

Message

From: Matthew Fielden [GRO]
on behalf of Matthew Fielden [GRO]
Sent: 07/08/2014 07:41:15
To: Parsons, Andrew [GRO]; Belinda Crowe [GRO]; Chris Aujard [GRO]; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO]
Subject: RE: Project Sparrow [BD-4A.FID20472253]

Andy,

Thanks, I have scanned the draft letter and Linklaters points off mobile and read Part 2 and associated emails in detail yesterday. Happy to support drafting and proofing etc.

I agree with an initial holding response today flagging methodological and content concerns followed by further more detailed response.

Matthew

[GRO]

Sent from my Windows Phone

From: Parsons, Andrew [GRO]
Sent: 06/08/2014 22:03
To: Belinda Crowe [GRO]; Chris Aujard [GRO]; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO]
Cc: Matthew Fielden [GRO]
Subject: RE: Project Sparrow [BD-4A.FID20472253]

Belinda

Please find attached my working draft of the response to Part 2. I've incorporated the key points from Linklaters in the covering letter.

You'll see there are few issues where we need more information and I need to incorporate a number of the points that POL have fired through in the last day or so. (It also needs a good check for typos but my eyes are getting weary!)

Happy to chat through tomorrow.

Kind regards
Andy

Andrew Parsons
Senior Associate
for and on behalf of Bond Dickinson LLP
[cid:image001.jpg@01CE3A00.C5D848A0]<http://www.bond dickinson.com/>

[GRO]

Follow Bond Dickinson:

[cid:image006.jpg@01CE4584.3F945B50]<https://twitter.com/Bond_Dickinson> [cid:image007.jpg@01CE4584.3F945B50]<http://www.linkedin.com/company/3098928?trk=tyah>

www.bonddickinson.com<http://www.bonddickinson.com/>

From: Belinda Crowe [GRO]
Sent: 06 August 2014 21:18
To: Chris Aujard; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Parsons, Andrew
Cc: Belinda Crowe
Subject: Fwd: Project Sparrow

Please see below from Linklaters. My aim would be to write to SS tomorrow making as many of these points as are relevant as a placeholder for a more detailed response later.

I would also want to make the point that SS have been engaged continuously by Post office since 2012 and we would have expected that over that time they would have had sufficient opportunity to provide a more substantive analysis than contained in the report.

I would also want to make the point that the challenge over lack of facts/evidence/context is one we have made a number of times. It is taking up considerable time and resource within Post Office to comment on and provide input into products we are paying SS to deliver.

Andy, would we be able to sit down tomorrow to draft this together?

Chris, I understand you may be picking up some emails and if so many have a view on approach.

Best wishes
Belinda

Belinda Crowe

GRO
GRO
GRO

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Swil, Jonathan" GRO
Date: 6 August 2014 19:32:11 BST
To: "Belinda Crowe" GRO

GRO
"Rodric Williams"
>
Cc: "David Oliver" GRO
GRO
"Band, Christa"

Subject: RE: Project Sparrow
Dear Belinda and Rodric

We have considered Second Sight's draft thematic report - part two (the final version Belinda sent us yesterday). As discussed with Belinda, we set out some general, preliminary observations about the report and Post Office's relationship with Second Sight. We also set out some more detailed preliminary comments on the report's content, focussing, as requested, in particular on the section concerning the Subpostmaster contract.

• We note at the outset that the report illustrates a broader concern about Second Sight's role within the Scheme and its relationship with Post Office. Pursuant to the engagement letter dated 1 July 2014 (the "Engagement Terms"), Second Sight are engaged by Post Office and are paid by Post Office to provide services to the Working Group and Post Office in respect of the Scheme. Ideally, therefore, they would only perform work when and as required and directed by Post Office or the Working Group. Given how poor the standard of the report is (as discussed below), and Second Sight's track record in this regard, we think now might be an appropriate time to take as much control over Second Sight's role within the Scheme as possible. For example, ordinarily, it would not be for Second Sight to dictate the timeframes in which responses to their reports should be received. Indeed, in the ordinary course, in our view, the work generated by Second Sight to date, and even just this report alone, would justify the termination of their engagement. But we appreciate that there are other considerations in this case - such as pressure on and from the Working Group not to be seen to delay the complaint assessment process any longer and public commitments given to persist with Second Sight - which mean Post Office does not feel it has the flexibility it perhaps should to direct Second Sight or to take more serious steps. We think, however, that Post Office should now seriously consider taking whatever further steps it sensibly can to "rein" them in.

In the same vein, we also suggest re-approaching the Chairman of the Working Group to seek his support to help control Second Sight, or at least letting him know what Post Office intends to do so that he is kept abreast of its position and a mature dialogue with him can be established on this issue. Again, we appreciate this may be difficult to achieve in practice given the position the Chairman has taken to date, but suggest it may well be worth another attempt, in light of the quality of this report, the harm it might cause to Post Office's position if published to Applicants in its current form and the prospect of the present difficulties with Second Sight persisting in future.

• The report is well below the standard we would expect of a firm of "experienced accountants" engaged to prepare an independent, evidence-based report. As with Second Sight's previous work-product, the report largely fails to draw conclusions from any of the issues which it identifies and seeks to explore, and those conclusions it does draw do not appear to be based on any facts or evidence available to Second Sight. It also opines on issues and facts on which Second Sight are not qualified to opine, or are not reasonably within their remit i.e. because they are not sufficiently connected with Horizon. Plainly, the report does not serve Post Office's interests. From a wider perspective and perhaps more importantly, the report does nothing to advance the Applicants' positions either or assist the satisfactory operation of the Scheme. It will create even more unrealistic expectations and make settlement or other resolution of claims even harder. This point should be made clear to the Working Group, and the Chairman in particular, in order to ensure that to those whose opinions matter, if and to

the extent it is not finalised in an acceptable form, the report reflects much more poorly on Second Sight than it does on Post Office.

- We think that in replying to Second Sight initially, the Post Office should stress that the report should not be sent to any Applicant unless and until the Post Office has approved it. We understand that nonetheless, the Working Group may allow the report to be sent to each Applicant as part of the package of documents they receive after Second Sight assess their case. In that case, it goes without saying that Post Office should make every effort to have the report sufficiently amended such that it is in a more acceptable form. If the report is not finalised in a form acceptable to Post Office, we understand Post Office intends to prepare a document responding in detail to the report which will be sent to Applicants at the same time as the report. We agree with that approach.

- In order to respond properly to the report, we suggest Post Office first deal with points in the report which are based more soundly in fact and which appear (at least on their face and even if outside the scope of Second Sight's engagement) to be the more reasonable areas of complaint - e.g. the operation of ATMs or sale of lottery tickets after hours. We suggest if a reasonable explanation cannot be given for these points in the first instance, Post Office should volunteer to do more work itself to determine the facts behind these issues.

Section 2 of the report - the Subpostmasters' contract

To give context to Second Sight's commentary on the Subpostmasters' contract (the "Contract"), and the report generally, we have identified the following key provisions of the Engagement Terms.

Clause 2.1 - the Scheme has been set up to resolve Subpostmasters' concerns about "Horizon and associated issues".

Clause 2.2 - Second Sight is a member of the Working Group whose role it is to oversee the Scheme and assist investigating individual complaints.

Clause 2.3 - Post Office has engaged Second Sight to provide Services to the Working Group in relation to the Scheme.

Para 1 of Sch 1 (Scope of Services) - this defines the Services Second Sight are engaged to provide. These are: serving as a Member of the Working Group, advising, as requested by Post Office or the Working Group, on the format style and content of documents submitted by Post Office and/or Subpostmasters during the Scheme, investigating specific complaints raised by each Subpostmaster and assisting with reasonable requests made by the Working Group or Post Office.

Para 2 of Sch 1 - Second Sight must conduct the Services in furtherance of the objectives of the Scheme as set out by the Working Group.

Para 4 of Sch 1 - Second Sight is to act independently in providing the Services and assessments or opinions it gives shall be without bias and based on the facts and evidence available.

Para 5.1 of Sch 1 - in providing the Services, Second Sight shall act with the skill and care of qualified experienced accountants and it is acknowledged that matters relating to criminal law and procedure are outside SS's scope of expertise and accordingly SS shall not be required to give an opinion in relation to such matters.

As a general comment, we do not think that Post Office should be overly defensive about the contract. There are several good reasons why it is reasonable and, indeed, typical of contracts of its kind and why concerns raised by Second Sight as to its "fairness" are groundless. In particular, the following could be said in response to what Second Sight say in section 2:

1 Second Sight, as a firm of accountants, are not qualified to opine on legal matters, including issues concerning the "fairness" of the Contract or any criminal matters. Nor have they been engaged under the Engagement Terms to do so, especially as such matters are not reasonably related (or related at all) to issues "concerning Horizon and any associated issues". Accordingly, any assertions they make or conclusions they draw on this issue necessarily carry little or no weight.

2 The Contract is essentially an arms-length, commercial transaction. The concept of freedom of contract means that Subpostmasters can, ultimately, choose whether or not to enter the Contract if they are not happy with its terms. Post Office should confirm whether it is aware of any instances of Subpostmasters somehow being prevented from seeking legal advice before becoming Subpostmasters. No doubt this is unlikely and if true, a rare exception.

3 We understand that a body representing Subpostmasters, the NFSP, negotiated the terms of the Contract on behalf of Subpostmasters. Indeed, in a network of several thousand Subpostmasters, it is reasonable to expect the contract to have been negotiated in that way. It would be impractical and potentially unfair to certain Subpostmasters for the Contract to be negotiated on an individual basis by each Subpostmaster before he becomes a Subpostmaster.

4 The risk allocation under the Contract is typical of and reasonably expected in contractual arrangements of this kind. It is a contract of agency. Agents (Subpostmasters), by definition, have

custody and/or control over the principal's (Post Office's) assets and interests and are engaged by the Principal in order to protect, safeguard and further the principal's interests on his behalf. In this case, Subpostmasters are necessarily responsible for ensuring the safe-keeping and proper accounting for the revenue generated for Post Office throughout the Subpostmaster network. Accordingly, the risk allocation in the Contract properly reflects the role the Subpostmaster plays, including the level of his control and responsibility for and trust placed in him by Post Office with respect to Post Office's assets. That allocation is in any event reflected in the general law e.g. in the form of the equitable duty of an agent to account to his principal.

5 Thousands (and the vast majority) of Subpostmasters have not complained about the allocation of risk under the Contract and have been signing up to it for two decades. The issues raised by Second Sight represent the views of a very small, self-selecting proportion of Subpostmasters, if they represent the views of any at all.

6 Unless Second Sight can substantiate any instance in which an Applicant's entry into the Contract was the subject of any undue influence, unconscionable conduct on the part of Post Office or any other "unfair" circumstances, then the concepts of fairness or bias are legally meaningless in this context. Further, Second Sight should be asked to explain what they mean by "bias" in this context, or for that matter, what they mean when they say that appropriate risk mitigation measures may not have been implemented by the Subpostmasters. It is not clear to us what they mean by these things.

7 The "fairness" or otherwise of the risk allocation under the contract is, we assume, not the subject of any specific complaint within the Scheme. If that is the case, it is not a matter which falls for consideration in the Scheme or in any work-product Second Sight should be preparing.

8 Post Office should investigate Second Sight's allegations as to the terms of the Contract not being brought to the attention of Subpostmasters adequately or at all. Second Sight refer to an "Acknowledgment of Appointment" letter. Post Office should confirm the process for signing up Subpostmasters to the Contract and where possible refer and explain in their response to Second Sight all steps that are taken, including the acknowledgement letter, to bring the terms to their attention before they commence their role.

The report generally

As discussed with Belinda, we suggest that a detailed response to the report should be prepared in due course after full consideration and investigation of the relevant factual issues it seeks to raise. We are not able in the time available to set out a comprehensive commentary on the report, nor do we have access to the facts to do so, but make these brief observations at this juncture. We do not suggest these points be shared with Second Sight at this stage, i.e. while they are unallied to substantive responses to the factual points Second Sight raise.

a) The report in several instances refers to "Subpostmasters" generally rather than "Applicants". It fails to draw conclusions in many places, thus leaving unhelpful ambiguous and speculative assertions on which readers are then left to draw their own conclusions. It lacks examples or statistics to substantiate the largely speculative conclusions it does draw. These matters suggest to us and would suggest to any reasonable reader, that the report is not intended to reflect only the specific subject matter of complaints made in the Scheme and that Second Sight have a wider agenda. They also suggest the report is largely not or not adequately based in fact and the available evidence, as the Engagement Terms require.

b) As mentioned, the report refers to several matters outside the expertise of "qualified experienced accountants" or matters which are expressly out of scope. See e.g. section 2, references to high street banks' usage of ATMs (3.5), opinion as to "system design error" with respect to automatic transaction reversals in Horizon (10.3), criminal issues such as sections 13 (Pensions and Allowances) and 22 (Post Office investigations).

c) The report refers to matters that have little or nothing to do with the subject matter of the Scheme - i.e. Applicants' concerns with the functioning of Horizon and associated issues. See e.g. the contract commentary in section 2, ATMs (section 3), Motor Vehicle Licences and the misprinting of bar codes (section 4), cash and stock remittances (section 11), Post Office's data retention policy (section 14), cash withdrawals accidentally processed as deposits and other counter errors (section 16).

We are happy to comment on and otherwise assist Post Office with the preparation of the proposed detailed response to the report. Please do let us know how we can help or if you have any questions or comments about the points above.

Kind regards

Jonathan

From: Rodric Williams [GRO]
Sent: 01 August 2014 17:17
To: Swil, Jonathan
Cc: Belinda Crowe; David Oliver [GRO]
Subject: Project Sparrow

Jonathan,

We have not yet received Second Sight's "Part Two" report, but will forward this to you as soon as it comes in.

I do however attach an email containing a pdf of the first draft of this report, Section 2 of which sets out SS's "commentary" (for want of a better word) on the standard subpostmaster contract.

As we discussed yesterday, could you please help us prepare a form of challenge to SS's commentary on Section 2, which ideally would compel SS to either remove or neutralise that section from the Report, or failing that, provide a response to the commentary which could be read alongside it.

In case it assists, I also attach an email with the Engagement Letter we have with SS. Para 5.1 of the Schedule may provide a bit of a hook - if SS are required to "act with the skill and care expected of qualified and experienced accountants", to me that means they have agreed not to stray into other areas of expertise, e.g. contract law.

With thanks for your assistance,
Rodric

Rodric Williams I Litigation Lawyer

148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

GRO

GRO

GRO

Post Office stories<<http://www.postofficestories.co.uk/>>

@postofficenews<<http://www.twitter.com/postofficenews>>

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use, disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you have received this in error, please contact the sender by reply email and then delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540. Registered Office: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.

Any business communication, sent by or on behalf of Linklaters LLP or one of its affiliated firms or other entities (together "Linklaters"), is confidential and may be privileged or otherwise protected. If you receive it in error please inform us and then delete it immediately from your system. You should not copy it or disclose its contents to anyone. Please be aware that messages sent to and from Linklaters may be monitored for reasons of security, to protect our business, and to ensure compliance with legal and regulatory obligations and our internal policies. Emails are not a secure method of communication, can be intercepted and cannot be guaranteed to be error free. Anyone who communicates with us by email is taken to understand and accept the above.

Linklaters LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC326345. It is a law firm authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (www.sra.org.uk<<http://www.sra.org.uk>>). The term partner in relation to Linklaters LLP is used to refer to a member of Linklaters LLP or an employee or consultant of Linklaters LLP or any of its affiliated firms or entities with equivalent standing and qualifications. Please refer to www.linklaters.com/regulation<<http://www.linklaters.com/regulation>> for important information on our regulatory position. A list of Linklaters LLP members together with a list of those non-members who are designated as partners and their professional qualifications, may be inspected at our registered office, One Silk Street, London EC2Y 8HQ and such persons are either solicitors, registered foreign lawyers or European lawyers.

This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the addressee only. If you are not the named recipient, you must not use, disclose, reproduce, copy or distribute the contents of this communication. If you have received this in error, please contact the sender by reply email and then

delete this email from your system. Any views or opinions expressed within this email are solely those of the sender, unless otherwise specifically stated.

POST OFFICE LIMITED is registered in England and Wales no 2154540. Registered Office: 148 OLD STREET, LONDON EC1V 9HQ.

Please consider the environment! Do you need to print this email?

The information in this e-mail and any attachments is confidential and may be legally privileged and protected by law. matthew.fielden@GRO only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not GRO, please notify GRO as soon as possible and delete any copies. Unauthorised use, dissemination, distribution, publication or copying of this communication or attachments is prohibited and may be unlawful.

Any files attached to this e-mail will have been checked by us with virus detection software before transmission. Bond Dickinson LLP accepts no liability for any loss or damage which may be caused by software viruses and you should carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment.

Content of this email which does not relate to the official business of Bond Dickinson LLP, is neither given nor endorsed by it.

This email is sent for and on behalf of Bond Dickinson LLP which is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC317661. Our registered office is St Ann's Wharf, 112 Quayside, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE1 3DX, where a list of members' names is open to inspection. We use the term partner to refer to a member of the LLP, or an employee or consultant who is of equivalent standing. Our VAT registration number is GB123393627.

Bond Dickinson LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority.

PA Consulting Services Limited is registered in England & Wales with Registered Number: 414220, having its registered office at 123 Buckingham Palace Road, London SW1W 9SR, United Kingdom. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, please notify the sender as soon as possible, delete it from your systems and do not disclose its contents to anyone else.