

Message

From: Glenn Chester [/O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=GLENN.CHESTERB0647277-72DE-494B-8B60-F73112F672CD]
Sent: 05/09/2012 08:23:17
To: Contract Admin Team [/O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=Network.contracts.s28fe8267-fa6a-4125-bb32-84e15b92f8]
Subject: ECT 178/12 Customer name: Paul Popov Feedback due: 13/08/12 Case signatory: ECT - Branch: Dunstan FAD 225329 - FOR FILING ON EFC PLEASE
Attachments: ECT 178-12 -Paul Popov v5ri.doc

CAT

I would be very grateful if you could please add this e-mail plus attachment to the EFC for Dunston branch (225 329). Many thanks.

Regards

Glenn

Mobex GRO

From: Sharon V Green **On Behalf Of** ECT

Sent: 04 September 2012 15:19

To: Rod Ismay

Cc: Alwen Lyons; Andy Garner; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Donna Gilhooly; ECT; Glenn Chester; John Breeden; Lesley J Sewell; Peter D Johnson; Sabrina Jethwa; Simon Baker; Susan Crichton; RodricWilliams/e/POSTOFFICE

Subject: RE: FOR ACTION: Ref: ECT 178/12 Customer name: Paul Popov Feedback due: 13/08/12 Case signatory: ECT - Branch: Dunstan FAD 225329

Hi Rod

The consensus has been to retain the full paragraph and due to the follow up correspondence, I do believe that it is necessary to include a thorough explanation of where losses can occur.

David Southall has advised that the branch was closed during the period of the suspension. Having reviewed the information on the case, Interim Enterprises were found to act as an interim, however as terms could not be agreed with the staff at the branch, the branch was closed. The reference to Interim Enterprises has now been removed.

Please see attached for the final response.

(See attached file: ECT 178-12 -Paul Popov v5ri.doc)

Kind Regards

Sharon Green

Stakeholder Correspondence Team

Post Office Limited
1st Floor, Bunhill Row Wing
148 Old Street
London
EC1V 9HQ

Tel:
Postline:

Rod Ismay

Sent by: Rod Ismay

To: ECT

cc:

04/09/2012 14:56

Subject: Re: FOR ACTION: Ref: ECT 178/12

Customer name: Paul Popov Feedback due: 13/08/12

Case signatory: ECT - Branch: Dunstan FAD 225329

Have you checked in with Rodric as he tended to agree with me and he sent his email one minute after yours.
Thanks Rod

▼ Rodric Williams <rodric.williams@

Rodric Williams

<rodric.williams@

Sent by: Rodric Williams

<rodric.williams@

04/09/2012 14:28

To: Rod Ismay/e/POSTOFFICE, ECT, Andy

Garner/e/POSTOFFICE, Angela Van-Den-

Bogerd/e/POSTOFFICE, Alwen

Lyons/e/POSTOFFICE, Susan Crichton

<susan.crichton@

Jethwa/e/POSTOFFICE, Lesley J

Sewell/e/POSTOFFICE, Simon

Baker/e/POSTOFFICE, John

Breeden/e/POSTOFFICE, Glenn

Chester/e/POSTOFFICE

cc: Donna Gilhooly/e/POSTOFFICE, Peter D

Johnson/e/POSTOFFICE

Subject: RE: FOR ACTION: Ref: ECT 178/12

Customer name: Paul Popov Feedback due:

13/08/12 Case signatory: ECT - Branch:

Dunstan FAD 225329

All,

I agree with Rod that the main thrust of the response should be that the losses stopped when improved controls were implemented (which I also note seem to have been implemented following audit and suspension). It is for Mr Popov to establish that the losses were caused by something else, and not for us to show that it did not.

I therefore also agree that we do not need to get into the detail about how Horizon operates, and suggest the following (slightly) varied first sentence, which can run into the preceding paragraph,

“Despite this, losses will occur across our network for a number of different reasons. These include incorrect data entry, staff or agent theft and customer fraud.”

I would like to see the reference to “incorrect data entry reinstated as an example of an “innocent” cause for a loss.

I hope this helps. Please let me know if you need anything further.

Rodric

Rodric Williams

Litigation Lawyer

Post Office Ltd

148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

GRO Mobile: GRO
rodric.williams GRO

From: Rod Ismay

Sent: 04 September 2012 13:40

To: ECT; Andy Garner; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Alwen Lyons; Susan Crichton; Rodric Williams; Sabrina Jethwa; Lesley J Sewell; Simon Baker; John Breeden; Glenn Chester

Cc: Donna Gilhooly; Peter D Johnson

Subject: RE: FOR ACTION: Ref: ECT 178/12 Customer name: Paul Popov Feedback due: 13/08/12
Case signatory: ECT - Branch: Dunstan FAD 225329

I attach my mark ups. I have had several days holiday so apologise for not having been able to respond earlier.

Whilst I have proposed a fairly significant rewording of the lengthy "losses and gains" paragraph I would also like to query whether we actually need such a long section there at all.

We are robustly stating to Mr Popov that we rebut his assertion about equipment and robustly believe the extra controls he finally introduced are the thing that made the difference. On that basis don't we risk opening an unnecessary avenue of dispute by getting into the miskeyed "loss and gain" arena?

Could that paragraph simply be reduced to its first sentence?

ie. "However, losses do occur across our network for a number of different reasons. These include staff or agent theft and customer fraud."

If you strongly feel that Mr Popov's original concerns required the length of comment then I would prefer my rewording, but I have read his original complaint and I don't think we need to get into keying issues in such detail to respond to his question.

I've also suggested some grammatical points.

Am around to discuss on **GRO**

Thanks, Rod

From: Sharon V Green **On Behalf Of** ECT

Sent: 04 September 2012 11:58

To: Andy Garner; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Alwen Lyons; Susan Crichton; Rodric Williams; Sabrina Jethwa; Lesley J Sewell; Simon Baker; Rod Ismay; John Breeden; Glenn Chester

Cc: Donna Gilhooly; Peter D Johnson

Subject: FOR ACTION: Ref: ECT 178/12 Customer name: Paul Popov Feedback due: 13/08/12 Case

signatory: ECT - Branch: Dunstan FAD 225329

Importance: High

Dear All

Please see attached for the proposed response to Paul Popov, which has been reviewed by Pete Johnson.

(See attached file: ECT 178-12 -Paul Popov v4(PJ).doc)

I am looking to send the response today, so if I could please have any feedback by 14:30 at the latest.

Whilst I appreciate that this is short notice, the case is very overdue, and we have already had a follow up letter from Mr Popov to chase a response.

Kind Regards

Sharon Green
Stakeholder Correspondence Team

Post Office Limited
1st Floor, Bunhill Row Wing
148 Old Street
London
EC1V 9HQ

Tel: ()

Postline: