

Message

From: Mark Underwood1 [/O=MMS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=MARK UNDERWOO222A42EC-51A8-4DFA-A353-DCEA512679657B4]
Sent: 11/02/2015 10:37:50
To: 'Parsons, Andrew' [GRO]; 'Loraine, Paul' [GRO]
Subject: FW: POL Response

With reference to the call – below is the email (highlighted in red for ease) Belinda was talking about where SS identified why they wanted the emails

Mark

From: Patrick Bourke
Sent: 10 February 2015 18:01
To: Mark Underwood1; Belinda Crowe
Subject: RE: POL Response

Great – that's already extremely good news – esp the 'since' and the 'available'.

P

From: Mark Underwood1
Sent: 10 February 2015 17:57
To: Belinda Crowe; Patrick Bourke
Subject: RE: POL Response

For what it is worth, whilst we await results from the Horizon black box, attached is the info relevant to email provision pulled out. It's a bit of a minefield and needs tidying up, but there are some useful bits in there.

- Initial request from SS was for emails since 2008
- All data that was available from April 2008 – March 2013 was supplied
- Old emails are difficult to get hold of as an email archiving system was only installed in Oct 2011

I just do not think we can realistically go back on this issue until we know what is in the black box – or else we leave ourselves open. I will chase Dave again tomorrow.

Mark

From: Belinda Crowe
Sent: 10 February 2015 16:42
To: Patrick Bourke; Mark Underwood1
Subject: Re: POL Response

I think there are two issues. One is what we say about what we have already provided and second what we provide going forward.

I think we should consider a witness statement. I part completed a note on this basis which I will pick up later. B

[GRO]

From: Patrick Bourke
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2015 04:33 PM
To: Mark Underwood1; Belinda Crowe

Subject: RE: POL Response

Mark

Thanks and there is a great deal of sense in that approach.

I think the difficulty I see ahead is that the issue of what we were asked for and what we supplied was made so much of during the Select Committee evidence session that people will find it hard to accept if we do not say, categorically, that we were asked for X and we provided X (or X-Y because, eg, the whole of X was no longer available). The argument is no longer just about what the data may or may not reveal (which your approach would address) but the way in which PO and SS are working together, it seems to me.

Easy for me to say, I know, and I am no expert but I do wonder quite how hard it is to access the data on that disk if it is simply password protected – there must be companies out there that do this sort of thing every day, no ?

Patrick

From: Mark Underwood1
Sent: 10 February 2015 16:21
To: Belinda Crowe; Patrick Bourke
Subject: RE: POL Response

Hi both,

Though the goal posts moved I think we know, broadly speaking, what we were asked for. However, having spoken to Dave again this morning – we are not any closer to gaining access to the Hard Drive.

This in mind - can we turn this on its head and say regardless of any debate around data provision – the issue in question, namely remote access, is no longer a live issue and thus, PO is confused by it re-surfacing at the hearing.

As far as I can see, the below email is the only time Ian has given a reason for SS's request for email records. The question of Remote Access has been definitively answered time and time again and is now accepted (by PO at least) as not possible. Unless Ian has an additional reason for still wanting these emails, he must be asserting that he does not believe PO.

It is worth noting that in one of the first notes sent on this topic (Feb 25 2013) Simon Baker of PO stated "It has been reconfirmed to me that the Test Team do not have access to live data, in any environment".

As you said earlier this week, there comes a point where SS just have to accept what we say as being true or write in their P2 report they are not fully satisfied – to which we can then respond.

Mark

From: Ian Henderson [mailto:] GRO
Sent: 14 March 2014 15:32
To: Belinda Crowe
Cc: Angela Van-Den-Bogerd; mediation: GRO David Oliver1
Subject: RE: Email retrieval

Belinda

The procedure you have mentioned applies to the investigations conducted by Angela and her team.

There is also a need for Second Sight to request directly from POL further information that it needs for its own investigations. This may arise at a number of different points such shortly after the receipt of a CQR or after Angela's team have delivered their report.

The request for email records, some of which have been supplied already, relates to the 26 cases where allegations of centrally generated transactions have been made.

Many thanks

From: Belinda Crowe
Sent: 10 February 2015 15:52
To: Patrick Bourke
Cc: Mark Underwood1; Belinda Crowe
Subject: Re: POL Response

Patrick

Mark is in contact with Dave King about this. He chased yesterday but I do not know where he got to today. I have copied him as he may have an update.

I cannot call as I have no signal on my blackberry.

I am also seeing Jane tomorrow early so maybe we could combine the two?

Best wishes

Belinda

GRO

From: Patrick Bourke
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2015 03:20 PM
To: Belinda Crowe
Subject: RE: POL Response

Belinda

Just had a chat with Jane – we're going to sit down together in the morning once we've got the better base material from BD and bash the cover document out – she thinks it should try to be a summary of the key points we make in the longer doc and that's what I originally thought too – but in practice to go down that route it need to be very short indeed and we need really to take the headlines out of the bigger doc. We'll be able to circulate for comments during the course of tomorrow.

Separately, what is happening on the Dave King code breaking ? We'll need a definitive answer on what we were asked and what we provided SS in terms of emails from Bracknell.

Julie George came looking for you with a bunch of papers.

Patrick

From: Belinda Crowe
Sent: 10 February 2015 11:19
To: Patrick Bourke
Subject: Re: POL Response

Thanks Patrick. That sounds like a plan. B

GRO

From: Patrick Bourke
Sent: Tuesday, February 10, 2015 10:43 AM

To: Belinda Crowe
Subject: POL Response

Belinda

Hope all is going as well as it can with your folks.

So, have had a word with Andy and we'll speak again at 1430 but he is now sharpening up the answers to the questions in the format you'd suggested.

We spoke about the overlay I had envisaged and concluded that, so long as the answers in the longer doc are indeed sharpened up, there is no point going over the same ground but, instead, make it very short and land no more than 3 or so key messages.

Are you content with that ?

P

Patrick Bourke

GRO