POL00305565

From: Rodric Williams[/O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=RODRIC WILLIAMSE9C114F4-B03F-4595-B082-CE89BE5C79D47B]
Sent: Fri 08/08/2014 10:59:52 AM (UTC)
To: 'jonathan.swil GRO
Cc: Belinda Crowe GRO
Subject: Re: Response to Second Sight Part 2

Thanks for you work on this Jonathan - for what it's worth, I fully support the advice you're giving and that we appear to be following.

Kind regards, Rodric

From: Swil, Jonathan [mailto GRO
Sent: Friday, August 08, 2014 01:56 PM
To: Melanie Corfield; Belinda Crowe; Andrew Parsons < GRO ; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; matthew fielden GRO ; Rodric Williams
Cc: Band, Christa GRO
Subject: RE: Response to Second Sight Part 2

Belinda

I attach some suggested amendments from us (including fixing the typos we spotted as we went, I hope that is ok) and have highlighted new wording that does not show as fresh mark-up .

Two key comments:

- In order to try to avoid being seen as obstructionist or defensive, we think the key point to get across is that this report does not help applicants or the scheme. Accordingly, I have moved that point to be upfront and amended it slightly to make clear it is the main concern.

- We think we should avoid using the word bias and accusing SS even if indirectly of being biased. It is a serious accusation to make and one we should probably avoid if we do not have clear evidence for it and are comfortable it is being made in an appropriate context and at the right time. I have made some amendments accordingly.

I will call you shortly.

Kind regards

Jonathan

From: Melanie Corfield [mailto GRO
Sent: 08 August 2014 10:41
To: Belinda Crowe; Andrew Parsons; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; matthew fielden; Swil, Jonathan; Rodric Williams
Subject: RE: Response to Second Sight Part 2

Belinda
Agree with previous comments - lands the points effectively. A few tracked changes from me in attached.....a couple of 'minor' but important ones included:

- In the section on evidence and analysis I've tweaked the words re "largely speculative" - can we say instead "it lacks examples or statistics to substantiate speculative conclusions it does draw". This gives us a useful point of reference if report reaches public domain

POL00305565

- Refer to applicants not subpostmasters in penultimate para

Mel

From: Belinda Crowe
Sent: 08 August 2014 05:50
To: Andrew Parsons; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; matthew fielden; Jonathan Swil GRO
Melanie Corfield; Rodric Williams
Cc: Belinda Crowe
Subject: Response to Second Sight Part 2

All,with apologies for the very scrappy appearance of the attached but I would welcome urgent views on this,with many thanks to Andy and Matthew.

I am looking at a potential annex now, and how much detail to put in it.

Please feel free to either comment or track and also make any suggestions for improved wording as anything else.

Copying Rod as he may want to have an opportunity to comment and I know is checking some emails.