

**From:** Paula Vennells  
**Sent:** Sun, 9 Feb 2014 22:57:37 +0000  
**To:** Alasdair Marnoch  
**Cc:** Alice Perkins; Larissa Wilson; neil [GRO]; Tim Franklin; Chris M Day; Alwen Lyons; Chris Aujard; Virginia Holmes - PO; Susannah Storey; Susannah Hooper  
**Subject:** Re: 2014 02 11 ARC teleconference

Hi Alasdair, I have already asked Chris to pick up these questions and Neil's; we will come well briefed, including detail on how the BIP has engendered the change. (Chris/Alwen, if we haven't already done so, it might be worth having Angela VdB on stand-by.)

I thought it would be worth sharing my thoughts on why we are different; in my mind it relates to the operational nature of PO rather than product or services, where there is more commonality:

The difference and perhaps not immediately obvious to our leading Counsel, is scale. None of the businesses Brian Altman compared us to has a network the size of ours (most will be much less than 10% of our size) and although some (few) may operate agencies, none will have the unique relationship that we do with Spms, nor the cash handling through individuals who are not employees, nor the spread of very different and in some cases not very successful adjacent businesses, which itself causes problems. We are more complex and operate without the ability to monitor our agents easily, (though the BIP is improving this); and most of the comparator businesses he referred to will have line management structures, which make conformance easier.

This is an important area for the business and so I am particularly grateful to our NEDs for your attention. We will do what we can to facilitate a good debate.

Paula

Sent from my iPad

On 9 Feb 2014, at 22:30, "Alasdair Marnoch" [GRO] wrote:

Thanks Alice.

I agree this is a tricky issue and we will explore all the options in our call. As you say it's difficult to understand why we should be different to others although the timing of a shift from our current policy will be key.

I'd also like to understand more about the BIP and what is driving the reduction in cases recently (more relaxed approach on prosecutions and/or BIP impact).

I hope you manage to join the debate but if not we will make sure your comments are taken into account.

Best

Alasdair

---

From: [aliceperkins](#) [GRO]  
To: [larissa.wilson](#) [GRO]; [neil](#) [GRO];  
[timfranklin1](#) [GRO]; [alasdairmarnoch](#) [GRO];  
[paula.vennells](#) [GRO]; [chris.m.day](#) [GRO];  
[Alwen.lyons](#) [GRO]  
CC: [christopher.ajard](#) [GRO]; [virginia.holmes.t21](#) [GRO];  
[susannah.storey](#) [GRO]; [susannah\\_hooper](#) [GRO]  
Subject: Re: 2014 02 11 ARC teleconference  
Date: Sat, 8 Feb 2014 12:03:40 +0000

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 [GRO]; Alasdair Marnoch [GRO]; Tim Franklin [GRO]; Alice Perkins; Paula Vennells [GRO]; Chris M Day [GRO]; Alwen Lyons [GRO]  
**Cc:** Chris Aujard [GRO]; Virginia Holmes [GRO]; Susannah Storey [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

**GRO**

UK Freephone:

**GRO**

Chairperson passcode:

Participant passcode:

**GRO**

Kind regards

Larissa

Larissa Wilson I Company Secretarial Assistant

<image001.png>

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

**GRO**

<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)

---

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*