

15 April 2012 by email

Dear David,

Thanks for your prompt response - though I am surprised by it for these reasons:

1/ You give no indication that you have read the information I provided or that you appreciate the seriousness of Safer Roads Humber issuing grotesquely misleading claims for the benefits of their cameras.

2/ The single most important aspect of those false claims - other than their probably being illegal in one or more ways - is that the wildly exaggerated claims will - as is surely intended - influence policy and spending decisions in favour of cameras and against other more cost effective methods. **That can only cost lives and limbs.**

3/ SRH's response throughout has been that they base their calculations on what they are told to do by the DfT. Last week you copied me the 2005 Handbook for Partnerships, implying (it seemed to me) that this was indeed the case - but today you tell me that such analysis "is a matter for" them!

4/ Accordingly I will now advise SRH of that position, that they cannot pretend that they are only following the DfT's instructions and must answer for themselves. Luckily your email arrived just in time for me to include that point in my formal complaint of criminal misconduct that I will be filing today.

5/ You fail to respond in any way to the clear evidence that from 2005 at least until April 2007, the PA Consulting Handbook in effect told Partnerships how they should wildly exaggerate their claims for the effects of cameras.

I have to ask - do you and the DfT think it acceptable that PA Consulting issued such grotesquely misleading recommendations - **and that at least some of the relevant organisations are still following those instructions, whether they are obliged to or not?**

6/ For all of these reasons I would be obliged if you would confirm to me that **you and your colleagues will review the information I copied to you, consider what needs to be done to remove any remaining influence that Handbook might have on relevant organisations, including contacting all those organisations to point out the serious flaws in the methods they will have used in the past and advising them both to stop using such methods to calculate benefit, and also to withdraw any previous such claims.**

7/ In addition that you will consider **what form of censure would be appropriate to apply to PA Consulting over their very serious error** - for which they will no doubt have been paid substantial fees.

I am sorry to say that throughout the Hypothecation Scheme and since, the DfT's conduct in terms of planning, analysis and review has been one characterised most of all by gross incompetence closely followed by cover-ups and refusal to face facts - as again seems to be happening on this issue. I hope it is clear that I am not prepared to let this matter drop, and will pursue it by all available means unless it is dealt with properly,

I have added your reply and my response to my web site.

Yours sincerely

Idris Francis