POL00143573

From: Rod Ismay [GRO]
Sent: Tue 04/09/2012 12:39:54 PM (UTC)
To: ECT [GRO]; Andy Garner [GRO]; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO]; Alwen Lyons [GRO]; Susan Crichton [GRO]; Rodric Williams [GRO]; Sabrina Jethwa [GRO]; Lesley J Sewell [GRO]; Simon Baker [GRO]; John Breeden [GRO]; Glenn Chester [GRO]
Cc: Donna Gilhooly [GRO]; Peter D Johnson [GRO]
Subject: RE: FOR ACTION: Ref: ECT 178/12 Customer name: Paul Popov Feedback due: 13/08/12 Case signatory: ECT - Branch: Dunstan FAD 225329
Attachment: ECT 178-12 -Paul Popov v5ri.doc

I attach my mark ups. I have had several days holiday so apologise for not having been able to respond earlier.

Whilst I have proposed a fairly significant rewording of the lengthy "losses and gains" paragraph I would also like to query whether we actually need such a long section there at all.

We are robustly stating to Mr Popov that we rebut his assertion about equipment and robustly believe the extra controls he finally introduced are the thing that made the difference. On that basis don't we risk opening an unnecessary avenue of dispute by getting into the miskeyed "loss and gain" arena?

Could that paragraph simply be reduced to its first sentence?

Ie. "However, losses do occur across our network for a number of different reasons. These include staff or agent theft and customer fraud. "

If you strongly feel that Mr Popov's original concerns required the length of comment then I would prefer my rewording, but I have read his original complaint and I don't think we need to get into keying issues in such detail to respond to his question.

I've also suggested some grammatical points.

Am around to discuss on [GRO]

Thanks, Rod

From: Sharon V Green **On Behalf Of** ECT
Sent: 04 September 2012 11:58
To: Andy Garner; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Alwen Lyons; Susan Crichton; Rodric Williams; Sabrina Jethwa; Lesley J Sewell; Simon Baker; Rod Ismay; John Breeden; Glenn Chester
Cc: Donna Gilhooly; Peter D Johnson
Subject: FOR ACTION: Ref: ECT 178/12 Customer name: Paul Popov Feedback due: 13/08/12 Case signatory: ECT - Branch: Dunstan FAD 225329
Importance: High

Dear All

Please see attached for the proposed response to Paul Popov, which has been reviewed by Pete Johnson.

(See attached file: ECT 178-12 -Paul Popov v4(PJ).doc)

I am looking to send the response today, so if I could please have any feedback by 14:30 at the latest.

POL00143573

Whilst I appreciate that this is short notice, the case is very overdue, and we have already had a follow up letter from Mr Popov to chase a response.

Kind Regards

Sharon Green
Stakeholder Correspondence Team

Post Office Limited
1st Floor, Bunhill Row Wing
148 Old Street
London
EC1V 9HQ

Tel: GRO
Postline: GRO