Witness name: Mark Cheeseman
Statement No.: Third
Exhibits: 1
Dated: 9 December 2025

UK COVID-19 INQUIRY

SUPPLEMENTARY CORPORATE WITNESS STATEMENT OF MARK CHEESEMAN

I, Mark Cheeseman, will say as follows: -

1. I make this supplementary statement to provide factual corrections and clarifications to my previous Corporate Witness Statement for Module 9 [MC3/1 - INQ000657728].

2. A formatting error meant that **Figure 1**, an image, was concealing some footnotes to my previous statement. The footnotes should read as follows:

> *Footnote 14: MC/009 - INQ000055871*
> *Footnote 15: MC/010 - INQ000547811*
> *Footnote 16: MC/011 - INQ000477232*
> *Footnote 17: MC/012 - INQ000593945*

3. I understand the documents in these footnotes were disclosed to core participants in the usual way.

4. The final sentence of **Paragraph 4.42** of my previous statement did not correctly cite the SEISS numbers in the HMRC report referenced in Footnote 171. The final sentence of Paragraph 4.42 should read as follows:

> *For SEISS the fraud and error rate was 5.2%, worth £1.47 billion.*[171]

5. The second sentence of **Paragraph 4.76** should read as follows:

> *On 1 December 2020, CoEx wrote to BEIS and BBB, flagging that the most recent Post Event Assurance Action Plan submission from BEIS covered*

BBLs and Covid Grants, but did not cover CBILS or CLBILS.

6. This clarification replaces the word '*initial*' with '*most recent*'. This is to reflect the fact that earlier versions of the Post Event Assurance Action Plan had covered CBILS and CLBILS, but the most recent draft had not.

7. For the same reason and for consistency, the second sentence of **Paragraph 4.94** should read as follows:

> *On 1 December 2020, CoEx wrote to BEIS and BBB, flagging that the most recent Post Event Assurance Action Plan submission from BEIS covered BBLs and Covid Grants, but did not cover CBILS or CLBILS.*

8. In relation to **Paragraph 4.163**, I should clarify that the measurements provided by Project Hastings gave two data points: an estimate of the level of fraud in BBLS, and an estimate of the loss from fraud. These are different, as some fraudulently taken loans may be paid back. In addition, data from the suspected fraud flags applied by lenders shows the value of guarantees paid out where there is a suspected fraud flag.

9. I should clarify the description of the funding in **Paragraph 5.1** could more helpfully provide a breakdown of the component that went to the PSFA. The sentence should read as follows:

> *As a demonstration of its commitment to tackling public sector fraud, in March 2022 the Chancellor announced an additional £48.8 million funding over three years to support the creation of the PSFA and enhance counter-fraud work across the British Business Bank and the National Investigation Service,[436] of which £24.7 million was for the PSFA, and a taskforce was convened to oversee the PSFA's implementation.*

10. My previous statement cites a range of data from the Cross-Government Fraud Landscape Report 2021-2022, referenced at **Paragraphs 5.18 to 5.19** and footnote 458. For completeness, based on pages 10-11 of the Report, I should record that overall, the Report indicates, across 2020-21 and 2021-22, a total estimated level of fraud and error in COVID-19 schemes of £10.48 billion.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true. I understand that proceedings may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth.

Signed:

Personal Data

Dated: 9 December 2025