

Message

From: Alwen Lyons [GRO]
on behalf of Alwen Lyon [GRO]
Sent: 25/03/2014 18:36:58
To: Chris Aujard [GRO]; David Oliver1 [GRO]
CC: Paula Vennells [GRO]
Subject: LL report

Here are my thoughts on the LL advice.

1.2 said in this way this is exactly the heavy handed big business v small sub-postmasters that James A thinks we are guilty of

1.4 the Board will be indifferent places, NM will say good then we put the lid back on the can of worms and pay very little. AP will be more concerned about political optics

1.8 this is the crux whether we have proved through all the 2nd Sight work that we have no systemic issue, and if they continue to try to prove this with the new cases

2.3 is unhelpful, because it suggested we should have taken a different route, and commissioned such a report rather than use 2nd Sight, so why didn't we

3.3

3.3.1 why have we got to this point, why do sub-postmasters in the mediation scheme think they have a right to consequential loss

3.3.2 why haven't you done this so far

3.3.3 by taking us down the mediation approach aren't you assuming conciliation

3.3.4 I think AP is in a place where she feels she has promised in good faith that we will try to resolve past cases

3.3.5 there will be a range here, and not everyone is as worried about the political noise as AP

5.1 the inequality of the contract was one of the initial issues raised by JA, and seen as unfair, so falling back behind it now may be difficult

5.3 so where do we stand if we cannot prove they have signed the contract

5.10 I know we mean a legal duty of care but this is I think where we started with JA, where AP didn't want us to be seen as not caring, I know that is not what II are saying but a watch point

5.15 are the sub postmasters being advised to raise these claims by the advisors we are paying for,

5.26 this is the moment when they have to decide to declare a misbalance or make good the money, or falsely account. This was high on JA agenda of why things go wrong as the spmr has to do this to continue trading.

5.30 this will worry them as we have said all along that there is no systemic issue which horizon, this may make them think there might be an issue and why hasn't the business undertaken a proper forensic review/audit

5.32 I think they will concur, which will raise the lessons learned issue, how have we got the here and is they are that useless how do we get rid of them

5.43 I assume this refers to theft

5.55 this will cause concern again as it reopens the PO as a prosecutor, even if that is not what is being said

5.58 so were we give bad advice by BD on setting up the scheme

5.65 this is what happened when system issues where found

So at the end of reading how will the neds feel

- Annoyed that we used 2nd Sight
- Frustrated that we are continuing to use them
- Wanting the lessons learned review!
- Confused as to why we haven't done an end to end forensic review
- Comfortable that we are not legally caught
- Confused as to why we have set the scheme up in this way
- Angry that we have opened up the expectations gap for compensation
- Unclear about how we take this forward

Hope that helps

Thanks

Alwen

Alwen Lyons I Company Secretary

