

Witness Statement

(CJ Act 1967, s9; MC Act 1980, ss
5A(3)(a)
and 5B, MC Rules 1981, r 70)



Statement of GARETH IDRIS JENKINS

Age if under 18 Over 18 (If over 18 insert 'over 18')

This statement (consisting of three (3) pages each signed by me) is true to the best of my knowledge and belief and I make it knowing that, if it is tendered in evidence, I shall be liable to prosecution if I have wilfully stated in it anything which I know to be false or do not believe true.

Dated the 8 day of July 2010

Signature **GRO**

Further to my statement of 9th March 2010 I would like to add the following.

I have been employed by Fujitsu Services, working on the Post Office Account, formally ICL Pathway Ltd, since 1996 as a Customer Solutions architect, involved in many aspects of design and implementation of the computer system known as Horizon. This is a computerised accounting system used by Post Office Ltd.

Fujitsu have a Security Department which is responsible for providing audit data to the Post Office Limited's Fraud Team.

An audit of all information handled by the TMS is taken daily by copying all new messages to archive media. This creates a record of all completed outlet transaction details including its origin - outlet and counter, when it happened, who caused it to happen and the outcome. The TMS journal is maintained at each of the Fujitsu Services Data Centre sites and is created by securely replicating all completed transaction records that occurred in every Outlet. They therefore provide the ability to compare the audit track record of the same transaction recorded in two places to verify that systems were operating correctly. Records of all transactions are

Signature **GRO**

Signature witnessed by **GRO**

Rang Don Workman 12:00
21 July & advised that contrary
to Para 2, page 2, LOC had not
agreed to this wording. He said
he was happy that as a representative
of LOC he had agreed this process in
this case. He will come back to me
if he requires a replacement statement

Witness Statement

(CJ Act 1967, s9; MC Act 1980, ss 5A(3)(a) and 5B, MC Rules 1981, r 70)

Continuation of statement of **GARETH IDRIS JENKINS**

written to audit archive media.

With Horizon counters, the mechanism by which data is audited has always worked on the principle that it is acceptable to audit the same data more than once – in particular if in doubt as to whether or not it has been previously audited successfully. The Mechanism used on Horizon to retrieve the audit data took this into account and only presented one instance of such duplicate data in the ARQ extracts. The Audit Mechanism cannot alter the base information and therefore a re-running of the audit process will always produce the same result.

In January 2010 a new HNG-X application was introduced to filter transaction records for presentation to Post Office Limited. It has recently been noticed that this HNG-X retrieval mechanism does not remove such duplicates. An enhancement to the extraction toolset will be developed, tested and deployed and will remove such duplicate data in the future. However until this enhancement is deployed, there is a possibility that data is duplicated. The reliable way to identify a duplicate transaction is to use the <Num> attribute that is used to generate the unique sequence numbers. This will be included in all future transaction record returns until the retrieval mechanism is enhanced. A semi-automated process to copy the returned data, and then to identify and remove any duplicated records which may be present from this copy by using the <NUM> attribute, has been agreed with Post Office Limited for use in the interim period.

A transaction log data disc has been produced as exhibit PT/02 in the trial of Seema Misra. The transaction log data disc is made up of ARQ's 436 to 448. It should be noted that ARQ 447 which records the transactions between 1st November 2007 to 30th November 2007 does contain some duplications of audited records.

It is emphasised that the duplication of audited records has not, in any way, affected actual physical transactions recorded on any counter at any outlet. The duplication of records has

Signature:

GRO

Signature witnessed by

GRO

Witness Statement

(CJ Act 1967, s9; MC Act 1980, ss 5A(3)(a) and 5B, MC Rules 1981, r 70)

Continuation of statement of **GARETH IDRIS JENKINS**

occurred during the auditing process when records were in the process of being recorded purely for audit purposes from the correspondence servers to the audit servers.

There is no reason to believe that the information in this statement is inaccurate because of the improper use of the computer. To the best of my knowledge and belief at all material times the computer was operating properly, or if not, any respect in which it was not operating properly, or was out of operation was not such as to effect the information held on it. I hold a responsible position in relation to the working of the computer.

Signature

GRO

CS011A

Signature witnessed by

GRO

Version 3.0 11/02

Thomas Penny

From: Marilyn Benjamin [GRO]
Sent: 15 July 2010 16:26
To: Thomas Penny; John Longman; Mark Dinsdale
Subject: REGINA v SEEMA MISRA - GUILDFORD CROWN COURT



Penny,

I refer to our telephone conversation this morning when you confirmed that Gareth Jenkins has been authorised and will be contacting the Defence Expert Charles McLachlan with a view to making arrangements to discuss the issues in this case as per the Direction given by Guildford Crown Court at the last hearing. I confirm that I have spoken to the Defence Solicitors that Mr Jenkins will be contacting Charles McLachlan today.

I understand that Gareth Jenkins and Charles McLachlan are due to meet on Tuesday 20th July 2010.

Thank you for your kind assistance.

Kind regards.

Jarnail Singh
Senior Lawyer
Criminal Law Division

Tel No. [GRO]

***** Royal Mail Group Limited registered in England and Wales registered number 4138203 registered office 3rd Floor, 100 Victoria Embankment, London, EC4Y 0HQ This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use, disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you have received this in error, please contact the sender and then delete this email from your system. *****