POL00130502

From: Kevin Gilliland[/O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=KEVIN.GILLILAND19520D27-808B-4112-9FF0-1E20FF5AF5B4]

Sent: Wed 05/02/2014 10:26:37 PM (UTC)

To: Alwen Lyons[GRO]

Cc: Chris Aujard[GRO]; Chris M Day[GRO]; Fay Healey[GRO]; Lesley J Sewell[GRO]; Mark R Davies[GRO]; Martin Edwards[GRO]; Martin George[GRO]; Nicholas Kennett[GRO]; Paula Vennells[GRO]; Neil Hayward[GRO]; Alwen Lyons[GRO]; Amanda A Brown[GRO]; Gina Gould[GRO]; Glenda C Hansen[GRO]; Helena Murray[GRO]; Jackie Meylak[GRO]; Jorja Preston[GRO]; Paula.Reed[GRO]; Ruth Phillips[GRO]; Sarah Paddison[GRO]; Suzanne Jolley[GRO]; Theresa Iles[GRO]; Tracy Cox[GRO]

Subject: Re: Prosecution Policy Paper

Attachment: image001.gif

Attachment: image002.png

Attachment: image003.png

Attachment: image004.png

Attachment: image005.png

Attachment: image006.png

Hi Alwen/Chris,

This is a big step in the right direction. I'm largely supportive of the policy but have a few observations/questions below:

Although the paper states that the civil recovery process is outside the scope of the paper, I'm assuming that if we reduced the number of prosecutions then these cases would be pursued through the civil courts? Therefore it would be useful to understand the recovery rate in the civil courts for comparison to the 46% through criminal prosecutions to help assess the overall impact on losses through the change of policy.

On 4.3 I agree that one of the filters should be the size of the loss - but building on my point above it needs to be linked to the civil recovery process. If it costs £7500 for each prosecution and we only recover 46% of our losses then it doesn't make commercial to pursue cases less than £20k - which ties in with the suggestion in the paper. The 25 cases at £15k could be pursued in the civil courts where necessary.

More generally, I think we need to try to quantify the commercial impact.

How much loss is associated with the stacked cases? A change in policy could present a different additional recovery risk for these cases because of their status.

Why is it 'best practice' to publish this policy on our web-site and where did we get this from eg who else does it?

On the chart at appendix a, it would be useful to add a line showing the losses for each year.

I hope this is helpful.

Regards,

K

Sent from my iPhone

> On 5 Feb 2014, at 13:44, "Alwen Lyons" <[GRO]> wrote:

POL00130502

>
> Please find attached a prosecutions policy paper from Chris A. We will have a full debate about this at the ExCo next week but because of the timing of the ARC on the 11th and the circulation of paper tomorrow, Chris would like you input asap.
>
> Specifically he needs sign off from Kevin, Neil and Chris D, before circulation to the ARC.
>
>
>
> Thanks
> Alwen
> Alwen Lyons I Company Secretary
>
> [Description: address]
>
> 148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ
>
> [Description: phone]
>
> GRO
>
> [Description: mobile]
>
> GRO
>
> [Description: email]
>
> alwen.lyons GRO
>
>
>
>
>
> [Description: footer]
>
>
>
>
>
> From: David Oliver1
> Sent: 05 February 2014 09:31
> To: Alwen Lyons
> Cc: Rodric Williams; Belinda Crowe; Chris Aujard
> Subject: Prosecution Policy Paper
>
> Alwen,
>
> On behalf of Chris Aujard please find attached a paper on Post Office's prosecution policy. Paula has asked if ExCo could consider this paper quickly as possible. Paula has also asked for Kevin Gilliland, Neil Hayward and Chris Day to explicitly sign off the paper.
>
> We need EXCO clearance to allow this paper to be amended and circulated to ARC in time for the 11 february meeting.
>
> Many thanks
>
> David
>
> David Oliver
> Programme Manager
> Initial Complaint and Mediation Scheme
> David.oliver1 GRO

POL00130502

> Mobile 07880 055 256
>
> <Prosecutions Policy Paper Feb 2014 CCA 04 02 14 FINAL.pdf>
> <image001.gif>
> <image002.png>
> <image003.png>
> <image004.png>
> <image005.png>
> <image006.png>