POL00101728

Message

From: Belinda Crowe [IMCEAEX-_O=MMS_OU=EXCHANGE+20ADMINISTRATIVE+20GROUP+20+28FYDIBOHF23SPDLT+29_CN=RECIPIENTS_CN=BELINDA+20CROWE79B93F11-569F-4526-A078-F5B4958A8917220@C72A47.ingest.local]
on behalf of Belinda Crowe <IMCEAEX-_O=MMS_OU=EXCHANGE+20ADMINISTRATIVE+20GROUP+20+28FYDIBOHF23SPDLT+29_CN=RECIPIENTS_CN=BELINDA+20CROWE79B93F11-569F-4526-A078-F5B4958A8917220@C72A47.ingest.local> [IMCEAEX-_O=MMS_OU=EXCHANGE+20ADMINISTRATIVE+20GROUP+20+28FYDIBOHF23SPDLT+29_CN=RECIPIENTS_CN=BELINDA+20CROWE79B93F11-569F-4526-A078-F5B4958A8917220@C72A47.ingest.local]
Sent: 09/12/2014 00:16:02
To: Melanie Corfield GRO; Mark R Davies GRO; Patrick Bourke GRO; Tom Wechsler GRO; Ruth X Barker GRO
CC: Belinda Crowe GRO
Subject: Re: Line

Hi Mel
I too will try to get there at 7. I agree with all your points and on the number 90 pc I agree its ok to say don't know where that came from and don't recognise the figure.

Re many others I agree we should say we are not aware of many others falling outside the Scheme.

I think generally if they ask why we don't recognise a lot of what JA has said we can only say that we are not aware of where. They are getting their info from and cannot commen on it.

Best wishes
Belinda

GRO

----- Original Message -----
From: Melanie Corfield
Sent: Tuesday, December 09, 2014 12:07 AM
To: Mark R Davies; Belinda Crowe; Patrick Bourke; Tom Wechsler; Ruth X Barker
Subject: RE: Line

Mark

I've spoken with Ruth and I will come to BBC while she monitors media in office and feeds it through to us. Will be there at 7am. Think the line is good and also agree Ruth's amends. I think you can also say at relevant point: With due respect to MPs, we have to deal with all the facts and substance of each individual case which are all very different and which they do not have all the details about.

Other points (forgive me if already discussed/ agreed): We must knock down the "refusal to mediate 90% of cases" if we can and I suggest you say (subject to Belinda's agreement - we must not be hostage to fortune) : That is not true, I do not recognise that. I am not going to break the confidentiality by getting into detail about the scheme but every case is being considered on its facts and substance and the scheme is still continuing. (If we mention that some cases resolved there is a risk you will get pressed on how many and how they were resolved and get drawn into too much detail on the scheme)

Re: accusation that there are "many people" who fell outside the scheme, no chance to be heard: Need to nip in bud any suggestion that there are still thousands out there, but you have Angela's note re steps we have taken (and it simply untrue to suggest that there alot of cases put forward that were not allowed into the scheme or that there are lots of unsatisfied complaints about Horizon)

On agreeing for MPs to meet SS I assume you will knock this away with reflecting on points of detail that have only just been made to us.

The context numbers will also be useful re your line below.....since Horizon introduced nearly half a million subpostmasters and employees have been using it.

I think the rebuttals and other docs has everything covered but we can run through in morning and, after Today prog, discuss next steps with any other media requests.

Mel

POL00101728

From: Mark R Davies
Sent: 08 December 2014 21:38
To: Belinda Crowe; Patrick Bourke; Tom Wechsler; Ruth X Barker; Melanie Corfield
Subject: Line

Just talked it through with the researcher who said what they hear about cases is "kafkaesque". I agree but they didnt mean it as good for us.

They believe that we do lots of awful things which force people to lose money and their homes etc...

On this I will say:

"I can't talk about individual cases. Indeed it is a shame being asked to do so when we have a scheme agreed by all set up to examine.

"But I just must challenge your assertion and ask this. As a retail business we conduct audits of our branches. Nothing unusual in that. So in the imaginary case where we find a substantial loss, what are we to do? Turn a blind eye? Or investigate?

"I think I know the answer most people would give particularly as SPMRs are entrusted with the money of the public.

"Now not going to talk about individual cases but I do ask you to mull on that"

Ok?

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: GRO

Sent from my iPhone