
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

- 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
Melanie Corfield; Rodric Williams

GRO

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.

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use, disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you have received this in error, please contact the sender by reply email and then delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540. Registered Office: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.

Any business communication, sent by or on behalf of Linklaters LLP or one of its affiliated firms or other entities (together "Linklaters"), is confidential and may be privileged or otherwise protected. If you receive it in error please inform us and then delete it immediately from your system. You should not copy it or disclose its contents to anyone. Please be aware that messages sent to and from Linklaters may be monitored for reasons of security, to protect our business, and to ensure compliance with legal and regulatory obligations and our internal policies. Emails are not a secure method of communication, can be intercepted and cannot be guaranteed to be error free. Anyone who communicates with us by email is taken to understand and accept the above.

Linklaters LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC326345. It is a law firm authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (www.sra.org.uk). The term partner in relation to Linklaters LLP is used to refer to a member of Linklaters LLP or an employee or consultant of Linklaters LLP or any of its affiliated firms or entities with equivalent standing and qualifications. Please refer to www.linklaters.com/regulation for important information on our regulatory position. A list of Linklaters LLP members together with a list of those non-members who are designated as partners and their professional qualifications, may be inspected at our registered office, One Silk Street, London EC2Y 8HQ and such persons are either solicitors, registered foreign lawyers or European lawyers.