

---

**From:** Patrick Bourke[/O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=PATRICK BOURKBE7DB8D6-53EC-4534-922B-495877001727E11]  
**Sent:** Fri 19/06/2015 10:10:38 AM (UTC)  
**To:** Melanie Corfield; GRO  
**Subject:** RE: Panorama - update

Thanks. Is there anything you can do to stop him ? We really need a) to draft a proper statement with lawyers and those of us actually on the day to day and b) with the benefit of knowing what has happened in the meeting with Ceri Thomas. On which note, I am unhappy about him doing it alone. Slightly tired of this now.

---

**From:** [Melanie Corfield](#)  
**Sent:** 19/06/2015 11:04  
**To:** [Patrick Bourke](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Panorama - update

No it's not you! Don't worry, I've just quickly tweaked a few things and gone back to make that very point. We have to be clear about a statement that the programme MUST use in full (I am sure Susan will support) - and although his points are ok, this needs work. The statement should be clearly separated out. Need to stop him going on about every po in the land etc and focus on miscarriages of justice story. Also will need a par at end to CLOSE IT DOWN. I will await all the other comments - then hopefully we can get on and write a better statement that is actually, er, a statement.  
Mel

---

**From:** Patrick Bourke  
**Sent:** 19 June 2015 09:41  
**To:** Melanie Corfield  
**Subject:** FW: Panorama - update

He's come over a bit Churchillian, no ?

Not sure this is how I would want to make a statement to Panorama to carry in lieu of an interview – at all – but perhaps it's just me ?

P

---

**From:** Mark R Davies  
**Sent:** 19 June 2015 10:26  
**To:** Patrick Bourke; Melanie Corfield; Rodric Williams; Jane MacLeod; Susan Barty; Tom Reid; Mark Underwood1; Kim Fletcher; Craig Breheny; Jane Hill  
**Cc:** Alana Renner  
**Subject:** Panorama - update

All

I am seeing the editor of Panorama on Monday at 11. This might be best as a 121 but I will discuss with you all and would welcome thoughts. Either way I will prepare a speaking note and circulate. I am copying Alana as she will need to stand in for me at ET.

I do not have high expectations for the Panorama meeting but it is important and might give us an opportunity

to make key points.

Following that meeting, I suggest we contact Panorama to confirm that we will not be taking part in the programme.

With apologies for another note to clear, I suggest text along lines of below, which could also form the basis of our public statement.

I would welcome views.

I'd like to catch up with whoever is around on this at 2pm today in FD If possible.

Mark

Thanks for your emails and questions over recent weeks.

It has become clear from your emails and questions, mainly submitted after the two hour meeting we held to allow you to ask questions, that the focus of your programme is to be on individual cases.

As you know we are bound by a confidentiality agreement in relation to individuals who submitted applications to the mediation scheme. We don't intend to break that agreement.

Given that you will no doubt wish to ask questions about individual cases, as is your right, and that we won't be able to answer, because of our obligations to individuals, your programme will be unable – sadly for all concerned – to reflect a balanced picture.

As you are also aware some individuals have asked the independent Criminal Cases Review Commission to examine their cases. That is their right. It is also further reason to avoid making public comment on individual cases.

We therefore feel unable to take part in your programme. We are very sorry about this, as there is so much more to this issue than meets the eye.

We are particularly sorry because of the risk of the programme, without our input, unfairly impacting the thousands of postmasters and branch colleagues who successfully use the robust Horizon system every day on behalf of our customers.

We will do everything we can to support all those who work under the Post Office name in every corner of the land.

For the record, you may use any element of this note for your programme as a statement. I hope you will do so fully in order to reflect as clearly as possible the Post Office's resolute position on this matter. The following points are critical:

We don't prosecute people very often. But in a billion pound business, sometimes it is necessary.

We don't prosecute on a whim. The courts would throw the case out if we did.

We don't prosecute people for making mistakes. Everyone makes mistakes.

We only prosecute when there is clear evidence of criminal intent, such as knowingly covering up of branch losses.

We think prosecuting in those cases is reasonable: and we think customers would agree (it's their money after all).

Getting into a muddle with other people's money and then covering that up to the tune of several thousand pounds cannot be excusable in any business.

Where there is criminal behaviour we will act and that is what we have done in the past.

But in the face of serious allegations about our computer system and processes, the Post Office has done the right thing.

We launched an inquiry, set up an independently verified mediation scheme and thoroughly re-investigated every case put to it.

Throughout all that, no actual evidence has emerged to support the allegations we expect to be made in the

Panorama programme.

Customers can therefore be assured that, after almost three years of investigation, there is no reason to suggest that our computer system does not work as it should. Indeed it is robust and effective in dealing with six million transactions a day.

Mark Davies  
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director  
Post Office Ltd

Mobile: **GRO**