

**From:** Tony Marsh[CN=Tony Marsh/OU=e/O=POSTOFFICE]  
**Sent:** Tue 01/07/2003 10:34:13 AM (UTC)  
**To:** Drew McBride[GRO]; David Mellows-Facer[GRO]  
[GRO]; George Hooper[GRO]; John  
Holden[GRO]; Paul Maisey[GRO]; Owen  
Thackeray[GRO]; Eddie Herbert[GRO]  
**Cc:** David W Miller[GRO]; Byron  
Roberts[GRO]; Richard W Barker[GRO]  
Sue Huggins[GRO]; Alison Bolsover[GRO]  
Michele Storey[GRO]; Jenny  
Struggles[GRO]; Dave Pardoe[GRO]  
Amanda Waller[GRO]; Kevin  
Mcadam[GRO]; Hugh Stacey[GRO]; SALT;  
Carol Ballan[GRO]  
**Subject:** Wish You Were Here (WYWH)  
**Attachment:** WYWH outstanding errors to 250603.xls

Saved to WYWH folder

Colleagues

The spreadsheet attached below shows the present position on uncleared WYWH error notices, I know that several retail line managers have been awaiting confirmation of the position on WYWH errors before pursuing settlement further.

I have discussed the situation with Dave Miller and both of us have had discussions at various times with Colin Baker and other NFSP representatives. One point which I would like to emphasise is that at no point have we indicated that any form of mass appeal from the NFSP was under consideration. WYWH error notices should now be pursued and brought to account without further delay.

The final amounts for recovery from each office have been determined based on a review of the product design, the date on which the error/loss was incurred and therefore the level of communication to branches which had preceded it and on branches' own statements, via questionnaire, on the actions which they took before, during and after the transaction and their consequent level of compliance with procedures. Considerable efforts were made to ensure that the process was at the very least objective, in practice it was actually weighted in favour of branches, and none of these factors are appropriate bases for further appeals.

If agents wish to appeal or raise any other factor not considered in the initial review of the WYWH product this must follow the normal process for appealing an error notice via their Retail Line or Contract Manager, examples of suitable factors might be hardship or presentation of the original customer with information to challenge the chargeback.

Transaction Processing are understandably anxious to conclude this exercise and it would be appreciated if all cases, but particularly those offices under the headings "RLM chasing up" and "Refuses to BTA/no comments received/under investigation" could be progressed as a matter of urgency. Jenny Struggles on the TP Foreign Currency Error Resolution duty is maintaining a record of cases and should be kept up to date with developments.

Amanda Waller, Public Relations Executive, will be undertaking some research into the potential PR impacts of taking some or all of these offices to their logical conclusions and may be in contact with you regarding local media or political attitudes. The aim will be to manage and minimise potential PR fallout proactively, both internally and externally.

I would be happy to address any questions or concerns which may arise from a policy perspective, whilst Dave Pardoe from my team can help with exact rationales behind specific office contribution percentages and Jenny Struggles or Michele Storey in TP will cover accounting process issues. A new policy on accounting for losses is in the final stages of agreement between Security (Audit), the Retail Line, TP and the NFSP. Whilst it would not be appropriate to refer to it openly as it has yet to be agreed in its final form by the NFSP, since one of the principles that it will accept is that of hardship terms for payment being allowed for multiple error notices, this approach to resolving these errors would be acceptable provided agents are prepared to allow the recovery to be deducted from remuneration at source.

This has been a complicated exercise, necessary because in fairness to branches it was felt that the product could have

been more tightly designed and communicated in the early stages of its offering. The only other option would have been to charge the full value of error notices back to branches in accordance with a strict interpretation of contractual liability. The support of the retail line and TP in particular has been and continues to be appreciated in helping to bring the exercise to a conclusion.

In summary the key points are:

- Pursue normal processes to arrange for error notices to be brought to account
- No joint/bulk or extraordinary appeal or review underway or under consideration
- Hardship principles may be applied to multiple error notices if considered appropriate, NB any relief offered to subpostmasters will be set against retail line P&L
- PR will be managed proactively please advise Amanda Waller or a member of the Communications Public Relations team if negative media or political activity is anticipated.

Regards

Tony Marsh  
Head of Security  
Post Office Ltd

80 Old Street  
London  
EC1V 9PP

GRO

GRO