

Minutes of Meeting

Confidential / Legally Privileged/ Do not Share



GLO CONTINGENCY PLANNING GOVERNANCE	
Finsbury Dials	
[7 May 2019; 4.00 pm]	
Attendees: Ben Foat (BF), Zoe Brauer (ZB), Rodric Williams (RW), Rawa Hussain (RH)	
Apologies: Mark Underwood (MU), Angela Van-Den-Bogerd (AVB)	

Agenda

1	Operational Focused Updates
2	Litigation Focussed Updates
3	Mailwork Variation
4	AOB
5	Actions

1	<p><u>Operational Focussed Updates</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BF- there was a GE discussion earlier today and one of the prominent themes was on Group Litigation which has formed a significant proportion of the Post Office plan. Group Litigation is the biggest thing that everyone needs to focus on and Al Cameron expressed strong concerns about operational transformation. He wants a position on the contract/ losses by next week. We can't keep telling him there is background work as that has been the case for several weeks. We now need an options paper and solutions. • BF – examples of options include: a) we do nothing; b) what we think commercially and reasonably should happen taking into account what the Judgment says; c) make changes altogether. Whatever position we recommend, now is the time to make decisions and take a stance. • BF – we need a table with answers/ recommendations. A briefing note on what the approach is on contracts to be provided before Monday. • ZB – we have given advice to the business but there has been no interaction/ engagement back from the business and there has been some confusion from the client about who the client is. • BF – Julie Thomas is the client and Al thinks so too. • ZB – with regards to Julie's transformation programme – this should be intertwined with the contract work we are doing but Julie is seeing it separately. • BF – the transformation programme is not seen as separate. Julie's programme is the overarching programme and Group Litigation provides different segments as part of that. • ZB – examples of bad behaviour of K advisors – Julie sent me – wants a weekly catch up with me and is separating that. • RW – Julie has an idea that we deliver the perfect legal solution but we explained in our meeting with her earlier today (related to historic claims) that we are here to provide advice and options. • BF – a ways of working needs to be established with Julie. <u>For now, a paper is to be drafted capturing the following: 1. What is the issue?; 2. What is the 'answer'/ recommendation?; 3. What are the options? With options, provide pros and cons and their consequences.</u> If it comes down to it, come to a view. • BF – in GE, the issue of resource was raised and I explained we are getting backfill for ZB and RW. Seconddees start next week Monday. • ZB – on contracts piece, this is more straightforward as we can take Norton Rose's mark up of the contract. However, the business still needs to make a call on that. Once we have that clearance, that is our go ahead.
---	---

Minutes of Meeting**Confidential / Legally Privileged/ Do not Share**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ZB – I have an Operations table which I provided to Julie and it more or less has what we need on there. (ZB to pass to RH operations table and RH to print with the attachments and to give to BF and RW). • ZB – the emails received over weekend from Julie shows she is confused about her expectations. • BF – <u>provide in the table name of decision maker in a separate column.</u> • BF – I want to present a sensible, logical approach to GE on Monday. Some reassurance we're not going to have envisaged every single thing that we think will come out. On Monday, AI will want a paper proposing what we will do and continue to look at over the year. We have at least finalised one contract that is recommended.
2	<u>Litigation Focussed Updates</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Main Appeal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BF – there is a board sub- committee this Thursday about the appeal. • RW – we went through draft grounds. Errors of law, procedural unfairness and findings of fact. Revised grounds were circulated at midday today with skeleton argument. • BF – we want to approach the board to say we want your consent to file our appeal- there needs to be a board paper for this. • RW – Herbert Smith can do a draft document. 2. Recusal Application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RW - permission to appeal may come this week. 3. Horizon Issues Trial <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RW - Preps continue. Our expert wants to file another report which we have no permission for. Still need to update BF on this (previously updated Jane MacLeod).
3	<u>Mailwork Variation</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BF - Dieter sent an email today – issuing 8 bespoke letters. • BF - happy to present to GE that we have provided advice and someone needs to provide sign off.
4	AOB None.

Actions

No	Description	Owner	Status
1	ZB to send RH Operations table.	ZB	Done.
2	RH to print off and give a copy of Operations table to BF and RW.	RH	Done.
3	To draft a briefing note/ table of the issues, recommendations and pros and cons of relevant options in time for GE meeting on Monday.	ZB	
4	To draft a board paper for the sub-committee for this Thursday in relation to the main appeal.	RW	

Author of Minutes: RH

Date: 7 May 2019