

Message

From: Patrick Bourke [GRO]
Sent: 09/01/2015 19:03:38
To: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO]; Belinda Crowe [GRO]; Tom Wechsler [GRO]; Mark R Davies [GRO]
CC: Melanie Corfield [GRO]; Rodric Williams [GRO]; Parsons, Andrew [/O=BOND PEARCE/OU=First Administrative Group/cn=Recipients/cn=ap6]
Subject: RE: The "dossier"
Attachments: POST OFFICE RESPONSE TO WESTMINSTER HALL DEBATE v2 - pb - clean working version - 1900.docx

As promised, slightly reworked version which I hope reads ok – the whole document was in good shape - again, I have tried to do a bit more signposting and while acknowledging the interconnection between some of these issues, trying to make specific accusations and rebuttals to stand on their own a bit more.

I'll be looking at this between now and Monday, so comments always welcome.

Best wishes

Patrick

From: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd
Sent: 09 January 2015 16:43
To: Belinda Crowe; Patrick Bourke; Tom Wechsler; Mark R Davies
Cc: Melanie Corfield; Rodric Williams; Parsons, Andrew
Subject: RE: The "dossier"

All,

I've answered the questions/points highlighted for my attention. I've tried to keep the explanation as simple as possible which is somewhat difficult when trying to explain branch accounting. Hope this is helpful. If you need anything further please let me know.


- JA suggestion that at the end of the day, accounts were sometimes over, and sometimes under, and changing balances between a Sat and a Monday
 Unless a branch does a full cash and stock balance at the end of the day there is likely to be some variance (over or under) in the derived accounting position of the branch. It is only at the point in which the branch does a full balance is that true accounting position of the branch evident. Balances would vary from day to day if transactions are processed either after the cash declaration had been made or where some post office products are offered from the retail side of the business after the post office has closed and input to the Horizon system at a later time.
- JA suggestion about discrepancies doubling following helpline advice
 Where Post Office has investigated this type of claim as part of the Scheme the findings are that the helpline has given the correct advice. The NBSC call advisor offers advice on the information told to them by the branch as they are unable to see what the branch has actually done. So by way of an example if a branch were to ring NBSC and say that they had 'remmed out' £2000 rather than 'remming in' £2000 the correct advice from NBSC would be to reverse the £2000 'remmed out' transaction and then 'rem in' the £2000 amount. As a result of correcting the situation this would result in a £2000 loss which on the information the branch had provided to NBSC this was the correct accounting position for this branch.
- Calls to helpline abandoned (10s of thousand)
- I'm awaiting this info and will update separately.
- 25% cut to support staff

Post Office continuously looks to provide effective and efficient support to its network. Making better use of technology will enable Post Office to enhance the effectiveness of the support it offers in a value for money way. The training of new postmasters is an area that Post Office has recently reviewed and identified that by using modern technology a proportion of the existing classroom training could be delivered on-line. As a result new postmasters and their staff will be able to access on-line training at a time and from a location that is convenient for them. The duration of the on-site training remains unchanged. An added benefit is that this on-line training will be accessible to the whole network not just new postmasters. Technology has also been used to reduce 'paperwork' and administration time within the support team. The overall impact of these changes means that less people are needed to deliver an enhanced level of support to the network

Angela Van Den Bogerd | Head of Partnerships

 Ty Brwydran House, Atlantic Close, SWANSEA SA7 9FJ

 Mobile: **GRO** Mobex: **GRO**

 angela.van-den-bogerd@postoffice.co.uk **GRO**



Confidential Information:

This email message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorised review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient please contact me by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

From: Belinda Crowe

Sent: 09 January 2015 12:28

To: Patrick Bourke; Tom Wechsler; Mark R Davies

Cc: Melanie Corfield; Rodric Williams; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Parsons, Andrew

Subject: RE: The "dossier"

Yellow, Angela

Red – Jess has contact details for the Andy Holt replacement

Belinda Crowe

148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

GRO Postline: **GRO**

belinda.crowe@postoffice.co.uk **GRO**

From: Patrick Bourke

Sent: 09 January 2015 12:09

To: Tom Wechsler; Mark R Davies

Cc: Belinda Crowe; Melanie Corfield; Rodric Williams; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Parsons, Andrew

Subject: RE: The "dossier"

Tom

We spoke.

Some of Mark's questions fall into the technical and I'd very much welcome Rod's advice on another two, as below:

For techhie:

- JA suggestion that at the end of the day, accounts were sometimes over, and sometimes under, and changing balances between a Sat and a Monday
- JA suggestion about discrepancies doubling following helpline advice
- Calls to helpline abandoned (10s of thousand)
- 25% cut to support staff
- Horizon was 'second hand' and designed for other purposes

For Rod please:

- The specific Bridgen accusation that we bring criminal cases even when CPS has advised against
- Statute of limitations

I think there is something of a limit to the number of accusations we can expect the dossier to cover, not in the sense that there are so many (although there are), but some just don't really lend themselves to an easy answer: for instance, it seems highly improbable that a discrepancy would double as the direct result of a call to the Helpline – what would have doubled it, presumably, were the actions taken by the relevant SPM following the call but this then becomes case-specific and off bounds.

Most of the others will simply involve adding to your draft which, as we noted yesterday, is already in good shape.

Speak later

Patrick

From: Tom Wechsler
Sent: 08 January 2015 16:26
To: Mark R Davies
Cc: Belinda Crowe; Melanie Corfield; Rodric Williams; Patrick Bourke; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Parsons, Andrew
Subject: RE: The "dossier"

Thanks Mark – really helpful.

Some of it is covered (eg the substance of Rudkin if not as a named case) but your suggestions are probably a level of detail below that I originally pitched at. Now we have the shorter version, I think a more detailed rebuttal probably is the way to go. A fair amount of this is in Second Sight's questions so we'll get on to it.

Cc others for info and the potential need for help

Tom

Tom Wechsler

GRO

From: Mark R Davies
Sent: 08 January 2015 16:10

To: Tom Wechsler
Subject: RE: The "dossier"

Hi Tom

This looks very good.

Apologies if I have missed these points as I have read through but if they are not there could we directly respond to the following as well:

- The Rudkin case
- JA suggestion that at the end of the day, accounts were sometimes over, and sometimes under, and changing balances between a Sat and a Monday
- JA suggestion about discrepancies doubling following helpline advice
- The specific Bridgen accusation that we bring criminal cases even when CPS has advised against
- Have we covered off sufficiently the JA suggestion that we have broken 'agreement' with MPs re range of the scheme?
- -'set out to sabotage' – I think we need to specifically rebut this
- Lost or destroyed documents
- Calls to helpline abandoned (10s of thousand)
- 25% cut to support staff
- Put it in an envelope
- Statute of limitations
- Horizon was 'second hand' and designed for other purposes

M

Mark Davies I Communications and Corporate Affairs Director



From: Tom Wechsler
Sent: 08 January 2015 15:33
To: Patrick Bourke; Rodric Williams; Mark R Davies; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Parsons, Andrew; Jarnail Singh; Jane Hill
Cc: Belinda Crowe; Melanie Corfield; Chris Aujard; Georgia Barker; Jessica Barker
Subject: The "dossier"

All

With thanks to Belinda and Mel for their input so far, please find a first draft dossier attached. This would be for the us to offer to the Minister to place in Parliament and for us to use with MPs etc / publicly.

Please note: As colleagues are still commenting on the "short version" there will need to be a reconciliation of the two documents mostly for style / language rather than substance.

All comments welcome.

Thanks

Tom

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.
