

Strictly confidential and privileged
Draft for comment 10 March 2014

The Post Office Limited

Initial Complaint Review and Mediation Scheme

Proposed outline of report for the Board

1 Background to the report

- 1.1 The report is being commissioned by the Board of Post Office following concerns over the level of claims and costs and other potential legal and financial exposure for Post Office in connection with the Initial Complaint Review and Mediation Scheme (the “**Scheme**”).
- 1.2 We understand that the Scheme was set up in August ~~last year~~ 2013 with a view to bringing closure to the various allegations that had been brought about the Horizon system (“**Horizon**” ; at that time the working assumption was that there were:
- 1.2.1 ~~No~~ no systemic problems with Horizon; and
 - 1.2.2 the training and support for Subpostmasters (“**SPMRs**” ~~”~~ with) respect to Horizon could be improved upon in certain areas;
- 1.3 It is intended that the report will be presented to the Board on 26 March 2014.

2 Key matters to be addressed

- 2.1 The report will consider:
- 2.1.1 Whether and to what extent Post Office has any legal liability with respect to (a) complaints made by applicants to the Scheme and (b) any other matters identified as part of the investigatory work carried out by Post Office in the process of responding to applicants.
 - 2.1.2 -The nature and extent of the risks arising from and associated with the Scheme in its current form.
 - 2.1.3 Whether and to what extent the Scheme, as currently structured, can be sensibly modified in order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of its operation, and mitigate any of the risks identified ~~in the~~ above.
 - 2.1.4 The nature of any dispute resolution (or similar) mechanisms that could be established either in order to replace the Scheme or augment its operation. In particular, the mechanisms considered will include adjudication, arbitration and the use of ombudsman services.
 - 2.1.5 In the event that a decision is made by the Board to discontinue the Scheme, what steps Post Office could take to minimise any existing legal exposure.
- 2.2 In addressing the issues set out in paragraphs 2.1.3 to 2.1.5 above we will have regard to administrative convenience, cost, complexity, relative merits and viability of the alternative structures.

3 Policy Factors

- 3.1 It is expected that as part of the Board’s decision making process it will have regard to the following factors:

Strictly confidential and privileged
Draft for comment 10 March 2014

- 3.1.1 Does Post Office wish to consider paying compensation by reference to principles other than legal entitlement? If so, how will it articulate and apply those principles? What will it say to ~~Subpostmasters~~ SPMRs and other stakeholders?
- 3.1.2 Whether or not the Post Office now wishes to conduct a fullscale audit of the Horizon system to establish, with finality, that it functions as it should.
- 3.1.3 How important is it to Post Office to determine the facts of each individual claim? In any claim is Post Office' s stance to be more conciliatory than adversarial? What are the limits of this approach?
- 3.1.4 To what extent does Post Office need to invest in resolving past issues to enable it to put relationships with ~~Subpostmasters~~ SPMRs now on a sound footing?
- 3.1.5 How and to what extent will Post Office wish to strike a balance between the matters above and achieving a satisfactory political outcome, including with regard to what has been said in Parliament about the Scheme and Horizon?

4 The basis on which the report has been prepared

- 4.1 The report will consider the issues primarily from the perspective of the general law, but we will highlight where we think appropriate, associated public relations issues and/or political implications which might arise.
- 4.2 The report will not consider certain matters which are expressly “ out of scope” . These currently include PI and D&O insurance, which is understood to be the subject of a separate report to the Board..

Christa Band and Jonathan Swil

Linklaters LLP

Comparison Details	
Title	DocsCorp Compare Comparison Results
Date & Time	11/03/2014 17:54:09
Comparison Time	3.12 seconds
compareDocs version	v3.4.11.52

Sources	
Original Document	H:\settings\profile\desktop\Cut down Outline Paper 14032014.docx
Modified Document	H:\Documentum\Export\Cut down Outline Paper 14032014.docx

Comparison Statistics	
Insertions	7
Deletions	6
Changes	7
Moves	0
TOTAL CHANGES	20

Word Rendering Set Markup Options	
Name	Linklaters
<u>Insertions</u>	
Deletions	
<u>Moves</u> / Moves	
Inserted cells	
Deleted cells	
Merged cells	
Formatting	Color only.
Changed lines	Mark left border.
Comments color	By Author.
Balloons	False

compareDocs Settings Used	Category	Option Selected
Open Comparison Report after Saving	General	Prompt
Report Type	Word	Track Changes
Character Level	Word	False
Include Headers / Footers	Word	True
Include Footnotes / Endnotes	Word	True
Include List Numbers	Word	True
Include Tables	Word	True
Include Field Codes	Word	True
Include Moves	Word	True
Show Track Changes Toolbar	Word	False
Show Reviewing Pane	Word	True
Update Automatic Links at Open	Word	False
Summary Report	Word	End
Include Change Detail Report	Word	Separate
Document View	Word	Print
Remove Personal Information	Word	False
Flatten Field Codes	Word	True