
From: Dave Posnett [GRO]
Sent: Tue 25/06/2013 5:41:06 PM (UTC)
To: Helen Dickinson [GRO]
Subject: FW: Notes following meeting: In confidence
Attachment: Notes Meeting Martin Smith KC.doc
Attachment: Managing audit shortages process and policy guidelines REVISED.doc

Helen,

I've read your 'managing audit process' ... seems okay to me
I associate notes Rob has drafted re a meeting with Martin Smith.

I've highlighted couple of points on your document that may just need tweaking to fit in with what Rob says:

- **'If there is an admission of fraud'** ... SPMRs don't always admit fraud, sometimes they say things like **'there'll be a deficit'** or **'you'll be £10k short'** or **'can you come back in an hour'** ... in other words I think your document should read something like **'If there is any significant statement relating to the audit'**? There is more in Robs notes under the heading 'Significant Comments' ... but not sure you want to get too bogged down on this in your document.
- Send all documentation ... Robs notes mention sending documents RD (I think this should be SD ... Special Delivery). So perhaps you should stress in your document that documents should be sent SD?

Regards,

Dave Posnett | Accredited Financial Investigator

Security Team, 2nd Floor Banner Wing, 148 Old St, London, EC1V 9HQ

GRO Postline GRO
GRO Mobex GRO
GRO
GRO

POST
OFFICE

From: Rob King
Sent: 25 June 2013 18:13
To: martin.smith [GRO]
Cc: Jarnail A Singh; Darrell Kennedy; Dave Posnett; Andy Hayward; Andrew Wise; Andrew Daley
Subject: Notes following meeting: In confidence

Hi Martin,

Apologies for the belated response! I have attached some notes following our meeting on 10th June and have allowed myself the indulgence of expanding them albeit on a similar theme. [Please ignore italics, merely operational thoughts]

The continuity of exhibits remains a thorny issue which I think requires a best efforts approach. I understand that more often than not, the Investigator is not present at the audit and has to rely on the Auditor to gather the documentary evidence. Ideally I agree the finder should be the exhibitor but this I believe sits more in the aspiration tray! The Auditors currently do not have the necessary skill level required to manage a crime scene in terms of exhibit retrieval. The current practice although short of ideal is for documents found to be handed into to the lead Auditor who collectively packages the document, signs and seals the package and sends to the named Investigator who exhibits the documents covering off the continuity in the statement. Clearly where the Investigator has arranged the audit one would expect him/her to be present. This would solve the problem with the exhibits

Anyway one no doubt for discussion going forward!

Regards

Rob

Rob King | Senior Security Manager Operations

Security Team, 2nd Floor Banner Wing, 148 Old St, London, EC1V 9HQ

GRO	Postline	GRO
GRO	Mobex	GRO
GRO		

