

Appendix A

Email 7

Below is my reply to Email 6:

Date: December 4, 2013

Dear Minister Bruton

I had hoped I would receive a reply from you directly, but maybe you prefer to separate yourself from this issue for some reason. The reply I received from John Maher, your private secretary, does not in my opinion sufficiently address this issue. In fact, the last paragraph seems constructed so that individual sentences are designed to be technically correct, but together seem to have a tenuous if any correlation. I would like to know why Mr. Maher can say "The IFI evaluation process was only put in place for EI commitments as at all times EI only makes commitments following competitive calls for proposals." and "The formal evaluation processes were designed to assist EI in making their commitments."? Were these sentences/statements just added now for convenience in response to this issue? I suppose anything can be said after the fact. I would like to see where these statements were used in Government materials back in 2011 as I was certainly unaware that some IFI applicants had to be subjected to a legal evaluation process while others did not.

Therefore, you leave me no other choice but to seek justice by sending all relevant communications pertaining to this issue including my recent communications with the Taoiseach, and that which I received from Enterprise Ireland back in 2010 supporting my stance on this troubling issue, to the European Union/Troika (and other relevant independent bodies), and requesting a full independent investigation by them into the investment/funding related practices at Enterprise Ireland (EI) and the National Pensions Reserve Fund (NPRF), and a fair resolution to this troubling issue.

Seeking a fair resolution to this issue externally (EU/Troika) is the least attractive option for me, as it is not my intention to potentially subject Ireland to further negative press, or potentially negatively affect its ability to re-enter the international financial markets (which is a risk when control of such an issue is no longer in domestic hands), when these possible negative consequences can be avoided by achieving the same fair resolution to this issue internally (i.e. directly through the Irish Government).

However, a fair resolution to this issue through whichever fair means, regardless of the potentially negative consequences, will be a significantly better outcome for the Irish tax payer in the long run in that if the actions of EI and the NPRF with regards to the funding of (name of U.S. based VC firm) are found to be unfair and unjust, appropriate oversight will be put in place that imposes the highest level standards of integrity within Irish Government agencies, and those involved in this possible unfair and

unjust practice will hopefully be brought to justice.

Regards

Maurice D. Landers