
From: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO]
Sent: Fri 10/05/2013 9:15:27 AM (UTC)
To: Simon Baker [GRO]
Subject: RE: Spot review responses

Simon,

I suggest Craig and Neil Corrick as he heads up the training & audit team.

Thanks,
Angela

Angela Van Den Bogerd | Head of Partnerships



148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ



GRO

Mobex:

GRO



angela.van-den-bogerd [GRO]



[Post Office stories](#)



[@postofficenews](#)



POST
OFFICE

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: Simon Baker
Sent: 10 May 2013 09:53
To: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd
Subject: RE: Spot review responses

Ok I will set up a 30 call next week for lessons learnt. Apart from you, should I invite anyone else, eg Craig?

Simon

From: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd
Sent: 10 May 2013 09:39
To: Simon Baker
Subject: RE: Spot review responses

Hi Simon,

OK – it makes sense now. A review of lessons learnt would be good and I have implemented some along

the way but we should formally record these and any others that transpire.

Thanks,
Angela

Angela Van Den Bogerd | Head of Partnerships



148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ



GRO Mobex GRO



angela.van-den-bogerd@GRO



Post Office stories



@postofficenews



POST
OFFICE

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: Simon Baker
Sent: 10 May 2013 09:17
To: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd
Subject: RE: Spot review responses

Hi Angela

Our position hardened when Ron and Ian made it clear that our response will be put into public domain, this has lead our legal team to become concerned that anything we include could be used against us in the future and made us take a more cautious approach. Since then Ron & Ian have back tracked a bit and said they'd only put in an exec summary of our spot reviews in the report – however the point remains as we don't know what part they will pick out.

Ron/Ian can come back with more questions if they want. However we are trying to influence them to only focus on areas which answer the question "is there a systemic defect in Horizon" – most of these spot reviews seem to be peripheral matters.

I do need to talk to you separately about lessons we have learned from the investigation and what/when we are going to implement them – this is for Paula to show James that even though no systemic problem was found there were some benefits to the exercise (hopefully we can think of some!). I'll give you a call next week to discuss.

I have

From: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd
Sent: 09 May 2013 21:17

To: Simon Baker
Subject: RE: Spot review responses

Simon,

Intentionally not answering questions raised by 2nd Sight will in my view give rise to suspicion ie that we have something to hide and is not in the spirit of our interaction/engagement with Ron and Ian. By trying to dodge answers that may not present POL as positively as we would like will in the long term come back to bite us. I would much rather be upfront from the start. There was always a risk that our policies, procedures and processes would come under the spotlight and in some cases be deemed to not be as good as some would expect whether this expectation is reasonable or otherwise – this was a risk I believe we accepted from the start and whilst the integrity of the Horizon system may be intact we should not ignore any lessons learnt that come out of these investigations.

You may think that I'm being overly holistic here (and perhaps I've missed something by not attending as many of the recent meetings/conf calls) but I don't believe I am and would be interested in the views of Alwen and Susan although I am aware that they did not raise any issues/questions on the spot reviews.

Angela

Angela Van Den Bogerd | Head of Partnerships



148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ



GRO

Mobex

GRO



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

GRO



[Post Office stories](#)



[@postofficenews](#)



POST
OFFICE

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: Simon Baker
Sent: 09 May 2013 20:52
To: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd
Subject: FW: Spot review responses

Angela

Thanks for your comments.

Responses on them below, please let me know if they don't answer your questions.

Regards, Simon

From: Parsons, Andrew [GRO]
Sent: 09 May 2013 10:23
To: Simon Baker
Subject: RE: Spot review responses

Simon

My thoughts embedded below.

Kind regards
Andy

Andrew Parsons
Senior Associate
for and on behalf of Bond Dickinson LLP

Bond Dickinson

Direct: [GRO]
Mobile:
Fax:

Follow Bond Dickinson:



www.bonddickinson.com

From: Simon Baker [GRO]
Sent: 09 May 2013 08:59
To: Parsons, Andrew
Subject: Fw: Spot review responses

From: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd
Sent: Thursday, May 09, 2013 07:32 AM
To: Simon Baker
Subject: RE: Spot review responses

Simon,

As requested my feedback is below:

- Spot review 1 – happy with our response
- Spot review 11 – we have not responded to the request “POL is requested to provide statistical information about the number of days taken to send TCs to the SPMRs in the Horizon Investigation Sample

We have intentionally not provided the stats on TC submission times for the following reasons:

1. This is irrelevant to the Second Sight's scope of work – the time taken to submit TC is a POL operations issue not a Horizon issue.
2. There is no simple answer to this question – the time taken to respond to any particular TC depends on the product, nature of error, investigation process, date the error is discovered, etc.
3. Compiling this information would be disproportionately expensive / time consuming for in light of (1) and (2) above.
4. Anecdotally, the view is that these stats would show POL in a negative light as there will always be a material lag between a transaction and a TC. There is no simple way to spin this in POL's favour.
5. The submission date of a TC does not fairly reflect the date on which the SPMR will have knowledge of an error. In many cases, an enquiry regarding an error will have been raised with the SPMR before the TC is issued. Providing TC stats would lead to a misleading view that there is a long delay between transaction date and the SPMR's opportunity to investigate an error.

The above points cannot be explained in concise way that would not detract from an otherwise very positive response on the accountability of GIRO transactions (which is the core issue in SR11). It was therefore thought best to simply avoid this question for now. If Second Sight pushes for these stats, POL can then produce a separate and bespoke response that addresses above points in detail.

- Spot review 12 – we state that “there will be around 100 cases per month where it becomes apparent that a cheque has actually gone missing”. Could we present this as a % to demonstrate that this is not a big issue in terms of volumes.

The figure of "100" missing cheques a month is anecdotal only. We would need to ask Andy Winn / Linn Norbury if there is any hard data to back-up this figure or to convert it to a % of total cheques processed.

It would also be helpful to give some average time taken to raise a TC – discrepancies between cheques received at processing centre and cheques remmed out would be identified relatively quickly (within how many days?). A cheque that didn't clear and that had been accepted incorrectly would be returned to branch within xx? number of days.

See comments on SR11 above.

- Spot review 13 – happy with our response

Thanks,
Angela

Angela Van Den Bogerd | Head of Partnerships



148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ



GRO

Mobex

GRO



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

GRO



[Post Office stories](#)



@postofficenews

POST
OFFICE

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: Simon Baker
Sent: 01 May 2013 16:47
To: Susan Crichton; Alwen Lyons; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd
Cc: Lesley J Sewell
Subject: Spot review responses

Susan, Alwen, Angela

Attached are our response to the second sight spot reviews for your approval.

The first zip file contains the four spot review requests from second sight, the second zip file contains our responses to these requests.

Please could you send me your feedback by Monday.

Thanks, Simon

Simon Baker Head of Business Change and Assurance

2nd Floor, 148 Old Street, London, EC1V 9HQ

GRO

simon.baker@

GRO

postoffice.co.uk

@postofficenews

POST
OFFICE

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. simon.baker@bond-dickinson.co.uk only is authorised to access this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not simon.baker@bond-dickinson.co.uk please notify andrew.parsons@bond-dickinson.co.uk 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.