POL00117056

From: Patrick Bourke GRO
Sent: Tue 27/01/2015 8:37:08 AM (UTC)
To: Tom Wechsler GRO Mark R Davies GRO
Subject: Re: Fwd: Options - comments

I don't think you've gone too far either - it would be good if PV recognised that, although I drafted the paper, it is reflective of views as a whole.

I am very happy to keep an open mind to all options, as must we all, but that includes the possibility that closing the Scheme is the least worst choice.

P

From: Tom Wechsler
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2015 08:09 AM
To: Mark R Davies; Patrick Bourke
Subject: Re: Fwd: Options - comments

No you haven't.

A number of the CRRs Paula has seen were written some months ago. Their. approach has changed more recently but expressed through Part Two questions etc and evidence we have of collusion with eg advisors. And even then, their conclusions are bizarre eg "clear evidence that applicant was solely responsible for the loss but recommend mediation". That is at best partial.

Second Sight's correspondence with us is now clearly written by or at least cleared lawyers (we assume Edwin Coe) and there is evidence to suggest that (although I cannot prove it) their questions are being written to order. They mirror some used by advisors in mediation.

They labour under the same illusions as eg JFSA about the role of Parliament and their behaviours are fundamentally hostile to POL.

It is hard to see unless you are immersed in it, or bizarrely, come to it completely fresh. Brunswick's view was very clear yesterday as I understand Brian Altman's was.

Part Two should only be allowed to see the light of day if we can regain some control. That means no Working Group and new terms of engagement. That may cause them to walk.

I realise that much of this is circumstantial but we have to assume they are a threat.

Hope this helps

Tom

From: Mark R Davies
Sent: Tuesday, January 27, 2015 07:56 AM
To: Patrick Bourke; Tom Wechsler
Subject: Fwd: Options - comments

I'm going into the breach here. If I have gone too far please say now.

POL00117056

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: GRO

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Paula Vennells GRO
Date: 27 January 2015 07:51:22 GMT
To: Mark R Davies GRO
Subject: Re: Options - comments

Mark, let's talk.
How many of the SS reports have you personally read?
I'll call you shortly.
Paula

Paula Vennells
Chief Executive
Post Office Ltd

T: GRO
GRO

Sent from my iPad

On 26 Jan 2015, at 21:07, Mark R Davies GRO wrote:

Hi Paula

I hope you don't think I am being too strong here, but I think Patrick's description of Second Sight is about right given their behaviour in recent weeks. They are, I am sure, colluding with JFSA rather than acting as independent players. I've never come across anything quite like this and I have challenged the team but, having done so, I'm now certain of it. Quite why this is the case I am not sure: perhaps their heads have been filled with the notoriety/attention they are getting, but I am afraid to say that there is coalition campaigning against us, and they are part of it.

Mark

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: GRO

Sent from my iPad

On 26 Jan 2015, at 19:36, "Paula Vennells" GRO wrote:

POL00117056

Hi Patrick, thanks for the work on this and do please excuse my notes below in haste - I hope they might be of some use. Numbering refers to the paras in the doc.

Overall, this is exactly the format I was hoping for. Thank you. And of course, we might develop an option, which is a permutation of those you helpfully set out: worth flagging that as a potential outcome. A watch out: the paper clearly points to a conclusion. If that is the team's view, and I'm sure you have considered many variations, many times (!), fine... But let's be open to debate tomorrow.

Some more detailed comments:

. 3. didn't think it was possible to bring a 'group action'? This was Chris' view to the S/Ctte.
. 4. I can see that there is truth in it, but worded as it is, this para leads to a conclusion of disbanding the scheme, before you have 'gamed' the options. More balance at this stage in the paper?
. 5. can the summary of options be more balanced? Or offer pros and cons? Again, this leads to a conclusion. Alasdair is looking to debate the options first.
. 5. "SS's impartiality is a fiction": this is too strong. I read a number of their reports over the weekend, they are mostly balanced and factual because they draw extensively on the PO investigation reports; where they lose independence is around recommendations to mediate, though not all.

Thanks again.
Paula

Paula Vennells
Chief Executive
Post Office Ltd

GRO

Paula Vennells
Chief Executive
Post Office Ltd

GRO

Sent from my iPad

On 26 Jan 2015, at 15:35, Patrick Bourke <GRO> wrote:

POL00117056

Paula

I gather from Gavin that you wanted early sight of the paper for discussion at tomorrow evening's meeting. It's very short, in line with Chris' wishes, and has an annex for each of the options, plus a matrix comparing them at them end.

It's out for a second round of comments from others prior to circulation early tomorrow to attendees at tomorrow's meeting.

I'd envisage a longer piece for a Sub Committee or Board discussion but you can take a view on that.

Kind regards

Patrick

Patrick Bourke
GRO

<January Options - v4 - clean.docx>