

## Message

**From:** Paula Vennells [GRO]  
on behalf of [GRO]  
**Sent:** 17/09/2014 17:24:12  
**To:** Chris Aujard [GRO]  
**CC:** Gavin Lambert [GRO]; Martin Edwards [GRO]; Belinda Crowe [GRO]  
**Subject:** Kay Linnell

Hi Chris, I have just bumped into Kay at Bonn airport!  
So we had a chat together. Off the record but of course not really.  
She had some interesting angles. My notes are below - really as a reminder for me, so that I can talk to you about it. The tone won't come across easily in the email. She was trying to be helpful.  
I countered where I felt she was pushing too hard but we were discussing emotions rather than facts of course, so it wasn't a debate. (She was very calm and relaxed; and was genuinely offering her view without expecting any change.)

- she senses frustration bubbling up. But didn't indicate anything imminent as a result.
- let SPMRs go into the mediation process. Don't stop them. If you then don't mediate, they will have vented their fury at least. She is quite insistent this is a useful outcome; and we should be helping it - it's in our interests.
- where Tony is taking a decision to back the PO view (ie., no progression to mediation), this will simply be a factual letter that says 'sorry' but with no understanding, explanation, etc. SPMRs will feel badly done by, much worse than if nothing had happened with their complaint, because they believe they were going through to mediation, by entering the process. The fall-out will therefore be even more emotive, noisy, involve MPs, and her implication - backfire on PO reputationally.
- can we get Angela to lead on mediations? Particularly if we think we think we are unlikely to move our position. Kay's view is she is credible, understandable (v important) and stands the best chance of getting people on side or at least to feel they have been listened to, even if they still disagree.
- we should consider being more open to mediation on the cases where more money was at stake not less. Because this had a greater emotional impact on those affected (lost jobs, homes, etc) and therefore, they are the ones who need to vent more. And who would benefit from us allowing them to 'yell' at us. (She thinks we're big enough to take that.)
- Jo Harrison(?) (JA Spmr) Kay intends to go into mediation with her - she thinks she needs looking after. Kay indicated that Jo had done something wrong but feels sorry for her, as she got so out of her depth; Kay implied that today we might have had a better /more understanding way of dealing with her. Plus apparently Jo has more evidence that wasn't available at the time of prosecution (a witness statement?).

It is the same point that JA made: let SS call out a handful of extreme cases, which obviously shouldn't go through but otherwise, let the rest take their course through mediation. The PO will be seen in a better light. She wasn't - at all - in the place of believing we would settle any more, nor was she expecting SPMRs to reap great payouts. The point was to let the have 'their day in court'.

Let's pick up.  
Paula

Sent from my iPad