

**From:** Simon Baker[imceaex-  
\_o=mms\_ou=exchange+20administrative+20group+20+28fydibohf23spdl+29\_cn=recipients\_cn  
=simon+2ebaker4b1a8ef6-d2e0-4dec-94ea-591dfa651f2e@c72a47.ingest.local]  
**Sent:** Mon 22/04/2013 11:55:28 AM (UTC)  
**To:** Susan Crichton[GRO]; Alwen Lyons[GRO]  
**Cc:** Lesley J Sewell[GRO]  
**Subject:** horizon investigation

Susan, Alwen

The key points to me in the letter from JA to Alan Bates are:

1. His suggestion that Second Sight focus their efforts on the two best MP cases.
2. As "result" – even if preliminary, by the summer.
3. He doesn't respond to Alan Bates request to focus the investigation on "systemic failures"
4. He says Alan Bates's request for PO to continue to fund Kay Linnell is for Alan Bates to take up with the Post Office.

This gives us the opportunity to really contain the scope of the investigation.

My recommendation is we take advantage of this and draft a letter from Paula/Alice to James where we suggest the following:

1. We are concerned about the overrun of cost and time of the investigation, noting it has been running for a year and to date no evidence of systemic failures have been found
2. To move forward we suggest that Second Sight complete two in-depth MP cases – selecting the ones that they feel indicate systemic problems.
3. Post Office respond to the four spot reviews that have been submitted by second sight to respond to specific allegations (the work is already done and I think defend our position well)
4. We meet JA in June, we share the findings – both spot reviews and MPs cases.
5. Set the expectation that when we meet in June, unless there is strong evidence of any system failures we will close the investigation at that point.

Thoughts?

Simon

Simon Baker Head of Business Change and Assurance

2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, 148 Old Street, London, EC1V 9HQ

GRO  
GRO  
postoffice.co.uk  
GRO

POST  
OFFICE