
From: Callard Richard (ShEx)/[O=BIS PRODUCTION/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=EF0FA57983304064B518D3B87774A899-RCALLARD]
Sent: Mon 08/02/2016 8:43:24 AM (UTC)
To: Devitt Stephen (Legal B) ([REDACTED] GRO)
Cc: Manson Justin (ShEx) ([REDACTED] GRO)
Subject: FW: Extraordinary Meeting of the Post Office Limited Board - 09 Feb 2016
Attachment: TRINITY Board Report February 09 FINAL.pdf

Hi Stephen

As you may have guessed, the further call last week on the POL IT issue did not happen. The attached paper (issued for a Board call tomorrow) might explain that, as there appears to have been a change of direction, and I wondered if I could ask for your views on it today? The paper itself is long-ish (25 pages) but some of it is more technical in nature and probably isn't as relevant. In short, what they are going to do is put an OJEU out saying they are going to award an extension to Fujitsu for 3 years (from 2018 to 2021) with two further one year extensions allowed, and will be relying on s72 of the procurement regs (which takes any challenge period down from 6 months to 30 days).

This would seem to me to be a better option on the basis that:

- We are being more upfront with people – we are saying “this is what we are going to do, and we think we have these decent reasons why we don't think a challenge is worthwhile”, versus “we're going out to competition, and nudge nudge, don't bid”.
- If we are challenged, we are challenged fast, and the award is unwound – I would be interested in your views as to whether that reduces the penalty for damages and reduces legal risk generally, but it would seem that logically it would.

Clearly they need a contingency plan if they are challenged, and I will ask them about that, but on the assumption that they aren't this seems to offer the best way through. Do you agree?

I would also like to get your views on the issue of malfeasance in public office. If we go down the path above, to what extent am I and other directors exposed (I would like to understand risks, penalties, defences etc).

It would be really helpful if we could speak today if possible – apologies for the short notice but as you can see the paper was only issue late Friday afternoon when I was already out at meetings at that point and I didn't really clock it until the evening.

Many thanks

Richard

From: Samantha Andrews [mailto:[REDACTED] GRO]
Sent: 05 February 2016 16:09
To: Callard Richard (ShEx); Tim Franklin; Ken McCall ([REDACTED] GRO); Carla Stent ([REDACTED] GRO); Paula Vennells; Alisdair Cameron; Alwen Lyons; Tim Parker; Virginia Holmes ([REDACTED] GRO)
Subject: Extraordinary Meeting of the Post Office Limited Board - 09 Feb 2016

Dear All,

Please see attached the first paper for the Extraordinary Board Meeting on the 9th February 2016. This paper is available on Boardpad.

A further two papers are to follow. The first is legally privileged and will be issued today. The second will be issued on Monday.

Kind regards,

Sam



Samantha Andrews
Assistant Company Secretary

First Floor, Finsbury Dials
20 Finsbury Street
London
EC2Y 9AQ



[samantha.andrews](mailto:samantha.andrews@gro.gov.uk) **GRO**

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use, disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you have received this in error, please contact the sender by reply email and then delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540. Registered Office: Finsbury Dials, 20 Finsbury Street, London EC2Y 9AQ.

This email was received from the INTERNET.

Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes.
