



Teri Clifton
OFGEM
10 South Colonnade
Canary Wharf
London
E14 4PU

By post and email to: teri.clifton@ofgem.gov.uk

21 December 2018

Dear Madam

Re: The Independent Public Inquiry into the Non Domestic Renewable Heat Incentive (RHI) Scheme

Provision of a Section 21 Notice requiring the provision of evidence in the form of a written statement

I am writing to you in my capacity as Solicitor to the Independent Public Inquiry into the Non Domestic Renewable Heat Incentive (RHI) Scheme (known as 'the RHI Inquiry') which has been set up under the Inquiries Act 2005 ('the Act').

I know that you are by now very familiar with the work of the Inquiry and its Terms of Reference from your previous engagement with it; and the Inquiry remains grateful for the evidence you have already provided.

However, as you may be aware, the Inquiry continues to seek some further written evidence from witnesses and participants where it is necessary to do so. The Inquiry Chairman also retains the right to require witnesses to attend to provide further oral evidence, and consideration will be given to whether that is necessary in light of additional written evidence which is received.

In the circumstances, please find enclosed with this letter a further Section 21 Notice requiring you to provide evidence to the RHI Inquiry Panel in the form of a further written statement addressing the matters identified in the Schedule to the Section 21 Notice.

As the text of the Section 21 Notice explains, you are required by law to comply with it.

As before, it is vital that the further witness statement you provide to the Inquiry is your own evidence, absent the influence of others; that it is comprehensive; and that it fully explains your involvement in the matters about which you have been asked.

I appreciate that you may require or desire access to some documentation in order to assist you in preparing your statement. In particular, you may wish to see documentation to which you previously had access but now no longer have access in your current post. If that applies in your case, I understand that Ofgem will assist you, at least in the first instance. You should contact Mark Mills, Principal Legal Advisor at Ofgem. He is contactable at Mark.Mills@ofgem.gov.uk. I have informed Mark Mills that you may be making contact with him to arrange access to documentation, or for general assistance and support; but there is, of course, no obligation upon you to do so. If you encounter any difficulties, of whatever kind, you should not hesitate to get in touch with me.

The questions in the attached notice refer to various documents. The Inquiry is grateful that Ofgem undertook to provide those documents to you for your consideration in advance of receiving this Notice.

I also remind you, as before, of the restriction orders made by the Chairman of the RHI Inquiry, which affect how you may deal with this correspondence and its enclosures (which are also provided to you under a duty of confidentiality to the RHI Inquiry). You may, of course, share the correspondence and the enclosed Notice and documents with your legal representative(s), under the same conditions as I set out in my previous correspondence.

Given the tight time-frame within which the RHI Inquiry must operate, the Chairman of the Inquiry would be grateful if you would comply with the requirements of the Section 21 Notice as soon as possible and, in any event, by the date set out for compliance in the Notice itself.

Finally, I would be grateful if you could acknowledge receipt of this correspondence and the enclosed notice by email to Patrick.Butler@rhiinquiry.org.

Please do not hesitate to contact me to discuss any matter arising.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Patrick Butler". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Patrick Butler

Solicitor to the RHI Inquiry

02890408928

SCHEDULE**[No 248 of 2018]**

You are referred to the following documentation:

- Mr Fyfe's Inquiry witness statement at **WIT-99001 to WIT-99019**;
- A copy extract from an email Mr Fyfe says he sent to PCAW on the 3 February 2017 at **IND-80033**;
- Material relating to Mr Fyfe provided to the Inquiry by Ofgem:
 - o An extract from a record of a meeting on the 1 February 2017 at **OFG-270112/3** (irrelevant parts redacted); and
 - o An extract from a letter of the 1 February 2017 at **OFG-270114** (irrelevant parts redacted);
- A copy email Mr Fyfe sent to Sinn Féin on the 20 January 2017 (**POL-10095 to POL-10103**); and
- Media material relevant to Mr Fyfe and Ofgem at **INQ-125501 to INQ-125523**.

Edward's Fyfe's statement to the Inquiry of the 31 August 2017

1. On **WIT-99010** at sections 5 and 6, Edward Fyfe makes reference to the deletion or alteration of records and files on the internal Sharepoint system. As to this:
 - a. Were you aware of a "war room"? If so, please explain what you knew about it.

- b. Were you aware, at any time during your employment with Ofgem, of documents or files being deleted or altered, or anything that could be so construed, or misconstrued, whether by Edward Fyfe or others?
 - c. Please explain the connection, if any, of the above matters to the Northern Ireland Non Domestic RHI Scheme.
2. In his statement Edward Fyfe, in summary, appears to allege that Ofgem was mismanaging the administration of schemes, including the Northern Ireland Non Domestic RHI Scheme, and was then not being transparent about that mismanagement, but instead covering it up. Are you aware of anything that could be so construed, or misconstrued, whether by Edward Fyfe or others, that may amount to or resemble the issues he has raised? If so, please provide full details.
3. Please set out anything else you wish to say in response to the witness statement provided to the Inquiry by Edward Fyfe.

Extract from what is said to be an email from Mr Fyfe to PCAW of 3 February 2017

4. Mr Fyfe states that he said to PCAW on 3 February 2017 (IND-80033) that you were involved in *"wiping clean and sanitising information ahead of the meeting on NI on 24/02/2017"* and that it was *"just crazy to watch documents disappear. Staff are being told not to speak to auditors, and there is a significant cover-up of what has happened"*. As to this:
 - a. What was the *"meeting on NI on 24/02/2017"* and what was your role in it?
 - b. What do you say to the allegation that you were involved in *"wiping clean and sanitising information ahead of the meeting on NI on 24/02/2017"* (the Inquiry takes this to be a reference to information held by Ofgem)?

- c. During your employment with Ofgem have you ever been involved in, or aware of, any activity which could be construed, or misconstrued, whether by Edward Fyfe or otherwise, as activity that may, or could, amount to *"wiping clean"* or *"sanitising"* information within Ofgem?
- d. What do you say about the allegation that Ofgem staff were *"being told not to speak to auditors"*?
- e. At any time during your employment with Ofgem did you tell anyone, were you told by anyone, or were you aware of others telling anyone, not to speak to auditors? If the answer is 'yes', then please provide a full explanation of the facts and circumstances.
- f. Are you aware, at any time during your employment with Ofgem, of any member of Ofgem staff saying anything that could be construed, or misconstrued, whether by Edward Fyfe or others, as encouraging staff not to speak to, or otherwise fully co-operate with, auditors? If the answer is 'yes', then please provide a full explanation of the facts and circumstances.
- g. What do you say about the allegation that there was a *"significant cover-up of what has happened"* (which the Inquiry takes to be a reference to what happened during Ofgem's administration of the Northern Ireland Non Domestic RHI Scheme)?
- h. At any time during your employment with Ofgem were you involved in, or aware of, anything that could be construed, or misconstrued, as a *"cover-up"*? If the answer is 'yes', then please provide a full explanation of the facts and circumstances.

Generally

- 5. Please set out any other information of which you consider the Inquiry should be aware.

NOTE:

It is important for the efficiency of the RHI Inquiry that the issues identified above are addressed as fully as possible and by reference, where available, to the dates and locations of specific incidents to which reference is made. The statement should be broken down into paragraphs, which should be numbered sequentially from '1' to the end. The use of appropriate section headings or sub-headings is also encouraged. A template witness statement is provided with this Notice for your assistance and should be used as the format for your response.

INQUIRY INTO THE RENEWABLE HEAT INCENTIVE SCHEME**RHI REF: Notice 248 of 2018****DATE: 29 January 2019**

Witness Statement of: Mrs Teresa Johanna Clifton

I, Teresa (Teri) Clifton, will say as follows: -

Introduction

As you may already be aware, Mr Fyfe was based in the London Ofgem office, working on the GB Domestic RHI Scheme. As I have already explained in my witness statement dated 9 March 2018, I am the Head of Operations for the RHI Scheme based in Glasgow.

My only encounter with Mr Fyfe was in September 2015 when I was asked by Chris Poulton to support the then Associate Director, Paul Fisher, with a project looking at Operational processes within the Domestic Scheme. This was a small project lasting about a month which focussed on operational excellence. I wanted to interview a number of staff within the Operations areas as well as outside the Operations area to better understand how the teams were communicating with each other. I interviewed Mr Fyfe as part of this process. Until this point, I had not had any dealings with Mr Fyfe as he worked in the GB Domestic RHI Audit team as an Assistant Manager.

From June 2016 onwards, the Senior Management team consisted of Gareth John, Jane Pierce and Edmund Ward, all based in London and me, based in Glasgow. The audit team that Mr Fyfe worked in was also based in London and had no contact with the Non-Domestic RHI teams in Glasgow. As a senior management team, we made sure that communications out to the teams covered all Schemes, so that everyone had a general awareness of what was happening in both locations, so he would have had a general awareness of the NI Scheme closure.

As part of my normal duties, I visited London on a number of occasions, mainly for meetings, and latterly to work with the Operations teams to get a better understanding of how the GB Domestic Scheme worked.

I had no dealings directly with the GB Domestic Audit team. I cannot recollect any time speaking directly to Mr Fyfe (other than in September 2015 as explained above) although it is likely that he would have been part of the general audience at any NI Scheme updates I gave as part of the senior management team at any London team meetings I attended.

Edward's Fyfe's statement to the Inquiry of the 31 August 2017

1. On **WIT-99010** at sections 5 and 6, Edward Fyfe makes reference to the deletion or alteration of records and files on the internal Sharepoint system. As to this:

a. Were you aware of a “war room”? If so, please explain what you knew about it.

Calling a room a ‘war room’ is a colloquialism for a centre of operations where there is significant activity being undertaken. There were two general meeting rooms which may sometimes have been referred to as “war rooms”, but more commonly known as RHI Project Rooms in London. There was also one in Glasgow. These were predominately used by the lawyers trawling the email systems to get the NI related emails from staff, and to prepare documentation for the NI Inquiry. From time to time, the rooms were also used for NI specific meetings between London colleagues and myself in Glasgow, so that we could discuss NI matters both inquiry related and normal business as usual work.

The Senior Management team did have 2 people searching the internal sharepoint system to bring all NI documents together to support the lawyers for the purpose of ensuring all material relevant to the inquiry was identified. This included any weekly MI reports relating to the NI Scheme. To my knowledge, nothing was deleted or altered, but moved to a more central location.

Until reading Mr Fyfe's statement I had never been made aware of his accusations or that he had raised concerns with individuals as he is now suggesting.



- b. **Were you aware, at any time during your employment with Ofgem, of documents or files being deleted or altered, or anything that could be so construed, or misconstrued, whether by Edward Fyfe or others?**

I do not believe that there is anything that can be construed or misconstrued amounting to this.

I am not aware of documents being deleted or altered. That said, it is just about conceivable that Ofgem's responses to Freedom of information (FOIs) requests might have been misunderstood. We would have redacted information if it was justified and being sent outside of Ofgem, under guidance by the lawyers. A specific example of this would be for FOIs, where employee names were mentioned. We received a significant volume of these between the NI Scheme closure and the NI RHI Inquiry. If Mr Fyfe overheard any discussions in relation to what did or not need redacting, he may have misunderstood. If ever we do redact information for FOI responses, Ofgem does retain the original, unredacted document so that Ofgem's records are complete.

It is also worth noting that part of my role is to proof-read the work of individuals who work on the GB and NI RHI Schemes before it is finally published. A few examples include any external updates; website updates and formal letters. This is part of our normal checking process and is a control check to ensure that accurate information is provided to the reader when the document has been finalised. I cannot see how proof-reading can be mis-construed as altering documents.

- c. **Please explain the connection, if any, of the above matters to the Northern Ireland Non Domestic RHI Scheme.**

See a and b above.



2. **In his statement Edward Fyfe, in summary, appears to allege that Ofgem was mismanaging the administration of schemes, including the Northern Ireland Non Domestic RHI Scheme, and was then not being transparent about that mismanagement, but instead covering it up. Are you aware of anything that could be so construed, or misconstrued, whether by Edward Fyfe or others, that may amount to or resemble the issues he has raised? If so, please provide full details.**

I am not aware of anything that can be construed or misconstrued in relation to Ofgem mismanaging the administration of Schemes.

I believe that Ofgem has been very transparent in its support to the inquiry and the management of the administration of the Schemes. The inquiry has been provided with a vast amount of material in relation to the management of the Schemes we administer. I am not aware of any material that is relevant to Scheme management that the Inquiry has not been provided with. The RHI Schemes are complex, with challenging legislation and budgets underpinning them. At all points, we must uphold the law and be bound by the regulations as written. Through the maturity of the schemes, a number of issues have arisen which we have discussed with Dfe and BEIS as appropriate, after following our own escalation routes within Ofgem.

3. **Please set out anything else you wish to say in response to the witness statement provided to the Inquiry by Edward Fyfe.**

It is important that the Inquiry considers that Mr Fyfe was a relatively junior member of staff who would not have had visibility of the overall governance and management of the Schemes. It is also fair to say that he was working at Ofgem at an extremely busy time and would have seen a change of Senior Management in relation to the GB Domestic Scheme that he worked on. These managers/directors may have had different styles in running their teams, but the central governance controls, such as the risk committees and independent Director over sight at Scheme Boards would have remained throughout, so it doesn't chime with Mr Fyfe's allegations.



I would question the roles that Mr Fyfe says he had at Ofgem, as I have only known him to be an Assistant Manager in the GB Domestic RHI Scheme, based in London. To my knowledge, he has not worked in an advisory capacity (subject matter expert) in relation to installation of commercial properties, and I am not aware of any support he gave to the Counter Fraud team in an unofficial capacity. I cannot comment on the role he undertook for the Domestic GB Scheme, other than he worked in the audit team.

In addition, Laura Gagen left the RHI Scheme team in April 2014 and Alan Hendle left the RHI team in March 2015. I cannot recall that they had further involvement with any RHI Schemes following their move to the Counter Fraud teams so I'm at a loss to understand the suggestion that Mr Fyfe could have been asked to help them with the NI Scheme close down.

In response to Mr Fyfe's question 3 a, I was the Head of Operations responsible for the close down of the Scheme. He never approached me to discuss any potential fraud issues and he would not have been aware of the operational checks we undertook to mitigate the potential for fraud as the Scheme closed. For clarity, each case (100%) had an initial operational check to ensure compliance with Section 1 of the Regulations – particularly around proof of commissioning dates. This was the pre-assessment check that was undertaken before the full review began. There were many discussions at senior management level on our operational approach to both the spike and the Scheme closure, and Mr Fyfe was not involved in these.

Specifically Mr Fyfe says he provided a Script. I am very surprised by this as Mr Fyfe never came to me or any members of my Operations team with a script to use. As the Head of Operations, I would have expected to know if a member of the GB RHI audit team had offered support independently.

It would not have been appropriate to use the Domestic call handlers (based in London) to call applicants as they had no knowledge of the NI RHI Scheme.



Any call outs would have needed to be scripted, and I would have been the primary sign-off for this, along with Jane Pierce. Jane and I provided text for the phone team (who were based in Glasgow) to use as soon as Scheme closure was announced, and each email being sent to NI applicants and potential applicants was quality checked and had specific wording about the Scheme closure.

In response to Mr Fyfe's question 3b, I am not aware whether Mr Fyfe was asked to help with outstanding audits and I cannot find any records of him helping with the NI Audits. To my knowledge, Mr Fyfe had no involvement in the NI audit strategy, the planning or the implementation. It is not true to say the audit programme had been ignored.

Mr Fyfe's response to question 4 appears to be in relation to the GB Domestic Scheme. I don't know what 'damning evidence' he is suggesting or what information he passed to Deloitte or when that happened.

Mr Fyfe's Questions 5 and 6 are covered by my response to question 1a and 1 b above. I would further add that Mr Fyfe was not in the London office from 1 February 2017 as he had an extended period of leave as noted in OFG-270114, so I am not clear how he can have observed any alleged cover up after 1 February 2017.

In response to Mr Fyfe's question 7a – We kept staff updated generally about the closure of the NI Scheme, so he would have been aware of the increased volumes around the spike, and about the closure generally.

In response to Mr Fyfe's question 7b - I was part of the Senior Management team for the Non-Domestic Schemes until late 2016/2017, when I also took responsibility for the GB Domestic Scheme. As a Senior Manager within Ofgem E serve, I never received any weekly reports from Mr Fyfe.

Mr Fyfe says he raised concerns with issues on major non domestic compliance. He appears to be referring to GB Domestic RHI and not the NI



Scheme. In any event, I can confirm that neither the named individual nor any other member of the Senior Management team told me that a member of staff was raising these concerns.

General discussion with the senior management team would have taken place about non-compliances and what could be done to improve on them, as the Inquiry has seen through the Board reports.

Within these discussions, senior management had sight of and discussed material non-compliances v non-material non-compliances and all teams from policy, communications, compliance and operations would have discussed ways to improve processes and communication to participants in relation to this. Although not directly involved in the ongoing audit BAU work, I understand that regular meetings took place with BEIS to review non-compliances relating to the GB Schemes, which it appears Mr Fyfe is referring to.

In response to Mr Fyfe's question 7d – In 2017, the Senior Management team were actively working with Deloitte on an audit looking at the GB Domestic Scheme around this time. This was a planned audit as the Scheme had been running for 3 years. I can't comment on what Mr Fyfe provided to Deloitte and I can't say whether it was ignored or that Deloitte concluded that it didn't class as non-compliance. I can only assume he did not see the findings. This would not be unusual, as the report was prepared for Senior Management, and Mr Fyfe was an Assistant Manager. I am not clear from this, whether Mr Fyfe believes there was a separate audit completed and if so, I have not seen it. The report from the GB Domestic Deep Dive findings was finalised in June 17, so I can only assume his comments related to the same audit. I am not clear who he is referencing as 'internal audit' or which letter states there were 'no real issues' as I haven't seen this nor would I have any reason to see such a letter. What I can say is that there were a number of findings that Ofgem have been working to resolve as part of a wider assurance review that relates to the GB Domestic Scheme only, so not relevant for the NI Inquiry.



In response to Mr Fyfe's question 8 – Again, this is something that Mr Fyfe has made assumptions on. I note that he doesn't say he overheard me in this response. I can, however, confirm I have not heard anyone in Ofgem saying such a thing.

In response to Mr Fyfe's question 9b – From my point of view as part of the Senior Management team, this is simply not true. Whilst Mr Fyfe is responding to the Inquiry's question, I can only assume he is referring to 'coffee point discussions' taking place in London. I don't know what Mr Fyfe was told by his manager, but in relation to Amy Powell-Tuck specifically, she was temporarily promoted into a Senior Manager (Band D) for a period of time, and reverted to her substantive role at the end of the period.

In response to Mr Fyfe's questions 9c and 9d – relates to the GB Domestic Scheme and was covered by the Deloitte audit.

In response to Mr Fyfe's questions 10a and 10b – these comments relate principally to the GB Domestic Scheme, in a period prior to my involvement.

I am not aware of the claimed dominance stated by one company in NI, as that was not evidenced on the NI Non-Domestic Scheme. If it is in relation to the NI Domestic Scheme, Ofgem are not responsible for the administration of that. None of these issues were raised with me and none of the named individuals told me that he had raised issues with them.

In response to Mr Fyfe's question 10c – I am not aware of these meetings.

In response to Mr Fyfe's question 10d – I would simply reiterate that using Deloitte was not a cover up of issues, in fact, we encouraged them to explore any issues they found so that Ofgem could take the appropriate actions.

In response to Mr Fyfe's questions 11 and 12 a and b – As previously mentioned, Laura Gagen and Alan Hendle left the RHI teams in 2014 and 2015



respectively, so would not have been involved in the audit strategy. As far as I can recall, when they were in the RHI teams they worked on the Non-Domestic Schemes and not the GB Domestic Scheme that Mr Fyfe supported.

In response to Mr Fyfe's question 12c – as mentioned previously, Mr Fyfe was never involved in the checks we undertook at Scheme closure, and had no knowledge of the NI RHI Scheme. He was also not involved in any audit strategy for the NI Scheme.

In response to Mr Fyfe's questions 12d and e – please see my response to 3 above.

In response to Mr Fyfe's question 12f – This is a personal opinion. I don't think it is appropriate to discuss the competence of individual members of staff, or what basis of knowledge Mr Fyfe used to determine this.

In response to Mr Fyfe's questions 13a - c – I am not clear what issues Mr Fyfe alleges he was raising in relation to the NI Scheme. I am clear that at the time nothing was raised with me that corresponds to what he was talking about.

In response to Mr Fyfe's question 13d - I am aware of a once-off incident of a lack of a security check of a temporary member of staff in London. I cannot recall when this happened. My understanding was that it was a once-off and not suggestive that the Scheme was out of control.

In response to Mr Fyfe's question 14 – relates to the GB Domestic Scheme and at a time when I had no individual involvement, so I am unable to comment further.

In response to Mr Fyfe's question 14a – This response is in relation to the GB Domestic Scheme.



In response to Mr Fyfe's question 14e – I am not aware of any connection between Elliott Thickett and the NI scheme, so I can only assume this relates, if true, to the NI Domestic Scheme which is not administered by Ofgem.

In response to Mr Fyfe's question 15 – It would not be appropriate for me to comment on the specifics, but this all relates to the GB Domestic Scheme, and not the NI Scheme.

Extract from what is said to be an email from Mr Fyfe to PCAW of 3 February 2017

4. **Mr Fyfe states that he said to PCAW on 3 February 2017 (IND-80033) that you were involved in “wiping clean and sanitising information ahead of the meeting on NI on 24/02/2017” and that it was “just crazy to watch documents disappear. Staff are being told not to speak to auditors, and there is a significant cover-up of what has happened”. As to this:**

It is important I make clear at the outset that this is this is the first time that I have seen these documents, provided by the Inquiry. None of this extract has been repeated in his statement in relation to his points 5 and 6, so it seems clear to me that this is **not** now an allegation he is making against me. That would make sense as this is an accusation completely without foundation, although I do not understand his motive for making these allegations.

- a. **What was the “meeting on NI on 24/02/2017” and what was your role in it?**

I don't know what meeting Mr Fyfe is referring to as there was no meeting on NI on 24/2/17. Furthermore, I've checked my calendar and Gareth John was on annual leave that week. To my knowledge, Alison Smith has never been involved or attended any meetings, which I've been to, in relation to the NI Scheme.



- b. **What do you say to the allegation that you were involved in “wiping clean and sanitising information ahead of the meeting on NI on 24/02/2017” (the Inquiry takes this to be a reference to information held by Ofgem)?**

I find this malicious falsehood really offensive and slanderous. I have never had any part in wiping clean or sanitising documents as suggested by Mr Fyfe and I never took part in any cover up.

- c. **During your employment with Ofgem have you ever been involved in, or aware of, any activity which could be construed, or misconstrued, whether by Edward Fyfe or otherwise, as activity that may, or could, amount to “wiping clean” or “sanitising” information within Ofgem?**

No, please see answer above.

- d. **What do you say about the allegation that Ofgem staff were “being told not to speak to auditors”?**

I have never heard this before. Of course I would not tell my team not to speak to auditors and I can't believe that any other senior manager would do otherwise. If Deloitte came in to audit, the teams would be open and transparent in sharing any information needed to support the audit. Deloitte would normally sit with the subject matter experts to better understand the operational processes, and we would provide relevant evidence to support their investigations.

- e. **At any time during your employment with Ofgem did you tell anyone, were you told by anyone, or were you aware of others telling anyone, not to speak to auditors? If the answer is ‘yes’, then please provide a full explanation of the facts and circumstances.**



No.

- f. **Are you aware, at any time during your employment with Ofgem, of any member of Ofgem staff saying anything that could be construed, or misconstrued, whether by Edward Fyfe or others, as encouraging staff not to speak to, or otherwise fully co-operate with, auditors? If the answer is ‘yes’, then please provide a full explanation of the facts and circumstances.**

No. We would arrange for staff with the relevant expertise to sit with the auditors when there was an audit underway so that they could provide a fully-rounded presentation of our processes and controls in the area that they were focussed on. Often the auditors were sat at desks within the teams whilst they carried out their investigations, and were given a dedicated point of contact to direct queries to.

- g. **What do you say about the allegation that there was a “*significant cover-up of what has happened*” (which the Inquiry takes to be a reference to what happened during Ofgem’s administration of the Northern Ireland Non Domestic RHI Scheme)?**

I think that Mr Fyfe’s allegation is very completely wrong and I do not believe there has been a cover up. I feel that I and other Ofgem representatives have been very transparent in its dealings with the public and the Inquiry and we have provided a huge amount of material to the Inquiry to support this.

- h. **At any time during your employment with Ofgem were you involved in, or aware of, anything that could be construed, or misconstrued, as a “*cover-up*”? If the answer is ‘yes’, then please provide a full explanation of the facts and circumstances.**



No

Generally

5. Please set out any other information of which you consider the Inquiry should be aware.

These allegations have come as a shock to me as I had no awareness that Mr Fyfe had sent these to both PCAW and Sinn Fein. This has been at personal detriment to my health and my family's wellbeing, as they came as a total shock when I received this request just before Christmas.

The specific allegation about me, made in his email to PCAW but not in his Inquiry statement -that I was "wiping clean and sanitising information" for the purpose of a "cover up" - is exceptionally serious and goes to my integrity as a public servant. The allegation is completely without foundation. If the Inquiry considers that it needs to refer to this allegation against me, either in the report or by publishing document reference IND-80033 then in the interests of fairness to me, I would ask that the Inquiry makes a clear and unequivocal determination that there is no evidence of me having engaged in this conduct. If the Inquiry does not do this, there is a real risk that the inevitable publicity that this entirely baseless allegation will receive will cause significant damage to my reputation as an individual and as a public servant.

Statement of Truth

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

Signed:

Dated: _____ 29 January 2019 _____