
From: Mark R Davies[/O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=MARK R DAVIESA80D7269-659B-41D0-9C80-68D9DE4FA7C5D38]
Sent: Tue 02/07/2013 11:19:43 PM (UTC)
To: Martin Edwards [GRO]
Subject: Re: PV and AP brief

Agreed! Well, will happily take a look if you like though will be sloping off to bed shortly. Let me know in next 15 or so.

M

Sent from my iPad

On 3 Jul 2013, at 00:17, "Martin Edwards" [GRO] wrote:

Sorry, just saw this, not ignoring you! Yes, I'm doing now. Not right that either of us should have to rewrite so significantly at this time of night!

From: Mark R Davies
Sent: 02 July 2013 23:46
To: Martin Edwards
Cc: Mark R Davies
Subject: Re: PV and AP brief

Are you doing it now? Doesn't seem right! I am happy to have a go if you prefer.

MRk

Sent from my iPad

On 2 Jul 2013, at 23:45, "Martin Edwards" [GRO] wrote:

Yes, good idea, but unfortunately not in time for an 8.45am meeting!

From: Mark R Davies
Sent: 02 July 2013 23:45
To: Martin Edwards
Subject: Re: PV and AP brief

I know. I'm wondering if we give it to Portland to prepare properly as part of the Q&A pack. It will probably help them.

Sent from my iPad

On 2 Jul 2013, at 23:41, "Martin Edwards" [GRO] wrote:

Many thanks, will integrate your language below, which is spot on.

Exchanging phone calls/emails with Susan and Hugh to try to pin them down on the prosecutions point... I agree we need something fairly clear if pressed on miscarriages of justice...

The whole brief needs re-writing, infuriating!

From: Mark R Davies
Sent: 02 July 2013 23:38
To: Mark R Davies
Cc: Martin Edwards; Mark R Davies
Subject: Re: PV and AP brief

Looks good in your rewrite.

I think in the main body we really need to emphasise more that there is no connection between the 14 and the 64 and the spot reviews o prosecutions.

Do they need an if pressed line on miscarriages of justice? "Nothing has emerged in this report to suggest wrongful conviction. Cases have been through the judicial process and we have never relied entirely on Horizon in any court case"

I'd use the bit at the bottom of my email below, reproduced here for ease of reading

we must be satisfied that when the report is released it truly reflects the position - the Post office business is too important to too many people for faith to be questioned unfairly

Another point which needs bringing out is the public money point - we do have a duty to protect public money, and where there is wrongdoing we must act: it would be entirely wrong if we did not. We want to support our people and will make sure that we do everything we can to improve training and support in order to ensure that their stewardship of public funds cannot be questioned.

Sent from my iPad

On 2 Jul 2013, at 23:14, "Mark R Davies" <

GRO

wrote:

On BBC - Concerned to learn that you have lined up an interview with the BBC. Keen to understand your thinking here.

On media statement - we can offer to share statements but not to agree them: he will try to water ours down. Suggest we say in the brief "We will let you know our handling plan in relation to the media, and share statements. We would be grateful if you were able to do the same. You will appreciate the danger of the media exaggerating the report and our need firmly to defend our reputation."

on Fujitsu: "clearly this issue has significant bearing on one of our suppliers, Fujitsu. They will be asked for their views on the report before publication."

On the User group naming, I know Lesley and Alwen were keen to avoid referencing Horizon so it needs a call from them. I am uneasy too because it places all the emphasis on the "computer"

M

Sent from my iPad

On 2 Jul 2013, at 23:08, "Martin Edwards"

<GRO> wrote:

Thanks – questions/comments below. Current draft attached (so far I've only re-worked the summary box, but that's the key section I think).

From: Mark R Davies
Sent: 02 July 2013 22:57
To: Martin Edwards
Subject: Re: PV and AP brief

Thanks

Current version is pretty weak.

The speaking note needs to be firmer - we want to make clear our position and underline our view that no evidence to support the systemic failures.

It should specifically address the BBC point. WHAT POINT SHOULD WE MAKE. GRATEFUL FOR SOME WORDS

A really key point is that we should not guarantee to agree our media lines with JA. If he comes out strongly as it sounds as though he will, we will have no choice but to come back strongly. So am concerned about the line where it talks about agreeing media statements. SO SHOULD WE REMOVE THIS ALTOGETHER? DIFFICULT TO ASK FOR HIS MEDIA STATEMENT WITHOUT OFFERING TO SHARE OURS...

There needs to be a line in there about Fujitsu if there isn't currently. WHAT LINE?

I think it needs to be up front in addressing the issue where JA is said to be angry - the prosecutions and the new evidence.

On training we need to be very careful about language - the current version is too loose - this is your point about not leaving any glimmer which suggests that cases might need to be reopened. So we need to acknowledge that training can always be improved (rather than our training must be

improved - important difference) and need to follow that with further statement that there is no evidence of systemic failures.

The brief needs to make clear that none of the 14 or the 62 impact on the spot reviews in the interim report and are therefore not relevant to the interim report.

We shouldn't call the user group a "Horizon" user group - makes it appear we are acknowledging issue with Horizon - branch management user group? CAN WE CALL IT AN HORIZON SUPPORT USER GROUP?

Can you send final version to me before it goes wider so I can go through one more time? Will look back on notes to see what missed.

Overall it didn't feel to me that it captured Alice's views and I think she was right to be so clear.

It may be worth setting out three overall "rocks" for the two of them to return to:

- there is no evidence in the interim report to support any suggestion of systemic failures
- this is a system which deals with six million transactions a day or more than 40 million a week, and is used by more than 50,000 people every day
- we must be satisfied that when the report is released it truly reflects the position - the Post office business is too important to too many people for faith to be questioned unfairly

Another point which needs bringing out is the public money point - we do have a duty to protect public money, and where there is wrongdoing we must act: it would be entirely wrong if we did not. We want to support our people and will make sure that we do everything we can to improve training and support in order to ensure that their stewardship of public funds cannot be questioned.

We also need to bring out the scale more - how many convictions over what period compared with xx transactions in 11800 branches etc...

Mark

Sent from my iPad

On 2 Jul 2013, at 22:31, "Martin Edwards"

GRO

> wrote:

Send me thoughts on the current version, I'm doing quite a lot of re-working of the original. thanks

From: Mark R Davies
Sent: 02 July 2013 22:30
To: Martin Edwards
Subject: Re: PV and AP brief

Hi

Do you reckon you'll have a new version over shortly ? Or shall I just send you some thoughts on the current version?

M

Sent from my iPad
On 2 Jul 2013, at 21:37, "Martin Edwards"

GRO

> wrote:

Many thanks Susan and Alwen. I'll make a few drafting changes and recirculate.

On the prosecutions section of the brief there is a half-finished sentence (see below) – what were you planning to say?! Was this going to cover the issue around previous convictions? If not, what is our best possible defence against the suggestion that this process had called into question the validity of previous prosecutions? Think we definitely need a line on this.

On the first bullet below, presumably we should add a sentence to state that where it is

clear that the Horizon system isn't the issue at stake, we have a duty to protect public money by pursuing appropriate action (and this why some prosecutions are still happening)? Presumably there is some kind of reasonableness test here – i.e. a spmr can't just get off scot free by saying it's an Horizon issue, irrespective of the circumstances?

- **Prosecutions**
- Where cases have been referred to SS via JFSA these are subject to the immunity agreement. Where we have investigated sub postmasters since the start of the SS work, and the sub postmaster has said that the Horizon computer systems has been key to the issues that have arisen in the branch we have not taken action against the sub postmaster.
- Where POL takes legal action against a

From: Susan Crichton
Sent: 02 July 2013
20:34
To: Martin Edwards;

Paula Vennells; Hugh
Flemington; Mark R
Davies
Cc: Susan Crichton;
Alwen Lyons; Simon
Baker
Subject: PV and AP
brief

Martin/Mark

Susan and I have pulled
this together with help,
so it is now over to you,
to work your magic and
send on the final
document to Paula,
Alice and me tonight.

Hugh would you please
check any comments
please come back to
Susan.

Mark would you also
please check

Martin is holding the
pen please send back to
him

Also include in AP and
PV and my pack any
other docs you think we
need

Thanks
Alwen & Susan

Susan Crichton | HR &
Corporate Services
Director
<image001.jpg>
1st Floor, Central Wing,
148 Old Street, London,
EC1V 9HQ

GRO	Postline
GRO	Mobex

GRO

<image002.jpg>