
From: Paula Vennells [mailto: [REDACTED] GRO]
Sent: Mon 09/09/2013 1:18:12 PM (UTC)
To: Alice Perkins [mailto: [REDACTED] GRO]
Subject: Re: Thanks

Cheers. The MDA negotiation wouldn't really affect that as it would be removing penalties that RM shouldn't have banked, and small efficiency payments in the future. Not big deals for them in terms of the prospectus, at least I wouldn't think so.

Btw - I have just seen Richard Hatfield. He was generous and understanding. We have agreed a payment for 4 days - I suggested 5, he said 3, so I settled on 4.

He had been v interested in the work, so I expect there could still be an opportunity re a challenge session for the new ToR. I mentioned in passing but said it was not a proposal currently and if it materialised, I would get back to him.

A lovely man. And, I am sure we would benefit from his contribution at some future stage.

Paula

Sent from my iPad

On 9 Sep 2013, at 14:11, "Alice Perkins" [mailto: [REDACTED] GRO] wrote:

> No I didn't mean that. I was referring to it being late to renegotiate the MDA in time for the prospectus.
> On the content of the prospectus, Will was absolutely clear that this should be and would be properly sorted. You only need to read the Hansard of last week's Parliamentary debate to see how important that will be politically. So I am sure Jo S would swing into action on this if it were necessary.

> A

>

> ----- Original Message -----

> From: Paula Vennells [mailto: [REDACTED] GRO]

> Sent: Monday, September 09, 2013 12:40 PM

> To: Alice Perkins

> Subject: Re: Thanks

>

> Thanks. Just one small point for clarification: are you suggesting that we have left it late to talk to RM about the Romec deal?

>

> That is not the case. RM knew we would need to go to market when we were negotiating the MSA, as all contract dates were discussed; that is how the indemnity came about. They were then informed in November last year that we would be going to market. And this year, the teams have been in frequent conversation, as we have been requesting information from RM re Romec staff numbers engaged in delivery of PO services. This has probably escalated because of the prospectus and their requirement to disclose business risks.

>

> On the prospectus, now Mark is back I have him, Martin and Hugh meeting this pm and they will speak to BIS today. I am still not happy with the content: although it may be legally accurate, it is not helpful reputationally. (Ironically, we have enough branches signed up to cover the distribution though.) I'll keep you posted.

>

> Paula

>

>

> Sent from my iPad

>

> On 9 Sep 2013, at 10:00, "Alice Perkins" [mailto: [REDACTED] GRO] wrote:

>

>> Thank you for your emails. As you know, I appreciate no surprises even if the news is unwelcome!

>> I agree about telling Neil about the MDA. We are short of bandwidth to re-negotiate this and it does seem a little late in the process.... But if it meant that RM was in a weaker position (Big If) and we could win some big issues from them, it might be worth it.

>> I was glad to hear your reassurances about Board involvement on this and on the cliff etc. And very glad to hear the better news re Susan. I know you intend to speak to her today - good that you are doing that quickly if she is really in a better place.

>> I am on the train to see Charlotte with loads of PO papers to read....

>> A

>>

>> This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. www.websense.com

>

>

> *****

> 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.

>

> *****

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.
