

---

**From:** Paula Vennells[/O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=PAULA.VENNELLS8C63D283-A511-46C3-A93E-DC6F2AE7A78D]  
**Sent:** Fri 21/10/2011 7:32:42 AM (UTC)  
**To:** Mike Young[GRO]  
**Subject:** Fw: Legally privileged and confidential

Mike, I've realised I sent this to you and it was intended for Lesley.

But actually as her boss, would you mind looking into. (Also, watch the tone - not always easy to judge in mails - on re-reading it sounds 'cross'! I'm not (I'm well chilled on holiday!) but have some specific questions that need answering.

Appreciate your help. P

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

From: Paula Vennells  
Sent: Friday, October 21, 2011 09:01 AM  
To: Mike Young  
Subject: Re: Legally privileged and confidential

This is very high profile. We have had lawyers' advice re how mails etc are now handled...so What is happening here?

Why do Fujitsu think they can change the test company after they have told us who they were using? Why is there a meeting to discuss scope and timing - when it was asked for 6 months ago and the scope must have already been agreed as Pentest were appointed?

And re 'timing in another two months' - Lesley, the last comms you and I had was that we'd have it in a couple of weeks!

This is unsatisfactory - it looks as though it is not being taken seriously and I don't know where the accountability lies - in POL or in Fujitsu?

A Class Action legal case against POL could be hugely negative reputationally, it could cost us a lot of money and this verification, which presumably could be of enormous help is not even off the blocks?

I don't understand.

And, how can it be independent if Fujitsu are choosing and swapping suppliers? Is that sustainable evidence in court - independently verified by a company they choose? KPMG are a good company - are they qualified to do this? And do they have any association with Fujitsu?

Finally, I know everyone is working very hard but I'm a bit disappointed that I found out only by asking as a result of potential BBC coverage.

With this going on, I could easily have sent a note in response to a Board query, saying not to worry because there's a verification underway and the results are due any day soon! It doesn't help our IT credibility if I'm on the back foot with what's going on.

Paula

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

From: Lesley J Sewell  
Sent: Thursday, October 20, 2011 05:39 PM  
To: Paula Vennells  
Cc: Mike Young; Kevin Gilliland; Hugh Flemington; Emily B Springford  
Subject: Legally privileged and confidential

Paula

Fujitsu have reviewed who they will use for the review of HNGx and as such will not be using Pen Test Partners as they

had originally intended. They have now engaged with KPMG to complete the review which they now expect to take up to two months.

There is a meeting tomorrow with Legal to discuss the scope and timing of this review.

Regards Lesley

---

Lesley J Sewell  
Head of IT & Change  
Post Office Ltd  
148 Old Street LONDON EC1V 9HQ

Tel: [GRO] or [GRO]  
Mob: [GRO]  
Email: [GRO]

Building a Post Office® we can all be proud of

Confidential Information:

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorised review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please contact me by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

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

From: Paula Vennells  
Sent: 20 October 2011 15:48  
To: Lesley J Sewell  
Cc: Mike Young; Kevin Gilliland  
Subject: Horizon independent assessment

Lesley, excuse me if I missed it - did you get back to me re confirmation as to how robust/reliable Pintest (is that the right name) were? ie what other type of validation work they have done on this scale/ for whom?

Also when do we expect the results?

Kevin has heard today the BBC may be going for more coverage.

Thx Paula