
From: Paula Vennells [GRO]
Sent: Sun 22/09/2013 9:08:29 AM (UTC)
To: Alice Perkins CB [GRO]
Subject: Fwd: Prospectus

Not sure how much you want keeping in the loop. But hoping it goes through, I have earned my keep on this one. Unusually BIS misjudged it: they were unable to get the changes through and seemed to be unclear (?) on how much time we had before the deadline. So we were told our luck and time had run out on Friday.

Read bottom up. I hope it is now resolved.

Paula

Ps. [GRO]

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Jon Millidge <[GRO]>
Date: 21 September 2013 13:25:16 BST
To: Paula Vennells <[GRO]>
Subject: Re: Prospectus

Ok. I think we should be able to remove but I will need to confirm on Monday.
Jon

----- Original Message -----

From: Paula Vennells
Sent: Saturday, September 21, 2013 07:48 AM
To: Jon Millidge
Subject: Re: Prospectus

No Jon, the request is to remove it.

It is not an RM 'contract risk' either. Thx Paula

Sent from my iPad

On 20 Sep 2013, at 22:56, "Jon Millidge" [GRO] wrote:

And that is the point I have just raised with the team - maybe better under contracts.

Jon

----- Original Message -----

From: Paula Vennells

Sent: Friday, September 20, 2013 09:54 PM

To: Jon Millidge

Subject: Re: Prospectus

It is. Just odd therefore that it features in an IT risk section.

Thx v much. P

Sent from my iPad

On 20 Sep 2013, at 22:44, "Jon Millidge" <GRO> wrote:

Paula

I thought that this risk only repeated the press release and that your team were ok with it.

Evidently not! So let me check with the team. I will get back to you.

Jon

----- Original Message -----

From: Paula Vennells

Sent: Friday, September 20, 2013 09:36 PM

To: Jon Millidge

Subject: Prospectus

Hi Jon, I realise this is ridiculously late and for that my sincere apologies. However, i have just seen an email that our team in BIS appear to have hit a brick wall on one particular para in the prospectus. And I'm told it has to be lodged with UKLA by 8am Monday.

It is:

“ In July 2013, an interim report was published into alleged problems with POL's "Horizon" computer system, which is used to record

transactions in its branch network. The report confirmed that no system wide problems had been found in relation to the "Horizon" software, but suggests that POL should examine its support and training processes for sub-postmasters."

Our challenge is that this is not a risk to RM and is particularly misleading in the IT risks section. As your para states, the findings of the interim report related to Spmr training and support not IT faults.

Can you get this para removed? Alice had offered to contact Donald if necessary but I don't want to disturb her this weekend.

So sorry to bother you with this. And I recognise that the para makes it clear there isn't an IT fault. But its presence in an IT risk section potentially opens up a sensitive and politically high profile situation.

Regards, Paula

Ps. There are still concerns regarding the negative tone of POL references in the risk section but whilst we don't much like it, we understand that is the point of that section; and both our teams have worked hard to redress some of the more extreme original text. I am told a more positive picture of the RM/POL partnership is painted elsewhere in the prospectus and marketing materials. Could you send me some examples that would illustrate that - it would aid both our businesses if I can put the balanced view to my Board next week.
Thanks. P

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.
