POL00116348

From: Neil Hayward[neil.hayward GRO]
Sent: Wed 19/03/2014 2:02:08 PM (UTC)
To: Belinda Crowe[belinda.crowe GRO]
Cc: Paula Vennells[paula.vennells GRO ; Chris Aujard[christopher.aujard GRO]; Chris M Day[chris.m.day GRO ; Mark R Davies[mark.r.davies GRO]; Martin Edwards[martin.edwards GRO]; Belinda Crowe[belinda.crowe GRO]; David Oliver1[david.oliver GRO]
Subject: Re: POST OFFICE LTD BOARD Mediation Scheme Update March 2014 V3.docx

Thanks Belinda. Nothing to add to the
Legal aspects except to say that I thought the LL session was excellent and reassuring.

On the definition of the relationship with Second Sight personally I am not sure why you would not seek to regularise a relationship ahead if deciding the future of the mediation scheme and their role on it. If we are not going forward with them are they not easier to remove with no agreement?
I assume the justification is therefore purely confidentiality but shouldn't the agreement bind them to what we want from them and when we want it rather than earlier on?

Sorry if I am missing the point.

Regards

NEIL
Sent from my iPhone

On 19 Mar 2014, at 13:10, "Belinda Crowe" <belinda.crowe GRO > wrote:

> Please find attached a copy of a draft cover paper for the Board to accompany the Linklaters advice.
>
> Chris would be grateful for comments by 5pm today.
>
> (formatting/typos will be checked before final submission to the Board)
>
> Best wishes
> Belinda
>
> **Belinda Crowe**
> 148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ
>
> GRO Postline: GRO
>
> GRO
>
> belinda.crowe GRO

<POST OFFICE LTD BOARD Mediation Scheme Update March 2014 V3.docx>