POL00116076

From: Nina Arnott[IMCEAEX-_O=MMS_OU=EXCHANGE+20ADMINISTRATIVE+20GROUP+20+28FYDIBOHF23SPDLT+29_CN=RECIPIENTS_CN=NINA+20ARNOTT3A57824E-3F07-4026-A548-2ABA48C32F17F24GRO]
Sent: Tue 16/07/2013 2:08:38 PM (UTC)
To: Mark R Davies[GRO]; Alana Renner[GRO]
Subject: RE: Horizon

Thanks. Interesting idea. Any feedback?

N

From: Mark R Davies
Sent: 15 July 2013 18:03
To: Alana Renner; Nina Arnott
Subject: Fwd: Horizon

For your info

Sent from my iPhone
Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** <mark.r.davies@GRO>
> **Date:** 15 July 2013 17:52:47 BST
> **To:** Paula Vennells <GRO>
> **Cc:** Susan Crichton <GRO>, Martin Edwards <GRO>
> **Subject: Horizon**
>
> Paula
>
> I have been reflecting on our conversation on Friday around Horizon.
>
> The danger in reputational terms is that the issue rumbles on without conclusion both before and after the 'final' Second Sight report. This could really damage the business and hamper NT.
>
> We need somehow to take the sting out of it, in advance of the report.
>
> We are taking the right steps in looking to the future (with the working group, user forum and independent adjudicator).
>
> But none of these will go far enough to address the damage which some believe they have suffered. These cases will continue and the noise will be louder as the SS process concludes.
>
> There is an opportunity here to make a big statement about the kind of business we are and intend to be in future.
>
> We can't though issue a blanket apology because we just don't know the details of each case. At present we also face the risk of an "open ended" situation where the pipeline of cases is potentially very long.
>
> So I wonder whether something like the following would work;

POL00116076

- we create an independent panel to oversee cases where a SPMR feels lack of training or support contributed to an issue (therefore in addition to the legal review)

- we proactively invite people to submit their cases to the panel (including writing to the likes of those in the Telegraph piece)

- the panel is chaired by a QC or perhaps a former MP/peer

- it hears evidence from the SPMR and PO on the training and support elements and reaches a 'judgement'

- evidence is made public

- we allocate funding to compensate in cases where training and support judged to have fallen short (but the fund is limited)

I appreciate this is potentially expensive and needs more thought but I think it worth considering.

Thoughts?

Mark

Sent from my iPhone