

Message

From: Ron Warmington [GRO]
Sent: 23/07/2014 15:50:01
To: rjw[GRO]; 'Angela Van-Den-Bogerd' [GRO]; 'Belinda Crowe' [GRO]; 'Chris Holyoak' [GRO]
CC: mediation[GRO]; Parsons, Andrew [/O=BOND PEARCE/OU=First Administrative Group/cn=Recipients/cn=ap6]; 'David Oliver' [GRO]
Subject: RE: Second Sight Briefing Report - Part Two
Attachments: M075_one_sided_txn_example.pdf

M075 provides an example of a customer benefitting from a one-sided transaction... noticing that benefit... and repaying it to POL. In this instance, the benefitting customer was also the SPMR so would only have benefitted at her own expense thus having no incentive to keep quiet. Nonetheless, it serves as an example of the phenomenon.

As you may recall, in this example the SPMR asked a clerk to pay £300 in for her and she was credited with that amount three times over. POL initiated one reversal, but the SPMR herself, as we understand it, had to action the other reversals in order to correct the position.

Our point all along has been that, when a customer gets nothing for something (e.g. if he/she pays a Utility bill and gets debited with the cost of doing that, but the bill doesn't get paid, then there exists a very effective secondary error detection control (they'll get a Final Demand from the Utility Company). There is, on the other hand, no such secondary error detection control in the case of one-sided transactions that benefit customers (the bill gets paid but they don't pick up the cost: the SPMR does).

Do you need more examples?

Regards, Ron.

From: Ron Warmington [mailto:GRO]
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 4:07 PM
To: 'Angela Van-Den-Bogerd'; 'Belinda Crowe'; 'Chris Holyoak'
Cc: mediation[GRO]; 'Parsons, Andrew'; 'David Oliver'
Subject: RE: Second Sight Briefing Report - Part Two

OK, I understand. We'll provide examples.

From: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [mailto: [REDACTED] GRO]
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 3:45 PM
To: [REDACTED] GRO Belinda Crowe; 'Chris Holyoak'
Cc: [REDACTED] GRO 'Parsons, Andrew'; David Oliver [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Second Sight Briefing Report - Part Two

Ron,

I can respond to question 1 'One-sided' transactions (Could they have led to customers getting something for nothing at the Subpostmaster's expense?) in generic terms ie how the system is designed to operate which is I suggest more of a Part one response however I understood your Part 2 to reflect specific detail of cases already investigated by you and therefore your "thematic issues" would be evidenced based.

In relation to M014 I have responded to the assertion of a "one-sided transaction." The reason I have not responded to question 1 in my earlier response is because this question is not relevant to M014.

I am more than happy to respond to your question 1 in relation to a case/cases where this is an issue. I don't recall that we have submitted any such cases to you at present but if I am mistaken please advise and I will draft a response in relation to that case.

Best regards,
Angela

Angela Van Den Bogerd I Head of Partnerships



148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ



[REDACTED] GRO Mobex: [REDACTED] GRO



[REDACTED] GRO



[Post Office stories](#)



[@postofficenews](#)



Confidential Information:

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorised review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please contact me by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: Ron Warmington [mailto: [REDACTED] GRO]
Sent: 22 July 2014 14:37
To: Belinda Crowe; 'Chris Holyoak'
Cc: [REDACTED] GRO 'Parsons, Andrew'; David Oliver [REDACTED]; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd
Subject: RE: Second Sight Briefing Report - Part Two

Yes Belinda, Angela did respond but the key question remains unanswered.

From: Belinda Crowe [mailto: [REDACTED] GRO]
Sent: Tuesday, July 22, 2014 1:59 PM
To: Chris Holyoak
Cc: [REDACTED] GRO Parsons, Andrew [REDACTED] GRO; David Oliver [REDACTED]; Angela Van-Den-

Bogerd; Belinda Crowe

Subject: RE: Second Sight Briefing Report - Part Two

Chris,

With many apologies, my email below contains an error – Angela has already responded to Ron in relation to Question 1.

Best wishes

Belinda

Belinda Crowe

148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

GRO Postline **GRO**
GRO

From: Belinda Crowe

Sent: 22 July 2014 13:52

To: 'Chris Holyoak'

Cc: **GRO**; Parsons, Andrew; **GRO**; David Oliver; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Belinda Crowe

Subject: RE: Second Sight Briefing Report - Part Two

Thanks Chris

I have just completed the minutes of last week's call (I was out of the office at the end of last week). I note the date in the minutes shows 27 July for the Part 2 report. I suggest I leave it to you to update the Working Group of the delivery date.

In relation to the 3 outstanding questions:

Answers to 1 and 3 are being finalised and should be with you tomorrow.

In relation to 2. Angela and Andy are not aware of any outstanding questions relating to ATMs. I have copied them in and perhaps you can let them have the question so that they can respond.

As to your final point, I think we will have to take great care on version control and it may be worth you setting out for the Working Group how that will work in practice. I assume that the Working Group will want to be sighted on any changes, and for clarity as far as I am concerned with my secretariat hat on, I will need to be clear, if the document is being regularly updated, which version is being sent to the applicants when we issue the draft CRR. If I have misunderstood what you are saying, please let me know.

Best wishes

Belinda

Belinda Crowe

148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

GRO Postline **GRO**
GRO

From: Chris Holyoak [mailto:
Sent: 22 July 2014 13:23
To: Belinda Crowe; David Oliver
Cc: 
Subject: Second Sight Briefing Report - Part Two

Belinda,

In advance of Thursday's call and given the email traffic about Part Two of Second Sight's Briefing Report, I thought that it might be useful to confirm our understanding and anticipated delivery timetable of a draft report.

Despite a number of email exchanges with Post Office we are awaiting detailed responses to the following questions that will impact on final delivery:

1. 'One-sided' transactions (Could they have led to customers getting something for nothing at the Subpostmaster's expense?)
2. ATMs (Can the 16:30-16:30 output reports be corrupted by power or telecommunications failures?)
3. Suspense Accounts (Has Post Office or any of its 'clients' written back amounts from suspense accounts into profit?)

Notwithstanding the above, we anticipate releasing a preliminary Draft Report to the Working Group, including an updated ATM section, by Friday 1 August.

We have always advised that Part Two of our Briefing Report would be a living document and in many respects will not be considered complete until we have finalised the analysis of substantially all cases in the Scheme, but at present we are confident that most of the significant issues and our comments will be included in this draft.

Please feel free to include this message in the agenda for Thursday's call if helpful.

Regards

Chris Holyoak
Senior Consultant
Second Sight Support Services Ltd

Phone: 
Mobile: 
Email: 
Website: <http://www.2ndsight.eu>

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.

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.
