

**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Subject:** Re: The one I forgot...  
**Date:** 06 June 2013 12:32:15

---

Yes I understand. The DWP position now needs to feed in, which complicated things further.

I need to brief you on what we are discussing/ and how responding.

It could probably wait till Monday am as we're gathering data but if you'd like an interim slot sooner - suggest a time and I'll see what's possible. P

Sent from my iPhone

On 6 Jun 2013, at 08:52, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

> Thanks - both points good to know.

> One reflection re JS etc. I completely get the political imperative and the need to try and bring The Fed with us. However, we mustn't forget that we will have to live with the consequences (cf the "voluntary" give). There is a point where the give required would make the end goal unachievable ie we may not be able to square the circle and even if we appear to do so in the short-term, it may unravel in the next 2 years thro' no fault of our own. Important she gets that.

> A

>

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

> From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]

> Sent: Thursday, June 06, 2013 01:00 AM

> To: Alice Perkins

> Subject: Re: The one I forgot...

>

> Me too. It was a useful catch up. Lots going on - welcome back and genuinely good to have you around.

Thanks for your time.

>

> Mkg Dir: seen 5; 2 very good candidates impressive and experienced. 1 v good but less experienced. Putting all three through Xancam then having second interviews. We need to talk about when/who you see. No women or ethnic backgrounds though:( The only woman, who wasn't in the top tier, pulled out - location issue.

>

> The one I forgot: Chris met with DWP ([REDACTED] asked for a meeting, which I couldn't make as I had the FCA interview). [REDACTED] was fine with Chris meeting his DG Finance and has said we should meet up post that meeting. I will get a full debrief with Chris tomorrow. He sent a couple of texts which indicate there will be nothing imposed in the short-term as previously indicated. That is helpful and gives some breathing space. But... conversations that were then had around the medium-longer term still concern me. I'll let you know obviously.

>

> BW Paula

>

>

> Sent from my iPad

>

> On 5 Jun 2013, at 15:36, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>

>> was how you are getting on with the Marketing Director role but you can update me on that when we meet next week.

>> Thanks for all the updates today - helpful and encouraging.

>> Looking forward to the chat next week.

>> Alice

>>

>> This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://www.websense.com)

>

>

**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Subject:** Re: File - PV Objectives 2013-14 draft 1.docx  
**Date:** 10 June 2013 22:26:18

---

Alice, I will get this to you tomorrow. (Objectives tidied up - [REDACTED] away, so easier to do it personally.)

Also, re the catch up, unless your meeting with JS happens tomorrow ([REDACTED] thought unlikely after speaking to [REDACTED]), I will leave briefing you on DWP till our 121, as [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and Chris are meeting tomorrow I hope.

If the JS meeting does go ahead, either [REDACTED] or I will call you. (I'm on leave tomorrow - taking [REDACTED] to an open day - but can be available if required.)

[REDACTED]

I hope all is well. P

Sent from my iPhone

On 6 Jun 2013, at 18:55, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Paula,  
Got this safely (twice - just so you know it worked first time).  
I am happy with your changes and if someone could tidy it up and send it back to me, I can circulate it to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and then [REDACTED] can forward it to BIS.  
Thanks very much.  
It might be good for us to catch up tomorrow. I am flexible but just need to know when you'd like to talk. Let me know in the morning.  
Have a good evening  
Alice

---

**From:** Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 06, 2013 01:20 AM  
**To:** Alice Perkins  
**Subject:** Fwd: File - PV Objectives 2013-14 draft 1.docx

Hi Alice, just belt and braces. I did forward to you via quick office but couldn't see my copy. So this is in case it didn't arrive. P

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Paula Vennells <[REDACTED]>  
**Date:** 6 June 2013 01:18:50 BST  
**To:** Paula Vennells <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** File - PV Objectives 2013-14 draft 1.docx

**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Some thoughts  
**Date:** 13 June 2013 13:40:25

---

Great note - thanks Alice. P

Sent from my iPhone

On 13 Jun 2013, at 10:00, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi Paula,

I have not yet read Lesley's thoughts but I will.

On your re-structuring and how to handle me/the NEDs, the thought in my mind was the steer from the Board that we wanted to hear more from you about what you, personally, think about things. There is a balance to be struck here between backing your judgment and taking account of the NEDs' expertise and perspectives. In my view, talking to all the NEDs in advance of a Board discussion on this subject would have got that balance wrong. The top team is CEO territory - for the very good reason that you are the one who has to work with them. However, it is quite normal, to run proposals such as yours past your Chairman (wise, even!) And it is the case that this is an area of deep expertise for me. So I would have thought it very odd if we hadn't had yesterday's conversation and allowed time for me to reflect on that.

I think you could get feedback from [REDACTED] about [REDACTED] in advance - it depends on how tentative you feel about whether he is up to it or not. If you are sure he is the right person, go for it on the basis we discussed. If you are not sure, that in itself is telling you something.

Having reflected on what you said yesterday, I am not yet convinced about [REDACTED]. But I hardly know him. So this is not based on evidence about him but more, a concern about the scale of the job/challenge.

I respect your argument for going for an inside appointment in the mix but my challenge to this is, have we got the luxury of another 12 months if we aren't sure about the calibre of the internal appointee? This is a huge job to run as steady state. But it is much more than that. This has to be the person who really drives out the cost. And we need to get on with that. The Board feels anxious about the organisation's ability to deliver this. So they will be wanting reassurance on this point.

A compromise might be to have an external search to see if we can find someone who is appreciably better than either [REDACTED] or Lesley while giving them both a serious shot at it. But if you are confident about [REDACTED], that's different.

I hope this is helpful. Let me know if you want to talk further. And if I have further thoughts I will of course, let you know.

Good luck today.

Alice

**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Subject:** Re: SoS meeting  
**Date:** 19 June 2013 21:21:34

---

Before I read any further: point two - I had exactly the same thought!

I will consider the rest and I'm sure add to it, over the next few hours. But thought you should know in case you speak to [REDACTED]. I did have a brief side conversation and mentioned that he and I might catch up over a coffee.

P

Sent from my iPad

On 19 Jun 2013, at 21:07, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

- > Thanks Paula. (And thanks for your thanks.)
- > I have a number of thoughts following today which I will try and convey below. Apologies if the lateness in the day means they are not communicated as well as they might be.
- > Before that, let me say that I realise that this is all pretty heavy-going at the moment. But it was good to be together and talking about positive things (most of the time). I thought you showed some commendable restraint at moments (including not getting to eat last night). Thank you. And I also thought Chris did very well on the outsourcing piece (at last!). I'd be fascinated to know if that was all his work.
- > On to my thoughts.
- > 1) I can do the meeting with VC and am happy to do so. (It means giving up a day's of PO visits which is shame, but it couldn't be in a better cause).
- > 2) Following something you said last week, you and I should have a conversation at our next 1:1 about whether there is some different way in which we might want to use [REDACTED]. I think this would be complicated but we should talk it through. I did have a fleeting moment of wondering about the new role on internal services etc with the outsourcing piece in it. Probably quite mad.
- > 3) On the strategy, I think we have a good way forward with the Board. We need to remember what it feels like to be out of the loop when something as important as this is happening. I picked up quite a lot of real concern among the NEDs (even after I had said last night that we would need a Board meeting to discuss the proposed changes relating to NFSP) but that had quietened down by the time we left. It is just a fact of life that people get distrustful when they don't feel they understand what is going on and here it is complicated by the fact that some of them do not understand the context eg [REDACTED] not knowing what a Permanent Secretary is. (This is an observation for the future - it doesn't call for any additional action).
- > Apart from the 2 papers commissioned for Monday (on NTP and on proposed gives for the Fed), I think it would be incredibly helpful to all of us, including [REDACTED], if we had a short paper - one side - with the top compelling reasons why mandation/our strategy is right. In retrospect, I don't think I was as crystal clear as I could have been for my meeting with Jo on that. Could the team please work that up quickly?
- > Our aim on Monday should be to recommend to the Board a package that we can live with/afford, which doesn't undermine the intent of the strategy and which we believe will land George. This may need to be a core of measures with an agreed negotiating remit around some of them. But we will need to be crystal clear about what room for manouvre the Board is delegating to you and the team.
- > 4) On the CWU, here are some intuitive reactions.
- > I think they want a way out.
- > I do too. The dispute is manageable but it is unhelpful and goes against what we want to do on engagement.
- > I think there may be the elements of something constructive around the idea of intense negotiations within very clear TOR which might be facilitated by someone independent - if not ACAS, ??? [REDACTED]? I think Chris could helpfully be part of that mix. I am sure it shouldn't involve me - and I don't think it should involve you directly. I think there may be some explicit role for you to play but I can't define it right now. It did seem to me that there might be something in the idea that [REDACTED] floated at the end about what might happen after April 2015 in terms of consolidated pay but it would have to be affordable.
- > Do you think there is anything in the charge that our side is not being creative?? I did wonder.
- > That's quite enough for now.
- > All the best and thanks again
- > Alice
- >

>

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

> From: Paula Vennells [mailto: ]

> Sent: Wednesday, June 19, 2013 07:21 PM

> To: Alice Perkins

> Subject: SoS meeting

>

> Hi Alice. I hope you have arrived home safely. (Traffic has been awful, so we are still some way to go - but a good driver makes a difference!)

>

> I reflected I had been less than helpful re my communication re . If your diary can accommodate it, I do think we should do it together (as we had discussed previously), unless a good reason emerges why not over the next few days.

>

> It is 11/7 at 12.00-12.45.

>

> BW, Paula

>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

>

> \*\*\*\*\*

> 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 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.

\*\*\*\*\*

**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins CB](#); [Paula Vennells](#)  
**Subject:** File - awayday notes 19 june 2013.docx  
**Date:** 19 June 2013 22:44:27  
**Attachments:** [awayday notes 19 june 2013.docx](#)  
[ATT00001.txt](#)

---

Hi Alice, comments re your email in blue (I hope!) P

**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Subject:** Re: [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 20 June 2013 21:53:44

---

That's v good news :) Hope you shouted loud enough!

I agree - we're in frequent touch with [REDACTED] (!); I'll mail [REDACTED] tonight and see if we can bring forward.

I'll give you some steers tomorrow re BoI. Sorry I can't be there but we thought it better you go ahead and meet [REDACTED] as he is over. Des has been stood down.

Spk tomorrow. P

Sent from my iPhone

On 20 Jun 2013, at 21:08, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

> Have just had a chat with him at the FT party! He asked how it was going and I was able to say positive things. I said we were seeing him soon and he asked when. Hoped it was "before the break". I said yes but we might need to bring it forward. I said we had a great Board and the executives were doing really well. He said he only heard about us from the Fed. I said he needed another perspective! Things were basically going well; we were very committed; there were some difficulties but they were manageable. He was friendly and made nice noises about the Board.

> It was a very noisy party so it was a miracle to get a word over the racket but it may have set the right mood music for our meeting. I do think it would be worth exploring an earlier date. We should consult [REDACTED].

> I believe a brief is in preparation for the BoI lunch. I hope it will be pitched at the right level. We'll see.

> Speak at 9 30.

> Alice

>

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

> From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]

> Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2013 07:34 PM

> To: Alice Perkins

> Subject: Re: Board Papers -urgent request for tomorrow.

>

> Fantastic - thank you for the feedback. Tough day but no quarter given.

>

> On my way to the NE - a day of two halves tomorrow: opening a new main ([REDACTED]); then off to understand the conversion process with an area manager (neutral I hope); followed by a visit to one of GT's more unpleasant branch secs who told me from the conference platform he could show me how to do my job better... I thought I'd take him up on his offer as I was in the area (he was surprised!) and I'm sure I'll learn something!

>

> I have just finished a call with Des Crowley. Good feedback - no negatives for a change (so slightly suspicious:), and helpful steers for your lunch on Monday. (I assume you have a brief in prep?)

>

> Speak tomorrow at 9.30am. I hope your day was good.

>

> Paula

>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

> On 20 Jun 2013, at 17:09, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>

>> Really helpful email. Thank you.

>> Sounds encouraging.

>> I have a completely crazy day. But could we talk at 9 30 tomorrow morning? Would that work for you?

>> In the meantime, well done for getting through today in one piece.

>> And to cheer you on your way, I had great feedback from [REDACTED] about you as part of his Board evaluation interview. He is convinced we are going to get a good outcome re the Strategy. I so hope he is right.

>> Alice

>>

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

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

>> Sent: Thursday, June 20, 2013 03:34 PM

>> To: Alice Perkins

>> Subject: Re: Board Papers -urgent request for tomorrow.

>>

>> Alice, I had not intended anyone to think this was optional. Apologies if you gained that impression. We are very clear that nothing can be agreed without the Board extending the mandate.

>>

>> It would be good to catch up over the phone. There is more context that would be helpful, but summary of meeting is as follows:

>>

>> We had a useful meeting with BIS. The conversion numbers are understood. But I have set the team more work to do. We need a story for Jo and are not there as they have been working logically not politically. [REDACTED] and I discussed this 121.

>>

>> The Jo meeting was positive and upbeat. [REDACTED]'s reading and mine.

>> The conversion numbers were not raised. GT was clearly behind a planned approach. JS asked us to work up some options and told GT he would need to prioritise his asks. Not sure that landed as strongly as it could. [REDACTED] and I have just finished another 121 and he is going back up to Jo's office to get a debrief from her PS.

>>

>> I have a further catch up with my team and [REDACTED] later.

>>

>> Let me know if you would like a call today or tomorrow.

>>

>> Thx Paula

>>

>>

>>

>>

>> Sent from my iPad

>>

>> On 20 Jun 2013, at 10:37, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>

>>> Paula,

>>> Thank you for copying this to me.

>>> There is an important point that I need to add here and which all concerned need to understand otherwise we are heading for a train-wreck with the Board. I apologise if I have mis-read the note below - I know it is written in shorthand because of the time pressures.

>>> The Board meeting on Monday is being called because it is required for governance reasons, as agreed at the last formal Board meeting. The note below could be read as suggesting it is optional.

>>> The Board signed off a document which described the Strategy which it had agreed. If there are to be substantive changes to that Strategy, they need explicit Board approval. For that reason, we set up a Board Sub-C'tee with delegated authorities which made this clear.

>>> So while Monday's meeting is indeed important to keep the Board "briefed and supportive", it is not being held primarily for those reasons but because it is required. Without Board approval, the executive team do not have the authority to agree to changes beyond those which have been explicitly delegated. Going forward, to give the executives reasonable room for negotiation, one of the things which we need to agree on Monday is what the new delegated limits should be. It would be helpful to have a paper suggesting what these might be, reflecting the reality of the situation which we are now in with our shareholder.

>>> On a minor point, I gave Alwen a template yesterday for the factual information which the Board would like on NTP conversions.

>>> I am keeping my fingers crossed for today's meetings at BIS - good luck!

>>> All the best

>>> Alice

>>>

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



**From:** [Alice Perkins](#) on behalf of [Alice Perkins](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Paula Vennells](#)  
**Subject:** Re: NTP  
**Date:** 21 June 2013 15:50:55

---

Thanks Paula. I'm going to be out of touch now for the rest of the day. I share your ambitions and I agree about blame. But I hadn't picked up from our conversation this morning where [REDACTED] was on this issue, which was why I asked about whether he'd been delphic.  
Hope the rest of your day is/ has been OK. And that you have some rest over the weekend.  
All the best  
Alice

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

**From:** Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 21, 2013 11:26 AM  
**To:** Alice Perkins  
**Subject:** Re: NTP

No not too Delphic. I'll reply in due course as need to dash. I completely understand where he is coming from. And did suggest to him that I thought different statements had been put together. Which is the team's view. He may not agree. And I have already asked [REDACTED] to dig a bit deeper.

There is nothing I have not said to you.

I understand it is serious. But I also have to find a way through. And we also need to help officials and ministers to realise this is more complex than most things. It will always be a moving feast. I want complete transparency in how I work with my team. It won't help us if people get scared of making mistakes, if one happened. (I'm not sure it did. But if so, we'll deal with it.) Or if they get too ambitious to keep ministers and officials happy and tell people what they want to hear. Think of CQC at the moment.

The point is how we move it forward and manage the politics, the logic of a programme and get Jo back on side.

I am keen to do so. P

Sent from my iPad

On 21 Jun 2013, at 10:44, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

- > Hi Paula,
- > That was a useful conversation, thank you.
- >
- > I have, however, just had a slightly disconcerting email from [REDACTED] (arranging for the two of us to talk on Monday afternoon).
- >
- > He says that while his team do now understand what is happening on the NTP practicalities, we do still have a real difficult handling problem with JS.
- > [REDACTED] re-iterates in his email that JS was told by us that the 1450 would be up and running by mid-summer. From the tone of his email, he believes that that is what was said. He says she expressly asked the question about when the 1450 would be delivered and was told by the end of Q1. He said he shared his concerns with you privately after the meeting yesterday and that he is worried about our present timetable (as you are).
- >
- > I am writing to make absolutely sure that we are all sharing everything here. Did you understand his position fully from him yesterday or was he being too delphic with you?
- >
- > I don't need a post-mortem on this but I am worried that [REDACTED] doesn't accept that they got the "wrong end of the stick" or put 2 and 2 together to make 5. I hadn't realised that from the conversation you and I just had.
- >

- > As we discussed on the phone, the important points remain winning back BIS's and JS's trust that we don't over-promise and under-deliver; and that we find a way of accelerating the action on the ground. Both difficult but critical going forward.
- >
- > Sorry to prolong the conversation but it is important to share this. No need for you to reply today but we do need to pick this up next week.
- >
- > All the best
- > Alice
- >
- > This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://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.

\*\*\*\*\*

**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Subject:** Re: [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 27 June 2013 07:24:19

---

Good morning Alice! Thanks for letting me know.

What time can you speak to debrief? I am chairing the Fres Board this morning but could listen before 10.30am (I'm travelling in a car with others); or will be completely available after 2pm. (However, this is sufficiently important that if you can only do between 10.30-2pm, then I can hand over to Des to chair temporarily.)

Paula

Sent from my iPad

On 26 Jun 2013, at 21:11, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

> Speaking to Bob at 9 30 tomorrow morning.

> A

>

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

> From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]

> Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2013 08:45 PM

> To: Alice Perkins

> Subject: Re: [REDACTED]

>

> Have done - [REDACTED] is keen but would like a further conversation with me on 'some thoughts' he has according to SS.

> Concert going well:)

>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

> On 26 Jun 2013, at 19:55, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>

>> Bob willing to talk but don't know when. Better just take advantage of that before going firm. Yes, [REDACTED] happy for me to do so.

>> A

>>

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

>> From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]

>> Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2013 07:06 PM

>> To: Alice Perkins

>> Subject: Re: [REDACTED]

>>

>> Great. So pleased!

>>

>> I have mailed SS to get in touch, offer the job and give a sense of what would seal the deal. It would be great to get Bob Ayling's view, though I understand why not, if not. [REDACTED] Did you mention to [REDACTED] about speaking to Bob?

>>

>> Thx for seeing him.

>> Will keep you posted. P

>>

>> Sent from my iPad

>>

>> On 26 Jun 2013, at 18:21, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>

>>> I thought he was very impressive, full of energy and relevant ideas and would definitely model the change we want to see.

>>> I asked him what he would do if we offered him the job. He said he'd give it "very serious consideration".

>>> I have left a text for Bob Ayling asking if he'd be willing to talk to me about him but [REDACTED] and that just may not happen.

>>> I should move fast. Clear the proposed salary with Remco (I don't think you need NomCo clearance for the appointment (Alwen will know) because he isn't a Board member and at the same time (if I'm right about NomCo) tell him you want him (assuming you still do). You could have him really quickly according to the paperwork.

>>> 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.

>

> \*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Cc:** [Susan Barton](#); [Alwen Lyons](#); [REDACTED]; [Chris M Day](#)  
**Subject:** Re: PRINTED Board Call  
**Date:** 01 July 2013 11:25:19

---

Hi Alice.

We are literally about to meet on SS as Alwen has just arrived back, so will update you afterwards. Sue is working on a discussion brief for the strategy conversation.

We will get something to you.

Paula

Sent from my iPad

On 1 Jul 2013, at 09:39, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

- > As we know, an hour on the phone passes rapidly.
- > Apart from updating the Board on SS (on which we need to allow time for questions/discussion) and discussing the mutualisation timeline (arguments for publishing the financial as well as the engagement timeline), what would it be helpful for you to get from this meeting and what would it be helpful to the Board to focus on?
- > I think you need to start by reporting on developments on the substance (you've covered the process in the Update).
- > How has the argument moved on since last Monday eg [REDACTED]'s alternatives to our preferred approach? Are the options for a deal with the Fed narrowing and if so how? Is there anything which alters the boundaries of the mandate you've been given? And anything else on which you'd like a steer?
- > I'll start by outlining the areas we need to discuss so people have a clear idea of what we are trying to do but I should be grateful for a quick update in answer to my questions by 2 30 please (I am in a meeting between 3 and 5pm).
- > Many thanks
- > Alice
- >
- > This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://www.websense.com)

**From:** [Alice Perkins](#) on behalf of [Alice Perkins](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Paula Vennells](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Today's call  
**Date:** 01 July 2013 16:55:54

---

I am free now - my diary says the call starts at 5 15 so have time to talk first.  
A

----- Original Message -----  
From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
Sent: Monday, July 01, 2013 04:05 PM  
To: Alice Perkins  
Subject: Today's call

Alice, I know you have spoken to [REDACTED] but I thought it would make sense for us to have a quick catch up if you have time.

The meeting with SS finishes at 4.30pm. Then I am expecting a speaking brief for this evening's call from [REDACTED] and Alwen. My thought is that I send that over to you and if you have the time, we try and catch 5-10 mins just before the call. I agree that we should deal with the SS issue first.

Does that help?  
  
Paula

Sent from my iPad

---

\*\*\*\*\*  
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 message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://www.websense.com)

**From:** [Alice Perkins](#) on behalf of [Alice Perkins](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Paula Vennells](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Latest on SS  
**Date:** 02 July 2013 09:01:50

---

Thanks Paula. I am looking forward to seeing you too.

I see we have 2 hours. Fine by me but if you need to shorten it in the circs, I would completely understand.

2 thoughts on this subject.

Do you need a refresh of media training? At any rate, someone should put you through your paces on the issues (I think incidentally, you will do this very well but it will be hostile - a different experience from hitherto). Also do we need to bring in a PR company eg Brunswick to help us handle Monday and the aftermath - absolutely not an implied criticism of Mark, just wanting us to have the best resources on the case.

Finally, I do think we need to think very carefully about who is there for us on Monday. At the very least we must have someone to take a note and I still lean towards having our own (silent) lawyer there.

See you later.

Alice

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

From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
Sent: Monday, July 01, 2013 10:07 PM  
To: Alice Perkins  
Subject: Latest on SS

Hi Alice, I'm looking forward to catching up properly tomorrow. I thought the Board were generous in their patience tonight over the SS discussion. It is helpful to know that they are supportive of the need to be robust. That said, I thought [REDACTED]'s intervention was good - it is why we haven't been completely heavy handed yet. We can discuss nuances and next steps tomorrow.

I caught up with Susan this evening after we finished. She had finished her meeting with SS and wade of the view that they do now understand the risk of being caught up in something bigger and more sensitive. She is hoping their report should be more balanced, should say they have found no evidence of systemic Horizon (computer) issues but will confirm shortcomings in support processes and systems, and that Post Office has already identified and corrected a number of these. I hope when they speak to James tomorrow that they will confirm all this. They will also want to say their work is not finished and therefore still not conclusive.

Not a final position by any means nor one that controls what they might say rather than write but sounding slightly better.

Rest assured there will be a thorough lessons learnt exercise, which if you are comfortable, I'd like to suggest reports to the ARC. As you said tonight, we need to get through this first though.

Paula

Sent from my iPad

\*\*\*\*\*

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.

\*\*\*\*\*

**From:** [Alice Perkins](#) on behalf of [Alice Perkins](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Paula Vennells](#)  
**Subject:** Re: SS: The Future after Monday  
**Date:** 04 July 2013 12:44:06

---

I will call you as soon after 2pm as I can.  
A

----- Original Message -----  
From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
Sent: Thursday, July 04, 2013 11:34 AM  
To: Alice Perkins  
Cc: [REDACTED]@postoffice.co.uk<  
Subject: Re: SS: The Future after Monday

Alice, let's catch up on this a bit later please? I have been reflecting (calmly) and I think we have to change our tack a bit both to support James and to share the lead on the story. He is still briefing more against us rather than with us. I am available from 1 pm.

Paula

Sent from my iPhone

On 4 Jul 2013, at 10:35, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

- > A reflection.
- > I am uncomfortable about committing ourselves too firmly to arrangements post the Interim Report when everyone is tired and up to their ears trying to handle the immediate issues.
- > If we can leave that somewhat open while committing to the principle of working with the users including JFSA, that would be helpful and it fits with JA's suggestion that we should see what ideas come out of Monday's meeting.
- > If we have to continue with SS, my firm belief is that we need a totally different approach to managing and rewarding them and that the significant over-run in the budget to date should feature in our negotiations.
- > I think a fresh pair of eyes on this could be very helpful and picking up your earlier suggestion of the ARC leading a post-mortem, I am wondering about asking [REDACTED] to give us a bit of time on this. What do you think?
- > A
- >
- > This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://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.

\*\*\*\*\*



**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Cc:** [Chris M Day](#); [Alwen Lyons](#); [REDACTED]; [Mark R Davies](#); [Susan Crichton](#); [Lesley J Sewell](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Second Sight update 4/7/13  
**Date:** 05 July 2013 08:10:39

---

Thank you Alice.

As I sure you know, I am incredibly well supported (advised and sometimes restrained!) by those copied.

We will get through this and I hope deliver the 'triumph' not the disaster.

I have just received a text from Alan Bates and had a further conversation with him. I shall probably want to brief you at some stage.

Could the team please meet at 9am.

Paula

Sent from my iPhone

On 5 Jul 2013, at 07:22, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>

> This is a good clear note - thank you for sending it so late last night and thank you for letting me see the letter you've sent to James Arbuthnot, also good and striking the right balance.

> You are doing the right things and I have nothing further to suggest at this point.

> I hope you will all get some rest at the weekend.

> Best wishes

> Alice

>

> From: Paula Vennells [REDACTED]

> Sent: 04 July 2013 22:52

> To: Alice Perkins; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]

> Cc: Chris M Day; Alwen Lyons; [REDACTED]; Mark R Davies; Susan Crichton; Lesley J Sewell

> Subject: Second Sight update 4/7/13

>

> Dear all,

>

> I wanted to send you a brief email to update you on where we are with the Second Sight (SS) investigation.

>

> We have been engaging closely with SS throughout the week to understand the position they intend to take in the interim report and emphasise our concern that their findings must be even-handed and grounded in the facts. In line with our discussion on Monday's Board call, we understand that they have not found any evidence yet of systemic issues with the Horizon system (and it should be noted that this is based on a detailed review of their four "best" cases in terms of compelling evidence). However, as expected, they do intend to draw attention to wider failings in the training and support provided to sub-postmasters, with the implication that this was the root-cause of some of the problems related to Horizon.

>

> We expect to receive a full draft of the report tomorrow morning, enabling us (and Fujitsu) to check for factual accuracy and consistency with the terms of reference before it is shared more widely with MPs on Monday evening. (We have made it clear that we reserve the right to review this timing in the event of any fundamental points of substance that remain unresolved by Monday). They shared with us today the introductory sections of the report, which give some cause for concern in relation to the overall professionalism of the drafting and the widespread use of subjective (and at times somewhat emotional) statements of opinion rather than more neutral or evidence-based insights. We have already provided initial feedback on these concerns, and are hopeful that they will take these on board. However, clearly this is a difficult and carefully balanced situation – we have to respect the independence of the report, and it is our firm view that it would not

be credible or appropriate to take a more forceful approach in relation to the report at this stage (as we would be happy to explain in more detail over the telephone). There will therefore inevitably remain elements in the final draft which make for uncomfortable reading.

>

> We are focussing heavily on our media and stakeholder handling strategy. To summarise very briefly, we have taken the view that the best way to minimise the reputational risks associated with the review and to do the right thing for the business and its people is to welcome the broad thrust of the report and commit to acting on its key finding in relation to the need for improvements in our support and training processes. This is entirely consistent with the broader imperative for cultural change across the organisation which the Board has discussed over recent months. We are preparing a proactive media statement which we plan to issue on Monday before the MPs meeting, which will enable us to get on the front foot in dealing with the issues raised in the report. Our thinking at this stage is that a central part of our response should be to announce the launch of a new user forum involving sub-postmasters, the JFSA and other stakeholders, with the remit of providing direct feedback into the business on areas for improvement in our training and support systems. The first priority of the forum will be to bring the Second Sight review to a rapid conclusion, but it will also have a permanent role beyond that.

>

> Alongside this, we are also engaging carefully with relevant stakeholders:

>

> • James Arbuthnot is a pivotal figure, as he has been chairing the Parliamentary input into the process on behalf of other MPs with constituency cases, and will be hosting the meeting on Monday at which the interim report is released. Alice and I had a constructive but at times challenging meeting with him yesterday to discuss handling, emphasising the importance of an even-handed approach which doesn't undermine public confidence in the Post Office. There nonetheless remains a significant risk that he will seek to raise the media profile of the report (and his role) on Monday. I have a further phone call with him scheduled tomorrow afternoon and we are staying in close contact with his office.

>

> • I briefed Jo Swinson on the situation yesterday, and we are also staying in regular contact with her officials, not least given the possibility that the Government may be asked to make a statement in Parliament.

>

> • Linked to this, we also plan to engage (either directly or via BIS) other members of the government with constituency cases who may be attending Monday's meeting of MPs, such as Oliver Letwin and Tessa Munt, with the aim of ensuring that they can help promote an even-handed discussion at the meeting.

>

> • I had a very constructive telephone conversation with Alan Bates this evening (Mr Bates is the ex-sub-postmaster leading the JFSA campaign who was instrumental in starting this whole process). The call was helpful in reassuring him that we intend to take the key findings of the report seriously, and would like to work collaboratively with him in identifying process improvements.

>

> • Finally, we will of course need to brief the NFSP and CWU on the situation, most likely on Monday.

>

> We will share a draft of our proposed media statement with the Board over the weekend, and I will also email you with any further significant updates tomorrow. Please also do not hesitate to call me or one of the team if you would like further detail on any of the points noted above or would like to discuss our approach. This is an extremely challenging and complex issue and I would greatly value your input, although some of the nuances and details are best discussed over the phone rather than by email.

> Kind regards,

> Paula

>

>

>

>

> \*\*\*\*\*

> 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.

>

**From:** [Alice Perkins](#) on behalf of [Alice Perkins](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Paula Vennells](#)  
**Subject:** Re: My movements  
**Date:** 05 July 2013 11:11:27

---

Fine. Thx.  
A

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

From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
Sent: Friday, July 05, 2013 10:57 AM  
To: Alice Perkins  
Subject: Re: My movements

Alice, thank you. I am absolutely fine. Feeling great and most importantly thinking clearly!  
I have a third call with Alan Bates at around 11am. Best that I call you after that.

And on a different note am seeing [REDACTED] at 12.30 re prep for [REDACTED] and the latest options with the Fed. So if you can manage 1pm - I could then cover both?

Paula

Sent from my iPad

On 5 Jul 2013, at 10:49, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

- > Just to let you know I am travelling to [REDACTED] by train this afternoon and will be tied up this evening.
- > I will be at home shortly until about 2pm. I could talk on the train but the signal isn't great on that line.
- > I hope you are surviving.
- > A
- >
- > This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://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.

\*\*\*\*\*

**From:** [Alice Perkins](#) on behalf of [Alice Perkins](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Paula Vennells](#)  
**Subject:** RE: draft horizon statement 2.docx  
**Date:** 08 July 2013 07:08:47

---

Paula,

Thank you, yes we did have a great time. [REDACTED]

Thanks for sending me this. It is looking good.

I have a few questions on the draft which I don't need a reply to - just would like you to think about them.

4 of 47 cases looks like a very small number which could lead the determined to say it isn't a full enough review. Worth explaining that they were the ones thought to be best test.

In the first initiative, it talks about "past" cases which could be read as open-ended ie open to additional cases. Should it say something about cases already in the scope of the review?

In the second,, the reference to "disputed cases" - again it is open-ended. Is that what we mean? I assume there would be some disputed cases which we would not want to put through an independent adjudicator because they were cut and dried.

At the very end, I wondered whether the reference to avoiding legal proceedings could be read to imply some weakness in relation to past rulings?

I think it's fine for you to update the Board after your 9am phone call.  
Good luck.

Alice

---

From: Paula Vennells [REDACTED]  
Sent: 07 July 2013 21:08  
To: Alice Perkins  
Subject: draft horizon statement 2.docx

Alice, I hope you have had a great weekend! [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

In between some rest, we have been working v hard on the statement and the report. Attached is our latest statement, which responds to the report, which I shall mail shortly. Mark and Martin have produced their usual high standards of editing and I am now comfortable with it. We have decided to take the welcome it/collaborative approach but have made the reliability of Horizon the main intro. As in fact the report now does.

I have exchanged texts with Alan Bates and sent him a copy of this statement. He and JA were sent the report by SS. [REDACTED] and I are speaking tomorrow at 9am and meeting at 3pm. Mark has sent a copy of the statement to [REDACTED] and I shall try to get a call with James as well. I texted [REDACTED] but not heard back (possible it is no longer the same no., of course), so we will go via his office tomorrow and I'll offer a call.

No counting chickens yet. But some good work under our belts.

I think I shall update the Board after the [REDACTED] phone call Monday am - is that ok?

BW Paula

[REDACTED]

████████████████████

---

\*\*\*\*\*

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 message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://www.websense.com)

**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Update  
**Date:** 09 July 2013 07:43:26

---

Alice, yes that's fine. Speak then. P

Sent from my iPad

On 9 Jul 2013, at 07:16, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

> Hi Paula,  
> Shall we talk about 8 15 to touch base? Is that still OK? Alice  
>  
> From: Paula Vennells [REDACTED]  
> Sent: 08 July 2013 20:32  
> To: Alice Perkins  
> Cc: Paula Vennells  
> Subject: Re: Update  
>  
> Well that's ok then:) I prefer your personal media watcher to mine!  
>  
> No need for a call. We are on top of all we can. I am hoping that JA decided not to give an interview. The BBC website although muddled in its story does give our side.  
>  
> [REDACTED]. I  
could call b4 9 or later am. Anything more urgent - Mark can deal with.  
>  
> Finally, just listened to news headlines on BBC - no mention at all. And Radio 4 had dropped it by 7pm.  
>  
> Fingers crossed.. P  
>  
> Sent from my iPhone  
>  
> On 8 Jul 2013, at 19:49, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:  
>  
>> Hi there.  
>> My meeting went on till late and I am still on the train - not good for a conversation.  
>> I had a text from my personal media follower who said he thought it looked OK from the BBC news he had seen (in Istanbul!).  
>> No need for a call tonight unless you would positively like one in which case my guess is I'll be home about 8 45.  
>> Alice  
>>  
>> ----- Original Message -----  
>> From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
>> Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 07:31 PM  
>> To: Alice Perkins  
>> Subject: Update  
>>  
>> Hi Alice. If you would like a call to update pls say.  
>>  
>> Our view currently (Mark and I have just talked) is to let it die down.  
>>  
>> 4 MPs went to the meeting. Grandstanding occurred where expected. James was reasonably balanced and we were portrayed positively. But he held onto reputational redress point for some.  
>>  
>> I had a good meeting with Alan Bates. And will fill you in when we speak. There is a way forward but will need careful handling.

>>

>> Paula

>>

>> Sent from my iPhone

>>

>>

>> \*\*\*\*\*

>> 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 message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://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.

\*\*\*\*\*

**From:** [Alice Perkins](#) on behalf of [Alice Perkins](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Paula Vennells](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Fwd: Job Offer  
**Date:** 14 July 2013 11:32:01

---

Paula,

I agree that on the face of it, it looks as though he wants to keep all his options open and that being Chief Commercial Officer for the Post Office is not something he sees as a destination in itself.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
So I think you are dead right to be cautious. As you say, next stop [REDACTED] but I would also talk to SS again and see if they can shed any light on this (altho' beware their motivation - they will want to conclude this now without much more effort....).

Then I think eye-balling [REDACTED] must be right. There is no point him coming if he isn't going to throw himself into this.

Good luck.

A

---

**From:** Paula Vennells [mailto:[REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** Sunday, July 14, 2013 09:57 AM  
**To:** Alice Perkins  
**Subject:** Fwd: Job Offer

Alice, I blind copied you but thought I should share my feelings /what else I think I should do:

[REDACTED]. As well as understanding why he left and getting a general reference, I also want to explore the personality. I am not sure if we are dealing with someone who is very loyal to the NED and charity commitments he has (entirely possible); or, perhaps understandably as he is looking for work, too focused on his own interests, wanting to keep his future options open. Either way, he is coming across as possibly less committed to the PO because of it.

I reflected very carefully on how I wrote the note - my initial reaction was that he was legalistic in the tone of his email, considering he hadn't taken me up on the offer of a call, but felt that I should be straight and friendly, giving him the option to respond in the same way.

However, if there is any doubt after his response and my conversation with [REDACTED], I think I should meet [REDACTED] again. He may of course decide that he isn't interested if he can't keep the two NED positions. (I do think I have read that right - just giving him an option to change his mind and save face.)

Any wisdom/experience to add?

Paula

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:



**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#); [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Board Effectiveness Paper  
**Date:** 17 July 2013 08:46:45

---

Alice, let's settle on 11-45am (or as soon as) at JCA tomorrow.

[REDACTED], could you rearrange the diary - I don't want to miss the NTP review, so please explain to [REDACTED] and Chris why. They will understand.

Thanks, Paula

Sent from my iPad

On 17 Jul 2013, at 08:08, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

> I have an appointment at the OFT at 10 30 tomorrow for an hour - could maybe cut it back to 45 minutes (it's near Blackfriars). So I could meet you for an hour at a coffee place I know in Tudor St at 9 15 (obviously not private). Alternatively, I have someone coming to me at JCA at 1pm so I could see you there at midday or perhaps 11 45. After that I am tied up.

> A further alternative is today at 5 30 when again, I'll be at JCA.

> Just let me know what is best for you.

> Alice

>

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

> From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]

> Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2013 09:47 PM

> To: Alice Perkins

> Subject: Re: Board Effectiveness Paper

>

> Thanks Alice. How about I come to you at 9.30 am on Thursday? Where will you be?

>

> Paula

>

> Sent from my iPad

>

> On 16 Jul 2013, at 18:46, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>

>> That's fine. I have some time tomorrow and Thursday mornings. Both afternoons are difficult. Speak soon.

>> A

>>

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

>> From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]

>> Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2013 05:05 PM

>> To: Alice Perkins

>> Subject: Re: Board Effectiveness Paper

>>

>> We need a conversation before Monday evening Alice.

>>

>> I need to reflect on today from a number of angles.

>>

>> I'll get back to you and suggest some times.

>>

>>

>> Paula

>>

>> Sent from my iPhone

>>

>> On 16 Jul 2013, at 16:27, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>

>>> Paula, I am sorry if some of this read as though it was patronising. That was certainly not intended.  
>>> When I was able to read this email - after the Board meeting! - I no longer had the paper with me, so I don't know what you may have in mind.

>>> I would be reluctant to change the Report. It is an honest account of what people said to me (apart, obviously, from the individual feedback). It would have been helpful to know about these reservations before today (yesterday afternoon's 1:1 was intended to prepare for the Board among other things) or to have had them mentioned in the discussion.

>>> But if you still feel strongly about this, just let me have the report, flagged with your concerns and I will think about them.

>>> It was a tough meeting today but I think it was very much in the spirit of the Board review. I thought you handled both the Strategy and the SS discussions very well. Thank you.

>>> There are a number of points which we need to pick up at our 1:1/our dinner next week but if there is anything you'd like to discuss before then, do let me know and we can speak on the phone.

>>> I had a conversation with [REDACTED] following the Board and I know he was coming to see you afterwards. He will think about ways in which he could help Chris, [REDACTED] and/or you in the short term while he is relatively free. He mentioned that you had floated something with him in light-hearted terms. Let us keep our tinder dry on anything executive. I have a call with [REDACTED] but I am far from convinced that that would be wise even if he were willing to abandon the private equity route. He says he is better at challenging than doing!

>>> Fingers crossed for the BIS meeting tomorrow and for your meeting with [REDACTED] on Thursday.

>>> All the best

>>> Alice

>>>

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

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

>>> Sent: Tuesday, July 16, 2013 09:31 AM

>>> To: Alice Perkins

>>> Subject: Board Effectiveness Paper

>>>

>>> Alice, I think this mostly reads well and is a good account.

>>>

>>> Personally, I am uncomfortable with some of the wording - only a small section but I felt I should be honest. I know Chris is too.

>>>

>>> Rather than address this in the Board, would you like to discuss separately? There are just a couple of points where if this is going to BIS, I would like the wording amended. All of the Directors have come on a development journey and you and I have had several conversations about some. The comments about the Executives could be construed more negatively and also slightly patronising.

>>>

>>> Thanks, Paula

>>> Sent from my iPad

>>>

>>>

>>> \*\*\*\*\*

>>> 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 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

**From:** [Alice Perkins](#) on behalf of [Alice Perkins](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Paula Vennells](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Thank you  
**Date:** 23 July 2013 09:39:53

---

Paula, thank you.

I had an email half completed (but a business breakfast intervened) to thank you for making the time for last night when you have so much on your plate and have your boys at home. It was good to have that opportunity. I'll send you a list of things I'd like to cover off tomorrow and then I am looking forward to the thought of you being away from it all.

Hope you have a good day today.

Alice

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

From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
Sent: Tuesday, July 23, 2013 08:52 AM  
To: Alice Perkins  
Subject: Thank you

Alice, just a brief note to say thank you for last night. Lots to think about. I do appreciate the time you invest in the Post Office and in me as CEO. It is always (don't know how to underline - but it should be!) helpful and instructive.

Looking forward to seeing you tomorrow.

Paula

Sent from my iPad

\*\*\*\*\*

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 message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://www.websense.com)

**From:** [Alice Perkins](#) on behalf of [Alice Perkins](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Paula Vennells](#)  
**Subject:** Re: People  
**Date:** 25 July 2013 09:30:16

---

Thanks Paula. All interesting and good stuff. We just need to be careful that [REDACTED] doesn't become the default decision maker over the next few weeks. He rightly commands respect and we are very lucky to have his input but as you point out below, he doesn't get it all and he is not the whole Board! Also need to watch that it's easy to say the Board doesn't need the detail if you are the person who has seen the detail. On something like SS, where confidence is shaken, you might want to give the Board more rather than less. Let's see.

Will let you know re call. Possibly mid am.

In haste

A

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

From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
Sent: Thursday, July 25, 2013 08:21 AM  
To: Alice Perkins  
Subject: Re: People

Hi, a few notes to update you Alice. I haven't covered Susan, as that's probably best done over the phone. Let me know when you can take a call.

1) Board update SS: working group with JFSA and SS today, Chris then to resolve cost question. Steering group tomorrow. I had a very good paper overnight from [REDACTED], which explains everything I need. There are gaps left in it for the outcome of the working group and for the SS cost question. It covers the scope, including the questions raised at the Board, which reassures me we have a handle on it. You and [REDACTED] would find it helpful too. It will be finalised tomorrow evening.

Alasdair thinks we should not be giving the Board anything more than a brief update to reassure that work in progress is satisfactory; and would be prepared to send a note as Chair of ARC to cover the legal/risks side. He is reassured over the independence aspects and that we have the risks covered as much as we can at this stage. There is merit in his view - too much detail could pull NEDs in too much. What I suggest is that I wait to see the final report, take a view and let you know. I will also get [REDACTED] to draft a shorter note in case.

Either way, the work in progress is satisfactory. Much hinges on the workshop today.

2) NFSP: not sure if you have spoken to [REDACTED]. No white smoke but the occasional wisp appearing. They have suggested the cliff edge should be more of a gentle slope. We have refused because [REDACTED] flagged OTR to [REDACTED] that he needed a 'negotiation'. Sue thinks there could be merit and it might work if the Fed were 100% behind it. That is the risk. Both [REDACTED] and I have flagged to Sue she needs to think about how she messages this to the Board.

The other risk is the timing, which was stretching too far. I have called it out. We need to use the party conference as a deadline ([REDACTED] said 14/9 is LibDem). Jo will want the speech of her life and we will want to give it to her. The political significance had not landed with [REDACTED]. In fact, she was quite happy as she had seen [REDACTED], who of course wouldn't necessarily have thought of the party conference either. Mark would have, as would [REDACTED]. I insisted to [REDACTED] and Sue that the 'involve your colleague' point is critical. (Though frustratingly, Mark and [REDACTED] are on holiday next week. [REDACTED] is here and [REDACTED] is, so they will substitute.)

That's it on the two big areas. We covered others yesterday.

Finally, you are right, Chris is in a receptive place. It was worth the tough conversation - that was probably the preparing the ground! He is genuinely open to help. Both [REDACTED] and I are still slightly circumspect as he hasn't had any of the 'this is what a proper CFO would do' conversations. Ie., Chris has to turn the 'extra help' at some stage into doing his job differently. [REDACTED] is very aware of that but is taking it carefully and I'm delighted - and hopeful - that his style might get Chris there.

Speak later, Paula

Sent from my iPad

On 24 Jul 2013, at 15:16, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

- > I had a very interesting meeting with Chris at lunchtime. He seemed very thoughtful and positive about his meeting with [REDACTED] this morning which he obviously found really helpful. It may just be that [REDACTED] can help him see his role in a different way and how to fill it. Which would be wonderful.
- > (I know you would do this anyway but you do have a lot to clear before you go), please could you let me know if anything significant comes out of your 1:1 with Susan this afternoon which might be relevant to mine with her next week.
- > Thanks and have a great break.
- > Alice
- >
- > This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://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.

\*\*\*\*\*

**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Update?  
**Date:** 02 August 2013 17:30:13

---

Thanks Alice. This is helpful. And thank you for all your tremendous efforts over the last month: I promise no more mails after this unless absolutely necessary.

Great news on Chris - he needs to sustain it and I will do all I can to encourage that. I'll pick up with [REDACTED] to get his views too.

[REDACTED] - thanks for seeing him. He does take feedback given carefully, which you will have done. He will need to find a reason why he should do something about it :)

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] And have sent you a brief response to your file note.

You sounded calm about [REDACTED] and the funding work - hopefully we are still on track re important timings.

CWU: agreed. (Will look up the FT article.)

ARA: PA have covered us almost word for word from our statement. But the only coverage an hour or so ago was on the Telegraph website - Moya [REDACTED] and an apology from Donald. I expect they will be cross that it has dominated the coverage so far. But at least it has kept our side of things quiet for a while. (Can't check the radio - clash with the Test Match!)

That said, it is a pity we couldn't do our big story. You should read our statement again before you switch off for your holiday. We have made great progress! And there is much more to come.

Well done for doing such a great job as chairman. Enjoy your break.

Best wishes to both you and [REDACTED].

Paula

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

On 2 Aug 2013, at 16:11, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

> Hi there,

> I was planning an update and here it is.

> [REDACTED]

> [REDACTED].

> The good news is that this week things appear to have gone well and Chris has been doing a great job in your absence, as I have told him. He has been cheerful, authoritative and in all the places he needed to be. It felt completely different. And I think he has been enjoying it. You can certainly safely leave him in charge again on this basis. I also gave him his Board feedback at the beginning of the week and he responded well. It was helpful that we have all been saying the same things. He seemed to be very comfortable with the way he and [REDACTED] are working together.

> The Board discussion went well. We explored the work which [REDACTED] and co are doing to analyse the NFSP's proposals and were clear about what we would need to see before we could endorse a departure from the

"alternative approach". We have agreed not to have another call (unless there is a crisis) until 19 August [REDACTED]

> On Susan, I have done a long separate note on my conversation with her. I sent it to [REDACTED] for your return but will forward it to you in a minute. Your conclusion about her is right. Her attitude and judgment are wrong and she is angry - though I'm not quite clear who she is angry with. A mixture probably. But she appears to be doing an OK job at the moment, thank goodness. I am sure that she is building up her "case" which is one of the reasons I wrote my note. I suggest you also continue to record your interactions with her.

> [REDACTED] and I have done some further thinking about the post-mortem and have a good way forward I believe. He is going to talk to you about it so I will leave that to him and if you are happy, he can take it forward with you in my absence.

> I think he has been doing good things this week - we are lucky to have his input.

> I gave [REDACTED] some feedback about his interactions with the Board which he took well. At his request, I have suggested a couple of coaches for him to choose from and I have put them in touch with him. I hope he will act on this but it will only work if he really wants to change. I'm not yet convinced that he really understands why it matters.

> On the CWU etc, I realise that leaving a Board discussion till late September is probably too late if we are to have any chance of a settlement in the run-up to Christmas. Chris and I discussed this briefly (and I drew his attention to a great article in Thursday's FT about Mandela's approach to negotiation which should be required reading for the team). I think we need a Board paper on the options for early September at the latest and we could take it on a Board call. Without this, if we wanted a negotiation, we wouldn't be able to start it till early October - seems too late to me.

> I think that's it for now.

> I would prefer not to receive emails at least for the first couple of weeks. My brain really does need a rest. But of course, I rely on your judgment to contact me if you need to. Fingers crossed for the ARA coverage.

> Go on enjoying yourself with your family and make sure you have some more time before the month is over. Fill up the tank!

> All the best

> Alice

>

>

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

> From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]

> Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 08:00 PM

> To: Alice Perkins

> Subject: Update?

>

> Hi Alice, I have been as good as my word and not opened my mails. One exception this am was to read yours re SS.

>

> Before you go away - i wondered if you could drop me a mail. I'm particularly keen to know if there is anything to follow up re the strategy or re Susan/SS. (I could try to take a call - signal not great though.)

>

> [REDACTED]

>

> And if I don't hear anything from you, I'll pick up from Chris, and I hope you have a truly well deserved rest too.

>

> Paula

>

> Sent from my iPhone

>

>

> \*\*\*\*\*

> 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 message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://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.

\*\*\*\*\*



**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Bcc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Donald Brydon  
**Date:** 15 August 2013 11:46:15

---

Hi Alice, the update is not that different:

- GT met Michael Fallon and Jo Swinson on Monday to discuss his concerns re Privatisation linked to govt., failure to deliver Front Office work. Both ministers resolute according to [REDACTED]. No delay despite GT's request. Fallon did query why GT was depriving members of extra remuneration by opposing prospectus distribution offer.
- We have agreed the overall approach and process with BIS (who is the client and working with us on the proposals; RM fully in the loop). Passport Check n' Send branches - approx 2800 nationally spread - will stock the forms. They will be written to shortly and asked to opt-in; once we have received confirmation (instantaneous via Horizon) packs will be sent out when BIS decide the timings. Where a branch refuses we will follow up with other local alternatives. No refusals are expected from multiples and crowns, which make up about 1000 of the 2800. (BIS are currently considering whether to restrict to these branches only, in view of the recent coverage/opposition from NFSP.)
- I have seen the draft letter to branches, which is waiting final clearance and dates from BIS. It is fine. It is clear that this is a good thing to be part of and is good money for very straightforward work. It does not give any hint of Privatisation dates but asks for confirmation that the branch wishes to be a nominated distributor of forms when the time comes. Anticipated send date is by end next week to allow sufficient time to recruit additional branches as a result of refusals.
- Although the relative remuneration is generous in the sense that all the branch is asked to do is to stock a box of forms, it is not in my view going to be a big incentive if a branch is anti-Privatisation. It is £25 per box of 80 forms. Most branches taking part will receive only one box.
- You may remember the Postcard campaign was a threat by George to undermine Privatisation. It is still not confirmed. If it followed the DVLA model, the NFSP would supply Spmrs with postcards, to be signed by customers and sent to their MPs. GT's intention was that the message would be Privatisation will be detrimental to POs and likely to end in PO closures. However, after Monday's 'resolute' meeting, [REDACTED]'s view is that the NFSP may now change to something more like ... if Privatisation goes ahead, the govt., must guarantee POs more Front Office work. Customers would be asking their MPs to support this. If it does switch to that balance of message, it will be easy for all Parties to support but too vague to achieve anything substantial; but no downside for us or RM.

I hope this helps. Do forward to Donald if you wish. I am getting another update tomorrow and will contact [REDACTED] if I think there is anything to flag.

Best, Paula

Sent from my iPad

On 15 Aug 2013, at 08:37, "Paula Vennells" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

> Hi Alice, I do know about this - George has been threatening for some while. It is his postcard campaign. I spoke with [REDACTED] last week but at the time it was not considered a big deal. [REDACTED]'s words were 'a nuisance but it's not going to stop anything as the train has left the station'. [REDACTED] was clear we are not the default application channel - only an exception. High commission rates would be offered (but these would be over a smallish volume).

>

> Before you do anything, let me get updated and get back to you, just in case anything has changed. I'll also check what comms have gone /are planned to go out. (And our legal status, tho' I expect their will be little we can do to enforce.)

>

> Thank you - [REDACTED] I have a series of updates on the major issues today and tomorrow, so Monday would be good to catchup before the Board call. We can liaise later.

>

> I'll get back to you asap. P

>

> Sent from my iPad

>

> On 15 Aug 2013, at 08:12, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>

>> Hi Paula,

>> I hope you are well and life is treating you OK back at 148.

>> I received a voicemail from DB late yesterday and was unable to hear it till just now.

>> It is hard to hear exactly what he is saying [REDACTED] but it is to the effect that George is asking his members to do something to oppose privatisation of RM which will deny them commission. DB wants to know whether we are doing something to tell his members that this is what GT is asking them to do before he/RM discuss the implications with the Govt this week. He did not appear to be implying that we should. He wanted to know the position.

>> I am of course!, completely in the dark about this.

>> Do you understand the point? And could you please get back to me with what I should say to him?

Alternatively, can you have the conversation with someone else in RM and I will then tell him that that is what you are doing? [REDACTED]

>> Separately, I will be in touch about us having a word on the phone perhaps next Monday, if that suits you - before the Board call on Tuesday.

>> All the best

>> Alice

>>

>> This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://www.websense.com)

**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Catch up?  
**Date:** 19 August 2013 08:34:18

---

Thx will do

Sent from my iPhone

On 19 Aug 2013, at 08:16, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

> 9 15 is fine. Please could you call me on [REDACTED] ?

> A

>

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

> From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]

> Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2013 07:54 PM

> To: Alice Perkins

> Subject: Re: Catch up?

>

> Hi Alice, I hope you are really well - I am on great form, thanks.

> Could you manage 9.15am? (Just gives me a bit of time to prep for the weekly exco afterwards.)

> If not, fine.

> Paula

>

> is 9.15am possible?

>

> Sent from my iPad

>

> On 18 Aug 2013, at 19:13, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>

>> Hi Paula,

>> Thanks for this.

>> How about 9 30am tomorrow? Would that work for you?

>> Hope you had a good weekend.

>> Will be good to talk to you.

>> Alice

>>

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

>> From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]

>> Sent: Friday, August 16, 2013 06:14 PM

>> To: Alice Perkins

>> Subject: Catch up?

>>

>> Hi Alice, we thought it would be good to catch up b4 the Board call: do you want to let me know when would suit? Other than 10-11am, I can be flexible.

>>

>> There is nothing you need to know about that can't wait until you get back. So my starter for ten for our call is brief:

>> • Funding [REDACTED] latest position and next steps. [REDACTED] will circulate an update to the Board tonight, which should form the basis for the Board discussion.

>> • Horizon/SS: no written update to the Board but I suggest I give an oral one. I will update you. There are a couple of new risks I highlighted to Susan; but in summary I'm pleased with how it is looking. Susan is also sounding more confident and her update was good.

>> • CWU: very brief oral update to Board, to confirm new 'action short of a strike' (work to rule) and 2 additional strikes called for Friday and Tuesday either side of Bank Holiday Monday. Chris is setting up a Industrial Action deep dive for the Board on 10 or 11 Sept., for the Board to discuss in more detail. Tom is now leading on this - good feedback on his approach. I will explain to you what we propose to cover.

>> • RM Prospectus: the language in the risks section which refers to PO is very negative. We are on the case -

it is being handled through external lawyers and I have asked for a revised draft by Monday. I am not suggesting we flag this to the Board yet but you need to be in the picture. Susan has picked this up and insisted inaccuracies are removed and the tone improved. However, as this is the risks section, my guess is we may still be uncomfortable even with their final draft and so I have already asked Susan to flag to [REDACTED] that we may want to escalate it to HMG. We will need to brief the Board properly at some stage but probably best when we have something to send out.

>>

>> Chris and I have looked at the September Board agenda and will have a good outline of what/how we propose to cover the agenda, which we can pick up on your return. Lots more .. But no intention of spoiling your holiday!

>>

>> Enjoy the weekend. Paula

>>

>> Ps. Thx for the note back from [REDACTED] :)

>>

>>

>> Sent from my iPad

>>

>>

>> \*\*\*\*\*

>> 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 message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://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.

\*\*\*\*\*

**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Subject:** Re: This am coverage  
**Date:** 24 August 2013 12:16:35

---

Hi, the person who has the note in hand is me! Others are either on holiday or under enough work pressure.

I asked for input on Thursday and have a couple of notes back indicating nothing major. If that is the case, I'll drop you a brief note. If I think there is more, then I'll suggest a call as it will be quicker.

There is a summary note prepared by [REDACTED] on Funding Update. I plan to add updates on IA and SS and get to the Board over the weekend.

I am still well rested thank you; and trying my best to hold on to that!

[REDACTED]  
Paula

Sent from my iPhone

On 24 Aug 2013, at 10:55, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

- > Hi Paula,
- > Thank you for letting me see all this.
- > In fact, we had people round late last night and so far, I have heard/seen almost nothing of the outside world this morning.
- > I am very glad that we are having the planned Board discussion shortly. And that you are taking the pro-active stand which you are.
- > [REDACTED]
- > [REDACTED]
- > I can see you have been very busy and I hope that you got sufficient rest earlier in the month.
- > I think you are aware that I am seeing [REDACTED] at 2pm on Tuesday at his suggestion. I gather he wanted to see me next week before he goes on holiday. I am happy to take this as it comes on the basis that I will only just have got back but if there are things I need to be aware of, I am sure someone has a note in hand.
- > I am looking forward to catching up with you on Wednesday - I'm sure there will be lots to talk about!
- > All the best
- > Alice
- >

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

- > From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]
- > Sent: Saturday, August 24, 2013 09:30 AM
- > To: Alice Perkins
- > Subject: Fwd: This am coverage

- >
- > Hi there Alice. I hope you are well rested?
- >

> Although it remains a challenging situation, the team has robust plans in place to handle operations and comms for the weekend IA. The comms team are already in touch with the BBC to challenge some bias; the main slot was balanced.

> [REDACTED] did a good job. He would benefit from a refresher media training, which I'll ask for. (Looked a tiny bit worried: needs to look concerned but calm.) He was confident however, which is most important and his answers spot on.

> There is plenty of work going into the Board IA deep-dive. [REDACTED] is doing a great job - better for concentrating on this, (and his briefing is outstanding). I have had an informal contact from Acas Chief Conciliator. We are speaking Tues pm.

**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins CB](#); [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [Alwen Lyons](#); [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Fwd: ToR  
**Date:** 29 August 2013 12:56:00  
**Attachments:** [Post Office LLR - TOR PV 2.docx](#)

---

Dear all, please find attached a copy of the final "Lessons Learned" ToR.

Thank you to Alice for her comments yesterday and [REDACTED] over the weekend. You will see that we now have one document, with the scope section highlighted in bold and the 'ground to be covered' section re-ordered and attached as an appendix.

[REDACTED], Alwen and I have just run through the main changes, and have noted the need to avoid scope creep. We flagged potential pitfalls, especially around going back too far, or spending too long on cultural issues we are already aware of, (acknowledging that [REDACTED] will need to explore some of this ground as context and I am keen to have his observations). [REDACTED] had the same concern and will check ongoing to ensure he is able to keep to the ToR: Alwen will field any first line queries and [REDACTED] and I will have a weekly update, which will also help.

BW,

Paula

Sent from my iPad

From: Paula Vennells [mailto: [REDACTED]]  
Sent: Wednesday, August 28, 2013 08:16 PM  
To: Alice Perkins  
Cc: Susan Crichton [REDACTED]@postoffice.co.uk>; Chris M Day [REDACTED]@postoffice.co.uk>  
Subject: Re: SS and costs

Thanks Alice. Useful for me too. And I did receive your other mail, which is the next task in hand.

The Horizon costs have been scoped, and a budget is now in place. We have needed to look at the end to end costs: for instance, the mediation process, as well as internal and external resources to see us through. I'm grateful to Susan who has led this review and has devised a way of time limiting the Second Sight costs.

If I try to remember the exact figure estimated for SS, I will get it wrong so have copied Susan to respond, as she and Chris worked on this together. The intention is for Second Sight to have finished their work by year end (I think calendar year?). And then for any ongoing activity to be handed over to Angela and her team, so that it becomes a BAU process. [REDACTED] will work hand in glove with SS over the next few months to enable this, and as importantly, to give SS the reassurance that they can safely hand over to her. So far, I understand this is working well and they have expressed respect for her input and capability.

Susan, could you and/or Chris update re the SS/costs?

Thx Paula

Sent from my iPad

On 28 Aug 2013, at 15:24, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

- > Hi Paula,
- > That was a useful catch-up this morning, thank you. You should by now have had my thoughts on the TOR. I realised while I was looking at those papers that I should have asked you where we got to on SS's costs which had not been fixed by the time I went away. Perhaps you or someone else could let me know?
- > Many thanks
- > Alice
- >
- > 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.

\*\*\*\*\*

**From:** [Alice Perkins](#) on behalf of [Alice Perkins](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Paula Vennells](#)  
**Cc:** [Alwen Lyons](#); [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Meeting Alan Johnson  
**Date:** 04 September 2013 15:16:28

---

Hi,

Just to let you know I am now due to meet him next Tuesday 10th at the House of Commons at 3 30.

I have positioned this as an off the record, private chat about the PO with the emphasis on the Crowns. It may be that the Board paper for the deep dive later in the week will do the trick in terms of briefing. But I will want to read whatever briefing I need on Monday ([REDACTED] knows my logistics).

Should be useful timing.

All the best

Alice

This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://www.websense.com)



**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Subject:** Lessons learned  
**Date:** 06 September 2013 11:00:32

---

..and I should have said, I have [REDACTED] working on how we will do the lessons learned. He is rewriting the TOR, and we have worked up an approach as to how we conduct it. I will discuss with [REDACTED] when I speak to him and also send across to you when ready. (Monday) P

Sent from my iPad

On 6 Sep 2013, at 10:49, "Paula Vennells" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

- > There is an answer to "great minds..." but it wouldn't apply in your case :)
- >
- > I'll try and get him over the weekend. I'm seeing [REDACTED] on Monday pm and will simply stand him down. I'll also insist we pay his bill and expenses so far; and I shall order a case of wine to send to his home afterwards.
- >
- > I won't mention the Chair role as I'd like to meet one or two first having read the spec and the cvs. If we then don't find the right person, I would go to [REDACTED]. I think it would be unfair to him to bring him in at this stage when the field is still open, with the possibility of not giving him the job! (I have had a good recommendation from someone who knows and has worked with [REDACTED], so certainly worth seeing him.)
- >
- > Timings will be confirmed next week after I've also spoken to [REDACTED].
- >
- > Enjoy your Friday.
- >
- > Paula
- >
- > Sent from my iPad

> On 5 Sep 2013, at 19:03, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

- >> Great minds..... Was thinking the same.
- >> I haven't done anything about [REDACTED] I imagine he is either back or about to be back - ARC next week. I'd be grateful if you would brief him before you communicate with the Board.
- >> Let me know if you would like a word tomorrow.
- >> All the best
- >> Alice
- >>
- >> ----- Original Message -----
- >> From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]
- >> Sent: Thursday, September 05, 2013 05:58 PM
- >> To: Alice Perkins
- >> Subject: Briefing [REDACTED]
- >>
- >> Alice, you'll see I've sent a note to [REDACTED], suggesting that I meet him briefly next week. I want to look at the chairman cvs and spec. (If [REDACTED] is back, it would be good to get his take.)
- >>
- >> Have you briefed [REDACTED] or made a mental note to do so? If not, I think that is something I should do before I send a note advising the Board, and certainly before the ARC.
- >>
- >> I expect to speak to Susan on Monday - tell you more when we next speak.
- >>
- >> Regards, Paula
- >>
- >> Sent from my iPad
- >>
- >> \_\_\_\_\_

>> \*\*\*\*\*

>> 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 message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://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.

\*\*\*\*\*

**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Briefing [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 07 September 2013 10:01:11

---

Yes a beautiful morning!

Thanks Alice. It will be a surprise and I need to make sure we have enough time to talk it through.

My approach needs to remind [REDACTED] where we left off, then paint the story to arrive at the conclusion carefully. Esp as the last time we spoke, I had been in the place of trying to help Susan repair the damage. So that will be a change.

I think he will understand. [REDACTED] had raised a couple of questions re Susan's judgement, but less than others.

Re speaking to Susan, I had a tip-off from Alwen that Susan may raise it with me on Monday herself. They spoke mid-week: Susan [REDACTED], and, she didn't see how she could continue having lost the confidence of the Board.

Exactly the same conclusions.

Although that makes it slightly easier if she does raise it, people can change their minds (not tidy!). So I shall wait and see what happens. Either way, assuming Susan is in 148, we will have the conversation on Monday.

I am speaking to [REDACTED] this weekend as we will need to be thinking about which lawyers we use, interim cover and about business messages. And indeed when Susan goes. It sounds as though she wants that to be straightaway. Much will depend on Susan's [REDACTED]. I have been in situations like this where people have been helpful and suggested the best outcomes themselves. Susan is capable of doing that but I'm not holding my breath.

I hope this sounds calm - I am - on the outside... on the inside, it was never going to be easy. [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Thank you for your support - and helpful questions are always welcome.

Enjoy the weekend.

Paula

Sent from my iPhone

On 7 Sep 2013, at 08:56, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

- > Thanks Paula.
- > When you talk to [REDACTED] all this will come as a complete surprise to him of course. So you may need to give him time to understand it - on the other hand, given where you have got to now it may fall into place quickly. If it helps, please say I would of course, be happy to talk to him whenever he likes.
- > Glad to hear about the positive pieces of news.
- > I hope you have woken up to the same beautiful morning as I have.
- > A
- >
- > ----- Original Message -----
- > From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]
- > Sent: Friday, September 06, 2013 07:06 PM
- > To: Alice Perkins

> Subject: Re: Briefing [REDACTED]

>

> Thank you Alice. It will help not having a call. For what it's worth, I do not think we could have ended up in a different place with [REDACTED]; none of us could have foreseen the reaction. (I wasn't making work btw, it was [REDACTED]'s suggestion as [REDACTED] had asked some good and challenging questions of us. I will simply play by ear with [REDACTED]. Not a big deal either way; and I certainly don't want him thinking I'm trying to soften the blow.)

>

> There are a couple of business updates I want to send you, which will follow over the weekend.

>

> In the meantime: a couple of items of cheer: I had an excellent meeting with Yamamoto San the President of Fujitsu yesterday. As well as the formal goodwill exchanges, key business points were made, which should play into our negotiations over the IPR. I shall make sure Chris follows up. He was only over for two days - we are clearly important (as they are to us). Lesley did a great job in the briefing, planning and her contribution to the meeting.

>

> And, today I took boxes of chocs down to the NT teams to say well done on the 1000 branches. When I congratulated them on customer satisfaction still running at 95%, they were at great pains to tell me I was wrong: it is 98%!

>

> [REDACTED]

>

> Best wishes, Paula

>

>

>

> Sent from my iPad

>

> On 6 Sep 2013, at 17:41, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>

>> OK Paula, that's fine. I understand properly now. No need to speak. And no need to "make work" for [REDACTED]. What's happened is embarrassing but your willingness to a) be straightforward with him, and b) compensate him properly will mean that he will feel properly treated. And who knows, we may have something genuine for him to do in future. When this is out of the way, and he's back from his autumn trip, I'll take him out to lunch.

>> Hope you manage to have a good weekend.

>> All the best

>> Alice

>>

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

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

>> Sent: Friday, September 06, 2013 02:04 PM

>> To: Alice Perkins

>> Subject: Re: Briefing [REDACTED]

>>

>> Hi Alice, I'm sorry if there's a misunderstanding. That was what I tried to explain when I called you: if Susan and [REDACTED] had left the business, then we couldn't effectively do [REDACTED]'s review. I heard you say that you had the same thought. I felt we should stand him down, as the context is now different. (That was why I called you - no other reason. Just to make sure we were on the same page.)

>>

>> I still feel very strongly that we should do the LL review. As I'm sure you do too. And as the individuals who would have had the sensitivities will have moved on, then I would like the business to do it - we all of us know what needs to be said. We did a good review in the case of Rainbow. We can for this.

>>

>> My follow-up note to you this am said I have a way through, which [REDACTED] is drafting. Why don't we speak on Monday, I'll get [REDACTED] to check diaries. [REDACTED] will try to get the revised TOR/brief to us by mid-morning.

>>

>> An after-thought is that we could ask [REDACTED] if he would be prepared to challenge and review our LL paper and we arrange a half-day session with him to do that, before we prepare a final report for the ARC/Board. We will always benefit from an external and independent perspective. I will ask [REDACTED] to add this in.

>>

>> If it helps, we could speak this pm. Let me know.

>>

>> Paula

>>

>> Sent from my iPad

>>

>> On 6 Sep 2013, at 11:49, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>

>>> Hi,

>>> When we spoke on Wed, we hadn't concluded what we should do re the lessons learned review, other than asking [REDACTED] to rewrite much narrower TOR. The options we discussed were to discuss revised TOR with the lawyers and then either proceed now or wait till SS were off the scene.

>>> You also (on the phone later, I think) commented that it would be v difficult to do the review given changes in personnel.

>>> The decision to stand [REDACTED] down completely was a surprise - I hadn't got to that conclusion. (I'm not saying it isn't right - just want to understand.)

>>> Could you please share your reasoning on that with me?

>>> Thanks

>>> A

>>>

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

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

>>> Sent: Friday, September 06, 2013 10:49 AM

>>> To: Alice Perkins

>>> Subject: Re: Briefing [REDACTED]

>>>

>>> There is an answer to "great minds..." but it wouldn't apply in your case :)

>>>

>>> I'll try and get him over the weekend. I'm seeing [REDACTED] on Monday pm and will simply stand him down. I'll also insist we pay his bill and expenses so far; and I shall order a case of wine to send to his home afterwards.

>>>

>>> I won't mention the Chair role as I'd like to meet one or two first having read the spec and the cvs. If we then don't find the right person, I would go to [REDACTED]. I think it would be unfair to him to bring him in at this stage when the field is still open, with the possibility of not giving him the job! (I have had a good recommendation from someone who knows and has worked with [REDACTED], so certainly worth seeing him.)

>>>

>>> Timings will be confirmed next week after I've also spoken to [REDACTED].

>>>

>>> Enjoy your Friday.

>>>

>>> Paula

>>>

>>> Sent from my iPad

>>>

>>> On 5 Sep 2013, at 19:03, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>>

>>>> Great minds..... Was thinking the same.

>>>> I haven't done anything about [REDACTED]. I imagine he is either back or about to be back - ARC next week. I'd be grateful if you would brief him before you communicate with the Board.

>>>> Let me know if you would like a word tomorrow.

>>>> All the best

>>>> Alice

>>>>

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

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

>>>> Sent: Thursday, September 05, 2013 05:58 PM

>>>> To: Alice Perkins

>>>> Subject: Briefing [REDACTED]

>>>>

>>>> Alice, you'll see I've sent a note to [REDACTED], suggesting that I meet him briefly next week. I want to look at the chairman cvs and spec. (If [REDACTED] is back, it would be good to get his take.)

>>>>

>>>> Have you briefed [REDACTED] or made a mental note to do so? If not, I think that is something I should do before I send a note advising the Board, and certainly before the ARC.

>>>>

>>>> I expect to speak to Susan on Monday - tell you more when we next speak.

>>>>

>>>> Regards, Paula

>>>>

>>>> Sent from my iPad

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> \*\*\*\*\*

>>>> 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 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.

>>>>

>>>> \*\*\*\*\*

>>>>

>>>>

>>>> \*\*\*\*\*

>>>> 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

**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Thanks  
**Date:** 09 September 2013 14:18:12

---

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 [REDACTED]. 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" <[REDACTED]> 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, [REDACTED] 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:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
> 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 [REDACTED] is back I have him, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] 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" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>  
>> Thank you for your emails. As you know, I appreciate no surprises even if the news is unwelcome!  
>> I agree about telling [REDACTED] 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 [REDACTED] with loads of PO papers to read.....

>> A

>>

>> This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://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.

\*\*\*\*\*



**From:** [Alice Perkins](#) on behalf of [Alice Perkins](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Paula Vennells](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Susan  
**Date:** 09 September 2013 16:34:53

---

I am very glad to hear this - a relief for everyone but especially for you.  
I don't know good headhunters for lawyers. I can ask my colleagues at JCA and will do so.  
A

----- Original Message -----  
From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
Sent: Monday, September 09, 2013 04:08 PM  
To: Alice Perkins  
Subject: Susan

Hi Alice, I'll update you properly F2F. But the conversation with Susan went well. She made the suggestion that she needs to leave and has thought carefully about how we handle this for the Post Office, as well as for her.

[REDACTED] is looking into the proposal Susan has drafted; [REDACTED] and I have spoken briefly about it and my initial view is we will need to negotiate a couple of points but in principle we have a way through. An important outcome will be that we and Susan manage the messaging calmly and carefully for the business and for the stakeholders.

I will speak to [REDACTED] tomorrow and then take a view on whether I need an interim. Before I start recruitment, do you have any views on headhunters?

I hope [REDACTED] is really well!

Paula

Sent from my iPad

---

\*\*\*\*\*  
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 message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://www.websense.com)

**From:** [Alice Perkins](#) on behalf of [Alice Perkins](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Paula Vennells](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Jeannie Drake?  
**Date:** 11 September 2013 15:49:43

---

I don't know her. Your idea sounds good.  
A

----- Original Message -----  
From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
Sent: Wednesday, September 11, 2013 12:59 PM  
To: Alice Perkins  
Subject: Jeannie Drake?

Alice, do you know Baroness Drake? (Used to be Dep Gen Sec of CWU.)

I have been invited to the annual private viewing of the PO & BT Art Club, which she is opening.

I know the event and opened it a couple of years ago. Nice to do but not a diary priority as a visitor... unless you know Jeannie Drake and think she is worth getting to know, then I'll go and make a point of meeting her, as another angle into CWU.

Paula

Sent from my iPad

---

\*\*\*\*\*  
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 message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://www.websense.com)

**From:** [Alice Perkins](#) on behalf of [Alice Perkins](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Paula Vennells](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Briefing the Board  
**Date:** 12 September 2013 08:52:31

---

Fine.  
A

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

From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
Sent: Thursday, September 12, 2013 08:49 AM  
To: Alice Perkins  
Subject: Briefing the Board

Alice, on reflection would you mind if I briefed the Board re Susan before the ARC? There are a number of areas we will cover that fall within her remit and would be helpful for the NEDs to be aware she is leaving so they can then reflect on any areas of concern - that might be easier if they know before the meeting starts? I would ask them to let me know privately afterwards. I will not take long as there is not much to be gained by a detailed discussion.

If you are ok with this, I will ask Alwen to put other attendees on standby and not to come in immediately.

Susan won't be at the ARC, [REDACTED].

Paula

Sent from my iPad

\*\*\*\*\*

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 message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://www.websense.com)

**From:** [Alice Perkins](#) on behalf of [Alice Perkins](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Paula Vennells](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Strategy update  
**Date:** 17 October 2013 08:57:13

---

Thank you Paula.

This is helpful.

I am glad to read about the drop-dead timetable. I guess it would be wise to check that Mark will be available next week - I don't know whether he has school age children. If he is on leave, we'd need to get to him before he goes.

In the meantime, my thanks to you and all the key players for the continued hard work and commitment which this is continuing to demand.

Fingers crossed for your meeting with GT. I know you'll let me know.

All the best

Alice

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

From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 07:44 AM  
To: Alice Perkins  
Subject: Strategy update

Hi Alice. I hope you had a good evening.

In the spirit of keeping you updated: first of all, the team are doing a very thorough job under great pressure. [REDACTED] is proving a real asset. You can imagine how [REDACTED] is feeling as this is high pressure, especially with the CWU injunction as well; but as far as I can see he appears completely on top of it and thinking very clearly. He is taking input and support from various colleagues and I have 'loaned' him [REDACTED] to make sure we are keeping the BIS angles covered.

On that score, [REDACTED] is going to help prepare notes and counter-factuals for briefing ministers; we will need to be ready to bring [REDACTED] in if necessary, to help with George or JS or both depending on outcome. [REDACTED] believes but is also going to double-check that [REDACTED] is keeping Jo and [REDACTED] briefed.

So far, every angle I have tested the team have thought about. Plus, the legal team are doing a helpful job in horizon scanning the implications of a 15 year agreement, inc public procurement angles that will be raised by the CWU.

I spoke with George yesterday. He understands that he is getting very close to (almost on in fact) our red lines: on timing, and on what any 15 year agreement needs to cover - for our protection as well as his. He is coming in today to go through our final proposals. George thinks there is a deal to be done but I am not sure if he still thinks that is because we will move to his terms. In my mind we have moved as far as we should within the mandate; and in respect of the requirement for a 15 year agreement, we have moved as far as I think is still within the bounds of responsible use of public funds by the PO. I will touch base with him F2F just so that he knows I'm serious.

I have also made sure the team know that there is no more time. If the Fed cannot reach a deal today, we will be briefing the Board over the weekend or early next week, and we will be escalating to BIS and to ministers. If it gets to this, I will call you. (We have concurrently been thinking through plan Bs, both re., funding the Fed via BIS directly, NT options without Fed agreement, or long grass politics!)

Hope that helps. Any thoughts or queries pls call me or [REDACTED] or [REDACTED].

Paula

Sent from my iPad

\*\*\*\*\*

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 message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://www.websense.com)

**From:** [Alice Perkins](#) on behalf of [Alice Perkins](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Paula Vennells](#)  
**Subject:** Re: JCA document  
**Date:** 17 October 2013 12:30:10

---

Thank you for your reflections and feedback, Paula. Lovely to hear and see your thoughts about the longer term. I suggest we take time to discuss this, the half year, your development and the way we deal together with issues which affect you personally.

If we are to do this before the NomCom on 6 November, it will have to be before the Board next meets as I am very busy in the days immediately after the Board meeting. As it happens, I have time on Monday 28 or Tuesday 29 October and would be happy to carve out a couple of hours plus for this.

Alternatively, we could have dinner one evening that week or the beginning of the following week.

Perhaps you could let me know what would suit you?

Alice

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

From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2013 06:15 AM  
To: Alice Perkins  
Subject: JCA document

Hi Alice. I've read the document and I completely get it.

I do hope you don't mind me saying that a separate conversation about it might have been a better approach, with some time to absorb and discuss. However, it was never going to be an easy matter for you to broach that I understand, it's just that landing it out of the blue at the end of a 121, after we had discussed a series of high pressure issues, made it more difficult than it needed to be.

But as I say, I get it. The report is well written and it is common-sense.

Interestingly, re., leadership styles and values that will be needed in the future, it makes the same points on the bottom of p11 and on p12, as the leadership chapter in the book I was talking about: 'Higher Ambition', and according to McKinsey it's where academic research is leading as well. Clearly in the Zeitgeist and I'll bring in the book for you. The chapters on future leadership and on the importance of resilience in organisations are very good.

The point being they are qualities and a style, which are unquestionably mine. My past achievements in the commercial sector are also completely aligned to where we need to go. I was serious about the point I made yesterday: once we get through the NT and IR issues, the PO has the longer term potential to be my 'last big job' - if we really believe in the once in a generation opportunity you spoke of, and I do, then we should talk much more openly about what we think that needs in terms of my future leadership orientation and development, as well as the people to get us there. That conversation ought to be complementary to your process - for me and for the business.

I would like a better conversation about it before you brief [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], which I think you offered? And as far as a CEO can be involved, I will be supportive. If we can create a couple of roles that could be proving grounds for potential successors, that can only be helpful to us all.

Paula

Sent from my iPad

\*\*\*\*\*

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 message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://www.websense.com)

**From:** [Alice Perkins](#) on behalf of [Alice Perkins](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Paula Vennells](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Signing out!  
**Date:** 21 October 2013 12:56:44

---

Thanks Paula.  
Rain is good for the complexion - or so they say....  
A

----- Original Message -----  
From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2013 12:53 PM  
To: Alice Perkins  
Subject: Re: Signing out!

None at all - put it down to a late night grump! (And nothing to do with you at all :)

Thank you. I have been out for a muddy run, been to the local abbey and plan to do some wet gardening this pm. So all very restful.

I hope you have a good week.

Paula

Sent from my iPhone

> On 21 Oct 2013, at 11:42, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:  
>  
> Paula,  
> Thank you for this. All clear and helpful. I hope you get a real break this week.  
> One thing. I'd like to understand why you don't want me to talk to [REDACTED] about her leaving? As you say, we can discuss this next Monday evening - a lot to get through - but if she's made up her mind, what harm can it do?  
> All the best  
> Alice  
>  
>  
>  
> ----- Original Message -----  
> From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
> Sent: Monday, October 21, 2013 12:47 AM  
> To: Alice Perkins  
> Cc: Chris M Day <[REDACTED]@postoffice.co.uk>; [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@postoffice.co.uk>  
> Subject: Signing out!  
>  
> Hi Alice, don't worry about the lateness of this note - I am clearing the I tray before signing out. I hope your weekend has been good despite the autumn rains.  
>  
> Chris is well briefed, as is [REDACTED].  
>  
> A couple of updates:  
>  
> • Sir Anthony Hooper/Sparrow: very positive phone call on Friday pm. No issue at all re Hillsborough; he is going to send a file note. He also understood the SS angle and is keen to support. [REDACTED] is now well glued in to what is happening.  
> My concern re Sparrow currently is our obligations of disclosure re., an unsafe witness. (The representative from Fujitsu made statements about no bugs, which later could be seen to have been undermined by the SS report.) We do not think it material but it could be high profile. [REDACTED] is briefed if you want more detail. This



is just in case.

>

> • Fed/strategy: I have read the draft MoU for the 15 year agreement and fed back some comments on style and content. [redacted] and [redacted] will be in touch to take you through. It is on the right track, it needs more of a PO balance and the accompanying paper must have a horizon scan. I have yet to read the operating document but expect this in some ways to be less difficult. Mark is working on the comms planning and I know will be happy to talk to you as well, if you would like to. I decided not to issue a Board update - it risked being too upbeat too soon. But the team will get something out post-Thursday's meeting with the NFSP, where the final details should be agreed having gone through lawyers. (George [redacted].)

>

> • half-year: Chris and Mark will pick up all comments, inc., [redacted]'s.

>

> • [redacted] has decided to leave. I would prefer if you didn't raise with her but wanted you to know in case. I shall use the opportunity as a catalyst for wider changes and we can explore when we meet next Monday. (Obviously Chris, [redacted] and [redacted] are aware.)

>

[redacted] The CWU are due in this week

as per my note.

>

> I think that's all the important areas. Chris is in the loop. If you do need me - same system as before - don't assume I'll be reading emails but I will pick up texts and can be directed to email that way. I know you won't bother me unless serious, but if in doubt, don't hesitate.

>

> Best wishes and thanks to Chris and [redacted] in advance.

>

> Paula

>

>

>

> Sent from my iPad

>

>

> \*\*\*\*\*

> 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 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.

\*\*\*\*\*

**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Tomorrow  
**Date:** 28 October 2013 12:18:36

---

Alice, thanks. That's exactly what I'd like to cover too.  
See you tomorrow.  
Paula

Sent from my iPad

> On 28 Oct 2013, at 12:14, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:  
>

> I was on a long phone call when you rang. I am sorry I missed you. Don't worry at all about today. Not a lot you can do about this!

> And thanks for the messages about business today.

> I have asked [REDACTED] to book us a room at JCA tomorrow. I suggest we meet at 3 15 and allow our selves whatever time we need up to about 6pm.

> I would like to talk about the following:

> How the two of us work together as we move into the next Chapter at the Post Office and specifically, how we discuss personal messages;

> The future;

> How this year is going so far;

> How you are working with and developing your top team.

> Do let me know whether there are other things on your list for this conversation. I look forward to it.

> Many thanks

> Alice

>

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

> From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]

> Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 11:43 AM

> To: Alice Perkins

> Subject: Re: Tomorrow

>

> Hi Alice, I tried to call you.

>

> I have just returned home after a frustrating time at Bedford station. There are now no trains to London at all, all day. I have since checked my only alternative route - from Milton Keynes - and there is chaos there too. Difficult to find out what is happening exactly other than websites say no trains or don't travel.

>

> I am sorry it is not ideal for either of us. The best solution is probably that we meet tomorrow afternoon, I can move my diary: this is important and as you say better done separately to the board meeting discussion. I have dinner with the CWU tomorrow early evening, so as you need to be at Regents Park for 6.30pm - why don't we meet at JCA or somewhere close to where you need to be: that is also a better direction for me than coming to your house. Will you let me know if you will book a room at JCA or if you would like me to find a venue.

>

> The business is coping well with the bad weather. Although inconvenient for customers and staff affected, there are however just 48 branches so far closed/without power - a small number in the scheme of things - we usually run into 100s in seriously bad weather. And whilst there are always lessons to be learned in these situations, actually it has been pretty slick. I'm pleased as we have a number of senior people on half-term leave and a manual workaround for an IT feedback system that is closing due to separation. Contingencies were requested of Fujitsu last week re the bad weather and they are managing within normal response rates, which is reassuring; and we are monitoring their figures on lines down to ensure they are prioritised.

>

> Let me know what you'd like to do re tomorrow. Sorry again for today!

>

> Paula

>

> Sent from my iPad

>

>> On 28 Oct 2013, at 10:12, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>

>> Thanks Paula. That's helpful.

>> I hope you had a good week. I am fine and [REDACTED]'s announcement has brought with it wonderful recognition for him which is great.

>> It is important that we meet and have time to have a proper conversation this week, preferably before the Board meeting.

>> It would be best from my point of view if we could do that today and I can meet you earlier if you prefer. Alternatively, I could meet you tomorrow afternoon from 3 onwards (ideally but not necessarily) in my house - I need to be near Regents Park by around 6 30.

>> I also have time on Wednesday morning (we are due to meet in the afternoon) but I think it might be better to have more space between the different conversations.

>> Please keep me posted on what you think would be best.

>> On the separate issue of business continuity, whose responsibility at Director level is it to be on top of that? And was anything done last week given that this storm has been predicted for days?

>> Looking forward to our meeting

>> All the best

>> Alice

>>

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

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

>> Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 09:44 AM

>> To: Alice Perkins

>> Subject: Tomorrow

>>

>> Hi Alice, I hope you have had a good weekend - not too disrupted by [REDACTED]'s news or the blustery weather!

>>

>> This is to suggest that we should still meet tonight but that rather than supper at [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. My trains are disrupted and it will be better that I don't leave too late. I expect to be in London by the afternoon as the website says they plan to run a reduced service by midday.

>>

>> If it looks like staying put is the best option, then I'll let you know.

>>

>> There is as you will have seen a business continuity meeting under way. If there is anything significant, I'll let you know.

>>

>> See you later,

>> Paula

>>

>> Sent from my iPad

>>

>>

>> \*\*\*\*\*

>> 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 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.

\*\*\*\*\*

**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Subject:** Re: [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 30 October 2013 21:48:16

---

Should have said - this was mostly off the record, particularly as he has been asked not to share the successor news yet as not landed.

Sent from my iPad

> On 30 Oct 2013, at 21:44, "Paula Vennells" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>

> I decided that it is easiest whilst it is still fresh (so please forgive the shorthand):

>

> • [REDACTED]

> • his successor likely to be [REDACTED] (maybe wrong name - signal was not great). [REDACTED] currently in [REDACTED]. [REDACTED]'s view is that he is v competent, a 'good thing' and going places. Not had chance to check that out yet! The reason the appointment isn't yet confirmed is that [REDACTED] will bring some responsibilities with him. (Not sure how negotiable or serious this is - it happened before with [REDACTED] and was not a problem. To be reviewed.) If we have not landed our deal, Shex (encouragingly) know that we need a full time heavyweight to do so. Therefore - v helpful that [REDACTED] is under some pressure to land it before he goes so that [REDACTED] can transfer. [REDACTED] wants to do that, was optimistic and believes he has everyone lined up their end. The signal then went before I could ask where we are on JS - but he did sound positive.

> • I asked where I needed to worry and where could we help him: he replied 'not the deal' but listed other issues, any or all of which could disrupt the messaging if they coincided: rates (valuation office issue); not landing the Poca (Maypole paper) option - although he mentioned this more positively - obviously working on bringing it together to tell a better story and would like us to do all we can to help with the timing; NS&I - BIS Finance transitional funding (negotiated by [REDACTED] for Premium bonds from memory), which may run out earlier than expected.

>

> All in all, a positive conversation. More than I hoped for. I am about to flag to [REDACTED] & [REDACTED] to be on top of the 'worry' areas.

>

> BW Paula

>

> Sent from my iPad

>

>> On 30 Oct 2013, at 18:58, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>>

>> [REDACTED]

>> If we don't know by tomorrow, we should establish from [REDACTED] what his timing is when we see him.

>> Have a good evening

>> A

>>

>> This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://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.

**From:** [Paula Vennells](#) on behalf of [Paula Vennells](#) <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** [Alice Perkins](#)  
**Subject:** Re: [REDACTED]  
**Date:** 31 October 2013 21:10:28

---

Thanks Alice. I have thought about all that too.

Apologies because my shorthand didn't say that I would want to talk to [REDACTED]. I suppose I assumed you would realise that is how I manage. Getting [REDACTED]'s buy in is important. And I need (and want) to keep [REDACTED] happy, both from my own integrity re someone who has worked hard for me and also for Sue to stay motivated.

[REDACTED] is loyal and has good values. I did say to you (sometime this week!) that I had already asked [REDACTED] if she would work with me before she went to look at how the ExCo and the business could be more effective. (She is a good consultant.) And she had had the very same ideas on structure. Exactly the same - inc her role.

But all to be talked about and I wouldn't be surprised if we didn't end up with [REDACTED] suggesting what I outlined below.

Thanks for your prompt response. Your point 1) is the priority. Best that I get us there carefully - I am (usually) good at that. We'll see :)

Paula

Sent from my iPhone

> On 31 Oct 2013, at 20:35, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>

> Hi Paula,

> Thanks.

> I have several thoughts about this.

> 1) My bottom line is that you should move to your new structure while keeping [REDACTED] to complete the things you mention but I am not sure whether it is right to dismantle her job while she is still around unless that is something she wants. Which it might be. But to take her off Exco could be humiliating for her which I don't think any of us would want. Especially for the sake of a few months. But if she wants to scale down while finishing the work, that's different.

> 2) I am not in a position to know what she's like as a line manager but I do see that her collaboration with colleagues may be an issue.

> 3) I think she has some things to say about how she has found working in the PO which it would be worth the two of you talking about frankly.

> 4) I can see that it is important that she doesn't become negative and perhaps you should also talk frankly about that.

> This is in shorthand. Apologies. We can talk about it more next week if that would be helpful.

> All the best

> Alice

>

>

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

> From: Paula Vennells [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]

> Sent: Thursday, October 31, 2013 07:02 PM

> To: Alice Perkins

> Subject: Re: [REDACTED]

>

> True.

> Chris and I had a very good and long chat afterwards about structure, refocusing, and lifting our ambitions for the business as we come out of this tough period, and about [REDACTED]. His view is identical to yours and mine - that she simply hasn't made the transition to line management in a big, complex operational business. And whilst she continues to do a great job for the Board and in the stakeholder context, she is becoming more negative internally and both Chris and I feel we should watch that. I think I told you that [REDACTED] has said that is a likely default behaviour.

>  
> We can discuss at Nomco next week, but my thinking is that I will make the changes we discussed the other day. One of which is to put customer (ie., product and channel) Strategy under [REDACTED] and IT under service delivery. (Different conversation to be had about an ExCo CIO/CTO at some stage.) And move to a more senior and smaller EXCo.

>  
> I would then keep [REDACTED] maybe on reduced time if necessary, for as long as it takes to land the NT legals. I would also like her to finish the CWU facilitation on the vision work. She can continue oversight of the Mutualisation and any other standalone projects until I am ready to transfer them but would come off the ExCo.

> Let me know if that prompts any other thoughts.

> I thought we had a good meeting today. I will get the informal view back from [REDACTED] but the debate was good with Mark.

> And being in the branch, though it was terribly stuffy and the energy levels dipped a bit after lunch, was excellent. We should do it more often. I hope you and the NEDs got value from talking to the NT team - they're a great bunch. Any feedback - please let me know.

> Paula

> Sent from my iPad

>> On 31 Oct 2013, at 17:15, "Alice Perkins" <[REDACTED]> wrote:

>> Just a further thought to feed into the mix. [REDACTED] commented to me on the way out that the simultaneous loss of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] was unfortunate. A further argument for keeping her to see the legals through if that is possible.

>> 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.

\*\*\*\*\*