POL00022227

Message

From: Melanie Corfield GRO
Sent: 21/08/2014 21:21:04
To: Swil, Jonathan [/O=LAW/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=Jswil]; Belinda Crowe GRO
CC: Parsons, Andrew GRO GRO David Oliver GRO Rodric Williams GRO
Subject: RE: Examples for letter to SS [BD-4A.FID20472253]

Jonathan and Belinda
Just a quick comment from me from a comms point of view. I think we might need to tweak the wording when we refer to the July 2013 interim report. We would want to avoid a situation where anything could unjustly be taken out of context to undermine important aspects of the 2013 report.
I'm just getting a Brunswick view re this too.
Happy to discuss - I think the tweaks will only need to be minor.
Mel

From: Swil, Jonathan GRO
Sent: 21 August 2014 19:21
To: Belinda Crowe
Cc: Parsons, Andrew GRO David Oliver; Rodric Williams; Melanie Corfield
Subject: RE: Examples for letter to SS [BD-4A.FID20472253]

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

POL00022227

From: Belinda Crowe GRO
Sent: 21 August 2014 16:32
To: Parsons, Andrew; Swil, Jonathan
Cc: David Oliver; 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

GRO

From: Parsons, Andrew GRO
Sent: 21 August 2014 11:49
To: Jonathan Swil GRO GRO
Cc: David Oliver; 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.

POL00022227

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 it 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

Bond Dickinson

GRO

Follow Bond Dickinson:

www.bonddickinson.com

POL00022227

****

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.

****