

**Brian Little**

Adjusted by email on  
18 Dec 2009 that

**From:** Brian Little [brian@fortfield.com]  
**Sent:** 10 November 2009 08:39  
**To:** 'ian.powell@uk.pwc.com'; 'christie.j.b.clark@ca.pwc.com'  
**Cc:** 'caroline.mcquater@uk.pwc.com'; 'robert.j.osborne@ca.pwc.com';  
'john.f.tracey@uk.pwc.com'; 'stephanie.leblanc@ca.pwc.com';  
'stephen.r.moore@ca.pwc.com'; 'carla.eisnor@ca.pwc.com';  
'brenda.j.eprile@ca.pwc.com'  
**Subject:** FW: Final Draft Report Version AA - comments on factual accuracy by Friday 13 November 2009 please before final Report/release  
**Attachments:** BL rule34claim mystory friends public 16jan2009.doc; 1285.units and EAC .etc.summaries.xls.jackie.xls; Brian.Little.A340.On the.record.16.Nov.2006.Q3.2009.doc; AGM2008qa.all.AGM2009qa.all.transcript.doc

my A340 final rept was released on website / members at

For the record

Apologies. It has been brought to my attention that I omitted to attach the Q&A record of the MAC AGM on 12 May 2009. This is now attached for completeness.

Yours sincerely

Brian Little

**From:** Brian Little [mailto:brian@fortfield.com]  
**Sent:** 09 November 2009 11:51  
**To:** 'ian.powell@uk.pwc.com'; 'christie.j.b.clark@ca.pwc.com'  
**Cc:** 'caroline.mcquater@uk.pwc.com'; 'robert.j.osborne@ca.pwc.com'; 'john.f.tracey@uk.pwc.com'; 'stephanie.leblanc@ca.pwc.com'; 'stephen.r.moore@ca.pwc.com'; 'carla.eisnor@ca.pwc.com'; 'brenda.j.eprile@ca.pwc.com'  
**Subject:** Final Draft Report Version AA - comments on factual accuracy by Friday 13 November 2009 please before final Report/release

9 NOVEMBER 2009

For the record  
Dear Mr. Powell and Mr Clarke

As promised, I attach my summary of the events to date on the above matter. This FINAL DRAFT document (6Mb) , after its finalisation early next week, is intended to provide my first on-the-record public summary that is available not only to the various protagonists in this case but also the witnesses, family members , other interested parties and members of the media who have contacted me to date plus any MAC shareholders who choose to access this information on my website following my comments at the MAC AGM in May 2009 – see attached record..

As can be expected, much of the document deals with the circle of deceit and misrepresentation that surrounds the balance sheet treatment of the A340 NRC asset and the factual basis that led to those conclusions. I have called it "forensic deceit" as you will be able to read in the Executive Summary. . In this context, I also make explicit reference to the independent forensic investigation conducted by Mr. John Tracey of PwC, which by any credible definition was neither "forensic" nor a "professional investigation" of the matters originally contained within my Grounds of Complaint and even the original terms of reference.

I was disappointed and shocked by Mr. Tracey's handling of the investigation, including his undue reliance upon a flawed information base and a process that did not seek to confirm the factual accuracy of the report with all informed parties before its issuance. This seems a particularly poor judgment after the UK court Ordered disclosure of that Final Draft to us and we asked would we

be invited to comment on its factual accuracy . This all the worse as Mr Tracey had assured my accountant Mr McCreery and I that given Mr Dimma's prior involvement he would ensure that all the necessary process safeguards would be incorporated to do so – on audio tape. I have also been disappointed but against a backdrop of the low expectation levels established from the original investigation, not surprised that neither you nor Mr. Tracey has sought to address these shortcomings, preferring instead to remain silent on all related matters.

Nevertheless, as a professional services firm, I can only assume that you will have now conducted your own internal investigation following my email of 5 July 2009 into this matter to determine the validity of my claims. Consequently, I expect that the attached document will be useful in providing both context and supporting analysis/information for you in support of that internal independent investigation.

I do genuinely invite any comments either directly to me or via the Audit Committee of MAC on the factual basis of this Report by Friday 13 November 2009 prior to its finalisation and preliminary release next week after the MAC Q3.2009 financial results are publicly released.

As always, do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss any aspect of this matter with me.

Yours sincerely

Brian Little

Supporting information

Extract from 5 July 2009 email to you both (see page 93-95 in report)

I therefore attach Section 8 of that PwC report on A340 (Canadian copy) and **we suggest that you both activate now , if you have not already done so , a thorough and independent internal PwC process to review the adherence to PwC stated Quality Standards ( Mr AR Palmer as at February 2007) and your Ethics policy for this assignment. I do not know who was allocated as the PwC Quality Assurance partner on this assignment but that aspect should of necessity be reviewed now too.**

Finally it is clear from a review of the Canadian biographies of the PwC people apparently involved on A340 (Stephanie Leblanc and Stephen R. Moore, who for the record never spoke with me) were either ill-equipped in aerospace industry current experience to undertake this assignment in Canada without reference to people such as Neil Hampson and the UK team ( who I have copied here ) or were under instructions as to what they were to find to support the previous "no problems" report/conclusions of their client's Chair Mr Dimma.

In any event the "buck", as they say, stops with Mr Tracey and both of you.

Obviously it is clearly a matter for you as to what actions you take now , but I at least we are satisfied that we have provided you both with the latest information and that opportunity now. No feedback to me on any actions you take or not is expected by us.

I believe you have all the information with PwC to conduct an independent investigation of your own "Report and processes deployed" and should you require any further information then please do not hesitate to have a "genuine" independent person make contact with me."

5B Extract of email on 14 October 2009 to PwC:Mr Powell (UK Chair) and Mr Clarke (Canada CEO)

For the Record

Mr Ian Powell / Mr Christie Clark

"I have now received confirmation that a File of Papers (copy 2/11 – Mr Ian Powell and copy 3/11 – Mr Christie Clark) in connection with the PwC process and investigation at Magellan Aerospace Corporation has been delivered and signed for at your offices. You also received the email below directly from me some 100 days ago now (5 July 2009).

This Blue file contains the written "process" paperwork and communications between PwC and I from January 2007 to today. As of now it deals only in part on the factual accuracy of the PwC reports following the alleged "independent forensic investigation" undertaken under Mr John Tracey in PwC UK and Canada in the seven months from January 2007 – August 2007 as the file contains my email dated 28 September 2009 with an attached summary of the identified changes between the Final Draft PwC report of May 2007 to the final PwC report in late August 2007 and the related comments from us on its factual accuracy and conclusions. This file does not contain any comments on its factual accuracy, by reference to oral or contemporaneous documents, on a para by para basis or substantive omissions from either of these Reports. You know from my prior emails in mid 2007 that Mr Tracey of PwC determined, with the Mr Dimma of the Audit Committee (despite the fact that the final draft had been Ordered for disclosure by the UK court), that it was not necessary to receive any factual comments from myself or my advisory team in the two month period prior to its publication in late August 2007. As the Deloitte partners said at that time to us - this would seem to have been a significant error in professional judgment from an enterprise risk management and firm reputation perspective.

One would like to expect that by now in your executive governance roles both of you will have discussed my email below and put in place a review of that work by PwC and the associated process in the last 100 days. I know there is a certain irony in investigating the quality of one own "independent forensic investigation" but professionally it seems that is was required. I would expect, from my own experience, that the analysis and conclusions of that review should be with you both by now

In my 5 July 2009 email I did not wish to explicitly pre-empt the conclusions of that own internal review but, for the avoidance of doubt, I am now satisfied from all the oral and written evidence and documentation ( not just in UK) that there are "material" factual errors and omissions in both PwC reports (particularly on A340) . Additionally I consider that PwC have compromised themselves ethically and professionally in its conduct of this investigation and report to best practice standards in a number of substantive matters.

Your own internal investigation by now will have enabled you as the primary executives responsible for the governance of PwC in UK and PwC in Canada to address what has been found and what you and your firm will do about that.

Kind regards

Brian Little

---

**From:** Brian Little [mailto:brian@fortfield.com]

**Sent:** 03 November 2009 08:43

**To:** 'caroline.mcquater@uk.pwc.com'

**Cc:** 'robert.j.osborne@ca.pwc.com'; 'john.f.tracey@uk.pwc.com'

**Subject:** FW: Invitation for comments on any factual accuracy errors in the attached A340 single page - Please provide any written inputs with supporting evidence by Wednesday 21 September 2009 on behalf of PwC

[For the record](#)

As per my email yesterday I have extended the time for comments on the factual accuracy of the draft report attached to my email below - extended to 6 November 2009 COB

Kind regards

Brian Little