
From: Melanie Corfield[/O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=MELANIE CORFI1DE623C2-38B2-49FB-AE9A-12E4B20D626720C]
Sent: Thur 09/04/2015 5:38:29 PM (UTC)
To: Mark R Davies; GRO
Cc: Patrick Bourke; GRO; Ruth X Barker; GRO
Subject: Re: Second Sight's final report

Thanks Mark

Yes of course re letting you have summary tomorrow - I will pull together.

I will leave Patrick to respond re legal and Jane's view (Jane is away until next week so I think her opportunities to assess will have been limited). But I think we need to be a bit cautious re going back to SS again on it because of (a) timescales and (b) potential allegations we have pressured them to change it. We address it all in our full response to the report and our cover letter (both in draft) that we do not endorse it and, in the full response we spell out why.

But Patrick can provide more re current view from Andy Parsons I think re legal. We are around if you want a call tomorrow.

Mel

Mel Corfield
Communications Team
Mobile: GRO

From: Mark R Davies
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2015 05:41 PM
To: Melanie Corfield
Cc: Patrick Bourke; Ruth X Barker
Subject: Re: Second Sight's final report

Hi

Thanks

I think we need a summary of the key points to be sent to the whole GE: AI in particular will want to see the element about suspense accounts.

I would also like to have a sense as to any legal avenues we might have here: surely given the inaccuracies we can take control and not allow what as you say is clearly an attempt to use language rather than fact to paint an untrue picture?

I think Exco will want to see the summary and the report and possible steps we could take before we agree to send it out.

Is it possible to have a summary tomorrow?

Paula will want to see the report in full and I don't think that a bad thing as it will underline resolve.

What is Jane view?

Mark

Mark Davies

Communications and Corporate Affairs Director

GRO

On 9 Apr 2015, at 17:16, Melanie Corfield GRO wrote:

Yes, apologies, they probably just need summary, happy to craft from below.
SS have toned down the prosecutions stuff but they have left sufficient for media to run with 'investigators say may be miscarriages of justice'. We do of course have a strong rebuttal because external lawyers - as opposed to accountants - have reviewed!
The key thing will be for us to keep our cool stance to avoid any revivals of interest, now that interest has been whittled away. But it's possible that we could see a day with some stories in wider media - I think that would be the worst scenario, no legs to take it further.
Mel

From: Patrick Bourke
Sent: 09 April 2015 17:01
To: Melanie Corfield; Mark R Davies
Cc: Ruth X Barker
Subject: RE: Second Sight's final report

Mel

Many thanks.

I do just wonder whether AP and PV actually need the report itself or whether the heads up from Mark would be sufficient ? Mark - views ?

Also, they have toned down the language on prosecutions.

All the best

Patrick

From: Melanie Corfield
Sent: 09 April 2015 16:54
To: Mark R Davies
Cc: Ruth X Barker; Patrick Bourke
Subject: Second Sight's final report

Hi Mark

I attach Second Sight's final P2 report. I have highlighted the key paras that I think will form the media narrative. The report is clearly written with other audiences in mind and there are several carefully crafted phrases to undermine our statements that there are no systemic flaws and that our prosecutions have been carried out correctly. There is also an angle we have not previously faced externally - the suspense account and the suggestion that Post Office could be profiting from money that might have been due to postmasters (they have used some big numbers).

As discussed yesterday, the report is still planned to go out to applicants on Tuesday together with a full Post Office response. ***Can you let me know how you want to get the report to Paula and Alice (I can draft a note for you, giving the flavour and likely media when this leaks)? We think they should have it asap and then note to Board & Exco next week as discussed (will send you draft note for that). Our approach re media will be as discussed - measured reactive statement on reality re continuing mediations etc and not getting into point by point (I will be circulating latest draft material tomorrow).***
I am not in the office tomorrow but working from home if need to speak.

Key points of Report(not all as explicit in the report as I have described below, but how I think media will use content):

- POL has been obstructive - closure of working group, deadline for report before investigations complete and refusal to hand over important documents & information
- New information might come to light through cases they have not yet reviewed - SS suggest a potential supplementary report (not going to happen)
- Underlying issues in the report **could apply to much wider group of postmasters**
- Prosecution process focussed on debt recovery not justice - could be misconduct by prosecutors
- Charges not always supported by necessary degree of evidence/ **decisions to prosecute may have been contrary to Code for Crown Prosecutors**
- Agreements whereby no mention was to be made in Court, by the defendant, of any criticism of the Horizon system
- Post Office/ Fujitsu did have and might still have ability to alter branch records without knowledge of postmasters
- Post Office potentially profiting through money in suspense account that could due to postmasters (big numbers quoted that could make headlines)
- **Horizon's failure to record transactions correctly**
- Horizon not universally fit for purpose and "**can be systemically flawed from a user's perspective**"
- Unfair postmaster contracts that have been increasingly transferring risk
- No incentive for Post Office to improve because postmasters have to pay

On the (rather limited) plus side:

- Investigations have shown that the majority of branch losses were caused by errors at the counter
- The most commonly reported issue was complaints about Training and Support (some concerns in report were raised by fewer than 15 people)

Mel Corfield
Communications Team
1st Floor - Old Street
Mobile: GRO