

From: Minh Alexander <REDACTED>

Subject: Questions about the whistleblowing APPG's relationship with its corporate backers and about its secretariat, proposal to cede control of whistleblowing to the MoJ or Home Office and other matters

Date: 17 August 2019 at 11:10:19 BST

To: Heather Wood <REDACTED>

Cc: REDACTED

BY EMAIL

Registrar of Members' Interests
Houses of Parliament

17 August 2019

Dear Heather,

Support provided by NAVEX Global to the Whistleblowing APPG & requirement for declaration

You may recall that on 3 July I asked the Whistleblowing APPG for details of 'support' that it had received from NAVEX Global - see correspondence below.

This support was not declared in the APPG register and is still not declared in the latest APPG register of 31 July 2019. I do not know if the support reaches the threshold for declaration.

On 8 July Norman Lamb (APPG Vice Chair) 's office wrote to me to say that Norman Lamb had asked Whistleblowers UK, the APPG's secretariat, for information about NAVEX Global's contribution. I was promised the information when it became available.

I have not received it, although I did send a reminder on 19 July, as below.

Please could the Registrar investigate and clarify whether any support received from NAVEX Global, whether financial or in kind, reaches a threshold that requires declaration in the published APPG register.

I attach a screenshot from the Whistleblowing APPG's website, taken today, which still displays a statement that the APPG has received support from NAVEX Global.

Many thanks and best wishes,

Minh

Dr Minh Alexander

Cc

Baroness Kramer Co Chair

Stephen Kerr MP Co Chair

Anneliese Dodds MP Vice Chair

Norman Lamb MP Vice Chair

Andrew Mitchell MP Vice Chair

This APPG is kindly supported by:

CONSTANTINE

CANNON

NAVEX GLOBAL

From: Minh Alexander <REDACTED>

Subject: Questions about the whistleblowing APPG's relationship with its corporate backers and about its secretariat, proposal to cede control of whistleblowing to the MoJ or Home Office and other matters

Date: 19 July 2019 at 06:34:20 BST

To: REDACTED

BY EMAIL

Whistleblowing APPG

Baroness Kramer Co Chair

Stephen Kerr MP Co Chair

Norman Lamb Vice Chair

Anneliese Dodds Vice Chair

Andrew Mitchell Vice Chair

19 July 2019

Dear Whistleblowing APPG,

(1) Questions about the whistleblowing APPG's relationship with its corporate backers and about its secretariat

(2) Serious erroneous claim in the APPG's report which may place whistleblowers at risk

(3) Questions about the proposed independence of the APPG's proposed Office of the Whistleblower and proposal to cede control of whistleblowing to the MoJ or Home Office

(4) Costing of proposal to extend whistleblowing protection to all citizens

(1) Since writing to ask about issues of financial sponsorship and other matters of possible conflict of interest surrounding the APPG, I have received a note from Mr Lamb's office advising that he would forward the questions to the private company, Whistleblowers UK, which acts as the APPG's secretariat. But I have not yet received any answers to my questions.

(2) Since I wrote as above, the APPG has published the first of what it indicates is a series of three reports. I brought a seriously incorrect and misleading claim in the report to the APPG's attention two days ago:

https://twitter.com/alexander_minh/status/1151481941771849729

but there has been no acknowledgment. The APPG's report states that NHS Guardians are Prescribed Persons under current whistleblowing law. They are most certainly not. They are the **employees** of the organisations about which NHS staff whistleblowers are making disclosures. Only the National Guardian's Office, a part of the health and social care regulator, the Care Quality Commission, is a Prescribed Person to whom whistleblowers can turn as an external route of disclosure. It is clearly vital not to mislead any potential whistleblowers about this important difference. Please acknowledge this and advise what the APPG will do to correct the error and when.

(3) The APPG has orchestrated a news splash on the release of its report, much of which focuses on the creation of a purportedly independent Office for whistleblowing.

However, tucked in the report's small print is the persistent proposal, made public by Whistleblowers UK months ago, that the Office should be hosted by the Ministry of Justice or the Home Office. No government of the day can be relied upon to exclude its own political interests from any whistleblowing governance decisions. But I have to question why the APPG would light on two of the most scandal-stricken government departments as suitable host environments for a tender new whistleblowing agency.

The new Office for the Whistleblower could be accommodated within the Home Office or the Ministry of Justice and could be funded through fines and levies but more importantly from the savings that will be realised by early intervention avoiding costly litigation and settlements;

Do the excess deaths and daily human rights violations in our prisons, the catastrophic outsourcing of probation services and other elements of the criminal justice system, the constant suppression in these departments, the revelations of the ongoing spy cops public inquiry about breaches against not only activists but journalists, the State-sponsored persecution of immigrants and the unforgiveable, unlawful deportation of British Windrush citizens count for nothing?

No justification is even attempted in the APPG's report for its proposal to locate the whistleblowing Office in either the MoJ of the Home Office. Please could the APPG provide the rationale for its proposal.

(4) The APPG seeks to extend whistleblowing protections to all citizens, but without giving any details. The proposal of course would introduce the conditions by which UK citizens could eventually be deputised to file qui tam suits. In other words, US style bounty hunting, a model which leaves many practical and ethical questions unanswered, but is highly profitable for middlemen such as Constantine Cannon LLP, one of the APPG's financial backers.

<https://minhalexander.com/2018/09/12/whistleblowing-v-bounty-hunting-and-a-new-whistleblowing-appg-with-sponsorship-from-bounty-hunters/>

Please could the APPG advise if it has in any way defined or attempted to cost its proposal to extend whistleblowing protection to all citizens, and if so share the details and justification for the proposal.

I again copy this to the Shadow Minister for Labour and the Registrar's Office

Yours sincerely,

Dr Minh Alexander

Cc Laura Pidcock Shadow Minister for Labour
Registrar of Members' Interests

From: "LAMB, Norman" <REDACTED>

Subject: RE: Questions about the whistleblowing APPG's relationship with its corporate backers and about its secretariat

Date: 8 July 2019 at 09:34:38 BST

To: Minh Alexander <REDACTED>

Dear Minh,

Thanks for your email to Norman.

Norman has written to Georgina Halford-Hall, enclosing the questions which you have raised regarding the transparency of the APPG.

I will send you the response as soon as it's received.

Best wishes,

Will



William Cowie

Parliamentary Researcher for Sir Norman Lamb MP

Liberal Democrat Member of Parliament for North Norfolk

T: REDACTED A: House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA

From: Minh Alexander <REDACTED >

Sent: 03 July 2019 10:36

To: REDACTED

Subject: Questions about the whistleblowing APPG's relationship with its corporate backers and about its secretariat

BY EMAIL

Whistleblowing APPG

Baroness Kramer Co Chair

Stephen Kerr MP Co Chair

Anneliese Dodds MP Vice Chair

Norman Lamb MP Vice Chair

Andrew Mitchell MP Vice Chair

3 July 2019

Dear Whistleblowing APPG,

Questions about the whistleblowing APPG's relationship with its corporate backers and about its secretariat

I tweeted some of your members several times about what "support" the private company NAVEX Global is providing to the Whistleblowing APPG, and whether the support includes finance.

https://twitter.com/alexander_minh/status/1143387940120403969

To date I have not yet received a substantive reply.

Norman Lamb responded this morning to say that he had seen my question for the first time.

He has agreed to find this information.

In case the APPG and or its members have apparently overlooked or not noticed my other recent tweeted questions, I would be grateful if you could note and respond to them, particularly as the Whistleblowing APPG is seeking to influence UK whistleblowing policy and has been asking whistleblowers for their contributions and support.

I think transparency and accountability is needed in the circumstances.

My as yet unanswered questions are as follows:

1) Has Whistleblowers UK, the APPG's secretariat, or any officers of Whistleblowers UK had any business dealings or paid engagements with the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA)?

I ask as a post dated 21 January 2019 on the Whistleblowers UK's website states that Whistleblowers UK's CEO has been advising the FCA:

https://twitter.com/alexander_minh/status/1146093832653746176

2) If Whistleblowers UK or its officers have undertaken paid work for the FCA, what is the Whistleblowing APPG's view on how this affects the APPG's neutrality, and what action might it take in response?

3) Will the Whistleblowing APPG end its association with NAVEX Global given NAVEX Global's claims that it has helped SERCO commit to ethical business conduct, when numerous scandals continue?

https://twitter.com/alexander_minh/status/1144120109428068352

4) Will the Whistleblowing APPG be willing to transparently list the organisations to which Whistleblowers has sold services, or to which Whistleblowers UK has provided

NEDs to act as whistleblowing champions?

I ask as the CEO of whistleblowers UK appears to be advertising these services on her LinkedIn account:

“services include providing professional non executive directors in the whistleblower champion role. We provide training, consultancy, media advice.. a range packages to meet regulatory requirements.”

https://twitter.com/alexander_minh/status/1146052516263518208

These services may not exist yet. It is not clear if these services exist yet, as a post on the Whistleblowers UK website states that the company will be offering training to organisations, but that this training is “in development”.

https://twitter.com/alexander_minh/status/1146050970482294785

5) Can the APPG or its secretariat explain why a post on the Whistleblowers UK website of 15 May 2019 seems to be stating that Whistleblowers UK is a charity:

https://twitter.com/alexander_minh/status/1145785480216268800

when other material on the website states that the company is a 'not for profit' organisation, and Whistleblowers UK tweeted explicitly on 22 June 2019 that it was not a charity?

https://twitter.com/alexander_minh/status/1145787106633142275

I copy this to Laura Pidcock as Shadow Minister for Labour, and to the registrar's office.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Minh Alexander

NHS whistleblower and former consultant psychiatrist

Laura Pidcock

Registrar of Members' Financial Interests

UK Parliament Disclaimer: this e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. This e-mail address is not secure, is not encrypted and should not be used for sensitive data.