

Supplementary statement of Dr Andrew Crawford in response to comments made by Andrew McCormick on day 111 of the Inquiry, 26 October 2018.

I, Andrew Crawford, will say as follows:

1. This is my fourth statement to the Inquiry. I make it in order to reply to the comments of Dr Andrew McCormick on day 111 of the Inquiry (TRA-16672). During his oral evidence Dr McCormick claimed that during a discussion at a NIFDA dinner in 2016 I said: "I thought this was AME, and we could fill our boots". This statement is not true. At no time did I make this or any similar comment. I believe that Dr McCormick made this misleading and inaccurate comment to deflect any criticism of his role in relation to the RHI scheme and this has resulted in a great deal of negative publicity towards myself.

Dr McCormick made several references to the discussion that he had with me in relation to the RHI scheme in his various statements and during his oral evidence to the Inquiry. In his first witness statement (WIT-10523) Dr McCormick stated that: *"Private discussions with Andrew Crawford in October 2016 confirmed that he had been of the view the view that there was no good reason against maximising uptake of the RHI scheme and hence the HMT funding"*.

Later in his first witness statement (WIT-10528) Dr McCormick states that: *"I do recall one conversation with Andrew Crawford at some stage when he spoke to me about some concern about the possible abuse of the scheme....It seems more likely that this conversation would have occurred in the autumn of 2015, though again I cannot remember any particular reason for me to have been in a one-to-one conversation with Andrew Crawford. In any event I do not recall any details of the conversation."*

In his second witness statement Dr McCormick (WIT 11259) states that: *"the conversation contributed to the impression that he had seen no harm in maximising the benefit of the Scheme."*

In his third witness statement (WIT-26293) Dr McCormick was asked to provide more information regarding our conversation. In response (WIT-26294) he says that I was of the view that because the Scheme was funded from AME, it was actually desirable for Northern Ireland participants to maximise the return from it and went on to say *"I have no further recollection of that conversation"*.

There is no reference in any of Dr McCormick's considered, lengthy and detailed statements to me saying *"I thought this was AME, and we could fill our boots"*.

During my oral evidence on day 89 of the Inquiry (TRA 13132) I was asked about a discussion that I had with Dr McCormick at a NIFDA diner. In my evidence I said that I can remember having a conversation with Dr McCormick but I could not recollect the details of the conversation. In my evidence (TRA-13133), in response to a discussion of when Dr McCormick and I had a discussion at a NIFDA dinner (October 2016), I stated that I believed that it took place earlier than that. Now that I have had the time to reflect on my evidence, I believe that I did not in fact attend the NIFDA dinner in October 2016 but did attend the

annual dinner in 2015. I therefore believe that the discussion with Dr McCormick was in 2015, and not 2016.

Dr McCormick's comment "*I thought this was AME and we could fill or boots*" was new information that Dr McCormick had not previously provided to the Inquiry. I want to reiterate that at no stage did I think never mind say, "*I thought this was AME, we should fill our boots.*" I was very disappointed not only that Dr McCormick made this unfounded and untruthful remark but that the comment was not challenged during the evidence hearing resulting in a great deal of negative media publicity against me.

Statement of Truth

I believe the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

Signed:



Dated:

26th November, 2018