understand that the 13 expert was jointly instructed? 14 A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' 15 letter. 16 Q. Did you understand the implications of that? 17 Did you know what a jointly instructed expert 18 was? 19 A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we 20 would be involved in that decision who to 21 appoint. But it would appear not. 22 Q. It says there the expert was approved by the 23 Court. 	currently on our screen, it says:8"The County Court instructed the parties9jointly to commission a report from an expert10approved by the Court."11Pausing there. Did you understand that the12expert was jointly instructed?13A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines'14letter.15D. Did you understand the implications of that?16Did you know what a jointly instructed expert17M. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we19would be involved in that decision who to20appoint. But it would appear not.21Q. It says there the expert was approved by the22Court.23A. Yeah. But the parties being presumably24Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25A		Q.	•		
 9 "The County Court instructed the parties 10 jointly to commission a report from an expert 11 approved by the Court." 12 Pausing there. Did you understand that the 13 expert was jointly instructed? 14 A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' 15 letter. 16 Q. Did you understand the implications of that? 17 Did you know what a jointly instructed expert 18 was? 19 A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we 20 would be involved in that decision who to 21 appoint. But it would appear not. 22 Q. It says there the expert was approved by the 23 Court. 	"The County Court instructed the parties9jointly to commission a report from an expert10approved by the Court."11Pausing there. Did you understand that the12expert was jointly instructed?13A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines'14letter.15D. Did you understand the implications of that?16Did you know what a jointly instructed expert17A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we19would be involved in that decision who to20appoint. But it would appear not.21D. It says there the expert was approved by the22Court.23A. Yeah. But the parties being presumably24Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25	8			8	
 jointly to commission a report from an expert approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	jointly to commission a report from an expert10approved by the Court."11Pausing there. Did you understand that the12expert was jointly instructed?13A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines'14letter.15D. Did you understand the implications of that?16Did you know what a jointly instructed expert17A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we19would be involved in that decision who to20appoint. But it would appear not.21D. It says there the expert was approved by the22Court.23A. Yeah. But the parties being presumably24Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25	9			9	
 approved by the Court." Pausing there. Did you understand that the expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	approved by the Court."11Pausing there. Did you understand that the12expert was jointly instructed?13A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines'14letter.15Did you understand the implications of that?16Did you know what a jointly instructed expert17A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we19would be involved in that decision who to20appoint. But it would appear not.21Q. It says there the expert was approved by the22Court.23A. Yeah. But the parties being presumably24Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25A	10		jointly to commission a report from an expert	10	
 expert was jointly instructed? A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Q. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	expert was jointly instructed?13A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines'14letter.15D. Did you understand the implications of that?16Did you know what a jointly instructed expert17A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we19would be involved in that decision who to20appoint. But it would appear not.21D. It says there the expert was approved by the22Court.23A. Yeah. But the parties being presumably24Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25A	11		approved by the Court."	11	
 A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	 A. Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines' letter. Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert Max No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. Yeah. But the parties being presumably Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not Vent State St	12		Pausing there. Did you understand that the	12	
 15 letter. 16 Q. Did you understand the implications of that? 17 Did you know what a jointly instructed expert 18 was? 19 A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we 20 would be involved in that decision who to 21 appoint. But it would appear not. 22 Q. It says there the expert was approved by the 23 Court. 	letter.15 D id you understand the implications of that?16Did you know what a jointly instructed expert17 A No, because I just assumed, rather, that we19would be involved in that decision who to20appoint. But it would appear not.21 D . It says there the expert was approved by the22Court.23 A . Yeah. But the parties being presumably24Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25	13		expert was jointly instructed?	13	
 16 Q. Did you understand the implications of that? 17 Did you know what a jointly instructed expert 18 was? 19 A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we 20 would be involved in that decision who to 21 appoint. But it would appear not. 22 Q. It says there the expert was approved by the 23 Court. 	 Did you understand the implications of that? Did you know what a jointly instructed expert Did you know what a jointly instructed expert Max No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Court. Court. Yeah. But the parties being presumably Max Max	14	Α.	Well, only insofar as it's in Keith Baines'	14	
 Did you know what a jointly instructed expert was? A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	Did you know what a jointly instructed expert17Awas?18A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we19would be involved in that decision who to20appoint. But it would appear not.21Q. It says there the expert was approved by the22Court.23A. Yeah. But the parties being presumably24Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25	15		letter.	15	
 18 was? 19 A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we 20 would be involved in that decision who to 21 appoint. But it would appear not. 22 Q. It says there the expert was approved by the 23 Court. 	was?18A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we19would be involved in that decision who to20appoint. But it would appear not.21Q. It says there the expert was approved by the22Court.23A. Yeah. But the parties being presumably24Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25A	16	Q.	Did you understand the implications of that?	16	
 19 A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we 20 would be involved in that decision who to 21 appoint. But it would appear not. 22 Q. It says there the expert was approved by the 23 Court. 	 A. No, because I just assumed, rather, that we would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. D. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. A. Yeah. But the parties being presumably Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not 25 	17		Did you know what a jointly instructed expert	17	Α
 would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	would be involved in that decision who to appoint. But it would appear not.20Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court.21Q. Yeah. But the parties being presumably Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not24QQ	18		was?	18	
 appoint. But it would appear not. Q. It says there the expert was approved by the Court. 	appoint. But it would appear not.21 Q. It says there the expert was approved by the22Court.23 A. Yeah. But the parties being presumably24Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25 A.	19	Α.	No, because I just assumed, rather, that we	19	
22 Q. It says there the expert was approved by the23 Court.	Q.It says there the expert was approved by the Court.22A.Yeah. But the parties being presumably Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not24QQ	20		would be involved in that decision who to	20	
23 Court.	Court.23A. Yeah. But the parties being presumably24Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25A.A.	21		appoint. But it would appear not.	21	
	A. Yeah. But the parties being presumably24QMrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not25A	22	Q.	It says there the expert was approved by the	22	
24 A. Yeah. But the parties being presumably	Mrs Wolstenholme and Post Office. We were not 25 A	23		Court.	23	
		24	Α.	Yeah. But the parties being presumably	24	Q
	19	25			25	Α
19				19		

1		Helpdesk logs but no unregulated transaction
2		data was produced? Was it looked for?
3	A.	No, they emanate from different sources. So
4	Λ.	I can only assume that the Helpdesk itself was
5		maintaining records but they weren't passed to
6		the audit archive system, and that was the part
7		I was commenting on there. They weren't
8		available in the audit archive. And, as I say,
9		subsequently, Helpdesk records were found, but
10		they were nothing to do with the audit archive.
11	Q.	Can we look at POL00095375, please. We're now
12		on 5 February 2004 so guite some time after that
13		initial contact in August 2003.
14	Α.	Yeah.
15	Q.	This is a letter to Colin Lenton-Smith from
16		Keith Baines at the Post Office. Did you see
17		this letter at the time?
18	Α.	Possibly.
19	Q.	Had you had any contact with the Post Office
20		subsequent to that 21 August contact, in respect
21		of this case?
22	Α.	Well, I don't know. I mean, there are some
23		documents that have got dates and the points of
24		my involvement with the various people but
25		I know there was a delay, or quite a delay
		18
1		part of any kind of appointment there.
2	Q.	So did you not take it to have any real
3		significance that the expert had been jointly
4		commissioned?
5	Α.	No, I didn't.
6	Q.	If we scroll down on that page, we'll see there:
7		"I'm sure you'll understand, Post Office is
8		concerned by these findings, not only in
9		relation to this particular case, but also
10		because of any precedent that this may set and
11		that may be used by the Post Office's agents to
12		support claims that the Horizon System is
13		causing errors in their branch accounts."
14		Was this the first occasion where you
15		realised the potential implications of the
16		Cleveleys case?
17	Α.	No. I mean, I think we got how can I explain
18		this? From Horizon's point of view, from my
19 20		point of view, helping the Post Office resolve
20 21		this was really just another piece of work
21		coming down the line. I didn't have any personal buy-in to it. It was just a request
22		for help to provide information.
23 24	Q.	So
24	ખ.	00

25 A. Essentially, it was -- it started off by seeking 20

1		any help to counter some of the opinions in the
2		expert's report.
3	Q.	So you didn't take it in any way personally?
4	Α.	No, no. It was work.
5	Q.	You didn't feel any kind of vested effort to win
6		in this case?
7	Α.	No, I didn't have any skin in it at all, so why
8		would I? It was just a piece of work that we
9		were asked to do by the Post Office. We didn't
10		have any real background, other than the fact
11		that the postmaster was in dispute and had
12		confiscated the equipment and wouldn't return
13		it. But, other than that, it was just
14		responding to the request made to us by the Post
15	-	Office.
16	Q.	Do you feel you maintained that neutral approach
17		throughout the conduct of the case?
18	Α.	That's an interesting one because, clearly, we
19		didn't much like some of the comments and the
20		attitude of the expert's report but that's his
21		report. So all we could do was try to counter
22		some of the claims with what we felt were
23	•	reasonable counterarguments.
24	Q.	5
25		professional approach throughout? 21
1		comply with that duty."
2		Were you aware at that time that an expert
3		owes duties to the court?
4	Α.	No, I hadn't seen that document at that time.
5	Q.	Irrespective of well, this document is in
6		fact part of the opinion that you were provided
7		with. If we scroll back you'll see that this is
8		just part of the opinion. It's, effectively,
9		the back page of the opinion. But, irrespective
10		of the opinion itself, you were somebody who was
11		providing statements in court proceedings. Were
12		you aware that an expert owes duties to the
13		court?
14	Α.	No, no.
15	Q.	We see there, near the bottom it says, "Law
16		Society 2003 Accredited Expert Witness", and it
17		gives his accredited expert witness number.
18		Can we now look at WITN04600302. So the
19		expert report is dated 21 January or
20		20 January, provided thereafter. By 11 February
21		2002, you are carrying out some investigations
22		in order to address what's written in that
23		report; is that correct?
24 25	A.	Yeah, that's correct, yeah.

25 $\,$ Q. So we have correspondence here between somebody $\,$

23

1	Α.	Yes, I think I did.
2	Q.	Let's look at the actual witness the expert's
3		report, it's WITN00210101. Now, we've been
4		through the report, it's over the page. We've
5		been through the various opinions with other
6		witnesses. I think you've been provided with
7		this as part of your preparation, so I'm not
8		going to go into detail at this stage on the
9		report itself. I just want to take you to
10		page 5 of the report, and that is the CV of the
11		expert that appeared as part of the report.
12		I'll just read to you the first few paragraphs.
13		He says there:
14		"I confirm that I have made clear in my
15		report those facts that are within my own
16		knowledge and which I believe to be true, and
17		that opinions I have expressed represent my true
18		and complete professional opinion.
19		"I have no known connection with any of the
20		parties, witnesses or advisers involved in this
21		case.
22		"Under the requirements of the Civil
23		Procedure Rules 1999, as amended in January 2002
24		I confirm that I fully understand my duty to the
25		court and I have complied and will continue to 22
1		called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones?
1 2	А.	
-	А.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones?
2	A.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was
2 3	A. Q.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer
2 3 4		called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but
2 3 4 5	Q.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but If we scroll down
2 3 4 5 6	Q. A.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but If we scroll down I can't remember.
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but If we scroll down I can't remember. we can see Mark Jones, MSU team. Who was the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but If we scroll down I can't remember. we can see Mark Jones, MSU team. Who was the MSU team?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but If we scroll down I can't remember. we can see Mark Jones, MSU team. Who was the MSU team? I don't know. Management Support Unit,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. A.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but If we scroll down I can't remember. we can see Mark Jones, MSU team. Who was the MSU team? I don't know. Management Support Unit, possibly.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but If we scroll down I can't remember. we can see Mark Jones, MSU team. Who was the MSU team? I don't know. Management Support Unit, possibly. Let's have a look at that email. It says: "Richard asked me to provide some call analysis from 2000. All the FADs here are 6
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but If we scroll down I can't remember. we can see Mark Jones, MSU team. Who was the MSU team? I don't know. Management Support Unit, possibly. Let's have a look at that email. It says: "Richard asked me to provide some call analysis from 2000. All the FADs here are 6 counter outlets Cleveleys comes out top (or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but If we scroll down I can't remember. we can see Mark Jones, MSU team. Who was the MSU team? I don't know. Management Support Unit, possibly. Let's have a look at that email. It says: "Richard asked me to provide some call analysis from 2000. All the FADs here are 6 counter outlets Cleveleys comes out top (or bottom) depending on your view."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but If we scroll down I can't remember. we can see Mark Jones, MSU team. Who was the MSU team? I don't know. Management Support Unit, possibly. Let's have a look at that email. It says: "Richard asked me to provide some call analysis from 2000. All the FADs here are 6 counter outlets Cleveleys comes out top (or bottom) depending on your view." Now, we see there that there are six
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but If we scroll down I can't remember. we can see Mark Jones, MSU team. Who was the MSU team? I don't know. Management Support Unit, possibly. Let's have a look at that email. It says: "Richard asked me to provide some call analysis from 2000. All the FADs here are 6 counter outlets Cleveleys comes out top (or bottom) depending on your view." Now, we see there that there are six outlets. You have Cleveleys. SD02 is software
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but If we scroll down I can't remember. we can see Mark Jones, MSU team. Who was the MSU team? I don't know. Management Support Unit, possibly. Let's have a look at that email. It says: "Richard asked me to provide some call analysis from 2000. All the FADs here are 6 counter outlets Cleveleys comes out top (or bottom) depending on your view." Now, we see there that there are six outlets. You have Cleveleys. SD02 is software error, so that's the code that's been attributed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but If we scroll down I can't remember. we can see Mark Jones, MSU team. Who was the MSU team? I don't know. Management Support Unit, possibly. Let's have a look at that email. It says: "Richard asked me to provide some call analysis from 2000. All the FADs here are 6 counter outlets Cleveleys comes out top (or bottom) depending on your view." Now, we see there that there are six outlets. You have Cleveleys. SD02 is software error, so that's the code that's been attributed by the Helpdesk for software errors and, on the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but If we scroll down I can't remember. we can see Mark Jones, MSU team. Who was the MSU team? I don't know. Management Support Unit, possibly. Let's have a look at that email. It says: "Richard asked me to provide some call analysis from 2000. All the FADs here are 6 counter outlets Cleveleys comes out top (or bottom) depending on your view." Now, we see there that there are six outlets. You have Cleveleys. SD02 is software error, so that's the code that's been attributed by the Helpdesk for software errors and, on the analysis from Mr Jones that's come back soon
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but If we scroll down I can't remember. we can see Mark Jones, MSU team. Who was the MSU team? I don't know. Management Support Unit, possibly. Let's have a look at that email. It says: "Richard asked me to provide some call analysis from 2000. All the FADs here are 6 counter outlets Cleveleys comes out top (or bottom) depending on your view." Now, we see there that there are six outlets. You have Cleveleys. SD02 is software error, so that's the code that's been attributed by the Helpdesk for software errors and, on the analysis from Mr Jones that's come back soon after your receipt of that report, it seems as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but If we scroll down I can't remember. we can see Mark Jones, MSU team. Who was the MSU team? I don't know. Management Support Unit, possibly. Let's have a look at that email. It says: "Richard asked me to provide some call analysis from 2000. All the FADs here are 6 counter outlets Cleveleys comes out top (or bottom) depending on your view." Now, we see there that there are six outlets. You have Cleveleys. SD02 is software error, so that's the code that's been attributed by the Helpdesk for software errors and, on the analysis from Mr Jones that's come back soon after your receipt of that report, it seems as though Cleveleys has quite a high number, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but If we scroll down I can't remember. we can see Mark Jones, MSU team. Who was the MSU team? I don't know. Management Support Unit, possibly. Let's have a look at that email. It says: "Richard asked me to provide some call analysis from 2000. All the FADs here are 6 counter outlets Cleveleys comes out top (or bottom) depending on your view." Now, we see there that there are six outlets. You have Cleveleys. SD02 is software error, so that's the code that's been attributed by the Helpdesk for software errors and, on the analysis from Mr Jones that's come back soon after your receipt of that report, it seems as though Cleveleys has quite a high number, in fact the highest comes out at the top or at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A.	called Mark Jones who was Mark Jones? I'm not sure I can remember. I think he was probably somebody who worked in customer services, but If we scroll down I can't remember. we can see Mark Jones, MSU team. Who was the MSU team? I don't know. Management Support Unit, possibly. Let's have a look at that email. It says: "Richard asked me to provide some call analysis from 2000. All the FADs here are 6 counter outlets Cleveleys comes out top (or bottom) depending on your view." Now, we see there that there are six outlets. You have Cleveleys. SD02 is software error, so that's the code that's been attributed by the Helpdesk for software errors and, on the analysis from Mr Jones that's come back soon after your receipt of that report, it seems as though Cleveleys has quite a high number, in

1		I mean, this analysis is very much the point	
2		that Mr Coyne was making in his report, isn't	
3	_	it?	
4	Α.	Well, I guess so, yes.	
5	Q.	So we're at February 2004. You knew at this	
6		stage, as we've been over the troubled history	
7		of the EPOSS product, you were aware of	
8		complaints by subpostmasters or you had access	
9		to those KELs and call logs that we have looked	
10		over and now you've received from Mr Jones of	
11		the Management Support Unit team figures that	
12 13		are entirely consistent with the report of Jason	
13 14		Coyne. Wasn't this, February 2004, the point to say	
14		there might actually be something in the	
16		subpostmistress's complaint?	
17	Α.		
18	Λ.	Post Office request for help. It's not our	
19		place. It was not our place, at least I wasn't	
20		aware it was my place, to start challenging on	
21		behalf of, you know, the postmaster or the	
22		postmistress, this information.	
23	Q.	Because, as you've said, you were entirely	
24		professional and neutral throughout?	
25	Α.	Indeed, yes. Trying to be.	
		25	
1		report was, in fact, received by you on	
2		6 February?	
3	Α.	Yeah.	
4	Q.	Can we please have a look over the page. You've	
5		said:	
6		"On P5. I have asked for an analysis of HSH	
7		calls from 1 January 2000 to 20 November 2000	
8		for Cleveleys and 20 other 6 Counter Outlets	
9		chosen at random with full error code analysis.	
10		I should have this today/tomorrow"	
11		It seems by that stage, having received that	
12		information from Mark Jones, which showed	
13		Cleveleys at the top or the bottom of the list,	
14		you then commissioned further analysis of 20	
15		other six-counter outlets or 20 six-counter	
16		outlets.	
17		I'd like to look at that final paragraph as	
18		well. You say at the end of that:	
19		"Blue screens and system freezes have always	
20		been a problem and the stock HSH reply has	
21		always been to reboot."	
22		Did you acknowledge at that time in February	
23 24		that blue screens and system freezes had always	
24 25	^	been a problem? Well isn't that what that sentence says?	
20	Α.	Well, isn't that what that sentence says? 27	
		£1	

1	Q.	I mean, you have the independent expert's report
2		and now you see that Cleveleys is very much
3		having problems with software errors. It was
4		only one branch. It had obviously made calls
5		about software errors. You didn't have the data
6		because it had been deleted. How could you be
7		confident that there was not a software issue in
8		the branch?
9	Α.	Well, I couldn't, could I?
10	Q.	Can we please look at WITN04600203. This is
11		a document that you produced. I think we've
12		seen a few of these kinds of documents. Are
13		they documents that you kept yourself, notes of
14		what was happening at the time?
15	Α.	Yeah, this was an internal a document for
16		internal consumption, just as an initial
17		response to that report because, clearly, Post
18		Office wanted us to make some kind of formal
19		response so these were, if you like, my first
20		drop down thoughts of what was going on.
21	Q.	If we scroll down, so you note there "Today,
22		(12 February)", so as we to take it that these
23		notes were written on 12 February?
24	A.	That's what that would imply, yes.
25	Q.	I think, if we look at the top, it says the
		26
1	Q.	Absolutely. So are those your words and your
1 2	Q.	Absolutely. So are those your words and your acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue
	Q.	, , , ,
2	Q.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue
2 3	Q.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been
2 3 4	Q. A.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes.
2 3 4 5		acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot?
2 3 4 5 6	A.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7	A.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes. Can we go to FUJ00121485. This is an early view
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes. Can we go to FUJ00121485. This is an early view that you have provided to Colin Lenton-Smith on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes. Can we go to FUJ00121485. This is an early view that you have provided to Colin Lenton-Smith on 18 February 2004. We can look at the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes. Can we go to FUJ00121485. This is an early view that you have provided to Colin Lenton-Smith on 18 February 2004. We can look at the attachment, that's FUJ00121486. So this is your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes. Can we go to FUJ00121485. This is an early view that you have provided to Colin Lenton-Smith on 18 February 2004. We can look at the attachment, that's FUJ00121486. So this is your early view response. We've seen this document
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes. Can we go to FUJ00121485. This is an early view that you have provided to Colin Lenton-Smith on 18 February 2004. We can look at the attachment, that's FUJ00121486. So this is your early view response. We've seen this document already but if we scroll down to the second half
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes. Can we go to FUJ00121485. This is an early view that you have provided to Colin Lenton-Smith on 18 February 2004. We can look at the attachment, that's FUJ00121486. So this is your early view response. We've seen this document already but if we scroll down to the second half of the page, it says:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes. Can we go to FUJ00121485. This is an early view that you have provided to Colin Lenton-Smith on 18 February 2004. We can look at the attachment, that's FUJ00121486. So this is your early view response. We've seen this document already but if we scroll down to the second half of the page, it says: "On 6 February POA [that's Fujitsu's Post
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes. Can we go to FUJ00121485. This is an early view that you have provided to Colin Lenton-Smith on 18 February 2004. We can look at the attachment, that's FUJ00121486. So this is your early view response. We've seen this document already but if we scroll down to the second half of the page, it says: "On 6 February POA [that's Fujitsu's Post Office Account] received a copy of the Expert's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes. Can we go to FUJ00121485. This is an early view that you have provided to Colin Lenton-Smith on 18 February 2004. We can look at the attachment, that's FUJ00121486. So this is your early view response. We've seen this document already but if we scroll down to the second half of the page, it says: "On 6 February POA [that's Fujitsu's Post Office Account] received a copy of the Expert's report with a request from POL for an early
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes. Can we go to FUJ00121485. This is an early view that you have provided to Colin Lenton-Smith on 18 February 2004. We can look at the attachment, that's FUJ00121486. So this is your early view response. We've seen this document already but if we scroll down to the second half of the page, it says: "On 6 February POA [that's Fujitsu's Post Office Account] received a copy of the Expert's report with a request from POL for an early response. POL are concerned that the Expert's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes. Can we go to FUJ00121485. This is an early view that you have provided to Colin Lenton-Smith on 18 February 2004. We can look at the attachment, that's FUJ00121486. So this is your early view response. We've seen this document already but if we scroll down to the second half of the page, it says: "On 6 February POA [that's Fujitsu's Post Office Account] received a copy of the Expert's report with a request from POL for an early response. POL are concerned that the Expert's opinion (that the system was at fault) might set
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes. Can we go to FUJ00121485. This is an early view that you have provided to Colin Lenton-Smith on 18 February 2004. We can look at the attachment, that's FUJ00121486. So this is your early view response. We've seen this document already but if we scroll down to the second half of the page, it says: "On 6 February POA [that's Fujitsu's Post Office Account] received a copy of the Expert's report with a request from POL for an early response. POL are concerned that the Expert's opinion (that the system was at fault) might set a precedent against future POL prosecutions."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes. Can we go to FUJ00121485. This is an early view that you have provided to Colin Lenton-Smith on 18 February 2004. We can look at the attachment, that's FUJ00121486. So this is your early view response. We've seen this document already but if we scroll down to the second half of the page, it says: "On 6 February POA [that's Fujitsu's Post Office Account] received a copy of the Expert's report with a request from POL for an early response. POL are concerned that the Expert's opinion (that the system was at fault) might set a precedent against future POL prosecutions." So that's essentially that letter that we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes. Can we go to FUJ00121485. This is an early view that you have provided to Colin Lenton-Smith on 18 February 2004. We can look at the attachment, that's FUJ00121486. So this is your early view response. We've seen this document already but if we scroll down to the second half of the page, it says: "On 6 February POA [that's Fujitsu's Post Office Account] received a copy of the Expert's report with a request from POL for an early response. POL are concerned that the Expert's opinion (that the system was at fault) might set a precedent against future POL prosecutions." So that's essentially that letter that we saw from the Post Office; is that right?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes. Can we go to FUJ00121485. This is an early view that you have provided to Colin Lenton-Smith on 18 February 2004. We can look at the attachment, that's FUJ00121486. So this is your early view response. We've seen this document already but if we scroll down to the second half of the page, it says: "On 6 February POA [that's Fujitsu's Post Office Account] received a copy of the Expert's report with a request from POL for an early response. POL are concerned that the Expert's opinion (that the system was at fault) might set a precedent against future POL prosecutions." So that's essentially that letter that we saw from the Post Office; is that right? Yeah, that was our understanding at the time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q.	acknowledgement there, at that time, that blue screens and system freezes had always been a problem and the stock, as in the standard, the automatic, HSH reply had always been to reboot? That was my understanding at the time, yes. Can we go to FUJ00121485. This is an early view that you have provided to Colin Lenton-Smith on 18 February 2004. We can look at the attachment, that's FUJ00121486. So this is your early view response. We've seen this document already but if we scroll down to the second half of the page, it says: "On 6 February POA [that's Fujitsu's Post Office Account] received a copy of the Expert's report with a request from POL for an early response. POL are concerned that the Expert's opinion (that the system was at fault) might set a precedent against future POL prosecutions." So that's essentially that letter that we saw from the Post Office; is that right? Yeah, that was our understanding at the time. Or my understanding at the time.

(7) Pages 25 - 28

1		"[Post Office Account] are able to review
2		an unregulated archive of records of the other
3		installed 6 Counter Outlets over a comparable
4		period. At the table below shows the output
5		from that analysis."
6		Now, sorry, could we just stick there for
7		one moment on the previous page.
8		So the unregulated archive are records of
9		the other installed six-counter outlets over
10		a comparable period. Do you remember what that
11		exactly meant? Because that's quite it seems
12		to be quite specifically worded, "the other
13		installed 6 counter outlets".
14	Α.	Yeah, now on an earlier document, I said
15		I wanted an analysis of 20 six-counter outlets
16		selected at random. So when this information
17		came back, if you scroll down, you will see that
18		there aren't 20 six-counter outlets in existence
19		at that time.
20	Q.	Absolutely. Well, there aren't 20 in that
21		table.
22	Α.	No, but those are the six-counter outlets that
23		were identified, I believe. So there weren't
24		any dropped off the end. They were the
25		six-counter outlets in existence at that point
		29
1	Α.	So it appears.
2	Q.	Do you know why those original figures were
3		excluded from this table?
4	Α.	No, I've no idea. I mean, this second table on
5		the right was also provided to me. So, you
6		know, I'm just being fed information to try to
7		put it together to form some kind of coherent
8		response. To be fair, I didn't notice the
9		disparity between the two lists. Well
10	Q.	Is it possible that some were removed that
11		didn't suit your case?
12	Α.	Not by me.
13	~	We can take down the left-hand side now. Thank
14	Q.	
	Q.	you very much. In this table, the one that has
15	ų.	
15 16	Q.	you very much. In this table, the one that has been provided that doesn't provide those other counters with the lower figures, in that table
	Q.	you very much. In this table, the one that has been provided that doesn't provide those other counters with the lower figures, in that table we still see Cleveleys with the second highest
16 17 18	ų.	you very much. In this table, the one that has been provided that doesn't provide those other counters with the lower figures, in that table
16 17	Q. A.	you very much. In this table, the one that has been provided that doesn't provide those other counters with the lower figures, in that table we still see Cleveleys with the second highest
16 17 18 19 20		you very much. In this table, the one that has been provided that doesn't provide those other counters with the lower figures, in that table we still see Cleveleys with the second highest figure for "S", software issues. Yeah. Again, I don't want to repeat all the things
16 17 18 19	А.	you very much. In this table, the one that has been provided that doesn't provide those other counters with the lower figures, in that table we still see Cleveleys with the second highest figure for "S", software issues. Yeah.

22 logs that were available, the table that you

- 23 originally received, your knowledge of things
- 24 like blue screen freezes, blue screen system
- 25 freezes. Looking at this, software number 2,

- in time.
- 2 Q. Can we put that side by side with WITN04600302,
- please. Thank you very much. So that's the 3
- 4 email you received from Mark Jones.
- 5 A. Yes.

1

7

- 6 Q. Let's look at the left-hand side. He is saying all the FADs here are six-counter outlets?
- 8 A. Yeah.
- Q. Worlds End, where's Worlds End on the right-hand 9 side? 10
- 11 Α. No, I can't see it.
- Shoreham-by-Sea? 12 Q.
- 13 No, can't see it. Α.
- 14 Q. Cookstown?
- A. Can't see it. 15
- 16 Q. Halstead is there, in fact, on the right-hand
- 17 side, so there is one that matches, although, on
- the left-hand side we have three SD02 codes but 18
- 19 that has increased to seven on the right-hand
- 20 side. Staines?
- A. No, I can't explain the discrepancy. 21
- 22 Q. I mean, those previous six counter outlets that 23 had been identified seem to largely have been
- excluded from this table, the ones that had low 24
 - numbers for software errors?
 - 30

1		the second worst in terms of numbers. Did this
2		not give you pause for thought at this stage?
3	Α.	No, because that wasn't what I was doing here.
4		I wasn't, sort of, doing some kind of
5		substantive test of the numbers and of errors.
6		I was merely collating information to respond to
7		the report. So whether that's an oversight on
8		my part, okay, but I wasn't there analysing the
9		figures themselves to understand what was going
10		on beneath them. I was merely collating them to
11		make a response.
12	Q.	Cleveleys seems to have distinguished between
13		rollout and post-rollout, that's the difference
14		between 1 and 2. Was there the same analysis
15		for those other branches or was it just
16		Cleveleys that the two differences were
17		identified?
18	Α.	No, it looks just like Cleveleys.
19	Q.	Even if we take the second, the lower figure,
20		because it doesn't include the Horizon rollout,
21		the subpostmistress still had cause to call the
22		Helpdesk 85 times in that period.
23	Α.	Mm-hm.

- 24 Q. It's not beyond fantasy that Mrs Wolstenholme
- 25 may have been experiencing software problems 32

1		with Harizon is it?
2	Α.	with Horizon, is it? Well, no, those figures suggest that that was
2	А.	the case.
4	Q.	If we scroll down, there's the comment about
5	·	Ms Elaine Tagg's statement. I wonder, actually,
6		if we could bring that on to screen. The
7		extract from Ms Tagg's statement in Mr Coyne's
8		report. That's WITN00210101. If that could be
9		bought alongside, that would be fantastic. So
10		it's the second, over the page on the left-hand
11		side, and it is that second the second half
12		of that page. Thank you. So on the right-hand
13		side, what you've said about the statement of
14		Ms Elaine Tagg is:
15		"Based on the analysis, and without
16		analysing each and every call record it would be
17		hard to dispute the opinion of the Expert."
18		On the left-hand side, it shows what the
19		expert was saying. He identified that Ms Elaine
20		Tagg had said that:
21		"'Mrs Wolstenholme persisted in telephoning
22		the Horizon System Helpdesk in relation to any
23		problems which she had with the system
24		generally, these problems related to the use and
25		general operation of the system and were not 33
		55
1		side, please, and enlarge thank you. If we
2		could scroll over to the next page, page 3. We
3		then get to the "Operator advice to 'Reboot'",
4		and the second paragraph there, you say:
5		"In this context the opinion of the Expert,
6 7		that 'this instruction treats the effect and not
7 0		the cause' is correct." Again, it seems, at least in some respects
8 9		there, you are agreeing with Mr Coyne?
10	Α.	Well, yes, he is right. I mean, rebooting the
11		system might be the instruction that's given to
12		the postmaster and it does deal with the effect
13		and not the cause. So there should be further
14		work undertaken to try to understand what the
15		cause was, determine the root cause and find
16		a way of removing it.
17	Q.	In this document, so in this initial response,
18		one thing you don't go as far as to say is your
19		admission that blue screens and freezes have
20		always been a problem. I don't think that's
21		contained in this document, is it?
22	Α.	Possibly not, no.
23	Q.	If we scroll down to the final paragraph in this
24		document, about discrepancies, it says:
25		"This argument has been put forward by
		35

1		technical problems'"
2		Then Mr Coyne's opinion was:
3		"This, in my opinion is not a true
4		representation on the evidence that have had
5		access to."
6		It seems as though you agreed with Mr Coyne
7		in that respect, at least at that stage.
8	Α.	Well, insofar as I said based on the analysis,
9		either table, but without analysing each and
10		every call record, you know, it's hard to
11	-	dispute. It is.
12	Q.	Because I think you're saying on the right-hand
13		side that, even if you take out the 15 that are
14		classified as advice and guidance and the 16
15		that are to do with the rollout, you still have
16		70 calls. So Mrs Tagg's statement in that
17		respect can't possibly be right in terms of them
18		not being technical problems; is that right?
19	Α.	Yeah, well, I guess so. I mean clearly there
20		were some problems there that Mrs Wolstenholme
21 22	~	was experiencing.
22	Q.	There is at least some truth in Mr Coyne's
23 24	A.	opinion in that respect? Yes, I believe that's the case, yeah.
24 25	д.	Can we stay with the document on the right-hand
25	α.	34
1		a number of PMc in the past when challenged and
1		a number of PMs in the past when challenged and
2		prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent
2 3		prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when
2 3 4		prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates
2 3 4 5		prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during
2 3 4 5 6		prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period."
2 3 4 5 6 7		prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period." Was that the general view at Fujitsu? Is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8		prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period." Was that the general view at Fujitsu? Is that a view that was held by your colleagues:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period." Was that the general view at Fujitsu? Is that a view that was held by your colleagues: that because it hadn't been proved in the past,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period." Was that the general view at Fujitsu? Is that a view that was held by your colleagues: that because it hadn't been proved in the past, that in itself demonstrates that there isn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A.	prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period." Was that the general view at Fujitsu? Is that a view that was held by your colleagues: that because it hadn't been proved in the past,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q.	prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period." Was that the general view at Fujitsu? Is that a view that was held by your colleagues: that because it hadn't been proved in the past, that in itself demonstrates that there isn't a problem? Yeah, that's fair enough. You could say that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period." Was that the general view at Fujitsu? Is that a view that was held by your colleagues: that because it hadn't been proved in the past, that in itself demonstrates that there isn't a problem? Yeah, that's fair enough. You could say that. Can we please now look at WITN04600304. We are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period." Was that the general view at Fujitsu? Is that a view that was held by your colleagues: that because it hadn't been proved in the past, that in itself demonstrates that there isn't a problem? Yeah, that's fair enough. You could say that. Can we please now look at WITN04600304. We are now on 17 February 2004, and this is an email
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period." Was that the general view at Fujitsu? Is that a view that was held by your colleagues: that because it hadn't been proved in the past, that in itself demonstrates that there isn't a problem? Yeah, that's fair enough. You could say that. Can we please now look at WITN04600304. We are
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period." Was that the general view at Fujitsu? Is that a view that was held by your colleagues: that because it hadn't been proved in the past, that in itself demonstrates that there isn't a problem? Yeah, that's fair enough. You could say that. Can we please now look at WITN04600304. We are now on 17 February 2004, and this is an email from Steve Parker. Can you help us with who
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period." Was that the general view at Fujitsu? Is that a view that was held by your colleagues: that because it hadn't been proved in the past, that in itself demonstrates that there isn't a problem? Yeah, that's fair enough. You could say that. Can we please now look at WITN04600304. We are now on 17 February 2004, and this is an email from Steve Parker. Can you help us with who Steve Parker was?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q.	prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period." Was that the general view at Fujitsu? Is that a view that was held by your colleagues: that because it hadn't been proved in the past, that in itself demonstrates that there isn't a problem? Yeah, that's fair enough. You could say that. Can we please now look at WITN04600304. We are now on 17 February 2004, and this is an email from Steve Parker. Can you help us with who Steve Parker was? No, I was looking at this myself the other day
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q.	prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period." Was that the general view at Fujitsu? Is that a view that was held by your colleagues: that because it hadn't been proved in the past, that in itself demonstrates that there isn't a problem? Yeah, that's fair enough. You could say that. Can we please now look at WITN04600304. We are now on 17 February 2004, and this is an email from Steve Parker. Can you help us with who Steve Parker was? No, I was looking at this myself the other day and can you just scroll down to what was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A.	prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period." Was that the general view at Fujitsu? Is that a view that was held by your colleagues: that because it hadn't been proved in the past, that in itself demonstrates that there isn't a problem? Yeah, that's fair enough. You could say that. Can we please now look at WITN04600304. We are now on 17 February 2004, and this is an email from Steve Parker. Can you help us with who Steve Parker was? No, I was looking at this myself the other day and can you just scroll down to what was presumably my request for help?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q.	prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period." Was that the general view at Fujitsu? Is that a view that was held by your colleagues: that because it hadn't been proved in the past, that in itself demonstrates that there isn't a problem? Yeah, that's fair enough. You could say that. Can we please now look at WITN04600304. We are now on 17 February 2004, and this is an email from Steve Parker. Can you help us with who Steve Parker was? No, I was looking at this myself the other day and can you just scroll down to what was presumably my request for help? Absolutely.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q.	prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period." Was that the general view at Fujitsu? Is that a view that was held by your colleagues: that because it hadn't been proved in the past, that in itself demonstrates that there isn't a problem? Yeah, that's fair enough. You could say that. Can we please now look at WITN04600304. We are now on 17 February 2004, and this is an email from Steve Parker. Can you help us with who Steve Parker was? No, I was looking at this myself the other day and can you just scroll down to what was presumably my request for help? Absolutely. Right, well, that's not very helpful, is it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q.	prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period." Was that the general view at Fujitsu? Is that a view that was held by your colleagues: that because it hadn't been proved in the past, that in itself demonstrates that there isn't a problem? Yeah, that's fair enough. You could say that. Can we please now look at WITN04600304. We are now on 17 February 2004, and this is an email from Steve Parker. Can you help us with who Steve Parker was? No, I was looking at this myself the other day and can you just scroll down to what was presumably my request for help? Absolutely. Right, well, that's not very helpful, is it? Yeah. So, obviously, I sent him the expert
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A.	prosecuted by POL for alleged fraudulent behaviour and each time it has fallen when confronted by transaction data that demonstrates that the system was operating normally during the disputed time period." Was that the general view at Fujitsu? Is that a view that was held by your colleagues: that because it hadn't been proved in the past, that in itself demonstrates that there isn't a problem? Yeah, that's fair enough. You could say that. Can we please now look at WITN04600304. We are now on 17 February 2004, and this is an email from Steve Parker. Can you help us with who Steve Parker was? No, I was looking at this myself the other day and can you just scroll down to what was presumably my request for help? Absolutely. Right, well, that's not very helpful, is it? Yeah. So, obviously, I sent him the expert report and the call volume comparison.

(9) Pages 33 - 36

1	Q.	the words in I'm slightly colourblind,
2		I think I'd say purple
3	Α.	Blue.
4	Q.	blue are from Steve Parker; is that right?
5	Α.	Yes, that's correct, yeah.
6	Q.	He said:
7		"I have had a chance to read through this
8		now. Here are a few thoughts you might like to
9		develop."
10		It's the "Worrying discrepancies" section
11		that I'd like to look at. It says:
12		"Must be the major issue. Counter systems
13		cause discrepancies."
14		I think he's stating that that is the
15		argument that is put forward:
16		"Answer has to be 'no way':
17		"a) Almost all accounting errors in computer
18		systems are caused by user error. GIGO
19		principle."
20 21		Did you understand that to be "garbage in
21	Α.	garbage out" principle? Yes. Yes, I did, yeah.
22	Q.	Then it says systems are in place to resolve
23 24	ω.	discrepancies, and then we have:
25		"Yes, software errors can make such
20		37
1	Q.	Can we look at WITN04600305. This is a response
1 2	Q.	Can we look at WITN04600305. This is a response from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his
	Q.	
2	Q.	from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his
2 3	Q.	from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is
2 3 4	Q.	from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words.
2 3 4 5	Q.	from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words. You say there:
2 3 4 5 6	Q.	from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words. You say there: "The Cleveleys situation has us a bit on the
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words. You say there: "The Cleveleys situation has us a bit on the back foot and I'm having to bring in POL imposed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words. You say there: "The Cleveleys situation has us a bit on the back foot and I'm having to bring in POL imposed SLAs as a form of justification for HSH advice
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words. You say there: "The Cleveleys situation has us a bit on the back foot and I'm having to bring in POL imposed SLAs as a form of justification for HSH advice being to reboot 9 times out of 10."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words. You say there: "The Cleveleys situation has us a bit on the back foot and I'm having to bring in POL imposed SLAs as a form of justification for HSH advice being to reboot 9 times out of 10." Back foot: I mean, that sounds a bit like
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words. You say there: "The Cleveleys situation has us a bit on the back foot and I'm having to bring in POL imposed SLAs as a form of justification for HSH advice being to reboot 9 times out of 10." Back foot: I mean, that sounds a bit like a competition, like you're getting out-manoeuvred. Was that your concern at the time?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A.	from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words. You say there: "The Cleveleys situation has us a bit on the back foot and I'm having to bring in POL imposed SLAs as a form of justification for HSH advice being to reboot 9 times out of 10." Back foot: I mean, that sounds a bit like a competition, like you're getting out-manoeuvred. Was that your concern at the time? No, out-manoeuvre is wrong. I mean we had to go
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words. You say there: "The Cleveleys situation has us a bit on the back foot and I'm having to bring in POL imposed SLAs as a form of justification for HSH advice being to reboot 9 times out of 10." Back foot: I mean, that sounds a bit like a competition, like you're getting out-manoeuvred. Was that your concern at the time? No, out-manoeuvre is wrong. I mean we had to go on the defensive and clearly HSH advice being to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words. You say there: "The Cleveleys situation has us a bit on the back foot and I'm having to bring in POL imposed SLAs as a form of justification for HSH advice being to reboot 9 times out of 10." Back foot: I mean, that sounds a bit like a competition, like you're getting out-manoeuvred. Was that your concern at the time? No, out-manoeuvre is wrong. I mean we had to go on the defensive and clearly HSH advice being to reboot nine times out of ten, on the face of it,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words. You say there: "The Cleveleys situation has us a bit on the back foot and I'm having to bring in POL imposed SLAs as a form of justification for HSH advice being to reboot 9 times out of 10." Back foot: I mean, that sounds a bit like a competition, like you're getting out-manoeuvred. Was that your concern at the time? No, out-manoeuvre is wrong. I mean we had to go on the defensive and clearly HSH advice being to reboot nine times out of ten, on the face of it, looks unacceptable, so we have to understand why
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words. You say there: "The Cleveleys situation has us a bit on the back foot and I'm having to bring in POL imposed SLAs as a form of justification for HSH advice being to reboot 9 times out of 10." Back foot: I mean, that sounds a bit like a competition, like you're getting out-manoeuvred. Was that your concern at the time? No, out-manoeuvre is wrong. I mean we had to go on the defensive and clearly HSH advice being to reboot nine times out of ten, on the face of it, looks unacceptable, so we have to understand why that is. And the argument was used that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19		from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words. You say there: "The Cleveleys situation has us a bit on the back foot and I'm having to bring in POL imposed SLAs as a form of justification for HSH advice being to reboot 9 times out of 10." Back foot: I mean, that sounds a bit like a competition, like you're getting out-manoeuvred. Was that your concern at the time? No, out-manoeuvre is wrong. I mean we had to go on the defensive and clearly HSH advice being to reboot nine times out of ten, on the face of it, looks unacceptable, so we have to understand why that is. And the argument was used that the purpose of the HSH is to get the postmasters up
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20		from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words. You say there: "The Cleveleys situation has us a bit on the back foot and I'm having to bring in POL imposed SLAs as a form of justification for HSH advice being to reboot 9 times out of 10." Back foot: I mean, that sounds a bit like a competition, like you're getting out-manoeuvred. Was that your concern at the time? No, out-manoeuvre is wrong. I mean we had to go on the defensive and clearly HSH advice being to reboot nine times out of ten, on the face of it, looks unacceptable, so we have to understand why that is. And the argument was used that the purpose of the HSH is to get the postmasters up and running as quickly as possible and not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words. You say there: "The Cleveleys situation has us a bit on the back foot and I'm having to bring in POL imposed SLAs as a form of justification for HSH advice being to reboot 9 times out of 10." Back foot: I mean, that sounds a bit like a competition, like you're getting out-manoeuvred. Was that your concern at the time? No, out-manoeuvre is wrong. I mean we had to go on the defensive and clearly HSH advice being to reboot nine times out of ten, on the face of it, looks unacceptable, so we have to understand why that is. And the argument was used that the purpose of the HSH is to get the postmasters up and running as quickly as possible and not interfere and not interrupt their business
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words. You say there: "The Cleveleys situation has us a bit on the back foot and I'm having to bring in POL imposed SLAs as a form of justification for HSH advice being to reboot 9 times out of 10." Back foot: I mean, that sounds a bit like a competition, like you're getting out-manoeuvred. Was that your concern at the time? No, out-manoeuvre is wrong. I mean we had to go on the defensive and clearly HSH advice being to reboot nine times out of ten, on the face of it, looks unacceptable, so we have to understand why that is. And the argument was used that the purpose of the HSH is to get the postmasters up and running as quickly as possible and not interfere and not interrupt their business cycle.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words. You say there: "The Cleveleys situation has us a bit on the back foot and I'm having to bring in POL imposed SLAs as a form of justification for HSH advice being to reboot 9 times out of 10." Back foot: I mean, that sounds a bit like a competition, like you're getting out-manoeuvred. Was that your concern at the time? No, out-manoeuvre is wrong. I mean we had to go on the defensive and clearly HSH advice being to reboot nine times out of ten, on the face of it, looks unacceptable, so we have to understand why that is. And the argument was used that the purpose of the HSH is to get the postmasters up and running as quickly as possible and not interfere and not interrupt their business cycle. So sometimes the easy answer was to say
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		from Richard Brunskill to yourself. So his response is in colour. Your original email is in black. I'm going to start with your words. You say there: "The Cleveleys situation has us a bit on the back foot and I'm having to bring in POL imposed SLAs as a form of justification for HSH advice being to reboot 9 times out of 10." Back foot: I mean, that sounds a bit like a competition, like you're getting out-manoeuvred. Was that your concern at the time? No, out-manoeuvre is wrong. I mean we had to go on the defensive and clearly HSH advice being to reboot nine times out of ten, on the face of it, looks unacceptable, so we have to understand why that is. And the argument was used that the purpose of the HSH is to get the postmasters up and running as quickly as possible and not interfere and not interrupt their business cycle.

on IT	n IT Inquiry 28 Ju		
1		mistakes. However, the systems in place ensure	
2		that such errors are picked up and resolved. If	
3		this problem was caused by a software error, the	
4		same error would exist on all Horizon sites.	
5		17,000 [postmasters] are not complaining of	
6		misbalancing and discrepancies."	
7		I mean, that is nonsense, isn't it?	
8	Α.	I at the time, I thought that was rather glib	
9		and I don't think I don't think any of this	
10		was used in further correspondence between me	
11		and the Post Office.	
12	Q.	I mean, it seems the impression that's given	
13		is that it's getting a little desperate to look	
14		for some sort of counterargument to what	
15		Mr Coyne is saying; would you accept that?	
16	Α.	Yeah, I mean, if I can remember who Steve Parker	
17		was and what role he played, what position he	
18		had, I might be able to put this more into	
19		context as to why that reply came back looking	
20		like it did. But I remember at the time, it	
21		wasn't I wasn't overly impressed with it and,	
22		you know, the comment at the end that, you know,	
23		it would exist on all Horizon sites 17,000, PMs	
24		are not complaining, I mean, that's well, I'm	
25		sorry, that's just silly.	
		38	
1		what happened to that after they rebooted? Did	
		mat mappenda to that alter they reposited. Dia	

1		what happened to that after they rebooted? Did
2		they do anything with it? Well, yes, they did
3		because the presence of KELs where these things
4		have been further investigated, suggests that
5		work was done after the event to try to better
6		understand what was going on. So it wasn't just
7		the case of "Yeah, you've got a problem, reboot;
8		next one, reboot; next one". It wasn't quite
9		that straightforward and simple.
10	Q.	That's not actually the question I'm asking you.
11		I'm asking you about that first sentence and the
12		way that it's worded. You're saying you're on
13		the back foot and then you're saying, "I'm
14		having to bring POL imposed SLAs a form of
15		justification". Now, it might be suggested that
16		having to bring in the SLAs, it means you didn't
17		otherwise have a good answer to why the advice
18		was to reboot nine out of ten times.
19	Α.	Yeah, well, that's a fair comment.
20	Q.	I mean, thinking back to your evidence earlier
21		and about how you were professionally and coolly
22		responding, only providing information, do you
23		think by this stage you've lost a little bit of
24		objectivity?
25	Α.	I don't think so. I mean, you know, I'm trying 40

1		to I say, justify. I mean if the advice is	1	
2		being given by the HSH to do that, they must be	2	
3		doing it that for a reason, and one of those	3	
4		reasons is SLAs that are imposed by POL to get	4	
5		the postmasters up and running a bit more	5	
6		quickly. Having us on the bit of a back foot is	6	
7		just a phrase, isn't it? I mean, we're trying	7	
8		to find ways of or I'm trying to find ways of	8	
9		justifying the advice but not necessarily just	9	
10		limiting it to that advice. You don't just do	10	
11		that and walk away.	11	
12	Q.	If we look at what Mr Brunskill has said, in	12	
13		response to question 1, your question was: "	13	
14		"Time to fault resolution from original call	14	
15		and how was fault resolution defined getting	15	
16		the Outlet back up or fully resolving the	16	
17		problem?"	17	
18		So your question about the SLAs, was the SLA	18	
19		about getting the outlet up and running or was	19	
20		it about actually resolving the problem? We	20	
21		have there	21	Α
22	Α.	(Unclear).	22	
23	Q.	Mr Brunskill's response. He says:	23	
24		"Depends on the issue. Simple advice and	24	Q
25		guidance at the time centred around	25	
		41		
1		about getting up and running again, essentially	1	
2		as quickly as possible.	2	
3	Α.	That's correct, yeah.	3	
4	Q.		4	
5	.	"Hence the proliferation of reboots to solve	5	
6		known problems"	6	
7		Proliferation, it's not a positive word.	7	
8		I mean, it's often used in the context of	8	A
9		nuclear weapons, something you don't want to	9	
10		happen. Is your reading here that he is not	10	
11		being overly positive about the use of reboots	11	
12		to fix problems?	12	Q
13	Α.	No, I didn't read that into his words. I just	13	Ā
14	Π.	read it as a high number.	14	~
15	Q.	Do you read it now, looking at it,	15	
16	ч.	"proliferation of reboots"? I mean	16	Q
17	Α.		17	Ā
18		of ten reboots being the solution from the	18	
19		Horizon System Helpdesk. I didn't see anything	19	
20		deeper in it than that.	20	
20	Q.		20	
22	ч.	response, here from David Cooke.	21	
23	Α.	Yeah.	22	
23	Q.		23	Q
25	ч.	what I want to understand is that second	24	-34
20		43	20	

דו	[Inq	uiry 28 Ju
		resolution in 5, 10, 30 or 45 minutes depending on the query. Blue screens or system freezes would generally have been coded as 'Software' and claimed under break fix SLTs, which, depending on which branches location, fall into the local, intermediate or remote category with anything from 4 to 24 hours to fix. I would expect a software call to be resolved by either a reboot, workaround or kit swap. The underlying issue is not subject to SLA this can be fixed as per release timetable, etc, the issues under the SLA is 'get the branch up and running again'. Hence the proliferation of reboots to solve known problems and get things
5		going." So what he's saying there is that the SLA is
7		not about fixing the problem. It's about
3		getting the branches up and running because it's
)		about timing and speed of resolution. Do you
)		accept that?
1	Α.	It's to do with timing to get the branch up and
2		running again. The problem resolution is
3	~	subject to other activities and other schedules.
1 5	Q.	What he's saying there is that you can't rely on the SLA about resolution because the SLA is 42
		paragraph. He says: " any reboots that took place during
		a session would have wiped all EPOSS
		transactions."
		Am I to read into this that there is
		a suggestion that reboots could wipe EPOSS
		transactions or not?
	Α.	Well, that's what the words say, and David and
		James were both very knowledgeable members of
)		the technical members of the team. So if
2	Q.	this is Dave Cooke, isn't it? Yes.
3	Q. A.	So if Dave says any reboots that took place
1	7.0	during the session would have wiped all EPOSS
5		transactions, I would take that as a truth.
3	Q.	Is that potentially problematic?
7	Α.	I don't know because I don't know all the
3		technical details that go behind the reboot and
9		wiping old transactions and re-establishing
)		transactions once they've been rebooted. As
1		I said in my first in November, I'm not
2		a technical person. So you're getting into
3	~	levels of detail that I really can't answer.
1 5	Q.	Well, I mean, these are emails to you from people providing you with information in which 44

(11) Pages 41 - 44

1		to respond to an expert a technical expert's
2		report. At the time, did you feel you didn't
3		have the technical expertise to respond to that
4		expert report?
5	Α.	No, because I did reply to it and
6	Q.	
7		expertise to be able to address these matters"?
8	Α.	No, I can reflect what people tell me.
9	Q.	I mean, we're in the context of litigation here,
10		court proceedings, quite a serious matter, where
11		witness statements are being provided and
12		an expert has been jointly instructed,
13		a response is being provided to that expert in
14		the context of court proceedings. Do you feel
15		you didn't have the expertise to be doing the
16		job you were doing in that respect?
17	Α.	Well, I felt comfortable at the time but, now
18	~	you're challenging it, I'm not so sure I was.
19	Q.	
20		now on 20 February 2004. This is the response
21		to Keith Baines from Colin Lenton-Smith,
22		attaching the appendix which is the response. Yeah.
23 24	A. Q.	
24 25	Q.	lf we turn over the page, please, thank you. "Horizon System Helpdesk".
25		45
4		
1		about the speed at which we get up". It's not
2 3		about resolving the the SLA itself is not
3 4		about resolving the underlying dispute, technical issue
4 5	Α.	Is that what you mean by "fully"? So you
6	А.	fully if you fully resolve the call, you get
7		them up and running and you solve the problem.
8		In that case, no, the SLA isn't about fully
9		doing that. It's about getting the outlet back
10		up and running.
11	Q.	Do you think it was still appropriate, after
12	.	having received Mr Brunskill's email, to be
13		focusing in your response on the SLA, which was
14		about quick fix?
15	Α.	In response to the statement of nine out of ten,
16		I can't think of any other way of doing it. You
17		know, if the reboot advice is there and it's
18		happening nine times out of ten or too many
19		times to be acceptable to Mr Coyne, based on his
20		knowledge and experience, we have to explain why
21		that is operating like that, with that frequency
22		of reboots, and the reason it was, was through
23		the SLAs requiring that we get the post offices
24		back up and running.
25	Q.	What Mr Brunskill is saying is that the
		47

iiry 28 Ju
Sorry to trouble you again, but could we
bring onto screen WITN04600305 alongside this.
Thank you very much.
The first paragraph under "Horizon System
Helpdesk", it says:
"It operates under strict contractual
Service Level Agreements covering aspects such
as pick-up time, first time fix and time to
close."
Refreshing our memory from what Richard
Brunskill said, I mean the essence of what he
said was it's not really about the SLA. Do you
think there was too much focus, in light of
that, on the right-hand side in the response on
the SLA?
I'm not quite sure what you're getting at. The
SLA exists and has to be met in our relationship
with the Post Office.
Your request to Richard Brunskill was about "I'm
•
having to bring in the SLA in order to defend
ourselves. I effectively want to say that
that's going to that that's also about
getting the outlet back up and running fully",
and Richards response to you is "It's not really
about getting it up and running fully; it's 46
40
underlying issue itself is not subject to the
SLA.
No, it's not. Because that will fall into
a different sort of line of activity, which
was I suppose putting all these problems into
a bucket, looking at PinICLs and PEAKs, and then
aligning them with releases where the work is
done to fix the problem, or putting a workaround
in place through a KEL.
The final sentence of Mr Brunskill's first
paragraph, where he says "Hence the
proliferation of reboots to solve known problems
and get things going", does that in any way
feature in the response?
What in the response on the right?
Yes. So the kind of you know, his mention of
proliferation of reboots, the mention of known
problems. Does the words "known problems" even
appear on the right-hand side?
No, because on the right-hand side we're saying
why we do the reboots:
" quick response to their call and, to
the extent possible over the phone time,
a timely"
Sorry: 48
40

(12) Pages 45 - 48

1		" a quick response to their call and, to
2		the extent possible over the phone, a timely
3		return to normal business operations", which is
4		what the SLA was trying to do.
5	Q.	If you had mentioned in that response that
6		people were being told to reboot to solve known
7		problems, to get things going, do you think that
8		that would have undermined your case?
9	Α.	No, because the desire to reboot to get the
10		business up and running still exists, whether
11		it's a known fault or an unknown fault new
12		fault.
13	Q.	Is there a reference to known faults on the
14		right-hand side?
15	Α.	I don't know. I don't think so.
16	Q.	Can we keep the right-hand side on the screen,
17		please, and turn to page number 4 of that
18		document. We have there, I think for the first
19		time, this paragraph:
20		"It is worth noting that Fujitsu Services is
21		not aware of similar complaints or claims being
22		made from other Outlets in the above list, some
23		of which have higher call profiles than
24		Cleveleys."
25		Now, that's quite a carefully worded
		49
1		"not all". But is it your evidence that, in
		not an . Bat lo le your offaorloo that, in
		fact this paragraph was inserted by somebody
2		fact, this paragraph was inserted by somebody else?
2 3	Α.	else?
2 3 4	Α.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know.
2 3 4 5	Α.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of
2 3 4 5 6	A.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it
2 3 4 5 6 7	A.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Α.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that sentence in or not, I don't know. Whether I put
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that sentence in or not, I don't know. Whether I put that sentence in, I can't remember.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that sentence in or not, I don't know. Whether I put that sentence in, I can't remember. Does it sound like your kind of writing? Does
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that sentence in or not, I don't know. Whether I put that sentence in, I can't remember. Does it sound like your kind of writing? Does it sound like something that you would have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that sentence in or not, I don't know. Whether I put that sentence in, I can't remember. Does it sound like your kind of writing? Does it sound like something that you would have said?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that sentence in or not, I don't know. Whether I put that sentence in, I can't remember. Does it sound like your kind of writing? Does it sound like something that you would have said? I can't comment on that. I don't know.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that sentence in or not, I don't know. Whether I put that sentence in, I can't remember. Does it sound like your kind of writing? Does it sound like something that you would have said? I can't comment on that. I don't know. If we zoom out on this page, are you able to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that sentence in or not, I don't know. Whether I put that sentence in, I can't remember. Does it sound like your kind of writing? Does it sound like something that you would have said? I can't comment on that. I don't know. If we zoom out on this page, are you able to assist us with where on this response the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that sentence in or not, I don't know. Whether I put that sentence in, I can't remember. Does it sound like your kind of writing? Does it sound like something that you would have said? I can't comment on that. I don't know. If we zoom out on this page, are you able to assist us with where on this response the acceptance of Mr Coyne's criticism of Elaine
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that sentence in or not, I don't know. Whether I put that sentence in, I can't remember. Does it sound like your kind of writing? Does it sound like something that you would have said? I can't comment on that. I don't know. If we zoom out on this page, are you able to assist us with where on this response the acceptance of Mr Coyne's criticism of Elaine Tagg's statement features? I mean, we read that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that sentence in or not, I don't know. Whether I put that sentence in, I can't remember. Does it sound like your kind of writing? Does it sound like something that you would have said? I can't comment on that. I don't know. If we zoom out on this page, are you able to assist us with where on this response the acceptance of Mr Coyne's criticism of Elaine Tagg's statement features? I mean, we read that in your initial draft. Where is that now?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that sentence in or not, I don't know. Whether I put that sentence in, I can't remember. Does it sound like your kind of writing? Does it sound like something that you would have said? I can't comment on that. I don't know. If we zoom out on this page, are you able to assist us with where on this response the acceptance of Mr Coyne's criticism of Elaine Tagg's statement features? I mean, we read that in your initial draft. Where is that now? I don't know. It's not there.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that sentence in or not, I don't know. Whether I put that sentence in, I can't remember. Does it sound like your kind of writing? Does it sound like something that you would have said? I can't comment on that. I don't know. If we zoom out on this page, are you able to assist us with where on this response the acceptance of Mr Coyne's criticism of Elaine Tagg's statement features? I mean, we read that in your initial draft. Where is that now? I don't know. It's not there. Did you remove it? Did somebody else remove it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that sentence in or not, I don't know. Whether I put that sentence in, I can't remember. Does it sound like your kind of writing? Does it sound like something that you would have said? I can't comment on that. I don't know. If we zoom out on this page, are you able to assist us with where on this response the acceptance of Mr Coyne's criticism of Elaine Tagg's statement features? I mean, we read that in your initial draft. Where is that now? I don't know. It's not there. Did you remove it? Did somebody else remove it? I can't remember and I don't know.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that sentence in or not, I don't know. Whether I put that sentence in, I can't remember. Does it sound like your kind of writing? Does it sound like something that you would have said? I can't comment on that. I don't know. If we zoom out on this page, are you able to assist us with where on this response the acceptance of Mr Coyne's criticism of Elaine Tagg's statement features? I mean, we read that in your initial draft. Where is that now? I don't know. It's not there. Did you remove it? Did somebody else remove it? I can't remember and I don't know.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that sentence in or not, I don't know. Whether I put that sentence in, I can't remember. Does it sound like your kind of writing? Does it sound like something that you would have said? I can't comment on that. I don't know. If we zoom out on this page, are you able to assist us with where on this response the acceptance of Mr Coyne's criticism of Elaine Tagg's statement features? I mean, we read that in your initial draft. Where is that now? I don't know. It's not there. Did you remove it? Did somebody else remove it? I can't remember and I don't know.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that sentence in or not, I don't know. Whether I put that sentence in, I can't remember. Does it sound like your kind of writing? Does it sound like something that you would have said? I can't comment on that. I don't know. If we zoom out on this page, are you able to assist us with where on this response the acceptance of Mr Coyne's criticism of Elaine Tagg's statement features? I mean, we read that in your initial draft. Where is that now? I don't know. It's not there. Did you remove it? Did somebody else remove it? I can't remember and I don't know. I mean, you'll remember when we looked at it, it was something that you felt that Mr Coyne was right on. Do you remember removing comments
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. A. Q.	else? I honestly can't remember. I just don't know. I know that Colin may well have tweaked some of the content before he sent it off, because it was going off in his name. Whether he put that sentence in or not, I don't know. Whether I put that sentence in, I can't remember. Does it sound like your kind of writing? Does it sound like something that you would have said? I can't comment on that. I don't know. If we zoom out on this page, are you able to assist us with where on this response the acceptance of Mr Coyne's criticism of Elaine Tagg's statement features? I mean, we read that in your initial draft. Where is that now? I don't know. It's not there. Did you remove it? Did somebody else remove it? I can't remember and I don't know.

1		sentence. You are there referring only, it
2		seems, to the outlets in the above table; is
3		that right?
4	Α.	Yeah. Yes.
5	Q.	Yes, because, of course, Fujitsu couldn't have
6		said that they are not aware of similar
7		complaints or claims being made by outlets in
8		the general, could they? You
9	A.	(Unclear).
10	Q.	You couldn't have broadened it to outlets
11 12		because that wouldn't have been true, because
12		there were similar complaints or claims being made from other outlets; is that right?
13	Α.	Presumably, yes.
14	Q.	Do you remember wording this quite carefully in
16	ч.	that regard?
17	Α.	No, because I don't think I worded that
18	7.0	sentence. This is a letter from Colin
19		Lenton-Smith. isn't it?
20	Q.	The letter is sent by Colin Lenton-Smith, it
21		includes what is called a response to expert's
22		opinion.
23	Α.	Yes.
24	Q.	Most of the words have appeared in your initial
25		thoughts document, not all, and we'll come to
		50
		50
1	А.	
1 2	А.	50 No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that.
	A. Q.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have
2		No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that.
2 3	Q.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that. Well, who would have?
2 3 4	Q. A.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that. Well, who would have? I've no idea. I mean, this is 24 years ago.
2 3 4 5	Q. A. Q.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that. Well, who would have? I've no idea. I mean, this is 24 years ago. Well, you said
2 3 4 5 6	Q. A. Q. A.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that. Well, who would have? I've no idea. I mean, this is 24 years ago. Well, you said Or
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q. A. Q. A.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that. Well, who would have? I've no idea. I mean, this is 24 years ago. Well, you said Or you're sure that you wouldn't have removed it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q. A. Q. A.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that. Well, who would have? I've no idea. I mean, this is 24 years ago. Well, you said Or you're sure that you wouldn't have removed it but, equally, you have no recollection because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q. Q.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that. Well, who would have? I've no idea. I mean, this is 24 years ago. Well, you said Or you're sure that you wouldn't have removed it but, equally, you have no recollection because it was 24 years ago.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. Q.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that. Well, who would have? I've no idea. I mean, this is 24 years ago. Well, you said Or you're sure that you wouldn't have removed it but, equally, you have no recollection because it was 24 years ago. I mean, I'm not sure whether I would have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. Q. A.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that. Well, who would have? I've no idea. I mean, this is 24 years ago. Well, you said Or you're sure that you wouldn't have removed it but, equally, you have no recollection because it was 24 years ago. I mean, I'm not sure whether I would have removed it or not. I can't remember if I did. Can we look at page 5, please. We have there the "Conclusion":
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. Q. A.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that. Well, who would have? I've no idea. I mean, this is 24 years ago. Well, you said Or you're sure that you wouldn't have removed it but, equally, you have no recollection because it was 24 years ago. I mean, I'm not sure whether I would have removed it or not. I can't remember if I did. Can we look at page 5, please. We have there the "Conclusion": "The report presented by the Expert is based
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. Q. A.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that. Well, who would have? I've no idea. I mean, this is 24 years ago. Well, you said Or you're sure that you wouldn't have removed it but, equally, you have no recollection because it was 24 years ago. I mean, I'm not sure whether I would have removed it or not. I can't remember if I did. Can we look at page 5, please. We have there the "Conclusion": "The report presented by the Expert is based on a simple analysis of HSH records and not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. Q. A.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that. Well, who would have? I've no idea. I mean, this is 24 years ago. Well, you said Or you're sure that you wouldn't have removed it but, equally, you have no recollection because it was 24 years ago. I mean, I'm not sure whether I would have removed it or not. I can't remember if I did. Can we look at page 5, please. We have there the "Conclusion": "The report presented by the Expert is based on a simple analysis of HSH records and not a detailed understanding of how the Horizon
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. Q. A.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that. Well, who would have? I've no idea. I mean, this is 24 years ago. Well, you said Or you're sure that you wouldn't have removed it but, equally, you have no recollection because it was 24 years ago. I mean, I'm not sure whether I would have removed it or not. I can't remember if I did. Can we look at page 5, please. We have there the "Conclusion": "The report presented by the Expert is based on a simple analysis of HSH records and not a detailed understanding of how the Horizon System works, or even the prime objectives of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. Q. A.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that. Well, who would have? I've no idea. I mean, this is 24 years ago. Well, you said Or you're sure that you wouldn't have removed it but, equally, you have no recollection because it was 24 years ago. I mean, I'm not sure whether I would have removed it or not. I can't remember if I did. Can we look at page 5, please. We have there the "Conclusion": "The report presented by the Expert is based on a simple analysis of HSH records and not a detailed understanding of how the Horizon System works, or even the prime objectives of the Horizon System Helpdesk."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. Q. A.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that. Well, who would have? I've no idea. I mean, this is 24 years ago. Well, you said Or you're sure that you wouldn't have removed it but, equally, you have no recollection because it was 24 years ago. I mean, I'm not sure whether I would have removed it or not. I can't remember if I did. Can we look at page 5, please. We have there the "Conclusion": "The report presented by the Expert is based on a simple analysis of HSH records and not a detailed understanding of how the Horizon System works, or even the prime objectives of the Horizon System Helpdesk." The criticism there is that it's a simple
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. Q. A.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that. Well, who would have? I've no idea. I mean, this is 24 years ago. Well, you said Or you're sure that you wouldn't have removed it but, equally, you have no recollection because it was 24 years ago. I mean, I'm not sure whether I would have removed it or not. I can't remember if I did. Can we look at page 5, please. We have there the "Conclusion": The report presented by the Expert is based on a simple analysis of HSH records and not a detailed understanding of how the Horizon System works, or even the prime objectives of the Horizon System Helpdesk." The criticism there is that it's a simple analysis. Do you think that Mr Coyne had been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. Q. A.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that. Well, who would have? I've no idea. I mean, this is 24 years ago. Well, you said Or you're sure that you wouldn't have removed it but, equally, you have no recollection because it was 24 years ago. I mean, I'm not sure whether I would have removed it or not. I can't remember if I did. Can we look at page 5, please. We have there the "Conclusion": "The report presented by the Expert is based on a simple analysis of HSH records and not a detailed understanding of how the Horizon System works, or even the prime objectives of the Horizon System Helpdesk." The criticism there is that it's a simple analysis. Do you think that Mr Coyne had been provided with enough information at that stage
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. Q. A.	No, no, I don't think no. I wouldn't have done that. Well, who would have? I've no idea. I mean, this is 24 years ago. Well, you said Or you're sure that you wouldn't have removed it but, equally, you have no recollection because it was 24 years ago. I mean, I'm not sure whether I would have removed it or not. I can't remember if I did. Can we look at page 5, please. We have there the "Conclusion": The report presented by the Expert is based on a simple analysis of HSH records and not a detailed understanding of how the Horizon System works, or even the prime objectives of the Horizon System Helpdesk." The criticism there is that it's a simple analysis. Do you think that Mr Coyne had been

(13) Pages 49 - 52

a single perspective."

enough.

A. Yeah.

criticism?

there. Um --

Mr Coyne was a joint expert. The parties had agreed to rely on a joint expert. Your

perspective. How many experts would have been

criticism is that he presents from a single

A. Sorry, I don't understand what you're getting at

A. No, no, no, no, no. He had a view and he put it

He was a jointly appointed expert selected by

agreement between the Post Office and the

forward. We didn't always agree with it.

Q. Well, "simple analysis", "single perspective".

solicitors. Do you think that that's a fair

a criticism, as such. It's just, you know, it's

a statement that that was how we felt at the

"I am confident in my statement ...

"In short to answer the question posed in

We went through this morning your history of

the EPOSS problems, 1998, 1999, 2000. We went

through some error logs from the contemporaneous

period that Mrs Wolstenholme was having her

issues, referring to software problems affecting

sent to you by Mark Jones in February, showing

comments about the proliferation of reboots. We

saw also you own agreement with important parts

Was now, 2 March 2004, not the time to say

"Enough is enough, we give in, put up the white 56

transactions. We saw that first table that was

that Cleveleys was at the top of the list or the

bottom of the list, depending on your

perspective. We saw Richard Brunskill's

of Mr Coyne's original report. Now we have

a further response from the jointly appointed

expert, where he has maintained his view.

your letter, no my opinion, currently, remains

"Worrying discrepancies ..." We see the final sentence is there:

time about his report and we put together what

54

"presented from a single perspective"? Do you

Q. Presented from -- what did you mean by

mean he's only one man?

defendant in that case --

Q. -- liaising with the Post Office's own

A. I think it's just a statement. It's not

"Defective equipment

as stated in my original note."

he says things like:

1	Q.	Well, he didn't have transaction data, we know	1
2		that much, don't we, because that had been	2
3		destroyed?	3
4	Α.	Destroyed.	4
5	Q.	The Helpdesk original records had also, it's	5
6		your evidence, been destroyed, but another	6
7		version had been found.	7
8	Α.	Indeed, yeah, yeah.	8
9	Q.	But that's all that you recall having been	9
10		provided by Fujitsu in respect of this case?	10
11	Α.	To POL, yeah.	11
12	Q.	Well, to POL, sorry. Yes.	12
13	Α.	Yeah, and because we had no direct contact with	13
14		Jason Coyne, everything went through POL because	14
15		it was their relationship.	15
16	Q.	We see in later documents reference to inviting	16
17		Mr Coyne to attend Fujitsu but, at this stage,	17
18		are you aware of any invitation having been made	18
19		to Mr Coyne to attend Fujitsu or to obtain	19
20		further documentation?	20
21	Α.	No. Not at this first cycle.	21
22	Q.	We see there it says:	22
23		"Consequently the opinions expressed in the	23
24		report, whilst not always incorrect, do not	24
25		present the whole story and are presented from	25
		53	
1		we felt was a fairly well-presented rebuttal	1
2		and, as we'll see consequently, he just said it	2
3	_	didn't make any difference	3
4		As	4
5		to his opinion.	5
6	Q.	5 . 5	6
7		you were still maintaining your professional,	1
8		calm approach to this case?	8
9	Α.	Yes.	9
10	MR	BLAKE: Sir, I think that might be an appropriate	10
11		time to take a 15-minute break. Could we come	11
12		back at 11.35?	12
13		R WYN WILLIAMS: Certainly. All right. 11.35.	13
14		BLAKE: Thank you very much.	14
15	(11	.18 am)	15
16	(4.4	(A short break)	16
17	•	.35 am)	17
18	MR	BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir.	18
19		Mr Holmes, I'm just going to take you	19
20		before the break you referred to the expert's	20
21		response, where his view stayed the same. Let's	21
22		look at that. That's FUJ00121535.	22
23		So we have here, this is the response from	23
24		Mr Coyne to Weightman Vizards and, if we look at	24
25		the final page sorry, the second page even, 55	25

55

(14) Pages 53 - 56

1		flag"?
2	Α.	Sorry, is that a question?
3	Q.	Yes. It started with the word "would".
4	Α.	Possibly, yes, but at the time we decided we'd
5		have one more pass around to see if we could
6		provide any kind of extra assistance that might
7		help him to change his mind. Things like, you
8		know, because we couldn't provide crashdumps on
9		failure, of the period in question, we could
10		invite him to Stevenage to see how they actually
11		worked and operated. But, I mean, he'd
12		obviously decided he'd turned his face against
13		the offer. It wasn't just a walk around, as
14		suggested, we were prepared to give him access
15		to systems so he could do further testing and
16		digging around that he wanted to do. So it
17		wasn't just a PR stunt to try to soften him up;
18		it was a serious attempt to offer him access to
19		parts of the system that normally we wouldn't
20	~	provide access to.
21	Q.	Did you do your own vanes at that time of the
22		Known Error Logs, the PEAKs, the PinICLs,
23 24		looking at the time when Mrs Wolstenholme was
24 25		experiencing her problems, investigating other branches to see if they were experiencing
20		57
1		just put something into context here? At the
2		beginning of Horizon going in, this provision of
3		litigation support, prosecution support that we
4		were obliged to do, was absolutely in its
5		infancy and each case was unique, insofar as, if
6		it wasn't just providing them with audit data,
7		if it was other pieces of information, work or
8		whatever that they wanted, it was new every
9		time.
10		So we were learning all the time how to go
11		through this process with the Post Office. This
12		was the first time, to my knowledge, that we had
13		to interact, through the Post Office, with
14		an expert witness so when I say "influence"
15		I don't mean "Come on, Jason, change your mind",
16		it was more about giving him access to the
17		things that might help him change his mind or
18	~	change his opinion.
19	Q.	Were you, by this stage, quite frustrated with
20		the situation?
21	Α.	This was disappointing. The response was
22		disappointing. Essentially, we put quite a lot
23 24		of work into preparing our response to his
24 25		report and it was pretty much dismissed as having no effect on his opinion. So yes,
20		59

1 similar problems	1 simil	lar problems	
--------------------	---------	--------------	--

2 **A.** No.

3 Q. -- looking at the kinds of KELs that we looked 4

at this morning? Α. No.

5	Α.	No.
6	Q.	Can we look at FUJ00121549. This is a day after
7		that reply was received. This is from you to
8		Colin Lenton-Smith attaching your initial

9 thoughts on Jason Coyne's reply.

A. Mm-hm. 10

1

19

20

1	Q.	Your response is at FUJ00121550.	Thank you.
~		The first second second stress second	

The third paragraph there, you say: 12 13 "I have spoken to Jim Cruise ... and we both 14 feel that there is probably another opportunity to influence Jason Coyne's opinion by inviting 15 16 him to Bracknell and providing him with access

17 to data, records and people who can deal with

18 his observations directly."

Did you really feel at that stage, so far

down the line, having everything in mind that

21 I've just been mentioning, did you really think

22 that it was proper to be trying to influence the

23 independent, jointly appointed expert's opinion

24 at that late stage?

25 A. Well, "influence" is a word. I mean, can we 58

1		"disappointing" is a word, not frustrated, but
2		disappointing, and we wanted to try to find
3		see if there was a way we could "influence"
4		is probably not the right word, you know, offer
5		him further evidence that might help him change
6		his opinion. That was all.
7	Q.	Is "disappointing" as high as you would put it?
8		Were you still cool and professional?
9	Α.	(The witness laughed). Yes, yes. We were.
10	Q.	Can we look at FUJ00121557, please. I'll let
11		you have a moment with this particular email,
12		Mr Holmes?
13	Α.	Yeah, that's fine.
14	Q.	11 March 2004:
15		"Colin, I've done a bit more to this but if
16		I continue I fear I might call him a git or
17		something worse."
18		Still
19	Α.	Well, it's like the other email
20	Q.	professional?
21	Α.	It's like the other email where I said I don't
22		want to piss the expert off. I mean, yeah,
23		disappointing, frustrating but, you know, it's
24		just business, isn't it?

25 Q. Is it? I mean, calling somebody a "git", I mean 60

1		the impression that is given here is that you're
2		taking it a little too personally. Do you
3		disagree with that?
4	Α.	I do. It's an internal email.
5	Q.	You originally agreed with some of the comments
6		in Mr Coyne's report. We took you to those
7		earlier.
8	Α.	Yeah, that's
9	Q.	Do you think taking this approach so far down
10		the line, March 2004, was appropriate?
11 12	Α.	What, you mean going back for another giving him the opportunity to come and visit locations
12		and speak to people and dig into systems?
13	Q.	No, I mean calling an independently, jointly
15	ω.	appointed expert in court proceedings, who has
16		produced a report and a further report, some of
17		which you in fact agreed with, calling him
18		a "git"?
19	Α.	Well, I've got nothing more to say to that.
20	Q.	Can we therefore turn to FUJ00121561, please.
21	-	We're now at 12 March 2004. An email from
22		yourself to Colin Lenton-Smith. You've said:
23		"I've transferred the contentious statement
24		from the paper to the email because it's not in
25		our interests to piss the expert off. That said
		61
1		on to us to do. So if there was an issue of
2		reputation on the system, brought through by
3		Jason Coyne's report or his opinion, POL did
4		very little to dispute or challenge it and it
5		was all down to us. And if the system came
6		under challenge through that, then obviously
7		Post Office Account were potentially at risk of
8		a reputational impact and we are on the back
9		foot. There is nothing we can do about it.
10	Q.	Did you see this case as an important case in
11		which to defend your reputation as a company?
12	Α.	Well, obviously, anything is you know,
13		anything to do with the reputation is
14		an important one to defend but, as I said
15		a couple of minutes earlier, these were early
16		
		days, this was a learning curve, this was the
17		days, this was a learning curve, this was the first time thorough for this kind of work. We
17 18		days, this was a learning curve, this was the first time thorough for this kind of work. We used to provide audit data, that's fairly
17 18 19		days, this was a learning curve, this was the first time thorough for this kind of work. We used to provide audit data, that's fairly straightforward, you know, take the request,
17 18 19 20		days, this was a learning curve, this was the first time thorough for this kind of work. We used to provide audit data, that's fairly straightforward, you know, take the request, provide a CD and a witness statement as to how
17 18 19 20 21		days, this was a learning curve, this was the first time thorough for this kind of work. We used to provide audit data, that's fairly straightforward, you know, take the request, provide a CD and a witness statement as to how it was stored and retrieved, et cetera. But
17 18 19 20 21 22		days, this was a learning curve, this was the first time thorough for this kind of work. We used to provide audit data, that's fairly straightforward, you know, take the request, provide a CD and a witness statement as to how it was stored and retrieved, et cetera. But this, where it's a bespoke, I suppose, piece of
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	0	days, this was a learning curve, this was the first time thorough for this kind of work. We used to provide audit data, that's fairly straightforward, you know, take the request, provide a CD and a witness statement as to how it was stored and retrieved, et cetera. But this, where it's a bespoke, I suppose, piece of work, we're learning as we are going.
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q.	days, this was a learning curve, this was the first time thorough for this kind of work. We used to provide audit data, that's fairly straightforward, you know, take the request, provide a CD and a witness statement as to how it was stored and retrieved, et cetera. But this, where it's a bespoke, I suppose, piece of work, we're learning as we are going. As time went on, of course, Fujitsu got more
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q.	days, this was a learning curve, this was the first time thorough for this kind of work. We used to provide audit data, that's fairly straightforward, you know, take the request, provide a CD and a witness statement as to how it was stored and retrieved, et cetera. But this, where it's a bespoke, I suppose, piece of work, we're learning as we are going.

1		it has to be pointed out to Jim that his report
2		is far from impartial and, in truth, we have
3		a problem because there is little we can do to
4		dispel some of his assertions other than say
5		'rubbish'."
6		Final sentence there:
7		"POL have to decide what they want to see
8		happening here. I understand the reputational
9		aspects of the situation but I fear that POA
10		[that's the Fujitsu Post Office Account] are on
11		the back foot."
12		There's again reference to "back foot". Did
13		you still continue to see it as some sort of
14		combat between yourselves and Mrs Wolstenholme?
15	Α.	No, because, as I've explained before, we
16		weren't involved directly with Mrs Wolstenholme.
17		We were involved with Post Office Limited, POL,
18		okay? So the arrangement between POL and
19		Mrs Wolstenholme, and through Jason Coyne, was
20		their relationship. We were just trying to help
21	~	POL solve their problem.
22	Q.	Who were you on the back foot against?
23	Α.	Well, yeah, because whether or not POL managed
24 25		the expert, they did very little to refute or
25		challenge the report. They just passed it all 62
1		atatamenta in respect of quite a number of
1		statements in respect of quite a number of
2	٨	cases. Were you involved in that?
2 3	А.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last
2 3 4	A.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005
2 3 4 5	A.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different
2 3 4 5 6	A.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support.
2 3 4 5 6 7	A.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support. And if you go back to the very original email
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Α.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support. And if you go back to the very original email from Pete Sewell to me, the original request was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	А.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support. And if you go back to the very original email from Pete Sewell to me, the original request was sent into security and he asked if I could take
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support. And if you go back to the very original email from Pete Sewell to me, the original request was sent into security and he asked if I could take it up, you know, take up the work because,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support. And if you go back to the very original email from Pete Sewell to me, the original request was sent into security and he asked if I could take it up, you know, take up the work because, presumably, they were busy. I don't know. So
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support. And if you go back to the very original email from Pete Sewell to me, the original request was sent into security and he asked if I could take it up, you know, take up the work because, presumably, they were busy. I don't know. So I did.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support. And if you go back to the very original email from Pete Sewell to me, the original request was sent into security and he asked if I could take it up, you know, take up the work because, presumably, they were busy. I don't know. So I did. So if this was all a bit difficult for you and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support. And if you go back to the very original email from Pete Sewell to me, the original request was sent into security and he asked if I could take it up, you know, take up the work because, presumably, they were busy. I don't know. So I did. So if this was all a bit difficult for you and for your department, because you weren't used to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support. And if you go back to the very original email from Pete Sewell to me, the original request was sent into security and he asked if I could take it up, you know, take up the work because, presumably, they were busy. I don't know. So I did. So if this was all a bit difficult for you and for your department, because you weren't used to this kind of thing, do you think it was then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support. And if you go back to the very original email from Pete Sewell to me, the original request was sent into security and he asked if I could take it up, you know, take up the work because, presumably, they were busy. I don't know. So I did. So if this was all a bit difficult for you and for your department, because you weren't used to this kind of thing, do you think it was then No, that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support. And if you go back to the very original email from Pete Sewell to me, the original request was sent into security and he asked if I could take it up, you know, take up the work because, presumably, they were busy. I don't know. So I did. So if this was all a bit difficult for you and for your department, because you weren't used to this kind of thing, do you think it was then No, that's appropriate
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support. And if you go back to the very original email from Pete Sewell to me, the original request was sent into security and he asked if I could take it up, you know, take up the work because, presumably, they were busy. I don't know. So I did. So if this was all a bit difficult for you and for your department, because you weren't used to this kind of thing, do you think it was then No, that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support. And if you go back to the very original email from Pete Sewell to me, the original request was sent into security and he asked if I could take it up, you know, take up the work because, presumably, they were busy. I don't know. So I did. So if this was all a bit difficult for you and for your department, because you weren't used to this kind of thing, do you think it was then No, that's appropriate That's not what I said. I didn't say it was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support. And if you go back to the very original email from Pete Sewell to me, the original request was sent into security and he asked if I could take it up, you know, take up the work because, presumably, they were busy. I don't know. So I did. So if this was all a bit difficult for you and for your department, because you weren't used to this kind of thing, do you think it was then No, that's appropriate That's not what I said. I didn't say it was difficult. I just said it was novel and new.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support. And if you go back to the very original email from Pete Sewell to me, the original request was sent into security and he asked if I could take it up, you know, take up the work because, presumably, they were busy. I don't know. So I did. So if this was all a bit difficult for you and for your department, because you weren't used to this kind of thing, do you think it was then No, that's appropriate That's not what I said. I didn't say it was difficult. I just said it was novel and new. Do you think that Fujitsu and people within
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support. And if you go back to the very original email from Pete Sewell to me, the original request was sent into security and he asked if I could take it up, you know, take up the work because, presumably, they were busy. I don't know. So I did. So if this was all a bit difficult for you and for your department, because you weren't used to this kind of thing, do you think it was then No, that's appropriate That's not what I said. I didn't say it was difficult. I just said it was novel and new. Do you think that Fujitsu and people within Fujitsu were sufficiently qualified to continue
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. Q.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support. And if you go back to the very original email from Pete Sewell to me, the original request was sent into security and he asked if I could take it up, you know, take up the work because, presumably, they were busy. I don't know. So I did. So if this was all a bit difficult for you and for your department, because you weren't used to this kind of thing, do you think it was then No, that's appropriate That's not what I said. I didn't say it was difficult. I just said it was novel and new. Do you think that Fujitsu and people within Fujitsu were sufficiently qualified to continue to be involved in court proceedings after this?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. Q.	cases. Were you involved in that? No, no. This essentially, I think, was my last sort of stab at this, because from about 2005 onwards, I started migrating to different aspects of work away from litigation support. And if you go back to the very original email from Pete Sewell to me, the original request was sent into security and he asked if I could take it up, you know, take up the work because, presumably, they were busy. I don't know. So I did. So if this was all a bit difficult for you and for your department, because you weren't used to this kind of thing, do you think it was then No, that's appropriate That's not what I said. I didn't say it was difficult. I just said it was novel and new. Do you think that Fujitsu and people within Fujitsu were sufficiently qualified to continue to be involved in court proceedings after this? Well, interesting one. I mean, this started off

1		were able to do that, and we made our attempt	1
2	•	and failed.	2
3	Q.		3
4 5		draft email to Jim Cruise that was written by	4 5
6	Α.	yourself. Yeah.	6
7	Q.		7
8	ч.	above that actually, it says:	8
9		" the next step is to make available to	9
10		him the people, data and resources at Post	10
11		Office Account and allow him to address his	11
12		doubts to the true experts and practitioners.	12
13		"In conclusion it has to be said that his	13
14		analysis of the situation is at best selective	14
15		and at worst simply wrong, and his conclusions	15
16		partial."	16
17		Do you regret calling Mr Coyne's conclusions	17
18		"partial"?	18
19	Α.		19
20	Q.	,	20
21		yesterday. Looking back, do you still continue	21
22		to view him as partial?	22
23	Α.		23
24		was written in 2004. That was my view at the	24
25		time. Whether my view has changed now, based on 65	25
1		approved by the court."	1
2		I wouldn't bring it up but, for the	2
3		transcript, it's POL00022840.	3
4		Considering that, considering the evidence	4
5		that you saw yesterday or the day before	5
6		yesterday, in fact, of Mr Coyne, do you regret	6
7		the kinds of allegations that are made in these	7
8		emails to the Post Office, or in your internal	8
9		emails, the words used, "git", for example,	9
10		looking back now on what you have heard and what	10
11		you heard in Phase 2 of this Inquiry?	11
12	Α.		12
13		misplaced and inappropriate. But, as I said,	13
14		that was the situation in 2004. We're now in	14
15		2023 with different information available. So,	15
16		you know, your opinion can change.	16
17	•		
40	Q.		17
18		original opinion, and you	18
19	Α.	original opinion, and you Yes	18 19
19 20		original opinion, and you Yes had background from your earlier involvement	18 19 20
19 20 21	Α.	original opinion, and you Yes had background from your earlier involvement in the EPOSS matters in those various issues	18 19 20 21
19 20 21 22	A. Q.	original opinion, and you Yes had background from your earlier involvement in the EPOSS matters in those various issues that were going on within Fujitsu?	18 19 20 21 22
19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A.	original opinion, and you Yes had background from your earlier involvement in the EPOSS matters in those various issues that were going on within Fujitsu? Yes, that's correct.	18 19 20 21 22 23
19 20 21 22	A. Q.	original opinion, and you Yes had background from your earlier involvement in the EPOSS matters in those various issues that were going on within Fujitsu? Yes, that's correct.	18 19 20 21 22

Q.	What is it now?
Α.	I don't know. Maybe we got it wrong.
Q.	I can read to you an extract from the Bates
	litigation. It's the Horizon Issues judgment
	number 6. I can bring it on to screen, if you
	like, but I'll just read you an extract from
	paragraph 800. This is Mr Justice Fraser, he
	says:
	"I consider Mr Coyne to have been a helpful
	and constructive witness"
	This is in the <i>Bates</i> litigation, not in the
	Cleveleys case, of course.
	" and I find the suggestions made to him
	that he was biased to the claimants and not
	independent are criticisms that are not
	justified. He and his small number of
	assistants had done a great amount of
	investigation into the very numerous PEAKs and
	the smaller number of KELs and he had embarked
	upon a careful and sensible exercise necessary
	for him to reach conclusions on the Horizon
	Issues as drafted and agreed by the parties and
	66
	dated 20 August 2004, so I'm taking it slightly
	out of sequence in time. But I just want to
	take you to number 2 there, which references the
	Shobnall Road, case. It says there that:
	"Shobnall Road has come back. Bill has
	apparently been asked to provide a Witness
	Statement to the effect that nothing contained
	in the HSH calls over the period in question
	could have caused, or be described as, a system
	malfunction. I'm attaching a brief analysis of
	the HSH transcripts that I did in April.
	Comments made by engineers that 'keyboards can
	cause phantom transactions' do not help the Post
	Office's position. I suspect that we cannot
	make the statement required and when [Post
	Office] read the transcripts in detail they may
	well think that they could not submit them
	anyway."
	The reason I'm taking this to you now is
	there is reference to you being involved in
	analysing the transcripts in April from Shobnall
	Road. So this is around the same time as those
	emails I've taken you to, where you are accusing
	Mr Coyne of being partial. You were, it seems,
	reading the transcripts in the Shobnall Road 68
	00

what I saw yesterday or the situation as it's

gone on, is -- it's what it is now. But that's

what it was then.

Q. What is it now?

67

(17) Pages 65 - 68

1		case. Do you remember doing that?	1
2	A.	No, I don't. I don't.	2
3	Q.		3
4		transcripts. I think it's FUJ00121725.	4
5		Is this the analysis that you were doing in	5
6 7		April 2004 in the Shobnall Road case? Well, it looks like it but I don't remember it.	6 7
8	A. Q.	Okay, I'll read you a few extracts from it.	8
9	ω.	If we start with 6 January 2003, it says:	9
10		"[Postmaster]: failing to register	1(
11		transactions. Freezing when scanning. Phantoms	1
12		when unfreezing. 7 January SSC could not	12
13		recreate the problem as described by [the	1;
14		postmaster]. 2 [Known Error Logs] referenced.	14
15		HSH then asked about lighting as could cause	1
16		interference. PM also using an RF baby	16
17		machinery and local cab firm had been operating	17
18		and setting off burglar alarms. PM also stated	18
19		suffering from power surges. Call closed and	19
20		raising new call as environmental but no	20
21		evidence of new call."	21
22		If we scroll down to the substantive entry	22
23		on the 12 December 2002, it says:	23
24		"New screen and cable fitted and both	24
25		engineers saying problem is NOT monitor.	25
		69	
1		agree with what Mr Coyne has to say"?	1
2	Α.	With hindsight, possibly, yes. But we still	2
3		I still felt it was worth having another go.	3
4		Post Office didn't. They didn't offer the	4
5		response to Mr Coyne, so that was the end of it.	5
6	Q.	Can we turn to FUJ00121637, please. We're now	6
7		moving to June 2004, 7 June. It's an email from	7
8		yourself to Colin Lenton-Smith. I'm going to	8
9		read to you a few extracts:	9
10		"POL are still taking advice as to how best	10
11		to deal with this and Mandy's view/belief was	11
		the safest way to manage this is to throw money	12
12			
13		at it and get a confidentiality agreement	1:
13 14		signed. She is not happy with the 'Expert's' as	14
13 14 15		signed. She is not happy with the 'Expert's' as she considers it to be not well balanced and	14 15
13 14 15 16		signed. She is not happy with the 'Expert's' as she considers it to be not well balanced and wants, if possible, to keep it out of the public	14 11 10
13 14 15 16 17		signed. She is not happy with the 'Expert's' as she considers it to be not well balanced and wants, if possible, to keep it out of the public domain. This is unlikely to happen if it goes	14 18 10 11
13 14 15 16 17 18		signed. She is not happy with the 'Expert's' as she considers it to be not well balanced and wants, if possible, to keep it out of the public domain. This is unlikely to happen if it goes to Court."	14 11 10 11 11
13 14 15 16 17 18 19		signed. She is not happy with the 'Expert's' as she considers it to be not well balanced and wants, if possible, to keep it out of the public domain. This is unlikely to happen if it goes to Court." The next paragraph, the final sentence:	14 11 11 11 11 11 11
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20		signed. She is not happy with the 'Expert's' as she considers it to be not well balanced and wants, if possible, to keep it out of the public domain. This is unlikely to happen if it goes to Court." The next paragraph, the final sentence: "The liability question is removed and it's	14 15 10 17 18 19 20
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		signed. She is not happy with the 'Expert's' as she considers it to be not well balanced and wants, if possible, to keep it out of the public domain. This is unlikely to happen if it goes to Court." The next paragraph, the final sentence: "The liability question is removed and it's then just about 'how much to go away and keep	14 18 10 11 18 19 20 20
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		signed. She is not happy with the 'Expert's' as she considers it to be not well balanced and wants, if possible, to keep it out of the public domain. This is unlikely to happen if it goes to Court." The next paragraph, the final sentence: "The liability question is removed and it's then just about 'how much to go away and keep your mouth shut'.	14 13 16 17 18 18 20 22 22
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		signed. She is not happy with the 'Expert's' as she considers it to be not well balanced and wants, if possible, to keep it out of the public domain. This is unlikely to happen if it goes to Court." The next paragraph, the final sentence: "The liability question is removed and it's then just about 'how much to go away and keep your mouth shut'. "One concern I have is that while they've	14 15 16 17 18 19 20 20 21 22 22 22 22 22
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		signed. She is not happy with the 'Expert's' as she considers it to be not well balanced and wants, if possible, to keep it out of the public domain. This is unlikely to happen if it goes to Court." The next paragraph, the final sentence: "The liability question is removed and it's then just about 'how much to go away and keep your mouth shut'.	14 13 16 17 18 18 20 22 22

1		Phantom transactions and not registering real
2		transactions. Certain products not registering
3		at all. HSH advise 'keyboard can cause phantom
4		transactions as well but as she has been having
5		so many problems with figures disappearing then
6		the keyboard and base unit will be swapped'."
7		An entry on 6 December 2002:
8		"PM: screen not responding and keyboard will
9		not work. Also system freezing and then
10		releasing itself. Later HSH suggested rebooting
11		but did not resolve the problem.
12		"HSH records shows 'Replaced screen due to
13		phantom transactions/calibration problems."
14		This was your analysis in April 2004. At
15		the risk of repeating myself, is now not the
16		time to say maybe Mr Coyne's report is not so
17		wrong after all?
18		I mean, we have there a subpostmaster
19		experiencing issues with transactions, they are
20		referred to by Fujitsu as "phantom
21		transactions". We've seen the earlier Known
22		Error Log from years before that referring to
23		phantom transactions. You were no doubt aware
24		of the description of phantom transactions. Is
25		April 2004 the time to say, "Maybe we should
		70
1		it's now too late for them to enter a Witness
2		Statement that might further repudiate the
3		Expert's original report. This means that their
4		Council [I think that means counsel with an 'S']
5		might have to have thorough briefing, by us,
6		before going to Court."
7		By 7 June 2004, do you think that you, by
8		that stage, had lost all objectivity in respect
9		of this matter?
10	Α.	What makes you say that?
11	Q.	Well, for example, the history of EPOSS; error
12		logs that we saw; the table that was sent to
13		you; Richard Brunskill's comments; your
14		agreement
15	Α.	No, I know all that but what makes you say had
16		I lost all objectivity?
17	Q.	Looking at the final paragraph, you are still
18		trying to further repudiate the expert's
19		original report and that is a report that, in
20		some respects at least, you originally agreed
21		with. Why are you persisting in June 2004 to
22		try to fight this matter?
23	Α.	I'm not. This is an internal mail to Colin
24		saying it's now too late for them, POL, to enter
25		a witness statement that might further repudiate
		72

(18) Pages 69 - 72

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 **A**.

25

Α.

to a court situation and it was a question that

we need to involve Masons at this stage?

Q. Can we look at WITN04600309, please. Is this

this 7 June 2004? The middle number could be

a 5 could be a 6. Perhaps we could zoom in on

"Fear that throwing money at the problem is

"Concede [the] content is accurate (it is

"Question 'how much to keep your mouth

Smith and we saw that slide that Dave Smith

produced in the session this morning, with Jason

had produced. Again, I don't know who "we", is, I don't know if it's "we" POA or "we" POL and

and I'm not sure what we did concede, and now

POL are in a difficult position. So, you know, so my concern there was well, is he now trying

to park the blame on us or is he sort of saying

And my comment about "given our late

involvement", bear in mind that we didn't get

involved in this until -- was it February 2004? And the issues were all happening in 2000/2001.

You know, I just wanted to be certain that he

wasn't going to try and push this all onto us and say we've done a bad job because I didn't

Q. Was there pressure in that respect? Did you

feel pressure coming from POL that you may

Well, no, I mean, the words there are the words

that came from that conversation with Keith. My

76

not -- that you may be blamed in this case?

that, you know, we've got to find a way of

managing this?

think we did.

Coyne, who showed him the slide that Dave Smith

POA have conceded what we should not have done,

What do you mean here in brackets, that the 74

I think that's a 6. Is that 7 June, the

Q. Can you assist us with the date in the top left-hand corner? Is this the same date, is

Nothing more or less than that.

Yeah, this is my daybook.

Q. The final entry on that page is:

the only way to deal with it:

"Liability is removed

but opinion is crap).

shut!"

"[Either] admit [the] report.

your note?

that if possible.

same date? A. It looks like a 6, yeah.

I was asking Colin as the Commercial Manager, do

1		the expert's original report, if they chose to
2		do it. But if they didn't, and they didn't,
3		then it's a different end game, isn't it?
4	Q.	The impression given by that email though is
5		that you're quite frustrated that you're not
6		going to be able to defend yourselves?
7	Α.	No, that's not so. That's your interpretation.
8		That's not what was meant by that.
9	Q.	I'm giving you an opportunity to say whatever
10		you like on that. What's your interpretation of
11		this email?
12	Α.	Just that if they wanted to further repudiate,
13		which they decided not to, then it's getting
14		very late, the trial date has been set, for them
15		to answer a witness statement that might further
16		repudiate the expert's original report. That's
17		all.
18	Q.	The final sentence:
19		"Do we need to involve Masons at this
20		stage?"
21		Masons being Fujitsu's lawyers, is it?
22	Α.	Yes, that's correct.
23	Q.	Why were you wondering whether you needed to
24		involve your own lawyers at that stage?
25	Α.	It was well, simply because it was getting up
		73
1		content is accurate but "opinion is crap"?
2	Α.	Well, that's a contemporaneous record of the
3		conversation I had with Mandy Talbot on the
4		phone, so it must have come out of that
5	_	conversation.
6	Q.	Do you think those were her words or your words?
7	Α.	I can't remember.
8	Q.	Can we look at FUJ00121668, please. 30 July
9		2004, we have an email from yourself to Colin
10		Lenton-Smith. You've:
11		" spoken to Keith Baines who alluded to
12		a number of other calls that he was going to
13		have to make on the case but didn't pass any
14		details on He said that Dave Smith would be
15		speaking to lan on the subject it seems Dave
16		believes 'we' (not sure whether that's the Royal
17		we or just us) have conceded what 'we' should
18		not have done and POL are now in a difficult
19		position. Given our late involvement by POL
20		I trust he's not trying to park it all on us."
21		At this stage, July 2004, was there
22		something of a blame game going on in relation
23		to this case?
24	Α.	Well, no, it's just that, in that conversation
25		with Keith, obviously, you know, he said Dave 75
		10

(19) Pages 73 - 76

1		feeling, my understanding, my belief and my
2		concern but seeing as I didn't know who "we"
3		were, was it POA, was it POA and POL, or was it
4		POL yeah. So, you know, I was just concerned
5		that we were he was going to try and say it's
6		all our fault.
7	Q.	Moving to August 2004, can we look at
8		WITN04600310, please. Is this also a note that
9		you made?
10	Α.	Yeah, it was a case conference call that was
11		held in August and I just making handwritten
12		notes of the progress of the meeting.
13	Q.	Now "SL" is POL's counsel. So when there are
14		references to "SL", it seems that is to Stephan
15		Lewinski?
16	Α.	Again, incorrectly spelt, so I apologise for
17		that but yes.
18	Q.	His advice is recorded there. If we look at the
19		final two sentences of his advice, it says:
20		"[Had] if goes to dispute likely to find
21		that computer system let [Julie Wolstenholme]
22		down."
23		Was it your understanding that counsel's
24		advice was that, if it went to court, the court
25		was likely to find that the computer had let the
		77
1		conference call and I was there, I think,
2		probably because of my involvement in it up to
2 3		probably because of my involvement in it up to that point.
2 3 4	Q.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have
2 3	Q.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so?
2 3 4 5 6	Q. A.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth
2 3 4 5	Α.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys.
2 3 4 5 6		probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys. If we look at page 4, it says, I think it's
2 3 4 5 6 7	Α.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Α.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys. If we look at page 4, it says, I think it's
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	Α.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys. If we look at page 4, it says, I think it's "Status of 2nd report". That's the second
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys. If we look at page 4, it says, I think it's "Status of 2nd report". That's the second report that you had written?
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q. A.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys. If we look at page 4, it says, I think it's "Status of 2nd report". That's the second report that you had written? Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys. If we look at page 4, it says, I think it's "Status of 2nd report". That's the second report that you had written? Yes. "Not forwarded to Mr Coyne."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q. A.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys. If we look at page 4, it says, I think it's "Status of 2nd report". That's the second report that you had written? Yes. "Not forwarded to Mr Coyne." Correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys. If we look at page 4, it says, I think it's "Status of 2nd report". That's the second report that you had written? Yes. "Not forwarded to Mr Coyne." Correct. "KB and I need to get our act together. KB
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q. A.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys. If we look at page 4, it says, I think it's "Status of 2nd report". That's the second report that you had written? Yes. "Not forwarded to Mr Coyne." Correct. "KB and I need to get our act together. KB agreed."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q. A.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys. If we look at page 4, it says, I think it's "Status of 2nd report". That's the second report that you had written? Yes. "Not forwarded to Mr Coyne." Correct. "KB and I need to get our act together. KB agreed." Now, that second report was the one that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys. If we look at page 4, it says, I think it's "Status of 2nd report". That's the second report that you had written? Yes. "Not forwarded to Mr Coyne." Correct. "KB and I need to get our act together. KB agreed." Now, that second report was the one that offered, I think, for Mr Coyne to attend
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys. If we look at page 4, it says, I think it's "Status of 2nd report". That's the second report that you had written? Yes. "Not forwarded to Mr Coyne." Correct. "KB and I need to get our act together. KB agreed." Now, that second report was the one that offered, I think, for Mr Coyne to attend Fujitsu?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys. If we look at page 4, it says, I think it's "Status of 2nd report". That's the second report that you had written? Yes. "Not forwarded to Mr Coyne." Correct. "KB and I need to get our act together. KB agreed." Now, that second report was the one that offered, I think, for Mr Coyne to attend Fujitsu? Yes, that's correct.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys. If we look at page 4, it says, I think it's "Status of 2nd report". That's the second report that you had written? Yes. "Not forwarded to Mr Coyne." Correct. "KB and I need to get our act together. KB agreed." Now, that second report was the one that offered, I think, for Mr Coyne to attend Fujitsu? Yes, that's correct. Do you recall why it wasn't forwarded to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys. If we look at page 4, it says, I think it's "Status of 2nd report". That's the second report that you had written? Yes. "Not forwarded to Mr Coyne." Correct. "KB and I need to get our act together. KB agreed." Now, that second report was the one that offered, I think, for Mr Coyne to attend Fujitsu? Yes, that's correct. Do you recall why it wasn't forwarded to Mr Coyne?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys. If we look at page 4, it says, I think it's "Status of 2nd report". That's the second report that you had written? Yes. "Not forwarded to Mr Coyne." Correct. "KB and I need to get our act together. KB agreed." Now, that second report was the one that offered, I think, for Mr Coyne to attend Fujitsu? Yes, that's correct. Do you recall why it wasn't forwarded to Mr Coyne? No, no. I'm not sure I found out about it until
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	probably because of my involvement in it up to that point. If you disagreed with something would you have felt free to say so? Yes, but I would have been out of my depth talking to, you know, the legal guys. If we look at page 4, it says, I think it's "Status of 2nd report". That's the second report that you had written? Yes. "Not forwarded to Mr Coyne." Correct. "KB and I need to get our act together. KB agreed." Now, that second report was the one that offered, I think, for Mr Coyne to attend Fujitsu? Yes, that's correct. Do you recall why it wasn't forwarded to Mr Coyne? No, no. I'm not sure I found out about it until really quite late after the event. But it

1		subpostmistress down?
2	Α.	That's what you can read into that. That was
3		his opinion.
4	Q.	Can we look page 3, please. We have halfway
5		down that page another opinion from the Post
6		Office's counsel. It's recorded as saying:
7		"Cannot say that there were no glitches.
8		Will be candid about that but what did we do to
9		help it."
10		So the focus seems to be not on the fact
11		that there were no errors but now it's turning
12		to the Helpdesk and assistance that was provided
13		to Mrs Wolstenholme. Do you recall that?
14	Α.	Well, that's what that looks like.
15	Q.	At this meeting, did you feel able to talk
16		freely?
17	Α.	Yeah, I mean, there's a couple of entries with
18		my initials against it.
19	Q.	Yes. I mean, if we look at the first page, it's
20		a discussion that involves yourself, POL
21		commercial, POL Legal, Weightman Vizards,
22		Masons so that's your own solicitors, is it?
23	Α.	Yeah, yeah.
24	Q.	POL Commercial sorry, POL counsel there.
25	Α.	Yeah, so, I mean, essentially, it was a POL case 78
		10
1		made any difference, so they ain't gonna do it.
2	Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the
2 3	Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team.
2 3 4	Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of?
2 3	Q. A.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report?
2 3 4 5 6		This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part of the decision-making process in that respect?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part of the decision-making process in that respect? No, that's how you're reading it but I wasn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part of the decision-making process in that respect? No, that's how you're reading it but I wasn't part of that decision-making process. That was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q. A.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part of the decision-making process in that respect? No, that's how you're reading it but I wasn't part of that decision-making process. That was a POL decision on their own.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part of the decision-making process in that respect? No, that's how you're reading it but I wasn't part of that decision-making process. That was a POL decision on their own. Did you respond, when you were told that it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q. A. Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part of the decision-making process in that respect? No, that's how you're reading it but I wasn't part of that decision-making process. That was a POL decision on their own. Did you respond, when you were told that it wasn't forwarded to Mr Coyne?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q. A. Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part of the decision-making process in that respect? No, that's how you're reading it but I wasn't part of that decision-making process. That was a POL decision on their own. Did you respond, when you were told that it wasn't forwarded to Mr Coyne? No, no, we were just disappointed.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13	A. Q. A. Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part of the decision-making process in that respect? No, that's how you're reading it but I wasn't part of that decision-making process. That was a POL decision on their own. Did you respond, when you were told that it wasn't forwarded to Mr Coyne? No, no, we were just disappointed. It says:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A. Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part of the decision-making process in that respect? No, that's how you're reading it but I wasn't part of that decision-making process. That was a POL decision on their own. Did you respond, when you were told that it wasn't forwarded to Mr Coyne? No, no, we were just disappointed. It says: "[Keith Baines] and I need to get our act
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A. Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part of the decision-making process in that respect? No, that's how you're reading it but I wasn't part of that decision-making process. That was a POL decision on their own. Did you respond, when you were told that it wasn't forwarded to Mr Coyne? No, no, we were just disappointed. It says: "[Keith Baines] and I need to get our act together."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part of the decision-making process in that respect? No, that's how you're reading it but I wasn't part of that decision-making process. That was a POL decision on their own. Did you respond, when you were told that it wasn't forwarded to Mr Coyne? No, no, we were just disappointed. It says: "[Keith Baines] and I need to get our act together." What did you mean by that?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A. Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part of the decision-making process in that respect? No, that's how you're reading it but I wasn't part of that decision-making process. That was a POL decision on their own. Did you respond, when you were told that it wasn't forwarded to Mr Coyne? No, no, we were just disappointed. It says: "[Keith Baines] and I need to get our act together." What did you mean by that? Well, I think there was some outstanding
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part of the decision-making process in that respect? No, that's how you're reading it but I wasn't part of that decision-making process. That was a POL decision on their own. Did you respond, when you were told that it wasn't forwarded to Mr Coyne? No, no, we were just disappointed. It says: "[Keith Baines] and I need to get our act together." What did you mean by that? Well, I think there was some outstanding documents that we needed to get sorted out and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part of the decision-making process in that respect? No, that's how you're reading it but I wasn't part of that decision-making process. That was a POL decision on their own. Did you respond, when you were told that it wasn't forwarded to Mr Coyne? No, no, we were just disappointed. It says: "[Keith Baines] and I need to get our act together." What did you mean by that? Well, I think there was some outstanding documents that we needed to get sorted out and it was just it's just a phrase, isn't it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part of the decision-making process in that respect? No, that's how you're reading it but I wasn't part of that decision-making process. That was a POL decision on their own. Did you respond, when you were told that it wasn't forwarded to Mr Coyne? No, no, we were just disappointed. It says: "[Keith Baines] and I need to get our act together." What did you mean by that? Well, I think there was some outstanding documents that we needed to get sorted out and it was just it's just a phrase, isn't it? "We need to get our act together". Keith
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part of the decision-making process in that respect? No, that's how you're reading it but I wasn't part of that decision-making process. That was a POL decision on their own. Did you respond, when you were told that it wasn't forwarded to Mr Coyne? No, no, we were just disappointed. It says: "[Keith Baines] and I need to get our act together." What did you mean by that? Well, I think there was some outstanding documents that we needed to get sorted out and it was just it's just a phrase, isn't it? "We need to get our act together". Keith agreed. And there's an email following it,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part of the decision-making process in that respect? No, that's how you're reading it but I wasn't part of that decision-making process. That was a POL decision on their own. Did you respond, when you were told that it wasn't forwarded to Mr Coyne? No, no, we were just disappointed. It says: "[Keith Baines] and I need to get our act together." What did you mean by that? Well, I think there was some outstanding documents that we needed to get sorted out and it was just it's just a phrase, isn't it? "We need to get our act together". Keith agreed. And there's an email following it, where there's a list of items that I said
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A. Q. A. Q.	This was August 2004, where you were part of the meeting with the Post Office and the legal team. Was that a decision that you were part of? Sorry, what decision: not to forward the report? Yes. Certainly it reads as though you were part of the decision-making process in that respect? No, that's how you're reading it but I wasn't part of that decision-making process. That was a POL decision on their own. Did you respond, when you were told that it wasn't forwarded to Mr Coyne? No, no, we were just disappointed. It says: "[Keith Baines] and I need to get our act together." What did you mean by that? Well, I think there was some outstanding documents that we needed to get sorted out and it was just it's just a phrase, isn't it? "We need to get our act together". Keith agreed. And there's an email following it,

1	Q.	Can we now look at WITN04600215, please.	1	Q.	Did you, at that stage, think that there might
2		16 August, we have an email from yourself to	2		be something in that argument?
3		Bill Mitchell. And you say:	3	Α.	I can't say that I did, to be honest. I don't
4		"Bill,	4		think I put too much into it.
5		"Just a quick note to let you know that	5	Q.	I mean, the expression "rolled out" suggests
6		Mrs Wolstenholme finally accepted an increased	6		that I mean, it's a line that's rolled out
7		offer from the [Post Office] to settle her case.	7		time and time again but not something with
8		Equipment will be returned as part of the Court	8		substance in it. Is that a fair analysis of
9		Order and she will have a confidentiality clause	9		what is said earlier or is that unfair?
10		associated with her settlement. However, she	10	Α.	No, again, I think that's your interpretation.
11		was still going to call a host of other PMs as	11		All I'm saying is that it's quite possible that
12		part of her case so I guess the 'issue of poor	12		the issue of poor systems and inadequate levels
13		systems and inadequate levels of support'	13		of support could well be rolled out in future
14		argument could well be rolled out again."	14		cases
15		In that meeting that you had with counsel,	15	Q.	Did you a view
16		the advice from counsel was that, if you get	16	Α.	because it's
17		into a dispute, it is likely to be found that	17		as to those who were rolling it out in cases?
18		the system let Mrs Wolstenholme down. Also,	18		When you say "did I have a view", do you mean
19		advice from counsel was that you cannot say that	19	7.0	did I have an opinion of the postmasters?
20		there were no glitches. Did you still think	20	0	Absolutely. Did you have an opinion as to the
21		that the issue of poor systems and inadequate	20	ч.	type of person who rolled out that argument?
22		levels of support argument was just a silly	22	Α.	No, not at all. It's just an obvious thing to
23		argument that it was being rolled out?	23	Λ.	do. If a case has been won using that argument,
23 24	A.	No, I was just advising Bill that I think we	23		then future cases could well use the same
25		could see that one again.	25		argument in order to try and secure a victory.
20		81	20		82
	_				
1	Q.	Can we look at FUJ00121724, please. This is the	1		term is for them but she apparently was going to
2		document we looked at earlier and I said I'd	2		circulate through a number of postmasters the
3		return to it, so we're now at 20 August and it's	3		outcome of the court case and it was, you know,
4		to Colin Lenton-Smith and Bill Mitchell. We've	4		I guess inevitably that the they would use it
5		looked at the Shobnall Road issue but let's look	5	_	to their benefit.
6		at Cleveleys now. It says:	6	Q.	What could possibly be wrong with subpostmasters
7		"Although Cleveleys may appear to be closed	7		using success in a court case to their benefit?
8		it could be construed that POL bought off	8	Α.	Nothing.
9		Mrs Wolstenholme rather than defend their	9	Q.	So why the critical words and why such
10		system. Even if a gagging order is placed on	10		an attempt to prevent that from happening?
11		the woman, she apparently has a gaggle of	11	Α.	Sorry, where was I attempting to stop that
12		postmasters lined up to support her case and	12		happening?
13		they will be well aware of what the final	13	Q.	Well, the continued effort to defend and respond
14		outcome was."	14		to Mr Coyne's independent report over months ma
15		Do you think, looking at that now, that that	15		be said to be a continued effort to try to
16		was an appropriate stance to have taken?	16		prevent a negative outcome that could be shared
17	Α.	Well, the words may be unfortunate but no,	17		with a "gaggle of postmasters". Do you agree
18		I think it's to be expected, isn't it?	18		with that?
19	Q.	Reference to a "gaggle of postmasters", I mean,	19	Α.	No, I don't. No, I mean, the two things are
20		do you regret what appears to be effectively	20		separates. I mean, in trying in refuting or
		a demonisation of subpostmasters in this regard?	21		in arguing against the Jason Coyne's report,
21		Well, I think "demonisation" is a bit of	22		that was one part of our support to the Post
	Α.				
	Α.	a strong word. I could have said, you know,	23		Office. That's been and gone to now. This is
22	Α.		23 24		Office. That's been and gone to now. This is after the event.

1		concern on your part that Mrs Wolstenholme would
2		share what was a successful court case on her
3		part with other subpostmasters and that that
4		would cause you some sort of problem in the
5		future?
6	Α.	I don't think so. I mean, it just says what it
7		says. Even if a gagging order is placed
8		because don't forget, as far as I was aware,
9		I was talking to Mandy Talbot, she said that she
10		would want to get a gagging order. So I'm
11		saying I don't know what the outcome was but
12		even if it was in place, it's highly unlikely
13		that it would stop her or stop others trying to
14		find out what the outcome was and how that was
15		achieved.
16	Q.	
17		woman", do you not think that the words used
18		were derogatory at that time, showed a sense of
19		frustration?
20	Α.	
21	Q.	
22		with the chair before I finish?
23	Α.	Well, no. I did mention earlier about the fact
24		that this was a this was a unique situation
25		that we found ourselves in, that I found myself 85
1		was their work. If they don't want to do
2		anything with it, then it's up to them, it's not
2		up to us.
4	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: No, I follow that. I just
5	•	wondered whether, because it was a specific
6		suggestion that had been made, no doubt made by
7		you but having no doubt considered it with
8		others, whether you would have liked to have
9		known the reason why they didn't do it. But
10		there we are.
11	Α.	Yeah, perhaps natural curiosity didn't get the
12		better of me that time.
13	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Fine. Okay.
14	MR	BLAKE: Sir, do you have any other questions,
15		otherwise we have some on behalf of Core
16		Participants?
17	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: No, they can fire away.
18	MR	BLAKE: Thank you very much.
19	Α.	That's a bit of an unfortunate phrase!
	ein	WYN WILLIAMS: There we are. Even chairs of
20	SIR	
20 21	SIR	inquiries have to occasionally choose their
	SIK	words carefully, Mr Holmes.
21	SIK	
21 22		words carefully, Mr Holmes.
21 22 23		words carefully, Mr Holmes. Questioned by MR JACOBS

1		in and we were having to learn how to do this
2		and to pick up how to do this as we went along.
3		It was the first time I'd been involved with
4		an expert witness as such.
5		POL had asked us to challenge the report,
6		which we did. All right, perhaps we took of the
7		challenge one step too far by offering him site
8		visits, and what have you, but there comes
9		a point when you want to see something reach
10		a natural conclusion and the second the offer
11		to host him and let him have access to people
12		and systems, was probably the last toss of the
13		die. The fact that Post Office didn't forward
14		that report to him was their choice and then we
15		take the next step which is going to court.
16		You know, as I said at the start, it's
17		a job. We had a job of work to do and we did
18		that work.
19	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Did you ever discover why Post
20		Office decided against making the offer that you
21		thought that they should?
22	A.	No, no sir, I didn't.
23	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: All right, thank you.
24	A.	At one level, it didn't seem important. They
25		chose not to do it. It was their report. It
		86
1		subpostmasters. I have couple of questions for
2		you. Could we go to document FUJ00121486,
3		please. We'll just wait for it to come up on
4		the screen. If we scroll down to just before
5		the paragraph beginning "The Expert's Opinion",
6		so that's right. So the paragraph that begins
7		"On 6th February". So it says:
8		"On 6th February POA received a copy of the
9		Expert's report with a request from POL for
10		an early response."
11		Then:
12		"POL are concerned that the Expert's opinion
13		(that the system was at fault) might set
14		a precedent against future POL prosecutions."
15		Now, this is a draft response that you sent
16		to Mr Lenton-Smith in February 2004, in relation
17		to a letter that he'd received from Mr Baines.
18		Do you recall that?
19	Α.	Yeah, yes, I do.
20	Q.	Mr
21	Α.	Sorry, I'm looking to the side. I'm looking at
22		my laptop to find some documents, which I think,
23		or a daybook scan, where that concern was raised
24		in a conversation.
25	Q.	Well, I'm going to ask you about that a bit
		88

(22) Pages 85 - 88

	later. Mr Blake put the same point to you from	1		precedent? You haven't said what it was that
	another document and you said that that was your	2		they said.
	understanding at the time; is that right?	3	Α.	Well, that would have been in phone
	Yeah.	4		conversations. I'm just looking at just bear
Q.	If we could now go to your witness statement, at	5		with me a minute. Well, you've seen the day
	paragraph 10 and your statement is WITN04600200.	6		book scan from the phone call with Mandy Talbot
Α.	Is this my third or second witness statement?	7		in June. No, I mean these concerns would have
Q.	I think it's your second witness statement.	8		been expressed in phone conversations and also
	It's your second witness statement, yes.	9		in Keith Baines's letter. Obviously I've got
Α.	5 , 5	10		a record of Mandy Talbot's phone conversation
Q.		11		but not Jim's, where that concern was expressed.
	page 76 but I think it's page 4 of 10?	12		So in a my recordkeeping is not as good as it
	Yes, that's correct, I've got it.	13		usually is.
Q.	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	14	Q.	Well, of course, this was a long time ago but
	you were exasperated with the Post Office and	15		you say in your statement that they both
	their handling of this issue and their handling	16		verbally expressed concerns and I really wanted
	of the expert witness and lack of communication.	17		to ask you whether you remember what it was that
	Then you say here:	18		they said, what specific concerns they expressed
	"[Post Office Limited], specifically Jim	19		about precedent.
	Cruise and Mandy Talbot, had both verbally	20	Α.	Well, no, I suspect what I'm talking about there
	expressed concerns about precedent should the	21		is the fact that if the if the report
	Expert's report become common knowledge and had	22		well, which it did, of course if the report
	asked for our assistance in challenging it."	23		resulted in a positive outcome for the
	Now, what I want to ask you is what did Jim	24		postmaster, then I think they were concerned
	Cruise and Mandy Talbot verbally express about 89	25		that this issue of poor systems and poor support 90
		4		
	would be, as I've said in another email, rolled	1	ME	No, that's it. Thank you very much.
	out time and again by postmasters who were	2	MR	BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry.
0	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue.	2 3		BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY
Q.	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and	2 3 4		BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about,
Q.	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post	2 3 4 5	MR	BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes.
Q.	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this	2 3 4	MR A.	BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah.
Q.	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this material in court because it might lead to them	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR A.	BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah. Firstly, when you prepared your response to
Q.	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this material in court because it might lead to them being acquitted. That's really what this is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR A.	R BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY R MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah. Firstly, when you prepared your response to Mr Coyne's report or indeed your response to his
	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this material in court because it might lead to them being acquitted. That's really what this is about, isn't it?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR A.	BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah. Firstly, when you prepared your response to Mr Coyne's report or indeed your response to his reply, did you check PinICLs or KELs relating to
	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this material in court because it might lead to them being acquitted. That's really what this is about, isn't it? Well, I think that's what I've just said but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR A. Q.	 BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah. Firstly, when you prepared your response to Mr Coyne's report or indeed your response to his reply, did you check PinICLs or KELs relating to Cleveleys?
A.	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this material in court because it might lead to them being acquitted. That's really what this is about, isn't it? Well, I think that's what I've just said but you've probably put it much better than I can.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR A. Q. A.	 BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah. Firstly, when you prepared your response to Mr Coyne's report or indeed your response to his reply, did you check PinICLs or KELs relating to Cleveleys? No.
	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this material in court because it might lead to them being acquitted. That's really what this is about, isn't it? Well, I think that's what I've just said but you've probably put it much better than I can. Thank you very much.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR A. Q. A. Q.	BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah. Firstly, when you prepared your response to Mr Coyne's report or indeed your response to his reply, did you check PinICLs or KELs relating to Cleveleys? No. You're sure about that?
A.	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this material in court because it might lead to them being acquitted. That's really what this is about, isn't it? Well, I think that's what I've just said but you've probably put it much better than I can. Thank you very much. So our clients also say, and I wanted your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR A. Q. A. Q.	BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah. Firstly, when you prepared your response to Mr Coyne's report or indeed your response to his reply, did you check PinICLs or KELs relating to Cleveleys? No. You're sure about that? Yeah. I mean, I didn't get down to the
A.	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this material in court because it might lead to them being acquitted. That's really what this is about, isn't it? Well, I think that's what I've just said but you've probably put it much better than I can. Thank you very much. So our clients also say, and I wanted your comment on this, that really what the Post	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13	MR A. Q. A. Q.	BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah. Firstly, when you prepared your response to Mr Coyne's report or indeed your response to his reply, did you check PinICLs or KELs relating to Cleveleys? No. You're sure about that? Yeah. I mean, I didn't get down to the technical level of looking at individual
A.	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this material in court because it might lead to them being acquitted. That's really what this is about, isn't it? Well, I think that's what I've just said but you've probably put it much better than I can. Thank you very much. So our clients also say, and I wanted your comment on this, that really what the Post Office were doing was they were, in 2004, trying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	МR А. Q. А. Д.	BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah. Firstly, when you prepared your response to Mr Coyne's report or indeed your response to his reply, did you check PinICLs or KELs relating to Cleveleys? No. You're sure about that? Yeah. I mean, I didn't get down to the technical level of looking at individual PinICLs, PEAKs or KELs.
A.	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this material in court because it might lead to them being acquitted. That's really what this is about, isn't it? Well, I think that's what I've just said but you've probably put it much better than I can. Thank you very much. So our clients also say, and I wanted your comment on this, that really what the Post Office were doing was they were, in 2004, trying to cover up evidence of defects in the Horizon	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR A. Q. A. Q. Q.	BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah. Firstly, when you prepared your response to Mr Coyne's report or indeed your response to his reply, did you check PinICLs or KELs relating to Cleveleys? No. You're sure about that? Yeah. I mean, I didn't get down to the technical level of looking at individual PinICLs, PEAKs or KELs. Right.
A. Q.	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this material in court because it might lead to them being acquitted. That's really what this is about, isn't it? Well, I think that's what I've just said but you've probably put it much better than I can. Thank you very much. So our clients also say, and I wanted your comment on this, that really what the Post Office were doing was they were, in 2004, trying to cover up evidence of defects in the Horizon System. Do you accept that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR A. Q. A. Q. Q.	BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah. Firstly, when you prepared your response to Mr Coyne's report or indeed your response to his reply, did you check PinICLs or KELs relating to Cleveleys? No. You're sure about that? Yeah. I mean, I didn't get down to the technical level of looking at individual PinICLs, PEAKs or KELs. Right. The discussion was a slightly higher level of
A. Q.	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this material in court because it might lead to them being acquitted. That's really what this is about, isn't it? Well, I think that's what I've just said but you've probably put it much better than I can. Thank you very much. So our clients also say, and I wanted your comment on this, that really what the Post Office were doing was they were, in 2004, trying to cover up evidence of defects in the Horizon System. Do you accept that? I can't really answer to that one. I don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR A. Q. A. Q. Q.	BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah. Firstly, when you prepared your response to Mr Coyne's report or indeed your response to his reply, did you check PinICLs or KELs relating to Cleveleys? No. You're sure about that? Yeah. I mean, I didn't get down to the technical level of looking at individual PinICLs, PEAKs or KELs. Right. The discussion was a slightly higher level of just, you know, the principle of whatever it
A. Q. A. Q.	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this material in court because it might lead to them being acquitted. That's really what this is about, isn't it? Well, I think that's what I've just said but you've probably put it much better than I can. Thank you very much. So our clients also say, and I wanted your comment on this, that really what the Post Office were doing was they were, in 2004, trying to cover up evidence of defects in the Horizon System. Do you accept that? I can't really answer to that one. I don't Well	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR A. Q. A. Q. A.	 BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah. Firstly, when you prepared your response to Mr Coyne's report or indeed your response to his reply, did you check PinICLs or KELs relating to Cleveleys? No. You're sure about that? Yeah. I mean, I didn't get down to the technical level of looking at individual PinICLs, PEAKs or KELs. Right. The discussion was a slightly higher level of just, you know, the principle of whatever it was I can't remember now, so far back.
A. Q.	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this material in court because it might lead to them being acquitted. That's really what this is about, isn't it? Well, I think that's what I've just said but you've probably put it much better than I can. Thank you very much. So our clients also say, and I wanted your comment on this, that really what the Post Office were doing was they were, in 2004, trying to cover up evidence of defects in the Horizon System. Do you accept that? I can't really answer to that one. I don't Well I don't know what their motive motivation was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR A. Q. A. Q. A.	BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah. Firstly, when you prepared your response to Mr Coyne's report or indeed your response to his reply, did you check PinICLs or KELs relating to Cleveleys? No. You're sure about that? Yeah. I mean, I didn't get down to the technical level of looking at individual PinICLs, PEAKs or KELs. Right. The discussion was a slightly higher level of just, you know, the principle of whatever it was I can't remember now, so far back. Could we, just to clarify that, just have a look
A. Q. A. Q.	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this material in court because it might lead to them being acquitted. That's really what this is about, isn't it? Well, I think that's what I've just said but you've probably put it much better than I can. Thank you very much. So our clients also say, and I wanted your comment on this, that really what the Post Office were doing was they were, in 2004, trying to cover up evidence of defects in the Horizon System. Do you accept that? I can't really answer to that one. I don't Well I don't know what their motive motivation was to handling the case. I just know what we did	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR A. Q. A. Q. A.	BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah. Firstly, when you prepared your response to Mr Coyne's report or indeed your response to his reply, did you check PinICLs or KELs relating to Cleveleys? No. You're sure about that? Yeah. I mean, I didn't get down to the technical level of looking at individual PinICLs, PEAKs or KELs. Right. The discussion was a slightly higher level of just, you know, the principle of whatever it was I can't remember now, so far back. Could we, just to clarify that, just have a look at WITN04600206. This is the first page. This
A. Q. A. Q.	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this material in court because it might lead to them being acquitted. That's really what this is about, isn't it? Well, I think that's what I've just said but you've probably put it much better than I can. Thank you very much. So our clients also say, and I wanted your comment on this, that really what the Post Office were doing was they were, in 2004, trying to cover up evidence of defects in the Horizon System. Do you accept that? I can't really answer to that one. I don't Well I don't know what their motive motivation was to handling the case. I just know what we did to try to assist them in what they were asking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR A. Q. A. Q. A.	BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah. Firstly, when you prepared your response to Mr Coyne's report or indeed your response to his reply, did you check PinICLs or KELs relating to Cleveleys? No. You're sure about that? Yeah. I mean, I didn't get down to the technical level of looking at individual PinICLs, PEAKs or KELs. Right. The discussion was a slightly higher level of just, you know, the principle of whatever it was I can't remember now, so far back. Could we, just to clarify that, just have a look at WITN04600206. This is the first page. This is "Fujitsu Services Post Office Account
A. Q. A. Q. A.	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this material in court because it might lead to them being acquitted. That's really what this is about, isn't it? Well, I think that's what I've just said but you've probably put it much better than I can. Thank you very much. So our clients also say, and I wanted your comment on this, that really what the Post Office were doing was they were, in 2004, trying to cover up evidence of defects in the Horizon System. Do you accept that? I can't really answer to that one. I don't Well I don't know what their motive motivation was to handling the case. I just know what we did to try to assist them in what they were asking us to do.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR A. Q. A. Q. A.	 BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah. Firstly, when you prepared your response to Mr Coyne's report or indeed your response to his reply, did you check PinICLs or KELs relating to Cleveleys? No. You're sure about that? Yeah. I mean, I didn't get down to the technical level of looking at individual PinICLs, PEAKs or KELs. Right. The discussion was a slightly higher level of just, you know, the principle of whatever it was I can't remember now, so far back. Could we, just to clarify that, just have a look at WITN04600206. This is the first page. This is "Fujitsu Services Post Office Account Response to the Expert's Reply to Fujitsu
A. Q. A. Q. A.	out time and again by postmasters who were suffering the same sort of issue. You see, our clients' take on this evidence, and I suggest that this must be right, is that Post Office didn't want subpostmasters to use this material in court because it might lead to them being acquitted. That's really what this is about, isn't it? Well, I think that's what I've just said but you've probably put it much better than I can. Thank you very much. So our clients also say, and I wanted your comment on this, that really what the Post Office were doing was they were, in 2004, trying to cover up evidence of defects in the Horizon System. Do you accept that? I can't really answer to that one. I don't Well I don't know what their motive motivation was to handling the case. I just know what we did to try to assist them in what they were asking	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR A. Q. A. Q. A.	 BLAKE: Mr Moloney or Mr Henry. Questions by MR MOLONEY MOLONEY: I've just two things to ask you about, please, Mr Holmes. Yeah. Firstly, when you prepared your response to Mr Coyne's report or indeed your response to his reply, did you check PinICLs or KELs relating to Cleveleys? No. You're sure about that? Yeah. I mean, I didn't get down to the technical level of looking at individual PinICLs, PEAKs or KELs. Right. The discussion was a slightly higher level of just, you know, the principle of whatever it was I can't remember now, so far back. Could we, just to clarify that, just have a look at WITN04600206. This is the first page. This is "Fujitsu Services Post Office Account Response to the Expert's Reply to Fujitsu Services Submission"?

Q.

Α.

Q.

Α.

Q.

Α.

Q.

Α.

Q.

Α. l ca

Q.

(23) Pages 89 - 92

1	~	Vac. and under the "Usizan System Usindesk" if
2	Q.	Yes, and under the "Horizon System Helpdesk", if we scroll down slightly to the second
2		subparagraph, we can see that:
4		"His statement that the HSH was not
4 5		interested in getting to the 'bottom of the
6		continual occurrence' is flawed given that one
7		of the calls that he specifically referenced was
, 8		closed using a Known Error Log. The presence of
9		a KEL clearly indicates that problems were
9 10		investigated and workarounds provided pending
11		a permanent fix through a system upgrade."
12		So does that in any way affect your answer
13		that you didn't look at PEAKs or KELs in
14		relation to Cleveleys or PinICLs?
15	Α.	No, what I suspect may have happened there and
16		I can only surmise that that was the case, is
17		that I may well have had conversations with
18		interested parties about the response that he'd
19		made and the question of HSH not interested in
20		getting to the bottom of the continual
21		occurrence was probably challenged by somebody.
22		one somebody I was talking to, and saying "Well,
23		no, that's not true because we have KELs", which
24		means that we do look at the problem to try to
25		come up with a quick solution for future use,
		93
1		Then at 2:
2		"Introduce formal Root Cause Analysis into
3		Problem and Complaints management as a matter of
4		course. This is already being addressed within
5		[Customer Service]."
6		Then, at page 7 of the document, we see
7		4.1.2, "Problem Root Cause Analysis":
8		"CS/PRD/021 also introduces the concept of
-		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

2		"Introduce formal Root Cause Analysis into
3		Problem and Complaints management as a matter of
4		course. This is already being addressed within
5		[Customer Service]."
6		Then, at page 7 of the document, we see
7		4.1.2, "Problem Root Cause Analysis":
8		"CS/PRD/021 also introduces the concept of
9		Root Cause Analysis for problems although again,
10		no guidance or examples are provided. No
11		evidence of completed [Root Cause Analyses]
12		could be identified.
13		"It is recommended that RCA guidance is
14		provided, either in CS/PRD/021 or in
15		a standalone procedure."
16		So by November 2001, around the time of or
17		just after, even, the Cleveleys relevant event,
18		there was sufficient concern to note that
19		there'd been no evidence of any RCAs completed
20		for any problems addressed so far.
21	Α.	Well, yes, that's what's in the report, so that
22		must have been what was found.
23	Q.	You're the originator of this report, Mr Holmes?
24	Α.	Yeah, yeah.
25	Q.	Was this not consistent with the analysis of 95

1		pending an update or a reissue of software at
-		
2	_	a later release date.
3	Q.	The second issue concerns that, as it were,
4		getting to the bottom of things and root cause
5		analysis. Could we look at
6	Α.	Yeah.
7	Q.	document POL00089802. This, as you can see,
8		is an "Audit of Customer Service Support
9		Processes", and we can see that the originator
10		is yourself, Mr Holmes?
11	Α.	Yes, yes.
12	Q.	It's 1 November 2001, and if we could please go
13		to paragraph 3.1, at page 3 thank you very
14		much which reads that:
15		"The overall opinion formed is that the
16		management of Incidents, Problems and Complaints
17		and Alerts has reached a level of maturity
18		where consistency now the norm"
19		But if we see that, further down:
20		"There are a number of relatively minor
21		issues that, while not impairing the current
22		management of incidents and problems could, if
23		accepted and addressed improve the performance
24		of this part of [Customer Service]. They are
25		" "

1		Mr Coyne?
2	Α.	Well, yes, I suppose it is. I mean, yeah.
3	Q.	Was that reflected in your response to the
4		report of Mr Coyne?
5	Α.	I well, you can show me the response but
6		I guess what you're saying is that, although
7		we'd found this in an audit in 2001, it wasn't
8		reflected back in our response to him.
9		I suppose, in my defence, there is an awful lot
10		going on in different streams. So, yes, this
11		would have been found at the time of the audit
12		but it doesn't stick in the forefront of my mind
13		when I'm looking at other things going on. Now,
14		that may sound like a poor excuse, I know, but
15		that's the way it is.
16	Q.	Shall we just look at your response, just to
17		assist you, which is FUJ00121504. Towards the
18		bottom of page 1, if we could, please. There we
19		see in terms of the Helpdesk:
20		"The HSH represents the 1st line of support
21		to postmasters. It operates under strict
22		Service Level Agreements covering aspects such
23		as pick-up time, first time fix and time to
24		close. These measures are imposed by Post
25		Office Limited and are designed to ensure that 96

1		PMs receive a quick response to their call and,
2		to the extent possible over the phone, a timely
3		return to normal business operations.
4		Depending on the nature of the call the HSH,
5		operator would work with the PM to solve the
6		problem and return the Outlet to normal
7		operation as soon as possible, in line with the
8		prevailing SLAs. If this could not be achieved
9		the call would be escalated up the support
10		channel to 2nd, 3rd or 4th line depending on the
11		severity of the problem. Again, the primary
12		objective is to return the Outlet to normal
13		operation as soon as possible and rebooting the
14		counter often meets that objective. This does
15		not mean that the problem was closed at that
16		point in time, as a detailed scrutiny of overall
17		problem management in the Post Office Account
18		would reveal."
19		Then we see into "Transaction Handling on
20		Reboot".
21		That's a fairly generic statement about the
22		purpose of HSH, isn't it, Mr Holmes?
23		Yes, it is, yeah.
24	Q.	Did you take any steps to investigate whether
25		there'd been any root cause analysis in respect 97
		57
1		clearly, Mr Holmes?
2	_	Yes, I can now. Yeah.
3	Q.	-
4		incident management system. So what does that
5		mean?
6	Α.	Well, PEAK was the system where all incidents
7 8	~	were logged. You were, you say, not involved at that level?
8 0	Q.	
9 10	Α.	I was on this one because this was an issue that affected our ability to produce audit data
10		request request sort of thingy-bob what's
12		the word SQL type query statements because
12		there was no Attribute Grammar catalogue
13		available for the TMS journal. So we weren't
14		able to look at a request coming in from outside
16		and say "Well, in order to satisfy that we need
17		to get this piece of information, this piece of
18		information, that piece of information, and
19		stick it together as a query type statement".
20		So that was just identifying the absence of
20		a piece of technical documentation.
22	Q.	Did this feature, this problem, that you have
	- e -	
		just referred to, in the original report that
23		just referred to, in the original report that vou wrote with Mr McDonnell?
23 24	А.	you wrote with Mr McDonnell?
23	A.	

of problems at Cleveleys?

A. No.
 Q. Why not?
 A. Because t

1

5

- A. Because that wasn't really the objective of what
- I was trying to do with this response.
- 6 Q. Did you have skin in the game here, as you said,7 Mr Holmes?
- 8 A. Yeah, I'd been asked to do something and I was
- 9 doing it to, at that time, the best of -- what
- 10 I felt was the best of my ability. Of course,
- 11 21 years later, it's very easy to criticise and
- 12 come back and say "Well, you didn't do that very
- 13 well, did you?" And the answer is, no,
- 14 I didn't, I can see that and I could have done
- 15 more but, at that time, I felt that was what was
- 16 required.

18

17 **MR MOLONEY:** Thank you, Mr Holmes.

Questioned by MR HENRY

- 19 MR HENRY: Good afternoon, Mr Holmes. Edward Henry,
- 20 representing a number of subpostmasters,
- 21 including Ms Tracy Felstead.
- 22 Mr Holmes, could I just ask you, and it's in
- 23 relation to a question that you have been asked
- 24 by my learned friend just now, could I ask you
- 25 to go to FUJ00075674, please. Can you see that 98

1	Q.	But would you agree that it would again be
2		symptomatic of a financial accounting system
3		that was unfit for purpose?
4	Α.	No. No, this all this was, was just saying
5		we didn't have any record descriptions that
6		would allow us to search through the records to
7		pull audit data off. Nothing to do with what
8		the system itself was doing.
9	Q.	But it's very, very important, isn't it, in
10		order to analyse root cause analysis of problems
11		in the system and, also, the recording and
12		retention of data must be fundamental to
13		a financial accounting system that works?
14	Α.	Well, I agree with you, and the TMS journals
15		were there in the audit archive and were
16		complete and valid and accurate. What we didn't
17		have was the means to get into them to pull the
18		information out that was required on request.
19		That was all. I'm trying to think of
20		a parallel.
21	Q.	Well, I suppose the parallel could be, it could
22		be like, yeah, you've got all of the stuff, like
22		the bioroglyphe but until you've get the Posette

- 23 the hieroglyphs but until you've got the Rosetta
- 24 Stone, you don't know what the hieroglyphs are
- 25 because you can't access them.

1	Α.	Absolutely right.
2	Q.	Right. So let's just go to the first entry
3		there, 1 July:
4		"The ability to interrogate TMS journals is
5		an integral element of the Audit Solution that
6		we supply to POCL. The interrogations are
7		achieved using R-Query and constructing SQL type
8		query statements. The structure of the TMS
9		records is complex and uses Attribute Grammar to
10		establish identities for the record attributes.
11		There is currently no definitive catalogue of
12		the Attribute Grammar used in the Horizon
13		solution ['solution' perhaps should have been
14		put in inverted commas] which makes the
15		construction of an R-Query statement to meet
16		a customer's business enquiry difficult, time
17		consuming and very 'hit and miss'."
18		Were those your words?
19	Α.	Yes.
20	Q.	"Hit and miss".
21		You are still in control of this issue in
22		September 2001, are you not?
23	Α.	Yes.
24	Q.	Because we go to the 12 September 2001 at 11.05.
25		The call record has been assigned to the team 101
		101
1	Q.	That's 21 June.
1 2	Q. A.	That's 21 June. Yeah, because on 19 January, there's
2		Yeah, because on 19 January, there's
2 3		Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version
2 3 4		Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar
2 3 4 5		Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced
2 3 4 5 6		Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced the document that was missing when the PinICL
2 3 4 5 6 7		Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced the document that was missing when the PinICL was first raised. So that was passed back to me
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Α.	Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced the document that was missing when the PinICL was first raised. So that was passed back to me as the originator to close it, which I did.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Α.	Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced the document that was missing when the PinICL was first raised. So that was passed back to me as the originator to close it, which I did. But this was a serious problem and it wasn't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q.	Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced the document that was missing when the PinICL was first raised. So that was passed back to me as the originator to close it, which I did. But this was a serious problem and it wasn't closed until 2004?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A. Q.	Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced the document that was missing when the PinICL was first raised. So that was passed back to me as the originator to close it, which I did. But this was a serious problem and it wasn't closed until 2004? Why do you say it's a serious problem, Mr Henry?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A. Q.	Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced the document that was missing when the PinICL was first raised. So that was passed back to me as the originator to close it, which I did. But this was a serious problem and it wasn't closed until 2004? Why do you say it's a serious problem, Mr Henry? The absence of a catalogue that describes the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A. Q.	Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced the document that was missing when the PinICL was first raised. So that was passed back to me as the originator to close it, which I did. But this was a serious problem and it wasn't closed until 2004? Why do you say it's a serious problem, Mr Henry? The absence of a catalogue that describes the records for audit to build SQL queries was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A. Q.	Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced the document that was missing when the PinICL was first raised. So that was passed back to me as the originator to close it, which I did. But this was a serious problem and it wasn't closed until 2004? Why do you say it's a serious problem, Mr Henry? The absence of a catalogue that describes the records for audit to build SQL queries was an inconvenience and a problem and a nuisance
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A. Q. A.	Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced the document that was missing when the PinICL was first raised. So that was passed back to me as the originator to close it, which I did. But this was a serious problem and it wasn't closed until 2004? Why do you say it's a serious problem, Mr Henry? The absence of a catalogue that describes the records for audit to build SQL queries was an inconvenience and a problem and a nuisance but it wasn't a serious error.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A. Q. A.	Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced the document that was missing when the PinICL was first raised. So that was passed back to me as the originator to close it, which I did. But this was a serious problem and it wasn't closed until 2004? Why do you say it's a serious problem, Mr Henry? The absence of a catalogue that describes the records for audit to build SQL queries was an inconvenience and a problem and a nuisance but it wasn't a serious error. There is currently no you agree with me it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A. Q. A.	Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced the document that was missing when the PinICL was first raised. So that was passed back to me as the originator to close it, which I did. But this was a serious problem and it wasn't closed until 2004? Why do you say it's a serious problem, Mr Henry? The absence of a catalogue that describes the records for audit to build SQL queries was an inconvenience and a problem and a nuisance but it wasn't a serious error. There is currently no you agree with me it was like the hieroglyphs before the discovering
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q. A.	Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced the document that was missing when the PinICL was first raised. So that was passed back to me as the originator to close it, which I did. But this was a serious problem and it wasn't closed until 2004? Why do you say it's a serious problem, Mr Henry? The absence of a catalogue that describes the records for audit to build SQL queries was an inconvenience and a problem and a nuisance but it wasn't a serious error. There is currently no you agree with me it was like the hieroglyphs before the discovering of the Rosetta Stone:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A. Q. A.	Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced the document that was missing when the PinICL was first raised. So that was passed back to me as the originator to close it, which I did. But this was a serious problem and it wasn't closed until 2004? Why do you say it's a serious problem, Mr Henry? The absence of a catalogue that describes the records for audit to build SQL queries was an inconvenience and a problem and a nuisance but it wasn't a serious error. There is currently no you agree with me it was like the hieroglyphs before the discovering of the Rosetta Stone: "There is currently no definitive catalogue
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q. A.	Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced the document that was missing when the PinICL was first raised. So that was passed back to me as the originator to close it, which I did. But this was a serious problem and it wasn't closed until 2004? Why do you say it's a serious problem, Mr Henry? The absence of a catalogue that describes the records for audit to build SQL queries was an inconvenience and a problem and a nuisance but it wasn't a serious error. There is currently no you agree with me it was like the hieroglyphs before the discovering of the Rosetta Stone: "There is currently no definitive catalogue of the Attribute Grammar used in the Horizon
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q. A.	Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced the document that was missing when the PinICL was first raised. So that was passed back to me as the originator to close it, which I did. But this was a serious problem and it wasn't closed until 2004? Why do you say it's a serious problem, Mr Henry? The absence of a catalogue that describes the records for audit to build SQL queries was an inconvenience and a problem and a nuisance but it wasn't a serious error. There is currently no you agree with me it was like the hieroglyphs before the discovering of the Rosetta Stone: "There is currently no definitive catalogue of the Attribute Grammar used in the Horizon solution which makes the construction of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q. A.	Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced the document that was missing when the PinICL was first raised. So that was passed back to me as the originator to close it, which I did. But this was a serious problem and it wasn't closed until 2004? Why do you say it's a serious problem, Mr Henry? The absence of a catalogue that describes the records for audit to build SQL queries was an inconvenience and a problem and a nuisance but it wasn't a serious error. There is currently no you agree with me it was like the hieroglyphs before the discovering of the Rosetta Stone: "There is currently no definitive catalogue of the Attribute Grammar used in the Horizon solution which makes the construction of an R-Query statement to meet a customer's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A. Q. A.	Yeah, because on 19 January, there's a document in PVCS, with a reference at version 0.4, that is an up-to-date Attribute Grammar catalogue. So in other words, they had produced the document that was missing when the PinICL was first raised. So that was passed back to me as the originator to close it, which I did. But this was a serious problem and it wasn't closed until 2004? Why do you say it's a serious problem, Mr Henry? The absence of a catalogue that describes the records for audit to build SQL queries was an inconvenience and a problem and a nuisance but it wasn't a serious error. There is currently no you agree with me it was like the hieroglyphs before the discovering of the Rosetta Stone: "There is currently no definitive catalogue of the Attribute Grammar used in the Horizon solution which makes the construction of an R-Query statement to meet a customer's business enquiry difficult" Your words, "difficult".

1		member Jan Holmes, correct? So you're still in
2		control of this in September 2001, correct?
3	Α.	Where does it say that?
4	Q.	Go to 12 September 2001, which is at page 3 of 4
5		in the internal numbering, 11.05.
6	Α.	Yeah, I can see it.
7	Q.	You're still in control of this 21 June 2004?
8	A.	Well, it's been passed back to me because as
9		I was the originator. So it's been sent back to
10		me and it says:
11		"This has been identified as a requirement
12		for Network Banking and has been included in the
13		NWB Performance Improvements document. It has
14		not been transferred to the SDS but the PinICL
15		remains open pending the delivery of such
16		a catalogue as part of BI3."
17		So what was happening there was the
18		production of this catalogue had been put on the
19		back burner, and until a later release of
20		Horizon was made.
21	Q.	But it's still if we go to the last entry but
22		one, 21 June 2004, there's an entry:
23		"The call record has been assigned to the
24		Team Member: Jan Holmes."
25	Α.	Yes, that's right.
		102
1	Q.	" time consuming and very 'hit and miss'."
2		That's a serious problem, Mr Holmes.
3	Α.	In your opinion, possibly. But it was just one
4		of a number of things that we were dealing with.
5	Q.	That's a serious
6	Α.	We could
7	Q.	problem, Mr Holmes, even if it is one of
8		number of things you may be dealing with
9		because, as you accepted on the last occasion
10		you gave evidence before the Inquiry, the Post
11		Office was entirely dependent on Horizon data
12		for its prosecution of subpostmasters. You
13		agreed with that?
14	Α.	Yes, that's right.
15	Q.	Right, okay.
16	Α.	So all the absence of the Attribute Grammar
17		catalogue did was just made our life slightly
18		more difficult when we were pulling the audit
19		data. The audit data was there. It just
20	Q.	The audit data has to be picked out impartially,
21		independently, comprehensively and fully. It
22		can't be picked out on a hit and miss basis.

- 23 Surely you agree with that?24 A. Exactly, that's why the PinICL was raised.
- 25 Q. Yes. Right.

1		Now, that is not closed until 2004, is it?		1
2	Α.	That's correct, yeah.		2
3	Q.	Right. Ms Felstead was convicted in 2002. So		3
4		I now move on to her case. You were asked about		4
5		this on the last occasion, and I was asking		5
6		about Tracy Felstead when I was questioning you		6
7		on the last occasion. Would you like to go to		7
8		the transcript of that? Shall we go to it?		8
9		It's INQ00001019.		9
10		Can I just do a quick whistlestop tour		10
11		through this transcript. Could we go internal		11
12		numbering, please, to 5 of 83, page 20 of the		12
13		transcript, line 7. This is when Mr Beer is		13
14		questioning Mr McDonnell, and it's page 20.		14
15		Yes. Thank you. Line 7. This was about the		15
16		EPOS System being the joke of the building.		16
17		Then he said:		17
18		"Yes, I think everybody knew, specifically		18
19		the test team who, when I spoke to those guys,		19
20		they would make it very clear that the quality		20
21		of the code that was being deliver was to such		21
22		a bad, poor level that they're wasting their		22
23		time testing it, because they knew that it was		23
24		just broken. They were going to end up raising		24
25		lots of PinICLs from it. So they'd give a very 105	2	25
1		agree with Mr Holmes that that was a concern?"		1
2		Because he was being taken to your concerns,		2
3		Mr Holmes, and the answer was:		3
4		"I do and, in fact, within this document		4
5		there's a very good example of that when, during		5
6		the Taskforce, which was supposed to be all		6
7		about getting the quality under control, they		7
8		took away of sum of the resource to force in		8
9		extra functionality for, I think it was		9
10		balancing and something else. There's three		10
11		parts to it. It's referred to in the document		11
12		somewhere. But it was a sizeable piece of		12
13		development work which was being developed on		13
14		the fly and shoe-horned into the code right in		14
15		the middle of the Taskforce initiative, where we		15
16		were trying to stabilise the product, and that's		16
17		a typical example of not understanding the		17
18		problem of where we were at the time and		18
19		continuing with the same bad behaviour, in my		19
20		view.	:	20
21		"Question: Those two concerns that	:	21
22		Mr Holmes mentions and which you agree with, in	:	22
23		your view, would they have had any impact on the	:	23
24		integrity of the system, how it operated or how	:	24
25		it was operated by subpostmasters?	:	25
		107		

1		frank and very honest opinion about the ability
2		of some of the guys, not all of them some of
3		them were good in the team, and the quality
4		of the product that that team was producing. It
5		was a standing joke in the building."
6		Mr Beer said:
7		"You say in your statement it was known up
8		to the highest level, including Fujitsu Japan,
9		because they sent over three coders to perform
10		an audit."
11		Mr McDonnell confirms that he can't remember
12		what date that actually was.
13		Could we go to page 31, please. At page 31,
14		I'm sorry I don't see the numbering on this.
15		I'm so sorry. I was meaning page 31 of the
16		actual transcript. It's internal page 8.
17		That's entirely my fault. Internal page 8 of
18		83. Thank you. So is that page 8 of 83. Thank
19		you very much. Page 31, lines 1 to 25, and this
20		is:
21		" he says there was a concern which he
22		considered to be the greater of the two concerns
23		which relate to the impact of continual changes
24		to existing code to fix problems and/or to
25		insert new functionality into the code. Do you
		106
1 2		"Answer: Yes, it would. It would result in functional errors, bugs, spurious behaviour."
3		Internal forgive me, I just go to the top
4		of page 32:
5		"Was that the view held by you and others at
6		
7		ICL Pathway at the time?
8		ICL Pathway at the time? "Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was
0		•
9		"Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was
		"Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was a belief that was pervasive throughout the
9		"Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was a belief that was pervasive throughout the building."
9 10		"Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was a belief that was pervasive throughout the building." Of course, Mr Holmes, you being the
9 10 11		 "Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was a belief that was pervasive throughout the building." Of course, Mr Holmes, you being the co-author of the report, it would have been
9 10 11 12	А.	 "Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was a belief that was pervasive throughout the building." Of course, Mr Holmes, you being the co-author of the report, it would have been a view that you trenchantly shared together with
9 10 11 12 13	A. Q.	"Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was a belief that was pervasive throughout the building." Of course, Mr Holmes, you being the co-author of the report, it would have been a view that you trenchantly shared together with your co-author, wouldn't it?
9 10 11 12 13 14		 "Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was a belief that was pervasive throughout the building." Of course, Mr Holmes, you being the co-author of the report, it would have been a view that you trenchantly shared together with your co-author, wouldn't it? I would have shared it with him, yes.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15		 "Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was a belief that was pervasive throughout the building." Of course, Mr Holmes, you being the co-author of the report, it would have been a view that you trenchantly shared together with your co-author, wouldn't it? I would have shared it with him, yes. Trenchantly, I'm sure. You're not backward in
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		 "Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was a belief that was pervasive throughout the building." Of course, Mr Holmes, you being the co-author of the report, it would have been a view that you trenchantly shared together with your co-author, wouldn't it? I would have shared it with him, yes. Trenchantly, I'm sure. You're not backward in coming forward, Mr Holmes. You're the co-author
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q.	 "Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was a belief that was pervasive throughout the building." Of course, Mr Holmes, you being the co-author of the report, it would have been a view that you trenchantly shared together with your co-author, wouldn't it? I would have shared it with him, yes. Trenchantly, I'm sure. You're not backward in coming forward, Mr Holmes. You're the co-author of that report.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q.	 "Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was a belief that was pervasive throughout the building." Of course, Mr Holmes, you being the co-author of the report, it would have been a view that you trenchantly shared together with your co-author, wouldn't it? I would have shared it with him, yes. Trenchantly, I'm sure. You're not backward in coming forward, Mr Holmes. You're the co-author of that report. Well, all right, if you want to use that term,
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A.	 "Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was a belief that was pervasive throughout the building." Of course, Mr Holmes, you being the co-author of the report, it would have been a view that you trenchantly shared together with your co-author, wouldn't it? I would have shared it with him, yes. Trenchantly, I'm sure. You're not backward in coming forward, Mr Holmes. You're the co-author of that report. Well, all right, if you want to use that term, feel free.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A.	 "Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was a belief that was pervasive throughout the building." Of course, Mr Holmes, you being the co-author of the report, it would have been a view that you trenchantly shared together with your co-author, wouldn't it? I would have shared it with him, yes. Trenchantly, I'm sure. You're not backward in coming forward, Mr Holmes. You're the co-author of that report. Well, all right, if you want to use that term, feel free. Well, Mr Holmes, it's not a secret that when you
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A.	 "Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was a belief that was pervasive throughout the building." Of course, Mr Holmes, you being the co-author of the report, it would have been a view that you trenchantly shared together with your co-author, wouldn't it? I would have shared it with him, yes. Trenchantly, I'm sure. You're not backward in coming forward, Mr Holmes. You're the co-author of that report. Well, all right, if you want to use that term, feel free. Well, Mr Holmes, it's not a secret that when you wished to express an opinion, you express
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A.	 "Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was a belief that was pervasive throughout the building." Of course, Mr Holmes, you being the co-author of the report, it would have been a view that you trenchantly shared together with your co-author, wouldn't it? I would have shared it with him, yes. Trenchantly, I'm sure. You're not backward in coming forward, Mr Holmes. You're the co-author of that report. Well, all right, if you want to use that term, feel free. Well, Mr Holmes, it's not a secret that when you wished to express an opinion, you express an opinion, you express
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q.	 "Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was a belief that was pervasive throughout the building." Of course, Mr Holmes, you being the co-author of the report, it would have been a view that you trenchantly shared together with your co-author, wouldn't it? I would have shared it with him, yes. Trenchantly, I'm sure. You're not backward in coming forward, Mr Holmes. You're the co-author of that report. Well, all right, if you want to use that term, feel free. Well, Mr Holmes, it's not a secret that when you wished to express an opinion, you express an opinion with a certain degree of confidence and, shall we say, vigour?
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q.	 "Answer: Yes, it was. I think it was a belief that was pervasive throughout the building." Of course, Mr Holmes, you being the co-author of the report, it would have been a view that you trenchantly shared together with your co-author, wouldn't it? I would have shared it with him, yes. Trenchantly, I'm sure. You're not backward in coming forward, Mr Holmes. You're the co-author of that report. Well, all right, if you want to use that term, feel free. Well, Mr Holmes, it's not a secret that when you wished to express an opinion, you express an opinion with a certain degree of confidence and, shall we say, vigour? No, "trenchantly" is not a term that I would

(27) Pages 105 - 108

	I see. Confidence, then. Unequivocal in your	1		able to do it.
2	view?	2		HENRY: So b
3 A.		3	TH	E WITNESS: C
4	report. So I was, you know, happy to concur	4		something? I
5	with him.	5	-	
	Page 11, internal, please.	6	IHI	E WITNESS: Y
	R BLAKE: Sir, I'm sorry to interrupt, Mr Henry.	7		the loo, that's
8	In terms of timing, I just want to make sure	8	SIR	
9	because we're certainly not going to use up this	9		have that. Rig
10	afternoon's session. The question is, whether	10	WR	HENRY: Coul
11	we take a short break now or at some appropriate	11	010	accommodate
12	point before Mr Henry continues or whether	12	216	
13	Mr Henry considers he will be finished shortly.	13		I will call a loo
14 15 OK	If not, there's no problem at all.	14		1.00.
	R WYN WILLIAMS: Well, Mr Blake, I was beginning	15	MR	HENRY: Sir,
6	to wonder. I'm not really keen, Mr Henry, on	16		time than that
7	going back to the points that you're focusing on	17		Because I did
8	at the moment, unless they are really laying the	18		response to y
9	ground for some important point in relation to	19		speeding thing
20	this morning's evidence.	20		a little bit mor
	R HENRY: Well, they are, sir, but I can take them	21	015	concise.
22	a lot more quickly.	22	216	WYN WILLIAM
	R WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I would prefer to complete	23		do is say this:
24	the evidence without a further break, if I can	24		HENRY: Tha
25	put it in that way and I think we ought to be 109	25	214	R WYN WILLIAM
1	cease no later than 1.30.	1	Q.	Oh, I can hea
2 MI	RHENRY: So be it, sir.	2		Did you give a
	R WYN WILLIAMS: Fine.	3		it?
4 (1)	2.53 pm)	4	Α.	l gave an ans
5	(A short break)	5		which was, ye
6 (1 .	11 pm)	6		question in No
	R BLAKE: Thank you, sir. We can see and hear you.	7	Q.	Yes, and your
8	Can you see and hear us?	8		an administrat
	R WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you.	9	Α.	To the best of
IO MI	R HENRY: May I begin, sir?	10	Q.	Yes. Now, ca
	R WYN WILLIAMS: Of course, yes.	11		time, had you
	R HENRY: Thank you, sir.	12		prosecution o
13	Mr Holmes, the report that you co-authored	13		your knowled
14	with Mr McDonnell, I asked you on a previous	14	Α.	
15	occasion why you retrieved it on 14 May 2001.	15		was associate
	Do you recall me asking you that question?	16	Q.	Camberwell G
6	Yes, I believe you did, yes.	17	Α.	Right. Now, I
				statement for
7 A .		18		
17 A. 18 Q .	Sorry, sir. I can't hear you.	18 19		knowledge of
17 A. 18 Q . 19 A .	Sorry, sir. I can't hear you. I'm unmuted. Yeah, I think you did.	19	Q.	0
 17 A. 18 Q. 19 A. 20 Q. 	Sorry, sir. I can't hear you. I'm unmuted. Yeah, I think you did. I'm afraid we've lost the sound.		Q.	You certainly
 A. Q. A. A. A. A. A. A. A. 	Sorry, sir. I can't hear you. I'm unmuted. Yeah, I think you did. I'm afraid we've lost the sound. No, I am unmuted.	19 20	Q.	You certainly Camberwell G
17 A. 18 Q. 19 A. 20 Q. 21 A. 22 SI	Sorry, sir. I can't hear you. I'm unmuted. Yeah, I think you did. I'm afraid we've lost the sound.	19 20 21	Q.	You certainly Camberwell G because you o
17 A. 18 Q. 19 A. 20 Q. 21 A. 22 SII 23	Sorry, sir. I can't hear you. I'm unmuted. Yeah, I think you did. I'm afraid we've lost the sound. No, I am unmuted. R WYN WILLIAMS: I can hear Mr Holmes, so it's	19 20 21 22	Q.	knowledge of You certainly Camberwell G because you o You were ask 12 October 20
 18 Q. 19 A. 20 Q. 21 A. 22 SII 23 	Sorry, sir. I can't hear you. I'm unmuted. Yeah, I think you did. I'm afraid we've lost the sound. No, I am unmuted. R WYN WILLIAMS: I can hear Mr Holmes, so it's a problem in the hall, by the sound of it. R HENRY: Yes.	19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	You certainly Camberwell G because you You were ask

be it, sir.

Okay, hang on, sorry? Can I say

I would like a break.

WS: Do you mean a short break?

Yeah, just a natural break to go to s all.

WS: Of course. Of course, you must light.

uld we have a break now, then, sir, to te Mr Holmes, perhaps?

WS: Yes. We will break off for what

o break. We'll bring us back at

could I ask for a little bit more

- at? Just a little bit more.
- d have some material and, in
- your request for, as it were,
- ngs along, I would just like to have

re time to make things more

WS: Right. Well, what I'm going to

- : we're going to break until 1.10.
- ank you, sir.

WS: But then the questioning will 110

ar you now, Mr Holmes. Thank you. an answer, because we didn't hear

swer to the question you just asked es, I do recall you asking the lovember.

Ir answer was that it was a sort of ative catch-up?

- of my memory, yes.
- an I just ask you please, at the
- u been asked to assist in the

of Ms Tracy Felstead to the best of

lge and belief?

- what was the name of the outlet she ted with?
- Green.
- I do believe I did a witness
- Camberwell Green but with no f who was involved.
- did make a witness statement for
- Green and I'm sure that's right

do not mention Ms Felstead's name.

- ked to consider data between
- 2000 and 1 March 2001.
- ay "consider", do you mean review it, 112

(28) Pages 109 - 112

1		analyse it or extract it?
2	Q.	Shall we go to your witness statement
3	Α.	Yeah, let's do that.
4	Q.	that will probably be the best thing to do.
5 6	Α.	I can't get my hands on it immediately here. So yeah.
7	Q.	Don't worry because we can have it put up on the
8	٩.	screen.
9	Α.	Okay.
10	Q.	It's WITN04600217. I wonder if you could put
11		that up.
12		Now you, sir, are not a technical person.
13	Α.	No.
14	Q.	You have said that on more than one occasion.
15	Α.	Yeah.
16	Q.	Right. This is not signed, but you have
17		mentioned that you were asked to make a witness
18		statement. Did you eventually sign a witness
19		statement?
20	Α.	l don't know.
21	Q.	I suppose that would be the natural presumption
22		of going to the trouble of writing a draft
23		witness statement, a draft witness statement, of
24		course, which has been amended, as we can see.
25	Α.	Well, I was going to say, this is still in draft
		113
1		copy of this, in the sense that all I've got is
2		a copy that you've got, which is in a draft
3		form, and I can't unless I can see one that
4		I've signed, I don't know what to say.
5	Q.	Well, I'm not going to be asking you about any
6		of the bits that have been amended. So all I am
7		going to be asking you about is your direct
8		knowledge of the contents of this statement.
9	Α.	Okay.
10	Q.	Now
11	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Before we go any further,
12		Mr Henry, will we be able to establish today
13		whether or not Mr Holmes actually made a signed
14		witness statement?
15	WR	HENRY: I'm afraid, given the effluxion of time,
16 17		sir, unless there's something that I have not
		yet detected, I am afraid I can't answer that
18 19	SID	question. WYN WILLIAMS: So, I mean, obviously I will
20	JIK	defer to your view as to whether you pursue this
20 21		at the moment but I'm not quite sure what I will
21		get in terms of my investigation from
22		an examination of a draft which may never have
23 24		become more than a draft, if I can put it in
25		that way.
Z:1		

1		form, isn't it?
2	Q.	Yes. I mean, were you in the habit, as you
3		were, for example, in the Cleveleys case, of
4		making witness statements?
5	Α.	I made a few over the years, yes.
6	Q.	In fact, I think in some of the documents that
7		you very kindly produced, you were remarking
8		about the fact that you were being asked to make
9		a few about various locations at one point and
10		that I'm not sure of the exact words but
11		that it was a bit of an imposition; do you
12		recall?
13	Α.	Well, they take time to produce, but it's part
14		and parcel of the job, isn't it?
15	Q.	Yes, it is. You presumably read the declaration
16		that it was going to be, once signed, true to
17		the best of your knowledge and belief, and you
18		would make it knowing that if it were to be
19		tendered in evidence you would be liable to
20		prosecution if you had wilfully stated in it
21		anything which you knew to be false or did not
22		believe to be true. So, obviously, you realised
23		it was a matter of some solemnity and
24		importance.
25	Α.	I'm just concerned that I don't have a final
		114
1	MR	HENRY: Could I go to some subsidiary documents,
2		then, if I may. Could we go we'll come back
3		to this, but I want to be quite fair to you,
4		Mr Holmes. Could we go to WITN04600216. This
5		is a "Pathway Change Control Notice (CCN)
6		Sheet". It's a document that you produced,
7		Mr Holmes. It came from your garage or wherever
8 9		you were keeping these documents.
9 10		The date is 10 January 2002 and it was again under the umbrella of the Camberwell Green Post
10		Office case. Could we go, please, to page 4 of
12		5. Do you remember on the last occasion,
12		Mr Holmes and I can give the precise
14		reference if you would wish to go to it, but let
15		me ask the question first that I put to you
16		that at Ms Felstead's trial, a request had been
17		made by ICL Fujitsu for £20,000 for unused
18		material, and do you see the figure there?
19	Α.	Yes, I do.
20	Q.	It's remarkably similar, isn't it, to the
20	<u>~</u> .	£20,000 in relation to a Camberwell Green case.
22		Do you agree?
23	Α.	Well, yeah, the numbers are roughly the same but

- 24 I have no knowledge of this at all.
- 25 **Q.** But these are your documents that you produced 116

1		to the Inquiry. You obviously kept them for
2		a reason.
3	Α.	I didn't produce the CCN. That's not my
4		document that I'm looking at now.
5	Q.	Right. I'm very sorry, I thought these were
6		documents that were actually produced by you as
7		a result of being requested to produce them by
8		the Inquiry.
9	Α.	Can you scroll this one on screen up to the top,
10		and let's have a look at what it is. Right this
11		is a Change Control Note which is raised by us
12		in response to a change request that is raised
13		by the Post Office, which we then raise a change
14		proposal that effectively establishes the work
15		within Post Office Account. And the CCN is the
16		Change Control Note that goes back to the Post
17		Office to say, "This is what we're going to do
18		and this is how much it's going to cost".
19		I have nothing to do with that. In fact,
20		you can see the CCN was raised by Graham Hooper,
21		who was a Security Manager at that time.
22	Q.	I see. Nevertheless, in relation to Camberwell
23		Green, because this is what we understand and
24		that's the description of the document as to its
25		provenance, in relation to the Camberwell Green
		117
1	Α.	Yes.
2	Q.	Could we go to, please, if we may, to the
3		conclusion of the witness statement, please, or
4		page 4 of 5. Forgive me, page 4 of 5. Could
5		l ask you, please, to scroll down. I do
6		apologise.
7		You're dealing here with Horizon System
8		Helpdesk calls, Tivoli event logs, non-polling
9		reports. So far as you are aware, was this
10		information that was being supplied to you
11		you not being a technical person that this
12		was information being supplied to you by
13		somebody else?
14	Α.	l don't know, or these might have been audit
15		data that we'd extracted and then had a look at.
16		So I can't tell you, if the Horizon System
17		Helpdesk calls data, the 21 calls, were
18		extracted from the audit solution and then

- 18 extracted from the audit solution and then
- I looked at it or whether it was given to me by
 somebody else.
- 21 Q. I mean, obviously, a witness statement in
- 22 a civil case can often be an amalgam of
- 23 information that is relayed to one by other
- 24 people and that it is sometimes even constructed
- 25 by the solicitor on behalf of the witness, but

1		case, it's remarkably close, is it not, to the
2		£20,000 that I put out to you on the last
3		occasion?
4	Α.	Yeah, but I you can't expect me to comment on
5		something that I had no part in the production
6		of. Yes, the numbers are nearly the same but so
7		what?
8	Q.	Could I just again I appreciate that you do
9		not refer to Ms Felstead by name in your witness
10		statement but could we go back to that draft
11		witness statement, please, and that's
12		WITN04600217. Again, just the introduction:
13		"I have been employed by ICL Pathway for
14		5 years employed as the Quality and Audit
15		manager responsible for Quality and Audit
16		Management and the User Authority for the Audit
17		Solution from where the Audit Data is sourced.
18		I have working knowledge of the computer system
19		known as Horizon, which is the computer supplied
20		by ICL Pathway Limited and used by Post Office
21		Limited in Post Office Outlets. I am authorised
22		by ICL Pathway Limited to undertake extractions
23		and analyses of audit that held on the Horizon
24		System."
24 25		Is all of that completely accurate?
		Is all of that completely accurate?
		Is all of that completely accurate?
25		Is all of that completely accurate? 118
25 1	А.	Is all of that completely accurate? 118 this was a statement that was intended for
25 1 2	А.	Is all of that completely accurate? 118 this was a statement that was intended for submission in a criminal case. Do you follow?
25 1 2 3	A.	Is all of that completely accurate? 118 this was a statement that was intended for submission in a criminal case. Do you follow? Well, actually, if you go back to the previous
25 1 2 3 4	A.	Is all of that completely accurate? 118 this was a statement that was intended for submission in a criminal case. Do you follow? Well, actually, if you go back to the previous page, I'm putting my hand up there and saying:
25 1 2 3 4 5	А.	Is all of that completely accurate? 118 this was a statement that was intended for submission in a criminal case. Do you follow? Well, actually, if you go back to the previous page, I'm putting my hand up there and saying: "On various dates and at various times
25 1 2 3 4 5 6	A.	Is all of that completely accurate? 118 this was a statement that was intended for submission in a criminal case. Do you follow? Well, actually, if you go back to the previous page, I'm putting my hand up there and saying: "On various dates and at various times between 14 January and 25 January I analysed
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	A.	Is all of that completely accurate? 118 this was a statement that was intended for submission in a criminal case. Do you follow? Well, actually, if you go back to the previous page, I'm putting my hand up there and saying: "On various dates and at various times between 14 January and 25 January I analysed audit data for transactions and activities
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A.	Is all of that completely accurate? 118 this was a statement that was intended for submission in a criminal case. Do you follow? Well, actually, if you go back to the previous page, I'm putting my hand up there and saying: "On various dates and at various times between 14 January and 25 January I analysed audit data for transactions and activities undertaken by Camberwell Green Post Office
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A. Q.	Is all of that completely accurate? 118 this was a statement that was intended for submission in a criminal case. Do you follow? Well, actually, if you go back to the previous page, I'm putting my hand up there and saying: "On various dates and at various times between 14 January and 25 January I analysed audit data for transactions and activities undertaken by Camberwell Green Post Office during the period 12 October 2000 to 1 March
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		Is all of that completely accurate? 118 this was a statement that was intended for submission in a criminal case. Do you follow? Well, actually, if you go back to the previous page, I'm putting my hand up there and saying: "On various dates and at various times between 14 January and 25 January I analysed audit data for transactions and activities undertaken by Camberwell Green Post Office during the period 12 October 2000 to 1 March 2001 (the Material Period).
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	Is all of that completely accurate? 118 this was a statement that was intended for submission in a criminal case. Do you follow? Well, actually, if you go back to the previous page, I'm putting my hand up there and saying: "On various dates and at various times between 14 January and 25 January I analysed audit data for transactions and activities undertaken by Camberwell Green Post Office during the period 12 October 2000 to 1 March 2001 (the Material Period). Yes.
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q.	Is all of that completely accurate? 118 this was a statement that was intended for submission in a criminal case. Do you follow? Well, actually, if you go back to the previous page, I'm putting my hand up there and saying: "On various dates and at various times between 14 January and 25 January I analysed audit data for transactions and activities undertaken by Camberwell Green Post Office during the period 12 October 2000 to 1 March 2001 (the Material Period). Yes. I have to assume that what follows, Horizon
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q.	Is all of that completely accurate? 118 this was a statement that was intended for submission in a criminal case. Do you follow? Well, actually, if you go back to the previous page, I'm putting my hand up there and saying: "On various dates and at various times between 14 January and 25 January I analysed audit data for transactions and activities undertaken by Camberwell Green Post Office during the period 12 October 2000 to 1 March 2001 (the Material Period). Yes. I have to assume that what follows, Horizon System Helpdesk, Tivoli event logs, non-polling
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	Is all of that completely accurate? 118 this was a statement that was intended for submission in a criminal case. Do you follow? Well, actually, if you go back to the previous page, I'm putting my hand up there and saying: "On various dates and at various times between 14 January and 25 January I analysed audit data for transactions and activities undertaken by Camberwell Green Post Office during the period 12 October 2000 to 1 March 2001 (the Material Period). Yes. I have to assume that what follows, Horizon System Helpdesk, Tivoli event logs, non-polling reports, were pulled from the audit archive.
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A.	Is all of that completely accurate? 118 this was a statement that was intended for submission in a criminal case. Do you follow? Well, actually, if you go back to the previous page, I'm putting my hand up there and saying: "On various dates and at various times between 14 January and 25 January I analysed audit data for transactions and activities undertaken by Camberwell Green Post Office during the period 12 October 2000 to 1 March 2001 (the Material Period). Yes. I have to assume that what follows, Horizon System Helpdesk, Tivoli event logs, non-polling reports, were pulled from the audit archive. I mean, I can't remember, 21 years on.
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	Is all of that completely accurate? 118 this was a statement that was intended for submission in a criminal case. Do you follow? Well, actually, if you go back to the previous page, I'm putting my hand up there and saying: "On various dates and at various times between 14 January and 25 January I analysed audit data for transactions and activities undertaken by Camberwell Green Post Office during the period 12 October 2000 to 1 March 2001 (the Material Period). Yes. I have to assume that what follows, Horizon System Helpdesk, Tivoli event logs, non-polling reports, were pulled from the audit archive. I mean, I can't remember, 21 years on. Of course. So, in other words, you were,
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	Is all of that completely accurate? 118 this was a statement that was intended for submission in a criminal case. Do you follow? Well, actually, if you go back to the previous page, I'm putting my hand up there and saying: "On various dates and at various times between 14 January and 25 January I analysed audit data for transactions and activities undertaken by Camberwell Green Post Office during the period 12 October 2000 to 1 March 2001 (the Material Period). Yes. I have to assume that what follows, Horizon System Helpdesk, Tivoli event logs, non-polling reports, were pulled from the audit archive. I mean, I can't remember, 21 years on. Of course. So, in other words, you were, although not a technical person, you were
25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A.	Is all of that completely accurate? 118 this was a statement that was intended for submission in a criminal case. Do you follow? Well, actually, if you go back to the previous page, I'm putting my hand up there and saying: "On various dates and at various times between 14 January and 25 January I analysed audit data for transactions and activities undertaken by Camberwell Green Post Office during the period 12 October 2000 to 1 March 2001 (the Material Period). Yes. I have to assume that what follows, Horizon System Helpdesk, Tivoli event logs, non-polling reports, were pulled from the audit archive. I mean, I can't remember, 21 years on. Of course. So, in other words, you were, although not a technical person, you were analysing the data. Was anybody there to assist

- A. I can't remember whether there was or not, to behonest with you.
- 23 **Q.** I see. Then could we go to the next page,
- 24 please, and the "Conclusion"?
- 25 **A.** Can I just stop you there, Mr Henry? 120

		o
1	Q.	
2	Α.	I'm looking at a version of this document, which
3		is version 1, which has the changes in the same
4		way that you've got on yours, but I've also got
5		another oh, I must be imagining it.
6		I thought there was something there about time.
7		No, right. Forget it, sorry. I beg your
8		pardon.
9	Q.	Don't worry, Mr Holmes.
10		Your "Conclusion":
11		"There are no reasonable grounds for
12		believing that the information stored on the
13		Horizon system would be inaccurate because of
14		improper use of computer terminal. During the
15		Material Time the Horizon system was operating
16		properly at the Camberwell Green Post Office
17		Outlet or if not, any respect in which it was
18		not operating properly or was out of operation
19		was not such as to affect the production of
20		audit records or accuracy of their contents."
21	Α.	Mm-hm.
22	Q.	Now, sir, are those your words or were they
23		effectively a rubric that you had been provided
24		with?
25	Α.	I can't recall. I cannot recall. 121
1		quality unstable and vulnerable to each decay
2		quality, unstable and vulnerable to code decay.
2		You were aware of all these things?
3	۸	Lapont that and weak
4	A.	
4	A. Q.	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that
5		Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was
5 6	Q.	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu?
5 6 7	Q. A.	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do.
5 6 7 8	Q.	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do. I suggest to you, Mr Holmes, that that can't be
5 6 7 8 9	Q. A. Q.	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do. I suggest to you, Mr Holmes, that that can't be right.
5 6 7 8 9 10	Q. A.	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do. I suggest to you, Mr Holmes, that that can't be right. Well, all right, fine. If you believe that to
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A. Q.	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do. I suggest to you, Mr Holmes, that that can't be right. Well, all right, fine. If you believe that to be incorrect, perhaps you can enlighten me as to
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q. A.	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do. I suggest to you, Mr Holmes, that that can't be right. Well, all right, fine. If you believe that to be incorrect, perhaps you can enlighten me as to how you arrive at that
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A.	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do. I suggest to you, Mr Holmes, that that can't be right. Well, all right, fine. If you believe that to be incorrect, perhaps you can enlighten me as to how you arrive at that WYN WILLIAMS: Hang on now, hang on.
5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A.	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do. I suggest to you, Mr Holmes, that that can't be right. Well, all right, fine. If you believe that to be incorrect, perhaps you can enlighten me as to how you arrive at that WYN WILLIAMS: Hang on now, hang on. First of all, it's 1.30 and, secondly, this
5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A.	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do. I suggest to you, Mr Holmes, that that can't be right. Well, all right, fine. If you believe that to be incorrect, perhaps you can enlighten me as to how you arrive at that WYN WILLIAMS: Hang on now, hang on. First of all, it's 1.30 and, secondly, this session was supposed to be about Cleveleys and
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A.	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do. I suggest to you, Mr Holmes, that that can't be right. Well, all right, fine. If you believe that to be incorrect, perhaps you can enlighten me as to how you arrive at that WYN WILLIAMS: Hang on now, hang on. First of all, it's 1.30 and, secondly, this session was supposed to be about Cleveleys and the relevance sorry, the evidence relating to
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A.	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do. I suggest to you, Mr Holmes, that that can't be right. Well, all right, fine. If you believe that to be incorrect, perhaps you can enlighten me as to how you arrive at that WYN WILLIAMS: Hang on now, hang on. First of all, it's 1.30 and, secondly, this session was supposed to be about Cleveleys and the relevance sorry, the evidence relating to Cleveleys. We're now going off on a completely
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A.	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do. I suggest to you, Mr Holmes, that that can't be right. Well, all right, fine. If you believe that to be incorrect, perhaps you can enlighten me as to how you arrive at that WYN WILLIAMS: Hang on now, hang on. First of all, it's 1.30 and, secondly, this session was supposed to be about Cleveleys and the relevance sorry, the evidence relating to Cleveleys. We're now going off on a completely different tangent in circumstances about which
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A. Q. A.	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do. I suggest to you, Mr Holmes, that that can't be right. Well, all right, fine. If you believe that to be incorrect, perhaps you can enlighten me as to how you arrive at that WYN WILLIAMS: Hang on now, hang on. First of all, it's 1.30 and, secondly, this session was supposed to be about Cleveleys and the relevance sorry, the evidence relating to Cleveleys. We're now going off on a completely different tangent in circumstances about which I am uncomfortable, when it is not even known
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A.	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do. I suggest to you, Mr Holmes, that that can't be right. Well, all right, fine. If you believe that to be incorrect, perhaps you can enlighten me as to how you arrive at that WYN WILLIAMS: Hang on now, hang on. First of all, it's 1.30 and, secondly, this session was supposed to be about Cleveleys and the relevance sorry, the evidence relating to Cleveleys. We're now going off on a completely different tangent in circumstances about which I am uncomfortable, when it is not even known whether or not an actual witness statement was
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. SIR	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do. I suggest to you, Mr Holmes, that that can't be right. Well, all right, fine. If you believe that to be incorrect, perhaps you can enlighten me as to how you arrive at that WYN WILLIAMS: Hang on now, hang on. First of all, it's 1.30 and, secondly, this session was supposed to be about Cleveleys and the relevance sorry, the evidence relating to Cleveleys. We're now going off on a completely different tangent in circumstances about which I am uncomfortable, when it is not even known whether or not an actual witness statement was made.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. SIR	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do. I suggest to you, Mr Holmes, that that can't be right. Well, all right, fine. If you believe that to be incorrect, perhaps you can enlighten me as to how you arrive at that WYN WILLIAMS: Hang on now, hang on. First of all, it's 1.30 and, secondly, this session was supposed to be about Cleveleys and the relevance sorry, the evidence relating to Cleveleys. We're now going off on a completely different tangent in circumstances about which I am uncomfortable, when it is not even known whether or not an actual witness statement was made. HENRY: So be it, sir. The reason why I have
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. SIR	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do. I suggest to you, Mr Holmes, that that can't be right. Well, all right, fine. If you believe that to be incorrect, perhaps you can enlighten me as to how you arrive at that WYN WILLIAMS: Hang on now, hang on. First of all, it's 1.30 and, secondly, this session was supposed to be about Cleveleys and the relevance sorry, the evidence relating to Cleveleys. We're now going off on a completely different tangent in circumstances about which I am uncomfortable, when it is not even known whether or not an actual witness statement was made. HENRY: So be it, sir. The reason why I have been asking this is because it appears to be in
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q. SIR	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do. I suggest to you, Mr Holmes, that that can't be right. Well, all right, fine. If you believe that to be incorrect, perhaps you can enlighten me as to how you arrive at that WYN WILLIAMS: Hang on now, hang on. First of all, it's 1.30 and, secondly, this session was supposed to be about Cleveleys and the relevance sorry, the evidence relating to Cleveleys. We're now going off on a completely different tangent in circumstances about which I am uncomfortable, when it is not even known whether or not an actual witness statement was made. HENRY: So be it, sir. The reason why I have been asking this is because it appears to be in lock step with Cleveleys in, as it were,
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. SIR	Yeah. So, again, I ask you, do you think that this is a fair reflection of that which was known at that stage by you but also Fujitsu? Yes. I do. I suggest to you, Mr Holmes, that that can't be right. Well, all right, fine. If you believe that to be incorrect, perhaps you can enlighten me as to how you arrive at that WYN WILLIAMS: Hang on now, hang on. First of all, it's 1.30 and, secondly, this session was supposed to be about Cleveleys and the relevance sorry, the evidence relating to Cleveleys. We're now going off on a completely different tangent in circumstances about which I am uncomfortable, when it is not even known whether or not an actual witness statement was made. HENRY: So be it, sir. The reason why I have been asking this is because it appears to be in

1	Q.	Do you think they fairly reflect the knowledge,
2		your personal knowledge, that learned counsel to
3		the Inquiry was exploring with you this morning,
4		about bugs, errors and defects which were
5		apparent at this time?
6	Α.	Sorry, can you repeat that?
7	Q.	Do you think that this fairly reflects the
8		knowledge, your personal knowledge, of bugs,
9		errors and defects that were apparent at this
10		time?
11	Α.	Well, I guess it must do because those did exist
12		at that time, we all know that now. We didn't
13		necessarily know it at the time.
14	Q.	Well, you were aware, were you not, of
15		difficulties in retrieving data and difficulties
16		with, as it were, obtaining the information that
17		was required for these prosecutions, correct?
18	Α.	Yeah, well, that wasn't because the data didn't
19		exist or it was invalid or corrupt. It was
20		because we didn't have an Attribute Grammar
21		catalogue to help us build the SQL statements.
22	Q.	You were aware of balancing errors that had been
23		drawn to your attention at the time?
24	Α.	If you say so.
25	Q.	You were aware that the EPOSS code was of poor
		122
1		was suspended in February 2001, so
2	SIR	R WYN WILLIAMS: I understand how it could be
3		extremely relevant to Ms Felstead's case but not
4		the Cleveleys case and I want to be clear in my
5		mind as to where we are day by day, so to speak.
6	MR	HENRY: I see, sir. I'm very, very grateful to
7		Counsel to the Inquiry, who understood from our
8		representations that we were trying to, as it
9		were, draw a parallel with Cleveleys, in that
10		this being a defence of the Horizon System at or
11		about the same time. But that is my apology, in
12	e10	its old-fashioned sense, to the Inquiry.
13 14	316	t WYN WILLIAMS: That's fine. That's fine. And if there comes a point in time when there is
14		I
16		reasonable grounds to suspect I think I put it as low as that that a witness statement
17		was made in Ms Felstead's case, I'm not saying
18		
19		I won't return to that paragraph, Mr Henry. But not at the moment.
20	MP	HENRY: So be it, sir.
20 21	WIK	Mr Holmes, thank you very much.
22	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr Holmes, for giving
23	5.11	evidence for a second time and for giving in
24		total now three witness statements to the
25		Inquiry.
		124

(31) Pages 121 - 124

1	That concludes the Inquiry's business for	1	INDEX	
2	today. We're now going to embark upon	2	JAN ROBERT HOLMES (affirmed)	1
3	a vacation period, where no doubt many of the	3	Questioned by MR BLAKE	1
4	people involved in the Inquiry, if not all of	4	Questioned by MR JACOBS	87
5	them, will be taking a well-earned break.	5	Questions by MR MOLONEY	92
6	I wish everyone a good holiday, if they're	6	Questioned by MR HENRY	98
7	having one and I will see you all on	7		
8	5 September. Thank you.	8		
9	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Sir Wyn.	9		
10	(1.34 pm)	10		
11	(The hearing adjourned until 5 September 2023)	11		
12		12		
13		13		
14		14		
15		15		
16		16		
17		17		
18		18		
19		19		
20		20		
21		21		
22		22		
23		23		
24		24		
25		25		
	125		126	

MR BLAKE: [12] 1/3 1 March [1] 120/9 10/23 11/14 22/23 52/9 73/6 78/15 99/15	111/2 111/10 111/12 111/24 115/15 116/1 123/22 124/6 124/20 MR JACOBS: [2] 87/24 91/24 MR MOLONEY: [2] 92/4 98/17 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: [26] 1/5 1/10 55/13 86/19 86/23 87/4 87/13 87/17 87/20 109/15 109/23 110/5 110/8 110/12 110/22 110/25 111/3 111/9 111/11 111/22 115/11 115/19 123/13 124/2 124/13 124/22 THE WITNESS: [3] 110/3 110/6 125/9 ' 'bottom [1] 93/5 'dropped [1] 13/19 'Expert's' [1] 71/14 'get [1] 42/12 'hit [2] 101/17 104/1 'how [2] 71/21 74/23 'issue [1] 81/12 'keyboards [1] 68/12 'Mrs Wolstenholme [1] 33/21 'mrs Wolstenholme [1] 35/3 'Replaced [1] 70/12 'rubbish' [1] 62/5 'S' [1] 72/4 'Software' [1] 42/3 'solution' [1] 101/13 'this [1] 35/6 'we' [2] 75/16 75/17 ' [1] 34/1 0	1 March [1] 120/9 1 March 2001 [1] 112/24 1 May 2001 [1] 14/2 1 November 2001 [1] 94/12 1.00 [1] 110/14 1.10 [1] 110/23 1.11 [1] 111/6 1.30 [2] 111/1 123/14 1.34 [1] 125/10 10 [7] 7/6 39/9 42/1 89/6 89/11 89/12 89/14 10 January 2002 [1] 116/9 10 May 2000 [1] 7/7 10.00 [1] 1/2 11 [1] 109/6 11 February [1] 23/20 11 March 2004 [1] 60/14 11.05 [2] 101/24 102/5 11.18 [1] 55/15 11.35 [3] 55/12 55/13 55/17 12 December 2002 [1] 69/23 12 February [2] 26/22 26/23 12 March 2004 [1] 61/21 12 October [1] 112/24 12 October [1] 120/9 13 September 2001 [2] 101/24 102/4 12.53 [1] 11/4 129 [1] 12/21 14 [2] 2/17 13/3 14 January [1] 120/6 14 May 2001 [1] 111/15 15 [1] 34/13 157 [1] 87/25 16 [1] 34/14 16 August [1] 81/2 16 May 2023 [1] 2/13 17 [2] 5/3 36/14 17 April [1] 13/1 17,000 [2] 38/5 38/23 18 [5] 15/17 15/24 16/5 17/5 17/9 18 February [1] 28/9 19 [1] 6/6	10/23 11/14 22/23 56/10 1st [1] 96/20 2 2 March 2004 [1] 56/24 2 May [1] 14/5 20 [9] 27/7 27/8 27/14 27/15 29/15 29/18 29/20 105/12 105/14 20 August [1] 83/3 20 August 2004 [1] 68/1 20 February 2004 [2] 45/20 55/6 20 January [1] 23/20 20,000 [3] 116/17 116/21 118/2 2000 [18] 7/2 7/7 8/7 8/10 8/14 11/14 11/23 12/1 12/2 15/16 15/19 19/2 24/13 27/7 27/7 56/10 112/24 120/9 2000/2001 [2] 3/3 76/16 2001 [17] 3/3 3/3 3/18 13/1 14/2 76/16 94/12 95/16 96/7 101/22 101/24 102/2 102/4 111/15 112/24 120/10 124/1 2002 [7] 15/21 22/23 23/21 69/23 70/7 105/3 116/9 2004 [32] 18/12 25/5 25/14 28/9 36/14 45/20 55/6 56/24 60/14 61/10 61/21 65/24 67/14 68/1 69/6 70/14 70/25 71/7 72/7 72/21 74/10 75/9 75/21 76/15 77/7 80/2 88/16 91/15 102/7 102/22 103/10 105/1 2005 [1] 64/4 2008 [1] 3/4 2023 [5] 1/1 2/1 2/13 67/15 125/11 21 June [1] 103/1 21 June [1] 103/1 21 June 2004 [1]	52/9 25 [1] 106/19 25 January [1] 1/26 27 January [1] 1/25 28 July 2023 [1] 1/1 2nd [2] 79/9 97/10 3 3.1 [1] 94/13 30 [1] 42/1 30 July [1] 75/8 30 May [1] 15/21 30 November [1] 15/18 30p [2] 13/20 13/21 31 [4] 106/13 106/13 106/15 106/19 32 [1] 108/4 3rd [1] 97/10 4 4 4 May [1] 14/10 4.1.2 [1] 95/7 45 [1] 42/1 4th [1] 97/10 5 5 February 2004 [1] 18/12 5 September [1] 125/8 5 September 2023 [1] 125/11 5 years [1] 118/14 6 6 December 2002 [1] 70/7 6 February [2] 27/2 28/14 6 January 2003 [1] 69/9 6th February [2] 88/7 88/8 7 7 January [1] 69/12 7 January [1] 69/12 7 January [1] 69/12 7 June [2] 71/7 74/13 7 June 2004 [2] 72/7 74/10 70 [1] 34/16 76 [1] 89/12 8 800 [1] 66/10 83 [3] 105/12 106/18 106/18 85 [1] 32/22 A	110/1 115/12 about [73] 4/5 9/15 10/14 10/23 11/1 11/15 13/2 14/1 15/4 15/8 15/20 26/5 31/21 33/4 33/13 35/24 40/11 40/21 41/18 41/19 41/20 42/17 42/17 42/19 42/25 43/1 43/11 46/12 46/19 46/22 46/25 47/1 47/2 47/3 47/8 47/9 47/14 54/25 56/19 59/16 63/9 64/4 69/15 71/21 71/24 76/13 78/8 79/22 85/23 88/25 89/21 89/25 90/19 90/20 91/9 92/4 92/12 93/18 97/21 105/4 105/6 105/15 106/1 107/7 114/8 114/9 115/5 115/7 121/6 122/4 123/15 123/18 124/11 above [3] 49/22 50/2 65/8 abroad [1] 1/9 absence [3] 99/20 103/12 104/16 absolutely [8] 3/23 9/22 28/1 29/20 36/20 59/4 82/20 101/1 accept [5] 14/21 38/15 42/20 91/17 123/3 acceptable [1] 47/19 acceptance [1] 51/16 accepted [4] 7/11 81/6 94/23 104/9 access [10] 14/25 25/8 34/5 57/14 57/18 57/20 58/16 59/16 86/11 100/25 accommodate [1] 110/11 Account [8] 28/15 29/1 62/10 63/7 65/11 92/22 97/17 117/15 accounting [3] 37/17 100/2 100/13 accounts [1] 20/13 accredited [2] 23/16 23/17 accuracy [1] 121/20 accuracy [1] 68/23 achieved [3] 85/15
1/7 1					
1/7 1	021 [2] 95/8 95/14		102/22	ability [41 98/10	91/0 101/1
1/7 1/7 1/1 1	021 [2] 95/8 95/14	1997 [1] 3/1			
1/7 1/7 1/11 1/14 <	021 [2] 95/8 95/14	1997 [1] 3/1		ability [4] 98/10	
1/7 1/7 1/11 1/14 5/14 <			1112/22		
1/7 /1/11 /114 /2 50/10 1/8 (1) 2001 [1] 4/2 2/8 (1) 100/9 2/8 (1) 100/9 about [73] 4/6 9/15 87/14 52/2 109/7 1 May 2001 [1] 4/2 2/8 (1) 4/2 2/8 (1) 4/2 1/1/2 11/2 10/1/4 1/2 11/1 11/1 5/22 2/6 3/1 11/1 5/22 2/6 3/1 11/1 5/22 2/6 3/1 11/1 5/22 2/6 3/1 11/1 5/22 2/6 3/1 11/1 5/22 2/6 3/1 11/1 5/22 2/6 3/1 11/1 5/22 2/6 3/1 11/1 5/22 2/6 3/1 11/1 5/22 2/6 3/1 11/1 5/22 2/6 3/1 11/1 5/22 2/6 3/1 11/1 5/22 2/6 3/1 11/1 5/22 2/6 3/1 11/1 5/21 2/2 11/1 5/21 2/2 11/1 5/21 2/2 11/1 5/21 2/2 11/1 1/2 2/1 1/2 11/1 1/2 2/1 1/2 11/1 1/2 2/1 1/2 2/1 2/2 2/2 11/1 1/2 2/1 1/2 2/1 2/2 2/2 11/1 1/2 2/1 1/2 11/1 1/2 2/1 1/2 11/1 1/2 2/1 1/2 11/1 1/2 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
1/7 1/1 1		19 January [1] 103/2		Α	
1/7 1/7 1/14 <	0.4 [1] 103/4	19 [1] 6/6			accusing [1] 68/23
1/7 1/7 1/14 <				85 [1] 32/22	
1/7 1/7 1/14 <	0				
1/7 1/7 1/1 1					
1/7 1/7 1/1 1	'[1] 34/1	18 [5] 15/17 15/24	21 August 2003 [1]		accuracy [1] 121/20
1/7 1/7 1/1 1	·			800 [1] 66/10	
1/7 1/11 1/14 1/12/24 1 1/12/24 1 1/12/24					
1/7 1		17 April [1] 13/1	21 [2] 102/7 119/17	8	
1/7 1/7 1/8 1/11		17 [2] 5/3 36/14			accounts [1] 20/13
1/7 1/11 1/14 1/12/24 1 1/12/24 1/11/24	'this [1] 35/6			76 [1] 89/12	
1/7 1/1 1		16 May 2022 141 0/42		/U[1] 34/16	
1/7 1		16 August [1] 81/2	2008 [1] 3/4		accounting [3] 37/17
177 111 11224 1111224 111111111111111111111111111111111111	'Software' [1] 42/3				
177 1				7 June 2004 [2] 72/7	
1/7 1/7 1/1 1		157 [1] 87/25	102/22 103/10 105/1		29/1 62/10 63/7 65/11
1/7 1/7 1/1 1/1 1/1 1/2 1/1 1/2 1/1 1/2 1/1 1/2 1/1 1/2 1/1 1	'rubbish' [1] 62/5				
1/7 1/7 1/1 1					
1/7 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/14 56/14		111/15	75/21 76/15 77/7 80/2	7 January [4] 60/40	110/11
1/7 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/17 56/14	'Reboot' [1] 35/3			<u> </u>	
1/7 1/7 1/1 1		14 May 2001 [1]	72/21 74/10 75/9	7	accommodate [1]
177 1/11 1/12 1/14 1/12 1/14 1/12 1/14 1/12 1/14 1/12 1/14 1/12 1/14 1/14 1/12 1/14	28/24				
177 111 1/14 55/10 1112/24 152/14 151/15				88/8	
1/7 1/11 1/12 1/11 1/12		1 4 [2] 2/17 13/3	05/24 07/14 68/1 69/6		57/20 58/16 59/16
1/7 1/7 1/11 1/14 1/12/24 1/12/	'no [1] 37/16			6th February [2] 88/7	
1/7 1/11 1/14 1/12/24 1/11/24 1		129 [1] 12/21	60/14 61/10 61/21		25/8 34/5 57/14 57/18
1/7 1/11 1/14 1/12/24 1	[1] 33/21				
1/7 /11 //14 (55/10 111/224 111/224 111/224 111/224 111/224 111/224 111/224 111/224 111/214 11			45/20 55/6 56/24	6 January 2003 [1]	
1/7 /11 1/14 55/10 1 March 2001 [1] 12/2 11/2/24 55/14 55/18 87/14 11/2/24 11/2/24 11/7 11/2/2 1 May 2001 [1] 14/2 1 11/7 11/2/24 1 May 2001 [1] 14/2 1 11/7 11/2 11/16 11/2/24 10/14 10/23 11/1 11/17 11/10 11/16 11/10/13 11/16 11/16/13 11/16 11/16/13 11/16 11/16/13 11/16 11/16 11/16/13 11/16 11/16/13 11/16/13 11/16 11/16/13 11/16/13 11/16/13 11/16/13 11/16/13 11/16/13 11/16/13 11/16/14		[2] 101/24 102/4			81/6 94/23 104/9
1/7 /11 1/14 65/10 1 March 2001 [1] 12/2 112/24 55/14 55/18 87/14 112/24 1 May 2001 [1] 14/2 11/7 1MR HENRY: [15] 1May 2001 [1] 14/2 9/19 109/21 110/2 100 [1] 110/14 11/15 13/2 14/1 15/4 11/12 111/10 111/12 1.00 [1] 110/14 11/15 13/2 14/1 15/4 11/12 111/10 111/12 1.00 [1] 110/14 11/15 13/2 14/1 15/4 11/12 111/10 111/12 1.00 [1] 110/14 20 [1] 14/5 20 [1] 27/7 27/8 11/12 111/10 111/12 1.36 [1] 12/10 20/18 29/20 105/12 30 [1] 42/1 40/11 40/21 41/18 11/12 111/10 111/12 1.36 [1] 12/10 20/18 29/20 105/12 30 [1] 42/1 40/14 40/22 46/25 11/12 111/10 111/12 1.36 [1] 12/10 11/15/18 30 [1] 42/1 40/14 40/22 46/25 11/12 111/12 11/14 11/15/18 30 [1] 42/1 40/14 40/22 46/25 11/12 111/12 11/16/11 11/2 10/14 10/14 11/16/2 11/16/21 11/2 10/14 10/25 11/14 10/16/15 10/14 11/16/21 11/2 11/16/17 10/14 11/25 11/16/17 11/16/17 11/16/2 11/16/17 11/1	'Mrs [1] 33/21			28/14	
1/7 /11 1/14 55/10 1 March 2001 [1] 12/24 1/7 /11 1/14 55/16 1 May 2001 [1] 1/2/2 1 May 2001 [1] 1/2/2 1 May 2001 [1] 1/2/2 1/17 /11 1/14 55/16 1 May 2001 [1] 1/2/2 1 May 2001 [1] 1/2/2 2 March 2004 [1] 1/17 /11 1/14 55/16 1 May 2001 [1] 1/1/2 1 Movember 2001 [1] 2 March 2004 [1] 2 March 2004 [1] 1/15 March 2004 [1] 3/14 March 2004 [1] 1/15 March 2004 [1] 1/15 March 2004 [1] 1/15 March 2004 [1] 3/14 March 2004 [1] 3/14 March 2004 [1] 3/14 March 2004 [1] 1/15 March 2004 [1] 3/14 March 2004 [1] 3/14 March 2004 [1] 3/14 March 2004 [1] 1/15 March 2004 [1] 3/14 March 2004 [1] 1/15 March 2004 [1] 3/14 March 2004 [1] 1/15 March 2004 [1] 3/14 March 2004 [1] 3/14 March 2004 [1] 3/14 March 2004 [1] 1/15 March 2004 [1] 1/14 March 2004 [1]<			2004 [32] 18/12 25/5		
1/7 /11 1/14 55/10 1 March 2001 [1] 12/24 1/7 /11 1/14 55/10 1 May 2001 [1] 1/2/1 136/10 25 January [1] 12/2 100/14 10/23 11/1 1/7 /11 1/14 55/16 1 May 2001 [1] 1/2/1 1 May 2001 [1] 1/2/1 2 March 2004 [1] 27 January [1] 1/2/5 10/14 10/23 11/1 1/1/1 1/16 1.00 [1] 110/14 1.00 [1] 110/14 2 March 2004 [1] 27 January [1] 1/2/5 3//4 10/14 10/23 11/1 1/1/2 111/2 1.00 [1] 110/14 1.00 [1] 110/13 2 May [1] 14/5 2//4 3//4 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>acceptance [1] 51/16</td></td<>					acceptance [1] 51/16
1/7 /1/1 1/14 55/10 112/24 112/24 112/24 112/24 112/24 111/2 1		120/0	23/16 60/0	70/7	
1/7 /1/1 1/14 55/16 1 March 2007 [1] 55/14 55/18 87/14 112/24 1 112/24 1 112/24 1 112/24 1 112/24 1 112/24 1 112/24 1 112/24 1 112/24 1 112/24 1 112/24 1 112/24 1 112/24 1 112/24 1 112/24 1 112/24 1 112/24 1 111/21 11/2 1 111/21 11/2 1 11/2 1 11/2 1 11/2 1 11/2 1 11/2 1 11/2 1 11/2 1 11/2 1 11/2 1 11/2 1 11/1 11/2 1 1 1 11/1 1 11/2 1 <td></td> <td>12 October 2000 [1]</td> <td>2003 [4] 15/6 18/13</td> <td></td> <td>acceptable [1] 47/19</td>		12 October 2000 [1]	2003 [4] 15/6 18/13		acceptable [1] 47/19
1/7 /1/1 1/14 55/10 112/24 112/24 112/24 112/24 111/2 110/2 111/2 110/2 11	'issue [1] 81/12			6 December 2002 [1]	
1/7 /1/1 1/14 (55/10 11/2/24 11/2/25 20/17 11/2/25 20/17 11/2/25 20/17 11/1/14 11/15 11/2/25 20/17					
1/7 /1/1 1//4 55/10 1/12/24 1/11/15 1/		12 October [1]		6	38/15 42/20 91/17
1/7 /1/11 /1/4 55/10 11/2/24 10/11/2 11/2/24 11/2/24 10/11/2 11/2/24 11/2/24 10/11/2 11/2/24 11/2/24 11/2/24 10/11/2 11/2/24 11/2/24 11/2/24 11/2/24 11/2/24 11/2/24 11/2/24 11/2/24 11/2/24 11/2/24 11/2/24 11/2/24 11/2/24 11/2/24 11/2/24 11/2/24 10/11/2 1					
1/7 /1/11 /1/4 55/10 11/2/24 1		61/21	2002 [7] 15/21 22/23	5 years [1] 118/14	accept [5] 14/21
1/7 /1/1 1/14 (55/10 11/2/24 1					
1/7 1/11 1/12 1/11 1/12 1/11 1/12 1/11 1/12 1/11		12 March 2004 [1]	120/10 124/1		59/4 82/20 101/1
1/7 1/11 1/12 1/11 1/12 1/11	'Expert's' [1] 71/14				
1/7 1/1/1 1/1/2 1				5 September 2023 [1]	
1/7 1/1/1 1/1/2 1			101/22 101/24 102/2	125/8	absolutely [8] 3/23
1/7 1/1/1 1/1/2 1	'bottom [1] 93/5				
1/7 1/1 1				5 September [1]	
1/7 1/1 1	•	12 December 2002	3/18 13/1 14/2 76/16		absence [3] 99/20
1/7 1/1 1					
1/7 1/1 1	110/3 110/6 125/9			5 February 2004 [1]	
1/7 1/1 1		11.35 [3] 55/12 55/13			65/8
1/7 1/1 1/4 55/18 87/14 1/4 55/18 87/14 1/4	THE WITNESS: [3]			5	
1/7 1/1 1/1 1/1 1/2 1/2 3/1 3/1 1/2 1				-	
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 112/24 112/24 112/24 112/2 112/24 112/24 112/24 112/24 112/24 111/2 112/24 111/2<				401[1] 97710	123/15 123/18 124/11
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 112/24 112/24 112/24 11/7 1/11 1/14 55/18 87/14 11/2/24 11/2 11/1 11/2 11/1 11/2 11/1 11/2 11/1 11/2 11/1 11/2 11/1 11/2 11/1 11/2 11/1 11/2 11/1 11/2 11/1 11/2 11/1 11/2 11/1 11/2 11/1 11/2 11/1 11/2 11/1 11/1 11/2 11/1 11/2					
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/8/12/24 30/10 35/10 36		11.05 [2] 101/24	19/2 24/13 27/7 27/7		115/7 121/6 122/4
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1 March 2001 [1] 112/24 111/2 112/24 111/2 111/1 111/2 111/2 111/2 111/2 111/1 111/2	111/11 111/22 115/11				
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1 March 2001 [1] 11/2 4 11/2 1 10/1 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 1 10/1 11/2 1 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 1 10/1 11/2 1 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 1 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 1 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 1 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 1 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 1 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 1 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 1 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 4 11/2 4/1 4/1 4 11/2 4/1 4/1 4/1 4/1 4/1 4/1 4/1 4/1 4/1 4/1			12/1 12/2 15/16 15/19	4.1.2 [1] 95/7	114/8 114/9 115/5
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1 Marcin 2001 [1] 112/24 111/2 111/2 111/2 111/2 111/2 111/2 111/2 111/2 111/2 111/2 111/2 111/2 111/2 111/2 111/2 111/1 111/2 <	110/25 111/3 111/9	11 March 2004 [1]			105/15 106/1 107/7
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/2/24 1/12/24 1/12/24 1/12/24 1/12/24 1/12/24 1/12/24 1/12/24 1/11 1/12 1/11/12 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>4 May [1] 14/10</td><td></td></t<>				4 May [1] 14/10	
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/Marcli 2001 [1] 150/10 10/1 110/12 55/14 55/18 87/14 112/24 112/24 112/24 112/24 87/18 92/2 109/7 11/7 1/11 112/24 112/24 112/24 112/24 10/1 110/12 10/1 110/12 10/1 110/12 10/1 110/12 10/1 110/12 10/1 110/12 10/1 110/12 10/1 110/12 11/1 110/13 10/1 110/12 11/1 110/13 10/1 110/12 10/1 110/12 11/1 110/13 10/1 110/12 10/1 110/12 10/1 110/12 10/1 110/12 10/1 110/12 10/1 110/12 10/1 110/12 10/1 110/12 10/1 110/13 10/1 110/14 11/1 110/13 10/1 110/14 11/1 110/13 10/1 110/14 11/1 110/14 11/1 110/14 11/1 110/14 11/1 110/14 1		23/20		·	97/21 105/4 105/6
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/2/24 1/2/25 1/2/25 1/2/25 1/2/25 1/2/25 1/2/25 1/2/25 1/2/25 1/2/25 1/2/25 1/2/25 1/2/25 1/2/25 1/2/25 1/2/25 1/2/25 1/2/25 1/2/25 1/2/25	109/15 109/23 110/5			4	
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/2/24 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/2/24 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/2/24 1/7 1/11 1/14 1/2/24 1/7 1/11 1/14 1/2/24 1/7 1/11 1/14 1/2/24 1/7 1/11 1/14 1/2/24 1/7 1/11 1/14 1/2/24 1/7 1/11 1/14 1/2/24 1/7 1/11 1/14 1/2/24 1/7 1/11 1/14 1/2/24 1/7 1/11 1/14 1/2/24 1/7 1/11 1/14 1/2/24 1/7 1/14 1/14 1/1/2 1/14/15 1/1/1 1/14 1/1/14 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/8 arch 2001 [1] 30/10 25 [1] 100/19 110/19 about [73] 4/5 9/15 55/14 55/18 87/14 1/8 y 2001 [1] 14/2 1 May 2001 [1] 14/2 1st [1] 96/20 25 January [1] 120/6 about [73] 4/5 9/15 111/7 110/1 110/1 110/1 1/5 1/2 10/14 10/23 11/1 11/15 13/2 14/1 15/4 111/7 110/1 110/1 10/1 110/1 11/2 10/14 10/23 11/1 11/15 13/2 14/1 15/4 111/2 10/10/15 110/24 1.00 [1] 110/14 2 March 2004 [1] 56/24 33/4 33/13 35/24 40/11 40/21 41/18 111/2 111/2 111/2 111/2 27/14 27/15 29/15 30 [1] 42/1 33/4 33/13 35/24 40/11 40/21 41/18 111/2 111/2 111/1 111/2 27/14 27/15 29/15 30 [1] 42/1 41/19 41/20 42/17 111/2 113/2 10 [7] 7/6 39/9 42/1 29/18 29/20 105/12 30 May [1] 15/21 30 May [1] 15/21 30 May [1] 15/21 30 May [1] 15/21 46/19 46/22 46/25 111/2 10 January 2002 [1] 116/9 10 January 2002 [1] 68/1 30 P [2] 13/20 13/21 56/19 59/16 63/9 64/2 116/9 <t< td=""><td></td><td> 11 [1] 109/6</td><td></td><td>3rd [1] 97/10</td><td>89/25 90/19 90/20</td></t<>		11 [1] 109/6		3rd [1] 97/10	89/25 90/19 90/20
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/March 2001 [1] 30/10 25 [1] 100/15 110/1 110/12 55/14 55/18 87/14 112/24 112/24 111/2	86/19 86/23 87/4				
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/7 1/11 1/14 12/2 1/7 1/11 1/12 1/7 1/11 1/12 1/7 1/11 1/12 1/7 1/11 1/12 1/7 1/11 1/12 1/7 1/11 1/12 1/7 1/11 1/12 1/7 1/12 1/7 1/12 1/7 1/11 1/12 1/7 1/12 1/7 1/12 1/7 1/12 1/7 1/12 1/7 1/12 1/11/12			20 January [1] 23/20	32 [1] 108/4	
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 55/		10 May 2000 [1] 7/7			76/13 78/8 79/22
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/15 56/14 55/15 56/	SIR WYN WILLIAMS:				
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1/8 arch 2001 [1] 1/7 55/14 55/18 87/14 112/24 112/24 87/18 92/2 109/7 112/24 1 May 2001 [1] 14/2 11/7 11/7 11/7 MR HENRY: [15] 98/19 109/21 110/2 1.00 [1] 110/14 11/2 111/10 111/12 1.10 [1] 110/14 2 March 2004 [1] 11/2 111/10 111/12 1.00 [1] 110/14 56/24 11/2 111/10 111/12 1.11 [1] 111/6 56/24 11/2 111/10 111/12 1.11 [1] 111/6 20 [9] 27/7 27/8 11/2 4 115/15 116/1 1.30 [2] 111/1 123/14 27/14 27/15 29/15 13/2 4 91/24 10 [7] 7/6 39/9 42/1 20 August [1] 83/3 87/24 91/24 89/14 20 August [1] 83/3 89/14 10 [7] 7/6 39/9 42/1 20 August [1] 83/3 89/14 10 [7] 7/6 39/9 42/1 20 August [1] 83/3 89/14 10 [7] 7/6 39/9 42/1 20 August [1] 83/3 89/14 10 [7] 7/6 39/9 42/1 20 August 2004 [1] 15/18 30 November [1] 47/1 47/2 47/3 47/8 10/14 10/23 11/1 11/2 10/14 10/23 11/2 111/2 111/2 1.11 [1] 110/24 11/2 11/					
1/7 1/1 1		10 January 2002 [1]	68/1	30p [2] 13/20 13/21	56/19 59/16 63/9 64/4
1/7 1/1 1		89/14	20 August 2004 [1]		47/9 47/14 54/25
1/7 1/1 1					
1/7 1/1 1	MR JACOBS: [2]				
1/7 1/1 1					
1/7 1/1 1		1.34 [1] 125/10	29/18 29/20 105/12	30 July [1] 75/8	43/1 43/11 46/12
1/7 1/1 1					42/17 42/19 42/25
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/	111/2 111/10 111/12				
1/7 1/1 1				3.1 [1] 94/13	
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1 March 2001 [1] 30/10 25 [1] 100/19 110/1113/12 55/14 55/18 87/14 1 May 2001 [1] 14/2 1st [1] 96/20 25 January [1] 120/6 about [73] 4/5 9/15 87/18 92/2 109/7 1 May 2001 [1] 14/2 2 2 2 10/14 10/23 11/1 111/7 November 2001 [1] 94/12 2 March 2004 [1] 56/24 10/14 10/23 11/1 98/19 109/21 110/2 1.00 [1] 110/14 56/24 2 March 2004 [1] 33/4 33/13 35/24		1.10 [1] 110/23	2 May [1] 14/5	<u> </u>	40/11 40/21 41/18
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1 March 2001 [1] 30/10 25 [1] 100/19 110/1113/12 55/14 55/18 87/14 112/24 1 May 2001 [1] 14/2 1st [1] 96/20 25 January [1] 120/6 about [73] 4/5 9/15 87/18 92/2 109/7 1 Movember 2001 [1] 14/2 2 2 January [1] 1/25 10/14 10/23 11/1 11/7 11/7 94/12 2 March 2004 [1] 2 March 2004 [1] 2/12 15/8 15/20 26/5 31/2				3	
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1 March 2001 [1] 30/10 25 [1] 100/19 110/1113/12 55/14 55/18 87/14 112/24 1 May 2001 [1] 14/2 1st [1] 96/20 25 January [1] 120/6 about [73] 4/5 9/15 87/18 92/2 109/7 1 November 2001 [1] 14/2 2 2 January [1] 1/25 10/14 10/23 11/1 111/7 9/12 9/12 2 March 2004 [1] 2/12 2/10/14 10/23 11/1	MR HENRY: [15]				
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1 March 2001 [1] 50/10 25 [1] 100/19 110/1 113/12 55/14 55/18 87/14 112/24 112/24 1st [1] 96/20 25 January [1] 120/6 about [73] 4/5 9/15 87/18 92/2 109/7 1 May 2001 [1] 14/2 2 2 11/2 10/14 10/23 11/1 1 November 2001 [1] 14/2 2 2 2 2 2			2 March 2004 [1]		
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1 March 2001 [1] 30/10 25 [1] 100/19 110/1113/12 55/14 55/18 87/14 112/24 112/24 1st [1] 96/20 25 January [1] 120/6 about [73] 4/5 9/15 87/18 92/2 109/7 1 May 2001 [1] 14/2 14/2 10/14 10/23 11/1		1 November 2001 [1]	<u> </u>		11/15 13/2 14/1 15/4
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 1 March 2001 [1] 50/10 25 [1] 100/19 110/1113/12 55/14 55/18 87/14 112/24 1st [1] 96/20 25 January [1] 120/6 about [73] 4/5 9/15			2		
1/7 1/11 1/14 55/10 TWARCH 2001 [1] 50/10 25 [1] 100/19 110/11/5/12			1st [1] 96/20		
1 July [1] 101/3 1999 [7] 6/2 6/13 8/4 24 years [2] 52/4 38/18 45/7 51/14 65/		1 July [1] 101/3	1999 [7] 6/2 6/13 8/4	24 years [2] 52/4	38/18 45/7 51/14 65/1

Α	81/14 81/25 82/7	91/13 95/8 100/11	68/18	aren't [2] 29/18 29/20
acquitted [1] 91/8	82/10 91/2 95/9 97/11		apologise [2] 77/16	arguing [1] 84/21
act [3] 79/14 80/15	100/1 116/9 118/8	although [6] 5/9	119/6	argument [10] 35/25
80/21	118/12 123/4	30/17 83/7 95/9 96/6	apology [1] 124/11	37/15 39/18 81/14
action [1] 13/15	again' [1] 42/13	120/17	apparent [2] 122/5	81/22 81/23 82/2
actions [2] 7/2 8/4	against [7] 28/19	always [8] 27/19	122/9	82/21 82/23 82/25
active [1] 15/19	57/12 62/22 78/18	27/21 27/23 28/3 28/5		arising [1] 11/18
activities [2] 42/23	84/21 86/20 88/14	35/20 53/24 54/13	83/11 84/1	around [6] 41/25
120/7	agents [2] 20/11 71/25	am [11] 1/2 14/11 44/5 55/15 55/17 56/3	appear [3] 19/21 48/19 83/7	57/5 57/13 57/16 68/22 95/16
activity [2] 11/7 48/4	ago [3] 52/4 52/9	111/21 115/6 115/17	appeared [4] 1/18	arrangement [1]
actual [3] 22/2	90/14	118/21 123/19	2/23 22/11 50/24	62/18
106/16 123/20	agree [11] 54/13	amalgam [1] 119/22	appearing [1] 1/9	arrive [1] 123/12
actually [12] 9/4 14/13 25/15 33/5	67/17 71/1 84/17	amended [3] 22/23	appears [3] 31/1	as [132]
40/10 41/20 57/10	100/1 100/14 103/16	113/24 115/6	83/20 123/23	ask [17] 2/6 2/14
65/8 106/12 115/13	104/23 107/1 107/22	amount [1] 66/20	appendix [1] 45/22	43/24 52/23 88/25
117/6 120/3	116/22	analyse [2] 100/10	applied [2] 4/11 11/2	89/24 90/17 91/24
additional [1] 4/15	agreed [10] 34/6 54/3		applying [1] 65/23	91/25 92/4 98/22
address [4] 6/21	61/5 61/17 66/25	analysed [1] 120/6	appoint [1] 19/21	98/24 110/15 112/10
23/22 45/7 65/11	72/20 79/15 80/22	analyses [2] 95/11	appointed [4] 54/15	116/15 119/5 123/4
addressed [3] 94/23	104/13 109/3	118/23	56/22 58/23 61/15	asked [17] 21/9
95/4 95/20	agreeing [1] 35/9 agreement [4] 54/16	analysing [5] 32/8 33/16 34/9 68/21	appointment [1] 20/1 appreciate [1] 118/8	24/12 27/6 64/9 68/6 69/15 86/5 89/23 98/8
addresses [1] 7/3	56/20 71/13 72/14	120/18	approach [4] 21/16	98/23 105/4 111/14
adjourned [1] 125/11	Agreements [2] 46/7	analysis [29] 9/2	21/25 55/8 61/9	112/4 112/11 112/23
administrative [1]	96/22	24/13 24/20 25/1 27/6		113/17 114/8
112/8	ain't [1] 80/1	27/9 27/14 29/5 29/15		asking [11] 40/10
admission [1] 35/19 admit [1] 74/19	alarms [1] 69/18	32/14 33/15 34/8	83/16 109/11	40/11 64/24 74/2
adversely [1] 4/16	Alerts [1] 94/17	52/15 52/20 52/22	approved [3] 19/11	91/22 105/5 111/16
advice [16] 34/14	aligning [1] 48/7	54/14 65/14 68/10	19/22 67/1	112/5 115/5 115/7
35/3 39/8 39/15 40/17	all [58] 11/16 19/1	69/3 69/5 70/14 82/8	April [7] 13/1 13/3	123/23
41/1 41/9 41/10 41/24	21/7 21/21 24/13 30/7	94/5 95/2 95/7 95/9	68/11 68/21 69/6	aspects [4] 46/7 62/9
47/17 71/10 77/18	31/20 37/17 38/4	95/25 97/25 100/10	70/14 70/25	64/6 96/22
77/19 77/24 81/16	38/23 44/3 44/14	Anne [1] 12/2	April 2004 [1] 70/14 archive [10] 15/16	assertions [1] 62/4
81/19	44/17 48/5 50/25 51/1	4/17 5/24 12/9 12/11	17/8 17/15 18/6 18/8	assessment [1] 120/20
advise [1] 70/3	62/25 63/5 64/13 70/3		18/10 29/2 29/8	assigned [2] 101/25
advised [1] 13/17	70/17 72/8 72/15	58/14 61/11 71/3 78/5		102/23
advisers [1] 22/20	72/16 73/17 75/20	89/2 91/1 121/5	are [83] 4/5 5/9 5/10	assist [6] 51/15 74/8
advising [1] 81/24 affect [3] 4/17 93/12	76/16 76/18 77/6	answer [15] 15/11	6/14 6/15 8/5 9/1 9/12	
	82/11 82/22 86/6	37/16 39/23 40/17	12/13 13/8 15/6 15/24	
affected [4] 8/19 9/4	86/23 99/6 100/4	44/23 56/6 73/15	16/3 18/22 22/15	assistance [3] 57/6
12/21 99/10	100/19 100/22 104/16		23/21 24/13 24/16	78/12 89/23
affecting [2] 14/22	106/2 107/6 108/18	107/3 112/2 112/4	25/12 26/12 28/1	assistants [1] 66/20
56/13	108/25 109/14 110/7 115/1 115/6 116/24	112/7 115/17	28/17 29/1 29/8 29/22 30/7 34/13 34/15 35/9	associated [2] 81/10 112/15
affirmed [2] 1/12	118/25 122/12 123/2	any [37] 13/14 15/14 18/19 20/1 20/2 20/10		
126/2	123/10 123/14 125/4	20/21 21/1 21/3 21/5	37/23 38/2 38/5 38/24	
afraid [3] 111/20	125/7	21/7 21/10 22/19	41/4 44/24 45/11 50/1	
115/15 115/17	allegations [1] 67/7	29/24 33/22 38/9 44/2		assuming [1] 4/12
after [19] 11/14 11/18 15/24 16/5 17/5 17/9	alleged [1] 36/2	44/13 47/16 48/13	53/25 62/10 63/8	at [213]
17/14 17/15 18/12	allow [2] 65/11 100/6	53/18 55/3 57/6 75/13		at page 4 [1] 79/8
24/21 40/1 40/5 47/11	alluded [1] 75/11	80/1 87/14 91/24	67/7 68/23 70/19	attaching [3] 45/22
58/6 64/22 70/17	Almost [1] 37/17	93/12 95/19 95/20	71/10 72/17 72/21	58/8 68/10
79/23 84/24 95/17	along [2] 86/2 110/19		75/18 76/8 76/24	attachment [1] 28/10
afternoon [2] 87/25	alongside [2] 33/9 46/2	107/23 115/5 115/11 121/17	77/13 84/19 87/10	attempt [4] 17/16
98/19			87/20 88/12 94/20 94/24 95/10 96/24	57/18 65/1 84/10
afternoon's [1]	already [4] 4/13 28/12 31/21 95/4	anybody [2] 45/6 120/18	96/25 100/24 101/6	attempting [1] 84/11 attempts [2] 9/24
109/10	also [22] 1/17 8/25	anything [9] 9/13	101/21 101/22 109/18	
again [24] 6/3 10/5	9/8 15/24 17/2 17/3	40/2 42/7 43/19 63/12		
13/23 31/20 35/8	20/9 31/5 46/22 53/5	63/13 85/21 87/2	116/25 118/6 119/9	53/19 79/17
39/24 42/22 43/1 46/1 62/12 76/4 77/16	56/20 69/16 69/18	114/21	121/11 121/22 124/5	attention [1] 122/23
02/12/10/4/1/10	70/9 77/8 81/18 90/8	anyway [2] 10/10	areas [1] 9/3	attitude [1] 21/20
L			I	(34) acquitted - attitude

(34) acquitted - attitude

Α	118/10 120/3	bear [2] 76/14 90/4	behalf [3] 25/21	58/13 69/24 89/20
Attribute [7] 99/13	background [2]	because [73] 10/13	87/15 119/25	90/15
101/9 101/12 103/4	21/10 67/20	10/16 11/5 14/6 17/4	behaviour [3] 36/3	bottom [11] 12/10
103/20 104/16 122/20	backward [1] 108/15	19/19 20/10 21/18	107/19 108/2	13/4 14/9 23/15 24/15
attributed [1] 24/18	bad [5] 5/2 5/11	25/23 26/6 26/17	behind [1] 44/18	24/24 27/13 56/17
attributes [1] 101/10	76/19 105/22 107/19	29/11 32/3 32/20	being [33] 10/17	93/20 94/4 96/18
audit [42] 2/25 5/25	Baines [5] 18/16		19/24 31/6 34/18 39/9	bought [2] 33/9 83/8
8/3 8/10 9/1 10/16	45/21 75/11 80/15	42/25 44/17 45/5 48/3 48/20 49/9 50/5 50/11		brackets [1] 74/25
10/20 15/16 16/3 16/4	88/17 Baines' [1] 19/14	50/11 50/17 51/6 52/8		Bracknell [1] 58/16
16/9 16/13 16/22 17/8	Baines's [1] 90/9	52/24 53/2 53/13	64/24 68/20 68/24	branch [5] 20/13 26/4 26/8 42/12 42/21
17/15 18/6 18/8 18/10	balance [1] 14/7	53/14 57/8 61/24 62/3		
59/6 63/18 94/8 96/7	balanced [1] 71/15	62/15 62/23 64/4	105/16 105/21 107/2	42/5 42/18 57/25
96/11 99/10 100/7	balancing [5] 8/19	64/10 64/14 67/25	107/13 108/10 114/8	break [16] 13/13 42/4
100/15 101/5 103/13	12/13 14/22 107/10	73/25 76/19 79/2	117/7 119/10 119/11	55/11 55/16 55/20
104/18 104/19 104/20	122/22	82/16 85/8 87/5 91/7	119/12 124/10	109/11 109/24 110/4
106/10 118/14 118/15	Banking [1] 102/12	93/23 98/4 99/9 99/12		110/5 110/6 110/10
118/16 118/17 118/23	Barnes [1] 14/11	100/25 101/24 102/8	71/11 77/1 108/8	110/12 110/13 110/23
119/14 119/18 120/7 120/14 121/20	base [1] 70/6	103/2 104/9 105/23	112/13 114/17	111/5 125/5
August [9] 15/6	based [8] 7/16 15/1	106/9 107/2 109/9	believe [7] 22/16	brief [3] 3/1 8/21
18/13 18/20 68/1 77/7	17/22 33/15 34/8	110/17 112/2 112/22	29/23 34/24 111/17	68/10
77/11 80/2 81/2 83/3	47/19 52/14 65/25	113/7 117/23 121/13	112/17 114/22 123/10	
August 2003 [1]	baseline [4] 10/8	122/11 122/18 122/20		bring [10] 1/20 33/6
18/13	10/10 10/21 11/5	123/23	believing [1] 121/12	39/7 40/14 40/16 46/2
August 2004 [2] 77/7	baselines [1] 10/7	become [3] 4/13	below [1] 29/4	46/20 66/8 67/2
80/2	basic [1] 5/17	89/22 115/24	beneath [1] 32/10	110/13
author [6] 8/2 8/3 8/6	basis [2] 4/22 104/22	been [86] 4/11 9/5	benefit [2] 84/5 84/7	broadened [1] 50/10
108/11 108/13 108/16	Bates [2] 66/6 66/14	10/10 14/12 14/17 15/8 15/20 16/9 16/10	bespoke [1] 63/22	broadly [1] 11/2
authored [1] 111/13	be [117] 1/11 3/11 3/25 4/16 4/20 6/23	17/4 17/8 17/20 17/22		broken [1] 105/24 brought [1] 63/2
authorised [1]	7/9 7/13 10/19 11/2	17/24 20/3 22/3 22/5	98/10 112/9 112/12	Brunskill [5] 39/2
118/21	11/19 14/18 15/23	22/6 24/18 25/6 26/6	113/4 114/17	41/12 46/11 46/19
Authority [1] 118/16	17/1 17/6 19/20 20/11	27/20 27/21 27/24	better [3] 40/5 87/12	47/25
automatic [1] 28/5	22/16 25/15 25/25	28/3 28/5 30/23 30/23		Brunskill's [5] 41/23
automatically [1]	26/6 29/12 31/8 33/8	31/15 32/25 35/20	between [13] 8/10	47/12 48/10 56/18
15/17 autumn [2] 3/14 3/14	33/9 33/16 34/17	35/25 36/9 40/4 42/3	8/23 19/1 23/25 31/9	72/13
available [6] 17/20	35/11 35/13 37/12	44/20 45/12 50/11	32/12 32/14 38/10	bucket [1] 48/6
18/8 31/22 65/9 67/15	37/16 37/20 38/18	52/20 53/2 53/6 53/7	54/16 62/14 62/18	bug [1] 5/12
99/14	40/15 41/2 42/8 42/11	53/9 53/18 54/5 58/21		bugs [4] 9/4 108/2
aware [17] 8/16 9/22	45/7 45/15 46/17	66/12 67/12 68/6	beyond [1] 32/24	122/4 122/8
23/2 23/12 25/7 25/20	47/12 47/19 55/10	69/17 70/4 71/24	BI3 [1] 102/16	build [2] 103/13
49/21 50/6 53/18	58/22 62/1 64/22	71/25 73/14 79/6	biased [1] 66/17	122/21
70/23 83/13 85/8	65/13 68/9 70/6 71/15 73/6 74/10 74/11	90/3 90/8 95/19 95/22	Bill [5] 68/5 81/3 81/4	105/16 106/5 108/9
119/9 122/14 122/22	75/14 76/17 76/23	96/11 97/25 98/8	bit [14] 39/6 39/10	burglar [1] 69/18
122/25 123/2	78/8 78/10 80/24 81/8		40/23 41/5 41/6 60/15	
away [5] 41/11 64/6	81/14 81/17 82/2 82/3		64/13 83/22 87/19	business [8] 39/21
71/21 87/17 107/8	82/13 83/7 83/8 83/13			49/3 49/10 60/24 97/3
awful [1] 96/9	83/17 83/18 83/20	102/23 108/11 112/11		101/16 103/23 125/1
В	84/6 84/15 84/15	113/24 115/6 116/16	bits [1] 115/6	busy [1] 64/11
baby [1] 69/16	84/16 91/1 91/5 95/12		black [1] 39/4	but [120] 1/21 3/3 4/1
back [39] 10/20 23/7	97/8 97/9 100/1	122/22 123/23	BLAKE [4] 1/13 89/1	8/23 9/5 9/18 9/24
23/9 24/20 29/17	100/12 100/21 100/22		109/15 126/3	10/7 10/19 11/20
38/19 39/7 39/10	104/8 104/20 104/22	106/6	blame [2] 75/22	12/16 14/16 14/18
40/13 40/20 41/6	106/22 107/6 109/13	before [13] 15/15	76/10	
41/16 46/23 47/9	109/25 110/2 111/2	51/6 55/20 62/15 67/5		18/5 18/9 18/24 19/21
47/24 55/12 61/11	113/4 113/21 114/16	70/22 72/6 85/22 88/4 103/17 104/10 109/12		19/24 20/9 21/13 21/20 23/9 24/4 25/17
62/11 62/12 62/22	114/18 114/19 114/21 114/22 115/5 115/7	115/11	31/24 35/19 37/3 37/4	28/12 29/22 30/18
63/8 64/7 65/21 67/10	115/12 116/3 119/22	beg [1] 121/7	42/2	32/8 34/9 38/20 41/9
67/25 68/5 92/19 96/8	120/21 121/5 121/13	begin [2] 3/6 111/10	bob [1] 99/11	45/17 46/1 51/1 52/8
98/12 102/8 102/9	123/8 123/11 123/15	beginning [3] 59/2	book [1] 90/6	53/6 53/9 53/17 57/4
102/19 103/7 109/17 110/13 116/2 117/16	123/22 123/23 124/2	88/5 109/15	Boston [1] 4/9	57/11 60/1 60/15
110/13 110/2 117/10	124/4 124/20 125/5	begins [2] 12/25 88/6		60/23 62/9 63/14
				(35) Attribute - but

(35) Attribute - but

В	30/2 31/13 34/25	cases [5] 63/25 64/2	50/12	come [14] 7/23 14/20
	36/13 36/15 36/18	82/14 82/17 82/24	clarify [1] 92/20	24/20 50/25 55/11
but [71] 63/21 66/2	36/25 37/25 38/16	catalogue [9] 99/13	Class [5] 13/18 13/19	
66/9 67/2 67/13 67/17	39/1 42/11 43/21	101/11 102/16 102/18		68/5 75/4 88/3 93/25
68/2 69/7 69/20 70/4 70/11 71/2 72/15 73/2	43/24 45/8 45/19	103/5 103/12 103/19	classified [1] 34/14	98/12 116/2
74/21 75/1 75/13 77/2	49/16 52/12 58/6	104/17 122/21	clause [1] 81/9	comes [4] 24/14
77/17 78/8 78/11 79/6	58/17 58/25 60/10	catch [1] 112/8	clear [5] 4/4 15/2	24/23 86/8 124/14
79/23 80/8 82/7 83/5	61/20 62/3 63/9 66/6	catch-up [1] 112/8	22/14 105/20 124/4	comfortable [1]
83/17 84/1 85/11 86/8	66/8 67/16 67/24	category [1] 42/6	ClearDesk [1] 12/20	45/17
87/7 87/9 89/12 90/11	68/12 69/3 70/3 71/6	cause [19] 3/17 4/13	cleared [1] 12/19	coming [4] 20/21
90/14 91/10 94/19	74/5 74/8 75/8 77/7	9/25 32/21 35/13	clearly [7] 5/15 21/18 26/17 34/19 39/15	76/22 99/15 108/16
96/5 96/12 96/14	78/2 78/4 81/1 83/1 87/17 91/11 93/3	35/15 35/15 37/13 68/13 69/15 70/3 85/4		commas [1] 101/14
98/15 100/1 100/9	93/16 94/7 94/9 96/5	94/4 95/2 95/7 95/9	Cleveleys [32] 8/9	comment [8] 10/3 33/4 38/22 40/19
100/23 102/14 102/21	98/14 98/25 99/2 99/3		10/21 15/7 15/8 15/15	
102/21 103/9 103/15	102/6 105/10 109/21	cause' [1] 35/7	20/16 24/14 24/17	118/4
104/3 107/12 109/21	109/24 110/3 111/7	caused [4] 12/18		commenting [1] 18/7
110/25 112/18 113/16	111/8 111/9 111/22	37/18 38/3 68/9	31/17 32/12 32/16	comments [9] 5/14
114/10 114/13 115/21 116/3 116/14 116/23	111/25 112/1 112/10	causing [1] 20/13	32/18 39/6 49/24	10/23 21/19 51/24
116/25 118/4 118/6	113/7 113/24 115/3	CCN [4] 116/5 117/3	56/16 66/15 83/6 83/7	56/19 61/5 67/12
118/10 119/25 121/4	115/24 116/13 117/9	117/15 117/20	92/10 93/14 95/17	68/12 72/13
123/6 124/3 124/11	117/20 119/22 120/25		98/1 114/3 123/15	commercial [3] 74/2
124/18	122/6 123/11	cease [1] 111/1	123/17 123/24 124/4	78/21 78/24
buy [1] 20/22	can't [35] 5/21 9/3	central [1] 15/16	124/9	commission [1]
buy-in [1] 20/22	10/20 16/24 24/6 30/11 30/13 30/15	centred [1] 41/25	clients [1] 91/13	19/10
C	30/11 30/13 30/15 30/21 34/17 42/24	certain [3] 70/2 76/17 108/22	clients' [1] 91/4 close [4] 46/9 96/24	commissioned [2] 20/4 27/14
	44/23 47/16 51/4 51/9		103/8 118/1	common [1] 89/22
cab [1] 69/17	51/13 51/21 52/11	80/6 109/9 112/20	closed [8] 7/9 7/22	communication [1]
cable [1] 69/24	75/7 82/3 91/18 92/19		69/19 83/7 93/8 97/15	
calibration [1] 70/13 call [29] 12/24 14/12	100/25 104/22 106/11		103/10 105/1	company [1] 63/11
15/12 24/12 25/9	111/18 113/5 115/3	chair [1] 85/22	closing [1] 8/11	comparable [2] 29/3
32/21 33/16 34/10	115/17 118/4 119/16	chairs [1] 87/20	co [4] 108/11 108/13	29/10
36/23 41/14 42/8 47/6	120/15 120/21 121/25		108/16 111/13	comparison [1]
48/22 49/1 49/23	123/8	63/4 63/6 86/5 86/7	co-author [3] 108/11	36/23
60/16 69/19 69/20	candid [1] 78/8	challenged [2] 36/1	108/13 108/16	competition [1]
69/21 77/10 79/1	cannot [5] 14/4 68/14	93/21	co-authored [1]	39/11
81/11 90/6 97/1 97/4	78/7 81/19 121/25	challenging [3] 25/20 45/18 89/23	111/13	complaining [2] 38/5 38/24
97/9 101/25 102/23	captured [4] 16/13 16/19 16/22 17/7	Chambers [1] 12/2	code [22] 4/6 4/7 4/11 4/12 4/25 5/2 5/6	
110/13	car [1] 9/14	chance [1] 37/7	5/9 5/15 7/14 7/16 9/6	
called [4] 14/6 14/11	career [1] 2/24	change [11] 57/7	9/8 10/3 24/18 27/9	49/21 50/7 50/12
24/1 50/21	careful [1] 66/23	59/15 59/17 59/18	105/21 106/24 106/25	94/16 95/3
calling [4] 60/25 61/14 61/17 65/17	carefully [3] 49/25	60/5 67/16 116/5	107/14 122/25 123/1	complete [3] 22/18
calls [10] 26/4 27/7	50/15 87/22	117/11 117/12 117/13		100/16 109/23
28/25 34/16 68/8	carried [2] 4/9 9/21	117/16	coders [1] 106/9	completed [2] 95/11
75/12 93/7 119/8	carry [1] 9/20	changed [1] 65/25	codes [1] 30/18	95/19
119/17 119/17	carrying [1] 23/21	changes [4] 7/14	codeset [1] 7/18	completely [2]
calm [1] 55/8	case [51] 8/9 12/4	10/14 106/23 121/3	coherent [1] 31/7	118/25 123/17
Camberwell [9]	15/7 15/9 16/11 18/21		Colin [14] 18/15 28/8	complex [1] 101/9
112/16 112/18 112/21	20/9 20/16 21/6 21/17 22/21 31/11 33/3		45/21 50/18 50/20	complied [1] 22/25
116/10 116/21 117/22	34/24 40/7 47/8 49/8	choice [1] 86/14 choose [1] 87/21	51/5 58/8 60/15 61/22 71/8 72/23 74/2 75/9	comply [1] 23/1 comprehensively [1]
117/25 120/8 121/16		chose [2] 73/1 86/25	83/4	104/21
came [6] 16/18 29/17	63/10 63/10 66/15	chosen [1] 27/9	collating [2] 32/6	computer [6] 37/17
38/19 63/5 76/25	68/4 69/1 69/6 75/13	CI4 [1] 7/18	32/10	77/21 77/25 118/18
116/7	75/23 76/23 77/10	circulate [1] 84/2	colleagues [1] 36/8	118/19 121/14
can [100] 1/3 1/5 1/11 1/14 2/14 3/10	78/25 81/7 81/12	circumstances [1]	collection [1] 83/24	concede [2] 74/20
3/21 4/16 6/2 6/6 7/19	82/23 83/12 84/3 84/7	123/18	collective [1] 83/25	76/7
7/23 10/4 10/5 11/1	85/2 91/21 93/16	civil [2] 22/22 119/22	colour [1] 39/3	conceded [2] 75/17
14/20 18/4 18/11	105/4 114/3 116/11	claimants [1] 66/17	colourblind [1] 37/1	76/6
20/17 23/18 24/2 24/7	116/21 118/1 119/22	claimed [1] 42/4	combat [1] 62/14	concept [1] 95/8
26/10 27/4 28/7 28/9	120/2 124/3 124/4	claims [5] 20/12	combination [1] 5/10	
	124/17	21/22 49/21 50/7	combined [1] 15/3	6/14 9/18 39/12 71/23
				(36) but - concern

(36) but... - concern

С	26/16	35/2 36/12 44/6 46/1	52/20 53/14 53/17	dates [3] 8/22 18/23
	contact [4] 18/13	50/8 55/11 57/5 57/9	53/19 54/2 55/24	120/5
concern [8] 76/9	18/19 18/20 53/13	57/15 60/3 64/9 68/9	62/19 66/12 67/6	Dave [7] 44/11 44/13
77/2 85/1 88/23 90/11 95/18 106/21 107/1	contacted [1] 15/8	68/17 69/12 69/15	68/24 71/1 71/5 76/3	75/14 75/15 75/25
concerned [9] 4/5	contained [2] 35/21	74/10 74/11 74/11	79/12 79/17 79/21	76/1 76/3
11/15 13/6 20/8 28/17	68/7	81/14 81/25 82/13	79/24 80/12 96/1 96/4	David [4] 3/22 3/23
77/4 88/12 90/24	contemporaneous	82/24 83/8 83/23 84/6		43/22 44/8
114/25	[2] 56/11 75/2	84/16 88/2 89/5 92/20		
concerns [11] 10/25	content [3] 51/6	94/5 94/12 94/22	56/21 58/9 58/15 61/6	
11/2 15/3 89/21 90/7	74/20 75/1	95/12 96/18 97/8	63/3 65/17 65/20	124/5
90/16 90/18 94/3	contentious [1] 61/23	98/14 98/22 98/24	70/16 84/14 84/21	daybook [2] 74/7
106/22 107/2 107/21		100/21 100/21 104/6 105/11 106/13 110/10	92/8	88/23
concise [1] 110/21	contents [3] 3/25 115/8 121/20	110/15 113/10 116/1	crashdumps [1] 57/8	days [1] 63/16 deal [4] 35/12 58/17
concludes [1] 125/1	context [7] 9/10 35/5	116/2 116/4 116/11	crashed [1] 14/6	71/11 74/18
conclusion [6] 52/13	38/19 43/8 45/9 45/14		criminal [1] 120/2	dealing [3] 104/4
65/13 86/10 119/3	59/1	119/4 120/23 124/2	critical [2] 12/6 84/9	104/8 119/7
120/24 121/10	continual [3] 93/6	couldn't [4] 26/9 50/5		decay [4] 4/12 9/8
conclusions [3] 65/15 65/17 66/24	93/20 106/23	50/10 57/8	criticism [5] 51/16	10/3 123/1
concur [1] 109/4	continue [6] 7/15	Council [1] 72/4	52/19 54/4 54/21	December [3] 8/14
conduct [1] 21/17	22/25 60/16 62/13	counsel [9] 72/4	54/23	69/23 70/7
conducting [1] 10/16	64/21 65/21	77/13 78/6 78/24	criticisms [1] 66/18	decide [1] 62/7
conference [2] 77/10	continuea [3] 6/22	81/15 81/16 81/19	crop [1] 11/23	decided [4] 57/4
79/1	84/13 84/15	122/2 124/7	Cruise [6] 15/8 15/11	57/12 73/13 86/20
confidence [2]	continues [1] 109/12 continuing [1]	counsel's [1] 77/23	58/13 65/4 89/20 89/25	decision [6] 19/20 80/4 80/5 80/7 80/9
108/22 109/1	107/19	counter [20] 12/6 15/19 21/1 21/21	Cruise's [1] 19/3	80/10
confident [2] 26/7	contract [1] 8/13	24/14 24/25 27/8	CS [2] 95/8 95/14	decision-making [2]
56/3	contractual [2] 13/13		CS/PRD/021 [2] 95/8	80/7 80/9
confidentiality [2]	46/6	29/13 29/15 29/18	95/14	declaration [1]
71/13 81/9	control [7] 101/21	29/22 29/25 30/7	CSR [7] 5/25 8/2 8/10	
confirm [3] 1/6 22/14 22/24	102/2 102/7 107/7	30/22 37/12 97/14	9/1 10/7 10/20 11/6	decorating [1] 9/14
confirms [1] 106/11	116/5 117/11 117/16	counterargument [1]	curiosity [1] 87/11	deeper [1] 43/20
confiscated [1]	conversation [6]	38/14	current [2] 4/21	Defective [1] 56/2
21/12	75/3 75/5 75/24 76/25		94/21	defects [9] 7/16 8/25
confronted [1] 36/4	88/24 90/10	[1] 21/23	currently [5] 19/8	9/3 10/11 11/6 11/17
connection [1] 22/19	conversations [3]	counters [3] 12/21	56/7 101/11 103/16	91/16 122/4 122/9
consequently [2]	90/4 90/6 93/17	14/23 31/16 counting [1] 11/12	103/19	defence [3] 96/9 123/25 124/10
53/23 55/2	convicted [1] 105/3 Cooke [2] 43/22	County [1] 19/9	curve [1] 63/16 customer [5] 6/16	defend [6] 46/20
consider [4] 6/19	44/11	couple [4] 12/14	24/3 94/8 94/24 95/5	63/11 63/14 73/6 83/9
66/12 112/23 112/25	Cookstown [1] 30/14		customer's [2]	84/13
considered [3] 7/13	cool [1] 60/8	course [17] 15/3 50/5		defendant [1] 54/17
87/7 106/22	coolly [1] 40/21	63/24 66/15 67/17	CV [1] 22/10	defensive [1] 39/15
considering [2] 67/4 67/4	copy [5] 2/1 28/15	90/14 90/22 95/4	cycle [2] 39/22 53/21	defer [1] 115/20
considers [2] 71/15	88/8 115/1 115/2	98/10 108/10 110/8	cycles [2] 7/21 11/9	defined [1] 41/15
109/13	Core [1] 87/15	110/8 111/11 113/24	D	definitive [2] 101/11
consistency [1]	corner [2] 3/16 74/9	120/16 121/1 121/1		103/19
94/18	correct [18] 3/4 3/5	court [24] 16/10 19/9	data [30] 15/15 15/20 16/8 16/9 17/4 17/18	degree [1] 108/22
consistent [2] 25/12	8/8 17/3 23/23 23/24 35/7 37/5 43/3 67/23	19/11 19/23 22/25 23/3 23/11 23/13	18/2 26/5 36/4 53/1	delay [2] 18/25 18/25
95/25	73/22 79/13 79/19	45/10 45/14 61/15	58/17 59/6 63/18	deleted [8] 15/17 15/20 15/24 16/4 17/5
constructed [1]	89/13 102/1 102/2	64/22 67/1 71/18 72/6		17/9 17/15 26/6
119/24	105/2 122/17	74/1 77/24 77/24 81/8		
constructing [1]	corrective [2] 7/2 8/4	84/3 84/7 85/2 86/15	104/19 104/20 112/23	delivery [2] 4/22
101/7	correctly [1] 10/7	91/7	118/17 119/15 119/17	102/15
construction [2] 101/15 103/21	correspondence [2]	cover [1] 91/16	120/7 120/18 120/20	demonisation [2]
constructive [1]	23/25 38/10	covered [1] 7/20	122/15 122/18	83/21 83/22
66/13	corrupt [1] 122/19	covering [2] 46/7	date [10] 15/18 71/25	demonstrate [1]
construed [1] 83/8	cost [3] 7/11 7/12	96/22	73/14 74/8 74/9 74/14	
consuming [2]	117/18	Coyne [31] 16/7	94/2 103/4 106/12 116/9	demonstrates [2]
101/17 104/1	could [66] 2/6 9/20 9/25 17/1 21/21 26/6	16/16 25/2 25/13 34/6 35/9 38/15 39/25	dated [5] 1/25 2/13	36/4 36/10 department [1] 64/14
 	1 J/LJ 11/1 L1/L1 LU/U	00/000/1000/20		
consumption [1]		47/19 51/23 51/25	15/15 23/19 68/1	dependent [1]
consumption [1]	26/9 29/6 33/6 33/8	47/19 51/23 51/25	15/15 23/19 68/1	dependent [1]

(37) concern... - dependent

D	didn't [45] 10/13 20/5		domain [1] 71/17	88/10
dependent [1]	20/21 21/3 21/5 21/7	32/12	don't [60] 10/5 10/12	earned [1] 125/5
104/11	21/9 21/19 26/5 31/8	do [110] 2/1 9/16	11/11 17/21 17/23	easy [3] 15/12 39/23
depending [7] 24/15	31/11 40/16 43/13	14/12 18/10 21/9	18/22 24/9 31/20	98/11
24/24 42/1 42/5 56/17	43/19 45/2 45/15 53/1 54/13 55/3 64/18 71/4	21/16 21/21 29/10 31/2 34/15 40/2 40/22	35/18 35/20 38/9 38/9 40/25 41/10 43/9	
97/4 97/10	71/4 73/2 73/2 75/13	41/2 41/10 42/19	43/17 44/17 44/17	effect [4] 35/6 35/12 59/25 68/7
Depends [1] 41/24	76/14 76/19 77/2	42/21 43/15 45/14	45/6 49/15 49/15	effectively [6] 7/10
depth [1] 79/6	86/13 86/22 86/24	46/12 47/11 48/21	50/17 51/4 51/8 51/13	23/8 46/21 83/20
derogatory [1] 85/18	87/9 87/11 91/6 92/13	49/4 49/7 50/15 51/24		117/14 121/23
described [3] 12/5	93/13 98/12 98/14	52/20 53/24 54/10	52/23 53/2 54/7 59/15	
68/9 69/13	100/5 100/16 112/2	54/20 57/15 57/16	60/21 64/11 66/5 69/2	effort [3] 21/5 84/13
describes [1] 103/12	117/3 122/12 122/18	57/21 59/4 61/2 61/4	69/2 69/7 76/4 76/5	84/15
description [2] 70/24	122/20	61/9 62/3 63/1 63/9	79/24 82/3 83/25	either [4] 34/9 42/8
descriptions [1]	die [1] 86/13	63/13 64/15 64/20	84/19 85/6 85/8 85/11	74/19 95/14
100/5	difference [3] 32/13	65/1 65/17 65/21 67/6		Elaine [4] 33/5 33/14
design [1] 5/11	55/3 80/1	68/13 69/1 72/7 73/2	99/25 99/25 100/24	33/19 51/16
designed [1] 96/25	differences [1] 32/16	73/19 74/2 74/25 75/6		Electronic [1] 6/7
desire [1] 49/9	different [8] 10/10	78/8 78/13 79/20 80/1		element [2] 6/17
desperate [1] 38/13	18/3 48/4 64/5 67/15	82/18 82/23 83/15	121/9	101/5
destroyed [3] 53/3	73/3 96/10 123/18	83/20 84/17 84/25 85/17 86/1 86/2 86/17	done [10] 10/17 40/5 48/8 52/2 60/15 66/20	elementary [1] 5/16
53/4 53/6	difficult [8] 64/13 64/19 75/18 76/8	86/25 87/1 87/9 87/14		eise [5] 51/351/20 107/10 119/13 119/20
detail [3] 22/8 44/23	101/16 103/23 103/24	88/18 88/19 91/17	98/14	email [21] 24/11 30/4
68/16	104/18	91/23 93/24 98/5 98/8		36/14 39/3 47/12
detailed [2] 52/16	difficulties [2] 122/15	98/12 100/7 103/11	87/7 125/3	60/11 60/19 60/21
97/16	122/15	105/10 106/25 107/4	doubts [1] 65/12	61/4 61/21 61/24 64/7
details [2] 44/18 75/14	dig [1] 61/13	110/1 110/5 110/23	down [37] 3/21 4/23	65/4 67/25 71/7 73/4
detected [1] 115/17	digging [1] 57/16	111/16 112/5 112/17	5/5 6/2 7/23 13/3	73/11 75/9 80/22 81/2
determine [1] 35/15	diminished [2] 6/13	112/22 112/25 113/3	13/16 14/1 14/9 14/20	91/1
develop [1] 37/9	10/25	113/4 114/11 116/12		emails [4] 44/24 67/8
developed [1] 107/13	direct [2] 53/13 115/7	116/18 116/19 116/22		67/9 68/23
development [8]	directly [2] 58/18	117/17 117/19 118/8	29/17 31/13 33/4	emanate [1] 18/3
4/25 5/19 5/25 8/3	62/16	119/5 120/2 122/1	35/23 36/18 58/20	embark [1] 125/2
10/20 11/8 12/12	disagree [1] 61/3 disagreed [1] 79/4	122/7 122/11 123/4 123/7	61/9 63/5 65/3 69/22	embarked [1] 66/22 employed [2] 118/13
107/13	disappeared [2]	document [36] 3/11	88/4 89/14 92/13 93/2	
developments [1]	13/22 13/24	3/18 3/20 4/1 5/24 6/1		end [9] 2/18 27/18
7/25	disappearing [1]	6/3 6/6 8/1 8/6 23/4	draft [10] 51/18 65/4	29/24 30/9 30/9 38/22
dickering [1] 71/24	70/5	23/5 26/11 26/15	88/15 113/22 113/23	71/5 73/3 105/24
did [76] 5/21 5/23	disappointed [1]	28/11 29/14 34/25	113/25 115/2 115/23	engineered [1] 4/7
16/23 18/16 19/12 19/16 19/17 20/2 22/1	80/13	35/17 35/21 35/24	115/24 118/10	engineers [2] 68/12
27/22 32/1 37/20	disappointing [6]	49/18 50/25 83/2 88/2		69/25
37/22 38/20 40/1 40/2	59/21 59/22 60/1 60/2	89/2 94/7 95/6 102/13		enlarge [1] 35/1
45/2 45/5 45/6 51/20	60/7 60/23	103/3 103/6 107/4	drawn [1] 122/23	enlighten [1] 123/11
51/20 52/11 52/22	discover [1] 86/19	107/11 116/6 117/4	drop [1] 26/20	enough [5] 36/12
52/25 54/9 57/21	discovering [1] 103/17	117/24 121/2	dropped [1] 29/24	52/21 54/6 56/25 56/25
58/19 58/21 62/12		documentation [2] 53/20 99/21	due [2] 13/11 70/12 during [11] 1/18 6/12	enquiries [1] 10/14
62/24 63/3 63/10	discrepancies [8] 13/9 13/14 35/24	documents [13] 3/7	10/24 11/9 14/7 36/5	enquiry [2] 10/14 enquiry [2] 101/16
64/12 67/17 68/11	37/10 37/13 37/24	8/15 18/23 26/12	44/2 44/14 107/5	103/23
70/11 76/7 76/20	38/6 56/4	26/13 53/16 80/19	120/9 121/14	ensure [2] 38/1 96/25
76/21 78/8 78/15	discrepancy [1]	88/22 114/6 116/1	duties [2] 23/3 23/12	enter [2] 72/1 72/24
80/11 80/17 80/24	30/21	116/8 116/25 117/6	duty [2] 22/24 23/1	entirely [4] 25/12
81/20 82/1 82/3 82/15 82/18 82/19 82/20	discussed [1] 7/9	does [10] 35/12		25/23 104/11 106/17
85/23 86/6 86/17	discussion [2] 78/20	48/13 48/18 51/10	E	entries [2] 13/2 78/17
86/19 89/24 90/22	92/17	51/10 93/12 97/14	each [4] 33/16 34/9	entry [7] 7/7 69/22
91/21 92/9 97/24 98/6	dismissed [1] 59/24	99/3 99/4 102/3	36/3 59/5	70/7 74/16 101/2
98/13 99/22 99/25	disparity [1] 31/9	doesn't [3] 31/15	earlier [11] 4/6 15/3	102/21 102/22
99/25 103/8 104/17	dispel [1] 62/4	32/20 96/12	29/14 40/20 61/7 63/15 67/20 70/21	environmental [1]
110/17 111/17 111/19	dispute [7] 21/11 33/17 34/11 47/3 63/4	doing [12] 32/3 32/4 41/3 45/15 45/16 47/9		69/20 EPOS [1] 105/16
112/2 112/17 112/20	77/20 81/17	47/16 69/1 69/5 91/15		EPOS [1] 103/10 EPOSS [26] 3/13 4/6
113/18 114/21 122/11	disputed [1] 36/6	98/9 100/8	28/11 28/16 63/15	4/7 4/21 5/9 5/19 6/8
				(29) dependent EDOSS

(38) dependent... - EPOSS

E	95/19 104/10 109/20	90/11 90/16 90/18	February 2000 [1]	103/7 116/15 123/14
	109/24 114/19 123/16		8/10	Firstly [1] 92/7
EPOSS [19] 6/12	124/23	extent [3] 48/23 49/2	February 2001 [1]	fitted [2] 14/15 69/24
6/14 6/18 6/20 7/4 9/4	exact [1] 114/10	97/2	124/1	fix [13] 4/15 5/1 9/24
10/24 11/1 11/3 11/4 15/4 25/7 44/3 44/6	exactly [2] 29/11	extra [2] 57/6 107/9	February 2004 [5]	9/25 42/4 42/7 43/12
44/14 56/10 67/21	104/24	extract [4] 33/7 66/6	25/5 25/14 36/14	46/8 47/14 48/8 93/11
72/11 122/25	examination [1]	66/9 113/1	76/15 88/16	96/23 106/24
equally [1] 52/8	115/23	extracted [2] 119/15	fed [1] 31/6	fixed [1] 42/11
equate [1] 10/20	example [6] 9/5 67/9	119/18	feel [9] 21/5 21/16	fixes [3] 4/11 5/12
equipment [3] 21/12	72/11 107/5 107/17	extractions [1]	45/2 45/14 58/14	9/9
56/2 81/8	114/3	118/22	58/19 76/22 78/15	fixing [1] 42/17
equivalent [1] 17/16	examples [1] 95/10 exasperated [1]	extracts [2] 69/8 71/9 extremely [2] 4/5	feeling [1] 77/1	flag [1] 57/1 flawed [1] 93/6
error [17] 11/25 12/9	89/15	124/3	feels [1] 14/3	fly [1] 107/14
12/16 13/7 14/8 24/18	excluded [2] 30/24		Felstead [6] 98/21	focus [2] 46/13 78/10
27/9 37/18 38/3 38/4	31/3	F	105/3 105/6 112/12	focusing [2] 47/13
56/11 57/22 69/14	excuse [1] 96/14	face [2] 39/16 57/12	118/9 123/25	109/17
70/22 72/11 93/8 103/15	exercise [1] 66/23	facing [3] 6/12 6/17	Felstead's [4] 112/22	follow [2] 87/4 120/2
errors [14] 20/13	exist [4] 38/4 38/23	10/24	116/16 124/3 124/17	following [1] 80/22
24/19 26/3 26/5 30/25	122/11 122/19		felt [10] 21/22 45/17	follows [3] 12/6
32/5 37/17 37/25 38/2	existence [2] 29/18	23/6 24/23 27/1 30/16		15/11 120/12
78/11 108/2 122/4	29/25	51/2 61/17 67/6 78/10 85/23 86/13 90/21		
122/9 122/22	existing [2] 5/6 106/24	107/4 114/6 114/8	98/15 few [8] 13/1 22/12	40/13 41/6 62/11
escalated [1] 97/9	exists [2] 46/17	117/19 120/19	26/12 37/8 69/8 71/9	62/12 62/22 63/9 force [1] 107/8
Escher [1] 4/8	49/10	facts [1] 22/15	114/5 114/9	forefront [1] 96/12
essence [1] 46/11	expect [2] 42/8 118/4		fiddle [1] 9/15	forget [2] 85/8 121/7
essentially [7] 10/2	expectation [1] 4/8	failed [1] 65/2	fight [1] 72/22	forgive [2] 108/3
20/25 28/20 43/1 59/22 64/3 78/25	expected [1] 83/18	failing [1] 69/10	figure [4] 11/21	119/4
establish [2] 101/10	experience [1] 47/20	failure [1] 57/9	31/18 32/19 116/18	form [5] 31/7 39/8
115/12	experiencing [5]	fair [8] 8/16 31/8	figures [8] 6/11	40/14 114/1 115/3
establishes [1]	32/25 34/21 57/24	36/12 40/19 54/20 82/8 116/3 123/5	10/23 25/11 31/2	formal [4] 16/3 16/9
117/14	57/25 70/19	fairly [6] 8/17 55/1	31/16 32/9 33/2 70/5 final [17] 2/6 2/15	26/18 95/2
establishing [1]	expert [34] 16/16 19/5 19/10 19/13	63/18 97/21 122/1	7/17 12/10 27/17	formally [1] 16/12 formed [1] 94/15
44/19	19/17 19/22 20/3	122/7	35/23 48/10 55/25	forward [6] 35/25
et [3] 13/25 14/19	22/11 23/2 23/12	fall [2] 42/5 48/3	56/5 62/6 71/19 72/17	37/15 54/13 80/5
63/21	23/16 23/17 23/19	fallen [1] 36/3	73/18 74/16 77/19	86/13 108/16
et cetera [3] 13/25	33/17 33/19 35/5	false [1] 114/21	83/13 114/25	forwarded [4] 79/12
etc [1] 42/11		familiar [2] 3/12 3/25	finally [1] 81/6	79/20 79/24 80/12
even [14] 32/19	45/13 52/14 54/2 54/3		financial [2] 100/2	found [12] 16/8 17/10
34/13 48/18 52/17	54/15 56/23 59/14	fantasy [1] 32/24 far [9] 35/18 58/19	100/13	17/12 18/9 53/7 79/22
55/25 83/10 85/7	60/22 61/15 61/25 62/24 64/25 86/4	61/9 62/2 85/8 86/7	find [11] 17/25 35/15 41/8 41/8 60/2 66/16	81/17 85/25 85/25 95/22 96/7 96/11
85/12 85/16 87/20	89/17	92/19 95/20 119/9	76/11 77/20 77/25	frank [1] 106/1
95/17 104/7 119/24	expert's [19] 21/2	fashioned [1] 124/12	85/14 88/22	Fraser [1] 66/10
123/19	21/20 22/2 26/1 28/15		finding [1] 13/9	fraudulent [1] 36/2
event [8] 12/6 17/14 40/5 79/23 84/24	28/17 45/1 50/21	41/15 49/11 49/11	findings [1] 20/8	free [2] 79/5 108/19
95/17 119/8 120/13	55/20 58/23 72/3	49/12 77/6 88/13	fine [6] 60/13 87/13	freely [1] 78/16
events [2] 12/8 12/13	72/18 73/1 73/16 88/5		111/3 123/10 124/13	freezes [7] 27/19
eventually [1] 113/18	88/9 88/12 89/22	faults [1] 49/13	124/13	27/23 28/3 31/24
ever [1] 86/19	92/23	favour [1] 51/25	finish [1] 85/22	31/25 35/19 42/2
every [4] 13/6 33/16	expertise [3] 45/3 45/7 45/15	fear [4] 4/12 60/16 62/9 74/17	finished [1] 109/13 fire [1] 87/17	freezing [2] 69/11 70/9
34/10 59/8	oxporto [2] 51/5	feature [2] 48/14	firm [1] 69/17	frequency [1] 47/21
everybody [1] 105/18	65/12	99/22	first [30] 1/25 4/2	Friday [1] 1/1
everyone [1] 125/6	explain [3] 20/17	features [1] 51/17	9/17 13/18 13/19	friend [1] 98/24
everything [2] 53/14 58/20	30/21 47/20	February [20] 8/10	13/21 13/22 13/23	front [1] 2/1
evidence [23] 5/18	explained [1] 62/15	18/12 23/20 25/5	13/24 20/14 22/12	frustrated [3] 59/19
5/22 6/22 21/24 34/4	exploring [1] 122/3	25/14 26/22 26/23	26/19 40/11 44/21	60/1 73/5
40/20 51/1 53/6 55/6	express [3] 89/25	27/2 27/22 28/9 28/14		frustrating [1] 60/23
60/5 65/20 67/4 69/21	108/21 108/21	36/14 45/20 55/6 56/15 76/15 88/7 88/8	53/21 56/14 59/12	frustration [1] 85/19
91/4 91/16 95/11	expressed [7] 22/17 53/23 89/21 90/8	88/16 124/1	63/17 78/19 86/3 92/21 96/23 101/2	FUJ00059075 [2] 10/4 11/25
	33123 03121 30/0		32121 30123 101/2	10/4 11/20

(39) EPOSS... - FUJ00059075

F	88/14 93/25	goes [4] 4/18 71/17	21/11 25/8 26/4 26/6	40/16 41/6 46/20
FUJ00059141 [1]	G	77/20 117/16	27/23 28/3 28/5 30/23	
12/15	gagging [4] 83/10	going [53] 1/8 1/20	30/24 32/21 33/20	56/12 58/20 59/25
FUJ00075674 [1]	85/7 85/10 85/16	1/24 2/24 3/6 6/9 9/16 12/14 15/5 22/8 26/20	33/23 34/4 37/7 38/18 39/14 49/5 52/20 53/2	70/4 71/3 86/1 87/7 125/7
98/25	gaggle [4] 83/11	32/9 39/4 40/6 42/15	53/5 53/7 53/13 54/3	he [50] 13/7 13/8
FUJ00079782 [1] 6/1	83/19 83/24 84/17	46/22 48/13 49/7 51/7	54/12 59/12 66/20	13/17 14/7 22/13 24/2
FUJ00080690 [1] 3/11	game [3] 73/3 75/22	55/19 59/2 61/11	66/22 67/20 69/17	30/6 33/19 35/10 37/6
FUJ00086680 [1]	98/6	63/23 67/22 67/25	72/8 72/15 75/3 76/4	38/17 38/17 41/23
12/22	garage [1] 116/7	71/8 72/6 73/6 75/12	77/20 77/25 79/10	43/4 43/10 44/1 46/11
FUJ00121485 [1]	garbage [2] 37/20 37/21	75/22 76/18 77/5	79/25 80/25 81/15	48/11 51/6 51/7 52/22
28/7	gave [3] 1/19 104/10	81/11 84/1 86/15 88/25 91/24 96/10	86/5 86/17 87/6 89/20 89/22 93/17 102/18	53/1 54/4 54/12 54/12 54/15 55/2 56/1 56/23
FUJ00121486 [2]	112/4	96/13 105/24 109/9	103/5 107/23 112/11	57/15 57/16 64/9
28/10 88/2	general [3] 33/25	109/17 110/22 110/23		66/10 66/17 66/19
FUJ00121504 [1] 96/17	36/7 50/8	113/22 113/25 114/16		66/22 75/12 75/14
FUJ00121512 [1]	generally [2] 33/24	115/5 115/7 117/17	hadn't [2] 23/4 36/9	75/25 76/9 76/10
45/19	42/3	117/18 123/17 125/2	half [2] 28/12 33/11	76/17 77/5 93/7
FUJ00121535 [1]	generic [1] 97/21 get [26] 35/3 39/19	gone [3] 13/12 66/2	halfway [3] 13/3 14/1	105/17 106/11 106/21
55/22	961 [26] 33/3 39/19	84/23	78/4 hall [1] 111/23	106/21 107/2 109/13 he'd [4] 57/11 57/12
FUJ00121549 [1]	47/6 47/23 48/13 49/7	gonna [1] 80/1 good [9] 1/3 4/10	Halstead [1] 30/16	88/17 93/18
58/6	49/9 71/13 76/14	40/17 87/25 90/12	hand [19] 3/15 30/6	he's [5] 37/14 42/16
FUJ00121550 [1] 58/11	79/14 80/15 80/19	98/19 106/3 107/5	30/9 30/16 30/18	42/24 54/11 75/20
FUJ00121557 [1]	80/21 81/16 85/10	125/6	30/19 31/13 33/10	head [1] 10/7
60/10	87/11 89/10 92/13	got [18] 10/6 14/7	33/12 33/18 34/12	hear [9] 1/3 1/8 111/7
FUJ00121561 [1]	99/17 100/17 113/5 115/22	18/23 20/17 40/7	34/25 46/14 48/19	111/8 111/18 111/22
61/20	getting [19] 19/3	61/19 63/24 66/5 76/11 89/11 89/13	48/20 49/14 49/16 74/9 120/4	111/25 112/1 112/2 heard [2] 67/10 67/11
FUJ00121637 [1]	38/13 39/11 41/15	90/9 100/22 100/23	handling [4] 89/16	hearing [1] 125/11
71/6	41/19 42/18 43/1	115/1 115/2 121/4	89/16 91/21 97/19	held [4] 36/8 77/11
FUJ00121668 [1] 75/8	44/22 46/16 46/23	121/4	hands [1] 113/5	108/5 118/23
FUJ00121724 [2]	46/25 47/9 54/7 73/13	Graham [1] 117/20	handwritten [1]	help [14] 19/4 20/23
67/24 83/1	73/25 93/5 93/20 94/4 107/7		77/11	21/1 25/18 36/15
FUJ00121725 [1]	GIGO [1] 37/18	101/9 101/12 103/4 103/20 104/16 122/20	hang [3] 110/3 123/13 123/13	36/19 57/7 59/17 60/5 62/20 64/24 68/13
69/4	git [4] 60/16 60/25	grateful [1] 124/6	happen [3] 9/20	78/9 122/21
Fujitsu [18] 36/7	61/18 67/9	great [1] 66/20	43/10 71/17	Helpdesk [21] 15/23
49/20 50/5 53/10 53/17 53/19 62/10	give [7] 1/14 32/2	greater [2] 6/14	happened [2] 40/1	16/14 17/7 17/14 18/1
63/24 64/20 64/21	56/25 57/14 105/25	106/22	93/15	18/4 18/9 24/19 32/22
67/22 70/20 79/18	112/2 116/13	Green [9] 112/16	happening [7] 26/14	33/22 43/19 45/25
92/22 92/23 106/8	given [11] 35/11 38/12 41/2 61/1 73/4	112/18 112/21 116/10		46/5 52/18 53/5 78/12
116/17 123/6	75/19 76/13 93/6	116/21 117/23 117/25 120/8 121/16	84/10 84/12 102/17 happy [2] 71/14	93/1 96/19 119/8 119/17 120/13
Fujitsu's [2] 28/14	115/15 119/19 120/19	around [1] 109/19	109/4	helpful [2] 36/21
73/21	gives [2] 12/7 23/17	grounds [2] 121/11	hard [2] 33/17 34/10	66/12
full [2] 1/15 27/9 fully [9] 22/24 41/16	giving [5] 59/16	124/15	has [40] 5/1 5/15	helping [1] 20/19
46/23 46/25 47/5 47/6	61/11 73/9 124/22	group [1] 6/15		Hence [3] 42/13 43/5
47/6 47/8 104/21	124/23	guarantee [1] 4/15	14/17 24/22 27/20	48/11
functional [1] 108/2	glib [1] 38/8 glitches [2] 78/7	guess [6] 25/4 34/19	30/19 31/14 35/25	Henry [12] 92/2 98/18 98/19 103/11
functionality [4] 4/16	81/20	81/12 84/4 96/6 122/11	36/3 37/16 39/6 41/12 45/12 46/17 56/23	109/7 109/12 109/13
7/15 106/25 107/9	go [38] 5/3 14/1 14/5	guidance [5] 34/14	61/15 62/1 65/13	109/16 115/12 120/25
fundamental [1]	14/9 22/8 28/7 35/18	41/25 71/24 95/10	65/25 68/5 68/5 70/4	124/18 126/6
100/12 further [18] 1/23	39/14 44/18 59/10	95/13	71/1 71/25 73/14	her [11] 8/13 56/12
27/14 35/13 38/10	64/7 71/3 71/21 88/2	guys [3] 79/7 105/19	82/23 83/11 94/17	57/24 75/6 81/7 81/10
40/4 53/20 56/22	89/5 94/12 98/25 101/2 101/24 102/4	106/2	101/25 102/11 102/12	
57/15 60/5 61/16 72/2	102/21 105/7 105/8	Н	102/13 102/23 104/20 113/24 121/3	85/13 105/4 here [19] 10/5 23/25
72/18 72/25 73/12	105/11 106/13 108/3	habit [1] 114/2	hasn't [1] 4/13	24/13 30/7 32/3 37/8
73/15 94/19 109/24	110/6 113/2 115/11	had [66] 3/17 10/11	have [167]	43/10 43/22 45/9
115/11 future [6] 28/19	116/1 116/2 116/4	11/3 11/18 13/19	haven't [1] 90/1	45/19 55/23 59/1 61/1
82/13 82/24 85/5	116/11 116/14 118/10		having [19] 14/16	62/8 74/25 89/18 98/6
	119/2 120/3 120/23	18/19 18/19 20/3	26/3 27/11 39/7 40/14	113/5 119/7
				(40) EU 100059141 - boro

(40) FUJ00059141 - here

Н	66/24 91/16 93/1	I could [4] 2/6 64/9	40/25 41/1 41/7 43/8	I understand [2] 62/8
hieroglyphs [3]	101/12 102/20 103/20		43/16 44/24 45/9	124/2
100/23 100/24 103/17	104/11 118/19 118/23		46/11 51/17 51/22	I unmute [1] 1/5
high [4] 4/9 24/22	119/7 119/16 120/12		52/4 52/10 58/25	I want [3] 43/25
43/14 60/7	121/13 121/15 123/25		60/22 60/25 60/25	89/24 116/3
higher [2] 49/23	124/10	80/24 82/3 85/23	61/14 64/23 70/18	I wanted [2] 29/15
92/17	Horizon's [1] 20/18	103/8 110/17 112/17	76/24 78/17 78/19	91/13
highest [3] 24/23	horned [1] 107/14 host [2] 81/11 86/11	I didn't [13] 20/5 20/21 21/7 31/8 43/13	78/25 82/5 82/6 83/19 84/20 85/6 90/7 92/13	I was [27] 9/10 10/16 10/18 13/17 18/7 32/3
31/17 106/8	hours [1] 42/7	43/19 64/18 76/19	96/2 114/2 115/19	32/6 32/10 36/17
highly [1] 85/12	how [21] 17/23 20/17	77/2 86/22 92/13	119/21 120/15	45/18 74/2 77/4 79/1
him [29] 36/22 52/24	26/6 40/21 41/15	98/14 117/3	I meant [1] 10/2	81/24 85/8 85/9 93/22
57/7 57/10 57/14	52/16 54/5 54/24	I do [8] 61/4 88/19	I might [2] 38/18	98/5 98/8 99/9 102/9
57/17 57/18 58/16	57/10 59/10 63/20	107/4 112/5 112/17	60/16	105/5 105/6 106/15
58/16 59/16 59/17 60/5 60/5 60/16 61/12	71/10 80/8 85/14 86/1	116/19 119/5 123/7	I must [1] 121/5	109/4 109/15 113/25
61/17 65/10 65/11	86/2 107/24 107/24	I don't [26] 10/5	I need [2] 79/14	I wasn't [5] 25/19
65/22 66/16 66/24	117/18 123/12 124/2	10/12 11/11 18/22	80/15	32/4 32/8 38/21 80/8
76/3 86/7 86/11 86/11	However [2] 38/1	31/20 35/20 38/9	l now [1] 105/4	I will [4] 110/13
86/14 96/8 108/14	81/10		I put [3] 51/8 82/4	115/19 115/21 125/7
109/5	HSH [19] 27/6 27/20	52/1 52/23 54/7 59/15		I wish [1] 125/6
hindsight [2] 65/23	28/5 39/8 39/15 39/19		I really [2] 44/23	I won't [1] 124/18
71/2	41/2 52/15 68/8 68/11	82/3 83/25 84/19	90/16	I wonder [2] 33/5
his [36] 5/20 13/13	69/15 70/3 70/10 70/12 93/4 93/19	85/11 91/18 99/25 99/25 106/14	I referred [1] 16/6 I remember [1] 38/20	113/10
14/7 21/20 23/17 25/2	96/20 97/4 97/22		I represent [1] 87/25	I would [10] 8/24
39/2 43/13 47/19	hundreds [1] 4/10	l explain [1] 20/17	I said [10] 17/6 29/14	42/7 44/15 52/10 79/6
48/16 51/7 54/25 55/5		I fear [2] 60/16 62/9	34/8 44/21 60/21	80/24 108/14 109/23
55/21 56/23 57/7	I	I felt [3] 64/25 98/10	63/14 64/18 67/13	110/4 110/19
57/12 58/18 59/17	I accept [1] 123/3	98/15	83/2 86/16	I wouldn't [5] 10/12
59/18 59/23 59/25	I agree [1] 100/14	I find [1] 66/16	I saw [1] 66/1	16/11 16/18 52/1 67/2
60/6 62/1 62/4 63/3	I agreed [1] 109/3	I finish [1] 85/22	I say [5] 3/24 18/8	l'd [7] 11/16 27/17
65/11 65/13 65/15 66/19 67/17 77/18	I am [5] 56/3 111/21	I follow [1] 87/4	41/1 59/14 110/3	37/2 37/11 83/2 86/3
77/19 78/3 92/8 93/4		I found [2] 79/22	I see [3] 109/1	98/8
history [5] 2/24 25/6	I analysed [1] 120/6	85/25	117/22 124/6	I'II [5] 13/1 22/12
31/21 56/9 72/11	I apologise [1] 77/16		I sent [1] 36/22	60/10 66/9 69/8
hit [2] 101/20 104/22			I should [1] 27/10	l'm [69] 1/20 1/24
hm [3] 32/23 58/10	118/8		I spoke [1] 105/19	2/24 3/6 6/9 9/1 11/7
121/21	l ask [5] 2/14 98/24 110/15 119/5 123/4	34/19 81/12 84/4 96/6		11/11 12/14 15/5 16/2
holiday [1] 125/6	l asked [1] 111/14		I still [1] 71/3	20/7 22/7 24/2 31/6 37/1 38/24 39/4 39/7
Holmes [42] 1/8 1/11	I attempting [1]	I hadn't [1] 23/4 I have [14] 22/19	I suggest [2] 91/5 123/8	40/10 40/11 40/13
1/12 1/16 1/17 2/23	84/11	22/25 27/6 71/23	I suppose [6] 48/5	40/25 41/8 43/17
55/19 60/12 87/22	l beg [1] 121/7	82/18 88/1 91/24	63/22 96/2 96/9	44/21 45/18 46/16
87/25 92/5 94/10	I begin [1] 111/10	115/16 116/24 117/19		46/19 52/10 55/19
95/23 97/22 98/7	I believe [4] 22/16	118/13 118/18 120/12		68/1 68/10 68/19 71/8
98/17 98/19 98/22	29/23 34/24 111/17	123/22	90/20 93/15	72/23 73/9 76/7 79/22
99/1 102/1 102/24 104/2 104/7 107/1	I can [18] 1/5 18/4	I honestly [1] 51/4	I think [43] 3/3 3/15	82/11 85/10 88/21
107/3 107/22 108/10	24/2 38/16 45/8 66/6	l just [18] 10/5 19/19	5/4 8/6 9/8 16/17 19/4	88/21 88/25 90/4
108/16 108/20 110/11	66/8 69/3 91/11 93/16	22/9 43/13 43/24 45/6		90/20 91/24 96/13
111/13 111/22 112/1	98/14 109/21 109/24	51/4 64/19 68/2 76/17		100/19 106/14 106/15
115/13 116/4 116/7	111/22 112/1 115/3	77/11 87/4 91/21	37/14 49/18 54/22	108/15 109/7 109/16
116/13 121/9 123/8	115/24 116/13	98/22 108/3 112/10	55/10 64/3 65/20 69/4	110/22 111/19 111/20
124/21 124/22 126/2	I can't [21] 5/21 9/3 10/20 16/24 30/11	118/8 120/25	72/4 74/13 79/1 79/8	112/21 114/10 114/25
honest [3] 82/3 106/1	30/21 47/16 51/9	l know [4] 18/25 51/5 72/15 96/14	79/17 80/18 80/24 81/24 82/10 83/18	115/5 115/15 115/21 117/4 117/5 120/4
120/22	51/13 75/7 82/3 91/18		81/24 82/10 83/18 83/22 88/22 89/8	121/2 124/6 124/17
honestly [1] 51/4	92/19 111/18 113/5	l lost [1] 72/16	89/12 90/24 91/10	l've [21] 10/6 11/10
Hooper [1] 117/20	/ /	I made [1] 114/5	105/18 108/7 109/25	15/1 31/4 31/21 52/4
Horizon [34] 3/10		I may [2] 93/17 116/2	111/19 114/6 124/15	58/21 60/15 61/19
8/11 8/18 10/15 11/15	I cannot [1] 121/25		I thought [3] 38/8	61/23 62/15 68/23
20/12 32/20 33/1	I confirm [2] 22/14	16/2 18/22 20/17 25/1	• • •	89/11 89/13 90/9 91/1
33/22 38/4 38/23 43/19 45/25 46/4	22/24	26/1 30/22 31/4 34/19		91/10 92/4 115/1
52/16 52/18 59/2 66/7	I consider [1] 66/12	35/10 38/7 38/12	I took [1] 6/25	115/4 121/4
	I continue [1] 60/16	38/16 39/14 40/20	I trust [1] 75/20	lan [1] 75/15
L				(41) bioroglyphs - lan

(41) hieroglyphs - lan

	increased [2] 30/19	26/16 61/4 67/8 72/23	issues [13] 8/17	86/17 86/17 114/14
	81/6	102/5 105/11 106/16	10/11 10/19 14/22	joint [3] 54/2 54/3
ICL [7] 3/1 3/4 108/6	indeed [3] 25/25 53/8		31/18 42/12 56/13	109/3
116/17 118/13 118/20	92/8	interpretation [3]	66/7 66/25 67/21	jointly [9] 19/10
118/22	independent [4] 26/1	73/7 73/10 82/10	70/19 76/16 94/21	19/13 19/17 20/3
ICL Pathway [2]	58/23 66/18 84/14	interrogate [1] 101/4	it [373]	45/12 54/15 56/22
118/13 118/20	independently [2]	interrogations [1]	it's [104] 1/16 1/21	58/23 61/14
idea [2] 31/4 52/4	61/14 104/21	101/6	2/3 2/5 3/12 5/5 8/16	joke [3] 5/21 105/16
identified [7] 11/16	indicate [2] 6/11	interrupt [2] 39/21	9/13 9/15 12/16 12/23	106/5
29/23 30/23 32/17	10/24	109/7	12/24 19/14 22/3 22/4	
33/19 95/12 102/11	indicates [1] 93/9	into [23] 7/19 11/14	23/8 25/18 32/24	24/7 24/20 25/10
identifying [1] 99/20	individual [1] 92/14	22/8 38/18 42/5 43/13		27/12 30/4 56/15
identities [1] 101/10	inevitably [1] 84/4	44/5 44/22 48/3 48/5	38/13 40/12 42/17	journal [1] 99/14
if [127]	infancy [1] 59/5	59/1 59/23 61/13 64/9		
ill [1] 5/12	influence [5] 58/15	66/21 78/2 81/17 82/4		101/4
imagining [1] 121/5	58/22 58/25 59/14	95/2 97/19 100/17	47/1 47/9 47/17 48/3	judgment [1] 66/7
immediately [1] 113/5	60/3	106/25 107/14	49/11 51/19 52/19	Julie [2] 8/12 77/21
	information [21]	introduce [3] 7/14	53/5 54/22 54/22	July [4] 1/1 75/8
impact [4] 10/14 63/8 106/23 107/23	20/23 25/22 27/12	9/12 95/2	54/23 54/23 60/19	75/21 101/3
impairing [1] 94/21	29/16 31/6 32/6 40/22	introduces [1] 95/8	60/21 60/23 61/4	July 2004 [1] 75/21
impartial [1] 62/2	44/25 52/21 52/25	introduction [2] 7/18	61/24 63/22 66/1 66/2	June [10] 71/7 71/7
impartially [1] 104/20	59/7 67/15 99/17	118/12	66/7 67/3 67/25 69/4	72/7 72/21 74/10
imperfections [3]	99/18 99/18 100/18	invalid [1] 122/19	71/7 71/20 72/1 72/24	
9/23 9/24 9/25	119/10 119/12 119/23		73/3 73/13 75/24 76/5	
implications [2]	121/12 122/16	investigate [1] 97/24	77/5 78/6 78/11 78/19	June 2004 [2] 72/21
19/16 20/15		investigated [2] 40/4	79/8 80/20 82/6 82/11	102/7
imply [1] 26/24	35/17 50/24 51/18	93/10		just [108] 1/24 3/8
importance [1]	58/8	investigating [1]	83/18 85/12 86/16	4/1 5/8 6/9 7/25 8/15
114/24	initials [1] 78/18	57/24	87/2 87/2 89/8 89/9	8/25 10/5 13/1 13/19
important [7] 8/18	initiative [1] 107/15	investigation [2]	89/12 94/12 98/11	14/14 15/1 19/19
56/20 63/10 63/14	INQ00001019 [1]	66/21 115/22	98/22 99/3 100/9	20/20 20/22 21/8
86/24 100/9 109/19	105/9	investigations [1]	102/8 102/9 102/21	21/13 22/9 22/12 23/8
imposed [4] 39/7	inquiries [1] 87/21	23/21	103/11 105/9 105/14	25/17 26/16 29/6 31/6
40/14 41/4 96/24	Inquiry [12] 1/19 5/19		106/16 107/11 108/20	
imposition [1]	12/24 67/11 104/10	invite [1] 57/10	111/22 113/10 114/13	
114/11	117/1 117/8 122/3	inviting [2] 53/16	116/6 116/20 117/18	41/10 43/13 43/17
impossible [1] 11/20	124/7 124/12 124/25	58/15	118/1 123/14	43/24 45/6 51/4 54/22
impressed [1] 38/21	125/4	involve [3] 73/19	items [1] 80/23	54/23 55/2 55/19
impression [3] 38/12	Inquiry's [1] 125/1	73/24 74/3	its [5] 4/21 59/4	57/13 57/17 58/21
61/1 73/4	insert [1] 106/25	involved [15] 8/5	104/12 117/24 124/12	
improper [1] 121/14	inserted [1] 51/2	19/3 19/20 22/20	itself [8] 18/4 22/9	62/25 64/19 65/7 66/9
improve [1] 94/23	insofar [4] 11/16	62/16 62/17 63/25	23/10 36/10 47/2 48/1	68/2 71/21 73/12
Improvements [1]	19/14 34/8 59/5	64/2 64/22 68/20	70/10 100/8	75/17 75/24 76/17
102/13	installed [4] 8/12 29/3 29/9 29/13	76/15 86/3 99/8 112/19 125/4	J	77/4 77/11 80/13 80/20 80/20 81/5
inaccurate [1]	instances [1] 11/23	involvement [5]	JACOBS [2] 87/23	80/20 80/20 81/5 81/22 81/24 82/22
121/13	instructed [4] 19/9	18/24 67/20 75/19	126/4	85/6 87/4 88/3 88/4
inadequate [3] 81/13	19/13 19/17 45/12	76/14 79/2	James [1] 44/9	89/10 89/14 90/4 90/4
81/21 82/12	instruction [2] 35/6	involves [1] 78/20	Jan [6] 1/8 1/12 1/16	91/10 91/21 91/24
inappropriate [1]	35/11	irrespective [2] 23/5	102/1 102/24 126/2	92/4 92/18 92/20
67/13	integral [1] 101/5	23/9	January [11] 1/25	92/20 95/17 96/16
incident [2] 12/3 99/4	integrity [1] 107/24	is [294]	22/23 23/19 23/20	96/16 98/22 98/24
incidents [4] 3/9	intended [1] 120/1	isn't [20] 8/16 15/2	27/7 69/9 69/12 103/2	99/20 99/23 100/4
94/16 94/22 99/6	interact [1] 59/13	25/2 27/25 36/10 38/7		101/2 104/3 104/17
include [1] 32/20	interested [3] 93/5	41/7 44/11 47/8 50/19		104/19 105/10 105/24
included [1] 102/12	93/18 93/19	60/24 73/3 80/20	Jason [11] 16/7 19/5	108/3 109/8 110/6
includes [1] 50/21	interesting [2] 21/18	83/18 91/9 97/22	25/12 53/14 58/9	110/16 110/19 112/4
including [3] 8/20	64/23	100/9 114/1 114/14	58/15 59/15 62/19	112/10 114/25 118/8
98/21 106/8	interests [1] 61/25	116/20	63/3 76/2 84/21	118/12 120/25
inconvenience [1]	interfere [1] 39/21	issue [16] 26/7 37/12	Jim [7] 15/8 19/3	Justice [1] 66/10
incorrect [2] 53/24	interference [1]	41/24 42/10 47/4 48/1		justification [2] 39/8
123/11	69/16	63/1 81/21 82/12 83/5		40/15
incorrectly [1] 77/16	intermediate [1] 42/6			justified [1] 66/19
	internal [11] 26/15	99/9 101/21	job [5] 45/16 76/19	justify [1] 41/1
L	1			(42) ICL - justify

(42) ICL - justify

J	knowledgeable [1]	113/3 117/10	lock [2] 12/18 123/24	21/16 21/24 56/23
justifying [1] 41/9	44/9	letter [9] 18/15 18/17	Log [5] 12/1 12/9	maintaining [2] 18/5
	known [23] 6/21	19/15 28/20 50/18	12/16 70/22 93/8	55/7
K	11/25 12/9 12/15	50/20 56/7 88/17 90/9		maintenance [1]
KB [2] 79/14 79/14	12/20 22/19 42/14	level [9] 46/7 86/24	logs [15] 14/24 14/24	7/11
keen [1] 109/16	43/6 48/12 48/17	92/14 92/17 94/17 96/22 99/8 105/22	15/23 16/15 17/7	major [1] 37/12
keep [4] 49/16 71/16	48/18 49/6 49/11 49/13 57/22 69/14	106/8	17/14 18/1 25/9 31/22 56/11 57/22 69/14	make [16] 7/19 10/13 26/18 32/11 37/25
71/21 74/23	70/21 87/9 93/8 106/7		72/12 119/8 120/13	55/3 65/9 68/15 75/13
keeping [1] 116/8	118/19 123/6 123/19	81/13 81/22 82/12	long [2] 4/1 90/14	105/20 109/8 110/20
Keith [10] 18/16	-	Lewinski [1] 77/15	loo [2] 110/7 110/13	112/20 113/17 114/8
19/14 45/21 75/11	<u>L</u>	liability [2] 71/20	look [56] 3/17 3/23	114/18
75/25 76/25 80/15 80/21 80/25 90/9	lack [2] 4/25 89/17	74/22	4/2 7/3 10/4 11/22	makes [4] 72/10
KEL [4] 11/25 12/11	laptop [1] 88/22	liable [1] 114/19	12/5 12/9 12/15 12/17	72/15 101/14 103/21
48/9 93/9	largely [1] 30/23	liaising [1] 54/19	12/22 13/2 17/16	making [7] 25/2
KELs [8] 25/9 40/3	last [10] 6/25 15/19	life [1] 104/17	18/11 19/7 22/2 23/18	
58/3 66/22 92/9 92/15	64/3 86/12 102/21	light [3] 6/21 13/12	24/11 26/10 26/25	114/4 120/20
93/13 93/23	104/9 105/5 105/7	46/13	27/4 27/17 28/9 30/6	malfunction [1]
kept [2] 26/13 117/1	116/12 118/2	lighting [1] 69/15	36/13 37/11 38/13	68/10
keyboard [2] 70/6	late [9] 6/13 10/23	like [34] 5/20 8/19	39/1 41/12 43/21	man [1] 54/11
70/8	58/24 72/1 72/24 73/14 75/19 76/13	9/9 9/19 21/19 26/19	45/19 52/12 55/22	manage [1] 71/12
Ki [1] 14/11	79/23	27/17 31/24 32/18 37/8 37/11 38/20	55/24 58/6 60/10 65/7	manageable [1]
kind [10] 20/1 21/5	later [7] 53/16 70/10	39/10 39/11 47/21	67/24 74/5 75/8 77/7 77/18 78/4 78/19 79/8	11/21 managed [1] 62/23
26/18 31/7 32/4 48/16	89/1 94/2 98/11	51/10 51/11 56/1 57/7	81/1 83/1 83/5 92/20	management [9]
51/10 57/6 63/17	102/19 111/1	60/19 60/21 66/9 69/7		7/10 24/9 25/11 94/16
64/15	laughed [1] 60/9	73/10 74/15 78/14	96/16 99/15 117/10	94/22 95/3 97/17 99/4
kindly [1] 114/7	Law [1] 23/15	85/21 96/14 100/22	119/15	118/16
kinds [4] 14/24 26/12 58/3 67/7	lawyers [2] 73/21	100/22 103/17 105/7	looked [9] 3/8 12/23	manager [4] 3/1 74/2
kit [2] 14/16 42/9	73/24	110/4 110/19	18/2 25/9 51/22 58/3	117/21 118/15
knew [4] 25/5 105/18	laying [1] 109/18	liked [1] 87/8	83/2 83/5 119/19	managing [1] 76/12
105/23 114/21	lead [1] 91/7	likely [5] 9/12 9/15	looking [25] 3/10 8/9	Mandy [6] 75/3 85/9
know [73] 9/14 9/16	leading [2] 8/20 13/8	77/20 77/25 81/17	8/15 10/17 11/4 11/6	89/20 89/25 90/6
10/6 10/12 10/12	learn [1] 86/1	Limited [6] 62/17	15/6 31/25 36/17	90/10
10/13 11/11 11/11	learned [2] 98/24	89/19 96/25 118/20	38/19 43/15 48/6	Mandy's [1] 71/11
11/21 16/18 16/19	122/2 learning [3] 59/10	118/21 118/22	57/23 58/3 65/21	manner [1] 9/21
18/22 18/25 19/17	63/16 63/23	limiting [1] 41/10	67/10 72/17 83/15 88/21 88/21 90/4	manoeuvre [1] 39/14
24/9 25/21 31/2 31/6	least [8] 8/17 8/17	line [10] 20/21 48/4 58/20 61/10 82/6	92/14 96/13 117/4	manoeuvred [1] 39/12
34/10 38/22 38/22	12/21 25/19 34/7	96/20 97/7 97/10	121/2	many [6] 3/12 4/10
40/25 44/17 44/17	34/22 35/8 72/20	105/13 105/15	looks [5] 32/18 39/17	47/18 54/5 70/5 125/3
47/17 48/16 49/15 51/4 51/5 51/8 51/13	left [6] 30/6 30/18	line 7 [2] 105/13	69/7 74/15 78/14	March [6] 56/24
51/19 51/21 52/23	31/13 33/10 33/18	105/15	lose [1] 13/5	60/14 61/10 61/21
53/1 54/23 57/8 60/4	74/9	lined [1] 83/12	lost [4] 40/23 72/8	112/24 120/9
60/23 63/12 63/19	left-hand [6] 30/6	lines [1] 106/19	72/16 111/20	March 2004 [1] 61/10
64/10 64/11 66/5	30/18 31/13 33/10	linkage [1] 8/23	lot [3] 59/22 96/9	Mark [6] 24/1 24/1
67/16 72/15 75/25	33/18 74/9	linked [1] 19/4	109/22	24/7 27/12 30/4 56/15
76/4 76/5 76/8 76/11	legal [5] 13/15 16/17	list [6] 27/13 49/22	lots [1] 105/25	Masons [4] 73/19
76/17 77/2 77/4 79/7	78/21 79/7 80/3	56/16 56/17 80/23	low [2] 30/24 124/16	73/21 74/3 78/22
79/24 81/5 83/23	Lenton [11] 18/15	80/25	lower [2] 31/16 32/19	
83/25 84/3 85/11	28/8 45/21 50/19 50/20 58/8 61/22 71/8	lists [1] 31/9	Μ	matches [1] 30/17
86/16 91/20 91/21	75/10 83/4 88/16	59/3 64/6 66/7 66/14	machinery [1] 69/17	material [5] 91/7 110/17 116/18 120/10
92/18 96/14 100/24	Lenton-Smith [10]	little [9] 38/13 40/23	made [27] 4/16 6/18	121/15
109/4 113/20 115/4	18/15 28/8 15/21	61/2 62/3 62/24 63/4	8/24 17/16 21/14	mathematics [1]
	50/19 50/20 58/8	110/15 110/16 110/20		5/16
knowing [1] 114/18	61/22 71/8 75/10 83/4		50/13 53/18 65/1	matter [5] 45/10 72/9
knowledge [19] 2/10 2/21 17/19 17/22	less [1] 74/4	11/12	66/16 67/7 68/12 77/9	72/22 95/3 114/23
22/16 31/23 47/20	let [8] 60/10 77/21	local [2] 42/6 69/17	80/1 87/6 87/6 93/19	matters [2] 45/7
59/12 89/22 112/13	77/25 81/5 81/18	located [2] 16/8	102/20 104/17 114/5	67/21
112/19 114/17 115/8	86/11 89/10 116/14	17/14	115/13 116/17 123/21	maturity [1] 94/17
116/24 118/18 122/1	let's [11] 3/23 4/1	location [1] 42/5	124/17	may [30] 2/13 3/18
122/2 122/8 122/8	11/22 22/2 24/11 30/6		mail [1] 72/23	7/2 7/7 8/7 14/2 14/5
	55/21 83/5 101/2	114/9	maintained [4] 16/3	14/10 14/18 15/21
				(13) justifying - may

(43) justifying - may

Μ	memory [6] 3/9 3/17	63/24 74/4 91/24	53/19 54/2 55/24	Ms Felstead [3]
	5/8 5/25 46/10 112/9	98/15 104/18 109/22	66/12 67/6 68/24 71/1	
may [20] 20/10 20/11 32/25 51/5	mention [4] 48/16	110/15 110/16 110/20		Ms Felstead's [4]
67/12 68/16 76/22	48/17 85/23 112/22	110/20 113/14 115/24	79/21 80/12 96/1 96/4	
76/23 83/7 83/17	mentioned [2] 49/5	morning [6] 1/3 1/7	Mr Coyne's [11] 33/7	124/17
84/14 93/15 93/17	113/17	56/9 58/4 76/2 122/3	34/2 34/22 51/16	Ms Tagg's [1] 33/7
96/14 104/8 111/10	mentioning [1] 58/21	morning's [1] 109/20	56/21 61/6 65/17	Ms Tracy [2] 98/21
111/15 115/23 116/2	mentions [1] 107/22	most [2] 5/17 50/24	65/20 70/16 84/14	112/12
119/2	merely [2] 32/6 32/10		92/8	MSU [2] 24/7 24/8
May 2000 [1] 7/2	message [1] 12/7	motive [1] 91/20	Mr Cruise [1] 15/11	much [25] 1/7 1/14 1/17 21/19 25/1 26/2
May 2001 [1] 3/18	met [1] 46/17 middle [2] 74/10	mouth [2] 71/22 74/23	Mr Henry [9] 92/2 103/11 109/7 109/12	30/3 31/14 46/3 46/13
maybe [3] 66/5 70/16	107/15	move [2] 11/22 105/4	109/13 109/16 115/12	53/2 55/14 55/18
70/25	might [20] 17/20	moving [2] 71/7 77/7	120/25 124/18	59/24 71/21 74/23
McDonnell [8] 3/22	25/15 28/18 35/11	Mr [115] 1/8 1/11	Mr Holmes [36] 1/11	82/4 87/18 91/11
3/23 5/5 9/6 99/24	37/8 38/18 40/15	1/13 1/17 2/23 5/5	1/17 2/23 55/19 60/12	91/12 92/1 94/14
105/14 106/11 111/14	55/10 57/6 59/17 60/5	5/18 5/22 9/6 15/11	87/22 87/25 92/5	106/19 117/18 124/21
McDonnell's [2] 5/18 5/22	60/16 72/2 72/5 72/25	16/16 24/20 25/2	94/10 95/23 97/22	must [10] 37/12 41/2
me [23] 1/4 24/12	73/15 82/1 88/13 91/7	25/10 33/7 34/2 34/6	98/7 98/17 98/19	75/4 79/25 91/5 95/22
31/5 31/12 38/10 45/8	119/14	34/22 35/9 38/15	98/22 99/1 104/2	100/12 110/8 121/5
64/8 87/12 89/10 90/5	migrating [1] 64/5	39/25 41/12 41/23	104/7 107/1 107/3	122/11
96/5 102/8 102/10	mind [7] 57/7 58/20	47/12 47/19 47/25	107/22 108/10 108/16	
103/7 103/16 108/3	59/15 59/17 76/14 96/12 124/5	48/10 51/16 51/23 51/25 52/20 53/17	108/20 110/11 111/13 111/22 112/1 115/13	11/10 17/19 17/22 18/24 20/18 22/14
111/16 111/25 116/15	minds [1] 9/20	53/19 54/2 55/19	116/4 116/7 116/13	22/15 22/17 22/24
118/4 119/4 119/19	minor [1] 9/20	55/24 56/21 60/12	121/9 123/8 124/21	25/20 26/19 28/6
123/11	minute [2] 55/11 90/5	61/6 65/17 65/20	124/22	28/23 32/8 34/3 36/19
mean [67] 8/22 11/1	minutes [2] 42/1	66/10 66/12 67/6	Mr Jan [1] 1/8	44/21 56/3 56/7 56/8
16/2 18/22 20/17 25/1	63/15	68/24 70/16 71/1 71/5		59/12 64/3 65/19
26/1 30/22 31/4 34/19 35/10 38/7 38/12	misbalancing [1]	79/12 79/17 79/21	25/10	65/24 65/25 74/7 76/9
38/16 38/24 39/10	38/6	80/12 84/14 87/22	Mr Justice Fraser [1]	76/13 76/25 77/1 77/1
39/14 40/20 40/25	misplaced [1] 67/13	87/23 87/25 88/16	66/10	77/1 78/18 79/2 79/6
41/1 41/7 43/8 43/16	miss [2] 101/20	88/17 88/20 89/1 92/2		88/22 89/7 90/12 96/9
44/24 45/9 46/11 47/5	104/22	92/2 92/3 92/5 92/8	88/16	96/12 98/10 98/24
51/17 51/22 52/4	miss' [2] 101/17 104/1	97/22 98/7 98/17	Mr McDonnell [6] 5/5 9/6 99/24 105/14	106/17 107/19 112/9 113/5 115/22 117/3
52/10 54/9 54/11	misses [1] 13/8	98/18 98/19 98/22	106/11 111/14	120/4 124/4 124/11
57/11 58/25 59/15	missing [1] 103/6	99/1 99/24 103/11	Mr McDonnell's [2]	myself [4] 1/5 36/17
60/22 60/25 60/25	mistaken [1] 11/7	104/2 104/7 105/13	5/18 5/22	70/15 85/25
61/11 61/14 64/23	mistakes [1] 38/1	105/14 106/6 106/11	Mr Moloney [3] 92/2	<u> </u>
70/18 74/25 76/24 78/17 78/19 78/25	misunderstood [1]	107/1 107/3 107/22	92/3 126/5	<u>N</u>
80/17 82/5 82/6 82/18	11/10	108/10 108/16 108/20		name [6] 1/15 3/21
83/19 84/19 84/20	Mitchell [2] 81/3 83/4	109/7 109/12 109/13	12/4 19/25 32/24	51/7 112/14 112/22
85/6 90/7 92/13 96/2	Mm [3] 32/23 58/10	109/15 109/16 110/11		118/9
97/15 99/5 110/5	121/21	111/13 111/14 111/22		natural [4] 86/10 87/11 110/6 113/21
112/25 114/2 115/19	Mm-hm [3] 32/23 58/10 121/21	112/1 115/12 115/13 116/4 116/7 116/13	62/19 78/13 81/6 81/18 83/9 85/1	nature [1] 97/4
119/21 120/15	modified [1] 7/18	120/25 121/9 123/8	Mrs Julie [1] 8/12	near [2] 13/3 23/15
meaning [2] 9/10	Moloney [3] 92/2		Mrs Tagg's [1] 34/16	nearly [1] 118/6
	92/3 126/5	126/3 126/4 126/5	Mrs Wolstenholme	necessarily [3] 16/11
means [5] 40/16 72/3	moment [6] 11/24	126/6	[13] 19/25 32/24	41/9 122/13
72/4 93/24 100/17 meant [3] 10/2 29/11	29/7 60/11 109/18	Mr Baines [1] 88/17	34/20 56/12 57/23	necessary [1] 66/23
73/8	115/21 124/19	Mr Beer [2] 105/13	62/14 62/16 62/19	need [7] 7/13 73/19
measures [1] 96/24	money [2] 71/12	106/6	78/13 81/6 81/18 83/9	
meet [2] 101/15	74/17	MR BLAKE [3] 1/13	85/1	80/21 99/16
103/22	monitor [2] 7/15	89/1 126/3	Mrs Wolstenholme's	needed [2] 73/23 80/19
meeting [4] 77/12	69/25	Mr Brunskill [2]	[2] 8/20 12/4	negative [1] 84/16
78/15 80/3 81/15	months [6] 15/17 15/24 16/5 17/5 17/9	41/12 47/25 Mr Brunskill's [3]	Ms [13] 33/5 33/7 33/14 33/19 98/21	network [2] 7/19
meets [1] 97/14	84/14	41/23 47/12 48/10	105/3 112/12 112/22	102/12
member [2] 102/1	more [24] 4/19 9/11	Mr Coyne [25] 16/16	116/16 118/9 123/25	neutral [2] 21/16
102/24	9/12 12/14 13/14	25/2 34/6 35/9 38/15	124/3 124/17	25/24
members [3] 4/4	38/18 41/5 52/22 57/5	39/25 47/19 51/23	Ms Elaine [3] 33/5	never [1] 115/23
44/9 44/10	59/16 60/15 61/19	51/25 52/20 53/17	33/14 33/19	Nevertheless [1]
L				(44) may Navarthalaaa

(44) may... - Nevertheless

N	88/15 89/5 89/24	112/24 120/9	operated [3] 57/11	39/3 41/14 53/5 56/8
Nevertheless [1]	92/19 94/18 96/13	off [12] 20/25 29/24	107/24 107/25	56/21 64/7 64/8 67/18
117/22	98/24 99/2 105/1	51/6 51/7 60/22 61/25		72/3 72/19 73/1 73/16
new [8] 10/8 49/11	105/4 109/11 110/10	64/23 69/18 83/8	96/21	99/23
59/8 64/19 69/20	111/25 112/1 112/10	100/7 110/12 123/17	operating [5] 36/5	originally [3] 31/23
69/21 69/24 106/25			47/21 69/17 121/15	61/5 72/20
next [9] 4/23 14/5	117/4 121/22 122/12 123/13 123/17 124/24	offer [7] 57/13 57/18 60/4 71/4 81/7 86/10	121/18	originator [4] 94/9 95/23 102/9 103/8
35/2 40/8 40/8 65/9	125/2	86/20	operation [4] 33/25 97/7 97/13 121/18	other [32] 10/1 13/20
71/19 86/15 120/23	nuclear [1] 43/9	offered [1] 79/17	operations [2] 49/3	13/21 21/10 21/13
nights [1] 13/11	nuisance [1] 103/14	offering [1] 86/7	97/3	22/5 27/8 27/15 29/2
nine [5] 39/16 40/18	number [25] 8/25	Office [47] 8/12	operator [2] 35/3	29/9 29/12 31/15
43/17 47/15 47/18	11/21 15/25 17/1 17/2	18/16 18/19 19/25	97/5	32/15 36/17 42/23
no [129]	17/3 17/17 23/17	20/7 20/19 21/9 21/15	opinion [36] 22/18	42/23 47/16 49/22
non [4] 6/14 11/1 119/8 120/13	24/22 31/25 36/1	25/18 26/18 28/15	23/6 23/8 23/9 23/10	50/13 57/24 59/7
non-EPOSS [2] 6/14	43/14 49/17 64/1 66/8	28/21 29/1 38/11	28/18 33/17 34/2 34/3	
11/1	66/19 66/22 68/3	46/18 52/23 54/16	34/23 35/5 50/22 55/5	
non-polling [2] 119/8	74/10 75/12 84/2	59/11 59/13 62/10	56/7 58/15 58/23	87/14 96/13 103/5
120/13	94/20 98/20 104/4	62/17 63/7 65/11 67/8		
nonsense [1] 38/7	104/8	68/16 71/4 80/3 81/7	65/19 67/16 67/18	others [3] 85/13 87/8
norm [1] 94/18	number 1 [3] 17/2 17/3 17/17	84/23 86/13 86/20 89/15 89/19 91/6	74/21 75/1 78/3 78/5 82/19 82/20 88/5	108/5
normal [4] 49/3 97/3	number 2 [4] 15/25	91/15 92/22 96/25	82/19 82/20 88/5 88/12 94/15 104/3	otherwise [2] 40/17 87/15
97/6 97/12	17/1 31/25 68/3	97/17 104/11 116/11	106/1 108/21 108/22	ought [1] 109/25
normally [3] 36/5	number 6 [1] 66/8	117/13 117/15 117/17	opinions [4] 21/1	our [26] 1/18 7/20
57/19 108/25	numbering [3] 102/5	118/20 118/21 120/8	22/5 22/17 53/23	19/8 25/18 25/19
not [154]	105/12 106/14	121/16	opportunity [3] 58/14	
notable [1] 8/17 note [8] 26/21 56/8	numbers [7] 9/2	Office's [4] 20/11	61/12 73/9	59/23 61/25 65/1
74/6 77/8 81/5 95/18	10/18 30/25 32/1 32/5	54/19 68/14 78/6	or [97] 3/17 4/15 5/16	
117/11 117/16	116/23 118/6	offices [1] 47/23	6/20 11/12 12/1 14/22	I I
notes [3] 26/13 26/23	numerous [1] 66/21	often [3] 43/8 97/14	14/23 15/20 16/23	84/22 89/23 91/4
77/12	NWB [1] 102/13	119/22	17/12 18/25 19/2	91/13 92/25 96/8
nothing [8] 18/10	0	oh [3] 9/7 112/1 121/5	22/20 23/19 24/14 24/23 25/8 25/21	99/10 104/17 124/7 ourselves [2] 46/21
61/19 63/9 68/7 74/4	objective [3] 97/12	okay [8] 32/8 62/18	27/13 27/15 28/23	85/25
84/8 100/7 117/19	97/14 98/4	69/8 87/13 104/15	32/15 41/8 41/16	out [38] 3/2 4/9 5/12
notice [2] 31/8 116/5	objectives [1] 52/17	110/3 113/9 115/9	41/19 42/1 42/2 42/6	23/21 24/14 24/23
notices [1] 13/7	objectivity [3] 40/24	old [2] 44/19 124/12	42/9 44/7 47/18 48/8	34/13 37/21 39/9
noting [1] 49/20 novel [1] 64/19	72/8 72/16	old-fashioned [1]	49/11 49/21 50/7	39/12 39/14 39/16
November [9] 12/1	obligations [1] 13/13	124/12	50/12 51/8 52/6 52/11	40/18 43/17 47/15
12/2 15/16 15/18 27/7	obliged [1] 59/4	on [176]	52/17 53/19 56/16	47/18 51/14 62/1 68/2
44/21 94/12 95/16	observations [1]	once [2] 44/20	59/7 59/17 60/16	71/16 75/4 79/6 79/22
112/6	58/18 obtain [1] 53/19	114/16	62/23 62/24 63/3 63/4 65/7 66/1 67/5 67/8	80/19 81/14 81/23
November 2000 [2]	obtaining [1] 122/16	one [34] 12/23 21/18 26/4 29/7 30/17 31/14		82/5 82/6 82/13 82/17 82/21 85/14 91/2
12/1 12/2	obvious [1] 82/22	35/18 40/8 40/8 41/3	76/5 76/10 77/3 82/9	100/18 104/20 104/22
November 2001 [1]	obviously [11] 26/4	54/11 57/5 63/14	84/20 85/13 88/23	118/2 121/18
95/16	36/22 57/12 63/6	64/23 71/23 79/16	89/7 92/2 92/8 92/9	out-manoeuvre [1]
now [80] 6/1 6/13 7/2 8/9 10/4 12/22 14/12	63/12 75/25 90/9	81/25 84/22 86/7	92/15 93/13 93/14	39/14
14/15 15/5 15/6 15/25	114/22 115/19 117/1	86/24 91/18 93/6	94/1 95/10 95/14	out-manoeuvred [1]
18/11 22/3 23/18	119/21	93/22 99/9 102/22	95/16 97/10 106/24	39/12
24/16 25/10 26/2 29/6	occasion [9] 7/1	104/3 104/7 113/14	107/24 109/11 109/12	
29/14 31/13 36/13	20/14 104/9 105/5	114/9 115/3 117/9	113/1 114/21 115/13	84/3 84/16 85/11
36/14 37/8 40/15	105/7 111/15 113/14	119/23 123/3 125/7	116/7 119/3 119/14	85/14 90/23
43/15 45/17 45/20	116/12 118/3 occasionally [1]	ones [2] 13/8 30/24	119/19 120/21 121/17	outlet [8] 41/16 41/19
49/25 51/18 56/21	87/21	ongoing [2] 7/11 10/14	121/18 121/20 121/22 122/19 122/19 123/20	
56/24 61/21 65/23	occurred [2] 19/2	only [11] 7/13 11/16	122/19 122/19 123/20	outlets [22] 10/9
65/25 66/2 66/4 67/10	19/2	18/4 19/14 20/8 26/4	order [10] 23/22	24/14 24/17 24/25
67/14 67/24 68/19	occurrence [1] 93/21	40/22 50/1 54/11	46/20 81/9 82/25	27/8 27/15 27/16 29/3
70/15 71/6 72/1 72/24	occurrence' [1] 93/6	74/18 93/16	83/10 85/7 85/10	29/9 29/13 29/15
75/18 76/7 76/9 77/13 78/11 79/16 81/1 83/3	occurring [1] 12/13	onto [2] 46/2 76/18	85/16 99/16 100/10	29/18 29/22 29/25
83/6 83/15 84/23	occurs [1] 12/8	onwards [1] 64/5	origin [2] 16/20 16/20	
	October [3] 6/2	open [1] 102/15	original [14] 31/2	50/7 50/10 50/13
L	1	1		5) Nevertheless - outlets

(45) Nevertheless... - outlets

0	106/17 106/18	58/17 61/13 64/20	place [14] 3/14 10/21	poor [12] 5/1 5/11
	page 9 [1] 7/3	65/10 86/11 119/24	11/5 16/11 16/14	6/22 9/6 81/12 81/21
outlets [1] 118/21 output [1] 29/4	page number 4 [1]	125/4	25/19 25/19 25/20	82/12 90/25 90/25
outside [1] 99/15	49/17	people's [1] 9/19	37/23 38/1 44/2 44/13	96/14 105/22 122/25
outstanding [2]	paper [1] 61/24	per [1] 42/11	48/9 85/12	posed [1] 56/6
12/18 80/18	paragraph [22] 4/2	perform [1] 106/9	placed [3] 83/10 85/7	position [4] 38/17
over [21] 5/13 6/8 7/6	4/23 19/7 27/17 35/4	performance [2]	85/16	68/14 75/19 76/8
7/25 14/5 22/4 25/6	35/23 44/1 46/4 48/11 49/19 51/2 58/12 65/7	94/23 102/13	planning [1] 4/22 played [1] 38/17	positive [4] 43/7 43/11 51/25 90/23
25/10 27/4 29/3 29/9	66/10 71/19 72/17	perhaps [6] 74/11 86/6 87/11 101/13	please [41] 1/11 1/15	possible [11] 31/10
33/10 35/2 45/24	88/5 88/6 89/6 89/11	110/11 123/11	2/15 6/6 10/4 18/11	39/20 43/2 48/23 49/2
48/23 49/2 68/8 84/14	94/13 124/18	period [16] 3/2 6/12	26/10 27/4 30/3 35/1	71/16 74/12 82/11
97/2 106/9 114/5	paragraph 10 [2]	8/1 8/19 8/21 10/25	36/13 45/19 45/24	97/2 97/7 97/13
overall [2] 94/15 97/16	89/6 89/11	29/4 29/10 32/22 36/6	49/17 52/12 60/10	possibly [9] 12/18
overly [2] 38/21	paragraph 3.1 [1]	56/12 57/9 68/8 120/9		18/18 24/10 34/17
43/11	94/13	120/10 125/3	75/8 77/8 78/4 81/1	35/22 57/4 71/2 84/6
oversight [1] 32/7	paragraph 800 [1]	permanent [1] 93/11	83/1 88/3 89/11 92/5	104/3
owes [2] 23/3 23/12	66/10 paragraphs [1] 22/12	persisted [1] 33/21	94/12 96/18 98/25 105/12 106/13 109/6	post [54] 8/12 14/21 18/16 18/19 19/25
own [8] 11/10 22/15	parallel [3] 100/20	person [6] 44/22	112/10 116/11 118/11	20/7 20/11 20/19 21/9
54/19 56/20 57/21	100/21 124/9	82/21 113/12 119/11	119/2 119/3 119/5	21/14 25/18 26/17
73/24 78/22 80/10	parcel [1] 114/14	120/17 120/20	120/24	28/14 28/21 29/1
Р	pardon [1] 121/8	personal [3] 20/22	pm [16] 13/6 13/9	32/13 38/11 46/18
P5 [1] 27/6	park [2] 75/20 76/10	122/2 122/8	13/12 13/17 13/19	47/23 52/23 54/16
page [63] 2/7 2/7	Parker [4] 36/15	personally [3] 16/11	14/3 14/3 14/6 14/16	54/19 59/11 59/13
2/15 2/17 3/24 5/3	36/16 37/4 38/16	21/3 61/2	69/16 69/18 70/8 97/5	62/10 62/17 63/7
5/13 6/6 6/9 7/3 7/6	part [25] 4/17 6/9	perspective [7] 4/20 16/17 54/1 54/5 54/10	111/4 111/6 125/10	65/10 67/8 68/13
7/6 13/4 13/16 14/1	6/20 8/18 17/7 18/6 20/1 22/7 22/11 23/6	54/14 56/18	PM's [1] 14/14 PMs [4] 36/1 38/23	68/15 71/4 78/5 80/3 81/7 84/22 86/13
14/5 14/10 20/6 22/4	23/8 32/8 80/2 80/4	pervasive [1] 108/8	81/11 97/1	86/19 89/15 89/19
22/10 23/9 27/4 28/13	80/6 80/9 81/8 81/12	Pete [1] 64/8	POA [7] 28/14 62/9	91/5 91/14 92/22
29/7 33/10 33/12 35/2 35/2 45/24 49/17	84/22 85/1 85/3 94/24		76/5 76/6 77/3 77/3	96/24 97/17 104/10
51/14 52/12 55/25	102/16 114/13 118/5	14/14 14/17 68/13	88/8	116/10 117/13 117/15
55/25 65/3 74/16 78/4	partial [4] 65/16	70/1 70/3 70/13 70/20		117/16 118/20 118/21
78/5 78/19 79/8 89/12	65/18 65/22 68/24	70/23 70/24	101/6	120/8 121/16
89/12 92/21 94/13	Participants [1] 87/16	Phantoms [1] 69/11	point [15] 6/7 16/19	post-rollout [2] 14/21 32/13
95/6 96/18 102/4		Phase [5] 1/19 1/20 2/23 3/8 67/11	20/18 20/19 25/1	postmaster [6] 21/11
105/12 105/14 106/13	20/9/00/11	Phase 2 [5] 1/19 1/20	89/1 97/16 109/12	25/21 35/12 69/10
106/13 106/15 106/16	parties [6] 19/9 19/24	2/23 3/8 67/11	109/19 114/9 124/14	69/14 90/24
108/4 109/6 116/11	22/20 54/2 66/25	phone [9] 13/17	pointed [1] 62/1	postmasters [12]
119/4 119/4 120/4	93/18	48/23 49/2 75/4 90/3	points [2] 18/23	38/5 39/19 41/5 82/19
120/23	parts [4] 5/9 56/20	90/6 90/8 90/10 97/2	109/17	83/12 83/19 83/24
page 1 [1] 96/18	57/19 107/11		POL [37] 28/16 28/17	83/25 84/2 84/17 91/2
page 10 [1] 7/6	pass [2] 57/5 75/13 passed [4] 18/5	87/19 pick [3] 46/8 86/2	28/19 36/2 39/7 40/14 41/4 53/11 53/12	96/21 postmistress [1]
Page 11 [1] 109/6	62/25 102/8 103/7	96/23	53/14 62/7 62/17	25/22
page 14 [1] 2/17	passes [1] 7/17	pick-up [2] 46/8	62/18 62/21 62/23	potential [1] 20/15
page 17 [1] 5/3 page 19 [1] 6/6	past [2] 36/1 36/9	96/23	63/3 71/10 72/24	potentially [2] 44/16
page 13 [1] 0/0 page 20 [2] 105/12	Pathway [5] 108/6	picked [3] 38/2	75/18 75/19 76/5 76/8	63/7
105/14	116/5 118/13 118/20	104/20 104/22	76/22 77/3 77/4 78/20	
page 3 [3] 35/2 94/13	118/22	piece [8] 20/20 21/8	78/21 78/24 78/24	PR [1] 57/17
102/4	pause [1] 32/2	63/22 99/17 99/17 99/18 99/21 107/12	78/25 79/25 80/10 83/8 86/5 88/9 88/12	practitioners [1] 65/12
page 31 [4] 106/13	Pausing [1] 19/12 pay [1] 13/14	pieces [1] 59/7	88/14	PRD [2] 95/8 95/14
	PEAK [4] 12/23 13/2	PinICL [8] 3/13 4/11	POL's [1] 77/13	precedent [6] 20/10
page 32 [1] 108/4 page 4 [4] 14/1 89/12	99/3 99/6	4/15 8/1 9/9 102/14	POL00022840 [1]	28/19 88/14 89/21
119/4 119/4	PEAKs [5] 48/6 57/22	103/6 104/24	67/3	90/1 90/19
page 5 [2] 22/10	66/21 92/15 93/13	PinICLs [12] 6/14	POL00089802 [1]	precise [1] 116/13
52/12	pending [3] 93/10	11/1 11/8 11/8 11/11	94/7	prefer [1] 109/23
page 7 [2] 3/24 95/6	94/1 102/15	11/17 48/6 57/22 92/9		preparation [1] 22/7
page 76 [1] 89/12	penultimate [1] 65/7 people [12] 3/12	92/15 93/14 105/25 piss [2] 60/22 61/25	18/11 polling [2] 119/8	prepared [3] 13/12 57/14 92/7
page 8 [4] 2/7 106/16	18/24 44/25 45/8 49/6		120/13	preparing [1] 59/23
				(A6) outlate proparing

(46) outlets... - preparing

P	23/11 45/10 45/14 61/15 64/22	pulled [1] 120/14 pulling [1] 104/18	117/11 117/12 117/20 raising [2] 69/20	31/23 47/12 58/7 88/8 88/17
presence [2] 40/3	process [5] 5/1 8/5	purple [1] 37/2	105/24	recollection [1] 52/8
93/8	59/11 80/7 80/9	purpose [4] 2/4	random [2] 27/9	recommendation [3]
present [2] 13/9 53/25	Processes [1] 94/9	39/19 97/22 100/3	29/16	7/4 7/22 8/11
presented [5] 52/14 53/25 54/9 54/10 55/1	produce [4] 99/10 114/13 117/3 117/7	pursue [1] 115/20 push [1] 76/18	rather [4] 7/11 19/19 38/8 83/9	recommendations [2] 6/19 6/23
presents [2] 4/14	produced [12] 1/23	put [28] 11/19 13/22	RCA [1] 95/13	recommended [1]
54/4	11/9 18/2 26/11 61/16 76/2 76/4 103/5 114/7	13/24 30/2 31/7 35/25 37/15 38/18 51/7 51/8		95/13
pressure [2] 76/21	116/6 116/25 117/6	54/12 54/25 56/25	re-engineered [1] 4/7	reconsidered [1] 6/24
76/22	producing [2] 80/24	59/1 59/22 60/7 82/4	re-establishing [1]	record [12] 15/14
presumably [5] 19/24 36/19 50/14	106/4	89/1 91/11 101/14	44/19	16/13 16/22 17/17
64/11 114/15	product [10] 4/6 4/13	102/18 109/25 113/7	reach [2] 66/24 86/9	33/16 34/10 75/2
presumption [1]	4/21 6/22 7/13 7/16	113/10 115/24 116/15		90/10 100/5 101/10
113/21	11/3 25/7 106/4 107/16	118/2 124/15 putting [3] 48/5 48/8	read [17] 6/9 13/1 22/12 37/7 43/13	101/25 102/23 recorded [2] 77/18
pretty [1] 59/24	production [4] 19/5	120/4	43/14 43/15 43/24	78/6
prevailing [1] 97/8	102/18 118/5 121/19	PVCS [1] 103/3	44/5 51/17 66/6 66/9	recording [1] 100/11
prevent [2] 84/10 84/16	products [1] 70/2		68/16 69/8 71/9 78/2	recordkeeping [1]
previous [4] 29/7	professional [6]	Q	114/15	90/12
30/22 111/14 120/3	21/25 22/18 25/24	qualified [1] 64/21	reading [3] 43/10	records [14] 16/3
previously [1] 12/24	55/7 60/8 60/20	quality [12] 4/6 4/10 6/16 6/23 7/16 9/6	68/25 80/8	17/13 18/5 18/9 29/2 29/8 52/15 53/5 58/17
primary [1] 97/11	professionally [1] 40/21	105/20 106/3 107/7	reads [2] 80/6 94/14 real [3] 20/2 21/10	70/12 100/6 101/9
prime [1] 52/17	profiles [1] 49/23	118/14 118/15 123/1	70/1	103/13 121/20
principle [4] 9/17 37/19 37/21 92/18	Programme's [1]	queries [1] 103/13	realised [2] 20/15	recreate [1] 69/13
probability [1] 13/7	4/20	query [7] 42/2 99/12	114/22	recurrence [1] 14/17
probably [10] 16/21	programming [2]	99/19 101/7 101/8	really [14] 20/20	redesign [2] 6/19 7/4
16/24 24/3 58/14 60/4	5/11 5/17	101/15 103/22	44/23 46/12 46/24	reduce [1] 11/20
79/2 86/12 91/11	progress [2] 7/17 77/12	question [20] 39/25 40/10 41/13 41/13	58/19 58/21 79/23 90/16 91/8 91/14	refer [1] 118/9 reference [9] 9/8
93/21 113/4	proliferation [7]	41/18 56/6 57/2 57/9	91/18 98/4 109/16	49/13 53/16 62/12
problem [40] 9/12	42/13 43/5 43/7 43/16	68/8 71/20 74/1 74/23		68/20 83/19 84/25
12/11 12/17 12/20 27/20 27/24 28/4	48/12 48/17 56/19	93/19 98/23 109/10	reason [6] 41/3 47/22	
35/20 36/11 38/3 40/7	proper [1] 58/22	111/16 112/4 112/6	68/19 87/9 117/2	referenced [2] 69/14
41/17 41/20 42/17	properly [2] 121/16	115/18 116/15	123/22	93/7
42/22 47/7 48/8 62/3	121/18 proposal [1] 117/14	Questioned [6] 1/13 87/23 98/18 126/3	reasonable [3] 21/23 121/11 124/15	references [2] 08/3 77/14
62/21 69/13 69/25	prosecuted [1] 36/2	126/4 126/6	reasons [1] 41/4	referred [6] 16/6 16/7
70/11 74/17 85/4 93/24 95/3 95/7 97/6		questioning [3]	reboot [14] 27/21	55/20 70/20 99/23
97/11 97/15 97/17	104/12 112/12 114/20		28/5 39/9 39/16 39/24	
99/22 103/9 103/11	prosecutions [3]	questions [5] 87/14	40/7 40/8 40/18 42/9	referring [4] 16/2
103/14 104/2 104/7	28/19 88/14 122/17	quick [7] 47/14 48/22	44/18 47/17 49/6 49/9 97/20	
107/18 109/14 111/23	proved [1] 36/9 provenance [1]	49/1 81/5 93/25 97/1	rebooted [2] 40/1	refers [3] 12/9 12/11 17/6
problematic [1] 44/16	117/25	105/10	44/20	reflect [2] 45/8 122/1
problems [38] 6/11	provide [10] 20/23	quickly [4] 39/20	rebooting [3] 35/10	reflected [2] 96/3
6/16 10/1 10/24 12/12	24/12 31/15 52/22	41/6 43/2 109/22	70/10 97/13	96/8
13/11 14/16 14/18	57/6 57/8 57/20 63/18 63/20 68/6	quite [18] 18/12 18/25 24/22 29/11	reboots [13] 42/14	reflection [1] 123/5
19/1 26/3 32/25 33/23	provided [18] 16/15	29/12 40/8 45/10	43/5 43/11 43/16 43/18 44/2 44/6 44/13	reflects [1] 122/7 refresh [3] 3/8 5/8
33/24 34/1 34/18	22/6 23/6 23/20 28/8	46/16 49/25 50/15	47/22 48/12 48/17	5/24
34/20 42/14 43/6 43/12 48/5 48/12	31/5 31/15 45/11	59/19 59/22 64/1 73/5		refreshed [1] 3/16
48/18 48/18 49/7	45/13 52/21 52/24	79/23 82/11 115/21	rebuttal [1] 55/1	Refreshing [1] 46/10
56/10 56/13 57/24	53/10 63/25 78/12	116/3	recall [12] 3/15 5/21	refuse [1] 13/14
58/1 70/5 70/13 93/9	93/10 95/10 95/14 121/23	R	7/7 53/9 78/13 79/20 88/18 111/16 112/5	refute [2] 62/24 64/24
94/16 94/22 95/9	providing [5] 23/11	R-Query [2] 101/7	114/12 121/25 121/25	refuting [1] 84/20
95/20 98/1 100/10	40/22 44/25 58/16	101/15	recap [1] 7/25	regard [2] 50/16
106/24 procedure [2] 22/23	59/6	raise [3] 9/19 85/21	receipt [1] 24/21	83/21
95/15	provision [1] 59/2	117/13	receive [1] 97/1	register [1] 69/10
proceedings [5]	public [1] 71/16	raised [8] 12/1 39/25 88/23 103/7 104/24	received [10] 25/10	registering [2] 70/1
	pull [2] 100/7 100/17		27/1 27/11 28/15 30/4	70/2
				47) presence - registering

(47) presence - registering

R	27/1 28/16 32/7 33/8	45/16 53/10 64/1 72/8	104/14 104/15 104/25	12/15 16/21 16/24
regret [3] 65/17 67/6	36/23 45/2 45/4 52/14	76/21 80/7 97/25	105/3 107/14 108/18	32/14 38/4 55/21
83/20	53/24 54/25 56/21	121/17	110/9 110/22 112/17	68/22 74/9 74/14
reissue [1] 94/1	59/24 61/6 61/16	respects [2] 35/8	112/21 113/16 117/5	82/24 89/1 91/3
relate [1] 106/23	61/16 62/1 62/25 63/3	72/20	117/10 121/7 123/9	107/19 116/23 118/6
related [1] 33/24	64/24 70/16 72/3 72/19 72/19 73/1	respond [5] 32/6	123/10	121/3 124/11
relating [4] 3/9 11/3	73/16 74/19 79/9	45/1 45/3 80/11 84/13		satisfy [1] 99/16
92/9 123/16	79/10 79/16 80/5	responding [4] 21/14 25/17 40/22 70/8	33/12 34/12 34/25	save [1] 2/25 saw [9] 28/21 56/14
relation [11] 15/12	84/14 84/21 86/5	response [47] 26/17	46/14 48/19 48/20	56/18 56/20 65/20
20/9 33/22 75/22	86/14 86/25 88/9	26/19 28/11 28/17	49/14 49/16	66/1 67/5 72/12 76/1
88/16 93/14 98/23	89/22 90/21 90/22	31/8 32/11 35/17 39/1	rightly [1] 16/5	say [63] 2/25 3/24
109/19 116/21 117/22	92/8 92/25 95/21	39/3 41/13 41/23	risk [3] 9/19 63/7	4/18 8/16 8/25 9/3
117/25	95/23 96/4 99/23	43/22 45/13 45/20	70/15	10/5 15/13 15/22 16/5
relationship [3] 46/17 53/15 62/20	108/11 108/17 109/3	45/22 46/14 46/24	Road [6] 68/4 68/5	16/23 18/8 25/14
relatively [1] 94/20	109/4 111/13	47/13 47/15 48/14	68/22 68/25 69/6 83/5	27/18 35/4 35/18
relayed [1] 119/23	reporting [1] 9/1	48/15 48/22 49/1 49/5		36/12 37/2 39/5 39/23
release [3] 42/11	reports [2] 119/9	50/21 51/15 55/21	1/16 126/2	41/1 44/8 45/6 46/21
94/2 102/19	120/14	55/23 56/22 58/11	role [2] 3/2 38/17	56/24 58/12 59/14
releases [1] 48/7	represent [2] 22/17	59/21 59/23 71/5	rolled [7] 81/14 81/23	
releasing [1] 70/10	87/25		82/5 82/6 82/13 82/21	70/16 70/25 71/1
relevance [1] 123/16	representation [1]	92/23 93/18 96/3 96/5 96/8 96/16 97/1 98/5		72/10 72/15 73/9 76/19 77/5 78/7 79/5
relevant [2] 95/17	34/4 representations [1]	96/8 96/16 97/1 98/5 110/18 117/12	rolling [1] 82/17 rollout [5] 14/21	81/3 81/19 82/3 82/18
124/3	124/8	responsible [1]	32/13 32/13 32/20	89/14 89/18 90/15
reliance [3] 4/20	representing [1]	118/15	34/15	91/13 98/12 99/3 99/8
16/12 16/14	98/20	result [2] 108/1 117/7		99/16 102/3 103/11
rely [2] 42/24 54/3	represents [1] 96/20	resulted [2] 5/1	room [1] 3/12	106/7 108/23 110/3
remains [2] 56/7	repudiate [5] 72/2	90/23	root [8] 35/15 94/4	110/23 112/25 113/25
102/15	72/18 72/25 73/12	results [1] 11/13	95/2 95/7 95/9 95/11	115/4 117/17 122/24
remarkably [2] 116/20 118/1	73/16	retention [1] 100/12	97/25 100/10	saying [21] 30/6
remarking [1] 114/7	reputation [3] 63/2	retrieved [2] 63/21	Rosetta [2] 100/23	33/19 34/12 38/15
remember [24] 5/13	63/11 63/13	111/15	103/18	40/12 40/13 42/16
6/25 24/2 24/6 25/17	reputational [2] 62/8		roughly [1] 116/23	42/24 47/25 48/20
29/10 38/16 38/20	63/8	return [7] 21/12 49/3	Royal [1] 75/16	69/25 72/24 76/10
50/15 51/4 51/9 51/21	request [17] 19/4	83/3 97/3 97/6 97/12 124/18	rubric [1] 121/23	78/6 82/11 85/11 93/22 96/6 100/4
51/22 51/24 52/11	20/22 21/14 25/18 28/16 36/19 46/19	returned [2] 3/3 81/8	rules [2] 5/17 22/23	120/4 124/17
69/1 69/7 75/7 90/17	63/19 64/8 88/9 99/11		running [15] 10/9	says [48] 4/2 4/24 5/8
92/19 106/11 116/12	99/11 99/15 100/18	reveal [1] 97/18	39/20 39/24 41/5	6/10 7/8 12/6 12/7
120/15 120/21	110/18 116/16 117/12		41/19 42/13 42/18	12/11 12/16 12/17
remote [1] 42/6	requested [2] 16/10	112/25	42/22 43/1 46/23	13/3 13/16 14/2 14/10
remotely [1] 1/9 remove [2] 51/20	117/7	reviews [2] 4/25 7/21	46/25 47/7 47/10	19/8 19/22 22/13
51/20	required [5] 13/15	revised [1] 10/8	47/24 49/10	23/15 24/11 26/25
removed [5] 31/10	68/15 98/16 100/18	rewrite [3] 6/20 7/4	runs [1] 12/20	27/25 28/13 28/25
52/7 52/11 71/20	122/17	7/12	S	35/24 37/11 37/23
74/22	requirement [1]	Rewrites [1] 7/12	safest [1] 71/12	41/23 43/4 44/1 44/13
removing [2] 35/16	102/11	RF [1] 69/16 Richard [6] 24/12	said [44] 17/6 25/23	46/5 48/11 53/22 56/1
51/24	requirements [1] 22/22	Richard [6] 24/12 39/2 46/10 46/19	27/5 29/14 31/21	65/8 66/11 68/4 69/9 69/23 77/19 79/8
reopen [1] 7/14	requiring [1] 47/23	56/18 72/13	33/13 33/20 34/8 37/6	
repeat [3] 2/25 31/20	resolution [6] 41/14	Richards [1] 46/24	41/12 44/21 46/11	88/7 102/10 106/21
122/6	41/15 42/1 42/19	right [54] 3/15 8/7	46/12 50/6 51/12 52/5	
repeating [1] 70/15	42/22 42/25	9/16 10/18 28/21 30/9		scanning [1] 69/11
reply [8] 27/20 28/5	resolve [4] 20/19	30/16 30/19 31/5	61/25 63/14 64/18	scenario [1] 13/10
38/19 45/5 58/7 58/9 92/9 92/23	37/23 47/6 70/11	33/12 34/12 34/17	64/19 65/13 67/13	schedule [2] 7/1 8/4
report [74] 3/13 3/24	resolved [2] 38/2	34/18 34/25 35/10	75/14 75/25 80/23	schedules [1] 42/23
4/3 6/18 9/1 11/10	42/8	36/21 37/4 46/14	82/9 83/2 83/23 84/15	screen [19] 1/21 2/3
19/6 19/10 21/2 21/20	resolving [4] 41/16	48/15 48/19 48/20	85/9 86/16 89/2 90/1	11/24 13/19 14/6 14/8
21/21 22/3 22/4 22/9	41/20 47/2 47/3	49/14 49/16 50/3	90/2 90/18 91/1 91/10	
22/10 22/11 22/15	resource [1] 107/8	50/13 51/24 55/13	98/6 105/17 106/6 113/14	46/2 49/16 66/8 69/24
23/19 23/23 24/21	resources [1] 65/10 respect [12] 18/20	60/4 86/6 86/23 88/6 89/3 89/10 91/5 92/16		70/8 70/12 88/4 113/8 117/9
25/2 25/12 26/1 26/17	34/7 34/17 34/23	101/1 101/2 102/25		screens [5] 27/19
				(18) roarot - scroops

(48) regret - screens

S	selective [1] 65/14	75/17 76/6 86/21	skin [2] 21/7 98/6	82/7 86/9 98/8 107/10
screens [4] 27/23	senior [1] 4/4	89/21 101/13	SL [2] 77/13 77/14	110/4 115/16 118/5
28/3 35/19 42/2	sense [3] 85/18	show [1] 96/5	SLA [15] 41/18 42/10	121/6
scroll [27] 3/20 4/23	115/1 124/12	showed [3] 27/12	42/12 42/16 42/25	sometimes [3] 12/8
5/5 5/13 6/2 6/8 7/6	sensible [1] 66/23	76/3 85/18	42/25 46/12 46/15	39/23 119/24
13/16 20/6 23/7 24/5	sent [9] 36/22 50/20	showing [1] 56/15	46/17 46/20 47/2 47/8	
26/21 28/12 28/24	51/6 56/15 64/9 72/12 88/15 102/9 106/9	shows [4] 29/4 33/18 70/12 84/25		107/12 soon [3] 24/20 97/7
29/17 33/4 35/2 35/23	sentence [12] 12/10	shut [1] 74/24	SLAs [7] 39/8 40/14 40/16 41/4 41/18	97/13
36/18 36/24 65/3	27/25 40/11 48/10	shut' [1] 71/22	47/23 97/8	sorry [21] 29/6 38/25
69/22 88/4 89/14 93/2 117/9 119/5	50/1 50/18 51/8 51/9	side [19] 30/2 30/2	sleepless [1] 13/11	46/1 48/25 53/12 54/7
scrutiny [1] 97/16	56/5 62/6 71/19 73/18		slide [2] 76/1 76/3	55/25 57/2 78/24 80/5
SD02 [2] 24/17 30/18	sentences [1] 77/19	30/18 30/20 31/13	slightly [5] 37/1 68/1	84/11 88/21 106/14
SDS [1] 102/14	separates [1] 84/20	33/11 33/13 33/18	92/17 93/2 104/17	106/15 109/7 110/3
Sea [1] 30/12	September [6]	34/13 35/1 46/14	SLTs [1] 42/4	111/18 117/5 121/7
search [1] 100/6	101/22 101/24 102/2 102/4 125/8 125/11	48/19 48/20 49/14 49/16 88/21	small [1] 66/19	122/6 123/16
second [22] 15/22	September 2001 [2]	sign [1] 113/18	smaller [1] 66/22 Smith [15] 18/15	sort [11] 17/17 32/4 38/14 48/4 62/13 64/4
28/12 31/4 31/17 32/1	101/22 102/2	signature [2] 2/7	28/8 45/21 50/19	76/10 85/4 91/3 99/11
32/19 33/10 33/11	sequence [1] 68/2	2/17	50/20 58/8 61/22 71/8	112/7
33/11 35/4 43/25 55/25 79/9 79/16	serious [8] 6/16	signed [5] 71/14	75/10 75/14 76/1 76/1	sorted [1] 80/19
86/10 89/7 89/8 89/9	45/10 57/18 103/9	113/16 114/16 115/4	76/3 83/4 88/16	sound [5] 51/10
92/25 93/2 94/3	103/11 103/15 104/2	115/13	so [147]	51/11 96/14 111/20
124/23	104/5		Society [1] 23/16	111/23
secondly [1] 123/14	Service [6] 6/8 46/7	significant [2] 5/10	soften [1] 57/17	sounds [1] 39/10
secret [1] 108/20	94/8 94/24 95/5 96/22 services [4] 24/4	7/14 significantly [1] 5/4	software [15] 9/14 24/17 24/19 26/3 26/5	source [1] 16/7
section [4] 5/3 5/5	49/20 92/22 92/24	silly [2] 38/25 81/22	26/7 30/25 31/18	sources [1] 18/3
6/7 37/10	session [5] 44/3	similar [6] 49/21 50/6		speak [2] 61/13
sections [1] 5/10	44/14 76/2 109/10	50/12 58/1 80/25	38/3 42/8 56/13 94/1	124/5
secure [1] 82/25 securely [1] 16/21	123/15	116/20	solemnity [1] 114/23	speaking [1] 75/15
security [2] 64/9	set [6] 17/13 20/10	Similarly [1] 15/23	solicitor [1] 119/25	specific [4] 6/18
117/21	28/18 71/25 73/14	simple [5] 40/9 41/24		11/22 87/5 90/18
see [53] 1/3 3/21	88/13	52/15 52/19 54/14	78/22	specifically [5] 7/20
5/22 6/2 18/16 20/6	setting [1] 69/18	simply [3] 9/2 65/15 73/25	solution [7] 43/18	29/12 89/19 93/7 105/18
23/7 23/15 24/7 24/16	settle [1] 81/7 settlement [1] 81/10	since [6] 1/23 4/10	93/25 101/5 101/13 103/21 118/17 119/18	
26/2 29/17 30/11	seven [1] 30/19	13/22 15/16 15/24	Solutions [1] 6/18	speed [2] 42/18 47/1 speeding [1] 110/19
30/13 30/15 31/17	severity [1] 97/11	16/12		spelt [1] 77/16
43/19 53/16 53/22 55/2 56/5 57/5 57/10	Sewell [1] 64/8	single [4] 54/1 54/4		
57/25 60/3 62/7 62/13	shall [4] 96/16 105/8	54/10 54/14	97/5	spoken [2] 58/13
63/10 81/25 86/9 91/4	108/23 113/2		some [45] 3/7 3/9	75/11
93/3 94/7 94/9 94/19	share [1] 85/2	55/18 86/22 87/14	3/17 8/18 11/22 14/23	
95/6 96/19 97/19	shared [3] 84/16 108/12 108/14	109/7 109/21 110/2 110/10 110/15 110/24	17/17 18/12 18/22 21/1 21/19 21/22	SQL [4] 99/12 101/7 103/13 122/21
98/14 98/25 102/6	she [11] 33/23 70/4	111/2 111/7 111/10	23/21 24/12 26/18	SSC [1] 69/12
106/14 109/1 111/7	71/14 71/15 81/9	111/12 111/18 113/12		
111/8 113/24 115/3	91/10 92/11 97/1 95/0			stabilise [1] 107/16
116/18 117/20 117/22 120/23 124/6 125/7	85/9 112/14	124/6 124/20 125/9	49/22 51/5 56/11 61/5	
seeing [2] 43/17 77/2	Sheet [1] 116/6	Sir Wyn [1] 125/9	61/16 62/4 62/13	25/6 27/11 32/2 34/7
seeking [1] 20/25	Shobnall [6] 68/4	site [2] 14/13 86/7	65/20 67/12 67/17	40/23 52/21 53/17
seem [3] 10/19 30/23	68/5 68/21 68/25 69/6		72/20 80/18 85/4	58/19 58/24 59/19
86/24	83/5	situation [9] 4/14	87/15 88/22 106/2	72/8 73/20 73/24 74/3
seems [14] 3/16 13/5	shoe [1] 107/14 shoe-horned [1]	39/6 59/20 62/9 65/14 66/1 67/14 74/1 85/24		75/21 82/1 123/6 Staines [1] 30/20
24/21 27/11 29/11	107/14	six [11] 24/16 24/25	116/1	stamps [7] 13/18
32/12 34/6 35/8 38/12	Shoreham [1] 30/12	27/15 27/15 29/9	somebody [10] 23/10	
50/2 68/24 75/15	short [5] 55/16 56/6	29/15 29/18 29/22	23/25 24/3 51/2 51/20	
77/14 78/10 seen [8] 8/15 14/13	109/11 110/5 111/5	29/25 30/7 30/22	60/25 93/21 93/22	stance [1] 83/16
15/1 23/4 26/12 28/11	shortcomings [1]	six-counter [8] 27/15		standalone [1] 95/15
70/21 90/5	6/21	27/15 29/9 29/15	something [20] 8/23	standard [2] 4/9 28/4
selected [2] 29/16	shortly [1] 109/13	29/18 29/22 29/25	9/11 10/5 25/15 43/9	standing [1] 106/5
54/15	should [11] 4/20 6/23 7/9 27/10 35/13 70/25		51/11 51/23 59/1 60/17 75/22 79/4 82/2	start [6] 3/10 9/15 25/20 39/4 69/9 86/16
	113 21110 33/13 10/23		00/11/10/22/19/4 02/2	23/20 33/4 03/3 00/ 10

(49) screens... - start

S	strong [1] 83/23	63/22 96/2 96/9	107/2	3/5 3/20 6/1 7/1 8/8
started [4] 20/25	structure [1] 101/8	100/21 113/21	taking [6] 61/2 61/9	9/13 15/2 19/7 21/18
57/3 64/5 64/23	stuff [3] 9/15 15/12	supposed [3] 19/1	68/1 68/19 71/10	21/20 23/24 24/18
state [2] 4/21 14/13	100/22	107/6 123/15	125/5	24/18 24/20 26/24
stated [3] 56/8 69/18	stunt [1] 57/17 subject [4] 42/10	suppressors [1] 14/15	Talbot [5] 75/3 85/9 89/20 89/25 90/6	28/10 28/14 28/20 29/11 30/3 32/7 32/13
114/20	42/23 48/1 75/15	sure [17] 7/20 17/1	Talbot's [1] 90/10	33/8 34/24 35/11
statement [50] 1/20	submission [2] 92/24			35/20 36/12 36/21
2/9 2/12 2/13 2/15	120/2	52/7 52/10 75/16 76/7	talking [4] 79/7 85/9	37/5 38/12 38/24
2/20 33/5 33/7 33/13	submit [1] 68/17	79/22 92/12 108/15	90/20 93/22	38/25 40/10 40/19
34/16 47/15 51/17 54/22 54/24 56/3	submitted [1] 16/10	109/8 112/21 114/10	tangent [1] 123/18	43/3 44/8 46/22 46/22
61/23 63/20 68/7	subparagraph [1]	115/21	taskforce [9] 3/13	49/25 53/9 54/20
68/15 72/2 72/25	93/3	Surely [1] 104/23	4/5 6/12 8/1 10/25	55/22 60/13 61/8
73/15 89/5 89/6 89/7	subpostmaster [1]	surges [1] 69/19	11/4 11/18 107/6	62/10 63/18 64/16
89/8 89/9 90/15 93/4	70/18	surmise [1] 93/16	107/15	64/18 66/2 67/23 73/7
97/21 99/19 101/15	subpostmasters [10]		TC [1] 7/21	73/7 73/8 73/16 73/22
103/22 106/7 112/18	14/23 25/8 83/21 84/6 85/3 88/1 91/6 98/20	90/20 93/15 124/15 suspended [1] 124/1	team [12] 5/19 7/10 24/7 24/8 25/11 44/10	74/13 75/2 75/16 78/2 78/14 78/22 79/9
112/20 113/2 113/18	104/12 107/25	swap [1] 42/9	80/3 101/25 102/24	79/19 80/8 82/6 82/10
113/19 113/23 113/23	subpostmistress [3]	swapped' [1] 70/6	105/19 106/3 106/4	84/23 87/19 88/6
115/8 115/14 118/10	8/21 32/21 78/1	sworn [1] 1/11	technical [15] 5/11	89/13 91/8 91/10 92/1
118/11 119/3 119/21 120/1 123/20 124/16	subpostmistress's	symptomatic [1]	34/1 34/18 44/10	93/23 95/21 96/15
statements [9] 1/24	[1] 25/16	100/2	44/18 44/22 45/1 45/3	97/21 102/25 103/1
23/11 45/11 64/1	subsequent [2] 5/18	system [59] 4/17	47/4 92/14 99/21	104/2 104/5 104/14
99/12 101/8 114/4	18/20	6/17 7/5 8/18 9/23	113/12 119/11 120/17	104/24 105/2 106/17
122/21 124/24	subsequently [3]	11/15 13/5 14/3 14/4	120/19	107/16 108/25 110/7
stating [1] 37/14	12/19 16/6 18/9 subsidiary [1] 116/1	15/4 16/4 17/22 18/6 20/12 27/19 27/23	telephoning [1] 33/21	112/21 117/3 117/24 118/11 124/13 124/13
Status [1] 79/9	substance [1] 82/8	28/3 28/18 31/24	tell [2] 45/8 119/16	their [23] 20/13 39/21
stay [2] 3/25 34/25	substantive [2] 32/5	33/22 33/23 33/25	ten [5] 39/16 40/18	48/22 49/1 53/15
stayed [2] 3/4 55/21	69/22			62/20 62/21 71/25
step [4] 65/9 86/7 86/15 123/24	success [1] 84/7	45/25 46/4 52/17	tendered [1] 114/19	72/3 80/10 83/9 84/5
Stephan [1] 77/14	successful [1] 85/2	52/18 57/19 63/2 63/5		84/7 86/14 86/25 87/1
steps [1] 97/24	such [10] 37/25 38/2	68/9 70/9 77/21 81/18		87/21 89/16 89/16
Steve [4] 36/15 36/16	46/7 54/23 84/9 86/4	83/10 88/13 91/17	terminal [1] 121/14	91/20 97/1 105/22
37/4 38/16	96/22 102/15 105/21 121/19	93/1 93/11 99/4 99/6 100/2 100/8 100/11	terminated [1] 8/13 terms [5] 32/1 34/17	121/20 them [24] 1/25 10/11
Stevenage [1] 57/10	suffering [3] 13/10	100/13 105/16 107/24		32/10 32/10 34/17
stick [3] 29/6 96/12	69/19 91/3	118/18 118/24 119/7	test [4] 11/8 11/13	47/7 48/7 59/6 68/17
99/19	sufficient [1] 95/18	119/16 120/13 121/13		72/1 72/24 73/14 84/1
still [28] 6/15 8/14 10/19 11/17 14/16	sufficiently [1] 64/21	121/15 123/25 124/10		87/2 91/7 91/22
14/18 31/17 32/21	suggest [4] 8/22 33/2		57/15 105/23	100/17 100/25 106/2
34/15 43/17 47/11	91/5 123/8	37/18 37/23 38/1	than [14] 7/12 21/10	106/3 109/21 117/1
49/10 55/7 60/8 60/18	suggested [3] 40/15	57/15 61/13 81/13	21/13 43/20 49/23	117/7 125/5
62/13 65/21 71/2 71/3	57/14 70/10 suggesting [1] 6/15	81/21 82/12 86/12 90/25	52/22 62/4 74/4 83/9 91/11 110/16 111/1	themselves [2] 9/25 32/9
71/10 72/17 81/11	suggestion [2] 44/6		113/14 115/24	then [46] 1/23 2/12
81/20 101/21 102/1	87/6	<u>T</u>	thank [36] 1/7 1/14	4/10 4/18 6/21 6/25
102/7 102/21 113/25	suggestions [1]	table [13] 12/19 29/4	1/17 1/17 2/4 3/6 7/22	11/23 12/7 15/1 15/22
stock [2] 27/20 28/4	66/16	29/21 30/24 31/3 31/4		16/4 27/14 34/2 35/3
Stone [2] 100/24 103/18	suggests [2] 40/4	31/14 31/16 31/22	33/12 35/1 45/24 46/3	37/23 37/24 39/24
stop [6] 11/19 14/7	82/5	34/9 50/2 56/14 72/12		40/13 48/6 63/6 64/15
84/11 85/13 85/13	suit [1] 31/11	Tagg [2] 33/14 33/20	86/23 87/18 87/24	66/3 69/15 70/5 70/9
120/25	sum [1] 107/8	Tagg's [4] 33/5 33/7 34/16 51/17	91/12 92/1 94/13	71/21 73/3 73/13
stored [4] 16/4 16/21	supplied [3] 118/19 119/10 119/12	take [25] 1/24 12/14	98/17 105/15 106/18 106/18 110/24 111/7	82/24 86/14 87/2 88/11 89/18 90/24
63/21 121/12	supply [1] 101/6	13/15 15/5 20/2 21/3	111/9 111/12 112/1	95/1 95/6 97/19
storm [1] 12/8	support [14] 20/12	22/9 26/22 31/13	124/21 124/22 125/8	105/17 109/1 110/10
story [1] 53/25	24/9 25/11 59/3 59/3	32/19 34/13 44/15	125/9	110/25 116/2 117/13
straightforward [2] 40/9 63/19	64/6 81/22 82/13	55/11 55/19 63/19	that [691]	119/15 119/18 120/23
streams [1] 96/10	83/12 84/22 90/25	64/9 64/10 68/3 69/3	that I [8] 5/24 22/24	there [129]
stressful [1] 13/10	94/8 96/20 97/9	86/15 91/4 97/24	68/11 80/23 108/24	there'd [2] 95/19
strict [2] 46/6 96/21	support' [1] 81/13 suppose [6] 48/5	109/11 109/21 114/13 taken [3] 68/23 83/16	110/13 110/2 110/5 that's [961 2/13 2/17	97/25 there's [13] 6/7 33/4
	Suppose [0] 40/0		uiai 5 [30] 2/13 2/17	uiere s [13] 0/1 33/4
				(50) started - there's

(50) started - there's

	05/00 07/0 07/4 4 00/0	45/47 40/0 40/0 40/0	07/40	
T	35/20 37/2 37/14 38/9		97/19	Um [2] 17/3 54/8
there's [11] 62/12	38/9 40/23 40/25	48/23 49/19 54/25	transactions [21]	umbrella [1] 116/10
65/3 78/17 80/22	46/13 47/11 47/16	55/11 56/24 57/4	12/25 13/5 14/14	unacceptable [1]
80/23 102/22 103/2	49/7 49/15 49/18	57/21 57/23 59/9	14/18 14/22 44/4 44/7	39/17
107/5 107/10 109/14	50/17 52/1 52/20	59/10 59/12 63/17	44/15 44/19 44/20	Unclear [2] 41/22
	54/20 54/22 55/10	63/24 65/19 65/25	56/14 69/11 70/1 70/2	50/9
115/16	58/21 61/9 64/3 64/15	68/2 68/22 70/16	70/4 70/13 70/19	uncomfortable [1]
thereafter [2] 11/24	64/20 65/20 68/17	70/25 82/7 82/7 85/18		123/19
23/20	69/4 72/4 72/7 74/13	86/3 87/12 89/3 90/14		under [11] 12/10
therefore [1] 61/20	75/6 76/20 79/1 79/8	91/2 95/16 96/11		22/22 42/4 42/12 46/4
these [27] 6/23 11/17			transactions' [1]	
12/8 12/13 13/11	79/17 80/18 80/24	96/23 96/23 96/23	68/13	46/6 63/6 93/1 96/21
14/23 15/24 19/1 20/8	81/20 81/24 82/1 82/4		transactions/calibrati	
26/12 26/19 26/22	82/10 83/15 83/18	101/16 104/1 105/23	on [1] 70/13	underlying [3] 42/10
33/24 40/3 44/24 45/7	83/22 84/25 85/6		transcript [7] 1/21	47/3 48/1
48/5 63/15 67/7 90/7	85/17 88/22 89/8	110/20 112/11 114/13	2/4 67/3 105/8 105/11	undermined [1] 49/8
96/24 116/8 116/25	89/12 90/24 91/10	115/15 117/21 121/6	105/13 106/16	understand [14]
	99/25 99/25 100/19	121/15 122/5 122/10	transcripts [5] 68/11	19/12 19/16 20/7
117/5 119/14 122/17	105/18 107/9 108/7	122/12 122/13 122/23		22/24 32/9 35/14
123/2	109/25 111/19 114/6	124/11 124/14 124/23		37/20 39/17 40/6
they [77] 10/11 11/1	122/1 122/7 123/4	timely [3] 48/24 49/2	transferred [2] 61/23	43/25 54/7 62/8
11/2 11/12 13/22	122/1122/1123/4			117/23 124/2
14/13 14/15 16/8		97/2	102/14	
16/18 16/19 16/20	thinking [1] 40/20	times [7] 32/22 39/9	treats [1] 35/6	understanding [9]
16/21 16/24 17/8	third [4] 2/12 19/7	39/16 40/18 47/18	trenchantly [3]	5/16 28/6 28/22 28/23
17/15 17/20 17/21	58/12 89/7	47/19 120/5	108/12 108/15 108/24	52/16 77/1 77/23 89/3
17/23 18/3 18/5 18/7	this [221]	timetable [1] 42/11	trial [3] 71/25 73/14	107/17
18/10 19/2 26/13	thorough [2] 63/17	timing [3] 42/19	116/16	understood [1] 124/7
	72/5	42/21 109/8	tried [1] 11/18	undertake [1] 118/22
29/24 40/1 40/2 40/2	those [28] 1/25 5/14	timings [1] 10/6	trouble [2] 46/1	undertaken [2] 35/14
41/2 50/6 50/8 52/24	9/3 9/4 9/24 11/11	tinker [1] 9/11	113/22	120/8
52/25 57/10 57/25	22/15 24/25 25/9 28/1		troubled [1] 25/6	Unequivocal [1]
59/8 62/7 62/24 62/25	29/22 30/22 31/2	120/13	true [10] 2/9 2/20	109/1
64/11 68/16 68/17				
70/19 71/4 73/1 73/2		TMS [4] 99/14 100/14		unfair [1] 82/9
73/2 73/12 73/13 80/1	61/6 67/12 67/21	101/4 101/8	50/11 65/12 93/23	unfit [1] 100/3
83/13 84/4 86/21	68/22 75/6 82/17	today [6] 1/18 8/9	114/16 114/22	unfortunate [2] 83/17
86/24 87/1 87/9 87/17	101/18 105/19 107/21		trust [2] 14/4 75/20	87/19
90/2 90/15 90/18	121/22 122/11	125/2	truth [3] 34/22 44/15	unfreezing [1] 69/12
90/18 90/24 91/15	though [5] 3/16	today/tomorrow [1]	62/2	unique [2] 59/5 85/24
	24/22 34/6 73/4 80/6	27/10	try [14] 11/20 21/21	unit [3] 24/9 25/11
91/22 94/24 103/5	thought [6] 5/12 32/2	together [7] 31/7	31/6 35/14 40/5 57/17	
105/20 105/23 105/24	38/8 86/21 117/5	54/25 79/14 80/16	60/2 72/22 76/18 77/5	
106/9 107/7 107/23	121/6	80/21 99/19 108/12	82/25 84/15 91/22	unless [5] 11/7 11/10
109/18 109/21 114/13	thoughts [4] 26/20	told [3] 9/5 49/6	93/24	109/18 115/3 115/16
121/22 122/1				
they'd [1] 105/25	37/8 50/25 58/9	80/11	trying [18] 9/19 25/25	
they're [3] 9/2 105/22	three [5] 13/18 30/18		40/25 41/7 41/8 49/4	85/12
125/6	106/9 107/10 124/24	too [7] 46/13 47/18	58/22 62/20 72/18	unmute [1] 1/5
they've [2] 44/20	through [20] 2/24	61/2 72/1 72/24 82/4	75/20 76/9 84/20	unmuted [2] 111/19
71/23	7/17 19/3 22/4 22/5	86/7	85/13 91/15 98/5	111/21
	37/7 47/22 48/9 53/14	took [7] 3/14 6/25	100/19 107/16 124/8	unregulated [8] 16/7
thing [4] 35/18 64/15	56/9 56/11 59/11	44/2 44/13 61/6 86/6	turn [7] 2/6 2/14 6/6	17/12 17/13 17/17
82/22 113/4	59/13 62/19 63/2 63/6		45/24 49/17 61/20	17/25 18/1 29/2 29/8
things [20] 8/19 9/9	84/2 93/11 100/6	top [10] 3/15 6/9	71/6	unreliable [1] 14/3
31/20 31/23 40/3	105/11	24/14 24/23 26/25	turned [1] 57/12	unstable [2] 4/14
42/14 48/13 49/7 56/1				123/1
57/7 59/17 84/19 92/4	throughout [4] 21/17		turning [1] 78/11	
94/4 96/13 104/4	21/25 25/24 108/8	108/3 117/9	tweaked [1] 51/5	unsure [1] 14/11
104/8 110/19 110/20	throw [1] 71/12	toss [1] 86/12	two [9] 1/23 8/23	until [9] 3/4 76/15
123/2	throwing [1] 74/17	total [1] 124/24	31/9 32/16 77/19	79/22 100/23 102/19
thingy [1] 99/11	time [87] 4/1 9/17	tour [2] 3/7 105/10	84/19 92/4 106/22	103/10 105/1 110/23
thingy-bob [1] 99/11	10/8 10/22 11/5 12/3	towards [2] 14/9	107/21	125/11
	16/20 18/12 18/17	96/17	type [4] 82/21 99/12	unused [1] 116/17
think [82] 3/3 3/15	23/2 23/4 26/14 27/22	Tracy [3] 98/21 105/6		up [47] 1/21 8/20
5/4 8/6 9/8 16/17	28/2 28/6 28/22 28/23		typical [1] 107/17	11/23 36/24 38/2
17/21 17/23 19/4	29/19 30/1 36/3 36/6	transaction [9] 13/6		39/19 39/24 41/5
20/17 22/1 22/6 24/2	38/8 38/20 39/13	13/23 15/15 17/4	U	41/16 41/19 42/12
26/11 26/25 34/12	41/14 41/25 45/2	17/18 18/1 36/4 53/1	ultimately [1] 16/15	42/18 42/21 43/1 46/8
				(51) thora's _ un

(51) there's... - up

U	victory [1] 82/25	25/5 41/7 45/9 45/19	38/17 38/17 40/1 40/6	42/4 42/5 44/25 45/22
	view [23] 20/18 20/19		41/12 42/16 42/24	47/1 47/13 48/4 49/3
up [32] 46/23 46/25	24/15 28/7 28/11 36/7	67/14 67/24 71/6 83/3	43/25 44/8 45/8 46/10	49/23 61/17 63/11
47/1 47/7 47/10 47/24	36/8 54/12 55/21	109/9 110/23 117/17	46/11 46/16 47/5	68/3 73/13 80/24 86/6
49/10 56/25 57/17	56/23 65/22 65/24	123/17 125/2	47/25 48/15 49/4	86/15 88/22 89/11
64/10 64/10 67/2	65/25 71/11 79/25	we've [11] 12/23 22/3		90/22 93/23 94/14
73/25 79/2 83/12 86/2	82/15 82/18 107/20	22/4 25/6 26/11 28/11	61/11 62/7 64/18 66/1	96/17 101/14 102/4
87/2 87/3 88/3 91/16	107/23 108/5 108/12	70/21 76/11 76/19	66/2 66/3 66/4 67/10	103/8 103/21 106/21
93/25 96/23 97/9	109/2 115/20	83/4 111/20	67/10 71/1 72/10	106/23 107/6 107/13
103/4 105/24 106/7	view/belief [1] 71/11	weapons [1] 43/9	72/15 73/8 74/25	107/22 112/5 112/14
109/9 112/8 113/7	viewpoint [1] 24/24	Weightman [2] 55/24	75/17 76/6 76/7 78/2	113/24 114/21 115/2
113/11 117/9 120/4	vigour [1] 108/23	78/21	78/8 78/14 80/5 80/17	115/23 117/11 117/13
update [1] 94/1	virtually [1] 11/20	well [104] 3/18 3/22	82/9 83/13 83/20	118/19 121/2 121/3
upgrade [1] 93/11	visit [1] 61/12	5/9 8/22 9/10 10/2	83/25 84/6 85/2 85/6	121/17 122/4 123/5
upon [2] 66/23 125/2	visits [1] 86/8	11/4 11/16 11/22 15/1	85/11 85/14 86/8	123/18
us [23] 19/3 21/14	vital [1] 6/16	16/17 17/9 18/22	89/24 89/24 90/1	while [3] 12/13 71/23
26/18 36/15 39/6 41/6 51/15 63/1 63/5 72/5	Vizards [2] 55/24	19/14 23/5 25/4 26/9	90/17 90/18 90/20	94/21
74/8 75/17 75/20	78/21	27/18 27/25 29/20	91/8 91/10 91/14	whilst [1] 53/24
76/10 76/18 86/5 87/3	volume [1] 36/23	31/9 33/2 34/8 34/19	91/20 91/21 91/22	whistlestop [2] 3/7
91/23 100/6 110/13	vouch [1] 16/25	35/10 36/21 38/24	93/15 95/22 96/6 98/4	105/10
111/8 117/11 122/21	vulnerable [1] 123/1	40/2 40/19 44/8 44/24	98/9 98/15 99/3 99/4	white [1] 56/25
usage [1] 7/19	W	45/17 51/5 52/3 52/5	100/7 100/16 100/24	who [23] 1/8 19/20
use [10] 33/24 43/11		53/1 53/12 54/14 55/1	102/17 106/12 110/12	23/10 24/1 24/3 24/7
82/24 84/4 91/6 93/25	wait [1] 88/3	58/25 60/19 61/19	110/22 112/14 115/4	36/15 38/16 52/3
108/18 108/25 109/9	waiting [1] 71/24	62/23 63/12 64/23	115/21 117/10 117/17	58/17 61/15 62/22
121/14	walk [2] 41/11 57/13	65/19 65/23 67/12	117/23 118/7 120/12	75/11 76/3 76/4 77/2
used [11] 20/11	want [17] 22/9 31/20	68/17 69/3 69/7 70/4	what's [4] 23/22	82/17 82/21 91/2
38/10 39/18 43/8	43/9 43/25 46/21	71/15 72/11 73/25	73/10 95/21 99/11	105/19 112/19 117/21
63/18 64/14 67/9	60/22 62/7 68/2 85/10			124/7
85/17 101/12 103/20	86/9 87/1 89/24 91/6	78/14 80/18 81/14	10/21 52/24 59/8 73/9	
118/20	108/18 109/8 116/3	82/13 82/24 83/13	92/18	whole [3] 6/20 13/10
user [2] 37/18 118/16	124/4	83/17 83/22 84/13	when [31] 1/5 2/23	53/25
uses [1] 101/9	wanted [9] 26/18	85/23 88/25 90/3 90/5		
using [6] 10/18 69/16	29/15 57/16 59/8 60/2	90/14 90/20 90/22	29/16 36/1 36/3 51/22	31/2 38/19 39/17
82/23 84/7 93/8 101/7	73/12 76/17 90/16	91/10 91/19 93/17	57/23 59/14 68/15	40/17 47/20 48/21
usually [1] 90/13	91/13	93/22 95/21 96/2 96/5	69/11 69/12 77/13	72/21 73/23 79/20
	wants [1] 71/16	98/12 98/13 99/6	80/11 82/18 86/9 92/7	79/24 84/9 84/9 86/19
<u>V</u>	was [343] was there [1] 104/19	99/16 100/14 100/21	96/13 103/6 104/18	87/9 98/3 103/11
vacation [1] 125/3	was mere [1] 104/19 wasn't [26] 15/25	102/8 108/18 108/20	105/6 105/13 105/19	104/24 111/15 123/22
valid [1] 100/16	16/12 17/2 17/3 25/14	109/15 109/21 110/22 113/25 114/13 115/5	107/5 108/20 112/25 123/19 124/14	Wild [1] 5/20
vanes [1] 57/21	25/19 32/3 32/4 32/8	116/23 120/3 122/11	where [30] 3/2 4/14	wilfully [1] 114/20 will [28] 3/11 3/25
various [6] 18/24	38/21 38/21 40/6 40/8			
22/5 67/21 114/9	57/13 57/17 59/6	125/5	40/3 45/10 48/7 48/11	
120/5 120/5	76/18 79/20 79/24	well-presented [1]	51/15 51/18 55/21	22/25 29/17 48/3 70/6
vastly [1] 11/7	80/8 80/12 96/7 98/4	55/1	56/23 60/21 63/22	70/8 78/8 81/8 81/9
verbally [3] 89/20	103/9 103/15 122/18	went [9] 2/23 3/2	68/23 80/2 80/23	83/13 109/13 110/12
89/25 90/16	wasting [1] 105/22	13/21 53/14 56/9	84/11 88/23 90/11	110/13 110/25 113/4
version [6] 12/16 17/12 53/7 103/3	way [16] 3/17 10/17	56/10 63/24 77/24	94/18 99/6 102/3	115/12 115/19 115/21
	21/3 35/16 40/12	86/2	107/15 107/18 118/17	125/5 125/7
121/2 121/3	47/16 48/13 60/3	were [143]	124/5 125/3	win [1] 21/5
very [38] 1/7 1/14 1/17 13/10 25/1 26/2	71/12 74/18 76/11	weren't [11] 11/14	where's [1] 30/9	wipe [1] 44/6
30/3 31/14 36/21 44/9	93/12 96/15 109/25	16/19 16/20 16/23	wherever [1] 116/7	wiped [2] 44/3 44/14
46/3 55/14 55/18	115/25 121/4	18/5 18/7 29/23 62/16		wiping [1] 44/19
62/24 63/4 64/7 66/21	way' [1] 37/16	64/14 99/14 120/19	10/6 10/10 11/12 32/7	wish [2] 116/14
73/14 87/18 91/12	ways [2] 41/8 41/8	West [1] 5/20	49/10 51/7 51/8 52/10	
92/1 94/13 98/11	we [270]	what [114] 9/2 9/3	62/23 65/25 73/23	wished [1] 108/21
98/12 100/9 100/9	we'd [3] 57/4 96/7	9/10 10/2 13/12 14/11	75/16 87/5 87/8 90/17	
101/17 104/1 105/20	119/15	15/1 15/12 16/2 16/6	97/24 109/10 109/12	22/15 64/20 67/22
105/25 106/1 106/19	we'll [7] 20/6 50/25	16/6 16/22 19/17	115/13 115/20 119/19	
107/5 114/7 117/5	55/2 88/3 89/14	21/22 26/14 26/20	120/21 123/20	without [4] 4/16
124/6 124/6 124/21	110/13 116/2	26/24 27/25 29/10	which [55] 3/14 7/7	33/15 34/9 109/24
vested [1] 21/5	we're [22] 1/8 6/13	32/3 32/9 33/13 33/18		WITN00210101 [2]
	7/2 8/9 15/6 18/11	35/14 36/18 38/14	22/16 27/12 33/23	22/3 33/8
				(52) up WITN00210101

(52) up... - WITN00210101

W	wondering [1] 73/23	50/11 52/1 52/7 57/19	89/13 92/25 93/1	121/7 121/10 121/22
WITN04600100 [1]	word [8] 14/15 43/7	67/2 79/25 108/13	94/11 94/11 95/21	122/2 122/8 122/23
1/22	57/3 58/25 60/1 60/4	writing [2] 51/10	96/2 96/10 97/23 99/2	
WITN04600104 [1]	83/23 99/12 worded [4] 29/12	113/22 written [10] 5/4 5/10	101/19 101/23 102/25	26/13 39/2 61/22 65/5
7/1	40/12 49/25 50/17	6/3 15/18 17/5 23/22	105/18 108/1 108/7	71/8 75/9 78/20 81/2
WITN04600200 [2]	wording [1] 50/15	26/23 65/4 65/24	108/14 109/23 110/12	
2/5 89/6	words [23] 5/20 28/1	79/10	111/9 111/11 111/17	yourselves [2] 62/14
WITN04600202 [1] 15/5	37/1 39/4 43/13 44/8	wrong [10] 9/16	111/17 111/24 112/5	73/6
WITN04600203 [1]	48/18 50/24 67/9 75/6		112/7 112/9 112/10	Z
26/10	75/6 76/24 76/24	39/14 65/15 66/5	114/2 114/5 114/15	
WITN04600206 [1]	83/17 84/9 85/17	70/17 84/6	116/19 118/6 119/1	zoom [2] 51/14 74/11
92/21	87/22 101/18 103/5 103/24 114/10 120/16	wrote [3] 3/20 5/15	120/11 123/7 yesterday [4] 65/21	
WITN04600215 [1]	121/22	Wyn [1] 125/9	66/1 67/5 67/6	
81/1	work [21] 4/8 10/17		yet [2] 14/16 115/17	
WITN04600216 [1] 116/4	20/20 21/4 21/8 35/14		you [488]	
WITN04600217 [2]	40/5 48/7 59/7 59/23	yeah [82] 2/16 6/5	You'd [1] 52/23	
113/10 118/12	63/17 63/23 64/6	7/24 8/22 9/7 9/7 9/7	you'll [7] 3/15 5/13	
WITN04600300 [1]	64/10 70/9 86/17	9/18 15/10 16/2 18/14 19/24 23/24 23/24		
2/14	86/18 87/1 97/5 107/13 117/14	26/15 27/3 28/22	51/22 you're [25] 34/12	
WITN04600302 [2]	workaround [2] 42/9	29/14 30/8 31/19	39/11 39/24 40/12	
23/18 30/2	48/8	34/19 34/24 36/12	40/12 40/13 44/22	
WITN04600304 [1] 36/13	workarounds [1]	36/22 36/25 37/5	45/18 46/16 52/7 54/7	
WITN04600305 [2]	93/10	37/22 38/16 40/7	61/1 65/23 73/5 73/5	
39/1 46/2	worked [3] 17/23	40/19 43/3 43/23	80/8 92/12 95/23 96/6	
WITN04600306 [1]	24/3 57/11	45/23 50/4 53/8 53/8 53/11 53/13 54/18	102/1 102/7 108/15	
43/21	working [2] 9/21 118/18	60/13 60/22 61/8	108/16 109/17 119/7	
WITN04600309 [1]	workmanship [1] 5/1	62/23 65/6 65/23	you've [16] 8/15 22/6 25/10 25/23 27/4	
74/5	works [2] 52/17	67/12 74/7 74/15 77/4		
WITN04600310 [1] 77/8	100/13	77/10 78/17 78/23	61/22 75/10 90/5	
witness [38] 1/19	Worlds [2] 30/9 30/9	78/23 78/25 87/11	91/11 100/22 100/23	
22/2 23/16 23/17	worry [2] 113/7 121/9	88/19 89/4 89/10 92/6		
45/11 59/14 60/9	worrying [3] 4/19	92/13 94/6 95/24	your [104] 1/14 2/7 2/9 2/17 2/20 2/24 3/8	
63/20 63/25 64/25	37/10 56/4 worse [1] 60/17	99/2 100/22 102/6	2/9 2/17 2/20 2/24 3/8 3/16 3/21 5/8 5/24	
66/13 68/6 72/1 72/25	worst [2] 32/1 65/15	103/2 103/25 105/2	15/11 21/24 21/24	
73/15 86/4 89/5 89/7	worth [2] 49/20 71/3	110/6 111/19 113/3	22/7 24/15 24/21	
89/8 89/9 89/17 112/17 112/20 113/2	would [71] 8/22 8/24	113/6 113/15 116/23	24/24 28/1 28/1 28/10	
113/17 113/18 113/23	10/9 10/19 11/19	118/4 122/18 123/3	31/11 31/23 35/18	
113/23 114/4 115/14	14/21 14/24 15/20	123/4	36/8 39/3 39/4 39/12	
118/9 118/11 119/3	16/9 17/4 17/8 17/21	year [3] 4/7 8/14 11/18	40/20 41/13 41/18	
119/21 119/25 123/20	17/23 19/20 19/21 21/8 26/24 33/9 33/16		43/10 46/19 47/13 49/8 50/24 51/1 51/10	
124/16 124/24	38/4 38/15 38/23 42/3	70/22 98/11 114/5	51/18 53/6 54/3 55/6	
witnesses [2] 22/6	42/7 44/3 44/14 44/15	118/14 120/15	55/7 56/7 56/9 56/17	
22/20 Wolstenholme [16]	49/8 51/11 52/3 52/10	yes [97] 1/10 1/16 2/3	57/21 58/8 58/11	
8/13 19/25 32/24	54/5 57/3 60/7 75/14	2/8 2/11 2/19 2/22 3/5		
33/21 34/20 56/12	79/4 79/6 80/24 84/4	3/19 3/22 5/7 5/23 5/24 8/8 10/2 10/4	67/8 67/16 67/20	
57/23 62/14 62/16	85/1 85/4 85/10 85/13 85/21 87/8 90/3 90/7	5/24 8/8 10/2 10/4 15/2 15/3 22/1 25/4	70/14 71/22 72/13 73/7 73/10 73/24 74/6	
62/19 77/21 78/13	91/1 96/11 97/5 97/9	25/17 25/25 26/24	73/773/1073/2474/6	
81/6 81/18 83/9 85/1	97/18 100/1 100/1	28/6 30/5 34/24 35/10		
Wolstenholme's [2]	100/6 105/7 105/20	37/5 37/22 37/22	89/5 89/6 89/8 89/9	
8/20 12/4 woman [2] 83/11	107/23 108/1 108/1	37/25 40/2 44/12	90/15 91/13 92/7 92/8	
85/17	108/11 108/14 108/24			
won [1] 82/23	109/23 110/4 110/19	50/23 53/12 55/9 57/3 57/4 59/25 60/9 60/9		
won't [2] 3/25 124/18	113/21 114/18 114/19 116/14 121/13	64/25 67/19 67/23	106/7 107/2 107/23 108/13 109/1 110/18	
wonder [3] 33/5	wouldn't [14] 10/12	71/2 73/22 77/17	112/7 112/13 113/2	
109/16 113/10	10/13 16/11 16/14	78/19 79/6 79/11	114/17 115/7 115/20	
wondered [1] 87/5	16/18 17/6 21/12	79/19 80/6 88/19 89/9		
L	1		(1	53) WITN04600100 - zoom

(53) WITN04600100 - zoom