

---

**From:** Ruth X Barker [GRO]  
**Sent:** Mon 02/06/2014 7:22:47 AM (UTC)  
**To:** Mark R Davies [GRO]; Belinda Crowe [GRO]  
**Cc:** Nina Arnott [GRO]; Sophie Bialaszewski [GRO]; David Oliver [GRO]; Belinda Crowe [GRO]  
**Subject:** RE: Continue but refine

Thanks Belinda we can look at the Deloitte messaging today.

It would be good to see info on the exact terms of the Deloitte report and the levels of assurance it provides – i.e. is it the highest level possible? If so then we can of course say we wanted this to ensure our people have the same confidence in our systems and processes as we do and bring out some of its credentials.

If there's anything you can share would be useful.

Thanks

Ruth

---

**From:** Mark R Davies  
**Sent:** 01 June 2014 21:26  
**To:** Belinda Crowe  
**Cc:** Nina Arnott; Sophie Bialaszewski; Ruth X Barker; David Oliver; Belinda Crowe  
**Subject:** Re: Continue but refine

Thanks both. This is good challenge.

My view is we need to do some work to firm up the Deloitte point. On the second, it is important to get this across (ie they have had another year and found nothing) but there may be a better way of putting it.

M

Sent from my iPhone

On 1 Jun 2014, at 20:19, "Belinda Crowe" <[GRO]> wrote:

Thanks Nina

On 1, I think the problem is that the reason we commissioned the Deloitte work is that SS never really produced what we would have expected. That is something more about the system rather than an inconclusive report about a few cases. I think the context is something like SS found nothing but there were still questions therefore we commissioned a further piece from someone else to look at the issue in a different way. If people want to draw conclusions about that and press us we would say that SS's report was helpful, but still did not quieten the critics. etc.etc.

On2 Its perhaps not the best way of putting it but I do think its a significant point that SS spent months investigating and published a report saying they found no significant problems and since then have spent almost another year investigating cases and still found nothing. However, we should pick the best lines and use those. You guys are the experts so will bow to your judgement.

Best wishes  
Belinda

Belinda Crowe  
148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

GRO  
GRO

belinda.crowe GRO

On 1 Jun 2014, at 16:52, "Nina Arnott" GRO > wrote:

Hello all

Please find my suggested amends attached. Mainly just tweaks with just two points to resolve:

1. What context do we put around bringing in Deloitte? It could raise questions about the initial report by Second Sight.
2. I'm not sure the final sentence of this para necessarily adds anything here?

In the two years since the inquiry investigation began there has been no evidence of deficiencies systemic issues with the Horizon system. Indeed, Second Sight found no systemic issues in its report in 2013. It has since been investigating cases and this work supports this finding.

Best,  
Nina

---

**From:** Sophie Bialaszewski  
**Sent:** 01 June 2014 14:56  
**To:** Mark R Davies; Ruth X Barker; Nina Arnott; Belinda Crowe; David Oliver  
**Subject:** Continue but refine

Hi All,

Again, thanks Ruth for first drafts of this. I've added in another narrative based on what we all created a while ago (incident with BIS) to show that an action of a WG could be public or within WG - either situations might make us have to reconsider the scheme?

See what you think. If you could get track changes to David today that would be great so that this can go into an annex of the slides for monday.

Thanks

Sophie  
<Continue but refine narrative V2 NA comments.docx>