

Dear Sir,

I note that your terms of reference refer at item 1 to examining, in addition to the hacked e mails, other e mails and information.

It is difficult, of course, to see how the issues that are to be considered could be fairly assessed without wide further disclosure of such material – at the very least to put the hacked e mails into context and to show to what extent the content of the same was typical of communications between the relevant parties.

Equally, it is difficult to see how the Review can be truly transparent and gain public confidence if such 'other' material is not also disclosed so that those who have been invited to send in evidence and/or submissions may also have the benefit of it.

In light of the above, could you urgently clarify:

1. What 'other' e mails and information has been (a) sought as part of the Review, and (b) obtained;
2. Whether this further material is going to be posted on the web site (in addition to third party evidence and submissions as currently indicated);
3. If such 'other' material is not to be published, (a) why not and (b) how the public, as well as those inclined to submit their own evidence/submissions, are supposed to know the full context of both the hacked e mails and in time your eventual findings?

It seems to me that as a simple matter of fairness such 'other' material should be disclosed as part of the Review – especially if the Review Committee in time considers any such 'other' material to be significant to its eventual findings.

Regards,

Vincent Moran