POL00132939

From: Mark Underwood1[GRO]
Sent: Wed 11/02/2015 3:47:44 PM (UTC)
To: Belinda Crowe[GRO]; Chris Aujard[GRO]; Parsons, Andrew[GRO]; Rodric Williams[GRO]; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd[GRO] GRO]
Cc: Melanie Corfield[GRO]; Mark R Davies[GRO]
Subject: RE: Note of telecon with Ian Henderson 20 Jan

Hi Belinda,

In terms of the questions without an answer posed by SS in relation to Part 2. They are as follows:

- 5.5, 7.3, 7.4, 7.7, 11.8, 13.7 – Rod Ismay has now provided answers, and Andy P is in the process of making sure these align with the info provided in the recent suspense account paper. Once finalised they will be included in our answers V3 and issued to SS (likely next week)
- 15.1-15.3d. These are now covered off by the recent Suspense Account paper
- 6.3 (Bracknell emails). This will be dealt with separately to Part 2.
- 12.5-12.7 (assertions of underhand behaviour in respect of Branch Closures). Agreed by the WG as being too Wide. Onus is on SS to re-supply more specific questions.
- 11.4 – question not understood. Again, onus is on SS to provide a more articulate question
- 13.2, 13.3 & 13.6. PO does not hold this info.

From: Belinda Crowe
Sent: 11 February 2015 07:07
To: Chris Aujard; Parsons, Andrew; Rodric Williams; Angela Van-Den-Bogerd
Cc: Melanie Corfield; Mark R Davies; Belinda Crowe; Mark Underwood1
Subject: Re: Note of telecon with Ian Henderson 20 Jan

Further to this, I think we have four outstanding issues to address with Second Sight re the provision of information:
1. The provision of emails relating to Bracknell
2. The provision of prosecution documents
3. Further information re what started off as being suspense accounts etc.
4. The few outstanding questions/information requests from the Part Two questions

This where we are and should plan to be going forward:
1. Emails - I have requested from Dave King as much email data as he can get from the people on the list Ian sent through to me after my conversation with him on 20 Jan. I have some email data for Martin Rolfe and Dave is looking to what he can get re the other people on the list (Mark Underwood keeping track)
I have also obtained the disk we gave to Ian with what data we managed to obtain last time. Dave is trying to access that data to see exactly what was provided.
When I have both of the above (which should hopefully be within the next few days) I will email Ian to set out what he has asked for, what we previously provided. I should ask him to, as we discussed on 20 Jan, let me know what his search criteria are and also exactly what questions he is looking to answer from the emails so that we can consider how best to answer those questions and provide relevant information. I think that if Second Sight are, as we believe, looking for evidence to support the erroneous assertion that a team in Bracknell were able to manipulate branch data

POL00132939

without the knowledge of the spmr then the best way of dealing within this may be a statement from Post Office refuting the allegation. The provision of email data is not going to be determinative and Second Sight are likely to return for more data which will be inconclusive. I therefore think we should set out the question we consider they are trying to answer and do a paper/witness statement. In that we need to set out the history of what we have provided, the conversations we have had with them and how we have explained why we cannot provide more, if we cannot.

2. Prosecution docs - continue as now.

3. Suspense accounts - I am not involved in tat but presume continue as now

4. Other questions - how many do we have outstanding?

Shall we catch up later about handling?

Best wishes
Belinda

Belinda Crowe
148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ

GRO Postline: GRO

GRO

GRO

On 9 Feb 2015, at 18:18, Belinda Crowe <GRO> wrote:

> To see
>
> This was a note I made of my call with Ian Henderson on 20 Jan. I apologise it is rather scrappy but it was simply meant to be a note.
>
> This is why I was rather surprised at what he said in his evidence at the Select Committee in which he made no reference to:
> - our conversation
> - the WG decision about the prosecution docs (especially as he did not raise this with POL when he came in to discuss the suspense accounts).
>
> Best wishes
> Belinda
>
> **Belinda Crowe**
> 148 Old Street, LONDON, EC1V 9HQ
>
> GRO Postline: GRO
>
> GRO
>
> GRO

POL00132939

<Discussion with Ian Henderson 20 Jan 2015.docx>
