

Note of call with Ian Henderson – Second Sight

At the last WG Chris H had said that he'd had the table on the files requested and I had, against some, noted 'no further docs to be provided'. He asked for me to list specifically what info was being provided, what wasn't and why. I had said I would pick up outside of the meeting. I had tried to call Chris but he was away so I called Ian and we discussed:

- Prosecution docs
- Emails
- Other misc general information

Prosecution docs

- 1) When I spoke to Ian to clarify I explained:
 - a) some of the cases are completed so presumably POL would not send any further information on those
 - b) SS appear to now want a note from POL in every case where there is a legal file to say what information it holds and whether it releases it. That is impractical because some files contain 'extraneous' routine info' and there is no merit in sending that or even listing every document to justify why some information was not being provided. I don't think Ian realises just how much information is in files that is just routine, duplicates (an issue we have encountered before with Second Sight – they do not understand enough about how prosecutions work – e.g. Ron asking for transcripts for magistrates hearings) in all cases the information 'relevant' to the complaint had been provided with the POIR
 - c) Ron was adding new requests for papers – therefore what started off as a small exercise in only a few cases now seemed to be applying to all cases where there had been a prosecution – making it a larger exercise – e.g. retrieving files and going through them, scanning in information etc.

Ian made the following points:

- 2) He knows that a lot of the information Second Sight have requested (***including general information/answers to questions***) has already been provided but it is helpful to have it again provided in response to later requests (I challenged that and said that was not efficient and do they really know what information they have as there have been a considerable number of instances where they have asked for information or asked questions where the information has already been provided). Ian sort of acknowledged that point.
- 3) He acknowledged that - with no disrespect to anyone (I assume he meant Ron) – the issue of how to handle potential information provided from legal files when Second Sight had completed its investigation (and in some instances had already been passed to CEDR) had not been properly thought through. What he had in mind is that even if a case had been completed, or passed to CEDR, if SS think there should be further 'disclosure' they would send the information to the applicant. I questioned whether this was the right mechanism for this. Ian acknowledged he had not given this any thought.

- 4) He said that prior to the Scheme he had been allowed to come into POL and go through all legal files and thought that's the arrangement which should be possibly put in place again. I explained that the task was now different, the Working group had agreed, and Tony had set out, what further docs should be provided where they existed. Ian acknowledged this but said he did not really accept it. I suggested that this was therefore something to take back to the Working Group. He suggested that SS and POL should perhaps meet to discuss the matter in more detail as a tag on to the meeting with finance on 2 Feb 2015.

Emails

- I said that I had put in a request to retrieve emails he had requested for the employee and when I had received them we could discuss how to identify the information he wants. I said I wanted to understand what he was looking for as my understanding was that he was looking to prove a negative. That is he was looking to find evidence that there was some operation in Bracknell in relation to M051. He said that it was more than that but didn't expand.
- He said, however, that he didn't want just one set of emails, he wanted all employees who worked in the area. I said this was not what he had asked for back in March so he said he would send some further historical emails setting out what he wanted but he thought he was looking for emails for about ten employees (he subsequently sent those through and there are indeed ten on his list).
- I said I would have to pick that up separately when I had had chance to see those emails.
- I reminded Ian that he had said he would let us have the 'key words he would use to search for what he was looking for and he said he would but that it wasn't straightforward - it was iterative in that one thing can lead to another but he would send his something through along with greater clarity about exactly what questions Second Sight were looking to answer.

Belinda Crowe

20 January 2015