

Message

From: Jane MacLeod [j[REDACTED]GRO]
Sent: 17/03/2015 12:16:10
To: Patrick Bourke [REDACTED]GRO
CC: Melanie Corfield [REDACTED]GRO; Rodric Williams [REDACTED]GRO; Belinda Crowe [REDACTED]GRO; Tom Wechsler [REDACTED]GRO; Mark Underwood1 [REDACTED]GRO; Parsons, Andrew [A[REDACTED]GRO]; Amanda A Brown [REDACTED]GRO
Subject: RE: Responding to SS' Part II
Attachments: IN CONFIDENCE - SS - 170315 v2.docx

Patrick

Please see slightly amended version attached with some further embedded questions. This is a bit of a rush – hope it makes sense!

jane

From: Patrick Bourke
Sent: 17 March 2015 10:51
To: Jane MacLeod
Cc: Melanie Corfield; Rodric Williams; Belinda Crowe; Tom Wechsler; Mark Underwood1; Parsons, Andrew
Subject: RE: Responding to SS' Part II

Jane

Revised draft attached giving them 2 opportunities to change their report (one now, one after receipt of our detailed comments early next week), with a final deadline of close 27/3.

Best wishes

Patrick

From: Patrick Bourke
Sent: 17 March 2015 09:08
To: Jane MacLeod
Cc: Melanie Corfield; Rodric Williams; Belinda Crowe; Tom Wechsler; Mark Underwood1; Parsons, Andrew
Subject: RE: Responding to SS' Part II

Jane

Many thanks.

Our detailed report is underway and should be finalised by the end of this week. However, we need to give Rod and opportunity to input into it. If we get it to him on Monday morning and he is able to prioritise it, we can get the detailed comments across to SS that same day.

I'd therefore suggest, and I think this is also Belinda's view, that we effectively give them 2 bites at the cherry – one on the basis of the broad comments in the letter I have provided and a further one following receipt of the detailed comments. This would lead us to require a finalised report by the end of next week (close 27th).

I will review the draft on that basis and return it to you this morning. Do shout if this proposal doesn't meet your needs.

Appreciate you're enjoying GE all day (!), but it would be good to get this out later on if at all possible.

Kind regards

Patrick

From: Jane MacLeod
Sent: 17 March 2015 07:35
To: Patrick Bourke
Cc: Melanie Corfield; Rodric Williams; Belinda Crowe; Tom Wechsler; Mark Underwood1; Parsons, Andrew
Subject: Re: Responding to SS' Part II

Thanks Patrick. I have a few minor tweaks but my main question is a logistical one: it reads as if we are saying we want their report for 24/3, but our response won't be finalised until after that date? Are we therefore giving them the opportunity to consider changing theirs (having seen ours), or are we saying that they should just take account of our 3 generic comments?

I'll get you my comments shortly.

Jane MacLeod
General Counsel
The Post Office

GRO

Sent from my iPad

On 16 Mar 2015, at 17:08, Patrick Bourke <patrick.bourke@**GRO**> wrote:

Jane

I attach an updated version of the letter which, I hope, takes the trick on the points you raised with me – specifically, I have tried to position ourselves as willing to assist in a process of improvement of the Report but which does not occasion undue delay, nor allow ourselves to become too closely associated with the end product which will, inevitably, remain sub-standard.

I have given them until close on Wednesday 24 March, which was the day the report was due to be discussed by the Working Group.

Let me know what you think. Substantive comments from others welcome too.

Best wishes

Patrick

From: Patrick Bourke
Sent: 12 March 2015 18:09
To: Jane MacLeod
Cc: Melanie Corfield; Rodric Williams; Belinda Crowe; Tom Wechsler; Mark Underwood1; Parsons, Andrew
Subject: Responding to SS' Part II

Jane

Following receipt of Second Sight's report, a number of us met this afternoon to decide how Post Office might respond most effectively.

The collective view (Sparrow, Comms and BD) is that we ought to register with SS the fact that we think the Report goes over ground we have already addressed with them, strays in to areas beyond the Scheme and SS's professional expertise, and lacks evidence for many of the claims it makes.

However, we feel that there is little to be gained from engaging in a protracted discussion with them on the precise content. The rationale for that is that:

- a) We will never get it into what we might consider to be an acceptable shape;
- b) We will, in any event, have to prepare our own document to put the record straight which can then also be sent to Applicants (as we have had to in respect of their previous work);
- c) It is so poor that we might want to consider whether we might, at some stage, choose to publish on the basis that it might illustrate the challenge we have been facing to a wider audience;
- d) We need SS to focus on CRRs and individual cases in the remaining time during which we have some control over them..

If you agree, I have prepared a first draft of a letter for you to send to Ian which I attach. It has already had the benefit of others' comments but can no doubt be further improved.

I try to work from home on Fridays but if you would like to discuss with me and/or anyone else, I am of course very happy to dial in. The only time can't make is 0945-1115.

Best wishes

Patrick

Patrick Bourke
GRO

<IN CONFIDENCE - SS - 160315.docx>

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.
