POL00109904

Message

From: Mark R Davies GRO
on behalf of Mark R Davies GRO
Sent: 23/01/2015 11:18:43
To: Louise Chatfield GRO
Subject: FW: Second Sight's Investigations
Sensitivity: Company Confidential

Another!

Best wishes,

Mark

Mark Davies I Communications and Corporate Affairs Director

1st Floor, Banner Wing, 148 Old Street, London, EC1V 9HQ
GRO Postline GRO
Mobex
mark.r.davies GRO

From: Belinda Crowe
Sent: 22 January 2015 14:48
To: Jane Hill; Melanie Corfield
Cc: Belinda Crowe; Chris Aujard; Mark R Davies; Rodric Williams; Patrick Bourke; Tom Wechsler; Parsons, Andrew
Subject: FW: Second Sight's Investigations
Sensitivity: Confidential

Please see the exchange below.

I have alerted Paula to the fact that this is in existence and relevant to the Select Committee. She has asked specifically that we have answers to these questions. I assured her we would – Rod will be able to provide answers to these questions. He Andy Parsons and I have been trawling old documents (some of which I have forwarded) to highlight the fact that the terms of the original enquiry changed following the publication of their report and the establishment of the Scheme.

Best wishes
Belinda

Belinda Crowe

148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ
GRO Postline: GRO
belinda.crowe GRO

From: Ian Henderson GRO
Sent: 21 January 2015 13:03
To: Chris Aujard

POL00109904

Cc: Belinda Crowe; rjw[GRO]; 'WALKER, Janet'
Subject: RE: Second Sight's Investigations
Sensitivity: Confidential

Chris

I will need to go back through my notes.

My clear recollection is that Post Office (Paula / Alice) provided a number of undertakings to Second Sight both before Second Sight was appointed and subsequently. Similar undertakings were given to James Arbuthnot's office around the time of our appointment.

The main points were:

- Post Office was committed to "seeking the truth" however painful the outcome may be
- Second Sight was appointed to conduct an independent investigation into the matters raised by Subpostmasters
- Post Office would not interfere with the scope of work deemed necessary by Second Sight
- Second Sight would be provided with access to any documents held or controlled by Post Office, that Second Sight considered necessary for the purpose of its investigation

I have checked with Janet Walker of James Arbuthnot's office and she has confirmed my recollection / understanding on these points.

I have previously referred you to the *"Raising Concerns with Horizon"* document which described the basis upon which documents would be provided to Second Sight by Post Office.

I would further point out that for many months following Second Sight's appointment, Post Office was providing full access to all documents requested by Second Sight, including documents that were confidential or subject to legal professional privilege. It is only in the last year that Post Office has chosen to challenge or withhold a number of documents requested by Second Sight.

With best wishes

Ian R Henderson CCE CISA FCA
Advanced Forensics - London, UK

Forensic computing expert witness and electronic disclosure specialist

---
UK Mobile: [GRO]

Email: irh[GRO]
Website: http://advancedforensics.com
LinkedIn: http://linkedin.com/in/forensicgod
Twitter: http://twitter.com/forensicgod

From: Chris Aujard [GRO]
Sent: 21 January 2015 11:51
To: Ian Henderson
Cc: Belinda Crowe

POL00109904

Subject: RE: Second Sight's Investigations
Sensitivity: Confidential

Dear Ian

While I await your response to my email below responding to the specific points you have made regarding information requests, there is one further matter which requires attention. Given that your email also refers to a number of "undertakings" purportedly given by Post Office (of which I have had no visibility) I would ask that you provide to me *as soon as possible* the specific details of these purported "undertakings" (e.g. when, where, by whom, to whom and by what means you assert they were given) so that I can consider more fully your assertions in this regard.

I hope that you understand that in the meantime our position remains reserved.

Regards

Chris

From: Chris Aujard
Sent: 20 January 2015 16:13
To: 'Ian Henderson'
Cc: Belinda Crowe
Subject: RE: Second Sight's Investigations
Sensitivity: Confidential

Dear Ian

Thank you for your email, forwarded to me last Friday evening; I confess to having been quite surprised to receive it.

First I would like to stress that in response to your list of some 109 questions, Post Office provided a response to the majority of questions you posed. Our responses ran to over thirty pages with, in addition, over 100 pages of documents in 16 annexes. I would hope you agree that is a considerable amount of information collated in less than one month.

Following our meeting to discuss those responses, and specifically those questions where Post Office had asked you to clarify how the information you were requesting related to specific issues raised by applicants so that we could narrow down what appeared to be a number of wide requests for general information (and you will recall that the last Working Group the Chair agreed that a number were 'too wide'), you helpfully narrowed down some of your requests and explained more fully and clearly what information you were actually seeking and the issues you were seeking to address. We are now in the process of pulling together a further response, as we agreed, on the basis of your clarification. I hope to get more information to you by the start of next week. You have also emailed separately about information relating to "suspense accounts" which I have been discussing with my finance colleagues, and I will respond to that shortly.

In addition, Belinda is liaising with Chris Holyoak (who has also been in touch separately about prosecution files) and she is looking at the provision of the emails you have requested and she will liaise with you about that in due course.

That said, I was rather perplexed by your reference to the 'Raising Concerns with Horizon' document. As we have discussed previously, and I thought agreed, Second sight is engaged to review the individual applications in the Scheme, and your engagement letter and the Terms of Reference of the Working Group, makes that clear. This document relates to your original work, which led to the publication of your report in July 2013. Following this report, it was then agreed with you (and JFSA) that Second Sight would focus on reviewing the complaints of individual Subpostmasters to try to bring those complaints to a close rather than trying to evaluate the whole of Post Office's organisation which was considered unlikely to directly assist individual Subpostmasters.

Finally, you appear to be suggesting that if Post Office does not provide the information you have requested, which, as set out above, we are in the process of doing, you will raise this in your written and oral evidence to the Select

POL00109904

Committee. On that point, you emailed me yesterday to say you had been invited to attend (and I will also respond separately on that) but there was no reference in that email, or the invitation, of a request for written evidence. If it is your intention to provide an unsolicited written submission to the Select Committee I should be grateful if you would let me know as soon as possible.

Regards

Chris

From: Ian Henderson [GRO
Sent: 16 January 2015 17:03
To: Chris Aujard
Cc: Belinda Crowe; Paula Vennells
Subject: FW: Second Sight's Investigations
Importance: High
Sensitivity: Confidential

Privileged and Confidential – Created for the purpose of obtaining legal advice

Chris

When Second Sight was first appointed by Post Office and Members of Parliament in July 2012, a number of undertakings were given by POL in order to satisfy MPs that Second Sight would be able to conduct a truly independent investigation into the matters of concern.

Those undertakings included the following:

- Unrestricted access to documents held by POL (including documents subject to confidentiality and legal professional privilege)
- No limitation in the scope of work determined necessary by Second Sight

Those undertakings were reflected in the *"Raising Concerns with Horizon"* document signed by POL on 17 Dec 2012 (Attached). A key paragraph was:

In order to carry out the Inquiry, Second Sight will be entitled to request information related to a concern from Post Office Limited, and if Post Office Limited holds that information, Post Office Limited will provide it to Second Sight.

I am sure that many Subpostmasters and Applicants to the Mediation Scheme will have relied on that paragraph, when reporting matters to Second Sight.

As we have discussed in the context of POL's incomplete response to our Part 2 questions, POL is now seeking to challenge those undertakings and so far has not provided the information requested on a number of critical matters, including the Bracknell emails, prosecution documents and full details of transactions relating to the Suspense account.

Second Sight takes this matter very seriously and will not hesitate in raising this important non-compliance and integrity issue in the next version of our Part 2 Report and in written and oral evidence to the BIS Committee.

All of this can be resolved by POL taking all practical steps necessary to answer the questions put to it by Second Sight. If any questions raise particular difficulties, we are of course, happy to discuss an alternative approach.

I would be grateful if you would consider these matters before our meeting with POL's Finance team next week.

With best wishes

POL00109904

Ian R Henderson CCE CISA FCA
Advanced Forensics - London, UK

Forensic computing expert witness and electronic disclosure specialist

---
UK Mobile: GRO

Email: irh GRO
Website: http://advancedforensics.com
LinkedIn: http://linkedin.com/in/forensicgod
Twitter: http://twitter.com/forensicgod