
From: Mark R Davies [GRO]
Sent: Fri 07/11/2014 9:55:04 AM (UTC)
To: Melanie Corfield [GRO]
Cc: Belinda Crowe [GRO]; Chris Aujard [GRO]; Patrick Bourke [GRO]; Tom Wechsler [GRO]
Subject: Re: Scheme report

Strongly agree and v happy to sponsor this approach.

M

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile [GRO]

Sent from my iPhone

On 7 Nov 2014, at 09:53, "Melanie Corfield" <[GRO]> wrote:

I agree with this. We will need something on the record to bust the many myths that will otherwise rumble on (and potentially be fuelled by SS's never-ending "investigations"), that draws the line and also highlights the positive actions on training and support that address the original SS 'conclusions'. It is as Tom says not without risk but if we do not do this we will continue to have to provide info piecemeal in various ways and to different audiences. We need a permanent point of reference with all the facts. We know these will not be accepted in some quarters but at least we can shut the dialogue down.
Mel

From: Belinda Crowe
Sent: Friday, November 07, 2014 08:03 AM
To: Mark R Davies; Chris Aujard; Melanie Corfield; Patrick Bourke; Tom Wechsler
Cc: Belinda Crowe
Subject: Scheme report

All

I have been giving some thought again to how we might deal with what seem to be an increasing number of FoI requests in relation to the Scheme – a trend that I think will continue. I think that we have reached the stage at which we should consider making a decision now to publish a report on the Scheme when it ends.

Section 22 of FoIA exempts information if, at the time of the request for it the public authority intends to publish the information at some future date (whether determined or not) and in all the circumstances it is reasonable to withhold the information prior to publication. This is a qualified exemption therefore the public interest test must be considered.

My proposition is that we make a decision now to publish a report on the Scheme when all cases have been closed.

The contents of that report could include:

- Background to the establishment of the Scheme – why and how we did it set it up
- The Working Group – membership, ToRs, how it worked, number of meetings etc.
- Case information:

- o Applications received
 - o Number ineligible
 - o Number resolved prior to entry
 - o Number resolved prior to mediation
 - o Number SS recommended for mediation
 - o Number WG approved for mediation
 - o Number WG did not approve for mediation
 - o Number mediated
 - o Number where party declined to mediate
 - o Number of 'criminal conviction' cases
 - o Number of cases previously heard in the criminal courts
 - o Number of convictions appealed on the basis of information
 - o Number resolved at mediation
 - o Number not resolved at mediation
 - o Number of applicants with advisors
 - o Number of unrepresented applicants
 - o Number of different advisors
 - o Etc.etc. As many facts as possible .
- Finances
 - o Cost of Scheme ?
 - o Amount paid to advisors for CQRs (flat fee) per case and aggregated
 - o Amounts paid to advisors for attending mediation (flat fee) – per case and aggregated
 - o Amounts paid in expenses for attending mediation
 - o Financial resolution (aggregated amounts)
 - Our approach
 - o Where liable
 - o Where at fault
 - What we found
 - o No systemic problem with Horizon
 - What we did
 - o Branch improvement etc.

The aim would be to tell the story based on facts and figures.

In deciding exactly what goes into the report we could take account of questions we have been asked about the Scheme

Making this decision would allow us to:

- deal with Fol requests (subject to the PI test) on the basis that we plan to publish a report on the Scheme at its conclusion. We do not need to announce the decision (although we may wish to do so) – just make it.
- allow us to draw a line under this issue at the end
- put us on the front foot in terms of dealing with the inevitable spate of Fol requests we would get at the end
- show we are open and transparent and that our 'not giving a running commentary on the Scheme was really based on not undermining it
- take control of what happens at the end to ensure others do not seek to produce a report

There are risks. Anything we publish may give rise to further enquiries but we would not discuss individual cases. But if we don't tell the story, someone else will and we may as well do that proactively. For that reason I think we should consider this.

Grateful for views - subject to that I will think about how to put this to ExCo/Board to get a decision.

Best wishes
Belinda

Belinda Crowe
148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

GRO

Postline:

GRO

GRO