

Message

From: Mark R Davies [REDACTED]
on behalf of Mark R Davies [REDACTED]
Sent: 10/04/2015 08:24:33
To: Alisdair Cameron [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED]
CC: Jane MacLeod [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED] Neil Hayward [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED] Paula Vennells [REDACTED]
Subject: GRO [REDACTED]; Rod Ismay [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED]
Re: Sparrow

Thanks Al - very helpful. And yes, undoubtedly wilful misunderstanding I am afraid.

Mark

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
GRO

> On 10 Apr 2015, at 09:22, Alisdair Cameron [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED] wrote:

> Thanks, hugely frustrating that they have misunderstood (wilfully?) what we have told them. I gave Mark and the team some rebuttal words yesterday, being

> The balances of £96m and £66m were routine trading balances yet to be settled with the other organisation at that particular month end. In other words, they represent amounts due not amounts that are unreconciled. This description is therefore misleading. As previously reported to SS, the statistic that gives genuine comfort is that neither account had any unreconciled balances which were over six months old. If the client accounts were being operated as an alternative suspense account, this would not be the case. Taking this with the work previously shared on the suspense account, we can see no evidence for any ongoing concern.

> Rod Ismay has all the detailed understanding if you need more help next week.

> Not sure I can add much more at this point....but we can and should be able to defend our position: there is no evidence of issues.....

> A1

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Mark R Davies

> Sent: 10 April 2015 09:04

> To: Alisdair Cameron

> Cc: Jane MacLeod; Neil Hayward

> Subject: Sparrow

> A1

> I am conscious that you are away next week and Sparrow is likely to rear its head again, and there could be focus on suspense accounts.

> We received Second Sight's part 2 report yesterday. It is flawed and inaccurate, and will inevitably leak (unless we publish proactively alongside a rebuttal, which I am considering as an option).

> On suspense accounts, the report, which I can forward to you if you wish, claims that Post Office is potentially profiting through money in suspense account that could be due to postmasters (big numbers are quoted that could make headlines).

> I am planning to send a summary of the report to GE later today, but wanted to give you an early heads up. I can forward the full report if you wish. I have also asked for an assessment of any legal options open to us.

> The risk for us is that it will leak and be sensationalised by journalists. It is probably a one day story, but it has the potential, because of the nature of the claims, to attract wider coverage than in March [there are also lines about PO potentially committing an abuse of power in bringing prosecutions].

> Please let me know if you would like to see the full report.

> Mark

> Mark Davies

> Communications and Corporate Affairs Director

> Mobile: GRO [REDACTED]

> Sent from my iPad

POL00102389
POL00102389

POL-0101972