

**To:** Alice Perkins[aliceperkins@GRO]  
**Cc:** Larissa Wilson[larissa.wilson@GRO]; neil@GRO; timfranklin1@GRO; timfranklin1@GRO; alasdairmarnoch@GRO; alasdairmarnoch@GRO; Paula Vennells[paula.vennells@GRO]; Chris M Day[chris.m.day@GRO]; Alwen Lyons[Alwen.Lyons@GRO]; Chris Aujard[christopher.aujard@GRO]; virginia.holmes.t21@GRO; virginia.holmes.t21@GRO; susannah.storey@susannah.storey@GRO; susannah.storey@susannah.storey@GRO  
**From:** Susannah Hooper[susannah.hooper@GRO]  
**Sent:** Mon 10 Feb 2014 7:29:52 AM (UTC)  
**Subject:** Re: 2014 02 11 ARC teleconference  
[image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)

Thanks for copying me on these papers and given I am not on the ARC, I am just passing my thoughts for information. But my read of the paper was similar to Alice's. It doesn't seem we had sufficient reasons to discard option C and I think it would be interesting to explore further. It seems hard to imagine in 2014 POL is so different from other organisations to necessitate this approach.

As an aside, I also find the statistics for Pol surprising and I can't help wondering if any other organisation, to the extent we could get comparable data, would have anything like this level of situations that need investigation. Either way, I would have thought any next steps must be accompanied by more focus on training and better support. But sure that's ongoing anyway.

Best wishes  
 Susannah

On 8 Feb 2014, at 12:03, "Alice Perkins" <aliceperkins@GRO> wrote:

Alasdair,

It is not yet clear whether it will be possible for me to participate in this teleconference. I will if I can.

My reaction to this paper which is helpful and clear in many respects (and the BIP and its impact to date is very good indeed), is that it does not spell out clearly enough for me, why we think it is right in principle for us to maintain a different policy from other organisations (the Brian Altman point) ie option C is dismissed too summarily.

I do of course, understand that we couldn't just throw our cases at the CPS and walk away at a moment's notice. And I appreciate that we might find the CPS route less satisfactory in cases where we were convinced we should be prosecuting. But if it is the case that the banks and other financial institutions are content to live with this, why are we different? And what would our public justification for being different be? In considering this, I would like to understand better how much money would potentially be at risk if we were to go for option C? And what are the relative costs of giving the work to external lawyers rather than doing it in-house under option B?

I accept that option C could not be adopted immediately even if we did think it right. And I absolutely agree we should have a financial cut off of between £20k and £30k and take other factors into consideration before proceeding whoever is conducting the prosecutions.

If you'd like a word, do let me know.

All the best

Alice

---

**From:** Larissa Wilson [mailto:larissa.wilson@GRO]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 07, 2014 12:14 PM GMT Standard Time  
**To:** Neil McCausland (neil@GRO) <neil@GRO>; Tim Franklin (timfranklin1@GRO) <timfranklin1@GRO>; Alasdair Marnoch (alasdairmarnoch@GRO) <alasdairmarnoch@GRO>; Alice Perkins; Paula Vennells <paula.vennells@GRO>; Chris M Day <chris.m.day@GRO>; Alwen Lyons <alwen.lyons@GRO>  
**Cc:** Chris Aujard <christopher.aujard@GRO>; Virginia Holmes (virginia.holmes.t21@GRO) <virginia.holmes.t21@GRO>; Susannah Storey (susannah.storey@GRO) <susannah.storey@GRO>; susannah hooper@GRO <susannah.hooper@GRO>  
**Subject:** 2014 02 11 ARC teleconference

All

Please find attached the agenda and paper for the ARC teleconference 5pm – 6pm 11 February. The teleconference will focus specifically on Post Office as a prosecuting authority. An update on Project Sparrow will come to the

February Board.

In line with the decision at the last Board meeting, these papers have been circulated to the whole Board. Papers are also available on BoardPad.

Room 501 has been booked for the meeting if you wish to attend in person and teleconference details are:

Dial in from mobile

UK Freephone:

Chairperson passcode:

Participant passcode:

Kind regards

Larissa

Larissa Wilson | Company Secretarial Assistant

<image001.png>

1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Banner Street Wing, 148 Old Street, London, EC1V 9HQ

larissa.wilson@

<image002.png>

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://www.websense.com)