POL00413697

Message

From: Kay Linnell [GRO]
Sent: 14/08/2013 16:55:38
To: 'Susan Crichton' [GRO]; 'Simon Baker' [GRO]; 'Ian Henderson' [GRO]; alan.bates [GRO]; 'Ron Warmington' [GRO]; 'Andy Holt' [GRO]; 'Angela Van-Den-Bogerd' [GRO]
CC: 'Rodric Williams' [GRO]; Parsons, Andrew [/O=BOND PEARCE/OU=First Administrative Group/cn=Recipients/cn=ap6]
Subject: RE:
Importance: High

Dear Susan

I have spoken to Alan and he and I have a few concerns about the membership and voting on the working party so could the Post Office numbers of members be specified with the right for substitution/ use of alternates and could I suggest we restrict the number of votes not for each member but 2 to the Post Office, 2 to JFSA and a vote to release deadlock to the Chairman? It is suggested as the primary investigators that 2nd Sight should not vote as their role is as advocates to present their findings. Otherwise every vote will be the Post Office's majority decision.

Secondly it is a major concern that appearances or reviews before the Working Party should be in camera as a safe environment for Complainants to voice their real concerns with fear of repercussions and that anything disclosed will not be used against them. This is the same debate as was had about the "indemnity" letter earlier for the "amnesty". Rather than legal professional privilege should we not consider "confidentiality"?

The monthly meetings should be noted as either by telephone conference or face to face so this is not prescriptive and allows the Chairman some discretion depending on case load and whether it is desirable to hear Complainants in person as part of a "rejected for mediation" review process.

The objectives of the scheme are somewhat contradictory taken as a whole but individually make sense and perhaps the role of the Working Party is to ensure that these objectives are met but there are no sanctions like "adverse inference" for the failure to produce information or pleadings within the time limits set out or a financial penalty for non compliance.

What does funded "predominantly" by PO and how it is envisaged that "value for money" will be measured?

Who will be responsible for keeping the records of the Scheme and at whose cost? How will they be verified and checked? Who will have access to them?

What are the powers available to the Working Party? Can they order specific performance, suggest a financial remedy?

What is the initial budget (presumably for administering the Working Party) is not enough?

What professional risk to any members of this working party face? 2nd Sight and I have our own PII policies and presumably POL will cover any actions by its employees but what about others especially Alan? Should we consider a clause that participants agree to waive any legal rights to pursue anyone or take out an insurance against that?

Sorry to have so many questions

Kay
Miss Kay Linnell
Kay Linnell & Co
Brick Kiln Cottage
The Avenue, Herriard

POL00413697

Near Basingstoke
Hampshire RG25 2PR
Tel/Fax
Mobile : GRO
DX : 46901 Alton

From: Susan Crichton GRO
Sent: 14 August 2013 15:01
To: Simon Baker; Ian Henderson; alan.bates GRO kay GRO 'Ron Warmington'; Andy Holt; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd
Cc: Rodric Williams; 'Parsons, Andrew'
Subject:

Dear All – here is our first attempt at the terms of reference for the Working Group, grateful for views and input.

Thanks

Susan

Susan Crichton I General Counsel

1st Floor, Central Wing, 148 Old Street, London, EC1V 9HQ
GRO Postline Mobex GRO
GRO