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(10.30 am)
    a very minor admin point, the various hearings that have
    been taking place since 21 March on the transcript seem
    for some reason to adopt a different sort of numbering
    and start again at 1A. They should just be numbered Day
    10, Day 11, etc, continuing on from the 21st, so I just
    thought I would make that point so as to avoid any
    confusion.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Is your Lordship indicating that the
    recusal application should be treated as part of this
    trial ?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I think it should, actually. I think it
    should. It's just a question of numbering really that's
    all. Opus sent me an email about it, I answered it, and
    then they seemed to adopt a different sort of numbering
    so I just thought I would mention it first thing.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Your Lordship will be aware that there
    is two-and-a-quarter hours left on the claimant's clock.
            The Post Office' intention would be to call two
    witnesses, namely Mr Parker and Mr Membery.
    Your Lordship will be aware of Mr Membery's illness.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: And I think I said in the recusal
    1
    judgment that it wasn't necessarily expected he would be
    available immediately.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Well, I can tell your Lordship that he
    is not well enough to give evidence here today.
    My Lord, in those circumstances, and I have to say I
    hadn't picked up what your Lordship had said in
    your Lordship's judgment, my instructing solicitors have
    given notice of their intention to rely on Mr Membery's
    witness statement as hearsay evidence.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Understood.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: And my learned friend's team have, if
        I may say so, very sensibly and kindly indicated that
        they are willing to extend time for that to have been
        done, for notice to have been given under CPR33.2.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, he was in a particular situation
        which requires a degree of sympathy.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Yes. So, my Lord, for the purposes of
        today, I will just be calling Mr Parker.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Understood. Thank you very much.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: And I do call Mr Parker.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Have a seat, Mr Parker.
            STEPHEN PAUL PARKER (Sworn)
            Direct Examination by MR DE GARR ROBINSON
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Thank you. Mr Parker, there should be
        a bundle of documents in front of you there.
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A Yes?
Q Could I ask you to go to tab 11 of that bundle?
A Yes?
Q Is that your first witness statement?
A The first page is a correction to, but the following
page is, yes.
Q If you turn to the second page is that your name and
address at the top?
A It is.
Q If you go to the last page, is that your signature?
A It is.
Q So is that your first witness statement?
A Yes.
Q If you could look at the correction page at the front of
that tab, is that a -- there is one correction here, I
believe. Is that a correction you wish to make to your
witness statement?
A It is, yes.
Q And there is a correction to a document reference. Was
that a typo?
A It was indeed, yes.
Q If I could then ask you to go to tab 12 of the same
bundle, I apprehend there is going to be a corrections
document, and then over the page there will be another
witness statement? 3

## 1 A That's correct. Yes.

2 Q There is your name and address and at the back of that witness statement, is that your signature again?
A It is.
Q There is a corrections page. Do you see that?
A I do.
Q Two corrections there. Are those two corrections you wish to make?
A They are.
Q And for the reference it's -- for the Magnum reference of the corrections, it's $\{E 2 / 17 / 1\}$.

The first correction, there is a change to paragraph
29, a reference to a phrase, "In Legacy Horizon". If we could go to page 10 of your witness statement, $\{E 2 / 12 / 10\}$ you will see what the change is from. Do you see that?
A I do.
Q It is a change from, "While Mr Roll was employed by Fujitsu ". Do you see that?
A That's correct. Yes.
Q Now, why is that change needed?
A That change was actually needed because I applied the
wrong name to the wrong timescale to the document.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Just before you move on, so the correction on 29 is that -- does that paragraph end
A Yes?
Q Could I ask you to go to tab 11 of that bundle?
A Yes?
Q Is that your first witness statement?
A The first page is a correction to, but the following page is, yes.
If you turn to the second page is that your name and

A It is.
Q If you go to the last page, is that your signature?
A It is.

A Yes. believe. Is that a correction you wish to make to your witness statement?
A It is, yes.
And there is a correction to a document reference. Was that a typo?
A It was indeed, yes.
bundle, I apprehend there is going to be a corrections witness statement?

A They are.
after, "Legacy Horizon", full stop?
A Yes it does.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: It does, so I need to delete the --
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: "While Mr Roll was employed by Fujitsu ". My Lord, yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Thank you.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: At the bottom of the same page you will see there is a footnote, a list of Peaks. If you go back to the corrections page you will see that there is $\{\mathrm{E} 2 / 17 / 1\}$, to one of the Peaks in the footnote. Could you explain why that change is needed?
A When it was transcribed one of the Peak references was doubled up and one was missed as a result of that.
Q Thank you. Then if we could go forward to tab 13 , again, is there a corrections page?
A Yes there is.
Q If you go past that page you will see, is this your third witness statement?
A Yes it is.
Q And is it your signature at the end of that witness statement? \{E2/13/1\}?
A Yes it is.
Q And then if you could look at the corrections page \{E2/13/16\} there are two corrections indicated on the page. Are these the corrections you wish to make?
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\{E2/171\}.
A They are.
Q The first one is to paragraph 18. The original text reads, "The wording of PC0146096 implies", and that is changed to, "The wording of PC0146066 of which PC0146094 was a clone implies".
A Yes.
Q Could you explain what the purpose of that change is?
A The original reference in there referenced the clone Peak which is not the useful one. It 's the Peak it was being cloned from, which contains the -- needed the information we actually need.
Q And then paragraph 19, if we could -- you will see that -- paragraph 19 of the corrections document -- it sets out -- I think the first sentence of paragraph 19, and then it suggests two changes to that sentence. You will see there is text added and there is text deleted. First of all, perhaps you could explain what the purpose of the deletion is.
A Again, it's a timescale thing.
Q Is it the same -- is it reflecting the correction that you made to your previous witness statement?
A Yes it is.
Q And then the additional text, could you explain what the additional text is therefore?

A The additional text -- yes -- because it makes it clearer, that the information presented there was a result of the searches which wasn't actually made clear in the first wording.
Q Thank you, Mr Parker.
Subject to those corrections, and to some corrections made in your later statements to your earlier statements, do you confirm that these statements are true to the best of your knowledge, recollection and belief?
A I do, yes.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Thank you. If you could wait there?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Mr de Garr Robinson, I don't have
a sheet and you don't have to give me one now, but
I don't have the corrections to the third witness statement.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord, yes, I do have a copy. I can hand that up now.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: And can I just check, I will check directly with Mr Parker -- the last correction to paragraph 19 which is still on the screen which is to your paragraph 19 of your third statement --
A Yes?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Can you go to the actual paragraph of your statement? I understand the strike -through because
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that is shown on the correction. Have you got paragraph 19 ?
A I have now, yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes? If you go over the page, "While Richard Roll was employed by Post Office", is struck through. Is that last sentence, should that still be there $\{\mathrm{E} 2 / 11 / 4\}$ or is that -- you don't deal with that in your correction.
A The sentence saying, "Of the six circumstances listed "?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes.
A That should still be there.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: That should remain. I thought it should. I just wanted to check.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: I notice that Mr Parker doesn't have a screen. I have only just noticed.
MR GREEN: We have only just noticed as well.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes. Now that you mention it, I have only just noticed and it's rather important. Just bear with me just one second. He obviously has to have a screen.
(Discussion regarding screen)
I will rise for five minutes. It's going to be exactly five minutes. It's not going to be any longer than that. All right. Mr Parker, I'm sorry about this, one of those things that happens, because you started

[^0]```
Q And which there was no clear available knowledge on prior to you looking into?
A Correct.
Q Can I just try to trace through an example of how these
    witness statements hang together by reference -- let s
    take the thing that his Lordship was asking you about
    a moment ago. Let's look at paragraph }19\mathrm{ of your third
    witness statement {E2/13/4} please. At the moment I'm
    just trying to understand how these hang together.
        Paragraph 19 of your third witness statement you
        say:
            "The vast majority of server injections would not
        have been to inject transaction data. In paragraph 29
        of my second witness statement I listed the
        circumstances in which data was injected into a counter
        in Legacy Horizon ..."
            Just pause there for a moment. So you are actually
        referring back to paragraph 29 in that paragraph, aren't
        you?
A I am, yes.
Q So let's go back to paragraph 29, and we have got that
        in your second witness statement at page {E2/12/10}.
        There you talk about one of your colleagues having done
        some searches.
A Yes.
```
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Q Pick search terms that were used in that particular search.
A Yes.
Q And then --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Hold on just one second. Which page should we be on?
MR GREEN: Page 10 my Lord, paragraph 29.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes. Thank you very much.
MR GREEN: You say:
"At my request, my colleague John Simpkins (Senior Consultant), carried out a search of the incident management system for incidents which required injecting data into the counter ...", etc, giving examples of the search terms that were used on that occasion?
A Yes.
Q Then you say:
"From the results I can determine that this was only carried out in the following circumstances ..."

And then the words that we have to remember to forget, as it were, are, " ... while Mr Roll was employed by Fujitsu ".
A That's correct. Yes.
Q Now, if we -- it might be helpful for you to look at the paper ones, because it is difficult to do it on the screen, but if we can look at the correction, please, at
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\{E2/16/4\} on the screen, and then -- so what you are doing to paragraph 29 in the corrections is you are expanding the period that you are talking about.
A That's right. I am. Yes.
Q From Mr Roll's employment you are going much wider to say the whole of Legacy Horizon?
A That's correct. Yes.
Q And then if we look at paragraph 19, and we look at \(\{E 2 / 17 / 1\}\) please, you are actually -- you appear to be saying that you are confining what's being said in that paragraph to what was found as a result of the searches in that paragraph, not, "These are all the ones that happened in the whole of Legacy Horizon".
A That's correct. Yes.
Q So one is -- so the paragraph 29 is expanding it to the whole of Legacy Horizon?
A That's correct, yes.
Q But paragraph 29 is confining this to only the searches described in paragraph 29.
A Correct. Yes.
Q And what's the real reason for that change?
A Because, again, the timescale that I put on it in the statement was incorrect. Yes.
Q Okay, well, pausing there, there are two points. Let's ignore the change in timescale from Richard Roll to the
```
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whole of Legacy Horizon. You explained to the court this morning, in relation to this change here, where you say -- you add the words, "Found as a result of the searches described in that paragraph" --
A Yes?
Q -- you said that was just to make it clearer, effectively, what you were referring to.
A Correct. Yes.
Q Now, do you know the real reason why that's been changed to say that?
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord, is that a fair question?
MR GREEN: Well, I'm just going to ask it and see what answer --

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, let's just hold on one second. Asking him what the real reason is a fair question, so you can put it again. Well, so far as he knows.
MR GREEN: Do you know what the real reason for making that change is?
A This is the change where we strike out, "Whilst Richard Roll was employed" --
MR GREEN: No. Sorry?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Both of you, if you speak over each other it doesn't go on the transcript, all right? Mr Green?
MR GREEN: No, the change I'm asking about is the addition
of the words, "Found as a result of the searches", described in that paragraph. Why is that being changed now?
A Because I felt that made it clearer that the information presented there was a result of the searches and not -and the exact search terms used, because it was an expansion of the previous search terms used. Does that ...
Q Can you explain that again very carefully?
A So when the -- the first time that we sought to gather this information, a certain set of search terms were used when searching the incident management system. My colleague, who is very, very diligent, decided upon some additional search terms afterwards, and that's what this second bit reflects, that he found extra search terms and some extra incidents relevant to the court and what we are trying to say there.
Q And, well, as we are on the point, let's just quickly bring up \{H253\} please?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Can I just ask, when you are giving your evidence generally, if you could try and firstly explain what you yourself did and then if you need to go on and explain -- because you have used the word, "We",
a couple of times and it just makes it confusing to know what's your direct evidence and what's been done by
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somebody else.
A Yes, my Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I'm not saying don't tell us what other
people did but just make it clear which was you
individually and which was other people.
A Okay my Lord. Thank you.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Mr Green?
MR GREEN: Now, this is $\{\mathrm{H} / 253 / 1\}$. This is a letter from Womble's dated 20 March 2019. That is the day before you are due to give evidence, so we are in the middle of cross-examining, and this letter is sent while we are in court. It says:
"We understand from Fujitsu that the SS C has been carrying out further work to identify any Peaks that show transactions being injected into the counter in Legacy Horizon in addition to those referred to in paragraphs 29 and 30 of Mr Parker's second statement. On Monday ..."

## So this is Wednesday:

"On Monday we learned that an SSC technician has: Searched for all KELs that mentioned RiposteMessageFile, Ripostemport and RiposteMessage"; correct?
A Correct, yes.
Q "Collated the responsive KEL references ... re-searched the Peak system for any Peaks which contained those KEL
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    references; and identified ..."
        Some further Peaks.
A That's correct. Yes.
Q You haven't amended paragraph 29 of your second witness
    statement and corrected it to include those Peaks or an
    explanation in paragraph 29 of that search having been
    undertaken, have you?
A Can I refer to that? So in my second statement ...
Q Yes. Look at {E2/12/10}.
A I can do that on paper, but yes, okay. So paragraph 29
    of that one?
Q Yes.
A Yes?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Are you looking at the paper copy?
A I'm looking at the paper copy.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Can we retain on the common screen the
    document at {H/253/1} please? Right.
        Mr Green?
MR GREEN: There are a number of points which arise in
    relation to that letter. The first is that different
    search terms have been used.
A That's correct. Yes.
Q For example.
In this search the RiposteImport command has been searched for, which is the directly applicable one for
```
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```
injecting data; yes?
A RiposteImport is one of the ways of injecting data, yes.
Q And if we look at your paragraph 29, that was not one of the search terms that was used when that search was undertaken.
A That's correct. Yes.
Q So the real reason that the amendment that was made to paragraph 19 to somehow cater for the fact, without actually saying it out loud that additional searches had been done, and additional results had been done that you hadn't dealt with in your statement?
A These are additional to the searches from my original statement, yes.
Q We all know that. We know that they are not in there and we know that they are additional because they were provided the night before you were due to be cross-examined, or the day before you were due to be cross-examined?
A Yes.
Q The question I'm asking you is the fact that those searches had been done, that's the real reason for the change in your third statement, isn't it? I think you have effectively accepted that already.
A I must admit I'm not clear on your point, but --
Q Well, let's have a look one last time.
```

A -- I accept that we have added in extra search items to give us more information.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I wonder if we could do two things. Mr Green, when you are saying, "The real reason", I think you need to specify or particularise what, in fact, the witness either did or didn't do or what the witness either understands or doesn't is the real reason, because that phrase is open to --
MR GREEN: I understand my Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: -- a little bit of misinterpretation, potentially.
MR GREEN: My Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: And, Mr Parker, in that last answer you used the first person plural again and said, "We".
A Yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I wonder if you could just remember what I said earlier on.
A Apologies. Yes, my Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: You don't need to apologise, it is understandable if you work in a corporate environment, you are used to doing that.
A Yes. Indeed.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: But it's your evidence and you are the person being cross-examined, so ...

Right. Mr Green?
19

MR GREEN: Was it your idea to make the corrections in the statement? Your third witness statement.
A I notified the legal team that Mr Simpkins had done some more work and as a result of that we changed -- we -this letter was actually generated.
Q And you didn't think it was important to correct paragraph 29 of your second witness statement accurately to reflect the situation as it would have been on the day you were due to give evidence, or indeed today?
A That wasn't a choice I made personally. I was advised that we generated this letter .
Q Can I ask on a different point, just so we understand what the effect of the combination of these statements is?

If we look, please, at $\{\mathrm{E} 2 / 11 / 3\}$ ?
Now, you will see there paragraph 11. This is your first witness statement and this is where you were -your witness statement was commenting on Mr Roll's statement; yes?
A That's correct. Yes.
Q And Mr Roll had given evidence about what Fujitsu was able to do if terms of its powers; yes?
A Yes.
Q And what could be done?
A Yes.

```
Q And you have subsequently accepted, I think, that you needed to modify your first witness statement in respect of that?
A Yes.
Q So let's look at paragraph 11, because we don't have one consolidated witness statement explaining what your evidence is now. We have to infer it from five different documents, don't we.
A Yes. We do, yes.
Q Okay, so let's look at paragraph 11 and look at the end of paragraph 11. You say there:
"As I explain below, those suggestions are incorrect and Mr Roll's account of Fujitsu 's actions and powers is inaccurate and misleading".
A Yes.
Q Now, when you took the oath and then said you believed your witness statements to be true --
A Yes?
Q -- what were you saying to the court about that sentence? Could you just explain it please?
A In that paragraph I am trying to make the point that the suggestion that we frequently changed branch transaction data without informing the branches that such actions were being actually taken is not correct. "Frequently", is a subjective term but I would not have described the
```
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rate at which we were changing branch transaction data
as, "Frequently".
Q Well, pausing there, your position in your first witness statement was, at least in one material respect that you have now changed your position on, that Fujitsu couldn't do it at all, and you have accepted that in the light of Mr Roll's, as you say, clarification, you would now accept that Fujitsu did have powers which, in your first statement, you didn't accept that it did have. That's fair, isn't it?
A I'm not aware of where I have said that we never changed branch transaction data.
Q Well, you have said -- you have answered about the part of the paragraph I specifically didn't ask you about, and the part of the paragraph I did specifically ask you about is the last line where you say:
"As I explain below, those suggestions are incorrect and Mr Roll's account of Fujitsu's actions and powers is inaccurate and misleading".
A Yes.
Q Now, given the change of your evidence in your later statements about the ability remotely to access and inject transaction data, can you explain to the court what you were saying you believed about that sentence? What should the court now read for those words in the
light of the three statements that it has before it?
A If I take the last sentence in isolation, which is what I think you are asking me to do, then I don't understand how I apply it, because I am -- I have been simply trying to say there that the frequency was not high, and that we would always involve the SubPostmaster wherever possible if that sort of action was actually being taken. That's what I'm trying to say by that.
Q Well, pausing there, can you focus on the word, "Powers", in that line? Do you see that?
A Sorry, for the word, "Powers"? Yes. Okay.
Q Yes? Let's not talk about actions, how frequently it was done or not?
A Okay. Yes?
Q Because what you said about Mr Roll was his evidence about Fujitsu's actions which could be the frequency, but powers was also misleading. If we just go through -- just for a moment we will go forward, I'm only going to ask you this one more time, but to give you context, let's have a look at $\{\mathrm{E} 2 / 12 / 9\}$ please. By way of example you say at paragraph 27:
"In paragraph 20 of Roll 2, Mr Roll describes a process by which transactions could be inserted via individual branch counters by using the correspondence server to piggy back through the gateway. He has not
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previously made this point clear. Now that he has, following a discussion with colleagues who performed such actions I can confirm that this was possible".

So you weren't in a position to say that this was possible before, and you didn't say it was possible before.
A That's correct. Yes.
Q You didn't say that Fujitsu had that power before, did you, in your first witness statement? And you accept that it does now?
A I accept that Fujitsu has always had that power. I think it was a case of the phrasing of my original statements in relation to the point I was trying to get over there.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Did you know that Fujitsu had that power --
A Yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: -- just wait for the question.
A Sorry.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: When you signed your first witness statement?
A Yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: You did.
A I did, yes.
MR GREEN: Let's step back for a moment and just look at

```
    your role. You say in paragraph 7 of your first witness statement at \(\{\mathrm{E} 2 / 11 / 2\}\), paragraph 7 , you say, at the end of that statement:
"Although I didn't have the formal title, I acted as the Deputy Manager to the SSC as a whole".
A That's correct. Yes.
Q Now, Mr Roll didn't remember it exactly that way. How could people tell that you were acting as the Deputy Manager of -- to the SSC?
A They could tell by the fact that I would stand in for the manager in his absence. I would also make decisions on approving actions for him and other operational decisions in general.
Q You say at paragraph 7.1 you were responsible for the management of incidents between December 2009 and 2010?
A That's correct. Yes.
Q Through the whole support process?
A That's correct.
Q So a detailed knowledge of that?
A Yes.
Q And 7.2 in March 2010 you became the manager of SSC and was responsible for the provision of third line application support to the Post Office account, including the management of the staff working on the account, so you well understand what third line support
```
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does.
A I do, yes.
Q Is that fair?
A I do, yes.
Q Would you agree with the description that Mr de Garr Robinson gave to Mr Roll of you being part of the super elite and Mr Roll being part of the elite? Would you regard yourself as being part of the super elite in that way?
A I wouldn't have used that wording but in any support group there are people of varying skills .
Q Because the impression -- I mean I understand the answer you have just given to his Lordship is that you knew when you did your first witness statement that it was possible to piggy back in the way that we have seen Mr Roll suggesting, but you didn't mention it. I'm going to suggest to you that you gave your evidence from the position of not being terribly well informed about what could or could not be done. Is that right or wrong?
A That would be wrong. It can be difficult to remember exactly what was being done 15 years ago in detail, but in general terms I am confident of the information I gave.
Q Apart from not mentioning something that you knew about

A I agree that that is one of the roles of the third line

## 27

group, yes.
Q And they would have detailed knowledge of the system based on documentation and source code inspection, wouldn't they?
A The detail of the knowledge would vary person to the person.
Q But the third line support role, they would be expected to have detailed knowledge of the system, based on both documentation and the inspection of source code.
A For some members of staff that would be true, yes.
Q I'm suggesting for all members.
A No. I couldn't -- could not agree with that.
Q And I'm suggesting that definitely for Mr Roll.
A I couldn't agree with that either.
Q Okay.
They would also be trained on not only the operating systems but also the commercial off-the-shelf packages that underlie the application?

A That is correct. Yes.
Q And the coding languages used within the application?
A Some of them, yes.
Q No, all of them.
A No, some of them.
Q Okay, and they were also expected, weren't they, to train themselves by examining support guides, design
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documentation and so forth for the components of the end user application?
A That is correct, yes.
Q And they would also have access to development and package management tools to allow the production of specialised diagnostic code, scripts and support tools.
A That is correct, yes.
Q Are you beginning to recognise this? Let's have a look
at \(\{F / 823 / 19\}\). This is Fujitsu's own document, and look at page \(\{F / 823 / 19\}\) please. Paragraph 5 , and it spells out what third line support are supposed to do?
A It does indeed.
Q I have basically just been reading this out to you.
A Yes indeed.
Q Some of it you agreed with and some of it you disagreed with and some of it you partially disagreed with?
A That is correct in the context of individual people within the group, yes.
Q So you would expect them, I think you would accept, to undertake in-depth investigation into incidents; yes?
A I would expect that of certain members of staff. The skill level varied amongst the members of staff and the skills of each staff member on individual subjects it varied.
Q Well, Mr Roll was conscientious.
```
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```
A Yes he is. I would agree with that.
Q Skilled?
A He is scaled, yes.
Q Experienced?
A He is, yes.
Q And you gave him a personal reference?
A That's correct, yes.
Q Your witness statement slightly tends to underplay his
    involvement and skill level, doesn't it?
A My witness statement was an accurate reflection of my
    view of Mr Roll's skills.
Q And the answers you were giving until you began to
    recognised what was being read to you, were slightly
    underplaying what third line support did, weren't they?
A No. What -- there is a varying degree of skills and
        actual knowledge within the group. Not everybody cannot
        know everything about all aspects of the actual system.
        Skills would actually vary, knowledge would vary. We
        would have, and do have, specialists in different areas.
Q Let's move forward if we may, please.
    Now, Mr Roll's recollection of what he was doing was
        challenged in cross-examination. Were you here for
        that?
A Yes I was, yes.
Q And it was challenged on the basis of the spreadsheet
```

which you exhibited to your witness statement. Yes?
A That was part of it, yes, indeed.
Q Because it's in your witness statement, first witness statement, paragraph 28 , which is at $\{\mathrm{E} 2 / 11 / 8\}$. You say:
"Between 1 January 2001 and 31 December 2004 ... the SSC received a total of 27,005 calls, meaning that on average 563 calls per month were dealt with over this 4 year period. This is shown by a spreadsheet prepared by a team in the SSC which appears at ... SPP 1".

Now, let's pause there. Who was in the team?
A To produce that information there were at least two other people within my team who helped me to produce the basic stats. I analysed the stats into the summary that you see there.
Q Well, let's take it in stages.
A Yes, by all means.
Q Who were the people that you are referring to that did that exercise?
A Two of my colleagues, John Simpkins and Mark Wright.
Q And they are organised and work as a team?
A They are part of my team.
Q Would they normally work together as a team?
A They would two of the senior people within the group so yes, they often do.
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Q Okay. Let's look, please, if we may, at $\{F / 1839 / 1\}$. Was there any reason why you didn't say who they were?
A No particular reason, no. I mean, I produced the summary and the pivot tables in that document. I just didn't do the searches to produce the raw data.
Q Well, let's have a look, if we may. So we have got \{F1/839/1\} and we are going to look at the tab at the bottom which is called, "RR Peak Live by Category". It's just across there. Could we make that a little bit bigger please? Could you scroll up to the top? If you could hold down the control button on the keyboard and roll the mouse forward it will just expand a little bit. We can just see what the categories are.
A I do, yes.
Q So your evidence about what Mr Roll was doing was based largely on this spreadsheet, wasn't it?
A It was based largely on this spreadsheet but also my recollection of the work that Mr Roll completed.
Q I mean, you sounded a little bit hazy earlier on about things that had happened a long time ago. This spreadsheet you regard as important to get done, so that it would refresh your memory. Is that right?
A I thought it was important to get this done to give the court accurate -- more like accurate information to support my recollection.

```
Q Because the accuracy of the information is very
    important, isn't it.
A The accuracy is important, yes.
Q It is very important.
A It is very important. Yes.
Q That wasn't intended to be a controversial question,
Mr Parker.
    Now, in paragraph 36 of your witness statement, if
        we can just give this context, it's at {E2/11/9}, you
        say:
            "I disagree with Mr Roll's suggestion that much of
        the work being carried out by the SSC while he was
        employed could be described as firefighting coding
        problems in the Horizon system. There were times when
        the SSC was very busy, for example networking problems
        causing application issues across the whole estate and
        data centre outages. But there were only rare
        circumstances where a coding issue had an estate wide
        impact and, in those instances, Mr Roll would have been
        involved in executing avoidance actions to mitigate
        impact to the estate ..."
            There was still a need, wasn't there, as we have
        seen in the description of third line support, to
        address coding issues even if they are not having an
        estate wide impact?
```
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        A That is true, yes.
    Q And if we look at paragraph $40\{E 2 / 11 / 10\}$ you say:
"With that in mind, the final response codes that
were allocated to incidents (ie Peaks) reported to SSC
between 1 January 2010 and 31 December 2004 were as
follows ..."
And you set them out, and you got those from the
spreadsheet that we have just been looking at?
A I did, yes.
Q And this was the basis upon which Mr Roll's evidence was
directly challenged, and this was put to him, and he
accepted that the figures that he was being shown didn't
reflect his recollection as he remembered it.
A Sorry, did you say, "Did", or, "Didn't"?
Q Did not. Sorry, I may have misspoken there. He
accepted very fairly that the figures that he was being
shown didn't reflect the situation as he remembered it?
A As he remembered it, indeed, yes.
Q Yes. So let's go back to \{F/1839/1\} please? It's the
one we had open. That's very helpful. Thank you. Can
we go back to that tab? That's it.
So what you have done in your -- in the spreadsheet
is the closure categories, which is a code given by the
operators when a Peak is closed by number --
A That's correct. Yes.

```
Q -- have been recorded in column A?
A Yes.
Q The associated description has been recorded in column
        B?
A That's correct.
Q And the overall count recorded in column C.
A That's correct. Yes.
Q Yes? And then Mr Roll's count where he is expressly
mentioned --
A Yes.
Q -- as having been involved is in column D; yes?
A I would describe it not as expressly mentioned. Richard
Roll would have been the person who put the final
response on, not necessarily mentioned in.
Q So it's only where he put a final response on?
A Correct. Yes.
Q So lots of other ones where he may have done that?
A Generally no. The person who puts the final response on
is the technician who has been most involved in
completing that work.
Q But you could be involved in lots of Peaks where you are
not the person looking into them trying to help, where
you are not the person who is the final person who signs
off.
A That would be a much -- a very small incidence.
```
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Q Well, we will have a look at that in a minute, but let's
have a look at what you have chosen to put at column E.
Now, is that your heading at column E?
A It is, yes.
Q So who did columns $A$ and $B$ and $C$ ?
A A, B and C were just established as a pivot of the main
data. I'm fairly sure I did that myself.
Q Okay. So you did a pivot table of the main underlying
data?
A Yes.
Q Fine, and then column D. Who did that? Who went
through and decided whether it was an RR count or not?
A The RR count, as I remember it, was based on the
original extract from the database and it would be
whether or not Mr Roll put the final response on that
Peak.
Q I understand that --
A So the original database --
Q Who did it?
A -- I see, so the original database extract was done by
John Simpkins as an sql search on the database.
Q And then potential software error. Who decided --
A That was me.
Q That's you, and then you have done the columns all the
way off to the right have you?
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yes.
Q If you wanted to give an accurate impression to the court did you check with anyone before you decided on those categories or did you just have a little bit of a go yourself?
A I did those based on my own experience.
Q Did you check with anyone?
A NoI didn't.
Q Okay. In fact, in your statement you actually go a sort of step further and say that the potential software error we have in column $E$, even that doesn't mean there actually was one, because it could be something as trivial as the use of, "KG", or something like that.
A It could be a trivial problem indeed, yes.
Q Yes, so even where you have plucked out, I think, four times in his entire career where he was involved in a potential software error on that analysis, even those might not actually be one? That's your point?
A That is possible. It was actually 29 showing there, not four. I think you just said, "Four".
Q Sorry, the four we see there, you are right, the total, if we go all the way up--
A Sorry, you mean the four different categories?
Q Yes.
A Apologies. Yes.

Q I could have made it clearer. That's my fault
You would accept, wouldn't you, that some software errors may look like user errors.
A At first analysis I think that is possible. Generally though, when you see a pattern of repeating user errors you then immediately think, well, there must be more to this.
Q Yes.
A But yes, some could, yes. Agreed.
Q It's unlikely that people will suddenly be careless in the same way --
A Correct.
Q -- from out of nowhere.
A Correct.
Q Now, let's have a look, if we may, please, at category 68 please. You have got that in that line there. Could you just tell the court what you understand that encompasses?

A "Administrative Response", was used when -- in a number of situations when there was no work to be done, you would use, "Admin Response". When there was no technical work to be done you would use it. It would also be used when no other closure category was appropriate.
Q Okay. Well, it was specifically not to be used as
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a catch-all for, "Unable to decide which category to use".
A That would be fair.
Q The reason it's fair, I think, is because if we look at F -- we will keep that available as it is if we may -but if we look briefly at $\{\mathrm{F} / 823 / 24\}$, albeit a 2011 document, we can see there, "Administrative Response", at 9.1.9:
"Only to be used for closing calls which cannot be closed in a legitimate category for 'administrative' reasons -- eg incident incorrect changed by the system ... test calls; mis-routes; double escalates ; unintended escalates, etc ".

So it is an Administrative Response, isn't it?
A I would agree with those, yes.
Q What it is not to be used for, as we see there expressly, it is not to be used as a catch-all for, "Unable to decide which category to use".
A It does say that indeed, yes.
Q Now, let's have a look, if we may, at $\{\mathrm{F} / 16 / 1\}$ please? We need to look at the second page of this because that's where it actually begins, the text begins on \{F/16/2\}. It's Peak 0027887 and it's given a category B, "Business restricted ". That is a serious category, isn't it?

```
A It's one of the more serious categories, yes.
Q Because it only goes up to A.
A A through E, yes.
Q So this is the second-highest category?
A It is.
Q We have seen this one before during the trial, you have
probably been in court when it has been mentioned, it is
the one where there is a balance bought forward on week
12 of £1 million, over £1 million -- £1,082,544.32 --
that subsequent doubles; yes?
A Yes.
Q It's very serious. It is described in the summary as,
"Receipts and payments mis-balance"; yes?
A It is indeed, yes.
Q And then if we look on page {F/16/3} of that please, you
can see the doubling in the bottom box, the bottom
yellow box.
A Yes.
Q To £2.279 million?
A Yes.
Q Then it says:
                            "The discrepancy was therefore 1,082,540.28. This
was due a known software error which has no been
resolved".
A That's correct.
```


## 41

```
Q Now let's assume in your favour that that was, "Has now
been resolved"; yes?
A I don't know but --
Q Or, "Not been resolved ". We don't know.
A It must be either, "Now", or, "Not", I would think, yes.
Q If we go to page 8 please {F/16/8} we can see in the
bottom box of 13 October a number of different
investigations into different periods, periods 9, 10 and
11 and 12 and 13.
A Yes.
Q And at the bottom we can see that there is an agreement
at least with Mike Crowshaw's explanation of the
imbalances in periods }10\mathrm{ and 11 which were due to
a stock transfer of £12,000 which was not settled
correctly to the presence of a corrupt DLL file on the PC involved.
A That's what the notes say, indeed.
Q And there are various different aspects they are also investigating . They are concerned they may not have sufficient evidence; yes?
A Yes.
Q Over the page, if we see at \(\{\mathrm{F} / 16 / 9\}\), insufficient evidence at the top, then further data provided, yellow box at the bottom, halfway down:
"I have obtained new evidence ..."
```

There are ten different people working on this Peak. That's not uncommon, is it?

A Those extra people working on the Peak are in the Development group and not the SSC but I would agree there were multiple people working on this Peak, yes.
Q And if we go to page $\{F / 16 / 11\}$ there is a target release halfway down, set to M1 to reflect the categorisation.
A Reflecting the release when this might be fixed at, yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Where are you looking?
MR GREEN: Sorry, halfway down my Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Which colour?
MR GREEN: In the yellow box, July 2000, 11.03.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes.
MR GREEN: If we go over the page $\{F / 16 / 12\}$, some surprise being expressed at the bottom of the page that it only had six counter 32 transactions. Counter 32 transactions are transactions that had not been done by the SubPostmaster or assistants, aren't they?

A Without looking at the original data I cannot be sure what that notation means. I could assume that 32 was the identifier used for central correspondence servers and not the counters.
Q Yes.
A That's all I can sensibly say without looking at the original data and not actually knowing why that
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particular note has been made.
Q Well, that was what the significance of 32 was, wasn't it?

A I don't know --
Q Normally.
A -- in this case. 32 is the identifier used for correspondence server main data centre server messages. Whether that's what was meant here I don't know.
Q Okay. Then you will see on $\{\mathrm{F} / 16 / 13\}$, a third of the way down:
"I see this is a very old problem ..."
July '99:
" ... there have been many ... updates ... may I suggest we discontinue investigation of this particular problem ..."

Just underneath that you will see the defect cause, three lines up from the bottom, updated to development -- code?
A Sorry, where are you? Three lines up from the bottom? Sorry, of the top box?
Q Of the top box. You see that?
A Yes. Got that.
You have got, "Code", and then in the box below:
"Closing call on the basis of insufficient evidence. As this is such an old call I have not contacted the

```
    call originator. I suggest that this call remains
    closed!"
        Do you see why there is an exclamation mark there?
A I don't know.
Q And then we see it is categorised as Category 68,
    Administrative Response?
A It has been closed that way, indeed.
Q And it's right, isn't it, that that would have involved
    people looking into code and trying to find out what had
    gone wrong and trying to trace the underlying cause of
    the incident.
A In the example that we see there, the Development group
    were doing that work, yes.
Q Yes, and the person in SSC would have been looking into
    it too?
A I don't know to what extent Microsure was involved in
    looking into code on this particular incident.
Q You don't know that, but that's quite likely to have
    been done, isn't it?
A I cannot say.
Q Okay. Let's have a look at another one?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, before you go on, categorising
    that in your spreadsheet you took from the category that
    had been identified in the Peak. Is that right?
    "Administrative Response".
call originator. I suggest that this call remains closed!"
Do you see why there is an exclamation mark there?
A I don't know.
Q And then we see it is categorised as Category 68,
Administrative Response?
A It has been closed that way, indeed.
Q And it's right, isn't it, that that would have involved people looking into code and trying to find out what had gone wrong and trying to trace the underlying cause of the incident.
A In the example that we see there, the Development group were doing that work, yes.
Q Yes, and the person in SSC would have been looking into it too?
A I don't know to what extent Microsure was involved in looking into code on this particular incident.
Q You don't know that, but that's quite likely to have been done, isn't it?
A I cannot say.
Q Okay. Let's have a look at another one?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, before you go on, categorising
that in your spreadsheet you took from the category that had been identified in the Peak. Is that right?
"Administrative Response".
```
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    A The spreadsheet reflects the final response used in each
MR GREEN: Let's look, please, at $\{F / 1326 / 1\}$. You will see
"Up to 10 unnecessary reconciliation errors each
week, requiring calls to be raised and checks made.
Q It is a description of what we are dealing with?
"Please note (in capitals) this call has an 8 hour
Q So it had to be closed within that time; yes, to comply
Peak, yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes. Right.
in the -- halfway down you will see:
Could obscure genuine issues "; yes?
A That's -- yes. Got that, yes.
A Yes.
Q It is assigned category C , non- critical?
A It is indeed, yes.
Q Just look in the yellow box --
A The first yellow box?
Q Yes.
A Yes?
Q 11 March:
SLA".
A That's correct, yes.
A Yes.
with the SLA?

1
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with the SLA?
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```
A The MSU had to respond to it within that time, yes.
Q Okay.
    If we go over the page, {F/1326/2}, if we look in
    the -- Anne~Chambers gets involved. She is involved, it
    seems -- appears in a lot of these. Does she still work
    at Fujitsu?
A No she doesn't, no.
Q When did she leave?
A I cannot be very accurate -- three, four years ago she
    retired.
Q Okay. Looking at the top of page 2:
            "After investigating the specific incidence I will
        use this call to investigate the sudden increase in
        zero-value state 4 reconciliation calls -- something
        must have changed somewhere. DRS data currently goes
        back to 11 December".
            So that's rather the point you were making about
        when you get a pattern it's important to investigate it
        seriously?
A It is indeed, yes.
Q If we go to page {F/1326/3} please, and we look at the
        bottom box of that, Anne~Chambers, she is in SSC?
A That's right, she is .
Q And she is investigating this?
A That's right.
A The MSU had to respond to it within that time, yes.
```

```
Q
```

Q
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Q She says:
"I finally have a theory as to what is happening,
and I think it must be connected to a BAL change ...
That's the Branch Access Layer?
A It is.
Q "... made in release 11.7 which went live on 8
February".
See that?
A I do.
Q And if we go down to the penultimate paragraph:
"It is these unsettled transactions, where the C0
has reached TES prior to settlement, which are giving
the reconciliation errors ... I have made various checks
of TES timestamps before and after the upgrade which
support the scenario. Please can development check what
went into R11.47 which has changed the behaviour.
Related to failure to read recovery data?"
You can see there, "PC0234448 was fixed to change
the behaviour but I think it went live at an earlier
release?"; yes?
A Indeed that's what it says, yes.
Q So there are ten people working on this Peak as well --
over ten actually?
A Where are the -- I will have to take your word for that.
Q There are more than ten different names people dealing
"It is these unsettled transactions, where has reached TES prior to settlement, which are giving

Q There are more than ten different names people dealing
3

```
    with it?
A That is a slightly dangerous assumption because some of
        those people will have been admin people transferring
        things round, but --
Q Okay.
A -- that would only account for one or two.
Q Okay.
    Let's look at page {F/1326/4} please. To be fair,
    Anne~Chambers is driving this?
A From the SSC perspective, indeed, yes.
Q And halfway down:
    "A new business impact has been added: Up to 10
    unnecessary reconciliation errors each week, requiring
    calls to be raised and checks made. Could obscure
    genuine issues ".
        That appears to be the source of what we saw at the
        beginning?
A It does.
Q And if we look at the bottom of the page in the yellow
        box, Anilkumar Malipatil is Anilkumar in SSC or this
        development?
A No, that would be a member of the Development Team.
Q Okay. He says:
    "This Peak is the regression of the Peak PC0234448";
        yes?
            4 9
        A Indeed he does, yes.
Q And underneath he has put:
    "Category 41 -- product error diagnosed"?
A He does indeed, yes.
Q The reason he does that is because there has been
    a regression to a problem that had previously happened
    as a result of a subsequent software release not having
    caught a fix?
A That's the note that the developer has made, yes.
Q And if we look on page {F/1326/5} please, towards the
        bottom of the first blue box, penultimate paragraph:
            "Risks (of releasing and of not releasing proposed
        fix ): Without this fix, there will be possibilities of
        system errors at counter and while doing reversal
        transaction "; yes?
A That's what it says indeed.
Q So that would go into the decision to do the fix or not,
        and then if we go forward to page {F/1326/9} please, we
        look at the very bottom there, so we have got
        Mr Boston -- who is he, three up from the bottom?
A I'm trying to -- John Boston had various roles that were
        mainly administrative. I don't know what role he held
        in September '16.
Q Because up to that point we can see it is being
        categorised as category 60; yes?
```
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Q And underneath he has put:
"Category 41 -- product error diagnosed"?
A He does indeed, yes.
Q The reason he does that is because there has been a regression to a problem that had previously happened as a result of a subsequent software release not having caught a fix?
A That's the note that the developer has made, yes.
Q And if we look on page $\{\mathrm{F} / 1326 / 5\}$ please, towards the bottom of the first blue box, penultimate paragraph:
"Risks (of releasing and of not releasing proposed fix ): Without this fix, there will be possibilities of system errors at counter and while doing reversal transaction "; yes?
A That's what it says indeed.
Q So that would go into the decision to do the fix or not, and then if we go forward to page $\{F / 1326 / 9\}$ please, we look at the very bottom there, so we have got Mr Boston -- who is he, three up from the bottom?
A I'm trying to -- John Boston had various roles that were mainly administrative. I don't know what role he held in September '16.
Q Because up to that point we can see it is being categorised as category 60; yes?

A Yes.
Q And final -- and there is a fix that has been released to live because we can see that above in the yellow box, just over halfway down.
A Yes?
Q It says:
"Fix been released. SW fix available to call logger".

Then let's have a look at how it's closed out by Jason Muir:
"Now seeing minimal if any zero state 4 transactions. Closing Peak is complete ..."

Oh. It has become 68 suddenly.
A That's how Jason who has closed it -- Jason is a member of the management support unit.
Q Mm-hmm, so that is one where everyone has been working on the code trying to develop a fix, been released into live, and it is closed Administrative Response?
A That is what has happened in this case, yes.
Q If it wasn't so serious to challenge Mr Roll's recollection on the basis of this -- all these categories, some of these categorisations are almost comical, aren't they, Mr Parker?
A I wouldn't describe them as such. I think I do say in my witness statement that they are the subjective view
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of the person doing the closure. I would go on to say that they were not -- I accept they were not always right, but in the most cases they were right.
Q Well, that's not accepted, for the avoidance of any doubt.

You also say that there was no review -- after you said in your statement that they were subjective, you also say there was no review undertaken to ensure consistency or appropriate categorisation?
A That's correct, yes.
Q It's not very robust, is it?
A The codes are used to generally assess the workload. As long as they are mainly correct they support that function.

Q But there is no way of checking whether they are mainly correct, as you have fairly pointed out in your witness statement?
A That's correct. Yes.
Q Rebut the question: not very robust, is it?
A Depends on the purpose. I would -- the purpose they were used for was to actually assess the workloads. They were not expected to be 100 per cent accurate.
Q But accuracy is important for you to have any fair view of what's actually being thrown up by the system, isn't it?

```
A Accuracy is important, yes. These were used to assess the workload, not for any forensic purpose.
Q And we also know that the proper management -- just as an aside -- the proper management system wasn't brought in either. We covered that with Mr Godeseth, you were here for that?
A Yes.
Q So there was no problem management system brought in, notwithstanding it was internally recommended, and so all you're left with is this system of looking at the codes and seeing how they have been categorised on closure.
A I'm sorry, I don't understand the correlation between response codes and the problem management system.
Q Because the problem management system was going to track what sort of problems were being encountered into a structured way so that an overall monitoring of the system could be done, and give an idea and feedback of where the problems lay, and that was not brought in and that appears to have been a deliberate decision. We covered it with Mr Godeseth and you were here. So I'm saying in the absence of that, all we are left with, data-wise, are these codes, and I have got an entire file -- I'm not going to be able to go through all of them with you -- but I'm going to keep going through
```
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them and I'm going to show you how all of these have been closed, including all the big categories that Mr Roll did, so I'm going to ask you now; do you accept that it was unsatisfactory not to have a proper system in place to ensure these codes were accurately allocated?
A For the purpose for which I was using them I cannot accept that. They were used as a general guide to the workload.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: When you say, "Purpose", you mean the purpose when you were doing your job at the time, not the purpose in compiling your spreadsheet for the witness statement?

A Yes. Correct. Yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Because you have used them -- I think you have been quite fair, you have used them for your spreadsheet but you have taken the way that the person categorised them, you haven't made a separate categorisation of your own.
A That's correct.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: If you are going to start going through your file we will need a five-minute break for the --
MR GREEN: My Lord, shall we take that now? We have got quite a lot to cover, so ...
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes. Now, you do only have two hours.

```
MR GREEN: I understand that, my Lord, that's why I'm going
    at some pace.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: And some of it, if I may, with
    respect --
MR GREEN: Was a bit long?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, it also verged quite a long way
    into prior submission before you actually put the
    question. It's really about evidence, not arguing the
    case. So shall we have the five-minute break now?
MR GREEN: By all means.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Right. Mr Parker you get a five -minute
    break, I encourage you to leave the witness box, move
    around, stretch your legs, we will come back in at two
    minutes to twelve.
(11.55 am)
                                    (A short break)
(12.02 pm)
MR GREEN: Mr Parker, on the basis that you haven't reviewed
    any of these Peaks to look at their content, and you
    have merely relied on the codes that have been
    allocated -- yes? Is that right?
A Indeed that's correct, yes.
Q So I'm just going to put some example ones to you to
    save time.
A Thank you.
```
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Q Let's look at Code 62 which is, "No Fault in Product".
A Yes.
Q We will take an example at -- well, first of all can you
just tell the court what you think that means? What
does, "No Fault in Product", mean?
A I would probably be better to refer to the document,
but, "No Fault in Product", would generally be used
where we cannot identify a software fault in the
particular piece of the application being looked at.
Q Did you go back to the document before you allocated the
figures in the table on F/1839 to the ones that had
potential software error?
A I did. I reviewed it.
Q Did you? You actually went back to this document?
A I reviewed the content of it, yes.
Q When you say, "Reviewed" --
A I read through it once more. Some of those category
codes are not ones that I -- when I was a technician --
would have used on a regular basis because they were
development codes, so it was necessary for me to refresh
my memory.
Q Okay. Well, let's be fair to you. Let's go to
$\{\mathrm{F} / 823 / 23\}$. We are going to look at Code 62 which is
9.1.3, "No fault in product".
A Yes.
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Now, pausing there, the Postmaster was right about that. They should be closed to the SubPostmaster's permission, shouldn't they?
A That would be a Help Desk process, so I would think so, yes.
Q Is that something you actually know about or are you guessing?
A That is something I do not have personal experience of. I would expect that to be part of the Help Desk process.
Q Okay:
"PM very unhappy about this".
Now, if we go down to about three-quarters of the way down that page you will see $17.04 .01,9.48$, and the word, "Contacted".
A I have got that, yes.
Q "I have left a message on Ki Barnes' voicemail as the PM is now complaining about her. I was speaking to her about the last complaint call and we both feel that this PM is complaining unjustly. She has been in contact with him and I feel he is complaining because the feedback has been advising it is user error whereas the PM thinks it's software".

Yes?
A That's the notes, indeed.
Q So that's sort of suggesting that they have given the
feedback to the SPM that it is user error and the SPM is a bit distressed and cross about it?
A Suggest that, yes.
Q Okay, and there are a number of further entries. I will give you an example of one if we go to page \{F/97/2\}. You can see at the bottom of that page in the yellow box, half way down:
"The system is still playing up in that the screen is hanging in the middle of transactions -- PM did transaction ... but left office for 1 hour -- when he came back the monitor had 141 first - class stamps on screen totalling $£ 38.07$ ", see that?
A Yes. I see that.
Q You would accept that that is not how the system is supposed to work. Is that fair?
A That's fair.
Q If we go over the page, please, to page $\{\mathrm{F} / 97 / 3\}$. At the top:
"I have advised that problem may be due to environmental issue. May be investigated as such" --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Where are you reading?
MR GREEN: Sorry, the top yellow box.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: You mean the top yellow box?
MR GREEN: I'm so sorry, top yellow box. Do you see that,
" Possibility of hand-held radios or $x$-ray machinery, or
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is it more likely a software problem", and then $\{\mathrm{F} / 97 / 4\}$ over the page, halfway down, just a bit less than halfway down, the letters, "PM would like to add current complaint"?
A Just below the bold text, isn't it. Yes.
Q "PM would like to add to the current complaint that transactions are currently appearing and disappearing on screen and also the PM's counter printer has not been working either. PM had a message on screen stating to abort transaction, then the screen froze and timed out. When logged back in, the transaction was not on screen. PM re-booted the printer, and a receipt for this transaction was printed. Now the printer won't print any receipts whatsoever for any transaction. This is an ongoing problem".

That's not how the system is supposed to work, is it?
A It's not, no.
Q And if you look a little bit below that it says:
"Information: PM feels that the system is unreliable. PM cannot trust this system".
A That's what's said, yes, indeed.
Q And if the PM's experience was as recorded, which you don't know about, that's not an unfair reaction, is it?
A No. It's not.

```
Q And if we go to page {F/97/5} --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Just before you do, go back to {F/97/4}.
    You see towards the bottom there is an entry, 1 May
    10.56? It's been 20 lines up.
A Yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Do you see that one? Underneath it
    says, "Information: ROMEC". Do you see what ROMEC do?
A Engineering. They were the hardware engineering team.
    They also did Environmental Surveys.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Mr Green?
MR GREEN: If we go over the page to page {F/97/5} and look
    at the bottom, we have got -- there is -- just -- 3 May
    2001, 15.34:
    "Information: ROMEC have been to the site and done
        all that they can do. There is no more UK SS2 can do
        for this site "; yes?
A Indeed.
Q And just below that:
    "Ki Barnes has called in. I am unsure as to what to
        do with this call now. ROMEC have been to site and
        state that they have actually seen the phantom
        transactions, so it is not just the PM's word now".
A That's what it says, indeed.
Q "They've fitted suppressors to the kit but the PM is
        still having problems. As yet there's been no recurrence
```
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    to the phantom transactions but there still may be
    problems". Do you see that?
    A I do, yes.
Q So there we have got third party witnessing of the
problem by ROMEC, haven't we?
A We have, yes.
Q If we go to page $\{\mathrm{F} / 97 / 7\}$ please:
"I now have pressing evidence to suggest that
unwanted peripheral input is occurring, the likely
source being the screen. This has been seen at old
Isleworth ..."
This is in the yellow box at the bottom.
A Yes, I have got it.
Q Do you have that:
"And warn with OI being the best site. When the PM
has been asked to leave the screen on overnight I have
observed system activity corresponding to screen presses
happening with no corresponding evidence of either
routine system activity or human interference. The way
forward now is to correlate this with Microtouch
complied monitoring software and to this ends Wendy is
arranging for installation of the kit on Friday ..."
And so forth. Do you see that?
A I do.
Q So that's further evidence there, and then if we go to
page $\{\mathrm{F} / 97 / 9\}$ please, the bottom of page 9 --
A Yes?
Q "Phantom transactions have not been proven in circumstances which preclude user error ".
A Indeed.
Q "In all cases where these have occurred a user error related cause can be attributed to the phenomenon"?
A That is what it says, indeed.
Q So the -- go over the page if we may $\{F / 97 / 10\}$ :
"I'm therefore closing this call as no fault in product"?
A That's correct.
Q Is that no fault in the system as a whole or no fault in the Fujitsu software or no fault in either? What does that mean?

A I would interpret that as being no fault in the application software.
Q But it is something that people would have been trying to work out and investigate from all perspectives.
A There was a lot of work going on there, indeed.
Q Yes, and those perspectives would also have included trying to see if there was any underlying software cause, as well as hardware.
A Yes.
Q And if we go, please, to $\{F / 100.1 / 1\}$, that is Peak
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## $0068327 ?$

A This is a different one I assume from the previous one; yes?
Q Yes, and this is priority status B, and that is
a relatively high status, as we have established?
A That's right.
Q And it's closed, "No Fault in Product", and it looks as if -- it says here:
"PM reports he has been having phantom transactions continually for months ..."
MR JUSTICE FRASER: You have really got to tell us where you are on the page.
MR GREEN: I'm so sorry -- at the top my Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: At the very top? Yes.
MR GREEN: Very top. Still persisting, and then, "Advice", just a little bit further down:
"Advice: PM reports that 2 resistance monitors were sent out but only 1 was replaced as 1 was faulty. The resistance monitor that was replaced is causing the problems".

Then if we go down towards the bottom of that blue box you will see, "Information", in the left -hand Marcher under 25 July '01, 10.35 :
"This office has been identified as a problem office and as such is being monitored. Wendy Kerrigan has
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asked SSC/Development for Performance Monitoring at this outlet. I suggest this goes to SSC possibly for the attention of Pat Carroll as he is dealing with phantom transactions ".
Who was Pat Carroll?
A Pat Carroll was one of the senior technicians within the SSC.
MR GREEN: Was he elite or super elite in my learned friend's jargon?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, that's not really -- the witness has already said he didn't agree with, "Super elite ", and, " Elite ", and he doesn't know what Mr de Garr Robinson is doing when he is categorising people.
MR GREEN: Was he at your level of seniority or close to it or was he similar to Mr Roll? Where was he.
A He was above Mr Roll, a similar level to myself at that time.
Q So it was quite a serious issue, having phantom transactions, wasn't it?
A It would be, yes.
Q And thence the category B priority?
A That -- yes. That's true, yes.
Q And if we look at page 2 of that \(\{F / 100.1 / 2\}\) we have got 5 September 2001 in the yellow box, the lower yellow box:
```
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"Following a significant amount of monitoring we have been unable to definitively link any equipment/environmental issues to any particular event. There have been incidents which showed a possible correlation between system activity and phantom transactions. These pointed to a touch screen problem and as a result the screen was replaced with a resistive model. As this produced no measurable improvement it has to be assumed that the problems were user related ".

That's closed, "No Fault in Product"?
A It is indeed, yes.
Q And if we go, please, to $\{\mathrm{F} / 174 / 1\}$ this is a KEL which 2000-2004 we can see. Do you see that?
A I do.
Q And it is items appearing on stack without being selected. That is essentially phantom transactions. An example of phantom transactions?
A It could be indeed, yes.
Q Symptoms:
"There have been several calls over the last few months where Postmasters have reported phantom sales. Items appear by themselves for which the PM has not pressed an Icon. These may be individual items or several of the same item. Sometimes when no one has been near the screen items may appear".

Now, pausing there, your point earlier is when you get a pattern of these things happening you have to take notice that it might be system issue?
A We would do, yes.
Q Problem: Since the system cannot put items on the stack without being told to, the desktop must be receiving specific requests to sell the items in question. In the cases I have looked at I could only conclude that either the screen or the keyboard has been generating key sequences. A more recent case revealed that the cable between the screen and the base unit was the root cause".

Then we see, "Solution -- ATOS":
"In the first instance send an engineer with a recommendation to replace both the keyboard and the screen. (Also check whether there is a problem with the screen cable )".

There are detailed instructions then in terms of evidence for Pat Carroll to deal with environmental issues, so would your answer to the previous -- on the previous Peak be the same that where it is No Fault in Product what has been recorded is the conclusion is it doesn't appear to be a software issue, whatever else it may be?
A It would, yes.
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Q And if we now have a look, please, at $\{F / 718 / 1\}$-sorry, yes, F/718-- now, we are turning here to Code~70, "Avoidance action supplied". Could you tell the court what you understand that to be?
A It could be classified as an actual work round we have advised on some action to be taken to avoid the symptoms that have been described.
Q Well, let's pause there. Do you accept it is to be used where there is a fault in the product?
A Not necessarily.
Q Well, let's have a look at $\{F / 823 / 24\}$ to see what the document that you recently considered says. What we are looking for here is avoidance action supplied, and the -- it's actually over the page, if you have got page 24 there, it's 9.1.10, and the word, "Is ", which I emphasised in my intonation, is in capitals?
A It is indeed.
Q So the correct answer to that question would have been, "Yes"?
A It would indeed.
Q And you now accept that?
A I do.
Q Okay. So having done that, can we go back to $\{\mathrm{F} / 718 / 1\}$ please? And this has only been given a priority of C . Do you see that?

it's a software fault.
Q Okay. Let's have a look. $\{\mathrm{F} / 718 / 1\}$. This we can see has Avoidance Action Supplied at the top; yes?
A Yes indeed, yes.
Q Which we have seen is to be used where there is a fault in the product.
A Yes.
Q And if we go down to the yellow becomes and under the double tram lines you will see:
"PM states that he has rolled over but the system is telling him that he hasn't -- PM states that he is in balance period 7 and he states he is getting the message 'wrong trading period MSG 31318 office balancing error '".

Yes?
A Yes.
Q You will see in the log line below:
"Non-zero trading position ... on rollover of branch by user WMC002 to trading period 8 ".

Do you see the problem?
A I do.
Q So this is a type of payments mismatch issue, isn't it.
A I would be hesitant to classify it as that. All I can say is it's an office balancing error. That's all I can see there.
Q Well, just give me a second. (Pause)
Let's go forward, if we may, to page \{F/718/2\}. If
we look at the bottom yellow box please, Cheryl Card.
Who is she?
A She is a member of the SSC.
Q And who is Lorraine Elliott?
A She was the SSC administrator at that time.
Q And Sheryl card in the bottom yellow box, 27 September
2010, 15: 16:
$\quad$ "The problem occurred on 15/09/20 when stock unit
02 rolled over. This was originally reported, as per
KEL, BALLANTJL759Q, in call PC0204537... but for some
reason the call was closed without being investigated.
There is a known problem with the use of the Cancel
button during the stock unit rollover. This is fully
described in KEL WRIGHTM33145J".
Do you recognise that KEL number?
A I don't, no.
Q But that is the payments mismatch number, isn't it?
A I did not recognise it as such. Without seeing it ...
Q Okay, because you didn't look at any of these before you
Qave your evidence and compiled the spreadsheet?
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## MR JUSTICE FRASER: No.

MR GREEN: Apparently not.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Or not yet.
MR GREEN: Top of the page on page 3:
"As agreed routing to Gareth Jenkins as at bus apps desk for advice on how to correct the differences"?
A That's right. Yes.
Q Next yellow box down:
"The branch accounts will need be corrected ..."
A Yes.
Q And advice about how to do that, and if we just go to page $\{F / 718 / 7\}$ please, if we look at the severity in the blue box at the top of the page, it says, "Critical ", doesn't it?

A Yes it does.
Q Yes. "Severity: Critical", but we saw that the Peak incident management system records it as non- critical?
A It recorded it as C I believe, didn't it?
Q C is non- critical . The definition of C is,
"Non- critical ".
A Yes. Correct.
Q Then at the bottom of that page in the yellow box:
"The software issue that caused the discrepancy is being monitored and all instances are being reported directly to POL duty manager with all the relevant

```
    figures and reports. I have confirmed that this issue
    at this office has already been reported through. P O L
    will get in touch with PM regarding any remedial
    actions. Closing call ... Call type category 70 ...
    avoidance action supplied"?
A Indeed.
Q So there has been pretty detailed investigation of
    what's going on and what's gone wrong and it's closed as
    Avoidance Action Supplied because that's where there is,
    by definition a fault with the system?
A Indeed.
Q So it would be fair to say that a fair categorisation,
    if you had read the definition of, "Avoidance Action",
    as you say, a fair categorisation on your spreadsheet
    would have included that code, wouldn't it, for
    potential software errors?
A That code, in my experience, has not always been used
        purely for potential software errors, and that's why I
        categorised it in a different way from that in the
        document. That's the best I can -- you know. Avoidance
        Action Supplied has not always been used purely for
        a software fault.
    Q Well, there are two layers of chaos. One is the way
        that categories are assigned. Do you agree with that?
    A I agree that they are not checked after use.
```
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    Q And that they are highly subjective?
    A And that they are very subjective, yes.
    Q And the second point is that when you were compiling
        your witness statement you went a bit off piste and
        departed from the definition that you say you read. Is
        that fair?
    A It's fair to say that I used the definition my
        experience dictated rather than that in the document.
    Q You didn't think that was important it make clear to the
        court?
    A I forgot that that was exactly what I had done in that
        circumstance when I prepared that a few months ago.
    Q Mr Parker, I will give you an opportunity to consider
        this. Is the truth of the matter that when you
        looked -- well, is the truth of the matter that you had
        not specifically looked at the words of the Avoidance
        Action Supplied definition and you went with
        recollection without considering the tension between the
        definition and your recollection?
    A I read the details in that document to refresh my memory
and allocated the codes based on my experience and the
document.
Q Well, in that case, it appears you have taken
a deliberate decision to exclude a category which you
knew included a fault with the product from Potential

Software Error column. Is that what you did?
A What I did was I used my experience to put that in what I believed to be the right category heading for it .

Q So it was a deliberate decision to depart from the definition in the documentation we have looked at and record it as not having even the potential for a software error? Is that your evidence?
A My evidence is that my experience is that it is used more times when it is outside a software fault than inside.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I wonder if you could put the question a third time.
MR GREEN: Was it a deliberate decision to depart from the express words that you had looked at carefully -- or looked at?

A Yes. It was.
Q Why did you think that was an appropriate thing to do when giving your witness statement knowing that you were challenging Mr Roll's recollection by doing so?
A Because my -- that was the value and the way it was used based on my own experience, so I felt that was a fair way to define it.
Q Let's look and consider your experience.
What we have seen so far on this example is that your experience conflicts not only with the content of
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this example, but with the definition in the policy document.
A It conflicts with the definition, certainly, yes, and this particular example.
Q I suggest to you that Mr Roll's recollection of what he was doing is correct in the light of what we have seen so far, isn't it?
A I stand by the original use of that spreadsheet. It is used to classify, in general, the workload that the support units do, and that's the way I used it when I was trying to classify Mr Roll's work.
Q Okay. Well, let's have a look at $\{\mathrm{F} / 93 / 1\}$ then please. Again, this is actually priority B , business restricted; yes?
A Indeed, yes.
Q And it is closed for Avoidance Action Supplied?
A Yes.
Q "PM reports she had a discrepancy of a gain ..."
And then it runs out. If we look at the top of the blue box, please, 15 March 2001:
"PM reports she had a discrepancy of a gain, so she rolled everything over, and then redeclared her cash, and adjusted her stock then tried to roll over again by going to Balance report F6".

If we go down a little bit further in relation to

[^1]Q In the penultimate yellow box he tried to reproduce the
scenario, putting the system under load and so forth?
A Yes.
Q And found he couldn't.
A Yes.
Q Not sure what to suggest. He says:
"Have looked at the PS log, also this does not
reveal any unexpected impulses from other applications.
Spent a few days on this as has Alex Kaiser (in previous
incarnations of this problem)".
There had previously been examples of it. Who is
Alex Kaiser?
A I don't know.
Q "I have no choice but to pass back as insufficient
evidence but would ask that EDSC keeps an eye out to see
if any patterns arise or any sign of the problem
actually being reproduced at will ".
Insufficient evidence there and then if we go to
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A According to the documentation, that's correct.
Q And if we look at the two Peaks that it refers to --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Just before you do that, on $\{F / 93 / 3\}$, Mr Parker, where it says:
"Clearly we need to keep an eye on this type of situation, the systems we have tried to reproduce on contains adding all bug fixes ..."

Do you read that as meaning the systems on which they are trying to replicate the problem?
A Yes I do.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Is that the same as the expression, "Test rig ", that has been used in other areas?
A Not necessarily. I would think so. I mean, all I read that to mean was that they weren't sure because the version of software on the systems they were trying it on were not the same as what's out in the --

## MR JUSTICE FRASER: In the field?

A -- in the field, yes. That's how I would read it. MR JUSTICE FRASER: Mr Green, back to you. MR GREEN: I'm most grateful.

If we just look briefly at the -- there are two other Peaks, I'm not sure I have got time to deal with them.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Remember you need to leave time for re-examination.

```
MR GREEN: My Lord yes.
            Can we just briefly, please, look at {F/589/1}? You
    will see this is non-critical and closed with Solicited
    Known Error. Do you see that?
A I do.
Q That is a problem of duplicated pouches, as you see
    underneath the two tram lines.
A Yes.
Q And the amount that was renned in twice was £25,000.
A That's what the notes says, yes.
Q It's pretty serious for the SubPostmaster?
A I would think so, yes.
Q But category priority is C, non- critical?
A That's correct.
Q And at {F/589/3} if you look down the penultimate blue
    box, 5 March 2010, 12.33:
    "POL have been informed of the error. Hopefully
    they'll issue a TC to correct loss at the branch. The
    underlying problem caused by using previous button
    during or just after scanning pouch barcodes, is still
    under investigation ".
        It is closed as Solicited Known Error?
A That's correct.
Q If we look, just going forward for a moment to
    {F/1156/1} we can see there again C, non- critical ,
```
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    closed, No Fault in Product, P doing cash declarations
    every now and again has a major loss, and you can see in
    the yellow box towards the bottom underneath, "Log",
    about three-quarters of the way down:
    "PM has had cash declaration problem throughout the
    year and it losing a lot every now and again".
    Do you see that?
    A I do.
Q "He 'phoned up helpline told him can't of declared
properly. He states that he losses $£ 2,000$ then jumps
suddenly to $£ 4,000$, one point they lost $£ 8,000$ and is
always losing money. PM stated that he has three post
offices, only happens on this site ", and then about
five, six lines up from the bottom:
"Done a declaration this morning and had a $£ 6,000$
also. It shows no error message when doing it. No
report prints out only print-out of cash declarations ".
Pausing there, if the PM is correctly reporting
that, then that would be very serious for the
Postmistress or Postmaster, wouldn't it?
A If it is being correctly reported, yes.
And it would not be the system working as it should.
A If we attribute it as a system fault, yes.
Q Let's go forward, please, just to $\{F / 66 / 1\}$, this is Peak
0055964. It is a receipt and payments mismatch. Do you
see that? The summary?
A Yes I do.
Q Classified as non- critical, and you can see that in the top of the blue box at -- on 13 October 2000, "PM is doing a trial cash account and it is saying receipts and payments don't match". Do you see that?
A I do.
Q And at the bottom of that blue box, if you go up a few lines in that last big paragraph you will see on the right-hand side:
"PM appears to have dealt with her losses and gains correctly for week 28 by putting into susp account unable to trace mismatch"; yes?
A Yes.
Q If we go over the page to page 2 please $\{\mathrm{F} / 66 / 2\}$ in the blue box we can see that the Regional Network Manager is still not happy, the second blue box down, halfway down:
"RNM still not happy. His PO is closed and PM wants to balance".

A Yes.
Q Now, this is still only being given a non- critical priority . Why is that? Category C?
A I can only assume that whoever was looking at it didn't see fit to actually change it.
Q What should it have been? A B?
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```
A I would probably have classified that as B, yes.
Q And if we read on in that box you will see:
            "STA advised me to call EDSC to find out how long it
        would take to action and resolve a call. EDSC said they
        were dealing with it now and they will speak to me asap.
        Spoke to SMC. They said PM was informed incorrectly. He
        was told the problem would be resolved by the end of
        today but it is only C priority and is only just being
        looked into ".
            So classifying it as a C priority rather than a B
        will have an impact on how speedily it's looked into,
        won't it .
A Certainly B priorities would be looked into before Cs.
        It does not imply that we would deliberately wait
        a period of time before looking at a C.
Q Okay. Let's look at the bottom of page 2, penultimate
        box which is a yellow one, 18 October 2000. Last line
        of that:
            "Advised PM that third line are investigating the
        mismatch problem".
            See that?
A Sorry, you have lost me.
Q In the yellow box at the bottom?
A The 14.52 one?
Q Yes. That's it?
```
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page on page $\{\mathrm{F} / 66 / 4\}$ and they say, in the yellow box:
"We have done the necessary paperwork for this. Development have already corrected this particular fault, with the opening figures and it will be fixed at CI4 ".

What is CI4?
A CI4 is a release of the system.
Q Okay, great, and that is closed as, "Reconciliation Resolved"?
A That's correct, yes.
Q Category 90 ?
A That's correct. Yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I don't think you are going to have time to do any more of these.
MR GREEN: I'm not going to do any more of those, my Lord, I'm cutting it there because -- not least because the witness accepts that he didn't go through them before he gave his witness statement.

Just briefly, if I may, Mr Parker, in relation to -just go back for a moment in relation to the injection of transaction data, in your witness statement at paragraph 22 on page 5, that's \{E2/11/5\} I will just be very brief on this if I may, but your evidence to the court was that you knew about the ability to access remotely when you gave this witness statement.

[^2]believe there was at least one other.
Q Was there any reason why you didn't put the names in the witness statement?
A Didn't see it as being relevant. They were all members of my team and I rely on my team to do the technical details.
Q Okay, and do you know where -- was it your understanding that the comments that they put in were their own comments or were they provided for them by someone else? Do you know? What was your understanding?
A They were their own comments.
Q And did you check them at all or did you just accept them on trust from them?
A I read through them but I do trust my team to get the technical detail right.
Q Just very briefly, they comment on the issue of transaction corrections in various places. Is that something you know about the system for or not?
A Is that something I know about the system for? Sorry, I don't ...
Q Did you understand how Post Office decides to issue a TC, who does it and ...
A No, I don't.
Q Are your team familiar with that, or ...
A We are only familiar with the processing of them, not
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how they are actually generated.
Q If we look -- I was going to take you through the first few and then have a look at another one by example because we're short of time, if we look, please, at \{E2/11/38\}, now looking at that example, do you know -you are suggesting there that a -- do you see the response to Mr Coyne there? In the, "Response to Mr Coyne", column?
A Got you, in the Fujitsu's comments, the first column of those two, yes.
Q Yes. You see a REN in reversal not particularly common transaction, prohibited later on.
A Yes.
Q Do you see that?
A I do.
Q Where has that come from? Is that a member of your team?
A Of my team, yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: But you don't know, I imagine, on the face of this, which of those gentlemen.
A I don't my Lord, no.
MR GREEN: And if we look at -- would you give them any guidance as to how to do this or not?
A Other than getting them to read the context that the problems were described in, no.
Q Do you know if anyone gave them any guidance?
A Not aware of it, no.
Q And was it your idea to produce the table?
A What -- in this format?
Q Yes?
A I will be honest, I can't remember. It seems like
a logical format to do things in. I'm not sure whether
I generated it or not now.
Q Is there any reason -- well, did you -- do you know
whether the team had a draft of Dr Worden's report in
front of them before they filled in these comments?
A I don't know. I don't think they did. I think we just
gave them Coyne's report for them to get the context.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: You said, "We", again.
A Sorry, I gave them it, yes.
MR GREEN: My Lord, in the circumstances I will deal with
everything else by way of submissions.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes. Mr de Garr Robinson?
Re-examination by MR DE GARR ROBINSON
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Mr Parker, there were just a few
questions. At the beginning of your cross-examination
some time was taken on the letter at \{H/253/1\}. Perhaps
we could look at that letter again. You will recall
that this is a letter written by WBD to Freeth's on 20
March.
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A Yes.
Q Which starts by saying:
"We understand from Fujitsu that the SSC has been carrying out further work to identify any Peaks that show transactions being injected at the counter ..."
A That's correct. Yes.
Q You have seen that letter before, earlier on.
Could I ask, who is it who provided this intelligence to Post Office?
A I provided the intelligence. It was provided to me by a member of my team.
Q I see, and were you aware or not aware or were you involved in the process by which this further work was done?
A I wasn't involved in it, no. A member of my team -- the thought occurred to him that he could add some other search terms into the work that he had done previously.
Q And so what happened? Did you then become aware --
A I did become aware. He came to me with the new data.
Q And what did you then do?
A I then informed the legal team.
Q Now -- and that then resulted in this letter. You were asked a large number of questions which appeared to me at least to carry with it the implication that there was some attempt on your part to conceal the fact that this
extra work had been done. Would you care to comment on that suggestion?
A That suggestion would be wrong. When I was aware of it and I had a chance to actually read it I sent it on to the legal team so that appropriate action could be taken. I was actually quite pleased that a member of the team had taken it upon himself to get even more accurate data.
Q You were also asked a number of questions which I think were based upon the implication that in amending your witness statement, your third witness statement as you did, again, there was an attempt to conceal from someone the fact that this extra work had been done. Would you care to comment on that? I'm making what was implicit explicit . Would you care to comment on that suggestion?
A I have, at no time, attempted to conceal anything. I'm just trying to get the right data for the court which can be difficult sometimes when you are going back fifteen years.
Q Thank you, Mr Parker. Just another few questions, if you will give me a moment.
The majority of the time that was spent cross-examining you was spent in an effort to suggest that the spreadsheet that you put together analysing the output of the SSC during Mr Roll's involvement and the
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output of Mr Roll's during his employment by Fujitsu was misleading or unreliable or unrepresentative. I would just like to raise that point squarely with you to give you an opportunity actually squarely to address the suggestion that that is the case.
A It's not unrepresentative. We use -- although response codes can be subjective, they are our only reasonable way of judging our workload, and we use it for that purpose. Since I was attempting to compare Mr Roll's workload with the workload of the unit as a whole, I felt that was a reasonable way of doing it .
Q It was put to you that accuracy was important. Could I ask you to comment on the question whether you think there has been any lack of accuracy or any particular accuracy in the process that you attempted to do?
A I have been accurate with the data I have. I accept that you may find a few Peaks where the response code does not tally with the document, but when you are talking about 220,000 Peaks I think human beings will make those errors.
Q In relation to particular Peaks you say you could point to a few Peaks, you were taken to a number of Peaks in which it was suggested that the categorisation was wrong, or the closure category was wrong.
A Yes.

Q It was suggested to you that -- I think with the
implication that you should have looked at these Peaks
before you gave your evidence. Now, by my tally, most
of the Peaks that Mr Green took you to were Peaks that
related to a period during which Mr Roll was not
employed. Do you feel it would have been appropriate
for you to look at Peaks outside that period for the
purposes of analysing -- doing the analysis that you did
in your spreadsheet?
For the purposes of that analysis, no, and trying to --
even for that analysis period, which was 27,000 Peaks, I
couldn't possibly read all of them.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord, I have no further questions.
Thank you Mr Parker.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Thank you very much. Just give me one
second. I have a couple of questions.
Now, in answering these questions, if you could
avoid the first person plural --
A understand my Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: -- and also the expression, "My team",
because I find it easier if we can deal with names. You
have got on the screen \{H/253/1\} --
A Yes?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: -- which Mr de Garr Robinson has just
been asking you about now. Am I right that the extra
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work that was being done was being done by Mr Simpkins?
A That's correct.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Is that correct?
A That is.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Is it the case you asked him to do that work or you just found out he was doing that work.
A I did not ask him to. He did the original work and then came back to me some period afterwards and said, "I have just thought of this ".
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Right. Now, when did he do that?
A I cannot be exact. It was shortly before I gave it to the actual legal team because I would have looked at it, read it, and then passed it on.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, if we could avoid, "I would have", I would like to know what you can remember doing and if you can't, that's, of course, understandable. Are we talking in the last couple of weeks or earlier than that?
A Last couple of weeks prior to 20 March when this was generated?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes.
A Yes, it would have been in that time period.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: So it's some time -- and why want to put words into your mouth so if you can't remember --
A Understand.
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MR JUSTICE FRASER: -- it 's some time in 2019?
A Oh yes. Certainly.
MR JUSTICE FRASER:After or before the start of the trial
    so far as you know?
A It was after the start.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: After the start of the trial . And when
    did you decide that you wanted to make corrections to
    your third witness statement.
A I can't remember exactly.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, after or before the start of the
    trial ?
A After.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: After the start of the trial?
A Yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Before this week.
A Yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: A couple of weeks ago? Last Friday? Or
    can't you remember?
A I'm sorry I can't.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: All right. Any questions arising out of
any of that? No? All right. Thank you very much
    Mr Parker. You can leave the witness box.
A Thank you.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Now, I think Mr de Garr Robinson, on the
basis of Mr Membery, that's your evidence of fact
```
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finished. Is that right?
Now, we have to address the situation in respect of the remaining tranche of the Horizon trial, and I do recall that in the order that was produced the day before yesterday I said that we would do that at 2 o'clock. Is that likely to take very long and/or can it usefully be done now or would you like to come back?
MR GREEN: My Lord I think we might need to come back because there are quite a few consequential pathways to consider how they intermesh.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: All right. Would it be inconvenient to come back at ten to two?

MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord no.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: The reason for that is, and it is wholly unconnected with this case, there is a meeting I'm supposed to be at at the Ministry of Justice this afternoon. It is a long meeting, it goes on for three hours, I can say wholly neutrally they are expecting me to be slightly late, but obviously if I could be less late than staggeringly late then that would be useful, so if we come back at ten to two and we will deal with the second -- and the features, I think, are any housekeeping, predominantly the dates for the experts and also there is the two days of closings.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord yes.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Is there anything else on that --
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord there is one more point to raise with your Lordship which is that Dr Worden has -it has occurred to Dr Worden there is a new way of looking at the Peaks and the OCPs, OCRs and MSCs in this case which, in his view shed considerable light on certain of the Horizon issues. He feels it is his duty to inform your Lordship of that. He has already informed Mr Coyne of that fact and it is only right that I should bring it to your Lordship's attention.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Thank you. I think on the same subject, then, and given that the expert evidence isn't going to start until the 20th, I'm also minded, unless each of you seek to persuade me otherwise, to order another expert's meeting anyway.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Simply in terms of the date.
MR GREEN: My Lord, that would be convenient. What we did was we -- solicitors and counsel and experts liaised to find the window that everybody can do, and that is in the -- towards the end of June.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, we are going to deal with all of that at ten to two. I have said it is starting -- are you talking about the evidence in general?
MR GREEN: The expert evidence. Two experts.
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MR JUSTICE FRASER: I have ordered that that is happening on 20 May. It 's starting on 20 May. We will revisit it if you are going to try to seek to persuade me to move that date at ten to two but you are going to find it very difficult. We will address that at ten to two.
( 1.09 pm )
(Luncheon adjournment)
( 1.50 pm )

## HOUSEKEEPING

MR GREEN: My Lord, it may be the source of some confusion last time might be because we misunderstood your Lordship's order in the light of what your Lordship said orally at the recusal application hearing, because your Lordship --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Which bit of the order?
MR GREEN: Well, there are two provisions, paragraph 9 and -- setting the dates for the expert evidence, and paragraph 3. We had understood paragraph 3 to reflect the fact that your Lordship had graciously accepted that my commitments in the week prior to that would mean we wouldn't be able to resume before that, and when we looked at dates afterwards --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, you told me that you were in the Court of Appeal the week before that.
MR GREEN: Correct.

MR JUSTICE FRASER: So my original intention in this order was to order that the expert evidence commenced on 13 May and that couldn't happen for the reasons you explained on Tuesday.
MR GREEN: Precisely, we had understood that, and then your Lordship mentioned us coming back to deal with the relevant dates. We don't need to look at the transcript but the -- paragraph 9, we understood as reflecting what your Lordship had said orally to us.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, you, I think -- well, two points, Mr Green. Firstly, the Post Office Horizon issues team weren't here at all.
MR GREEN: Precisely.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: And the recusal team had no instructions in respect of experts' availability, etc.
MR GREEN: Exactly.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Secondly, you sought to give me submissions in an understandably fragmented way about what Mr Coyne's plans were.
MR GREEN: Indeed.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: So I said, which is reflected in the order, we will start on the 20th, I don't want to supervise a one-sided tennis match in terms of diary, we will deal with that when we have finished the evidence of fact.
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MR GREEN: Exactly, and so that's what--
MR JUSTICE FRASER: And you interpreted that as meaning we are not going to have any experts until June, did you?
MR GREEN: We didn't interpret that as meaning that. We interpreted that as the parties should go off, conscientiously consider who is available when and come back to the court with an informed answer which was what I was trying to return to the court with.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, bearing in mind the overriding point which I also made on Tuesday, which is this is a part heard trial --
MR GREEN: My Lord, yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: The Court of Appeal takes priority , Supreme Court takes priority. Other than that it's part heard, we are getting on with it.
MR GREEN: But it's difficult to do without the experts present, so we have got --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: What do you mean, without the experts present now or at any point after Tuesday?
MR GREEN: No, no. What we sought to do, my Lord, is find dates the experts can attend, are able to attend, because, for example, you know, by way of example, Mr Coyne's in a three-week hearing at the moment on a three-week trial.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, Mr Coyne would have been giving
evidence in this trial at the moment. If the recusal application --
MR GREEN: Going forward from the 1 st --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Can we just start from some basic principles, all right? If the recusal application had not been issued, Mr Coyne's evidence would have been last week.
MR GREEN: Exactly.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: And this week Dr Worden would have been giving evidence and I assume Mr Coyne would have been in court to listen to his cross-examination.
MR GREEN: Exactly.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: So the fact he is in a three-week trial --
MR GREEN: Sorry, I was looking ahead at the diary for the period we have identified.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: But we are part heard. This is a part heard trial.
MR GREEN: My Lord yes. I agree, and not of our making.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: No, no, I know that.
MR GREEN: That's the difficulty, because we have obviously --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: But this trial is not now going to embark on a jigsaw puzzle to fit around things that other people are intending to do in the future. It is
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a part heard trial.
MR GREEN: It is, and we have got some immoveable problems.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well that is a different issue, but none of them, I assume, can relate to 20 May.
MR GREEN: Well they do my Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: You didn't mention them to me on Tuesday.
MR GREEN: What I understood had happened, it may be my -I'm sure it's my fault, what I understood had happened was your Lordship had announced a date when it was going to resume and I noticed immediately that I was in the Court of Appeal and your Lordship then very fairly observed, well, actually, rather than have a tennis match about dates, we will deal with that today.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: With one of the players not here.
MR GREEN: Exactly. So that was -- and so we thought to help the court we must go off, carefully, find out when the experts are and are not available, and identify any Supreme Court or Court of Appeal cases that we have and also one member of my team has got four weeks of adoption leave which is not --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I know, but both -- right, Mr Green, I'm sorry, there has to be a balance struck between this. You have a team with more than one counsel and so does Mr de Garr Robinson. It might be entirely
understandably that on some of the days not all the counsel can be available for all the days. What we need is the cross-examining counsel, the main counsel for the other side and the experts. That's what we need in order to deal with the expert evidence. If we start trying to fit together a matrix that includes the entirety of both full teams plus all the experts' commitments, we will still be dealing with this at the end of 2019. That's not going to happen.
MR GREEN: My Lord, we have found a window that is possible for everyone in June.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well --
MR GREEN: At the end of June, as I understand it. There may be some difficulty with my learned friend possibly having a holiday commitment at the end, but we have found a window when everyone can do it, because Ms Donnelly, for example, is the senior junior on my team and she has got four weeks of adoption leave in May which is --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: You don't have to go into those sorts of details.
MR GREEN: My Lord, we are hesitant to be prejudiced on the claimant's side by something that is not of our making.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, all right.
MR GREEN: If there's no -- we will let your Lordship look
at the dates --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I'm not going to look at the dates in this form I'm going to come on to the dates in a moment but that's our outline situation, is you are saying revisit paragraph 3 and the debate that was had in front of me by Mr Cavender and you, don't have the experts on 20 May, put it off a month and approach it that way. That's the nub of it.
MR GREEN: Under paragraph 9 that's the --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I'm not saying that because it's in paragraph 3 rather than paragraph 9 I'm not going to do it, I'm just identifying what it is you are telling me.
MR GREEN: My Lord, yes, because of difficulties with expert availability, counsel's availability.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: In other words, treat it as if it is not a part trial is what it comes down to.
MR GREEN: No my Lord because we are excluding things that are not in the Supreme Court or the Court of Appeal, so with respect, I'm trying to comply with what your Lordship has said, and so we are just looking only at experts' availability and trials to which we are committed in the Court of Appeal or above, so that is the only -- I'm not trying to treat it as if it is not a part heard trial at all.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: All I think that that can be interpreted
as is as follows; approaching it as though it is expert availability not taking account that it's part heard. Because the fact an expert is doing $\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y}$ or Z , if he is in a part heard trial he should be dealing with his evidence in the part heard trial, should he not, as a higher priority? Neither of them can be in the Court of Appeal or the Supreme Court because those courts adopt hear evidence.
MR GREEN: No. I mean, Mr Coyne is on his son's 21st birthday holiday abroad between 22 May and 29 May.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Right. Well, okay. Those are your outlines. I'm going to hear from Mr de Garr Robinson. MR GREEN: I've got various Supreme Court issues later .
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Right. Mr de Garr Robinson? Admittedly you weren't here on Tuesday but I imagine --
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: I've read the transcript and in fairness to my learned friend I did read the transcript as containing an indication by your Lordship that the commencement date would be -- you indicated 20 May, but my understanding from the transcript was there would then be a full debate about that today, but that is a welcome piece of agreement between my learned friend and myself.

My Lord, my concern -- I do not protest that my expert is unavailable on 20 May. One of my juniors is
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briefed on something else, but I don't complain about that either, it's not the Court of Appeal or the Supreme Court. My Lord, one issue I do pray in aid, however, is that if Mr Coyne is cross-examined on 20 May there will then be something like ten days' gap between the completion of his evidence, in fact more than ten days, and the commencement of Dr Worden's cross-examination. My Lord, that gives my learned friend a material advantage because -- particularly in a complicated case of this sort, it will be a real advantage to have ten or twelve days to meticulously plan a cross-examination based on answers given in cross-examination the week before. My Lord, I'm anxious about that, and I would invite your Lordship not to split up the experts in that way, but as a matter of simple fairness, to have the two experts giving evidence back-to-back, and I would therefore suggest, respectfully, and of course it is a matter entirely for your Lordship, I do entirely acknowledge that we are part heard in a trial, but I would respectfully suggest that the cross-examination should start at the beginning of the following term.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, what Mr Green has told me means that Mr Coyne's examination -- cross-examination -couldn't be done in the week of the 20th because it sounds from what he told me as if there is only two days
that week available before Mr Coyne is going off to do whatever it is he is doing, and you are entitled to four days.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: So he would not have access to his expert at all.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: That's when I'm supposed to be cross-examining him. I'm not making my learned friend's submissions. If your Lordship directs that the hearing resume on 20 May I apprehend that Mr Coyne will attend for cross-examination. I might be wrong about that, but my simple submission to your Lordship is, as a matter of simple fairness to both parties, your Lordship should arrive at a period where the experts are giving evidence back-to-back.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: And that period, so far as you are concerned --
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord, I would suggest that it starts -- Mr Coyne's cross-examination starts on Tuesday, 4 June. That would involve your Lordship sitting for four days, that would involve your Lordship sitting on the Friday of that week.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, that's not an issue.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: And then Dr Worden giving evidence on the --
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MR JUSTICE FRASER: So that is a four-day week because it is vacation on the Monday.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Because term starts on the Tuesday. My Lord, Dr Worden giving evidence on 10 June for, I think, three days, I apprehend.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, it was three with a possibility of four because I proffered parity on number of days and Mr Green hadn't decided.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: And then, my Lord, I would respectfully suggest that it makes sense from bitter experience, it makes sense to have a week off to allow the closing submissions to be properly formulated, and then have oral submissions the week following, the week -- that would be the week beginning 24 June.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Just remind me -- that was going to be a day each?
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: So that is your projected suggested timetable.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord yes. It may accommodate Mr Coyne's problems as well, but as I say that is a matter for my learned friend, not for me.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: All right. Just give me a second. Yes. All right. Mr Green?
MR GREEN: My Lord, the only difficulty with that, there are
two points, Mr Coyne's in a trial on 11 June for three days which will try and have to get adjourned or --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, in terms of --
MR GREEN: -- because it is a part heard trial .
MR JUSTICE FRASER: In a way I don't want to sound grand about this, but those sorts of problems are issues in that other trial. They can't be issues for us.
MR GREEN: I understand my Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Or for me. It 's not because I'm trying to throw my toys out of the pram and assume some superior position, but -- is that a High Court trial? MR GREEN: I don't know. It is in Newcastle so --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, so it can't -- well, district registry maximum. Okay.
MR GREEN: My Lord, I'm in the Supreme Court in the middle week that my learned friend wants us to be preparing our submissions.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, I have got something to say about submissions anyway in a minute but you're int he Supreme Court the week of the 17th?
MR GREEN: Exactly, and so if we were able to have a time when I could devote time to the case that would be fairer.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: How many days are you in the Supreme Court?
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MR GREEN: I am in the Supreme Court on the Wednesday and Thursday.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Wednesday the 19th and Thursday the 20th?
MR GREEN: Correct. I have got one day after that. A Friday.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes. I understand. All right. But other than Mr Coyne's appointment in Newcastle, so far as the evidence is concerned, Mr de Garr Robinson's suggestion will work?
MR GREEN: My Lord yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, let's put closing submissions to one side. The important thing -- well, there is a range of important things, but in order; the first most important thing is to complete the evidence.
MR GREEN: Indeed.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Are you going to require or want four days or are you still three possibly four?
MR GREEN: Well my Lord, given that on this plan we are going to sit on the Friday --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes?
MR GREEN: -- if we were able to sit on the Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday I would complete it in three.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Right.
MR GREEN: Just because that extra time may allow us to
narrow what we have to challenge.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: That is understood. Right. Well, I'm going to deal with evidence first and then I'm going to come on to closing submissions.

Paragraph -- can someone remind me of today's date? Is it the 11th? Okay. So unlike the order of the other day I would like some one of the counsel to draw this up and agree the wording. Paragraph 3 of my order of 9 April is varied so that the expert evidence is to commence on 4 June 2019 with Mr Coyne's evidence to be between 4 and 7 June inclusive and Dr Worden to be called on 11 June and his evidence to be between 11 and 13 June inclusive. Does that deal with the actual dates?

So that's expert evidence.
Then the next issue is really closing submissions.
Now, Mr de Garr Robinson, you suggested a week which is sensible. You have heard what Mr Green is doing that week. It seems to me closing submissions could be a little bit later than that. I don't know if you have anything that you want to say about that.
MR GREEN: My Lord, I would have no objections to having more time for written closings. The closings might be shorter as a result.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes. Well, that would be beneficial .
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So then if we move your suggestion a week and we could have closings on 1 and 2 July. One day each.

Mr Green, is that -- so that's moved it a week to reflect your Supreme Court activity.
MR GREEN: I'm grateful my Lord. Very grateful for that.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Right. So are those dates all now quite clear? Good. Right. So that's evidence.
MR GREEN: Would your Lordship want the closing submissions in on the Thursday before? Or the Friday.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: No, I think the Thursday. Thank you very much for mentioning that. In fact, let's say in view of how long you will have had them, let's say noon on the Thursday. Noon on Thursday the 22nd.
MR GREEN: My Lord, would it be possible to have the following week because we are coming back on the 1st and --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Oh I'm sorry, did I say 22nd? I meant 27th. All right?

So that deals with evidence, that deals with closings.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Mr de Garr Robinson?
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord, I need to address your Lordship on -- it is a matter of some awkwardness actually. Dr Worden has recently realised that there is
a new way of looking at the evidence in this case which, in his view, could greatly assist your Lordship, assist the court, in deciding Horizon issues 1, 12 and 13. This approach involves focusing on those Peaks OCRs, OCPs and MSCs which actually mention the FAD codes of one or more of the claimant branches.

Just to explain, when Fujitsu did any authorised remote handling of data, to put it neutrally, which might affect branch accounts, they raised an OCP, OCR or MSC whose text was likely to include the six digit FAD code of the relevant branch. So it's therefore possible to search all the OCPs, OCRs and MFCs with a view to finding all of those which mention the claimant branches during the relevant claimant's period of tenure. This search yields a limited number of OCPs, OCRs and MSCs, and it's therefore possible to assess expert issues 12 and 13 , which is how often was remote access facility exercised and what effect did it have. It is possible to assess those questions as they affect the claimants by examining that much smaller document set. My Lord, that is the first exercise that he would like to undertake, and indeed he has embarked work on -- I think this week he has embarked work on that.

Second, if a detected bug affected the accounts of any branch the Peak relating to that bug was likely to
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mention that branch's FAD code. Typically, it will also -- it may also mention a sum of money. It's therefore possible to search all the Peaks in the same way that I have just outlined, looking for Peaks which mention any claimant's FAD code during the relevant claimant's period of tenure, and again, this document could shed some light on Horizon Issue 1 to which extend is it likely that bugs have affected the relevant branches.

Now, Dr Worden has specifically asked me to offer his apologies to the parties and to the court that he didn't think of this before. In fact, frankly, he is kicking himself that he didn't do so. He believes that he and Mr Coyne would only need a short time to consider the relevant documents and to consider how it affects their views on those issues. He wishes to discuss the documents with Mr Coyne with a view to agreeing what they do or do not show.

My Lord, in the days since the recusal application was issued he started to consider how the new approach affects his views. He believes on Issue 1 it allows the parties to make a much simpler analysis of the point, and he takes a similar view in relation to the remote access issues. It makes, in his view, it possible for the experts to form a view as to how often remote access
was exercised and what its likely effect was.
It is Dr Worden's view that it is his duty under CPR
Part 35 to inform the court of this change of view and
to allow the court to consider whether or not it wishes
to see it considered. That belief is based, as your Lordship will be aware, on CPR35.3 which imposes a duty on experts to help the court on the matters within their expertise, whether or not they are instructed so to do. My Lord, it's also based on CPR35 -- I should say the practice direction CPR35, paragraph 2.5, which requires experts to inform the court of any change of views.

I should emphasise this -- none of this comes at the request or instigation of my client. This has come from Dr Worden. This is his idea. My Lord, he wishes to discuss it with Mr Coyne in a further meeting between the experts, but of course it's -- it's only right that your Lordship should be aware of that. I'm not making any application for permission to put in supplemental expert reports --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I don't think you have any supplemental experts' reports to apply for permission for, are you?
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: I'm not making any kind of application, I'm simply sharing with your Lordship the view that has been expressed to me by Dr Worden.
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MR JUSTICE FRASER: But in order to -- I'm grateful for that and that's noted, but in order to make an application to put in supplementary expert evidence from Dr Worden you would need to have a supplementary expert report from Dr Worden, wouldn't you. You can't apply for permission in the abstract.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Well my Lord I'm conscious of your Lordship's own judgment in the Imperial Chemical Industries case against Merrill Technology and your Lordship will have a much clearer recollection than I do of the criticisms you levelled at one of the experts for going off and doing an exercise on the basis of documents that he had, and for not engaging in a collaborative process with the other expert with a view to them jointly coming to a view as to whether it was beneficial and what it did or did not show. I have brought a copy of that case here, but I apprehend your Lordship doesn't need to be reminded of it .

My Lord, in those circumstances your Lordship may think it appropriate for that procedure, the procedure that your Lordship described in paragraph 158 of that judgment to be followed in this case, but as I say I'm not making any application to your Lordship.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: No, no. I understand entirely the difference between a collaborative exercise explored by
experts either jointly or singly, and a supplementary expert's report but I go back to the point that I have just mentioned. In order to apply for permission to adduce extra expert evidence you would have to have a draft of the report for which you would be seeking permission, wouldn't you?
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord not necessarily.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: You don't think so?
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord, I would submit not. It would depend on the circumstances. Often one would have such a report. I'm conscious that in the ICI case your Lordship cited as a reason for not giving the relevant party permission to put in a report which they had prepared, that the experts hadn't gone through that collaborative process and I'm quite anxious to ensure that my expert doesn't fall into the same trap, if I can put it that way.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, depending on whichever point one reaches in terms of you actually make an application to put in a supplementary expert's report, that application will be dealt with as and when it's made, so I'm not dealing with that either positively or negatively at the moment.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Thank you.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: What I am going to do, which I think I
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explained to you just before the short adjournment, I am going to make an order for the experts to meet again. I am not in any way going to proscribe or insist on the content or agenda of that meeting. It's just an order for a further meeting. What they explore, wish to explore, how it's done, etc, is solely a matter for them, but I'm going to make a direction in respect of a further meeting.

Before I do that though, Mr de Garr Robinson, is there anything you want to add on this particular point?
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord, I don't have an application.
I simply feel it is my duty to inform your Lordship of --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I understand. I will just seek observations from Mr Green.
MR GREEN: My Lord --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: If any.
MR GREEN: It's probably of the, "In any", variety. The only observation is we are slightly concerned that this is a -- what is proposed is a slightly different iteration of what Dr Worden was already doing. We were concerned he appeared to be doing in his existing reports, which is rather than giving evidence about the Horizon issues as formulated at CE1/1, which was generally and not by reference to all the individual
claimants, how were these questions to be answered, instead, to invite your Lordship basically to enter into the sort of $\{\mathrm{C} 1 / 1 / 1\}$ exercise to which such great exception was taken, we say albeit on a flawed premise, on the recusal application, namely to start going through individual SubPostmasters and invite your Lordship because FAD codes have not been included in Peaks, to conclude, without any disclosure from the claimant's cohort, other than the few people we have got, that they haven't actually happened and bounce us, and it's difficult to resist the temptation to think that if the factual premise upon which Dr Worden's report is based starts to fall away in factual evidence and you suddenly get, "I have come up with a completely new idea".
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, that is a different point.
MR GREEN: It is a different point but it's not one which we welcome.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, all I intend to do so far as the experts -- and I will just tell you what the proposed direction is in terms so you can seek to -- well, make any observation before I actually make the order, I intend to order that at least one further meeting be held between the experts to seek further agreement on the Horizon issues by 4 o'clock on 3 May, so that gives
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them quite a long time to do it. That's not saying they can only have one meeting, they might decide -- I
suppose it ought to say, and if such agreement can be reached the production of a fifth agreed joint statement. Do either of you have any observations on that order? No? It seems perfectly non-controversial. The only thing is it imposes a date but it's not a date on the imminent horizon.

Right. So that's the experts. Anything else in terms of directions?
MR GREEN: My Lord is there any cut- off date by which any application for a supplemental statement should be made?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: No.
MR GREEN: No, so we will leave it open and deal with it if it comes?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I'm not generally persuaded cut-off dates are a good idea. Any application will be -- any application will be made by either side for any further material and will be dealt with if or when they are issued in accordance with all the principles that are set down in the CPR.

Right. So as far as directions for resumption then, is that everything?
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord I believe so.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Right. There is some minor assorted
miscellany of housekeeping. Mr de Garr Robinson, you were part of the way through a redactions review.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord I was, and this is a matter of great embarrassment to myself. Coming back here today I have done -- I have gone through all of the documents except one, and there is still one outstanding and if I had known we were coming back today then that document would have been gone through already and I can't apologise enough.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: And the results of the ones that you have gone through absent that one?
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord, your Lordship will recall --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I think you had done three.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: One has already been released.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Two documents involving claims to legal privilege, my Lord, in my judgment they are legally privileged.

## MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes.

MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord, there is then a series of documents which have been redacted for confidence and irrelevance. My Lord, in relation to those, the approach I'm adopting will involve the unredaction, as it were, of a number of extra passages, and in order to make things easier for everyone to see that there isn't
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any great concealment going on, what I'm currently minded to do is to unredact most of the headings, so one can see what is being dealt with in the parts that are still redacted.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Right.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: So whether that's strictly in accordance with the rules, I don't know, but that seems to me to be a helpful way of shedding light on what might otherwise be a matter for suspicion.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: All right. I tell you what I'm going to do about this. I'm going to order, and it will go in today's order, please, that the results of the review of redactions exercise undertaken by leading counsel for the Post Office in the Horizon issues trial to be identified in a letter from WBD to Freeth by ... and then you are going to suggest a date.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord, seven days is ample time.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: So by noon on the 18 th. That's seven days.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: And then together with --
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: The relevant documents, insofar as --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: -- open brackets, if any, close
brackets, and then if there is any further actions or anything that is necessary to be taken they will flow
after that.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: So today's order is going to have a provision in, and it's to be a letter. All right?
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Thank you my Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: So that's an outstanding housekeeping matter which I had on my list. Have you got any on your list?
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord no.
MR GREEN: My Lord, there are a couple of dates which are at large, or potentially to be fixed. Your Lordship may or may not want to deal with them today. One is the costs of the common issues judgment which we had suggested 8 May which was a date upon which we were going to be coming back for this trial, and your Lordship did have a window for it then.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes. Well, because I was supposed to be hearing closing submissions.
MR GREEN: Precisely, so we're going to suggest common issues costs and the adjourned costs of the recusal application, namely as to basis and payment, whether it be summarily assessed or put off to assessment with a payment on account. Those two costs issues --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: They need to be fixed. You want them on the 8 th?
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MR GREEN: On the 8th.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I'm minded to do it some time the week of the 20th, to be honest.
MR GREEN: 20th of?
MR JUSTICE FRASER: May, like the 23 rd. That will be time estimate half a day, I imagine.
MR GREEN: Half a day.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Half a day. Yes.
MR GREEN: My Lord, we can make ourselves available for that.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Mr de Garr Robinson? I imagine it won't be you, it will be the other team.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord, it won't be me and so I'm speaking on instructions. My Lord, my primary submission is your Lordship -- I would invite your Lordship not to make any listing of any matters of that sort until the appeal that will today be being issued in relation to recusal is dealt with.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, there is an application for -permission will be known about before then, won't it .
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: I apprehended your Lordship would say that, hence the directions you have made in relation to the Horizon trial, and there I would simply submit that it makes a great deal of sense to fix a time by which point the Court of Appeal --

MR JUSTICE FRASER: Well, that's why I chose the week of the 20th. I tell you what I'm going to do. I'm going to put liberty to apply in today's order, so that if and when there is any developments on the front you have just identified you can always come back.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Yes.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: The common issues costs won't be affected by the recusal application, prospects in the Court of Appeal, because that involves submissions that I think were lodged in writing on 29 March by both sides and the position of the Post Office was it was premature to make any order for costs because one wouldn't know who had won and that the Post Office had been partially successful in any event, both of which were identified by me in my recusal judgment as being correct, so that position won't change, whether I'm recused or not, and I will still have to deal with common issues costs because they wouldn't be dealt with by a new managing judge, they would have to be dealt with by me, but with liberty to apply if and when the recusal application were to have any life breathed into it by a grant of permission to appeal, well then that date can be readily refixed without anyone having to come back.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord I hear what your Lordship says. Your Lordship will understand that's not my
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submission, but --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: No, no, I understand. All right. So today's order will be that the hearing of the application by the claimants for their costs on the common issues, together with associated matters -- well, actually forget, "Associated matters" -- application by the claimants for their costs on the common issues trial and the further order necessary on the costs recusal application under paragraph 8 of the order of 9 April will be dealt with on 23 May 2019, time estimate half a day, but at the bottom of the order, please, it will say, "Liberty to apply".
MR GREEN: My Lord then --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Is that everything?
MR GREEN: No it isn't everything. I'm sorry.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Is that everything on the costs?
MR GREEN: Everything on the costs, yes it is .
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Next point?
MR GREEN: And my Lord then the -- we have been obviously slightly thrown by the intervention and what's happened, and --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: The intervention?
MR GREEN: The recusal application.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Oh well ...
MR GREEN: It's because we are one team responding to the
different streams coming at us, but there are directions for round 3 --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes there are.
MR GREEN: -- which start at any moment.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes they do.
MR GREEN: And we are going --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: And which was set on the understanding that this trial would be over.
MR GREEN: Precisely, and we would invite your Lordship to vary the dates for those.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Right. Do you want to call them up on the common screen?
MR GREEN: Yes. It's in the -- I can tell your Lordship what they are. \{C7/39/1\}. It's in the seventh CMC order, and in terms of sort of sequential progress we have got the -- at paragraph 4.1 \{C7/39/2\} we have got the IPOCs being pleaded on 15 May and we have thereafter got the individual defences, 17 June, 8 July.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: And you are asking for extensions to all those dates?
MR GREEN: My Lord yes and there is a sort of slight wrinkle in that where the round 3 issues relate to breach and/or the deliberate concealment --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: By, "Round 3", you mean further issues I think. We're called them, "Further issues ".
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MR GREEN: Sorry, further issues, relate to breach, that's dependent on the findings your Lordship has made in the common issues judgment, which the defendant has said it's going to appeal.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes.
MR GREEN: And there is an asymmetry of impact of costs which are expended for the claimants. We have a category of impact that the defendant doesn't have which, although we don't think that appeal will be successful, we have to be prudent in trying to manage the --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Understood. So what is it you are asking?
MR GREEN: So my Lord, we would invite your Lordship to stay the directions pending the determination--
MR JUSTICE FRASER: On the further issues trial ?
MR GREEN: -- on the further issues trial, pending the determination of permission on their common issues appeal.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Which has been mentioned by Lord Grabiner but hasn't actually been issued?
MR GREEN: No, and the date for that was meant to be 16 May and we wondered whether your Lordship might consider bringing that forward because of the impact only --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: No, I think what I will do is I will --
how many directions are there following on from paragraph 4 of this order?
MR GREEN: Quite a lot. The ones that are immediately important to cover the period when permission will be considered are effectively, I think, contained in paragraph 4 and there is a provision for budgets on 1 July .
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Right. So what you need, really , is that the directions in the seventh CMC order relating to the further issues trial from paragraph 4 onwards to be stayed --
MR GREEN: To be stayed pending the --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: -- well, to be stayed, comma, that stay to be lifted upon seven days' notice in writing by either party.
MR GREEN: Indeed.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: When that stay is lifted, whenever it might be, then the court will revisit those directions. MR GREEN: I'm most grateful my Lord.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Because it depends when the stay --
MR GREEN: Exactly.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: There is no point me going through now and giving a whole bunch of dates which are overtaken, and things might happen very quickly they might not, so I think that's what I will do.
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The thing I'm not going to do at the moment, or indeed at all but I haven't prejudged it, is change the dates for the further issues trial.
MR GREEN: My Lord we don't --
MR JUSTICE FRASER: At the moment.
MR GREEN: Exactly. Well, we will have to see.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: But that depends what happens. It's something of a moveable feast. Mr de Garr Robinson? MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord, the application made by my learned friend takes me somewhat by surprise. It hasn't been shared with my instructing solicitors before that. MR JUSTICE FRASER: Yes.
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: So what I can say is inevitably rather limited but my Lord I have been glancing over frantically while my learned friend was speaking. My Lord, in principle, the Post Office has no objection to a stay of the sort that has been proposed. I would only refer your Lordship to the fact that the stay ought to include paragraph 3.4 of the order that I see on the screen.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: Is that disclosure?
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: Yes. My Lord, that's all I can tell your Lordship now.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: It seems to me, whatever form of words the two of you settle, or the two groups of you settle
on in the next hour or two, the principle is that dates 1 that are looming upon the immediate horizon or the -- 2
I didn't mean a pun -- dates that are looming
immediately for the further issues trial should not be seen as having to be complied with at the moment because they have been overtaken by events, so disclosure on further issues, IPOCs, any of the other directions that are supposed to be happening in May and early June sensibly have to be relieved in some way, either by moving them later or me just imposing a stay.

I mean, I assume that that principle seems --
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: My Lord, I entirely see the force of that principle. As I say, my instructions are not to oppose a direction of that sort.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: All right. So that's what I will do
then, and if it can as well -- I did say in my order say
paragraph 4, Mr de Garr Robinson has pointed out it
needs to include paragraph 3.4 which it obviously does.
If there are any other paragraphs, I think the seventh
CMC order is one of those specials that goes on for some
pages, and if there are any others in there that I have
missed, then doubtless you will sweep them up when you
have a look at it .
Right. So is that all your housekeeping?
24
MR GREEN: My Lord that's all our housekeeping. 25
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MR JUSTICE FRASER: Mr de Garr Robinson, I don't think you had anything?
MR DE GARR ROBINSON: I have nothing.
MR JUSTICE FRASER: I don't have any more.
There is a point I have to draw to your attention.
This court is no longer our court, as of now. It will,
I hope, become our court again when we come back in June, but that can't be guaranteed. Obviously I will do my best, and thank you all very much and thank you, in particular, to Opus and I will see you all in June if not before.
( 2.34 pm )
(Hearing adjourned to a date to be fixed)
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[^0]:    giving your evidence you are not allowed to talk to anyone about the case. Obviously your evidence is going to be over this morning, so that's not going to apply for any lengthy period of time but we are going to need five minutes to get you a screen.
    (10.40 am)
    (A short break)
    ( 10.45 am )
    MR JUSTICE FRASER: Right. Do you have a screen?
    A I have got a screen.
    MR JUSTICE FRASER: Does it have anything on it?
    A It does.
    MR JUSTICE FRASER: Excellent. Right. Mr Green?
    MR GREEN: Mine has gone away a bit.
    MR JUSTICE FRASER: It might be safer to move your lectern towards the screen rather than moving the screen towards you.

    Cross-examination by MR GREEN
    MR GREEN: Mr Parker, just to clarify, we have got your first witness statement which is 16 November 2018, at \{E2/11/1\}. Then we have got your second witness statement of 29 January 2019 \{E2/12/1\}; yes.
    A Yes.
    Q Then we have got your third witness statement of 28 February 2019 \{E2/13/1\}, and both the second and the

    9
    third witness statements were making some amendments to prior witness statements; yes?
    A Yes. Indeed.
    Q Then we have got the list of corrections at $\{E 2 / 16 / 1\}$, if we go down, I think it's page $4\{E 2 / 16 / 4\}$ which are the corrections that were produced prior to the beginning of the week where you were supposed to give evidence.
    A Yes.
    Q And then yesterday we got $\{\mathrm{E} 2 / 17 / 1\}$ which are the corrections that you were assisting his Lordship with a moment ago.

    Was one of the reasons why there was a need for a number of corrections that you have had to rely quite heavily on some of your colleagues to help you with information you have been providing to the court? Is that fair?
    A That was only one of the reasons.
    Q What were the other reasons?
    A Are -- my understanding -- my first statement, my understanding of some of the information Mr Roll put on his statement was imperfect because some of it was a little bit vague and it is a result, sometimes, of refining our knowledge based on looking further into things which happened fifteen years ago.

[^1]:    further advice:
    "PM reports that after she had rolled over stock unit and office she redeclared her cash".

    Then underneath that:
    "When it got to the print, preview and exit screen she chose preview like she always does but then it printed off final balance instead of the trial balance like the PM wanted. Now she is in CAP01, period 01, instead of CAP52 of the previous year. Business period 2. Period 2. PM believes this is a software issue. Search KEL couldn't find a reference." Yes?
    A Indeed it does, yes.
    Q Now if what the PM was saying was happening the system was not working as it should, was it?
    A That's true, yes.
    Q If we go down a little bit further you can see that just to rule out a calibration error on the screen they checked calibration.
    A Yes.
    Q And the PM says calibration is fine, not out of alignment, because that was an issue that sometimes happened, wasn't it?
    A There were screen calibration issues, yes.
    Q And if we go over the page, please $\{F / 93 / 2\}$, in the blue box, if you come down underneath $1,2,3,4,5,6$, it 77
    says:
    "I believe and also PM confirmed that the 'preview' button had been pressed for the second time which may have resulted in final balance printout and SU roll to CA P1".

    So that's your point about when there is a pattern you have to take it seriously?
    A Mm-hmm.
    Q And then it refers to two other Peaks. Do you see those?
    A I do.
    Q And a KEL, PSTEED34T?
    A That's right, yes.
    Q "I've advised PM not to press preview or print button which may cause this type of problem again. PO now have stock unit 1 CAP ahead of office and therefore PM need to contact NBSC and seek help on what to do on Wednesday before rollover"; yes?
    A Yes indeed.
    Q So the Postmaster has been left to deal with the consequence for rollover with the help of the NBSC?
    A Indeed that's what those notes say, yes.
    Q Then at the bottom of page 2, "Have looked at ..."
    In the blue box, Martin McConnell. Who is he?
    A Martin McConnell was a developer I believe.

[^2]:    A Yes.
    Q And you knew about the ability to do so by piggy backing rather than using the correspondence server. That's what you told the court.
    A Yes. Goon. Yes.
    Q Well, is that true or not?
    A It is true, yes.
    Q So you did know about that when you gave your January statement?
    A I knew that we could insert transactions at the correspondence servers, and it was my belief that that is what we did.
    Q Did you or did you not know when you made your January statement that you could insert by piggy backing rather than through the correspondence server?
    A If by, "Piggy backing", we mean going on to the counter and doing it from there, no, I wasn't aware at that stage. It was only when we started to investigate in order to provide the evidence that colleagues told me, well, yes, we did it occasionally at the counter, and we then investigated more to classify that.
    Q Who were the colleagues who told you that?
    A I think it was John Simpkins, I think.
    Q Any others? Because that's only one and you said, "Colleagues", and you say, "Colleagues", in your witness
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    statement as well.
    A I checked it again with another one who I believe was a gentleman named Dave Seddon and he said, "Yes, I do remember doing that".
    Q Did you check with anyone else?
    A By that stage we were starting to look into classifying it so I didn't need to check further because we were actually producing Peak references where I could see it being done.
    Q Okay, well, the last topic, if I may, very briefly, just to look at the back of your witness statement where you did a table, it's at $\{\mathrm{E} 2 / 11 / 23\}$. There are three particular things I want to ask you about. First of all, who put this together?
    A We were given a list of references and various members of the team would analyse them and give back the comments.
    Q Who gave you the list of references?
    A I think it was the legal team.
    Q Okay, and who in the team analysed them and gave the comments?
    A I had a spreadsheet reflecting it but I can't remember all the names for you. It will be --
    Q Can you remember anyone?
    A I remember John Simpkins, Mark Wright, Dave Seddon. I

