

**From:** [McCormick, Andrew \(DFE\)](#)  
**To:** [Richard Bullick](#); [McCormick, Andrew \(DFE\)](#)  
**Cc:** [David](#); [Timothy Johnston](#); [John Robinson](#)  
**Subject:** Re: RHI statement  
**Date:** 17 December 2016 16:10:12

---

Not sure - will check with Chris.

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone.

---

**From:** Richard Bullick  
**Sent:** Saturday, 17 December 2016 15:01  
**To:** McCormick, Andrew (DFE)  
**Cc:** David; Timothy Johnston; John Robinson  
**Subject:** Re: RHI statement

---

Presumably the changes were tracked and visible to JB?

Sent from my iPad

On 17 Dec 2016, at 14:55, McCormick, Andrew (DFE) <[Andrew.McCormick@economy-ni.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.McCormick@economy-ni.gov.uk)> wrote:

Yes and as the note will show, Chris did not seek a meeting with the Minister or in any sense whistle-blow. It was the Minister who asked to speak to Chris having noticed the changes in the paper.

Hope this helps.

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone.

---

**From:** Richard Bullick  
**Sent:** Saturday, 17 December 2016 14:37  
**To:** David  
**Cc:** McCormick, Andrew (DFE); Timothy Johnston; John Robinson  
**Subject:** Re: RHI statement

---

That's for Amc but I believe so

Sent from my iPhone

On 17 Dec 2016, at 14:29, David <Personal information redacted by the RHI Inquiry> wrote:

Can it be categorically said that this was the only occasion when Chris S spoke to the then Minister re documentation referring to OFMDFM being altered?

---

**From:** McCormick, Andrew (DFE) <[Andrew.McCormick@economy-ni.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.McCormick@economy-ni.gov.uk)>  
**Sent:** 17 December 2016 12:11:47  
**To:** David; Richard Bullick; Timothy Johnston; John Robinson  
**Subject:** Re: RHI statement

Chris and I are working on a "note for the record" on this point.

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone.

---

**From:** David  
**Sent:** Saturday, 17 December 2016 11:45  
**To:** McCormick, Andrew (DFE); Richard Bullick; Timothy Johnston; John Robinson  
**Subject:** Re: RHI statement

---

Further thought - I don't think releasing the documents alone will nail the nonsense about records being cleansed.

They won't be readily understood including by many in the media and a common response will be - 'what about other documents, email chains etc?'. It will be seen as just DUP spin and not have the impact that is needed to set the record straight.

---

**From:** McCormick, Andrew (DFE) <[Andrew.McCormick@economy-ni.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.McCormick@economy-ni.gov.uk)>  
**Sent:** 17 December 2016 11:03  
**To:** David; Richard Bullick; Timothy Johnston; John Robinson  
**Subject:** Re: RHI statement

PAC got the emails (three in all) from me. All are to officials. Bad for civil servants but no hazard for Ministers.

I can forward (will take a bit of searching).

Many thanks.

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone.

---

**From:** David  
**Sent:** Saturday, 17 December 2016 10:59  
**To:** Richard Bullick; McCormick, Andrew (DFE); Timothy Johnston; John Robinson  
**Subject:** RHI statement

---

Some additions in red here. (I've had to save it in a new word file, hope that doesn't cause problems)

\* Ironically, given I've added more, I fear it may be too long and too detailed in parts eg on the technicalities of the scheme. The sad lesson of the last few weeks is that detail doesn't win the argument.

\* According to the Irish News yesterday, the PAC has a copy of a second email Janette wrote to Arlene (personal email) shortly after the first one, in which some concerns were detailed. This could blow up in FM's face, so need for extreme care in references to whistleblower in speech. Is it too much to hope that members of PAC could advise on alleged second email?

\* I think whatever is announced on Monday now needs to be called an inquiry.