

**From:** Dave Pardoe[/O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=DAVID.PARDOE67BD3DF3-0E73-404F-A642-5ABB9DC3D83D]  
**Sent:** Tue 30/08/2011 8:54:34 AM (UTC)  
**To:** Allison Drake[GRO]; Andrew Wise[GRO]; Dave Posnett[GRO]; Jason G Collins[GRO]; John Longman[GRO]; Lesley Frankland[GRO]; Lisa Allen[GRO]; Paul Southin[GRO]; Sharron L Jennings[GRO]; Stuart Pilgrim[GRO]  
**Subject:** FW: Project Golden - process/issues arising from security training  
**Attachment:** GB Investigation Interview Structure.doc  
**Attachment:** SUMMARY OF CONDUCT PROCESSv4.doc

All, to note please; the Interview Structure must be followed. We need to approach these fact finds with consistency and cover the elements that our stakeholders wish to see addressed.

Huge thanks for this. My take is that we see what the volume of suspensions look like this week and then look at bringing on board, as required, more Security Managers to support.

Have a good one!

Regards

David Pardoe  
Senior Security Manager Physical Crime Strand  
Post Office Ltd, Security Team

GRO  
GRO  
GRO

Spread the word...  
**Grapevine** GRO  
...Stop the crime

Confidential Information: This e-mail message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorised review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact me by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

POST OFFICE

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

**From:** louise.bloomfield  
**Sent:** 29 August 2011 17:52  
**To:** Paul Meadows; Roger W Gale; Andrew J Thompson; Paul J White; Jayshree Patel; Ann Miller; Ali Piper; Dave Pardoe; Richard Z Walden; 'Alec Hughes'; Steve Holdbrook; Ruth H Barker; Paul Southin; Peter Emanuel  
**Subject:** Project Golden - process/issues arising from security training

Hi all

Further to the security training on Friday 26 August, which Jane Moore, Jayshree Patel, Ann Miller and I facilitated (along with Adam Furby from Reward with regards to the FS incentive scheme), a few points arose from the session which I wanted to highlight in this email. I have updated the Conduct Process document accordingly.

1. Firstly, it would appear that the security investigators have a great deal of information to absorb, and therefore it may not be feasible to hold the initial meetings with the suspended FSs on Thursday/Friday this week as envisaged. The FS should be given at least 48 hours notice of their meeting with the security investigator and before the initial meeting, the security investigator needs to be provided with the following:

- a. Full details of the MI report and the customer sales pertaining to each FS they are investigating;
- b. Call transcripts, together with details of the calls to be finalised, for the FS;
- c. The FS's Training and Development file which should be held in branch;
- d. The Customer Review Forms relating to the calls made (NB: as an aside, I recommend that these are scanned after completion to prevent someone going back and amending them);
- e. If the FS called the call centre for advice about the matter, the call details will need to be provided (this will only be necessary if the FS raises this in the investigation meeting);
- f. Details of any live disciplinary warnings and/or MUP (managing under-performance process) for each FS – **to be provided by HR**;
- g. Copies of suspension letters/invites to meetings from HRSC for each FS; and
- h. Details of what suspended people can/cannot do – i.e. they cannot go to branch, they cannot contact colleagues – **HR to confirm the wording**.

**How can the other details listed above be collated; who can take the lead on this please?**

2. In addition to these points, some additional tweaks have been made to the Investigation Guide (attached). Please note that this is not a script per se, but a guide as to the basics to be followed. The security investigator will need to adapt his/her questioning depending on the responses provided by the FS. **Dave/Paul S**– can you please ask the security investigators to add to/amend this where they feel it is necessary?
3. At the meeting on Friday, we reiterated that this is a Conduct Code investigation so if any criminality is suspected, the meeting with the FS should be adjourned and advice taken from the Project Team as to next steps.
4. If Branch managers (and above) are implicated during the investigation and it is necessary to commence an investigation into them, we need to address whether the relevant security investigators the correct grade to do this because the Conduct Code demands that investigations are carried out by those of a senior grade. If they are not, then I think we can justify this as it is only the investigation stage and the security team are trained to do so but I appreciate it is outside the Conduct Code and we should make the decision at the time.
5. Jayshree and her team **must** continue the calls relating the suspended FSs, not just those who are yet to be suspended. We need all of the evidence relating to those for whom disciplinary action is a potential option.
6. We need to be more joined up regarding accreditation suspensions because HR were not aware that these were being sent out separately from the standard suspension letters. We should tie these into the suspension letters and therefore the HRSC can co-ordinate this centrally.
7. The invite to investigation letters need to include that the individual should contact the Security Investigator to confirm attendance and give details of rep/colleague.
8. The security investigators will be provided with a template document for the minutes of the meeting. The notes of the meeting will need to be signed by the FS after the meeting has concluded.

As a general point, please can we be careful about producing documents relating to the FSs which detail the case against them without listing these as “potential allegations” or “subject to investigation”. All documents, which are not

subject to legal privilege, are capable of disclosure in any subsequent legal proceedings so we should not be producing anything which suggests guilt or possible disciplinary action to be taken until we are at such a time to do so.

If anyone has any additional comments/points, please do let me know.

Many thanks  
Louise

---

**Louise Bloomfield**

Principal Lawyer - Employment and Pensions Team  
Legal Services

**Royal Mail**

100 Victoria Embankment, London, EC4Y 0HQ



DDI:

GRO

postline:

GRO

mobile:

GRO



GRO

Web

[www.royalmail.com](http://www.royalmail.com)

**Confidential Information:** *This e-mail message is for the sole use of the intended recipient (s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact me by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.*

---