From: Paula Vennells[GRO	
Sent: Thur 18/12/2014 7:24:30 AM (UTC)	
To: Alice Perkins CB[GRO [t]	
Subject: Fwd: One Show	
Hi Alice, if you get chance probably worth a view of the OneShow. (From both your directorships actually BBC produced a very viewable 5minute bulletin, pity it is so wrong.)	y - the
The note below refers. Worth at least reading Angela's reply to my questions.	
I do hope the carols went well! I stayed late cleared a lot of work and then had a wonderful family supper great :)	. Really
Paula	
Paula Vennells Chief Executive	
Post Office Ltd	
T: GRO	
GRO	
Sent from my iPad	
Begin forwarded message:	
From: Paula Vennells GRO	
Date: 18 December 2014 07:19:37 GMT	
To: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd GRO , Mark R Davies	
GRO , Chris Aujard	
Cc: Belinda Crowe GRO RO R	

Angela, thanks so much. And my apologies first of all for missing you off the email yesterday. Without the work that you and your team have done, none of what we are doing would be possible!

Mark, I don't know if you think we can do anything, it's probably best not to but worth the thought.

Chris, if you didn't see the OneShow, please can you watch the clip - again I expect we are best to do nothing at this stage but Steve Phillips is completely out of order, inaccurate at best, lying at worst. And has wilfully collaborated to being us into disrepute. Any views?

Paula

Paula Vennells Chief Executive Post Office Ltd

Subject: Re: One Show

T: GRO GRO	
Sent from my iPad	
On 18 Dec 2014, at 00:05, Angela Van-Den-Bogerd GRO wrote:	
Paula,	
Steve Phillips at Nelson is in the Scheme. We have extensively investigated first as BAU and then as a Scheme application. He claims that interference telephone line was causing him losses in branch as well as intermittent power. We have invested a large amount of time sharing our investigation findings. I have personally visited him to share our findings and have demonstrated to the cause of his losses is highly likely to be errors at the counter (we have a large number of errors being attributed to Steve himself) although we can out theft as his security procedures were lacking. We advised him early on BAU when his losses had not reached £18k to introduce individual stock unrefused and the losses continued. When I became involved I insisted he intrindividual stock units which my team set up for him. Since this point the loss stopped (other than the usual tolerance level ie £20ish per week)	on his er cuts. with him. o him that evidence of a not rule through nits. He roduce
The reason we haven't been in touch with Steve about the loss is that I agree him we would block his debt until his application had concluded in the School is aware of this. He is also aware that our investigation has found no system equipment fault and therefore he realises he is responsible for the loss. Secondary yet to produce their view on this case - this is I believe a few weeks off	eme. Steve n or ond Sight
Angela	
From: Belinda Crowe	
Sent: 17 December 2014 22:42	
To: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd	
Subject: Fw: One Show	
See below from Paula.	

GRO

Original Message
From: Paula Vennells
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2014 09:45 PM
To: Mark R Davies; Belinda Crowe; Gavin Lambert; Patrick Bourke
Cc: Alice Perkins GRO
Subject: One Show
Hi all. I managed to catch the one show on iPlayer.

Not denying the fact it is unhelpful and inaccurate, (especially the focus on Horizon - but see below re thoughts on that), Mark has achieved a balance of reporting beyond anything I could have hoped for. The statements stamped across the screen with the PO sign as a back drop were really powerful. They emphasised everything we have done, and came across as ... fact! Very good.

The rest was hype and human interest. Not easy for me to be objective but I was more bored than outraged. The MP quoted (who?) was full of bluster, and inaccurate. Jo Hamilton lacked passion and admitted false accounting on TV. JA was nowhere to be seen. And the bulletin was too long.

What I thought was helpful was that it presented Horizon as the problem, which is exactly what SS say they haven't found. And so easier for us to refute. There was nothing about intimidation, poor coaching and the message about not knowing how to use the system, in my eyes made the SPMRs look inadequate.

Lastly, (belt and braces I know - forgive me), can we find out how the SPMR in Nelson (Wales) thinks we're about to go after him for £18k and why he thinks we haven't been in touch. That sounds like a live issue, not one in the scheme? (I'm sure we have been in touch!)

My sincere thanks to all of you. I had an email tonight from Richard C saying how much you had helped, that we could have done nothing more and he was sorry the debate had not gone better.

Paula

Sent from my iPhone

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use, disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you have received this in error, please contact the sender by reply email and then delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540. Registered Office: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.
