

Message

From: Kevin Gilliland [REDACTED] **GRO**
on behalf of Kevin Gilliland [REDACTED] **GRO**
Sent: 08/07/2012 18:59:49
To: Paula Vennells [REDACTED] **GRO**
Subject: Fwd: James Arbuthnot correspondence

Further to the earlier email.....

Regards,

K

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kevin Gilliland [REDACTED] **GRO**
Date: 8 July 2012 19:43:31 GMT+01:00
To: Alice Perkins [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]
Cc: Glenda C Hansen [REDACTED] **GRO**
Subject: Re: James Arbuthnot correspondence

Thanks Alice,

I've already fed back to the team that the draft wasn't acceptable and ensured that they were involved and responsible for the re-draft (as part of the learning process).

Best wishes,

Kevin

Sent from my iPhone

On 8 Jul 2012, at 18:53, "Alice Perkins" [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED] wrote:

Kevin,

First of all, thank you so much for the trouble you have taken on this. I am very grateful and sorry that you were at this so late on Friday.

The letter is transformed. And I understand much better, thank you.

I do think it would be brilliant if the correspondence team could adopt your draft as their template - it is so much more positive and understandable than the draft I was given. Could you do what you can on that front please?

Glenda, I have a small number of tiny changes to suggest to this letter which I will bring with me on Tuesday when I'm in.

All the best

Alice

----- Original Message -----

From: Kevin Gilliland [REDACTED] **GRO**
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2012 08:20 PM
To: Alice Perkins
Cc: Glenda C Hansen [REDACTED] **GRO**
Subject: RE: James Arbuthnot correspondence

Hi Alice,

I'm sorry we didn't get a chance to discuss this on Wednesday. I've now seen the draft letter and arranged for some suggested changes to be made (please see attached for your approval).

To pick up on your specific points:

The local model works best when it is integrated into an existing retail business such as a convenience store, where customers can access their retail goods and Post Office services at the same time. For this model to be attractive to retailers it is important that Post Office transactions are simple so that staff behind the counter can focus on serving customers quickly and efficiently. To achieve this, transactions need to be automated and require no end of day processing otherwise operators believe this will lead to their staff making errors and losses, (hence why most convenience retailers will no longer accept cheques).

The vast majority of banking transactions are available in our local branches. All automated banking transactions are available (including the Post Office Card Account service which enables customers to withdraw pensions and benefits payments) as well as enveloped cheque deposits for banking customers (which is a service we've recently added to the model).

Manual banking deposits are not available in local branches however these are low in volume (typically less than 2 per day in a local branch). Our main client for manual banking transactions is Santander who have a number of their customers continuing to use the manual transcash service and holding supplies of these 'paying in' forms. Santander recognise the need to automate this transaction and as stocks of forms are gradually depleted, customers will be required to move onto an automated solution.

In addition, the local model does not accept cheques as a method of payment, (for the reasons outlined above) except as payment for DVLA car tax discs (and now enveloped cheque deposits. However, as the banking cheque guarantee card scheme is no longer in operation the number of cheques presented as payment in a typical local will be very low at less than 1 per day.

The roll out of new pin pads across the Post Office estate is expected to be completed by late Autumn and will allow contactless payment to be accepted in all Local branches, further enhancing both the efficiency and customer experience in the local model.

I hope this makes sense but please let me know if it doesn't or you require further information.

Best regards,

Kevin

-----Original Message-----

From: Alice Perkins [REDACTED] **GRO** [REDACTED]

Sent: 04 July 2012 08:30

To: Kevin Gilliland

Subject: James Arbuthnot correspondence

Hi Kevin,

I'm not sure whether you are aware that James A has written to me about Odiham in his constituency.

I decided to reply personally for obvious reasons.

I saw a draft reply yesterday which didn't really answer the questions re lack of a facility to do business banking and tax discs. I've asked them to have another go at it but it has left me confused about the locals offer. I thought we had a solution to handling cheques but I was told yesterday that that was only agreed in relation to tax discs, not more generally in relation to business banking.

If we get a minute perhaps we could have a separate word about this this morning?

Thanks

Alice

This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. www.websense.com

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 and then delete this email from your system.

ROYAL MAIL GROUP LIMITED registered in England and Wales at 100
VICTORIA EMBANKMENT, LONDON EC4Y 0HQ with the registered
company number 04138203

POST OFFICE LIMITED registered in England and Wales at 148 OLD STREET,
LONDON EC1V 9HQ with the registered company number 02154540

