

---

**From:** Parsons, Andrew [GRO]  
**Sent:** Mon 21/10/2013 9:43:26 AM (UTC)  
**To:** Andy Holt [GRO]  
**Cc:** Matthews, Gavin [GRO]; Belinda Crowe [GRO]; Jarnail A Singh [GRO]  
**Subject:** RE: Sparrow - text for CEO's report [BD-4A.FID20472253]

Andy

Draft answers to Martin's questions below – too much detail or not enough?

1. Would be good to include a line on the review of prosecutions policy – i.e. just updating the Board that work on this is progressing and they will see a paper at the next ARC or Board. Following yesterday's discussion, please can we confirm the arrangements?

Brian Altman QC's review of the prosecution policy is being finalised. The report was originally due on 31 Oct but should now be ready by 25 Oct. The review will address the question of how POL may wish to approach prosecutions in the future. [ANDY – I'm not sure what the board process is for this report. Hugh mentioned that there might be an extraordinary ExCo to review the report before it goes to ARC or the Board.]

2. I think we should have a few lines on compensation policy, as this is very much on the Board's mind given the link to costs and outcomes. Please can we have some sentences to explain what work has been done so far, the initial conclusions and the next steps to develop the policy in more detail?

A written Settlement Policy for the Scheme is being produced. The Policy will explain (1) the process for refining our understanding of the costs and outcomes of the Scheme and (2) the parameters for where/how POL may be prepared to settle individual cases. This policy is being developed to ensure that a consistent approach is taken to each case and to ensure that those attending each mediation on behalf of POL have a clearly defined mandate for what may be offered by way of settlement. Meetings have been held with internal stakeholders and external lawyers are preparing a first draft Policy. This Policy will be reviewed and approved by the Sparrow Steering Group before submission to ExCo / the Board.

3. I think the Criminal Case review process needs more explanation, in particular an explanation of the implications of the 11 cases where disclosure has been recommended. (Even if we don't want to include too much on this in the text itself, useful for Paula to have in her background notes). Can we also have an explanation of the high level conclusions of the Brian Altman review, along the lines outlined by Rodric yesterday?

[Jarnail / CK to amend / complete]

Brian Altman QC's First Review has now been received. This First Review looked into POL's compliance with its prosecution duties in light of Second Sight's findings – in particular, it considered POL's legal duty to ensure that SS' findings were fully disclosed to any person who is currently being or has previously been prosecuted by POL. Mr Altman QC concluded that POL is complying with its duties and that the approach adopted by the prosecution team was "fundamentally sound". This report gives POL good grounds to resist any formal external review of its historic prosecutions (ie. by the Criminal Cases Review Commission).

4. Further to yesterday's discussion, please could we also have some lines for background speaking notes on the process/outlook for resolving SS's involvement in the WG etc?

[ANDY / BELINDA – thoughts on the below?]

Work is continuing on managing SS out of the Scheme. In general, SS' role is gradually being reduced until

they can be removed entirely. This work has already begun:

- SS' role has been reduced to investigating specific cases – under its original scope of work SS was entitled to look broadly at any aspect of Horizon.
- SS is no longer required to give a definitive view on the efficacy / reliability of Horizon – it only needs to offer its best assessment of each Subpostmaster's case
- A dedicated internal POL team has been setup to streamline SS' investigation process.

Next steps

- Use the appointment of Sir Anthony to remove the need for SS to formally vote at Working Group meetings – thereby moving them to an advisory role only.
  - Continue to migrate the investigation of cases from SS to the internal POL team.
5. Would be good to put in a rough date (or at least month) for the first meeting of the Branch User Forum. Late October? Early November? Or at least by end November?

[One for you Andy]

6. At what point do we expect the first cases to go to mediation?

The first few selected cases should hopefully go through mediation before Christmas. The majority will be Q1 2014. The more complicated cases are likely to be held off until Q2 2014 (so that POL has a good track record before taking on these difficult cases)

7. Finally, as mentioned to Charles, Paula/Chris will need a few background notes on projected costs and accounting arrangements.

[One for you Andy – but happy to discuss]

**Andrew Parsons**

Senior Associate

for and on behalf of Bond Dickinson LLP

*Bond Dickinson*

Direct:  
Mobile:  
Fax:

**GRO**

Follow Bond Dickinson:



[www.bonddickinson.com](http://www.bonddickinson.com)

---

**From:** Andy Holt [mailto:**GRO**]  
**Sent:** 21 October 2013 09:33  
**To:** Parsons, Andrew  
**Subject:** RE: Sparrow - text for CEO's report

Hi Andy  
Martin wants this back asap so something by early afternoon would be great.  
Thanks  
Andy

---

**From:** Rodric Williams  
**Sent:** 20 October 2013 23:49  
**To:** Andy Holt  
**Cc:** GRO  
**Subject:** Fw: Sparrow - text for CEO's report

Andy - I've asked Andy P to help respond to Martin's points.

Kind regards, Rodric

---

**From:** Martin Edwards  
**Sent:** Friday, October 18, 2013 03:25 PM  
**To:** Andy Holt  
**Cc:** Belinda Crowe; Rodric Williams; Chris Aujard; Hugh Flemington; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; Charles Colquhoun  
**Subject:** Sparrow - text for CEO's report

Andy

Thanks very much for this. A few questions/requests for further information (which copy recipients may be better placed to answer).

1. Would be good to include a line on the review of prosecutions policy – i.e. just updating the Board that work on this is progressing and they will see a paper at the next ARC or Board. Following yesterday's discussion, please can we confirm the arrangements?
2. I think we should have a few lines on compensation policy, as this is very much on the Board's mind given the link to costs and outcomes. Please can we have some sentences to explain what work has been done so far, the initial conclusions and the next steps to develop the policy in more detail?
3. I think the Criminal Case review process needs more explanation, in particular an explanation of the implications of the 11 cases where disclosure has been recommended. (Even if we don't want to include too much on this in the text itself, useful for Paula to have in her background notes). Can we also have an explanation of the high level conclusions of the Brian Altman review, along the lines outlined by Rodric yesterday?
4. Further to yesterday's discussion, please could we also have some lines for background speaking notes on the process/outlook for resolving SS's involvement in the WG etc?
5. Would be good to put in a rough date (or at least month) for the first meeting of the Branch User Forum. Late October? Early November? Or at least by end November?
6. At what point do we expect the first cases to go to mediation?
7. Finally, as mentioned to Charles, Paula/Chris will need a few background notes on projected costs and accounting arrangements.

For the additional text which needs to go into the report itself it would be good to have this as soon as possible. We've got more time for the background notes (would need these finalised by the end of next week).

Give me a shout if useful to discuss.

Thanks,  
Martin

---

**From:** Andy Holt  
**Sent:** 16 October 2013 16:21  
**To:** Martin Edwards  
**Subject:** RE: Information for Paula's 1:1 with Chairman

Martin

Does this look like the right sort of level/content. I have tried to stick to the themes of the previous update so this is relevant to the board. I have not mentioned next steps on compensation policy as I couldn't find a reference to this in the last paper but for you info I would expect another iteration next week before we can look at how this works with a sample of current submissions. We will bring this back to the steering board for review in 2 weeks.

### **Project Sparrow Update**

The Improvement Work stream has completed the 'as is' experience for subpostmasters. The team are now progressing with the "to be" picture and identifying the gaps and issues as well as the activities that will be needed get us to our future model. Members of the programme are now tasked with articulating the vision, behaviours and outcomes they as leaders should be looking for from their teams so that they address both cultural challenges as well as the improvement activities needed to achieve the outcomes required.

The Mediation Scheme has now received 46 applications from subpostmasters since it was opened at the end of August. 37 of the application have been accepted on to the scheme and await full submissions from the subpostmasters. The remainder require additional information, need to exhaust internal Post Office processes or are in legal processes which exclude them from joining at this time. The application closure date is the 18<sup>th</sup> November, we will then have all the cases we will need to manage in the initial scheme. We are in the final stages of appointing Sir Anthony Hooper as the independent chair and expect to have him in place by the end of October.

The Criminal Case reviews continue with our external firm of solicitors. They have completed several sifts of past cases and have recommended disclosure on 11. Brian Altman QC's review is also progressing well and it is expected to complete as planned by the end of October.

Having approved the terms of reference for the Branch User Forum we are now recruiting subpostmasters to participate on the forum so that the initial meeting can convene.

Regards

Andy

---

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

---

**Please consider the environment! Do you need to print this email?**

---

The information in this e-mail and any attachments is confidential and may be legally privileged and protected by law. belinda.crowe [GRO] only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not belinda.crowe [GRO] please notify andrew.parsons [GRO] as soon as possible and delete any copies. Unauthorised use, dissemination, distribution, publication or copying of this communication or attachments is prohibited and may be unlawful.

Any files attached to this e-mail will have been checked by us with virus detection software before transmission. Bond Dickinson LLP accepts no liability for any loss or damage which may be caused by software viruses and you should carry out your own virus checks before opening any attachment.

Content of this email which does not relate to the official business of Bond Dickinson LLP, is neither given nor endorsed by it.

This email is sent for and on behalf of Bond Dickinson LLP which is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales under number OC317661. Our registered office is St Ann's Wharf, 112 Quayside, Newcastle Upon Tyne, NE1 3DX, where a list of members' names is open to inspection. We use the term partner to refer to a member of the LLP, or an employee or consultant who is of equivalent standing. Our VAT registration number is GB123393627.

Bond Dickinson LLP is authorised and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority.