POL00099050

Message

From: Martin Edwards GRO
on behalf of GRO
Sent: 06/07/2013 20:08:25
To: Mark R Davies GRO
CC: Alwen Lyons GRO; Mark R Davies GRO Paula Vennells GRO; Lesley J Sewell GRO; Susan Crichton GRO; Theresa Iles GRO
Subject: Re: Proposed way forward

Hmm, the boundaries between these groups are getting quite blurred and confusing (at least in my mind!).

I thought the focus of the working group involving the JFSA would be primarily thematic (i.e. the 8 or so themes which emerged from the SS process) - rather than focussing on resolving specific cases, which we would pick up through the seperate 1:1 briefings with MPs. The description below appears to shift it more towards the latter. Perhaps this is an academic distinction which we can't sustain in practice, but it certainly feels like safer territory to have the JFSA focussing on themes to do with training and support (which would then morph into the branch user forum) rather than individual cases...

Or have I misunderstood?

We also need to think about how the review of past cases by our external lawyers plays into the messaging (if at all). Certainly not something we would put in our proactive media statement I would have thought, but would we refer to this in meetings as an avenue if pushed by MPs or the JFSA?

Martin

Martin Edwards
Chief of Staff to the Chief Executive
Post Office
GRO

On 6 Jul 2013, at 18:18, "Mark R Davies" GRO wrote:

> I think that is the working group (number 2 below).
>
> Sent from my iPad
>
> On 6 Jul 2013, at 17:53, "Alwen Lyons" GRO wrote:
>
> > I think the only thing that is missing from James' agenda maybe not Alan's is what we do about past cases to scorch the suggestion os unfair convictions
> >
> > Thanks
> > Alwen
> >
> > Alwen Lyons
> > Company Secretary
> > GRO
> >
> > Sent from Blackberry

POL00099050

From: Mark R Davies
Sent: Saturday, July 06, 2013 04:46 PM
To: Paula Vennells
Cc: Martin Edwards; Mark R Davies; Lesley J Sewell; Susan Crichton; Alwen Lyons; Theresa Iles
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" <GRO> wrote:

> FYI and for any thoughts pls
> Paula
> Sent from my iPad
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
> **From:** Paula Vennells
> GRO
> **Date:** 6 July 2013 10:35:03 BST

POL00099050

To: Alan Bates GRO
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" <GRO> 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'

POL00099050

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