POL00117054

From: Mark R Davies GRO
Sent: Tue 27/01/2015 7:56:16 AM (UTC)
To: Patrick Bourke GRO Tom Wechsler GRO
Subject: Fwd: Options - comments

I'm going into the breach here. If I have gone too far please say now.

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: GRO

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Paula Vennells <GRO>
Date: 27 January 2015 07:51:22 GMT
To: Mark R Davies <GRO>
Subject: Re: Options - comments

Mark, let's talk.
How many of the SS reports have you personally read?
I'll call you shortly.
Paula

Paula Vennells
Chief Executive
Post Office Ltd

T: GRO
Paula.vennells GRO

Sent from my iPad

On 26 Jan 2015, at 21:07, Mark R Davies <GRO> wrote:

> Hi Paula
>
> I hope you don't think I am being too strong here, but I think Patrick's description of Second Sight is about right given their behaviour in recent weeks. They are, I am sure, colluding with JFSA rather than acting as independent players. I've never come across anything quite like this and I have challenged the team but, having done so, I'm now certain of it. Quite why this is the case I am not sure: perhaps their heads have been filled with the notoriety/attention they are getting, but I am afraid to say that there is coalition campaigning against us, and they are part of it.
>
> Mark

POL00117054

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: GRO

Sent from my iPad

On 26 Jan 2015, at 19:36, "Paula Vennells" <GRO> wrote:

> Hi Patrick, thanks for the work on this and do please excuse my notes below in haste - I hope they might be of some use. Numbering refers to the paras in the doc.
>
> Overall, this is exactly the format I was hoping for. Thank you. And of course, we might develop an option, which is a permutation of those you helpfully set out: worth flagging that as a potential outcome. A watch out: the paper clearly points to a conclusion. If that is the team's view, and I'm sure you have considered many variations, many times (!), fine... But let's be open to debate tomorrow.
>
> Some more detailed comments:
>
> • 3. didn't think it was possible to bring a 'group action'? This was Chris' view to the S/Ctte.
> • 4. I can see that there is truth in it, but worded as it is, this para leads to a conclusion of disbanding the scheme, before you have 'gamed' the options. More balance at this stage in the paper?
> • 5. can the summary of options be more balanced? Or offer pros and cons? Again, this leads to a conclusion. Alasdair is looking to debate the options first.
> • 5. "SS's impartiality is a fiction": this is too strong. I read a number of their reports over the weekend, they are mostly balanced and factual because they draw extensively on the PO investigation reports; where they lose independence is around recommendations to mediate, though not all.
>
> Thanks again.
> Paula
>
> Paula Vennells
> Chief Executive
> Post Office Ltd
>
> T: GRO
> Paula.vennells@ GRO

Paula Vennells
Chief Executive
Post Office Ltd

T: GRO

POL00117054

Paula.vennells GRO

Sent from my iPad

On 26 Jan 2015, at 15:35, Patrick Bourke
GRO wrote:

> Paula
>
> I gather from Gavin that you wanted early sight of the paper for discussion at tomorrow evening's meeting. It's very short, in line with Chris' wishes, and has an annex for each of the options, plus a matrix comparing them at them end.
>
> It's out for a second round of comments from others prior to circulation early tomorrow to attendees at tomorrow's meeting.
>
> I'd envisage a longer piece for a Sub Committee or Board discussion but you can take a view on that.
>
> Kind regards
>
> Patrick
>
> **Patrick Bourke**
> GRO
>
> <January Options - v4 - clean.docx>