

To: Paula Vennells[**GRO**]
Cc: Martin Edwards[**GRO**]; David Oliver1[**GRO**]; Chris Aujard[**GRO**]; Mark R Davies[**GRO**]; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd[**GRO**]
From: Mark R Davies[**GRO**]
Sent: Mon 24/03/2014 11:15:10 PM (UTC)
Subject: Re: Question about the briefing

Hi

I think that particular issue was handled well at the meeting - it was never going to satisfy Mike Wood, but both Paula and Chris stuck clearly and credibly to the line, and I think most people in the room accepted it, if not welcomed it.

I will prepare a note of the meeting.

Cheers

Mark

Sent from my iPad

On 24 Mar 2014, at 20:06, "Paula Vennells" <[**GRO**]> wrote:

Hi both, thanks for this. It was impossible to avoid it as Mike Wood MP insisted (several times and several different tacks) on asking the question. Both Chris and I said we were v sorry but couldn't be drawn on it; when he said that meant we were ruling it out, I corrected him and said it was not ruled out by the scheme but that the scheme had been set up to resolve disputes and cases would be reviewed individually. Kay was helpful in underlining this.

Mark/Chris, anything you want to add?

Mark, as the observer could you drop a view on the overall content and how it was handled? Probably helpful to have this prior to the Board?

Finally, my thanks to Angela and to Chris who were professional and credible.
Paula

Sent from my iPad

On 24 Mar 2014, at 17:31, "Martin Edwards" <[**GRO**]> wrote:

See below - compensation was mentioned in the scheme documentation. If this comes up I guess the line is that we'll judge each case on its merits, taking into account the interests of the spmr, the business and the taxpayer.

From: David Oliver1
Sent: Monday, March 24, 2014 04:04 PM
To: Martin Edwards; Mark R Davies; Chris Aujard; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd
Cc: Ruth X Barker; Sophie Bialaszewski
Subject: Question about the briefing

Martin,

The reason the line was drafted in that way is that given the forthcoming discussions with the Board if Paula could avoid talking about any form of payment that would be ideal and would minimise difficulties going forward. That said below is the text from the Scheme FAQs which does mention

Compensation as a possibility.

Belinda was keen to try and avoid talking about compensation (or indeed any outcome) and stick to the process as far as possible and draw it back to the realistic of position of both the Post Office and the applicant.

D

How might my case be resolved?

The advantage of mediation is that the parties can agree any solution that is legal, realistic and enforceable. Post Office is keeping an open mind to all possibilities for resolution.

Compensation is one possible solution that could be agreed by the parties but this will depend on what happened in your case.

If a resolution is reached by the parties, then this is likely to be drawn up into a formal settlement agreement for you to sign.

David Oliver
Programme Manager
Initial Complaint and Mediation Scheme

GRO