

---

**From:** Susan Crichton[IMCEAEX-  
\_O=MMS\_OU=EXCHANGE+20ADMINISTRATIVE+20GROUP+20+28FYDIBOHF23SPDLT+29  
\_CN=RECIPIENTS\_CN=SUSAN+20CRICHTONC5FA6431-DC28-49AB-8F0F-  
BE4237A4AD4F@C72A47.ingest.local]  
**Sent:** Wed 14/03/2012 11:57:08 AM (UTC)  
**To:** Alwen Lyons [GRO]  
**Subject:** RE: Investigations MOU

Oh no its all Lesley needs at the moment

Susan Crichton  
Legal and Compliance Director  
Post Office Limited  
148 Old Street  
London  
EC1V 9HQ

Telephone [GRO]

---

**From:** Alwen Lyons  
**Sent:** 14 March 2012 11:55  
**To:** Susan Crichton  
**Subject:** FW: Investigations MOU

Mike would have stamped on this very quickly.

**Alwen Lyons**

Company Secretary

**Post Office Ltd**

148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

Tel: [GRO] / Mobile: [GRO] Mobex: [GRO]

[GRO]

---

**From:** Tony Marsh  
**Sent:** 14 March 2012 11:32  
**To:** Nigel O'Donoghue; Anna Malley; John M Scott; Paul M Brown; Eamon Price; Phil Gerrish; Dave Pardoe; Lesley J Sewell; Harry Clarke; Alwen Lyons  
**Cc:** Darragh Canavan  
**Subject:** RE: Investigations MOU

Colleagues

The conference call will take place. The main issue has been unflagged changes made by POL in returned documents and the fact that whilst Phil Gerrish, RM Security Director of Investigations, has been fully empowered to negotiate for RMG at all times no empowered POL negotiator has ever been involved, hence constant revisions and changes driven by POL.

John will understand, but other non-security experts may not, that what RMG insists is that no detected and ongoing criminal behaviour is disrupted by unilateral action by one organisation, whether the employing organisation or the losing organisation. This would run counter to all principles of effective crime prevention and law enforcement and would be considered to be in unacceptable bad faith if done in the case of a POL employee predominantly predating RMG products.

It is inaccurate and disingenuous for John to state "RMG Security focus primarily on investigations & prosecution with a view for compensation via the Courts and then supported by crime prevention post apprehension. They seek to allow further theft/crime to continue in order to be able to identify and apprehend the offender for such prosecution." as he does in his associated email of 6<sup>th</sup> March to Mike Young. If this was the basis of John's briefings to Mike Young then some of Mr Young's more inexplicable beliefs and positions may now be better understood. RM Security naturally pursues a strategy of prevention, deterrence, disruption and detection, with prosecution and asset recovery a key element of the deterrence approach. RM Security would never seek to prolong offending behaviour, as this would exacerbate losses to the organisation and its customers, impact negatively on customer satisfaction and public perception and might result in an offender facing increased penalties, which would in itself be an affront to natural justice. Any suggestion to the contrary is unprofessional and does John little credit.

Provided all parties on the conference call are fully empowered to negotiate and conclude matters there and then all will be well.

Regards

Tony

Group Security Director  
Royal Mail Group  
RM Security  
6a Eccleston Street  
LONDON  
SW1W 9LT

Telephone:

Postline:

Mobile:

Mobex:

External Email:

To report any crime or suspected crime against the Royal Mail Group please phone the Security Help Desk on postline

or std

---

**From:** Nigel O'Donoghue

**Sent:** 13 March 2012 19:25

**To:** Anna Malley; John M Scott; Paul M Brown; Eamon Price; Tony Marsh; Phil Gerrish; Dave Pardoe; Lesley J Sewell; Harry Clarke; Alwen Lyons

**Cc:** Darragh Canavan

**Subject:** Re: Investigations MOU

Thanks Anna

Agreed

---

**From:** Anna Malley

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 13, 2012 08:21 PM

**To:** Nigel O'Donoghue; John M Scott; Paul M Brown; Eamon Price; Tony Marsh; Phil Gerrish; Dave Pardoe; Lesley J Sewell; Harry Clarke; Alwen Lyons

**Cc:** Darragh Canavan

**Subject:** Re: Investigations MOU

Folks - I share Nigel's concern that this looks like we are getting stuck. As this is an MDA rather than an MSA obligation, it would hardly seem fair to burden the MSA separation directors with getting involved. So my counter

suggestion is that the call proceeds with myself and Paul M Brown. Thanks

Anna Malley  
Consumer Channel Director

---

**From:** Nigel O'Donoghue  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 13, 2012 08:09 PM  
**To:** John M Scott; Paul M Brown; Eamon Price; Tony Marsh; Phil Gerrish; Dave Pardoe; Anna Malley; Lesley J Sewell; Harry Clarke; Alwen Lyons  
**Cc:** Darragh Canavan  
**Subject:** Re: Investigations MOU

Thanks John,

Would you mind if I suggest a conference call between security parties, Harry and I in the first instance.

The escalation process needs to start there.

Nigel

---

**From:** John M Scott  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 13, 2012 08:03 PM  
**To:** Paul M Brown; Nigel O'Donoghue; Eamon Price; Tony Marsh; Phil Gerrish; Dave Pardoe; John M Scott; Anna Malley; Lesley J Sewell; Harry Clarke; Alwen Lyons  
**Subject:** FW: Investigations MOU

Dear All.

We have just been advised that RMG Security are not satisfied with the wording previously sent on the 6 March and wish to make amendments over the next two days.

The position of Post Office Security I believe is clearly detailed below in regards to supporting RMG Security in investigations/prosecution/recovery as appropriate to RMG products, but must retain the right to prevent further crime being committed in the examples described (offenders committing offences against other products, crime against RMG products also impact POL products/contracts, or signification risk to brand/reputation). If preventative action is taken, Post Office Security would still support RMG in the investigation/prosecution/recovery of offences committed up to that point.

Additionally it is for the organisation that employs the individuals committing any such offences to conduct the lead investigation/interview and the prosecution. This plays both ways, i.e. can also include RMG personnel (i.e. Postman) who commit offences against POL (theft of cash etc) and dealt with by RMG Security.

From a Post Office Security perspective, these conditions need to be agreed to and clearly detailed in the Investigations MOU.

In light of concern of timescale and to put some focus on the issue, I suggest that unless there is formal agreement by both Post Office Security and RMG Security by the close of play this week, disappointingly then the matter would need to be formally escalated.

Dave Pardoe and I will be available for the remainder of the week.

I suggest a conference call that involves Tony Marsh (RMG), Phil Gerrish (RMG), Dave Pardoe (POL) and myself is organised.

Dave Pardoe – can you please arrange.

Regards.

John.

---

**From:** John M Scott  
**Sent:** 13 March 2012 13:41  
**To:** Paul M Brown  
**Cc:** Anna Malley; Nigel O'Donoghue; Eamon Price; Tony Marsh; Phil Gerrish; Dave Pardoe; John M Scott  
**Subject:** FW: Investigations MOU

Dear All.

The position on the Investigations MOU detailed to Mike Young is below.

The latest position is that Phil Gerrish, RMG Security was emailed on the 6 March with a view to agree the latest amendment with a view to sign off. POL Security is still waiting on a response. I will forward that email following this.

Cheers.

John.

---

**From:** John M Scott  
**Sent:** 06 March 2012 10:15  
**To:** Mike Young  
**Cc:** Dave Pardoe; John M Scott  
**Subject:** RE: Investigations MOU

Mike.

We believe we are close to an agreement.

There have been a number of debating points, but are now down to the last two:

No: 1

RMG Security focus primarily on investigations & prosecution with a view for compensation via the Courts and then supported by crime prevention post apprehension. They seek to allow further theft/crime to continue in order to be able to identify and apprehend the offender for such prosecution. Post Office Security will support this approach in most circumstances, but cannot agree on every occasion which has been discussed.

For example:

- Where other criminal offences are being committed against other Post Office Ltd products or services by the same offender and cannot allow this continue whilst the theft of RML products is investigated.
- Post Office products or services are being impacted from the theft/crime to RML products i.e. encashed cheques at the branch or documentation for other products are being stolen from the RML Special Delivery items.
- Where to allow the continue theft of RML products would impact or damage the Post Office brand or reputation to an unacceptable level.

The position with the agreement is that Post Office Security would be allowed to take preventive action if other Post Office products are impacted, if appropriate. An investigation actually may be the best course of action, Post Office Security need the flexibility to decide and not always be committed to investigations. In regards to where RML products are solely involved, then an operational plan between the two Security Teams will be agreed as soon as possible and anyhow within seven days on how to conduct the approach, including investigations.

No: 2

RMG Security wish to take the prosecution lead for offences committed against RMG products including Post Office employees and/or agents. Post Office Security position is that the lead/parent organisation of the employee/agent apprehended should take the lead for prosecution (in line with their HR and Prosecution Policy and will be the organisation most likely to have the evidential material in which to support a prosecution).

These has been referred back to RMG for agreement.

All the other areas have been dealt with.

Email sent again today back to RMG Security – await response.

Cheers.

John.

---

**From:** Mike Young  
**Sent:** 06 March 2012 07:39  
**To:** John M Scott  
**Subject:** Fwd: Investigations MOU

John

What's the issue here?

Mike

Sent from my iPhone  
Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Paul M Brown [GRO]  
**Date:** 6 March 2012 07:21:38 GMT  
**To:** Mike Young [GRO]  
**Subject:** Fw: Investigations MOU

Mike,

Are you aware of the issues here? I would assume that we want to avoid any escalation.

Can you get involved to try and speed this up at all?

Thanks

Paul

---

**From:** Anna Malley  
**Sent:** Monday, March 05, 2012 09:42 PM  
**To:** Paul M Brown  
**Cc:** Nigel O'Donoghue  
**Subject:** Investigations MOU

Hi Paul. Our security team have shared their concern that the talks on the Investigations MOU required

by the MDA appear to be going nowhere. To give you a flavour of the debate, one of the issues as I understand it is that we need to have the ability to obtain the most robust evidence possible to ensure that we have the option to prosecute where we think theft has occurred; however I'm advised that your security team want to draft the MOU in such a way that will compromise our ability to get this evidence. This is untenable for us, and I can't imagine that POL would really want to seek to intervene in a situation in a way that would frustrate a potential prosecution! We are running out of time to resolve this; this is the first milestone to come up under the MDA, and I would really hope that we can avoid having to escalate.

It was clear from the negotiations that there is some ongoing friction between the respective security teams; it would be very helpful if you could try to get involved and establish whether there is a genuine issue here that can't be resolved other than through escalation, or whether this is a storm in a teacup.

Thanks

Anna