

>-----  
-----  
|----->  
| Subject: |  
|----->  
>-----  
-----  
|Re: J. Epstein KYC Updates: Additional signer [I]  
|  
>-----  
-----

Classification: For internal use only

I understand the broadness of the letter but I don't see how darren could be added as jeffrey is not authorized on her accounts. It would be impossible to add him to that account without her signature. Is that not sufficient for the kyc purposes?

----- Original Message -----  
From: Janice Franklin  
Sent: 03/03/2014 02:05 PM EST  
To: Amanda Kirby  
Cc: Jacqueline Lightbody  
Subject: Re: J. Epstein KYC Updates: Additional signer [I]  
Classification: For internal use only

That was my guess. The point I wanted to make is given how the letter is written Mr. Indyke should be added to [REDACTED] account. Why? Because the letter states ". . . to give Mr. Indyke signing authority . . . on all accounts associated with the Southern Financial Relationship. [REDACTED] account is associated with the Southern Financial Relationship.

I recommend that Mr. Epstein sends you another letter listing the specific accounts he wants to update or he could broadly write he would like Mr. Indyke added to the accounts in his (Mr. Epstein's) name and where he is the ultimate beneficial owner. If the instructions are written in this manner, [REDACTED] account would not be an issue.

Regards,  
Janice P. Franklin

-----  
(Embedded image moved to file: pic07579.gif)

Janice Franklin, CAMS, CFSA, CFIRS  
Vice President | AML Compliance Officer  
  
Deutsche Bank Trust Company Americas  
Compliance  
60 Wall Street, 10005-2836 New York, NY, USA  
Tel. [REDACTED]  
Fax [REDACTED]  
Email [REDACTED]

(Embedded image moved to file: pic26979.gif)

|----->  
| From: |  
|----->  
>-----  
-----