
From: Paula Vennells[GRO]
Sent: Tue 23/07/2013 4:52:52 PM (UTC)
To: Alwen Lyons[GRO]
Cc: Susan Crichton[GRO]; Chris M Day[GRO];
Martin Edwards[GRO]
Subject: Re: Notes of the meeting on the 22nd July

Congratulations on a good set of minutes. Alwen, thank you.

Susan, we have a 121 tomorrow at 2.30pm; it would be good if we can use most of this to catch up on SS. If Angela is around it would be good if she could join us. Also Chris if available, so we do a smooth handover.

Thx Paula

Sent from my iPhone

On 23 Jul 2013, at 17:41, "Alwen Lyons" <[GRO]> wrote:

> Dear All

>

>

>> Notes of the meeting held on 22nd July at Old Street to discuss the proposed mediation process

>> Attending: PV, JA, RW, IH, SC, MD, AL

>>

>> PV welcomed all to the meeting, want to work collaboratively, respond to learnings and put a process in place to move the cases forward

>>

>> POL has already committed to

>> Creating a working party To work collaboratively to complete the review of cases started by second sight last year.

>> A reviewed chaired by an independent figure to mediate in disputed cases.

>> A branch user forum to provide a way for subpostmasters and others to raise issues and I sights

>>

>> We accept that there needs to be a satisfactory process going forward

>>

>> The meeting discussed the proposed process - SEE FLOW CHART

>>

>> JA considered it a good way forward and said that this was very close to the process suggested by Alan Bates a week ago.

>> The process had been sent to AB for comments and he had emailed his input to AL.

>> SC that this was a process which would enable the sub postmaster to put their case to POL and to get resolutions. POL would also use the information to inform changes in business processes. It was hoped that this would give sub postmasters the opportunities to raise issues with POL using a new process in the future which would hopefully reduce the need for new cases.

>>

>> JA pointed out that the 47 cases currently being considered were not the only cases, this was accepted but it was agreed that if we put these cases through the process this would prove it worked and then it would provide a route for the other MP cases.

>> JA said he had had a lot of new cases since the statement in the house.

>> The Monthly Oversight Board would stay in existence initially for 12 months and the hope was this would be enough time to see the cases through IH agreed that the process would bring the 'sides' together. Mediator would help. Good will on both side would give it a chance.

>> JA had expected POL to suggest the review needed to be finished by the end of October and would not have been pleased if it had, but he was pleased with the proposal IH was also pleased and said the spot review approach worked well with this approach.

>>

>> It was suggested that a workshop be held on Wed or Thurs to flesh out the approach.

>> JA asked the workshop to consider the precise steps which need to be taken for each different type of case. It was agreed that an email would be sent to JA for onward transmission to MPs (agreed with SS) which would explain what will happen with MP cases.

>>

>> JA explained that the MPs had taken up the cases because their constituents could not see any other way to get satisfaction, JA accepted that not all cases would be resolved to the satisfaction of the constituents but that the process did provide an independent mediations.

>> IH said that any case submitted needed a level of detail before it could be investigated and some MP cases did not have the required level of detail.

>>
>> JA needed to go back to the MPs and tell them which cases did not have enough detail. SS to provide an email setting out what is required based on the JFSA standard of evidence.
>>
>> SC explained that the process made provision for the SPMR to have an independent advisor, she made the point about costs in the context of this and the process in general and said that they should be proportionate and would need to be controlled, she expected it to be the role of the MOB to oversee value for money in the context.
>>
>> JA said that we needed to consider the consequences if cases get over turned. RW pointed out that the independent advisor for sub postmasters was very important as some of the SPMRs found it difficult to explain their case
>>
>> IH it will not take long to push some of the cases through, made sense to put those with tangible evidence to the front of the queue, but also ensure that the cases of MPs who have attended the meetings are given priority.
>>
>> The workshop this week would look at different ways of working, then there would be an ongoing working group, working through cases and meeting formally once a week to sort out any issues.
>>
>> Getting the information from Fujitsu had been an issue in the past. PV asked for evidence of this so that the business could challenge FJ.
>>
>> JA offered to intervene with the FJ Chairman, Simon Blagdon, if it would be helpful.
>>
>> IH said the business needed their commitment to process and speed of getting data.
>> It was thought that Gareth Jenkins produced high quality and he may be able to help the process.
>>
>> IH to provide JA with the email to call in the evidence, the lack of evidence would be a problem and we would have to filter out cases where IT wasn't possible to take them forward.
>>
>> SS would look at each case individually to see if the evidence available enabled it to proceed
>>
>> SC explained that this process would not stop SPMRs taking a civil case against the PO if they thought that was appropriate, but that would take them outside of the mediation process.
>>
>> AL would call AB tomorrow morning and invite him or Kay Linnell to attend the workshop if possible
>>
>> Consider if it would be good to put out a joint POL/ JFSA communication about the mediation process. Once the process is in place need to contact each SPMR to ask them if they want. To put their case through mediation.
>>
>> ACTIONS In the meeting
>
> Work shop the mediation proposal on the 24th July with SS, JFSA and POL
>>
>> After the workshop, POL/SS/JFSA provide an email for JA to send to MPs to explain the process (the email needs to be able to quoted or used in correspondence with their constituents)
>>
>> SS to provide a list of MP cases which do not have enough evidence and an email for JA to send to MPs concerned explaining what evidence is required, using the JFSP standard
>>
>> Provide an email for JA which is an amalgamation of the two above for use with new cases, explaining the process.
>>
>>
>> Thanks
>> Alwen
>>
>> Alwen Lyons
>> Company Secretary
>>

GRO

>>