

Meeting with Second Sight and Paula Vennells, Susan Crichton and Alwen Lyons July 3rd

- Thank you for coming in, we had a meeting with James this morning and thought we should have a face to face to explain where we got to

At the beginning of the meeting

- James reported that you had told him last week that you had 'nailed' something and that your interim report would show real concerns in the whole process
- He thought that there was a risk that people had been prosecuted and were still being prosecuted based on the system, process and software which was not operation correctly leading to miscarriages of justice
- He said he wanted to work with us and that the report could be a 'triumph' for the post Office.

Body of the meeting

- Need to very clear about the definition of Horizon. We accepted that SS were also looking at the wider system, but that we need to be clear, cannot misrepresent what Horizon – the computer system means.
- Discussed the anomalies which PO had brought to the attention of SS during the review. The 64 and 14 cases. He accepted that these are things found in all computer programmes and suggested that we use an example of other systems to make that live. He accepted that the most important thing was how they had been managed
- Anomalies will lead subpostmasters to doubt the system, so we need to be clear that this is normal in a system of this size.
- James said he thinks **SS will come up with a report which says Horizon is a good system. But the combination of Horizon/ATMs/Camelot/audit/investigation/ support functions means Horizon gets the blame for something it shouldn't be bear.**
- **We all agreed Horizon should not be unfairly blamed**
- James was very concerned about an email which suggested that Product & Branch Accounts could be remotely journalled without the sub postmaster's knowledge. We need to be clear about what is happening here
- The review must be evidence based and in no way subjective or contain loose language, so definitions need to be clear and where improvement in support is needed, the work done to date, but also work to improve further.
- PO and Fujitsu will see the report on Friday and test for accuracy. As Salmon ruling for natural justice. Where those named have a right to check the facts before the report is made public.
- If the report is passed as factually correct then it will be available for the meeting on Monday

- The report must be based on evidence and facts
- PO will have two representatives at the meeting as observers they will not contribute (an external lawyer and an employee)
- Need to very precise in the meeting with language and stick to the agreed report
- PO will want to work with JFSA to help clear the cases and then set up a user group going forward, get feedback on the system and drive improvements.
- We are expecting the report latest Friday am.

OUTSTANDING ISSUES

- Agreed definition and how the report will split the computer from the processes
- Email regarding POLSAP