

Message

From: Simon Baker; GRO
Sent: 17/05/2013 11:04:27
To: Parsons, Andrew; GRO; Andrew Winn; GRO; Craig Tuthill; GRO; Dave Posnett; Gareth Jenkins; GRO; Ivan Swepson; GRO; Lin Norburt; GRO; Rod Ismay; GRO; Rodric Williams; GRO
Subject: Strictly Private and Confidential – Subject to Legal Privilege – Not for Wider Circulation

All

Some feedback on the Spot reviews from JFSA. We won't respond to these points right now, just to give you a flavour of how they were received, maybe a learning to how we tone our next batch of responses?

Simon

From: Ron Warmington; GRO
Sent: 17 May 2013 10:26
To: Simon Baker; Susan Crichton; Alwen Lyons
Cc: 'Ian Henderson'
Subject: Needed for this morning's Update Call: Kay Linnell's response to POL's Spot Review Responses

All:

We think this should be on today's Agenda. You're already aware of the strength of opinion (even hostility) that Alan and Kay hold in regard to the emerging issues. But Kay's response is rather more aggressive than even we expected it to be. I'll forward Alan's response too (that's shorter but equally dismissive). We always knew it was going to be extraordinarily difficult to satisfy the JFSA's leadership and members and Kay's and Alan's emails certainly confirm that. Let's discuss.

Ron.

From: Kay Linnell; GRO
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 10:41 AM
To: 'Ron Warmington'; 'Alan Bates'
Cc: 'Ian Henderson'
Subject: RE: Spot Review Responses

Dear Ron

I have had an opportunity to read these responses and I hope they are not representative of the quality you will get across the board for the 2 others you have submitted and the ones you are yet to finish because POL is still withholding or drip feeding data to you both.

Spot Review 1:

Point 5 "The User would have been informed" well he wasn't told about the reversal or he would have known about the reversal and told the customer who would not have had his phone cut off so who at POL failed to tell him ? this key question remains unanswered and should e sent back to POL.

Also why can POL refuse to call for log data on the grounds of costs to POL but ruin lives by demanding unsubstantiated sum because POL have not spent money or effort investigating the facts on which POL intend to rely simply assuming POL are always rights means prosecutions without full investigations are unsafe.

10 page replies quoting from procedural manuals are NOT an answer.

Spot Review 11:

Why do SPMRs say they can't review ALL Horizon transactions if POL say they can? Someone is incorrect.

Transaction corrections in "the vast majority of cases" – which can't the SPMRs see?

POL have dodged the specific instance referred to and speak in generalities – this is NOT a full and proper answer for this specific incident.

Spot Review 12:

How is the SPMR supposed to prove he/she has followed proper procedures by examining a cheque that is lost?

Spot Review 13:

Too old to investigate. Why wasn't a full investigation carried out at the time?

Why does POL think it relates to a TV licence? POL's general experience does not help. Nor does their continual defence of the Horizon software and procedures. Too general and does not address the issues.

Ron, this is extremely disappointing and I feel that we are being sidelined with a great volume of words not specifically addressing the real questions and issues.

I hope, it is early days.

Kay
Miss Kay Linnell
Kay Linnell & Co
Brick Kiln Cottage
The Avenue, Herriard
Near Basingstoke
Hampshire RG25 2PR

GRO

Kay Linnell & Co, Brick Kiln Cottage, The Avenue, Herriard, Near Basingstoke, Hampshire RG25 2PR

This communication is confidential and is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete this email immediately, as any disclosure, copying or distribution is strictly prohibited

From: Ron Warmington
Sent: 13 May 2013 11:06

GRO

To: 'Alan Bates'; [GRO]
Cc: 'Ian Henderson'
Subject: FW: Spot Review Responses

Hello Alan/Kay. We now have four Spot Review responses from POL. I have POL's permission to forward all of their responses to you both and each SPMR's relevant responses to that SPMR. I will do those distributions today, though am off to meeting shortly and in Vienna for a couple of days (will have laptop with me).

The responses are VERY detailed and long. But they are thorough. A few of our observations/allegations are challenged or refuted and it now falls to the SPMRs and myself to check out what POL has said so that we can all arrive at a solid and agreed set of facts upon which Ian and I can base our conclusions and, in due course, our report. I have read through all of this material and see no need, as yet, to change the original SRs. To do that would then necessitate amendment of POL's response and the whole process would become tediously circuitous. Only if/where it emerges we (I) have got something completely wrong will I alter or withdraw the SR. Does that make sense to you Ian?

Speak soon. Ron

From: Simon Baker; [GRO]
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2013 8:58 AM
To: Ron Warmington; Alwen Lyons
Cc: irth; [GRO] Susan Crichton
Subject: RE: Spot Review Responses

Ron

Spot reviews attached with confidential markings removed.

Simon

From: Ron Warmington; [GRO]
Sent: 13 May 2013 07:15
To: Alwen Lyons
Cc: Simon Baker; irth; [GRO] Susan Crichton
Subject: Re: Spot Review Responses

Of course Alwen. I shall make that completely clear to Alan, Kay and each SPMR. Each SPMR will only of course get the Spot Reviews applicable to his or her own case.

Sent from my iPhone

On 13 May 2013, at 07:06, Alwen Lyons [GRO] wrote:

Ron

We would still want JFSA to treat them as confidential at this stage, we certainly do not want any external statements

Thanks

Alwen

Alwen Lyons
Company Secretary
GRO

Sent from Blackberry

From: Simon Baker
Sent: Monday, May 13, 2013 05:49 AM
To: 'rwarming'; GRO
Cc: 'irl'; GRO; Susan Crichton; Alwen Lyons
Subject: Re: Spot Review Responses

Ron
Legal have got back to me, and confirmed that it is OK to forward to JFSA.
I will get a second version issued with the confidential markings removed.
Regards,
Simon

From: Ron Warmington; GRO
Sent: Saturday, May 11, 2013 06:02 PM
To: Simon Baker
Cc: 'Ian Henderson' <irl>; GRO; Susan Crichton; Alwen Lyons
Subject: RE: Spot Review Responses

Thanks Simon/Alwen: I am confident that Alan can be trusted and would welcome his input here. Will hold off of course until I hear from you.

Many thanks. Ron.

From: Simon Baker; GRO
Sent: Saturday, May 11, 2013 8:15 AM
To: Ron Warmington
Cc: Ian Henderson; Susan Crichton; Alwen Lyons
Subject: RE: Spot Review Responses

I think so, as they were written with the expectation that others would read them, but let me check with our legal team first.

From: Ron Warmington; GRO
Sent: 11 May 2013 06:02
To: Simon Baker
Cc: Ian Henderson; Susan Crichton; Alwen Lyons
Subject: Re: Spot Review Responses

Thanks Simon. These are very well written responses. They are, of course, marked Strictly Private and Confidential. We will need POL's approval therefore to disclose each response to the applicable SPMR

in order to arrive at closure on each Spot Review. We would also like to include Alan Bates and Kay Linnell in that process. Is that acceptable to you?

Thanks and regards. Ron.

Sent from my iPhone

On 10 May 2013, at 16:38, Simon Baker [GRO] wrote:

Ron, Ian

Please find attached the Post Office responses to the first four spot reviews.
Give me a call if you have any questions on them.

Regards, Simon

Simon Baker Head of Business Change and Assurance

<image001.png>

2nd Floor, 148 Old Street, London, EC1V 9HQ

GRO

postoffice.co.uk

@postofficenews

<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.

<Spot Review 1 - Response.pdf>

<Spot Review 11 - Response.pdf>

<Spot Review 12 - Response.pdf>

<Spot Review 13 - Response.pdf>

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.

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.

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.

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.
