Witness Name: William Paul Patterson (on behalf of Fujitsu Services Limited)

Statement No.: Second

Exhibits: FSL_04/1 to FSL_04/640

Dated: 29 December 2022

POST OFFICE HORIZON IT INQUIRY

SECOND CORPORATE STATEMENT OF FUJITSU SERVICES LIMITED

I, *MR. WILLIAM PAUL PATTERSON* (known as Paul Patterson), will say as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. I am a director of Fujitsu Services Limited ("**Fujitsu**") and am duly authorised to make this statement on its behalf. I make this statement in response to the Inquiry's Rule 9 Request, dated 17 August 2022, for a corporate statement addressing issues relevant to Phases 2 and 3 of the Inquiry (the "**Request**"). I am informed by Morrison Foerster, the Recognised Legal Representative for Fujitsu in the Inquiry, that an extension to this deadline has been agreed for the response to the issues relevant to Phase 3 to 14 October 2022.

2. On 28 September 2022, Fujitsu provided to the Inquiry a signed corporate statement addressing the issues relevant to Phase 2, namely Questions 1 – 43 as set out in Appendix 1 to the Request (the "**First Corporate Statement**"). This corporate statement deals with the issues relevant to Phase 3, namely Questions 44 – 71 as set out in Appendix 1 to the Request.

3. As noted in the First Corporate Statement, I do not have first-hand knowledge of many of the matters which are set out in this corporate statement. For this reason, I wish to reiterate at the outset how the information in this statement has

been compiled. For the purposes of preparing responses, I have been assisted by a team of individuals within Fujitsu and Morrison Foerster. This is due to the vast amount of documentation and sources of evidence which have had to be reviewed for a time period stretching over 25 years. This team has provided to me the documents which are referenced in this statement and exhibited at FSL_04/1 to FSL_04/640, and which are the principal source of my knowledge of this statement's contents.

4. As with the responses in the First Corporate Statement, responses to questions set out in this statement are generally drawn from documentary sources. These documents have been exhibited and/or referenced in accordance with the Inquiry's Protocol on Witness Statements. The responses provided in this second corporate statement represent Fujitsu's current understanding of the information available. Given that preparations for Phase 3 of the Inquiry are still on-going, it may be that Fujitsu will need to supplement this corporate statement as further material is identified and made available to Core Participants.

5. Also, as noted in the First Corporate Statement, I do not have a detailed technical knowledge of the Horizon IT System ("**Horizon**"), and I am reliant upon Fujitsu staff with relevant technical expertise and knowledge of such matters.

<u>SUPPORT</u>

6. In the Request, the Inquiry has asked a series of questions relating to the nature and scope of the support services that ICL Pathway Limited ("**ICL Pathway**") and subsequently Fujitsu (for ease of reference, these entities will be referred to collectively as Fujitsu for this section of the corporate statement) aimed to provide in relation to Horizon from the initial pilot to the date of the Request.

7. From around 2002, the nature and scope of certain support services provided by Fujitsu to Post Office and its branches are set out in 'Service Descriptions'. These are Contract Controlled Documents ("**CCDs**") which were agreed between Post Office and Fujitsu and make up part of the contractual framework between the parties. For the purposes of this corporate statement, Fujitsu has focused on support services provided from the time of the Codified Agreement entered into between Fujitsu and Post Office Counters Limited on 28 July 1999 (the "**Codified Agreement**") that deal with issues that may have impacted Post Office branches or were reported to Fujitsu (either directly or indirectly) by postmasters and summarises how those support services have changed over time.

8. For ease of reference, in this section of the corporate statement, both Post Office Limited and Post Office Counters Limited (as Post Office Limited was until known until August 2001) shall be referred to as "**POL**". Fujitsu also notes that for Service Descriptions relating to HNG-X that are dated in 2006, the dates on which those Service Descriptions became effective are set out in Change Control Note ("**CCN**") 1200 (FSL_04/1). In the majority of instances, this would have been at the rollout of HNG-X.

9. ICL Pathway and Fujitsu have undergone a number of reorganisations throughout the time period relevant to the Request. These reorganisations may have occurred at the corporate level, business unit or team level, and at individual account level, including in relation to the account responsible for the provision of services to POL.

10. For these reasons, the names, composition and structure of the services, teams, units and roles which delivered the support services changed, and there will

therefore be overlap in the responsibilities and time periods relating to the support services, teams and roles explained below.

Background

11. As documented in Fujitsu's "Incident Management Process" (see, for example, FSL_04/2 and FSL_04/3) and "End to End Application Support Strategy" (see, for example, FSL_04/4 and FSL_04/5), the framework for Fujitsu's support services can be broadly categorised into four levels:

    a. First line support, which at various times during the Legacy Horizon and HNG-X periods has included, (i) the Service Desk Service, delivered by the Service Desk team (the "**Service Desk**"), where issues were reported by postmasters, and (ii) Fujitsu's own system monitoring, provided by the Systems Management Service and delivered by the Systems Management Centre ("**SMC**");

    b. Second line support, which at various times during the Legacy Horizon and HNG-X periods has included, (i) the SMC, (ii) the Service Desk, and (iii) the Software Support Centre team (also known as the System Support Centre) (the "**SSC**").

    c. Third line support, as provided by the Third Line Support Service, which was delivered primarily by the SSC; and

    d. Fourth line support, as provided by the Application Support Service (also known during the Legacy Horizon period as '4th line support'), which was delivered by Fujitsu's Application Division teams and, later, some teams based overseas.

12. An 'incident' is defined in the Incident Management Process as "*any event which is not part of the standard operation of a service and which causes, or may cause,*

an interruption to, or a reduction in, the quality of that service." (FSL_04/2 and FSL_04/3). Incidents included faults or failures in equipment, software, services or procedures. The term "problem" is defined in the Customer Service Policy Manual as being "*an adverse situation that is: (a) caused by a defect in the specification, design, production, implementation or use of any of the service components and (b) substantial enough to warrant action to eradicate it. A problem may be indicated by a trend of incidents*" (FSL_04/6 and FSL_04/7).

13. The majority of the support services described below were provided by units and teams within the Customer Services team, which later became part of Fujitsu's Post Office Account (also known at various times as the Royal Mail Group Account). The Customer Services team's responsibilities included the delivery of services to POL under the terms of the contract between Fujitsu and POL (FSL_04/8 and FSL_04/9).

14. Although it is not possible to determine with certainty how many individuals were involved in each of the services or teams described below at any one time, Fujitsu has to date identified approximately 5,000 employees and/or contractors who have worked on Horizon over the life of the Horizon contract.

15. In addition to the information sharing methods set out in respect of the services outlined below, information was also shared between different levels of support team using various shared systems. These systems have included:

    a.   PowerHelp, a call-handling system used by the Service Desk, which was linked initially to the PinICL system described below and was in use until around 2007;

    b.   PinICL, the customised incident logging and resolution tracking system adopted by Fujitsu during the period 1996 to 2003;

c.   Peak, the customised incident logging system designed to replace the PinICL system in 2003; and

d.   The Known Error Log ("**KEL**"), a knowledge management tool used by Fujitsu to explain how to deal with, or work around, issues that arose in Horizon.

16.   Details relating to the PinICL, Peak and KEL systems were provided to the Inquiry by Fujitsu in its submissions dated 13 September 2022.

17.   Information was also shared between, by and within support teams through documentation, training and information-sharing sessions and meetings, including the following:

a.   team-based review meetings (for example, the Horizon Helpdesk Shift Review meeting);

b.   local work instructions provided by technical teams to specific support teams;

c.   the SSC intranet site;

d.   workshops and knowledge transfer sessions (for example, relating to technical aspects of Horizon and diagnostic techniques); and

e.   internal newsletters and bulletins, including Brief EnCounters and HSD Voice (see, for example, FSL_04/10 to FSL_04/13).

18.   There were processes for requesting additional resources which line managers would have followed. This included the Recruitment Authorisation process. Line managers would create a Recruitment Authorisation Requirement ("**RAR**"), which described the role and skills required. An example of a RAR is included at FSL_04/14. An example of ICL Pathway's Resourcing Procedure dated 22 June 2000 is included at FSL_04/15.

19. With regards to the performance of individual team members, between 1993 and 2012, Fujitsu operated a system known as Performance Plus to manage individual employee performance. This system was renamed Performance First in 2012 and began incorporating a moderation process in which performance ratings were applied (FSL_04/16). In general, the process included completion of a personal objectives form, a personal development plan, a performance review form, and a pre-appraisal preparation and self-assessment form (FSL_04/17). Following a performance appraisal exercise, a performance rating was agreed and, in some cases, it is understood that this could have impacted a relevant employee's remuneration.

20. To assess the performance of a team, Fujitsu generally undertook Organisation and Management Reviews (an "**OMR**") during the period. OMRs were an assessment of a team's 'people capability' against strategic objectives. The OMR took place at each level of the organisation where there was a formal business review. Further details of the process are set out in FSL_04/18.

21. Fujitsu understands that training for support service teams was provided on an ad hoc team-by-team basis and no central register of training was maintained (FSL_04/19). An example of the induction handbook for individuals working on the Post Office Account team can be found at FSL_04/20. Further detail in relation to training provided in respect of certain of the support service teams is set out below.

Service Management Service

Legacy Horizon

22. The primary aims of the Service Management Service ("**SMS**") were to monitor, manage and maintain the delivery of operational services and to report on these

matters to the Service Management Forum (which was also known as the Horizon Service Review Forum) ("**Service Management Forum**") (FSL_04/21). The key components of the SMS including the following operational services (FSL_04/22):

a.   the Service Desk Service;

b.   Management Information Service;

c.   Reconciliation Service;

d.   Systems Management Service;

e.   Third Line Support Service; and

f.   Engineering Service.

Each of these operational services are discussed below in this statement.

23.   The SMS was governed by the procedures defined in Schedule 4 of the Codified Agreement (FSL_04/22), as varied from time to time, which included:

a.   Service organisation;

b.   Service Management Forum;

c.   The introduction of releases ("**Release Introduction**");

d.   Management of problems and complaints; and

e.   Measurement and management of customer satisfaction

(FSL_04/21)

Service organisation

24.   The service description sets out key roles within Fujitsu and POL associated with the SMS (FSL_04/21):

a.   <u>Fujitsu Customer Service Director</u>, responsible for all aspects of the delivery of the operational services.

b. Fujitsu Infrastructure Service Manager, responsible for delivery of support services to branches, management information and the reporting of service levels. The Infrastructure Service Manager was specifically responsible for the provision of monthly service reports.

c. Fujitsu Operations and Support Manager, responsible for the delivery of services relating to data delivery and support.

d. Fujitsu Security Manager, responsible for the Security Management Service.

e. Fujitsu Service Introduction Manager, responsible for planning and managing the implementation of releases, which included planning and managing the implementation phase of all releases and keeping POL informed as to the content and progress of all releases. The Service Introduction Manager was supported by a team (the "**Service Introduction Team**"). The prime functional units of the Service Introduction Team are set out in the Customer Service Operations Manual ("**CS Operations Manual**") (see, for example, FSL_04/23 and FSL_04/24).

f. POL Head of Network Support, responsible for the business that the operational services supported.

g. POL Supplier & Service Performance Manager, responsible for liaison with Fujitsu in relation to the overall performance of operational services. This included monitoring delivered service levels, and receiving and analysing Fujitsu's monthly service reports.

h. POL Service Operations Manager, responsible for liaison with Fujitsu concerning issues and problems that occurred in the live estate.

i. <u>POL Information Security Manager</u>, responsible for various security-related matters, including establishing certain security policies.

Service Management Forum

25. Since at least the date of the Codified Agreement, there has been a contractual obligation for the parties to hold monthly service review meetings to provide a regular opportunity for POL and Fujitsu to meet and discuss the overall performance of services and systems in the live environment (Annex to Schedule A4, FSL_04/25). Generally, these meetings were called Service Management Reviews and were held between the Fujitsu's Customer Service Director and POL's Head of Network Support to review performance against Service Level Targets ("**SLTs**"), and issues and problems that had been escalated to the Service Management Forum (FSL_04/21). Service review meetings ("**Service Reviews**") were aided by a summary of the service performance statistics for the month under review. Service Reviews later became known as "**Service Review Books**". The content and format of the Service Review Books changed over time. Fujitsu has disclosed to the Inquiry all Service Reviews and Service Review Books identified during the course of its review. These Service Reviews / Service Review Books recorded, for example, the volume of calls received by the Service Desk and the part of the system those calls related to.

Release Introduction

26. Another component of the SMS was 'Release Introduction'. Initially, this service was carried out in accordance with the CCD entitled "Pathway Release Policy" ("**Release Policy**") (see, for example, FSL_04/26 and FSL_04/27).

27. A release is "*a documented collection of software and/or data provided by Fujitsu to deliver a service*". During the Legacy Horizon and HNG-X periods, releases

were classified as either software releases or reference data releases, and supported changes of POL's service delivery in order to implement a business change (FSL_04/26).

28. Releases were subject to change control procedures described in the Codified Agreement (see, for example, FSL_04/25). The change control procedures also contained 'emergency procedures', which allowed Fujitsu to proceed with any change it considered necessary for it to comply with its contractual obligations if there was insufficient time to comply with standard procedures, provided Fujitsu gave POL a CCN for retrospective change as soon as practicable (FSL_04/26).

29. Separately, the Release Policy made provision for 'maintenance releases', which were a type of software release. Maintenance releases were releases of new software and data to remove faults or to improve service levels without changing business functionality or business data. From July 1999, the Release Policy described three categories of maintenance releases:

    a. Performance / capacity improvements, where a CCN was required;

    b. Scheduled releases containing fault fixes and small functional changes, where a CCN was required; and

    c. Urgent fault fixes, where no CCN was required.

30. Maintenance releases ranged in scope from minor releases to major releases. Minor maintenance releases were solely concerned with rectifying faults reported to Fujitsu through "*the incident and problem management processes that resulted in no associated changes to designed system functionality, process, procedure, training or documentation*". Such releases were to be applied to the system as soon as they were authorised by Fujitsu, and POL was to be notified by entries made in the 'Online Problem Management Database'. Such releases

were also notified during Service Management Forum meetings and documented in the Service Review Book (FSL_04/26).

31. The procedures for authorising changes to Horizon's live estate were described in the CS Support Services Operations Manual (FSL_04/28). The procedures included a weekly Release Management Forum to decide which fixes should be created and to assess the impact of any associated risk (see, for example, FSL_04/28).

32. The Release Policy was changed over time, including changes to the definitions of releases, and the teams and processes relating to the authorisation of releases, which are set out in FSL_04/27.

Management of problems and complaints

33. Fujitsu was to provide a single point of contact for any operational or service-related issues and had overall responsibility for the integrity of the problem and complaint management process, and liaison with POL and individual service managers who managed individual problems (FSL_04/21).

Measurement and management of customer satisfaction

34. Fujitsu and POL were to measure satisfaction at regular intervals using a scorecard system. Fujitsu was also to report on progress against any service improvement plans within the Service Review Book (FSL_04/21).

HNG-X

35. Generally, the SMS continued to perform the same functions and responsibilities after HNG-X was introduced in 2010 (FSL_04/29).

36. In August 2014, after Fujitsu's first line support function was transferred to Atos as part of POL's towers strategy, the Major Account Controllers team ("**MAC Team**") was added to the SMS. The MAC Team's responsibilities included, (i)

providing a single point of contact for Atos enquiries and escalations, (ii) being a resolution contact point for branch logged software incidents and customer complaint handling, and (iii) trend reporting (FSL_04/30).

Service Desk Service

37. The Service Desk, which was also known at various times as the Horizon Systems Helpdesk (HSH) or Horizon Service Desk (HSD), provided first line support to Post Office branches and other designated groups through the provision of a support desk function, which included end to end incident management (FSL_04/31 to FSL_04/33). Postmasters reporting issues with Horizon counter equipment or software contacted the Service Desk and an incident would be logged (FSL_04/31 to FSL_04/33). The Service Desk acted as an initiator within the problem management process due to its ability to monitor incident trends against the severity received (FSL_04/33).

38. The Service Desk resolved calls relating to various types of incidents, including those concerning counter hardware, software and network issues. Further detail in relation to the service provided by the Service Desk is set out in the following documents:

    a. Before December 2002: the POCL Infrastructure Service Definition (see, for example, FSL_04/31);

    b. From December 2002 to October 2006: the Service Description for the Horizon Systems Helpdesk (FSL_04/32); and

    c. From October 2006 to June 2014: the "Service Desk Joint Working Document" ("**Working Document**") (see, for example, FSL_04/34) (FSL_04/35).

39. In late 2002 to early 2003, the Network Business Support Centre (the "**NBSC**") took over responsibility from the Service Desk for calls requiring advice or guidance in the Horizon system, and from November to December 2002, the Fujitsu Service Desk only handled Horizon system-related incidents (for example, incidents relating to hardware or software) (FSL_04/36). In 2014, as noted above, Fujitsu's first line support function was transferred to Atos (FSL_04/37).

40. During the time it was in place, the Service Desk managed the resolution of incidents using processes defined in the relevant incident management process (see, for example, FSL_04/3 and FSL_04/38).

Accessing the Service Desk

41. To access the Service Desk in the period September 1996 to approximately September 2001, branches used a direct telephone number. There was a separate telephone number for contacting POL (FSL_04/36 and FSL_04/39). From around September 2001 onwards, branches contacted the Service Desk by telephoning a 'Single Point of Contact' telephone number and following the interactive voice recording to select the Service Desk (FSL_04/31 to FSL_04/33). This telephone number was managed and controlled by POL.

42. If the Service Desk was contacted, a Service Desk agent would answer the call, obtain details from the caller concerning the reported issues and record these details (including the call classification or 'call type' and severity) (FSL_04/31 to FSL_04/33). The Service Desk agent would then refer to the knowledge-base and undertake basic diagnostics in an effort to resolve the incident. If resolved, the Service Desk agent would 'close' the incident with the agreement of the

caller. If the fault remained unresolved at the end of the call, the Service Desk agent would escalate the incident (FSL_04/31 to FSL_04/33).

43. The Service Desk's hours of operation changed over time:

    a.   <u>Before December 2002</u>: the Service Desk was to be provided from 8.00am to 8.00pm Monday to Saturday, excluding Bank Holidays and Christmas Day. A 'skeleton' Service Desk was also to be provided between 5.00am and 8.00am and between 8.00pm and 12.00am Monday to Saturday, and between 7.00am and 10.00pm on Sundays excluding Christmas Day (FSL_04/25);

    b.   <u>From December 2002 to October 2008</u>: the Service Desk was available from 8.00am to 6.30pm Monday to Saturday excluding Christmas Day (FSL_04/32);

    c.   <u>From October 2008 to April 2013</u>: the Service Desk was available from 8.00am to 6.00pm Monday to Friday, and 8.00am to 2.00pm on Saturday excluding Christmas Day (FSL_04/40); and

    d.   <u>From April 2013 to June 2014</u>: the Service Desk was available from 7.00am to 11.00pm Monday to Friday, 8.00am to 11.00pm on Saturday, and 8.00am to 5.00pm on Sunday and Bank Holidays excluding Christmas Day (FSL_04/33 and FSL_04/41).

44. Outside of these hours, the Service Desk provided a voicemail service. Any voicemail messages left by branches were to be retrieved and processed by the Service Desk from 8.00am on the following working day (FSL_04/32 and FSL_04/33).

The Wednesday Peak

45. The issue of the 'Wednesday Peak' was referred to in the First Corporate Statement at paragraph 144. Monthly Progress Reports for May 1999 (FSL_04/42) and June 1999 (FSL_04/43) noted that Customer Satisfaction was low due to the responsiveness of the Service Desk to the Wednesday Peak. As a result, support on Wednesdays and Thursdays was increased by introducing an 'expert domains' function on the Service Desk staffed by Fujitsu, Peritas Limited ("**Peritas**") and POL employees (further detail in relation to the role of Peritas is set out in the Training section below).

Training to the Service Desk

46. Service Desk staff were to be trained in the use of the Horizon system (FSL_04/44). According to the 1997 Horizon Systems Helpdesk Operations Manual, training plans would be created and maintained for Service Desk staff. It was the responsibility of the HSH Manager to design and implement a suitable induction and training programme for new staff joining the Service Desk (FSL_04/45). Fujitsu has identified various Service Desk newsletters which referred to training opportunities for Service Desk staff (see, for example, FSL_04/46 and FSL_04/47).

47. Performance was managed and monitored through SLTs, which included the time taken to answer and resolve certain types of call and the retrieval of voicemail messages (FSL_04/32).

48. From October 2006 to June 2014, performance was managed through both SLTs and Operational Level Targets ("**OLTs**"), which included the Service Desk's response time to customer complaints (FSL_04/33). OLTs only applied within the hours of 9.00am to 5.30pm Monday to Friday excluding Bank Holidays

(FSL_04/33 and FSL_04/35). The Service Desk was to use reasonable endeavours to supply daily performance statistics by midday on the next working day (FSL_04/33).

49. During the same period, Fujitsu was to monitor the quality of the Service Desk to ensure it met POL's specifications as documented within the Working Document (FSL_04/34). The monitoring could include recording calls, where reasonably practicable, for the purposes of monitoring call control, customer satisfaction, knowledge and system use. POL was to agree the method and timescale with Fujitsu, and POL reserved the right to audit the quality scoring.

Systems Management Service

<u>Legacy Horizon</u>

50. The Systems Management Service was provided by the SMC. The Service Descriptions for the Systems Management Service in the context of Legacy Horizon were initially set out in the Codified Agreement (see, for example, FSL_04/31) and later in a Service Description dated 18 December 2002 (FSL_04/48), which was withdrawn in January 2010 (FSL_04/49). Before the withdrawal, the primary elements of the service were:

    a.   an event management service; and

    b.   a software distribution service, allowing new and updated software to be deployed and remotely installed across the network.

51. The Service Description explains events as "*indications of conditions that have operational significance. They include software, hardware or security conditions that may require investigation and also include occurrences of events such as low battery in PIN Pads.*"

52. In addition to these services, the Systems Management Service included:

a.   Software repository management;

b.   Asset management, including maintenance of an asset register;

c.   Configuration management;

d.   Support for other services, including the Engineer Service;

e.   Business continuity testing; and

f.   A time synchronisation service.

53.   The Systems Management Service was for Fujitsu's internal use only and was available 24 hours a day, every day of the year.

54.   SMC staff were to be "*appropriately trained*". It was the responsibility of the SMC Team Leader to ensure training plans were created and maintained for each member of staff and that "*the required training outlined in their individual plans*" was received (FSL_04/50).

55.   Examples of the types of training that SMC teams would attend can be found at FSL_04/51 and FSL_04/52. In November 2002, a review of the SMC Training Strategy highlighted improvements to be made going forward, based on feedback from SMC staff (FSL_04/53 and FSL_04/54).

HNG-X

56.   Like the Systems Management Service in Legacy Horizon, the primary services for HNG-X also comprised an event management service and a software distribution service. The Systems Management Service also provided a system monitoring service (FSL_04/55 to FSL_04/60).

57.   The relevant Service Descriptions noted that the SMC was a first line support team that also had responsibilities to provide certain second line support functions (FSL_04/5).

58. Although the event management and software distribution services remained broadly the same, the Service Descriptions provided that all new platforms in HNG-X would have the appropriate level of performance monitoring software installed.

59. Once a system or network condition had been identified, the Systems Management Service was expected to raise an appropriate incident either via the Service Desk or through Fujitsu's incident management systems. The Systems Management Service would also provide service reporting for distribution to POL.

60. From April 2014, activity relating to POL systems Credence and POLSAP were excluded from the Systems Management Service and moved to separate services (FSL_04/58).

61. Similarly to Legacy Horizon, the Systems Management Service for HNG-X was for Fujitsu's internal use only and was available 24 hours a day, every day of the year.

Reconciliation Service

62. The Inquiry has asked Fujitsu to provide information in relation to the "Business Support Section" and the Management Support Unit ("**MSU**"). Fujitsu has been unable to identify documents relating to a Business Support Section; however, Fujitsu has identified documents relating to the Business Support Unit. Details in relation to the Business Support Unit ("**BSU**") are set out below.

Legacy Horizon

63. The BSU Incident Reconciliation Procedures for Release NR2 dated November 1998 explain that the BSU was responsible for ensuring that all APS transactions which occurred at a branch counter reached the intended clients (for example,

that payment of a customer's gas bill reached the system of the relevant energy company) (FSL_04/61). The procedures explain that details of these transactions had to pass through a number of system boundaries which may have caused rejections (or non-deliveries) and it was the BSU that would progress those transactions. At that time, the BSU was then said to have generated various reconciliation reports, some of which were internal and some of which were provided to POL.

64. The APS Reconciliation Report Delivery Process from August 1999 then explains that the BSU was disbanded following the withdrawal of the Benefits Agency from the Pathway Project and the MSU was formed (FSL_04/62).

65. Since at least September 1999, the MSU has supported operation in areas including:

    a.   Management information systems;

    b.   Information technology equipment;

    c.   EPOSS and APS transaction reconciliation, including working with the Customer Service Problem Manager to resolve reconciliation problems; and

    d.   Performance benchmarking.

66. Further detail in relation to the role of the MSU in the context of Legacy Horizon is set out in the Customer Services Infrastructure Operations Manual (FSL_04/63 and FSL_04/64).

67. Both the BSU and MSU formed part of Fujitsu's Reconciliation Service during the time of Legacy Horizon. With the introduction of Network Banking, Fujitsu understands that reconciliation occurred at two levels:

a. The counter reconciling with the "client" (in the context of Network Banking, this would have been the bank to which payment is being made); and

b. The counter reconciling with POL's own central systems,

(see, for example, FSL_04/65 to FSL_04/67).

68. During this time, the Reconciliation Service generated and circulated a number of reconciliation reports, including those described in the following documents:

a. TPS Reconciliation and Incident Management Procedures dating from December 2002 to October 2005 (FSL_04/68 to FSL_04/71); and

b. Network Banking Reconciliation and Incident Management Procedures, as referenced above, was amended in May 2005 to capture all "On Line Services". At the time, these services included banking transactions, debit and credit card transactions and electronic top-up transactions (FSL_04/72).

HNG-X

69. The Reconciliation Service continued during HNG-X. Examples of Service Descriptions during this time are at FSL_04/73 to FSL_04/76.

70. Fujitsu understands that a number of reports were given to POL containing statements of reconciliation across agreed boundary points. Details of these reports are set out in the End-to-End Reconciliation Reporting Service Description (FSL_04/77 to FSL_04/80). Transactions that Fujitsu could not reconcile were referred to as "Exceptions", which were also to be identified and reported to POL, and addressed by the Reconciliation Service (see Reconciliation and Incident Management, Joint Working Document: FSL_04/81 and FSL_04/82).

71. The Reconciliation Service was available 9.00am to 5.30pm Mondays to Fridays, excluding Bank Holidays. Although it is noted that the process of reconciliation is provided on an on-going and automated basis.

72. SLTs and OLTs for the Reconciliation Service are set out in the Service Descriptions.

Business and System Incidents

73. In the context of reconciliation and incident management, a 'Business Incident' is defined in the relevant Service Descriptions as a "*'symptom' of an underlying cause – e.g., the effect of the system fault on the resulting reconciliation or settlement information sent to Post Office.*" A 'System Incident' is then defined as the underlying 'cause' of a Business Incident.

74. Business Incidents could be raised by:

    a.   The Fujitsu Reconciliation Service;

    b.   POL; or

    c.   The Third Line Support Service (as discussed in more detail below).

75. Business Incident Management System ("**BIMS**") reports were raised to log Business Incidents. A BIMS report was designed to report the progress of a Business Incident to resolution.

Third Line Software Support Service

76. The Third Line Software Support Service provided third line application support functions and technical support. From the time of the Initial Go Live of Legacy Horizon, this role was undertaken by the European Development and Support Centre ("**EDSC**") (FSL_04/83). The service was later delivered by the SSC (FSL_04/5).

77. The technical support provided by the Third Line Support Service included (FSL_04/84 and FSL_04/85):

    a. Investigating and resolving new software incidents within the POL branch infrastructure escalated from the Service Desk or SMC. It provided software fixes, as required, to branches, counters and/or data centres. Ownership and management of the incident remained with the Service Desk that logged the incident;

    b. Producing and authorising workarounds and updates to entries within the KEL database; and

    c. Receiving solutions developed by the Application Support Service to resolve incidents.

78. According to an Operational Level Agreement dated June 2003, one of the roles of the SSC was to hold *"workshops and skills transfer sessions relating to technical aspects of the Pathway solution and diagnostic techniques"* for Service Desk staff (FSL_04/86). For examples of these sessions, see FSL_04/87 and FSL_04/88.

79. The Third Line Support Service was intended to be for Fujitsu's internal use and was not generally directly available to POL or postmasters. It was available 24 hours per day but provided only on an on-call basis outside of 9.00am to 5.30pm Monday to Friday and Bank Holidays (FSL_04/84 and FSL_04/85).

Application Support Service (Fourth Line Support)

80. Prior to August 2006 and in relation to Legacy Horizon, the Incident Management Processes (see, for example, FSL_04/2) and "End to End Application Support Strategy" set out the role of fourth line support (see, for example, FSL_04/4).

81. In relation to HNG-X, the service description for the Application Support Service, or Fourth Line Support Service, (the "**Application Support Service**") was initially produced in August 2006 (FSL_04/89), and included the following areas of support:

    a.   Application support in the context of software fixes; and

    b.   The investigation and resolution of new software incidents which could not otherwise be resolved by the Third Line Support Service.

82. The Application Support Service was delivered by Fujitsu's Application Division teams and, later, by certain overseas teams (FSL_04/5, FSL_04/90 and FSL_04/91).

83. From at least October 2010, the Application Support Service also provided support in respect of the POLSAP application, details of which were set out in the POLSAP Hosting Service: Joint Working Document (FSL_04/92 to FSL_04/94)

84. The "Operational Level Agreement for 4th Line Support of HNGX" (FSL_04/95 and FSL_04/96) describes the obligations of the Application Support Service and the Third Line Support Service. These obligations include (but are not limited to) the Third Line Support Service ensuring:

    a.   All calls passed to the Application Support Service are logged in the call management system (Peak);

    b.   All problems where a resolution is already known by the support community are filtered out; and

    c.   Calls are escalated in a timely manner.

85. Obligations owed by the Application Support Service to the Third Line Support Service include ensuring that resolution information recorded in the relevant

systems and that information and training relating to new releases is provided (FSL_04/86).

86. If the Application Support Service determined that a software incident resulted from a "known error", this was to be communicated to the Third Line Support Service. The relevant KEL record would then be identified and updated appropriately, and information would be disseminated to the Service Desk for use in relation to other similar incidents.

87. The Application Support Service also provided support by ensuring that Fujitsu's Third Line Support Service was made aware of the symptoms that generated the incident and would document that information so that it could also be made available to both the Service Desk and the Systems Management Service. Any resolutions or workarounds that were returned to the Third Line Support Service would have been tested and authorised in accordance with the agreed release authorisation process (FSL_04/97).

88. In addition to incident resolution, the Application Support Service also provided the Third Line Support Service with documentation relating to new Releases so that the Third Line Support Service could become familiar with any new products or services before they were released in the live environment.

89. From September 2013, the Application Support Service was also required to undertake the following on an annual basis (FSL_04/98):

    a. Deliver secure coding training;

    b. Maintain the secure guidelines; and

    c. Maintain the secure coding template.

90. There were no specific SLTs that applied to the service (FSL_04/89).

Engineering Service

91. The Engineer or Engineering Service ("**Engineering Service**") comprised an on-site replacement or repair service, for Horizon equipment at Post Office branches and other designated locations, together with associated support and administrative functions (for example, training centres and the NBSC) (FSL_04/99 and FSL_04/100). Associated support and administrative functions included tracking hardware assets, Local Area Network ("**LAN**") support and Portable Appliance Testing ("**PAT**") (FSL_04/99 and FSL_04/100).

92. The Engineering Service was provided by support engineers, who were Fujitsu employees or third-party subcontractors appointed by Fujitsu ("**Support Engineers**") (FSL_04/99 and FSL_04/100).

93. To access the on-site replacement or repair service, Post Office branches would report equipment and hardware faults to the Service Desk. Initially the Service Desk would attempt to diagnose and resolve the reported faults. If the fault could not be resolved and service restored to the branch, the Service Desk would arrange a Support Engineer to attend the branch to resolve the issue (FSL_04/99 and FSL_04/100).

94. Originally, the Engineering Service was available from 8.00am to 6.30pm Monday to Friday excluding all Bank Holidays (FSL_04/99). Then from approximately August 2013, the Engineering Service was available from 8.00am to 8.00pm Monday to Friday, and 8.00am to 5.00pm on Saturdays excluding all Bank Holidays (FSL_04/99 and FSL_04/100).

95. The associated support and administrative functions noted above were provided by Fujitsu to Post Office branches and POL on an ongoing basis (FSL_04/99 and FSL_04/100).

96. The Engineering Service was primarily responsible for SLTs which related to the level of service that POL required from Fujitsu (FSL_04/99 and FSL_04/100). The primary SLT for the Engineering Service concerned the time taken to resolve incidents (FSL_04/100).

Management Information Service

97. The primary aim of the Management Information Service ("**MIS**") was to provide POL with performance reporting and management information relating to Horizon services (FSL_04/101).

<u>Legacy Horizon</u>

98. The requirement for a MIS service was initially set out in Schedule E01 of the Codified Agreement (FSL_04/25). According to the MIS Service Description dated 20 December 2002 (FSL_04/101), during Legacy Horizon, the main elements of the MIS were to deliver to POL:

   a. The monthly Service Review Book, which contained various information including a management summary of highlights from the previous month's service delivery, a high-level review of each supplied service, service volumetric data, and a high-level review of problem management and cross domain problem statuses (amongst other things);

   b. Management information, including Network Banking management information, Order Book Control Service and Automated Payment Service client transaction management information, and capacity management information;

   c. Support on Miscellaneous Data Queries from POL; and

    d.   Support in relation to the calculation of liquidated damages that may have been owed to POL from Fujitsu as a result of not achieving particular service levels under service level agreements.

HNG-X

99. The MIS continued following the introduction of HNG-X (see, for example, (FSL_04/102), with certain changes, including (i) the delivery of a monthly Summary Service Overview until around November 2013, and (ii) a Transaction Time Benchmarking Service.

Additional Support Functions

100. In addition to the services described above, the Inquiry has also asked that Fujitsu provide some further information in relation to a number of other roles, fora and teams. To the extent these additional support functions are not addressed above, explanations are set out below.

Customer Service Problem Manager / Problem Manager

101. The role of Problem Manager was introduced in at least May 1998 to manage and co-ordinate the resolution of problems (FSL_04/103) by allocating to the individual most capable of handling the particular problem raised. Where appropriate, the role was to be performed by the service manager of the relevant service. For example, for at least the period 1998 to 2002, where financial reconciliation exceptions occurred more than once, a "Problem Incident" was reported to a Customer Service Problem Manager after the relevant support unit had dealt with the financial reconciliation itself. Details in relation to the resolution of financial reconciliation problems during this time are set out in the "Customer Services Infrastructure Services Operations Manual" (see, for example, FSL_04/63, FSL_04/64, FSL_04/104 and FSL_04/105).

102. The duties of the Problem Manager included developing a resolution plan, logging the problem on the problem database and keeping the database (and any parties involved in the resolution plan) updated, monitoring progress and then closing problems once all relevant parties agreed that the problem has been resolved.

103. Problem Managers were a means of liaison between the Service Management teams of Fujitsu and POL, and different processes and procedures were followed depending on the nature and impact of the problem (FSL_04/106).

104. Further detail in relation to the role of Problem Managers and the procedures followed are set out in the "Customer Service Problem Management Process" exhibited to this statement (FSL_04/107 to FSL_04/115).

Field Service Management

105. Fujitsu's Field Service Management ("**FSM**") team was operational during the Legacy Horizon period following the national rollout. Based on a draft "ICL Pathway Field Service Manager – Role Definition and Overview" dated 13 September 2000, the role of the FSM team was intended to encompass both Problem Management and participation in the Management Care Visit Programme. The FSM team was intended to be responsible for the proactive identification and management of system problems that affected individual Post Office branches. Root causes to problems were to be identified, and mitigating actions applied (FSL_04/116). An example of a RAR for a Field Service Manager role is at FSL_04/117.

106. The FSM team was field-based and spread geographically across the UK. Each Field Service Manager was responsible for an area of the UK. The role operated within the overall framework of the Customer Service Problem Management

Process, the End-to End Customer Complaint Process, and the ICL Pathway/POCL Problem Management Interface Agreement (FSL_04/116).

107. In relation to Problem Management, the FSM had responsibility for:

    a.   Identification of "Problem Offices": The FSM team was to proactively seek to identify offices displaying indications of Fujitsu related problems, through reference to various sources of information (FSL_04/116). These sources included: (i) an analysis of HSH call logs on a weekly or monthly basis, (ii) appointment as a Problem Manager within the Customer Services team, or (iii) referral of site-specific complaints by the Customer Services Strategic Services team under the End-to-End Customer Complaint Process (FSL_04/116).

    b.   Communication of Problem Offices to Post Office Network ("**PON**") Business Service Management ("**BSM**"): Each week, the FSM team was intended to pass to the PON BSM a consolidated list of branches which had been identified as having potential problems, and which a Field Service Manager would wish to visit in order to assist with assessing the problem and identifying the appropriate course of action. PON BSM would then, following certain internal POL processes, contact the relevant outlets and advise them that an ICL Pathway Field Service Manager would be contacting them to arrange a visit (FSL_04/116).

    c.   Visits to branches: During a branch visit, the Field Service Manager was to, amongst other things, seek to identify any potential external influences that could give rise to the system problems, and gather all information relating to the circumstances under which the problems

arise (FSL_04/116). Following the site visit, the FSM would produce an Action Plan to progress any Fujitsu related issues. Details of this action plan would be entered on the Problem Management Database and updated as resolution is progressed (FSL_04/116).

108. It was intended that the FSM team would participate in the Management Care Visit Programme (FSL_04/116). Further details of the Management Care Visit Programme are provided below.

109. As noted above, the FSM team interacted with other ICL Pathway teams and processes in discharging their role. These interactions are set out diagrammatically in (FSL_04/118).

Client Interface Management

110. The Client Interface Management was a unit responsible for the introduction and ongoing management of services relating to client interfaces, such as HAPS, APS clients, LFS and TIP. Further details of this unit are contained in the Operations Manuals for the Customer Services Directorate dating from November 2001 to May 2002 (FSL_04/23, FSL_04/24 and FSL_04/119).

Operations Service Unit

111. From at least January 2001, the Operations Services Unit was responsible for the following tasks, amongst others:

    a.   Providing a Duty Manager who was the single point of contact for live service issues, 7 days a week, 24 hours a day;

    b.   Problem management, which entailed unit staff taking on the role of problem manager where appropriate;

    c.   Business continuity services;

d.   Supplier management, specifically monitoring and reviewing supplier and service performance on a daily, weekly and monthly basis;

e.   Change management;

f.   Operations support, which provided administrative support for the Change, Duty and Problem Management processes;

g.   Reference data management (which appears to have ceased in November 2001); and

h.   Application service management (which appears to have ceased in November 2001).

(see "CS Operations Services Operations Manual" dated 24 January 2001: FSL_04/23 and FSL_04/120)

112.   Subsequently, Operations Support became responsible for managing other services including the non-polling report (including analysing and investigating non-polling incidents), managing electronic signatures for operational system changes and managing security passes for Fujitsu staff visiting Post Office branches (FSL_04/23).

Strategic Services Unit

113.   Further details of the Strategic Services Unit ("**SSU**") are set out in the Customer Service Infrastructure Services Operations Manual. This provided, amongst other things, that the SSU was responsible for ensuring that Horizon systems being operated within Post Office branches were properly implemented and remained useable for the postmaster (and NBSC) when conducting everyday business. It was also responsible for ensuring a high level of customer satisfaction (FSL_04/105). The SSU also had responsibility for processes, including in relation to customer satisfaction and managing monitored feedback

on service delivery from the Service Visit Reply (or "**SVR**") process (FSL_04/23). The SSU would review feedback on Reply Cards left at the Post Office branch following an engineer's visit that allowed a postmaster to comment on the quality of the service provided by the engineer during their visit, and on the service provided by the Service Desk.

Outlet Business Change Team

114. During the Legacy Horizon and HNG-X periods, the Outlet Business Change (later known as Operational Business Change) ("**OBC**") service, supported operational business changes within the POL's branch network (see, for example, FSL_04/121 and FSL_04/122).

115. The service was primarily concerned with delivering physical and configuration changes to the Horizon counter at Post Office branches when requested by POL, including the following:

    a.   the supply of Horizon equipment;

    b.   the installation and removal of Horizon equipment (for example, branch counters/terminals); and

    c.   moving Horizon equipment within and between outlets.

116. The OBC service was delivered by the OBC team, and the service was provided in planned, unplanned or emergency circumstances, including the opening or closure of a Post Office branch (FSL_04/24, FSL_04/121 and FSL_04/122).

117. To access the service, POL would submit a change order to Fujitsu (also known as an OBC Branch Change work order request). The performance of the OBC service was measured against SLTs and OLTs.

TRAINING

118. Fujitsu has been asked by the Inquiry to provide details relating to the training programme that was offered in respect of the Horizon system to non-ICL Pathway/Fujitsu employees.

119. As set out in more detail below, most, if not all, of the training provided to postmasters by Fujitsu took place before and during the national rollout, when the Fujitsu entity responsible for management of the Horizon contract was ICL Pathway. Accordingly, in this section of the corporate statement, references to both ICL Pathway and Fujitsu shall be used to reflect which entity was responsible for management of the Horizon contract at the relevant time.

Training Programme Requirements

120. ICL Pathway's proposed approach to the training programme for the implementation of the Horizon system was initially submitted as part of the contractual solution during the tender process for the Pathway Programme.

121. The provision of training was included in the services to be provided by ICL Pathway under the Related Agreements in 1996. The contractual requirements for the training programme were later set out in the Codified Agreement. Requirements 531-534 and Requirement 915 of Schedule A15 of the Codified Agreement stipulated that:

   a. by Requirement 531, training was to be provided *"to enable POCL's target audience to achieve acceptable standards in key competencies as defined by POCL"*. The 'target audience' included counter users, managers, trainers, auditors and certain non-user groups, *"i.e. retail network managers, regional helpline staff, and account teams in business centres"*;

    b. by Requirement 534, training was to take account of users' experience of automated products and their differing abilities to learn. The training requirements for different groups was to be agreed between ICL Pathway and POL; and

    c. by Requirement 915, training should *"enable POCL's staff or Agents to achieve acceptable standards in key competencies in the use of the POCL Services"* and *"incorporate the development design and delivery of agreed training events and support materials"*.

122. The key measurables of the training service set out in Requirement 915 included that:

    a. *"training shall not be delivered more than five (5) POCL Core Days before"* the Horizon system went 'live' in the relevant branch;

    b. *"training shall have received a positive rating of not less than 95% as a result of a training measurement questionnaire"*;

    c. the training services should *"ensure that 95% of trainees on completion of the training shall be able to demonstrate achievement of the agreed level of competence, which shall reflect a score of 90% for knowledge related areas for transactions and the operating platform"*; and

    d. competence levels *"shall be measured…to second level of the Kirkpatrick model"*. Fujitsu understands the Kirkpatrick model is a globally recognised method of evaluating the results of training and learning programs.

123. By Reference 915 of Schedule A16 of the Codified Agreement:

a. ICL Pathway was to provide a maximum of 12,600 training courses, broken down into 5,504 Counter Assistants Courses lasting one day (the "**Counter Assistants Course**"), 7,004 Managers Courses lasting one and a half days (the "**Counter Managers Course**"), 25 'Train the Trainer' courses, 34 Auditor courses and 33 POL helpline courses. The intended audience and specification for these courses is set out in more detail below.

b. Following national rollout "*all outstanding or ongoing training will be the responsibility of POCL*", including update training for new software releases or the training of new staff, unless ICL Pathway agreed to provide additional counter staff training (which would be charged in accordance with the rate card in paragraph 8.3 of Schedule A12 of the Codified Agreement). User training services provided by Fujitsu were no longer a requirement from the date of the Varied and Restated Codified Agreement in 2002.

124. Responsibility for planning, developing, delivering, and assessing training and education in relation to the rollout of the Horizon system was sub-contracted by ICL Pathway to Peritas, a subsidiary of ICL PLC, under the terms of a Purchase Agreement dated 26 July 1996 (the "**Peritas Purchase Agreement**"). According to publicly available information, the principal business activity of Peritas was the provision of training and related services. Peritas was awarded the National Training Award in 1997 and the IT Training Company of the Year Award between 1994 and 1997. Peritas changed its name to ICL Training Services Limited in 1998 and to KnowledgePool Limited ("**KnowledgePool**") in 1999.

125. Peritas' training specifications with respect to the Horizon system were set out in Appendix 1 to the Peritas Purchase Agreement. This required Peritas staff to undergo a 'gear up' before delivering training events, which would *"verify their capabilities"*, train them in POL *"culture, policy, procedures"* and *"establish the capability"* to deliver the relevant training event (FSL_04/123). Peritas was also required to ensure the effectiveness of the training programme was consistent with the Kirkpatrick model. The processes for doing so were set out in a Training Evaluation Paper and included (i) obtaining user feedback on the course, and (ii) testing user competence on using the system (FSL_04/124).

126. Further detail on the specific role of Peritas in relation to the implementation of the Horizon system is set out below.

Development of the Training Specification

127. According to Change Proposal 1294 (which was raised in June 1998), the original training programme under the Related Agreements was based upon ICL Pathway providing a 4-hour classroom-based training event, with subsequent exercises using workbooks in branches. This was to be followed by an *"after care visit"* to the branch to conduct a competency test. The amendments proposed in Change Proposal 1294 included, (i) removing the requirement for the competency test to be carried out during the aftercare visit, as it would instead be conducted during the appropriate training event, and (ii) the aftercare visit would be timed to coincide with the installation / go live dates for each branch (FSL_04/125).

128. Release 1A was rolled out in the Stroud area in September and October 1996. Given the limited functionality of Release 1A, the scale of the training provided was smaller than that required for later releases. A two-hour workshop was held

with staff which was timed to coincide with installation of the equipment. Exercises, workbooks and quick reference guides were also provided (FSL_04/126). A Lessons Learned report prepared by ICL Pathway in relation to the Initial Go Live ("**IGL**") phase contained a summary taken from a report on the IGL training provided in Stroud. Feedback in the Lessons Learned report included that the "*training and training documentation worked very well for the post masters*", the use of workbook exercises were "*essential for user's confidence*", trainers needed a "*comprehensive understanding*" of POL procedures, and in-branch training "*is not ideal, and if used, time needs to be added to take account of the distractions and interruptions*" (FSL_04/127).

129. The process to achieve development, delivery and sign off for training material for Release 1C onwards was set out in a "*Training development & sign off document*", as follows:

   a. Training Needs Analysis: This involved identifying the business needs to be achieved, setting business objectives, and drafting course specifications and performance indicators.

   b. Training Plans: Peritas was required to produce, (i) a Draft Programme Development Plan mapping out the specification, development schedule and allocation of resources, (ii) a Training Plan setting the objectives, performance standards, proposed media and timings for development of the course to begin, and (iii) a Training Programme Plan mapping out the schedule for the entire training programme. These would be submitted to ICL Pathway for discussion and comment before being signed off by ICL Pathway.

c. Training Course development cycle: This involved the development of training materials and evaluation sheets. Training modules would be scripted by Peritas and subject to peer review, using other trainers as 'students'. When all modules of a training course were in final draft, a 'dry run' would be conducted to ICL Pathway staff. Comments from the dry run were incorporated into the training material.

d. Sign off procedure: The training material to be approved by POL would be delivered to the model office testing team for comment. A dry run would then be delivered to POL, ICL Pathway and the Programme Delivery Authority (the "**PDA**"). More than one dry run would be delivered if significant changes were recommended to the course. Once comments from the dry run had been incorporated, the training event would be signed off by the PDA and ICL Pathway.

e. Delivery cycle: This included sending invitations to POL staff and delivering the training course.

f. User Evaluation Procedure: At the end of each training session, an evaluation form would be completed by each delegate to review the training received and their confidence in using the system. The information from these forms was fed into Peritas' Training Project Administration system which generated weekly reports of attendance and satisfaction. These reports would be submitted to ICL Pathway for monitoring (FSL_04/128). In reviewing its hard copy archives, Fujitsu has located thousands of these evaluation forms in respect of courses held in or around the period 2000 and 2001. In the time available, Fujitsu has scanned and processed a proportional sample of approximately

15% of the hard copy evaluation forms and submitted these to the Inquiry (FSL_04/129 to FSL_04/200). Fujitsu has offered to the Inquiry to scan and process the remaining evaluation forms if it would assist the Inquiry's investigations.

130. In line with the above, in March 1997, Peritas produced a *"Training Needs Analysis"* document in conjunction with ICL Pathway and POL. The analysis was the result of research undertaken by Peritas, which included, (i) reviews with secondees from the Benefits Agency and POL to ICL Pathway, (ii) attendance by Peritas trainers at a postmaster induction course and a Post Office Cash Accounting Course, (iii) *"detailed reviews"* with POL's National Training Consultant, (iv) visits to six reference Post Offices in the Swindon area, and (v) supplementary discussions with postmasters.

131. Peritas identified the training events required to satisfy the baseline objective of the training programme, which was stated as being "[t]*o ensure that all staff who work in post offices are competent in the use of the automated platform, are aware of the impact on operational procedures caused by the introduction of the platform and that specialist staff are provided with the appropriate additional information to perform their job role within an automated post office*" (FSL_04/201). The conclusions reached in the Training Needs Analysis included that:

    a. a 'dedicated classroom event' had been identified as being the most efficient process for initial learning. The venue must, however, be readily accessible (i.e. 15-30 minutes travel); and

b. computer-based training would provide consolidation and back-up support. This was to be provided through a Training Mode within the Horizon system (FSL_04/201).

132. This document also set out the competencies required of different groupings of staff within POL, which informed the specific training courses intended for those groupings. Draft course specifications were set out in Appendix D.

133. Broadly, the proposed training programme in the Training Needs Analysis comprised:

a. the one-and-a-half-day Counter Managers Course, targeted at all postmasters, identified POL managers, and other staff who were required to understand the full functionality of the Horizon system, including balancing reports. According to the draft specification for this course, the first four modules were dedicated to giving delegates an overview of the system hardware and desktop menu and taking them through the transaction screens which would be used to process various transactions, such as the sale of stock items using various payment methods, bill payments, DVLA licensing, bank withdrawals and cashing cheques, and voiding, modifying or reversing transactions. Modules five to seven would instruct delegates in generating reports and balancing activities at the end of the business day and, separately, at the end of the business week;

b. the one-day Counter Assistants Course, targeted at postmaster assistants and counter assistants (some of whom may attend the Counter Managers Course instead). The first four modules of this course mirrored the specification for the Counter Managers Course. Modules

five and six would instruct delegates on the procedure for balancing an individual counter position and, briefly, the office balancing process;

c. a two-day course for specialist POL staff, such as auditors, which was based on the content of the Counter Managers Course but tailored to meet the needs of the specific teams in question;

d. a five-day 'Train the Trainer' course for POL trainers. Further information in relation to this course is set out below (FSL_04/201).

134. In June 1998, ICL Pathway produced a Training and User Awareness Baseline Document which set out an updated approach to the training programme. This reflected the proposed programme in the Training Needs Analysis, as detailed above. Some aspects of the programme differed from the original programme, including the following:

a. The User Awareness Event ("**UAE**") was no longer mandatory, as initially proposed;

b. There would be no workbook-based learning during the training events, but workbook exercises would be provided and recommended for use in-branch. Examples of the workbooks can be found at (FSL_04/202 and FSL_04/212);

c. The 'after care visit' would not be undertaken by Peritas staff. According to Change Proposal 1292, this would be the responsibility of Horizon Field Support Officers ("**HFSOs**") (FSL_04/213); and

d. There would no longer be a specialist training help desk to support distance learning (FSL_04/214).

135. The Training and User Awareness Baseline document also set out details of the approach to the 'gear up' of Peritas trainers, which was to take three weeks. This included one week's training to be a postmaster, one week's training covering the "*training techniques associated with the Horizon programme*" and one week's training to "*deliver and understand the Horizon system/good practice*" (FSL_04/214). The purpose of the 'gear up' was to ensure Peritas staff were "*familiar with the functions of both automated and non-automated post offices and are competent to fulfil their role*" (FSL_04/201).

136. In addition to the training events detailed above, branch managers and postmasters in affected branches would be invited to attend a Management Infrastructure Briefing ("**MIB**"). This was part of the 'Split Implementation Programme Strategy', whereby the rollout of the Horizon system was to be split into an 'Infrastructure' phase and an 'Installation' phase. The objectives of the MIB were to introduce the Horizon system and inform delegates of the reasons for a change to the business. The event was to be delivered to 50-100 managers at a time and focussed on informing managers of the reasons for the automation programme, explaining the overall infrastructure and implementation programme and informing them of where to gain help and support (FSL_04/215).

137. Over 200 branches were invited to attend MIB events which took place in May 1998. 100 of these branches were then selected to take part in the Live Trial (FSL_04/216). The MIB was a key event in the 'Infrastructure' phase, as it was used to inform managers of their role and responsibilities in order to prepare for the way forward. In order to ensure the MIB contained correct, relevant information as the training programme adapted throughout rollout, a change

process was put in place to ensure errors and changes could be actioned quickly and effectively (FSL_04/217).

138. During the 12-week 'Installation' phase, the UAE would take place, aimed at all personnel working within or providing support to Post Office branches, to give an insight into the major changes affecting working practices and the implications of the implementation of Horizon (FSL_04/215). As with the MIB, to ensure the UAE was providing correct and relevant information as the rollout programme progressed and adapted, ICL Pathway put in place a change programme to ensure changes and errors could be implemented quickly and effectively (FSL_04/218).

139. The course specification for the UAE outlined that it was to be delivered in a venue with a theatre style layout, capable of accommodating up to 100 delegates, and would be presented by a speaker from ICL Pathway supported by a POL representative (FSL_04/219).

Training Programme – Live Trial

140. The programme of training and awareness events planned for Release 2 and the Live Trial of Horizon was set out in a Training Strategy document in March 1999 (FSL_04/216).

141. All branches participating in the Live Trial were encouraged to attend UAEs. This included the 204 branches which had previously attended UAEs as part of the training provided in respect of Release 1C. Branches that did not attend a UAE were provided with a User Awareness Briefing Pack "*to ensure that they had the appropriate information available to them*".

142. Within the five working days prior to installation of the Horizon system, Counter Assistants and Counter Managers Courses would take place. Both courses were

delivered in a classroom environment to a maximum of six attendees at a time, and delegates were required to pass a competency test (the Performance Standard Assessment ("**PSA**")) on completion. Appendix A to the Training Strategy Document lists amendments to these courses implemented after Release 1C (FSL_04/216). The five-day window was later extended to a 10-day window for some branches (FSL_04/220).

143. Before a branch could 'go live' on the Horizon system, it had to achieve Minimum Training Compliance ("**MTC**"). This meant that a sufficient number of staff in each branch had to be trained to use Horizon under normal circumstances by passing the competency test. The exact number for each branch was defined by POL (FSL_04/221). Peritas was required to report to ICL Pathway on competency levels, including whether delegates passed or failed the competency test (FSL_04/123). If delegates failed to pass the competency test, they would be scheduled to attend remedial training and re-take the test.

Training Programme – National Rollout

144. According to an ICL Pathway Implementation presentation dated February 2001, the scope of the training programme for national rollout had required 72,000 counter staff to be trained, delivery of nine different types of training course, and provision of 2,000 standalone training platforms. At its peak, 120 courses were being delivered each day. The average age of the delegates to be trained was 65, with the eldest being 92 (FSL_04/222).

145. The training programme for the national rollout was set out in version 11 of the Training and User Awareness Baseline Document (FSL_04/223). Training during national rollout was to include the UAE, MIB, a Managers Course and a Counter Assistants Course. The content, structure and format of these were intended to

be identical to that provided during the Live Trial (FSL_04/216 and FSL_04/224). ICL Pathway was required to provide monthly, weekly and daily reports to POL (via Peritas) containing statistical and management information to measure ICL Pathway's compliance with the criteria of Requirement 915. The information to be included in these reports included the results of the training programme, trends in feedback, and forecasts of when offices scheduled for installation of the Horizon system were expected to meet MTC (FSL_04/225).

146. ICL Pathway would also provide specialist training to groups other than those working in branches, including:

   a. a 'Train the Trainer' Course lasting five days, aimed at POL trainers who would be training existing and new staff on using the Horizon system following its implementation. This course included the content of the UAE and MIB for information purposes, and would cover delivery of both the Managers and Counter Assistants courses. Peritas staff would support the first live training delivered by the newly trained trainer to end-users, following which the newly trained trainer would be accredited (FSL_04/216). This accreditation would last to the end of Release NR2. Trainer upgrade training was available with each new release of Horizon software (FSL_04/226).

   b. Auditors and specialist staff within POL were to be provided with a two-day course based on the content delivered to branch managers and tailored to the needs of POL's national audit team. This course looked at the use of the Horizon system from an auditor's perspective and concentrated on possible areas of fraud and how to detect them. By September 2000, this course was three days in length. The first day

focussed on the functions and usage of the Horizon system. The second day focussed on balancing and the suspense account, and the final day focussed on systems for investigation in a Horizon environment (FSL_04/227).

    c. HFSOs were *"resourced from within POCL"* and their role was to support the installation of Horizon by providing onsite support to branches. HFSOs were to be assigned to a branch on the day of installation and would remain at the branch for the following two working days to assist with migration activities and provide support and advice to branch staff. Training was provided to prepare the HFSO to assist with implementation before, during and after it took place in branches. The HFSO course comprised a three-day induction by POL, in addition to the one-and-a-half-day Counter Managers Course, and a separate five-day course covering the specific requirements of a HFSO (FSL_04/216). The second week of the HFSO course focussed on how to migrate Post Office data into the Horizon system once it had been installed by ICL Pathway. The HFSO course would be carried out in a training room environment which was set up to simulate the whole migration process using multiple training scenarios (FSL_04/228).

147. On 19 May 1999, during the Acceptance process, Acceptance Incident 218 ("**AI 218**") was raised because of deficiencies in the accounting modules of the Counter Managers Training Course, stating that "[t]*he Managers Training Course is not acceptable due to deficiencies in the accounting modules. In the live environment, the training given did not equip the users to perform the completion*

of office cash accounts. This is a basic POCL function that is central to running and accounting for the POCL network" (FSL_04/229).

148. AI 218 was categorised as a 'high' severity incident. Problems were being encountered by users when using the stock unit balancing and cash account parts of the system, which resulted in high volumes of help desk calls and disruption in branches (FSL_04/226). Reasons for this, as identified by ICL Pathway, included uncertainty about POL business rules and how to apply them in the new system (FSL_04/230).

149. In response to the issues raised in AI 218, POL and ICL Pathway agreed to amend the training courses. CCN 519a was raised on 16 July 1999 to amend the contractual terms and implement the following changes requested by POL:

    a. courses should reflect changes to the balancing process which had been made since Live Trial, and should have an *"increased stress on balancing elements"*;

    b. the addition of extra exercises and practice to the Managers Course; and

    c. time previously spent on the Counter Assistants Course dealing with the Benefit Encashment Service (**"BES"**) should instead be spent on balancing or, for those who do not preform balancing, on more practice using the system (FSL_04/231).

150. Suggested course specifications for the amended courses were appended to Change Proposal 2081 (FSL_04/232).

151. The following steps were then taken by ICL Pathway:

    a. The Counter Manager Course was revised to emphasise and provide more coverage of the balancing process, with much of the second day of the course devoted to this.

b. The HFSO training programme was revised to provide more opportunities to practice migration processes. ICL Pathway re-trained HFSOs during Live Trial to increase coverage of balancing and related topics. ICL Pathway also developed a new three-day course for HFSOs to be attended after the POL induction training and before the five-day HFSO course. This provided in-depth coverage of balancing, the cash account, reversals, use of the suspense account, error detection and correction. ICL Pathway reported to POL that this new course had been *"very well received"* by POL HFSOs and POL observers, *"who were pleased that their comments from Live Trial were taken onboard* [sic]*"* (FSL_04/229).

c. Additional balancing training was provided on a weekly basis through the use of ICL Trainers. The cost of this was borne by ICL Pathway.

d. The number of 'Transition Executives' (**"TE"**), whose role it was to provide help and support to HFSOs, was doubled to eight, such that an extra TE was added to each region.

e. In July 1999, the Horizon system was installed in 24 additional outlets to form a basis on which the effectiveness of the changes to the training programme could be (and were) demonstrated (FSL_04/230).

152. On 10 August 1999, Bruce McNiven (Director of the Horizon Programme) wrote to John Dicks of ICL Pathway enclosing an evaluation of the changes implemented in relation to AI 218. Mr McNiven stated in this letter that while many of the agreed criteria had been met, *"the training and go-live process relies on the deployment of POCL HFSP recourse...without this resource there would*

have to be a complete revision of the training approach in order to ensure helpdesks were not rendered ineffective by the high level of calls". POL was not willing to reduce the severity rating of AI 218 from 'high' (FSL_04/233).

153. According to the minutes of a POL meeting on 11 August 1999, POL's view was that *"Training has not been adequate… With ICL, we have worked on a range of solutions. While these solutions have improved the position, staff have only been able to cope as well as they do, because of HFSO support"* (FSL_04/234).

154. The following day, Mr Dicks wrote in a letter to Mr McNiven that ICL Pathway *"has done everything it can to improve the training and prepare users for Horizon"*, and that the remaining issues to be addressed, including user confidence in the system, *"will be achieved only through managing the change in POCL business processes such that POCL's target standard approach is adopted across the Post Office network"*. Until this was achieved, *"it will be necessary for POCL to substitute additional support in one form or another"*. For these reasons, ICL Pathway's view was that AI 218 should be closed and no further revisions were required to the training courses, save for *"minor improvements already identified"* (FSL_04/229).

155. On 12 August 1999, ICL Pathway and POL discussed AI 218 at a Management Resolution Meeting. According to the minutes of this meeting, POL repeated its view that the training programme at that time was insufficient to satisfy Requirement 915. ICL Pathway disagreed with this, on the basis that changes to the training courses had already been implemented and a distinction needed to be drawn between the training courses and changes being introduced to POL's business processes (FSL_04/235).

156. On 13 August 1999, a joint workshop was held at which actions were agreed for the resolution of AI 218, including the introduction of a new pre-entry event intended to, (i) *"demystify computers"*, (ii) introduce standard balance terminology, and (iii) explain the change from a manual to an automated system, for approximately 20% of the user population. In response, ICL Pathway offered to develop and run, in conjunction with POL, 370 half-day events for up to 3,700 office managers (FSL_04/230). Potentially suitable candidates for the course would need to be identified by POL (FSL_04/236).

157. As set out in the First Corporate Statement, CSR Acceptance was not achieved by the 16 August 1999 target date specified in the Codified Agreement. AI 218 was one of the three 'Disputed Category A Faults' identified in the Supplemental Agreement as outstanding at the end of the CSR Operational Trial Review period (FSL_04/237).

158. ICL Pathway issued its Acceptance Proposal in relation to AI 218 on 23 August 1999 in which it submitted that the Acceptance Incident should be closed as the 'Clearance Plan' had been successfully implemented. The proposal stated that *"no effort has been spared to develop training events suitable for the wide range of users in the POCL network. However, we strongly maintain that the success of a programme of this size cannot be achieved by training alone. A change management approach must exist for pre-entry and steady state environments as well as for formal training"*. ICL Pathway's position was that the balancing process was too complicated for a high proportion of branches and that training was only part of the *"massive change programme"* that POL was undertaking by automating the Post Office network. The Acceptance Proposal also stated that, since 1996:

a. training events had been extended to provide more detailed training;

b. the training course population had increased from 67,000 to 72,000;

c. the number of training events to be provided by ICL Pathway increased from 12,000 to 12,600 *"to provide contingency for lower than expected attendance"*; and

d. following the cancellation of the benefits card, specific benefit card training was replaced by training focussing on balancing (FSL_04/230).

159. As set out in Fujitsu's First Corporate Statement, CSR Acceptance and authorisation by the Release Authorisation Board for national rollout were deemed to have been achieved on 24 September 1999. The Second Supplemental Agreement dated 24 September 1999 recorded AI 218 as one of the 13 Acceptance Incidents outstanding at the date of the Agreement (FSL_04/238). By the terms of the Second Supplemental Agreement, the parties agreed to use reasonable endeavours to resolve AI 218 in accordance with the Resolution Plan for AI 218 referred to in Schedule 2 of the Second Supplemental Agreement (FSL_04/239).

160. Section 3 of the Resolution Plan for AI 218 recorded that changes had been made to the Counter Managers Course to spend more time principally on stock unit balancing and cash account, and that these changes had proved successful in live events. It also listed the following seven agreed areas for potential improvement in association with AI 218. All activities listed had either been completed or were on schedule to be completed (FSL_04/239).

161. Contractually, ICL Pathway was required to meet the critical success factors set out in the table headed 'Critical Success Factors' in the Resolution Plan. These

included that all branches should be able to complete the cash account balance process and, on average, the NBSC should not receive more than 1.2 calls per week from each branch when performing their first two balances.

162. As part of the Rectification Plan, and following a review of the presentation of the PSA, the methodology which KnowledgePool trainers were to follow when presenting the PSA to delegates was amended. POL had expressed concern that, up to September 1999, no delegates had been passed back to POL as being unable to use the system (FSL_04/240).

163. According to an ICL Pathway Progress Summary for Input to Horizon / Pathway Delivery Meeting dated 24th November 1999, "[a]*ll ICL Pathway actions on the AI 218 Rectification Plan*" were complete and a joint meeting was scheduled with POL on 22 November 1999 to assess performance against the agreed criteria. ICL Pathway's latest commitment had been to submit KnowledgePool's Trainer Quality Monitoring report, which had been done during the week ending 19 November 1999. This progress summary also reported that the pilot of the Pre-Entry Event took place on 9 November 1999 and was "*well received by POCL delegates and Training representatives*" (FSL_04/241).

164. The Trainer Quality Monitoring report explained the processes used to ensure consistency and quality of trainers presenting the Horizon training, based on KnowledgePool's standard procedures which had been adapted for the Horizon project. In summary:

   a. Delegate feedback: Delegates were requested to complete evaluation questionnaires at the end of every session. The scores and comments provided by delegates were recorded against the relevant trainer's record and the KnowledgePool Training Operations Manager ("**TOM**")

would be informed of results which were either below the satisfactory level or exceptionally good. If negative comments were received, the TOM would review all evaluation questionnaires for the course to establish if it was an isolated comment. If a trend emerged, the TOM would arrange for an observer to attend the next appropriate event run by that trainer, who would provide feedback to the trainer regarding areas of deficiency and agree a plan for rectifying any issues. If the trainer demonstrated a fundamental problem with the bulk of the course, they would be given the opportunity to retrain, following which they would be observed again. If they failed to deliver to the required standard on their second observed course, they would be removed from the training programme.

b. Observations: Each trainer would be observed by KnowledgePool accredited trainers at least once every 30 days. A number of random, unannounced visits would also be made each month. Observers would use a standard marking guide to ensure consistency, including use of the correct documentation, correct set up, the trainer's style and ensuring key learning points are covered. The results of the observations would be reported by back to ICL Pathway, together with a short indication of any necessary action taken.

c. Complaints and comments: Any complaints or comments from POL regarding training would be routed via the ICL Pathway Training and Awareness Manager and would be investigated. The Training and Awareness Manager would provide feedback to POL and an overview

of the responses to complaints or comments would be provided as part of regular Training Review Meetings (FSL_04/242).

165. The ICL Pathway Progress Summary for Input to Horizon / Pathway Delivery Meeting dated 8 December 1999 reported on progress against the 13 outstanding Acceptance Incidents. According to this report, all ICL Pathway actions in relation to AI 218 were *"now complete and agreed. There are still some actions that require POCL to complete which will fully close AI 218"* (FSL_04/243).

166. According to a Performance Review Report for AI 218 dated 2 December 1999, it had been agreed at the meeting on 22 November 1999 between ICL Pathway and POL that the Rectification Plan had been followed to the satisfaction of both parties (FSL_04/244).

167. During the period following the Second Supplemental Agreement, a number of further changes were proposed to the timings of events during the training and implementation cycle, including Change Proposal 2650 which was raised to extend the length of the Counter Managers course to two days. The benefits of this included that more time would be available to spend on balancing and related topics, which would potentially reduce the volumes of calls to the Service Desk regarding balancing (FSL_04/245).

168. During the last phases of national rollout, the option of onsite counter assistant and postmaster courses was introduced. According to Change Control Note 0731, which was raised in November 2000, the branches to be installed during the final sweep of installations (the "tail") were geographically dispersed so classroom-based training was expected to be poorly attended (FSL_04/246).

The specification for these onsite courses was set out in an "Onsite and Combined CM/CA Course Specification Document" (FSL_04/247).

169. Following national rollout, responsibility for training staff was handed over to POL. According to Change Proposal 2372, this included training on CSR+ where it was being implemented in branches which had already gone live on the Horizon system (FSL_04/248).

170. According to Change Control Note 620, in April 2000, PON was considering its options to ensure that existing users of CSR became competent in CSR+ once it became available. POL sought a proposal from ICL Pathway as to how they would approach the delivery of training for CSR+ to existing Horizon users, and the associated costs of this. Fujitsu understands that POL ultimately decided to undertake this work themselves (FSL_04/249). Fujitsu also understands that ICL Pathway and POL agreed terms for POL to use the ICL Pathway training materials in developing 'steady state' training (FSL_04/250 and FSL_04/251).

MANAGEMENT CARE VISIT PROGRAMME

171. The following section of this corporate statement addresses the Inquiry's questions in relation to the Management Care Visit Programme (the "**MCVP**") and expands on information provided in the First Corporate Statement in this regard.

Background

172. The purpose of the MCVP is described in the MCVP Process Definition. This provides that the MCVP was designed to monitor postmaster perception in respect of services that ICL Pathway, and later Fujitsu, delivered (FSL_04/252). The MCVP was managed by the Customer Services department (FSL_04/253).

173. Participation in the MCVP was optional and postmasters were required to opt-in before a visit was arranged. MCVP visits were originally attended by an ICL Pathway Field Service Manager (as described in more detail above). Following a reform of the MCVP process in 2001, visits were carried out by MCVP managers from ICL Pathway and POL.

174. Feedback from MCVP visits was collated to assist ICL Pathway in understanding postmaster issues and concerns (FSL_04/252).

The initial MCVP process

175. As noted in the Monthly Progress Report for August 1997 (FSL_04/254), ICL Pathway presented its plans for the MCVP to POL Regional Liaison Managers in or around that time. It appears that the MCVP was planned to be performed on an annual basis, with visits to around 500 Post Office branches every year following the national rollout. Prior to national rollout, a smaller subset of Post Office branches were to form part of the programme (FSL_04/253).

176. Progress updates were generally recorded in ICL Pathway Monthly Progress Reports. For example, it was reported that in:

    a. November 1997, 16 MCVP visits had been conducted and feedback remained encouraging (FSL_04/255);

    b. December 1997, MCVP visits carried out to date had focused entirely on Release 1b, a software release, and overall satisfaction of the services provided was over 90%. It was also noted that positive responses were obtained in relation to the Service Desk and services provided by Horizon system engineers. Concerns were raised in relation to training schedules, and the travel and costs associated with attending such training sessions (FSL_04/256); and

    c. September 1998, progress on the MCVP was 'inadequate', stating that only 23 visits had been completed, 28 had been scheduled and 49 were yet to be arranged (FSL_04/257).

177. Further details of the MCVP process in these early years is set out in CS Operations Manuals (see, for example, FSL_04/23, FSL_04/63, FSL_04/64 and FSL_04/253).

Preparation and Training

178. According to the CS Operations Manuals, before any contact was made with Post Office branches, Field Service Managers were provided with certain information from the Customer Satisfaction Manager (and in later stages of the programme, the Strategic Services Implementation Manager) (as applicable, the "**FSM Manager**"), including (but not limited to):

    a. the purpose and goals of the MCVP;

    b. the interview procedure and questionnaire;

    c. any other relevant documentation; and

    d. address and questions or concerns raised by interviewers.

179. Field Service Managers conducting interviews followed a standard procedure so that results could be fairly compared, and accurate analysis could be obtained.

180. The CS Operations Manuals provide that documentation was given to Field Service Managers in electronic and paper form, which included a hard copy predefined interview pack which could be taken to the interviews. The interview packs themselves are said to have contained:

    a. a procedure document, including an Interview Summary Guide designed to be used as a reference guide during interview. A copy of this guide is

set out in the Customer Service: Service Management Operations Manual (FSL_04/253);

b. a phone script to be followed when contacting Post Office branches to arrange an appointment;

c. sample forms;

d. a questionnaire and associated documents; and

e. a list of post offices to contact.

181. The CS Operations Manuals explain that, prior to their visits, Field Service Managers were required to review the recent Service Desk call history of their allocated Post Office branches, to determine whether a visit was necessary. For example, FSL_04/253 states: "[T]*he call history should be assessed to check that there is no reason why the post offices should not be contacted now to arrange a visit*."

The MCVP Interview

182. In accordance with the CS Operations Manuals, once it was decided that a visit was necessary, the Field Service Manager would contact the relevant branch directly, following a phone script to arrange an appointment. Once confirmed, the FSM Manager would be informed accordingly to record appointment details in an Appointments Database.

183. The questionnaire provided to Field Service Managers described the general structure of MCVP interviews. Based on the CS Operation Manuals, the questionnaire had eleven sections:

a. Section 2: general details of how the implementation of the Horizon system went at the Post Office branch. Responses to this section were not included in the analysis process;

    b. Section 3 to 10: multiple choice questions, each with positive and negative answer options which could be supplemented with comments; and

    c. Section 11: a chance for the interviewees to express any concerns, problems or suggestions for improvement in respect of the Horizon system and its associated services.

184. The CS Operations Manuals set out a number of action points following the interview.

Analysis and Reporting

185. According to the CS Operations Manuals, the FSM Manager was responsible for the analysis of feedback from MCVP visits and publication of monthly and quarterly reports summarising their findings. Monthly reports were for internal use only. Quarterly reports were said to have been provided to POL via the Horizon Satisfaction Forum.

186. The CS Operations Manuals state that concerns, suggestions or comments which required further action were recorded separately on the data analysis spreadsheet as a log for action. Subsequent action was also to be recorded and kept open until a satisfactory conclusion was reached, after which the action would be marked as closed. It was the responsibility of the FSM Manager to maintain this log. It is also noted that the FSM Manager only contacted Post Office branches to follow up on feedback if it was agreed by the interviewee and only when considered necessary by ICL Pathway.

Revised MCVP Process

187. The MCVP appears to have been reviewed by ICL Pathway and POL in or around 2000 and 2001. The "Customer Service Monthly Report – July 2001" explains that a revised MCVP process was introduced around mid-2001

(FSL_04/258). The revised process is documented in the MCVP Process Definition (FSL_04/252).

188. Under this revised process:

    a. POL became responsible for contacting the Post Office branches to arrange the visits;

    b. interviews were to be conducted using an Aide Memoir document as a prompt, (FSL_04/259) in addition to questionnaires;

    c. interviews were to be conducted by MCVP managers from POL and ICL Pathway. The ICL Pathway MCVP manager could conduct interviews alone if the POL MCVP manager did not attend the Post Office branch; and

    d. The administration of the MCVP process was shared between POL and ICL Pathway. A copy of the questionnaire was left with the postmaster to complete after the visit and returned to POL. The questionnaire results were shared with the ICL Pathway MCVP administrator on a quarterly basis. The ICL Pathway MCVP manager submitted the completed Aide Memoirs to the ICL Pathway MCVP administrator for input into a database for analysis. The MCVP Process Definition explains that "*All results produced by the ICL MCVP administrator will be archived every quarter. All archived data will be kept for a 5-year period and then destroyed.*"

189. The MCVP was withdrawn in or around December 2003.

KNOWLEDGE AND RECTIFICATION OF BUGS

190. As explained in Fujitsu's opening statement dated 4 October 2022, no complex IT system will ever be completely free of bugs, errors and defects ("**BEDs**").

Fujitsu's monitoring systems and processes seek to identify faults, log them as Incidents, and then work to resolve them following the agreed Incident management processes. Fujitsu also relies on Incidents being reported by postmasters directly, or by POL. Many thousands of Incidents have been logged since the inception of Horizon.

191. In relation to the 29 BEDs listed by Mr Justice Fraser in Appendix 1 to the Horizon Issues Judgment (the "**Technical Appendix**"), the Inquiry has asked Fujitsu to provide details relating to the identification, investigation, communication and resolution of the BEDs.

192. In February 2021, Fujitsu helped to prepare a report for POL in relation to the 29 BEDs identified by Mr Justice Fraser (the "**BED Report**"). This BED Report has been disclosed to Core Participants and is exhibited to this corporate statement at (FSL_04/260).

193. In addition to the BED Report, Fujitsu has set out in Appendix 1 a series of summaries addressing each of the 29 BEDs and any sub-issues identified within those classifications. The BED Report and the summaries set out in Appendix 1 of this corporate statement seek to build on the Technical Appendix and have been prepared by reference to a variety of sources. These summaries are indicative of, amongst other things: (i) the investigation of each issue, (ii) the resolution of each issue, (iii) communication with other parties, including POL and wider management, and (iv) the impact on branches.

194. The summaries in Appendix 1 are based on a review of contemporaneous documents, primarily in the form of PinICLs, Peaks and KELs, that have been identified as related to the relevant BED. The summaries should be read in conjunction with these underlying records.

195. Appendix 2 to this corporate statement includes a table of PinICLs, Peaks and KELs that Fujitsu has identified as being relevant or linked to the 29 BEDs (FSL_04/311 to FSL_04/640).

196. Given the nature of the issues, the appendices are not intended to be an exhaustive list of all documents relevant to each BED.

197. In order to assist the Inquiry, Fujitsu has disclosed to the Inquiry various communications between itself and POL in relation to the 29 BEDs.

198. The Inquiry has also asked about the existence of any other problems / bugs or other sources of error in the Horizon system from the pilot to the date of the Request. In this regard, Fujitsu has disclosed records from the PinCL, Peak and KEL databases (as described above) created on or before 31 December 2000. As described in this corporate statement, there are procedures in place to monitor issues in the Horizon system, and records which fall within the Inquiry's requests have been produced with this corporate statement. Fujitsu is prepared to disclose the remaining records contained within the PinICL, Peak and KEL databases to the Inquiry should that be of assistance.

Statement of Truth

I believe the content of this statement to be true.

Signed: **GRO**

Dated: 29/12/2022

INDEX TO THE SECOND CORPORATE STATEMENT OF FUJITSU SERVICES LIMITED

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/1	Change Control Note No 1200 v.7.0 dated 7 August 2003	POINQ0126617F	FUJ00120425
FSL_04/2	ICL Pathway Customer Service Incident Management Process v.1.0 dated 13 November 2000	POINQ0086036F	FUJ00079865
FSL_04/3	POA Operations Incident Management Procedure v.9.0 dated 12 September 2017	POINQ0086559F	FUJ00080388
FSL_04/4	End to End Support Process Operational Agreement v.1.0 dated 10 October 1999	POINQ0126186F	FUJ00119994
FSL_04/5	End to End Application Support Strategy v.1.0 dated 28 July 2011	POINQ0086383F	FUJ00080212
FSL_04/6	ICL Pathway Customer Service Policy Manual v.1.0 dated 26 January 2001	POINQ0086026F	FUJ00079855
FSL_04/7	Fujitsu POA Customer Service Policy Manual v.2.0 dated 14 September 2005	POINQ0086146F	FUJ00079975
FSL_04/8	Customer Service Organisation Structure dated April 2005	POINQ0126618F	FUJ00120426
FSL_04/9	Customer Services Organisational Chart dated in 2006	POINQ0126621F	FUJ00120429
FSL_04/10	Email from Chrissie Kennedy to zDL UKS ICL Pathway Recipients with subject "Brief EnCounters" dated 17 December 1999	POINQ0085344F	FUJ00075735
FSL_04/11	Brief EnCounters, Issue 4 dated July 2003	POINQ0126622F	FUJ00120430
FSL_04/12	Brief EnCounters, Issue 5 dated November 2003	POINQ0126623F	FUJ00120431
FSL_04/13	Brief EnCounters, Issue 6 dated February 2004	POINQ0126624F	FUJ00120432
FSL_04/14	Recruitment Authorisation Requirement dated 23 October 2008	POINQ0126625F	FUJ00120433

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/15	ICL Pathway Resourcing Procedure v.1.0 dated 22 June 2000	POINQ0126626F	FUJ00120434
FSL_04/16	Performance First Circular dated 13 February 2012	POINQ0126627F	FUJ00120435
FSL_04/17	Performance Plus - Guide to Documentation undated	POINQ0126628F	FUJ00120436
FSL_04/18	Organisation and Management Review, Issue 3.0 dated 5 June 2006	POINQ0126630F	FUJ00120438
FSL_04/19	Post Office Training Guide and Strategy v.0.1 dated 28 February 2007	POINQ0126632F	FUJ00120440
FSL_04/20	Post Office Employee Induction Handbook v.5.0 dated June 2005	POINQ0126635F	FUJ00120443
FSL_04/21	Service Management Service: Service Description v.1.0 dated 31 December 2002	POINQ0126636F	FUJ00120444
FSL_04/22	Varied and Restated Codified Agreement dated 31 December 2002	POINQ0006245F	FUJ00000074
FSL_04/23	Operations Manual for Customer Service Directorate v.1.0 dated 26 November 2001	POINQ0086046F	FUJ00079875
FSL_04/24	Operations Manual for Customer Service Directorate v.2.0 dated 1 May 2002	POINQ0086059F	FUJ00079888
FSL_04/25	Codified Agreement between Post Office Counters Limited and ICL Pathway Limited dated 28 July 1999	POINQ0006242F	FUJ00000071
FSL_04/26	Pathway Release Policy v.5.0 dated 16 July 1999	POINQ0124362F	FUJ00118128
FSL_04/27	Fujitsu Services RMG BU Release Policy v.7.0 dated 14 September 2010	POINQ0126637F	FUJ00120445
FSL_04/28	CS Support Services Operations Manual v.2.0 dated 29 January 2001	POINQ0126638F	FUJ00120446

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/29	Service Management Service: Service Description v.1.0 dated 24 August 2006	POINQ0086164F	FUJ00079993
FSL_04/30	Service Management Service: Service Description v.5.0 dated 30 November 2016	POINQ0086551F	FUJ00080380
FSL_04/31	Schedule G01 to the Codified Agreement titled POCL Infrastructure Service Definition v.1.0 dated 16 July 1999	POINQ0126639F	FUJ00120447
FSL_04/32	Horizon Systems Helpdesk: Service Description v.1.0 dated 20 December 2002	POINQ0086599F	FUJ00080428
FSL_04/33	Service Desk Service Description v.6.0 dated 12 March 2014	POINQ0086655F	FUJ00080484
FSL_04/34	Horizon Service Desk Joint Working Document v.3.0 dated 26 February 2014	POINQ0086656F	FUJ00080485
FSL_04/35	Service Desk Service Description v.1.0 dated 31 August 2006	POINQ0086628F	FUJ00080457
FSL_04/36	Change Control Note No 1016a v.4.0 dated 30 October 2002	POINQ0007046F	FUJ00000875
FSL_04/37	Change Control Note No 1409a v.2.0 dated 3 June 2013	POINQ0007275F	FUJ00001104
FSL_04/38	POA Customer Service Incident Management Process Details v.4.0 dated 2 August 2005	POINQ0086139F	FUJ00079968
FSL_04/39	Change Control Note No 777b dated 24 July 2001	POINQ0006855F	FUJ00000684
FSL_04/40	Service Desk Service Description v.2.0 dated 29 September 2008	POINQ0086642F	FUJ00080471
FSL_04/41	Service Desk Service Description v.5.0 dated 29 April 2013	POINQ0086654F	FUJ00080483
FSL_04/42	ICL Pathway Monthly Report - May 1999 v.1.0 dated 14 June 1999	POINQ0064353F	FUJ00058182
FSL_04/43	ICL Pathway Monthly Report - June 1999 v.1.0 dated 15 July 1999	POINQ0064354F	FUJ00058183
FSL_04/44	NR2 Horizon System Helpdesk Processes and Procedures	POINQ0086581F	FUJ00080410

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
	Description v.1.0 dated 15 June 1999		
FSL_04/45	Horizon System Helpdesk Operations Manual v.1.0 dated 28 February 1997	POINQ0126194F	FUJ00120002
FSL_04/46	HSD Voice Bulletin dated May 2009	POINQ0126641F	FUJ00120449
FSL_04/47	HSD Voice Bulletin dated February 2012	POINQ0126643F	FUJ00120451
FSL_04/48	Service Description for Systems Management Service v.1.0 dated 18 December 2002	POINQ0126644F	FUJ00120452
FSL_04/49	Service Description for Systems Management Service v.1.0 (withdrawn) dated 17 October 2011	POINQ0126645F	FUJ00120453
FSL_04/50	Pathway SMC Operations Manual v.1.0 dated 28 February 1997	POINQ0126193F	FUJ00120001
FSL_04/51	SMC Training Plan undated	POINQ0126646F	FUJ00120454
FSL_04/52	SMC Training Timeline dated 26 November 2002	POINQ0126647F	FUJ00120455
FSL_04/53	SMC Training Strategy undated	POINQ0126648F	FUJ00120456
FSL_04/54	SMC Training Strategy dated November 2002	POINQ0126649F	FUJ00120457
FSL_04/55	Systems Management Service: Service Description v.1.0 dated 31 August 2006	POINQ0126650F	FUJ00120458
FSL_04/56	Systems Management Service: Service Description v.2.0 dated 26 August 2009	POINQ0126651F	FUJ00120459
FSL_04/57	Systems Management Service: Service Description v.3.0 dated 17 October 2013	POINQ0126652F	FUJ00120460
FSL_04/58	Systems Management Service: Service Description v.4.0 dated 16 April 2014	POINQ0126653F	FUJ00120461
FSL_04/59	Systems Management Service: Service Description v.5.0 dated 12 November 2015	POINQ0126654F	FUJ00120462

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/60	Systems Management Service: Service Description v.6.0 dated 20 July 2017	POINQ0126655F	FUJ00120463
FSL_04/61	ICL Pathway BSU Incident Reconciliation Procedures for NR2 v.1.0 dated 2 November 1998	POINQ0126656F	FUJ00120464
FSL_04/62	ICL Pathway/POCL APS Reconciliation Report Delivery Process v.1.0 dated 10 August 1999	POINQ0126657F	FUJ00120465
FSL_04/63	CS Infrastructure Services Operations Manual v.2.0 dated 21 September 1999	POINQ0064672F	FUJ00058501
FSL_04/64	CS Infrastructure Services Operations Manual v.3.0 dated 18 February 2000	POINQ0064674F	FUJ00058503
FSL_04/65	Network Banking Reconciliation & Incident Management v.1.0 dated 19 December 2001	POINQ0126658F	FUJ00120466
FSL_04/66	Network Banking Reconciliation & Incident Management v.2.0 dated 21 January 2002	POINQ0126659F	FUJ00120467
FSL_04/67	Network Banking Reconciliation & Incident Management v.5.0 dated 19 December 2002	POINQ0126660F	FUJ00120468
FSL_04/68	TPS Reconciliation & Incident Management v.1.0 dated 16 October 2000	POINQ0085993F	FUJ00079822
FSL_04/69	TPS Reconciliation & Incident Management v.2.0 dated 30 April 2002	POINQ0086052F	FUJ00079881
FSL_04/70	TPS Reconciliation & Incident Management v.4.0 dated 19 December 2002	POINQ0086055F	FUJ00079884
FSL_04/71	TPS Reconciliation & Incident Management v.5.0 dated 17 October 2005	POINQ0086147F	FUJ00079976
FSL_04/72	On Line Services Reconciliation & Incident Management v.6.0 dated 17 October 2005	POINQ0126661F	FUJ00120469

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/73	Reconciliation Service: Service Description v.1.0 dated 31 August 2006	POINQ0086165F	FUJ00079994
FSL_04/74	Reconciliation Service: Service Description v.2.0 dated 14 July 2009	POINQ0086244F	FUJ00080073
FSL_04/75	Reconciliation Service: Service Description v.3.0 dated 1 December 2010	POINQ0086367F	FUJ00080196
FSL_04/76	Reconciliation Service: Service Description v.4.0 dated 3 December 2013	POINQ0086425F	FUJ00080254
FSL_04/77	End to End Reconciliation Reporting v.1.0 dated 2 February 2007	POINQ0086195F	FUJ00080024
FSL_04/78	End to End Reconciliation Reporting v.2.0 dated 22 June 2011	POINQ0086384F	FUJ00080213
FSL_04/79	End to End Reconciliation Reporting v.3.0 dated 4 May 2012	POINQ0086397F	FUJ00080226
FSL_04/80	End to End Reconciliation Reporting v.4.0 dated 4 September 2017	POINQ0086557F	FUJ00080386
FSL_04/81	Reconciliation and Incident Management Joint Working Document v.2.0 dated 14 June 2011	POINQ0086386F	FUJ00080215
FSL_04/82	Reconciliation and Incident Management Joint Working Document v.3.0 dated 30 April 2012	POINQ0086395F	FUJ00080224
FSL_04/83	EDSC Call Management v.1.0 dated 13 January 1997	POINQ0124360F	FUJ00118126
FSL_04/84	Service Description for Third Line Software Support Service v.1.0 dated 19 December 2002	POINQ0126662F	FUJ00120470
FSL_04/85	Horizon Online 3rd Line Application Support Service: Service Description v.5.0 dated 24 May 2013	POINQ0086405F	FUJ00080234

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/86	End to End Support Process, Operational Level Agreement v.2.0 dated 17 June 2003	POINQ0086068F	FUJ00079897
FSL_04/87	Email from John Simpkins with subject "HSD Training" dated 3 May 2011	POINQ0126663F	FUJ00120471
FSL_04/88	Email from John Simpkins with subject "HSD Training Rota - 1st Changes" dated 3 May 2011	POINQ0126664F	FUJ00120472
FSL_04/89	Application Support Service (Fourth Line): Service Description v.1.0 dated 24 August 2006	POINQ0086168F	FUJ00079997
FSL_04/90	Application Support Service (Fourth Line): Service Description v.3.0 dated 29 October 2009	POINQ0126665F	FUJ00120473
FSL_04/91	HNG-X Architecture - Customer Services v.2.0 dated 23 November 2010	POINQ0126666F	FUJ00120474
FSL_04/92	POLSAP Hosting Service: Joint Working Document v.1.0 dated 7 October 2010	POINQ0126667F	FUJ00120475
FSL_04/93	POLSAP Hosting Service: Joint Working Document (Operational Level Agreement) v.2.0 dated 4 November 2010	POINQ0126668F	FUJ00120476
FSL_04/94	POLSAP Hosting Service: Joint Working Document (Operational Level Agreement) v.3.0 dated 6 March 2014	POINQ0126669F	FUJ00120477
FSL_04/95	Operational Level Agreement HNGx 4th Line Support v.1.0 dated 14 January 2010	POINQ0086254F	FUJ00080083
FSL_04/96	Operational Level Agreement HNGx Application 4th Line Support v.2.0 dated 05 April 2013	POINQ0086403F	FUJ00080232
FSL_04/97	Application Support Service (Fourth Line): Service Description v.7.0 dated 29 November 2016	POINQ0086550F	FUJ00080379
FSL_04/98	Application Support Service (Fourth Line): Service Description v.5.0 dated 13 September 2013	POINQ0086406F	FUJ00080235

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/99	Engineer Service: Service Description v.2.0 dated 15 May 2003	POINQ0126670F	FUJ00120478
FSL_04/100	Engineering Service: Service Description v.6.0 dated 29 October 2013	POINQ0086413F	FUJ00080242
FSL_04/101	Management Information Service: Service Description v.1.0 dated 20 December 2002	POINQ0126671F	FUJ00120479
FSL_04/102	Management Information Service: Service Description v.1.0 dated 31 August 2006	POINQ0126672F	FUJ00120480
FSL_04/103	ICL Pathway Problem Management Process v.1.2 dated 25 May 1998	POINQ0085968F	FUJ00079797
FSL_04/104	ICL Pathway Customer Service: Information Systems and Process Operations Manual v.1.0 dated 4 September 1998	POINQ0126673F	FUJ00120481
FSL_04/105	CS Infrastructure Services Operations Manual v.1.0 dated 7 November 2000	POINQ0126187F	FUJ00119995
FSL_04/106	Fujitsu/POL Interface Agreement for the Problem Management Interface v.1.0 dated 23 December 2002	POINQ0086057F	FUJ00079886
FSL_04/107	ICL Pathway Problem Management Process v.2.0 dated 26 August 1999	POINQ0126183F	FUJ00119991
FSL_04/108	ICL Pathway Customer Service Problem Management Process v.3.0 dated 13 November 2000	POINQ0086024F	FUJ00079853
FSL_04/109	ICL Pathway Customer Service Problem and Alert Management Process v.4.0 dated 27 November 2001	POINQ0126184F	FUJ00119992
FSL_04/110	POA Customer Service Problem Management Process Details v.5.0 dated 20 January 2005	POINQ0086106F	FUJ00079935

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/111	POA Customer Service Problem Management Process Details v.6.0 dated 29 July 2005	POINQ0086124F	FUJ00079953
FSL_04/112	RMGA Customer Service Problem Management Process v.2.0 dated 22 April 2008	POINQ0086214F	FUJ00080043
FSL_04/113	POA Customer Service Problem Management Procedure v.3.0 dated 20 December 2013	POINQ0086426F	FUJ00080255
FSL_04/114	POA Customer Service Problem Management Procedure v.4.0 dated 17 July 2014	POINQ0086477F	FUJ00080306
FSL_04/115	POA Customer Service Problem Management Procedure v.5.0 dated 12 July 2016	POINQ0086504F	FUJ00080333
FSL_04/116	ICL Pathway Field Service Manager - Role Definition and Overview v.0.1 dated 13 September 2000	POINQ0126215F	FUJ00120023
FSL_04/117	Recruitment Authorisation Requirement: Field Service Manager dated 13 February 2002	POINQ0126677F	FUJ00120485
FSL_04/118	ICL Pathway Field Service Management Process v.1.0 dated 24 September 2001	POINQ0126219F	FUJ00120027
FSL_04/119	Operations Manual for Customer Service Directorate v.1.1 dated 28 February 2002	POINQ0086048F	FUJ00079877
FSL_04/120	CS Operational Services Departmental Operations Manual v.2.0 dated 24 January 2001	POINQ0126678F	FUJ00120486
FSL_04/121	Service Descriptions for Outlet Change v.2.0 dated 7 July 1999	POINQ0126679F	FUJ00120487
FSL_04/122	Operational Business Change (Branch Change) Service: Service Description v.11.0 dated 5 October 2017	POINQ0126680F	FUJ00120488
FSL_04/123	Pathway/Peritas Purchase Agreement - Ref. No. PE001 v.8.0 dated 15 July 1996	POINQ0126681F	FUJ00120489

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/124	Training Evaluation Paper v.2.0 dated 8 July 1999	POINQ0125838F	FUJ00119646
FSL_04/125	Pathway Change Proposal No. 1294 dated 16 June 1998	POINQ0126682F	FUJ00120490
FSL_04/126	Training for Horizon Releases 1a to 1e v.0.2 dated 28 July 1997	POINQ0125877F	FUJ00119685
FSL_04/127	Initial Go Live - Lessons Learnt v.1.0 dated 12 November 1996	POINQ0064449F	FUJ00058278
FSL_04/128	Training Development & Sign Off Document v.1.0 dated 27 October 1997	POINQ0126683F	FUJ00120491
FSL_04/129	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 31 August 2000	POINQ0125898F	FUJ00119706
FSL_04/130	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 25 April 2000	POINQ0125899F	FUJ00119707
FSL_04/131	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 31 August 2000	POINQ0125900F	FUJ00119708
FSL_04/132	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 29 February 1999	POINQ0125901F	FUJ00119709
FSL_04/133	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 16 May 2000	POINQ0125902F	FUJ00119710
FSL_04/134	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 10 May 2001	POINQ0125903F	FUJ00119711
FSL_04/135	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 2 September 2000	POINQ0125904F	FUJ00119712
FSL_04/136	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 21 June 2000	POINQ0125905F	FUJ00119713
FSL_04/137	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 6 June 2000	POINQ0125906F	FUJ00119714

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/138	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 23 June 2000	POINQ0125907F	FUJ00119715
FSL_04/139	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 16 January 2001	POINQ0125908F	FUJ00119716
FSL_04/140	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 28 February 2000	POINQ0125909F	FUJ00119717
FSL_04/141	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 17 January 2000	POINQ0125910F	FUJ00119718
FSL_04/142	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 12 January 2001	POINQ0125911F	FUJ00119719
FSL_04/143	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 29 February 2000	POINQ0125912F	FUJ00119720
FSL_04/144	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 2 April 2000	POINQ0125913F	FUJ00119721
FSL_04/145	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 19 April 2001	POINQ0125914F	FUJ00119722
FSL_04/146	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 14 March 2001	POINQ0125915F	FUJ00119723
FSL_04/147	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 10 August 2000	POINQ0125916F	FUJ00119724
FSL_04/148	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 22 June 2000	POINQ0125917F	FUJ00119725
FSL_04/149	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 22 June 2000	POINQ0125918F	FUJ00119726
FSL_04/150	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 20 June 2000	POINQ0125919F	FUJ00119727

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/151	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 26 May 2000	POINQ0125920F	FUJ00119728
FSL_04/152	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 25 May 2000	POINQ0125921F	FUJ00119729
FSL_04/153	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 16 March 2000	POINQ0125922F	FUJ00119730
FSL_04/154	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 10 March 2000	POINQ0125923F	FUJ00119731
FSL_04/155	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 9 March 2000	POINQ0125924F	FUJ00119732
FSL_04/156	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 26 May 2000	POINQ0125925F	FUJ00119733
FSL_04/157	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 29 August 2000	POINQ0125926F	FUJ00119734
FSL_04/158	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 14 February 2000	POINQ0125927F	FUJ00119735
FSL_04/159	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 8 February 2000	POINQ0125928F	FUJ00119736
FSL_04/160	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 23 August 2000	POINQ0125929F	FUJ00119737
FSL_04/161	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 8 February 2000	POINQ0125930F	FUJ00119738
FSL_04/162	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 29 August 2000	POINQ0125931F	FUJ00119739
FSL_04/163	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 18 July 2000	POINQ0125932F	FUJ00119740

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/164	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 17 July 2000	POINQ0125933F	FUJ00119741
FSL_04/165	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 30 March 2000	POINQ0125934F	FUJ00119742
FSL_04/166	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 18 July 2000	POINQ0125935F	FUJ00119743
FSL_04/167	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 20 July 2000	POINQ0125936F	FUJ00119744
FSL_04/168	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 29 March 2000	POINQ0125937F	FUJ00119745
FSL_04/169	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 24 July 2000	POINQ0125938F	FUJ00119746
FSL_04/170	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 25 September 1999	POINQ0125939F	FUJ00119747
FSL_04/171	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 21 July 2000	POINQ0125940F	FUJ00119748
FSL_04/172	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 24 July 2000	POINQ0125941F	FUJ00119749
FSL_04/173	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 23 June 2000	POINQ0125942F	FUJ00119750
FSL_04/174	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 22 July 1999	POINQ0125943F	FUJ00119751
FSL_04/175	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 27 January 2000	POINQ0125944F	FUJ00119752
FSL_04/176	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 19 June 2000	POINQ0125945F	FUJ00119753

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/177	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 24 June 2000	POINQ0125946F	FUJ00119754
FSL_04/178	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 16 June 2000	POINQ0125947F	FUJ00119755
FSL_04/179	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 15 June 2000	POINQ0125948F	FUJ00119756
FSL_04/180	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 24 January 2000	POINQ0125949F	FUJ00119757
FSL_04/181	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 31 May 2000	POINQ0125950F	FUJ00119758
FSL_04/182	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 7 September 1999	POINQ0125951F	FUJ00119759
FSL_04/183	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 1 June 2000	POINQ0125952F	FUJ00119760
FSL_04/184	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 30 May 2000	POINQ0125953F	FUJ00119761
FSL_04/185	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 30 May 2000	POINQ0125954F	FUJ00119762
FSL_04/186	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 1 June 2000	POINQ0125955F	FUJ00119763
FSL_04/187	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 2 November 2000	POINQ0125956F	FUJ00119764
FSL_04/188	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 3 November 2000	POINQ0125957F	FUJ00119765
FSL_04/189	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 1 November 2000	POINQ0125958F	FUJ00119766

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/190	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 4 August 2000	POINQ0125959F	FUJ00119767
FSL_04/191	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 27 July 2000	POINQ0125960F	FUJ00119768
FSL_04/192	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 10 November 2000	POINQ0125961F	FUJ00119769
FSL_04/193	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 25 November 1999	POINQ0125962F	FUJ00119770
FSL_04/194	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 10 June 1999	POINQ0125963F	FUJ00119771
FSL_04/195	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 5 October 2000	POINQ0125964F	FUJ00119772
FSL_04/196	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 9 October 2000	POINQ0125965F	FUJ00119773
FSL_04/197	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 26 October 2000	POINQ0125966F	FUJ00119774
FSL_04/198	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 28 September 2000	POINQ0125967F	FUJ00119775
FSL_04/199	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 3 October 2000	POINQ0125968F	FUJ00119776
FSL_04/200	ICL Pathway Horizon Training Programme Evaluation Form dated 4 October 2000	POINQ0125969F	FUJ00119777
FSL_04/201	Training Needs Analysis for the BA/POCL Counter Automation Project v.1.0 dated 19 March 1997	POINQ0007447F	FUJ00001276
FSL_04/202	Horizon Training Workbook 4 - EPOSS 3 Scales Horizon System v.1.0 dated 24 July 2000	POINQ0123891F	FUJ00117719
FSL_04/203	Horizon Training Workbook 6 - APS Automated Payment Service	POINQ0123892F	FUJ00117720

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
	Horizon System v.1.0 dated 24 July 2000		
FSL_04/204	Horizon Training Workbook Addendum - Moveable Solution Horizon System v.1.0 dated 6 September 2000	POINQ0123902F	FUJ00117730
FSL_04/205	Horizon Training Workbook Addendum - Balancing using the Horizon System v.1.0 dated 23 July 2000	POINQ0123893F	FUJ00117721
FSL_04/206	Horizon Training Workbook Addendum - Help & basic Maintenance Horizon System v.1.0 dated 24 July 2000	POINQ0123894F	FUJ00117722
FSL_04/207	Horizon Training Workbook Addendum - EPOSS 2 Horizon System v.1.0 dated 24 July 2000	POINQ0123895F	FUJ00117723
FSL_04/208	Horizon Training Workbook Addendum - Functions Horizon System v.1.0 dated 24 July 2000	POINQ0123896F	FUJ00117724
FSL_04/209	Horizon Training Workbook Addendum - EPOSS 1 Horizon System v.1.0 dated 24 July 2000	POINQ0123897F	FUJ00117725
FSL_04/210	Horizon Training Workbook Addendum - OBCS Order Book Control Service Horizon System v.1.0 dated 24 July 2000	POINQ0123898F	FUJ00117726
FSL_04/211	Horizon Training Workbook Addendum - Introduction to the Horizon System v.1.0 dated 24 July 2000	POINQ0123899F	FUJ00117727
FSL_04/212	Horizon Training Workbook 9 - Office Administration Horizon System v.1.0 dated 24 July 2000	POINQ0123900F	FUJ00117728
FSL_04/213	Pathway Change Proposal No. 1292 dated 16 June 1998	POINQ0126684F	FUJ00120492
FSL_04/214	Training and User Awareness Baseline Document v.3.0 dated 12 June 1998	POINQ0125850F	FUJ00119658
FSL_04/215	Split Implementation Programme Strategy v.1.0 dated 30 June 1998	POINQ0126685F	FUJ00120493

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/216	1c to Release 2 Training Strategy v.1.0 dated 18 March 1999	POINQ0126686F	FUJ00120494
FSL_04/217	Management Infrastructure Brief - Change Process v.1.0 dated 23 April 1999	POINQ0126687F	FUJ00120495
FSL_04/218	User Awareness Event - Change Process v.1.0 dated 14 May 1999	POINQ0126688F	FUJ00120496
FSL_04/219	Horizon User Awareness Event v.1.0 dated 27 May 1998	POINQ0125876F	FUJ00119684
FSL_04/220	ICL Pathway Change Control Note (CCN) No. 487b dated 13 September 1999	POINQ0126689F	FUJ00120497
FSL_04/221	Training Scheduling and Minimum Training Compliance v.3.0 dated 21 March 2001	POINQ0125886F	FUJ00119694
FSL_04/222	ICL Pathway Implementation PowerPoint v.1.0 dated 02 February 2001	POINQ0126690F	FUJ00120498
FSL_04/223	Training and User Awareness Baseline Document v.11.0 dated 29 November 1999	POINQ0007528F	FUJ00001357
FSL_04/224	Training Workbook Change Process v.1.0 dated 15 August 2000	POINQ0126693F	FUJ00120501
FSL_04/225	Standard Reports and Formats v.3.0 dated 3 December 1999	POINQ0007531F	FUJ00001360
FSL_04/226	Training and User Awareness Baseline Document v.2.2 dated 26 March 1998	POINQ0126694F	FUJ00120502
FSL_04/227	PON Auditors & Investigators Course v.1.0 dated 14 September 2000	POINQ0126695F	FUJ00120503
FSL_04/228	Horizon Field Support Officer Migration Training Requirements v.0.1 dated 29 June 1998	POINQ0126696F	FUJ00120504
FSL_04/229	Letter from Bruce McNiven to John Hicks re: Review of Acceptance Incident 218 - Training		POL00029130

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/230	Acceptance Proposal for Acceptance Incident 218 v.1.0 dated 23 August 1999	POINQ0068757F	FUJ00079169
FSL_04/231	ICL Pathway Change Control Note (CCN) No. 519a dated 16 July 1999	POINQ0126697F	FUJ00120505
FSL_04/232	ICL Pathway Change Proposal No. 2081 dated 8 July 1999	POINQ0126698F	FUJ00120506
FSL_04/233	Letter from Bruce McNiven to John Dicks re Review of Acceptance Incident 218		POL00028365
FSL_04/234	"Meeting Output" concerning Acceptance Incidents discussed at meeting on 11 August 1999		POL00028360
FSL_04/235	Horizon Programme, Management Resolution Meeting Minutes		POL00028332
FSL_04/236	Specification of Pre-Entry Event v.1.1 dated 25 October 1999	POINQ0126699F	FUJ00120507
FSL_04/237	Supplemental Agreement between POCL and ICL Pathway dated 20 August 1999	POINQ0125799F	FUJ00119606
FSL_04/238	Second Supplemental Agreement between POCL and ICL Pathway Limited dated 24 September 1999	POINQ0124313F	FUJ00118149
FSL_04/239	Resolution Plan for Acceptance Incident 218 v.0.5 dated 23 September 1999	POINQ0125805F	FUJ00119612
FSL_04/240	Amended Process for Presenting the Performance Standards Assessment v.1.0 dated 8 October 1999	POINQ0126700F	FUJ00120508
FSL_04/241	ICL Pathway Progress Summary for Input to Horizon/Pathway Delivery Meeting dated 24 November 1999	POINQ0124345F	FUJ00118181
FSL_04/242	Monitoring of Trainer Quality v.1.0 dated 17 September 1999	POINQ0126701F	FUJ00120509
FSL_04/243	ICL Pathway Progress Summary for Input to Horizon/Pathway	POINQ0124400F	FUJ00118201

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
	Delivery Meeting dated 8 December 1999		
FSL_04/244	Performance Review Report for Acceptance Incident 218 v.1.0 dated 2 December 1999	POINQ0068774F	FUJ00079186
FSL_04/245	ICL Pathway Change Proposal No. 2650 dated 4 July 2000	POINQ0126702F	FUJ00120510
FSL_04/246	ICL Pathway Change Control Note (CCN) No. 731 dated 23 November 2000	POINQ0006816F	FUJ00000645
FSL_04/247	Onsite and Combined CM/CA Course Specification Document v.1.0 dated 21 March 2001	POINQ0125881F	FUJ00119689
FSL_04/248	ICL Pathway Change Proposal No. 2372 dated 20 December 1999	POINQ0126703F	FUJ00120511
FSL_04/249	ICL Pathway Change Control Note (CCN) No. 620 dated 9 March 2000	POINQ0126704F	FUJ00120512
FSL_04/250	Letter from John Cook to Liam Foley dated 20 January 2000	POINQ0126705F	FUJ00120513
FSL_04/251	Letter from Liam Foley to John Cook dated 4 February 2000 enclosing copy of letter from Tim Marsh to Sue Smith dated 18 November 1999	POINQ0126706F	FUJ00120514
FSL_04/252	Management Care Visit Program v.1.0 dated 18 December 2001	POINQ0064677F	FUJ00058506
FSL_04/253	ICL Pathway Customer Service: Service Management Operations Manual v.1.0 dated 24 August 1998	POINQ0064667F	FUJ00058496
FSL_04/254	Pathway Monthly Report - August 1997 v.1.0 dated 12 September 1997	POINQ0064334F	FUJ00058163
FSL_04/255	Pathway Monthly Report - November 1997 v.1.0 dated 16 December 1997	POINQ0064336F	FUJ00058165
FSL_04/256	Pathway Monthly Report - December 1997 v.1.0 dated 14 January 1998	POINQ0064337F	FUJ00058166

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/257	Pathway Monthly Report - September 1998 v.1.0 dated 22 October 1998	POINQ0064347F	FUJ00058176
FSL_04/258	Customer Service Monthly Report - July 2001 v.1.0 dated 31 July 2001	POINQ0126708F	FUJ00120516
FSL_04/259	Management Care Visit Program Aide Memoir undated	POINQ0126263F	FUJ00120071
FSL_04/260	The BED Report		POL00030528
FSL_04/261	RMGA HNG Pilot Daily Month to Date Extract September 2010 dated 20 September 2010	POINQ0087279F	FUJ00081108
FSL_04/262	Spreadsheet recording position at affected branches and POLSAP in relation to BED 1 dated in December 2010	POINQ0087692F	FUJ00081521
FSL_04/263	Email chain from M. Stewart to G. Jenkins, M. Wright and S. Bansal with subject " FW: EMMA RE: Receipts Missmatch Issue" dated 1 October 2010	POINQ0087308F	FUJ00081137
FSL_04/264	Document titled "Correcting Accounts for "lost" Discrepancies" dated 28 September 2010	POINQ0087310F	FUJ00081139
FSL_04/265	Document titled "Receipts/Payments Mismatch issue notes" dated in October 2010	POINQ0087755F	FUJ00081584
FSL_04/266	Email chain from G. Jenkins to J. Simpkins and M. Wirght with M. Stewart and S. Salawu in copy with subject "RE: Branches affected by Receipts Payments and Discrepancies issue" dated 6 October 2010	POINQ0087384F	FUJ00081213
FSL_04/267	Email from M. Wright to 'Duty Manager' Royal Mail with M. Woolgar, M. Stewart, G. Jenkins and S. Parker in copy with subject "Receipts and Payment Mismatch update 09/12/2010" dated 9 December 2010	POINQ0087390F	FUJ00081219
FSL_04/268	Email from M. Stewart to M. Wright, G. Jenkins and S. Bansal	POINQ0087298F	FUJ00081127

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
	with subject "RE: Receipts & Payments." dated 29 September 2010		
FSL_04/269	Email chain from M. Woolgar to M. Wright, G. Jenkins and J. Simpkins with M. Stewart in copy with subject "RE: Receipts and Payments issue" dated 12 November 2010	POINQ0087385F	FUJ00081214
FSL_04/270	Email chain from S. Salawu to M. Woolgar and M. Lowther with subject "FW: Receipts and Payments issue" dated 11 November 2010.	POINQ0087381F	FUJ00081210
FSL_04/271	Service Management Review PowerPoint dated in October 2010	POINQ0127243F	FUJ00121051
FSL_04/272	Service Management Review PowerPoint dated in November 2010	POINQ0127255F	FUJ00121063
FSL_04/273	Report titled "Receipts and Payments Mismatch" dated 17 February 2011	POINQ0087713F	FUJ00081542
FSL_04/274	Document titled "Receipts and Payments Mismatch" dated 11 February 2011	POINQ0127262F	FUJ00121070
FSL_04/275	Report titled "Receipts and Payments Mismatch" dated 25 February 2011	POINQ0087721F	FUJ00081550
FSL_04/276	Email chain from William Russell to T. Atkinson with subject "RE: Receipts & Payments Issue" dated 22 February 2011.	POINQ0087716F	FUJ00081545
FSL_04/277	Post Office account Release Note RNT9622 dated in November 2010.	POINQ0087723F	FUJ00081552
FSL_04/278	Email chain from M. Stewart to A. Chambers with subject "RE: Callendar Square - FAD 160868" dated 23 February 2006	POINQ0089943F	FUJ00083772
FSL_04/279	S90 Release Note v.1.0 dated 13 January 2006	POINQ0089978F	FUJ00083807

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/280	Email chain from C. Broe to G. Bell with no subject, dated 11 November 2015	POINQ0092033F	FUJ00085862
FSL_04/281	Email chain from P. Newsome to S. Bansal and G. Bell copying C. Dunford and P. Thompson, with subject "RE: The Dalmellington Error in Horizon / problemswithpol" dated 11 July 2016	POINQ0092138F	FUJ00085967
FSL_04/282	Email from P. Newsome to A. Van den Bogerd copying C. Broe, S. Bansal and P. Thompson with subject "Actions and Slides", dated 23 November 2015	POINQ0092054F	FUJ00085883
FSL_04/283	Slide deck titled "Out Reach Branch Issue" dated 23 November 2015	POINQ0092055F	FUJ00085884
FSL_04/284	Email chain from P. Newsome to A. Van den Bogerd copying C. Broe, P. Thompson and G. Bell with subject "FW: Updated Presentation and Actions Tracker" dated 25 November 2011	POINQ0092059F	FUJ00085888
FSL_04/285	Document titled "Outreach Actions Tracker" dated 25 November 2011	POINQ0092060F	FUJ00085889
FSL_04/286	Email from P. Newsome to A. Van den Bogerd copying C. Broe, P. Thompson, S. Bansal, C. Dunford and G. Bell with subject "Updates on Branch Outreach" dated 11 December 2015	POINQ0092072F	FUJ00085901
FSL_04/287	Slide deck titled "Branch Outreach Issue" dated 10 December 2015	POINQ0092073F	FUJ00085902
FSL_04/288	Spreadsheet titled "Outreach Actions Tracker" dated 11 December 2015	POINQ0092074F	FUJ00085903
FSL_04/289	Slide deck titled "Branch Outreach Issue (Initial Findings)" dated 10 December 2015	POINQ0092075F	FUJ00085904
FSL_04/290	Document titled "Automatic Settlement and Log Off" dated 11 December 2015	POINQ0092076F	FUJ00085905

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/291	Document titled "OCR Further Investigation - Component Test Plan" v.0.1 dated 15 January 2016	POINQ0092100F	FUJ00085929
FSL_04/292	Email chain from I. Oakley to G. Jenkins with subject line "RE: Fw: T30 Release - Impact on Stock Rems" dated 16 February 2007	POINQ0127263F	FUJ00121071
FSL_04/293	Email chain from G. Jenkins to G. Blackburn with subject line "RE: Rem Misbalance" dated 13 February 2007	POINQ0127264F	FUJ00121072
FSL_04/294	Report entitled "Rem Misbalance" dated 13 February 2007	POINQ0127265F	FUJ00121073
FSL_04/295	Email chain from I. Trundell to G. Jenkins with subject line "RE: Rem Misbalance" dated 14 February 2007	POINQ0127266F	FUJ00121074
FSL_04/296	Service Review Book for February 2007 dated 14 March 2007	POINQ0127267F	FUJ00121075
FSL_04/297	OCR 26169 dated 29 March 2010	POINQ0127268F	FUJ00121076
FSL_04/298	Email chain from G. Jenkins to B. Evans with subject line "RE: BTS issues 14/04/10" dated 29 April 2010	POINQ0127269F	FUJ00121077
FSL_04/299	Report entitled "LocalSuspense"	POINQ0127270F	FUJ00121078
FSL_04/300	Report entitled "HNG-X Issues that Impact P&BA" and dated 4 June 2010	POINQ0127272F	FUJ00121080
FSL_04/301	Release Note for RNT9612 dated 11 March 2010	POINQ0127273F	FUJ00121081
FSL_04/302	Report entitled "HNG-X Issues that Impact P&BA" and dated 4 June 2010	POINQ0127274F	FUJ00121082
FSL_04/303	Email chain from C. Drake to A. Chambers with subject line "RE: Recovery into wrong TP/BP" dated 26 May 2010	POINQ0127275F	FUJ00121083
FSL_04/304	Service Review - Performance Statistics for August 2000 dated on 14 August 2000	POINQ0064402F	FUJ00058231

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/305	Minutes of the Release Management Forum on 20 December 2000	POINQ0127277F	FUJ00121085
FSL_04/306	Service Review dated 17 April 2001	POINQ0127278F	FUJ00121086
FSL_04/307	Service Review dated 15 May 2001	POINQ0127279F	FUJ00121087
FSL_04/308	Email chain from SSC Duty Manager to PC0241528@peak2.fs.fujitsu.com with subject "POL Approval - Lydd 145925 - I6809429 | A7700407" dated 20 March 2015	POINQ0127090F	FUJ00120898
FSL_04/309	BIMS Incident Report - BE/0203215 dated 24 August 2010	POINQ0127285F	FUJ00121093
FSL_04/310	BIMS report - BE/0203284 dated 25 August 2010	POINQ0127288F	FUJ00121096
FSL_04/311	PC0194381	POINQ0087235F	FUJ00081064
FSL_04/312	PC0204263	POINQ0087333F	FUJ00081162
FSL_04/313	PC0204765	POINQ0087364F	FUJ00081193
FSL_04/314	ballantj1759Q	POINQ0087736F	FUJ00081565
FSL_04/315	PC0203864	POINQ0087757F	FUJ00081586
FSL_04/316	wrightm33145J	POINQ0087779F	FUJ00081608
FSL_04/317	PC0012751	POINQ0024157F	FUJ00017986
FSL_04/318	PC0032835	POINQ0038084F	FUJ00031913
FSL_04/319	JBallantyne5245K	POINQ0065220F	FUJ00059049
FSL_04/320	PC0056922	POINQ0079496F	FUJ00070841
FSL_04/321	PC0057981	POINQ0080557F	FUJ00071767
FSL_04/322	PC0057957	POINQ0081198F	FUJ00072379
FSL_04/323	PC0058994	POINQ0085136F	FUJ00075544
FSL_04/324	PC0075892	POINQ0089796F	FUJ00083625
FSL_04/325	PC0083101	POINQ0089802F	FUJ00083631
FSL_04/326	PC0083563	POINQ0089804F	FUJ00083633
FSL_04/327	PC0104233	POINQ0089813F	FUJ00083642

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/328	PC0103925	POINQ0089814F	FUJ00083643
FSL_04/329	PC0103864	POINQ0089815F	FUJ00083644
FSL_04/330	PC0106213	POINQ0089816F	FUJ00083645
FSL_04/331	PC0111976	POINQ0089817F	FUJ00083646
FSL_04/332	PC0116670	POINQ0089820F	FUJ00083649
FSL_04/333	PC0117083	POINQ0089821F	FUJ00083650
FSL_04/334	PC0086212	POINQ0089822F	FUJ00083651
FSL_04/335	PC0101472	POINQ0089823F	FUJ00083652
FSL_04/336	PC0126042	POINQ0089825F	FUJ00083654
FSL_04/337	PC0122035	POINQ0089832F	FUJ00083661
FSL_04/338	PC0126376	POINQ0089834F	FUJ00083663
FSL_04/339	PC0127246	POINQ0089838F	FUJ00083667
FSL_04/340	PC0193012	POINQ0089890F	FUJ00083719
FSL_04/341	JSimpkins338Q	POINQ0089891F	FUJ00083720
FSL_04/342	PC0078592	POINQ0126710F	FUJ00120518
FSL_04/343	PC0224126	POINQ0090909F	FUJ00084738
FSL_04/344	PC0223870	POINQ0091023F	FUJ00084852
FSL_04/345	PC0246949	POINQ0092002F	FUJ00085831
FSL_04/346	Acha621P	POINQ0092004F	FUJ00085833
FSL_04/347	PC0247207	POINQ0092014F	FUJ00085843
FSL_04/348	PC0247250	POINQ0092017F	FUJ00085846
FSL_04/349	PC0246997	POINQ0092084F	FUJ00085913
FSL_04/350	Acha621P	POINQ0092095F	FUJ00085924
FSL_04/351	PC0248024	POINQ0092152F	FUJ00085981
FSL_04/352	PC0246997	POINQ0092243F	FUJ00086072
FSL_04/353	PC0195911	POINQ0087737F	FUJ00081566
FSL_04/354	PC0195511	POINQ0126711F	FUJ00120519
FSL_04/355	PC0196154	POINQ0126712F	FUJ00120520
FSL_04/356	PC0196120	POINQ0126713F	FUJ00120521
FSL_04/357	PC0196671	POINQ0126714F	FUJ00120522

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/358	PC0197753	POINQ0126716F	FUJ00120524
FSL_04/359	PC0197605	POINQ0126718F	FUJ00120526
FSL_04/360	PC0197828	POINQ0126719F	FUJ00120527
FSL_04/361	PC0197838	POINQ0126721F	FUJ00120529
FSL_04/362	PC0197034	POINQ0126723F	FUJ00120531
FSL_04/363	PC0197837	POINQ0126726F	FUJ00120534
FSL_04/364	PC0197873	POINQ0126728F	FUJ00120536
FSL_04/365	PC0197032	POINQ0126730F	FUJ00120538
FSL_04/366	PC0197872	POINQ0126732F	FUJ00120540
FSL_04/367	PC0197651	POINQ0126734F	FUJ00120542
FSL_04/368	PC0195380	POINQ0126736F	FUJ00120544
FSL_04/369	PC0198115	POINQ0126748F	FUJ00120556
FSL_04/370	acha4221Q	POINQ0126750F	FUJ00120558
FSL_04/371	PC0207466	POINQ0126751F	FUJ00120559
FSL_04/372	PC0203085	POINQ0126755F	FUJ00120563
FSL_04/373	acha4221Q	POINQ0126761F	FUJ00120569
FSL_04/374	PC0226230	POINQ0126762F	FUJ00120570
FSL_04/375	PC0246629	POINQ0126763F	FUJ00120571
FSL_04/376	PC0251952	POINQ0126764F	FUJ00120572
FSL_04/377	GMaxwell3853P	POINQ0126765F	FUJ00120573
FSL_04/378	PC0120937	POINQ0126766F	FUJ00120574
FSL_04/379	PC0143501	POINQ0126767F	FUJ00120575
FSL_04/380	PC0143466	POINQ0126768F	FUJ00120576
FSL_04/381	PC0143439	POINQ0126769F	FUJ00120577
FSL_04/382	PC0143499	POINQ0126770F	FUJ00120578
FSL_04/383	PC0143441	POINQ0126771F	FUJ00120579
FSL_04/384	PC0143539	POINQ0126772F	FUJ00120580
FSL_04/385	PC0143440	POINQ0126773F	FUJ00120581
FSL_04/386	PC0143514	POINQ0126774F	FUJ00120582
FSL_04/387	PC0143506	POINQ0126775F	FUJ00120583

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/388	PC0143515	POINQ0126776F	FUJ00120584
FSL_04/389	PC0143513	POINQ0126777F	FUJ00120585
FSL_04/390	PC0143508	POINQ0126778F	FUJ00120586
FSL_04/391	acha508S	POINQ0126779F	FUJ00120587
FSL_04/392	PC0143500	POINQ0126780F	FUJ00120588
FSL_04/393	PC0143511	POINQ0126781F	FUJ00120589
FSL_04/394	PC0143507	POINQ0126783F	FUJ00120591
FSL_04/395	PC0143502	POINQ0126784F	FUJ00120592
FSL_04/396	PC0143503	POINQ0126785F	FUJ00120593
FSL_04/397	PC0143682	POINQ0126786F	FUJ00120594
FSL_04/398	PC0143504	POINQ0126787F	FUJ00120595
FSL_04/399	PC0144933	POINQ0126788F	FUJ00120596
FSL_04/400	PC0140829	POINQ0126789F	FUJ00120597
FSL_04/401	PC0143435	POINQ0126790F	FUJ00120598
FSL_04/402	PC0140826	POINQ0126791F	FUJ00120599
FSL_04/403	PC0144937	POINQ0126792F	FUJ00120600
FSL_04/404	GCSimpson1936L	POINQ0126793F	FUJ00120601
FSL_04/405	maxwellg460L	POINQ0126794F	FUJ00120602
FSL_04/406	PC0198077	POINQ0090840F	FUJ00084669
FSL_04/407	PC0198259	POINQ0102175F	FUJ00096004
FSL_04/408	cardc2043L	POINQ0126795F	FUJ00120603
FSL_04/409	PC0197756	POINQ0126796F	FUJ00120604
FSL_04/410	PC0197800	POINQ0126797F	FUJ00120605
FSL_04/411	PC0197758	POINQ0126798F	FUJ00120606
FSL_04/412	PorterS199P	POINQ0126799F	FUJ00120607
FSL_04/413	Acha5259Q (v1)	POINQ0126800F	FUJ00120608
FSL_04/414	PC0198066	POINQ0126801F	FUJ00120609
FSL_04/415	PC0197797	POINQ0126802F	FUJ00120610
FSL_04/416	Acha5259Q (v2)	POINQ0126804F	FUJ00120612
FSL_04/417	PC0198677	POINQ0126805F	FUJ00120613

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/418	PC0198678	POINQ0126808F	FUJ00120616
FSL_04/419	PC0199719	POINQ0126809F	FUJ00120617
FSL_04/420	PC0196767	POINQ0126810F	FUJ00120618
FSL_04/421	PC0197409	POINQ0126819F	FUJ00120627
FSL_04/422	cardc2043L	POINQ0126826F	FUJ00120634
FSL_04/423	PC0204497	POINQ0126827F	FUJ00120635
FSL_04/424	PC0204396	POINQ0126828F	FUJ00120636
FSL_04/425	PC0197261	POINQ0126830F	FUJ00120638
FSL_04/426	dsed2640M	POINQ0126838F	FUJ00120646
FSL_04/427	PC0198352	POINQ0126839F	FUJ00120647
FSL_04/428	PC0197769	POINQ0126848F	FUJ00120656
FSL_04/429	PC0193463	POINQ0126860F	FUJ00120668
FSL_04/430	cardc464Q	POINQ0126861F	FUJ00120669
FSL_04/431	acha5650L	POINQ0126862F	FUJ00120670
FSL_04/432	PC0223229	POINQ0126863F	FUJ00120671
FSL_04/433	dsed4010N	POINQ0126866F	FUJ00120674
FSL_04/434	PC0256502	POINQ0126867F	FUJ00120675
FSL_04/435	PC0256566	POINQ0126870F	FUJ00120678
FSL_04/436	seng2048K	POINQ0126871F	FUJ00120679
FSL_04/437	PC0264632	POINQ0126872F	FUJ00120680
FSL_04/438	PC0277508	POINQ0126873F	FUJ00120681
FSL_04/439	acha959T	POINQ0126876F	FUJ00120684
FSL_04/440	PC0089918	POINQ0126877F	FUJ00120685
FSL_04/441	PC0090109	POINQ0126886F	FUJ00120694
FSL_04/442	PC0091284	POINQ0126888F	FUJ00120696
FSL_04/443	PSteed2847N	POINQ0126889F	FUJ00120697
FSL_04/444	PC0043811	POINQ0069461F	FUJ00062016
FSL_04/445	PC0046811	POINQ0074762F	FUJ00066601
FSL_04/446	PC0033128	POINQ0080947F	FUJ00072143
FSL_04/447	PC0123319	POINQ0092553F	FUJ00086382

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/448	PC0123647	POINQ0092557F	FUJ00086386
FSL_04/449	PC0132133	POINQ0092627F	FUJ00086456
FSL_04/450	PC0121925	POINQ0092638F	FUJ00086467
FSL_04/451	MScardifield2219S	POINQ0092659F	FUJ00086488
FSL_04/452	PC0039313	POINQ0126890F	FUJ00120698
FSL_04/453	PC0043685	POINQ0049678F	FUJ00043507
FSL_04/454	PC0045509	POINQ0050444F	FUJ00044273
FSL_04/455	PC0047609	POINQ0052150F	FUJ00045979
FSL_04/456	PC0044101	POINQ0052241F	FUJ00046070
FSL_04/457	PC0040754	POINQ0052393F	FUJ00046222
FSL_04/458	PC0048630	POINQ0052564F	FUJ00046393
FSL_04/459	PC0044232	POINQ0069638F	FUJ00062193
FSL_04/460	PC0050418	POINQ0070826F	FUJ00063277
FSL_04/461	PC0050415	POINQ0070844F	FUJ00063295
FSL_04/462	PC0052804	POINQ0074322F	FUJ00066305
FSL_04/463	PC0052704	POINQ0074367F	FUJ00066341
FSL_04/464	PC0052320	POINQ0074401F	FUJ00066372
FSL_04/465	PC0052575	POINQ0074843F	FUJ00066669
FSL_04/466	PC0053975	POINQ0075816F	FUJ00067376
FSL_04/467	PC0054846	POINQ0076876F	FUJ00068300
FSL_04/468	PC0054973	POINQ0077113F	FUJ00068526
FSL_04/469	PC0056661	POINQ0078716F	FUJ00070073
FSL_04/470	PC0056915	POINQ0078937F	FUJ00070288
FSL_04/471	PC0056960	POINQ0079037F	FUJ00070388
FSL_04/472	PC0050861	POINQ0080765F	FUJ00071966
FSL_04/473	PC0068442	POINQ0126891F	FUJ00120699
FSL_04/474	PC0068633	POINQ0126892F	FUJ00120700
FSL_04/475	PC0075312	POINQ0126893F	FUJ00120701
FSL_04/476	PC0076065	POINQ0126894F	FUJ00120702
FSL_04/477	PC0073855	POINQ0126895F	FUJ00120703

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/478	DRowe440R	POINQ0126896F	FUJ00120704
FSL_04/479	JBallantyne5328R	POINQ0065257F	FUJ00059086
FSL_04/480	PC0051255	POINQ0078047F	FUJ00069436
FSL_04/481	PC0058528	POINQ0081357F	FUJ00072538
FSL_04/482	PC0058686	POINQ0082546F	FUJ00073490
FSL_04/483	PC0052823	POINQ0085212F	FUJ00075614
FSL_04/484	PC0071836	POINQ0126897F	FUJ00120705
FSL_04/485	PC0078204	POINQ0126898F	FUJ00120706
FSL_04/486	PC0064574	POINQ0126899F	FUJ00120707
FSL_04/487	PC0133822	POINQ0126900F	FUJ00120708
FSL_04/488	PC0138926	POINQ0126901F	FUJ00120709
FSL_04/489	PC0153851	POINQ0126902F	FUJ00120710
FSL_04/490	PC0153660	POINQ0126903F	FUJ00120711
FSL_04/491	DRowe4629L	POINQ0126904F	FUJ00120712
FSL_04/492	PothapragadaC4913L	POINQ0126905F	FUJ00120713
FSL_04/493	PC0200502	POINQ0126906F	FUJ00120714
FSL_04/494	PC0207834	POINQ0126918F	FUJ00120726
FSL_04/495	PC0208918	POINQ0126922F	FUJ00120730
FSL_04/496	PC0205404	POINQ0126923F	FUJ00120731
FSL_04/497	PC0209602	POINQ0126925F	FUJ00120733
FSL_04/498	pothapragadac4359R	POINQ0126934F	FUJ00120742
FSL_04/499	PC0208292	POINQ0126935F	FUJ00120743
FSL_04/500	PC0261710	POINQ0126947F	FUJ00120755
FSL_04/501	PC0265443	POINQ0126948F	FUJ00120756
FSL_04/502	PC0261541	POINQ0126985F	FUJ00120793
FSL_04/503	PC0277076	POINQ0126988F	FUJ00120796
FSL_04/504	PC0051108	POINQ0071802F	FUJ00064193
FSL_04/505	PC0052025	POINQ0073096F	FUJ00065316
FSL_04/506	PC0063755	POINQ0092841F	FUJ00086670
FSL_04/507	PC0064809	POINQ0092843F	FUJ00086672

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/508	PC0064922	POINQ0092845F	FUJ00086674
FSL_04/509	PC0065021	POINQ0092851F	FUJ00086680
FSL_04/510	PC0044966	POINQ0051383F	FUJ00045212
FSL_04/511	PC0040243	POINQ0071037F	FUJ00063485
FSL_04/512	PC0047955	POINQ0072865F	FUJ00065135
FSL_04/513	PC0045529	POINQ0073032F	FUJ00065277
FSL_04/514	PC0049578	POINQ0073244F	FUJ00065453
FSL_04/515	PC0045847	POINQ0073611F	FUJ00065695
FSL_04/516	PC0039832	POINQ0073930F	FUJ00065960
FSL_04/517	PC0204872	POINQ0087299F	FUJ00081128
FSL_04/518	PC0075240	POINQ0127038F	FUJ00120846
FSL_04/519	PC0077253	POINQ0127039F	FUJ00120847
FSL_04/520	PC0075415	POINQ0127040F	FUJ00120848
FSL_04/521	PC0076869	POINQ0127041F	FUJ00120849
FSL_04/522	PC0077508	POINQ0127042F	FUJ00120850
FSL_04/523	PC0236246	POINQ0127060F	FUJ00120868
FSL_04/524	AllenD44331I	POINQ0127061F	FUJ00120869
FSL_04/525	PC0156174	POINQ0127062F	FUJ00120870
FSL_04/526	PC0156246	POINQ0127063F	FUJ00120871
FSL_04/527	PC0051813	POINQ0073107F	FUJ00065327
FSL_04/528	PC0051485	POINQ0073880F	FUJ00065928
FSL_04/529	PC0051327	POINQ0081116F	FUJ00072297
FSL_04/530	PC0059635	POINQ0081871F	FUJ00072951
FSL_04/531	PC0027581	POINQ0085155F	FUJ00075563
FSL_04/532	PC0219432	POINQ0127064F	FUJ00120872
FSL_04/533	PC0220393	POINQ0127065F	FUJ00120873
FSL_04/534	PC0218702	POINQ0127069F	FUJ00120877
FSL_04/535	PC0197643	POINQ0127070F	FUJ00120878
FSL_04/536	PC0214982	POINQ0127072F	FUJ00120880
FSL_04/537	PC0220532	POINQ0127073F	FUJ00120881

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/538	surs1034R	POINQ0127074F	FUJ00120882
FSL_04/539	PC0241242	POINQ0127075F	FUJ00120883
FSL_04/540	PC0241216	POINQ0127078F	FUJ00120886
FSL_04/541	PC0241528	POINQ0127088F	FUJ00120896
FSL_04/542	PC0239846	POINQ0127098F	FUJ00120906
FSL_04/543	acha959T	POINQ0127107F	FUJ00120915
FSL_04/544	PC0118562	POINQ0127108F	FUJ00120916
FSL_04/545	PC0114154	POINQ0127109F	FUJ00120917
FSL_04/546	PC0120459	POINQ0127110F	FUJ00120918
FSL_04/547	PC0121331	POINQ0127111F	FUJ00120919
FSL_04/548	PC0129774	POINQ0127112F	FUJ00120920
FSL_04/549	PC0130019	POINQ0127113F	FUJ00120921
FSL_04/550	PC0130127	POINQ0127114F	FUJ00120922
FSL_04/551	PC0130057	POINQ0127115F	FUJ00120923
FSL_04/552	PC0130123	POINQ0127116F	FUJ00120924
FSL_04/553	PC0130185	POINQ0127117F	FUJ00120925
FSL_04/554	LKiang2837P	POINQ0127118F	FUJ00120926
FSL_04/555	PC0129587	POINQ0127119F	FUJ00120927
FSL_04/556	PC0130056	POINQ0127120F	FUJ00120928
FSL_04/557	PC0204350	POINQ0127121F	FUJ00120929
FSL_04/558	obengc2336R	POINQ0127122F	FUJ00120930
FSL_04/559	PC0205567	POINQ0127123F	FUJ00120931
FSL_04/560	PC0052776	POINQ0074782F	FUJ00066621
FSL_04/561	PC0049702	POINQ0075807F	FUJ00067367
FSL_04/562	PC0053160	POINQ0084748F	FUJ00075163
FSL_04/563	PC0097081	POINQ0127124F	FUJ00120932
FSL_04/564	AChambers2258K	POINQ0127125F	FUJ00120933
FSL_04/565	PC0098230	POINQ0127126F	FUJ00120934
FSL_04/566	AChambers2252R	POINQ0127127F	FUJ00120935
FSL_04/567	PC0129767	POINQ0127128F	FUJ00120936

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/568	PC0137437	POINQ0127129F	FUJ00120937
FSL_04/569	PC0151787	POINQ0127130F	FUJ00120938
FSL_04/570	AgnihotriV917N	POINQ0127131F	FUJ00120939
FSL_04/571	Agnihotriv245L	POINQ0127132F	FUJ00120940
FSL_04/572	PC0200435	POINQ0127133F	FUJ00120941
FSL_04/573	PC0200399	POINQ0127140F	FUJ00120948
FSL_04/574	PC0201340	POINQ0127141F	FUJ00120949
FSL_04/575	Obengc5443L	POINQ0127142F	FUJ00120950
FSL_04/576	PC0200090	POINQ0127143F	FUJ00120951
FSL_04/577	Obengc4026R	POINQ0127149F	FUJ00120957
FSL_04/578	PC0200042	POINQ0127150F	FUJ00120958
FSL_04/579	PC0209240	POINQ0127160F	FUJ00120968
FSL_04/580	PC0226573	POINQ0127161F	FUJ00120969
FSL_04/581	PC0254447	POINQ0127162F	FUJ00120970
FSL_04/582	PC0260834	POINQ0127163F	FUJ00120971
FSL_04/583	PC0128264	POINQ0127164F	FUJ00120972
FSL_04/584	PC0129811	POINQ0127165F	FUJ00120973
FSL_04/585	PC0129835	POINQ0127166F	FUJ00120974
FSL_04/586	AChambers4134R	POINQ0127167F	FUJ00120975
FSL_04/587	PC0129791	POINQ0127168F	FUJ00120976
FSL_04/588	PC0128728	POINQ0127169F	FUJ00120977
FSL_04/589	suklabaidyas4944I	POINQ0127170F	FUJ00120978
FSL_04/590	PC0203137	POINQ0127171F	FUJ00120979
FSL_04/591	PC0203108	POINQ0127172F	FUJ00120980
FSL_04/592	Ballantj020J	POINQ0127173F	FUJ00120981
FSL_04/593	PC0202925	POINQ0127178F	FUJ00120986
FSL_04/594	PC0203215	POINQ0127179F	FUJ00120987
FSL_04/595	PC0202894	POINQ0127181F	FUJ00120989
FSL_04/596	PC0203284	POINQ0127182F	FUJ00120990
FSL_04/597	PC0115804	POINQ0127184F	FUJ00120992

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/598	PC0115456	POINQ0127185F	FUJ00120993
FSL_04/599	PC0117659	POINQ0127186F	FUJ00120994
FSL_04/600	PC0118350	POINQ0127187F	FUJ00120995
FSL_04/601	PC0118677	POINQ0127188F	FUJ00120996
FSL_04/602	PC0119978	POINQ0127189F	FUJ00120997
FSL_04/603	PC0120063	POINQ0127190F	FUJ00120998
FSL_04/604	PC0122147	POINQ0127191F	FUJ00120999
FSL_04/605	PC0122354	POINQ0127192F	FUJ00121000
FSL_04/606	PC0122304	POINQ0127193F	FUJ00121001
FSL_04/607	JAnscomb1935Q	POINQ0127194F	FUJ00121002
FSL_04/608	PC0122631	POINQ0127195F	FUJ00121003
FSL_04/609	PC0122630	POINQ0127196F	FUJ00121004
FSL_04/610	PC0122664	POINQ0127197F	FUJ00121005
FSL_04/611	PC0122766	POINQ0127198F	FUJ00121006
FSL_04/612	PC0123056	POINQ0127199F	FUJ00121007
FSL_04/613	PC0123058	POINQ0127200F	FUJ00121008
FSL_04/614	PC0122544	POINQ0127201F	FUJ00121009
FSL_04/615	PC0125210	POINQ0127202F	FUJ00121010
FSL_04/616	PC0125123	POINQ0127203F	FUJ00121011
FSL_04/617	AChambers253L	POINQ0127204F	FUJ00121012
FSL_04/618	PC0156718	POINQ0127205F	FUJ00121013
FSL_04/619	PC0141145	POINQ0127206F	FUJ00121014
FSL_04/620	PC0189625	POINQ0127211F	FUJ00121019
FSL_04/621	Ballantj2547K	POINQ0127213F	FUJ00121021
FSL_04/622	PC0142604	POINQ0127214F	FUJ00121022
FSL_04/623	PC0131348	POINQ0127215F	FUJ00121023
FSL_04/624	PC0152156	POINQ0127216F	FUJ00121024
FSL_04/625	PC0153333	POINQ0127217F	FUJ00121025
FSL_04/626	PC0157357	POINQ0127218F	FUJ00121026
FSL_04/627	PC0159273	POINQ0127219F	FUJ00121027

Exhibit No.	Document Description	Control No.	Inquiry URN
FSL_04/628	PC0162929	POINQ0127220F	FUJ00121028
FSL_04/629	PC0164058	POINQ0127224F	FUJ00121032
FSL_04/630	PC0171637	POINQ0127226F	FUJ00121034
FSL_04/631	PC0174587	POINQ0127227F	FUJ00121035
FSL_04/632	PC0196893	POINQ0127229F	FUJ00121037
FSL_04/633	PC0260269	POINQ0127232F	FUJ00121040
FSL_04/634	cardc235Q	POINQ0127233F	FUJ00121041
FSL_04/635	PC0273234	POINQ0127237F	FUJ00121045
FSL_04/636	CHawkes4210N	POINQ0127238F	FUJ00121046
FSL_04/637	SSur343P	POINQ0127239F	FUJ00121047
FSL_04/638	PC0109020	POINQ0127240F	FUJ00121048
FSL_04/639	CHawkes1745L	POINQ0127241F	FUJ00121049
FSL_04/640	PC0142872	POINQ0127242F	FUJ00121050

APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF THE 29 BEDs

BED 1 – RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS MISMATCH

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/311 to FSL_04/316).

- The issue allowed postmasters to rollover with an unresolved discrepancy. The impact of the problem was that the stock unit appeared to have balanced, and the discrepancy could be carried over unnoticed until the branch tried to roll their accounts over at the end of the next accounting period, whereupon the accounts were found to be out of balance.

- In September 2010, Fujitsu opened a number of Peaks in relation to the issue: PC0204263 (FSL_04/312), PC0204765 (FSL_04/313), and PC0203864 (FSL_04/315). Fujitsu identified the circumstances in which it happened and the branches that were affected (FSL_04/261). Affected branches were identified by searching for specific event codes in system logs from the point at which HNG-X had gone live. This analysis was cross-checked by POL in their own back-end system (FSL_04/262).

- Fujitsu produced reports in relation to the issue for POL (see for example, "lost discrepancies.doc" dated 28 September 2010 (FSL_04/263 and FSL_04/264). This provided a summary of the issue, and the stated purpose of the note was to:

  a. *"Summarise the problem in terms that are meaningful to Post Office Ltd*

  b. *Define a process for identifying all affected branches*

  c. *Explain what analysis is needed on each affected branch*

d. *Define what ongoing monitoring is required to pick up further occurrences of the issue until the root cause of the problem is fixed*

e. *Provide a basis for agreeing the necessary data fixes with Post Office Ltd; and how they are to be applied*

f. *Explain how each problem branch can be fixed"*

- In early October 2010, POL and Fujitsu held a conference call to discuss the issue. A meeting note was produced showing attendees from POL and Fujitsu including the headings: *"What is the issue?"*, *"Impact"*, *"Identifying the issue and forward resolution"*, *"Proposal for affected Branches"*, and *"Action Point Summary"* (FSL_04/265).

- Following the call, there were further communications between Fujitsu and the POL Duty Manager with updates as to the affected branches and the financial impact (FSL_04/266). To assist the Inquiry, further communication with POL includes: FSL_04/264, FSL_04/265 and FSL_04/267 to FSL_04/269. On 11 November 2010, POL emailed FSL: *"I have a conference call on Monday with senior stakeholders within POL*[.] *I need a full update for Receipts and Payments"* (FSL_04/270). An internal Fujitsu staff member noted: *"I've been sending a report every week to Pol* [sic] *Duty Manager..."* (FSL_04/269).

- The issue was also part of the agenda for a number of the monthly Service Management Reviews that were held with Fujitsu and POL (FSL_04/271 and FSL_04/272).

- A report titled "Receipts and Payments.doc" (FSL_04/273), dated 17 February 2011, was drafted in response to POL's request to *"put together a "storyboard" showing the precise steps all the way through the problem* [i.e. the receipts and payments mismatch issue], *consisting of screen shots and snapshot reports from*

the system. This will assist in the explanation of the issue to senior management and, if necessary, the Press" (FSL_04/274). Rod Ismay, Head of Product and Branch Accounting – Finance (POL), provided input on the final document (FSL_04/275).

- An email dated 20 February 2011 from the POL service delivery team stated "[a]*s per the normal process, Fujitsu reported the issue into the SD Live Service Desk once the discrepancies were identified by the HNG system. SD pulled together a team of stakeholders to assess the issue and track through to resolution, this included; Fujitsu, P&BA, IT&C, Security, Network and Legal*" PC0204263 (FSL_04/276).

- The issue was rectified by firstly correcting the reference data on 13 October 2010 (FSL_04/312). The reference data correction was effective once counters received the 02.12 counter upgrade, which was rolled out to the live estate in mid-October 2010 (FSL_04/277).

- KEL wrightm33145J was also written which described the problem to allow the Service Desk to recognise that the issue had occurred again if contacted by branches (FSL_04/316).

- The software issue that caused the discrepancy was monitored for future occurrences (FSL_04/264).

BED 2 - CALLENDAR SQUARE

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/317 to FSL_04/342).

- A problem existed in Horizon whereby, on occasion, a 'lock' was not released, and a second process would then wait for a given time before it 'timed out' and reported an error saying it could not proceed. The problem could occur in various places in the Horizon applications. In the initial occurrences a reboot of the counter allowed the system to resume proper function with no data lost.

- In some cases, in the Callendar Square branch in particular, the lock problem caused data to be lost when carrying out transfers between different 'stock units', thereby causing receipts and payments mismatches.

- There appear to have been instances of these Riposte lock errors from at least September 2000, such as PC0056922 (FSL_04/320). In this instance, a postmaster reported an error message when trying to re-declare their cash. The call was discussed between various teams from POL and Fujitsu. To assist the Inquiry, further examples include (but are not limited to): PC0057957, (FSL_04/322), PC0058994 (FSL_04/323), PC0078592 (FSL_04/342) and PC0083563 (FSL_04/326).

- KEL JBallantyne5245K (FSL_04/319) advised that restarting Riposte, or rebooting the counter, would resolve incidents where a message reported a timeout waiting for a lock. Some of these also led to receipts and payments mismatches, which after investigation, were dealt with by the Fujitsu MSU team raising a BIMS report so POL could issue an error notice (later known as a transaction correction) to the postmaster to allow them to reconcile the accounts.

BIMS reports set out the progress to the resolution of a 'Business Incident'. POL would use the information from the BIMS report to carry out reconciliation or settlement with their clients.

- It was identified that an error in the underlying Escher Riposte software caused the lock problem. The issue was raised with Escher, who developed a fix. The fix was implemented in the S90 software release. The S90 release was scheduled to start on 4 March 2006 for completion by 14 April 2006 (FSL_04/278). As of 22 March 2006, the S90 migration report showed that the counter release was 99.9% complete (FSL_04/279 and FSL_04/337).

- Fujitsu monitored the issue. For example, on 27 March 2006, a Fujitsu employee noted on PC0127246 that the timeout locks had "*gone right down*" (FSL_04/339).

BED 3 – SUSPENSE ACCOUNT BUG

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/343 to FSL_04/344).

- A change introduced into Horizon in July 2011 had the unintended consequence of leaving certain 'orphaned' records from November / December 2010 relating to a branch's suspense account in a table in the branch database, rather than archiving them. The consequence was that, once a year, when an impacted branch produced its trading statement, if they had any amount in their suspense account, the suspense account records from 2010 were also pulled in so that the branch trading statement showed an erroneous amount in the suspense account.

- When the problem resurfaced a year later, a postmaster contacted Fujitsu and a Peak (PC0223870) was raised on 25 February 2013 (FSL_04/344). Fujitsu then diagnosed the issue and identified 14 branches as being affected.

- Following this, Fujitsu held a conference call with POL's Problem Manager for this issue (FSL_04/344). The orphaned records were subsequently removed by the Fujitsu development team. An extra set of checks were introduced in October 2013 so that if a similar problem surfaced in the future, an error message would be displayed to the postmaster telling them to contact the Horizon Service Desk.

BED 4 - DALMELLINGTON

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/345 to FSL_04/352).

- This problem manifested when a specific sequence of events occurred:

    a. A user was logged out while they were part-way through the login process, either because of user inactivity at the counter, or because of a failure in network connectivity.

    b. Some time later, the user logged back in and manually 'remmed-in' a pouch of cash into the account.

    c. Normally, when a pouch was remmed-in, a 'rem slip' would be printed and the user would continue to another screen.

    d. In this particular circumstance, the rem slip would be printed but the system stayed on the same screen, and if the user pressed enter again, another rem slip would be printed, and the cash amount would be added to the account again. The branch accounts would therefore now show twice the cash than had actually been received.

- On 8 October 2015, a postmaster reported an incident to the NBSC and Atos, who was responsible the first line support for Horizon at the time (FSL_04/280). On 10 October 2015, Fujitsu raised the KEL Acha621P – V1. This KEL described the symptoms of the bug and stated *"the cause of the problem is being investigated"* (FSL_04/346). On 13 October 2015, another call (PC0246949) was raised (FSL_04/345). The call was originally made to the NBSC and was later routed to Fujitsu for investigation.

- By 15 October 2015, Fujitsu understood how the problem occurred, had identified that the problem had also recently occurred in other branches, and had raised a KEL as a workaround to address the issue, and a development Peak (PC0246997) for a code fix (FSL_04/349).

- At the time, the issue was escalated within both Fujitsu and POL (FSL_04/281 to FSL_04/290)

- According to KEL Acha621P, the fix was commenced in January 2016 (FSL_04/350). By 14 January 2016, there were around 400 counters that were yet to receive the fix (FSL_04/352).

- In relation to the testing of the issue, DEV/CNT/CTP/3008 - ODR Further Investigation - Component Test Plan is a "*Description of the approach to be taken for further testing required in relation to "ODR" - Outreach and Duplicate Rems issues*" (FSL_04/291).

BED 5 – REMMING IN BUG – ISSUE 1

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/353 to FSL_04/376).

- This problem arose if (i) a postmaster tried to rem-in a pouch on one counter, (ii) encountered an issue, such as a printing problem before completing the process, then (iii) tried again on another counter. This sequence could cause the pouch to be registered twice in the Horizon system, causing a discrepancy in the branch accounts.

- On 17 August 2010, PC0203085 was raised (FSL_04/372). Fujitsu distinguished this from the other type of remming in bug (BED 5, Issue 2). On 18 August 2010, a BIMS was raised for the branch so POL could issue a correction to the accounts. KEL acha4221Q was added to the call (FSL_04/370). The Peak went through testing and by 23 January 2011, the fix was applied to the live estate as *"part of PSPID Release HRU7284B_PR for 03.21.00.50"*.

BED 5 – REMMING IN BUG – ISSUE 2

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/353 to FSL_04/376).

- If a postmaster used the 'prev' (previous screen) button to move backwards during the process of remming in a cash pouch, and then scanned the same barcode again, Horizon would register the pouch twice, leading to a discrepancy in the branch accounts.

- This incident was first raised to Fujitsu on 2 March 2010 by a postmaster who was participating in the HNG-X pilot (FSL_04/368). The postmaster had checked their reports and found a pouch had been remmed in twice. Similar issues were reported by postmasters on 3 March 2010 (PC0195511, FSL_04/354), 17 March 2010 (PC0196120, FSL_04/356), and 18 March 2010 (PC0196154, FSL_04/355).

- In diagnosing the extent of the issue, Fujitsu identified affected branches in March 2010. Fujitsu used this as a basis to run a daily report (the 'Check Rems' report) which would be sent to the reconciliation team to identify further occurrences. A number of Peaks were opened after Fujitsu had identified potential double remming of pouches (FSL_04/357, FSL_04/359 and FSL_04/362). Generally, these Peaks were investigated and reported to POL so that a Transaction Correction could be issued.

- The fix was tested by the Live Support Team on 25 March 2010 and was sent to all counters on 22 April 2010 (PC0195911, FSL_04/353).

BED 6 - REMMING OUT BUG – ISSUE 1

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/373 and FSL_04/377 to FSL_04/405).

- A coding error in a specific counter release (T30 INC1) caused imbalances when remming out multiple pouches of coins, which could cause discrepancies.

- The issue was first reported to Fujitsu on 12 February 2007 by a postmaster who had observed the problem (PC0143435, FSL_04/401). The issue was initially reported to the NBSC. Analysis from the SSC recognised that this would cause a receipts and payments mismatch, and that the problem could affect cash, stock and foreign exchange rem outs.

- Many instances of this problem were identified through reconciliation reports and affected branches were contacted by Fujitsu. See for example, PC0143503 at FSL_04/396. Other instances were reported by POL directly (see for example, PC0143514 at FSL_04/386), including one in April 2007 at a branch where the release regression (the fix mentioned below) had failed (PC0144937, FSL_04/403) (PC0144933, FSL_04/399).

- Fujitsu reported on possible branches that were affected in email correspondence between Fujitsu and POL (FSL_04/292). Fujitsu also prepared a report titled 'Rem Misbalance', setting out the nature and extent of the problem (FSL_04/293 and FSL_04/294). Fujitsu asked POL to distribute the paper to relevant POL employees (FSL_04/295). The discussion as to whether to inform postmasters about the issue was discussed internally within POL (FSL_04/292).

FUJ00126035
FUJ00126035

- Generally, a Transaction Correction (issued by POL) would have been required to fix the issue. It was also necessary to carry out an Operational Change Request ("**OCR**") to correct the data destined for POL's back-office systems.

- A fix was identified by 19 February 2007, and on 4 June 2007, it was reported to be live across all branches (FSL_04/401). According to the February 2007 Service Review Book, the T30 INC1 release was 'regressed', i.e., as far as possible counter applications were returned to the previous release, on the night of 12 February 2007 (FSL_04/296). KEL acha508S records that Fujitsu's SSC team had contacted the affected branches to provide advice as to what to do to remedy rem out issues (FSL_04/391).

- Release Notes RNT3035D and RNT3036C were both created on or around 22 February 2007 to monitor and track the progress of the releases.

BED 6 - REMMING OUT BUG – ISSUE 2

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/373 and FSL_04/377 to FSL_04/405).

- A postmaster attempted to rem out a pouch of coins. Upon receiving a message that the bar code was invalid, they were able to use the home button, which should not have been possible (PC0120937, FSL_04/378). This caused the transaction to be left in the branch suspense account.

- The problem was raised on 13 May 2005 by the postmaster. Following discussion between the SSC and Development team via the Peak, it was agreed that a KEL (GMaxwell3853P) would be raised in case future incidents were reported (FSL_04/377). Per PC0120937, Fujitsu understands the SSC also checked Peaks that had been raised since the introduction of Release S60 and were unable to identify previous occurrences. The call was passed back to the NBSC for rectification. The Peak was closed on 15 June 2005.

BED 7 – LOCAL SUSPENSE ACCOUNT ISSUE

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/406 to FSL_04/425).

- This issue was a combination of two issues: (i) a coding error in the Branch Access Layer ("**BAL**") server application referred to as a 'threading error', and (ii) insufficient error handling in the counter application, meant that when unexpected messages were received the counter either did not recognise that an error had occurred, and therefore behaved unexpectedly, or did not deal with the error in a helpful way.

- The combination of these two issues manifested at the counter in at least four ways, which were initially documented in several Peaks: PC0196767, PC0197409 and PC0197797 (FSL_04/420, FSL_04/421 and FSL_04/415, respectively). Fujitsu's records indicate that the Local Suspense Account issue was first noted on 29 March 2010 in Peak PC0196767 (FSL_04/420). The Peak noted that *"OCR 26169 has been raised"* (FSL_04/297). The branch appeared in a TPSC Harvester Exception report and a TPSC257 (POLFS Incomplete Summaries) report, and showed three new harvester exceptions.

- Fujitsu identified affected branches and discussed this with POL (FSL_04/298 to FSL_04/300).

- A workaround was provided in KEL cardc2043L on 15 April 2010 (FSL_04/408). Fujitsu's SSC and development teams worked together on these issues and determined that, whilst most incidents were raised because of issues at the counter, the root cause was on the BAL server. By 18 April 2010, development had managed to reproduce the problem and by 22 April 2010, code fixes required

to the BAL server applications had been identified (FSL_04/420). Testing of the BAL server fixes was fast-tracked and underway by 28 April 2010. The Peak was marked "*release to live*" on 17 May 2010. On 8 July 2010, the fix was rolled out in BAL_SRV_OSR_0122_V058-V057 (FSL_04/421 and FSL_04/422). In September 2010, the "[c]*ounter release RNT9612 delivering Tivoli Product COUNTER_X0210 54_1*" had begun its roll out to the live estate (FSL_04/406 and FSL_04/301).

BED 8 – RECOVERY ISSUES – ISSUE 1

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/426 to FSL_04/439).

- During the pilot of Horizon Online, an issue occurred when there was a failed transaction on one stock unit and the user then logged into another stock unit to invoke the recovery for the failed transaction. In this instance, a transaction could be recovered to the wrong trading period.

- Peak PC0197769 was raised on 15 April 2010 in relation to the issue. A postmaster reported a balancing issue after a clerk had swapped terminals (FSL_04/428).

- The problem itself was described in a report on issues likely to impact the POL's Product and Branch Accounting team, prepared by Fujitsu for the Joint Steering Board at the request of Ian Trundell (POL) (FSL_04/302). The SSC concluded that the issue could have an impact on branch accounts. On 29 April 2010, an email indicated that Fujitsu had identified 13 branches which might have been affected by this problem, and that, on 26 May 2010, three more had been identified (FSL_04/303). Details were passed to the Fujitsu Reconciliation team so that any accounting discrepancies could be communicated to POL for rectification.

BED 8 – RECOVERY ISSUES – ISSUE 2

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/426 to FSL_04/439).

- There were a number of failed recoveries within this issue. These are broadly grouped into: (i) State 4 recovery failures, (ii) State 4 pin pad issues, and (iii) recovery failures due to printer error.

State 4 Recovery failures

- KEL acha959t identifies the circumstances which could cause a transaction to be in State 4 (FSL_04/439). These include failure of the Recovery process. The KEL was originally written on 28 February 2010 during the Horizon Online pilot. It explains that Recovery can fail because:

  "If a T1 recovery request times out at the counter, recovery is abandoned and no second attempt is made to get the recovery information. This is as designed; it was decided to keep recovery simple and not have too many error paths. The priority is to get the User working again, so in this sort of error path we just mark the recovery as failed and leave it for SSC to sort out. If it does become a frequent occurrence development could look at this area again, but there is no obvious improvement."

- The KEL instructs Fujitsu's MSU as to what actions to take for each circumstance. In particular, where there is a failed Recovery, detailed checking is required as, under one circumstance, a branch customer's bank account could have been debited money which had not been paid to the customer. In others, the branch customer's bank account could be correct but a loss will have been incurred in the branch account.

- The general approach would have been for the MSU team to generate a BIMS report so that a Transaction Correction would be issued to correct the position of either branch or customer accounts. On occasion the MSU would also raise a Peak so that the SSC could confirm if there were any underlying software issues.

State 4 PIN pad issues

- An incident occurred in which the postmaster cancelled a banking transaction just as the customer was entering their PIN code into the PIN pad. The result was that, despite a cancellation receipt being produced, the customer's bank account was debited. Horizon produced a system error and then continued.

- Peak PC0223229 was opened on 28 January 2013 (FSL_04/432). Following investigation, it was determined that a manual reconciliation was needed to return funds to the customer. Fujitsu's Development team was asked to review the incident to determine whether there was a problem which could be fixed or whether a KEL should be raised. The Development team reproduced the problem on 30 January 2013 and appear to have determined that it was caused by the way the application handled error codes from the PIN pad. There was an investigation with the Fujitsu reconciliation team to see if other examples of this event had occurred.

- The Peak does not appear to have been investigated further and the issue was resolved during standard reconciliation processes.

Recovery failures due to printer error

- During the Horizon Online pilot, a customer transaction failed to complete at the counter, but the customer's bank account was debited. The transaction should have been recovered but the recovery failed. The root cause was found to be a bug in the printing system.

- Peak PC0193463 was opened on 19 January 2010 and a BIMS report was raised with POL on 20 January 2010 so that the customer could be refunded (FSL_04/429). The problem was reproduced on 21 January 2010 and a fixed specified. A patch containing the tested fix was prepared on 22 January 2010. By 3 February 2010, the fix had been tested and it was confirmed that banking transactions would not suffer from the same issue because of printing errors. The fix was scheduled for release and closed on 16 April 2010.

BED 9 - REVERSALS

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/440 to FSL_04/443).

- A code fix distributed as part of the S30 release, caused a problem under certain circumstances due to faulty logic. On occasion, when a postmaster attempted to 'reverse out' a sum which had been 'remmed in', the balance showed double the initial amount rather than zero. According to the April 2003 Service Review Book, dated 15 May 2003, delivery of S30 commenced in April 2003 and by 2 May 2003, 2,135 branches were live.

- The initial issue (PC0089918) was reported by a postmaster to the NBSC on 24 April 2003 (FSL_04/440). The problem was then sent to the Fujitsu SSC on 28 April 2003, who identified that an error had occurred. A KEL (PSteed2847N) was raised (FSL_04/443). The issue was also routed to the Fujitsu MSU team so that they could liaise with POL, who would then issue Transaction Corrections to rectify the accounts, following which the Peak was to be routed back to Fujitsu so that Development could produce a code fix.

- On 30 April 2003, the Fujitsu EPOSS Development team identified the coding error, and that it had been released with S30. An emergency fix was created, tested, and went live on 7 May 2003. Instructions for testers detailed how the fix was to be tested, to make sure that both the new problem and the original problem which S30 aimed to fix had been fixed.

BED 10 – DATA TREE BUILD FAILURES – ISSUE 1

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/444 to FSL_04/452).

- Fujitsu understands this issue was first reported by a branch on 10 November 1999 after a discrepancy occurred in the accounts (PC0033128, FSL_04/446).

- A number of PinICLs for similar incidents were raised between February and May 2000 (for example, see PC0039313, FSL_04/452).

- A list of cross-domain problems was presented in the monthly Service Review Books to be discussed in the Service Review Forum with POL. The issue with the Dungannon branch was tracked in a number of these (for example, see FSL_04/304).

- To resolve the issue, Fujitsu implemented two changes – specific diagnostics to log a failure to build the data tree, and more error checking in the application code. Such diagnostics were distributed to 99% of the estate by 16 May 2000 (FSL_04/446). This would allow any recurrences of the problem to be monitored.

- Error checking for this issue was included in the CI4 release, which was rolled out to existing live counters between August and October 2000. Fujitsu monitored the issue following the CI4 release. In the PinICL for Dungannon (PC0033128), Fujitsu stated on 29 November 2000 *"This problem has now been on monitor since the introduction of CSR+ and no further incidents have occurred. I have agreed closure with Theresa Walsh (POCL) who will close the corresponding POCL problem call"*. The call was subsequently closed.

BED 10 – DATA TREE BUILD FAILURES – ISSUE 2

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/444 to FSL_04/452).

Issue 2(1) - PC0121925

- Two incidents arose during testing by POL of release S80, whereby discrepancies appeared when balancing. The two incidents were raised in test by POL on 13 June 2005 and 4 July 2005 (FSL_04/450). A KEL was written with a workaround should a similar incident occur in live operations, but no further action was taken.

- A fixed was released on 18 August 2005. POL re-tested the issue and closed their own incident.

Issue 2(2) - PC0132133

- In this instance, a postmaster reported a situation whereby a cash report showed varying discrepancies over a 20-minute period, after which the discrepancy disappeared. The postmaster was referred to Fujitsu by the NBSC.

- The incident was initially raised on 10 February 2006 (FSL_04/449). Fujitsu identified a coding error and also specified that further diagnostics be inserted into the EPOSS application which would provide an audit log if this or a similar problem happened again, so that reoccurrence of the problem could be monitored.

- On 24 February 2006, the Release Management Forum authorised these fixes to be carried out. On 23 March 2006, the fixes were released in the live system. KEL MScardifield2219S was updated accordingly (FSL_04/451).

BED 11 – GIROBANK DISCREPANCIES – ISSUE 1

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/453 to FSL_04/478).

- In this case, Giro transaction reversals carried out after the report cut-off time were not included in the daily Giro report for that day, nor in the same report for the next day. Despite this, the transaction reversals would have been recorded correctly in the weekly office Cash Account report. In this instance, the system was working as designed so no fix was required.

- In some instances, the discrepancy was reported by Girobank to the postmaster, who would then call Fujitsu or POL through the Helpline, for example, PinICLs PC0044101 (FSL_04/456) and PC0050418 (FSL_04/460), whereas in other instances, the issues were discovered by the postmaster, for example PinICL PC0040754 (FSL_04/457).

BED 11 – GIROBANK DISCREPANCIES – ISSUE 2

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/453 to FSL_04/478).

- The same Giro deposit was included on two successive daily reports as a result of being committed during a particular window of time on a shared stock unit. It was noticed by Fujitsu while investigating BED 11, Issue 1 above, and a fix was applied to prevent reoccurrence. This appears to be another instance of the bug recorded in incident PC0052575, which is included in BED 11, Issue 3 below (FSL_04/465).

- The issue was fixed by new ReportProcessor, ReportBroker and DataServer files, and Fujitsu released the fix between 30 May and 23 June 2000 (FSL_04/474).

BED 11 – GIROBANK DISCREPANCIES – ISSUE 3

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/453 to FSL_04/478).

- A discrepancy occurred between the daily Giro report and the office daily report due to a transaction being carried out on a shared stock unit by one user while another user was printing and cutting off the daily report. The bug described in the first incident relating to this issue (PC0052575, FSL_04/465) appears to be identical to that described in BED 11, Issue 2. The other incident relating to this issue (PC0052704, FSL_04/463) appears to be the same as BED 11, Issue 1.

BED 11 – GIROBANK DISCREPANCIES – ISSUE 4

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/453 to FSL_04/478).

- In this instance, a programming error meant that the daily cut-off report could be produced more than once.

- The POL team, Post Office Network Business Service Management ("**PON BSM**") raised an incident with Fujitsu on 27 July 2001. Incident PC0068633 (FSL_04/474) was opened and by 2 August 2001, Fujitsu had reproduced the bug and identified the code fix required. The fix had been coded and tested by 21 December 2001.

BED 11 – GIROBANK DISCREPANCIES – ISSUE 5

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/453 to FSL_04/478).

- Fujitsu understands this related to differences between the daily Giro report and the office daily report.

- A postmaster initially raised a problem on 9 April 2002 and incident PC0075312 was raised on 10 April 2002 (FSL_04/475). It was investigated, and identified that the same problem, but relating to National Savings reports, had been previously raised in incident PC0073855 (FSL_04/477), which was being investigated by the Fujitsu development team. Incident PC0075312 was closed on 10 April 2002. PC0073855 subsequently investigated both this problem and the related National Savings problem.

- Diagnostics were put in place to ensure any future occurrence could be investigated in detail. KEL DRowe440r was also logged (FSL_04/478).

BED 11 – GIROBANK DISCREPANCIES – ISSUE 6

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/453 to FSL_04/478).

- Fujitsu understands this was a single incident relating to Girobank transactions not appearing on a daily cut-off report.

- Incident PC0076065 (FSL_04/476) was opened on 9 May 2002 after a call from the postmaster. Fujitsu investigated the issue on the same day by reviewing the message store and concluded that the postmaster had printed the report twice, once before the transactions had been carried out, and once after. This situation was explained to the postmaster.

BED 12 – COUNTER REPLACEMENT – ISSUE 1

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/479 to FSL_04/491).

- Fujitsu's solution to POL's requirements 820 and 832 (schedule A.16 of the Codified Agreement) used automatic replication of data between counter servers in a branch, or between a counter and the central correspondence server, to ensure "*recovery without operator intervention*" in the case of a local failure. If an engineer replaced a counter server, the system was intended to automatically replicate data back to this new hardware without loss of transactions. On occasion when a replacement took place, the server came out of recovery mode before replication was complete, resulting in a small number of messages being overwritten. Depending on what was overwritten, this may have stalled the upload of data to central servers from the branch or might result in lost transactions and a receipts and payments mismatch in the branch accounts.

- The problem first appears to have been recognised in incident PC0051255, which was opened on 27 July 2000 (FSL_04/480). In this instance, the branch had not "polled" (uploaded data to the central systems). By 1 August 2000, Fujitsu reported that the branch message store had been inspected and the cause had been tracked to missing messages. The issue was passed to Fujitsu's 4th line support, who suspected it was caused by a counter server replacement. Fujitsu then checked the message logs, and it was confirmed that a counter replacement had taken place.

- The problem was seen again independently during release testing on 21 August 2000 and incident PC0052823 was raised (FSL_04/483).

- Fujitsu discussed the fix to incident PC0052823 with POL at a Release Management Forum on 20 December 2000 (FSL_04/305). On 9 September 2002, the incident PC0052823 was closed after a successful retest.

- During the period in which incident PC0052823 was being investigated and fixes designed, a number of other incidents including PC0064574 (FSL_04/486) were raised because of live incidents of this problem which caused receipts and payments mismatches in branch accounts. When an incident caused receipts and payments mismatches, the Fujitsu MSU team generally liaised with POL through the reconciliation process to balance accounts.

- Fujitsu were also in communication with POL's Problem Manager for PC0064574 (Ed Jones) (FSL_04/486). In addition, the issue was referenced in Service Review Books on 17 April 2001 and 15 May 2001 which record *"PC0064574, raised 29/03/01 - PM - Hard drive swaps - R&P misbalance"* (FSL_04/306 and FSL_04/307).

BED 12 – COUNTER REPLACEMENT – ISSUE 2

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/479 to FSL_04/491).

- The issue was identified through the standard reconciliation process on 23 March 2006 (PC0133822, FSL_04/487). This issue occurred because messages were missing at the counter server in a branch though they were present on the central correspondence server. The problem occurred when the branch was reconfigured from being a three-counter branch to a single counter branch, and the root cause appears to have been that the engineer failed initially to install a "mirror" (backup) server for the single counter.

- By 27 March 2006, Fujitsu had identified the cause and impact of the problem, which was resolved through the standard process of issuing a BIMS report to POL so that a transaction correction could be issued by POL.

BED 12 – COUNTER REPLACEMENT – ISSUE 3

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/479 to FSL_04/491).

- Fujitsu's records indicate this issue arose in one branch and occurred due to a system problem. A report incorrectly showed a receipts and payments mismatch, though there was no underlying discrepancy in the accounts.

- The issue was identified through standard monitoring on 31 January 2008 and a Peak (PC0153660, FSL_04/490) was opened on 1 February 2008. By 4 February 2008, Fujitsu had investigated the counter messages and determined the cause, which appears to have been a synchronisation issue between two counters which caused a report to show the wrong information. It was determined that there was no underlying impact on the accounts.

- On 7 February 2008, the postmaster separately reported the issue to the NBSC, which then routed the incident to Fujitsu, resulting in a further Peak (PC0153851, FSL_04/489). Fujitsu confirmed: *"This has already been investigated (PC0153660) because the counter daily reconciliation showed up a problem. Caused by Riposte failing to index four messages. PC0153660 has been updated with information to be passed to POL"*. Fujitsu spoke with the postmaster and monitored the issue until the branch rolled into the next trading period. Both calls were subsequently closed and a final BIMS report was issued to POL.

BED 13 – WITHDRAWN STOCK DISCREPANCIES

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/492 to FSL_04/499).

- An issue occurred when a postmaster declared they held stock of a product that had been withdrawn by POL.

- The issue manifested in the live system at a branch concerning £5 savings stamps which had been withdrawn by POL. NBSC raised the incident with Fujitsu on 19 January 2011 (PC0207834, FSL_04/494). By 11 February 2011, an investigation under incident PC0207834 had been carried out to identify all branches impacted by the withdrawn stock problem. On 2 March 2011, it was confirmed that the "*NBSC have actioned the workaround successfully*".

- By 1 April 2011, it was confirmed that a code fix for this issue would be delivered to prevent any recurrences. Further, as set out in incident PC0209602 (FSL_04/497), user interface changes were made to ensure withdrawn products did not appear as options when a counter clerk was making stock declarations.

BED 14 – BUREAU DISCREPANCIES – ISSUE 1

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/500 to FSL_04/503).

- A discrepancy in branch accounts occurred when a network disconnection took place halfway through a transaction to sell a customer a basket with two different currencies. The total amount for both currencies appeared in the branch accounts, but only the order for the first currency was received by the currency provider.

- Peak PC0261541 (FSL_04/502) was first raised to Fujitsu on 17 August 2017 after the issue had occurred in a branch. By 18 August 2017, Fujitsu identified that the problem occurred after a communications timeout. By 23 August 2017, Fujitsu had identified that the problem related to an AP-ACD script. POL was informed so that the discrepancy could be remedied through a transaction correction. On 24 August 2017, Atos, who were responsible for maintenance of the script on behalf of POL, were informed of the problem and the changes required.

BED 14 – BUREAU DISCREPANCIES – ISSUE 2

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/500 to FSL_04/503).

- A discrepancy arose between the foreign currency amount for Euros and US Dollars recorded in Horizon at one branch, and the amounts which POL's back-office system (POLSAP) calculated that the branch was holding. The impact on the branch was that the request to replenish Euros and US Dollars were refused, so the branch could not make sales.

- The incident appears to have been initially raised with Fujitsu on 19 December 2017 in PC0265443 (FSL_04/501). The investigation involved four parties, POL (as the interface with the branch), Atos (overall service manager/problem manager), Fujitsu (provider of the Horizon system), Accenture (provider of the POLSAP system). The Peak also noted that *"The comparison of data between Fujitsu and Accenture identified no discrepancies and the visit to the branch by a POL trainer confirmed that the branch holdings matches the figures held in Horizon"*.

- It was agreed that the incident was outside Fujitsu's remit, specifically the MMBE Files for US Dollars and Euros which was agreed to be dealt with by Atos and Accenture. The Peak was subsequently closed in May 2018.

BED 15 – PHANTOM TRANSACTIONS – ISSUE 1

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/504 to FSL_04/509).

- A postmaster raised a call concerning transactions which appeared without the branch staff knowingly processing them, or which appeared in error when another transaction was processed. Other issues such as hardware problems were also reported.

- Peak PC0063755 (FSL_04/506) was opened on 12 March 2001. Two other Peaks were opened for later calls (PC0064809, FSL_04/507 and PC0064922, FSL_04/508). A master Peak (PC0065021, FSL_04/509) was opened on 13 June 2001 and records numerous calls from the postmaster raising issues. The Peak describes the action taken to identify the root cause of the issue. In addition, an engineer from ROMEC (a company contracted by POL) visited the branch.

- The master Peak (PC0065021) was closed in November 2001 concluding: "*Phantom Txns have not been proven in circumstances which preclude user error. In all cases where these have occurred a user error related cause can be attributed to the phenomenon.*"

BED 15 – PHANTOM TRANSACTIONS – ISSUE 2

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/504 to FSL_04/509).

- In August 2000, a postmaster reported a receipt containing three transactions was printed without any user input (PC0052025, FSL_04/505). Investigation from Fujitsu indicated that the transactions were in a suspended session and were not completed when the user was logged out after a period of inactivity. The system was designed to complete such transactions and print the receipt to evidence this. The situation was explained to the postmaster, and it was agreed that the incident could be closed.

FUJ00126035
FUJ00126035

BED 15 – PHANTOM TRANSACTIONS – ISSUE 3

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/504 to FSL_04/509).

- In August 2000, the same postmaster that reported the issue in BED 15, Issue 2 raised a call to the Fujitsu Helpdesk (PC0051108, FSL_04/504). The postmaster reported that there were differences between the icons displayed on the two counters at the branch. The second counter had not yet received the latest Riposte release. It would have been automatically upgraded in due course, but Fujitsu upgraded the second counter sooner to bring it up to date with the other counter.

BED 16 – RECONCILIATION ISSUES – ISSUE 1

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/446 and FSL_04/510 to FSL_04/524)

- This issue related to a report that identified any mismatches in relation to the Cash Account. An issue with the code meant, in the event of a particular sequence of operations being carried out by the postmaster, it would cause transactions to be brought forward from the previous week's Cash Account.

- The problem was initially flagged through Fujitsu's monitoring in PinICL PC0039832 (FSL_04/516, later cloned to PC0040243 (FSL_04/511)), which was opened on 3 March 2000. By 9 March 2000, it had been investigated and Fujitsu suspected it was an issue with the reconciliation reporting. It was flagged for a rapid fix as it impacted financial reconciliation. By 10 April 2000, the problem had been reproduced and the area of code which caused it had been identified. By 18 April 2000, a fix appears to have been tested, which later went live in July 2000.

- Two other PinICLs were raised (PC0044966 and PC0045529) and were found to be instances of the same problem which occurred before the fix went live (FSL_04/510 and FSL_04/513).

BED 16 – RECONCILIATION ISSUES – ISSUE 2

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/446 and FSL_04/510 to FSL_04/524)

- The problem was flagged to the Fujitsu SSC as a result of monitoring reports in two separate PinICLs in April 2002 (PC0075240, FSL_04/518 and PC0075415, FSL_04/520).

- SSC investigated both problems and by 30 April 2002, they found that a rounding error in the reporting code caused entries of £0.01 in the cash account to be ignored in a reconciliation report, causing spurious discrepancies to be flagged.

- It was originally fixed on 11 June 2002 and the fix went live on 19 June 2002. The fix (which encompassed other issues) was found to be causing the reconciliation report process to run very slowly, so the fix was withdrawn, redelivered on 12 July 2002, and went live on 28 August 2002.

BED 16 – RECONCILIATION ISSUES – ISSUE 3

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/446 and FSL_04/510 to FSL_04/524)

- The issue (PC0049578, FSL_04/514) occurred in a test system in around July 2000 and was flagged by POL's test team to the Horizon helpdesk, who ultimately passed the issue to the SSC. In this instance, there was a difference between the number of files recorded as being transferred to TIP and the number of files actually transferred.

- The Fujitsu development team investigated the issue. The problem was fixed by installing WP104 into the live estate on 11 August 2000. Fujitsu confirmed that the problem was corrected following the application of WP104 and subsequently closed the call.

BED 16 – RECONCILIATION ISSUES – ISSUE 4

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/446 and FSL_04/510 to FSL_04/524)

- A single incident caused by an issue described above (BED 10 - Data Tree Build Failure Discrepancies – Issue 1) meant a reconciliation report falsely flagged a discrepancy in the cash account. PC0045847 (FSL_04/515) was opened on 26 May 2000 as a discrepancy was shown for a branch which had just been migrated successfully. By 5 June 2000, Fujitsu had identified the cause as being a failure to record the correct totals during rollover.

- After investigation of the logs, it was established that there was a corruption of the message store when this incident occurred. By 11 August 2000, it was confirmed that this was a specific instance of the lack of Riposte error checking which caused BED 10 - Data Tree Build Failure Discrepancies – Issue 1, and would be fixed when the fix for that bug went live. The PinICL was closed on 14 August 2000.

BED 16 – RECONCILIATION ISSUES – ISSUE 5

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/446 and FSL_04/510 to FSL_04/524)

- This issue related to the Client Transaction Summary (CTS) file, which was sent from branch accounts and delivered to POL's back-office systems. Under certain circumstances, due to a coding error, data was missing from the CTS file but present in Client Files that were also sent to POL's back-office systems, causing a discrepancy to be registered in POL's back-office system (POLSAP).

- POL's Client Settlement and Accounts Payable team initially found a discrepancy between CTS and Client Files produced in August 2014 and raised the issue with Fujitsu, who raised Peak PC0236246 (FSL_04/523).

- Fujitsu's SSC investigated the issue and passed it on to Fujitsu's development team. On 18 September 2014, Fujitsu's Development team produced a hypothesis as to why the problem was occurring, which was that it related to new products that had start times which were not midnight. On 19 September 2014, the hypothesis was validated, and a fix proposed. Updates regarding the resolution and fix were provided to Atos in their role as operational service manager.

- A KEL (AllenD4431I) was written to describe the problem if it reoccurred before the fix went live (FSL_04/524).

- The fix was written, tested and integrated by 8 October 2014. The fix went live on 4 December 2014 via an operational change (MSC) and was later incorporated in a standard release.

BED 16 – RECONCILIATION ISSUES – ISSUE 6

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/510 to FSL_04/524).

- The incident (PC0204872) was raised on 28 September 2010 (FSL_04/517). It related to an issue in POL's back-office system (POLSAP). It was concluded that the problem was an issue with POLSAP rather than an issue with Horizon. The Peak was closed by 30 September 2010, and the person who raised the incident was informed.

BED 17 – BRANCH CUSTOMER DISCREPANCIES

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/525 to FSL_04/526).

- This was an incident where customer was charged by their bank although the transaction was not recorded by Horizon because the counter crashed while attempting the transaction. Fujitsu detected the problem transaction via the automated NB102 report, where it appeared as a state 4 transaction (an incomplete transaction). The report resulted in the creation of Peak PC0156174 (FSL_04/525) in March 2008.

- Fujitsu contacted the branch to advise the postmaster on the recovery processes and later that day, a BIMS report was issued to POL to rectify the issue.

BED 18 – CONCURRENT LOGINS – ISSUE 1

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/527 to FSL_04/531).

- Issue 1 related to a single user being able to log into Horizon at two counters at the same time, which the system should not have allowed.

- PinICL PC0027581 (FSL_04/531) was raised on 9 July 1999, after a postmaster reported to the NBSC that he had been able to log on to two counters at the same time. By 13 July 1999, Fujitsu confirmed that the Riposte message store seemed to show that the postmaster had been logged on two counters simultaneously. The diagnosis and resolution of the issue was passed between Fujitsu team members, and during this time, NBSC made contact with Fujitsu to confirm the status of the incident.

- On 3 November 1999, Fujitsu attempted to reproduce the problem and found it could be reproduced. Following this, there was discussion as to whether the issue was of sufficiently high priority to fix at that time. On 2 February 2000, the priority of the incident was raised and the team responsible for Escher investigated. On 25 May 2000, Fujitsu appears to have raised the issue with Escher. Escher released a new version of Riposte on 15 September 2000, which was meant to include a fix for this issue. However, a further test on 27 September 2000 demonstrated that the issue had not been rectified.

- On 11 October 2000, Escher stated that Riposte logins were working as designed. In or around June or July 2001, it appears that it was decided that Fujitsu's EPOSS team would implement a workaround for the issue.

- The PinICL was closed on 7 February 2002 with instructions to reopen the PinICL
  if the issue reoccurred.

BED 18 – CONCURRENT LOGINS – ISSUE 2

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/527 to FSL_04/531).

- Issue 2 concerned a receipts and payments mismatch that occurred due to a coding issue, which permitted a postmaster to transfer money from one counter to another while the first counter was being rolled over. The system should have prevented postmasters from undertaking a transfer in these circumstances.

- The incident was raised with Fujitsu on 24 July 2000 (PinICL PC0051327) (FSL_04/529). By 28 July 2000, Fujitsu had established what had happened after discussing the circumstances with the postmaster and confirmed that the postmaster should not have been effectively able to log into two counters with the same user identification number. On 1 August 2000, a further incident (PinICL PC0051485) was recorded as another instance of the same issue (FSL_04/528).

- A number of detailed analyses were carried out, with an interim diagnosis of why it occurred on 4 October 2000. By 22 November 2000, Fujitsu determined that this was a transient bug caused by two modules in the application using different methods to communicate with one another. It was further determined that an earlier release (known as CI45) should have already fixed the issue.

BED 19 – Post and Go TA Discrepancies in POLSAP

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/532 to FSL_04/534).

- The issue concerned Post Office branches that had installed Post & Go terminals, which were independent of Horizon, that Fujitsu understands allowed branch customers to pay for and print postage labels automatically.

- Postmasters had to manually input data from the Post & Go terminals into Horizon. This process was automated as part of Release 2 of HNG-X by taking the data from various terminals and kiosks (including the Post & Go terminal) and submitting the data in a Transaction Acknowledgement message. If the postmaster accepted this Transaction Acknowledgement message, the data would be automatically inputted into Horizon.

- The issue occurred in certain circumstances if a Post & Go terminal was only used for non-cash transactions. Due to a design flaw, Transaction Acknowledgement messages would not be sent in these circumstances, affecting the reporting of data from Horizon to POL's POLSAP system.

- On 13 June 2012, Peak PC0281702 (FSL_04/534) was raised by Fujitsu at POL's request after the issue was identified by POL's POLSAP system. The incident occurred at the Brent Cross branch, and it appears that Fujitsu and POL were already aware of a similar incident at the Ludgate Circus branch, which had been diagnosed as due to use of the Post & Go terminal for non-cash transactions. It was agreed that the immediate issue would be fixed by a Managed Service Change to run a script to generate the necessary Transaction Acknowledgement messages.

- On 18 June 2012, the changes required for a fix were identified.

- On 29 August 2012, Peak PC0220393 (FSL_04/533) was raised by Fujitsu after the POL POLSAP team requested further investigation. By 31 August 2012, Fujitsu determined that the cause of the incident was the same as for Peak PC0281702 (FSL_04/534), and that the immediate issue could be fixed via a Managed Service Change. Fujitsu recommended POL monitor a certain report (known as a "SubFileOnHold" report) to check for other instances of the issue (FSL_04/533).

- The fix was released on 17 December 2012.

BED 20 – RECOVERY FAILURES – ISSUE 1

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/535 to FSL_04/543).

- Issue 1 concerned two Peaks relating to an account discrepancy at a Post Office branch.

- On 13 January 2012, the first Peak (PC0214982, FSL_04/536) was raised by Fujitsu after a postmaster reported that a discrepancy in their branch accounts had occurred after a counter was replaced at their branch. Fujitsu investigated the incident and found that discrepancies existed before the counter had been swapped, and asked NBSC to investigate further by going through the branch's account transactions.

- On 5 September 2012, a second Peak (PC0220532, FSL_04/537) was raised after the same postmaster reported that they believed their discrepancy was caused by the failed counter. Fujitsu noted: *"If further investigation by Fujitsu is required, Post Office will have to request that the branch transaction data is retrieved from the audit server"*. Otherwise, the issue should be passed back to POL for reconciliation.

BED 20 – RECOVERY FAILURES – ISSUE 2

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/535 to FSL_04/543).

- Issue 2 concerned a coding error that affected branch counters. When a counter failed before a transaction paid with a debit card had completed, upon restart the counter would become stuck in a loop trying to recover, which rendered the counter unusable. The issue was caused by a loop in a POL supplied AP-ACD script, the root cause of which was an error in the Horizon code.

- Fujitsu became aware of this issue during testing. Peak PC0239846 (FSL_04/542) was raised on 19 December 2014 to investigate the root cause for the counters becoming stuck in a loop. On 22 December 2014, the Development team carried out an initial analysis, and determined a potential workaround to stop the POL script looping. This was emailed to POL on 23 December 2014.

- In January 2015, a further analysis was carried out by Fujitsu and a code fix was recommended as the bug could have an impact on trading. By 27 February 2015, it appears that the code changes required had been completed and initial testing had been passed.

- On 23 February 2015, two Peaks were raised with Fujitsu concerning live instances of the issue:

  a. Peak PC0241216 (FSL_04/540) was raised as the recovery failure issue had occurred at a branch whilst a banking and a health lottery transaction were being processed. By 9 March 2015, Fujitsu tested and confirmed that the issue would be fixed by the code fix relating to PC0239846 (FSL_04/542) and the incident was closed.

    b.   Peak PC0241242 (FSL_04/539) was raised at a branch where a counter was stuck in a loop processing a health lottery transaction. Fujitsu identified that the issue was the same as PC0241216 (FSL_04/540). On 24 February 2015, Fujitsu recommended that the stuck transaction be deleted, and that they needed authorisation from POL to do this as the transaction was a financial transaction (FSL_04/539).

- In March 2015, Fujitsu, POL and Atos exchanged emails concerning the issue (FSL_04/308)

- In May 2015, final testing was carried out and the fix released.

BED 20 – RECOVERY FAILURES – ISSUE 3

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/535 to FSL_04/543).

- Issue 3 concerned a one-off reconciliation exception incident. Peak PC0197643 (FSL_04/535) was raised by Fujitsu on 13 April 2010 after reconciliation procedures identified a discrepancy. There was a counter timeout issue; however, there was no evidence identified at the time that the timeout issue or recovery caused the incident to occur. It was noted that the incident may have been due to user error. The discrepancy was rectified in line with standard reconciliation procedures by Fujitsu issuing a BIMS report to POL.

BED 21 – TRANSACTION CORRECTION ISSUES – ISSUE 1

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/544 to FSL_04/559).

- Issue 1 involved four incidents that were raised by either Fujitsu or POL during system and integration testing of Release S80 between January and May 2005. Peaks PC0114154 (FSL_04/545) and PC0120459 (FSL_04/546) were raised by Fujitsu, and Peak PC0121331 (FSL_04/547) was raised by POL. All four incidents related to the display of buttons on the transaction correction processing screen in the counter application and did not relate to the live system.

- All four incidents were investigated and resolved by application of a code fix by Fujitsu by June 2005.

BED 21 – TRANSACTION CORRECTION ISSUES – ISSUE 2

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/544 to FSL_04/559).

- Issue 2 occurred when a Transaction Correction message issued by POL to a branch through Horizon contained a long sequence of characters with no spaces. Due to a coding error, these types of Transaction Correction messages would cause the counter application to freeze. This would in turn prevent the branch from processing the Transaction Correction and, as a consequence of the outstanding Transaction Correction, prevent the branch from being able to rollover the branch accounts at the end of the relevant trading period.

- On 1 December 2005, the issue was reported to Fujitsu after a postmaster reported that their counter hung while attempting to process a Transaction Correction. Peak PC0129587 (FSL_04/555) was raised as a result. The issue led to a number of Peaks, including PC0129774 (FSL_04/548) and PC0130057 (FSL_04/551).

- On 6 December 2005, Fujitsu was able to reproduce the issue by using the message store from the counter. That day, the issue was passed to the Development team, which discovered the bug.

- On 7 December 2005, the Development team created a fix and proposed a workaround to allow postmasters to continue until the fix was rolled out. Fujitsu also identified six other branches which were affected by the issue and planned to contact them to tell them how to handle it.

- On 8 December 2005, Fujitsu notified POL of the problem and recommended that Transaction Correction messages be produced without long strings of characters.

- In December 2005, the fix was tested and released to one of the affected branches so that they could attempt to rollover to the next trading period, and the branch confirmed the rollover had been successful. In January 2006, the fix was put on general release to the live estate and several offices used it to process Transaction Corrections and complete rollover.

BED 21 – TRANSACTION CORRECTION ISSUES – ISSUE 3

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/544 to FSL_04/559).

- Issue 3 concerned a reporting issue relating to Transaction Corrections that was caused by a disparity between the time period for which a postmaster could request a Processed Transaction Correction report on the system, and the time period for which records were held in the branch database.

- The Processed Transaction Correction report provided postmasters with a list of Transaction Corrections that had been processed over a certain time period. The reporting function on the system indicated that postmasters could request a report of Transaction Corrections that had been processed up to two months prior. However, the underlying database only stored Transaction Corrections in the branch records for 40 days. Consequently, Transaction Corrections that had been processed more than 40 days before the date of producing the report would not be displayed, even though the postmaster had selected a time period of more than 40 days prior.

- On 14 September 2010, the issue was reported to Fujitsu by the NBSC and Peak PC0204350 (FSL_04/557) was raised. A postmaster was trying to understand a cash loss in their account and had tried to review all Transaction Corrections that had been processed in the last two months. The postmaster had accepted Transaction Corrections in July (within the two-month time range); however, these Transaction Corrections did not appear on the report.

- On 20 October 2010, after obtaining further information from the postmaster, the SSC determined that Transaction Correction records were only kept in the

branch database for 40 days and passed the issue to the Development team. In October 2010, the Development team investigated and rectified the issue by changing the relevant database so that it retained records for two months.

- KEL obengc2336R (FSL_04/558) was recorded to ensure that if the situation arose again, postmasters could be advised.

BED 22 – BUGS INTRODUCED BY PEAK FIXES – ISSUE 1

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/560 to FSL_04/565).

- In this incident (PC0053160) if incorrect keys were pressed while generating a report, the screen could freeze (FSL_04/562). This was identified in August 2000 by a Fujitsu tester, testing a future release. Tests were carried out to see if the problem could arise in the live system. Fujitsu considered that while the issue had occurred on a training counter, the issue could occur in the live system. It was established that the root cause was a problem which had already been identified in earlier PinICLs and was resolved in the M1 release.

BED 22 – BUGS INTRODUCED BY PEAK FIXES – ISSUE 2

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/560 to FSL_04/565).

- Issue 2 concerned a software bug that was introduced by a previously applied fix to another Peak. The issue was revealed by a cash account discrepancy, which was reported by a postmaster, relating to the declaration and recording of cheques.

- On 13 January 2004, the postmaster reported the issue to the NBSC and Peak PC0098230 (FSL_04/565) was raised. The call was passed on to the SSC. On 14 January 2004, the SSC spoke with the postmaster to understand and diagnose the issue. The SSC determined that the discrepancy had occurred as there had been a recent change to the EPOSS code, and the postmaster had been using non-standard procedures when accounting for cheques. The postmaster's procedure had worked before the change to the EPOSS code (i.e., it did not cause cash account discrepancies); however, following the change to the EPOSS code, the postmaster's process now caused a discrepancy.

- On 15 January 2004, it was confirmed that the postmaster's accounts had balanced, and Fujitsu advised the postmaster of the correct procedures when accounting for cheques and spoke with a POL auditor who was on site with the postmaster. KEL AChambers2258K was recorded (FSL_04/564).

- On 16 January 2004, the Development team identified the code error was a fix for previous PinICL PC0097081 (FSL_04/563). On 19 January 2004, the Peak noted that information concerning the bug was to be passed onto POL.

- On 20 January 2004, the Development team determined that the issue could occur in other circumstances and could potentially cause other issues. The fix was developed, tested and released on or around 5 March 2004.

BED 22 – BUGS INTRODUCED BY PEAK FIXES – ISSUE 3

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/560 to FSL_04/565).

- PinICL PC0049702 (FSL_04/561) was opened on 7 July 2000 and PinICL PC0052776 (FSL_04/560) was opened on 21 August 2000 after defects were found during system testing. According to the PinICLs, these issues appear to have occurred in the test environment only. The issue was fixed in August 2000. The issue was tested and no recurrence of the problem was found.

BED 23 – BUREAU DE CHANGE – ISSUE 1

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/566 to FSL_04/582).

- Issues 1 concerned incidents relating to Bureau de Change that resulted in discrepancies in three separate Post Office branches.

- On 6 December 2005, Peak PC0129767 (FSL_04/567) was raised after a postmaster wrote to "Subpostmaster Magazine" about an issue they experienced when reversing a foreign currency transaction. Fujitsu investigated the issue and determined Horizon was working as designed, and the postmaster had misunderstood how to reverse the foreign currency transaction. Fujitsu determined that improvements in the associated user documentation provided by POL to postmasters could potentially improve their understanding of the matter. KEL AChambers2252R (FSL_04/566) was recorded to describe the issue and its resolution.

- On 10 July 2006, the issue arose again at another Post Office branch and was resolved the same day on the basis of the KEL (Peak PC0137437) (FSL_04/568).

BED 23 – BUREAU DE CHANGE – ISSUE 2

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/566 to FSL_04/582).

- Issue 2 concerned an incident relating to Bureau de Change that resulted in discrepancies in three separate Post Office branches.

- On 29 November 2007, a Peak was raised (PC0151787, FSL_04/569). On 3 December 2007, following its investigation, Fujitsu determined that the discrepancy was caused due to incorrect cash account declarations. Fujitsu informed second line support at the NBSC concerning the issue.

BED 23 – BUREAU DE CHANGE – ISSUE 3

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/566 to FSL_04/582).

- Issue 3 related to various incidents that were raised with Fujitsu in 2010 after branches reported that Bureau de Change rates displayed on the currency rates board did not match the rates on Horizon. The incorrect rates displayed on the currency rates board did not affect the rates used by Horizon for transactions when currency was sold.

- On 10 June 2010, Fujitsu's quality centre identified that rates were being inconsistently displayed during build testing. Peak PC0200042 (FSL_04/578) was raised in response. On 11 June 2010, a postmaster reported a similar issue and Peak PC0200090 (FSL_04/576) was raised. Further Peaks were raised relating to the issue following further reports from postmasters, which were received via the NBSC, including Peak PC0200399 (FSL_04/573), Peak PC0200435 (FSL_04/572) and Peak PC0201340 (FSL_04/574). Following investigations undertaken by Fujitsu, it was found that the issue occurred when:

  a. the currency rates board did not display the same number of significant figures in decimals as the Horizon counter application; or

  b. when some, but not all, Post Office branch counters were migrated to HNG-X from Legacy Horizon (which occurred in one instance and affected one branch).

- The issue in the counter code was diagnosed and a fix proposed by 14 June 2010. The fix was produced in accordance with the development lifecycle and

released in September 2010. Where the issue related to counter migration, Fujitsu arranged for the affected counter to be migrated to HNG-X.

- Four KELs were recorded in relation to the issue: obengc5443L (FSL_04/575), obengc4026R (FSL_04/577), Agnihotriv245L (FSL_04/571) and AgnihotriV917N (FSL_04/570). KEL Agnihotriv245L noted that the issue was a bug in the code.

BED 24 – WRONG BRANCH CUSTOMER CHANGE

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/583 to FSL_04/588).

- The 'Wrong Branch Customer Change Displayed' issue related to Smartpost transactions. When carrying out Smartpost transactions for cash, the Horizon system calculated the change due to customers incorrectly. The issue could impact branches by causing cash shortfalls.

- The issue was reported by a postmaster, and Peak PC0128728 (FSL_04/588) was raised on 4 November 2005. The postmaster had made several calls to Fujitsu's Service Desk and attempts had been made to fix the problem by swapping out equipment, which did not rectify the issue. The issue was escalated to the SSC, and by 9 November 2005, Fujitsu suspected there was a software-related issue, which was confirmed with the postmaster on 10 November 2005. The issue was escalated to the Development team, which determined that the issue was caused by a fault in a script that was distributed as part of reference data. By 18 November 2005, a code fix relating to the reference data was developed, tested and released. The postmaster was informed that the code fix had been released.

- In December 2005, three further Peaks concerning the same issue were raised by postmasters contacting Fujitsu and/or POL (PC0129791, FSL_04/587; PC0129811, FSL_04/584; PC0129835, FSL_04/585). Upon further investigation by Fujitsu, it was determined that due to a process error, the code fix relating to the reference data had not been distributed to all counters. Consequently, a correct version of the script was distributed to all counters on 7 December 2005.

- KEL AChambers4134R was recorded in relation to the issue (FSL_04/586).

BED 25 – LYCA TOP UP

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/589 to FSL_04/596).

- The Lyca Top Up issue was a reference data error that caused the Post Office branch counter to crash and log the user out of the Horizon system when attempting to process a top-up for a Lyca mobile phone account. If the transaction was recovered, and depending on the action taken by the postmaster after logging back into the Horizon system, the issue led to two scenarios:

  a. branch accounts would show a shortfall equal to the value of the top-up transaction amount; or

  b. a reconciliation discrepancy would show in daily reconciliation reports that were automatically produced by Horizon for POL.

- A postmaster reported the issue to Fujitsu on 12 August 2010, and Fujitsu raised Peak PC0202894 (FSL_04/595). Further Peaks were raised following further reports from postmasters experiencing the issue and as a result of daily reconciliation reports produced by the Horizon system, including: Peaks PC0203108 (FSL_04/591), PC0203137 (FSL_04/590), PC0203284 (FSL_04/596) and PC0203215 (FSL_04/594). Fujitsu investigated the issue and determined that the error occurred because of reference data that was not in the format expected by the counter application. Two KELs were recorded describing the issue (KEL Ballantj020J, FSL_04/592 and KEL suklabaidyas4944I, FSL_04/589).

- On 21 August 2010, Fujitsu confirmed that corrected reference data had been validated by POL and released to the live estate. Where necessary,

discrepancies were corrected by POL issuing a Transaction Correction in accordance with the BIMS reconciliation process (FSL_04/309 and FSL_04/310).

BED 26 – TPSC250 REPORT – ISSUE 1

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/597 to FSL_04/621).

- Issue 1 concerned a coding error that caused the TPSC250 report to display incorrect totals for a Post Office branch when a particular 'Smartpost' transaction was carried out.

- The TPSC250 report was only used by Fujitsu for reconciliation purposes. The report was not used by postmasters or POL, and the data contained in the report was not otherwise communicated to postmasters or POL.

- The issue was raised in Peak PC0115804 (FSL_04/597) on 10 February 2005, after it was identified the TPSC250 report showed a difference in the total amount reported to TPS and the counter. On 14 February 2005, Fujitsu commenced investigating the issue, and determined that the issue was caused by Smartpost transactions where a prepaid card was used to pay for postage of lower value, and change was given to the customer. KEL AChambers253L was logged (FSL_04/617).

- Between March and July 2005, further Peaks were raised concerning the same issue. For example, Peaks PC0117659 (FSL_04/599), PC0118350 (FSL_04/600) and PC0118677 (FSL_04/601). The Development team investigated the matter further and determined that the underlying problem had been discovered during testing for a forthcoming Horizon release (known as S80), and the issue would be resolved as part of that release. Following the release of S80, no further occurrences were noted for four years.

- In October 2009, Peak PC0189625 (FSL_04/620) was raised reporting the same issue and it was determined that KEL AChambers253L applied. It was decided to monitor for reoccurrences of the issues rather than investigate the matter further due to the launch of HNG-X.

BED 26 – TPSC250 REPORT – ISSUE 2

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/597 to FSL_04/621).

- This issue related to an application located in Fujitsu's data centre, which formed part of the End of Day process that collected data from branches for transmission to POL's back-end systems. Due to a coding error in the application, if there were delays in the receipt of data from Riposte, due to communications issues, the application wrote data in the wrong format causing the End of Day process to fail. The issue impacted Fujitsu and POL, as Fujitsu was required to manually correct the data before it could be uploaded to POL's accounting systems, which caused a delay to data delivery.

- On 29 June 2005, Peak PC0122544 (FSL_04/614) was raised following an alert from the data centre as the End of Day process had failed for five branches.

- Fujitsu investigated the issue and identified a marker field in the data was incorrectly formed. Fujitsu corrected the field manually and on 30 June 2005, the data was uploaded correctly.

- In June 2005, Peaks PC0122630 (FSL_04/609) and PC0122631 (FSL_04/608) were raised, which reported errors in the TPSC250 report for one of the branches impacted by the End of Day process failure. KEL JAnscomb1935Q (FSL_04/607) was recorded on 30 June 2005 in relation to the issue.

- A fix was tested and released by 9 August 2005. The fix for the issue was regressed (i.e., the previous version of the application without the fix was reinstalled) as it was considered that the fix may have caused other issues. The

regression was subsequently reversed when it was confirmed that the fix had not

caused such issues.

BED 26 – TPSC250 REPORT – ISSUE 3

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/597 to FSL_04/621).

- This was a similar issue to BED 26, Issue 2 above. Peak PC0122664 (FSL_04/610) was raised on 1 July 2005 due to a difference between the counter reported totals and the TPS total in the TPSC250 report.

- The fix was for this issue was the same as the one applied for BED 26, Issue 2 above.

BED 26 – TPSC250 REPORT – ISSUE 4

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/597 to FSL_04/621).

- Issue 4 concerned a TPSC250 report showing a difference in the TPS and counter totals for one Post Office branch. The incident was raised on 4 July 2005 and recorded in Peak PC0122766 (FSL_04/611). Fujitsu investigated the matter and determined the issue was due to a failure in the counter, which required the counter to be replaced. The incident was closed on 7 July 2005.

BED 26 – TPSC250 REPORT – ISSUE 5

- Issue 5 concerned a particular type of Smartpost transaction that produced intermittent exceptions on reconciliation reports. The Peak and KEL associated with this issue – PC0156718 (FSL_04/618) and KEL Ballantj2547K (FSL_04/621) – are related to and noted in BED 27 below.

BED 27 – TPS

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/618, FSL_04/619, FSL_04/621 to FSL_04/632).

- The incident related to issues found in TPS reports when reconciling transactions carried out through the Smartpost service.

- The issue was identified by Fujitsu's MSU on 14 November 2006 as part of Fujitsu's daily monitoring of reconciliation reports after discrepancies were identified in the TPS reports. Peak PC0141145 (FSL_04/619) was raised as a result, and the issue was recorded in KEL BallantJ2547K (FSL_04/621). A further 40 Peaks were identified that reference KEL BallantJ2547K, including Peak PC0156718 (FSL_04/618).

- Fujitsu investigated the issue, and by 16 November 2006, it was identified that a message had been incorrectly formed and the issue was escalated to the Development team. In most cases, where the issue occurred, an OCR procedure needed to be carried out, as part of which, transaction data provided to POL's back-end systems was corrected.

- Despite Fujitsu's investigations, the root cause of the erroneous reporting could not be identified. The Peak was closed on 30 September 2008.

BED 28 – DROP AND GO

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/633 to FSL_04/635).

- The Drop and Go issue occurred when a customer at a Post Office branch customer topped up a "Drop and Go" pre-payment card, and the Horizon system confirmed the top-up onto the pre-payment card despite that amount not being transferred to back-end systems.

- Peak PC0260269 (FSL_04/633) was raised with Fujitsu on 5 July 2017 by Accenture, who were attempting to reconcile the issue in the back-end systems. Fujitsu investigated the issue, and identified the problem was either caused by user error or by an error in the AP-ACD script, and the incident was routed to Atos who were responsible for script maintenance. The Peak was closed and KEL cardc235Q (FSL_04/634) was recorded.

- Another incident relating to the same issue was raised with Fujitsu on 21 August 2018 (PC0273234, FSL_04/635). Fujitsu investigated the issue that day and confirmed the cause was lack of error checking in the AP-ACD when a timeout had occurred. Fujitsu made POL and other parties aware of the issue in accordance with standard incident management processes.

BED 29 – NETWORK BANKING – ISSUE 1

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/636 to FSL_04/640).

- The issue concerned one Post Office branch, which experienced intermittent network problems due to faults on its BT line. In two instances, this resulted in a situation where authorisation from a customer's bank account for a transaction was delayed and the postmaster had cancelled the transaction. As a result, the customer's money was showing as being withdrawn from their bank account, but they had not received cash at the Post Office branch (as the money had been ring-fenced by customer's bank).

- On 1 October 2004, the postmaster at the affected branch contacted the NBSC and the call was forwarded to Fujitsu's first line support. The postmaster reported that their communications line was down and that there had been issues with their customers' accounts. Peak PC0109020 (FSL_04/638) was raised as a result.

- Fujitsu undertook investigations in relation to the communications network at the affected branch. Fujitsu switched the affected branch to a different communications method, which appeared to resolve the network issues.

- On 14 October 2004, Fujitsu asked the postmaster to carry out a "hard reboot" of the counter at their branch. On 15 October 2004, Fujitsu investigated the root cause of the discrepancies and determined that it was a timing issue between the customer's bank and the counter. One of the customer transactions had resolved itself automatically and the other transaction was provided to the MSU for resolution through reconciliation processes.

BED 29 – NETWORK BANKING – ISSUE 2

- Documents relating to Fujitsu's knowledge, rectification and communication of this issue, including PinICLs/Peaks and KELs, are set out in Appendix 2 (FSL_04/636 to FSL_04/640).

- The issue concerned one Post Office branch that experienced network communication issues, which prevented them from accessing online services.

- On 23 January 2007, the postmaster at the affected branch reported that they were unable to access online services. Fujitsu raised Peak PC0142872 (FSL_04/640) and commenced investigating the issue.

- On 25 January 2007, the postmaster reported that they were no longer experiencing communications issues at their branch, and it was suspected that severe weather in the region had been the cause. It was not reported or otherwise identified to have impacted other Post Office branches or branch accounts. Fujitsu continued to monitor the situation until 29 January 2007.

BED number	Document Title (PEAK/PinICL/KEL reference)	Control No. (POINQ...)	Inquiry reference (FUJ...)	Exhibit Reference
BED 2 – Callendar square	PC0122035	POINQ0089832F	FUJ00083661	FSL_04/337
BED 2 – Callendar square	PC0126376	POINQ0089834F	FUJ00083663	FSL_04/338
BED 2 – Callendar square	PC0127246	POINQ0089838F	FUJ00083667	FSL_04/339
BED 2 – Callendar square	PC0193012	POINQ0089890F	FUJ00083719	FSL_04/340
BED 2 – Callendar square	JSimpkins338Q	POINQ0089891F	FUJ00083720	FSL_04/341
BED 2 – Callendar square	PC0078592	POINQ0126710F	FUJ00120518	FSL_04/342
BED 3 – Suspense Account Bug	PC0224126	POINQ0090909F	FUJ00084738	FSL_04/343
BED 3 – Suspense Account Bug	PC0223870	POINQ0091023F	FUJ00084852	FSL_04/344
BED 4 - Dalmellington	PC0246949	POINQ0092002F	FUJ00085831	FSL_04/345
BED 4 - Dalmellington	Acha621P	POINQ0092004F	FUJ00085833	FSL_04/346
BED 4 - Dalmellington	PC0247207	POINQ0092014F	FUJ00085843	FSL_04/347
BED 4 - Dalmellington	PC0247250	POINQ0092017F	FUJ00085846	FSL_04/348
BED 4 - Dalmellington	PC0246997	POINQ0092084F	FUJ00085913	FSL_04/349
BED 4 - Dalmellington	Acha621P	POINQ0092095F	FUJ00085924	FSL_04/350
BED 4 - Dalmellington	PC0248024	POINQ0092152F	FUJ00085981	FSL_04/351
BED 4 - Dalmellington	PC0246997	POINQ0092243F	FUJ00086072	FSL_04/352
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0195911	POINQ0087737F	FUJ00081566	FSL_04/353
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0195511	POINQ0126711F	FUJ00120519	FSL_04/354
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0196154	POINQ0126712F	FUJ00120520	FSL_04/355
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0196120	POINQ0126713F	FUJ00120521	FSL_04/356
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0196671	POINQ0126714F	FUJ00120522	FSL_04/357
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0197753	POINQ0126716F	FUJ00120524	FSL_04/358
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0197605	POINQ0126718F	FUJ00120526	FSL_04/359
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0197828	POINQ0126719F	FUJ00120527	FSL_04/360
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0197838	POINQ0126721F	FUJ00120529	FSL_04/361
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0197034	POINQ0126723F	FUJ00120531	FSL_04/362
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0197837	POINQ0126726F	FUJ00120534	FSL_04/363
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0197873	POINQ0126728F	FUJ00120536	FSL_04/364

BED number	Document Title (PEAK/PinICL/KEL reference)	Control No. (POINQ...)	Inquiry reference (FUJ...)	Exhibit Reference
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0197032	POINQ0126730F	FUJ00120538	FSL_04/365
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0197872	POINQ0126732F	FUJ00120540	FSL_04/366
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0197651	POINQ0126734F	FUJ00120542	FSL_04/367
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0195380	POINQ0126736F	FUJ00120544	FSL_04/368
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0198115	POINQ0126748F	FUJ00120556	FSL_04/369
BED 5 – Remming In	acha4221Q	POINQ0126750F	FUJ00120558	FSL_04/370
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0207466	POINQ0126751F	FUJ00120559	FSL_04/371
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0203085	POINQ0126755F	FUJ00120563	FSL_04/372
BED 5 – Remming In	acha4221Q	POINQ0126761F	FUJ00120569	FSL_04/373
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0226230	POINQ0126762F	FUJ00120570	FSL_04/374
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0246629	POINQ0126763F	FUJ00120571	FSL_04/375
BED 5 – Remming In	PC0251952	POINQ0126764F	FUJ00120572	FSL_04/376
BED 6 – Remming Out	acha4221Q	POINQ0126761F	FUJ00120569	FSL_04/373
BED 6 – Remming Out	GMaxwell3853P	POINQ0126765F	FUJ00120573	FSL_04/377
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0120937	POINQ0126766F	FUJ00120574	FSL_04/378
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143501	POINQ0126767F	FUJ00120575	FSL_04/379
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143466	POINQ0126768F	FUJ00120576	FSL_04/380
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143439	POINQ0126769F	FUJ00120577	FSL_04/381
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143499	POINQ0126770F	FUJ00120578	FSL_04/382
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143441	POINQ0126771F	FUJ00120579	FSL_04/383
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143539	POINQ0126772F	FUJ00120580	FSL_04/384
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143440	POINQ0126773F	FUJ00120581	FSL_04/385
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143514	POINQ0126774F	FUJ00120582	FSL_04/386
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143506	POINQ0126775F	FUJ00120583	FSL_04/387
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143515	POINQ0126776F	FUJ00120584	FSL_04/388
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143513	POINQ0126777F	FUJ00120585	FSL_04/389
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143508	POINQ0126778F	FUJ00120586	FSL_04/390
BED 6 – Remming Out	acha508S	POINQ0126779F	FUJ00120587	FSL_04/391

BED number	Document Title (PEAK/PinICL/KEL reference)	Control No. (POINQ…)	Inquiry reference (FUJ…)	Exhibit Reference
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143500	POINQ0126780F	FUJ00120588	FSL_04/392
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143511	POINQ0126781F	FUJ00120589	FSL_04/393
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143507	POINQ0126783F	FUJ00120591	FSL_04/394
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143502	POINQ0126784F	FUJ00120592	FSL_04/395
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143503	POINQ0126785F	FUJ00120593	FSL_04/396
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143682	POINQ0126786F	FUJ00120594	FSL_04/397
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143504	POINQ0126787F	FUJ00120595	FSL_04/398
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0144933	POINQ0126788F	FUJ00120596	FSL_04/399
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0140829	POINQ0126789F	FUJ00120597	FSL_04/400
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0143435	POINQ0126790F	FUJ00120598	FSL_04/401
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0140826	POINQ0126791F	FUJ00120599	FSL_04/402
BED 6 – Remming Out	PC0144937	POINQ0126792F	FUJ00120600	FSL_04/403
BED 6 – Remming Out	GCSimpson1936L	POINQ0126793F	FUJ00120601	FSL_04/404
BED 6 – Remming Out	maxwellg460L	POINQ0126794F	FUJ00120602	FSL_04/405
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	PC0198077	POINQ0090840F	FUJ00084669	FSL_04/406
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	PC0198259	POINQ0102175F	FUJ00096004	FSL_04/407
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	cardc2043L	POINQ0126795F	FUJ00120603	FSL_04/408
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	PC0197756	POINQ0126796F	FUJ00120604	FSL_04/409
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	PC0197800	POINQ0126797F	FUJ00120605	FSL_04/410
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	PC0197758	POINQ0126798F	FUJ00120606	FSL_04/411
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	PorterS199P	POINQ0126799F	FUJ00120607	FSL_04/412
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	Acha5259Q (v1)	POINQ0126800F	FUJ00120608	FSL_04/413
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	PC0198066	POINQ0126801F	FUJ00120609	FSL_04/414
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	PC0197797	POINQ0126802F	FUJ00120610	FSL_04/415
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	Acha5259Q (v2)	POINQ0126804F	FUJ00120612	FSL_04/416
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	PC0198677	POINQ0126805F	FUJ00120613	FSL_04/417
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	PC0198678	POINQ0126808F	FUJ00120616	FSL_04/418
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	PC0199719	POINQ0126809F	FUJ00120617	FSL_04/419

BED number	Document Title (PEAK/PinICL/KEL reference)	Control No. (POINQ...)	Inquiry reference (FUJ...)	Exhibit Reference
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	PC0196767	POINQ0126810F	FUJ00120618	FSL_04/420
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	PC0197409	POINQ0126819F	FUJ00120627	FSL_04/421
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	cardc2043L	POINQ0126826F	FUJ00120634	FSL_04/422
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	PC0204497	POINQ0126827F	FUJ00120635	FSL_04/423
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	PC0204396	POINQ0126828F	FUJ00120636	FSL_04/424
BED 7 – Local Suspense account issue	PC0197261	POINQ0126830F	FUJ00120638	FSL_04/425
BED 8 – Recovery Issues	dsed2640M	POINQ0126838F	FUJ00120646	FSL_04/426
BED 8 – Recovery Issues	PC0198352	POINQ0126839F	FUJ00120647	FSL_04/427
BED 8 – Recovery Issues	PC0197769	POINQ0126848F	FUJ00120656	FSL_04/428
BED 8 – Recovery Issues	PC0193463	POINQ0126860F	FUJ00120668	FSL_04/429
BED 8 – Recovery Issues	cardc464Q	POINQ0126861F	FUJ00120669	FSL_04/430
BED 8 – Recovery Issues	acha5650L	POINQ0126862F	FUJ00120670	FSL_04/431
BED 8 – Recovery Issues	PC0223229	POINQ0126863F	FUJ00120671	FSL_04/432
BED 8 – Recovery Issues	dsed4010N	POINQ0126866F	FUJ00120674	FSL_04/433
BED 8 – Recovery Issues	PC0256502	POINQ0126867F	FUJ00120675	FSL_04/434
BED 8 – Recovery Issues	PC0256566	POINQ0126870F	FUJ00120678	FSL_04/435
BED 8 – Recovery Issues	seng2048K	POINQ0126871F	FUJ00120679	FSL_04/436
BED 8 – Recovery Issues	PC0264632	POINQ0126872F	FUJ00120680	FSL_04/437
BED 8 – Recovery Issues	PC0277508	POINQ0126873F	FUJ00120681	FSL_04/438
BED 8 – Recovery Issues	acha959T	POINQ0126876F	FUJ00120684	FSL_04/439
BED 9 – Reversals	PC0089918	POINQ0126877F	FUJ00120685	FSL_04/440
BED 9 – Reversals	PC0090109	POINQ0126886F	FUJ00120694	FSL_04/441
BED 9 – Reversals	PC0091284	POINQ0126888F	FUJ00120696	FSL_04/442
BED 9 – Reversals	PSteed2847N	POINQ0126889F	FUJ00120697	FSL_04/443
BED 10 – Data Tree Build Failure Discrepancies	PC0043811	POINQ0069461F	FUJ00062016	FSL_04/444
BED 10 – Data Tree Build Failure Discrepancies	PC0046811	POINQ0074762F	FUJ00066601	FSL_04/445
BED 10 – Data Tree Build Failure Discrepancies	PC0033128	POINQ0080947F	FUJ00072143	FSL_04/446
BED 10 – Data Tree Build Failure Discrepancies	PC0123319	POINQ0092553F	FUJ00086382	FSL_04/447

BED number	Document Title (PEAK/PinICL/KEL reference)	Control No. (POINQ...)	Inquiry reference (FUJ...)	Exhibit Reference
BED 10 – Data Tree Build Failure Discrepancies	PC0123647	POINQ0092557F	FUJ00086386	FSL_04/448
BED 10 – Data Tree Build Failure Discrepancies	PC0132133	POINQ0092627F	FUJ00086456	FSL_04/449
BED 10 – Data Tree Build Failure Discrepancies	PC0121925	POINQ0092638F	FUJ00086467	FSL_04/450
BED 10 – Data Tree Build Failure Discrepancies	MScardifield2219S	POINQ0092659F	FUJ00086488	FSL_04/451
BED 10 – Data Tree Build Failure Discrepancies	PC0039313	POINQ0126890F	FUJ00120698	FSL_04/452
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0043685	POINQ0049678F	FUJ00043507	FSL_04/453
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0045509	POINQ0050444F	FUJ00044273	FSL_04/454
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0047609	POINQ0052150F	FUJ00045979	FSL_04/455
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0044101	POINQ0052241F	FUJ00046070	FSL_04/456
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0040754	POINQ0052393F	FUJ00046222	FSL_04/457
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0048630	POINQ0052564F	FUJ00046393	FSL_04/458
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0044232	POINQ0069638F	FUJ00062193	FSL_04/459
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0050418	POINQ0070826F	FUJ00063277	FSL_04/460
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0050415	POINQ0070844F	FUJ00063295	FSL_04/461
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0052804	POINQ0074322F	FUJ00066305	FSL_04/462
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0052704	POINQ0074367F	FUJ00066341	FSL_04/463
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0052320	POINQ0074401F	FUJ00066372	FSL_04/464
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0052575	POINQ0074843F	FUJ00066669	FSL_04/465
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0053975	POINQ0075816F	FUJ00067376	FSL_04/466
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0054846	POINQ0076876F	FUJ00068300	FSL_04/467
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0054973	POINQ0077113F	FUJ00068526	FSL_04/468
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0056661	POINQ0078716F	FUJ00070073	FSL_04/469
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0056915	POINQ0078937F	FUJ00070288	FSL_04/470
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0056960	POINQ0079037F	FUJ00070388	FSL_04/471
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0050861	POINQ0080765F	FUJ00071966	FSL_04/472
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0068442	POINQ0126891F	FUJ00120699	FSL_04/473
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0068633	POINQ0126892F	FUJ00120700	FSL_04/474
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0075312	POINQ0126893F	FUJ00120701	FSL_04/475

BED number	Document Title (PEAK/PinICL/KEL reference)	Control No. (POINQ...)	Inquiry reference (FUJ...)	Exhibit Reference
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0076065	POINQ0126894F	FUJ00120702	FSL_04/476
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	PC0073855	POINQ0126895F	FUJ00120703	FSL_04/477
BED 11 – Girobank Discrepancies	DRowe440R	POINQ0126896F	FUJ00120704	FSL_04/478
BED 12 – Counter-Replacement issues	JBallantyne5328R	POINQ0065257F	FUJ00059086	FSL_04/479
BED 12 – Counter-Replacement issues	PC0051255	POINQ0078047F	FUJ00069436	FSL_04/480
BED 12 – Counter-Replacement issues	PC0058528	POINQ0081357F	FUJ00072538	FSL_04/481
BED 12 – Counter-Replacement issues	PC0058686	POINQ0082546F	FUJ00073490	FSL_04/482
BED 12 – Counter-Replacement issues	PC0052823	POINQ0085212F	FUJ00075614	FSL_04/483
BED 12 – Counter-Replacement issues	PC0071836	POINQ0126897F	FUJ00120705	FSL_04/484
BED 12 – Counter-Replacement issues	PC0078204	POINQ0126898F	FUJ00120706	FSL_04/485
BED 12 – Counter-Replacement issues	PC0064574	POINQ0126899F	FUJ00120707	FSL_04/486
BED 12 – Counter-Replacement issues	PC0133822	POINQ0126900F	FUJ00120708	FSL_04/487
BED 12 – Counter-Replacement issues	PC0138926	POINQ0126901F	FUJ00120709	FSL_04/488
BED 12 – Counter-Replacement issues	PC0153851	POINQ0126902F	FUJ00120710	FSL_04/489
BED 12 – Counter-Replacement issues	PC0153660	POINQ0126903F	FUJ00120711	FSL_04/490
BED 12 – Counter-Replacement issues	DRowe4629L	POINQ0126904F	FUJ00120712	FSL_04/491
BED 13 – Withdrawn Stock Discrepancies	PothapragadaC4913L	POINQ0126905F	FUJ00120713	FSL_04/492
BED 13 – Withdrawn Stock Discrepancies	PC0200502	POINQ0126906F	FUJ00120714	FSL_04/493
BED 13 – Withdrawn Stock Discrepancies	PC0207834	POINQ0126918F	FUJ00120726	FSL_04/494
BED 13 – Withdrawn Stock Discrepancies	PC0208918	POINQ0126922F	FUJ00120730	FSL_04/495
BED 13 – Withdrawn Stock Discrepancies	PC0205404	POINQ0126923F	FUJ00120731	FSL_04/496
BED 13 – Withdrawn Stock Discrepancies	PC0209602	POINQ0126925F	FUJ00120733	FSL_04/497
BED 13 – Withdrawn Stock Discrepancies	pothapragadac4359R	POINQ0126934F	FUJ00120742	FSL_04/498
BED 13 – Withdrawn Stock Discrepancies	PC0208292	POINQ0126935F	FUJ00120743	FSL_04/499
BED 14 – Bureau Discrepancies	PC0261710	POINQ0126947F	FUJ00120755	FSL_04/500
BED 14 – Bureau Discrepancies	PC0265443	POINQ0126948F	FUJ00120756	FSL_04/501
BED 14 – Bureau Discrepancies	PC0261541	POINQ0126985F	FUJ00120793	FSL_04/502
BED 14 – Bureau Discrepancies	PC0277076	POINQ0126988F	FUJ00120796	FSL_04/503

BED number	Document Title (PEAK/PinICL/KEL reference)	Control No. (POINQ...)	Inquiry reference (FUJ...)	Exhibit Reference
BED 15 – Phantom Transactions	PC0051108	POINQ0071802F	FUJ00064193	FSL_04/504
BED 15 – Phantom Transactions	PC0052025	POINQ0073096F	FUJ00065316	FSL_04/505
BED 15 – Phantom Transactions	PC0063755	POINQ0092841F	FUJ00086670	FSL_04/506
BED 15 – Phantom Transactions	PC0064809	POINQ0092843F	FUJ00086672	FSL_04/507
BED 15 – Phantom Transactions	PC0064922	POINQ0092845F	FUJ00086674	FSL_04/508
BED 15 – Phantom Transactions	PC0065021	POINQ0092851F	FUJ00086680	FSL_04/509
BED 16 – Reconciliation Issues	PC0033128	POINQ0080947F	FUJ00072143	FSL_04/446
BED 16 – Reconciliation Issues	PC0044966	POINQ0051383F	FUJ00045212	FSL_04/510
BED 16 – Reconciliation Issues	PC0040243	POINQ0071037F	FUJ00063485	FSL_04/511
BED 16 – Reconciliation Issues	PC0047955	POINQ0072865F	FUJ00065135	FSL_04/512
BED 16 – Reconciliation Issues	PC0045529	POINQ0073032F	FUJ00065277	FSL_04/513
BED 16 – Reconciliation Issues	PC0049578	POINQ0073244F	FUJ00065453	FSL_04/514
BED 16 – Reconciliation Issues	PC0045847	POINQ0073611F	FUJ00065695	FSL_04/515
BED 16 – Reconciliation Issues	PC0039832	POINQ0073930F	FUJ00065960	FSL_04/516
BED 16 – Reconciliation Issues	PC0204872	POINQ0087299F	FUJ00081128	FSL_04/517
BED 16 – Reconciliation Issues	PC0075240	POINQ0127038F	FUJ00120846	FSL_04/518
BED 16 – Reconciliation Issues	PC0077253	POINQ0127039F	FUJ00120847	FSL_04/519
BED 16 – Reconciliation Issues	PC0075415	POINQ0127040F	FUJ00120848	FSL_04/520
BED 16 – Reconciliation Issues	PC0076869	POINQ0127041F	FUJ00120849	FSL_04/521
BED 16 – Reconciliation Issues	PC0077508	POINQ0127042F	FUJ00120850	FSL_04/522
BED 16 – Reconciliation Issues	PC0236246	POINQ0127060F	FUJ00120868	FSL_04/523
BED 16 – Reconciliation Issues	AllenD44331I	POINQ0127061F	FUJ00120869	FSL_04/524
BED 17 – Branch customer discrepancies	PC0156174	POINQ0127062F	FUJ00120870	FSL_04/525
BED 17 – Branch customer discrepancies	PC0156246	POINQ0127063F	FUJ00120871	FSL_04/526
BED 18 – Concurrent Logins	PC0051813	POINQ0073107F	FUJ00065327	FSL_04/527
BED 18 – Concurrent Logins	PC0051485	POINQ0073880F	FUJ00065928	FSL_04/528
BED 18 – Concurrent Logins	PC0051327	POINQ0081116F	FUJ00072297	FSL_04/529
BED 18 – Concurrent Logins	PC0059635	POINQ0081871F	FUJ00072951	FSL_04/530

BED number	Document Title (PEAK/PinICL/KEL reference)	Control No. (POINQ...)	Inquiry reference (FUJ...)	Exhibit Reference
BED 18 – Concurrent Logins	PC0027581	POINQ0085155F	FUJ00075563	FSL_04/531
BED 19 – Post & GoTA Discrepancies in POLSAP	PC0219432	POINQ0127064F	FUJ00120872	FSL_04/532
BED 19 – Post & GoTA Discrepancies in POLSAP	PC0220393	POINQ0127065F	FUJ00120873	FSL_04/533
BED 19 – Post & GoTA Discrepancies in POLSAP	PC0218702	POINQ0127069F	FUJ00120877	FSL_04/534
BED 20 – Recovery failures	PC0197643	POINQ0127070F	FUJ00120878	FSL_04/535
BED 20 – Recovery failures	PC0214982	POINQ0127072F	FUJ00120880	FSL_04/536
BED 20 – Recovery failures	PC0220532	POINQ0127073F	FUJ00120881	FSL_04/537
BED 20 – Recovery failures	surs1034R	POINQ0127074F	FUJ00120882	FSL_04/538
BED 20 – Recovery failures	PC0241242	POINQ0127075F	FUJ00120883	FSL_04/539
BED 20 – Recovery failures	PC0241216	POINQ0127078F	FUJ00120886	FSL_04/540
BED 20 – Recovery failures	PC0241528	POINQ0127088F	FUJ00120896	FSL_04/541
BED 20 – Recovery failures	PC0239846	POINQ0127098F	FUJ00120906	FSL_04/542
BED 20 – Recovery failures	acha959T	POINQ0127107F	FUJ00120915	FSL_04/543
BED 21 – Transaction Correction Issues	PC0118562	POINQ0127108F	FUJ00120916	FSL_04/544
BED 21 – Transaction Correction Issues	PC0114154	POINQ0127109F	FUJ00120917	FSL_04/545
BED 21 – Transaction Correction Issues	PC0120459	POINQ0127110F	FUJ00120918	FSL_04/546
BED 21 – Transaction Correction Issues	PC0121331	POINQ0127111F	FUJ00120919	FSL_04/547
BED 21 – Transaction Correction Issues	PC0129774	POINQ0127112F	FUJ00120920	FSL_04/548
BED 21 – Transaction Correction Issues	PC0130019	POINQ0127113F	FUJ00120921	FSL_04/549
BED 21 – Transaction Correction Issues	PC0130127	POINQ0127114F	FUJ00120922	FSL_04/550
BED 21 – Transaction Correction Issues	PC0130057	POINQ0127115F	FUJ00120923	FSL_04/551
BED 21 – Transaction Correction Issues	PC0130123	POINQ0127116F	FUJ00120924	FSL_04/552
BED 21 – Transaction Correction Issues	PC0130185	POINQ0127117F	FUJ00120925	FSL_04/553
BED 21 – Transaction Correction Issues	LKiang2837P	POINQ0127118F	FUJ00120926	FSL_04/554
BED 21 – Transaction Correction Issues	PC0129587	POINQ0127119F	FUJ00120927	FSL_04/555
BED 21 – Transaction Correction Issues	PC0130056	POINQ0127120F	FUJ00120928	FSL_04/556
BED 21 – Transaction Correction Issues	PC0204350	POINQ0127121F	FUJ00120929	FSL_04/557
BED 21 – Transaction Correction Issues	obengc2336R	POINQ0127122F	FUJ00120930	FSL_04/558

BED number	Document Title (PEAK/PinICL/KEL reference)	Control No. (POINQ...)	Inquiry reference (FUJ...)	Exhibit Reference
BED 21 – Transaction Correction Issues	PC0205567	POINQ0127123F	FUJ00120931	FSL_04/559
BED 22 – Bugs Introduced by Peak Fixes	PC0052776	POINQ0074782F	FUJ00066621	FSL_04/560
BED 22 – Bugs Introduced by Peak Fixes	PC0049702	POINQ0075807F	FUJ00067367	FSL_04/561
BED 22 – Bugs Introduced by Peak Fixes	PC0053160	POINQ0084748F	FUJ00075163	FSL_04/562
BED 22 – Bugs Introduced by Peak Fixes	PC0097081	POINQ0127124F	FUJ00120932	FSL_04/563
BED 22 – Bugs Introduced by Peak Fixes	AChambers2258K	POINQ0127125F	FUJ00120933	FSL_04/564
BED 22 – Bugs Introduced by Peak Fixes	PC0098230	POINQ0127126F	FUJ00120934	FSL_04/565
BED 23 – Bureau de Change	AChambers2252R	POINQ0127127F	FUJ00120935	FSL_04/566
BED 23 – Bureau de Change	PC0129767	POINQ0127128F	FUJ00120936	FSL_04/567
BED 23 – Bureau de Change	PC0137437	POINQ0127129F	FUJ00120937	FSL_04/568
BED 23 – Bureau de Change	PC0151787	POINQ0127130F	FUJ00120938	FSL_04/569
BED 23 – Bureau de Change	AgnihotriV917N	POINQ0127131F	FUJ00120939	FSL_04/570
BED 23 – Bureau de Change	Agnihotriv245L	POINQ0127132F	FUJ00120940	FSL_04/571
BED 23 – Bureau de Change	PC0200435	POINQ0127133F	FUJ00120941	FSL_04/572
BED 23 – Bureau de Change	PC0200399	POINQ0127140F	FUJ00120948	FSL_04/573
BED 23 – Bureau de Change	PC0201340	POINQ0127141F	FUJ00120949	FSL_04/574
BED 23 – Bureau de Change	Obengc5443L	POINQ0127142F	FUJ00120950	FSL_04/575
BED 23 – Bureau de Change	PC0200090	POINQ0127143F	FUJ00120951	FSL_04/576
BED 23 – Bureau de Change	Obengc4026R	POINQ0127149F	FUJ00120957	FSL_04/577
BED 23 – Bureau de Change	PC0200042	POINQ0127150F	FUJ00120958	FSL_04/578
BED 23 – Bureau de Change	PC0209240	POINQ0127160F	FUJ00120968	FSL_04/579
BED 23 – Bureau de Change	PC0226573	POINQ0127161F	FUJ00120969	FSL_04/580
BED 23 – Bureau de Change	PC0254447	POINQ0127162F	FUJ00120970	FSL_04/581
BED 23 – Bureau de Change	PC0260834	POINQ0127163F	FUJ00120971	FSL_04/582
BED 24 – Wrong Branch Customer Change	PC0128264	POINQ0127164F	FUJ00120972	FSL_04/583
BED 24 – Wrong Branch Customer Change	PC0129811	POINQ0127165F	FUJ00120973	FSL_04/584
BED 24 – Wrong Branch Customer Change	PC0129835	POINQ0127166F	FUJ00120974	FSL_04/585
BED 24 – Wrong Branch Customer Change	AChambers4134R	POINQ0127167F	FUJ00120975	FSL_04/586

BED number	Document Title (PEAK/PinICL/KEL reference)	Control No. (POINQ...)	Inquiry reference (FUJ...)	Exhibit Reference
BED 24 – Wrong Branch Customer Change	PC0129791	POINQ0127168F	FUJ00120976	FSL_04/587
BED 24 – Wrong Branch Customer Change	PC0128728	POINQ0127169F	FUJ00120977	FSL_04/588
BED 25 – Lyca Top Up	suklabaidyas4944I	POINQ0127170F	FUJ00120978	FSL_04/589
BED 25 – Lyca Top Up	PC0203137	POINQ0127171F	FUJ00120979	FSL_04/590
BED 25 – Lyca Top Up	PC0203108	POINQ0127172F	FUJ00120980	FSL_04/591
BED 25 – Lyca Top Up	Ballantj020J	POINQ0127173F	FUJ00120981	FSL_04/592
BED 25 – Lyca Top Up	PC0202925	POINQ0127178F	FUJ00120986	FSL_04/593
BED 25 – Lyca Top Up	PC0203215	POINQ0127179F	FUJ00120987	FSL_04/594
BED 25 – Lyca Top Up	PC0202894	POINQ0127181F	FUJ00120989	FSL_04/595
BED 25 – Lyca Top Up	PC0203284	POINQ0127182F	FUJ00120990	FSL_04/596
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0115804	POINQ0127184F	FUJ00120992	FSL_04/597
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0115456	POINQ0127185F	FUJ00120993	FSL_04/598
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0117659	POINQ0127186F	FUJ00120994	FSL_04/599
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0118350	POINQ0127187F	FUJ00120995	FSL_04/600
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0118677	POINQ0127188F	FUJ00120996	FSL_04/601
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0119978	POINQ0127189F	FUJ00120997	FSL_04/602
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0120063	POINQ0127190F	FUJ00120998	FSL_04/603
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0122147	POINQ0127191F	FUJ00120999	FSL_04/604
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0122354	POINQ0127192F	FUJ00121000	FSL_04/605
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0122304	POINQ0127193F	FUJ00121001	FSL_04/606
BED 26 – TPSC250	JAnscomb1935Q	POINQ0127194F	FUJ00121002	FSL_04/607
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0122631	POINQ0127195F	FUJ00121003	FSL_04/608
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0122630	POINQ0127196F	FUJ00121004	FSL_04/609
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0122664	POINQ0127197F	FUJ00121005	FSL_04/610
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0122766	POINQ0127198F	FUJ00121006	FSL_04/611
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0123056	POINQ0127199F	FUJ00121007	FSL_04/612
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0123058	POINQ0127200F	FUJ00121008	FSL_04/613
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0122544	POINQ0127201F	FUJ00121009	FSL_04/614

BED number	Document Title (PEAK/PinICL/KEL reference)	Control No. (POINQ...)	Inquiry reference (FUJ...)	Exhibit Reference
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0125210	POINQ0127202F	FUJ00121010	FSL_04/615
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0125123	POINQ0127203F	FUJ00121011	FSL_04/616
BED 26 – TPSC250	AChambers253L	POINQ0127204F	FUJ00121012	FSL_04/617
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0156718	POINQ0127205F	FUJ00121013	FSL_04/618
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0141145	POINQ0127206F	FUJ00121014	FSL_04/619
BED 26 – TPSC250	PC0189625	POINQ0127211F	FUJ00121019	FSL_04/620
BED 26 – TPSC250	Ballantj2547K	POINQ0127213F	FUJ00121021	FSL_04/621
BED 27 – TPS	PC0156718	POINQ0127205F	FUJ00121013	FSL_04/618
BED 27 – TPS	PC0141145	POINQ0127206F	FUJ00121014	FSL_04/619
BED 27 – TPS	Ballantj2547K	POINQ0127213F	FUJ00121021	FSL_04/621
BED 27 – TPS	PC0142604	POINQ0127214F	FUJ00121022	FSL_04/622
BED 27 – TPS	PC0131348	POINQ0127215F	FUJ00121023	FSL_04/623
BED 27 – TPS	PC0152156	POINQ0127216F	FUJ00121024	FSL_04/624
BED 27 – TPS	PC0153333	POINQ0127217F	FUJ00121025	FSL_04/625
BED 27 – TPS	PC0157357	POINQ0127218F	FUJ00121026	FSL_04/626
BED 27 – TPS	PC0159273	POINQ0127219F	FUJ00121027	FSL_04/627
BED 27 – TPS	PC0162929	POINQ0127220F	FUJ00121028	FSL_04/628
BED 27 – TPS	PC0164058	POINQ0127224F	FUJ00121032	FSL_04/629
BED 27 – TPS	PC0171637	POINQ0127226F	FUJ00121034	FSL_04/630
BED 27 – TPS	PC0174587	POINQ0127227F	FUJ00121035	FSL_04/631
BED 27 – TPS	PC0196893	POINQ0127229F	FUJ00121037	FSL_04/632
BED 28 – Drop and Go	PC0260269	POINQ0127232F	FUJ00121040	FSL_04/633
BED 28 – Drop and Go	cardc235Q	POINQ0127233F	FUJ00121041	FSL_04/634
BED 28 – Drop and Go	PC0273234	POINQ0127237F	FUJ00121045	FSL_04/635
BED 29 – Network Banking	CHawkes4210N	POINQ0127238F	FUJ00121046	FSL_04/636
BED 29 – Network Banking	SSur343P	POINQ0127239F	FUJ00121047	FSL_04/637
BED 29 – Network Banking	PC0109020	POINQ0127240F	FUJ00121048	FSL_04/638
BED 29 – Network Banking	CHawkes1745L	POINQ0127241F	FUJ00121049	FSL_04/639

BED number	Document Title (PEAK/PinICL/KEL reference)	Control No. (POINQ…)	Inquiry reference (FUJ…)	Exhibit Reference
BED 29 – Network Banking	PC0142872	POINQ0127242F	FUJ00121050	FSL_04/640