

Message

From: Paula Vennells; GRO
on behalf of GRO
Sent: 07/07/2013 07:48:51
To: Mark R Davies; GRO
CC: Martin Edwards; GRO
Subject: Re: Proposed way forward

Mark, thanks for this and, I don't think we are too far apart - I didn't say this approach would be our media statement but they would need to be aligned.

You are right to call this out. And I will take your steer. no issue.

there are two objectives, the most urgent being to manage the media. The second is to make sure we do address the concerns of JA and Alan Bates, mainly looking forwards (but we should be aware AB's driver is really justice for the past); otherwise they will call for re opening cases. It may be that we get to manage AB/JA by playing on the 'go ballistic' view: ie., I will meet him privately to hear his views about these cases but that we cannot refer to anything in relation to past convictions. Any challenge must go via normal legal routes.

Thanks for suggesting we speak. I can at around 9.30am? Or at 10am. Then after 1pm anytime.

Btw, could you send over the latest set of Q&As. It will save me hunting down 00s of emails to find the last one.

I hope you are both managing to get some rest with your families. Paula

Sent from my iPad

On 7 Jul 2013, at 08:27, "Mark R Davies" <GRO> wrote:

Hi Paula

Could we have a word at some point today to discuss this, and specifically how far we go in terms of the wording below? I'm sending this just to you at this stage.

I am very concerned that we may get to a position where we go so far in our commitments that we actually fuel the story and turn it into something bigger than it is. I am not at all complacent about the issues, but there is real danger in going too far in commitments about past cases.

I say this for two reasons:

- first the substance of the report doesn't justify this response. Indeed the report is at such a level that our current media strategy would mean there would be some coverage, but not very much (the usual suspects). If we say publicly that we will look at past cases (and whatever we say to JA or JFSA will be public) whether from recent history or going further back, we will open this up very significantly, into front page news. In media terms it becomes mainstream, very high profile. It would also give JA a very strong case for asking for a Parliamentary statement from BIS.

- my second concern is the impact that this would have more broadly. It would have the "ballistic" impact which AB fears. It could lead to a very public narrative about the very nature of the business,

raising questions about Horizon (the reality of what SS has found would be misunderstood) and having an impact on public views about the PO and really widening the issue to the whole network.

The SS report would become irrelevant: in media terms it is the impression which counts (I was talking to the BBC's comms director last night about very similar issues), and the impression would be of a PO which doesn't have confidence/trust in its systems or processes, with the impact that could have on customer views of us.

I re read the SS report last night. It is a poor piece of work, but its over-riding finding is to support Horizon and urge us to improve our processes. But there isn't cause in there to question confidence in us. We can manage this in media terms in such a way that it doesn't escalate into a bigger issue, while having the right conversations with AB and JA.

Perhaps we can speak later?

Mark
Sent from my iPad

On 6 Jul 2013, at 22:46, "Paula Vennells" <[REDACTED]@GRO> wrote:

Hi, thank you for the inputs today. Susan I need your thoughts on the note below especially 1) and 2) please and the questions at the end of the mail.

I think we have the following which is a variant:

1) a working party over the next three/four months. This comprises PO working collaboratively with the JFSA and does three things:

- Firstly explores the SS (8) themes for improvement (can we get less than 8?) and agrees how they can be implemented.
- Secondly, looks at the remaining past cases with JFSA (and MPs if they wish) to see if either further themes or new evidence emerge.
- Thirdly, our external lawyers review all prosecutions in the past 12/18 months since PO has been independent of RM, in the light of the SS findings. The JFSA/PO working group reviews the findings.

[Why would they not review all cases of false accounting, eg., over the last 5-10 years, especially where the amounts have been 'small'? I assume 'large' amounts would be less likely to get away with saying they were muddle-headed and not helped? But could we review all? It is the false accounting charge JA was most concerned about.]

- Does the working party update JA in the autumn?

2) setting up of a review (chaired by PB/MO'C type) again via joint working between PO and JFSA, to determine how an independent safety net might be introduced ie., a commitment to an independent adjudicator or (non-statutory) ombudsman and the clear intention to agree scope and ToR.

3) the future introduction of an ongoing branch user group, once the working party has completed it's task. This will ensure ongoing independent involvement of Spmrs/(inc JFSA if they would like) to ensure the business listens to and acts upon issues as they arise; and as importantly, consults users on future systems planning and changes.

[4) a statement that although the system has been proved to have no systemic issues, and our training, support processes and helplines have worked for most of the 50-60000 colleagues over the past decade, we are nonetheless genuinely sorry that some of our

Spmrs, who were struggling did not feel we offered them sufficient help and support when they needed it. And that we are grateful to JFSA and JA for highlighting the issues. Many are historic and already improved but we are always open to new ways to improve how we do business to ensure the PO stays as trusted and effective in its communities as it ever was.]

Last thought: if we can draft this into something I could send to Alan Bates 'in confidence', it would get us to a better place in agreeing the press statement and way through with JA on Monday. Could Martin try and corral views into a draft by Sunday early pm? The more I speak with him the better I feel it will be.

Susan, would we ever ask the lawyers to consider reviewing past prosecutions? Is that what we are talking about in 1) above but simply not using the terms? If not, why would it be different? Of our 500 prosecutions, how many are false accounting? (For clarity these are open questions - just want to know the answers, not an indication that I want us to do so.)

Thanks, Paula

Sent from my iPad

On 6 Jul 2013, at 21:08, "Martin Edwards" {**GRO**} wrote:

Hmm, the boundaries between these groups are getting quite blurred and confusing (at least in my mind!).

I thought the focus of the working group involving the JFSA would be primarily thematic (i.e. the 8 or so themes which emerged from the SS process) - rather than focussing on resolving specific cases, which we would pick up through the seperate 1:1 briefings with MPs. The description below appears to shift it more towards the latter. Perhaps this is an academic distinction which we can't sustain in practice, but it certainly feels like safer territory to have the JFSA focussing on themes to do with training and support (which would then morph into the branch user forum) rather than individual cases...

Or have I misunderstood?

We also need to think about how the review of past cases by our external lawyers plays into the messaging (if at all). Certainly not something we would put in our proactive media statement I would have thought, but would we refer to this in meetings as an avenue if pushed by MPs or the JFSA?

Martin

Martin Edwards
Chief of Staff to the Chief Executive
Post Office

GRO

On 6 Jul 2013, at 18:18, "Mark R Davies"

GRO

} wrote:

I think that is the working group (number 2 below).

Sent from my iPad

On 6 Jul 2013, at 17:53, "Alwen Lyons"

GRO > wrote:

I think the only thing that is missing from James' agenda maybe not Alan's is what we do about past cases to scorch the suggestion of unfair convictions

Thanks

Alwen

Alwen Lyons
Company Secretary

GRO

Sent from Blackberry

From: Mark R Davies
Sent: Saturday, July 06, 2013 04:46 PM
To: Paula Vennells
Cc: Martin Edwards; Mark R Davies; Lesley J Sewell; Susan Crichton; Alwen Lyons; Theresa Iles
Subject: Re: Proposed way forward

Hi Paula

I think this points to the need for our package of measures to include two and possibly three new initiatives:

1. A Branch User Forum - for existing users to share views, discuss issues, examine processes etc.. Chaired by Exco and reporting to Exco. But this doesn't cover historic issues (ie the JFSA and MP cases) so we could also have (2)
2. A working party, to use Alan's phrase, to complete the MP and JFSA cases. This could "take over" the Second Sight review (perhaps involving them but perhaps not as they have effectively "cleared" Horizon, the remit of their inquiry). This would involve the JFSA and us working collaboratively on the remaining cases. We might wish to include an external party in this too (a PWC?). This is the area of greatest risk - looking back at historic cases which

have gone through the courts. But it is also completing the job we asked SS to do.

3. A review by a Mike o Connor or Patrick Burns figure to consider potential independent levers which could be developed to give SPMRs a means of independent adjudication or (non statutory) ombudsman.

This package, it feels to me, covers all bases. It looks ahead to fix internal issues and create independent balancing view, but it also completes the review and has the potential for doing so with SS playing a different, or no, role.

It is also a compelling package for media, which handled carefully, could contain the story.

Grateful for views.

Mark

Sent from my iPad

On 6 Jul 2013, at 10:35, "Paula Vennells"

GRO

wrote:

FYI and for any thoughts pls
Paula
Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From:
Paula
Vennell

s

GRO

Date: 6

July
2013
10:35:0
3 BST

To:
Alan
Bates



Subject
: Re:
Propos
ed way
forwar
d

Alan,
thank
you for
the
note.
Yes, I
thought
the
meetin
g with
James
was
positive
too. My
main
concern
is still
how we
manage
the
publicit
y, to
avoid -
as you
said - it
'going
ballistic
'.

We had
a useful
convers
ation re
a
statem

ent
from
James
with
quotes
from
you and
me, or
possibl
e joint
statem
ent.
And
agreed
we
would
pick up
again
on
Monda
y.

Ours is
now
bring
re-
worked
in the
light of
that
and as
we
liaise
with SS
over
the
weeken
d on
some
change
s to the
report
where
it is
factuall
y
inaccur
ate. I
am
hopeful
these
will be

address
ed.

Once I
have a
final
draft, I
would
be
happy
to send
across
to you.

It
would
be
good to
meet
on
Monda
y. And
as I
haven't
met
Kay,
then I
would
be
happy
to
extend
the
meetin
g to
include
her and
I would
bring
Alwen
Lyons,
who is
our
Compa
ny
Secreta
ry -
Alwen
has
been
the key
lead on
the

liaison
with
James'
office.

In the
meanti
me, I
hope
you
enjoy
the
glorious
weathe
r - at
last!

Paula

Ps. You
were
on my
list to
call
today
but I
imagine
this
email
exchan
ge is
sufficie
nt
now?
Howev
er, if
you
would
like to
speak
at any
time,
don't
hesitat
e to
text
me.

Sent
from
my iPad

On 6 Jul

2013,
at
09:51,
"Alan
Bates"



wrote:

H
e
l
l
o
p
a
u
l
a

l
u
n
d
e
r
s
t
a
n
d
t
h
e
m
e
e
t
i
n
g
w
i
t
h
J

a
m
e
s
A
r
b
u
t
h
n
o
t
w
e
n
t
w
e
l
l
o
n
F
r
i
d
a
y
a
n
d
l
b
e
l
i
e
v
e
h
e
w
i
l
l

b
e
d
i
s
c
u
s
s
i
n
g
h
i
s
v
i
e
w
s
w
i
t
h
m
e
o
n
M
o
n
d
a
y
m
o
r
n
i
n
g
.
I
a
m
s

u
r
e
y
o
u
w
i
l
l
a
g
r
e
e
t
h
a
t
i
t
i
s
i
m
p
o
r
t
a
n
t
t
h
a
t
w
e
h
a
v
e
e
v
e
n

a
n
o
u
t
l
i
n
e
d
o
c
u
m
e
n
t
o
f
t
h
e
p
r
o
p
o
s
e
d
w
a
y
f
o
r
w
a
r
d
w
e
h
a
v
e

d
i
s
c
u
s
s
e
d
,
b
e
f
o
r
e
t
h
e
M
P
s
,
m
e
e
t
i
n
g
.
A
s
s
o
o
n
a
s
i
t
i
s
a
v

a
i
l
a
b
l
e
,
l
w
o
u
l
d
a
p
p
r
e
c
i
a
t
e
s
e
e
i
n
g
y
o
u
r
v
e
r
s
i
o
n
o
f
w
h
a

t
i
s
p
r
o
p
o
s
e
d
,
h
o
p
e
f
u
l
l
y
a
m
e
n
d
e
d
t
o
a
d
d
r
e
s
s
t
h
e
c
o
m
m
e
n

t
b
e
l
o
w
.

L
o
o
k
i
n
g
t
h
r
o
u
g
h
m
y
n
o
t
e
s
f
r
o
m
o
u
r
l
a
s
t
c
o
n
v
e
r

s
a
t
i
o
n
,
t
h
e
r
e
i
s
a
n
e
a
r
l
y
i
t
e
m
o
f
c
o
n
c
e
r
n
,
t
h
a
t
b
e
i
n
g
t
h

e
n
a
m
e
o
f
t
h
e
p
a
n
e
l
w
h
i
c
h
y
o
u
r
e
f
e
r
r
e
d
t
o
a
s
t
h
e
'
u
s
e
r
g
r
o

u
p
'
.
W
h
i
l
s
t
l
c
a
n
a
p
p
r
e
c
i
a
t
e
y
o
u
w
a
n
t
s
u
c
h
a
g
r
o
u
p
t
o
c
o

n
t
i
n
u
e
o
n
i
n
t
o
t
h
e
f
u
t
u
r
e
,
a
t
w
h
i
c
h
t
i
m
e
s
u
c
h
a
n
a
m
e
m
a
y
b

e
s
u
i
t
a
b
l
e
.

l
n
i
t
i
a
l
l
y
,
a
n
d
w
h
i
l
s
t
i
t
i
s
a
l
s
o
l
o
o
k
i
n
g
a

t
t
h
e
i
s
s
u
e
s
s
u
r
r
o
u
n
d
i
n
g
t
h
e
r
e
p
o
r
t
a
n
d
t
h
e
c
a
s
e
s
,
p
o
s
s

i
b
l
y
'
t
a
s
k
g
r
o
u
p
'
o
r
'
w
o
r
k
i
n
g
p
a
r
t
y
'
m
i
g
h
t
b
e
m
o
r
e
a
c
c
u

r
a
t
e
,
a
s
t
e
c
h
n
i
c
a
l
l
y
,
t
h
e
b
u
l
k
o
f
J
F
S
A
a
r
e
e
x
u
s
e
r
s
,
a
n
d

o
t
h
e
r
s
w
i
l
l
n
o
d
o
u
b
t
p
i
c
k
u
p
o
n
t
h
e
n
a
m
e
.

l
c
o
u
l
d
o
f
f
e
r
,

r
e
v
i
e
w
b
o
a
r
d
,
,
b
u
t
l
c
o
u
l
d
s
e
e
t
h
a
t
m
i
g
h
t
n
o
t
b
e
a
c
c
e
p
t
a

b
l
e
.
R
e
g
a
r
d
i
n
g
M
o
n
d
a
y
8
t
h
,
d
o
y
o
u
s
t
i
l
l
w
a
n
t
t
o
m
e
e
t
?
I

f
w
e
d
o
m
e
e
t
,
a
n
d
o
t
h
e
r
s
a
r
e
t
o
a
t
t
e
n
d
,
I
w
o
u
l
d
l
i
k
e
K
a
y
L
i

n
n
e
l
l
,
w
h
o
h
a
s
b
e
e
n
w
o
r
k
i
n
g
w
i
t
h
u
s
f
o
r
t
h
e
l
a
s
t
y
e
a
r
,
t
o

a
c
c
o
m
p
a
n
y
m
e
.

W
i
t
h
t
r
a
v
e
l
a
r
r
a
n
g
e
m
e
n
t
t
o
f
i
n
a
l
i
s
e
,
l

w
o
u
l
d
a
p
p
r
e
c
i
a
t
e
a
r
e
s
p
o
n
s
e
t
o
t
h
a
t
p
o
i
n
t
a
s
s
o
n
a
s
y
o
u

a
r
e
a
b
l
e
t
o
l
e
t
m
e
k
n
o
w
.

R
e
g
a
r
d
s

A
l
a
n