

OPEN LETTER

WRITTEN SUBMISSION on Friday 06th April 2018

Concerning the Conduct and Contempt of Parliament by Sir Howard Davies, Chairman & Mr Ross McEwan, CEO of RBS re GRG. –

Concerning the Conduct & Contempt of Parliament by Mr Andrew Bailey CEO of the FCA & Mr John Griffith-Jones former Chairman of the FCA.

To the Chair and all the individual Members of the Treasury Select Committee,

(This is an Open Letter primarily addressed to you, but widely circulated to many other interested parties).

Copies:

Prime Minister, The Rt Hon Theresa May MP
Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Rt Hon Philip Hammond MP
Andrew Bailey, CEO, FCA

Call for Treasury Select Committee to:

- (1) Seek the Life time ban from Financial Services under the Senior Managers Regime or other such legislation by the FCA with immediate effect for a discernible lack of “exact integrity” of Mr Ross McEwan CEO of RBS in respect of misleading the Treasury Select Committee to account, have him fired by the RBS Board. And report him to the Speakers office for Parliamentary investigation.**
- (2) Seek the Life time ban from Financial Services under the Senior Managers Regime or other such legislation by the FCA with immediate effect for a discernible lack of “exact integrity” of Sir Howard Davies Chairman of RBS in respect of misleading the Treasury Select Committee to account, have him fired by the RBS Board. And report him to the Speakers office for Parliamentary investigation.**
- (3) Seek the termination and Life time ban from Financial Services for lack of “exact integrity” of Andrew Bailey, CEO of the Financial Conduct Authority for misleading in person the Treasury Select Committee over the initial findings of the S166 Investigation into RBS-GRG in November 2016 and for misrepresenting 2 summaries in 2017 as full fair & accurate representations of the full unredacted S166 Report - which upon the forced publication of the full S166 Report was found not to be the case as the most damning statements were left out from the summaries, making the summaries grossly inaccurate as to their principle material findings compared to those of the full S166 Report. - Report them to the Speakers Office for Parliamentary investigation.**
- (4) Seek the Life time Ban from Financial Services for lack of “exact integrity” of John Griffith-Jones, Former Chairman of the Financial Conduct Authority for misleading in person the Treasury Select Committee over the initial findings of the S166 Investigation into RBS GRG in November 2016 and for misrepresenting 2 summaries in 2017 as full Fair & Accurate representations of the full unredacted S166 Report - which upon the forced publication of the full S166 Report was found not to be the case as the most damning statements were left out from the summaries, making the summaries grossly inaccurate in their material principle findings compared to those of the full S166 Report. - Report them to the Speakers Office for Parliamentary investigation.**

(5) Hold The FCA & RBS to account for their serious inadequacies now identified in approach to the design, methodology, sampling, and consequential subjugation of the results and presentation and possible distortion of the S166 Report of the investigation into RBS GRG

Declaration of Interest: We the undersigned are affected by RBS – GRG.

Original Author: Mark Banister, RBS Customer & GRG Accuser
markbanister63@gmail.com

Reviewer & Contributor – R Neil W Mitchell, Customer & RBS Campaigner

Please Note that both of us are prepared to appear before the Treasury Select Committee to give ORAL Evidence if called upon.

Dear Chair and individual fellow Members of the Treasury Select Committee,

Thank you very much for inviting, or was it commanding me to exchange a few words with you, and the remnants of your Committee post last Thursdays hearing (28/3) of the Treasury Select Committee into Gender equality in the Workplace. - A very worthy subject too, and one I found most informative.

I apologise for being unprepared nor ready for your attack, however presumably that was your purposeful intention, seizing the chance to “ambush” me from the corridor outside the Committee room, where I was just about to speak to the Minister – John Glen MP - having politely let others with the same ambition go first, clearly nothing wrong with that then, contrary to your assertion!

Instead you hauled me back into the Committee room via the entreaties of your clerk so that you could deliver some immediate natural justice, vent your spleen, re-assert your authority via a spot of swift retaliation and retribution for my impertinence at possessing the temerity to write, and point out your Committees obligations related to matters of fact. Facts that still stand and won't go away, however much you wish they would – Sir Howard Davies and Mr Ross McEwan, Chairman and CEO respectively of RBS have lied and serially dissembled your Committee and that is prima facie Contempt of Parliament which you and your Committee must “call out”, or as noted, be responsible for bringing Parliament into disrepute, and sanctioning lying as acceptable before Committees, not to mention the wider consequences and chaos such a ridiculous notion would lead to. –

Clearly by no direct reference, other than my own, my letter of the 20th March was the elephant not otherwise in the room, and yes, I am sure it has made your life harder, it was intended too, and self-evidently given your noticeable angst and anger its fulfilling its function exactly as envisioned. -- You also questioned my position to tell your Committee what to do... If you treasure democracy and the rule of law, as I presume you do, (do you?) then quite obviously you answered your own question. Which then begs the intellectual concern of one who obviously considers herself a cut above the rest of us, as to why you thought it necessary to ask a question where the answer is so obvious? From my memory (you can check the transcripts when they become available, but you will find I am generally very accurate, despite listening to more than an hour and a half of testimony and on this occasion making no notes) Mr Mann MP posed the question “Who watches, the watchers.” Well the answer is clear, as it has always been, and is the very reason we practise substantively “Open” government. It is every citizens duty to defend democracy. So stop being indignant, and precious, when you and your Committee are so obviously found wanting. Rest assured “**exact integrity**” is still demanded of you and the Committee too, so get on with it rather than wasting all your energy, as currently, on trying to think of a million ways to wriggle round your obligations. Trust me there isn't a single one, other than “exact integrity,” that won't otherwise result in the severest personal detrimental reputational impact, which is just as it should be, the law and Parliament doesn't appreciate being perverted. (And you as a former Lawyer must know that!)

Welcome to my world, where I thrive, but the best you could manage when under pressure, I might add, entirely of your own making, was to stand on your dignity and squawk, accusing me of wasting your Secretariats time and troubling your Committee! A discreditable display of self-indulgent petulance, and all the more ridiculous for being fundamentally untrue.

I suppose it was only to be expected that my punishment should be rapid and resolute, stern admonishment for pointing out the facts your Committee sought to previously ignore, and even now is trying to find some way of sidestepping. Not forgetting your failed attempt at personal humiliation of me too, which I guess is fine when jumping “innocent” members of the public.

As you must have noted I wasn't "phased" or fussed, but in truth I would have thought it obviously demeaning and unbecoming of your position, not to mention a rather palpable misuse and abuse of power related to the proper conduct of such an important august position, charged with safeguarding the functioning of Government, and securing democracy, to then act in such a way. Thankfully, for you, it was me you unreasonably did this to. I think you found I retained broad shoulders, not being readily intimidated, or overly impressed by pretentious naked unfettered ambition, or a good measure of indignant grand standing. If I wanted to repay your thoughtfulness, which I assure you I don't, there are better more subtle understated ways of permanently securing that..... than falsely and improperly haranguing a member of the public as you did, which as you will now discover has back fired spectacularly. I never anticipated such a free gift, but so impoverished as I am, a result of RBS – GRG, I possess no shame, so have put your gift to good use!

Leadership & Chairpersonship:

While we are on the subject of conduct, permit me to make some observations relating to leadership and particularly Chairpersonship. - A "bad" chair rules and dominates a Committee, while a "good" chair serves it, being always an equal, - one of eleven - save in the sole context of bring order, and in such circumstances utilising the lightest touch possible. In a public context, which is of particular relevance, an experienced chair only ever references the power of the Committee, NEVER that of the chair as an individual, nor ignores the position and contribution of the Committee itself. It's the position that commands, not you personally. Clearly you retain ambitions for high political office but stop using this important position as a personal promotion platform. Its rude to your fellow Committee Members, thoroughly un-English, and certainly unbecoming too. Unless you're perceived as a team player, no one will ever trust you, irrespective of whether you are a team player or not, and this ceaseless self-promotion rather denies that you are or might be.

So Mrs Morgan.... ENOUGH. -- Don't ever talk down to anyone again, or belittle them, or misuse your parliamentary position however irritating, irksome, or far beneath you, you arrogantly consider that person to be. I despise bullies, and I won't tolerate such behaviour from you, or anyone else, and by now you should realise that I am more than capable of pricking the pomposity and position of anyone without limit that I choose, and done with just a pen. Further I never threaten people as you did me, that's for cowards who have neither the means, nor the will, both of which you certainly lack.

By contrast I just act, no warning, just devastating effective action, because demonstrably I have both the means and the will. You started this, but I have firmly finished it, unless of course your foolish enough to fancy your chances again, in which case I will show your gender the greatest respect and equality possible, by being completely blind to it, and utterly merciless with you as a consequence. Unlike you I always have the greatest respect for my opponents, not least because invariably they have been better resourced and more powerful. Therefore, I wouldn't dream of talking down to you, your colleagues, or any member of your staff, and whilst I am one of the most determined people you could ever imagine interfacing with, quietly pushing people to places, and to do things, they didn't believe they were capable of, or necessarily wanted to. I also try my very best to always be scrupulously polite, considerate, and courteous. Something I have every confidence ALL members of the Secretariat, that I have spoken with, would confirm. While similarly I am entirely confident Mr Jack, and his staff would also attest to the same.

Indeed, it bemuses me that the only other time we have ever met was when I made the effort to travel to Westminster to thank all the Committee in person, (I wonder how many others have ever done that - None I suspect) when of course you warmly greeted my presence, expressing no similar complaint at my attendance, as you did last Thursday. Clearly your personality is only equipped to accept adoration and praise, not justified objective criticism and rebuke. How very sad and disappointing, I and others expected better, believing you to be a bigger person, still it's never too late to reform, improve, and grow.

Regardless it seems this particular village idiot can certainly intellectually talk down to you whenever he chooses, after all he's the blighter that with a single letter has positioned you like few, if any others before. However, he doesn't choose to talk down to you, and did not do so on Thursday last, because every decent human being in society whether powerful or meek has merit if you bother to listen to their perspective, rather than declare it inconvenient, disagreeable, and dismiss them. And that includes those I seek to speak for, my own voice, and even yours, so don't ever do that again, especially if you wish to be considered a serious "decent" human being. – Which is especially important given the position you hold as an MP. Treat people as equals, show them respect, you will get a lot further, a lot faster, (and most especially when they vex you).

Time to be serious:

Madam Chairman and fellow Committee members, there are serious matters to be dealt with, so put your egos, self-importance, and indignance away permanently, and let us commence with an obvious matter that must be addressed first.

Threatening to drop the RBS – GRG enquiry.

The suggestion by you, that my interventions were more likely to cause the Committee to drop the entire enquiry than pursue it, will leave your fellow Parliamentarians - incredulous. Never again demean yourself, or the Treasury Select Committee, or Parliament in such a reckless, and frankly idiotic manner. Making such an empty threat in a blatant attempt to intimidate me into silence, is incorrigible.

To describe such a contemptuous outrageous baseless threat as melodramatic would be to accord it more credibility than it deserves, and frankly you should resign for it, because in the context of people who have lost everything including their loved ones through suicide related to the injustice wrought upon them without merit, such a remark was / is a heinous piece of personal self-indulgence of the most wretched kind. - Not even a petulant adolescent having a tantrum, and a total loss of mental reason and control would stoop so low, and you a former Minister of Education, a senior cabinet position, the whole proposition beggars' belief. – May God, or whoever you pray to, or whatever you believe in, forgive you all, because I am most unlikely ever to do so in context. If I could think of a strong enough adjective I would use it, but even my lexicon of superlatives doesn't extend that far. Disgraceful, despicable and sinful, will have to suffice.

I hope you will **all immediately issue and widely publicise a fulsome apology and relevant reassurance**, not to me, as I noted before, I am irrelevant, but to all the victims who have suffered such immeasurable loss, because in that moment YOU ALL Demeaned your positions and responsibilities. – To be clear, I don't currently seek any of your resignations, in fact I actively don't want them. What I do reasonably demand is that all of you fulfil your roles properly, and that most especially requires the immediate application of "Exact integrity" and the related necessary actions as set out so unequivocally in my letter dated 20th March 2018, irrespective of your perception of the difficult issues related, but if not, then regrettably it must be the heads of all those unequal to the task, or unable, or unwilling to show "exact integrity."

In the harsh, real world I exist in, its decision time; – "Put up, or shut up." The choice is EXCLUSIVELY yours, but it's one, or the other. Not because I say so, but because I imagine your fellow Parliamentarians will take an exceptionally dim view of these antics, and if not, they certainly should do, because none of this is conducive to, or acceptable to Public trust and confidence, which is the foundation of every Member of Parliament, and in turn, all of us citizens.

As an extension of this ludicrous threat to drop the enquiry, you also indicated that my interventions would do nothing to improve my chances at the proper time of being called to give witness, to which I think I made it clear that I had never held any such expectation, though of course were the opportunity to be afforded

me, I would have plenty of uncomfortable truths to tell. Indeed after your antics last Thursday I now consider there is an obligation towards me, and others by the Committee to engage with us properly, though I suggest a change in format also forms part of that obligation.

All of you would have to answer our questions in open session truthfully and factually, as we yours. We have already established you all possess considerable reserves of self-confidence, so let us put your abilities to the test, just as you would ours.... I should also add that there are others, far more qualified than I, who should also be called urgently before the Committee under its normal protocols, one of which I will address later, Anthony Stansfeld – The Thames Valley Police Commissioner, again a matter we both spoke to in our exchange.

You asked what my locus was, well let me explain beyond the personal family interest I mentioned.

-- Following the RBS – GRG debate in the Chamber on 18th January 2018 the SME Alliance held a meeting facilitated by the APPG for Fair Business Banking where about 150 – 200 gathered in the main committee room and listened to many MP's speak. A very charming self-effacing lady stood up explaining how she was to be made Bankrupt by her Local Authority the following day over the non-payment of Council tax for her rental property portfolio that remained in her name, making her legally liable, despite RBS repossessing the properties some 5 years previously. Emotion overwhelmed this totally decent Nurse, the type of hard working person that you, me, and even those reprehensible men from RBS rely upon in our hour of need. A woman who could be depended on to follow her ethical and moral commitments, to save our lives irrespective of her personal feelings, views about us, our actions, or our beliefs. In that moment I recognised that I was a bigger "\$HIT" than even all of your Committee that has such powers of influence, but has been so utterly irresolute and feckless in tangible action. And don't for one moment even attempt to tell me again its complex, it isn't, its only your foolish attempts to "bend" that which is straight (forward), that makes it complex.

Worse still a Committee that has not once meaningfully engaged formally with the victims, or sort their knowledge and perspectives. Members of a House of Parliament which passed the very laws that permit a Local Authority to bankrupt a thoroughly decent nurse whom all of us in society rely and depend upon, related to an initial injustice by RBS that needlessly ruined her 5 years ago, and even now continues to cause further anguish and torment on matters completely and obviously unjust, that she has no control over, nor ability to resolve. It's not perverse, it's disgusting.

No objective judgement could find this circumstance reasonable, especially for a lady, and her like, that all in society depend on. Further over almost the same time period your Committee has achieved nothing.... How many more times do I have to repeat myself, before you realise how culpable you are. In that moment of hearing the nurse speak, I recognised that rather than empathise with her, or merely safeguard my own interests, I needed to apply my meagre abilities, such as they are, to change this outrage, to hold you to account, and prosecute this fundamental indecency in any and every way permissible, which is exactly what I have done / am now doing. And quite clearly, I'm way better at it than you could conceivably imagine. Self-evidently I have your absolute attention, that of the Bank (you told me how famous I am - so I am forced to believe you, surely you wouldn't lie like Sir Howard and Mr McEwan in commentary at the Treasury Select Committee!) and believe me, I and others have only "caressed" you and the situation thus far, as you will shortly now discover.....

As I mentioned in my letter of 20th in the Post Script: *"The next damning instalment follows shortly, as necessary, each progressively worse and more shocking then the last.... and it doesn't go well for anyone by the end!"*--- and to be clear that references only what we have to "say" ... which is utterly nothing compared to what we are "DOING" We are not the problem.... YOU ARE..... and furthermore, having skilfully placed The ENTIRETY of the Establishment, The Govt, The Treasury, The Bank of England, The Regulator, your Committee, and now you personally between a rock and a hard place. No more suggestions that I don't know exactly what I am doing, lack understanding, or competency. Further by the time you finish reading

this letter you and innumerable others will be in even less doubt, as to that fact. Alternatively, of course we could all play a game of spoof or chicken.... as you prefer.

So from now on Mrs Morgan and the remainder of the Committee and all of the others just mentioned. You will all show the victims of this affair absolute respect. You don't have to like me, but never again indulge in the sort of reprehensible antics attempted last Thursday afternoon. If your life lies in the balance, or that of someone you hold dear, its ladies like the one I noted you will depend on.... and unlike you, they won't let you down, no matter how unpromising or "hard" the "difficulty" is, nor will they delay, or procrastinate when time is critical. So regardless of your angst with me personally, remember that by all dispassionate assessment, it is you that have absolutely let her down, and thousand of others like her doing nothing to make good your failings to this point either.

Yes, I am holding your feet to the fire, (and a lot of others beyond, some far more important than you) and to be clear I am utterly unrepentant in doing so, and with very good reason, because again unlike you thus far (and all those behind you), I am demonstrating "exact integrity."

As I listened to you admonishing me I got the distinct impression that a major part of your discomfort very conceivably arose because the predicament we placed you and the Committee in, is effectively now above your pay grade due to the expectations that others may well have of you, or your perception / fear of same. I therefore now address the Prime Minister – Theresa May MP, and The Chancellor of the Exchequer – Philip Hammond MP, directly. For reasons that will become immediately apparent you will kindly ensure that both receive this letter, and the letter of the 20th without ANY DELAY WHATSOEVER despite my sending them a copy directly myself.

Prime Minister, and Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Prime Minister, and Chancellor you will doubtless be well aware by now that I am demanding that the Treasury Select Committee instruct the FCA, that Sir Howard Davies, and Mr Ross McEwan, Chairman and CEO of RBS respectively have lied and serially dissembled in both written and oral evidence / testimony on numerous occasions to the Treasury Select Committee, and therefore they can no longer be considered fit and proper authorised persons to hold any position within the Financial Services Sector. That the FCA must instigate such proceedings as to facilitate their immediate removal from RBS, and thereafter from any future lifetime involvement in Financial Services. All the reasoning is contained in the letter of 20th March, sent to the Treasury Select Committee which has already caused so much consternation. This letter is now officially including you both into the content of this letter, and the letter of the 20th March (first sent to the Chair and Members of the Treasury Select Committee), its contents, demands, placing the same obligations on you both, namely that you show "exact integrity" and safeguard Parliament, the rule of law, and democracy, and call these men out.

You will note that on Monday 2 April 2018 Neil Mitchell my fellow signatory to both the 20th March letter to the Treasury Select Committee, and now this letter was interviewed in a half hour programme by Renegade Inc entitled "The Hillsborough of British Business" broadcast on the RT global media platform. (The RT platform has no relevance to recent events as the programme was originally made 4 months ago, and only re shot recently to reflect the evolution of the RBS story). The contents of the programme sets out the "true" reality of RBS, and indeed the position of the shareholders – the majority of which are, of course, UK taxpayers. Effectively RBS's equity is **worthless**, or perhaps more accurately and of greater relevance when the liabilities are properly ascribed to the balance sheet it is also, **insolvent**. I am not even going to begin to debate the finer details of any counter proposition you or others might wish to advance because in reality it would be nothing more than attempting to dance on the head of a pin.

Of equal and greater relevance you would be horrified by the volume, scale, depth and detail of the information that has found its way to us from morally and ethically disgusted whistle-blowers from all the

logical parties, all of which implicates the Government at every conceivable twist and turn in this long and sordid affair. Indeed, we and our legal advisors are still reviewing and collating this voluminous material, while the task is ironically not aided by the continuing receipt of yet more material, which on numerous occasions now seems to cross confirm material previously received. Our Counsels confidence in the potential to therefore successfully pursue any legal angle / case whether civil or criminal in any jurisdiction is now beyond doubt, and to be demonstrably clear in territories outside of the sphere of influence of the Government should any attempt be made to prevent justice here, though quite obviously such a notion would be hugely concerning and elicit a response like no other.

In effect we are telling you the game of denial in respect of RBS is unequivocally over, and as importantly the Governments absolute involvement, knowledge and complicity in the strategy the Bank pursued over the past years is known and evidenced, making it a co-defendant and jointly liable. Further none of this addresses the enormous liability to victims either. Whether you choose to believe us is entirely a matter for you, by outcome it will make no difference to us, however I rather suspect it makes an enormous difference to you both, in respect of the political and personal ramifications. In short risking the Government and economic stability for this circumstance can never be justified, so it is long past time to act sensibly and expediently, and your very fortunate to be dealing with men who understand that, especially when in the past none of you have shown any such wisdom.

Chancellor let me address you first. If all of this is known and clear to us, as it is, and indeed has been for many months, then it certainly must have been known to you and the Treasury, which means you have been making all sorts of misleading and false commentary to Parliament and the Public in respect of commentary about RBS, the potential for share sales, and its related impact on your budget forecasts etc.. Alternatively, you can claim innocence, and look incompetent as a consequence, but certain material now in our possession would make any attempt at pursuing that option very detrimental to your credibility and position and deny any perception of the required "exact integrity" necessary to the maintenance of your position.

Prime Minister your position is subtly different, but essentially the same as that of your Chancellor. Mr Anthony Stansfeld, The Thames Valley Police Commissioner wrote to you many months ago setting out in some considerable detail the Fraudulent cover up and denial of wrong doing by the Lloyds Bank Chairman, CEO and Board in respect of investigations his Police Force had pursued and successfully prosecuted. He also informed you how this malfeasance extended far beyond this confined circumstance. He requested that you actively pursue the matter to a resolution. He knows, as do we that you passed on his letter to others. However, importantly in the context of this letter, you failed to follow up, as was entirely necessary given the gravity of the matters raised, nor did you ensure that the issues Mr Stansfeld's letter highlighted were addressed effectively, an absolute necessity given their enormity and seriousness in respect of overt criminality. In effect the appearance will be that you stalled it deliberately, irrespective of whether you did or not. I will not be so rude as to point out the obvious issues and challenges this now presents for you personally and politically, much less the required execution of "exact integrity." The continuing lack of action means that innocents have needlessly suffered while you have taken no adequate steps to ensure it was prevented and stopped, making you liable to obvious accusations of an attempted cover up at a minimum, and active complicity at worst in the known maintenance of corruption, neither of which are tolerable in the circumstance, and especially by our Prime Minister. (I should make it absolutely clear that I have hard irrefutable evidence that Mr Stansfeld has no knowledge of this commentary I make to you now, so none of this can revert to him. While of course you need to remember at all times this letter is an open letter).

Clearly all of this has grave implications for the Government on many levels, as does this very letter itself, for you both. As I set out in my letter of the 20th particularly in sections 16 & 17 we are absolutely aware of the wider ramifications that the actions we demand, have the potential to create. We also set out with total clarity the necessity of action, and that the arrival at this point was as a direct consequence of decisions your Government both took, and of equal importance, overtly chose not to take, but should have taken. We are simply responding to unacceptable events and circumstances you created.

There are two alternative outcomes now. One where the Government, The Bank of England, The Treasury Select Committee, or The Financial Conduct Authority exclusively, or any preferred combination that best suits your political purposes, and chosen story line, are seen to take unequivocal affirmative action to resolve this issue. Or alternatively, your continued failure to do so. -- To be overtly clear, our purposes will be equally well served by the letter itself the moment it is sent to you, irrespective of how you elect to respond to it, or not. Broadly speaking its immaterial to us, though from a "shock and awe" perspective our interests are served by publishing and be damned, while any attempt at denial will only provide us with further evidence of your own Governments deceitful antics in respect of this affair and more free evidence/ammunition to fire back at you.

If you consider this letter's strategic positioning, significance and content, you will recognise the above sentence commencing. "-- To be overtly clear, our purposes will be equally well served by the letter itself the moment it is sent to you, irrespective of how you elect to respond to it, or not." -- as a matter of fact, however uncomfortable that realisation may be, we win either way, and will be seen to have acted as honestly and responsibly as humanly possible, in a very difficult set of circumstances that only ever arose out of the Governments repeated failings, whilst still conducting ourselves consistent with our own "exact integrity."

What I am sure we can all agree on is that it is better for the Country and its citizens, and importantly the financial stability all rely on, if their Government is perceived to be in control, purposefully determining / driving events, rather than the inverse, out of control and responding to events in a vacuous crisis driven manner. This letter is an "open letter" therefore you will readily appreciate given the paragraphs above what the perception will be, and the trauma / frenzy that will ensue as a consequence.

To be clear at the time the letter is sent to you, it will also be sent to our distribution agents outside of your jurisdiction, with the clearest instructions to disseminate it as widely as possible

There are other "events" in train that are now out of our hands that will chart their own course, that you cannot begin to conceive of, that have absolutely nothing to do with anything we have mentioned in this letter, or indeed Neil Mitchell mentioned in the aforementioned TV piece entitled "The Hillsborough of British Business." Therefore, in our genuine opinion it makes immeasurable sense for the Government to decide to be pro-active, because if not when all becomes clear, as it will, no one will ever comprehend why you Prime Minister, and you Chancellor elected not to act responsibly and demonstrate "exact integrity." I will set out our precise expectations in detail at the end of the letter so there can be no doubt, equivocation, or misunderstanding to the demonstrable certainty of all.

This is your chance to make a virtue out of a necessity, one chance, one time, no negotiation. Take it, leave it, trust us, don't trust us, as stated beyond being reasonable, which this is, we don't care.

RBS – REDRESS Scheme – A scheme of;- Deceit, Denial and Dismissal.

Chair of the Treasury Select Committee I corrected you about your published commentary pertaining to the "real" amount of money available in the RBS redress scheme that isn't.....

Contrary to your Website statement;

The facts are that the real amount available is circa £180m rather than the £280m you stated because you had forgotten to deduct the £100m provision RBS was charging back to the total fund to conduct the review from the total compensation fund. – Expressed another way it inflated the fund from its true extent of £300m to £400m to make it sound bigger while charging the £100m to run the review, to the fund itself.

- Embarrassing when the tables are turned on you and self-evidently you don't know your facts.... isn't it? Below is the link to your incorrect press release (BTW- another Nicky Morgan says, rather than the TSC says...)
- <https://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/treasury-committee/news-parliament-2017/rbs-global-restructuring-grg-evidence-17-19/>
- We should not forget that of the £115m the bank repaid in direct fees – it is estimated that circa £45 - 50m the Bank repaid itself because the entities still owed outstanding amounts from their bankruptcy! (So it didn't cost £115m in reality, it cost RBS £65 - 70m)
- So that wonderful redress scheme headline sounding all bountiful and compassionate has shrunk from £400m to barely £250m! - Feeling deceived by chance?
- A scheme hardly anyone qualifies for, and even if they did, it would equal just over £11K per claim of the 16,000+ victims. (£185m / 16,000 + victims = £11.3k)
- I told you we know of 10 legitimate prospective claims with consequential damages each one is in excess of £100m that's over £1bn of claims for 10 cases.... not forgetting the other 15,990 entities..... Suppose the average claim was £2m then the sum would be £32bn..... and the average claim is NOT £2m we estimate its probably closer to £5.0m which suggests a figure of £80bn +
- However there is another pool of victims that were excluded from the S166 report and related scheme by RBS and the FCA.... There are 8000 SRM claimants completely ignored by this scheme and never mentioned. Their average claim size seems to be very similar or an average of circa £5m so that would add another £40bn.
- Then there are the EFG claims again excluded for no credible discernible reason. This pool of victims were smaller companies (sole traders, shop owners and the like) The average claim here appears to be circa £150k so that equals £1.2bn
- **ALL TOLD that's approx £80bn GRG + £40bn SRM + £1.2bn EFG = £121.2bn Total !!!**
 - Suppose we are wrong by 50% then its still more than £60bn+..... and we aren't wrong by 50%!
 - Did we mention RBS did this overseas? Yes they did....Lots and lots of it..
 - The numbers sound ridiculously big but remember RBS was the biggest bank in the world with a balance sheet north of £2200bn so losses of 120bn represented only a 5% hit to total assets.

It should more factually be branded as the RBS – FCA sanctioned... **Deceit, Denial and Dismissal Scheme..... because by function that is exactly what it does... look at the numbers above** – follow the money as I constantly shout at everyone, the money doesn't lie....

We all lost collectively Many, many billions... yet somehow RBS have hood winked you into thinking it can fairly compensate victims with less than £250m net including consequential losses? –

- Who is kidding who...?
- How detached from reality are you and your Committee....? I know the Govt practises Voodoo economics (QE) on occasion, but this is beyond black magic.... this is fantasy land!
- The truly stunning thing is that all of you have been so completely bamboozled and taken in by RBS and the FCA....
 - and if your not deceived..... Why have you not called this out already....?
 - Instead of still sanctioning it... Your position is completely beyond belief!
- I can honestly tell you that in years to come Psychologists will conduct a case study on deception utilising your Committee as an illustration of just how gullible and naive intelligent people can be made to be. –

- Of course you will all bristle incandescent with rage at these outrageous and unfair comments....
 - But what have you DONE.....?
 - What material difference have you made.....?
- Nothing..... beyond sending RBS a *“Dear Ross, note - Utterly unprofessional in any circumstances – much less these ones. Do let us know how it’s going, keep us updated on how many former RBS customers you have managed to screw again with your redress scheme this quarter, Best wishes, Nicky.”*
 - This is truly deckchairs on the Titanic stuff while the band (named TSC by coincidence!) played on to soothe the poor victims frayed nerves, as the icy water rose up to drown them.
 - Can’t you hear the drowning victims shrieks of despair...? I can!
- This is the Banking equivalent of Paedophiles running social services where the regulator (FCA) has previous form for child exploitation and pimping, (and if he is not a former Paedophile he is looking forward to a future high paid management job with them. – The revolving door). The Treasury Select Committee turn up and naively interview all the protagonists, questioning them about how all the formerly rich now very poor children received their bruises (bankruptcies), probably fell in the playground, couldn’t possibly be a “rojjer” by that nice smartly dressed paedophile who works for the Bank! – Never mind children you go unaccompanied, in secret, with the nice bank man down to the deep dark “compensation” woods, and if you were very, very “good” and promise never to tell anyone about all the “rojjer” he did to you previously, and promise to sign another NDA, he might give you a couple of “sweeties” (he decides the amount) to make things better! More likely he’ll tell you to bugger off, *“sue me if you can afford to,” which you can’t... “Cause you don’t deserve any of my sweeties, because I was “legally” justified in “rojjer” you in the first place, and don’t whinge or complain because I’ve got FCA sanction for all this, and a Retired old High Court Judge (who if his judgement was viable, should have known better than to touch this lot with a barge pole) to validate my activities. Oh and the Treasury Select Committee also know what I am up to, and obviously they approve too, because they tell me to get on with it faster....!. and to send them updates on progress regularly! So you horrible pesky troublesome whining customers... You can SOD OFF because we don’t give a \$hit.---- We are the BANK, we can do what we like, and guess what, WE DO!”*
- Competence..... Get real, we haven’t seen any from you and your Committee.... yet.
- In short it’s a fiasco of a scheme put in place by the same corrupt individuals and institution who perpetrated the crime in the first place, facilitated by a regulator that doesn’t regulate, because it’s entirely supplicant and staffed by ex bankers and future bankers. Not to mention a past Chairman who was head of the firm that audited HBOS into oblivion along with the CO-OP Bank, and the new chairman who you sanctioned, is a past admitted tax dodger!

Good enough... ,maybe for you, but not for us... No wonder your struggling with “exact integrity.”

The FCA is a Rogue Regulator and my challenge to you **now is to prove its not...** And you cant, so all of you had better address that issue too, Prime Minister and Chancellor as I am speaking directly to you as the Government in making this comment. – Remember this is a Public Letter, and don’t for a moment think you could successfully rubbish us... We will bury you under an avalanche of evidence, at the time of our choosing, the majority of which has been supplied from within!

- Genuinely we are not sure which is more endemically corrupt RBS or the FCA.
 - Can you imagine a rapist acting as the jury in the very trial he was accused of rape in, and then the rapist deciding whether or not he owed the victim compensation....? While the Judge (FCA) openly and proudly admitted to administering and sanctioning such an arrangement with the rapist...claiming of course that he had no choice because rape is an

“unregulated activity.” -- Honestly you are all completely MAD – not incompetent – MAD and BAD.

- What on earth do you think you and your Committee are doing seeking updates on such an utterly corrupt unethical scheme?
- Worse still telling RBS to get on with it faster, and by seeking these updates lending your credibility to that scheme.- Again are you all MAD.....? No your BAD.
- But don't worry..... Its all OK and legitimate because an Ex High Court Judge is overseeing it. – So it must be OK. – 2 points please;
 - He is overseeing RBS incredibly narrow and totally corrupt terms of reference, and let's face it RBS were totally corrupt, but no one said they were stupid... So whilst it was never “just” it was often just marginally legal enough especially after a bit of unknown signature forgery, or the opening of shadow bank account that the customer never knew about, that went in the red and triggered a default, or a dodgy valuation by a tame valuer The variety and extensiveness of all these shenanigans was nothing if not ceaselessly creative, and all done to purposefully create a “legal” fig leaf by which the Bank could then validate every other action. – But to be clear legal is still totally immoral, unjust, and perverted. – Remember the Nurse?
 - Which is why any compensation scheme worthy of the name must operate on the basis of “reasonableness” not legality and revert back to a time when businesses were healthy and then work forward from that point so that the totality of everything the Bank did is considered, not just the narrow actions immediately surrounding the point of demise/ bankruptcy.
- You suggested I and others should trust you, on what basis? I have the clearest answer that any rational sane thinking individual would give. It would be a straight NO, not this side of hell freezing over!
- How could you expect to be taken seriously and accorded respect, much less trusted if the roles were reversed? You wouldn't trust me on that basis would you? (probably don't anyway!)

One last thing on this..... Prime Minister, Chancellor, Chair of the Treasury Select Committee and fellow Members..... I'm not a nutter, nor is this a rant, its intentionally written for an audience other than you... but Stop and think about what I have just said and done.

I have just crushed all of your respective competency and credibility to dust. I have probably defamed you all multiple times.... and yet I can tell you with no side whatsoever, that I am as calm as the proverbial cucumber, and there is a reason.... What I have written is the fundamental TRUTH so I have absolutely nothing to fear.... which by common logic – the inverse – means you have EVERYTHING to fear, in terms of your reputations and base competency. --- Unbelievable. ---

The S166 Promontory Report into RBS – GRG.

I have innumerable points to make on this and will write again another time.... (Something for you to look forward to!)

The key message is that you cannot trust ANY of the numerical and fact based statistical outcomes of the S166 Promontory Report.

- The S166 Promontory report was intentionally compromised through design by RBS and the FCA from inception.
- Promontory were substantially not involved in this. Everything they were instructed to do was defined to them as set out in the Appendix: I & V. To the extent they are complicit, it is limited to the

fact that they must have known they were being used and manipulated, but one imagines that a large pot of “treasure” and the maintenance of their future revenue streams potentially constrained the application of ethics and morality.

Importantly, you can however continue to trust all the “soft findings” pertaining to culture, policy, philosophy etc. These elements were not related discreetly to the cases as the “hard findings” were. The only caveat to this statement is one of degree, and emphasis, related to the soft findings.

- The contention being that the sampling and other methods deployed were developed to find the “least worst cases” despite the end point of the review being to prove or disprove the worst case allegations alleged in the Tomlinson and Large reports respectively.
 - Clearly since the intentional method “hobbled” the study from achieving the end points by intentional design bias, to self-select the “least worst cases” and absolutely avoid the selection of the “worst cases” especially by volume / frequency the “soft findings” may in fact be worse in reality, and certainly so by frequency if not degree, though likely that as well.

Your Committee finally secured the “formal” publication after we ensured that there were so many unofficial copies flying around that it became a credibility issue for you.... We were out in front leading again....

Everyone has read the report inside out, and back to front, including all of you presumably? but metaphorically speaking not one of you, or your Secretariat thought to check the veracity of the paper it was printed on, you just blindly accepted it was real paper. As ever you took it at face value. Its official, conducted by solid people with reputations. Promontory and Mazars.

So lets consider that first....

- Promontory fined \$15m by US authorities for colluding with an institution it was writing a report on and actively watering down findings for the institutions benefit in a report for US authorities. Opps.. but never mind!
- Mazars 8th largest accountancy and audit firm with an Insolvency practise that receives a significant portion of its work, like all others, from the Banks... No conflict there then....!

No need to worry however because the S166 report was commissioned by the FCA that pillar of independence, trustworthiness...and unimpeachable ethical standards, NOT.

- The FCA negotiated every aspect of the design of the review that now forms the S166 report with RBS... before it was even announced!
- Again... RBS and the FCA jointly agreed every aspect of the design of the review..... For instance....
 - RBS and the FCA decided on the artificial dates of 2008 – 2013... why?
 - RBS – GRG had been abusing and refining their modus operandi since the mid 1990's some 15 years previously.
 - The reason they selected 2008 as the start date was simple... The financial crash and associated financial dislocation provided perfect cover to legitimise the illegitimate practises they used. The market dislocation hid and explained every sin.
 - An earlier start date than 2008 would have provided no such cover from the financial crash.....
 - Worse still because the outcomes in the earlier period were the same as post 2008 and earlier date would affirmatively have proved that the actions / outcomes had in very little or nothing to do with the financial crash environment – they were absolutely and exclusively as result of RBS's manner of operating... Ouch!

- The FCA and RBS agreed what the definition of an SME was. It started as £1m - £20m
 - Later (as stated: Appendix I Pt. 2 - Pg. 325 - "Amendment to the definition of SME customer") they reduced the £1m to £250k because they didn't have enough samples in some subsections of the review.... (Incidentally this totally innocuous admission confirmed my initial concerns that something was very wrong with the fundamental design of the study).
 - Again this artificially constrained the number of potential claimants / victims to the RBS figure of 5,900 where in truth its 16,000+ To be accurate you then have to include the SRM customers another 8,000 making a total of 24,000
 - Then you can't forget the EFG customers circa another 8,000....
 - Yet RBS and the FCA only included 5,900 in their review and redress scheme beyond....
- Importantly RBS and the FCA designed exactly what the study would review,
 - How it would do it,
 - The way it was structured, and
 - The statistical methods, to be used
 - They even agreed the wording methodology etc just so that they could ensure what the report found could also declare them innocent when it didn't, because the finding wasn't widespread and systematic....
 - (This pertains to my "Murder analogy" in the 20th March letter section 10 mid way down page 13, read the two para's starting..... Ms McKinnell MP in extending the same line.....")
 - The precise illustration of this was given by Mr McEwan in answer to Ms Ali MP – Testimony 30 January 2018 (Q: 108) McEwan answered thus: *"I disagreed, because we felt that what it was interpreting against the actual requirements was wrong. That is the disagreement."* In (Q: 110) Mr McEwan further emphasised and added confirmation of my proposition: *"The interpretation of "systematic" was not what was put into the requirements for the skilled person. That is the piece that we disagree with."*
- To be clear "hobbling" the report suited both parties "needed" outcomes perfectly, so there was synchronicity of purpose from inception:
 - RBS needed to be found innocent from a fiscal liability perspective and
 - The FCA from a reputational failure to regulate perspective.
- Therefore, there was total and complete collusion to ensure their mutual requirements were met. As noted they did this through the design of the S166 review.

Permit me to use the analogy of a house. Your Committee and Secretariat have spent hours studying the S166 Report. You know every detail about the room sizes, the plumbing, the paint colours, the soft furnishings, but never once did you look at the floor, and importantly in this context the detail method of the construction of the otherwise unseen, uncared about, but totally pivotal foundations upon which everything you do know about, and do understand, was built on!

Sad to say the Foundations are completely unfit for purpose, and unstable, which means of course that so is everything that is constructed from the report in terms of hard findings. And just so we don't have an Argument about this....This is the opinion of the most knowledgeable academics in the country who through the Royal Statistical Society set most of the standards worldwide. In Professor Hutton's own words - Chair of

the RSS expert panel / committee on Stats & Law. (I have her full permission and knowledge to use this commentary in any Public Manner as I do that of her colleague's commentary Professor Ansell....).

Prof Hutton the text I would use is as originally sent by you.... yes, you have my permission

I have given some preliminary consideration to the issues you raise and do believe the concerns you noted have legitimacy. The design and analysis does not appear to be appropriate or as good as I would expect for a major value case. Further, the lack of information available in the public realm detailing the exact methodology used in the design and analysis, is also cause for concern. Normal full disclosure would demand study design details and method of analysis be published with the results. In my main area of application, medical statistics, there are detailed guidelines on transparency, precisely to allay many of the concerns you note. For example, simply excluding units with inadequate data is not recommended. It is both disappointing and of potential concern that the standard of reporting is less than would be expected to meet academic standards of openness.

I suggest that you respectfully ask that the MPs of the Treasury Select Committee request that the FCA / Promontory provide full information on the design of the study, with the reason for the choice of the design and the alternative designs considered, the sampling criteria used to implement the chosen design, a full and precise description of the statistical analysis. This would allow an assessment of the suitability of the design and analysis relative to the original brief set out by the FCA. The original brief might not have been entirely appropriate. Only when this full background information is available will I or others be able to confirm your initial concerns which as noted do seem to have merit.

For the avoidance of doubt we do not need any of the confidential data that goes into the study, only all the details of the study design and methodology. Of course, any reasoning or other related determinations that influenced why the study was designed as it was, would be useful.

Kind Regards

Jane Hutton

Professor J L Hutton
Department of Statistics, The University of Warwick
Coventry, CV4 7AL

=====

Prof Ansell the text I would use is as originally sent by you.... [I am happy that you use the material that I sent.](#)

The eloquent view of Professors Battistic and Hutton explain the views that Statisticians would have about the analysis eloquently. I fully agree with the points they make about the concern. My additional comment refers to specific element of removing data form the analysis

One particular has to be careful in exclusions of data. From my experience of credit scoring SMEs. missing information is very common. In the specific context of the analysis missing values not at random is a concern here. It is well known that missing data is a sign in credit scoring of lower scores. It is quite common to use Weights of Evidence in studies of credit risk and for lowest value to be assigned to missing values. Implying that those removed may be more likely to be extreme values, so again it would be wise to know exactly why the data was excluded.

Yours faithfully

Jake Ansell

Professor of Risk Management, BSc, MSc, PhD, CStat

=====

Permit me to interpret these very measured words that Academics always use.... When Professor Hutton says; *"The design and analysis does not appear to be appropriate or as good as I would expect for a major value case."* – this is a polite academics way of saying the study is not fit for purpose – my original contention proved.... she goes on.... *"the lack of information available in the public realm detailing the exact methodology used in the design and analysis, is also cause for concern."* – this is a polite way of saying you didn't publish the methodology clearly because it doesn't with stand scrutiny. While finally she says; *"This would allow an assessment of the suitability of the design and analysis relative to the original brief set out by the FCA. The original brief might not have been entirely appropriate."* This is effectively indicating the S166 review is rather unlikely to have been fit for purpose, again my original contention confirmed.

While Professor Ansell a published SME Credit scoring expert no less! And RSS panel member states *".....and for lowest value to be assigned to missing values. Implying that those removed may be more likely to be extreme values,"* - which interpreted means that the 20 cases or 11% of the 178 that were removed from the study due to "poor data" were highly likely to have been, as found in numerous other academic studies, *"It is well known that missing data is a sign in credit scoring of lower scores"* - i.e. the worst cases or just the ones you would want to replace if you were RBS / FCA and how would you achieve that without Promontory knowing, by finding that the data files were to poor..... what a pity.

Two things to note for the sceptics amongst you. Reverting back to Professor Hutton she states referencing amongst other things the missing data.... *"For example, simply excluding units with inadequate data is not recommended. It is both disappointing and of potential concern that the standard of reporting is less than would be expected to meet academic standards of openness."*

1. If the replaced data was innocently and genuinely due to poor data, normal minimum academic standards would require you to overtly publish absolutely every scrap of information on the dropped data precisely to prove that very contention. i.e. there was nothing to worry about.
2. The fact that they haven't published ANY information tells you everything you need to know about the dropped cases! (As confirmed in numerous other academic studies!
3. We now know that in Professor Hutton's opinion.... None of the reporting connected with the S166 Report meets minimum Academic standards!

But finally, and most importantly..... The total failure to set out clearly “how” the study design works in detail, means you can’t know at all, on what basis, or by what method, your judging the results.... Results are always results of something.... but what....? If you don’t know the “what” for sure, and in detail.... and your Committee doesn’t, along I might add with everyone else, then you can’t know what the results are, or what they really mean / show... In effect the results are just “smoke and mirrors.” A beautifully crafted deceit intended to fulfil RBS and the FCA’s needs.

So why did it take me to point all of this out ? Where you would all have happily been deceived and conned. Congratulations FCA and RBS you came so close to pulling it off.... but sadly for you, not quite good enough, or close enough!!!

As for you Chair and your Committee, yet another illustration of lack of attention to the detail, and a total failure to look under the bonnet and check the car actually had an engine. -- Hopeless

And you want me to trust you, (?) leave the complex, tricky stuff to you....? No, you have got the roles muddled. You can continue to flounce about looking busy and important achieving nothing, while we will continue to do the analysis, fact finding, that devastates and humiliates you....and takes the fight to RBS and very shortly the FCA.... UNEQUIVOCALLY by evidence the only people who are competent here.... is us!

Worse still you have every resource and influence available to you, while we have none. You could have made one call and had the RSS on side checking this as I did, yet it never even occurred to you to do so....

- Never once did you think that there might be a problem.... because of course you weren’t looking for it.
- You just blindly continued to trust the FCA and RBS both of which are IREFUTABLY totally corrupt by obvious evidence.
 - I can’t wait to watch each of them blame the other, suggesting it was all the others doing. - Hilarious.
- One more thing of pertinence that I have discussed with the academics at considerable length.....
 - This mess could NEVER have been the result of unfortunate serendipity....
 - This much deceit took a great deal of purposeful effort and execution, and the only two institutions in the room and involved.... were RBS and the FCA.
- So do not tell me that ENEDMIC CORRUPTION is not RIFE THROUGOUT BOTH INSTITUSTIONS the evidence for it sat in front of you, all smug and deceitful on your nice green chairs.

So Chairman and Committee behave and act, because if you haven’t yet realised you have no choice. BAN ALL of them regardless of whether or not its convenient... tricky.... difficult... expedient etc.... and bare in mind that when this letter hits... and is widely released to the public, and the press, all of you are going to receive the most almighty, humiliating, and well deserved kicking, and I greatly doubt any of you will survive it either.... My advice to you is to do what RBS laughably did to the FCA over the release of the S166 report – Strike first,.... and do exactly what we demand, show belatedly - “Exact Integrity”!

Anthony Stansfeld – The Thames Valley Police Commissioner.

I have already made extensive commentary in respect of Mr Stansfeld’s timely appearance before the Treasury Select Committee and indicated the reasons.

When we had our brief exchange of views last Thursday you spent some time talking down to me on a subject I understand full well. As I sat listening to you I quietly reflected on the fact that given Mr Stansfeld is indeed the Thames Valley Police Commissioner and has been for more than six years, re-elected for a second

term, he is in a far better position than you could ever be to know the general rules pertaining to giving evidence relative to any pending prosecutions, both as to what the boundaries were / are relative to anything that he might wish to say, or more pertinently would be constrained from saying. In short your commentary was rather obviously not very well thought through, next time think first, speak second.

I will conclude that YES Mr Stansfeld wants a platform and you both should and indeed must afford it to him at the earliest opportunity as he has matters of immense Public interest to say, and you and your committee should never find yourselves in the position of actively frustrating that ,as you have self-evidently already done. Not least in your acknowledgement that you had received a letter from him, and yet nearly two months later by your own admission you have done nothing. I wonder what your commentary to all the people who have been maltreated by the banks in question and been improperly and unjustly evicted from their homes will think, while you have done less than nothing. -- Shameful. –

FOS – Financial Ombudsman Service.

The Channel 4 Dispatches programme raised important issues of concern and it is good to see that the Treasury Select Committee was swift in following up on the points highlighted, writing to the FOS CEO Ms Wayman. However in reality Ms Wayman was only ever going to write back and offer calm reassurance that nothing much was wrong, which is exactly what she did. So by objective analysis this effort achieved nothing material, which is the core problem with so many of the TSC actions. A Paucity of outcome, relative to power to influence.... sound familiar?

In contrast the substantive question is this....

The Treasury Select Committee has known of major concerns within the FOS for many months past, related to low staff moral, and a common perception that the Executive Management of the FOS was / is failing. Indeed Mr Mann interviewed Md Wayman only recently. Yet the Committee has done nothing material. Moreover, it seems as if we live in a land where we wait for failure, and then do precious little to resolve it, rather than actively pursue policies and expectations of excellence that ensures failure is never reached.

Why did the TSC at its last session with the FOS not demand certain minimum standards be attained way above the floor level of failure and demand credible action plans be submitted and implemented to it on a timely basis that ensured such an outcome was attained within acceptable defined time limits?

Or the removal and replacement of the incumbent management by others able to achieve the necessary renewal and invigoration? Are you in the oversight business to accept mediocrity and lack of action?

You will argue this is not your role, rather that of the Board of the FOS, whereupon I would retort that not only is Ms Wayman failing, but self evidently the Board has too.... in failing to support Ms Wayman and manage her... and needs urgent renewal and rejuvenation, and that being the case it was absolutely your remit and obligation to make that call not in a reactive manner but a proactive one.

I observed that Ms Wayman's principle deflection tool was the appointment of an independent review to report to the Board. For goodness sake this is just admission of complete abdication of management responsibility, by both the Board and Ms Wayman.

If you don't know in the greatest detail what is wrong with the organisation you run, or the organisation your paid to have oversight of then you shouldn't be running it.... or overseeing it..... What earthly function, other than turning up, and nodding sagely, do they think they get paid for? Waiting for the sky to fall in so that they can call for independent review?

The entire circumstance is once again a joke, accept no one is laughing,..... and as such it is inconceivable amid this much malaise and management chaos that the FOS could even consider extending its remit and

role as the FCA and FOS planned.... and certainly not until the organisation is renewed and reformed, made fit for purpose functionally from the bottom up and most especially the top down.

Therefore on behalf of the GREAT BRITISH public you know what I am going to TELL YOU TO DO irrespective of whether you consider it to be my place.... and don't threaten to throw your toys out of the pram and shut this enquiry down because you can't, its one of your mandated obligations! – You need to immediately seek the removal and renewal of the FOS senior management and thereafter the entirety of the Board.

We are going to need a name for this action as there is going to be a lot of it around the City too, so from now on it will be known as the implementation of "R&R" – "Removal and Renewal" leading to of course permanent "Rest and Recuperation" for the departed and a lot of "Reform and Revitalisation" for those that remain.

As I have indicated in other contexts two clear things drive up standards.

- Personal culpability of action
- Total transparency of activity.

It is shocking that when we have known these simple "Best Practise" techniques for so long that they aren't integrated at every level and form an essential fundamental tenet of all organisations operational processes. (Public and Private) As soon as these two simple measures are widely implemented every individual will become fully vested in their own need to uphold basis ethics and standards of conduct with an obvious transformative homogenous outcome and benefit at a micro and macro levels.

Specific to the FOS it is also shocking and unsustainable that the complainant does not see the defendants submission and arguments, while conversely the defendant sees the complainants submission including the evolution of any subsequent arguments presented.

- Clearly the complaining consumer is at a considerable disadvantage before he starts.
- This must be changed and full transparency at every stage applied.
- It should be made mandatory that lay people review every decision before it is handed down with a power of veto.
 - This is a vital step to ensuring that we move society towards "justice" not legality. Justice has a moral and ethical dimension beyond what is legally permissible as a consequence of perversion of the law as seems to apply everywhere. Concisely expressed as "although its not fair (reasonable) but what we can get away with because its legal.
 - Ordinary people – consumers – operate their lives quite rightly on the basis of justice and morality not the outer edges of sharp practise that hides just inside a marginal interpretation of what can be stretched to be considered legally acceptable.... Catch my drift?
- Further it is inconceivable that there is no right of independent appeal outside of the FOS itself.

We know what Best Practise looks like in 2018, why is the Treasury Select Committee not ensuring that it is universally applied across all the organisations that it has responsibility for reviewing. It is deeply troubling that a programme like "Dispatches" can so easily uncover these deficiencies. Perhaps we need to send them in everywhere to assist the see no evil, hear no evil culture that pervades Government and many other parts of Society too.

In summary you must absolutely insist that the FOS is overtly managed up to "Best Practise" in the shortest time conceivable. Until then and the full implementation of personal culpability, full open transparency of information between the parties, and independent oversight and review with powers of veto over decisions, then the expansion of the FOS's responsibilities cannot be extended to include the handling of significantly higher value cases than now. The FOS just isn't fit nor capable.

Schedule of Requirements.

It must be abundantly clear to all by now that our real expectations extend far beyond just the named executives from RBS and the CEO and Former Chairman of the FCA. Indeed, we always wanted to achieve far more because relative to the scale of the malaise across the entire Banking sector and the wider Financial Services sector and related tertiary professions that surround and support them we knew the removal of these four men was / is substantially immaterial in the totally necessary broader context of "R&R" of the City and the Financial culture our Economy and Country must rely on. We also knew that it was most improbable that you would fulfil our expectations at the first attempt, and in not doing so we also knew you would generously empower us further now... Thank you. (Please see my original comments in points 16 & 17 in the letter dated 20th March).

I have already indicated that you can present the required events in any manner of your choosing, using whatever your preferred levers. My suggestion is that given the breadth and scale of the changes required to be implemented, this "event" should be presented as a comprehensive cultural renewal from top to bottom, hence the scale and sweeping renewal at a single stroke. It could never be done credibly by separate piece meal events because each time the powers of the entrenched system would deny and frustrate it, but if you take them all out in a single event, as extreme as this might appear, actually it is not, its safer because you will control it. The Public and media perception of strength will also play into your hands being seen as strong and decisive. It will sit extremely well with the Public mood as finally absolute tangible and credible renewal and action will be obvious, rather than the endless re-organisation of the same faces resulting in no material change, it will represent politically strong decisive assured Government people crave to see by a self-confident administration that actually leads and to borrow Labours appropriate tag line...."For the many not the (powerful) few. If you hold this pivotal thought in your minds as you consider the detail it will then make perfect sense, as a credible and decisive package of proposals, that could only ever have been driven by Government will and determination, so comprehensive are they. Your Government, your will....

Alternately you can attempt to frustrate us and suffer the consequences. I have one further comment to make in that regard. As you must realise every time you seek to frustrate us the scale of the changes increases in exact correlation with the ease of achieving them, because you are now effectively supplying the means! When you consider the position calmly and apply dispassionate rational detached analysis to the circumstances you will see that it is now a simple choice effect the changes, or create a huge and troublesome impact for yourselves. -The former is beneficial to all, the later harmful to all, the sole responsible choice is therefore made.

I will also set out how to pay for all of this with relatively less impact on the Tax payer.

RBS –

- **Sir Howard Davies** Chairman of RBS, banned for life from Financial Services by the FCA. Disbarred from being Director of any Public Company.
- **Mr Ross McEwan** CEO of RBS, banned for life from Financial Services by the FCA. Disbarred from being Director of any Public Company.
- Within one full year the entire RBS Board renewed starting with the Senior Non-Executives replaced at the upcoming AGM.

Former RBS employees:

- **Fred Goodwin** Former CEO - knew about GRG
- **Sir Tom McKillop** Former Chairman - knew about GRG
- **Sir George Mathewson** Former Chairman - knew about GRG

- **Sir Philip Hampton** Former Chairman - knew about GRG
- **Stephen Hester** Former CEO - knew about GRG
- **Dereck Sach** Former Head of GRG - operated GRG
- **Aubrey Adams** Former Head of West Register - operated GRG
- This list is not necessarily exhaustive, further investigations may very likely reveal others who must be similarly sanctioned.

All of the above named former RBS executives will be banned from any role or participation in Financial Services for life and disbarred from being Directors of any Public Company.

All current and former (back to 2000) Non- Executive Directors of RBS whose role and purpose was to oversee and review managements actions will be similarly banned from any role or participation in Financial Services for life and disbarred from being Directors of any Public Company.

All RBS managers and above in GRG or formerly in GRG related entities will be interviewed under caution and told to speak up and make full admissions in order to have any chance of retaining their registration status. Dependent on who and what is found our expectation is that a good number would be banned for life from Financial Services for acting without “integrity” while for lesser offences periodic bans or other meaningful and severe sanctions as deemed appropriate by a revitalised and renewed FCA.

Santander –

- Former RBS Executive **Mr Nathan Bostock** removed immediately and banned for life from Financial Services for his former role at RBS - responsibility for GRG - Disbarred from being Director of any Public Company.
- Former RBS Executive **Mr Chris Sullivan** removed immediately and banned for life from Financial Services for his former role at RBS - responsibility for GRG - Disbarred from being Director of any Public Company.
- Chairwoman **Shriti Vadera** removed immediately from Chair role for a lack of judgement in respect of Bostock & Sullivan – Not permitted to hold any future senior role in Financial Services. Disbarred from being Director of any Public Company.
- All Non-Executive Directors given severe warnings and Board of parent Company told to fully renew Board within 2 years. Disbarred from being Director of any Public Company.
-

Barclays –

- CEO **MR Jes Staley** – removed immediately and banned for life from Financial Services pertaining to acknowledged FCA infringements related to whistleblowing. Disbarred from being Director of any Public Company.
- Chairman – **Mr John McFarlane** – removed immediately for unsustainably poor judgement in respect of CEO Jes Staley, banned for life from Financial Services. Disbarred from being Director of any Public Company.
- The Senior Non-Executive Director removed immediately. Not permitted to hold any future senior role in Financial Services. Disbarred from being Director of any Public Company.
- Entire Board to be renewed within 2 years no existing Board Members permitted to hold any future senior role in Financial Services. Disbarred from being Director of any Public Company.

Lloyds –

- **CEO Mr Horta-Osorio** removed immediately banned for life from Financial Services. Disbarred from being Director of any Public Company.
- **Lord Blackwell** removed immediately banned for life from Financial Services. Disbarred from being Director of any Public Company.
- Within one full year the entire Board of Lloyds renewed starting with the Senior Non-Executive replaced at the upcoming AGM.
- All current and former (back to 2008) Non- Executive Directors of Lloyds whose role and purpose was to oversee and review managements actions will be similarly banned from any role or participation in Financial Services for life and disbarred from being Directors of any Public Company.
- Given the activities of Lloyds it may well be necessary for many other Senior executives to relinquish their posts and be banned from Financial Services either from senior roles or permanently as appropriate on further investigation and similarly potentially disbarred from being Director of any Public Company.

Comparable action will need to be taken with **HSBC, Clydsdale, Allied Dunbar** and **any other Bank** that engaged in these reprehensible unethical activities. My knowledge of those directly culpable in these institutions is not solid enough to directly name the names here, but other Campaigners will properly and reasonably fill the voids that I lack discreet knowledge of. These institutions

Regulator The FCA –

- Former Chairman **Mr John Griffith-Jones** banned for life from Financial Services for deceiving Parliament and the Public. Disbarred from being Director of any Public Company or holding any Govt or related posts.
- Current CEO **Mr Andrew Bailey** banned for life from Financial Services for deceiving Parliament and the Public. Disbarred from being Director of any Public Company or holding any Govt or related posts.
- Given the activities of The FCA it is almost inconceivable that there aren't a large number of other senior executives who will need to relinquish their posts and be banned from Financial Services either from senior roles or permanently as appropriate on further investigation and similarly potentially disbarred from being a Director of any Public Company or hold any Govt related post.

The Financial Ombudsman Service –

- The CEO Ms Wayman – asked / informed to step aside in the best interests of the FOS and of herself.
- The Board of the FOS – similarly asked / informed to step aside in the best interests of the FOS and the Public at large (undertaken progressively over a reasonable period of time to permit R&R as set out.

Doubtless all of this personal responsibility, accountability and culpability will appear outrageously radical to the City at large, the specific individuals named, and very possibly to you Prime Minister, Chancellor, and Governor of the Bank of England, however consider it from the perspective of a former SME customer ruined by a Bank. He or She devoted many years of their lives with these exact responsibilities as a normal mundane daily occurrence and never thought to consider them as anything less than an obligation they needed to fulfil. This is not radical, this is normal in the real world where your not isolated from the responsibility of your actions. To be utterly clear I am not anti Banks far from it I am pro them, when well and ethically run with a clear understanding that they have a moral and ethical role in Society as well as a financial one I am completely pro Banks. What I am not pro is amoral, unethical, unprincipled individuals who show no integrity.... and nor should you be..... See them all GONE for GOOD.... (ever and better).

Prime Minister:

You will doubtless be aware that there is a Backbench debate to be held on Tuesday 17th of April at 11:00am into RBS – GRG and related fraud conducted by other Banks.

Before that time it is our absolute and firm expectation that you and others as required will have taken and implemented the decisive steps necessary to remove all of the men and women and conceivably many others besides from their positions of power and influence and thus shown your own “exact integrity.” It is similarly our expectation that you will personally have taken such steps as to ensure that Mr Anthony Stansfeld – The Police Commissioner for the Thames Valley will have been called before the Treasury Select Committee in public session prior to that date. I am well aware that Parliament is nominally in recess however on important occasions such as this, exceptions and extraordinary circumstances dictate appropriately necessary actions. I would further note that normal activity, indeed emergency activity continues 24/7 in many parts of the economy and in all our emergency services besides, so this ask is hardly exceptional in reality, and therefore in context completely reasonable.

Prime Minister your party - the Conservative and Unionist Party - has always claimed to be the Party of Business and especially small businesses that represent more than half of the total economy and a similar or greater proportion of employment, in short the beating heart and life blood of our Country.

It is our ABSOLUTE and CLEAR expectation, indeed DEMAND that you and the ENTIRETY of the Front Bench without exception, will attend the debate and speak clearly and decisively in it finally showing the leadership that this most regrettable circumstance has lacked hitherto, and now demands beyond a question of doubt. Anything less, regardless of other circumstances or commitments, will be taken as a clear and unambiguous rejection of your promise in context to govern as spoken in your own words to which we now hold you to account:

“But the mission to make Britain a country that works for everyone means more than fighting these injustices. If you’re from an ordinary working class family, life is much harder than many people in Westminster realise. You have a job but you don’t always have job security. You have your own home, but you worry about paying a mortgage. You can just about manage but you worry about the cost of living and getting your kids into a good school.

If you’re one of those families, if you’re just managing, I want to address you directly.

I know you’re working around the clock, I know you’re doing your best, and I know that sometimes life can be a struggle. The government I lead will be driven not by the interests of the privileged few, but by yours.

We will do everything we can to give you more control over your lives. When we take the big calls, we’ll think not of the powerful, but you. When we pass new laws, we’ll listen not to the mighty but to you. When it comes to taxes, we’ll prioritise not the wealthy, but you. When it comes to opportunity, we won’t entrench the advantages of the fortunate few. We will do everything we can to help anybody, whatever your background, to go as far as your talents will take you.”

Mrs May, Prime Minister, cometh the hour..... *“There is a tide in the affairs of men, Which taken at the flood, leads on to fortune. Omitted, all the voyage of their life is bound in shallows and in miseries. On such a full sea are we now afloat. And we must take the current when it serves, or lose our ventures.”* -W. Shakespeare.

Be in no doubt this is you, and your Governments circumstance and hour. We therefore call on you and the Chancellor to make a clear and unequivocal commitment to the following:

- (1) An Independent Enquiry into Every aspect of Banking, Financial Services and related Professions and Services that link to them. The pivotal intent will be to restore ethics and integrity to the City without diminishing its ambitions and inventiveness. It must not be seen as a negative but a necessary renewal and enhancement to ensure its future vibrancy, independence, and vitality, but serving society not denying it. The Enquiry will have every conceivable power to compel testimony, seek evidence, and as necessary levy unlimited fines both corporate and personal and impose short prison sentences as necessary to ensure that its investigations are not frustrated.
- (2) It will consider how the FCA and FOS can be successfully reformed and how regulation can be pursued in future to prevent this circumstance every happening again.
- (3) The inquiry chair people will be appointed independently by Prof Scraton utilising Best Practise and full independence. He will similarly work with the chair people to divide this enormous task up into sub- enquiries so that the core work and report can be achieved in the shortest time period possible, but interim reports within 15months from the start date and a full report within the 2 year anniversary.
- (4) It will be paid for entirely by a levy on the City and all firms and people within it.
- (5) One of the Sub-enquiries will undertake the work to see that all victims of these Bank frauds are fully compensated according to “reasonableness” starting from when they were healthy and working forwards considering all the “events” that were relevant to the Bank and their ultimate situation via an independent scheme underwritten in full by the tax payer, but in time fully refunded by a levy on both the firms of the City, and also the staff of the city, (possibly multi year as required) with a disproportionate percentage being levied on the higher paid. This levy will also include those that formally worked in the city during the period 2005 to the present day but now retired or pursuing other activities. The City pleaded for self-regulation – it must now pay the price for failing to regulate itself.... and once the precedent has been set as now, it will think twice before transgressing again, and indeed should work to ensure that the rogue elements within it are routed out through self-interest. My letter of the 20th March 2018, para’s 16 &17 gave the clearest hint to this. This will not be economically detrimental to the nation it will simply fiscally amount to a redistribution and a positive one to the regions, as well as diversifying the wealth away from its current concentrations it will send it back from whence it came.
- (6) The Government and opposition parties will reach the fullest joint undertaking to implement the findings of the Public enquiry promptly and fully.
- (7) The Enquiry will also review all the current insolvency legislation and look to introduce extensive reform that leads to a chapter 11 style scenario for business renewal and restructuring.
- (8) There are many other aspects that the enquiry will rightfully consider and look at that I have left out but which others will make submissions on. I.e. Formal Whistle blower legislation. Etc.
- (9) The Government will publish and implement a whole raft of small business friendly legislation related to mandatory timely payment of invoices according to their terms and numerous other similar detail matters that we will address with the Govt shortly hereafter.
- (10) Finally but not least The Govt will implement new legislation that brings personal ethical responsibility and accountability and culpability into the workplace so that there is a clear incentive to ensure that responsible citizenship lies at the heart of our economic life, in short the renewal and rebirth of that which once stood.

Finally, Whilst I have written this letter, my voice is of no significance or importance, I have simply vicariously given expression to the views, wishes, and sentiments of the many victims who have suffered so much, indeed some irreversibly whose memories we must honour by achieving vindication, justice and “appropriate” full redress for all.

My grateful thanks in advance for your time and perseverance.

Now please, “Action this day...!” (W.S.C.)

Yours Sincerely,

Mark Banister.
RBS Customer & GRG Accuser

R Neil W Mitchell
RBS Customer & RBS Campaigner