
From: Rod Ismay[/O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=ROD.ISMAYB8406224-7AE7-4FF1-B8E6-F1A8E506F2E5]
Sent: Fri 08/02/2013 5:01:23 PM (UTC)
To: Susan Crichton[] GRO Simon Baker[] GRO
Angela Van-Den-Bogerd[] GRO Alwen
Lyons[] GRO Dave Posnett[] GRO
Subject: Second Sight - Agenda proposal (for pre-meet w/c 11 Feb)

Dear all – Please may I suggest an agenda for our one hour internal call next week. Amanda is checking diaries to fix a time.

Apologies if my proposal seems detailed, but I think we need to take stock of the approach, the interactions and how we drill into whatever the real questions are that we are to be asked.

If we can reach a conclusion on what those questions are then I would favour some form of paper outlining standard process and controls across the issue areas. Then either separate papers or appendices to respond to the facts of each allegation / “spot”. I feel it would help all parties if Second Sight can present concise, structured questions and if we can present similarly structured responses.

1. Status of the review:
 - a. Agreed themes or key questions arising (requiring feedback and/or concluded on)
 - i. Alleged incident types – comms interruptions, recovery mode, cheques, postage labels, giro payments, other?
 - ii. Understanding of branch training, report / data availability, central visibility of report usage, recovery screen guidance
 - iii. Timeliness and evidence in transaction corrections
 - iv. Transactional data retention and availability in branch for the subpostmaster
 - v. Central data and file retention including completed prosecution files
 - vi. False accounting versus theft charges. And related correspondence
 - vii. Bracknell operations
 - b. Effectiveness of communications
 - i. Clarity of the questions being asked
 - ii. Balancing generic process outlines versus specific incident facts
 - iii. Any learning points in tone and content
2. The known timeline – key briefings etc
3. The expected case process
 - a. 8th February “100 case potential” versus agreements on case volumes at outset
 - b. Ideas ahead of cases and spot reviews being presented – ideas to make the process the clearest and most efficient for Second Sight and POL
 - c. Deadlines and resource impacts
4. Business as usual debt recovery and legal actions
 - a. Some cases were put on hold pending the wider review. They are not all in the current list from Second Sight
 - b. Need to agree BAU approach so as not to undermine process or to lose chance of debt recovery due to statutory limitation periods etc
5. Media monitoring
 - a. Recent short articles in Computer Weekly, Accountancy Age, Finance Director etc – repeating old stories
 - b. Other?
 - c. Stance and responses
6. Face to face catch up with Ron and Ian later on in same week?

Thanks
Rod