

Message

From: Jenkins Gareth GI
Sent: 23/03/2006 15:50:57
To: Lowther Neneh [/o=ICL/ou=Retail REA24/cn=Recipients/cn=llonahN]
CC: Pinder Brian [/o=ICL/ou=UKSouth FEL01/cn=Recipients/cn=PinderB]
Subject: RE: Gaerwen
Attachments: 6323.GI GaerwenMar06.doc

Neneh,

I've annotated it with Revisions.



6323.GI
GaerwenMar06.d...

In particular, I don't feel I can include the last two paras, which may make the statement useless.

Regards

Gareth

This e-mail is only for the use of its intended recipient. Its contents are confidential and may be privileged. Fujitsu Services does not guarantee that this e-mail has not been intercepted and amended or that it is virus-free.

Gareth Jenkins
Distinguished Engineer
Applications TDA
Post Office Account

Fujitsu Services
Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berkshire, RG12 8SN

Tel: [REDACTED] GRO
Mobile: [REDACTED] GRO
email: Gareth.Jenkins@ [REDACTED] GRO
Web: <http://uk.fujitsu.com>

Fujitsu Services Limited, Registered in England no 96056, Registered Office 26, Finsbury Square, London, EC2A 1SL

From: Lowther Neneh
Sent: 23 March 2006 15:29
To: Jenkins Gareth GI
Cc: Pinder Brian
Subject: RE: Gaerwen

Hi, Gareth,

<< File: GI GaerwenMar06.doc >>

I have updated your WS with all the column headings you explained to me earlier.

I have not included your response below as I'm not quite sure where to fit it in.

Could you please help out with this.

Also I believe that Graham Ward is thinking that 'system failures' are drastic events. Could you please explain a little further on this like you said that they are normal system occurrences.

Please send back to me when you've finished so I can send to GW to look at today if possible.

Kind regards,

Neneh

-----Original Message-----

From: Jenkins Gareth GI
Sent: 22 March 2006 17:40
To: Lowther Neneh
Cc: Pinder Brian
Subject: RE: Gaerwen

Neneh,

I'm not quite sure what his problem is with what I've said.

Basically, any value of Response Code that is greater than 10 does imply some end to end system failure. The actual value makes it clearer what exactly the failure is and where it has been detected.

In the example there are two such codes:

- 23: In the spreadsheet, this is marked as "Timeout". However this is incorrect (I don't know where the look up value came from). 23 means "Failed by FI: Unexpected Response Code" and the clerk is requested to retry the transaction
- 26: In the spreadsheet this is marked as "Failed by FI: System Unavailable - Return Card" which reflects what has happened.

How do you want to play this? Do you want to add in specific text to the Witness statement to cover these two codes or persuade POL that the generic statement is OK (perhaps with some clearer words)?

Happy to discuss.

Regards

Gareth

This e-mail is only for the use of its intended recipient. Its contents are confidential and may be privileged. Fujitsu Services does not guarantee that this e-mail has not been intercepted and amended or that it is virus-free.

Gareth Jenkins
Distinguished Engineer
Applications TDA
Post Office Account

Fujitsu Services
Lovelace Road, Bracknell, Berkshire, RG12 8SN
Tel: [REDACTED] GRO
Mobile: [REDACTED] GRO
email: Gareth.Jenkins [REDACTED] GRO
Web: <http://uk.fujitsu.com>

Fujitsu Services Limited, Registered in England no 96056, Registered Office 26,
Finsbury Square, London, EC2A 1SL

-----Original Message-----

From: Lowther Neneh
Sent: 22 March 2006 15:14
To: Jenkins Gareth GI
Cc: Pinder Brian
Subject: FW: Gaerwen

Hi, Gareth,

Ps see reply from Graham below regarding your statement.

Please ignore the first bit about exhibits. I will print out the exhibits and update your statement with this.

I understand that you have copies of the spreadsheets sent to you yesterday from Brian Pinder.

Could you please look at his second para and advise with your comments again.

I have attached a copy of your draft statement too.

Kind regards

Neneh

-----Original Message-----

From: graham.c.ward [GRO]
Sent: 22 March 2006 14:11
To: Lowther Neneh
Cc: brian.pinder [GRO]
Subject: RE: Gaerwen

Neneh

The layout presumably is unfinished, paragraph spacings etc ?.

As per my earlier e mail, and more importantly the 3 spreadsheets sent with ARQ data need to be produced as individual exhibits (GIJ / 1 2 and 3 and each column header within these spreadsheets must be explained as you do with your usual statements (I noticed that 401 differs slightly from 459 and 460).

Also the line which begins at the foot of page 1 "RespCd with a value greater than 10....." appears unfinished ? and I'm concerned at the words 'system failure' which is also in an earlier line....."There has been some sort of system failure" - What does this mean exactly and is there any indication of a system failure at this office during the period in question ?

Regards

Graham

Lowther Neneh

"'graham.c.ward" <Neneh.Lowther@GRO> " <graham.c.ward@GRO>
To: GRO
cc:
Subject: RE: Gaerwen
22/03/2006 13:01

Graham,

Please see the draft WS for the above re 'Nil Transactions'.

Could you see if this meets your requirements.

Kind regards,

Neneh

-----Original Message-----

From: graham.c.ward@GRO
[mailto:graham.c.ward@GRO]

Sent: 22 March 2006 10:04
To: Pinder Brian
Cc: Lowther Neneh; Thomas Penny
Subject: Gaerwen

Brian

I'll get back to you once I have confirmed whether we need these statements or not (in respect of Torquay Road & Marine Drive).

Can I also take this opportunity to clarify our requirements in respect of the Gaerwen statement. In this case the Subpostmaster is blaming Horizon for his losses claiming that for various banking related transactions the counter desktop records amounts entered for payment but then shows 'Nil' when the transaction log is printed, and it is this we need to refute.

Various e mails passed between myself and your team on this matter and the reply below was received from Penny on the 20/10/05

Nil transactions could also be caused by errors in PIN Pad, counter, agents or host code depending on what constitutes a "nil transaction". This cannot be determined without access to the appropriate system logs.'

Penny also sent with the respective ARQ data, additional spreadsheets which showed all 'Nil' transactions for the periods

(See attached file: ARQ459 Analysis Nov 04.xls)(See attached file: ARQ 460 Analysis May 05.xls)(See attached file: ARQ401 Analysis.xls)

We therefore require the usual statement producing the Transaction and Event logs (Penny has sent me a draft and I have suggested one or two minor amendments). We will also need the above spreadsheets produced by whoever put them together, explaining the headings and under what circumstances 'Nil' transactions can occur. Finally, 'to cover all the angles' I would also like to produce the call logs during the entire period (01/11/04 - 30/11/05) so we can see whether the Postmaster ever reported this alleged fault with the system..... a statement similar to the Bill Mitchell statement sent in my e mail dated 10 March will be ideal.

Hopefully this will clarify our requirements in this case, but please ring if there is any confusion.

Regards

Graham

Casework Manager
Post Office Ltd Investigation Team

PO BOX 1, CROYDON, CR9 1WN

Postline: N/A...STD.Phone: [GRO] VoiceMail:
N/A, Mobex: [GRO]
External Email: graham.c.ward [GRO]

Pinder Brian

<Brian.Pinder [GRO]> To:
graham.c.ward [GRO] Fujitsu [GRO]
(FEL01)" <[GRO]> cc: "Sewell Peter
Subject: RE: ARQ's,
statement request and assistance
21/03/2006 15:29

Graham

No problem, we are happy to provide a statement presenting the helpdesk calls regarding Marine Drive and Torquay Road when required. Grateful if you could provide us with a heads up nearer the time.

Regds Brian

-----Original Message-----

From: graham.c.ward [GRO]
[mailto:graham.c.ward [GRO]]

Sent: 21 March 2006 14:02
To: Fujitsu [GRO]
Cc: Peter.Sewell [GRO]
Subject: ARQ's, statement request and assistance

Brian / Penny / Neneh

Can I enquire when the Gaerwan statement will be ready please (bold

paragraph below).....as it is required for the submission of prosecution committal papers which have to be in by the end of this week (Monday at the latest).

Also have you made any progress in deciding whether a similar statement as to the one previously prepared by Bill Mitchell will be possible in the Torquay Road and Marine Drive cases..... if we require one.

Regards

Graham

Casework Manager
Post Office Ltd Investigation Team

PO BOX 1, CROYDON, CR9 1WN

Postline: N/A, STD Phone: [GRO] VoiceMail:
N/A, Mobex: [GRO], Mobile: [GRO] External Email:
graham.c.ward [GRO]

----- Forwarded by Graham C Ward/e/POSTOFFICE on 21/03/2006 13:55 -----

Graham C Ward

To: Fujitsu
cc:
Subject: ARQ's, statement

10/03/2006 12:43

request and assistance

All

Firstly sorry for the length of this e mail and the high volume of requests attached.

(See attached file: 0506667-679 GW.doc) (See attached file: 0506680-690 GW.doc)

Both of the above requests relate to cases where PO Ltd are being challenged about the accuracy of the Horizon system (you are already aware of the case at Torquay Road and have provided data between the dates now being asked for).

Brian - In the cases of Marine Drive and Torquay Road for which you have previously provided written responses, I would like to 'sound out' the possibility of someone at Fujitsu providing a formal witness statement along the lines of the attachment below, which was provided by Bill Mitchell in one of our criminal cases (whilst Marine Drive & Torquay Rd are not criminal matters, given the allegations being made by the Postmasters, I'm sure you'll agree that it is very much in both ourselves and Fujitsu's interests to challenge the allegations and provide evidence that the system is not to blame for the losses being reported). Whilst it may not be a statement that

you, Penny or Neneh can provide, I'm sure there must be someone who can.

(See attached file: BM Shobnall Road SPSO [GRO] doc)

On a separate matter, I also require a witness statement in respect of the following ARQ's [GRO], all of which relate to Gaerwen SPSO. We need the usual (leave out para's H(b) and J, but we do need para K (call logs) covering an analysis over the period 01/11/04 - 30/11/05. Penny - you may recall this one which relates to nil transactions, my previous e mails dated 14th, 21st and 25th October refer. Can you add an extra paragraph in your statement explaining how on-line banking transactions are processed and the data downloaded and how nil transactions can occur.

Finally, also attached are a few more 'normal' ARQ's

(See attached file: 0506697-700 CK.doc) (See attached file: 0506692-694 PS.doc) (See attached file: 0506695-696 CK.doc) (See attached file: 0506691 JL.doc)

Again apologies for the length of the e mailand on a Friday as well !!!!

Regards

Graham

Casework Manager
Post Office Ltd Investigation Team

PO BOX 1, CROYDON, CR9 1WN

Postline: N/A, STD Phone: [GRO] VoiceMail:
N/A, Mobex: [GRO] External Email:
graham.c.ward [GRO]

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.

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.

>>>> G Jenkins Gaewenr WS.doc attachment was removed from this email <<<<

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.
