POL00101606

Message

From: Paula Vennells GRO
on behalf of Paula Vennells GRO
Sent: 01/12/2014 18:30:46
To: Alice Perkins GRO
CC: Belinda Crowe GRO Mark R Davies GRO Chris Aujard GRO Patrick Bourke GRO Gavin Lambert GRO
Subject: Re: JA

Well done Alice on landing the key messages even if they weren't accepted willingly.

Gavin will pick up with the team tomorrow and we can discuss properly on Wed.

Not easy to see a satisfactory way through but we will continue to explore the options.

Paula

Sent from my iPhone

> On 1 Dec 2014, at 17:15, "Alice Perkins" GRO wrote:
>
> I initiated a conversation with him on Saturday evening which was cut off (by the arrival of the Turkish President and the Duke of York for the gala dinner.....) Despite the opportunity for him to pick it up again yesterday, he chose not to do so.
> I started by asking him how he was and was rather surprised to be told he had had a "sleepless night" after receiving the letter from Paula.
> I asked how he thought his colleagues had behaved at the meeting. He replied that they were much more "restrained" than he had expected. I countered by saying that it hadn't sounded very restrained to me.
> We moved quickly on to the substance. The main thrust of his argument seemed to be that there big wrongs which we were not acknowledging; in other words the position he held when he first approached me about all this in early 2012. I said that we had bent over backwards to set up a process in collaboration with the key parties, and had had his agreement to the arrangements. At the time, I did not know for certain whether the process would uncover anything wrong but now that we had almost completed our investigations, we had found nothing of any significance.
> He clearly was not going to accept that. He said they would like to see AH if he would be willing to see them. I said I couldn't speak for him. He was trying to run an independent process and therefore might say no, but I didn't know. He asked if they could have access to SS. I said no; we couldn't have people second guessing an independent process which they had agreed to. We had spared no effort or resource on all this and there was an issue of VfM in going any further than we had.
> He then argued that the process was flawed. We should be willing to mediate cases where people had been convicted. I said no; they were matters to be settled through the courts. He moved on to people who had pleaded "guilty under duress" but who were in fact, innocent. I said we were investigating every case and there was no evidence for that assertion.
> He then said he thought Paula and I genuinely believed what we were saying - the implication being that we were being hoodwinked by others - a somewhat backhanded compliment if it was intended as such but unfortunately, the arrival of the bigwigs prevented me from responding and that was where the conversation ended.
> My takeaway from this, based on how he looked and what he said is that his position is exactly where it was two and a half years ago. I think it is unlikely that we will be able to shift that although we shouldn't give up. He should be clear from the conversation that we are not going to depart from the agreed process or supplement it. I can't predict what he will do next.
> All the best
> Alice
>
> This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. www.websense.com