
From: Jane Hill [/O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=JANE HILL3CAC1F62-1AED-475D-B993-541503D25432EA7]
Sent: Tue 20/01/2015 3:23:30 PM (UTC)
To: Mark R Davies [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED] Patrick Bourke [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED]
Cc: Belinda Crowe [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED] Chris Aujard [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED] Tom Wechsler [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: BIS Committee hearing 3 February 2015

I have explained to the Clark that we should give evidence separately to SS for the reasons Mark set out in his email yesterday. They are not budging – citing time restrictions, questions will be about process rather than individual cases.

Belinda's shorter email looks fine to me.

Can we discuss the way forward at 5pm?

Jane Hill | Head of Public Affairs

1st Floor, Banner Wing, 148 Old Street, London, EC1V 9HQ

[REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED] Mobex [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED]



From: Mark R Davies
Sent: 20 January 2015 15:14
To: Patrick Bourke
Cc: Belinda Crowe; Chris Aujard; Jane Hill; Tom Wechsler
Subject: Re: BIS Committee hearing 3 February 2015
Sensitivity: Confidential

Yes. Exactly. I thought I said this lat night but it may have been a limited email chain

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad
On 20 Jan 2015, at 15:13, "Patrick Bourke" [REDACTED] GRO [REDACTED] wrote:

Only thought is that we don't want him to be on a panel of witness if it includes Paula et al.

From: Belinda Crowe
Sent: 20 January 2015 15:11
To: Mark R Davies; Chris Aujard
Cc: Belinda Crowe; Jane Hill; Tom Wechsler; Patrick Bourke
Subject: FW: BIS Committee hearing 3 February 2015
Sensitivity: Confidential

Draft response from Chris to Ian of Second Sight - grateful for views on whether any more is needed. I think we should keep it short and simple.

Best wishes
Belinda

Dear Ian

Thanks for your email and for forwarding me the email from the Clerk. I understand why you have checked with me and thank you for doing so. Post Office would, of course, not object to Second Sight speaking with the Committee as part of a panel of witnesses.

Regards
Chris

Belinda Crowe
148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

GRO Postline **GRO**
GRO
GRO

From: Ian Henderson **GRO**
Sent: 19 January 2015 16:47
To: Chris Aujard
Cc: Belinda Crowe; Tom Wechsler; 'MONTGOMERY, Jessica'
Subject: BIS Committee hearing 3 February 2015
Sensitivity: Confidential

Chris

I have been invited to appear before the BIS Committee at 10:30 on 3 February 2015. The subject is "PO mediation scheme: evidence to BIS Committee".

This would appear to be a matter where I require the written consent of Post Office Limited, as the information being considered falls within the terms of Section 6 of our Engagement Letter dated 1 July 2014.

I assume that POL will not object to Second Sight giving evidence to BIS, but I would be grateful for your written approval to do this, in accordance with the terms of our engagement.

I am copying this email to Jessica Montgomery, Second Clerk, Business, Innovation and Skills Committee.

I would be grateful for a prompt reply to this letter.

With best wishes

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

Forensic computing expert witness and electronic disclosure specialist

UK Mobile: -----

Email:
Website: <http://advancedforensics.com>

LinkedIn:
Twitter:

CONFIDENTIALITY. This email and any attachments are confidential and may also be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me at and delete the email and any attachments.