POL00116444

From: Paula Vennells GRO

Sent: Wed 09/04/2014 7:48:37 AM (UTC)

To: Belinda Crowe GRO Mark R Davies GRO

Cc: Chris Aujard GRO Chris M Day GRO Belinda Crowe GRO

Subject: Re: Alice

Thanks am not completely clear but think this is where we will spend our time. Just realised I left Mark off the trail

The debate will need to hear from Mark re handling on 3. Esp when you look at what was said in the House and in public domain.
Mark any views/steers from you?

Sent from my iPad

On 9 Apr 2014, at 08:42, "Belinda Crowe" GRO wrote:

> Mark has updated us.
>
> We took the term closure out of the option 3 name but still used it in the descriptor. The key difference between option 3 and 4 is that 3 gives us greater control:
> - Second Sight would not be involved
> - The working group would be disbanded
> Therefore we would take out the cost of second sight (directly and the indirect costs they incur by raising what we often consider to be spurious issues which have to be responded to)
> Speed up the process
> Management overhead would reduce
> Would be more akin to business as usual
> - far fewer cases mediated (poss saving c£1m)
>
> With Option 4 we would still:
> - have a working group
> - second sight would still be involved (as members of the working group but could still slow down the process by raising issues in the same way as they do now). We would still have to negotiate what we wanted to do and either accept that we either fail or create (or continue) on going tensions with working group if we assert our authority. Therefore not pain free (and could leave us in Option 3 territory anyway if members walk)
> Therefore most cases would probably be mediated (cost as above)
> Best wishes
> belinda
>
> **Belinda Crowe**
> 148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ
>
> GRO Postline: GRO
>
> belinda.crowe GRO

POL00116444

From: Paula Vennells
Sent: 09 April 2014 07:59
To: Chris Aujard; Belinda Crowe
Cc: Chris M Day
Subject: Fwd: Alice

Hi there. Fyi. Mark may by now have updated you. But a heads up if not.
Alice's query is the same as mine would be - what's the difference between 3 and 4? (It was why I suggested to Belinda that you removed the term 'closure' from the original.)

Chris D - where are you on this?
Thx P

Sent from my iPad
Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** Mark R Davies GRO
> **Date:** 8 April 2014 18:58:45 BST
> **To:** Paula Vennells GRO
> **Subject: Alice**
>
> Hi Paula
>
> Alice was pretty relaxed about it. She feels that we will need to bring him in eventually so fine to do so now as long as we are clear there is more work to be done on any option.
>
> She was glad though for the call - I don't think she'd considered the point before.
>
> Her view is that we lack strong enough reasons to end the scheme and that we can't underestimate the parliamentary angle. Essentially, what would our story be if we took option 3?
>
> She will ask us to do some cost and resource comparisons for the various options - if for instance we took option 3 how much more painful would it be than option 4 and is the gap between the two worth the pain etc..
>
> Hope this helps. Happy to discuss of course.
>
> Mark
>
> Sent from my iPhone