

Alwen Lyons

From: WALKER, Janet [GRO]
Sent: 12 July 2013 15:36
To: Alwen Lyons
Subject: Thoughts from Alan Bates

Dear Alwen,

Alan has sent James the following, which comprise some initial thoughts on how to proceed, which may be helpful to you and Paula prior to your Board meeting next week.

James has read them would like to let Paula know that he thinks Alan's thoughts are quite outstanding.

Hope this helps!
Have a good weekend,
Janet

Janet Walker

Office of the Rt Hon James Arbuthnot, MP
House of Commons
London SW1A 0AA

Website: www.jamesarbuthnot.com

This e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail.

From: Alan Bates [mailto:GRO]
Sent: 11 July 2013 14:59
To: WALKER, Janet
Subject: Rough thoughts

Following on from the discussion this morning I have drafted the following note on one possible way forward to deal with the historic cases using a number of stages:-

The approach would be to assess each of the cases, in the first instance on the thematic/systemic failures/issues and secondly, the software/hardware problems. Weight would be given to each instance of supporting evidence provided by the SPMR as well as other factors surrounding their issue. By the same token, weight would be given to any supporting documentation provided by POL in reply to the assertions made by the SPMR.

Process

1. With the aid of JFSA, 2nd Sight would batch the cases by location and arrange to interview each person in that batch at a small number of locations around the country (time assessment required + interviews to arrange; other assessor to be involved specializing in these types of issues, able to explain realities to victim).
2. 2nd Sight + specialist assessor would prepare a summary of each case measured against the systemic issues and other factors, producing a summary report to the extent of damage caused by the initial treatment by POL.

3. Each case report is sent to POL for comment and assessment/agreement, then POL prepares a response and declares what they believe might be suitable (POL would probably wait for all reports to be completed to assess liability). 2nd Sight and JFSA would assist if required.
4. Victim, possibly through 2nd Sight, discusses (on telephone) response from POL, and
 - a. Accepts POL's response and implications
 - b. Refutes POL's comments, adds their own and updated report then returned to POL, starts point 3 again.
5. If victim chooses 4a, POL meets agreed settlement.

To be considered

- a. If 4b continually fails there has to be a way to arbitrate the issue.
- b. The matter of any conviction has to be addressed at some point.
- c. Timescales for:-
 - I. Dealing with historic cases
 - II. Accepting new cases

UK Parliament Disclaimer:

This e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail.

UK Parliament Disclaimer:

This e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail.