

---

**From:** Jane Hill [REDACTED] **GRO**  
**Sent:** Mon 26/01/2015 6:04:09 PM (UTC)  
**To:** Mark R Davies [REDACTED] **GRO**  
**Subject:** FW: Letter to committee  
**Attachment:** email to clerk.docx

Hi Mark

Not sure if this has gone. Assume it would be in an email from you. Have pasted amended text below for you to send in case helpful:

-----  
Thank you for your time on Friday.

I write as promised in relation to the Committee's session on the Post Office's Horizon system and Mediation Scheme on February 3.

As you know serious allegations have been made about Post Office's conduct, actions and behaviour in relation to this issue. The Post Office is very keen to set the record straight and welcomes the opportunity to do so.

At present the Committee is holding two sessions. The Post Office is due to attend for the second of these, alongside Second Sight.

I'm writing on behalf of the Post Office to request that the Post Office and Second Sight give evidence in two separate sessions. I do so for the following reasons:

- We engaged Second Sight to act as independent investigators. this position could be compromised, or appear to be compromised, by sitting on a panel alongside the Post Office.
- The Working Group set up to oversee the Mediation Scheme is made up of Post Office, the JFSA and Second Sight. This group is independently chaired, by Sir Anthony Hooper, a former Court of Appeal judge.
- The role of the Working Group is to consider whether cases investigated by the Post Office, and then reviewed by Second Sight, should go to mediation
- We would suggest that given this arrangement, there is a risk of the committee being drawn into operational detail around the workings and arrangements of the Working Group, including into specific cases
- All parties to the Working Group have agreed that its deliberations and individual cases should remain confidential: this is primarily to protect the interests of applicants to the mediation scheme

Given the above, we wish to suggest that the evidence session may be most productive if Post Office and Second Sight are able to give evidence separately.

I am grateful to you for agreeing to put these points to the Committee and look forward to hearing from you. I am of course happy to answer any further questions you may have.

Jane Hill | Head of Public Affairs

1st Floor, Banner Wing, 148 Old Street, London, EC1V 9HQ

[REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED] Mobex [REDACTED] GRO  
[REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Tom Wechsler  
Sent: 26 January 2015 12:17  
To: Jane Hill; Chris Aujard; Mark R Davies  
Cc: Belinda Crowe; Patrick Bourke; Rodric Williams; Melanie Corfield; Mark Underwood  
Subject: RE: Letter to committee

Thanks Jane.

Minor additional comments attached

Tom

Tom Wechsler

**GRO**

-----Original Message-----

From: Jane Hill  
Sent: 26 January 2015 08:59  
To: Chris Aujard; Mark R Davies  
Cc: Belinda Crowe; Patrick Bourke; Rodric Williams; Melanie Corfield; Tom Wechsler; Mark Underwood  
Subject: RE: Letter to committee

Have pasted into a word doc and tweaked, including Chris's comments.

Jane

Jane Hill | Head of Public Affairs

1st Floor, Banner Wing, 148 Old Street, London, EC1V 9HQ

**GRO**

Mobex

**GRO**

**GRO**

-----Original Message-----

From: Chris Aujard  
Sent: 26 January 2015 08:36  
To: Mark R Davies  
Cc: Belinda Crowe; Patrick Bourke; Rodric Williams; Melanie Corfield; Jane Hill; Tom Wechsler; Mark Underwood  
Subject: RE: Letter to committee

Thanks Mark - the sentiments expressed look to be about right to me - I think the point you make about SS's independence appearing "to be compromised" is a good one a worthy of bringing out with more force, possibly higher up in your third bullet point, but with more explanation. Otherwise, it looks good.

Chris

-----Original Message-----

From: Mark R Davies  
Sent: 25 January 2015 20:13  
To: Patrick Bourke; Chris Aujard; Rodric Williams; Melanie Corfield; Jane Hill; Tom Wechsler; Mark Underwood  
Cc: Belinda Crowe  
Subject: Letter to committee

All

See below for my proposed draft to the committee clerk. Grateful for comments.

Thanks  
Mark

Thank you for your time on Friday.

I write as promised in relation to the committee's session on the Post Office's Horizon session and Mediation Scheme on February 3.

As you know very serious allegations have been made about Post Office's conduct, actions and behaviour in relation to this issue. The Post Office is very keen to set the record straight in relation to these issues and welcomes the opportunity to do so.

At present the committee is holding two sessions. The Post Office is due to attend for the second of these, alongside Second Sight.

I'm writing on behalf of the Post Office to request that the Post Office and Second Sight evidence are split into separate sessions. I do so for the following reasons:

- the Mediation Scheme is overseen by a Working Group made up of Post Office, the JFSA and Second Sight. This group is independently chaired, by Sir Anthony Hooper, a former High Court judge.
- the role of the working group is to consider whether cases investigated by the Post Office, and then reviewed by Second Sight, should go to mediation
- we would suggest that given this arrangement, there is a risk of the committee being drawn into operational detail around the workings and arrangements of the Working Group, including into specific cases
- all parties to the Working Group have agreed that its deliberations and individual cases should remain confidential: this is primarily to protect the interests of applicants to the mediation scheme
- we suggest that two members of the Working Group giving evidence side by side risks the integrity of the Mediation Scheme being called into question
  
- there also exists the possibility of disagreement between Post Office and Second Sight on specific cases and operational detail around these matters may not be areas the committee wishes to examine

Moreover, as the committee may be aware, the JFSA has recently expressed its doubts about whether to remain as part of the Working Group.

Given the above, we wish to suggest that the evidence session may be most productive if Post Office and Second Sight are able to give evidence separately.

We are also concerned that having engaged Second Sight to act as independent investigators, this position could be compromised, or appear to be compromised, by sitting on a panel alongside the Post Office.

I am grateful to you for agreeing to put these points to the committee and look forward to hearing from you. I am of course happy to answer any further questions you may have.

Mark Davies  
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director  
Mobile: GRO

Sent from my iPhone

---