

PS 14/16-14/18

POST OFFICE LTD

PROJECT SPARROW SUB-COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Project Sparrow Sub-Committee of the Board
held at 148 Old Street, London EC1V 9HQ on 6 June 2014

Present:	Alice Perkins (AP) Alasdair Marnoch (AM) Richard Callard (RC) Paula Vennells (PV) Chris Aujard (CA)	Chair Non-Executive Director Non-Executive Director CEO General Counsel
In Attendance:	Alwen Lyons (AL) Belinda Crowe (BC) Mark Davies (MD) David Oliver (DO) Martin Edward (ME)	Company Secretary Programme Director, Project Sparrow Communications Director Project Sparrow CEO Chief of Staff

PS 14/16

OPENING OF MEETING

A quorum being present, the Chair opened the meeting of the Project Sparrow Sub-Committee ("the Committee") and welcomed Mark Davies, Belinda Crowe, Chris Aujard, Martin Edwards and David Oliver.

PS 14/17

INITIAL COMPLAINTS REVIEW AND MEDIATION SCHEME – THE WAY FORWARD

- (a) The Committee received a paper on the current position of the mediation scheme, the progress to date and the associated risks and challenges.
- (b) The Committee discussed the three options set out in the paper with reference back to the three fundamental principles agreed by the Business for its approach to Sparrow:
 - to gain a fuller understanding of the facts;
 - to ensure a fair outcome; and
 - to highlight lessons learned so that improvements can be made to Business processes.
- (c) The Committee reviewed the status of the mediation scheme and the urgency of any decision if it meant moving away from the current position (Option 1). The Committee agreed that Option 3 would be its preferred option subject to the Minister's support and there being a low probability of a successful application for a Judicial Review. This would be recommended to the Board.
- (d) The Committee asked for a paper to the Board explaining the three options. The General Counsel was asked to ascertain the risk of a successful application for Judicial Review, the likelihood of it

ACTION:
Mark Davies/
Belinda Crowe/
General Counsel

succeeding and the additional costs of defending such an action.

(e) The Committee recommended to the Board that:

- Option 1 be rejected as untenable given the challenges it poses to the best interests of the Business and value for money.
- The Business is asked to take the case for Option 3 to the Minister, with detailed costs and an analysis of the likelihood of a Judicial Review.
- The Business draws up details stakeholder plans for options 2 and 3.
- In the event that Option 3 is not possible. The Programme team is asked to develop an approach which moves to Option 2, to be implemented as soon as the Minister has been briefed.

PS14/18

CLOSE