From: ███████████

Sent: 30 September 2020 09:35

To: ███████████

Subject: RE: 2017-0877: Quest - closing the case

Hi ███

Good for me.

Rather than planning it for the next on-site inspection, as the schedule is already full, I would suggest to plan it for an **"on-site verification" visit**. This is something new that we discussed in the context of the follow-up of inspection recommendations back in March before the lockdown. This would help us address as well the recommendations of the IAS.

I have created a word document where we should list the items for verification. Please have a look and adjust text/add columns if needed: 📄 Topics for next on-site verification

May I also ask you to **fill in the CMS properties of the case and make sure that all reviews are properly documented** before asking ███████ to close it? If you remember, we have decided to use the CMS properties to list all actions taken throughout a case. As for the reviews, I refer to the exercise we had to perform in view of IAS audit (one of their findings is that despite the effort we made, we had not documented enough the reviews by the back-ups).

Kind regards,

███████

From: ███████████

Sent: 30 September 2020 09:15

To: ███████████

Subject: 2017-0877: Quest - closing the case

Hi ███

███ and I took a look at the Quest case file. We are both of the opinion that we can close the case.

The conclusion of this case is that, according to Europol, they have adequate logging via the UAS (that's the most relevant point) of the case that remains open to discussion. This is something we can have a look at during an on-site inspection (looking at the exact config/coding of the logging requests). As this UAS is on the operational network, we really need to be on-site in my opinion.

Are you OK with us closing the case and taking note of this item for a future on-site inspection? Cheers

███