

From: "Belinda Crowe" <IMCEAEX-
_O=MMS_OU=EXCHANGE+20ADMINISTRATIVE+20GROUP+20+28FYDIBOHF23SPDLT+29
_CN=RECIPIENTS_CN=BELINDA+20CROWE79B93F11-569F-4526-A078-
F5B4958A8917220@GRO>
Sent: Fri 31/01/2014 8:47:12 AM (UTC)
To: "Chris Aujard" @GRO
Cc: "David Oliver" @GRO
Bcc: "Belinda Crowe" @GRO
Subject: Fwd: Initial Complaints and Mediation Scheme – Settlement Policy

Confused as ever, I am. I have not seen any comments from Mark Davies and not sure whether he has any. I had understood from Paula (when we had the catch up with Alice for the JA meeting that she wanted to actually discuss the Settlement Policy with ExCo. I am not sure that it can go to the ARC without ExCo clearance.

Alwen's email yesterday suggested that we needed to put it to the ARC but I had thought that we had decided that the Settlement Policy was for ExCo and not the Board.

Copying David and will copy him to the other email from Alwen so he can make a start on the papers we need to have done.

Best wishes
Belinda

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Kevin Gilliland" @GRO
To: "Amanda A Brown" @GRO, "Chris Aujard" @GRO
Cc: "Alwen Lyons" @GRO, "Chris M Day" @GRO, "Fay Healey" @GRO, "Lesley J Sewell" @GRO, "Mark R Davies" @GRO, "Martin Edwards" @GRO, "Martin George" @GRO, "Nicholas Kennett" @GRO, "Susan Barton" @GRO, "Paula Vennells" @GRO, "Belinda Crowe" @GRO, "Jorja Preston" @GRO, "Glenda C Hansen" @GRO, "Helena Murray" @GRO, "Jackie Meylak" @GRO, "Paula Reed" @GRO, "Ruth Phillips" @GRO, "Suzanne Jolley" @GRO, "Theresa Iles" @GRO, "Gina Gould" @GRO
Subject: Re: Initial Complaints and Mediation Scheme – Settlement Policy

Hi Amanda/Chris,

Please see my comments and questions below relating to the policy document.

I hope these are helpful. Please let me know if anything is unclear. Happy to discuss.

Regards,

K

Who is the audience for this policy?

3.5 should be updated.

On the 'value the complaints' and set settlement parameters' sections, it is not clear why we keep reviewing these areas - isn't this moving the goalposts or changing the parameters, or are we completing both of these activities before we move into the meditation phase?

Will we be reviewing not only the effectiveness of the process but more specifically outcomes, implications and applying learnings?

In section 5 it seems that the initial cases will be critical in potentially determining what happens to the level of settlement for the rest. What are we doing to ensure that we are especially vigilant in getting these right?

Reporting. Shouldn't we be monitoring stakeholder/media reaction?

What is the purpose of 4.2 - simply a statement or under what circumstances would we use this?

4.5 it may be a given but we need to ensure that anyone entering into mediation on behalf of POL has the right skills, experience and training and as well as a clear mandate has an understands the full background and briefing.

5.9 I'm not sure I understand or agree the logic here. Eg if settlements are small and confidential they may be preferable and less damaging than a public apology. And what do we mean by 'commercial solution'?

Settlement thresholds:

The one that refers to lack of support to subpostmasters/helplines unhelpful, I think we need to qualify what we mean by not properly supported eg could have mitigated the loss if appropriate support was given;

Subpostmaster was 'forced' to file false accounts. What if they can evidence that pol advised them to account in a certain way?

Compensation matrix 5.31 whilst we have a 3 months notice period in the contract we don't exercise this clause. My question therefore is because of custom and practice does this work?

Goodwill payment amounts. How have these 3 amounts been arrived at?

Sent from my iPhone

On 22 Jan 2014, at 11:32, "Amanda A Brown" <[redacted]> wrote:

Hello



Please see email below sent out on the 6th January. Chris only received one response so therefore he is assuming that everyone is content.



Kind regards


Amanda

 I PA to General Counsel



 Postline 

 Mobex 

[amanda.a.brown](#) 

[cid:image004.jpg@01CF1765.71B5F680]

From: Jorja Preston

Sent: 06 January 2014 15:40

To: Alwen Lyons; Chris Aujard; Chris M Day; Fay Healey; Kevin Gilliland; Lesley J Sewell; Mark R Davies; Martin Edwards; Martin George; Nicholas Kennett; Paula Vennells; Susan Barton

Cc: Jorja Preston

Subject: Initial Complaints and Mediation Scheme – Settlement Policy

Please see email below and attachment from Chris A.

Many thanks



Jorja

Jorja Preston I PA to Alice Perkins, Chairman & Alwen Lyons, Company Secretary







 <mailto:Jorja.preston> 

[Footer 5]

Initial Complaints and Mediation Scheme – Settlement Policy

On 19 November we discussed the settlement policy and ExCo asked for it to be resubmitted to contain two new categories – “apology” and “no agreement but deeply regret any distress caused”. I have amended the policy accordingly. However, please note that if Post Office Limited has caused distress to a SPMR, then it must accept some fault which means the case probably falls into the bracket of warranting a settlement. If Post Office is not at fault, then we can only express regret for the distress suffered by the SPMR (even if we did not cause it).

Therefore the term ‘suffered’ rather than ‘caused’ has been used in the redraft of the policy. The amendments have been highlighted for ease of reference and are on pages 10,11,12/13 and 21.

I would be grateful if you can confirm that the policy can now be signed off by 13 January.

Regards

Chris

<_DOC_27643963(6)_DRAFT Settlement Policy - AB.DOCX>

<image001.png>

<image002.jpg>

<image003.jpg>

<image004.jpg>

<image001.png>

<image002.jpg>

<image003.jpg>

<image004.jpg>