

Exchange of e-mails dated 3 July 2003

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 July 2003 15:10
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED] FEENY PADDY;
Subject: RE: TRANSCRIPT- BBC R5- RE CABORN - Chelsea takeover

The point is that Govt (except for DTI/regulators' general powers relating to all businesses) has no powers to investigate Abramovich. The FA is still skirting round the governance issues, but as they aren't us, it is nothing to do with us if they do ever get round to "fit and proper" tests.

So because Richard was unclear about who "fit and proper" belonged to, it seems to have allowed the interpretation that we are "doing something" about Abramovich, when quite clearly we aren't, and shouldn't.

I only raised the IFC to get us off any hook that maybe we aren't doing anything even though we (possibly) implied that we are.

If there is any media follow-up we should dispel the illusion that any investigation is going to happen. Because it isn't,

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 July 2003 14:48
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: TRANSCRIPT- BBC R5- RE CABORN - Chelsea takeover

[REDACTED]

In so far as Mr Campbell appears to have allowed the Minister to comment, RC was quite right. The FA is working towards a "fit and proper" person requirement for club owners/directors. But this is two years away at least, and is in any event a legal minefield.

Use of the IFC here is problematic. The IFC has spent much of the time since its launch in March 2002 in arguing with the football authorities about the extent of its remit. Football would say very firmly that "fit and proper" is none of its business. But its terms of reference allow for some consideration of the football authorities' financial and other regulations. A grey area, and it doesn't seem wise to me to try to use this transient press story in an attempt to talk up the extent of its powers.

If it comes up, I would suggest a middle course. Simply referring the press to the IFC suggests that we consider it to have a direct and formal role here. I suggest we confirm that the FA is working towards a fit and proper person requirement for club owners, that the Government supports that aim, and that callers may well wish to seek the opinion of the IFC.

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 July 2003 14:24
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: TRANSCRIPT BBC R5- RE CABORN - Chelsea takeover

to see

[REDACTED]

Head of Sports Division
Department for Culture, Media and Sport
2-4 Cockspur Street
London
SW1Y 5DH

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 July 2003 13:27
To: FEENY PADDY; [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED] MCGIVAN ALEC; [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: TRANSCRIPT- BBC R5- RE CABORN - Chelsea takeover

Richard got close to hinting that we (Govt? DCMS??) might check out Abramovich as a "fit and proper person". We ought to be careful in clarifying this. We have no sector powers, although clubs as businesses are subject to the normal rules for the appointment and conduct of directors. So he would have no more scrutiny than the director/owner of any business.

There is the (wholly silent??) IFC - can we refer press to them?

[REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 July 2003 11:14
To: [REDACTED] FEENY PADDY; [REDACTED]
Subject: TRANSCRIPT- BBC R5- RE CABORN IV

<<030703 - Licensing - Caborn - R5Bfast - 1452 -ord7872.DOC>>

[REDACTED]

The Cabinet Office's computer systems may be monitored and communications carried on them recorded, to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.