

Message

From: Paula Vennells <[REDACTED] GRO>
on behalf of Paula Vennells <[REDACTED] GRO>
Sent: 21/08/2013 08:37:39
To: Theresa Iles <[REDACTED] GRO>
Subject: Fwd: IN CONFIDENCE: FOLLOW UP TO OUR MEETING

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Paula Vennells <[REDACTED] GRO>
Date: 21 August 2013 09:37:13 BST
To: Alasdair Marnoch <[REDACTED] GRO>
Subject: Fwd: IN CONFIDENCE: FOLLOW UP TO OUR MEETING

Alasdair, hi. I'm in touch with Richard to see him tonight or tomorrow. As we only covered very briefly, would really appreciate a further quick chat with you beforehand having now read his draft - would that be possible? I can do now until 10.00, between 11.00-13.00, or between 14.30-15.00. Are any of those of use?

If not, pls say and I will call Alice. She has offered to speak if urgent and I know she would want me to be comfortable pre-meeting Richard; but... I have also promised not to disturb her unless really necessary, as this is still her holiday.

Equally, I know we are drawing on your time ..

Paula

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Richard Hatfield <[REDACTED] GRO>
Date: 20 August 2013 15:18:08 BST
To: 'Alasdair Marnoch' <[REDACTED] GRO>, 'Paula Vennells' <[REDACTED] GRO>
Subject: RE: IN CONFIDENCE: FOLLOW UP TO OUR MEETING

Alasdair,

Thanks. Will await contact -- back in London later today and fairly flexible for rest of week.

GRO

GRO

Richard

From: Alasdair Marnoch [mailto:] **GRO**
Sent: 20 August 2013 11:57
To: Richard & Penny Hatfield; Paula Vennells
Subject: RE: IN CONFIDENCE: FOLLOW UP TO OUR MEETING

Richard

A brief update.

I've now caught up Alice and Paula (who are both back from holiday). We have some thoughts around refinement of the scope and sponsorship but in the first instance Paula is understandably keen to meet you and is going to arrange a meeting this week - her office will be in touch.

Regards

Alasdair

From: Alasdair Marnoch [mailto:] **GRO**
Sent: 15 August 2013 21:49
To: Richard & Penny Hatfield
Subject: RE: IN CONFIDENCE: FOLLOW UP TO OUR MEETING
Importance: High

Richard

This looks very good and thorough and I fully endorse the approach/key points you have raised below.

I agree with the TOR - we may refine a little further when you get a better understanding of the work done elsewhere but I think you have a very good grasp of the issues. I also thought your LLR scope was also good and I can see already you are starting to raise some important questions. So overall this looks good for me.

The next stage will be for me to clear with Alice and Paula - Alice particularly as she has a couple of areas she would liked covered off (and I think you have done so) and Paula for her proper buy in and also to get her view of the scope to ensure we get maximum impact from your work.

I would also like to get their views about talking to 3rd parties - normally would

not be an issue but we are clearly very sensitive to the external impact and of course there is a risk that someone externally will want to read your report. My reticence on this point is that your report will be more forthright if it is only for internal purposes. But i hope we can navigate through this so you can engage properly.

FYI - Shex is the Shareholder Executive (part of BIS) ie our shareholder and pretty important in our lives.

Finally thank you for your thoughts on timescales and fees. I'm appreciative that you feel able to keep to c20 days but understand this will be tight. I am happy on fees (but again i need to clear internally) and as we discussed if there is an overrun we should revisit your fees to ensure you are properly compensated.

So I will now follow up and aim to get agreement next week (holidays permitting)

thanks again

Alasdair

From: hatfields12 GRO
To: alasdairmarnoch GRO
Subject: IN CONFIDENCE: FOLLOW UP TO OUR MEETING
Date: Wed, 14 Aug 2013 17:05:56 +0100
Alasdair,

Following our very useful discussion, I have now read the Second Sight interim report and some other background on the web in order to work up my proposals for the conduct of the Review.

My proposal consists of the attached draft of fully fledged TOR developed from the initial sketch you sent me, our discussion last week and my preliminary assessment of the ground that I think the Review would need to cover.

The draft TOR are, I hope, generally self explanatory. I would welcome any comments or suggestions but I have, however, made explicit a number of key assumptions/suggestions about the status and methodology which I would like confirmed or corrected. In particular:

- The Review is about Lessons Learned by the Post Office from the whole episode – i.e. it is not an investigation of individual cases or of the performance of Horizon.
- For this reason, the Review will be commissioned as private report to the Board (or the chair? or you?). While I think this is the right starting point, I suggest the Board (and I) will want to keep in mind the possibility of releasing the findings in some form after the PO has had an opportunity to consider, both as a response to external interest and to assist with follow up action.
- The Review should not single out the Second Sight investigation, although the Second Sight work is clearly an important aspect to be covered.

- You and I will keep in contact throughout the Review, so there should be no surprises.

The second document expands the TOR but outlining the ground which I would want cover and some of the key questions which, even at this early stage, I believe need to be addressed (particularly in the light of my reading of the Second Sight report). Of course, other issues may well emerge as the Review progresses but please let me know if I am barking up any wrong trees or if I have missed something that you would like covered.

One point my initial reading has brought home to me is the need to be careful about ensuring that events and decisions are considered in their proper context. I suspect that this means spending more time than I had thought on initial preparation to ensure that I understand the chronology and organisational background before embarking on the main interview programme. I hope, however, this can be done while the holiday season is still upon us, so that it need not delay the start of interviews. One thing I will undoubtedly need help with is identifying and arranging interviews with key players. I am not clear whether you envisaged that I would talk to anybody outside the PO. I guess I might need to talk to one or two people who were involved before the PO split off (Alice's predecessor?) and if I am to do this thoroughly, especially in looking at possible wider implications, I probably ought to talk to James Arbuthnot and, conceivably, the JFSA. I would welcome your thoughts on this. One of the reasons for spending more time on preparation is to try to ensure that I cover the relevant ground with each interviewee as thoroughly as possible, not least to avoid imposing unduly on busy people. Nevertheless, it is likely that I will need to talk to some people a second time to clarify specific points or to address something which has come up in later interviews.

In the light of the above, I think that the estimate of 20 days work in total remains reasonable, if quite tight, but I am confident that there is no risk of a significant overrun. Nevertheless, I would like to give myself a little more flexibility about the exact end date and have proposed a deadline of the end of October. There are three reasons for this. First, fitting in all the interviews could turn out to be more problematic than we expect. Second, I would like to leave myself a little room for reflection both during the interviewing process and, particularly, after the main evidence gathering and analysis. Third, it might be helpful to discuss my emerging conclusions with you and/or Alice before finalising the report. I would also, of course, be very happy to discuss the final version with both of you and, indeed, with the Board, if you so wished.

If you are comfortable with my proposals for TOR and coverage, including outputs and timings, I suggest we agree a fixed fee of £10,000 for completion of the Review and submission of the Report, broadly equivalent to £500 a day. Please let me know whether this would be acceptable. If you are happy to proceed on this basis I would welcome an early chat about when and how I can get on with some preparatory work.

Happy to discuss.

Richard

PS. On a point of detail, who or what is “Shex”, referred to among the stakeholders?