

Message

From: Mark R Davies [REDACTED] **GRO**
on behalf of [REDACTED] **GRO**
Sent: 07/07/2013 07:27:34
To: Paula Vennells [REDACTED] **GRO**
Subject: Re: Proposed way forward

Hi Paula

Could we have a word at some point today to discuss this, and specifically how far we go in terms of the wording below? I'm sending this just to you at this stage.

I am very concerned that we may get to a position where we go so far in our commitments that we actually fuel the story and turn it into something bigger than it is. I am not at all complacent about the issues, but there is real danger in going too far in commitments about past cases.

I say this for two reasons:

- first the substance of the report doesn't justify this response. Indeed the report is at such a level that our current media strategy would mean there would be some coverage, but not very much (the usual suspects). If we say publicly that we will look at past cases (and whatever we say to JA or JFSA will be public) whether from recent history or going further back, we will open this up very significantly, into front page news. In media terms it becomes mainstream, very high profile. It would also give JA a very strong case for asking for a Parliamentary statement from BIS.

- my second concern is the impact that this would have more broadly. It would have the "ballistic" impact which AB fears. It could lead to a very public narrative about the very nature of the business, raising questions about Horizon (the reality of what SS has found would be misunderstood) and having an impact on public views about the PO and really widening the issue to the whole network.

The SS report would become irrelevant: in media terms it is the impression which counts (I was talking to the BBC's comms director last night about very similar issues), and the impression would be of a PO which doesn't have confidence/trust in its systems or processes, with the impact that could have on customer views of us.

I re read the SS report last night. It is a poor piece of work, but its over-riding finding is to support Horizon and urge us to improve our processes. But there isn't cause in there to question confidence in us. We can manage this in media terms in such a way that it doesn't escalate into a bigger issue, while having the right conversations with AB and JA.

Perhaps we can speak later?

Mark
Sent from my iPad

On 6 Jul 2013, at 22:46, "Paula Vennells" [REDACTED] **GRO** wrote:

Hi, thank you for the inputs today. Susan I need your thoughts on the note below especially 1) and 2) please and the questions at the end of the mail.

I think we have the following which is a variant:

- 1) a working party over the next three/four months. This comprises PO working collaboratively with the JFSA and does three things:
 - Firstly explores the SS (8) themes for improvement (can we get less than 8?) and agrees how they can be implemented.

- Secondly, looks at the remaining past cases with JFSA (and MPs if they wish) to see if either further themes or new evidence emerge.
- Thirdly, our external lawyers review all prosecutions in the past 12/18 months since PO has been independent of RM, in the light of the SS findings. The JFSA/PO working group reviews the findings. [Why would they not review all cases of false accounting, eg., over the last 5-10 years, especially where the amounts have been 'small'? I assume 'large' amounts would be less likely to get away with saying they were muddle-headed and not helped? But could we review all? It is the false accounting charge JA was most concerned about.]
- Does the working party update JA in the autumn?

2) setting up of a review (chaired by PB/MO'C type) again via joint working between PO and JFSA, to determine how an independent safety net might be introduced ie., a commitment to an independent adjudicator or (non-statutory) ombudsman and the clear intention to agree scope and ToR.

3) the future introduction of an ongoing branch user group, once the working party has completed it's task. This will ensure ongoing independent involvement of Spmrs/(inc JFSA if they would like) to ensure the business listens to and acts upon issues as they arise; and as importantly, consults users on future systems planning and changes.

[4) a statement that although the system has been proved to have no systemic issues, and our training, support processes and helplines have worked for most of the 50-60000 colleagues over the past decade, we are nonetheless genuinely sorry that some of our Spmrs, who were struggling did not feel we offered them sufficient help and support when they needed it. And that we are grateful to JFSA and JA for highlighting the issues. Many are historic and already improved but we are always open to new ways to improve how we do business to ensure the PO stays as trusted and effective in its communities as it ever was.]

Last thought: if we can draft this into something I could send to Alan Bates 'in confidence', it would get us to a better place in agreeing the press statement and way through with JA on Monday. Could Martin try and corral views into a draft by Sunday early pm? The more I speak with him the better I feel it will be.

Susan, would we ever ask the lawyers to consider reviewing past prosecutions? Is that what we are talking about in 1) above but simply not using the terms? If not, why would it be different? Of our 500 prosecutions, how many are false accounting? (For clarity these are open questions - just want to know the answers, not an indication that I want us to do so.)

Thanks, Paula

Sent from my iPad

On 6 Jul 2013, at 21:08, "Martin Edwards"  **GRO** wrote:

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 separate 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
[redacted]
GRO

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

I think that is the working group (number 2 below).

Sent from my iPad

On 6 Jul 2013, at 17:53, "Alwen Lyons" [redacted] GRO [redacted] 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
[redacted]
GRO

Sent from Blackberry

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

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 being 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

^{GRO} wrote:

Hello

Paula

I
underst
and the
meetin
g with
James
Arbuth
not
went
well on
Friday
and I
believe
he will
be
discussi
ng his
views
with
me on
Monda
y
mornin
g.

I am
sure
you will

agree
that it
is
importa
nt that
we
have
even an
outline
docum
ent of
the
propos
ed way
forward
we
have
discuss
ed,
before
the
MPs'
meetin
g. As
soon as
it is
availabl
e, I
would
appreci
ate
seeing
your
version
of what
is
propos
ed,
hopeful
ly
amend
ed to
address
the
comme

nt
below.

Looking
through
my
notes
from
our last
convers
ation,
there is
an early
item of
concern
, that
being
the
name
of the
panel
which
you
referre
d to as
the
'user
group'.
Whilst I
can
appreci
ate you
want
such a
group
to
continu
e on
into the
future,
at
which
time
such a
name
may be
suitable

. Initiall
y, and
whilst it
is also
looking
at the
issues
surroun
ding
the
report
and the
cases,
possibly
'task
group'
or
'workin
g party'
might
be
more
accurat
e, as
technic
ally, 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
accepta
ble.

Regardi
ng
Monda
y 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
accomp
any
me. Wi
th
travel
arrange
ment to
finalise,
I would
appreci
ate a
respons
e to
that
point as
soon as
you are
able to

let me
know.

Regards

Alan