
From: Belinda Crowe[IMCEAEX-
_O=MMS_OU=EXCHANGE+20ADMINISTRATIVE+20GROUP+20+28FYDIBOHF23SPDLT+29
_CN=RECIPIENTS_CN=BELINDA+20CROWE79B93F11-569F-4526-A078-
F5B4958A8917220@C72A47.ingest.local]

Sent: Wed 11/02/2015 7:07:04 AM (UTC)

To: Chris Aujard [GRO] Parsons,
Andrew [GRO] Rodric
Williams [GRO] Angela Van-Den-Bogerd [GRO]
[GRO]

Cc: Melanie Corfield [GRO] Mark R
Davies [GRO] Belinda Crowe [GRO] Mark
Underwood1 [GRO]

Bcc: Belinda Crowe [GRO]

Subject: Re: Note of telecon with Ian Henderson 20 Jan

Further to this, I think we have four outstanding issues to address with Second Sight re the provision of information:

1. The provision of emails relating to Bracknell
2. The provision of prosecution documents
3. Further information re what started off as being suspense accounts etc.
4. The few outstanding questions/information requests from the Part Two questions

This where we are and should plan to be going forward:

1. Emails - I have requested from Dave King as much email data as he can get from the people on the list Ian sent through to me after my conversation with him on 20 Jan. I have some email data for Martin Rolfe and Dave is looking to what he can get re the other people on the list (Mark Underwood keeping track) I have also obtained the disk we gave to Ian with what data we managed to obtain last time. Dave is trying to access that data to see exactly what was provided.

When I have both of the above (which should hopefully be within the next few days) I will email Ian to set out what he has asked for, what we previously provided. I should ask him to, as we discussed on 20 Jan, let me know what his search criteria are and also exactly what questions he is looking to answer from the emails so that we can consider how best to answer those questions and provide relevant information. I think that if Second Sight are, as we believe, looking for evidence to support the erroneous assertion that a team in Bracknell were able to manipulate branch data without the knowledge of the spmr then the best way of dealing within this may be a statement from Post Office refuting the allegation. The provision of email data is not going to be determinative and Second Sight are likely to return for more data which will be inconclusive. I therefore think we should set out the question we consider they are trying to answer and do a paper/witness statement. In that we need to set out the history of what we have provided, the conversations we have had with them and how we have explained why we cannot provide more, if we cannot.

2. Prosecution docs - continue as now.
3. Suspense accounts - I am not involved in tat but presume continue as now
4. Other questions - how many do we have outstanding?

Shall we catch up later about handling?

Best wishes
Belinda

Belinda Crowe

148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

GRO

Postline:

GRO

GRO

On 9 Feb 2015, at 18:18, Belinda Crowe **GRO** wrote:

To see

This was a note I made of my call with Ian Henderson on 20 Jan. I apologise it is rather scrappy but it was simply meant to be a note.

This is why I was rather surprised at what he said in his evidence at the Select Committee in which he made no reference to:

- our conversation
- the WG decision about the prosecution docs (especially as he did not raise this with POL when he came in to discuss the suspense accounts).

Best wishes

Belinda

Belinda Crowe

148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

GRO

Postline:

GRO

GRO

<Discussion with Ian Henderson 20 Jan 2015.docx>