UKGI00002842

From: Belinda Crowe GRO
Sent: Wed 17/12/2014 12:25:12 AM (UTC)
To: Callard Richard (ShEx) GRO
Cc: Patrick Bourke GRO; McInnes Tim (ShEx) GRO; Baugh James (ShEx) GRO
Subject: Re: Jo's conversations with James Arbuthnot- actions coming out

Richard
Just to confirm that I agree your final point. We could not possibly have done more and have been very accommodating. We cannot continue to be.
Best wishes
Belinda

Belinda Crowe
148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

GRO

On 16 Dec 2014, at 21:10, Callard Richard (ShEx) GRO wrote:

> Thanks. You do have to wonder don't you....????
>
> Sent from my Windows Phone

> **From:** Patrick Bourke
> **Sent:** 16/12/2014 21:00
> **To:** Callard Richard (ShEx); Swinson MPST
> **Cc:** McInnes Tim (ShEx); Baugh James (ShEx); Belinda Crowe
> **Subject:** Re: Jo's conversations with James Arbuthnot- actions coming out
>
> Richard
>
> Belinda and I will consider this and come back to you. I note your time constraints.
>
> Rgds
>
> Patrick
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Callard Richard (ShEx) GRO
> **Sent:** Tuesday, December 16, 2014 08:54 PM
> **To:** Swinson MPST GRO
> **Cc:** McInnes Tim (ShEx) GRO; Baugh James (ShEx) GRO; Belinda Crowe; Patrick Bourke
> **Subject:** RE: Jo's conversations with James Arbuthnot- actions coming out
>
> Alysa (cc Belinda and Patrick for expediency)

UKGI00002842

Not surprising re decision not to share the speech. Trying to answer each point in turn:

1. We have a line on that
2. An independent review of an independent review is a bit odd. Particularly given Tony Hoopers very independent stance. Who would do it?
3. We have a line for that.
4. SS probably need permission from the working group. They have gone native but I think Jo could possibly commit to asking Tony about it at the risk of putting tony in a difficult place. Belinda / Patrick, could we have a view and a line please?
5. Pass, over to POL. I know they are, or were, a prosecuting authority but if there has been theft or fraud and its in the public interest they have no real choice. Otherwise what is the deterrent? Anyone could put theft down to 'the system'. Belinda, could you do a line please?
6. We will think of a line. But presumably if they win the case they would get costs back. Why should spms be any different to other people? Belinda /Patrick, any views?
7. Pass, and interested in POLs view. At the risk of creating another independent review, I suppose we could consider it if it meant looking at all the evidence available (at least the failings of the spms could come to light and it could offer the potential to draw a line under the cases). Belinda / Patrick, again, a line and a view please. Presumably the commissioner could find there is nothing to investigate, but this could risk generating another story in its own right so if we did agree we'd have to be clear that this was to draw a line and not because we thought something was worth reviewing. On balance I think we should probably say no but open minded.

Belinda / Patrick - I'll be in from half we've tomorrow (or just after). I am busy from 10-1 and cant escape so would be great to get this sorted before ten if we can.

Alysa - some of these requests are rather unreasonable eg point 5. Jo might have to be a bit more "front footie" on those to close it down. Being conciliatory got us to where we are currently, so am keen not to repeat past mistakes.

R

Sent from my Windows Phone

From: Swinson MPST
Sent: 16/12/2014 19:56
To: Callard Richard (ShEx)
Subject: Jo's conversations with James Arbuthnot- actions coming out

Hi Richard,

So James no longer plans to share his speech with us ahead of time as apparently it is very inflammatory and he is worried about putting in an email (this bodes well for tomorrow…)

Him and Jo had a quick catch up in which he outlined his main “asks”. I understand you’ve got a packed day tomorrow but grateful if you could ask POL about some of these as Jo will need to respond in her speech and would be good to know how warm she should be to these asks.

1. He would like us to ask POL not destroy any documents relating to these cases in the scheme. This for me raises the question of, are they destroying documents now? How reasonable do you think this ask is?
2. He would also like there to be an Independent Review of the Scheme. This one seems as bit less likely as it’s already an independent working group.

UKGI00002842

3. He would like there to be no statute of limitations on the claims being made through the scheme. Is this one feasible?
4. He'd like Second Sight to do a briefing for MPs on the scheme and its progress. Jo would like to commit to asking Tony Hooper about this. What do you think?
5. He would like us to ask POL to stop acting as prosecutor on these cases. It's unclear to me who would then prosecute instead or why POL currently do it the way they do but Jo said she'd previously discussed this with Paula and she had been open to this.
6. We need to get some lines of what to say in response to the claim that SPM can't appeal court verdicts because of the cost
7. James would like the Criminal Cases Review Commissioner to set up an independent review of the cases relating to Horizons as well. Jo would like to be able to commit to writing to the Commissioner and asking him to do this, what do you think?

Thanks,
Alysa

Alysa Remtulla | Private Secretary to the Minister for Employment Relations and Consumer Affairs | Department for Business, Innovation & Skills | 1 Victoria Street, London SW1H 0ET | Work: GRO | GRO | www.bis.gov.uk

---
Communications via the GSi may be automatically logged, monitored and/or recorded for legal purposes
---

UKGI00002842