

Matt Jukes QPM
Deputy Commissioner

New Scotland Yard
Victoria Embankment
London
SW1A 2JL

12 June 2026

Kaya Comer-Schwartz

Deputy Mayor
Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC)
By email

Dear Deputy Mayor,

Unified Operational Analytics Procurement

I write in response to your letter of 21 May 2026 to the Commissioner where you declined to award the proposed Unified Operational Analytics (UOA) contract. We have thought carefully about how to respond to your public letter, and we would have preferred to have this exchange in private, where we may have been able to find an alternative solution. We considered whether we could respond privately, but do not feel able to given the reference in your letter to a "... clear and serious breach...". We cannot leave the public with a sense that the Met may have acted improperly, when we do not believe that to be the case. In that context we therefore believe it is important for the public record that we respond transparently.

This letter builds on the discussions our teams and we have had since your decision and sets out our budget context, the urgent business need and rationale for this procurement, the Metropolitan Police Services' (Met) reflections on the process and how we engaged with the Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC). I have also set out some proposed next steps to allow us to move forward constructively in the best interests of London. We are eager to do that, together.

While this letter reflects on the events of recent months, our focus now is on moving forward, and I welcome your commitment to working with us to re-procure UOA at pace. Advancements in technology are already making a real difference and supporting our officers and staff to deliver for London. UOA will acerate that.

Budget Context:

As you know, in setting the Met's budget for 2026/27 the Met and MOPAC worked extremely closely together, and we jointly advocated for increased funding which would have closed the Met's budget gap. The budget we agreed was clear that technology would play an important part in making the Met more productive and efficient and importantly improve outcomes for London. This was especially important, as the Met has a budget gap of £30m this year, and a forecast gap of £125m next year, 2027/28. To ensure we begin next year at an affordable strength, we therefore must reduce by 1,150 FTE – this is a further significant reduction on top of the 3,300 FTE reductions over the previous two years.

We discussed and agreed the principle of technology focused investments on numerous occasions, including at the MPS/MOPAC budget workshops that took place in the Autumn and again in March 2026. These workshops clearly set out the criticality of technology investment to balancing our budget, including to enable productivity and efficiency gains.

This agreement was documented in the draft MOPAC/MPS budget submission from November 2025 which said¹:

3.21. Investment in technology and data is central to the MPS' NMfL plan, and to its MTP. By investing in innovative technology such as AI, the MPS could unlock significant operational benefits including streamlining administrative processes, releasing officers and staff to frontline delivery. This may lead to a reduction of resource required in administrative and back-office roles, with productivity gains allowing the MPS to reinvest these resources into frontline policing.

It was also reflected in the MOPAC/MPS final budget published by MOPAC in March 2026, which said²:

14. *The MPS' approach to balancing its budget and closing its budget gap relies on three elements:*
- *Continue to pursue more funding;*
 - *Adopting cutting-edge technology to drive productivity, efficiency and better outcomes for Londoners; and*
 - *If necessary, consider further tough choices in the form of service reductions. These will only be pursued if the first two measures – pursuing funding and driving efficiency through technology – do not materialise to the extent required.*

Based on this shared understanding, and our joint aim to avoid having to make a further round of tough choices, we brought forward a proposal as MOPAC requested which would have used technology to automate and reduce manual research and double keying, in our back and middle office functions. This was Unified Operational Analytics.

Culture Standard and Integrity Ecosystem

Our confidence in our ability to deliver an ambitious technology investment which joins up the Met's data silos, integrates different data sets and allows us to fully exploit the data at scale, increased significantly following the work we did over the Autumn and into the Spring in professionalism including demonstrating our ability to move at pace while maintaining appropriate controls.

You will remember that in October, following BBC Panorama, the Commissioner wrote an open letter to the Mayor and the Home Secretary which included a commitment to innovate how we use data to spot trends in problematic behaviours. As MOPAC colleagues know, the Met has tried and failed on several occasions to bring together the data silos we hold relating to our workforce.

Recognising these previous failed attempts and that our Enterprise Data Platform (EDP) solution was making slower progress than we would want and only able to deliver part of the capability, we procured Palantir (via a compliant call off under the G-Cloud 14 framework), who came strongly recommended by Bedfordshire Police, City of London Police, and NHS England, for a time-bound three-month pilot to explore what was possible. As a result of the potential we saw during the first three months, we then extended the pilot for a further three months within the scheme of delegation to allow us to evaluate performance, usability, and operational benefit following initial build. We undertook this pilot using the Crown Commercial Service G-Cloud 14 framework, the contract award is transparently published on Gov.uk³.

This pilot has delivered and as you are aware we held our first week of action based on the information that the CSIE pilot highlighted including:

- **Rapid identification of inappropriate relationships:** During a lawful business monitoring (LBM) check, the tool identified officers involved in sexual misconduct. AI analysis of a work phone, combined with EBACS data, confirmed that inappropriate images involved a colleague, establishing an inappropriate relationship.
- **Undeclared declarable associations:** Officers who have failed to make declarations under our Declarable Associations Policy, including cases where officers have undertaken activity on Met devices associated with a declarable association.

¹ Available online at: www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2025-11/MOPAC%20-%20Consultation%20Budget%202026-27%20FINAL.pdf

² Available online at: www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2026-03/MOPAC%20-%20Final%20Budget%202026-27-WEB.pdf

³ <https://www.contractsfinder.service.gov.uk/notice/3e79d6d5-d090-4c74-9ecb-141cd987c6d6>

- **Serious misconduct and criminality:** Serious corruption and criminality, including abuse of authority for sexual purposes, fraud, sexual assault, misconduct in public office and misuse of MPS systems.

After years of trying to build something like this in house, we have with Palantir been able to deliver a platform which integrates the Met's legacy systems and brings together existing data we already hold around our people, provides an at scale ability to interrogate this data and provides a new always on 'discovery' tool allowing us to identify wrongdoing 24/7 and prevent harm. This has been game changing. As you know CSIE would have been one part of the broader UOA solution ensuring we retained access to the capabilities we have piloted.

As you know we have written to you separately on how we can find a pragmatic solution at pace to ensure that the benefits we have gained during the pilot are not lost and we are able to continue a CSIE like capability. I hope we will be able to update Londoners on this shortly.

UOA scope:

In light of the budget pressures I highlighted earlier, we set out to procure a Unified Operational Analytics (UOA) solution which would have delivered the productivity and efficiency savings built into our budget for the year, avoiding the need for further tough choices to operational services. The solution would have focused on how we could automate processes and reduce the amount of manual research that currently happens in the Met's middle and back-office functions. By releasing officer and staff time here, we would have been able to protect frontline services. To bring this to life that meant UOA would have:

1. **Made workforce efficiency and operational automation gains:** By integrating organisational data and embedding AI directly into operational workflows, routine and repetitive administrative tasks can be automated or augmented, allowing officers and staff to focus on higher value activities and freeing up significant capacity. Enabling staff to move from manual processing and reconciliation of information to oversight, judgement and decision making. Examples include:
 - Intelligence reports - Today searches for ~50 nominals across 50 reports can take 10 people ~8 hours, reduced to 1 person for 1 hour where intelligence has been RAG rated on an automated search that prioritises risk.
 - Performing device analytics on a seized mobile could be reduced from 48, to two hours. (which reduces massive backlogs on cases such as examining phones on VAWG investigations)
 - It currently takes the central data analysis teams on average three months to onboard and then manually transform unstructured data so that it is business ready (this is without analysis). By introducing an analytics acceleration layer, unstructured data can be analysed and outputted in a matter of minutes – significantly increasing our speed-to-value.
 - This would result in measurable productivity improvements, substantial staff time savings, and the ability to remove or shift resources to higher-value, frontline activities – spending less time on non-crime as set out in NMfL2.
2. **Supported proactive policing through integrated data insights:** By connecting previously siloed data sources and harnessing advanced analytics, the organisation can make far better use of existing information to highlight emerging risk patterns and identify high harm individuals and locations with greater speed and clarity. This enables us to respond more promptly and effectively to potential threats, supporting targeted interventions and informed decision making. Critically, this approach allows us to surface "unknown unknowns"; risks and patterns that would not be identified through traditional analysis or isolated datasets, as we are now able to join the dots across the system in a way that was not previously possible. In the CSIE pilot already delivered to the professionalism directorate, we uncovered 7000 anomalies in our system which may indicate error or manipulation. Launching accelerated analytics improves the speed of delivery from many hours or days of manual analysis across data sources to delivery of analysis

and new insight in seconds; refocusing our effort on the action and response. Deploying at an enterprise level will therefore increase our efficiency opportunity – otherwise patterns, trends and escalatory behaviours get lost in our volume of data.

- 3. Enhanced situational awareness:** A unified operational data environment enables investigators and operational leaders to access a connected, real-time view of intelligence, crime data, operational demand and contextual information. This reduces the need for manual data gathering and linking across systems, accelerates investigative workflows and enables faster, more informed operational decision making. Current intelligence operations are laboured with manual processes, typically using Word and Excel decision logs, multiple cut and paste processes and operational action sheets. Other forces have shown that we could save approximately 1,000 hours per advanced operation.

CSIE demonstrated that we could do this at pace, and that delivery and implementation timelines we had previously thought were not possible for data integration programmes, were. This is why we were ambitious in designing the requirements for UOA. However, all of these benefits, and ambition, are now on hold, and are unlikely to now be felt this year, even with a timely re-procurement exercise.

Procurement Process and MOPAC Engagement:

We strive to communicate in a timely way on many sensitive matters with MOPAC. Considering the significance of this procurement decision and its consequences, we were surprised that we received almost no notice of your decision. Until your letter arrived, we understood that Unified Operational Analytics (UOA) was likely to feature on the Mayoral Delivery Board agenda on 26 May 2026.

The public framing of your decision has led to questions about the Met's propriety and diligence. The Met is entrusted by Londoners to spend taxpayers' money carefully, we take that responsibility seriously and it is important that we lay out a response to the issues you set out in your letter so we can have the facts on public record:

1. MOPAC's Engagement and Scheme of Delegation

As you know MOPAC were engaged extensively by the Met over March, April and May on the procurement of UOA. We have detailed the key engagements in Annex A, as we believe it is important that we are transparent about the range of that engagement that took place. The timeline shows that Met colleagues spent a considerable amount of time, over two months, seeking decisions, engaging with or providing briefings for MOPAC colleagues. This timeline does not seek to capture all contact between the Met and MOPAC, but it is worth noting there was also significant email correspondence between both organisations.

The Met also ensured that MOPAC colleagues were able to access external assurance about different elements of our proposal, including from Bedfordshire Police, NHS England, and the Policing Chief Scientific Adviser. Senior Met colleagues spent a significant amount of time addressing many of MOPAC's questions and concerns about data sovereignty, data protection, control, access, and the risk of supplier lock in. These are all factors which we know matter to Londoners, and we presume by the fact these did not feature in your letter that you were reassured on these.

In your letter, you specifically set out your concern that the Met did not seek MOPAC's approval for the procurement strategy that the Met wished to adopt. As the timeline shows the Met's Executive Committee met on 31 March (with a MOPAC representative in attendance) and UOA the investment case was agreed in principle, and the commercial approach was endorsed by the Met's Executive Committee (ExCo). In that discussion it was noted that this would also need to go through MOPAC's governance, and it was agreed this would happen in parallel to deliver the speed required to deliver the benefits this year. Following this decision the Met submitted a Business Justification Paper (BJP) and a Part 1 decision paper on 2 April ahead of an IAM on 13 April, and a specific briefing for MOPAC colleagues on 8 April.

The timeline in the annex, we believe, shows that the Met made best endeavours to repeatedly engage with MOPAC colleagues and shows a significant level of engagement including formally submitting the Met's approach. I do not believe it is fair for MOPAC to characterise this as a '*clear and serious breach of the applicable procedural requirements*'. There is also a risk that the letter may imply to readers that some breach of law was occurring. This is not the case. The issue at hand here is the MOPAC Scheme of Delegation and a disagreement as to whether it was complied with.

The Met did act more quickly to procure a solution than we have done in the past, however this was with the clear intent to seek to avoid making cuts to frontline services and was the approach that we jointly agreed in setting the Met/MOPAC budget as I have already addressed. We now find ourselves in June, and scoping options for operational savings, which was the exact circumstance we wanted to avoid, via the procurement of UOA.

We believe that this process has highlighted that the Met and MOPAC need to be more precise as we make decisions which engage the Scheme of Delegation (SoD). There has clearly been a mismatch in expectations. Going forward we must both be more precise to avoid this re-occurring.

2. Commercial Approach

In your letter, you stated that the Met did not appear to have undertaken a reasonable or adequate process to test the market and determine whether Palantir represents the best and/or most economical provider.

The Met considers that these matters were already addressed in detail in the material shared with MOPAC during the procurement process. In summary, the Met considered a range of standard procurement routes, including:

- a. Awarding directly to a supplier without market engagement;
- b. An award following a desk-based assessment using pre-approved supplier offerings on a Crown Commercial Service (CCS) framework;
- c. Undertaking a full procurement through a public sector framework; and
- d. Running a full open market procurement exercise.

Having evaluated these options against factors such as urgency, risk, and value for money, the Met determined that the most appropriate route was to utilise a CCS framework. This enabled identification of suitable suppliers and award via a compliant process, while also benefiting from pre-agreed contractual provisions, including those relating to data processing, security, and exit management.

CCS frameworks, governed by the Cabinet Office, are designed to support efficient and legally compliant procurement across the public sector. They proactively award framework access to suppliers by performing open market competitive processes to validate their commercial offerings and conduct supplier due diligence. They are widely used across government, including by the Met. We routinely use CCS frameworks including for the supply of energy provision, technology applications, software licences and police vehicles amongst other services. It would be concerning if MOPAC's belief is that CCS frameworks did not provide an appropriate route to market as this would have significant consequences for our ability to procure.

In this instance, a supplier-agnostic desk-based assessment of available suppliers within the framework identified only one viable service offering capable of meeting the specific requirements. This reflects the specialised nature of the Met's specification. Use of the framework therefore reduced administrative burden compared to an open market exercise and provides a clear and agreed process to perform a fully compliant procurement. Legal advice was obtained throughout, and the Met worked closely with CCS to ensure full adherence to defined framework processes, which support regulatory and governance compliance.

In addition, the Met deliberately adopted a one plus one-year contract structure. This approach was intended to maintain flexibility, allowing future re-testing of the market as capability matures and more suppliers establish UK-based data solutions and engineering capacity. It also mitigates the risk of supplier lock-in and supports the Met's objective of securing the best possible product and value for money for Londoners.

The Met shares MOPAC's concern that the current UK supplier market for the rapid provision of solutions that provide data integration, advanced analytics and AI platforms, with UK based forward deployed engineers and secure and sovereign data centres is not as competitive as we would want. In recent months we have seen some US competitors begin to launch in the UK, but their offers still lack the maturity as they build their UK presence. This will improve in time. We also hope that we will also see UK head-quartered companies come forward with strong product offers that meet our requirements in the coming years.

3. Affordability

In your letter you have also raised concerns about affordability. In relation to UOA, as is now in the public domain via MOPAC, the Met had an agreed contract value of c.£25m a year for two years. As MOPAC will also be aware as you have seen the commercially sensitive information, this figure was the subject of clarifications relating to pricing approach (as permitted by the framework), and we believe competitive and value for money. This was affordable within our budgets for 26/27 and 27/28 with some prioritisation of spend.

Importantly UOA delivers value for money as it was projected to deliver total productivity and efficiency savings of £27.3M in year one and £48.2M in year two, providing a total of £75.5m savings over two years. This net saving, after investment costs, of c£25m over two years would have made significant inroads into the Met's budget gap and reduced the need for tough choices. These savings are on top of the projected operational benefits and outcomes – which as other forces including Bedfordshire, Leicestershire, and Hertfordshire have experienced are significant. UOA would also have helped reduce the service impact of the delayed tough choice we have to make this year in Serious and Organised Crime capabilities.

The projected return on investment alongside the operational benefits, we think are compelling. If we could deliver these benefits in house using our existing systems that would clearly be the best outcome, however that is not currently feasible. While we are building our own in house data infrastructure, this will take several years to mature before it may be able to replicate at scale some of the features that UOA would have provided.

Moving Forward:

As you can hopefully see from my response, the Met gave significant consideration to our approach to procuring a UOA solution, we did so at pace in response to our budget challenges and in line with the approach the Met and MOPAC jointly signed off when we set out the budget. Throughout this we engaged extensively with MOPAC.

The Met must now change our strategy to meet our budget gaps, as the Commissioner's report to the London Policing Board set out yesterday, we must rapidly identify c.500 FTE of reductions to frontline services and implement those changes, as we will no longer be able to make these reductions in middle and back-office functions in the medium term.

To help us move forward, and deliver the best outcomes for London and the Met, we have suggested some next steps, which we hope you will agree help us move forward together:

1. Thank you for our helpful first discussion on Wednesday about how we reset our approach to working together on technology and data procurement which enables the Met to procure at pace, within clear guardrails, to ensure that Londoners can benefit from technology. We have agreed that we should jointly review the long list of upcoming tech and data procurements and identify which ones are of particular interest to MOPAC, so we can ensure you have the assurances you need on these and identify any challenges earlier in the process. Without a more agile approach,



we will create an avoidable gap in capability that effectively leaves the door open to criminals to outpace us many times over, as they scale and innovate without constraint. I know that neither of us want that outcome and you have been very clear about that.

2. The Met will revise the current Met ExCo terms of reference to provide greater clarity on the role of the two MOPAC attendees to make clear their responsibility to raise a flag at the time if they believe our decisions are not within the letter or spirit of the MOPAC governance arrangements and the Scheme of Delegation (SoD). We have already begun pointing to this role even more deliberately in recent meetings.
3. The Met and MOPAC have discussed over the last three years the need to review the SoD which was last updated in 2016 to ensure it supports the Met's reform ambition – this should include consideration for the current delegation which means that the Met must seek approval for all spend over 0.0125% (£500,000) of the Met's budget. This is holding back our reform. We would now propose that we accelerate this work and jointly appoint an independent third party to review the current SoD with a focus on ensuring that it supports the scale and pace of reform that the Met is undertaking. We would suggest we aim to complete this by the end of September at the latest.

We hope these are agreeable tangible next steps which will improve the governance arrangements which have not worked as intended this time. In addition, there are three further urgent actions:

4. MOPAC are currently considering our request to approve sustaining the CSIE capability for 12 months.
5. As you have committed to in your letter MOPAC and Met colleagues need to work together at pace, to identify a route to market that is acceptable to us both to re-procure UOA. As pace matters, we should aim for a process that takes no longer than three months from start to finish.
6. As a direct result of your decision not to approve UOA, the Met is mobilising options, including further tough choices, to deliver the c.500 FTE reductions that UOA was set to deliver towards the 1,150 FTE reductions that we are required to deliver to balance our budget by March 2027.

While it is clear that the UOA procurement has created tension between the Met and MOPAC, the Met is determined to move forward. We have all acknowledged that given the work we have done together in delivering our plan for a New Met for London, this is an exceptional moment of friction. We are focused on delivering for London and would like to draw a line under this issue, so we can move forward positively while acknowledging our disagreement. Technology will play a growing part in supporting policing in London and I know you support our ambition to increase our use of technology and data.

We will share a copy of our response to your public letter with the London Assembly Police and Crime Committee, and with members of the London Policing Board.

Yours sincerely,

Matt Jukes QPM
Deputy Commissioner



Annex A - UOA MOPAC Engagement:

The timeline below sets out the significant engagement that Met colleagues have had with MOPAC colleagues between March and May. In addition to the key milestones set out below, there has also been significant correspondence via email. This BJP entered Governance in March and ran its course until your recent decision:

- **16 March 2026** - DAC Professionalism and the Director of Tasking and Performance briefed the Deputy Mayor and MOPAC's CEO on the CSIE pilot that we had delivered and our ambition to use this approach to data integration, exploitation, and summarisation in other areas of the Met through the upcoming UOA procurement.
- **31 March 2026** – The first UOA BJP was presented at ExCo (with MOPAC representative present) the investment case was agreed in principle, and the commercial approach was endorsed by ExCo. It was noted that this would need to also go through MOPAC's governance, and it was agreed this would happen in parallel to deliver the speed required to deliver the benefits this year e.g. the Met would move forward, at the same time as entering MOPAC governance. No objections to this parallel approach were made by the MOPAC representative.
- **2 April 2026** – As requested by the MOPAC via email on the 1 April, the Met submitted a Part 1 Paper and the BJP (part 2) to MOPAC.
- **8 April 2026** – Met colleagues joined a briefing for the DMPC on the proposed commercial approach including the Crown Commercial Service Framework process undertaken since the 31 March ExCo decision.
- **10 April 2026** – An extraordinary ExCo was held following the Commercial Process having been undertaken on the Crown Commercial Services Framework. ExCo Approved to: Conditionally approve UOA BJP subject to cost falling within £15-£25m envelope & conditionally approve a contract to sole supplier identified via the BOS 2 Framework. The MOPAC representative raised their concerns in this meeting at the pace the Met was proceeding and sought assurances on several issues.
- **10 April** – The Met received notice from MOPAC that the initial UOA BJP was being removed from the planned MOPAC IAM on the 13 April.
- **10 April 2026** – The Met sent MOPAC an email setting out proposed next steps following the MOPAC representatives' concerns, including a Met commitment to write a briefing note for MOPAC on the areas where assurance was sought. The Met also re-offered to attend IAM on 13 April to present the first or revised UOA BJP.
- **15 April 2026** – An assurance meeting was held between the Met, a member of the London Policing Ethics Panel and MOPAC.
- **16 April 2026** – UOA was discussed at the Mayor and Commissioner's regular bilateral meeting.
- **17 April** – Two assurance meetings took place:
 - One with representatives from MOPAC, City Hall, the Home Office, Policing Chief Scientific Adviser and MPS focused on the direction of travel for police technology and AI and how UOA would sit alongside those.
 - A second with representatives from MOPAC, City Hall, NHS England and the Met focused on learning from NHS England's experience with Federated Data Platform provided by Palantir.
- **20 April** – The Met ran a detailed Commercial 'Walk through' session with MOPAC colleagues to explain how the Met had approached selecting a CCS framework, and then down-selected from the chosen framework.
- **20 April** – A further assurance meeting took place with representatives from MOPAC, the Met and Bedfordshire Police focused on learning from Bedfordshire Police's experiences with Palantir.
- **23 April** - UOA was discussed at the Deputy Mayor and Commissioner's regular bilateral meeting.

- **24 April** – The Met shared with MOPAC a 21-page assurance note (as committed to on the 10 April) which covered themes including:
 - The rationale for pace and comparative analysis, the balance between the risk of proceeding and risk of not and potentially incurring more tough choices.
 - Commercial and procurement route, including process and consideration of alternatives
 - Data security
 - The impacts on trust and confidence given controversies/scrutiny of supplier and broader concerns about use of data/AI
 - Contract management, including potential exit and risk of integrated systems
 - Potential benefits, including the detail of savings, deliverability and mitigations
- **28 April** – At MOPAC’s request the Met shared the current redacted DPIA and EIA for the CSIE pilot.
- **29 April** – MOPAC shared 49 additional questions with the Met.
- **30 April** – The Met shared an updated part 1 and updated BJP, alongside an affordability and value for money assessment, and the Met’s external legal advice with MOPAC for submission to IAM.
- **6 May** – Met and MOPAC officials meet at Met’s request to get an update on MOPAC timelines, MOPAC were not able to provide one.
- **6 May** – The Met responded to MOPACs 49 questions of the 29 April with a 16-page briefing note.
- **8 May** – The Met facilitates an assurance meeting for City Hall with Palantir.
- **12 May** – The Deputy Commissioner emails the MOPAC to ask for an update on MOPACs timeline.
- **12 May** – The MOPAC responds to the Deputy Commissioner’s email and confirms that MOPAC will arrange an extraordinary IAM on the 15 May.
- **12 May** – The Met offers an assurance session for MOPAC with the Cabinet Office who are responsible for BOS 2 Crown Commercial Framework – This offer is not taken up by MOPAC colleagues.
- **15 May** – An extraordinary IAM is held, only 30mins is diarised by MOPAC, Met colleagues answered questions from the Deputy Mayor on savings deliverability, prioritisation of spend, alternatives to UOA and supplier lock in. We understood from this meeting that stage will be for the UOA to go to an upcoming Mayoral Delivery Board.
- **20 May** – The MOPAC representative updates at the Met ADOPT Portfolio Board that they awaited a MOPAC decision on next steps.
- **20 May** – The Deputy Commissioner and DMPC answer questions from the London Assembly Police and Crime Committee on CSIE.
- **21 May** – The Deputy Mayor calls the Deputy Commissioner to update that MOPAC are about to send a letter to the Commissioner refusing the approval of the proposed contract.