
From: Beal, Eleanor (Advanced Manufacturing and Services)[/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=D9ACA1E3B9B4451595D5194548DB3AB0-BEAL, ELEAN]
Organizer: Beal, Eleanor (Advanced Manufacturing and Services)[i. GRO
Subject: Note
Importance: Normal
Start Time: Wed 19/06/2019 2:00:00 PM (UTC)
End Time: Wed 19/06/2019 2:30:00 PM (UTC)

Updated on litigation: Al has moved - is now thinking they should make provision. Asked Tom to consider the technical question of accounting officer Qs that might limit ability to make a provision. Tom quite dismissive.

Updated on Herbert Smith approach to bringing paper to Monday meeting. Told Alex about the spreadsheet.

Hugo Roths(?) ask Ben. Alex recommended him.

Three groups – (1) just want £; (2) cases where POL has given evidence to the police.

Alex advised they make some 'stylised' cases as scenarios. How would they handle?

CEO: In advance of meeting with Kelly. Handling Tim will be tricky. Panel were in a difficult position. Four apart from Tim supported Nick Read. Tim supported Al. it was really a two horse race. It was a tactical decision to include Catherine. Alex: "before we write Catherine off" ... Tom: she has achieved a lot, but has never had to deal with multi-stakeholders. Didn't have breadth of experience with a complex business. Quite -ve language. Nick's presentation was outstanding. Impressive turnaround of Nisa. Challenged him on Nisa story being "too good to be true". Made the best impression on the panel, but we don't know his shortcomings. That was the area of debate re: Al. Alex: Left Nisa in 2017, doesn't do anything for 6 months. Surprised by the job he then took – wasn't big enough. Tom: liked him because he will get postmasters and retail. Didn't come across as a tough nut. Seemed v.reasonable. style/fit good. Al has effectively run the company for Paula for two years.

Al: knows all the issues, in safe hands. Has made bad hiring decisions. Tim says he knows it's a weakness and he will help. Others think it is a critical weakness. Ended up focussing on Al's weaknesses and that's an unfair comparison with Nick. Bit of a bully and control freak.

Alex: Quite a lot of negative stuff about company culture comes through from litigation. Arrogant and unwilling to see it's own faults. Tom: unfair to nail Al with that. Already got rid of Jane and Paula, next in line for culpability would be Tim. Jane wouldn't let anyone else near it. Alex: not convinced he is entirely off the hook.

Greater upside with Al.

Conclusion: Tim said he's good at choosing management teams and we need to go with Al. this is

about executing what we've got. Asked for panel backing. They didn't give it. Asked him to give a balanced picture to Ministers.

Alex: Kelly will ask what we think when Tim leaves – what do we say? Alex's hypothesis: from a risk point of view AI is more proven, from point of view of delivery on BAU he is lower risk.

Majority of the panel supported Nick Read. Given change orientation we would punt for Nick.

TC: Tim will give all the arguments, unlikely to say he was in the minority, will propose AI and ask Kelly to back him on this.

If Kelly chooses Nick, TC clear that AI will leave.

Deal with Tim by making it about something else than Tim's decision – focus on need for change.

Will he accept this? TC clear that Nick is quality. Doesn't think Tim would resign, but he has made it very personal.

If AI threw his toys out the plan, would Nick keep the show on the road?

Alex thought Tom and the lady should be there.