

Message

From: Swil, Jonathan [GRO]
Sent: 21/08/2014 19:21:06
To: Belinda Crowe [GRO]
CC: Parsons, Andrew [/O=BOND PEARCE/OU=First Administrative Group/cn=Recipients/cn=ap6]; David Oliver [GRO]; [GRO]; Rodric Williams [GRO]; Melanie Corfield [GRO]
Subject: RE: Examples for letter to SS [BD-4A.FID20472253]
Attachments: 140818_POL_Ltr_.docx
Importance: High

Belinda

I attach a revised draft of the letter to Second Sight.

Key changes to note are:

- I have changed the title to their "engagement" rather than referring to the Report, because the former is really what the letter is about.
- I have inserted an initial paragraph referring to the final report and fact PO will now need to take steps to deal with it.
- I have re-focussed the first main paragraph to, hopefully, be more "punchy" with regard to the key message of this letter- SS are failing in their role as an independent fact finder and service provider to the Working Group.
- I have inserted most of the examples you and Andrew sent through into places I hope others agree are appropriate.
- I have reworked the 3rd point into something more about SS's failure to perform its proper role and the lack of utility and helpfulness of what they are doing, than about their impartiality/bias.
- I have developed a bit the section on the proposed changes to their billing arrangements.

Do let me know if you have any questions or would like to discuss or need any further drafting work from me on the letter.

Kind regards

Jonathan

From: Belinda Crowe [GRO]
Sent: 21 August 2014 16:32
To: Parsons, Andrew; Swil, Jonathan
Cc: David Oliver [GRO]; Rodric Williams; Melanie Corfield; Belinda Crowe
Subject: RE: Examples for letter to SS [BD-4A.FID20472253]

Hi Jonathan

In addition to this Second Sight have come back on my request for a meeting about changes to their remuneration structure to say that they do not have a slot available until w/c 1 September.

In addition, although Second Sight declined to discuss the Draft Part two with as in the interests of having a proper audit trail and transparency (and we agreed to respond to them in writing, which we did and agreed that they should share it with JFSA) then then declined to share JFSA's comments with us because JFSA withheld their consent.

Best wishes

Belinda

Belinda Crowe

148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

GRO

Postline: **GRO**

GRO

From: Parsons, Andrew **GRO**

Sent: 21 August 2014 11:49

To: Jonathan Swil **GRO**

Cc: David Oliver **GRO**; Rodric Williams; Belinda Crowe; Melanie Corfield

Subject: Examples for letter to SS [BD-4A.FID20472253]

Jonathan

As discussed yesterday, please find below some example of SS' failings that you may wish to weave into the draft letter to SS.

Lack of engagement

We have sent 4 briefing notes to SS on specific technical topics where they requested more information (P&A Fraud, ATM retracts, Suspense Accounts and One-sided transactions – example attached). We have received no feedback on any of these notes.

Post Office produced 10 Spot Reviews on specific process / Horizon issues and, other than a few very minor follow-up questions, SS have not provided any feedback on the SRs before they submitted their interim report in July 2013. Even then the IR only dealt with 4 of the 10 SRs.

Post Office has submitted letters to Second Sight with comments on 12 CRRs. The majority of the information provided by POL is not referenced in the revised CRR and SS have never come back to POL to explain why it has rejected the information provided by Post Office.

Service provider

SS provided just 24 hrs notice for comments on Part 2 Report.

On a call between just Second Sight and Post Office on 11 August 2014 to discuss the draft Part 2 Report, Second Sight refused to allow Post Office to make any substantive comments on its draft Report (saying that they thought this was outside the agreed process). Regardless of any process, POL would have expected SS to take on board any substantive comments it may make.

Save for one meeting on 31 July 2014, Second Sight has, since the beginning of the Scheme, refused to attend or pulled out of any face-to-face meeting with just Post Office in attendance to discuss substantive issues that might affect applicants. This is despite requests from POL (see example attached in relation to the Part 1 Report).

Value for money

As SS was struggling with delivery, Post Office prepared a factfile on how Horizon works. This report was taken by SS and turned into their Part 1 report. However, probably 90% of the Part 1 Report was actually produced by POL. SS added little, if any, value to this document and indeed several WG meeting were required to correct some of the errors that SS tried to insert into the document.

Quality

On the 12 cases where POL have sent through comments on SS's CRRs, we have produced 46 pages of commentary and 136 line-by-line comments. POL has restricted its comments to matters of factual or logical inaccuracy or where

information has been omitted by SS. The number of comments being generated indicates that the quality of SS' work is sub-standard.

Not assisting applicants / fulfilling objectives of the scheme

A specific example is a recent CRR on M019 (attached) which highlights two issues in dispute but does not form any positive view on the outcome of those issues or whether those issues could have been causative of loss in the branch. This CRR is therefore of little or no use to Post Office or an Applicant.

Hope this helps. Please do give me a shout if you need more details.

Andy

Andrew Parsons

Senior Associate

for and on behalf of Bond Dickinson LLP

GRO

Direct:
Mobile:
Fax:

GRO

Follow Bond Dickinson:



www.bonddickinson.com

Please consider the environment! Do you need to print this email?

The information in this e-mail and any attachments is confidential and may be legally privileged and protected by law. [belinda.crowe](#) **GRO** only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not [belinda.crowe](#) **GRO**, please notify [andrew.parsons](#) **GRO** as soon as possible and delete any copies. Unauthorised use, dissemination, distribution, publication or copying of this communication or attachments is prohibited and may be unlawful.

Any files attached to this e-mail will have been checked by us with virus detection software before transmission. Bond Dickinson LLP accepts no liability for any loss or damage which may be caused by software viruses and you should carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment.

Content of this email which does not relate to the official business of Bond Dickinson LLP, is neither given nor endorsed by it.

This email is sent for and on behalf of Bond Dickinson LLP which is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC317661. Our registered office is St Ann's Wharf, 112 Quayside, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE1 3DX, where a list of members' names is open to inspection. We use the term partner to refer to a member of the LLP, or an employee or consultant who is of equivalent standing. Our VAT registration number is GB123393627.

Bond Dickinson LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority.

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.

Any business communication, sent by or on behalf of Linklaters LLP or one of its affiliated firms or other entities (together "Linklaters"), is confidential and may be privileged or otherwise protected. If you receive it in error please inform us and then delete it immediately from your system. You should not copy it or disclose its contents to anyone. Please be aware that messages sent to and from Linklaters may be monitored for reasons of security, to protect our business, and to ensure compliance with legal and regulatory obligations and our internal policies. Emails are not a secure method of communication, can be intercepted and cannot be guaranteed to be error free. Anyone who communicates with us by email is taken to understand and accept the above.

Linklaters LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC326345. It is a law firm authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (www.sra.org.uk). The term partner in relation to Linklaters LLP is used to refer to a member of Linklaters LLP or an employee or consultant of Linklaters LLP or any of its affiliated firms or entities with equivalent standing and qualifications. Please refer to www.linklaters.com/regulation for important information on our regulatory position. A list of Linklaters LLP members together with a list of those non-members who are designated as partners and their professional qualifications, may be inspected at our registered office, One Silk Street, London EC2Y 8HQ and such persons are either solicitors, registered foreign lawyers or European lawyers.