

From: Amy Prime <[REDACTED]>
To: "Matthew.Lenton" <[REDACTED]> <[REDACTED]>
Cc: "pete.newsom" <[REDACTED]> <[REDACTED]>, "Legal.Defence" <[REDACTED]>, Jonathan Gribben <[REDACTED]>, Lucy Bremner <[REDACTED]>

Subject: KEL Index [WBDUK-AC.FID26896945]

Date: Wed, 12 Dec 2018 10:42:02 +0000

Importance: Normal

Attachments: Historic_Kels.xlsx; Active_Kels.xlsx; KELS_not_in_Index.xlsx

Inline-Images: image553996.PNG; imagefac05e.PNG; imagedc2d96.PNG

Hi Matthew

I hope you are well.

Back in January of this year you provided us with two indexes of the KEL, an historic and active index (both attached). We have noticed that there are a number of KEL entries which were in the KEL extraction, but not contained within either of these indexes – a list of these KEL entries is also attached.

From a brief review, the KEL entries which are not in either of these indexes have a wide date range between 1999 and 2018 so I don't think the entries were generated after the indexes were produced. Please could you have a look into whether there is a reason that the extract contained more KEL entries than were listed in the indexes?

Separately, would you be able to provide us with a list of KEL entries which have been produced from 19 March 2018 to date?

Kind regards

Amy

Amy Prime

Solicitor

Womble Bond Dickinson (UK) LLP

d: [REDACTED]
m: [REDACTED]
t: [REDACTED]
e: [REDACTED]

[Stay informed: sign up to our e-alerts](#)



wombledonddickinson.com

