

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: List of current participants
Date: 14 July 2021 15:57:00

Hi [REDACTED]

I've responded below in blue.

Let me know if you need anything else.

Cheers,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Programme Support Officer

Phone:

E-mail: [REDACTED]

Newcastle City Council
City Futures Directorate
Economic Development Unit

Civic Centre, 9th floor

Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 8QH www.newcastle.gov.uk



European Union

European Structural
and Investment Funds

From: [REDACTED]@therecruitmentjunction.com>

Sent: 14 July 2021 15:29

To: [REDACTED]newcastle.gov.uk>

Cc: [REDACTED]@therecruitmentjunction.com>

Subject: RE: List of current participants

Congrats on your house, wow!

Also, a couple of months ago, we've discussed certification of documents received online where a hard copy was not available. We agreed that for those documents, you'll be certifying them as 'a true copy of the electronic document' instead of 'a true copy of the original document'. This is what would need to be provided for [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] (pieces of evidence highlighted in red in the report).

Ah, I hadn't understood the different certification wording – I've just reuploaded the normally certified copies, not understanding. OK will correct – [Fab!](#)

With regards to unsigned registration form for [REDACTED], we cannot accept a justification as we haven't been accepting this for other projects. We have either been asking the projects to obtain the signature via [REDACTED] (preferred option) or to attach the registration form to the email

address, send it to the participant and ask them to reply back with the attachment showing, confirming that all information in the reg. form is correct. Believe me, this is not our idea – this is the advice we received from the contract manager... I'm not sure if [REDACTED] has the IT skills, if not, it might be better/ easier to just wait a few weeks until it's possible for him to see you in the office?

[REDACTED] was the one who told me to just put in a justification – I'll try the non-[REDACTED] option and we'll see – I'd accept the justification as a last resort (i.e. participant disengaged), but if there's still a genuine possibility of him coming back and obtaining the signature, I'd try it first.

What do you suggest I obtain for [REDACTED] for what is still missing (exc the certification comments above) – his DWP adviser just know him as [REDACTED] his birth cert says [REDACTED] and I think you are 'refusing' to accept the deed poll name change. (Let's ignore the chopped up passport situation!). I don't know how else to proceed – and he has now started work, so I doubly want to record him! I think a justification explaining the situation would be the best solution. I'm not rejecting or refusing to accept the deed poll name change, however [REDACTED] did notice the discrepancy in dates – the Passport Office issued the letter in [REDACTED] but the change of name didn't take place until [REDACTED] and this is a bit odd. I'd suggest to ignore the letter from the passport office and let's provide a justification where you explain why you feel confident that [REDACTED] & [REDACTED] is the same person (based on the deed poll name change, birth certificate and DWP adviser's opinion) and you feel satisfied that he meets all the ESF eligibility criteria.

Thank you!

[REDACTED]