

Message

From: Mark R Davies [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]
on behalf of Mark R Davies [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]
Sent: 06/07/2013 16:46:26
To: Paula Vennells [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]
CC: Martin Edwards [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]; Mark R Davies [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED] Lesley J
Sewell [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED] Susan Crichton [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]; Alwen Lyons
[REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]; Theresa Iles [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Proposed way forward

Hi Paula

I think this points to the need for our package of measures to include two and possibly three new initiatives:

1. A Branch User Forum - for existing users to share views, discuss issues, examine processes etc.. Chaired by Exco and reporting to Exco. But this doesn't cover historic issues (ie the JFSA and MP cases) so we could also have (2)
2. A working party, to use Alan's phrase, to complete the MP and JFSA cases. This could "take over" the Second Sight review (perhaps involving them but perhaps not as they have effectively "cleared" Horizon, the remit of their inquiry). This would involve the JFSA and us working collaboratively on the remaining cases. We might wish to include an external party in this too (a PWC?). This is the area of greatest risk - looking back at historic cases which have gone through the courts. But it is also completing the job we asked SS to do.
3. A review by a Mike o Connor or Patrick Burns figure to consider potential independent levers which could be developed to give SPMRs a means of independent adjudication or (non statutory) ombudsman.

This package, it feels to me, covers all bases. It looks ahead to fix internal issues and create independent balancing view, but it also completes the review and has the potential for doing so with SS playing a different, or no, role.

It is also a compelling package for media, which handled carefully, could contain the story.

Grateful for views.

Mark

Sent from my iPad

On 6 Jul 2013, at 10:35, "Paula Vennells" [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED] > wrote:

FYI and for any thoughts pls

Paula

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Paula Vennells [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]
Date: 6 July 2013 10:35:03 BST
To: Alan Bates [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Proposed way forward

Alan, thank you for the note. Yes, I thought the meeting with James was positive too. My main concern is still how we manage the publicity, to avoid - as you said - it 'going ballistic'.

We had a useful conversation re a statement from James with quotes from you and me, or possible joint statement. And agreed we would pick up again on Monday.

Ours is now bring re-worked in the light of that and as we liaise with SS over the weekend on some changes to the report where it is factually inaccurate. I am hopeful these will be addressed.

Once I have a final draft, I would be happy to send across to you.

It would be good to meet on Monday. And as I haven't met Kay, then I would be happy to extend the meeting to include her and I would bring Alwen Lyons, who is our Company Secretary - Alwen has been the key lead on the liaison with James' office.

In the meantime, I hope you enjoy the glorious weather - at last!

Paula

Ps. You were on my list to call today but I imagine this email exchange is sufficient now? However, if you would like to speak at any time, don't hesitate to text me.

Sent from my iPad

On 6 Jul 2013, at 09:51, "Alan Bates" <[REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED]> wrote:

Hello Paula

I understand the meeting with James Arbuthnot went well on Friday and I believe he will be discussing his views with me on Monday morning.

I am sure you will agree that it is important that we have even an outline document of the proposed way forward we have discussed, before the MPs' meeting. As soon as it is available, I would appreciate seeing your version of what is proposed, hopefully amended to address the comment below.

Looking through my notes from our last conversation, there is an early item of concern, that being the name of the panel which you referred to as the 'user group'. Whilst I can appreciate you want such a group to continue on into the future, at which time such a name may be suitable. Initially, and whilst it is also looking at the issues surrounding the report and the cases, possibly 'task group' or 'working party' might be more accurate, as technically, the bulk of JFSA are ex users, and others will no doubt pick up on the name. I could offer 'review board', but I could see that might not be acceptable.

Regarding Monday 8th, do you still want to meet? If we do meet, and others are to attend, I would like Kay Linnell, who has been working with us for the last year, to accompany me. With travel arrangement to

finalise, I would appreciate a response to that point as soon as you are able to let me know.

Regards

Alan