

Message

From: Paula Vennells [GRO]
on behalf of [GRO]
Sent: 01/12/2014 19:11:48
To: Mark R Davies [GRO]
CC: Gavin Lambert [GRO]
Subject: Re: JA

Fab - well done!
And thx P

Sent from my iPhone

On 1 Dec 2014, at 19:08, "Mark R Davies" [GRO] wrote:

Hi both. I am in touch with Oliver and he has agreed to meet me in Westminster. We are just working through diaries.

I picked up with Belinda and Patrick on next steps today and will brief Gavin tomorrow.

Cheers

Mark

Mark Davies
Communications and Corporate Affairs Director
Mobile: [GRO]

Sent from my iPhone

On 1 Dec 2014, at 19:05, "Paula Vennells" [GRO] wrote:

Yes in fact spookily I had just opened my emails to ask Mark (now copied) where we are on that. In view of James' reaction, it becomes even more important that OL understands we are also trying to brief him personally, otherwise we are just seen to be referring to him in my letter to JA.

Thx both.

Paula

Sent from my iPhone

On 1 Dec 2014, at 18:36, "Gavin Lambert" [GRO] wrote:

Thank you - yes I'll pick up with the team tomorrow.

I think Mark has also contacted Oliver Letwin which needs to be factored into our plan.

Gavin Lambert
[GRO]

From: Paula Vennells
Sent: 01/12/2014 18:23
To: Gavin Lambert
Subject: Fwd: JA

FYI.

To be discussed with the team if you can please Gavin, as Alice will undoubtedly want to cover off on Wed. Probably best to see below before you read on.

I hope AH decides to keep to his position of independence. I have suggested a couple of times in the past few months, to Belinda, that Alice might meet AH just in terms of keeping the relationship going, or even me (tho' I now think Chairman is better as is more removed from the process). Alice had requested to do so as well. But B was reticent (she and Chris I believe, thought it would raise the profile too much).

This may be the time - now. Or ... it may be too late and be seen as the PO trying to influence, which would be wrong. (Tho' if we find AH agrees to meet the MPs, we'd have to see him as well.)

All rather difficult. Sounds as though Alice did a good job though.
P

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Alice Perkins <[redacted] GRO>
Date: 1 December 2014 17:15:19 GMT
To: "paula.vennells" <[redacted] GRO>
<[redacted] GRO>
"belinda.crowe" <[redacted] GRO>
<[redacted] GRO>
"mark.r.davies" <[redacted] GRO>
<[redacted] GRO>
"chris.ajard" <[redacted] GRO>
<[redacted] GRO>
"patrick.bourke" <[redacted] GRO>
<[redacted] GRO>
Subject: JA

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