

From: [David](#)
To: [Richard Bullick](#); [McCormick, Andrew \(DFE\)](#); [Timothy Johnston](#); [John Robinson](#)
Subject: RHI statement
Date: 17 December 2016 10:59:50

<!--[if lte mso 15 || CheckWebRef]-->

David has shared a OneDrive file with you. To view it, click the link below.

 [RHI statement DG addition.docx](#)

<!--[endif]-->

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.

From: [David](#)
To: [McCormick, Andrew \(DFE\)](#); [Richard Bullick](#); [Timothy Johnston](#); [John Robinson](#)
Subject: Re: RHI statement
Date: 17 December 2016 11:08:40

Given recent experiences, I am still somewhat paranoid on this.

Is it possible that a now angry Janette has searched and dredged up a second email to Arlene - maybe even one sent to a defunct Assembly email address?

Another Janette surprise would be unhelpful, to say the least

From: McCormick, Andrew (DFE) <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.

From: [David](#)
To: [McCormick, Andrew \(DFE\)](#); [Richard Bullick](#); [Timothy Johnston](#); [John Robinson](#)
Subject: Re: RHI statement
Date: 17 December 2016 11:45:13

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>
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.