Friday, 17 May 2024

1

paragraph 177 towards the bottom of the page, in the

2 2 (9.45 am) second line, there's a line which says: 3 MR BEER: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear us? 3 "... according to my diary took place on 4 March 2014 ..." 4 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you very much. 4 MR BEER: May I call Alisdair Cameron, please. 5 Should that be 4 March 2015? 5 6 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. 6 It should. 7 **ALISDAIR CHARLES JOHN CAMERON (affirmed)** 7 Q. So "4 March 2015", please. 8 Questioned by MR BEER 8 A. 9 9 MR BEER: Good morning, Mr Cameron. As you know, my name is Page 67 is the second correction. It's paragraph 279, 10 Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry. 10 again at the foot of the page. Can you give us your full name, please? 11 Yeah. 11 Α. A. Alisdair Charles John Cameron. 12 Q. In the second line, there's a document referred to, 12 13 Q. Thank you for providing a long and detailed witness 13 POL00021446, which is dated as 28 June 2016, whereas it statement to the Inquiry, it's dated 18 April 2024. 14 should be 28 June 2018? 14 15 A. Yes. 15 It's 115 pages long. Can we look at that, please. It's 16 WITN09840100. You should have a hard copy. 16 Q. Then, over the page, please. The last line reads --17 A. I do. 17 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Sorry, Mr Beer. That last one, a reference to 2018 in the second line, does that have 18 Q. I think there are five corrections that you wish to make 18 19 to it. Can we go through each of those in turn, please. 19 any effect on the 2016 in the first line? 20 A. There are six. There was one I put forward to the 20 MR BEER: Yes. 21 Inquiry a couple of days ago. 21 THE WITNESS: Ooh, I think it does, sorry. It should all be 22 Yes, I've left one out because it was just a grammar or 22 2018 in this paragraph. I apologise. 23 syntax one about a full stop. 23 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: No, that's fine, thank you. 24 24 MR BEER: Then, over the page to the last sentence: Α. Right. 25 Q. So I've cut that one. Page 42, please. If we look at 25 "This was subsequently accepted by Ernst & Young in 1 July 2017 ..." 1 statement you make an apology in paragraph 6 -- there's 2 That should read "July 2018"? 2 no need to turn it up -- but I think there's something 3 3 A. Absolutely. additional you wish to say now, so please do say that 4 Q. Thirdly, page 71. In the last line, there's a reference 4 which you wish to say. 5 to a document, FUJ00171778 and that's said to be 5 A. Thank you. I'm sorry that when I joined Post Office in 6 15 February 2019; that should be 15 March 2019 --6 2015 I accepted, without challenging the evidence, that 7 7 A. Okay. there had been no miscarriages of justice in the earlier 8 Q. -- and I think that is actually correctly dated in the 8 prosecutions which caused so much devastation to 9 first line of para 292? 9 postmasters and their families. As a member of the GLO 10 10 A. Okay. subcommittee, I am sorry I did not push against the lack SIR WYN WILLIAMS: It is. 11 of challenge and testing of Post Office's legal case. 11 12 Had I done better in these things, we might have started 12 MR BEER: At page 86, please, at the top of the page, which is paragraph 338, the date of the document, three lines 13 13 the process of getting justice for postmasters earlier. 14 in, should be 13 May 2019, not 23 May 2019. 14 I hope that my statement and evidence today assists 15 the Inquiry in its investigations and in getting to the 15 A. Yes. Q. Thank you. I think the sixth amendment was just typo, 16 truth, which is the least that those affected deserve. 16 17 so we needn't correct that. 17 Thank you for giving me this opportunity. 18 Can we go to page 115, please, in the hard copy. Is Q. Thank you very much, Mr Cameron. 18 that your signature? 19 You give evidence in your witness statements about 19 20 A. Yes. 20 issues that the Inquiry call Phase 5 and 6 issues --Q. With those corrections brought into account, are the A. 21 21 22 contents of that witness statement true to the best of 22 Q. -- and also some Phase 7 issues --23 your knowledge and belief? 23 Yes. 24 A. Yes, they are. 24 Q. -- which are bringing us up to date? 25 A. Yes. 25 Q. Thank you. Mr Cameron, I know that in your witness 4 3

- 1 Q. I'm not going to ask you about those Phase 7 issues
- 2 today.
- 3 A. Okay.
- 4 Q. If and to the extent that it's ever necessary to ask you
- 5 about those issues, that will happen after the summer.
- 6 A. Okay.
- 7 Q. Can I start with your background, please. You joined
- 8 the Post Office in January 2015 --
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. -- as a CFO?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Chief Finance Officer?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. Between 2017 and 2019 you were jointly the CFO and
- 15 COO --
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. -- Chief Operating Officer; is that right?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Between April 2019 and September 2019, you were the
- 20 Interim CEO --
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. -- chief Executive Officer?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. And from September 2019 until the present day, you have
- 25 been the Chief Finance Officer --
  - 5
- 1 please, a little bit more, this is your document --
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. -- is that right?
- 4 A. Yeah, absolutely.
- 5 Q. It's dated 19 November 2020?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. That appears on all of the pages. It's seven pages
- 8 long, and I'm going to spend some time on this document
- 9 this morning, if I may.
- 10 A. Of course.
- 11 Q. Because, essentially, it's a narrative account and your
- 12 reflections, is this right, as at 19 November 2020 --
- 13 **A.** Yes.
- 14 Q. -- on what went wrong in relation to Horizon?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. So, just to work out where we are in the narrative, the
- 17 chronology: at this time, Paula Vennells had ceased to
- 18 be the CEO for about 18 months; is that right?
- 19 **A.** Yes.
- 20 Q. She, I think, announced or disclosed her intention to
- 21 leave in about November '18 --
- 22 **A.** Yes.
- 23 Q. -- and left in about March '19?
- 24 A. Yes
- 25 Q. You had ceased to be the Interim CEO --

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. -- albeit you've been on medical leave since May 2023?
- 3 A. That's correct.
- 4 Q. Thank you. Prior to the Post Office, is this right, you
- 5 were a trainee accountant at Binder Hamlyn from
- 6 September 1987, you became a partner in Arthur Andersen
- 7 in 1999 -- is that right --
- 8 A. That's right.
- 9 Q. -- then Deloitte and Touche in 2002 --
- 10 A. Correct.
- 11 Q. -- again as a partner?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. That was in the Audit and Risk Management Department; is
- 14 that right?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. You subsequently became the Head of Internal Audit and
- 17 Risk Management for Centrica Plc?
- 18 A. Correct.
- 19 Q. Then from 2006 onwards you held various senior roles at
- 20 British Gas, including Finance Director?
- 21 A. Correct.
- 22 Q. Thank you. I'm going to start towards the end by
- 23 looking at a document called "What Went Wrong? A Draft
- 24 for Discussion". Can we look at it, please.
- 25 POL00175235. So you'll see, at the foot of the page,
- 1 A. Yeah.
- 2 Q. -- at the time that you wrote this document?
- 3 A. Yeah
- 4 Q. You finished in September 2019, so about 13 months
- 5 before this?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. At the time you were writing this, Nick Read was the
- 8 CEO; is that right?
- 9 **A.** Absolutely.
- 10 Q. Thank you. If we just go to the top of the page,
- 11 please. The purpose of, I think, the document is
- 12 explained in the first paragraph, and you say:
- "We need to explain, internally and externally, what
- 14 has gone wrong around the historical Postmaster
- 15 litigation."
- 16 **A.** Yes.
- 17 Q. So by this time, November 2020, the Common Issues
- 18 judgment had been issued --
- 19 **A.** Yes.
- 20 Q. -- the Horizon Issues judgment had been published --
- 21 **A.** Yes
- 22 Q. -- and the Group Litigation had reached a settlement?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Standing back, what was the intention behind writing the
- 25 document?

- A. And I think it does say it in here, it seemed to me --1
- 2 and I had this conversation with Nick, for whom I really
- 3 wrote the document -- was that if we were going to say
- 4 this can never happen again, which we were starting to
- 5 say, of course there's a sense of that literally being
- 6 true, because we'd never have prosecuted anyone again,
- 7 but, for that to be true, I think we had to have
- 8 a proper explanation that satisfied us as to what had
- 9 gone wrong. And the purpose of this document -- because
- 10 I had been there for a few years at this point,
- five years -- was to write down what I had thought was 11
- 12 gone wrong, not as a definitive answer, but as a first
- 13 contribution to what I hoped would be a wider debate, so
- 14 that out of collective experiences, you know, we would
- 15 get something more definitive.
- 16 In its second line under the title, it's said to be Q.
- 17 "A Draft for Discussion"?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Who did you intend to discuss the draft with?
- 20 A. I did discuss it with Nick Read and Richard Taylor and
- 21 Ben Foat.
- 22 Q. Was that after it had been written?
- 23 A. I wrote an initial draft, which I discussed, I think,
- 24 with Richard Taylor and Nick Read and they made some
- 25 comments and this was, I believe, the revised draft
- 1 A. Yeah.
- 2 Q. -- add to and contribute to your document --
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. -- and then, essentially, it would be settled as
- 5 an agreed account?
- 6 A. Yes. Although, listening to this Inquiry, I suspect we
- 7 would have kept changing it.
- 8 Q. Why do you think that?
- 9 A. Well, I've been absolutely staggered by some of the
- testimony you've got, particularly about things that 10
- 11 happened earlier, and so I suspect whatever narrative
- I created then would have been very incomplete. 12
- 13 Q. I understand. Do you know why the shared narrative, no
- 14 matter how much it moved over time, never got beyond the
- 15 draft that we see?
- A. No. 16
- Q. Did any of the three people that you mention, Mr Read, 17
- 18 Mr Taylor or Mr Foat, explain why it wasn't added to or
- agreed? 19
- 20 Α. No, I don't remembering it being a definitive
- 21 conversation. We just moved on.
- 22 Q. Was there an acceptance by the three of them of what you
- 23 said in the document?
- 24 Α. Yes, I believe that -- I mean, obviously, having been
- 25 there longer, there were things that I thought I'd seen

- 1 after that and the final draft.
- 2 Q. Can we just turn up paragraph 387 of your witness
- 3 statement, please, which is on page 101. You say, "The 4 paper" and you're talking about this document we are
- 5

7

11

- "... was discussed [as you've just said] with Nick
- Read, Richard Taylor (then Communications Director) and
- 8 Ben Foat and I believed helped prompt some cultural [change] for the leadership team in 2021."
- 9 10
  - Then you say this:
  - "I had intended the paper to be a first draft to be
- 12 built on by to others create a shared narrative for the
- 13 [Post Office] to test against the future. I am not
- 14 aware that that ever happened."
- 15 That's right. A.
- 16 Q. Do you know why that never happened, to your knowledge?
- 17 A. No, I don't remember us discussing it again. What I did
- see was some, you know, good cultural challenge and 18
- 19 debate in sort of January/February 2021, which I thought
- 20 was helpful and which I hoped this had helped prompt, it
- 21 might not have done, but I don't remember discussing
- 22 this document again after that.
- 23 Q. You said that it was your intention to create a shared
- 24 narrative. By that, do you mean that other people
- 25 would --

10

- 1 or knew that they wouldn't have done but, essentially,
  - I don't think they disagreed with it.
- 3 Q. Thank you. Can we go back to the document then, please?
- 4 A. Yes.

2

- 5 Q. POL00175235. In the first paragraph, continuing where
- 6 we left off, you say:

7 "Explaining the past is essential to restoring trust with third parties, many of whom are understandably 8

9 concerned and critical. It is important for Postmasters

10 who are working well with us and should be reassured

11 that they are in safe hands. It is important for longer

12

serving colleagues who have worked with Postmasters,

13 sometimes suspending, terminating and prosecuting. How 14

should such colleagues interpret what [the Post Office] 15 leadership asked of them and their own actions? It is

16

also important to us as leaders: we must be clear what 17

went wrong to prove to ourselves and others that it

18 cannot happen again."

19 That's essentially what you said in summary earlier

- 20 on?
- 21 A. Yes.

25

- 22 Q. You said:
- 23 "Firstly, there can be no doubt that things have 24 gone materially wrong:
  - "We expect the total cost of managing and settling

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

q

11

14

17

19

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10 11

14

17

18

21

22

23

24

25

1		claims to be between [£1 billion and £1.5 billion]."
2	Α.	Yes.
3	Q.	Was that a calculation that you undertook?
4	A.	No, it was my sense of where it was likely to go at the
5		time and I can't remember exactly where we were in terms
6		of the numbers for overturned historical convictions but
7		we were certainly starting with a much bigger number
8		than is currently provided, I think. So it was a view
9		of where it might go.
10	Q.	"[Secondly] We have been publicly criticised by
11		Mr Justice Fraser. Nick and I have apologised in
12		public.
13		"[Thirdly] We have not defended appeals against
14		criminal convictions that we prosecuted.
15		"The purpose of this paper is to document my
16		personal view about what has gone wrong. It relies on
17		my memory. That will be wrong or incomplete in places:
18		a lot of public studies show that memories are not
19		reliable. I joined in 2015, so many of the critical
20		happenings took place before I joined. I am sure this
21		narrative will also suffer from my unconscious bias to
22		justify myself.
23		"These issues need to be overcome so a single, core
24		narrative can emerge. More voices need to be heard with
25		different perspectives, including postmasters and
		13
1		a lot has emerged since which I think reinforces 2 and
2		3, particularly, even in the last couple of weeks at
3		this Inquiry.
4	Q.	So, at the time, you thought that some of them, 1 to 4,
5		had some substance but your view has hardened
6	A.	Yes.
7	Q.	in the light of evidence that you've heard
8	A.	Yes.
9	Q.	to the extent that you think they are made out?
10	A.	Sorry, I'm not sure I understood the question.
11	Q.	That 1 to 4 are, in your view now, established?
12	A.	Yes, I think so.
13	Q.	Let's look, then, at the view that you took at the time
14		in November 2020. You say:
15		"At the heart of everything, the original sin of
16		Post Office and this may go back a very long time
17		is that:
18		"1. Our culture, self-absorbed and defensive,
19		stopped us from dealing with Postmasters in
20		a straightforward and acceptable way."
21		Just stopping there, to understand what you are
22		saying and the status of what you're saying there, that
23		is a conclusion which you reached at the time

-- whereas the 1 to 4 above were the criticisms that you

15

24 A.

25 Q.

17 May 2024 critics. We must be brave in getting it right without too much concern for consequences. We must be confident of our facts. A core narrative can then be distilled, enabling credible, consistent and durable answers for stakeholders." Then you set out under the executive summary the four main lines of criticism that the Post Office had faced: "1. We have maintained an unacceptable relationship 10 with postmasters that was self-serving, based on an imbalance of power and information and a skewed contract. 12 13 "2. We were over-reliant on Horizon when we knew its weaknesses. "3. The original prosecutions were a deliberate 15 16 miscarriage of justice. "4. We should have settled the claims, apologised 18 and moved on years ago. We have defended ourselves to avoid the consequences. A waste of public money and 20 a postponement of justice." In relation to those four criticisms, what was your 22 view at the time as to the extent to which they were 23 accurate and had force? 24 So I believe through the two trials that this was 25 a reasonable view of what we knew at the time. Clearly, faced? A. Yes. Q. Okay, so 1, at the bottom of the page, is essentially your established view as at November 2020? Yes. Α. Q. Thank you. You describe it as an "original sin"? Q. Why did you use that language? A. I don't know and it sounds a little bit overblown, reading it again. But I think the point was that I think I was thinking about the management of 12 shortfalls in branches and the view that, you know, 13 I accepted when I joined, which was the postmasters were accountable for what happened in branches because Post 15 Office couldn't know what happened in branches and, whilst there was a logic to that, I think it gave us too 16 big an excuse not to really investigate what was happening and simply to accept that post offices were accountable. 19 20 And, you know, then you had the prosecutions, and

then -- and I think it's a point that Second Sight bring out, postmasters weren't necessarily being as open when they had problems because they feared the consequences, and so we weren't having the relationship we should have had, where they could flag concerns, we would help them

7

8

10

11

12

- 1 sort them properly and we would work together to run
- 2 a proper business, and so that was what I was I think,
- 3 trying to get at.
- 4 Q. I see. You describe there the Post Office's culture as
- 5 being "self-absorbed and defensive"?
- 6 Α. Yes.
- 7 Q. Did you form a view as to where that culture emanated
- 8
- 9 A. I think with all of this, I felt it had probably been
- 10 there for quite a long time but I think, you know, I'd
- 11 seen it and had tried to argue with it in places, you
- 12 know, around the response to Second Sight, around some
- 13 of the media responses and, you know, I did believe and
- 14 do believe that organisations should embrace challenge
- 15 and criticism and have dialogues with people, which is
- 16 why I was, you know, so keen to talk to Tim McCormack in
- 17 2019, against advice, because I thought we were better
- 18 being open.
- 19 Q. By this time you had been in the Post Office for nearly
- 20 six years, January 2015 to November 2020?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Had that culture that you describe there, of
- 23 self-absorbed and defensive, persisted in that period of
- 24 time?
- 25 Α. It was certainly true, through, I think, the
- 1 Issues judgment and the Horizon Issues judgment, which
- 2 had -- and, you know, the really shocking discovery that
- 3 there had been real miscarriages of justice because, you
- 4 know, Brian Altman's work. And so, you know, this was
- 5 where my views had shifted really significantly.
- 6 Q. Thank you. Then if we scroll down, please. Under the
- 7 heading of "The Report", that's essentially your report,
- 8 so you've moved on from the executive summary --
- 9 A.
- Q. -- you've then set out in bold some headings? 10
- A. Yes. 11

13

14

- 12 Q. The first one:
  - "We have maintained an unacceptable relationship with postmasters that was self-serving, based on
- 15 an imbalance of power and information."
- 16 That's back to the first point of criticism, the 17 first line of criticism?
- A. Yes, it's explaining more information below those 18 headlines. 19
- Q. Thank you. In the second paragraph under that heading, 20 21 you say:
- 22 "The fundamental belief that guided [the Post
- 23 Office] when I joined [remembering that was January
- 24 2015] and which had guided it for many years, was that

19

Postmasters were and had to be ... responsible for 25

- 1 litigations. I think it was, you know, much less true,
- 2 by November 2020.
- 3 Q. So certainly until early 2020?
- 4 I think that's probably about right, yes.
- Can we go over the page, please. You say: 5
  - "Everything else flows from that attitude and the lack of balance it created. It skewed the judgements made about the prosecutions and the subsequent
- 9 management of the case.

"The issues that followed are fundamentally for the Board, Executive and Legal teams. In particular ..."

- Then you set out six other conclusions between 2 to
- 13 7. I've just described them as conclusions. Am I right
- 14 to do so? These are, again --
- 15 A. That was what I understood at the time but, recognising
- 16 that some of this -- number 2, for example -- was just,
- 17 you know, I hadn't been there when that was happening
- 18 but that was what seemed to have happen.
- 19 So this is essentially what you believed had been
- 20 established on the facts that you had seen in your six
- 21 years? A.

Yes.

22

- 23 Q. Thank you. So, again, these aren't the allegations that
- 24 we saw on the first page; these are your views?
- 25 Correct and particularly views from seeing the Common
- 1 whatever happened in their shops. Once the systems,
- training and cash were handed over (and however well 2
- 3 they were handed over) the Postmaster was accountable:
- 4 'we cannot know what happens in a [post office] day to
- 5 day. When money is missing it may have been lost,
- 6 stolen by someone else or stolen by the Postmaster.
- 7 Whatever happened, the Postmaster still owes us the 8 money'."
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Did that state of mind persist throughout the period at
- 11 least up until the Horizon Issues judgment?
- 12 Yeah, even the Common Issues judgment, I think.
- 13 The Common Issues judgment.
- 14 Α. Yes
- 15 Q. I see. What you've put in quotation marks there, is
- 16 that actually somebody speaking or is that sort of
- 17 a synthesis of the views that you would expect senior
- 18 Post Office management, essentially, to express?
- 19 A. It's a synthesis.
- 20 Q. Right. Over the page, please. Foot of the page. Thank 21 you, three paragraphs from the bottom, you say:
- 22 "Often, defensiveness stopped us listening to our
- 23 critics. When I became Interim CEO, Tim McCormack
- 24 reached out to me. Paula had refused to talk to him for
- 25 some time. The advice of Mark Davies, Communications

1 Director, was never to talk to him because he couldn't 2 be trusted. I did speak to him on 2-3 occasions and 3 found him to be honest, concerned and trustworthy -- he 4 help me understand and fix an issue and then praised us 5 for it when he could have made a public fuss." 6 You referred to that earlier. 7 A. Yes. 8 We'll came later on this morning or early this afternoon Q. 9 to that exchange with Mr McCormack.

Why did you decide to speak with Mr McCormack? A. I thought we should listen to the people who were criticising us, just as a matter of principle. But I was told that, you know, he was sort of an enemy of the Post Office and he couldn't be trusted and he was just going to -- you know, anything we said to him would be used against us in public, and I was advised to read his blog, I think, which I did. And then I said, look, you know, this is someone who cares about post offices, not just the past, although he cared about that very much, but what was happening in post offices, he cared about post offices and I would always have a dialogue

with anyone who cares about post offices.

23 Q. You continue:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

9

20

21

"Second Sight, discussed elsewhere, challenged us on the principle that because disputes were not fully and

going on. We didn't chase errors in stamps because the Postmaster would probably fix them and it didn't cost

Are you referring there to contact you had from the subpostmaster at the Little Milton post office.

6 A.

7 Q. Again, we'll come to that later today. Over the page, 8 please. You say:

"Following the judge's verdict, I raised my concerns 10 with the General Counsel ..."

Is that Jane MacLeod? 11

No, that was Ben Foat. 12 Α.

That was Ben Foat by then? 13 Q.

14 A. Yeah.

Q. "... because I was now thinking about the Postmaster's 15 16 experience, not ours. The Network Operations Team now 17 proactively encourages postmasters to get stamps right, 18 counts are checked in Swindon and we do not convert 19 shortfalls to cash ..."

Then there's a passage in italics. Is that, essentially, your conclusion?

22 A. Yeah, it's my summary, yeah.

23 Q. When you say "summary", it's --

24 Α. Summary of that section.

-- a summary of that section --25 Q.

1 transparently resolved, Postmasters had little option

2 but to hide them. This is clearly debatable. But

3 I recall no debate: their report was drafted a few weeks 4

after I joined. This idea conflicted so hard with the

5 fundamental belief that it was not really considered."

6 Where you say it was not really considered, to whom 7 are you referring?

8 A. The leadership of Post Office.

9 Q. So can you date that?

10 A. Well, their report was drafted, I think, in April 2015 11 and published in the summer of 2015, or around that

time. So, you know, I would date it to that, I think. 12

13 Was that amongst the General Executive, generally? Q.

14 A. Yeah, and the Board. I mean, I don't think we debated 15 that point, that I recall.

16 Q. You continue:

17 "The judge's views ..."

18 That's Mr Justice Fraser?

19 Α. Yeah.

20 Q. "... made a difference to me. In summer 2019, a Post 21 Office came to me because they had a £4,000 shortage.

22 I asked the Network Operations Team to investigate. The

23 real source of the issue was resolved. But it took

24 months because there had been systematic misposting of

25 stamps, which made it very hard to see what had been

22

1 Yeah.

-- and you, we'll see, arrive at a "series of wrongs", 2

3 as you describe them?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Post Office wrongs?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. This is essentially your assessment?

8 Δ

"The first and fundamental wrong is that 'Our culture, 9

self-absorbed and defensive, stopped us from dealing 10

11 with Postmasters in a straightforward and acceptable way

12 ..."

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. That correlates to number 1 of 7 on the executive

15 summary?

Yes. 16 Α.

"We did not engage with Postmasters with an open mind or 17 Q.

18 listen properly to their concerns. We prioritised

19 issues according to their materiality to us and not to

20 a single Postmaster. We did not serve and assist

21 Postmasters. Training was not good enough. Support was

22 hard to access and of limited duration and insight. We

23 lacked transparency with Postmasters. We did not

24 resolve underlying issues, allowing them to recur

25 continuously as we prioritised other change and our

2

3

journey to profit. "By forcing Postmasters to be responsible for branch outcomes, they were more likely to pay for a shortfall or even accept a minor charge to avoid a major one. There was never a clear, transparent and objective process to resolve issues -- and arguably still isn't. "We did not engage with critics. We were convinced we were a good thing for the UK and anyone criticising was attacking. We defended or stayed silent." There's quite a lot there in those conclusions. A. Yes. Q. But you were satisfied that, on the basis of your six years' experience, working at a high level within the Post Office, which and every one of those facts is established? A. Yes. Q. Thank you. Can we turn to the second criticism that's put, one of four, in bold: "We were over-reliant on Horizon when we knew its weaknesses." You go on to address that. You say: "In 2014, Post Office stopped prosecuting Postmasters if the prosecution would place material reliance on evidence from Horizon. I do not think this decision included a full review of the implications for A. Yeah. Q. We know about that decision and we know the Board Were you a party to that decision making? A. Can you be a tiny bit more precise? Yes, in mid-2020 --Q. A. Yes. Q. -- mid-to late 2020. You were? A. Yeah. No, I joined Board meetings on that. Q. You say that: "... the Board has concluded that disclosures of historical Horizon issues should have been made." Can you be more precise as to what those disclosures were that you're talking about there? A. No. I mean, I can't remember what I was referring to, specifically. Q. But your view was that the Board had accepted that the Post Office ought to have disclosed, much earlier than it did, historical Horizon issues? A. Yeah, they should have been disclosed at the time of the initial trials, I think.

"The media interpretation that the shortfalls were

entirely caused by system issues -- and never theft or

lack of management -- does not ring true. Many

27

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22 **Q**.

23

24

25

You continue:

4 The first sentence is certainly accurate. The 5 second sentence, where you say, "I do not think this 6 decision included a full review of the implications for 7 earlier prosecutions", what did you know about what work 8 had been done in the year and a half before you joined 9 to review earlier prosecutions? 10 A. Nothing. I wasn't aware of any but, as I say at the 11 beginning of this document, this is just me writing 12 down, without research, what I understood at that time, 13 to then work with others to get a complete narrative. 14 So I wouldn't have made this statement in a more formal 15 document because I hadn't actually gone and researched 16 it. That was just my understanding at the time. 17 Q. You say: 18 "In my time, I do not recall until this year -- but 19 may have forgotten -- any discussion of the ongoing 20 duties of prosecutors. Nor do I recall any review of 21 historic issues with Horizon. 22 "Having reviewed the appeal cases in 2020, the Board 23 has concluded that disclosure of historical Horizon 24 issues should have been made. The Board chose not to 25 oppose appeals where the evidence relied on Horizon." 1 certainly hid issues and lied. Some will have stolen 2 money or failed to manage it. However, that is now 3 irrelevant. The convictions were and are unsafe. The 4 convictions must be overturned. No good can be served 5 from seeking retrials. The Postmasters are therefore 6 innocent." 7 Yeah. 8 Q. Why were you making that point? Was there still a view 9 within the Post Office that the subpostmasters may still 10 11 A. It may have been partly that, although I think Post 12 Office was not having a view on that, so much as, you 13 know, lawyers having a view of that, as they were 14 working through the schemes. But I think, you know --15 and this may just display my real ignorance of legal 16 processes, it did seem to me that, if you hadn't had 17 a fair trial, you can't be have been found properly 18 guilty, therefore you must be innocent because you're 19 innocent until proven guilty, whereas all the language around this, is around convictions being unsafe and 20 21 I thought, well, if they haven't had a fair trial, 22 they're innocent. 23 Q. I see. That's what that means, essentially?

earlier prosecutions. It clearly should have done and

addressed or not addressed at all."

it is important to know whether that question was badly

24

Yes.

25 Q. Got it. You say:

2

3

4

5

"Our legal advice [in the next paragraph] seems to have been wholly inadequate on the ongoing duties of prosecutors. Had we reviewed the prosecutions much earlier, we would presumably have known they were unsafe earlier and everything else would have been different."

6 A. Yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

Q. Was that a view held by anyone else in the GeneralExecutive?

9 A. I don't remember ever discussing it. I mean, I think it 10 was, for me -- I mean, we reached the settlement -- Nick 11 reached the settlement with the postmasters in December 12 '19 and, as part of that settlement, a review of the 13 prosecutions was agreed and, you know, I can't remember 14 the exact date when Brian Altman concluded that there 15 that been, you know, risk of miscarriage of justice and 16 informed the CCRC. But it was -- I think it was about 17 February. You know, so I mean it's a really short space 18 of time, with Christmas in between and, therefore, when 19 he got into it, it must have been really obvious that 20 there was a problem, was my take.

Now, all of that may be inaccurate speculation on my part. But that was my sense of it: that if we had really tested the evidence properly, we would have found the problem quicker.

25 Q. You say:

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

29

"The third wrong ..."

I should have said, that second wrong corresponds to paragraph 2 in the executive summary.

4 A. Yeah.

Q. "The third wrong is that 'We should never have conducted our own prosecutions'. There is an important duality in the state's approach, where the police investigate and the CPS prosecute. By undertaking both functions within [the Post Office], we set up a process that lacked challenge and independence. In addition, 'Some of the behaviours during the prosecutions, where we seemed to be using bullying tactics to get Postmasters to admit fault and take responsibility were unacceptable'."

Can you help us, where did you get the information about the use of bullying tactics to get postmasters to admit fault from?

A. I don't remember exactly when different stories and narratives emerged but what I'm talking about is evidence that, you know, people were pushed to accept a false accounting plea, rather than another sort of plea and that, you know, postmasters were told that no one else had ever seen this problem, and, you know, my sense of the narratives was that people had, you know, been pushed very, very hard to declare themselves guilty in a way that doesn't feel right.

"The second wrong is 'We did not disclose Horizon issues to the defence when we prosecuted Postmasters, especially between [2008], when evidence of concerns was emerging, and 2014", which is the date when you stopped prosecuting.

6 A. Yes.

7 **Q.** The date of 2008, which you put in square brackets,
8 which you say is "when evidence of concerns was
9 emerging", can you recall where you got (a) the date and
10 (b) the information that that's when evidence of
11 concerns was emerging from?

A. No, but it must have been. I can't remember exactly
 where we were in a sort of media narratives or what had
 come out of the trials but, you know, I obviously had
 a sense, which has come out more in this Inquiry, that,
 you know, information was available which people should

have shared with the defence at the time and didn't and, therefore -- and I was guessing it was about 2000 and

since, I think, I've read somewhere that between that
 sort of 2007, 2010, more information had emerged which
 should have been shared.

Q. So your doubt about the date is reflected by the use ofthe square brackets; is that right?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Continuing:

30

1 Q. In your view, that was established on the information2 that you had seen in your six years in the Post Office?

A. Not from anything I had seen in the Post Office, so this
 is stories about the past that had emerged --

5 Q. Yes, stories about the past?

6 A. -- because, obviously, we hadn't been doing prosecutions
7 in that period.

8 Q. Over the page, please, to the fourth wrong.

"The fourth wrong is 'We did not reassess our behaviour as prosecutors between 2014 and 2020'."

So you're talking about a sort of a lost six or seven years there, are you?

13 **A.** Yeah.

9

10

11

12

22

23

24

25

14 Q. "Instead, we went forward confident that the [Post 15 Office] was fundamentally reliable. We debated several 16 times in 2016-18 whether we insured restart 17 prosecutions. Our Legal Team were, rightly, firm that 18 we should not restart but the reason given was that it 19 might look as though we were being disrespectful of the 20 courts. No one suggested that Horizon was or had been 21 inherently inaccurate."

Then I'm going to skip over those bullet points and scroll down, please. You add:

"Fujitsu did have remote access, which was identified in 2015 (?) and then again later. There are,

of course, contractual limitations with Fujitsu that are important to us but are not of interest to anyone else."

The date on which you say remote access was identified as query 2015; do you know where that information came from?

- A. No, I think the question mark meant I couldn't remember.
   It was identified to me in 2016 and forms part of my witness statement.
  - Q. Yes. You say, moving on:

1

2

3

4

5

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

"The fifth wrong is that 'We relied on anecdotal evidence that things were working properly without fully investigating on a proactive basis. There were limited and partial investigations around Horizon and related issues like suspense accounts before and after 2012 but they were never thorough or complete. We did not seriously test what Fujitsu told us. When we did investigate, we looked "big picture" and not at the level of materiality relevant to an individual party.

So, breaking that down, you say that we, the Post Office, relied on anecdotal evidence. What are you referring to as "anecdotal evidence", I think, about the reliable of Horizon?

24 **A.** So I've been a business that -- whose main income system wasn't working properly and it's absolute chaos. This

33

- 1 Q. -- which you extrapolate to mean --
- 2 A. Yes.
- Q. -- the integrity of the system is sufficient foreveryone --
- 5 **A.** Yes.

16

17

18

19

20

- Q. -- without drilling down to what you describe as the
   materiality of any faults for an individual
   subpostmaster?
- 9 **A.** Yeah, and I think the materiality point is a really
  10 intractable one, which is why I make a reference to it
  11 still being true, because, you know, Post Office, you
  12 know, is a medium-sized business and you are operating
  13 at a level of materiality which is, you know, sort of
  14 hundreds of thousands to worry about an issue and, you
  15 know, our accounts are done in millions, and businesses

But if you're a local postmaster -- if you're a postmaster, 100 quid might make all the difference to good week/bad week, whether you're making a profit, whether you're not, and I genuinely don't know how you maintain both levels of materiality at once. I think

21 maintain both levels of materiality at once. I th 22 it's a really tricky question for the Post Office.

of that size run in a certain way.

Q. Are you saying, amongst the fifth wrong that you write
 about there, was that there had not been an independent
 and impartial investigation into the integrity of

35

isn't something you can choose. You know, there aremillions of stopped transactions, customers are

3 screaming at you, you can't answer the phones you can't

4 pull any financial information together, and Post

5 Office, in my time, didn't look like that at all. So

6 that was part of the sort of anecdotal evidence for me,

7 and the DMBs worked. So the DMBs used the same system

8 to process the same transactions and they just weren't

getting, as I understand it, the shortfalls that we were

seeing in some agency branches, and that led me, you

11 know, to believe that the problem wasn't the way the

software operated -- I mean, it might have been in 2005 or 2007 but, in the time I was in Post Office, it wasn't

the software that wasn't operating properly.

It was, you know -- and these are things that may have been absolutely contributed to by lack of support, lack of training and clear instructions but it wasn't -- you know, the post offices maybe weren't being managed as tightly as they were in the directly managed branches, which had much more experienced staff. So I assumed it was more a process and a control point, rather than a software point. So it's things like that.

Q. So there you're referring to anecdotal evidence as
 meaning sort of macro-level points --

25 A. Yeah.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

34

1 Horizon?

A. I think there had been some, before my time, I think
 KPMG had been involved in one, but, clearly, there
 hadn't been a really comprehensive one. And it's very
 difficult to prove negatives. I know a lot of work has
 been done since but it is tricky to prove something is
 working perfectly.

8 Q. Can we move on to, I think, what was the third9 allegation, in bold:

"The original prosecutions were therefore a deliberate miscarriage of justice."

You say:

"I cannot comment on the motivations of the original prosecutors. I joined at the tail end of the Mediation Scheme. I never heard anything which suggested that the Board had been anything other than straightforward in its desire to resolve issues and move on. I suspect but cannot prove that [the Post Office] people were in fact so convinced of their own positions that they interpreted every victory as being justice. If I am right, this was less a deliberate miscarriage of justice as a blindness towards the possibility of a miscarriage."

Then over the page, please. You say:
"People underestimate the chaos and lack of control
36

in [Post Office] in its early years as an independent business."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

23

24

25

What are you referring to there, please? A. Well, I think it goes on to explain, and I set this out as well in my 2019 speech to the NFSP conference, which is that I think everyone assumes that because Post Office was a much bigger business, you know, it had a degree of control and understanding that actually wasn't there. So it had been ripped out of Royal Mail at quite short notice and its systems were incredibly old and underinvestigated. At one point I was challenging the idea that Post Office could have a problem with Oracle software that Oracle had never seen before, because it seemed absurd to me, and they just said, well, you know, no other client has ever tried to upgrade eight versions of the system in one go. So it had been hugely neglected. It was old and vulnerable and it took four years of effort to actually pull them out of Royal Mail and set them up on separate support because the people who built, it had never occurred to them that that might be something they would need to do.

Nothing was documented and you always assume with an older business that everyone knows how it works but, actually, no one knew how it worked. It had either got

who were simply doing a task, 9 to 5, Monday to Friday and going home and they had no idea why they were doing it and why it mattered, and so we were starting at a really basic level.

Q. Moving on, you say "The sixth wrong", and again, I think this falls in the category of things that you believed were established by this date, is that quote:

"... 'We did not -- do not -- always balance the tactical battles with other priorities'."

You continue by setting out the allegation:

"We should have settled the claims, apologised and moved on years ago. We have defended ourselves inappropriately to avoid the consequences of our actions. This has been a waste of public money and a postponement of justice."

I think, essentially, you think that is established?

17 A. Yes. I think I then go through, in a separate paragraph, to show why I thought that retrospectively --

18

19 Q. Yes.

20 A. -- and didn't think it at the time, and what the 21 narratives were.

22 Q. Let's just look at those, then. You say:

> "On the creation of [Post Office] as an independent business, the Board set up a mediation scheme. This was coming to an end as I joined. Everything I heard

> > 39

1 lost in Royal Mail or people had retired and, often,

2 systems projects were tricky because no one knew how 3 they worked anyway and, you know, they were trying to 4

rediscover that as they were changing them.

5 Q. Sorry, did that extend to Horizon, the Horizon system? 6 You took the view that nobody in the Post Office truly 7 knew how Horizon worked?

8 A. Yes, it was an assumption that Fujitsu did. And, yeah, 9 so -- and, generally -- and I know it is absolutely 10 absurd to talk about victims within the Post Office now 11 because we know who the real victims are, and they're 12 postmasters, but there was a sort of victim mentality in 13 the Post Office, which was that, you know, everything 14 was better 20 years ago, it's all someone else's fault 15 and there's nothing we can do about it.

16 Q. Did that include at the Group Executive level?

17 A. No, I think the Group Executive were trying to sort of 18 challenge that. This was at more junior levels of the 19 organisation, where just people doing tasks in 20 a slightly hopeless way and, when I got more involved in 21 operations in 2017, we started at a really basic level 22 of asking all the teams in places like Chesterfield to 23 debate what were the tasks they were doing, who they 24 were doing them for, and what the difference between

success and failure was, because we had so many people

1 suggested the new Board in 2012 had set out to reach 2 a real settlement so the business could move forward. 3 This clearly hadn't happened ..."

Then you say:

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

"... and the narrative when I joined was:

"[1] We tried to reach a fair settlement.

"[2] We should not try and settle with people with criminal convictions. By definition, they had been found guilty by an independent legal process. Many had also admitted guilt.

"[3] The amounts some people were claiming were disproportionate -- school fees for years. This was opportunistic and unreasonable.

"Second Sight were the wrong choice. We should have got a proper accounting or law firm to do a professional piece of work and move on."

Lastly:

"This was not the right use of public money."

19 So you say this was the narrative when you joined in 20 January 2015; who was pushing that narrative?

21 So I think that was probably a collection of things but 22 this was the narrative as I recalled it when the 23 decisions were being made, in first half of 2015, to 24 deal with the Mediation Scheme differently, shut it

25 down, move on from Second Sight.

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- **Q.** Who was pushing or peddling that narrative? 1
- 2 A. Well, I think probably sort of Chris Aujard, Mark
- 3 Davies, Paula agreeing with it. I mean, I think it's in
- 4 those conversations.
- 5 So pushed by Chris Aujard and Mark Davies but with Paula Q.
- 6 Vennells agreeing to it?
- 7 A. That was my understanding.
- 8 Q. What was the relationship between Mark Davies and Chris
- 9 Aujard, on the one hand, and Paula Vennells, on the 10 other?
- A. I don't know what the relationship between Mark Davies 11
- was with Chris Aujard. Chris Aujard wasn't there for 12
- 13 very long and I'm not sure I ever saw them together
- 14 particularly. Mark appeared to have a strong positive
- 15 relationship with Paula, and vice versa.
- 16 Q. You continue:
- 17 "Paula [Paula Vennells], Jane [Jane MacLeod] ..."
- 18 A. Yeah.

1

2

8

16

- 19 "... and I discussed informally settling rather than
- 20 closing the mediation scheme in 2015."
- 21 Just stopping there, do you remember when that was 22
- 23 A. No, I think -- I mean, it was an informal conversation,
- 24 I don't remember it being a --
- 25 Q. What was the reason for the discussion about, "Well,

CCRC view."

- Can you tell us what you're referring to there, Jane
- 3 MacLeod saying, "If we settle in the mediation this
- 4 might trigger a change in the CCRC view"?
- 5 A. I really don't, actually. I was reading this again, you
- 6 know, a few years later. I didn't remember that
- 7 particularly, and I was -- yeah, I noticed it when
  - I read it. Because I remember the arguments being much
- 9 more about is a settlement sustainable, but I may be
- 10 conflating 2018 arguments with 2015. So I don't
- remember it, I'm sorry. 11
- 12 Q. On its face, that may look to be logic, that we can't
- 13 settle, essentially, civil claims because it may affect
- 14 the view that the regulator of miscarriages of justice,
- 15 the investigator of miscarriages of justice, takes of
  - us, and it might prompt the CCRC to think that there may
- 17 be more substance in the complaints of miscarriages of
- 18
- 19 A. I agree. At this time, I don't remember Jane saying
- 20 that but I obviously remembered it in 2020.
- 21 "The logic was [you continue] -- we have not done
- 22 anything wrong -- we could justify settling for £10 to
- 23 £20 million but not for hundreds of millions of pounds.

43

- 24 Jane's view never wavered and she was right on one
- 25 aspect -- the settlement of the GLO precipitated,

let's settle rather than shut the thing down"?

2 One of us, and it might have been me, just asked the 3 question, I think, which was "Well, could we settle 4 this?", because clearly, you know, it was a big part of

5 the business and, you know, we wanted to reach

6 a resolution and focus on, you know, the commercial

7 business. And I think -- so the question was: can we

8 settle this? And the feeling I recall Jane expressing

9 was that we could, and I obviously remember the figure

10 of 20 million, but it would never -- and this feeling

11 grew, so I'm slightly worried about remembering later

12 conversations, but the very strong view, I think, Jane 13 held, which I agreed with, during the development of the

14 GLO and afterwards, was that there was just too big

15 a gap between the parties for us to reach a settlement

16 that was sustainable. 17

And therefore, we had to test it in court, in a kind of win or lose way, not just kick it down the road, because then everyone would know where they are and we could reach some resolution.

21 Q. You continue:

> "Jane's strong and unwavering view was that the issue could not be settled because any settlement would trigger a second wave of claims. Later, she also expressed concerns that it might trigger a change in the

exactly the challenges and costs she was concerned about.

"This conversation recurred at different points. Jane's view was strengthened by the advice from our legal teams: we were going to win in court and our contract with Postmasters was lawful."

Then over the page:

"This legal advice became increasingly fixed in place. In my view the Legal team of Jane, [Womble Bond Dickinson] and David Cavender (QC on the Common Issues Trial) became an increasingly tight group that constantly reinforced each others's views: an extreme example of groupthink. We did challenge -- I have always held the view and articulated it that you only end up in court when both sides have lawyers telling them that they have a 70% chance of winning."

Just stopping there, you say that the legal advice became increasingly fixed and you attribute that to Jane, Womble Bond Dickinson and David Cavender QC, yes? A. Yes, and I think it's hugely influenced by the reaction to the Common Issues judgment because, to me, that was a seismic moment, because we had lost on basically everything, and the judge was extremely critical, and

24 I thought that was a real moment to stand back and 25 reflect, and the legal advice was "No, no, no, it's the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

- 1 judge that's the problem, crack on. You know, we're not 2 changing our position at all".
- 3 Q. We'll see in a moment that you say the effect was essentially to double down? 4
- 5 A. Yes

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

23

6 Q. You continue:

> "Paula also questioned whether [Womble Bond Dickinson] were good enough but Jane held the line very firmly, from a belief that a more assertive firm might make us look like bullies. With hindsight, a more assertive firm would have seen the pitfalls and kept us out of court in the first place."

Can you tell us what you're referring to in that paragraph, please?

A. I think I remember Paula questioning Jane about whether 15 Bond Dickinson were right, probably in 2018, and I think, you know, it did feel to me -- and I think I make a reference to it in one of the emails -- that the postmasters just had better lawyers than us, was my sort of emotional reaction to it, bearing in mind I'm spectacularly ignorant of the legal processes.

> So I think my recollection was that Paula did question Jane to say, "Look, you know, are Bond Dickinson the right people for us?", and Jane said, "Well, they've done an awful lot of work over the years

"Mr Justice Fraser was very critical of us from the off. When we pushed [David Cavender QC] on this, he said that he had caught the judge's eye and they were as one. Fraser was just posturing so it didn't look like

he was against the claimants."

So just understanding what you've written there, you were saying that you'd challenged David Cavender on this and he was telling you that, in fact, he, David Cavender, had caught the judge's eye and they were as one on the merits of the case --

A. Yes. 11

12 Q. -- and that Mr Justice Fraser's outward behaviour was 13 posturing for the benefit of showing that he wasn't 14 against the claimants?

- A. That was my understanding, yes. 15
- Q. That's what David Cavender was telling you? 16
- 17 A. Yes, and I think this played to a whole -- I mean,
- 18 fundamental -- I mean, it felt all the way through the
- 19 Common Issues Trial that we were fighting two completely
- 20 different trials. So ours was entirely focused on the
- 21 legal interpretation of the contract, was the contract
- 22 between the Post Office and postmasters legal, and the
- claimants were focusing on whether it was fair, and that 24 was presented to us, I think, by David Cavender as
- 25 evidence that the claimants had a really bad legal case, 47

and so they know a lot of information and that's important", which I completely accept. But she thought this was about the optics, whereas, if we had employed a really big, aggressive City firm with that sort of reputation, we would have looked like corporate bullies.

But my feeling is, actually, we looked like corporate bullies anyway because of the size of Post Office compared to the size of an individual post office, and we didn't get very good advice; so it was the worst of both worlds but some of that is retrospective.

12 I see. So this question of whether Womble Bond Q. 13 Dickinson were good enough versus a more assertive firm, 14 are you talking there about the substance of the advice

15 you were being given or, essentially, the nature of the 16 firm, one Womble Bond Dickinson, I don't know, a Second

17 Division provincial firm versus a Magic Circle firm?

18 A. I've got no view on legal firms in that sense at all, so 19 this was about, you know, were we seeing enough

20 challenge and debate in the arguments and, you know,

21 I increasingly felt that we just weren't and that became 22 painfully true after the Common Issues judgment.

23 Q. I see. So it's about the substance of the advice?

24 Α. Yes

25 Q. I see. You continue:

46

1 so they were having to resort to fairness because they 2 didn't have a good legal contractual case, whereas, in 3 fact, you know, utterly the opposite was true.

Q. You say:

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

"When we asked [Mr] Cavender if he might be wrong, he said that was his advice and he had been successful in a long career.

"When the Common Issues judgment came out, the Board asked for a second firm to provide independent advice, challenging our team's position. This was done with eminent QCs but it was not explained to the Board at the point of choosing this advice (again, from my memory) that they were all from the same chambers."

We have seen quite a lot of contemporaneous documents that this concerned you.

16 Α. Yes.

17 Q. What was your concern that the advice being received was 18 from barristers all within the same chambers; what are you getting at? 19

20 A. So what I'm getting at is that we had pursued a legal 21 strategy that had proved to be, in the Common Issues 22 Trial, entirely wrong and failed, and what I was

23 expecting had been a re-examination of our position and

24 that isn't what happened, there was a sort of doubling

25 down. So I wanted someone new to come in and start with

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

24

25

1 a clear mind, and not be trying to defend what had 2 happened in the previous year. And so I was worried 3 when, very quickly, Lords Neuberger and Grabiner came 4 in -- and look, you know, in Jane's testimony she may 5 say she told me this and I'm sure she's right that she 6 did -- but I hadn't clocked that they were all from the 7 same chambers, and so my question were they going to be 8 as independent and starting from scratch, you know, or 9 were they going to be sort of briefed by David Cavender 10 as a trusted colleague and, you know, start from 11 a different position?

12 Q. You carry on:

13

14

15

16

17

"We were pushed very hard to appeal. Cavender constantly laded his comments with 'this awful judge' until I had to ask him to stop."

Does that refer to you actually telling the barrister to stop saying something?

18 A. Yes. This was in internal conversations, and it's 19 referenced in email, in my thing, I think, when I give 20 a general business update to Tim Parker on email around 21 this time. I made a reference to this, so this is at 22 the time and so, you know, it was "This awful judge, 23 this terrible judge, this awful verdict", and I was 24 saying, you know, this isn't helpful, you know, we need 25 to face the facts as they are.

49

had we done so, given what we've heard since and even
 what we'd heard in 2020, then I think the weakness of
 the evidence would have had emerged before we went to
 court. But that is a retrospective supposition.

Q. You say, in conclusion:

"The seventh wrong is that 'We did not sufficiently challenge and test our legal advice until it was too late'."

9 A. Correct.

5

6

7

8

10 Q. Thank you. That can come down, thank you.

Speaking generally, how did Nick Read receive this communication?

13 Α. He and I and Richard, my memory is, debated it once, and 14 Richard made some helpful comments, actually pushing me 15 to the sort of sense that it was -- before it was 16 a contractual problem, it was a cultural problem, and 17 I thought that was right and helpful and adjusted it for 18 that. And, you know, we discussed it again and my sense 19 was that, you know, they'd found it helpful and sort of 20 broadly agreed with it, recognising they hadn't been 21 here in those earlier periods and had less personal 22 experience, and --

Q. Was there any sense you got from the then Chief
 Executive Officer of the Post Office, Nick Read, that
 anything you had written here, was heretical or --

51

Q. "The advice simply doubled down. Eventually and really too late, we changed [General Counsel], added [Herbert Smith Freehills] and changed QC -- instantly the advice changed and we moved on a path to settlement."

Then in the penultimate paragraph on this page:

"We accepted very bad legal advice. The Board should have had the downside explored and the advice challenged much earlier, as well of course as assessing the earlier prosecutions. This has indeed been a waste of money and a postponement of justice."

So, essentially, you were finding the allegation that the claim should have been settled earlier, there should have been an apology earlier and that the Post Office should have moved on years ago, established?

15 A. Yeah, and we should have -- you know, I do believe and 16 it was in my apology earlier, that, you know, this was 17 the first time I've been through a process like this but 18 if we did this again now, and Post Office has learnt 19 some of these lessons, you know, there would have been 20 vastly more broad challenge and debate, probably 21 a completely independent KC going through from a sort of 22 claimant's perspective, and a real debate about the 23 evidence on which we were relying.

And I think we accepted the position that that was being done by legal teams and we just didn't do it and,

50

1 **A.** No.

2 Q. -- or fundamentally wrong?

3 A. No. Not at all.

4 MR BEER: Thank you very much.

5 Sir, I wonder whether we could take the morning 6 break now, the first of them, until 11.10, please.

7 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, of course.

8 MR BEER: Thank you very much, Mr Cameron.

9 (10.56 am)

10 (A short break)

11 (11.10 am)

12 MR BEER: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear us?

13 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you.

MR BEER: Mr Cameron, can we just pick up two last points in
 your "What Went Wrong?" document, please, which I rather
 skipped over. POL00175235, page 7, please, four

paragraphs from the bottom, starting:

18 "We should have been tackling these issues 10 years19 ago."

20 Thank you, do you see that paragraph?

21 **A.** Yes.

24

25

22 **Q.** Then four lines in, if it can be highlighted, please,

23 you say:

"Paula did not believe there had been a miscarriage and could have not got there emotionally. We believed

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

that there were material financial consequences that had to be justified: there was consciousness that this was public money that could not be spent unnecessarily ..."

What did you base your view on, that Paula Vennells did not believe that there had been a miscarriage of justice?

- A. I mean, everything she sort of said at the time. She
   seemed clear in her conviction from the day I joined
   that nothing had gone wrong, and it's very clearly
   stated in my very first Board meeting, and she never, in
   my observations, sort of deviated from that or seemed to
   particularly doubt that.
- 13 Q. So she was unwavering in her conviction that there hadbeen no miscarriages of justice?
- 15 A. As far as I was concerned, yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

23

24

25

- 16 Q. Did that persist right up until you wrote this documentin November 2020?
- 18 A. As far as I know, obviously I wasn't, you know -- she'd
  19 left the business in 2019.
- 20 Q. Yes. Then in the paragraph below, please:

"In conclusion, because the deficiencies in the prosecutions had not been identified, [Post Office] did not believe there had been a miscarriage of justice. It was therefore impossible for Paula [Vennells] and Jane [MacLeod] to recommend a settlement that would have cost

have another case two to three years later and we did want, you know, to reach a genuine permanent settlement.

But if we had settled then, then it would probably have been years before another case could get funding and work through and emerge, and that would have been the cynical strategy which, actually, we choose not to take.

- 8 Q. I'm interested in this, and it's the second time we've9 seen it in the document --
- 10 A. Yeah.
- Q. -- that that a factor brought into the calculus on
   whether to settle or not was that it might affect the
   CCRC's views.
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Did anyone express that?
- A. I don't remember them doing so but they must have said
   something or I wouldn't have written it in 2020 but,
- 18 I must admit, I've forgotten it at this stage. And
- 19 I haven't seen -- I've, you know, thanks to disclosure,
- 20 read an awful lot of documents over the last couple of
- 21 months and I haven't seen any reference to it.
- 22 Q. Thank you. That can come down.

Now, in a number of places in the document, is this right, you are either indirectly critical or directly critical of Ms Vennells.

a great deal of money, an apology and would probably trigger new claims and even change the CCRC mindset."

Again, you're referring to a change of the CCRC mindset. To what extent, to your knowledge, was that a relevant consideration in not settling the claims?

. My memory of it was not. I mean, my memory of it was that the real issue, which we debated quite a lot in 2018 and debated with the Government into October 2018, was that a settlement wouldn't stick. And so the choice was, do you fight a case, win or lose -- of course, we expected to win -- but do you fight a case, win or lose, and then you can reach a settlement later that's in line with expectations and, obviously, we'd have had to have asked permission from the Government for this money, because there a kick-the-can down the road strategy which we chose not to take, which was to settle.

We thought we could settle purely financially in 2018 before the trials, and we could have done that, we thought, but the view was it wouldn't stick, because what we had already seen was people, I was told, had signed full and fair settlements, postmasters, in the Mediation Scheme, and then joined the GLO. So the feeling was you couldn't genuinely reach a full and final settlement for, you know, 20 million quid. You might reach a settlement but it wouldn't stick and you'd

5

I don't know, actually -- I can't remember what

I particularly thought then. I don't know what I think
now and, obviously, I haven't heard Paula's evidence to
this, that the mindset I've been thinking about -- it's
very easy to sort of go through and say "Wow, yes, I was
told that so I didn't do that and I didn't know that",
and the question I've been asking myself a bit is,
"Well, if I was magically transported back to January

9 2015 and I was joining the Post Office, what would I do differently?", because clearly, it's gone horribly wrong.

11 wr

13

14

15

16

17

18

25

So I would have to do something differently, whether I was wrong at the time or not. It's what would you do differently? And I think it is testing and challenging that evidence and, clearly, that hadn't happened, and -- but what exactly, you know, whether people knew and chose to disregard or were just glib in ignoring or didn't know, I don't know, and I think you'll be the judge.

judge.
Q. Do you accept that the document in places indirectly or directly critical of Paula Vennells?

- 22 A. Yeah, yeah.
- Q. Can we look, please, at PVEN00000445. It may be this isonly available in the pdf format.

Maybe there's a bug or even an anomaly!

55

- 1 A. Here we go.
- 2 Q. Ah, here we are. Good. Now, this is a new document for
- 3 the Inquiry. We got it at 11.17 last night from Paula
- 4 Vennells --
- 5 A. Yeah
- 6 Q. -- and I think you have been shown it in hard copy just
- 7 before you gave evidence this morning?
- 8 A.
- 9 Q. It's been put on the tables of the Core Participants
- 10 this morning.
- SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Mr Beer, can you tell me the reference 11
- again, please, so I've got a clear note of it? 12
- 13 MR BEER: PVEN00000445.
- SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you. 14
- MR BEER: We've been told by Ms Vennells' legal 15
- 16 representatives that she has conducted some further
- 17 searches and has found some 50 additional documents that
- 18 we're to get today, ahead of her giving evidence next
- 19 week, and this is one of them.
- 20 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right.
- 21 MR BEER: Can we see the date of it is 28 November '18 and,
- 22 if we look at the second page, we can see that it is
- 23 signed off by you.
- 24 A. Yes.

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

25 Q. If we look down a little further, yes, and this is your

myself: 'What would Paula do?' and I especially admire your self control, your restraint, your constant desire

3 to listen first and your endless ability to make tough 4

decisions and have honest conversations without ever forgetting the individual you are dealing with.

"You have a different and a better impact than any

[Managing Director] or CEO I have worked for -- the joy of our culture is how unpolitical it is, how collegiate

we can be and how shared our sense of urgency is. None

of that would have been created without you.

"However you are treated (I hope well and fittingly), I know and I hope you understand what a difference you've made to people's lives across the

[United Kingdom].

"I really can't imagine doing this without you ...

- "Thank you so much,
- 17 "AI."
- 18 Α. Yes.
- The sentiments that you express in this document which, 19
- 20 as I say, has recently emerged, appear rather different
- 21 from the November 2020 document?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. So what changed?
- 24 A. Well, Common Issues judgment, Horizon Issues judgment

59

25 and a recognition -- and the discovery that the earlier

- 1 writing and your letter?
- 2 A. Yes.

4

- Q. Let's just read through it. So November '18, I think 3
  - this is when Ms Vennells would have told you
- internally -- is that right --5
- 6 A. Yes --
- 7 Q. People internally, that she was going to leave?
- 8 A.
- Is this letter written in response to that internal 9
- 10 announcement?
- 11 Yes. A.
- 12 Q. "Dear Paula,

13 "Before we get into a world of announcements, 14 reactions and plans, I wanted to share what I'm feeling.

15 "Overwhelmingly, it's gratitude.

16 "I have loved the last 4 years. It has been

17 a privilege to serve the Post Office and that has been

18 made possible by you ..."

19 Does that say "bringing me in"?

- 20 A. I think it does.
- Q. Okay: 21

25

1

2

17

18

19

22 "... bringing me in, treating me like a valued

23 partner and supporting me so well. For all of your

24 generosity, thank you. Because your values are so

strong, I have learnt so much from you and often asked

trials were miscarriages of justice and that innocent

people had been sent to prison are the things that 3 changed. And so, you know, in the November 2020

4 document I'm trying to give, you know, a sense of how it

5 could have gone so appallingly wrong and, obviously,

6 Paula had been running the business for a long time,

7 whereas, in this, I didn't think any of that happened.

8 I didn't know that had happened and what I was 9 responding to was, you know, a personal sense of 10 gratitude. So the mission of helping the Post Office 11 business work better to help post offices stay open is 12 one that emotionally engaged me from the first day 13 I heard about it in 2014, as a possible job, and has 14 never stopped engaging me since. I think it's 15 desperately important and it's an absolute privilege to 16 be able to work on that and that feeling has never

changed. And I was grateful to her for giving me the job and working with me and giving me the opportunity, and I had

20 found her, you know, straightforward to deal with. 21 I think -- I mean, the only caveat I would add is 22 I wasn't trying to give her a performance appraisal

23 here. I was trying to say thank you and that was the

24 nature of the letter.

25 Q. You referred to information, facts and evidence

A. Of course.

1		emerging
2	A.	Yeah.
3	Q.	between November '18 and November '20?
4	A.	Yeah.
5 6	Q.	Did that, in fact, cause you to change your view of  Ms Vennells and her conduct?
7	٨	It causes me to be, you know, far less, sort of,
8	Α.	simple-minded about it, I had a sort of single view and
9		clearly it's much more complicated than that but, as
10		I think I said earlier, I'm trying really hard not to
11		form a final view of Paula until at least I've heard her
12		testimony next week and probably until I've heard the
13		Inquiry's verdict in due course, because I don't know
14	_	what to think.
15	Q.	
16		then, the Post Office's knowledge of issues with the
17		Horizon system and, in particular, your knowledge from
18		January 2015 onwards.
19	Α.	Yeah.
20	Q.	Can we look, please, at your witness statement to start
21		with. It'll come up on the screen, page 2, paragraph 6,
22		please.
23		I should say, Mr Cameron, if it helps, I'm going to
24		address some of these issues with a relatively light
25		touch because of the answers that you've given in 61
		O1
1		it had found no evidence of faults with the Horizon IT
2		System, or that convictions of postmasters had been
3		unsafe."
4		Then the last four lines:
5		"It became clear to me in 2019 that postmasters
6		needed far greater support, and this demanded a culture
7		shift. In 2020, I understood that there had been
8		miscarriages of justice which should never have been
9		allowed to happen"
10		Then if we go forwards, please, to page 23 of your
11		witness statement, paragraphs 94 and 95. In 94, you
12		say:
13		"By the time I joined in 2015, the [Post Office]
14		Board had concluded that its IT was old, underinvested
15		and vulnerable. The [Post Office's] IT had always been
16		provided by [Royal Mail Group] but following
17		independence new, separate third party support
18		structures had to be put in place by March 2016."
19		"95. There are a number of concerns regarding
20		Horizon, the 'Front office' IT system. It was dependent
21		on physical data centres which were old and needed
22		continuous investment. It was time consuming and
23		expensive to change. The contract with the system's

1 relation to the document that you wrote. 2 A. Thank you. Q. Can we look at page 2 of the witness statement, 3 paragraph 6, please. I think we're switching systems. 4 We had a system crash because we had to switch systems 5 6 in order to display of the new document. 7 I wonder if we could remain in the room for five 8 minutes with you switched off the screen, and we'll call 9 you when we're ready? 10 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I suppose prior to this Inquiry, I might 11 have been surprised about what are called "system crashes", but perhaps not as surprised now as I would 12 13 have been then! MR BEER: Thank you, sir. 14 So five minutes, please. 15 16 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. 17 (11.26 am) 18 (A short break) 19 (11.31 am) 20 MR BEER: Thank you. Sorry about that, Mr Cameron. We were 21 looking at paragraph 6 on page 2 of your witness 22 statement, please. You say that, if we just scroll 23 down, when you joined the Post Office, remembering 24 that's January 2015: 25 "... the business was confidently communicating that 1 understood to be operating effectively ..." 2 Then, lastly, page 105, paragraph 404: 3 "In my executive roles I rarely got involved with 4 issues faced by individual [subpostmasters], as the 5 primary stakeholder relationship with [the Post Office] 6 was through the Network or Retail teams. The teams 7 I was responsible for provided operational support and 8 I tended to see that through the lens of collective statistics, control measures, efficiency, and cost 9 effectiveness." 10 At the end: 11 12 "However, there were a few individual scenarios that 13 I was made aware of during my tenure which I set out 14 below." 15 Then you start in paragraph 405 with one in July 16 2016, yes? 17 A. Yes Q. So I just want to look, they're the paragraphs where you 18 speak about your understanding of the IT system, the 19 20 Post Office's view of its IT system, particularly 21 Horizon, and the extent to which you got involved in 22 individual cases? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. I just want to look at some individual cases, if I may.

64

provider, Fujitsu, was very expensive. It was slow and

24

Q. Can we start, please, by looking at POL00102249. You'll 1 2 see, at the bottom half of the page, please, an email of 3 1 March 2015, in which Paula Vennells copied you, 4 amongst others, into an email chain of a complaint made 5 by a subpostmaster called Michael Crocker, regarding 6 discrepancies with Horizon, and she says, Ms Vennells:

> "I would really appreciate your help. This complaint simply shouldn't have reached me ..."

Then she says, in her third paragraph:

"You will see that I have already asked for Angela to look into the complaint personally.

"This needs to be the priority.

"However, I am as concerned about the helpline answers and why this wasn't immediately flagged and escalated? We know that scratchcards have caused problems in the past; and as I say above, I'd like confirmation that any of the Sparrow/Second Sight themes are flagged so that colleagues know what to do if they are unable to resolve them at the first line."

Go back to the previous page and scroll up, thank you. Ms van den Bogerd replies:

"Hi Paula,

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

4

16

18

"I have already actioned your ... request and have dropped a brief email to Michael at the branch", and then some other information.

1 Q. -- the Mediation Scheme, the Second Sight report in 2 2014; when you joined were you aware of any of that?

A. Specifically, I don't think I had read them. So I was aware of the general tenor and noise and, obviously, you 5 know, in my first Board meeting, Paula, in her CEO 6 report, gave a very, very strong view to the Board,

7 who'd been around for a bit and didn't question it, that 8 a lot of work had been done on these things and there

9 was just nothing to see here.

10 Q. And that the Board should move along?

11 A. Well, certainly, I felt, my job -- the reason I'd been 12 hired was to focus on the business as it was in 2015,

13 and so I accepted that as, you know, I could focus on

14 the current business and what had happened before was,

15 you know, other people were dealing with -- been dealing

with it for years and were satisfied there were no

17 issues, having done a lot of work. Clearly that was,

you know, as I said in my apology earlier, the wrong

19 conclusion to draw but it's absolutely the conclusion

20 I did draw.

- Q. So when something like this came, in --21
- 22 **A**. Yeah.
- 23 -- you're a copyee, amongst quite a group of senior 24 people, what do you make of it?
- 25 A. I'm not sure I made anything of this particular one. It

67

Do you know why you were added to this email chain, 1 2 what had it got to do with you?

3 A. At this stage, I don't think directly -- so I got more 4 involved in operations later, so my memory is that

I wouldn't have been directly involved. Paula copied me 5

6 in on a lot of stuff but I don't know, specifically.

7 Q. This would appear, on the documents that we've got, to 8 be the first occasion, you having joined in January

9 '15 -- this is now March '15 -- in which you had drawn

10 to your attention an issue that, in broad terms,

11 concerned Horizon?

12 A. Okay.

13 Q. Before you joined, had you read any articles or press 14 coverage regarding issues with the Horizon system?

A. I don't remember specifically. I would have certainly, 15

16 as part of a recruitment process, you know, looked at

17 press coverage and I'm sure I would have asked, you

18 know, a question of Paula and Neil Hayward at the time

19 of my recruitment to what their view of that was. But

20 I don't remember it specifically.

21 Q. When you had joined, there had been the Computer Weekly

22 article in May 2009, there had been a series of BBC

23 programmes, there had been the Second Sight

24 investigation --

25 **A**. Yeah.

66

1 wasn't my area of accountability, it was one email and

2 I was probably getting 50 emails a day. And I don't

3 think -- no one was saying there can't be any problems,

4 or that branches can't be in the wrong position and, you

5 know, in the second batch of documents I got after my 6 witness statement, there are a lot of these over the

7 next -- you know, there's a dozen of these or so over 8 the next three years.

9 Q. I'm going to go through --

10 A. Okay.

11 Q. -- not all of the dozen but some of them --

12 Α.

13 Q. -- some examples of this kind of thing?

14 Yeah, okay.

15 It may be helpful if you just describe your generic 16 reaction to getting, say, a dozen emails raising

17 problems with the reliability or the integrity of

18 Horizon?

Well, so that wouldn't -- so, generally, the pattern of 19 20 these, having read them again over the last few days, is

21 it's a dozen emails over three years, four years --

22 so -- three years -- so I wasn't necessarily seeing them

23 as a huge pattern. The general way this worked is they

24 were triggered because Paula had personally got

25 a complaint. She had then distributed it for people to

look at. Every single time, it's Angela who is asked to investigate it and when there are a response back, that I can see in the documents, and there are on some and not on others, it's generally quite a reassuring response in the sense of "Yes, we've explained that, that postmaster is happy", "That postmaster isn't happy, but I'm clear that this is what has happened".

And so what I took from it, you know, rightly or wrongly, was that there was a sort of escalation because we hadn't resolved the issue properly the first time, and that is a good thing to have dealt with and recognised it and that, you know, generally, we had found an explanation that satisfied ourselves. And I don't remember any of them going "Yeah, you know what? There's a problem with Horizon here".

- 16 Q. Okay, let's look at a few more with some variations onthe theme.
- 18 A. Yeah.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- 19 Q. POL00233291. Look at the foot of the page first,20 please. This is an email from you of 1 October 2015.
- 21 A. Yeah.
- 23 it to but I think we can see, at the top of the page, it
- 24 was at least to Alwen Lyons, yes?
- 25 A. Yeah.

69

- understood it -- but they had withdrawn from the
   process, I think just before I joined and --
- 3 Q. Just to stop there.
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 **Q.** That part of what you were later to refer to in email
- exchanges as sort of a bluff exercise by Fujitsu, as yousaw it?
- 8 A. Well, I didn't know, obviously, but it seemed -- I at
- 9 least asked myself the question as to whether they were
- authentically withdrawing or merely putting ourselves in
- a position where we had to go back and ask them for more
- 12 help.
- 13 **Q.** Okay. Sorry, I #interrupted what you were saying. So
- 14 you thought that Fujitsu would be the preferred supplier
- 15 for the front office and you were then going to talk
- 16 about IBM.
- 17 A. Yeah, so when Fujitsu withdrew or -- you know, what
- 18 Lesley Sewell and others were doing was to continue the
- 19 procurement and it is -- you know, with Government
- 20 procurements you really do have to be careful about
- 21 varying them at all. So we continued the procurement,
- 22 and IBM won, and what they were being asked to do was to
- 23 build a new version of Horizon.
- 24 **Q**. Yes
- 25 **A.** So it would be more modern, it would be better digitally 71

1 Q. Then if we scroll down back down to your email, then --2 also to Gill, which I think must be Gill Tait?

3 A. Yeah.

4 **Q**. "Gill,

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

of hindsight.

"My understanding -- Alwen may be able to confirm -- is that the Board asked, a long time ago, for us to ensure that there was a fully independent review of the new IBM software to ensure that it works accurately before we complete/undertake (?) the rollout.

"At the same time, we need to work out who is going to give an expert assurance to the courts that we can rely on the system to prosecute people for theft.

Fujitsu used to do this but weren't considered independent enough.

"Could you please give some thought to how we do whatever you do to two birds with one stone?"

So, firstly, the new IBM software, can you explain, please, what that was?

A. Yeah, so when I joined, the Board had been going through
 a series of IT procurements to put in new support
 structures for the whole of POL's IT landscape and the
 assumption, as I understood it, had been that Fujitsu
 would be most likely to win the front office procurement
 the sort of Horizon system procurement because - I mean, they owned it and ran it and no one else

7

1 connected but it would basically do exactly the same 2 thing, and that was going to cost 100 million or so, and 3 they won that procurement, IBM, and started working on 4 it in 2015. And this got us into difficulty relatively 5 quickly because no one -- I mean, this was a difficult 6 thing to do and it proved more difficult than we 7 realised because, actually, no one knew how Horizon 8 worked and, therefore, recreating it without the help of Fujitsu was phenomenally difficult anyway and, actually, 9 10 it's a slightly maybe odd thing to do, with the benefit

But anyway, that's what the business was doing. And so we were really in doubt that it could be properly finished and rolled out by the date when Fujitsu's contract ended, so we extended the support contract with Fujitsu to give us more time. But by, I think, summer probably of 2015, early autumn, I was getting really anxious that the business just wouldn't be able to do the IBM work, so I asked Chris Broe, who was the Interim CIO because Lesley had resigned and left, to reach out to Fujitsu very quietly and say, "Look, if we don't do the IBM project, would you help and, you know, sort of come back", as it were.

come back", as it were.
Q. Just to cut to the issue there, you foresaw the need for the supplier to be able to give an expert assurance to

- 1 the court that the system could be relied on in criminal 2 prosecutions?
- 3 A. So, yes, and, you know, I'm sure we'll talk about
- 4 prosecutions. So, you know, Post Office does give a lot
- 5 of cash to a lot of people, and it has to be mindful
- 6 that it gets properly looked after and that someone
- 7 might steal it or lose it or not control it, and so --
- 8 and that was part of, you know, our expectation at the
- 9 time, that we would go back to --
- 10 Q. So here you're referring to the proposed IBM system, not
- 11
- 12 Yes. Α.

18

13 Q. Thank you. You say:

14 "Fujitsu used to do this [ie supply expert assurance 15 to the courts that we can rely on the system] but 16 weren't considered independent enough."

> Who told you that Fujitsu weren't considered independent enough?

- 19 A. I can't remember, I'm sorry.
- 20 Had it ever been explained to you by this time, October
- 21 '15, that the principal witness for Fujitsu, a man
- 22 called Gareth Jenkins, had been regarded by the Post
- 23 Office as being an unreliable witness who had breached
- 24 his duties to the court in the evidence that he had
- 25 given?

73

- 1 What would you need to do to believe that?" And we did
- 2 make another quite formal decision, I forget exactly
- 3 when, but Paula takes it to the Board or the GE, I can't
- 4 remember, and said, "Well, we're not doing it now and,
- 5 you know, for us to do this again, you would need
- 6 a really reliable expert witness". And I think that's
- 7 what -- I'm not sure this was particularly obvious to me
- 8 at the time but that was clearly what Jane was working
- 9 on with Deloittes at one point.
- 10 Q. Thank you. So your view in late 2015 was that the
- reason that the Post Office wasn't prosecuting wasn't 11
- 12 because of an acknowledgement that it had done anything
- 13 wrong in the past; it was simply a matter of choice?
- 14 A. That's right.
- Q. Thank you. Can we move on, please, to 2016. 15
- 16 POL00030012. This is an email, if we look at the middle
- of the page, please, from Rodric Williams, who I think 17
- 18 you will have known as a member of the Legal Team --
- 19 Α. Yes.
- 20 Q. -- to Rob Houghton?
- A. Yeah.
- 22 Q. Do you remember him?
- 23 A. Oh, yes.
- 24 What function did he perform?
- He was the CIO who joined in -- who I recruited, who 25 A. 75

A. No.

1

4

- 2 Q. By this time, had you been shown or been told about or 3 even had summarised to you the contents of legal advice
  - written by a man called Simon Clarke in mid-2013 to the
- effect that Mr Jenkins had breached his duties to the 5
- 6 court, was a tainted witness and couldn't be relied on
- 7 by the Post Office again?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 **Q.** Instead, it seems that you had been told by somebody
- 10 that Fujitsu weren't considered independent enough --
- 11 A.
- 12 -- and that's why they weren't giving evidence? Q.
- 13 Yeah, all through, you know, as I set out in my witness
- 14 statement, the time, I had a bee in my bonnet about
- 15 making decisions properly at the time and I was saying,
- 16 well look -- and the view, as I understood it from Jane
- 17 and the Legal Team was, "Look, we haven't done anything
- 18 wrong and so the reason we're not prosecuting is to give
- 19 the court cases time to work through and not to rile
- 20 people, but we'll probably come back to it later".
- 21 Q. When you say the legal people, can you be more specific
- 22

4

6

8

9

- 23 A. Well, I mean, Jane MacLeod specifically. And so that
- 24 was my understanding, and so what I was trying to say
- 25 was, you know, "Well, under what circumstances, when?

74

- 1 joined from Aviva in March/April 2016.
- 2 Q. He, Rod Williams says -- I'm not going to take you to 3 the whole of the chain because this summarises it:
- "... Paula's [Ms Vennells] just had another email 5 from Mr McCormack. It's typically intemperate so I'm not inclined to respond, but he does say 'the very same 7 error (ie the 'Dalmellington error') has just reoccurred
  - "Have you got anyone who can check this with Fuiitsu?"

in another branch in far more serious circumstances'.

- 10
- Now, I'm not going to take you to your witness 11
- 12 statement but you say in your witness statement, it's
- 13 page 105, paragraph 406, in relation to the
- 14 Dalmellington error, that, when you joined, you
- 15 understood that the problem had been resolved; is that 16 right?
- 17 A. Sorry, which paragraph is it?
- Q. Yes. Page 105, paragraph 406. Let's look at it. 18
- A. Yes, so this is precisely dealing with this 19
- 20 correspondence. So I saw the earlier emails, up to the
- 21 point, I think, at which Jane responds and says, you
- 22 know, that "We're on top of this".
- 23 Q. Yes.
- 24 A. I wasn't copied in on the later emails, as you can see
- 25 from the chain, but what I see in those emails, reading

		then flow, is that i ujitsu came back and said, we	ļ.	been fullling our Local Flus branch since September 20
2		understood this, we've already fixed the problem, 100	2	In August 2015, we had a pouch of euros delivered to ou
3		plus postmasters were affected and we've made sure that	3	branch, which was not input properly onto the system, so
4		they're in good shape". And then you get the exchange,	4	didn't show in the stock. It was picked up in
5		which I didn't see, with Tim McCormack saying, "It's	5	a subsequent balance. I called Chesterfield and Bristol
6		happening again", which obviously would call that into	6	to try to locate the pouch number, which would have
7		question but I didn't see that at the time.	7	rectified the problem, but no one was able to give me
8	Q.	I see. So it's the fact that you weren't copied in to	8	this information."
9		the chain	9	There's quite a lot of detail. If we go over the
10	A.	Yeah.	10	page, please, and scroll down, the subpostmaster says:
11	Q.	at the point that I have just displayed	11	"In summary:
12	A.	Yeah.	12	"We made a mistake.
13	Q.	that meant that you didn't have the knowledge that	13	"We asked for help.
14		there was evidence that the Dalmellington bug continued	14	"That help didn't come.
15		to have effect?	15	"It's going to cost me £1,400 that I really don't
16	A.	Yes.	16	have spare.
17	Q.	Thank you.	17	"I'm not sure what you can do to resolve a potential
18		Can we move on, please. POL00244301, and start at	18	system problem. It could take months. What I am askin
19		page 5, please. This is an email from a subpostmaster	19	is that this sum be written off in recognition that we
20		Kirsten Fernforth in Horam to Paula Vennells of 26 July	20	are doing our best, and have been failed by the system
21		2016, and we will see that later on, I think, you're	21	in getting a resolution. I am exhausted with dealing
22		included in the chain. The subpostmaster says:	22	with this. My integrity is bashed from it being implied
23		"I am writing with an issue I have been having in	23	that I took the money.
24		branch and I wonder if you can help. I seem to have hit	24	"I didn't. That is all."
25		a dead end with every other avenue available. I have 77	25	Then if we go to page 4, please. At the foot of the 78
		nana Ma Vannalla sanlias	4	
1		page. Ms Vennells replies:	1	"I've requested the latest position and will revert as soon as I have it."
2		"Dear Kirsten,	2	
3		"Thank you for flagging this I hope I can help.	3	Then further up the page, please, 5 August, the next
4		This has clearly taken too long to resolve and I would	4	day:
5		be as frustrated as you are.	5	"The latest is we have had all the details we need
6		"We are usually very good at resolving issues, with	6	from Kirsten but due to the incident happening last
7		6 million transactions a day we have to be!	7	year we need archived data. This typically takes
8		"I have copied [you] and Angela van den Bogerd	8	a fortnight to receive from Fujitsu Kirsten is happy
9		I know they will do their best to get to the right	9	that this is being investigated properly."
10		outcome."	10	Then, at the foot of page 2, Joe Connor, the Head or
11		That's on 26 July. Then if we scroll up, on	11	Shared Services is emailing you saying:
12		4 August, you email Angela van den Bogerd saying:	12	"Thanks. Update, please."
13		"There are we on this? Thanks, Al."	13	Then page 1, at the foot of the page, from Shirley
14		Just stopping there. Why were you being copied in	14	Hailstones. Then if we scroll up:
15		on this or being sent the complaint to deal with?	15	"We have now received and analysed the archived
16	A.	I can't remember, to be honest. I mean, the people who	16	data.
17		reported to me and what I was accountable for changed so	17	"Wendy is writing up the full case report"
18		frequently over this period, I can't remember. I can't	18	Then there's some details, which I'm not going to
19		remember if Angela was reporting to me at the time but	19	read. Go over the page, scroll down, "Conclusion":
20		she may have just been. Obviously, I didn't come to the	20	"The surplus is showing present at the branch on the
21		CFO role until 2017 so I'm not sure, but that may have	21	14th it is not in the branch by the time the
22		been it.	22	[Overnight Cash Holding] was declared on the 15th. We
23	Q.	Then to page 3, please, bottom of the page, the same	23	can assume that during this time, there must have been
24		day, 4 August. Ms van den Bogerd replies saying Wendy	24	a corresponding error carried out in branch or user
25		is dealing with it:	25	error (whether it be true or deliberate) must have
		79		80

1 2 So what was the outcome, as you read it there? 3 A. The outcome, as I read it there, is that the team aren't 4

seeing a system problem; they're seeing human error, and they're going to be talking to Kirsten to sort of take it to the next stage.

- 7 Q. Which will be for Kirsten to pay up, presumably?
- 8 A. Presumably.

5

6

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

occurred."

- 9 Q. Can we go on, please, to POL00174666, a letter of 10 22 June 2017. If we just look at the foot of page 2, please -- scroll down a bit further -- you'll see it's 11 12 from Nisha Kaur, a subpostmistress, and it's copied or 13 said to have been copied to you; can you see that?
- 14 A. Yeah.
- Q. If we go back to page 1, Ms Kaur says: 15

"I am writing to you out of a sense of desperation regarding present difficulties within my employment with the Post Office.

"I would be grateful if you could spend some time reading this letter and helping to resolve issues in a speedy and timely manner."

Then there's some detail, if we look at the foot of the page, please:

"I did not have any feedback from this until 6 June when he [the Auditor] visited again to tell me to close

1 den Bogerd?

- 2 A. I never felt I was the right person to investigate 3 individual issues, for a variety of reasons. You know, 4 I'm not trained to do that, I've never run a Post 5 Office, I've never worked behind a counter or used 6 Horizon. You know, I've got no legal background. So 7 I felt I was the wrong person to do the investigations. 8 My job was generally just to make sure that they were 9 being done and it is -- was notable to me, looking over, 10 you know, extra documents I was asked to look at over 11 the last few days, as I said, there was sort of a dozen 12 of these, they generally start with a complaint to Paula 13 and it is always Angela van den Bogerd who is asked to 14 investigate it.
- 15 Q. Do you know why that was?
- A. My sense, at the time, was that -- and I appreciate this 16 17 may seem counterintuitive -- that very few Post Office 18 people in the Home Office teams had ever actually worked 19 properly in a post office. There were some, of course, 20 but, generally, you know, people in Chesterfield have 21 been recruited to work in the Support Services, people 22 in the field teams. And so the number of people who 23 were actually experienced in running a post office and 24 using Horizon were very few, and it was a -- you know, 25 an issue and, therefore, I suspect it always defaulted

1 the Post Office business down for 4 hours whilst he and 2 his colleague performed a full audit. I was told that 3 both this audit and the January audit were faultless. 4 He told me I could open the business and that there were 5 no concerns. I spoke to him about the purported 6 computer losses of [£93,000] he [the Auditor] said he 7 had no answer. He phoned the Contracts Manager ... whom 8 I have never met ... who told him that [Ms Kaur] was not 9 allowed to open. No reason was given, the Auditor was 10 surprised at this."

So, again, this not Post Office copying you in; this is the postmistress copying you in. What responsibility did you have for resolving issues such as the one raised in this correspondence?

- 15 A. So this was 2017, I think.
- 16 Q. It is, yes.

11

12

13

14

- 17 A. It is. Then I would have --
- **Q.** June 2017? 18
- 19 -- had responsibility for the sort of Chesterfield team, 20 certainly, and so I don't remember seeing this letter or 21 seeing additional email correspondence but it's, you 22 know, horrible, and it should certainly have been 23 properly looked into and I can't recall whether it was 24 or not
- 25 Q. Did these kind of things tend to get referred to Ms van

1 to Angela because she had, I think, worked in and run 2 a post office and done years of investigations, and was 3 prepared to go out and talk to postmasters and visit 4 post offices and, therefore, she was probably the best 5 equipped to do that.

- 6 Q. From memory, I think she told us she left school at 16 7 and became a counter clerk?
- 8 Δ Yeah.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Can we move on. POL00163587. Look at page 4, please. 9 10 Scroll down, please. We can see an email -- you later 11 get copied into this chain -- but it starts with 12 an email from Councillor Geoffrey Hipperson to Liz Truss 13

> "Good morning Elizabeth, Help! Our post office is closing (Shouldham).

"The reason is disturbing. Apparently there are problems with operating system of the post office computers resulting in accounting anomalies. The amounts in our case bear no relation to the amounts that the subpostmistress handles. I am as sure as one can be that the lady is honest and having run the post office for 29 years has not suddenly started making mistakes.

"Unfortunately the situation cannot be endured so the post office is closing.

> "In fairness I have spoken to representatives of the 84

Post Office who are trying to get an interim person to 1 2 run the office. 3 "What is concerned however, is that this may not be 4 confined to this one office. One ex-postmaster has told 5 me that 'there are hundreds of ex-post office keepers 6 who have been under suspicion or worse because of this 7 problem'. 8 "I have no proof of anything and was only told about 9 this yesterday. 10 "This subject, and the possible implications of it are too much for me to handle." 11 12 Then Councillor Hipperson signs it off. If we 13 scroll up, please, and a little bit further, we see an email from Liz Truss MP to Ken Penton, and if we 14 15 scroll down, she says -- it's her case worker in fact: 16 "[Ms Truss] has been contacted by ... Councillor 17 Hipperson", can you look into this, please? 18 Scroll up, please. That then gets forwarded, if we 19 scroll a little bit further, to Paula Vennells on 20 May 20 21 "I have been contacted again by [Mr Hipperson] ... 22 the Post Office is now closed", please look into the 23 issues. 24 Then scroll up still further, a bit further, please, 25 20 May, it gets sent to you directly: 1 rather than the underlying issues. 2 Q. So when communication like this came in from an MP, that 3 didn't trigger an investigation of the substance of 4 matters? 5 A. Well, it might have done and it might have done at some 6 point but it wouldn't -- if people felt it had already 7 been investigated, then it might not have done. It 8 might have been, well, we think we know the answer to 9 this, and I can't remember on this specific which it 10 Q. Just scroll back down, please. The people you forwarded 11 12 to it, Ken Penton, Mark Davies, Amanda Jones and Julie 13 Thomas, were any of them Network people or Operational 14 people --15 A. Yes. Q. -- and if so, which? 16 17 A. Amanda Jones was are running the Network with Debbie 18 Smith and Julie Thomas was running the Operational 19 teams. 20 Q. The response, in fact, came back from a media person. 21 A. Yes 22 Q. If we just look what they say, so there's a note 23 attached, but: 24 "In summary: 25 "The closure was due to our suspending the

87

"Dear Interim Chief Executive, 1 2 "... I have been contacted again by my constituent 3 4 Scroll down 5 "... post office is now closed", please could you 6 look into the issues. 7 Then scroll up to the top of page 2: 8 "Thank you very much for contacting me and we will 9 revert as soon as possible." 10 Then bottom of page 1: 11 "See below. Can we have chapter and verse tomorrow 12 please." 13 Scroll up. This is from Jane Hill. What function 14 did she perform? 15 A. She was in Mark Davies's team, I think, with 16 a particular responsible for dealing with MPs, I think, 17 but, I mean, again, her role probably changed over time 18 so I could be wrong. 19 Q. So was she a media and communications person? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. Why would the media and communications person be the 22 right person to investigate and provide a response? 23 A. Only if the underlying issues had already been 24 investigated and the business had reached a conclusion 25 and, therefore, it was about managing the communication, 1 postmaster after an audit. 2 "The postmaster reported having regular balancing 3 shortages after new Horizon kit was installed last July.

"The [post office] was operated from the postmaster's house, so difficult to put in a [temporary] operator.

"We are looking at the cost of a mobile [post office] ...

"The Contracts team are trying to fix a meeting with the postmaster ...

"Ken has updated Liz Truss' office by phone today, and is drafting a note for her."

That doesn't really engage with the complaint made, does it --

15 A. It doesn't.

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

16 Q. -- which was from a councillor, saying that his

17 constituent had been a trusted postmaster for 29 years18 and had run the branch without problems.

19 A. (The witness nodded)

20  $\,$  Q.  $\,$  It seems new Horizon kit had been brought in and then

21 there were losses. Why was it dealt with in this way,

22 as a media issue?

A. I don't know, and I haven't seen the attached note but,
 reading it cold, you know, I think I dropped the ball on

25 this one. I think we should have gone back and said,

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- 1 "Well, your answer is all about how we're changing
  2 postmaster and opening an office, it's not about the
  3 underlying issue", and I am not aware of any evidence
  4 that I did that and I should have done.
- Q. Thank you. Can we move on, POL00280270. This is
   an email from you to Ben Foat headed "Confidential and privileged", of 2 August 2019.
- 8 A. Yes.

10

11 12

13

23

24

25

1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

9 Q. You say:

"... I have been made very uncomfortable by an issue at Little Milton post office."

That was the post office you referred to in your November 2020 note saying in mid-'19.

- 14 A. Yeah
- 15 Q. "They approached me recently because they had been asked 16 to pay a significant amount (£3,000-£4,000) to us. Kim 17 Abbots got involved but could not explain what had 18 happened remotely. At my suggestion an audit was held 19 and the belief now seems to be that there was no loss. 20 just misbooking of stock and misremming of cash. 21 However, Kim has not yet been able to explain things to 22 my satisfaction.

"Could you please work with Kim while I am away to understand what has happened and answer two questions.

"1. Is our understanding of what is happening in

Q. On what basis were you saying that?

of nagged them over that summer.

2 A. Well -- and I think, as we've seen from the evidence --3 I think I absolutely approached this differently because 4 of the Common Issues judgment. I'm not sure I would 5 have taken the same response the year before. But my 6 understanding of what had happened is that Post Office 7 had -- you know, it's a single-till community branch so 8 £3,000 or £4,000 is just a huge amount of money for them 9 and were asking for help, and so I gave it to good 10 people in the Operations Team and I was expecting them 11 to be able to explain it relatively quickly, and I sort

And my understanding was that the problem is that people had been ill, there had been temporary postmasters in and out and that the stamps had been systematically misbooked in. So unlike cash, and this does need to change, stamps have to be -- when they are delivered or picked up, manually keyed in and out, whereas cash, it's an automated process and you're barcoded and scanned, and that had never happened for stamp.

So there had been, I think, over quite a long period of time, lots of noise around the stamps and so you couldn't see -- or the Operations Team couldn't easily see what the underlying problem was because there was so

branch sufficient for us to be able to ask for money orsuspend postmasters -- it doesn't feel like it.

"2. Secondly, should there be any implications for our defence of the [Group Litigation].

"Given our shareholder's focus on a rapid settlement, I would rather you looked at these questions without it being clear I am asking -- I haven't used the whistleblowing process to protect privilege but I am asking for that confidentiality and protection. You do not therefore have my permission to discuss this elsewhere, other than talking to Kim about the specifics.

"Is that okay?"

So I think at this time, 2 August 2019, you were the Interim CEO; is that right?

16 A. Yes, but it was, I think, (a) before I was about to go
17 on holiday but (b) it was just after I was told that
18 I wouldn't be the CEO and that Nick Read had been
19 appointed and, therefore, I didn't know how long I would
20 be at Post Office.

21 Q. You say:

"Our understanding of what is happening in branch
doesn't feel as if it's sufficient for us to be able to
ask for money or to suspend postmasters."

25 A. That was my question, yeah.

90

- 1 much noise on the stamps accounting. And my memory is
- that, once that got cleared away, the branch was able to resolve the issue itself. I don't think I ever was told
- 4 what had happened by them, they took it away --
- Q. But you're seeing this as an issue not just about theLittle Milton Post Office?
- 7 **A.** Not at all about the Little Milton post office, really.

8 This is a --

- 9 Q. You're drawing a broader --
- 10 A. I'm drawing a broader conclusion, which is, if that can11 create so much noise, which was news to me, in a single
- 12 post office, then how does that affect the way we're
- dealing with all the other post offices who might also
- have got into a muddle on stamps? And so, you know, and
- that -- hence the two questions, is, you know, if
- 16 there's noise on stamps, does that change how we
- 17 approach other branch issues and should we be disclosing
- this, you know, in terms of the litigation?
- 19 **Q.** You were essentially raising this as a whistleblowing20 complaint --
- 21 **A.** Yeah.
- 22 Q. -- but outside the formal process; is that right?
- 23 A. Yeah, and it's a bit odd and it probably felt a bit odd
- 24 at the time. I probably made Ben's life a bit harder.
- 25 It was perfectly possible I -- I didn't know Nick at

1 this point -- it was perfectly possible he was going to 2 come in and say, "Look, I've got my own finance guy, 3 I want to start again, you know, you're done, move on". 4 So I didn't know if I was going to be there for very 5 long and what I didn't want to happen was for this to be 6 another sort of these corridor conversations where, you 7 know, I flag a concern and then there's new people and 8 everyone moves on and it's lost because I thought it 9 might be important.

> So my point about formally telling Ben and in writing, before I went on holiday, was so that he had to have a look at it and it had to be dealt with properly. I didn't use any sense -- I think my recollection is that I told Nick about this in our very first meeting, before he even started work, so I wasn't trying to hide it but I didn't know what -- I didn't know how the broader business and the shareholder and everyone was going to react to, you know, we'd had the CIJ not the HIJ and, therefore, was there going to be a closing down and moving on or were we going to be throwing everything open, and I just wanted it there formally so it had to be dealt with.

23 MR BEER: Thank you. We'll pick up what happened after the 24 second break of the morning, please.

Sir, can we break until 12.30, please?

Government Affairs?

2 Α. Yes.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

1

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3 Q. What was Norton Rose's role at this time, can you 4 remember?

- A. I wasn't aware that they particularly had one. So we brought them in after the Common Issues judgment, when we were looking for more independent legal counsel, and they did do a bit of work for us, but the decision was to bring Herbert Smith, so I wasn't particularly aware 10 that they were working for us at the time, but that 11 might have been the appeal.
- Okay. Anyway, Mr Foat towards it on to those three 12 13 people, he doesn't copy you in but he says:

"Thank you for your time. I understand that Norton Rose cannot act in respect of the previous matter given a conflict which is understood.

"Unfortunately I have received what I think is potentially another different whistleblowing event. This one is acutely sensitive and is only relevant to [the Post Office] so hopefully there should be no conflict.

"You will see from the email below that the current Interim CEO [that's you] is potentially whistleblowing an issue in respect of our Group Litigation issue. In effect, that our procedures around loss recovery isn't

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, of course. 1

MR BEER: Thank you, sir.

(12.18 pm) 3

4

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(A short break). I

5 (12.30 pm)

6 MR BEER: Sir, good afternoon.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Good afternoon. 7

MR BEER: Mr Cameron, can we pick up where we left off, 8 9 which was dealing with the Little Milton Post Office's 10 complaint, and we saw your email to Mr Foat.

> Can we then turn to see what Mr Foat did with it by looking at POL00327569. That's the first page, that's Mr Foat's email. If we look at the second page. We can see your email we've just looked at and so he forwards it on, yes?

Then if we go back to page 1, please, he sends your email under the heading "Strictly Confidential and Privileged -- Highly Sensitive -- Not for further forwarding" to Glenn Hall, who I think was a lawyer at Norton Rose --

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. -- and to Catrina Smith, also a lawyer at Norton Rose; 23 is that right?

24 A. I don't know.

25 Q. And Patrick Bourke, the Director of Public and

right and that we are incorrectly seeking repayment from subpostmasters (which is an allegation in respect of the Group Litigation which your firm has some awareness ['of', I think]).

"I should point out that the Interim CEO was recently unsuccessful in his application to become the permanent CEO. He will revert back to his CFO role once the new CEO starts on 16 September. From today the Interim CEO is on leave for about a month. Moreover, all of the [General Executive] have been informed that the shareholder intends to penalise their bonuses as a result of the GLO. He [that's you] has sent me the email below. On the one hand he says that he hasn't used the whistleblowing process but in effect seeks to do so and seeks the confidentiality and 'protections'.

"This is not the unusual scenario given that its the current CEO of the company that is making the qualified disclosure. I have not managed previously an issue where it is the CEO that makes the whistleblowing. Under the [Post Office] whistleblowing policy it can be made to a line manager or through a variety of channels which is subsequent reported to me as General Counsel. I currently report into the interim CEO who is making the apparent protected disclosure.

"I suspect that should there be further reorganising 96

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

25

of the General Executive Committee subsequent to the new CEO, the Interim CEO/CFO will seek to rely on the protections under this disclosure."

Just stopping here, there seems to be quite a lot of mention here about the fact that you were unsuccessful in your application to be CEO. Was the making of the disclosure connected to that in any way?

- 8 A. I didn't think I was talking about any of that and 9 I think, you know, reading it -- because obviously 10 I don't think I saw any of this at the time --
- 11 Q. No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

19

20

21

22

25

-- reading it now, I just want to kind of give Ben a hug 12 Α. 13 because I'd, obviously, made his life really complicated 14 and he was really anxious about it and I didn't mean to 15 do that at all, and I think, by using the word 16 "whistleblowing" in a pretty vague and ignorant way, 17 I think I just really complicated his life for a bit and 18 I hadn't meant to do that.

> So I just wanted it formally recorded, so that we were definitely going to have a look at it and understand a view before we blew it up if it needed blowing up and that was all I was trying to do.

23 Q. I'm going to skip the next paragraph and read the 24 following one:

"I should say I greatly respect the interim CEO who

- 1 without them doing so, my understanding --
- 2 Q. Just to test your understanding of why you can't speak,
- 3 you think the answer to my question might involve
- 4 disclosing legally privileged information --
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. -- after February 2020?
- 7 Α. Um, yeah, and information specifically Post Office still
- 8
- Q. Retained privilege --9
- 10 A. -- retained privilege over.
- 11 Q. Okay, were you aware whether this issue was raised with
- 12 Herbert Smith Freehills?
- 13 A. I don't think I know that. I'd probably assume so but
- 14 I don't know. And I don't know, you know, what was done
- 15 in terms of disclosure to the claimants.
- Q. Okay. Just for the transcript, for later references and 16
- 17 not for you at the moment, the answer to my question
- 18 about disclosure to Herbert Smiths, is found in
- 19 POL00280603, POL00284503 and POL00327575.
- 20 So you don't know whether disclosure was made in the Group Litigation of the issue that you had raised? 21
- 22 A. I don't remember either way.
- 23 Q. You don't remember or don't know the answer to your 24 first question, ie what investigation was carried out?
- 25 A. I do know some of the outcomes of the work that was

I think has done an excellent job and nothing above is to be taken to suggest otherwise but it does seem to me that this is an unusual situation which gives rise to some conflicts and potential risks for the business (down the track). Hence my seeking further advice.

"Could you advise me of what steps I should take including what investigation I should undertake; what initial response should be back to AI; whether I can disclose to any other person including the new CEO or shareholder (my understanding is not at least). I suspect that if I am instructed by my line manager that I can only speak to Kim that I will not be in a position to come to any conclusions in respect of the questions that he is seeking.

"Look forward to hearing from you."

16 What in the event happened, as a result of your 17 protected disclosure or your disclosure?

I told Nick about it and, I think -- and then Ben and I, 18 19 I think, did have a conversation where he explained some 20 of his challenges. I think I said, "Look, don't worry 21 about any of that". So work was done on it. I don't 22 know what happened in terms of -- of the two questions, 23 there was definitely more work done on stamps but I'm 24 getting into an area where Post Office hasn't waived its

privilege and I don't think I can talk about that

- 1 done.
- 2 Q. Which aren't protected by privilege?
- 3 A. Well, I think they are protected by privilege, really 4 quite specifically.
- 5 Q. Okay. Can I therefore move -- if that's an area that we cannot further explore -- to the suspense account. 6
- 7 A.

11

16

17

8 Q. Can we start with paragraph 159 of your witness 9 statement, please, which is on page 38, and you say, in 10 paragraph 159:

"On 15 January, very soon after I joined [the Post 12 Office] I was asked by Chris Aujard, Interim General 13 Counsel and others for urgent help to answer questions 14 from Second Sight on the operation of [the Post 15 Office's] suspense account."

So this is, I mean, literally the week or so of joining; is that right?

- A couple of weeks after, yeah. 18
- 19 Then at paragraph 162, which is over the page, you refer Q. 20
- 21 "Rod Ismay, who led the FSC, was the right person to 22 handle queries from Second Sight."
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Why was Rod Ismay the right person to handle queries 25 about the suspense account from Second Sight?

100

- Because I asked the Finance Team and they told me he 1 Α. 2 was, you know, the person who knew most about it.
- Q. 3 Then at paragraph 165, which is at the foot of the page, 4 you say that you saw a draft response to Second Sight, 5 which you weren't dealing with directly, and on
- 6 27 January you wrote to Chris Aujard and Jane MacLeod 7 that the response needed to be more comprehensive and
- 8 data driven. Okay?
- 9 A. Yes.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

17

10 Q. Can we look at some of the underlying documents, please, and start with POL00218942. If we scroll down, please, 11 12 and keep going, please, an email from Chris Aujard to 13 you on 16 January, so I think a day after you were asked 14 to address the issue of Second Sight's queries over the 15 suspense accounts. Mr Aujard says to you:

> "AI -- [for your information] -- just in case the well-oiled PA machine fails to ensure that this gets to you promptly.

"As you will see, I really need someone from your team who is technically switched on re suspense accounts, and can handle themselves in front of an adversarial audience.

"As you can imagine, I am concerned that we give Second Sight no more information than is necessary to address the narrow proposition that money that is

told, the underlying cases.

I have to say, I thought this was a pretty silly point on which to pause and, quite frankly, if there was a problem with the suspense accounts, you know, as the brand new CFO, I wanted to know about it.

So, you know, I think I generally sort of pushed back at this very narrow approach at this point.

- 8 Q. Do you know why Mr Aujard took a restrictive approach to 9 the disclosure of information generally to Second Sight?
- A. No, I did ask him. We came out of one -- I mean, 10 I never found Second Sight at all adversarial. The 11 12 meetings were all extremely sensible and, you know, 13 open. And I did -- I do remember asking Chris in the 14 corridor after one of those meetings where he had 15 been -- I don't know quite what the right word is --16 sort of chippy, with Second Sight, why, and he said, "Oh
- they just annoy me". 18 "They just annoy me"? Q.
- 19 A. Yeah.
- 20 Q. If we go up to see what your response was to page 1.
- 21 22 "Rod Ismay is the right person to do this."
- 23 Second paragraph:
- 24 "As ever, I may be more inclined to be open, while 25 recognising the desire not to set more hares running."

103

1 'missing' from a [subpostmaster] account is somehow 2 taken into our suspense account and then appropriated to 3 our [profit and loss]."

So Second Sight had asked for information, yes?

5 A. Yes

4

- 6 Q. Mr Aujard was saying to you that Second Sight should be 7 given no more information than is necessary to address 8 the narrow proposition made by them, yes?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Was that generally the approach that Mr Aujard took, 11 ie to be as restrictive as possible in the disclosure of 12 information?
- 13 With Second Sight, yes.
- 14 Q. Was that a theme of his engagement, so far as you saw it, with Second Sight? 15
- 16 A. Yes. Yeah, my understanding was that there was 17 a disagreement about the scope of Second Sight's work, and I'm not sure I understood it very precisely, but 18 19 what I took from that was that Second Sight had been 20 employed to look at individual cases in the Mediation
- 21 Scheme and to follow them where they went, whereas what
- 22 they were doing on suspense accounts was exploring 23 a hypothesis that money was being held there and
- 24 released to the P&L, which should have belonged to
- 25 postmasters, but which hadn't come from, as I was being

1 The line, "As ever I may be more inclined to be 2 open", did that reflect your general approach --

- 3 A.
- 4 Q. -- to Second Sight?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Why did you adopt that approach?
- 7 If there was a problem in the suspense account or 8 anywhere else, I thought we were better knowing that and
- 9 then we could deal with it. So fine, we could close it
- 10 down and push for time, or whatever, but, actually,
- I wanted to know if there was a problem and I thought 11
- 12 Second Sight had been employed by Post Office to do
- 13 a job; you know, their view of this job was that they
- 14 wanted to look at suspense accounts, we should let them
- 15 look at suspense accounts. I couldn't see the point of 16 saying no.
- 17 Q. You say, "whilst recognising the desire not to set more 18 hares running"; what were you concerned about there?
- So I think the concern I was hearing, you know, bearing 19 20 in mind it was the second day I had heard about this
- 21 issue, was that I think -- and I'm sort of slightly sort
- 22 of trying to remember here, that there was a feeling
- 23 that Second Sight would just go on forever asking
- 24 questions that hadn't been sourced from individual cases
- 25 and, therefore, we didn't just want to be on a treadmill

- of forever asking questions. I think that's what I was referring to.
- Q. Thank you. Can we move on, please, a separate topic.
   Can we look at paragraph 111 of your statement on
   page 128, please. You say:

"With hindsight I would now conclude that insufficient exclude of Horizon was undertaken before finding postmasters to be at fault for unresolved shortfalls."

I think that's something we've seen reflected in an email that we looked at earlier, and in your "What Went Wrong" document.

13 A. Yes.

Q. "I also acknowledge that even as we sought to answer questions on the safe working of Horizon as it operated at that point, this does not mean that it operated effectively in earlier periods. I also question the conclusion that postmaster training was fundamentally sound. In 2017, when I was more involved in operations, I attended a 2 day training course for new postmasters and did not consider it to be a strong basis to support [subpostmasters]. I later chased for improvements as a result of this."

I just want to examine what material you had at the time on these issues and whether hindsight was necessary 105

- 1 that, you know, the two-day course was poor.
- Q. Thank you, can we look at some of the underlyingdocuments then, please.
- 4 A. Sure.
- Q. Start with POL00027728. Look at page 3, please, at the foot of the page, "Dear Paula Vennells", this is
  an email from a man called Martin Barfoot, who I think
  is a member of the public not a subpostmaster. This is
  a chain that eventually finds its way to you:

"Dear Paula Vennells

"I need to contact you directly to bring a matter to your attention.

"I paid my income tax bill via the Post Office on 23 December 2014. The cheque was made payable to the Post Office and the money (£3,885) left my account on 30 December 2014. Since the 31 January deadline for payment HMRC has been sending me many demands for payment, including fines, as they have not received payment. I have had to make several lengthy phone calls and write 2 letters including scans of my receipt and bank statement

"I revisited the post office branch ... on 28 March and was told that the payment had been held up in a holding account, but was being directed to the correct account. I did not completely understand these details

to reach the conclusion that you did there.

So taking the points in turn, I think the insufficient

scrutiny for unresolved shortfalls was a conclusion
I reached later and that was with hindsight. I think
I was clear -- I think I've seen emails as part of
preparing for this -- that I was making the point pretty
consistently throughout, that, just as I was saying this
appears to be working okay in 2015, I think
I acknowledged at the time that that didn't mean it was
working in 2005 or 2010 because -- and no one was asking
me to say that. I mean, the Second Sight questions, for
example, were all about what was happening in 2015. So
I think I was very clear on that at the time.

Postmaster training operated in three stages in 2017: there was some online training, which I did; there was then a two-day classroom session, which I attended and thought -- and there's an email setting this out somewhere -- that it was really poor as a two-day training course; and the third piece was, you know, someone spending time with the new postmaster in branch for a couple of days doing the cash transfers and the balancing, and that sort of thing in real life, and that bit I didn't do.

So I wasn't making a particular conclusion on the whole of postmaster training but I was really clear 106

but was assured the money would go to the correct place.

"Still the demands and fines were sent to me, and HMRC have been phoning me. So I revisited the post office again and was told I needed to raise a complaint. After the lengthy phone call I did so ... I have sent a copy of the scanned receipt as requested, 3 weeks has passed and no response has been forthcoming.

"I am a Homephone customer. I am amazed that the Post Office would a) not pay the bill, b) not return the cheque uncashed to the bank, or to me, c) not tell me my bill is unpaid, d) cash the cheque and keep my money for over 5 months now. It is virtually theft."

If we see what happens to that, please, back to page 3. Scroll down, please, and again. Keep scrolling, page 3, thank you.

Reply by Ms Vennells on the same day:

"... thank you, first of all for taking the time to let me know. This is the first time I have heard anything like this happening -- I am very sorry. And would be as frustrated as you rightly are.

"Please leave this with me -- I will get on to it today and either I or one of my senior managers will respond to you personally."

If we go further up the page and look up the foot of page 2, Gavin, that's Gavin Lambert, on an email chain 108

. 

3

4

5

that you're copied in on:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

"... can you personally handle this please. Although I expect it is a one-off, as I genuinely haven't heard of anything like this before, we have been inept in handling it and I would like to learn the lessons, once it is resolved.

"More immediately and importantly, it will be unhelpful if any Sparrow connection is made, as reference to money held in holding accounts has also been voiced by the JFSA. My understanding is that this is not the case. Can I have this reconfirmed as well please."

So do you understand what happened Ms Vennells is referring to there, where she is saying it would be unhelpful if any Sparrow connection is made?

- 16 A. I assume she's referring to the suggestion that money is 17 being held in suspense accounts.
- 18 Q. le this money might be held in a suspense account, 19 a Post Office suspense account, we don't want 20 a connection made with the allegation that JFSA is 21 making that subpostmaster money or disputed amounts of 22 money is being held in suspense accounts?
- 23 A. Yes, I think so.
- 24 Q. Okav:

25 "I would like it resolved today. Certainly senior 109

- 1 Was the Post Office at this time very sensitive as to 2 its brand image and reputation and how that might be 3 damaged by the allegations being investigated by Second 4 Sight about the holding of subpostmaster money in 5 suspense accounts? 6 A. I don't recall there being a specific concern about
- 7 suspense accounts in terms of brand image. It was just 8 one item on Second Sight's list. Was Post Office 9 sensitive to its brand reputation as the whole of the 10 Mediation Scheme played out, was closed, postmasters 11 continued to, you know, say they thought things were 12 wrong? Yes, absolutely.
- 13 Q. Thank you. That can come down.

14 Were you aware of any attempts made politically, or 15 with politicians, in order to seek to ensure that 16 politicians did not raise issues or focus on issues 17 concerning the reliability of Horizon at this time?

- A. I don't remember anything. I've certainly seen, you 18 19 know, a document in this pack where Mark Davies talks 20 about it, although I'm not sure I saw it at -- maybe 21 I did see it at the time. I don't remember it being
- 22 a big conversation, certainly. 23 Q. Let's look at the document I think you're referring to. 24 POL00152283. If we scroll down to the middle of the page, please, there's an email from Mr Davies to Paula 25

111

contact made with Mr Barfoot. 1

"... I have copied a number of colleagues in as I'm not ... sure who is best placed to help. Could each person copied please read and get in touch with Gavin if you can help, or know where to point him.

6 "Al is away, so Colin and Rod copied in his 7 absence."

8 Just a little further on the Project Sparrow, why 9 would there be a connection made to Project Sparrow?

10 A. I don't know why Paula made that connection but, I mean, 11 I assume it is because Second Sight were questioning

12 whether we were holding money in suspense accounts.

13 Q. So any -- would this be right -- additional evidence of 14 holding money in suspense accounts would be unhelpful?

15 A. If it's postmaster money, yes, but, as I understood it 16 and understand it, it wasn't.

17 Q. No, this is a member of the public --

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. -- paying or trying to pay their tax bill?

20 A. Yes, absolutely.

21 Q. So how could a connection be made with Sparrow?

22 I don't know what Paula was specifically meaning and

23 I didn't interpret, I don't think, as anything other

24 than suspense accounts is one of those phrases that 25 people, you know, recognise.

110

1 Vennells, to you and to Neil Hayward. What did

2 Mr Hayward do at this time?

3 A. He was the People or HR Director, I forget his title.

Q. Headed "[Business, Innovation and Skills] committee", so 4 5 that's a Parliamentary Select Committee:

"Paula

6

7

8

9

"Some good news. The new chairman of the Business, Innovation and Skills committee is Iain Wright, a very good Labour MP who both Jane ..."

10 Presumably that's Jane MacLeod?

A. Might be Jane Hill. 11

12 Q. Which is more likely?

A. I would have thought Jane Hill, personally, because she 13 14 worked with politicians and worked in Mark's team but

15 I could be wrong.

16 Q. Okay:

17 "... who both Jane and I know. Can't promise he 18 won't look at Horizon but much better chance of avoiding 19 it. I have dropped him a line. You will remember he 20 was mentioned by the minister last week."

21 Was there an effort made by the Post Office, to your 22 knowledge, to steer Parliament away from looking too 23 closely at Horizon?

24 A. I don't know. I don't remember there being a considered 25 effort. Were those arguments made in individual

1

conversations? Well, reading this, yeah, it looks like

Affairs was making, that he might make an attempt to

2		it but I don't know. I mean, I think probably and	2	steer a select committee's sight away from Horizon?
3		I didn't remember this one I just thought it was	3	A. No, I don't think I did, otherwise I mean, if I'd
4		"Look, aren't I doing a good job", sort of "Don't I know	4	been worried about it, I'd probably have remembered it.
5		everyone", sort of comms bullshit, really? I didn't	5	MR BEER: Thank you.
6		take it terribly seriously and I didn't think a Select	6	Sir, it's 1.00. I wonder whether we might break
7		Committee Chair would have been put off an important	7	until 1.50, please?
8		subject by an old mate.	8	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, all right.
9	Q.	You didn't get to see the line that Mark Davies said	9	MR BEER: Thank you, sir.
10		that he had dropped the chairman of a select committee?	10	(1.00 pm)
11	A.	Not as far as I'm aware or that I've seen since.	11	(The Short Adjournment)
12	Q.	If the Post Office was confident in the robustness of	12	(1.50 pm)
13		Horizon, which I think it says that it was at this	13	MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear us?
14		time	14	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you.
15	A.	Yeah.	15	MR BEER: Good afternoon, Mr Cameron.
16	Q.	why would the Post Office not want a select committee	16	Can we turn to some cultural or big picture issues,
17		looking at it?	17	please, and, in particular, the attitude of the Post
18	A.	I guess because preparing for select committees and	18	Office towards its subpostmasters. Can we start by
19		I have done one is a very serious and time-consuming	19	looking at POL00354059. Can you see that this is
20		business. You know, you don't just turn up and answer	20	a draft "Management Information Review" produced for the
21		questions. You really, really prepare for them and it	21	Post Office Group Executive. Can you tell us what the
22		takes a lot of a CEO's time, and so I imagine, you know,	22	purpose of a Management Information Review of this kind
23		that the reason would be that.	23	was?
24	Q.	So are you saying you didn't take seriously the	24	A. I don't have a great recollection of this specific piece
25		suggestion that the Head of Communications and Corporate	25	of work, but and it's not an uncommon business
		113		114
1		problem, I've come across it before but you do want to	1	A. Yeah.
2		get your management information in the best shape you	2	Q that this was under your sponsorship?
3		can, so that you have one version of the truth and	3	A. Yes, completely so.
4		you're measuring the right things and you're doing it in	4	<b>Q.</b> So was this to introduce a system by which management
5		the right way, and that it's easily accessible to the	5	information was regularly and uniformly provided to the
6		people who need it. So it's often a matter of making	6	Group Executive or to review the way in which that
7		sure that you've got some discipline about where you get	7	information was provided and to potentially change it?
8		the information from, and you're presenting it in	8	<b>A.</b> I think more the latter, from memory.
9		a consistent, decided way. And I think this was	9	Q. You'll see from the foot of the page and it's on the
10		probably a sort of first go at trying to understand the	10	foot of every page, if we just scroll down, please,
11		landscape, from my point of view.	11	underneath the helpful triangle is Mr Goodman's name
12	Q.	Were these kind of documents produced with any	12	A. Yeah.
13	-	regularity?	13	Q and a date of May 2015. Who was Peter Goodman?
14	A.	No, I don't think so.	14	A. So he was a member of the Finance Team that was in place
15	Q.	You'll see the purpose is described as to:	15	when I joined Post Office Limited and he worked for us
16		" update the Group Executive on the recent	16	for another I can't remember but 18 months or so?
17		Management Information Review and to recommend next	17	Q. Thank you. Can we just look at a couple of things that
18		steps and a longer term route map to improve the	18	the review, or at least this draft of the review, says.
19		[management information] which is available to steer	19	Look at page 2, please. Scroll down to the blue box,
20		Post Office to meet its strategic objectives."	20	under "Findings", the first finding, "Content":
21		Under paragraph 2.1, it says that:	21	"Too much focus on sales volume/value and income."
22		"A review has been carried out at the request of the	22	Does that mean that the Post Office was too focused
23		Group Executive over a 7 week period under the	23	on "sales volume/value and income", or that the
24		sponsorship of Alisdair Cameron."	24	information that was provided to the Group Executive was
25		Is that right	25	too focused on "sales volume/value and income"?
-		115	_	116

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- A. I think it probably means both.
- 2 Q. Right. Was it correct that the Post Office, in March
- 3 '15, was too focused on its sales volumes/value and
- 4 income, in your view?
- 5 A. So I think -- and it's probably a fairly standard CFO
- 6 complaint -- is a lot of commercial teams get very
- 7 excited by sales volume, and the question that the CFO
- 8 always asks is, "Well, yeah, but are we making a profit
- 9 from it".
- 10 Q. Yes.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

7

8

9

10

11

16

21

1

- A. And so I think it was -- that that was, as I remember 11 12 it, the focus of that first line.
- 13 Q. Then, if we look at the third page, please, second blue 14 box down, first bullet point:

"Too many versions of the truth (Credence, Finance, local spreadsheets, client information -- eg Supply Chain and Royal Mail maintain own branch databases in addition to Network owned database)."

Firstly, can you explain in either the corporate world, or in information technology, or in management speak, what a "version of the truth" means?

22 A. So you can look at a particular area and, depending --23 and I'm struggling to think of an example off the top of 24 my head but, depending on how you've chosen to manage it 25 and what information you're disclosing -- I don't know.

1 the finance system would tell you the rest. Sorry, does 2 that help?

3 Q. Yes, thank you. Going back to page 2, please "Too much 4 focus on sales volume/value and income", just scroll 5 down, please, you tell us in your witness statement 6

> "At the heart of the issues experienced by Post Office was a culture which stopped us from dealing with postmasters in a straightforward and acceptable way."

Did a focus on sales volume/value and income contribute to that failure?

12 A. As I say, I think the sales volume versus profit was the 13 point I was trying to get to. So, in that specific 14

instance, really not, but I think throughout this -- and

15 I made comments in my witness statement about the Audit

Committee -- we were consistently treating postmasters

17 as someone else, rather than as a core part of Post

18 Office.

- 19 Q. Why was that?
- 20 A. Well, I think technically, of course, the vast majority
  - of postmasters are independent third parties and so it

119

- 22 was sort of technically true, and I think we were
- 23 absolutely focused, and I was being absolutely focused
- 24 on -- well, the two big focuses of in my first few years
- 25 in Post Office was getting the financial controls right

If you look at customer complaints, if you -- there are many different ways you can look at customer complaints and it could be on average how long they take to answer, whether they are ever repeated, what's the longest answer, you know, there's lots of different ways you can look at it. And what you want, in a perfect world is a single view of all those things measured from the right information. And so you might focus on one area but you've got the others there, measured in the same way

And when you've got too many versions of the truth, you've got a person who keeps their own spreadsheet that tells you, "Well, this is that", and then you've got a system over there that tells you how many and they're not really properly aligned or consistent and, therefore, someone can say -- so, I mean, I can give you a real example on the profit because I remember, you know, a particular instance of this. So Credence produced volumes, sales volumes, but it wasn't very good at the values. So it was a reliable system for the volumes, so I never used it for values because it had a limited ability to work out the value per product.

So if you used Credence, you could say "Oh, we've had a good week", but you might not have done in terms of value, it was only useful for branch volumes, whereas 118

1 and getting the profit to improve, the trading profit, and so, in both cases, you're very much focused on 2 3 what's on your balance sheet and what's in your P&L and 4 not on other people. And I think there was a relentless 5 focus on that.

6 Q. So you don't draw a direct line between what's recorded 7 here and the way in which Post Office treated its 8 subpostmasters?

A. Not on the specific comment about sales volume because, 9 10 as I say, I think -- but, I mean, it's a long time ago

11 now -- but I think that specific reference was income

12 versus profit, rather than Post Office versus

13 postmasters, but the wider point still stands.

14 Q. Thank you. That can come down.

15 We've seen in your "What Went Wrong" paper, you set 16 out your belief that, at the heart of the issues 17 experienced by the Post Office, was a culture that 18 stopped the Post Office from dealing with postmasters in 19 a straightforward and acceptable way.

20 Α.

23

24

25

21 Q. You tell us in your witness statement -- no need to turn 22 it up -- it's paragraph 386:

"This skewed Post Office's judgements about prosecutions and the subsequent management of the litigation."

1 In what way did the Post Office culture stop the 2 Post Office from dealing with postmasters in 3 a straightforward and acceptable way? 4

A. I think, by setting out the belief we referred to earlier, that a postmaster was accountable for whatever happened in a post office, I think, yes, there was a logic to it but it gave Post Office an excuse, in a way, not to investigate it because the burden was on the postmaster, rather than Post Office and Post Office's financials.

And I think one point where I saw that and, you know, it was genuine moment of being ashamed, is one of the areas I hadn't really looked at, was suspensions, and the judge obviously told us that we couldn't -- that we had to pay people during a period of suspension and when, you know, he said that, we thought, "Yeah, well that must be right", so we started doing that. And a few months later, one of the Operational people, you know, told me that, because this was now a cost to Post Office, the number of suspensions and the duration of the suspensions had fallen.

And I thought, oh, that is just awful, isn't it? Because it wasn't in our P&L, we just didn't prioritise it and the second it's in our P&L, we do a better job and a fairer job, and I was really ashamed of that.

121

1 everyone, absolutely.

- 2 Q. Were members of the General Executive incentivised to 3 contribute to that drive for profit by their own 4 personal remuneration?
- 5 A. Yes, absolutely.
- 6 **Q.** Would you agree that, up until the time you that speak 7 about, of the two judgments, the 2019 judgments, the 8 drive for profit was central to the Post Office's 9 strategy?
- A. Yes. 10

21

22

23

24

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 11 **Q.** To the detriment of subpostmasters?
- 12 A. I didn't think so at the time because one of the engines 13 of improving the profit was to very assertively reduce 14 the costs of Post Office Limited, its staff costs and 15 its non-staff costs, and I've always believed that doing 16 that was very pro-postmaster and, when I've spoken to 17 postmasters, you know, they would all say, "In my 18 experience, the Post Office was too expensive, too 19 bureaucratic, sucking up too much of the income in its 20 own stuff".

So I thought taking 100 million a year out of those costs was good for everybody because, in any given year, there was more money available for postmasters and more money to invest in the business and make it run better and be more resilient.

1 Q. The culture about which you speak in the paper and in 2 your witness statement, which prevented or stopped Post 3 Office from dealing with postmasters in an acceptable 4 way, who drove that culture?

5 A. I think, you know, we all did, in a way, because it was 6 the focus on -- so the absolute -- from shareholder to 7 Board to Executive Team and, absolutely, to me -- I was 8 absolutely part of this -- the focus was on improving 9 trading profit in the belief that we could provide the 10 investment in the business, and that Government subsidy 11 would reduce over time, and it did. I think its peak 12 was 415 million and it was down to sort of 50 million at 13 one point, although not sustainably so. 14

And, you know, that felt like an important component of making the business sustainable.

- 16 Q. Just stopping there --
- 17 A. Please.

15

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

21

22

23

24

25

- 18 Q. -- do I understand you to say that the Government 19 encouraged the drive for profit?
- 20 A. Oh, yes.
- 21 Q. Did it demand the drive for profit?
- 22 A. I don't think "demand" is -- so, in setting its 23 priorities and the priorities of the shareholder 24 representative, improving commercial performance, making
- 25 it more commercially sustainable was a priority for

122

That said, we could have absolutely taken a different view of how we invested that money and where we invested that money and done far more, which we started to do much more in 2019/20 to make the business simpler and better for postmasters.

6 Q. You tell us in your witness statement -- there's no need 7 to turn it up, it's paragraph 6 -- that:

"It became clear to me in 2019 that postmasters needed far greater support and this demanded a culture shift in the Post Office."

- A. Yeah. 11
- 12 Q. What was it about 2019 that made it clear to you that 13 postmasters needed far greater support?
- 14 A. So it had been developing over 2018, so Debbie Smith was 15 Retail Director in 2018, and she had worked at Boots for 16 a long time, and she was making the point, you know, 17 really quite clearly that, in her experience, as, you 18 know, a proper retailer, we didn't treat postmasters 19 with as such support and -- well, as much support as 20 retailers like Boots would treat their own shops.

And she wanted more people in the field, more support and she and I and Rob Houghton spent a few days in Chesterfield in the summer of 2018 trying to bring all these themes together, and she convinced me she was right and so, as I got more into that sort of Interim

- 1 Chief Executive space in 2019, that was the priority:
- 2 it's the priority I set out to the Board, it's the
- 3 priority I set out in my speech to the NFSP.
- 4 Q. We heard from Mark Davies that, similarly in 2019, it
- 5 was necessary to tackle a culture in some quarters which
- 6 wrongly placed subpostmasters in a subordinate role, as
- 7 he called it. Do you agree that, at least until 2019,
- 8 subpostmasters were seen by the Post Office as being in
- 9 a subordinate role?
- 10 A. I never really thought about that phrase and I don't
- 11 know precisely what Mark was alluding to but they were
- 12 seen as, sort of, someone else, a third party, like
- 13 a client, to some extent, and just didn't get, you
- 14 know -- as Debbie got more into it, there were people
- who just hadn't had a visit -- postmasters who hadn't
- 16 had a visit from Post Office for years, and --
- 17 Q. How about that they weren't seen as de facto business
- partners of the Post Office, which they were, given
- 19 their financial investment in their post offices?
- 20 A. Oh, they hugely were and the one that really sort of
- 21 took me aback was when I was doing that NFSP conference
- and I said, you know, postmasters are the heart and the
- 23 blood, or something, of Post Office -- which, of course,
- they are because, I mean, the DMBs were a red herring,
- you know, there are 11,500 post offices and, whatever 125
- 1 That's the Audit, Risk and Compliance Committee --
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. -- which is a committee of the Board?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. "... did not tackle the evidence underpinning the
- 6 performance of Horizon nor meaningfully consider the
- 7 potential outcomes for postmasters if there were issues
- 8 with shortfalls and balancing. Postmasters are rarely
- 9 mentioned in the documents and are treated as a third
- 10 party rather than an integral part of the business."
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. Is it implicit in that paragraph there that
- 13 responsibility for tackling the evidence concerning the
- 14 performance of Horizon fell to the Audit, Risk and
- 15 Compliance Committee of the Board?
- 16 A. No, I wouldn't say that but I think it should have been
- 17 there in the risk registers, there should have been
- 18 discussions about, well, how are we doing this? Are we
- doing enough? Are we doing the right things? Where's
- 20 the evidence? Which there were in other areas. And
- 21 so --
- 22  $\,$  **Q.** To your knowledge, was -- sorry to speak over you,
- 23 Mr Cameron -- the integrity and reliability of the
- 24 Horizon system ever on a risk register?
- 25 A. Looking back at the documents, I don't think it was.

- 1 there were, 150, at the time, Directly Managed Branches.
- 2 And so, you know, without postmasters there is no Post
- 3 Office and Post Office Limited only exists, you know, to
  - keep postmasters in post offices.
    - And so I'm --
- ${\bf 6} \quad {\bf Q.} \quad {\bf Sorry} \ to \ interrupt, were they seen as a different kind$ 
  - of species, essentially, from --
- 8 A. I think they were --
- 9 Q. -- centrally managed, directly managed branches?
- 10 A. Yes.

5

7

- 11 Q. And as a lesser form?
- 12 A. No, I don't think that's right because we were furiously
- 13 shutting directly managed branches at the time, but the
- 14 bit -- sorry to complete the too long anecdote -- I did
- that speech in ten minutes and a postmaster stopped me
- 16 as I came out in the break and said, "You know, you said
- 17 that, did you really mean it?" And I said, "Well, yes
- inat, did you really mean it: And I said, Well, ye
- 18 of course I did. I mean, it's obvious Post Office
- doesn't function without postmasters", and he said, "No
- one has ever said that to us before", and I thought "Oh,
- 21 my goodness, it's worse than I thought".
- 22 **Q**. You tell us in your witness statement -- perhaps you'd
- 23 better turn it up -- it's page 13, paragraph 56, you say
- paragraph 56, foot of the page:
- 25 "... with hindsight I feel that the ARC ..."

126

- Q. Do you know why that was?
- 2 A. I'm speculating a bit. It didn't strike me as peculiar
- 3 until I went back and read the documents now but
- 4 I assume that Horizon was seen as fundamentally
- 5 a Fujitsu accountability. But, I mean, that isn't
- 6 an excuse. Reading it back again, it clearly feels
- 7 wrong.

1

- 8 Q. Where, within the organisation, would responsibility
- 9 rest for the drawing up of an appropriate risk register
- 10 that would have included or should have included Horizon
- 11 on it?
- 12 A. So I think those teams reported to Jane MacLeod from
- 13 2015 to 2019, and to me, after Nick arrived.
- 14 Q. So to you from -- can you give us a date?
- 15 A. Oh, middle of 2019, after Jane left.
- 16 **Q.** Yes. How big were the teams that drew up the risk
- 17 register?
- 18 A. I'm thinking half a dozen people because the view was
- that the risk registers should be drawn up across the
- 20 business by different parts of the business, and the job
- 21 of the risk team -- although I'm sure it evolved at
- 22 points -- was to help them do that and then consolidate
- 23 a view that the Audit Committee or the Board or the
- 24 Executive could look at.
- 25 Q. The misfunctioning or non-functioning of Horizon was

- 1 plainly a risk to the business?
- 2 A. Yes, it was, and we were doing, obviously, work on
- 3 income flowing through, and it wasn't unusual to me.
- 4 I'd seen in a previous experience of not being able to
- 5 sort of audit through a system, so the external auditors
- 6 did a lot of work with Fujitsu on the controls around
- 7 Horizon and, if they didn't think they were good enough
- 8 in any particular year, they did additional substantive
- 9 testing. We developed a whole financial control
- 10 framework to go through all the income, follow it
- 11 through to reconcile it to third party sources, to test
- 12 it, do a lot of testing after the balance sheet date
- 13 and, you know, slowed down the speed at which we signed
- 14 the accounts to do more post-balance sheet testing.
- 15 So there was a lot of work being done.
- 16 Q. Again, can you assist as to why, to your knowledge,
- 17 Horizon never made it onto a risk register of the Post
- Office? 18
- 19 A. I don't know that I can. I've suggested that it is
- 20 perhaps that it was considered something Fujitsu was
- 21 doing but, in reading the documents again, for the
- 22 purpose of this Inquiry, it struck me as -- immediately
- 23 as odd.
- 24 Q. We hear quite often how many transactions a day, how
- 25 many transactions a week, how many transactions a year,
- 1 conversation.
- 2 Q. Can we look, please, at POL00249527, and look at page 2,
- 3 please, and just scroll down, please -- sorry, page 3
- 4 not page 2. An email of yours of 27 June 2017 --
- 5 A. Yeah.
- 6 Q. -- under the heading "Ops Board and Losses & Crime
- 7 Group". Can you explain what that group was, please?
- 8 A. So Operations Board was, you know, me working with
- 9 people to consistently, probably monthly, review
- 10 performance efficiency costs of different operational
- teams and --11
- 12 Q. That's different from the Management Board, is it?
- Yes, and Losses and Crime Group, I think -- and I must 13
- 14 admit I don't remember it particularly well -- was, you
- 15 know, trying to understand where we were losing money
- 16 and what we could do to stop that happening.
- 17 Q. You say:

19

- "The guidance yesterday was that we should not attempt to prosecute any cases where the losses had
- 20 arisen from or were identified via trading and Horizon 21 rather than a straight theft, until two things happen.
- 22 Firstly we complete the Deloitte work on systems
- 23 reliance. Secondly the CCRC opine. The former is fine
- 24 and I gather we are close. The second I want to make us
- 25 to make as a formal judgment with Paula engaged because

- 1 the amount of money that was put through the Horizon
- 2 system or processed by the Horizon system; isn't it
- 3 self-evidently obvious that the non-functioning or
- 4 misfunctioning of the system was a risk that ought to be
- 5 registered?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Control measures -- I mean, the idea is not just to
- 8 register a risk; it's to introduce control or mitigation
- 9 measures to reduce or eliminate the risk?
- A. And I think a lot of that work was being done and the 10
- 11 fact it wasn't debated in the risk register doesn't mean
- 12 it wasn't but, clearly, it would have been much more
- 13 satisfactory if that had been openly and consistently
- 14 debated through that period, and it wasn't.
- 15 Q. Thank you. That document can come down.
- 16 Did there ever come a time when you believed that it
- 17 would be necessary or desirable for the Post Office to
- 18 recommence prosecuting?
- 19 A. I asked the question on a number of occasions, as in.
- 20 "Are we making a deliberate decision here? Do we know
- 21 what the factors are?" We never got to a point or
- 22 anywhere close to it where we had a real conversation
- 23 about under what circumstances would we, and we never
- 24 got near a point where we thought about recommencing it,
- 25 but it was definitely a part of the background
  - 130
  - it is a big deal, with an open timetable and a strong
- 2 sense that this is now costing us blood."
  - What did you mean by that sentence?
- 4 A. So, as I think I said earlier, so I think there's three
- 5 things in this. The first is this was going to be a big 6 decision if we ever took it and we never got close to
- 7 taking it and, therefore, I wanted us to do it
- thoughtfully and properly, and make it as a big decision, which is something I really strongly believe 9
- 10 in on many fronts. Secondly, it was a big deal if we
- ever changed that and, therefore, Paula absolutely had 11
- 12
- to be engaged with this. This couldn't be a, you know,
- 13 lower level decision. It was a big decision, it had to
- 14 go to the Board. We didn't know what the timetable
- 15

1

3

8

- 16 And "costing us blood", which is clearly not 17 a phrase which reads well now, was simply saying that
- 18 the losses in the Network, which could be from a variety 19 of causes, you know, one might be shortfalls that we
- 20 didn't recover, one might be theft and robbery by third
- 21 parties but those losses were growing over time and 22 could continue to grow if we didn't do anything about
- 23 it.
- 24 Q. What did you mean by "is now costing us blood"?
- 25 Well, that's what I mean, is the costs were going up,

and the fear is, you know, that they would keep on going 1 2 up and, you know, as well as all the other 3 accountabilities, we are accountable for managing a lot 4 of public money. We have hundreds of millions pounds of 5 cash at any moment in post offices and moving back and 6 forward, you know, repatriating 80 million, 90 million 7 a day now, because obviously the -- you know, and we 8 have to look after that money. It's taxpayers money and 9 we have to be alive to that.

10 Q. You continue:

11

12

13

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

"My preference would be to do the Deloitte work ..."

I think that's referring back to Deloitte work on systems reliance; is that right?

14 A. Yes, I think so.

15 Q. What did you understand Deloitte were doing? This ismid-2017.

17 A. Yeah, I got, at times, a little bit confused between the 18 Deloitte work that never really happened on suspense 19 accounts, the Deloitte work for, you know, the 20 Chairman's review, the Deloitte work for the GLO 21 preparation and this Deloitte work. So I don't think 22 I was ever entirely clear what Deloitte was doing but, 23 clearly, I understood that they were doing some work on 24 the reliability of Horizon, as part of that package of 25 concern, and I think there's a document somewhere where

"In the meantime I have a specialist team setting up

prosecutions that will never happen."

133

What was that, the specialist team setting up prosecutions that weren't going to happen?

A. So there was a smallish team which sometimes, I think, worked for me and sometimes for Jane, who were the people who would collect evidence under PACE and had done so in relation to earlier prosecutions and this was partly a sort of budget argument between myself and Jane, because I was sort of saying, well, you know, we need to keep cutting our costs. If we're not going to be using these teams to do any prosecutions, then presumably we don't need that level of skill --

14 Q. We can lay them off, as you say here?

15 A. Sorry?

16 Q. We can lay them off, as you say here?

17 A. Yeah, so if we didn't need them and we could do
 18 investigations differently, then my question was "Do we
 19 need them?"

Q. To what extent were the proposals that you were making
 here connected to or separate from the product of the
 Chairman's review conducted by Jonathan Swift?

A. As far as I was concerned, completely separate. I never
 saw the product of the Chairman's review.

25 Q. You never saw it --

they were doing work to see if they would be appropriateto be an expert witness.

3 Q. Okay. At least that was your understanding.

4 A. Yes.

6

7

8

9

10

5 Q. You say your preference would be:

"... to do the Deloitte work and then seek
a prosecution relying on Horizon in a single sympathetic
case -- admission, good evidence, not too sympathetic
a postmaster, not part of the GLO ... And then we will
know."

11 What did you mean, "And then we will know"?

12 A Was the way the system was working capable of s

12 Was the way the system was working capable of supporting 13 a legal case if we were convinced that a postmaster had 14 stolen money? So, if we were convinced of that and it 15 was one of the cases where the evidence was relying on 16 Horizon, would it stand up to legal scrutiny? And that 17 was clearly important to all the future decisions. 18 I didn't know whether it would or not and that was the 19 idea of saying, "Well, look, let's just take a case, not 20 a controversial case or political case, but let's just 21 take a case, a new case, where we really believe that 22 someone has stolen and put it in a court, and see 23 whether they agree or not". Of course we never got

25 Q. You say:

24

8

21

22

23

24

25

134

A. No.

2 Q. -- in your time at the Post Office?

anywhere near that.

3 **A.** No

4 Q. Did you know about it?

A. I knew it was happening but I never saw the output that
 I'd remember, or anything I've seen in documents.
 I don't think I saw it.

Q. Can we look at your witness statement, please, at

paragraph 37, please. If we read paragraph 37, you say:
"During 2016-2017, I understood that Tim ..."

During 2016-2017, Funderstood that Tim ...

11 That's Tim Parker.

12 A. Yeah

13 "-- commissioned a Chairman's Review at the request of 14 Baroness Neville-Rolfe, to investigate matters related 15 to postmaster complaints and the Mediation Scheme. I do 16 not know how this work was reported, or how it was 17 transitioned from the Chairman's review into preparation 18 for the [Group Litigation]. The work was legally 19 privileged, and my recollection it was not shared, even 20 with the Board."

You were later included in work on suspense accounts:

"On reflection, the Board should have insisted on seeing and understanding this work as part of our preparation for the [Group Litigation]."

- 1 You say there the work was legally privileged. By 2 mentioning that, are you giving that as a reason or 3 a possible reason why it was not given or shared with 4 you?
- 5 A. That was my understanding.
- 6 Q. Where did you get that understanding from?
- 7 A. Well, I thought it was from Jane.
- 8  $\,$   $\,$   $\,$  Q.  $\,$  So Jane MacLeod told you that the reason why Jonathan
- 9 Swift's review was not being shared with you was because
- 10 of privilege?
- 11 A. That's my recollection but, you know, when you hear from
- 12 her, if she disagrees --
- 13 Q. We're not going to hear from her.
- 14 A. Okay.
- 15 Q. She lives abroad --
- 16 A. Okay.
- 17 Q. -- and won't cooperate.
- 18 A. Wow.
- 19 Q. So that's why I'm asking you --
- 20 A. Okay, so that is my recollection, was that Jane was
- 21 holding this and, when you speak to Tim Parker, he can
- 22 probably explain what he was told by Jane as to how this
- 23 material had to be handled but my understanding was that
- this was legally privileged and couldn't be shared,
- 25 except with the Chairman, and that was it.
  - 137
- Where I did push back was on things that were, you know,specific, like if there was work being done on the
- 3 suspense accounts, I was saying "Look, I have to know
- 4 that, as CFO", but, more broadly, no, I didn't.
- 5 Q. Thank you.

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- My last topic, then, please. The NFSP. Can we look, please, at paragraph 405 of your witness statement, please -- I'm so sorry, it's 411, on page 107, foot of the page. This is the chapter or section of your witness statement that deals with the NFSP and
- 11 you say that:
  - "At the [General Executive] on 12 March and the board meeting on 18 June 2015 [the Post Office] approved a new agreement with the NFSP whereby [the Post Office] would provide most of the NFSP's funding. The agreement also included a clause that the NFSP could not criticise [the Post Office] in public. It is clear to me that these facts undermined NFSP's independence from [the Post Office] in its representation of [subpostmasters]."
- 19 Post Office 20 Yes?
- 21 **A.** Yes.
- Q. What was your understanding as to the extent to whichthe Post Office provided NFSP funding before March '15?
- 24 A. I don't remember, actually. So I think it had
- 25 produced -- provided some but nothing like as much as 139

- 1  $\,$  Q. Did that understanding that you got from Jane MacLeod
- 2 extend to that being the reason that the Board didn't
- 3 get to see --
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. -- the report from Jonathan Swift too?
- 6 A. Yes
- 7 Q. Did the Board, to your knowledge, know about the
- 8 existence of the Chairman's review?
- 9 A. Oh, yes.
- 10 Q. Was there, to your knowledge, a summary or a synthesis
- 11 of it given to the Board?
- 12 A. Not as far as I recall.
- 13 Q. So does it follow that the board knew of the existence
- of Jonathan Swift's review but didn't ask to see it, to
- 15 your knowledge?
- 16 A. I think that's right. I think I'd been told they
- 17 weren't going to see it and I don't remember there being
- 18 a particular argument or debate about that but my
- 19 knowledge may be incomplete.
- 20 Q. Did you ever question the suggestion that it was
- 21 a privileged document, ie had been prepared for the
- 22 purposes of, in broad terms, litigation?
- 23 A. Yeah, I don't --
- 24 Q. In contemplation of litigation?
- 25 **A.** I don't think I did, which, you know, was clearly wrong.
- 1 now was being proposed but I could be wrong. I don't
- 2 remember.
- 3 Q. What was your understanding before March 2015 as to
- 4 whether any agreements between the Post Office and the
- 5 NFSP included clauses forbidding the NFSP from
- 6 criticising the Post Office in public?
- 7 A. I'm not sure until it came to the Group Executive that
- 8 I'd thought about the NFSP much in my first couple of
- 9 months but my memory is that those clauses were new.
- 10  $\,$  Q. Can we look, please, at NFSP00001075. Can you see this
- is the Grant Framework Agreement between the Post Office
- 12 and the Federation?
- 13 **A.** Yes.

25

- 14 Q. I think this is the agreement to which you're referring,
- 15 isn't it?
- 16 A. I think so.
- 17 Q. Can we look, please, at page 10, and can you see under
- 18 "General Conditions of the Grant", at paragraphs -- and
- 19 we're going to look at 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3. At 5.1:
- 20 "Both parties shall use reasonable endeavours to
- 21 identify any issues which will or may create tension
- between the interests of [the Post Office] and those of
- 23 Post Office Operators and use reasonable endeavours to
- resolve any such issues.

"For the avoidance of doubt, it is acknowledged that 140

1		the NFSP may	1		against [the Post Office]; and
2		"1. Represent individual Post Office Operators;	2		"6. Other activities or behaviours the effect of
3		"2. Discuss and comment on [the Post Office's]	3		which may be materially detrimental to [the Post
4		initiatives, policies and strategies with its	4		Office]."
5		membership;	5		The agreement does not, therefore, contain
6		"3. Publicly comment on the same;	6		a clause and this is the only relevant part of it
7		"4. State and explain its opinion on the same, even	7		I believe that the NFSP should not criticise the Post
8		if not in support of [the Post Office]; and	8		Office in public, does it?
9		"5. Lobby relevant stakeholders such as [Business,	9	A.	
10		Innovation and Skills] and Royal Mail Group on behalf of	10	۸.	I believed we sort of waived the clause in 2019, and
11		its members.	11		I had always understood that that was the case, but
12		"5.3. The NFSP shall not engage in any of the	12		I didn't go back and read this. And I think there is
			13		-
13		following activities or behaviours:			a reference in one of the documents as to the clause we
14		"1. Undertaking any public activity which may	14	_	unpicked in 2019 and whether it's 5.3 here, I'm
15		prevent [Post Office] from implementing any of its	15	Q.	•
16		initiatives, policies or strategies;	16	Α.	•
17		<ol><li>Undertaking or inducing a third party to</li></ol>	17	Q.	prepared in 2019, which, at paragraph 2.1.8, proposes
18		undertake media or political campaigns against [the Post	18		to delete some parts of clause 5
19		Office];	19	A.	Yeah.
20		<ol><li>"3. Organising or inducing a third party to</li></ol>	20	Q.	including paragraph 5.3. Just for the record, the
21		organise public demonstrations, protests or petitions	21		crossreference is NFSP00001082 but that variation in
22		against [the Post Office];	22		2019 doesn't affect the fact that, as originally drafted
23		"4. Organising or inducing a third party to	23		in 2015, there isn't a clause which prohibits the NFSP
24		organise boycotts of [the Post Office's] business.	24		from criticising the Post Office in public?
25		"5. Funding or inducing any third party litigation	25	A.	I thought there was. I apologise.
		141			142
1	Q.	Where did you get that understanding from?	1		questions are of such a length as we require some kind
2	A.	I think it must have been from the conversations in	2		of break. If they're literally ten minutes and five
3		2015, I think there was a sense of, "Well, if we're	3		minutes, then, obviously, we'll carry on but, otherwise,
4		going to be paying all the money, they can't, you know,	4		we might need to think about a break.
5		call us out in public", but, clearly, wiser heads	5	MR	BEER: Sir, I'm assured by nods and non-verbal
6		prevailed and it was a more limited set of restrictions.	6		communication of other types that they are 15 minutes at
7		I still think a lot of 5.3 is onerous and reducing it in	7		most so we will finish by 3.00 and, therefore, I don't
8		2019 was the right thing to do and that's what we did.	8		think we need a break.
	Q.	In fact, the deed of variation hasn't been signed,	9	SIE	R WYN WILLIAMS: Fine.
9	Q.	_		Sir	
10		I think, by the Post Office	10	МС	Questioned by MS PAGE
11	Α.	My goodness, I didn't know that.	11	IVIO	PAGE: Thank you, sir.
12	Q.	despite, as I understand it, the NFSP seeking to	12		Just a very short number of questions about the
13		persuade the Post Office to do so.	13		Finance Team. In your witness statement it's at
14	Α.	I do find that peculiar because I think, as Interim CEO,	14		paragraph 191 I don't intend to call it up, you say
15		I stood up and said that we would or had. So I'm	15		this:
16		astonished.	16		"My emerging view across my first year at POL was
17	MR	<b>BEER:</b> Mr Cameron, thank you very much for answering my	17		that the competence of the Finance Teams and the control
18		questions.	18		environment were weaker than they should have been.
19		I believe there are some questions on behalf of one	19		There were people with operational capabilities
20		Core Participant, namely Mr Stein, on behalf of the	20		undertaking financial roles."
21		Howe+Co group.	21		Am I right in thinking that's Chesterfield that
22		Oh, sorry, two Core Participants sir, five minutes	22		you're talking about?
23		on behalf of the HJA group.	23	A.	Yes.
24	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: I'm only hesitating because I'm	24	Q.	So, in effect, it's Mr Rod Ismay's team at Chesterfield?
25		wondering it's very nearly 2.40 whether the	25	A.	Yes.
		143			144

7

13

15

19

- When you started to worry about that, did you take it up 1 2 with Mr Ismay?
- 3 A. I don't know how much I did talk to Rod about it and how 4 much I just got on with what I thought needed doing,
- 5 which was to start to bring new people in and change the
- 6 senior Finance Team and create a very formal and
- 7 detailed financial controls framework that operated in
- 8 a way I thought was appropriate from past experience,
- 9 which took a couple of years to be fully embedded, and
- 10 to progressively develop the Finance Team's capability,
- 11 which is vastly better than it was then.
- 12 What impact did that have on the extent to which you Q.
- 13 felt able to trust Mr Ismay?
- 14 A. I don't know that it had much impact. I think I always
- 15 assumed that Rod was, you know, telling me the truth, as
- 16 he understood it at the time but -- and I can't remember
- 17 when this happened, but I did feel that we needed
- 18 stronger people. So very little of the senior Finance
- 19 Team -- I think any one member of the very senior
- 20 Finance Team, which he wasn't in at that point --
- 21 survived more than a couple of years and, you know, we
- 22 made progressive changes and Rod was one of those in
- 23 2017-ish, I'm not sure.
- 24 MS PAGE: Thank you. Those are my questions.
- 25 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

145

- 1 I don't need to take you to it -- you think that they 2 did become more active and that led to an increase in 3 pay?
- 4 A. So I thought that the brilliant work the NFSP did was in 5 the second quarter of 2019 because they did the survey 6 of members and, whilst the corporate postmasters, or 7 whatever it was, were going to throw the keys in wasn't, 8 I think, sort of literally true, I think it was a really 9
- impressive signal of intent and I thought they lobbied 10 to get the select committee very effectively and really
- 11 ramped it up.
- 12 I actually felt then when they turned up at the 13 Select Committee they slightly lost their nerve and
- 14 didn't push the point as hard as they might have done.
- 15 And I've always said the same things to the NFSP and
- 16 they get irritated with me for doing so, which is that
- 17 if this was working right, postmasters would voluntarily
- 18 pay the subs to fund the NFSP because they would see 19
- value in it and then they wouldn't need to be funded by
- 20 Post Office Limited. They were only funded by Post
- 21 Office Limited because postmasters won't fund it. And,
- 22 if postmasters funded it because they really felt they
- 23 were standing up for them, then that would be better.
- 24 Q. Because they'd feel invested in the organisation --
- 25 A. Yeah.

Questioned by MR STEIN

- 2 MR STEIN: Mr Cameron, as you may be aware I'm Mr Sam Stein.
- 3 I represent a large number of postmasters/mistresses and 4
  - other people that worked in branches.
- Just on a matter you were dealing with, with 5
- 6 Mr Beer, you were talking about the agreement with the
  - NFSP and your thoughts that they had had an extra
- 8 restriction on criticising the Post Office.
- 9 A. Yeah.
- 10 Q. The term that's used which might be described as
- 11 a catch-all is -- I won't bring up the document, I'll
- 12 just repeat it.
  - "The NFSP shall not engage in any of the following
- 14 activities or behaviours."
  - Then the sixth point for that is:
- 16 "Any other activities or behaviours the effect of
- 17 which may be materially detrimental to [the Post
- 18 Office]."
  - Do you think that that is where you drew the
- 20 conclusion that it's a bit wider than it seems?
- 21 A. It may have been. I don't recall.
- 22 In 2019, you encouraged, I think, in a speech, that the
- 23 NFSP should be more active --
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. -- and, in fact, I think in your statement -- again,

- 1 Q. -- and part of it?
- 2 A. Yeah, and postmasters would be comfortable that the NFSP
- 3 was really standing up for them.
- 4 Q. Now, help us, going back now to 2015, why did the Post
- 5 Office want to -- I'm going to use the word "shackle" --
- 6 why did the Post Office want to shackle the NFSP in this
- 7 way? Now, you've explained why Post Office needed to
- 8 pay --
- 9 A. Yeah.
- 10 Q. -- but you've not explained why it is that you think
- 11 there was this need to mute them at that time?
- 12 Um, I don't really remember but I think there was
- a sense of "Well, if we're paying for it, you know, they 13
- 14 can't just walk out and criticise us", and, you know, it
- 15 may even have been me that said that, I can't remember,
- 16 but I think it was that sense of "Well, if we're paying
- for everything, you know", and I have a -- I mean, lots 17
- 18 of people have different views on what's independence
- 19 but my view was very firmly sort of trained in from
- 20 an external audit relationship, where I'd spent a lot of
- 21 my career, and it's really, really clear that, if you're
- 22 getting a lot of your income from one source, you're not
- 23 independent of that source.
- 24 It's like, oh, I mean, I'm independent of the Post 25 Office; well, of course I'm not because they pay my

- 1 salary. And that was my sense of it.
- 2 Q. Obviously, this is the same time, 2015, whereby there's
- 3 the -- well, the issues have exploded all over the Post
- 4 Office already --
- 5 A. Yeah.
- 6 Q. -- but they are continuing?
- 7 A. Yeah.
- 8 Q. All right. Now, I'm going to turn to a different matter
- 9 and I'm going to drawing on your expertise and training
- 10 as an accountant, and then your work in the Post Office.
- 11 All right?
- 12 A. Okay.
- 13 Q. Okay. Now, stop me when I go wrong with this because
- 14 you may well understand this better than I do. First of
- all, the starting point is, is that the Horizon system
- is meant to be a double entry bookkeeping system, yes?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Overall?
- 19 A. Yeah.
- 20 Q. All right, so what should happen is that money coming in
- 21 should be accounted for against an item. So I'm going
- 22 to use stamps as my example, all right?
- 23 A. Okay.
- 24 Q. So money coming in to a branch for 20 stamps, that
- 25 should be capable of being accounted within the system, 149
- 1 Office, through the Horizon system, theoretically
- 2 identified a shortfall -- I'm using £5,000 as
- 3 an example -- of £5,000 for a branch, that wasn't
- 4 referenced by the Post Office to a particular
- 5 transaction. That's not what the subpostmasters say.
- 6 They don't say they were told "Look, it's the stamps" or
- 7 something else, they were just told "It's 5 grand".
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Help us try and understand how that could occur, how
- 10 Post Office would just simply say it's £5,000, and not
- 11 reference to any particular transaction with
- 12 identification?
- 13 A. Because I think what you had was a cash shortfall. So
- 14 what the Post Office view was, you know, at this point,
- 15 you said you had this much cash, last time you did
- 16 a cash declaration or last time it was counted or
- 17 whatever it was, and these are the transactions flowing
- in and out. But, you know, if this was a few days, that
- 19 would be easy. If it was 18 months, you were getting
- 20 downloads from Fujitsu, there were hundreds and hundreds

- 21 of transactions. But if you follow through all those
- 22 transactions, you should now have £20,000 in cash left,
- and we've counted it, and there's 15.
- 24  $\,$  Q. Yes, so by it being identified in that way as a cash
- 25 shortfall, from the subpostmaster's point of view, it

- 1 presumably using a date mark and some reference point to
- 2 it being stamps; is that fair?
- 3 A. Yeah, I think the transaction should be recorded, yes.
- 4 Q. Transactions should have an identification --
- 5 A. Yeah.
- 6 Q. -- otherwise you don't know what on earth the money is
- 7 for?
- 8 A. Yeah.
- 9 Q. Again, that's right. All right. Now, we know from the
- 10 evidence of subpostmasters and mistresses and their
- 11 managers and their assistants that what would happen
- 12 when trying to balance accounts on occasions would be
- 13 that Horizon would say there's a shortfall --
- 14 A. Yes
- 15 Q. -- but it would not be referenced to a particular item
- 16 like stamps or anything else. It would just say there
- is £5,000 that should be here and then subpostmasters,
- their helpers, their family members, would then try and
- 19 find, wherever they could -- it would take hours and
- 20 hours, evening after evening, they were trying to find
- 21 out what this £5,000 represented.
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. You've heard that evidence?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 **Q.** Right. So help us a bit more with this. When the Post 150
- 1 wasn't identified as being -- again, I'll go back to my
- 2 stamps -- it wasn't identified as being £5,000 out of
- 3 the stamps', you know --
- 4 A. No.
- 5 Q. -- transaction till --
- 6 A. No, exactly.
- 7 Q. -- from their point of view?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. It didn't have an ID.
- 10 A. Or from Post Office's point of view. So they didn't --
- 11 Post Office wouldn't have known what had gone wrong, if
- you like, in order to make up that shortfall. The whole
- point was Post Office didn't know what had happened.
- 14 Q. Yes. Okay. So let's just take this one step further.
- Now, the subpostmaster had been confronted with this
- shortfall. We know that the systems within and
- 17 discussed in the judgments of Mr Justice Fraser were
- that the subpostmasters were under pressure, putting it
- as neutrally as I can, to pay up for shortfalls.
- 20 **A**. Yes
- 21 Q. Right. You've gone through, in your evidence with
- 22 Mr Beer earlier today, about how you think that started
  - 23 because it was a way of "We didn't know what happened in
  - the branches"?
  - 25 **A.** Yes.

- 1 Q. All right, so let's stay with my example: shortfall,
- 2 5 grand, subpostmasters trying to work out what on other
- 3 is going on, it's not identified to a transaction.
- 4 Okay. So next step is, subpostmaster is under pressure
- 5 to pay the £5,000 --
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. -- shortfall, and we've heard examples of people selling
- 8 pensions and raiding piggy banks, and things, dreadful
- 9 things?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. They pay the money in to balance that shortfall, yes?
- 12 **A.** Yes
- 13 Q. Now, going back to when suspense accounts occurred, that
- 14 would be what was occurring, yes?
- 15 **A.** Um --
- 16 Q. So money would be disputed by putting it into suspense
- 17 and then eventually paid off.
- 18 A. No, I think -- well, I think this is where we have to be
- 19 careful of terminology and I'm very careful on this in
- 20 2015. So, in 2015, the suspense accounts were
- 21 accounting balance sheet accounts in which unresolved
- 22 transactions were held and these were primarily customer
- 23 issues. So they weren't about the postmasters.
- 24 Q. Okay, that's 2015?
- 25 **A.** So that's 2015. I do say in one of the emails that's in
- 1 Q. My transaction --
- 2 A. -- I'm happy to try to explain.
- 3 Q. Yes.
- 4 A. So when a shortfall is identified, there is a potential
- 5 loss to the Post Office in the sense that it views that
- 6 money as should be there, the system says it should be
- 7 there and it's not there, so there's a debit and, at
- 8 first, that debit was held as an amount owed by the
- 9 postmaster. So we're saying, until proved otherwise,
- 10 this is the postmaster's accountability and they owe us
- 11 the money, was the way it was accounted for.
- 12 And then after 60 days, so quite a short space of
- time, if the postmaster hadn't paid that amount back,
- 14 what Post Office considered a debt, then it was written
- off to the profit and loss account. So it was a loss
- 16 for Post Office, compared to what it believed the
- 17 position was at that point, and then it --
- 18 Q. So if they did pay it though?
- 19 A. If they did pay it, then there wasn't a loss to Post
- 20 Office because the money was restored to where the
- 21 system said it should have been.
- 22  $\,$  Q. But it was never referred, ever in this situation that
- 23 we're describing, to an actual transaction?
- 24 **A.** No
- 25 **Q.** It was never referred to stamps or any other transaction 155

- 1 my evidence pack that my understanding in 2015, what I'd
- been told, is that local branch accounts had been called
- 3 suspense accounts 10 years earlier and I specifically
- 4 ask "Are we sure, with the Second Sight investigation,
- 5 that they want to talk about suspense accounts today not
- 6 the branch accounts?", and they said yes or I was told
- 7 they said yes.
- 8 Q. All right, let's go back to my example, all right?
- 9 5 grand, postmaster pays it in. Now, when the
- postmaster pays in the £5,000, got through however, loan
- 11 shark, or whatever: they're paying it in.
- 12 **A.** Yes
- 13 Q. That then is being paid into the Post Office --
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. -- and there's no transaction that's identified for it.
- They are simply paying off the shortfall; do you agree?
- 17 A. Yes
- 18 Q. Right. So when that money is being paid in, identified
- shortfall, Horizon may be making it up, paid off by
- 20 subpostmaster. Now, that doesn't go back to any
- 21 transaction, any purchase, anything that is bought or
- paid for at the branch at all. Where is that accounted
- 23 for within the accounts? Do you understand what the
- 24 problem is?
- 25 **A.** Um --

- 1 that might take place?
- 2 A. Unless, you know, we'd found a specific explanation --
- 3 Q. Right
- 4 A. -- we didn't know what had caused it.
- 5 Q. Right. So going back to my example, where you've got
- 6 this £5,000 being identified, theoretical £5,000 by the
- 7 Horizon system, subpostmaster paying it in.
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Was there, at that stage, then someone designated to go
- 10 find out what on earth this was meant to represent? Go
- 11 find out what on earth this transaction was meant to
- 12 have been all about?
- 13 A. So I think at times people did try but I don't think
- 14 they tried hard enough. I mean, let's be clear and
- that's part of what I was talking about in 2020, because
- it was just too convenient. You know, that the theory
- 17 was only the postmaster knows what's happened, therefore
- until proved otherwise, they owe us the money, and that
- 19 will restore the system to where it was. And so I don't
- think there was enough investigation on that and,
   indeed, I think, you know, Post Office General Counsel
- has said that no investigations before, you know,
- 23 a certain date, would pass, you know, Mr Justice
- 24 Fraser's test of evidence to support.
- 25 Q. The other consequence of this, I think you'll agree,

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 1 Mr Cameron, is that, if you're not looking into things
- 2 that relate to the shortfall, subpostmaster stumping up
- 3 the cash, getting it from wherever and trying to
- 4 identify where on earth this came from, then that's
- 5 masking, again, potential problems in the Horizon system
- 6 because nobody is looking into it properly?
- 7 A. It might be.
- 8 Q. Yeah, okay. Now, let's go back, then, a bit further.
- 9 Now, the branch suspense accounts. Now, these were held
- 10 locally. So branch suspense accounts were where
- shortfall identified, there was an ability that was 11
- 12 removed around 2006 to put monies into suspense, as
- 13 a result of the IMPACT Programme; were you aware of
- 14
- 15 A. I think I've heard it. I don't understand the detail of
- 16 it because it was a long time before I joined.
- 17 Q. It may be a long time ago, Mr Cameron, but you have said
- 18 in your evidence that you thought there were limited
- 19 investigations and questions in relation to some matters
- 20 and one of those was suspense accounts. You've also
- 21 said, later on in your evidence, that when suspense
- 22 account questions came up, you decided to look into
- 23 this.

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

- 24 **A**. So --
- 25 Why didn't you go back and try to understand what on

1 And then later, at Lord Arbuthnot's request to Nick, 2 we got KPMG -- and I very deliberately didn't get

involved in it, I just let it flow -- to do another investigation into suspense accounts in 2020, which is in my witness statement, and Post Office have very kindly allowed us to put the papers reporting that, and

7 we did.

> In the summer of 2020 they did an investigation into the current operation of suspense accounts and then, in

- November 2020, they had done a backward-looking one.
- 11 And what they said is, "There is no evidence of
- 12 a problem in suspense accounts. There is not a problem
- 13 in suspense accounts because, if what Second Sight were
- 14 worried about was happening, then one of two things must
- 15 follow: either there's a huge build-up of credits in the 16
- suspense accounts, growing over time, or they were being 17 released to the P&L, and they weren't". And we kept
- 18 seeing this, and KPMG went through it with great care
- 19 and it wasn't happening.
- Q. Okay. So you've mentioned that you were aware of the 20
- 21 IMPACT Programme and your words were "I think I've heard
- 22 of it". All right. Were you aware the IMPACT Programme
- 23 had an impact on --
- 24 Α. No, I don't --
- 25 Q. -- on suspense accounts? Was that something you ever 159

1 earth had happened in those earlier days?

2 Well, happy to answer that. So in terms of what I think 3 of suspense accounts, the proper balance sheets suspense

accounts that I referred to and which we discussed with

5 the Second Sight in 2015, my understanding of the

6 immediate task was to see if there was evidence of

7 a problem in suspense accounts, based on Second Sight's 8 hypothesis, and I'm really clear in the emails that

9 I didn't think there was.

> When Deloitte were asked to do work by the Legal Team, which included work on suspense accounts, I'm really clear in emails that I didn't think there was a problem but, if they were going to do the work, then they should do a proper job and go into not just the formal suspense accounts but all the client creditor accounts that preceded them, which, again, we had looked at a couple of the big ones and there hadn't been any evidence of a problem. But I thought "Well, if you're going to do this, do a proper job, and then we can just

In the meantime, we were doing a huge amount of work on the Financial Controls Framework and so there were all sorts of investigations, checks, reconciliations, proof going on, and none of it suggested that there was a problem in suspense accounts.

158

1 came across and looked into?

settle everyone's mind at rest".

- 2 A.
- Q. Okay. A couple of last questions. I'm very conscious 3 4 of the time; we're getting close to the 3.00 cut-off, 5 okay? All right.

6 Help us understand a bit more to try to identify 7 where the money went, all right. So let's go back to

the branch suspense accounts, the ones that you don't 8

9 know much about, that were abolished by the IMPACT

10 Programme. How are we going to find out where that

11 money went, from subpostmasters stumping up the cash

12 from their family and friends, wherever they got it

13 from, where that money went when the Horizon system was

14 at least, they believe, on many occasions, at fault for

15 it? Where did that money go? How do we find that out,

16 Mr Cameron?

- 17 A. I genuinely don't know. I was always asked questions by 18 Second Sight and others about the operation at the time 19 at which I was in the business.
- 20 Q. Well, who should we ask, Mr Cameron?
- 21 A. Well, I think, I'd assumed -- and this may have been
- 22 false -- that the reason no one was asking to go back to
- 23 2005 or 2007 was because there just wasn't the data to
- 24 do it because, otherwise, I mean, I'd have thought they
- 25 would have done. So I don't know if there is

1		information to do that	1	A.	I absolutely understand the problem. I've always been
2	Q.	Who do we ask, Mr Cameron? I'm aware, obviously, you're	2		open to look at it. We've done a huge amount of
3		on sick leave. But who should we ask, because I don't	3		controls work over the years. I think and this is
4		think we can ask you to do this? Who should be able to	4		just a personal opinion that the suspense accounts in
5		give us that information?	5		terms of the formal client creditor and suspense
6	A.	Well, I think, you know, ask Nick Read. He's the CEO.	6		accounts in the balance sheet are a red herring on this.
7		I mean, I'm not saying he is the one who is going to do	7		I think we've done a lot of work over the years and
8		the work but he's the one that can marshal the resources	8		KPMG came in and checked it again in 2020, and they were
9		and make it a priority and ascertain if it is possible,	9		pleased with the controls over it, they were pleased
10		at this time of day, to go back as far as 2005.	10		with the checks and no one has found you know, if we
11	Q.	To get the records that would answer the questions for	11		were piling credits into suspense accounts, then either
12		later suspense accounts in other words, money being	12		you could see them there or you could see them being
13		paid in the way we have discussed, to get those records	13		released into the P&L account, and that has not
14		going forward, around the time that you were looking at	14		happened. And so
15		this, and the way that you've described, who do we go to	15	Q.	Did you see the records?
16		for those?	16	A.	it's not for me to decide what Post Office
17	A.	Also Nick.	17	Q.	Did you see the records for this, Mr Cameron?
18	Q.	Okay. You understand the concern	18	A.	Which records?
19	A.	Of course.	19	Q.	The records we've just been talking about?
20	Q.	that this is people's individual money	20	A.	The KPMG work? Yes, of course.
21	A.	Of course.	21	Q.	So you went through them yourself?
22	Q.	that they believe has literally been taken by the	22	A.	I read the reports and the underlying reports. I didn't
23		Post Office	23		go through individual transactions.
24	A.	Yes.	24	Q.	Okay, one last thing.
25	Q.	and put into profit. Do you understand the problem? 161	25	A.	Yeah? 162
1	Q.	Angela van den Bogerd mentioned the fact that she had	1		Inquiry.
2		a bonus the same year that she was shown by the High	2		E WITNESS: Thank you.
3		Court Judge, Mr Justice Fraser, as being someone that	3	SIF	R WYN WILLIAMS: So we'll resume on Tuesday with Ms Lyons,
4		was less than truthful.	4		yes?
5	Α.	Yes.	5		BEER: That's it. Alwen Lyons, 9.45 on Tuesday, sir.
6	Q.	Is not being truthful to a High Court, is that not on	6		R WYN WILLIAMS: Fine. Thank you very much.
7		the risk questions that relate to bonuses? Is it just	7		BEER: Thank you, sir.
8		something that the Post Office doesn't pick up?	8	(3.0	01 pm)
9	Α.	I think the mindset in 2019 and you see that through	9		(The hearing adjourned until 9.45 am
10		the recusal and the appeals was a belief that	10		on Tuesday, 21 May 2024)
11		Mr Justice Fraser wasn't treating Post Office witnesses	11		
12		and other witnesses fairly and on the same basis and so	12		
13		I think there was a feeling that that hadn't been	13		
14		a reasonable judgment. And I think that was the reason	14		
15		why no one was taking it at face value, however, you	15		
16	мъ	know, wrong that seems now.	16		
17		STEIN: Thank you, Mr Cameron.	17		
18		E WITNESS: Thank you.	18		
19		WYN WILLIAMS: Is that it, Mr Beer?	19		
20		BEER: Sir, it is.	20		
21	SIK	WYN WILLIAMS: All right.	21 22		
22		Well, Mr Cameron, I'm very grateful to you for your			
23 24		very detailed witness statement, and for answering many	23 24		
		questions today.	24		
25		Thank you very much for your participation in the	25		
25		Thank you very much for your participation in the 163	25		164

## INDEX

ALISDAIR CHARLES JOHN CAMERON (affire	ned) .1
Questioned by MR BEER	1
Questioned by MS PAGE	144
Questioned by MR STEIN	146

154/3 159/4 159/8 159/10 **5,000 [10]** 150/17 **20,000 [1]** 151/22 **10.56 [1]** 52/9 **2000 [1]** 30/18 162/8 150/21 151/2 151/3 MR BEER: [28] 1/3 **100 [2]** 35/18 77/2 **2002 [1]** 6/9 **2020' [1]** 32/10 151/10 152/2 153/5 1/5 1/9 2/20 2/24 3/12 **100** million [2] 72/2 **2005 [4]** 34/12 **2021 [2]** 10/9 10/19 154/10 156/6 156/6 52/4 52/8 52/12 52/14 123/21 106/10 160/23 161/10 **2023 [1]** 6/2 **5.1 [2]** 140/19 140/19 57/13 57/15 57/21 **101 [1]** 10/3 **2006 [2]** 6/19 157/12 2024 [3] 1/1 1/14 **5.2 [1]** 140/19 62/14 62/20 93/23 **5.3** [5] 140/19 141/12 105 [3] 64/2 76/13 **2007 [3]** 30/20 34/13 164/10 94/2 94/6 94/8 114/5 142/14 142/20 143/7 76/18 160/23 21 May 2024 [1] 114/9 114/13 114/15 **107 [1]** 139/9 **2008 [2]** 30/3 30/7 164/10 **50 [2]** 57/17 68/2 143/17 144/5 163/20 **50 million [1]** 122/12 11,500 [1] 125/25 **2009 [1]** 66/22 22 June 2017 [1] 164/5 164/7 **11.10 [2]** 52/6 52/11 2010 [2] 30/20 81/10 **56 [2]** 126/23 126/24 MR STEIN: [2] 146/2 106/10 **11.17** [1] 57/3 **23 [1]** 63/10 163/17 2012 [2] 33/14 40/1 **11.26** [1] 62/17 23 December [1] MS PAGE: [2] 6 June [1] 81/24 **11.31 [1]** 62/19 2013 [1] 74/4 107/14 144/11 145/24 **6 million [1]** 79/7 **111 [1]** 105/4 **2014 [8]** 2/4 25/22 **23 May [1]** 3/14 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: **60 days [1]** 155/12 **115 [1]** 3/18 32/10 60/13 67/2 78/1 **26 July [2]** 77/20 **[22]** 1/4 1/6 2/17 107/14 107/16 **67 [1]** 2/9 **115 pages [1]** 1/15 79/11 2/23 3/11 52/7 52/13 **12 March [1]** 139/12 **2014' [1]** 30/4 **27 January [1]** 101/6 57/11 57/14 57/20 **12.18 [1]** 94/3 **2015 [43]** 2/5 2/7 4/6 **27 June [1]** 131/4 62/10 62/16 94/1 94/7 **70 [1]** 44/16 **12.30 [2]** 93/25 94/5 5/8 13/19 17/20 19/24 **279 [1]** 2/9 114/8 114/14 143/24 **71 [1]** 3/4 22/10 22/11 32/25 **128 [1]** 105/5 **28 June [1]** 2/14 144/9 163/19 163/21 **13 [2]** 8/4 126/23 33/4 40/20 40/23 28 June 2016 [1] 164/3 164/6 **13 May [1]** 3/14 41/20 41/22 43/10 2/13 THE WITNESS: [4] **80 [1]** 133/6 **14th [1]** 80/21 56/9 61/18 62/24 **28 March [1]** 107/22 2/21 145/25 163/18 **86 [1]** 3/12 **15 [2]** 144/6 151/23 63/13 65/3 67/12 28 November [1] 164/2 69/20 72/4 72/17 **15 February [1]** 3/6 57/21 75/10 78/2 106/8 15 January [1] **29 years [2]** 84/22 **9.45 [2]** 1/2 164/5 106/12 116/13 128/13 88/17 100/11 '**15 [5]** 66/9 66/9 **9.45 am [1]** 164/9 15 March [1] 3/6 139/13 140/3 142/23 **292 [1]** 3/9 73/21 117/3 139/23 **90 million [1]** 133/6 143/3 148/4 149/2 **150 [1]** 126/1 **'18 [4]** 7/21 57/21 93,000 [1] 82/6 **159 [2]** 100/8 100/10 153/20 153/20 153/24 58/3 61/3 **94 [2]** 63/11 63/11 **3,000 [2]** 89/16 91/8 15th [1] 80/22 153/25 154/1 158/5 **'19 [3]** 7/23 29/12 **95 [2]** 63/11 63/19 **16 [1]** 84/6 **2016 [8]** 2/13 2/19 **3,885 [1]** 107/15 89/13 **3.00 [2]** 144/7 160/4 16 January [1] 33/7 63/18 64/16 **'20 [1]** 61/3 3.01 [1] 164/8 101/13 75/15 76/1 77/21 'Dalmellington [1] aback [1] 125/21 30 December [1] 2016-18 [1] 32/16 16 September [1] 76/7 **Abbots [1]** 89/17 107/16 96/8 **2016-2017 [1]** 136/10 'Front [1] 63/20 **ability [3]** 59/3 31 January [1] **162 [1]** 100/19 **2017 [12]** 3/1 5/14 'missing' [1] 102/1 118/22 157/11 107/16 38/21 79/21 81/10 **165 [1]** 101/3 **'of' [1]** 96/4 able [13] 60/16 70/5 **338 [1]** 3/13 82/15 82/18 105/19 17 May 2024 [1] 1/1 **'Our [1]** 24/9 72/18 72/25 78/7 **37 [2]** 136/9 136/9 **177 [1]** 2/1 106/15 131/4 133/16 'protections' [1] 89/21 90/1 90/23 **18 [4]** 7/18 32/16 136/10 **38 [1]** 100/9 96/15 91/11 92/2 129/4 116/16 151/19 **2017-ish** [1] 145/23 **386 [1]** 120/22 'Some [1] 31/10 145/13 161/4 **18 April [1]** 1/14 **387 [1]** 10/2 **2018 [12]** 2/14 2/18 'the [1] 76/6 abolished [1] 160/9 **18 June [1]** 139/13 2/22 3/2 43/10 45/16 'there [1] 85/5 about [119] 1/23 4/19 **19 November [2]** 7/5 54/8 54/8 54/18 **'this [1]** 49/14 5/1 5/5 7/18 7/21 7/23 124/14 124/15 124/23|4 August [2] 79/12 7/12 'we [7] 20/4 30/1 31/5 8/4 10/4 11/10 13/16 79/24 **2019 [32]** 3/6 3/6 **191 [1]** 144/14 32/9 33/10 39/8 51/6 16/11 18/4 18/8 21/18 4 March [2] 2/3 2/5 **1987 [1]** 6/6 3/14 3/14 5/14 5/19 'What [1] 59/1 21/19 21/21 21/22 **4 years [1]** 58/16 5/19 5/24 8/4 17/17 **1999 [1]** 6/7 23/15 26/7 27/2 27/14 22/20 37/5 53/19 63/5 **4,000 [3]** 22/21 89/16 29/16 30/18 30/22 91/8 89/7 90/14 123/7 ...**'[1]** 24/12 31/15 31/18 32/4 32/5 **404 [1]** 64/2 2 August [2] 89/7 124/8 124/12 125/1 32/11 33/22 35/14 **405 [2]** 64/15 139/7 90/14 125/4 125/7 128/13 35/24 38/10 38/15 128/15 142/10 142/14 **406 [2]** 76/13 76/18 **2-3 [1]** 21/2 1 billion [1] 13/1 41/25 42/11 43/9 44/2 **2.1 [1]** 115/21 **411 [1]** 139/8 142/17 142/22 143/8 1 March [1] 65/3 45/15 46/3 46/14 415 million [1] **2.1.8 [1]** 142/17 146/22 147/5 163/9 1 October [1] 69/20 46/19 46/23 50/22 122/12 **2.40 [1]** 143/25 **2019/20 [1]** 124/4 **1,400 [1]** 78/15 56/4 60/13 61/8 62/11 **42 [1]** 1/25 **20 [2]** 124/4 149/24 2020 [25] 7/5 7/12 **1.00 [2]** 114/6 114/10 62/20 64/19 65/13 **20 May [2]** 85/19 8/17 15/14 16/4 17/20 **1.5 billion [1]** 13/1 71/16 71/20 73/3 74/2 85/25 18/2 18/3 26/22 27/6 **1.50 [2]** 114/7 114/12 74/14 82/5 85/8 86/25 **5 August [1]** 80/3 **20 million [3]** 42/10 27/8 43/20 51/2 53/17 **10 [2]** 43/22 140/17

55/17 59/21 60/3 63/7

89/13 99/6 156/15

43/23 54/24

**20 years [1]** 38/14

**10 years [2]** 52/18

(43) MR BEER: - about

89/1 89/2 90/11 90/16

92/5 92/7 93/10 93/14

**5 grand [3]** 151/7

153/2 154/9

79/17 121/5 133/3 129/8 139/16 157/20 161/17 agency [1] 34/10 aggressive [1] 46/4 accountant [2] 6/5 address [5] 25/21 although [7] 11/6 about... [51] 96/9 ago [9] 1/21 14/18 149/10 61/24 101/14 101/25 21/19 28/11 109/3 97/5 97/8 97/14 98/18 accounted [4] 102/7 38/14 39/12 50/14 111/20 122/13 128/21 98/21 98/25 99/18 149/21 149/25 154/22 addressed [2] 26/3 52/19 70/6 120/10 Altman [1] 29/14 100/25 101/2 102/17 155/11 157/17 Altman's [1] 19/4 26/3 103/5 104/18 104/20 accounting [5] 31/20 adjourned [1] 164/9 agree [6] 43/19 123/6 always [14] 21/21 106/12 111/4 111/6 40/15 84/18 92/1 Adjournment [1] 125/7 134/23 154/16 37/23 39/8 44/14 111/20 114/4 115/7 153/21 114/11 63/15 83/13 83/25 156/25 119/15 120/9 120/23 agreed [5] 11/5 11/19 accounts [50] 33/14 117/8 123/15 142/11 adjusted [1] 51/17 122/1 123/7 124/12 35/15 101/15 101/21 29/13 42/13 51/20 145/14 147/15 160/17 admire [1] 59/1 125/10 125/17 127/18 102/22 103/4 104/14 agreeing [2] 41/3 **admission [1]** 134/8 162/1 130/23 130/24 132/22 admit [4] 31/12 31/16 41/6 Alwen [3] 69/24 70/5 104/15 109/9 109/17 136/4 138/7 138/18 109/22 110/12 110/14 164/5 55/18 131/14 agreement [6] 140/8 144/4 144/12 110/24 111/5 111/7 admitted [1] 40/10 139/14 139/15 140/11 am [28] 1/2 4/10 144/22 145/1 145/3 129/14 133/19 136/22 adopt [1] 104/6 140/14 142/5 146/6 10/13 13/20 18/13 146/6 152/22 153/23 adversarial [2] 139/3 150/12 153/13 33/19 36/20 52/9 agreements [1] 154/5 156/12 156/15 153/20 153/21 154/2 101/22 103/11 140/4 52/11 62/17 62/19 159/14 160/9 160/18 154/3 154/5 154/6 advice [21] 17/17 **Ah [1]** 57/2 65/13 77/23 78/18 162/19 154/23 157/9 157/10 20/25 29/1 44/4 44/8 78/21 81/16 84/20 ahead [1] 57/18 **above [3]** 15/25 157/20 158/3 158/4 44/17 44/25 46/9 AI [5] 59/17 79/13 89/3 89/23 90/7 90/8 65/16 98/1 158/7 158/11 158/15 46/14 46/23 48/6 48/9 98/8 101/16 110/6 98/11 101/23 108/8 abroad [1] 137/15 48/12 48/17 50/1 50/3 albeit [1] 6/2 158/16 158/25 159/4 108/8 108/19 144/21 absence [1] 110/7 159/9 159/12 159/13 50/6 50/7 51/7 74/3 aligned [1] 118/15 164/9 absolute [3] 33/25 159/16 159/25 160/8 98/5 Alisdair [5] 1/5 1/7 **Amanda [2]** 87/12 60/15 122/6 161/12 162/4 162/6 advise [1] 98/6 1/12 115/24 165/2 87/17 **absolutely [19]** 3/3 162/11 advised [1] 21/16 alive [1] 133/9 amazed [1] 108/8 7/4 8/9 11/9 34/16 accurate [2] 14/23 **Affairs [2]** 95/1 114/1 all [63] 2/21 7/7 17/9 **amendment** [1] 3/16 38/9 67/19 91/3 26/4 affect [4] 43/13 55/12 26/3 28/19 29/21 34/5 **amongst [4]** 22/13 110/20 111/12 119/23 accurately [1] 70/8 92/12 142/22 35/18 38/14 38/22 35/23 65/4 67/23 119/23 122/7 122/8 acknowledge [1] affected [2] 4/16 77/3 45/2 46/18 47/18 amount [7] 89/16 123/1 123/5 124/1 105/14 affirmed [2] 1/7 48/13 48/18 49/6 52/3 91/8 130/1 155/8 132/11 162/1 165/2 57/20 58/23 68/11 155/13 158/21 162/2 acknowledged [2] absorbed [4] 15/18 106/9 140/25 afraid [1] 33/19 71/21 74/13 78/24 amounts [4] 40/11 17/5 17/23 24/10 acknowledgement after [26] 5/5 9/22 80/5 89/1 92/7 92/13 84/19 84/19 109/21 absurd [2] 37/14 10/1 10/22 22/4 33/14 96/10 97/15 97/22 **[1]** 75/12 analysed [1] 80/15 38/10 46/22 68/5 73/6 88/1 across [5] 59/13 103/11 103/12 106/12 Andersen [1] 6/6 accept [5] 16/18 25/4 115/1 128/19 144/16 88/3 90/17 93/23 95/6 108/17 114/8 118/7 anecdotal [5] 33/10 31/19 46/2 56/20 122/5 123/17 124/24 160/1 99/6 100/11 100/18 33/21 33/22 34/6 acceptable [6] 15/20 act [1] 95/15 101/13 103/14 108/5 129/10 133/2 134/17 34/23 24/11 119/9 120/19 actioned [1] 65/23 128/13 128/15 129/12 143/4 146/11 149/3 anecdote [1] 126/14 121/3 122/3 actions [2] 12/15 133/8 150/20 155/12 149/8 149/11 149/15 Angela [8] 65/10 69/1 acceptance [1] 11/22 149/20 149/22 150/9 79/8 79/12 79/19 39/14 afternoon [5] 21/8 accepted [7] 2/25 4/6 active [2] 146/23 94/6 94/7 114/13 151/21 153/1 154/8 83/13 84/1 163/1 16/13 27/17 50/6 147/2 114/15 154/8 154/22 156/12 announced [1] 7/20 50/24 67/13 158/15 158/23 159/22 announcement [1] activities [4] 141/13 afterwards [1] 42/14 access [3] 24/22 142/2 146/14 146/16 again [41] 2/10 6/11 160/5 160/7 163/21 58/10 32/24 33/3 activity [1] 141/14 9/4 9/6 10/17 10/22 allegation [5] 36/9 announcements [1] accessible [1] 115/5 actual [1] 155/23 12/18 16/10 18/14 39/10 50/11 96/2 58/13 according [2] 2/3 18/23 23/7 32/25 39/5 actually [19] 3/8 109/20 annoy [2] 103/17 24/19 20/16 26/15 37/8 43/5 48/12 50/18 allegations [2] 18/23 103/18 account [17] 3/21 37/18 37/25 43/5 46/6 51/18 54/3 57/12 anomalies [1] 84/18 111/3 7/11 11/5 100/6 49/16 51/14 55/6 56/1 68/20 74/7 75/5 77/6 allowed [3] 63/9 82/9 anomaly [1] 56/25 100/15 100/25 102/1 72/7 72/9 83/18 83/23 81/25 82/11 85/21 159/6 another [10] 31/20 102/2 104/7 107/15 104/10 139/24 147/12 86/2 86/17 93/3 108/4 allowing [1] 24/24 55/1 55/4 75/2 76/4 107/24 107/25 109/18 acutely [1] 95/19 108/14 128/6 129/16 alluding [1] 125/11 76/8 93/6 95/18 109/19 155/15 157/22 129/21 142/9 146/25 add [3] 11/2 32/23 along [1] 67/10 116/16 159/3 162/13 already [7] 54/20 60/21 150/9 152/1 157/5 answer [16] 9/12 accountabilities [1] 158/16 162/8 65/10 65/23 77/2 34/3 82/7 87/8 89/1 added [3] 11/18 50/2 133/3 against [11] 4/10 86/23 87/6 149/4 89/24 99/3 99/17 66/1 accountability [3] addition [2] 31/10 10/13 13/13 17/17 also [15] 4/22 12/16 99/23 100/13 105/14 68/1 128/5 155/10 117/18 21/16 47/5 47/14 13/21 40/10 42/24 113/20 118/4 118/5 accountable [6] 45/7 70/2 92/13 94/22 additional [5] 4/3 141/18 141/22 142/1 158/2 161/11 16/14 16/19 20/3 57/17 82/21 110/13 149/21 105/14 105/17 109/9 answering [2] 143/17

(44) about... - answering

approached [2] Arthur [1] 6/6 attention [2] 66/10 89/15 91/3 article [1] 66/22 107/12 answering... [1] **appropriate [3]** 128/9| **articles [1]** 66/13 attitude [2] 18/6 163/23 134/1 145/8 articulated [1] 44/14 114/17 answers [3] 14/4 appropriated [1] attribute [1] 44/18 as [200] 61/25 65/14 audience [1] 101/22 ascertain [1] 161/9 102/2 anxious [2] 72/18 approved [1] 139/13 audit [13] 6/13 6/16 ashamed [2] 121/12 97/14 April [4] 1/14 5/19 121/25 82/2 82/3 82/3 88/1 any [53] 2/19 11/17 22/10 76/1 ask [15] 1/10 5/1 5/4 89/18 119/15 127/1 26/10 26/19 26/20 Arbuthnot's [1] 49/15 71/11 90/1 127/14 128/23 129/5 34/4 35/7 42/23 51/23 90/24 103/10 138/14 148/20 159/1 55/21 59/6 60/7 65/17 154/4 160/20 161/2 **ARC [1]** 126/25 **Auditor [3]** 81/25 66/13 67/2 68/3 69/14 81/24 87/13 89/3 90/3 archived [2] 80/7 161/3 161/4 161/6 82/6 82/9 asked [25] 12/15 80/15 **auditors** [1] 129/5 93/13 97/7 97/8 97/10 are [96] 1/18 1/20 22/22 42/2 48/5 48/9 August [6] 78/2 98/9 98/13 98/21 3/21 3/24 4/24 7/16 54/14 58/25 65/10 79/12 79/24 80/3 89/7 109/8 109/15 110/13 10/4 12/8 12/10 12/11 66/17 69/1 70/6 71/9 90/14 111/14 115/12 123/22 13/18 15/9 15/11 71/22 72/19 78/13 Aujard [12] 41/2 41/5 banks [1] 153/8 129/8 131/19 133/5 15/21 18/10 18/14 83/10 83/13 89/15 41/9 41/12 41/12 135/12 140/4 140/21 18/24 22/7 23/4 23/18 100/12 101/1 101/13 100/12 101/6 101/12 140/24 141/12 141/14 28/3 28/5 32/12 32/25 102/4 130/19 158/10 101/15 102/6 102/10 141/15 141/25 145/19 33/1 33/2 33/21 34/1 160/17 103/8 146/13 146/16 151/11 34/2 34/15 35/12 asking [12] 38/22 authentically [1] 154/20 154/21 155/25 35/15 35/23 37/3 56/7 78/18 90/7 90/9 71/10 158/17 38/11 42/19 45/23 91/9 103/13 104/23 **automated** [1] 91/19 anyone [7] 9/6 21/22 105/1 106/10 137/19 46/14 48/18 49/25 autumn [1] 72/17 25/8 29/7 33/2 55/15 55/24 57/2 58/24 59/5 160/22 available [5] 30/16 76/9 59/11 60/2 62/11 asks [1] 117/8 56/24 77/25 115/19 anything [18] 21/15 63/19 65/18 65/19 aspect [1] 43/25 123/23 32/3 36/15 36/16 68/6 69/2 69/3 78/20 **assertive** [3] 45/9 avenue [1] 77/25 43/22 51/25 67/25 79/5 79/6 79/13 84/16 45/11 46/13 average [1] 118/3 74/17 75/12 85/8 85/1 85/5 85/11 87/17 assertively [1] **Aviva [1]** 76/1 108/19 109/4 110/23 avoid [3] 14/19 25/4 88/7 88/9 91/17 96/1 123/13 111/18 132/22 136/6 100/3 108/20 113/24 assessing [1] 50/8 39/13 150/16 154/21 117/8 118/2 118/4 assessment [1] 24/7 avoidance [1] 140/25 battles [1] 39/9 anyway [**5**] 38/3 46/7 119/21 125/22 125/24 avoiding [1] 112/18 assist [2] 24/20 72/9 72/12 95/12 125/25 127/8 127/9 129/16 aware [16] 10/14 anywhere [3] 104/8 127/18 127/18 127/19 assistants [1] 150/11 26/10 64/13 67/2 67/4 bear [1] 84/19 130/22 134/24 130/20 130/21 131/24 assists [1] 4/14 89/3 95/5 95/9 99/11 apologise [2] 2/22 133/3 137/2 143/19 assume [6] 37/23 111/14 113/11 146/2 142/25 157/13 159/20 159/22 became [10] 6/6 6/16 144/1 144/6 145/24 80/23 99/13 109/16 apologised [3] 13/11 149/6 151/17 154/4 110/11 128/4 161/2 14/17 39/11 154/16 160/10 162/6 assumed [3] 34/21 awareness [1] 96/3 apology [5] 4/1 50/13 area [5] 68/1 98/24 145/15 160/21 away [6] 89/23 92/2 50/16 54/1 67/18 100/5 117/22 118/9 92/4 110/6 112/22 assumes [1] 37/6 appallingly [1] 60/5 areas [2] 121/13 114/2 assumption [2] 38/8 apparent [1] 96/24 awful [6] 45/25 49/14 127/20 70/22 **Apparently [1]** 84/16 aren't [4] 18/23 81/3 assurance [3] 70/11 49/22 49/23 55/20 appeal [3] 26/22 100/2 113/4 72/25 73/14 121/22 49/13 95/11 arguably [1] 25/6 assured [2] 108/1 appeals [3] 13/13 В argue [1] 17/11 144/5 26/25 163/10 back [43] 8/24 12/3 astonished [1] argument [2] 135/9 appear [2] 59/20 66/7 15/16 19/16 44/24 143/16 138/18 appeared [1] 41/14 56/8 65/20 69/2 70/1 arguments [4] 43/8 at [233] appears [2] 7/7 106/8 71/11 72/23 73/9 43/10 46/20 112/25 at page 2 [1] 131/2 application [2] 96/6 74/20 77/1 81/15 arisen [1] 131/20 at page 3 [1] 107/5 97/6 87/11 87/20 88/25 around [14] 8/14 attached [2] 87/23 appointed [1] 90/19 94/16 96/7 98/8 103/7 17/12 17/12 22/11 88/23 appraisal [1] 60/22 108/13 119/3 127/25 28/20 28/20 33/13 attacking [1] 25/9 appreciate [2] 65/7 128/3 128/6 133/5 49/20 67/7 91/23 attempt [2] 114/1 83/16 133/12 139/1 142/12 95/25 129/6 157/12 131/19 approach [7] 31/7 148/4 152/1 153/13 161/14 attempts [1] 111/14 92/17 102/10 103/7 154/8 154/20 155/13 arrive [1] 24/2 attended [2] 105/20 103/8 104/2 104/6 arrived [1] 128/13 156/5 157/8 157/25 106/16

84/1 85/6 89/15 91/3 91/25 93/8 97/9 97/13 101/1 106/10 110/11 112/13 113/18 118/17 118/21 120/9 121/8 (45) answering... - because

160/7 160/22 161/10

backward [1] 159/10

**bad [3]** 35/19 47/25

balance [11] 18/7

129/12 129/14 150/12

153/11 153/21 158/3

balancing [3] 88/2

barcoded [1] 91/20

Baroness [1] 136/14

barrister [1] 49/17

base [1] 53/4

19/14 158/7

based [3] 14/10

bashed [1] 78/22

basic [2] 38/21 39/4

basis [5] 25/12 33/12

91/1 105/21 163/12

batch [1] 68/5

**BBC [1]** 66/22

bearing [2] 45/20

20/23 44/8 44/11

because [97] 1/22

7/11 9/6 9/9 16/14

21/25 22/21 22/24

23/1 23/15 26/15

37/14 37/20 38/2

38/11 38/25 42/4

42/19 42/23 43/8

43/13 44/21 44/22

54/19 56/10 58/24

61/13 61/25 62/5

46/7 48/1 53/21 54/15

68/24 69/9 70/24 72/5

72/7 72/20 75/12 76/3

44/18 46/21 63/5 84/7

16/23 17/17 19/3 21/1

28/18 32/6 35/11 37/6

be [189]

104/19

124/8

basically [2] 44/22

**barristers** [1] 48/18

Barfoot [2] 107/7

106/22 127/8

ball [1] 88/24

bank [2] 107/21

39/8 78/5 120/3

background [3] 5/7

83/6 130/25

badly [1] 26/2

50/6

162/6

108/10

110/1

72/1

36/9 92/10 93/17 В 161/22 162/1 162/19 Ben's [1] 92/24 broadly [2] 51/20 163/13 benefit [2] 47/13 **Bond [7]** 44/9 44/19 because... [31] BEER [8] 1/8 1/10 72/10 45/7 45/16 45/23 139/4 121/19 121/23 122/5 2/17 57/11 146/6 best [6] 3/22 78/20 46/12 46/16 Broe [1] 72/19 123/12 123/22 125/24 152/22 163/19 165/4 79/9 84/4 110/3 115/2 bonnet [1] 74/14 brought [4] 3/21 126/12 128/18 131/25 **bonus [1]** 163/2 before [29] 8/5 13/20 better [16] 4/12 55/11 88/20 95/6 133/7 135/10 137/9 26/8 33/14 36/2 37/14 17/17 38/14 45/19 bonuses [2] 96/11 budget [1] 135/9 143/14 143/24 147/5 51/3 51/15 54/18 55/4 59/6 60/11 71/25 163/7 bug [2] 56/25 77/14 147/18 147/21 147/22 57/7 58/13 66/13 104/8 112/18 121/24 build [2] 71/23 bookkeeping [1] 147/24 148/25 149/13 67/14 70/9 71/2 90/16 123/24 124/5 126/23 159/15 149/16 151/13 152/23 155/20 145/11 147/23 149/14 **Boots [2]** 124/15 91/5 93/11 93/15 **build-up [1]** 159/15 156/15 157/6 157/16 97/21 105/7 109/4 between [20] 5/14 124/20 **built [2]** 10/12 37/20 159/13 160/23 160/24 5/19 13/1 18/12 29/18 **both [10]** 31/8 35/21 115/1 126/20 139/23 bullet [2] 32/22 161/3 140/3 156/22 157/16 30/3 30/19 32/10 44/15 46/10 82/3 117/14 become [2] 96/6 beginning [1] 26/11 38/24 41/8 41/11 112/9 112/17 117/1 **bullies [3]** 45/10 46/5 147/2 42/15 47/22 61/3 120/2 140/20 **behalf [5]** 1/10 46/7 bee [1] 74/14 141/10 143/19 143/20 120/6 133/17 135/9 **bottom** [7] 2/1 16/3 **bullshit** [1] 113/5 been [160] 4/7 5/25 143/23 140/4 140/11 140/22 20/21 52/17 65/2 **bullying [2]** 31/12 6/2 8/18 8/20 9/10 beyond [1] 11/14 behaviour [2] 32/10 79/23 86/10 31/15 9/22 11/9 11/12 11/24 burden [1] 121/8 47/12 bias [1] 13/21 bought [1] 154/21 13/10 17/9 17/19 **Bourke [1]** 94/25 **behaviours** [5] 31/11 big [15] 16/17 33/17 bureaucratic [1] 18/17 18/19 19/3 20/5 141/13 142/2 146/14 42/4 42/14 46/4 box [2] 116/19 123/19 22/24 22/25 26/8 146/16 111/22 114/16 119/24 117/14 business [40] 17/2 26/24 27/12 27/20 behind [2] 8/24 83/5 128/16 132/1 132/5 boycotts [1] 141/24 33/24 35/12 37/2 37/7 28/11 28/17 29/2 29/5 being [57] 9/5 11/20 132/8 132/10 132/13 37/24 39/24 40/2 42/5 brackets [2] 30/7 29/15 29/19 30/12 16/22 17/5 17/18 158/17 42/7 49/20 53/19 60/6 30/23 30/21 31/24 32/6 28/20 32/19 34/18 bigger [2] 13/7 37/7 branch [27] 25/2 60/11 62/25 67/12 32/20 33/24 34/12 35/11 36/20 40/23 **bill [4]** 107/13 108/9 65/24 76/8 77/24 78/1 67/14 72/12 72/18 34/16 35/24 36/2 36/3 41/24 43/8 46/15 108/11 110/19 78/3 80/20 80/21 82/1 82/4 86/24 93/17 36/4 36/6 36/16 37/9 48/17 50/25 71/22 80/24 88/18 90/1 98/4 112/4 112/7 **billion [2]** 13/1 13/1 37/17 39/14 40/8 42/2 73/23 78/22 79/14 Binder [1] 6/5 90/22 91/7 92/2 92/17 113/20 114/25 122/10 48/6 48/23 50/9 50/12 79/15 80/9 83/9 90/7 **birds** [1] 70/16 106/20 107/22 117/17 122/15 123/24 124/4 50/13 50/17 50/19 102/23 102/25 107/24 **bit [22]** 7/1 16/9 27/5 118/25 149/24 151/3 125/17 127/10 128/20 51/20 52/18 52/24 109/17 109/22 111/3 56/7 67/7 81/11 85/13 154/2 154/6 154/22 128/20 129/1 141/9 53/5 53/14 53/22 111/6 111/21 112/24 85/19 85/24 92/23 157/9 157/10 160/8 141/24 160/19 53/23 55/4 55/5 56/4 119/23 121/12 125/8 92/23 92/24 95/8 branches [11] 16/12 businesses [1] 35/15 56/7 57/6 57/9 57/15 97/17 106/23 126/14 129/4 129/15 130/10 16/14 16/15 34/10 but [174] 58/16 58/17 59/10 137/9 138/2 138/17 128/2 133/17 146/20 34/20 68/4 126/1 60/2 60/6 62/11 62/13 С 126/9 126/13 146/4 139/2 140/1 149/25 150/25 157/8 160/6 63/2 63/7 63/8 63/15 calculation [1] 13/3 150/2 151/24 152/1 **blew [1]** 97/21 152/24 66/5 66/21 66/22 152/2 154/13 154/18 blindness [1] 36/22 **brand [4]** 103/5 calculus [1] 55/11 66/23 67/7 67/8 67/11 call [7] 1/5 4/20 62/8 156/6 159/16 161/12 blog [1] 21/17 111/2 111/7 111/9 67/15 70/19 70/22 162/12 163/3 163/6 blood [4] 125/23 77/6 108/5 143/5 brave [1] 14/1 73/20 73/22 74/2 74/2 belief [9] 3/23 19/22 132/2 132/16 132/24 144/14 breached [2] 73/23 74/9 76/15 77/23 78/1 called [9] 6/23 62/11 22/5 45/9 89/19 blowing [1] 97/22 74/5 78/20 79/20 79/22 break [11] 52/6 52/10 65/5 73/22 74/4 78/5 120/16 121/4 122/9 **blue [2]** 116/19 80/23 81/13 82/22 107/7 125/7 154/2 163/10 117/13 62/18 93/24 93/25 83/21 85/6 85/16 calls [1] 107/19 believe [17] 9/25 **bluff [1]** 71/6 94/4 114/6 126/16 85/21 86/2 86/23 87/7 came [16] 21/8 22/21 11/24 14/24 17/13 board [38] 18/11 144/2 144/4 144/8 87/8 88/17 88/20 17/14 34/11 50/15 33/5 48/8 49/3 67/21 22/14 26/22 26/24 breaking [1] 33/20 89/10 89/15 89/21 77/1 87/2 87/20 52/24 53/5 53/23 75/1 27/2 27/9 27/11 27/17 **Brian [2]** 19/4 29/14 90/18 91/14 91/14 103/10 126/16 140/7 132/9 134/21 142/7 36/16 39/24 40/1 48/8 brief [1] 65/24 91/15 91/22 95/11 143/19 160/14 161/22 48/11 50/6 53/10 157/4 157/22 160/1 briefed [1] 49/9 96/10 102/19 103/15 63/14 67/5 67/6 67/10 brilliant [1] 147/4 162/8 **believed [9]** 10/8 104/12 104/24 107/17 Cameron [25] 1/5 1/7 18/19 39/6 52/25 70/6 70/19 75/3 122/7 **bring [6]** 16/21 95/9 107/23 108/3 108/7 1/9 1/12 3/25 4/18 123/15 130/16 142/9 125/2 127/3 127/15 107/11 124/23 145/5 109/4 109/10 113/7 128/23 131/6 131/8 52/8 52/14 61/23 142/10 155/16 146/11 114/4 115/22 124/14 62/20 94/8 114/15 belonged [1] 102/24 131/12 132/14 136/20 bringing [3] 4/24 127/16 127/17 130/12 115/24 127/23 143/17 **below [6]** 19/18 136/23 138/2 138/7 58/19 58/22 130/13 138/16 138/21 146/2 157/1 157/17 53/20 64/14 86/11 138/11 138/13 139/13 Bristol [1] 78/5 143/2 143/9 144/18 160/16 160/20 161/2 95/22 96/13 **Bogerd [7]** 65/21 British [1] 6/20 146/21 148/15 152/15 162/17 163/17 163/22 broad [3] 50/20 Ben [8] 9/21 10/8 79/8 79/12 79/24 83/1 154/2 154/2 155/21 23/12 23/13 89/6 165/2 83/13 163/1 66/10 138/22 156/12 158/17 160/21 93/10 97/12 98/18 **bold [3]** 19/10 25/18 broader [3] 92/9 campaigns [1]

84/15 84/24 93/19 C cares [2] 21/18 21/22 117/5 117/7 139/4 **choosing [1]** 48/12 carried [3] 80/24 chain [10] 65/4 66/1 chose [3] 26/24 **closure [1]** 87/25 campaigns... [1] 99/24 115/22 76/3 76/25 77/9 77/22 54/16 56/17 Co [1] 143/21 141/18 **carry [2]** 49/12 144/3 84/11 107/9 108/25 chosen [1] 117/24 cold [1] 88/24 can [120] 1/3 1/11 case [22] 4/11 18/9 117/17 Chris [10] 41/2 41/5 Colin [1] 110/6 1/15 1/19 3/18 5/7 41/8 41/12 41/12 47/10 47/25 48/2 Chair [1] 113/7 colleague [2] 49/10 6/24 9/4 10/2 12/3 54/10 54/11 55/1 55/4 chairman [3] 112/7 72/19 100/12 101/6 82/2 12/23 13/24 14/3 18/5 80/17 84/19 85/15 113/10 137/25 101/12 103/13 colleagues [4] 12/12 22/9 25/17 27/5 27/13 101/16 109/11 134/8 Christmas [1] 29/18 12/14 65/18 110/2 Chairman's [6] 28/4 30/9 31/14 34/1 134/13 134/19 134/20 133/20 135/22 135/24 chronology [1] 7/17 collect [1] 135/7 36/8 38/15 42/7 43/2 134/20 134/21 134/21 136/13 136/17 138/8 **collection [1]** 40/21 **CIJ [1]** 93/18 45/13 51/10 52/12 142/11 challenge [9] 4/11 **CIO [2]** 72/20 75/25 collective [2] 9/14 52/14 52/22 54/12 cases [10] 26/22 10/18 17/14 31/10 **Circle [1]** 46/17 64/8 54/15 55/22 56/23 64/22 64/24 74/19 38/18 44/13 46/20 circumstances [2] collegiate [1] 59/8 57/11 57/21 57/22 102/20 103/1 104/24 50/20 51/7 74/25 130/23 come [19] 23/7 30/14 59/9 61/15 61/20 62/3 120/2 131/19 134/15 challenged [3] 21/24 30/15 48/25 51/10 circumstances' [1] 65/1 69/3 69/23 70/11 cash [17] 20/2 23/19 47/7 50/8 76/8 55/22 61/21 72/23 70/17 73/15 74/21 73/5 80/22 89/20 City [1] 46/4 74/20 78/14 79/20 challenges [2] 44/1 75/15 76/9 76/24 91/16 91/19 106/21 98/20 civil [1] 43/13 93/2 98/13 102/25 77/18 77/24 78/17 108/11 133/5 151/13 claim [1] 50/12 111/13 115/1 120/14 challenging [4] 4/6 79/3 80/23 81/9 81/13 151/15 151/16 151/22 37/12 48/10 56/14 claimant's [1] 50/22 130/15 130/16 84/9 84/10 84/20 151/24 157/3 160/11 **chambers** [3] 48/13 **claimants** [5] 47/5 comfortable [1] 85/17 86/11 89/5 catch [1] 146/11 48/18 49/7 47/14 47/23 47/25 148/2 92/10 93/25 94/8 category [1] 39/6 chance [2] 44/16 99/15 coming [3] 39/25 94/11 94/13 95/3 Catrina [1] 94/22 149/20 149/24 112/18 claiming [1] 40/11 96/20 98/8 98/12 caught [2] 47/3 47/9 **claims [7]** 13/1 14/17 change [12] 10/9 **comment [4]** 36/13 98/25 100/5 100/8 24/25 42/25 43/4 54/2 39/11 42/24 43/13 120/9 141/3 141/6 cause [1] 61/5 101/10 101/21 101/23 54/3 61/5 63/23 91/17 caused [4] 4/8 27/24 54/2 54/5 comments [4] 9/25 105/3 105/4 107/2 65/15 156/4 92/16 116/7 145/5 Clarke [1] 74/4 49/14 51/14 119/15 109/2 109/11 110/5 causes [2] 61/7 changed [9] 50/2 classroom [1] commercial [3] 42/6 111/13 114/13 114/16 132/19 50/3 50/4 59/23 60/3 106/16 117/6 122/24 114/18 114/19 114/21 clause [6] 139/16 caveat [1] 60/21 60/17 79/17 86/17 commercially [1] 115/3 116/17 117/19 132/11 142/6 142/10 142/13 122/25 **Cavender [10]** 44/10 117/22 118/2 118/6 44/19 47/2 47/7 47/9 changes [1] 145/22 142/18 142/23 commissioned [1] 118/16 118/16 120/14 47/16 47/24 48/5 49/9 changing [4] 11/7 clause 5 [1] 142/18 136/13 128/14 129/16 129/19 committee [14] 97/1 49/13 38/4 45/2 89/1 clauses [2] 140/5 130/15 131/2 131/7 CCRC [7] 29/16 43/1 channels [1] 96/21 140/9 112/4 112/5 112/8 135/14 135/16 136/8 43/4 43/16 54/2 54/3 clear [20] 12/16 25/5 113/7 113/10 113/16 **chaos [2]** 33/25 137/21 139/6 140/10 34/17 49/1 53/8 57/12 131/23 36/25 119/16 127/1 127/3 140/10 140/17 140/17 63/5 69/7 90/7 106/5 **CCRC's [1]** 55/13 chapter [2] 86/11 127/15 128/23 147/10 152/19 158/19 161/4 ceased [2] 7/17 7/25 139/9 106/13 106/25 124/8 147/13 161/8 central [1] 123/8 charge [1] 25/4 124/12 133/22 139/17 committee's [1] can't [26] 13/5 27/15 148/21 156/14 158/8 centrally [1] 126/9 **CHARLES** [3] 1/7 114/2 28/17 29/13 30/12 centres [1] 63/21 1/12 165/2 158/12 committees [1] 34/3 34/3 43/12 56/1 Centrica [1] 6/17 chase [1] 23/1 cleared [1] 92/2 113/18 59/15 68/3 68/4 73/19 **CEO [24]** 5/20 7/18 clearly [21] 14/25 Common [13] 8/17 chased [1] 105/22 75/3 79/16 79/18 7/25 8/8 20/23 59/7 22/2 26/1 36/3 40/3 **check [1]** 76/9 18/25 20/12 20/13 79/18 82/23 87/9 99/2 67/5 90/15 90/18 checked [2] 23/18 42/4 53/9 56/10 56/15 44/10 44/21 46/22 112/17 116/16 143/4 95/23 96/5 96/7 96/8 162/8 61/9 67/17 75/8 79/4 47/19 48/8 48/21 145/16 148/14 148/15 96/9 96/17 96/19 checks [2] 158/23 124/17 128/6 130/12 59/24 91/4 95/6 cannot [7] 12/18 20/4 96/23 97/2 97/2 97/6 162/10 132/16 133/23 134/17 **comms [1]** 113/5 36/13 36/18 84/23 97/25 98/9 143/14 cheque [3] 107/14 138/25 143/5 communicating [1] 95/15 100/6 161/6 108/10 108/11 clerk [1] 84/7 62/25 capabilities [1] **CEO's [1]** 113/22 Chesterfield [7] **client [5]** 37/15 communication [4] 144/19 **CEO/CFO [1]** 97/2 38/22 78/5 82/19 117/16 125/13 158/15 51/12 86/25 87/2 capability [1] 145/10 certain [2] 35/16 83/20 124/23 144/21 144/6 162/5 capable [2] 134/12 156/23 144/24 clocked [1] 49/6 communications [5] 149/25 close [6] 81/25 104/9 certainly [12] 13/7 chief [7] 5/12 5/17 10/7 20/25 86/19 care [1] 159/18 130/22 131/24 132/6 5/22 5/25 51/23 86/1 17/25 18/3 26/4 28/1 86/21 113/25 cared [2] 21/19 21/20 66/15 67/11 82/20 125/1 160/4 community [1] 91/7 career [2] 48/7 82/22 109/25 111/18 chippy [1] 103/16 closed [3] 85/22 86/5 company [1] 96/17 148/21 **choice [3]** 40/14 54/9 111/22 111/10 **compared [2]** 46/8 careful [3] 71/20 CFO [9] 5/10 5/14 closely [1] 112/23 75/13 155/16 153/19 153/19 79/21 96/7 97/2 103/5 **choose [2]** 34/1 55/6 closing [4] 41/20 competence [1]

C 116/17 140/8 145/9 **Confidential [2]** 89/6 | **contents [2]** 3/22 core [6] 13/23 14/3 94/17 74/3 57/9 119/17 143/20 145/21 158/17 160/3 competence... [1] confidentiality [2] continue [12] 21/23 143/22 course [21] 7/10 9/5 144/17 90/9 96/15 22/16 27/22 39/10 **corporate [5]** 46/5 33/1 50/8 52/7 54/10 complaint [11] 65/4 confidently [1] 62/25 41/16 42/21 43/21 46/7 113/25 117/19 61/13 64/25 83/19 65/8 65/11 68/25 confined [1] 85/4 45/6 46/25 71/18 147/6 94/1 105/20 106/19 79/15 83/12 88/13 **confirm [1]** 70/5 132/22 133/10 correct [10] 3/17 6/3 107/1 119/20 125/23 92/20 94/10 108/4 6/10 6/18 6/21 18/25 126/18 134/23 148/25 confirmation [1] continued [3] 71/21 117/6 77/14 111/11 51/9 107/24 108/1 161/19 161/21 162/20 65/17 complaints [4] 43/17 court [12] 42/17 44/5 **conflating** [1] 43/10 continuing [3] 12/5 117/2 118/1 118/3 136/15 conflict [2] 95/16 30/25 149/6 correction [1] 2/9 44/15 45/12 51/4 73/1 **complete** [5] 26/13 **continuous [1]** 63/22 73/24 74/6 74/19 95/21 corrections [2] 1/18 33/15 70/9 126/14 conflicted [1] 22/4 continuously [1] 3/21 134/22 163/3 163/6 131/22 24/25 **conflicts** [1] 98/4 correctly [1] 3/8 **courts [3]** 32/20 complete/undertake confronted [1] contract [7] 14/12 **correlates** [1] 24/14 70/11 73/15 **[1]** 70/9 152/15 44/6 47/21 47/21 correspondence [3] coverage [2] 66/14 completely [6] 46/2 confused [1] 133/17 76/20 82/14 82/21 63/23 72/15 72/15 66/17 47/19 50/21 107/25 connected [3] 72/1 **Contracts** [2] 82/7 **CPS [1]** 31/8 corresponding [1] 116/3 135/23 97/7 135/21 88/9 80/24 crack [1] 45/1 Compliance [2] connection [6] 109/8 corresponds [1] 31/2 crash [1] 62/5 contractual [3] 33/1 127/1 127/15 109/15 109/20 110/9 48/2 51/16 **corridor** [2] 93/6 crashes [1] 62/12 complicated [3] 61/9 110/10 110/21 contribute [3] 11/2 103/14 create [5] 10/12 97/13 97/17 cost [8] 12/25 23/2 Connor [1] 80/10 119/11 123/3 10/23 92/11 140/21 component [1] **conscious [1]** 160/3 contributed [1] 34/16 53/25 64/9 72/2 78/15 145/6 122/14 88/7 121/19 created [3] 11/12 consciousness [1] contribution [1] 9/13 comprehensive [2] control [10] 34/21 costing [3] 132/2 18/7 59/10 53/2 36/4 101/7 36/25 37/8 59/2 64/9 132/16 132/24 creation [1] 39/23 consequence [1] computer [2] 66/21 costs [8] 44/1 123/14 Credence [3] 117/15 156/25 73/7 129/9 130/7 82/6 130/8 144/17 123/14 123/15 123/22 118/18 118/23 consequences [5] computers [1] 84/18 131/10 132/25 135/11 credible [1] 14/4 14/2 14/19 16/23 controls [6] 119/25 concern [7] 14/2 129/6 145/7 158/22 39/13 53/1 could [49] 16/25 21/5 creditor [2] 158/15 48/17 93/7 104/19 162/3 162/9 consider [2] 105/21 37/12 40/2 42/3 42/9 162/5 111/6 133/25 161/18 42/20 42/23 43/22 127/6 controversial [1] credits [2] 159/15 concerned [11] 12/9 consideration [1] 134/20 52/5 52/25 53/3 54/17 162/11 21/3 44/1 48/15 53/15 convenient [1] 54/5 54/18 55/4 60/5 62/7 Crime [2] 131/6 65/13 66/11 85/3 considered [9] 22/5 67/13 70/15 72/13 131/13 156/16 101/23 104/18 135/23 73/1 78/18 81/19 82/4 criminal [3] 13/14 22/6 70/13 73/16 conversation [8] 9/2 concerning [2] 73/17 74/10 112/24 11/21 41/23 44/3 86/5 86/18 89/17 40/8 73/1 111/17 127/13 98/19 111/22 130/22 89/23 98/6 104/9 129/20 155/14 critical [7] 12/9 13/19 concerns [9] 16/25 104/9 110/3 110/21 44/23 47/1 55/24 consistent [3] 14/4 131/1 23/9 24/18 30/3 30/8 115/9 118/15 conversations [7] 112/15 118/3 118/23 55/25 56/21 30/11 42/25 63/19 41/4 42/12 49/18 59/4 122/9 124/1 128/24 **criticise [3]** 139/16 consistently [4] 82/5 106/7 119/16 130/13 93/6 113/1 143/2 131/16 132/18 132/22 142/7 148/14 conclude [1] 105/6 135/17 139/16 140/1 131/9 convert [1] 23/18 **criticised** [1] 13/10 **concluded [4]** 26/23 150/19 151/9 162/12 criticising [5] 21/12 consolidate [1] conviction [2] 53/8 27/11 29/14 63/14 25/8 140/6 142/24 53/13 162/12 128/22 conclusion [14] constant [1] 59/2 convictions [7] 13/6 **couldn't [12]** 16/15 146/8 15/23 23/21 51/5 13/14 28/3 28/4 28/20 constantly [2] 44/12 21/1 21/14 33/6 54/23 criticism [5] 14/7 53/21 67/19 67/19 49/14 40/8 63/2 74/6 91/24 91/24 17/15 19/16 19/17 80/19 86/24 92/10 104/15 121/14 132/12 constituent [2] 86/2 convinced [5] 25/7 25/17 105/18 106/1 106/3 88/17 36/19 124/24 134/13 137/24 criticisms [2] 14/21 106/24 146/20 consuming [2] 63/22 134/14 **councillor [4]** 84/12 15/25 conclusions [4] 113/19 COO [1] 5/15 85/12 85/16 88/16 **critics [3]** 14/1 20/23 18/12 18/13 25/10 cooperate [1] 137/17 contact [3] 23/4 counsel [6] 23/10 25/7 98/13 107/11 110/1 copied [13] 65/3 66/5 50/2 95/7 96/22 Crocker [1] 65/5 Conditions [1] **contacted [3]** 85/16 76/24 77/8 79/8 79/14 100/13 156/21 crossreference [1] 140/18 81/12 81/13 84/11 85/21 86/2 **counted [2]** 151/16 142/21 conduct [1] 61/6 109/1 110/2 110/4 contacting [1] 86/8 151/23 cultural [4] 10/8 conducted [3] 31/5 110/6 counter [2] 83/5 84/7 10/18 51/16 114/16 contain [1] 142/5 57/16 135/22 **copy [5]** 1/16 3/18 **culture [14]** 15/18 contemplation [1] counterintuitive [1] conference [2] 37/5 17/4 17/7 17/22 24/9 138/24 57/6 95/13 108/6 83/17 125/21 copyee [1] 67/23 counts [1] 23/18 59/8 63/6 119/8 contemporaneous confident [3] 14/2 **[1]** 48/14 couple [11] 1/21 15/2 120/17 121/1 122/1 copying [2] 82/11 32/14 113/12

Content [1] 116/20

82/12

122/4 124/9 125/5

55/20 100/18 106/21

50/18 51/6 51/11 C deals [1] 139/10 demand [2] 122/21 digitally [1] 71/25 dealt [4] 69/11 88/21 122/22 52/24 53/4 53/5 53/16 direct [1] 120/6 current [4] 67/14 93/12 93/22 demanded [2] 63/6 53/22 55/1 55/15 61/5 directed [1] 107/24 95/22 96/17 159/9 Dear [5] 58/12 79/2 124/9 67/20 75/1 75/24 directly [11] 34/19 **currently [2]** 13/8 86/1 107/6 107/10 demands [2] 107/17 81/24 82/13 82/25 55/24 56/21 66/3 66/5 96/23 debatable [1] 22/2 108/2 86/14 89/4 94/11 95/8 85/25 101/5 107/11 **customer [4]** 108/8 debate [8] 9/13 10/19 demonstrations [1] 98/19 103/10 103/13 126/1 126/9 126/13 118/1 118/2 153/22 Director [7] 6/20 10/7 22/3 38/23 46/20 104/2 104/6 105/21 141/21 **customers** [1] 34/2 50/20 50/22 138/18 den [7] 65/21 79/8 106/1 106/15 107/25 21/1 59/7 94/25 112/3 cut [3] 1/25 72/24 79/12 79/24 83/1 108/5 111/16 111/21 debated [7] 22/14 124/15 160/4 32/15 51/13 54/7 54/8 83/13 163/1 112/1 114/3 119/10 disagreed [1] 12/2 **cut-off [1]** 160/4 130/11 130/14 121/1 122/5 122/11 **Department [1]** 6/13 disagreement [1] cutting [1] 135/11 **Debbie [3]** 87/17 dependent [1] 63/20 122/21 126/14 126/17 102/17 cynical [1] 55/6 124/14 125/14 126/18 127/5 129/6 depending [2] disagrees [1] 137/12 debit [2] 155/7 155/8 117/22 117/24 129/8 130/16 132/3 **discipline** [1] 115/7 debt [1] 155/14 describe [6] 16/6 132/24 133/15 134/11 **disclose [2]** 30/1 Dalmellington [2] 17/4 17/22 24/3 35/6 136/4 137/6 138/1 **December [3]** 29/11 98/9 76/14 77/14 138/7 138/20 138/25 107/14 107/16 68/15 **disclosed [3]** 7/20 damaged [1] 111/3 decide [2] 21/10 **described [4]** 18/13 139/1 142/9 143/1 27/18 27/20 data [6] 63/21 63/25 115/15 146/10 161/15 143/8 145/1 145/3 162/16 disclosing [3] 92/17 80/7 80/16 101/8 145/12 145/17 147/2 decided [2] 115/9 describing [1] 99/4 117/25 160/23 157/22 155/23 147/4 147/5 148/4 disclosure [13] database [1] 117/18 decision [11] 25/25 deserve [1] 4/16 148/6 151/15 155/18 26/23 55/19 96/18 databases [1] 117/17 26/6 27/2 27/4 75/2 designated [1] 156/9 155/19 156/13 159/7 96/24 97/3 97/7 98/17 date [18] 3/13 4/24 95/8 130/20 132/6 desirable [1] 130/17 159/8 160/15 162/15 98/17 99/15 99/18 22/9 22/12 29/14 30/4 99/20 102/11 103/9 132/9 132/13 132/13 desire [4] 36/17 59/2 162/17 30/7 30/9 30/22 33/3 decisions [4] 40/23 103/25 104/17 didn't [70] 23/1 23/2 disclosures [2] 39/7 57/21 72/14 desperately [1] 60/15 30/17 34/5 39/20 43/6 27/11 27/13 59/4 74/15 134/17 116/13 128/14 129/12 desperation [1] 46/9 47/4 48/2 50/25 declaration [1] **discovery [2]** 19/2 150/1 156/23 56/6 56/6 56/18 60/7 151/16 81/16 59/25 dated [4] 1/14 2/13 60/8 67/7 71/8 77/5 discrepancies [1] declare [1] 31/24 despite [1] 143/12 3/8 7/5 declared [1] 80/22 detail [3] 78/9 81/22 77/7 77/13 78/4 78/14 65/6 David [8] 44/10 44/19 deed [1] 143/9 discuss [4] 9/19 9/20 157/15 78/24 79/20 87/3 47/2 47/7 47/8 47/16 90/19 92/25 93/4 93/5 90/10 141/3 defaulted [1] 83/25 **detailed [3]** 1/13 47/24 49/9 defence [3] 30/2 145/7 163/23 93/13 93/16 93/16 discussed [8] 9/23 Davies [10] 20/25 30/17 90/4 details [3] 80/5 80/18 97/8 97/14 104/25 10/6 21/24 41/19 41/3 41/5 41/8 41/11 defend [1] 49/1 107/25 106/9 106/23 110/23 51/18 152/17 158/4 87/12 111/19 111/25 defended [4] 13/13 detriment [1] 123/11 113/3 113/5 113/6 161/13 113/9 125/4 14/18 25/9 39/12 detrimental [2] 142/3 113/9 113/24 121/23 **discussing [3]** 10/17 Davies's [1] 86/15 123/12 124/18 125/13 10/21 29/9 defensive [4] 15/18 146/17 day [19] 5/24 20/4 17/5 17/23 24/10 devastation [1] 4/8 128/2 129/7 132/14 discussion [4] 6/24 20/5 53/8 60/12 68/2 defensiveness [1] **develop [1]** 145/10 132/20 132/22 134/18 9/17 26/19 41/25 79/7 79/24 80/4 developed [1] 129/9 135/17 138/2 138/14 discussions [1] 20/22 101/13 104/20 105/20 developing [1] 139/4 142/12 143/11 127/18 deficiencies [1] 106/16 106/18 107/1 124/14 147/14 152/9 152/10 **display [2]** 28/15 53/21 108/16 129/24 133/7 152/13 152/23 156/4 definitely [3] 97/20 development [1] 62/6 161/10 157/25 158/9 158/12 98/23 130/25 42/13 displayed [2] 69/22 days [8] 1/21 68/20 definition [1] 40/8 deviated [1] 53/11 159/2 162/22 77/11 83/11 106/21 124/22 definitive [3] 9/12 dialogue [1] 21/21 difference [4] 22/20 disproportionate [1] 151/18 155/12 158/1 9/15 11/20 dialogues [1] 17/15 35/18 38/24 59/13 40/12 de [1] 125/17 disputed [2] 109/21 degree [1] 37/8 diary [1] 2/3 different [18] 13/25 de facto [1] 125/17 delete [1] 142/18 **Dickinson** [7] 44/10 29/5 31/17 44/3 47/20 153/16 dead [1] 77/25 44/19 45/8 45/16 49/11 59/6 59/20 **deliberate** [5] 14/15 disputes [1] 21/25 deadline [1] 107/16 36/11 36/21 80/25 45/24 46/13 46/16 95/18 118/2 118/5 disregard [1] 56/17 deal [7] 40/24 54/1 130/20 did [112] 4/10 9/19 124/2 126/6 128/20 disrespectful [1] 60/20 79/15 104/9 deliberately [1] 159/2 9/20 10/17 11/17 16/8 131/10 131/12 148/18 32/19 132/1 132/10 17/7 17/13 20/10 21/2 **delivered [2]** 78/2 149/8 **distilled** [1] 14/3 dealing [17] 15/19 91/18 21/10 21/17 24/17 differently [6] 40/24 distributed [1] 68/25 24/10 59/5 67/15 56/10 56/12 56/14 24/20 24/23 25/7 26/7 **Deloitte [12]** 6/9 **disturbing [1]** 84/16 67/15 76/19 78/21 131/22 133/11 133/12 27/19 28/16 30/1 91/3 135/18 **Division** [1] 46/17 79/25 86/16 92/13 133/15 133/18 133/19 31/14 32/9 32/24 difficult [5] 36/5 72/5 **DMBs [3]** 34/7 34/7 94/9 101/5 119/8 133/20 133/21 133/22 33/15 33/16 38/5 38/8 72/6 72/9 88/5 125/24 120/18 121/2 122/3 do [109] 1/17 4/3 38/16 39/8 44/13 134/6 158/10 difficulties [1] 81/17 146/5 **Deloittes** [1] 75/9 45/17 45/22 49/6 difficulty [1] 72/4 10/16 10/24 11/8

D 90/2 90/23 95/13 down [43] 9/11 19/6 76/20 105/11 105/17 eminent [1] 48/11 126/19 130/11 142/9 26/12 32/23 33/20 121/5 132/4 135/8 emotional [1] 45/20 do... [104] 11/13 emotionally [2] 52/25 142/22 154/20 163/8 35/6 40/25 42/1 42/18 152/22 154/3 158/1 17/14 18/14 23/18 45/4 48/25 50/1 51/10 early [4] 18/3 21/8 doing [32] 32/6 38/19 60/12 25/24 26/5 26/18 38/23 38/24 39/1 39/2 54/15 55/22 57/25 37/1 72/17 **employed** [3] 46/3 26/20 33/4 37/22 62/23 70/1 70/1 78/10 earth [5] 150/6 55/16 59/15 71/18 102/20 104/12 38/15 39/8 40/15 72/12 75/4 78/20 99/1 80/19 81/11 82/1 156/10 156/11 157/4 employment [1] 41/21 50/15 50/25 102/22 106/21 113/4 84/10 85/15 86/4 158/1 81/17 52/20 54/10 54/11 115/4 121/17 123/15 87/11 93/19 98/5 easily [2] 91/24 115/5 enabling [1] 14/4 56/6 56/9 56/12 56/13 101/11 104/10 108/14 easy [2] 56/5 151/19 125/21 127/18 127/19 encouraged [2] 56/20 59/1 65/18 66/1 127/19 129/2 129/21 111/13 111/24 116/10 effect [9] 2/19 45/3 122/19 146/22 66/2 67/24 70/13 133/15 133/22 133/23 116/19 117/14 119/5 74/5 77/15 95/25 encourages [1] 70/15 70/16 71/20 134/1 145/4 147/16 120/14 122/12 129/13 96/14 142/2 144/24 23/17 71/22 72/1 72/6 72/10 158/21 146/16 end [6] 6/22 36/14 130/15 131/3 72/18 72/21 73/14 don't [93] 10/17 downloads [1] effectively [3] 64/1 39/25 44/15 64/11 75/1 75/5 75/22 78/17 10/21 11/20 12/2 16/9 151/20 105/17 147/10 77/25 79/9 83/4 83/7 83/15 effectiveness [1] endeavours [2] 22/14 29/9 31/17 downside [1] 50/7 84/5 90/9 95/8 96/15 dozen [6] 68/7 68/11 35/20 41/11 41/24 64/10 140/20 140/23 97/15 97/18 97/22 43/5 43/10 43/19 68/16 68/21 83/11 ended [1] 72/15 efficiency [2] 64/9 99/25 103/8 103/13 46/16 55/16 56/1 56/2 128/18 endless [1] 59/3 131/10 103/22 104/12 106/23 56/18 61/13 66/3 66/6 draft [11] 6/23 9/17 effort [3] 37/18 endured [1] 84/23 109/13 112/2 115/1 66/15 66/20 67/3 68/2 9/19 9/23 9/25 10/1 112/21 112/25 enemy [1] 21/13 121/24 122/18 124/4 69/14 72/21 78/15 10/11 11/15 101/4 **eg [1]** 117/16 engage [5] 24/17 125/7 128/1 128/22 82/20 88/23 92/3 114/20 116/18 eight [1] 37/16 25/7 88/13 141/12 129/12 129/14 130/20 94/24 97/10 98/20 either [7] 37/25 55/24 146/13 drafted [3] 22/3 131/16 132/7 132/22 98/21 98/25 99/13 22/10 142/22 99/22 108/22 117/19 engaged [3] 60/12 133/11 134/6 135/12 99/14 99/14 99/20 drafting [1] 88/12 159/15 162/11 131/25 132/12 135/17 135/18 136/15 99/22 99/23 99/23 draw [3] 67/19 67/20 **eliminate** [1] 130/9 engagement [1] 143/8 143/13 143/14 103/15 109/19 110/10 120/6 Elizabeth [1] 84/14 102/14 146/19 149/14 153/25 110/22 110/23 111/6 drawing [4] 92/9 else [12] 18/6 20/6 engaging [1] 60/14 154/16 154/23 158/10 29/5 29/7 31/22 33/2 111/18 111/21 112/24 92/10 128/9 149/9 engines [1] 123/12 158/13 158/14 158/19 enough [12] 24/21 112/24 113/2 113/4 drawn [2] 66/9 70/25 104/8 119/17 158/19 159/3 160/15 125/12 150/16 151/7 113/20 114/3 114/24 128/19 45/8 46/13 46/19 160/24 161/1 161/2 115/14 117/25 120/6 dreadful [1] 153/8 **else's [1]** 38/14 70/14 73/16 73/18 161/4 161/7 161/15 122/22 125/10 126/12 drew [2] 128/16 elsewhere [2] 21/24 74/10 127/19 129/7 161/25 127/25 129/19 131/14 146/19 156/14 156/20 90/11 document [37] 2/12 133/21 135/13 136/7 drilling [1] 35/6 email [33] 49/19 ensure [4] 70/7 70/8 3/5 3/13 6/23 7/1 7/8 138/17 138/23 138/25 drive [4] 122/19 49/20 65/2 65/4 65/24 101/17 111/15 8/2 8/11 8/25 9/3 9/9 66/1 68/1 69/20 69/22 entirely [4] 27/24 139/24 140/1 144/7 122/21 123/3 123/8 10/4 10/22 11/2 11/23 144/14 145/3 145/14 driven [1] 101/8 70/1 71/5 75/16 76/4 47/20 48/22 133/22 12/3 13/15 26/11 146/21 147/1 148/12 dropped [4] 65/24 77/19 79/12 82/21 entry [1] 149/16 26/15 52/15 53/16 150/6 151/6 156/13 88/24 112/19 113/10 84/10 84/12 85/14 environment [1] 55/9 55/23 56/20 57/2 156/19 157/15 159/24 drove [1] 122/4 89/6 94/10 94/13 144/18 59/19 59/21 60/4 62/1 160/8 160/17 160/25 duality [1] 31/6 94/14 94/17 95/22 **equipped** [1] 84/5 62/6 105/12 111/19 161/3 96/13 101/12 105/11 due [3] 61/13 80/6 **Ernst** [1] 2/25 111/23 130/15 133/25 error [5] 76/7 76/14 done [41] 4/12 10/21 106/17 107/7 108/25 87/25 138/21 146/11 80/24 80/25 81/4 12/1 26/1 26/8 35/15 111/25 131/4 durable [1] 14/4 documented [1] 36/6 43/21 45/25 duration [2] 24/22 emailing [1] 80/11 error' [1] 76/7 37/23 48/10 50/25 51/1 121/20 emails [11] 45/18 errors [1] 23/1 documents [16] 54/18 67/8 67/17 during [6] 31/11 68/2 68/16 68/21 escalated [1] 65/15 48/15 55/20 57/17 74/17 75/12 83/9 84/2 42/13 64/13 80/23 76/20 76/24 76/25 escalation [1] 69/9 66/7 68/5 69/3 83/10 87/5 87/5 87/7 89/4 121/15 136/10 106/5 153/25 158/8 **especially [2]** 30/3 101/10 107/3 115/12 93/3 98/1 98/21 98/23 duties [4] 26/20 29/2 158/12 59/1 127/9 127/25 128/3 99/14 100/1 113/19 73/24 74/5 emanated [1] 17/7 **essential** [1] 12/7 129/21 136/6 142/13 118/24 124/3 129/15 **embedded** [1] 145/9 essentially [18] 7/11 does [20] 2/18 2/21 Ε 130/10 135/8 139/2 embrace [1] 17/14 11/4 12/1 12/19 16/3 9/1 27/25 49/16 58/19 147/14 159/10 160/25 each [3] 1/19 44/12 18/19 19/7 20/18 emerge [2] 13/24 58/20 73/4 76/6 88/14 110/3 162/2 162/7 55/5 23/21 24/7 28/23 91/17 92/12 92/16 earlier [29] 4/7 4/13 emerged [6] 15/1 39/16 43/13 45/4 double [2] 45/4 98/2 105/16 116/22 11/11 12/19 21/6 26/1 149/16 30/20 31/18 32/4 51/3 46/15 50/11 92/19 119/1 138/13 142/5 26/7 26/9 27/18 29/4 doubled [1] 50/1 59/20 126/7 142/8 29/5 50/8 50/9 50/12 established [8] 15/11 doubling [1] 48/24 **emerging [5]** 30/4 doesn't [13] 31/25 doubt [5] 12/23 30/22 50/13 50/16 51/21 30/9 30/11 61/1 16/4 18/20 25/15 32/1 69/22 88/13 88/15 59/25 61/10 67/18 53/12 72/13 140/25 144/16 39/7 39/16 50/14

153/1 154/8 156/5 55/15 59/19 Ε faults [2] 35/7 63/1 first [39] 2/19 3/9 fear [1] 133/1 **examples** [2] 68/13 expressed [1] 42/25 8/12 9/12 10/11 12/5 euros [1] 78/2 153/7 expressing [1] 42/8 feared [1] 16/23 18/24 19/12 19/16 even [12] 15/2 20/12 extend [2] 38/5 138/2 **excellent** [1] 98/1 **February [4]** 3/6 19/17 24/9 26/4 40/23 25/4 51/1 54/2 56/25 except [1] 137/25 extended [1] 72/15 10/19 29/17 99/6 45/12 50/17 52/6 74/3 93/15 105/14 exchange [2] 21/9 extent [9] 5/4 14/22 53/10 59/3 60/12 Federation [1] 136/19 141/7 148/15 65/19 66/8 67/5 69/10 15/9 54/4 64/21 140/12 77/4 evening [2] 150/20 125/13 135/20 139/22 feedback [1] 81/24 **exchanges** [1] 71/6 69/19 93/14 94/12 150/20 excited [1] 117/7 145/12 feel [7] 31/25 45/17 99/24 108/17 108/18 event [2] 95/18 98/16 90/2 90/23 126/25 115/10 116/20 117/12 exclude [1] 105/7 **external** [2] 129/5 eventually [3] 50/1 excuse [3] 16/17 148/20 145/17 147/24 117/14 119/24 132/5 107/9 153/17 feeling [8] 42/8 42/10 121/7 128/6 140/8 144/16 149/14 **externally [1]** 8/13 ever [22] 5/4 10/14 **executive [26]** 5/22 extra [2] 83/10 146/7 46/6 54/23 58/14 155/8 29/9 31/22 37/15 14/6 18/11 19/8 22/13 extract [1] 63/25 60/16 104/22 163/13 firstly [4] 12/23 70/17 41/13 59/4 73/20 24/14 29/8 31/3 38/16 extrapolate [1] 35/1 feels [1] 128/6 117/19 131/22 83/18 92/3 103/24 38/17 51/24 64/3 86/1 extreme [1] 44/12 fittingly [1] 59/12 fees [1] 40/12 104/1 118/4 126/20 96/10 97/1 114/21 **extremely [2]** 44/23 fell [1] 127/14 five [6] 1/18 9/11 127/24 130/16 132/6 115/16 115/23 116/6 felt [12] 17/9 46/21 62/7 62/15 143/22 103/12 132/11 133/22 138/20 eye [2] 47/3 47/9 116/24 122/7 123/2 47/18 67/11 83/2 83/7 144/2 155/22 159/25 125/1 128/24 139/12 87/6 92/23 122/14 five years [1] 9/11 every [5] 25/14 36/20 145/13 147/12 147/22 **fix [3]** 21/4 23/2 88/9 140/7 69/1 77/25 116/10 face [3] 43/12 49/25 exercise [1] 71/6 Fernforth [1] 77/20 fixed [3] 44/8 44/18 everybody [1] 123/22 163/15 few [13] 9/10 22/3 **exhausted** [1] 78/21 77/2 everyone [8] 35/4 **existence** [2] 138/8 faced [3] 14/8 16/1 43/6 64/12 68/20 flag [2] 16/25 93/7 37/6 37/24 42/19 93/8 64/4 69/16 83/11 83/17 flagged [2] 65/14 138/13 93/17 113/5 123/1 fact [13] 36/18 47/8 83/24 119/24 121/18 exists [1] 126/3 65/18 everyone's [1] 48/3 61/5 77/8 85/15 124/22 151/18 **expect [3]** 12/25 **flagging [1]** 79/3 158/20 87/20 97/5 130/11 20/17 109/3 field [2] 83/22 124/21 **flow [1]** 159/3 **everything [9]** 15/15 142/22 143/9 146/25 expectation [1] 73/8 **fifth [2]** 33/10 35/23 flowing [2] 129/3 18/6 29/5 38/13 39/25 163/1 fight [2] 54/10 54/11 expectations [1] 151/17 44/23 53/7 93/20 facto [1] 125/17 54/13 fighting [1] 47/19 flows [1] 18/6 148/17 factor [1] 55/11 **expected** [1] 54/11 figure [1] 42/9 Foat [9] 9/21 10/8 evidence [47] 4/6 final [3] 10/1 54/24 factors [1] 130/21 11/18 23/12 23/13 **expecting [2]** 48/23 4/14 4/19 15/7 25/24 facts [6] 14/3 18/20 91/10 61/11 89/6 94/10 94/11 26/25 29/23 30/3 30/8 25/14 49/25 60/25 **expensive [4]** 63/23 finance [14] 5/12 95/12 30/10 31/19 33/11 139/18 63/24 63/25 123/18 5/25 6/20 93/2 101/1 Foat's [1] 94/13 33/21 33/22 34/6 failed [3] 28/2 48/22 116/14 117/15 119/1 **experience** [7] 23/16 focus [13] 42/6 67/12 34/23 47/25 50/23 78/20 25/13 51/22 123/18 144/13 144/17 145/6 67/13 90/5 111/16 51/3 56/3 56/15 57/7 fails [1] 101/17 124/17 129/4 145/8 145/10 145/18 145/20 116/21 117/12 118/8 57/18 60/25 63/1 failure [2] 38/25 119/4 119/10 120/5 experienced [4] **financial [8]** 34/4 73/24 74/12 77/14 119/11 34/20 83/23 119/7 53/1 119/25 125/19 122/6 122/8 89/3 91/2 110/13 fair [6] 28/17 28/21 120/17 129/9 144/20 145/7 focused [7] 47/20 127/5 127/13 127/20 40/6 47/23 54/21 158/22 116/22 116/25 117/3 experiences [1] 9/14 134/8 134/15 135/7 150/2 **expert [5]** 70/11 financially [1] 54/17 119/23 119/23 120/2 150/10 150/23 152/21 fairer [1] 121/25 72/25 73/14 75/6 focuses [1] 119/24 **financials [1]** 121/10 154/1 156/24 157/18 **find [7]** 143/14 134/2 fairly [2] 117/5 focusing [1] 47/23 157/21 158/6 158/18 163/12 **expertise** [1] 149/9 150/19 150/20 156/10 **follow [5]** 102/21 159/11 fairness [2] 48/1 explain [12] 8/13 156/11 160/10 160/15 129/10 138/13 151/21 evidently [1] 130/3 84/25 11/18 37/4 70/17 finding [3] 50/11 159/15 evolved [1] 128/21 fallen [1] 121/21 89/17 89/21 91/11 105/8 116/20 followed [1] 18/10 ex [2] 85/4 85/5 falls [1] 39/6 117/19 131/7 137/22 Findings [1] 116/20 **following [5]** 23/9 ex-post [1] 85/5 141/7 155/2 false [2] 31/20 **finds [1]** 107/9 63/16 97/24 141/13 ex-postmaster [1] 160/22 fine [5] 2/23 104/9 **explained** [7] 8/12 146/13 85/4 families [1] 4/9 131/23 144/9 164/6 foot [16] 2/10 6/25 48/11 69/5 73/20 exact [1] 29/14 family [2] 150/18 98/19 148/7 148/10 fines [2] 107/18 20/20 69/19 78/25 **exactly [8]** 13/5 160/12 108/2 80/10 80/13 81/10 explaining [2] 12/7 30/12 31/17 44/1 far [13] 53/15 53/18 81/22 101/3 107/6 19/18 finish [1] 144/7 56/16 72/1 75/2 152/6 61/7 63/6 76/8 102/14 finished [2] 8/4 72/14 108/24 116/9 116/10 explanation [3] 9/8 examination [1] 113/11 124/3 124/9 **firm [11]** 32/17 40/15 126/24 139/9 69/13 156/2 48/23 124/13 135/23 138/12 45/9 45/11 46/4 46/13 **forbidding [1]** 140/5 **exploded [1]** 149/3 examine [1] 105/24 161/10 46/16 46/17 46/17 **explore** [1] 100/6 force [1] 14/23 example [10] 18/16 fault [5] 31/13 31/16 **explored** [1] 50/7 48/9 96/3 forcing [1] 25/2 44/13 106/12 117/23 38/14 105/8 160/14 firmly [2] 45/9 148/19 foresaw [1] 72/24 **exploring [1]** 102/22 118/17 149/22 151/3 faultless [1] 82/3 express [3] 20/18 firms [1] 46/18 forever [2] 104/23

72/16 72/21 73/14 76/11 78/15 80/18 38/16 38/17 44/11 **Geoffrey [1]** 84/12 get [32] 9/15 17/3 73/17 73/21 74/10 81/5 93/1 93/4 93/18 63/16 67/23 90/4 forever... [1] 105/1 76/10 77/1 80/8 128/5 23/17 26/13 31/12 93/19 93/20 97/20 95/24 96/3 99/21 forget [2] 75/2 112/3 129/6 129/20 151/20 31/14 31/15 46/9 55/4 97/23 101/12 119/3 114/21 115/16 115/23 forgetting [1] 59/5 Fujitsu's [1] 72/14 57/18 58/13 77/4 79/9 132/5 132/25 133/1 116/6 116/24 131/7 forgotten [2] 26/19 full [8] 1/11 1/23 82/25 84/11 85/1 135/4 135/11 137/13 131/7 131/13 136/18 55/18 136/25 140/7 141/10 25/25 26/6 54/21 108/21 110/4 113/9 138/17 140/19 143/4 form [3] 17/7 61/11 54/23 80/17 82/2 115/2 115/7 117/6 147/7 148/4 148/5 143/21 143/23 126/11 fully [4] 21/25 33/11 119/13 125/13 137/6 149/8 149/9 149/21 groupthink [1] 44/13 formal [7] 26/14 75/2 70/7 145/9 138/3 143/1 147/10 153/3 153/13 156/5 grow [1] 132/22 92/22 131/25 145/6 function [3] 75/24 147/16 159/2 161/11 158/13 158/19 158/24 growing [2] 132/21 158/15 162/5 86/13 126/19 161/13 160/10 161/7 161/14 159/16 formally [3] 93/10 gone [12] 8/14 9/9 functioning [2] gets [4] 73/6 85/18 guess [1] 113/18 93/21 97/19 85/25 101/17 9/12 12/24 13/16 128/25 130/3 guessing [1] 30/18 format [1] 56/24 getting [17] 4/13 4/15 26/15 53/9 56/10 60/5 **functions** [1] 31/8 quidance [1] 131/18 former [1] 131/23 guided [2] 19/22 fund [2] 147/18 14/1 34/9 48/19 48/20 88/25 152/11 152/21 forms [1] 33/7 good [30] 1/3 1/9 19/24 147/21 68/2 68/16 72/17 forthcoming [1] 78/21 98/24 119/25 10/18 24/21 25/8 28/4 guilt [1] 40/10 fundamental [4] 108/7 19/22 22/5 24/9 47/18 120/1 148/22 151/19 35/19 45/8 46/9 46/13 guilty [5] 28/10 28/18 fortnight [1] 80/8 48/2 52/12 57/2 69/11 28/19 31/24 40/9 fundamentally [5] 157/3 160/4 forward [6] 1/20 18/10 32/15 52/2 **Gill [3]** 70/2 70/2 70/4 77/4 79/6 84/14 91/9 guy [1] 93/2 32/14 40/2 98/15 give [17] 1/11 4/19 105/18 128/4 94/6 94/7 112/7 112/9 133/6 161/14 funded [3] 147/19 49/19 60/4 60/22 113/4 114/13 114/15 forwarded [2] 85/18 147/20 147/22 70/11 70/15 72/16 118/19 118/24 123/22 had [215] 87/11 72/25 73/4 74/18 78/7 129/7 134/8 hadn't [19] 18/17 funding [4] 55/4 **forwarding [1]** 94/19 97/12 101/23 118/16 26/15 28/16 32/6 36/4 139/15 139/23 141/25 **Goodman [1]** 116/13 **forwards [2]** 63/10 40/3 49/6 51/20 56/15 furiously [1] 126/12 128/14 161/5 Goodman's [1] 94/14 69/10 97/18 102/25 further [16] 57/16 given [14] 32/18 116/11 found [13] 21/3 28/17 104/24 121/13 125/15 57/25 80/3 81/11 46/15 51/1 61/25 goodness [2] 126/21 29/23 40/9 51/19 125/15 155/13 158/17 85/13 85/19 85/24 73/25 82/9 90/5 95/15 143/11 57/17 60/20 63/1 85/24 94/18 96/25 163/13 96/16 102/7 123/22 got [45] 11/10 11/14 69/13 99/18 103/11 **Hailstones** [1] 80/14 98/5 100/6 108/24 125/18 137/3 138/11 28/25 29/19 30/9 156/2 162/10 37/25 38/20 40/15 half [4] 26/8 40/23 110/8 152/14 157/8 gives [1] 98/3 four [8] 14/7 14/21 65/2 128/18 fuss [1] 21/5 giving [6] 4/17 57/18 46/18 51/23 52/25 25/18 37/18 52/16 57/3 57/12 64/3 64/21 Hall [1] 94/19 future [2] 10/13 60/18 60/19 74/12 52/22 63/4 68/21 Hamlyn [1] 6/5 134/17 66/2 66/3 66/7 68/5 four years [2] 37/18 hand [2] 41/9 96/13 68/24 72/4 76/9 83/6 Glenn [1] 94/19 68/21 G 89/17 92/2 92/14 93/2 handed [2] 20/2 20/3 glib [1] 56/17 fourth [2] 32/8 32/9 gap [1] 42/15 **GLO [7]** 4/9 42/14 handle [5] 85/11 115/7 118/9 118/11 framework [4] 118/12 118/13 124/25 100/22 100/24 101/21 **Gareth [1]** 73/22 43/25 54/22 96/12 129/10 140/11 145/7 109/2 Gas [1] 6/20 133/20 134/9 125/14 130/21 130/24 158/22 go [49] 1/19 3/18 handled [1] 137/23 gather [1] 131/24 132/6 133/17 134/23 frankly [1] 103/3 gave [5] 16/16 57/7 8/10 12/3 13/4 13/9 138/1 145/4 154/10 handles [1] 84/20 Fraser [7] 13/11 67/6 91/9 121/7 156/5 159/2 160/12 handling [1] 109/5 15/16 18/5 25/21 22/18 47/1 47/4 Gavin [3] 108/25 hands [1] 12/11 37/16 39/17 56/5 57/1 **Government [6]** 54/8 152/17 163/3 163/11 108/25 110/4 happen [11] 5/5 9/4 63/10 65/20 68/9 54/14 71/19 95/1 Fraser's [2] 47/12 12/18 18/18 63/9 93/5 **GE [1]** 75/3 71/11 73/9 78/9 78/25 122/10 122/18 156/24 general [16] 22/13 131/21 135/2 135/4 80/19 81/9 81/15 84/3 Grabiner [1] 49/3 Freehills [2] 50/3 149/20 150/11 23/10 29/7 49/20 50/2 90/16 94/16 103/20 grammar [1] 1/22 99/12 67/4 68/23 96/10 104/23 108/1 108/24 happened [32] 10/14 grand [3] 151/7 frequently [1] 79/18 96/22 97/1 100/12 10/16 11/11 16/14 115/10 129/10 132/14 153/2 154/9 Friday [2] 1/1 39/1 104/2 123/2 139/12 16/15 20/1 20/7 40/3 142/12 149/13 152/1 Grant [2] 140/11 friends [1] 160/12 48/24 49/2 56/15 60/7 140/18 156/21 154/8 154/20 156/9 140/18 front [3] 70/23 71/15 generally [12] 22/13 60/8 67/14 69/7 89/18 156/10 157/8 157/25 grateful [3] 60/18 101/21 38/9 51/11 68/19 69/4 89/24 91/6 91/20 92/4 158/14 160/7 160/15 81/19 163/22 fronts [1] 132/10 69/12 83/8 83/12 93/23 98/16 98/22 160/22 161/10 161/15 gratitude [2] 58/15 frustrated [2] 79/5 83/20 102/10 103/6 109/13 121/6 133/18 162/23 60/10 108/20 103/9 145/17 152/13 152/23 goes [1] 37/4 great [3] 54/1 114/24 **FSC [1]** 100/21 generic [1] 68/15 156/17 158/1 162/14 going [58] 5/1 6/22 159/18 FUJ00171778 [1] 3/5 generosity [1] 58/24 happening [13] 7/8 9/3 21/15 23/1 greater [3] 63/6 Fujitsu [24] 32/24 genuine [2] 55/2 16/18 18/17 21/20 32/22 39/2 44/5 49/7 124/9 124/13 33/1 33/16 38/8 63/24 77/6 80/6 89/25 90/22 121/12 49/9 50/21 58/7 61/23 greatly [1] 97/25 70/13 70/22 71/6 genuinely [4] 35/20 106/12 108/19 131/16 68/9 69/14 70/10 grew [1] 42/11 71/14 71/17 72/9 70/19 71/15 72/2 76/2 group [24] 8/22 136/5 159/14 159/19 54/23 109/3 160/17

128/4 128/10 128/25 Н head [4] 6/16 80/10 Hi [1] 65/22 | **I and [1]** 124/22 113/25 117/24 hid [1] 28/1 129/7 129/17 130/1 I apologise [2] 2/22 happenings [1] headed [2] 89/6 hide [2] 22/2 93/15 130/2 131/20 133/24 142/25 13/20 112/4 high [3] 25/13 163/2 134/7 134/16 149/15 I appreciate [1] happens [2] 20/4 heading [4] 19/7 163/6 150/13 151/1 154/19 83/16 108/13 19/20 94/17 131/6 highlighted [1] 52/22 156/7 157/5 160/13 lask [1] 1/10 happy [5] 69/6 69/6 horrible [1] 82/22 headings [1] 19/10 Highly [1] 94/18 l asked [4] 22/22 80/8 155/2 158/2 headlines [1] 19/19 **HIJ [1]** 93/19 horribly [1] 56/10 72/19 101/1 130/19 hard [11] 1/16 3/18 Hill [3] 86/13 112/11 lassume [3] 109/16 Houghton [2] 75/20 heads [1] 143/5 22/4 22/25 24/22 hear [6] 1/3 52/12 112/13 124/22 110/11 128/4 31/24 49/13 57/6 114/13 129/24 137/11 him [12] 20/24 21/1 hours [3] 82/1 I assumed [1] 34/21 61/10 147/14 156/14 21/2 21/3 21/15 49/15 150/19 150/20 137/13 lat [1] 71/8 hardened [1] 15/5 heard [18] 13/24 15/7 75/22 82/5 82/8 house [1] 88/5 I attended [2] 105/20 harder [1] 92/24 36/15 39/25 51/1 51/2 103/10 110/5 112/19 how [41] 11/14 12/13 | 106/16 hares [2] 103/25 56/3 60/13 61/11 hindsight [6] 45/10 35/20 37/24 37/25 I became [1] 20/23 104/18 61/12 104/20 108/18 72/11 105/6 105/25 38/2 38/7 51/11 59/8 I believe [4] 11/24 has [44] 8/14 13/16 109/4 125/4 150/23 59/8 59/9 60/4 70/15 14/24 142/7 143/19 106/4 126/25 15/1 15/5 26/23 27/11 153/7 157/15 159/21 Hipperson [4] 84/12 72/7 89/1 90/19 92/12 I believed [3] 10/8 30/15 36/5 37/15 hearing [3] 98/15 85/12 85/17 85/21 92/16 93/16 110/21 39/14 50/9 50/18 111/2 117/24 118/3 104/19 164/9 hired [1] 67/12 57/16 57/17 58/16 118/14 124/2 125/17 heart [4] 15/15 119/7 his [15] 21/17 48/6 58/17 59/20 60/13 120/16 125/22 49/14 73/24 74/5 82/2 127/18 128/16 129/24 I came [1] 126/16 60/16 69/7 73/5 76/7 129/24 129/25 136/16 I can [8] 69/3 79/3 held [15] 6/19 29/7 88/16 96/6 96/7 97/13 79/4 84/22 85/4 85/16 42/13 44/14 45/8 97/17 98/20 102/14 136/16 137/22 145/3 88/11 89/21 89/24 89/18 102/23 107/23 110/6 112/3 145/3 151/9 151/9 96/3 96/12 98/1 99/8 109/9 109/17 109/18 historic [1] 26/21 152/22 160/10 160/15 | I can't [14] 13/5 107/17 108/6 108/7 109/22 153/22 155/8 Howe [1] 143/21 historical [5] 8/14 109/9 115/22 126/20 157/9 13/6 26/23 27/12 however [9] 20/2 134/22 156/22 161/22 help [23] 16/25 21/4 27/19 28/2 59/11 64/12 162/10 162/13 31/14 60/11 65/7 65/13 85/3 89/21 hit [1] 77/24 hasn't [3] 96/13 71/12 72/8 72/22 **HJA [1]** 143/23 154/10 163/15 98/24 143/9 77/24 78/13 78/14 **HMRC [2]** 107/17 HR [1] 112/3 have [206] hug [1] 97/12 79/3 84/14 91/9 108/3 haven't [8] 28/21 100/13 110/3 110/5 holding [7] 80/22 huge [5] 68/23 91/8 55/19 55/21 56/3 119/2 128/22 148/4 107/24 109/9 110/12 158/21 159/15 162/2 74/17 88/23 90/7 150/25 151/9 160/6 110/14 111/4 137/21 hugely [3] 37/17 109/4 helped [2] 10/8 10/20 holiday [2] 90/17 44/20 125/20 having [12] 11/24 helpers [1] 150/18 93/11 human [1] 81/4 16/24 26/22 28/12 home [2] 39/2 83/18 hundreds [6] 35/14 helpful [7] 10/20 28/13 48/1 66/8 67/17 49/24 51/14 51/17 Homephone [1] 43/23 85/5 133/4 68/20 77/23 84/21 51/19 68/15 116/11 108/8 151/20 151/20 88/2 helping [2] 60/10 honest [4] 21/3 59/4 hypothesis [2] Hayward [3] 66/18 79/16 84/21 102/23 158/8 81/20 112/1 112/2 helpline [1] 65/13 hope [4] 4/14 59/11 he [62] 21/1 21/3 59/12 79/3 helps [1] 61/23 21/5 21/13 21/14 hence [2] 92/15 98/5 hoped [2] 9/13 10/20 | I absolutely [2] 91/3 21/14 21/19 21/20 162/1 her [17] 7/20 53/8 hopefully [1] 95/20 29/19 47/2 47/3 47/5 I accepted [3] 4/6 53/13 57/18 60/18 hopeless [1] 38/20 47/8 47/8 47/13 48/5 16/13 67/13 60/20 60/22 61/6 Horam [1] 77/20 48/6 48/6 51/13 73/24 61/11 65/9 67/5 85/15 I acknowledged [1] Horizon [66] 7/14 75/24 75/25 76/2 76/6 86/17 88/12 124/17 8/20 14/13 19/1 20/11 106/9 81/25 82/1 82/4 82/6 I actually [1] 147/12 137/12 137/13 25/19 25/24 26/21 82/6 82/7 93/1 93/11 26/23 26/25 27/12 I agree [1] 43/19 **Herbert [4]** 50/2 95/9 93/15 94/14 94/16 l agreed [1] 42/13 99/12 99/18 27/19 30/1 32/20 95/13 95/13 96/7 33/13 33/23 36/1 38/5 | I also [2] 105/14 here [19] 9/1 51/21 96/12 96/13 96/13 38/5 38/7 59/24 61/17 105/17 51/25 57/1 57/2 60/23 97/14 98/14 98/19 67/9 69/15 73/10 97/4 63/1 63/20 64/21 65/6 I always [1] 145/14 101/1 103/14 103/16 l am [20] 4/10 10/13 97/5 104/22 120/7 66/11 66/14 68/18 112/3 112/17 112/19 13/20 33/19 36/20 130/20 135/14 135/16 69/15 70/24 71/23 113/10 114/1 116/14 65/13 77/23 78/18 135/21 142/14 150/17 72/7 73/11 83/6 83/24 116/15 121/16 125/7 78/21 81/16 84/20 heretical [1] 51/25 88/3 88/20 105/7 126/19 137/21 137/22 89/3 89/23 90/7 90/8 105/15 111/17 112/18 herring [2] 125/24 145/16 145/20 161/7 98/11 101/23 108/8 162/6 112/23 113/13 114/2 he's [2] 161/6 161/8 108/8 108/19 **hesitating [1]** 143/24 127/6 127/14 127/24

142/9 142/10 I call [1] 1/5 I called [1] 78/5 98/8 98/12 98/25 118/16 129/19 152/19 27/15 29/13 30/12 73/19 75/3 79/16 79/18 79/18 82/23 87/9 116/16 145/16 148/15 I cannot [1] 36/13 I completely [1] 46/2 I could [5] 67/13 82/4 86/18 112/15 140/1 I couldn't [2] 33/6 104/15 I created [1] 11/12 I currently [1] 96/23 I did [22] 4/10 9/20 10/17 17/13 21/2 21/17 67/20 81/24 89/4 103/10 103/13 106/15 107/25 108/5 111/21 114/3 126/14 126/18 138/25 139/1 145/3 145/17 I didn't [31] 43/6 56/6 56/6 60/7 60/8 71/8 77/5 77/7 78/24 79/20 90/19 92/25 93/4 93/5 93/13 93/16 93/16 97/8 97/14 106/23 110/23 113/3 113/6 123/12 134/18 139/4 142/12 143/11 158/9 158/12 162/22 I discussed [2] 9/23 41/19 I do [11] 1/17 25/24 26/5 26/18 50/15 56/9 99/25 136/15 143/14 149/14 153/25 I doing [1] 113/4 (53) happenings - I doing

148/17 I don't [76] 10/17 10/21 11/20 12/2 16/9 22/14 29/9 31/17 41/11 41/24 43/10 60/13 43/19 46/16 55/16 56/1 56/2 56/18 61/13 66/3 66/6 66/15 66/20 67/3 68/2 69/14 82/20 10/20 88/23 92/3 94/24 97/10 98/21 98/25 99/13 99/14 99/14 46/21 99/22 103/15 110/10 110/22 110/23 111/6 111/18 111/21 112/24 112/24 113/2 114/3 114/24 115/14 117/25 122/22 125/10 126/12 127/25 129/19 131/14 133/21 136/7 138/17 138/23 138/25 139/24 140/1 144/7 144/14 145/3 145/14 146/21 147/1 148/12 156/13 156/19 157/15 159/24 160/25 161/3 I done [1] 4/12 I dropped [1] 88/24 I especially [1] 59/1 l ever [2] 41/13 92/3 I feel [1] 126/25 45/18 I felt [3] 17/9 67/11 83/7 I flag [1] 93/7 I forget [2] 75/2 112/3 I gather [1] 131/24 I gave [1] 91/9 I generally [1] 103/6 I genuinely [2] 35/20 160/17 I give [1] 49/19 **I go [1]** 149/13 **I got [5]** 38/20 66/3 68/5 124/25 133/17 I greatly [1] 97/25 I guess [1] 113/18 I had [12] 9/2 9/10 131/13 9/11 10/11 32/3 49/15 60/19 61/8 67/3 74/14 104/20 142/11 I hadn't [5] 18/17 26/15 49/6 97/18 121/13 I have [31] 13/11 44/13 58/16 58/25 59/7 65/10 65/23 77/11 77/23 77/25 79/8 80/2 82/8 84/25 85/8 85/21 86/2 89/10 95/17 96/18 103/2 107/19 108/5 108/18 109/11 110/2 112/19

113/19 135/1 139/3 I haven't [5] 55/19 55/21 56/3 88/23 90/7 I heard [2] 39/25 I hope [4] 4/14 59/11 59/12 79/3 I hoped [2] 9/13 I imagine [1] 113/22 I increasingly [1] I joined [17] 4/5 13/19 13/20 16/13 19/23 22/4 27/9 36/14 39/25 40/5 53/8 63/13 I right [2] 18/13 70/19 71/2 100/11 116/15 157/16 I just [10] 64/18 64/24 93/21 97/12 97/17 97/19 105/24 113/3 145/4 159/3 I knew [1] 136/5 I know [9] 3/25 36/5 38/9 53/18 59/12 79/9 99/13 112/17 113/4 I later [1] 105/22 I made [3] 49/21 67/25 119/15 I make [2] 35/10 I may [5] 7/9 43/9 64/24 103/24 104/1 I mean [35] 11/24 22/14 27/15 29/9 29/10 29/17 34/12 41/3 41/23 47/17 47/18 53/7 54/6 60/21 | I start [1] 5/7 70/25 72/5 74/23 79/16 86/17 100/16 106/11 110/10 113/2 114/3 118/16 120/10 125/24 126/18 128/5 130/7 132/25 148/17 148/24 156/14 161/7 I might [1] 62/10 I must [2] 55/18 I need [1] 107/11 I needed [1] 108/4 I never [7] 36/15 83/2 103/11 118/21 125/10 135/23 136/5 I noticed [1] 43/7 I obviously [3] 30/14 42/9 43/20 I or [1] 108/22 I paid [1] 107/13 I particularly [1] 56/2 I probably [1] 92/24 I put [1] 1/20 I raised [1] 23/9 I rarely [1] 64/3

I rather [1] 52/15 I reached [1] 106/4 I read [3] 43/8 81/3 162/22 I really [5] 9/2 43/5 78/15 101/19 132/9 I recall [5] 22/3 22/15 | I want [2] 93/3 26/20 42/8 138/12 I recalled [1] 40/22 I recruited [1] 75/25 I referred [1] 158/4 I remember [4] 43/8 45/15 117/11 118/17 I represent [1] 146/3 I revisited [2] 107/22 108/3 144/21 I said [8] 21/17 61/10 67/18 83/11 98/20 125/22 126/17 132/4 I saw [5] 76/20 97/10 111/20 121/11 136/7 I say [5] 26/10 59/20 65/16 119/12 120/10 I see [8] 17/4 20/15 28/23 46/12 46/23 46/25 76/25 77/8 I seem [1] 77/24 I set [5] 37/4 64/13 74/13 125/2 125/3 I should [7] 31/2 61/23 89/4 96/5 97/25 98/6 98/7 I sort [1] 91/11 I specifically [1] 154/3 I spoke [1] 82/5 I still [1] 143/7 **I stood [1]** 143/15 I suppose [1] 62/10 I suspect [5] 11/6 11/11 36/17 96/25 98/11 I tended [1] 64/8 I then [1] 39/17 I therefore [1] 100/5 I think [181] I thought [23] 10/19 11/25 17/17 21/11 28/21 39/18 44/24 51/17 93/8 103/2 104/8 104/11 121/22 123/21 126/20 126/21 137/7 142/25 145/4 145/8 147/4 147/9 158/18 I told [2] 93/14 98/18 I took [3] 69/8 78/23 102/19 I understand [4] 11/13 95/14 122/18 143/12

15/10 18/15 26/12 63/7 70/22 74/16 102/18 110/15 133/23 136/10 I very [1] 159/2 131/24 I wanted [4] 48/25 103/5 104/11 132/7 I was [64] 16/11 17/2 17/16 21/13 21/16 23/15 27/15 30/18 34/13 37/11 43/5 43/7 48/22 49/2 49/23 53/15 54/20 56/5 56/8 56/9 56/13 60/8 60/18 I've [32] 1/22 1/25 64/7 64/13 67/3 68/2 72/17 74/15 74/24 79/17 82/2 83/2 83/7 83/10 90/16 90/17 91/10 93/4 97/8 97/22 100/12 102/25 104/19 105/1 105/19 106/5 106/6 106/7 106/13 106/25 119/13 119/23 121/25 122/7 125/21 133/22 135/10 135/23 lain [1] 112/8 139/3 154/6 156/15 160/17 160/19 I wasn't [9] 26/10 53/18 60/22 68/22 76/24 93/15 95/5 95/9 idea [5] 22/4 37/12 106/24 I went [2] 93/11 128/3 I won't [1] 146/11 I wonder [2] 77/24 114/6 I would [18] 21/21 22/12 56/12 60/21 62/12 65/7 66/15 66/17 79/4 81/19 82/17 90/6 90/19 91/4 ie [6] 73/14 76/7 105/6 109/5 109/25 112/13 I wouldn't [5] 26/14 55/17 66/5 90/18 127/16 I wrote [1] 9/23 **I'd [16]** 11/25 17/10 65/16 67/11 97/13 99/13 114/3 114/4 129/4 136/6 138/16 140/8 148/20 154/1 160/21 160/24 **I'II [2]** 146/11 152/1 **l'm [71]** 4/5 5/1 6/22 7/8 15/10 31/18 32/22 41/13 42/11 43/11 45/20 48/20 49/5 55/8 58/14 60/4 61/10 61/23 66/17 67/25

I understood [10]

68/9 69/7 73/3 73/19 75/7 76/2 76/5 76/11 78/17 79/21 80/18 83/4 91/4 92/10 97/23 98/23 102/18 104/21 110/2 111/20 113/11 117/23 126/5 128/2 128/18 128/21 137/19 139/8 140/7 142/14 143/15 143/24 143/24 144/5 145/23 146/2 148/5 148/24 148/25 149/8 149/9 149/21 151/2 153/19 155/2 158/8 158/11 160/3 161/2 161/7 163/22 11/9 18/13 30/19 33/24 46/18 50/17 55/18 55/19 56/4 56/7 57/12 61/11 61/12 80/1 83/4 83/5 83/6 93/2 106/5 111/18 113/11 115/1 123/15 123/16 129/19 136/6 147/15 157/15 159/21 162/1 **IBM [8]** 70/8 70/17 71/16 71/22 72/3 72/19 72/22 73/10 **ID [1]** 152/9 39/2 130/7 134/19 identification [2] 150/4 151/12 I will [2] 98/12 108/21 identified [15] 32/25 33/4 33/7 53/22 131/20 151/2 151/24 152/1 152/2 153/3 154/15 154/18 155/4 156/6 157/11 identify [3] 140/21 157/4 160/6 99/24 102/11 109/18 138/21 ie had [1] 138/21 ie supply [1] 73/14 le this [1] 109/18 ie to [1] 102/11 ie what [1] 99/24 **if [114]** 1/25 5/4 7/9 8/10 9/3 19/6 25/23 28/16 28/21 29/22 35/17 35/17 36/20 43/3 46/3 48/5 50/18 52/22 55/3 56/8 57/22 57/25 61/23 62/7 62/22 63/10 64/24 65/18 68/15 70/1 72/21 75/16 77/24 78/9 78/25 79/11 79/19 80/14 81/10

102/12 103/9 114/20 improving [3] 122/8 interpretation [2] 89/3 89/10 92/3 92/5 122/24 123/13 114/22 115/2 115/8 27/23 47/21 95/24 95/24 96/18 if... [75] 81/15 81/19 inaccurate [2] 29/21 115/17 115/19 116/5 interpreted [1] 36/20 99/11 99/21 101/14 81/22 85/12 85/14 32/21 116/7 116/24 117/16 interrupt [1] 126/6 104/21 85/18 86/23 87/6 inadequate [1] 29/2 117/20 117/25 118/8 interrupted [1] 71/13 issued [1] 8/18 87/16 87/22 90/23 161/1 161/5 into [35] 3/21 29/19 issues [62] 4/20 4/20 inappropriately [1] 92/10 92/15 93/4 35/25 54/8 55/11 4/22 5/1 5/5 8/17 8/20 39/13 informed [2] 29/16 94/13 94/16 97/21 13/23 18/10 19/1 19/1 incentivised [1] 96/10 58/13 65/4 65/11 72/4 98/11 100/5 101/11 123/2 inherently [1] 32/21 77/6 82/23 84/11 20/11 20/12 20/13 103/3 103/20 104/7 85/17 85/22 86/6 24/19 24/24 25/6 incident [1] 80/6 initial [3] 9/23 27/21 104/11 108/13 108/24 inclined [3] 76/6 92/14 96/23 98/24 26/21 26/24 27/12 98/8 109/8 109/15 110/4 103/24 104/1 102/2 124/25 125/14 27/19 27/24 28/1 30/2 initiatives [2] 141/4 110/15 111/24 113/12 include [1] 38/16 141/16 136/17 153/16 154/13 33/14 36/17 44/10 114/3 116/10 117/13 included [9] 25/25 157/1 157/6 157/12 44/21 46/22 47/19 innocent [5] 28/6 118/1 118/1 118/23 26/6 77/22 128/10 28/18 28/19 28/22 157/22 158/14 159/4 48/8 48/21 52/18 127/7 129/7 130/13 128/10 136/21 139/16 60/1 159/8 160/1 161/25 59/24 59/24 61/16 132/6 132/10 132/22 61/24 64/4 66/14 140/5 158/11 **Innovation [3]** 112/4 162/11 162/13 134/1 134/13 134/14 including [7] 6/20 112/8 141/10 **intractable [1]** 35/10 67/17 79/6 81/20 135/11 135/17 136/9 13/25 98/7 98/9 input [1] 78/3 **introduce [2]** 116/4 82/13 83/3 85/23 86/6 137/12 139/2 141/8 107/18 107/20 142/20 Inquiry [12] 1/10 1/14 130/8 86/23 87/1 91/4 92/17 143/3 144/2 147/17 1/21 4/15 4/20 11/6 95/6 105/25 111/16 income [13] 33/24 invest [1] 123/24 147/22 148/13 148/16 107/13 116/21 116/23 15/3 30/15 57/3 62/10 invested [3] 124/2 111/16 114/16 119/7 148/21 151/18 151/19 116/25 117/4 119/4 129/22 164/1 124/3 147/24 120/16 127/7 140/21 151/21 152/11 155/13 119/10 120/11 123/19 **Inquiry's [1]** 61/13 investigate [10] 140/24 149/3 153/23 155/18 155/19 157/1 129/3 129/10 148/22 16/17 22/22 31/7 insight [1] 24/22 it [534] 158/6 158/13 158/18 incomplete [3] 11/12 insisted [1] 136/23 33/17 69/2 83/2 83/14 It'II [1] 61/21 159/13 160/25 161/9 it's [87] 1/14 1/15 13/17 138/19 installed [1] 88/3 86/22 121/8 136/14 162/10 investigated [4] 80/9 1/15 2/9 5/4 7/5 7/7 incorrectly [1] 96/1 instance [2] 118/18 ignorance [1] 28/15 increase [1] 147/2 119/14 86/24 87/7 111/3 7/11 9/16 16/21 19/18 ignorant [2] 45/21 20/19 23/22 23/23 increasingly [4] 44/8 **instantly [1]** 50/3 investigating [1] 97/16 29/17 33/25 34/22 44/11 44/18 46/21 Instead [2] 32/14 33/12 ignoring [1] 56/17 **incredibly [1]** 37/10 74/9 investigation [9] 35/22 36/4 38/14 41/3 **ill [1]** 91/14 indeed [3] 50/9 instructed [1] 98/11 35/25 66/24 87/3 98/7 44/20 44/25 46/23 image [2] 111/2 142/15 156/21 instructions [1] 99/24 154/4 156/20 49/18 53/9 55/8 56/4 111/7 independence [4] 34/17 159/4 159/8 56/10 56/13 57/9 imagine [3] 59/15 investigations [8] 31/10 63/17 139/18 insufficient [2] 105/7 58/15 60/14 60/15 101/23 113/22 148/18 106/2 4/15 33/13 83/7 84/2 61/9 67/19 68/21 69/1 **imbalance** [2] 14/11 independent [16] 135/18 156/22 157/19 69/4 72/10 76/5 76/12 insured [1] 32/16 19/15 35/24 37/1 39/23 40/9 integral [1] 127/10 158/23 77/5 77/8 78/15 81/11 **immediate** [1] 158/6 81/12 82/21 85/15 48/9 49/8 50/21 70/7 integrity [5] 35/3 investigator [1] immediately [3] 70/14 73/16 73/18 35/25 68/17 78/22 43/15 89/2 90/23 91/7 91/19 65/14 109/7 129/22 74/10 95/7 119/21 127/23 investment [3] 63/22 92/23 93/8 110/15 impact [8] 59/6 148/23 148/24 intemperate [1] 76/5 114/6 114/25 115/5 122/10 125/19 145/12 145/14 157/13 indirectly [2] 55/24 intend [2] 9/19 involve [1] 99/3 115/6 116/9 117/5 159/21 159/22 159/23 144/14 involved [9] 36/3 120/10 120/22 121/24 56/20 38/20 64/3 64/21 66/4 124/7 125/2 125/2 individual [15] 33/18 intended [1] 10/11 impartial [1] 35/25 66/5 89/17 105/19 intends [1] 96/11 126/18 126/21 126/23 35/7 46/8 59/5 64/4 implementing [1] 64/12 64/22 64/24 intent [1] 147/9 159/3 130/8 133/8 139/8 141/15 83/3 102/20 104/24 intention [3] 7/20 irrelevant [1] 28/3 142/14 143/25 144/13 implications [4] 144/24 146/20 148/21 112/25 141/2 161/20 8/24 10/23 irritated [1] 147/16 25/25 26/6 85/10 90/3 162/23 interest [1] 33/2 is [298] 148/24 151/6 151/7 implicit [1] 127/12 inducing [4] 141/17 interested [1] 55/8 ish [1] 145/23 151/10 153/3 155/7 implied [1] 78/22 141/20 141/23 141/25 interests [1] 140/22 Ismay [5] 100/21 162/16 **important [12]** 12/9 100/24 103/22 145/2 italics [1] 23/20 inept [1] 109/5 interim [16] 5/20 12/11 12/16 26/2 31/6 influenced [1] 44/20 7/25 20/23 72/19 85/1 145/13 item [3] 111/8 149/21 33/2 46/2 60/15 93/9 informal [1] 41/23 86/1 90/15 95/23 96/5 Ismay's [1] 144/24 150/15 113/7 122/14 134/17 96/9 96/23 97/2 97/25 isn't [11] 25/6 34/1 **informally [1]** 41/19 its [29] 4/15 9/16 importantly [1] 109/7 100/12 124/25 143/14 48/24 49/24 69/6 14/14 25/19 36/17 information [37] impossible [1] 53/24 14/11 19/15 19/18 95/25 121/22 128/5 37/1 37/10 43/12 internal [3] 6/16 **impressive** [1] 147/9 30/10 30/16 30/20 49/18 58/9 130/2 140/15 142/23 63/14 64/20 96/16 **improve [2]** 115/18 31/14 32/1 33/5 34/4 **internally [3]** 8/13 issue [22] 21/4 22/23 98/24 107/9 111/2 120/1 46/1 60/25 65/25 78/8 58/5 58/7 35/14 42/23 54/7 111/9 114/18 115/20 improvements [1] 99/4 99/7 101/16 66/10 69/10 72/24 117/3 120/7 122/11 interpret [2] 12/14 105/22 101/24 102/4 102/7 110/23 77/23 83/25 88/22 122/22 123/14 123/15

judge' [1] 49/14 163/11 large [1] 146/3 51/21 61/7 163/4 its... [6] 123/19 lesser [1] 126/11 judge's [4] 22/17 justified [1] 53/2 last [20] 2/16 2/17 139/19 141/4 141/7 2/24 3/4 15/2 52/14 23/9 47/3 47/9 justify [2] 13/22 lessons [2] 50/19 141/11 141/15 judgements [2] 18/7 43/22 55/20 57/3 58/16 63/4 109/6 itself [1] 92/3 68/20 80/6 83/11 88/3 let [3] 104/14 108/18 120/23 J 112/20 139/6 151/15 judgment [16] 8/18 159/3 Kaur [3] 81/12 81/15 151/16 160/3 162/24 8/20 19/1 19/1 20/11 **let's [15]** 15/13 39/22 Jane [34] 23/11 82/8 20/12 20/13 44/21 lastly [2] 40/17 64/2 42/1 58/3 69/16 76/18 41/17 41/17 42/8 **KC [1]** 50/21 46/22 48/8 59/24 111/23 134/19 134/20 late [3] 27/8 50/2 42/12 43/2 43/19 44/9 keen [1] 17/16 59/24 91/4 95/6 75/10 152/14 153/1 154/8 44/19 45/8 45/15 keep [6] 101/12 131/25 163/14 156/14 157/8 160/7 late' [1] 51/8 45/23 45/24 53/24 108/11 108/14 126/4 later [22] 21/8 23/7 letter [6] 58/1 58/9 judgments [3] 123/7 74/16 74/23 75/8 133/1 135/11 32/25 42/11 42/24 60/24 81/9 81/20 123/7 152/17 76/21 86/13 101/6 keepers [1] 85/5 Julie [2] 87/12 87/18 43/6 54/12 55/1 66/4 82/20 112/9 112/10 112/11 keeps [1] 118/12 **July [6]** 3/1 3/2 64/15 71/5 74/20 76/24 **letters [1]** 107/20 112/13 112/17 128/12 Ken [3] 85/14 87/12 77/21 84/10 99/16 level [9] 25/13 33/18 77/20 79/11 88/3 128/15 135/6 135/10 June [7] 2/13 2/14 88/11 105/22 106/4 121/18 34/24 35/13 38/16 137/7 137/8 137/20 kept [3] 11/7 45/11 81/10 81/24 82/18 136/21 157/21 159/1 38/21 39/4 132/13 137/22 138/1 131/4 139/13 159/17 161/12 135/13 Jane's [4] 42/22 keyed [1] 91/18 June 2017 [1] 82/18 latest [2] 80/1 80/5 levels [2] 35/21 43/24 44/4 49/4 keys [1] 147/7 junior [1] 38/18 latter [1] 116/8 38/18 **January [14]** 5/8 kick [2] 42/18 54/15 just [105] 1/22 3/16 law [1] 40/15 lied [1] 28/1 10/19 17/20 19/23 **Kim [5]** 89/16 89/21 7/16 8/10 10/2 10/6 lawful [1] 44/6 life [4] 92/24 97/13 40/20 56/8 61/18 11/21 15/21 18/13 89/23 90/11 98/12 97/17 106/22 lawyer [2] 94/19 62/24 66/8 82/3 kind [8] 42/17 68/13 18/16 21/12 21/15 94/22 **light [2]** 15/7 61/24 100/11 101/6 101/13 82/25 97/12 114/22 21/19 26/11 26/16 lawyers [3] 28/13 like [27] 33/14 34/5 107/16 115/12 126/6 144/1 28/15 34/8 37/15 34/22 38/22 45/10 44/15 45/19 January/February [1] kindly [1] 159/6 lay [2] 135/14 135/16 38/19 39/22 41/21 46/5 46/6 47/4 50/17 10/19 Kingdom [1] 59/14 42/2 42/14 42/18 58/22 65/16 67/21 leaders [1] 12/16 Jason [1] 1/10 44/17 45/19 46/21 Kirsten [6] 77/20 leadership [3] 10/9 87/2 90/2 108/19 Jenkins [2] 73/22 79/2 80/6 80/8 81/5 47/4 47/6 50/25 52/14 12/15 22/8 109/4 109/5 109/25 74/5 56/17 57/6 58/3 62/22 81/7 113/1 122/14 124/20 learn [1] 109/5 **JFSA [2]** 109/10 kit [2] 88/3 88/20 64/18 64/24 67/9 learnt [2] 50/18 58/25 125/12 139/2 139/25 109/20 68/15 71/2 71/3 72/18 knew [12] 12/1 14/13 least [10] 4/16 20/11 148/24 150/16 152/12 job [13] 60/13 60/18 14/25 25/19 37/25 likely [4] 13/4 25/3 72/24 76/4 76/7 77/11 61/11 69/24 71/9 67/11 83/8 98/1 38/2 38/7 56/16 72/7 79/14 79/20 81/10 98/10 116/18 125/7 70/23 112/12 104/13 104/13 113/4 101/2 136/5 138/13 83/8 87/11 87/22 134/3 160/14 limitations [1] 33/1 121/24 121/25 128/20 89/20 90/17 91/8 92/5 know [256] limited [10] 24/22 leave [6] 6/2 7/21 158/14 158/19 knowing [1] 104/8 58/7 96/9 108/21 33/12 116/15 118/22 93/21 94/14 97/4 Joe [1] 80/10 knowledge [13] 3/23 97/12 97/17 97/19 161/3 123/14 126/3 143/6 **JOHN [3]** 1/7 1/12 10/16 54/4 61/16 99/2 99/16 101/16 led [3] 34/10 100/21 147/20 147/21 157/18 165/2 103/17 103/18 104/23 61/17 77/13 112/22 147/2 line [20] 2/2 2/2 2/12 joined [29] 4/5 5/7 104/25 105/24 106/7 127/22 129/16 138/7 left [10] 1/22 7/23 2/16 2/18 2/19 3/4 3/9 13/19 13/20 16/13 138/10 138/15 138/19 110/8 111/7 113/3 12/6 53/19 72/20 84/6 9/16 19/17 45/8 54/12 19/23 22/4 26/8 27/9 113/20 116/10 116/17 **known [3]** 29/4 75/18 94/8 107/15 128/15 65/19 96/21 98/11 36/14 39/25 40/5 152/11 104/1 112/19 113/9 119/4 121/22 121/23 151/22 40/19 53/8 54/22 122/16 125/13 125/15 knows [2] 37/24 legal [31] 4/11 18/11 117/12 120/6 62/23 63/13 66/8 156/17 130/7 131/3 134/19 28/15 29/1 32/17 40/9 lines [4] 3/13 14/7 66/13 66/21 67/2 **KPMG [5]** 36/3 159/2 134/20 142/20 144/12 44/5 44/8 44/9 44/17 52/22 63/4 70/19 71/2 75/25 76/1 159/18 162/8 162/20 145/4 146/5 146/12 44/25 45/21 46/18 list [1] 111/8 76/14 100/11 116/15 148/14 150/16 151/7 47/21 47/22 47/25 listen [3] 21/11 24/18 157/16 151/10 152/14 156/16 48/2 48/20 50/6 50/25 59/3 joining [2] 56/9 **Labour [1]** 112/9 51/7 57/15 74/3 74/17 listening [2] 11/6 158/14 158/19 159/3 100/17 lack [6] 4/10 18/7 160/23 162/4 162/19 74/21 75/18 83/6 95/7 20/22 jointly [1] 5/14 27/25 34/16 34/17 163/7 134/13 134/16 158/10 literally [5] 9/5 Jonathan [4] 135/22 36/25 justice [27] 4/7 4/13 100/16 144/2 147/8 legally [4] 99/4 137/8 138/5 138/14 lacked [2] 24/23 31/9 13/11 14/16 14/20 136/18 137/1 137/24 161/22 Jones [2] 87/12 laded [1] 49/14 19/3 22/18 29/15 length [1] 144/1 **litigation [13]** 8/15 87/17 lady [1] 84/21 36/11 36/20 36/21 lengthy [2] 107/19 8/22 90/4 92/18 95/24 journey [1] 25/1 Lambert [1] 108/25 39/15 43/14 43/15 108/5 96/3 99/21 120/25 joy [1] 59/7 landscape [2] 70/21 43/18 47/1 47/12 136/18 136/25 138/22 lens [1] 64/8 judge [7] 44/23 45/1 115/11 50/10 53/6 53/14 **Lesley [2]** 71/18 138/24 141/25 49/22 49/23 56/19 language [2] 16/8 53/23 60/1 63/8 72/20 litigations [1] 18/1

152/17 156/23 163/3

28/19

less [5] 18/1 36/21

121/14 163/3

little [14] 7/1 16/9 22/1 23/5 57/25 85/13 85/19 89/11 92/6 92/7 94/9 110/8 133/17 145/18 lives [2] 59/13 137/15 Liz [3] 84/12 85/14 88/11 **loan [1]** 154/10 lobbied [1] 147/9 **Lobby [1]** 141/9 local [4] 35/17 78/1 117/16 154/2 locally [1] 157/10 locate [1] 78/6 logic [4] 16/16 43/12 43/21 121/7 long [19] 1/13 1/15 7/8 15/16 17/10 41/13 48/7 60/6 70/6 79/4 90/19 91/22 93/5 118/3 120/10 124/16 126/14 157/16 157/17 longer [3] 11/25 12/11 115/18 longest [1] 118/5 look [75] 1/15 1/25 6/24 15/13 21/17 32/19 34/5 39/22 43/12 45/10 45/23 47/4 49/4 56/23 57/22 57/25 61/20 62/3 64/18 64/24 65/11 69/1 69/16 69/19 72/21 74/16 74/17 75/16 76/18 81/10 81/22 83/10 84/9 85/17 85/22 86/6 87/22 93/2 93/12 94/13 97/20 98/15 98/20 101/10 102/20 104/14 104/15 105/4 107/2 107/5 108/24 111/23 112/18 113/4 116/17 116/19 117/13 117/22 118/1 118/2 118/6 128/24 131/2 131/2 133/8 134/19 136/8 139/3 139/7 140/10 140/17 140/19 151/6 157/22 162/2 looked [12] 33/17 46/5 46/6 66/16 73/6 82/23 90/6 94/14 105/11 121/13 158/16 160/1 looking [16] 6/23 10/5 62/21 65/1 83/9 88/7 94/12 95/7 112/22 113/17 114/19 127/25 157/1 157/6

159/10 161/14 looks [1] 113/1 **Lord [1]** 159/1 Lord Arbuthnot's [1] 159/1 **Lords [1]** 49/3 Lords Neuberger [1] 49/3 lose [4] 42/18 54/10 54/11 73/7 losing [1] 131/15 loss [7] 89/19 95/25 102/3 155/5 155/15 155/15 155/19 losses [7] 82/6 88/21 131/6 131/13 131/19 132/18 132/21 lost [6] 20/5 32/11 38/1 44/22 93/8 147/13 lot [28] 13/18 15/1 25/10 36/5 45/25 46/1 48/14 54/7 55/20 66/6 67/8 67/17 68/6 73/4 73/5 78/9 97/4 113/22 117/6 129/6 129/12 129/15 130/10 133/3 143/7 148/20 148/22 162/7 lots [3] 91/23 118/5 148/17 **loved [1]** 58/16 lower [1] 132/13 Lyons [3] 69/24 164/3 164/5 М

machine [1] 101/17 MacLeod [10] 23/11 41/17 43/3 53/25 74/23 101/6 112/10 128/12 137/8 138/1 macro [1] 34/24 macro-level [1] 34/24 made [41] 9/24 15/9 18/8 21/5 22/20 22/25 26/14 26/24 27/12 40/23 49/21 51/14 58/18 59/13 64/13 65/4 67/25 77/3 78/12 88/13 89/10 92/24 96/21 97/13 99/20 102/8 107/14 109/8 109/15 109/20 110/1 110/9 110/10 110/21 111/14 112/21 112/25 119/15 124/12 129/17 145/22 Magic [1] 46/17

magically [1] 56/8 Mail [6] 37/9 37/19 38/1 63/16 117/17 141/10

main [2] 14/7 33/24 maintain [2] 35/21 117/17 maintained [2] 14/9 19/13 major [1] 25/4 majority [1] 119/20 make [19] 1/18 4/1 35/10 35/18 45/10 45/18 59/3 67/24 75/2 83/8 107/19 114/1 123/24 124/4 131/24 131/25 132/8 152/12 161/9 makes [1] 96/19 making [20] 27/4 28/8 35/19 74/15 84/22 96/17 96/23 97/6 106/6 106/24 109/21 114/1 115/6 117/8 122/15 122/24 124/16 130/20 135/20 154/19 man [3] 73/21 74/4 107/7 manage [2] 28/2 117/24 managed [7] 34/18 34/19 96/18 126/1 126/9 126/9 126/13 management [15] 6/13 6/17 16/11 18/9 20/18 27/25 114/20 114/22 115/2 115/17 115/19 116/4 117/20 120/24 131/12 manager [3] 82/7 96/21 98/11 managers [2] 108/22 150/11 managing [4] 12/25 59/7 86/25 133/3 manner [1] 81/21 manually [1] 91/18 many [17] 12/8 13/19 19/24 27/25 38/25 40/9 107/17 117/15 118/2 118/11 118/14 129/24 129/25 129/25 132/10 160/14 163/23 map [1] 115/18 March [14] 2/3 2/5 2/7 3/6 7/23 63/18 65/3 66/9 76/1 107/22 117/2 139/12 139/23 140/3 March 2015 [1] 2/7 **March/April** [1] 76/1 mark [14] 20/25 33/6 41/2 41/5 41/8 41/11 41/14 86/15 87/12 111/19 113/9 125/4 125/11 150/1 Mark's [1] 112/14

marks [1] 20/15 marshal [1] 161/8 **Martin [1]** 107/7 masking [1] 157/5 mate [1] 113/8 material [4] 25/23 53/1 105/24 137/23 materiality [6] 24/19 33/18 35/7 35/9 35/13 35/21 materially [3] 12/24 142/3 146/17 matter [8] 11/14 21/12 75/13 95/15 107/11 115/6 146/5 149/8 mattered [1] 39/3 matters [3] 87/4 136/14 157/19 may [47] 1/1 1/5 3/14 3/14 6/2 7/9 15/16 20/5 26/19 28/9 28/11 28/15 29/21 34/15 43/9 43/12 43/13 43/16 49/4 56/23 64/24 66/22 68/15 70/5 79/20 79/21 83/17 85/3 85/19 85/25 103/24 104/1 116/13 138/19 140/21 measured [2] 118/7 141/1 141/14 142/3 146/2 146/17 146/21 148/15 149/14 154/19 130/7 130/9 **May 2015 [1]** 116/13 May 2023 [1] 6/2 maybe [4] 34/18 56/25 72/10 111/20 McCormack [6] 17/16 20/23 21/9 21/10 76/5 77/5 me [78] 4/17 9/1 20/24 21/4 22/20 22/21 26/11 28/16 29/10 33/7 34/6 34/10 meet [1] 115/20 37/14 42/2 44/21 45/17 49/5 51/14 57/11 58/19 58/22 58/22 58/23 60/12 60/14 60/18 60/19 60/19 61/7 63/5 65/8 66/5 75/7 78/7 78/15 79/17 79/19 81/25 82/4 83/9 85/5 85/11 86/8 89/15 92/11 96/12 96/22 98/2 98/6 membership [1] 101/1 103/17 103/18 106/11 107/17 108/2 108/3 108/10 108/10 108/18 108/21 121/19 122/7 124/8 124/24 125/21 126/15 128/2 128/13 129/3 129/22 131/8 135/6 139/17

145/15 147/16 148/15 149/13 162/16 mean [48] 10/24 11/24 22/14 27/15 29/9 29/10 29/17 34/12 35/1 41/3 41/23 47/17 47/18 53/7 54/6 60/21 70/25 72/5 74/23 79/16 86/17 97/14 100/16 103/10 105/16 106/9 106/11 110/10 113/2 114/3 116/22 118/16 120/10 125/24 126/17 126/18 128/5 130/7 130/11 132/3 132/24 132/25 134/11 148/17 148/24 156/14 160/24 161/7 meaning [2] 34/24 110/22 meaningfully [1] 127/6 means [3] 28/23 117/1 117/21 meant [6] 33/6 77/13 97/18 149/16 156/10 156/11 meantime [2] 135/1 158/21 118/9 measures [3] 64/9 157/17 160/21 164/10 measuring [1] 115/4 media [8] 17/13 27/23 30/13 86/19 86/21 87/20 88/22 141/18 mediation [10] 36/14 39/24 40/24 41/20 43/3 54/22 67/1 102/20 111/10 136/15 medical [1] 6/2 medium [1] 35/12 meeting [5] 53/10 67/5 88/9 93/14 139/13 meetings [3] 27/9 103/12 103/14 member [6] 4/9 75/18 107/8 110/17 116/14 145/19 members [4] 123/2 141/11 147/6 150/18 141/5 memories [1] 13/18 memory [10] 13/17 48/12 51/13 54/6 54/6 66/4 84/6 92/1 116/8 140/9 mentality [1] 38/12 mention [2] 11/17

М mention... [1] 97/5 mentioned [4] 112/20 127/9 159/20 163/1 mentioning [1] 137/2 merely [1] 71/10 merits [1] 47/10 met [1] 82/8 Michael [2] 65/5 65/24 mid [5] 27/6 27/8 74/4 89/13 133/16 mid-'19 [1] 89/13 mid-2013 [1] 74/4 mid-2017 [1] 133/16 mid-2020 [1] 27/6 mid-to [1] 27/8 middle [3] 75/16 111/24 128/15 might [39] 4/12 10/21 13/9 32/19 34/12 35/18 37/21 42/2 42/25 43/4 43/16 45/9 48/5 54/25 55/12 62/10 73/7 87/5 87/5 87/7 87/8 92/13 93/9 95/11 99/3 109/18 111/2 112/11 114/1 114/6 118/8 118/24 132/19 132/20 144/4 146/10 147/14 156/1 157/7 million [10] 42/10 43/23 54/24 72/2 79/7 122/12 122/12 123/21 133/6 133/6 millions [4] 34/2 35/15 43/23 133/4 Milton [5] 23/5 89/11 92/6 92/7 94/9 mind [6] 20/10 24/17 45/20 49/1 104/20 158/20 minded [1] 61/8 mindful [1] 73/5 mindset [4] 54/2 54/4 56/4 163/9 minister [1] 112/20 minor [1] 25/4 minutes [8] 27/3 62/8 62/15 126/15 143/22 144/2 144/3 144/6 misbooked [1] 91/16 misbooking [1] 89/20 miscarriage [8] 14/16 29/15 36/11 36/21 36/23 52/24 53/5 53/23 miscarriages [8] 4/7 19/3 43/14 43/15 43/17 53/14 60/1 63/8 150/25 160/6

misfunctioning [2] 128/25 130/4 misposting [1] 22/24 misremming [1] 89/20 missing [1] 20/5 mission [1] 60/10 mistake [1] 78/12 mistakes [1] 84/22 mistresses [2] 146/3 150/10 mitigation [1] 130/8 mobile [1] 88/7 modern [1] 71/25 moment [6] 44/22 44/24 45/3 99/17 121/12 133/5 **Monday [1]** 39/1 money [54] 14/19 20/5 28/2 39/14 40/18 50/10 53/3 54/1 54/14 MP [4] 84/13 85/14 78/23 90/1 90/24 91/8 101/25 102/23 107/15 MPs [1] 86/16 108/1 108/11 109/9 109/16 109/18 109/21 109/22 110/12 110/14 110/15 111/4 123/23 123/24 124/2 124/3 130/1 131/15 133/4 133/8 133/8 134/14 143/4 149/20 149/24 150/6 153/11 153/16 154/18 155/6 155/11 155/20 156/18 160/7 160/11 160/13 160/15 161/12 161/20 money' [1] 20/8 monies [1] 157/12 month [1] 96/9 monthly [1] 131/9 months [10] 7/18 8/4 22/24 55/21 78/18 108/12 116/16 121/18 140/9 151/19 more [61] 7/1 9/15 13/24 19/18 25/3 26/14 27/5 27/13 30/15 30/20 34/20 34/21 38/18 38/20 43/9 43/17 45/9 45/10 Mr Cameron [20] 1/9 46/13 50/20 61/9 66/3 69/16 71/11 71/25 72/6 72/16 74/21 76/8 95/7 98/23 101/7 101/24 102/7 103/24 103/25 104/1 104/17 105/19 109/7 112/12 116/8 122/25 123/23 123/23 123/25 124/3 124/4 124/21 124/21 124/25 125/14 129/14 130/12 139/4 143/6 145/21 146/23 147/2

Moreover [1] 96/9 morning [10] 1/3 1/9 7/9 21/8 52/5 52/12 57/7 57/10 84/14 93/24 most [4] 70/23 101/2 139/15 144/7 motivations [1] 36/13 move [13] 36/8 36/17 40/2 40/16 40/25 67/10 75/15 77/18 84/9 89/5 93/3 100/5 105/3 moved [7] 11/14 11/21 14/18 19/8 39/12 50/4 50/14 moves [1] 93/8 moving [4] 33/9 39/5 93/20 133/5 87/2 112/9 **MR [63]** 1/8 1/9 2/17 3/25 4/18 11/17 11/18 82/8 11/18 13/11 21/9 21/10 22/18 47/1 47/12 48/5 52/8 52/14 57/11 61/23 62/20 74/5 76/5 85/21 94/8 94/10 94/11 94/13 95/12 101/15 102/6 102/10 103/8 110/1 111/25 112/2 114/15 116/11 127/23 143/17 143/20 144/24 145/2 145/13 146/1 146/2 146/2 146/6 152/17 152/22 156/23 157/1 157/17 160/16 160/20 161/2 162/17 163/3 163/11 163/17 163/19 112/18 116/21 119/3 163/22 165/4 165/8 Mr Aujard [4] 101/15 102/6 102/10 103/8 Mr Barfoot [1] 110/1 **MR BEER [7]** 1/8 2/17 57/11 146/6 152/22 163/19 165/4 3/25 4/18 52/8 52/14 61/23 62/20 94/8 114/15 127/23 143/17 146/2 157/1 157/17 160/16 160/20 161/2 162/17 163/17 163/22 Mr Davies [1] 111/25 Mr Foat [4] 11/18 94/10 94/11 95/12 Mr Foat's [1] 94/13 Mr Goodman's [1] 116/11 Mr Hayward [1] 112/2

Mr Hipperson [1] 85/21 **Mr Ismay [2]** 145/2 145/13 **Mr Jenkins [1]** 74/5 Mr Justice [8] 13/11 22/18 47/1 47/12 152/17 156/23 163/3 163/11 Mr McCormack [3] 21/9 21/10 76/5 Mr Read [1] 11/17 Mr Rod [1] 144/24 **Mr Sam [1]** 146/2 Mr Stein [3] 143/20 146/1 165/8 **Mr Taylor [1]** 11/18 **Ms [18]** 55/25 57/15 58/4 61/6 65/6 65/21 76/4 79/1 79/24 81/15 82/8 82/25 85/16 108/16 109/13 144/10 164/3 165/6 Ms Kaur [2] 81/15 **Ms Lyons [1]** 164/3 **Ms van [2]** 79/24 82/25 Ms Vennells [8] 55/25 58/4 61/6 65/6 76/4 79/1 108/16 109/13 Ms Vennells' [1] 57/15 much [42] 1/4 4/8 4/18 11/14 13/7 14/2 18/1 21/20 27/18 28/12 29/3 34/20 37/7 43/8 50/8 52/4 52/8 58/25 59/16 61/9 85/11 86/8 92/1 92/11 120/2 123/19 124/4 124/19 130/12 139/25 narrow [3] 101/25 140/8 143/17 145/3 145/4 145/14 151/15 160/9 163/25 164/6 muddle [1] 92/14 must [16] 12/16 14/1 14/2 28/4 28/18 29/19 nearly [2] 17/19 30/12 55/16 55/18 70/2 80/23 80/25 121/17 131/13 143/2 159/14 mute [1] 148/11 my [116] 1/9 2/3 4/14 13/4 13/15 13/17 13/21 19/5 23/9 23/22 13/23 13/24 37/22 26/16 26/18 28/15 29/20 29/21 29/22 31/22 33/7 34/5 36/2 115/6 120/21 124/6 37/5 41/7 44/9 45/19 135/11 135/13 135/17 45/22 46/6 47/15 135/19 144/4 144/8 48/12 49/7 49/19

50/16 51/13 51/18 53/10 53/11 54/6 54/6 64/3 64/13 66/4 66/19 67/5 67/11 67/18 68/1 68/5 70/5 74/13 74/14 74/24 78/22 81/17 83/8 83/16 86/2 89/18 89/22 90/10 90/25 91/5 91/13 92/1 93/2 93/10 93/13 98/5 98/10 98/11 99/1 99/3 99/17 102/16 107/13 107/15 107/20 108/10 108/11 108/22 109/10 115/11 117/24 119/15 119/24 123/17 125/3 126/21 133/11 135/18 136/19 137/5 137/11 137/20 137/23 138/18 139/6 140/8 140/9 143/11 143/17 144/16 144/16 145/24 148/19 148/21 148/25 149/1 149/22 152/1 153/1 154/1 154/1 154/8 155/1 156/5 158/5 159/5 myself [5] 13/22 56/7 59/1 71/9 135/9

nagged [1] 91/12 name [3] 1/9 1/11 116/11 namely [1] 143/20 narrative [15] 7/11 7/16 10/12 10/24 11/11 11/13 13/21 13/24 14/3 26/13 40/5 40/19 40/20 40/22 41/1 narratives [4] 30/13 31/18 31/23 39/21 102/8 103/7 **nature [2]** 46/15 60/24 near [2] 130/24 134/24 143/25 necessarily [2] 16/22 68/22 necessary [6] 5/4 101/24 102/7 105/25 125/5 130/17 need [27] 4/2 8/13 49/24 70/10 72/24 75/1 75/5 80/5 80/7 91/17 101/19 107/11

Ν need... [3] 147/1 147/19 148/11 161/17 needed [10] 63/6 63/21 97/21 101/7 108/4 124/9 124/13 145/4 145/17 148/7 needn't [1] 3/17 needs [1] 65/12 negatives [1] 36/5 **neglected** [1] 37/17 Neil [2] 66/18 112/1 nerve [1] 147/13 Network [7] 22/22 23/16 64/6 87/13 87/17 117/18 132/18 **Neuberger** [1] 49/3 neutrally [1] 152/19 never [38] 9/4 9/6 10/16 11/14 21/1 25/5 27/24 31/5 33/15 36/15 37/13 37/20 42/10 43/24 53/10 60/14 60/16 63/8 82/8 83/2 83/4 83/5 91/20 103/11 118/21 125/10 129/17 130/21 130/23 132/6 133/18 134/23 135/2 135/23 135/25 136/5 155/22 155/25 Neville [1] 136/14 157/6 Neville-Rolfe [1] 136/14 new [24] 40/1 48/25 54/2 57/2 62/6 63/17 70/8 70/17 70/20 71/23 88/3 88/20 93/7 96/8 97/1 98/9 103/5 105/20 106/20 112/7 134/21 139/14 140/9 145/5 news [2] 92/11 112/7 next [10] 29/1 57/18 61/12 68/7 68/8 80/3 81/6 97/23 115/17 153/4 not [174] NFSP [24] 37/5 125/3 125/21 139/6 139/10 139/14 139/16 139/23 140/5 140/5 140/8 141/1 141/12 142/7 142/23 143/12 146/7 146/13 146/23 147/4 147/15 147/18 148/2 148/6 **NFSP's [2]** 139/15 139/18 NFSP00001075 [1] 140/10 NFSP00001082 [1] 159/10 142/21 November '18 [1] Nick [17] 8/7 9/2 9/20

51/11 51/24 90/18 23/15 23/16 28/2 92/25 93/14 98/18 29/21 38/10 50/18 128/13 159/1 161/6 52/6 55/23 56/3 57/2 night [1] 57/3 Nisha [1] 81/12 no [79] 2/23 4/2 4/7 10/17 11/13 11/16 11/20 12/23 13/4 22/3 23/12 27/9 27/15 28/4 30/12 31/21 32/20 33/6 37/15 37/25 38/2 38/17 39/2 41/23 44/25 44/25 44/25 46/18 52/1 52/3 53/14 number [12] 13/7 63/1 67/16 68/3 70/25 72/5 72/7 74/1 74/8 78/7 82/5 82/7 82/9 83/6 84/19 85/8 89/19 95/20 97/11 101/24 102/7 103/10 104/16 106/10 108/7 110/17 114/3 115/14 120/21 124/6 126/2 126/12 126/19 127/16 136/1 136/3 139/4 152/4 152/6 153/18 154/15 155/24 156/22 159/11 159/24 160/2 160/22 162/10 163/15 nobody [2] 38/6 nodded [1] 88/19 nods [1] 144/5 noise [5] 67/4 91/23 92/1 92/11 92/16 non [4] 123/15 128/25 130/3 144/5 non-functioning [2] 128/25 130/3 non-staff [1] 123/15 non-verbal [1] 144/5 none [2] 59/9 158/24 nor [2] 26/20 127/6 Norton [4] 94/20 94/22 95/3 95/14 notable [1] 83/9 **note** [5] 57/12 87/22 88/12 88/23 89/13 nothing [7] 26/10 37/23 38/15 53/9 67/9 98/1 139/25 notice [1] 37/10 noticed [1] 43/7 November [17] 7/5 7/12 7/21 8/17 15/14 16/4 17/20 18/2 53/17 57/21 58/3 59/21 60/3 61/3 61/3 89/13

58/3

now [47] 4/3 15/11

9/24 10/6 13/11 29/10

62/12 66/9 75/4 76/11 77/1 80/15 85/22 86/5 125/25 126/4 133/5 89/19 97/12 105/6 108/12 120/11 121/19 58/25 115/6 129/24 128/3 132/2 132/17 132/24 133/7 140/1 148/4 148/4 148/7 149/8 149/13 150/9 151/22 152/15 153/13 oiled [1] 101/17 154/9 154/20 157/8 157/9 157/9 163/16 18/16 24/14 55/23 63/19 78/6 83/22 110/2 121/20 130/19 144/12 146/3 number 2 [1] 18/16 **numbers** [1] 13/6 objective [1] 25/5 objectives [1] 115/20 observations [1] 53/11 obvious [4] 29/19 75/7 126/18 130/3 obviously [21] 11/24 30/14 32/6 42/9 43/20 53/18 54/13 56/3 60/5 67/4 71/8 77/6 79/20 97/9 97/13 121/14 129/2 133/7 144/3 149/2 161/2 occasion [1] 66/8 occasions [4] 21/2 130/19 150/12 160/14 occur [1] 151/9 occurred [3] 37/21 81/1 153/13 occurring [1] 153/14 October [3] 54/8 69/20 73/20 October 2018 [1] 54/8 odd [4] 72/10 92/23 92/23 129/23 off [17] 12/6 47/2 57/23 62/8 78/19 85/12 94/8 109/3 113/7 117/23 135/14 135/16 153/17 154/16 154/19 155/15 160/4 office [186] office' [1] 63/20 Office's [13] 4/11 17/4 61/16 63/15 64/20 94/9 100/15 120/23 121/10 123/8 141/3 141/24 152/10 Officer [5] 5/12 5/17 5/22 5/25 51/24

21/18 21/20 21/21 21/22 34/18 60/11 84/4 92/13 125/19 often [5] 20/22 38/1 oh [11] 75/23 103/16 118/23 121/22 122/20 Ooh [1] 2/21 125/20 126/20 128/15 138/9 143/22 148/24 **okay [38]** 3/7 3/10 5/3 5/6 16/3 58/21 66/12 68/10 68/12 68/14 69/16 71/13 90/13 95/12 99/11 99/16 100/5 101/8 106/8 109/24 112/16 134/3 137/14 137/16 137/20 142/16 149/12 149/13 149/23 152/14 153/4 153/24 157/8 159/20 160/3 160/5 161/18 162/24 old [5] 37/11 37/17 63/14 63/21 113/8 older [1] 37/24 on [232] once [6] 20/1 35/21 51/13 92/2 96/7 109/6 131/8 one [83] 1/20 1/22 1/23 1/25 2/17 19/12 25/4 25/14 25/18 31/22 32/20 35/10 37/25 38/2 41/9 42/2 43/24 45/18 46/16 47/4 47/10 57/19 60/12 64/15 67/25 68/1 68/3 70/16 70/25 60/19 72/5 72/7 75/9 78/7 88/25 95/5 95/19 96/13 97/24 103/10 103/14 106/10 108/22 option [1] 22/1 109/3 110/24 111/8 113/3 113/19 115/3 118/8 121/11 121/12 121/18 122/13 123/12 125/20 126/20 132/19 132/20 134/15 142/13 143/19 145/19 145/22 148/22 152/14 153/25 157/20 159/10 159/14 160/22 161/7 161/8 162/10 162/24 163/15 one-off [1] 109/3 onerous [1] 143/7 ones [2] 158/17 160/8 ongoing [2] 26/19 29/2 **online [1]** 106/15

offices [13] 16/18

only [13] 44/14 56/24 60/21 85/8 86/23 95/19 98/12 118/25 126/3 142/6 143/24 147/20 156/17 onto [2] 78/3 129/17 onwards [2] 6/19 61/18 open [12] 16/22 17/18 24/17 60/11 82/4 82/9 93/21 103/13 103/24 104/2 132/1 162/2 opening [1] 89/2 openly [1] 130/13 operated [6] 34/12 88/4 105/15 105/16 106/14 145/7 **operating [5]** 5/17 34/14 35/12 64/1 84/17 operation [3] 100/14 159/9 160/18 operational [6] 64/7 87/13 87/18 121/18 131/10 144/19 operations [8] 22/22 23/16 38/21 66/4 91/10 91/24 105/19 operator [1] 88/6 **Operators [2]** 140/23 141/2 opine [1] 131/23 36/3 36/4 37/11 37/16 opinion [2] 141/7 162/4 opportunistic [1] 40/13 opportunity [2] 4/17 oppose [1] 26/25 82/13 84/20 85/4 85/4 opposite [1] 48/3 **Ops [1]** 131/6 optics [1] 46/3 or [146] 1/22 7/20 11/18 11/18 12/1 13/17 20/6 20/16 21/8 22/11 24/17 25/4 25/9 26/3 27/24 28/2 30/13 32/11 32/20 33/15 34/13 38/1 40/15 41/1 42/18 46/15 49/8 51/25 52/2 53/11 54/10 54/11 55/12 55/17 55/24 56/13 56/17 56/17 56/20 56/25 59/7 63/2 64/6 66/13 68/4 68/7 68/17 69/8 71/10 71/17 72/2 73/7 73/7 74/2 74/2 75/3 79/15 80/24 80/25 81/12 82/20

155/9 156/18 160/24 76/13 76/18 0 Overwhelmingly [1] Page 42 [1] 1/25 ought [2] 27/18 130/4 58/15 page 5 [1] 77/19 paragraph 5.3 [1] or... [85] 82/24 83/5 owe [2] 155/10 our [38] 14/3 15/18 Page 67 [1] 2/9 142/20 85/6 87/13 90/1 90/24 20/22 24/25 29/1 31/6 156/18 page 7 [1] 52/16 paragraph 56 [2] 91/8 91/18 91/24 32/9 32/17 35/15 owed [1] 155/8 page 71 [1] 3/4 126/23 126/24 93/20 96/21 98/9 page 86 [1] 3/12 39/13 44/4 44/5 45/2 owes [1] 20/7 paragraph 6 [5] 4/1 98/17 99/23 100/16 48/10 48/23 51/7 59/8 own [9] 12/15 31/6 pages [3] 1/15 7/7 61/21 62/4 62/21 104/7 104/10 106/10 36/19 93/2 117/17 59/9 73/8 78/1 78/2 124/7 7/7 108/10 108/22 109/21 78/20 84/14 84/19 118/12 123/3 123/20 paid [8] 107/13 paragraphs [5] 20/21 110/5 110/19 111/14 87/25 89/25 90/4 90/5 153/17 154/13 154/18 52/17 63/11 64/18 124/20 111/16 112/3 113/11 90/22 93/14 95/24 owned [2] 70/25 154/19 154/22 155/13 140/18 114/16 116/6 116/16 95/25 102/2 102/3 117/18 161/13 paragraphs 94 [1] 116/18 116/23 117/20 121/23 121/24 135/11 painfully [1] 46/22 63/11 117/20 118/15 122/2 136/24 paper [5] 10/4 10/11 Parker [3] 49/20 125/23 128/10 128/23 **PA [1]** 101/17 ours [2] 23/16 47/20 13/15 120/15 122/1 136/11 137/21 128/23 128/25 130/2 ourselves [5] 12/17 **PACE [1]** 135/7 papers [1] 159/6 Parliament [1] 130/3 130/8 130/9 14/18 39/12 69/13 pack [2] 111/19 para [1] 3/9 112/22 130/17 130/21 131/20 154/1 Parliamentary [1] 71/10 para 292 [1] 3/9 134/18 134/20 134/23 package [1] 133/24 out [51] 1/22 7/16 paragraph [44] 2/1 112/5 135/21 136/6 136/16 9/14 14/6 15/9 16/22 page [84] 1/25 2/1 2/9 2/22 3/13 4/1 8/12 part [19] 29/12 29/22 137/2 137/3 138/10 2/9 2/10 2/16 2/24 3/4 10/2 12/5 19/20 29/1 33/7 34/6 42/4 66/16 18/12 19/10 20/24 138/18 139/9 140/21 3/12 3/12 3/18 6/25 30/14 30/15 37/4 37/9 31/3 39/18 45/14 50/5 71/5 73/8 106/5 141/13 141/16 141/17 8/10 10/3 16/3 18/5 37/19 39/10 40/1 52/20 53/20 61/21 119/17 122/8 127/10 141/18 141/20 141/21 18/24 20/20 20/20 45/12 48/8 64/13 62/4 62/21 64/2 64/15 130/25 133/24 134/9 141/23 141/25 142/2 70/10 72/14 72/20 23/7 32/8 36/24 44/7 65/9 76/13 76/17 136/24 142/6 148/1 143/15 146/14 146/16 74/13 80/24 81/16 50/5 52/16 57/22 76/18 97/23 100/8 156/15 147/6 150/16 151/6 61/21 62/3 62/21 84/3 91/15 91/18 96/5 100/10 100/19 101/3 partial [1] 33/13 151/16 151/16 152/10 63/10 64/2 65/2 65/20 103/23 105/4 115/21 99/24 103/10 106/17 Participant [1] 154/6 154/11 154/21 69/19 69/23 75/17 120/22 124/7 126/23 111/10 115/22 118/22 143/20 155/25 159/16 160/23 76/13 76/18 77/19 120/16 121/4 123/21 126/24 127/12 136/9 Participants [2] 57/9 162/12 78/10 78/25 79/1 125/2 125/3 126/16 136/9 139/7 142/17 143/22 Oracle [2] 37/13 79/23 79/23 80/3 143/5 148/14 150/21 142/20 144/14 participation [1] 37/13 151/18 152/2 153/2 80/10 80/13 80/13 163/25 paragraph 111 [1] order [3] 62/6 111/15 156/10 156/11 160/10 80/19 81/10 81/15 105/4 particular [13] 18/11 152/12 81/23 84/9 86/7 86/10 160/15 paragraph 159 [2] 61/17 67/25 86/16 organisation [3] 94/12 94/13 94/16 outcome [3] 79/10 100/8 100/10 106/24 114/17 117/22 38/19 128/8 147/24 100/9 100/19 101/3 118/18 129/8 138/18 81/2 81/3 paragraph 162 [1] organisations [1] 103/20 105/5 107/5 outcomes [3] 25/3 100/19 150/15 151/4 151/11 17/14 107/6 108/14 108/15 99/25 127/7 particularly [12] paragraph 165 [1] organise [2] 141/21 108/24 108/25 111/25 11/10 15/2 18/25 output [1] 136/5 101/3 141/24 116/9 116/10 116/19 outside [1] 92/22 paragraph 177 [1] 41/14 43/7 53/12 56/2 Organising [2] 117/13 119/3 126/23 outward [1] 47/12 2/1 64/20 75/7 95/5 95/9 141/20 141/23 126/24 131/2 131/3 over [44] 2/16 2/24 131/14 paragraph 191 [1] original [5] 14/15 11/14 14/13 18/5 20/2 131/4 139/8 139/9 144/14 parties [5] 12/8 42/15 15/15 16/6 36/10 140/17 144/10 165/6 20/3 20/20 23/7 25/19 119/21 132/21 140/20 paragraph 2 [1] 31/3 36/13 32/8 32/22 36/24 44/7 page 1 [5] 80/13 partly [2] 28/11 135/9 paragraph 2.1 [1] originally [1] 142/22 81/15 86/10 94/16 45/25 52/16 55/20 partner [3] 6/6 6/11 115/21 other [27] 10/24 103/20 68/6 68/7 68/20 68/21 paragraph 2.1.8 [1] 58/23 18/12 24/25 36/16 78/9 79/18 80/19 83/9 page 10 [1] 140/17 142/17 partners [1] 125/18 37/15 39/9 41/10 83/10 86/17 91/12 page 101 [1] 10/3 paragraph 279 [1] parts [2] 128/20 65/25 67/15 77/25 page 105 [3] 64/2 91/22 99/10 100/19 2/9 142/18 90/11 92/13 92/17 76/13 76/18 101/14 108/12 115/23 party [10] 27/4 33/18 paragraph 338 [1] 98/9 110/23 120/4 118/14 122/11 124/14 page 115 [1] 3/18 3/13 63/17 125/12 127/10 127/20 133/2 142/2 page 128 [1] 105/5 127/22 132/21 149/3 129/11 141/17 141/20 paragraph 37 [2] 144/6 146/4 146/16 page 13 [1] 126/23 159/16 162/3 162/7 136/9 136/9 141/23 141/25 153/2 155/25 156/25 page 2 [10] 61/21 162/9 pass [1] 156/23 paragraph 386 [1] 161/12 163/12 62/3 62/21 80/10 over-reliant [2] 14/13 120/22 passage [1] 23/20 others [9] 10/12 81/10 86/7 108/25 25/19 passed [1] 108/7 paragraph 387 [1] 12/17 26/13 65/4 69/4 116/19 119/3 131/4 Overall [1] 149/18 past [7] 12/7 21/19 10/2 71/18 100/13 118/9 page 23 [1] 63/10 overblown [1] 16/9 32/4 32/5 65/16 75/13 paragraph 404 [1] 160/18 page 3 [4] 79/23 **overcome** [1] 13/23 64/2 145/8 others's [1] 44/12 108/14 108/15 131/3 Overnight [1] 80/22 path [1] 50/4 paragraph 405 [2] otherwise [7] 98/2 page 38 [1] 100/9 overturned [2] 13/6 64/15 139/7 Patrick [1] 94/25 114/3 144/3 150/6 page 4 [2] 78/25 84/9 28/4 paragraph 406 [2] pattern [2] 68/19

121/11 122/13 124/16 possibility [1] 36/22 P perfect [1] 118/6 **piggy [1]** 153/8 130/21 130/24 145/20 possible [9] 58/18 **perfectly [3]** 36/7 piling [1] 162/11 pattern... [1] 68/23 pitfalls [1] 45/11 92/25 93/1 146/15 147/14 149/15 60/13 85/10 86/9 Paula [38] 7/17 20/24 place [9] 2/3 13/20 perform [2] 75/24 150/1 151/14 151/25 92/25 93/1 102/11 41/3 41/5 41/9 41/15 86/14 25/23 44/9 45/12 152/7 152/10 152/13 137/3 161/9 41/17 41/17 45/7 63/18 108/1 116/14 155/17 post [206] performance [5] 45/15 45/22 52/24 60/22 122/24 127/6 points [6] 32/22 156/1 post-balance [1] 53/4 53/24 56/21 57/3 127/14 131/10 placed [2] 110/3 34/24 44/3 52/14 129/14 58/12 59/1 60/6 61/11 performed [1] 82/2 125/6 106/2 128/22 postmaster [33] 8/14 65/3 65/22 66/5 66/18 perhaps [3] 62/12 **POL [1]** 144/16 20/3 20/6 20/7 23/2 places [5] 13/17 67/5 68/24 75/3 77/20 126/22 129/20 17/11 38/22 55/23 **POL's [1]** 70/21 24/20 35/17 35/18 83/12 85/19 107/6 period [8] 17/23 56/20 69/6 69/6 85/4 88/1 POL00021446 [1] 107/10 110/10 110/22 20/10 32/7 79/18 plainly [1] 129/1 2/13 88/2 88/10 88/17 89/2 111/25 112/6 131/25 91/22 115/23 121/15 105/18 106/14 106/20 **plans [1]** 58/14 POL00027728 [1] 132/11 130/14 played [2] 47/17 107/5 106/25 110/15 121/5 Paula's [2] 56/3 76/4 periods [2] 51/21 111/10 POL00030012 [1] 121/9 123/16 126/15 pause [1] 103/3 plea [2] 31/20 31/21 134/9 134/13 136/15 105/17 75/16 pay [15] 25/3 81/7 permanent [2] 55/2 please [104] 1/5 1/11 POL00102249 [1] 154/9 154/10 155/9 89/16 108/9 110/19 1/15 1/19 1/25 2/7 155/13 156/17 96/7 65/1 121/15 147/3 147/18 2/16 3/12 3/18 4/3 5/7 **POL00152283 [1]** permission [2] 54/14 postmaster's [3] 148/8 148/25 152/19 6/24 7/1 8/11 10/3 90/10 111/24 23/15 88/5 155/10 153/5 153/11 155/18 persist [2] 20/10 12/3 18/5 19/6 20/20 POL00163587 [1] postmasters [68] 4/9 155/19 53/16 23/8 32/8 32/23 36/24 84/9 4/13 12/9 12/12 13/25 payable [1] 107/14 37/3 45/14 52/6 52/15 POL00174666 [1] persisted [1] 17/23 14/10 15/19 16/13 paying [7] 110/19 52/16 52/22 53/20 16/22 19/14 19/25 person [14] 83/2 81/9 143/4 148/13 148/16 22/1 23/17 24/11 83/7 85/1 86/19 86/21 56/23 57/12 61/15 POL00175235 [3] 154/11 154/16 156/7 61/20 61/22 62/4 24/17 24/21 24/23 86/22 87/20 98/9 6/25 12/5 52/16 payment [4] 107/17 62/15 62/22 63/10 25/2 25/23 28/5 29/11 100/21 100/24 101/2 POL00218942 [1] 107/18 107/19 107/23 103/22 110/4 118/12 65/1 65/2 69/20 70/15 101/11 30/2 31/12 31/15 pays [2] 154/9 personal [5] 13/16 POL00233291 [1] 70/18 75/15 75/17 31/21 38/12 44/6 154/10 77/18 77/19 78/10 45/19 47/22 54/21 51/21 60/9 123/4 69/19 **pdf** [1] 56/24 POL00244301 [1] 162/4 78/25 79/23 80/3 63/2 63/5 77/3 84/3 peak [1] 122/11 personally [5] 65/11 80/12 81/9 81/11 90/2 90/24 91/15 77/18 peculiar [2] 128/2 POL00249527 [1] 68/24 108/23 109/2 81/23 84/9 84/10 102/25 105/8 105/20 143/14 112/13 85/13 85/17 85/18 131/2 111/10 119/9 119/16 peddling [1] 41/1 85/22 85/24 86/5 119/21 120/13 120/18 perspective [1] POL00280270 [1] penalise [1] 96/11 86/12 87/11 89/23 121/2 122/3 123/17 50/22 89/5 pensions [1] 153/8 93/24 93/25 94/16 123/23 124/5 124/8 perspectives [1] POL00280603 [1] **Penton [2]** 85/14 100/9 101/10 101/11 13/25 124/13 124/18 125/15 99/19 87/12 101/12 105/3 105/5 **persuade** [1] 143/13 POL00284503 [1] 125/22 126/2 126/4 penultimate [1] 50/5 **Peter [1]** 116/13 107/3 107/5 108/13 99/19 126/19 127/7 127/8 people [58] 10/24 petitions [1] 141/21 108/14 108/21 109/2 POL00327569 [1] 146/3 147/6 147/17 11/17 17/15 21/11 Phase [3] 4/20 4/22 109/12 110/4 111/25 147/21 147/22 148/2 94/12 30/16 31/19 31/23 114/7 114/17 116/10 5/1 POL00327575 [1] 153/23 36/18 36/25 37/20 Phase 5 [1] 4/20 116/19 117/13 119/3 99/19 postmasters/mistres 38/1 38/19 38/25 40/7 119/5 122/17 131/2 Phase 7 [2] 4/22 5/1 POL00354059 [1] ses [1] 146/3 40/11 45/24 54/20 phenomenally [1] 131/3 131/3 131/7 114/19 postmistress [1] 56/16 58/7 60/2 67/15 72/9 136/8 136/9 139/6 police [1] 31/7 82/12 67/24 68/25 70/12 phone [3] 88/11 139/7 139/8 140/10 policies [2] 141/4 postponement [3] 73/5 74/20 74/21 107/19 108/5 140/17 141/16 14/20 39/15 50/10 79/16 83/18 83/20 phoned [1] 82/7 pleased [2] 162/9 policy [1] 96/20 posturing [2] 47/4 83/21 83/22 87/6 phones [1] 34/3 162/9 political [2] 134/20 47/13 87/11 87/13 87/14 **phoning [1]** 108/3 plus [2] 77/3 78/1 141/18 potential [5] 78/17 91/10 91/14 93/7 **politically [1]** 111/14 98/4 127/7 155/4 phrase [2] 125/10 **pm [5]** 94/3 94/5 95/13 110/25 112/3 132/17 114/10 114/12 164/8 **politicians [3]** 111/15 157/5 115/6 120/4 121/15 phrases [1] 110/24 point [44] 9/10 16/10 111/16 112/14 potentially [3] 95/18 121/18 124/21 125/14 16/21 19/16 22/15 physical [1] 63/21 poor [2] 106/18 95/23 116/7 128/18 131/9 135/7 pick [4] 52/14 93/23 28/8 34/21 34/22 35/9 107/1 pouch [2] 78/2 78/6 144/19 145/5 145/18 94/8 163/8 37/11 48/12 75/9 position [10] 45/2 **pounds [2]** 43/23 146/4 148/18 153/7 picked [2] 78/4 91/18 76/21 77/11 87/6 93/1 48/10 48/23 49/11 133/4 156/13 93/10 96/5 103/3 50/24 68/4 71/11 80/1 picture [2] 33/17 power [2] 14/11 people's [2] 59/13 114/16 103/7 104/15 105/16 98/13 155/17 19/15 161/20 106/6 110/5 115/11 **piece [3]** 40/16 **positions** [1] 36/19 praised [1] 21/4 per [1] 118/22 117/14 119/13 120/13 positive [1] 41/14 106/19 114/24 **preceded [1]** 158/16

(61) pattern... - preceded

10/20 43/16 53/3 94/25 107/8 163/7 163/24 P **probably [25]** 17/9 18/4 23/2 40/21 41/2 **promptly [1]** 101/18 110/17 133/4 139/17 quicker [1] 29/24 precipitated [1] quickly [3] 49/3 72/5 45/16 50/20 54/1 55/3 **proof [2]** 85/8 158/24 140/6 141/14 141/21 43/25 61/12 68/2 72/17 proper [7] 9/8 17/2 142/8 142/24 143/5 91/11 precise [2] 27/5 74/20 84/4 86/17 40/15 124/18 158/3 publicly [2] 13/10 quid [2] 35/18 54/24 27/13 quietly [1] 72/21 92/23 92/24 99/13 158/14 158/19 141/6 **precisely [3]** 76/19 113/2 114/4 115/10 quite [17] 17/10 properly [19] 17/1 published [2] 8/20 102/18 125/11 117/1 117/5 131/9 24/18 28/17 29/23 22/11 25/10 37/10 48/14 preference [2] 137/22 33/11 33/25 34/14 pull [2] 34/4 37/19 54/7 67/23 69/4 75/2 133/11 134/5 problem [29] 29/20 69/10 72/13 73/6 78/9 91/22 97/4 100/4 purchase [1] 154/21 preferred [1] 71/14 29/24 31/22 34/11 74/15 78/3 80/9 82/23 103/3 103/15 124/17 purely [1] 54/17 preparation [3] 37/13 45/1 51/16 83/19 93/12 118/15 **purported** [1] 82/5 129/24 155/12 133/21 136/17 136/25 **purpose [6]** 8/11 9/9 51/16 69/15 76/15 132/8 157/6 **quotation [1]** 20/15 **prepare [1]** 113/21 77/2 78/7 78/18 81/4 proposals [1] 135/20 13/15 114/22 115/15 **quote [1]** 39/7 prepared [3] 84/3 91/13 91/25 103/4 **proposed [2]** 73/10 129/22 138/21 142/17 R 104/7 104/11 115/1 140/1 purposes [1] 138/22 preparing [2] 106/6 154/24 158/7 158/13 raiding [1] 153/8 proposes [1] 142/17 pursued [1] 48/20 113/18 158/18 158/25 159/12 proposition [2] raise [2] 108/4 push [4] 4/10 104/10 present [3] 5/24 111/16 159/12 161/25 162/1 101/25 102/8 139/1 147/14 80/20 81/17 raised [4] 23/9 82/13 problem' [1] 85/7 prosecute [3] 31/8 **pushed [6]** 31/19 presented [1] 47/24 99/11 99/21 problems [7] 16/23 31/24 41/5 47/2 49/13 70/12 131/19 **presenting [1]** 115/8 raising [2] 68/16 65/16 68/3 68/17 prosecuted [3] 9/6 103/6 press [2] 66/13 66/17 pushing [3] 40/20 92/19 84/17 88/18 157/5 13/14 30/2 pressure [2] 152/18 procedures [1] 95/25 prosecuting [6] 41/1 51/14 ramped [1] 147/11 153/4 12/13 25/22 30/5 put [14] 1/20 20/15 ran [1] 70/25 process [13] 4/13 presumably [6] 29/4 25/6 31/9 34/8 34/21 25/18 30/7 57/9 63/18 rapid [1] 90/5 74/18 75/11 130/18 81/7 81/8 112/10 70/20 88/5 113/7 rarely [2] 64/3 127/8 40/9 50/17 66/16 71/2 prosecution [2] 135/13 150/1 rather [13] 31/20 90/8 91/19 92/22 25/23 134/7 130/1 134/22 157/12 pretty [3] 97/16 103/2 34/22 41/19 42/1 96/14 prosecutions [22] 159/6 161/25 106/6 52/15 59/20 87/1 90/6 processed [1] 130/2 4/8 14/15 16/20 18/8 **putting [3]** 71/10 prevailed [1] 143/6 119/17 120/12 121/9 26/1 26/7 26/9 29/3 **processes** [2] 28/16 152/18 153/16 prevent [1] 141/15 PVEN00000445 [2] 127/10 131/21 45/21 29/13 31/11 32/6 prevented [1] 122/2 re [2] 48/23 101/20 32/17 36/10 50/9 56/23 57/13 procurement [5] previous [4] 49/2 reach [11] 40/1 40/6 70/23 70/24 71/19 53/22 73/2 73/4 65/20 95/15 129/4 42/5 42/15 42/20 71/21 72/3 120/24 135/2 135/4 previously [1] 96/18 QC [4] 44/10 44/19 54/12 54/23 54/25 procurements [2] 135/8 135/12 primarily [1] 153/22 47/2 50/3 55/2 72/20 106/1 prosecutions' [1] 70/20 71/20 primary [1] 64/5 QCs [1] 48/11 reached [8] 8/22 produced [4] 114/20 31/6 principal [1] 73/21 qualified [1] 96/17 15/23 20/24 29/10 115/12 118/19 139/25 prosecutors [4] principle [2] 21/12 29/11 65/8 86/24 quarter [1] 147/5 product [3] 118/22 26/20 29/3 32/10 21/25 106/4 quarters [1] 125/5 135/21 135/24 36/14 prior [2] 6/4 62/10 queries [3] 100/22 react [1] 93/18 professional [1] protect [1] 90/8 **priorities [2]** 122/23 reaction [3] 44/20 40/15 100/24 101/14 protected [4] 96/24 122/23 profit [17] 25/1 35/19 query [1] 33/4 45/20 68/16 98/17 100/2 100/3 **priorities'** [1] 39/9 question [23] 15/10 reactions [1] 58/14 102/3 117/8 118/17 protection [1] 90/9 prioritise [1] 121/23 26/2 33/6 35/22 42/3 read [27] 3/2 8/7 9/20 119/12 120/1 120/1 protections [1] 97/3 prioritised [2] 24/18 9/24 10/7 11/17 21/16 42/7 45/23 46/12 49/7 120/12 122/9 122/19 protests [1] 141/21 24/25 56/7 66/18 67/7 71/9 30/19 43/8 51/11 122/21 123/3 123/8 **prove [4]** 12/17 36/5 priority [6] 65/12 77/7 90/25 99/3 99/17 51/24 55/20 58/3 123/13 155/15 161/25 36/6 36/18 122/25 125/1 125/2 99/24 105/17 117/7 proved [4] 48/21 72/6 66/13 67/3 68/20 Programme [4] 125/3 161/9 130/19 135/18 138/20 80/19 81/2 81/3 90/18 157/13 159/21 159/22 155/9 156/18 prison [1] 60/2 questioned [7] 1/8 97/23 110/4 128/3 160/10 proven [1] 28/19 privilege [9] 58/17 45/7 144/10 146/1 136/9 142/12 161/6 provide [4] 48/9 programmes [1] 60/15 90/8 98/25 99/9 165/4 165/6 165/8 162/22 86/22 122/9 139/15 66/23 99/10 100/2 100/3 reading [11] 16/10 questioning [2] progressive [1] provided [8] 13/8 137/10 45/15 110/11 43/5 76/25 81/20 145/22 63/16 64/7 116/5 privileged [7] 89/7 88/24 97/9 97/12 116/7 116/24 139/23 questions [24] 1/10 progressively [1] 94/18 99/4 136/19 89/24 90/6 92/15 113/1 128/6 129/21 145/10 139/25 137/1 137/24 138/21 98/14 98/22 100/13 142/9 prohibits [1] 142/23 provider [1] 63/24 **pro [1]** 123/16 reads [2] 2/16 132/17 104/24 105/1 105/15 project [3] 72/22 **providing** [1] 1/13 pro-postmaster [1] 106/11 113/21 143/18 ready [1] 62/9 110/8 110/9 provincial [1] 46/17 123/16 143/19 144/1 144/12 real [11] 19/3 22/23 public [19] 13/12 projects [1] 38/2 proactive [1] 33/12 145/24 157/19 157/22 28/15 38/11 40/2 promise [1] 112/17 13/18 14/19 21/5 proactively [1] 23/17 160/3 160/17 161/11 44/24 50/22 54/7 prompt [3] 10/8 21/16 39/14 40/18

53/25 115/17 33/3 R regular [1] 88/2 responding [1] 60/9 reconcile [1] 129/11 **regularity [1]** 115/13 remotely [1] 89/18 responds [1] 76/21 real... [3] 106/22 removed [1] 157/12 reconciliations [1] regularly [1] 116/5 response [12] 17/12 118/17 130/22 158/23 regulator [1] 43/14 remuneration [1] 58/9 69/2 69/5 86/22 realised [1] 72/7 reconfirmed [1] reinforced [1] 44/12 123/4 87/20 91/5 98/8 101/4 really [58] 9/2 16/17 109/11 reinforces [1] 15/1 reoccurred [1] 76/7 101/7 103/20 108/7 19/2 19/5 22/5 22/6 relate [2] 157/2 163/7 record [1] 142/20 responses [1] 17/13 reorganising [1] 29/17 29/19 29/23 recorded [3] 97/19 related [2] 33/13 96/25 responsibility [5] 35/9 35/22 36/4 38/21 120/6 150/3 136/14 repatriating [1] 133/6 31/13 82/12 82/19 39/4 43/5 46/4 47/25 127/13 128/8 records [6] 161/11 relation [7] 7/14 repayment [1] 96/1 50/1 59/15 61/10 65/7 repeat [1] 146/12 responsible [4] 161/13 162/15 162/17 14/21 62/1 76/13 71/20 72/13 72/17 84/19 135/8 157/19 repeated [1] 118/4 19/25 25/2 64/7 86/16 162/18 162/19 75/6 78/15 88/13 92/7 replies [3] 65/21 79/1 rest [3] 119/1 128/9 recover [1] 132/20 relationship [8] 14/9 97/13 97/14 97/17 16/24 19/13 41/8 79/24 recovery [1] 95/25 158/20 100/3 101/19 106/18 recreating [1] 72/8 41/11 41/15 64/5 **Reply [1]** 108/16 restart [2] 32/16 106/25 113/5 113/21 recruited [2] 75/25 148/20 report [9] 19/7 19/7 32/18 113/21 118/15 119/14 22/3 22/10 67/1 67/6 relatively [3] 61/24 **restore** [1] 156/19 83/21 121/13 121/25 124/17 recruitment [2] 66/16 72/4 91/11 80/17 96/23 138/5 restored [1] 155/20 125/10 125/20 126/17 reported [5] 79/17 66/19 released [3] 102/24 restoring [1] 12/7 132/9 133/18 134/21 rectified [1] 78/7 159/17 162/13 88/2 96/22 128/12 restraint [1] 59/2 147/8 147/10 147/22 recur [1] 24/24 relentless [1] 120/4 136/16 restriction [1] 146/8 148/3 148/12 148/21 recurred [1] 44/3 relevant [5] 33/18 reporting [2] 79/19 restrictions [1] 143/6 148/21 158/8 158/12 recusal [1] 163/10 54/5 95/19 141/9 159/6 restrictive [2] 102/11 reason [14] 32/18 red [2] 125/24 162/6 142/6 103/8 reports [2] 162/22 41/25 67/11 74/18 reliability [4] 68/17 result [4] 96/12 98/16 rediscover [1] 38/4 162/22 75/11 82/9 84/16 111/17 127/23 133/24 represent [3] 141/2 105/23 157/13 reduce [3] 122/11 113/23 137/2 137/3 123/13 130/9 146/3 156/10 reliable [5] 13/19 resulting [1] 84/18 137/8 138/2 160/22 reducing [1] 143/7 32/15 33/23 75/6 representation [1] **resume [1]** 164/3 163/14 Retail [2] 64/6 124/15 refer [3] 49/16 71/5 118/20 139/19 reasonable [4] 14/25 reliance [3] 25/24 100/19 representative [1] retailer [1] 124/18 140/20 140/23 163/14 131/23 133/13 reference [12] 2/18 122/24 retailers [1] 124/20 reasons [1] 83/3 3/4 35/10 45/18 49/21 reliant [2] 14/13 representatives [2] retained [2] 99/9 reassess [1] 32/9 55/21 57/11 109/9 25/19 57/16 84/25 99/10 reassured [1] 12/10 120/11 142/13 150/1 relied [5] 26/25 33/10 represented [1] retired [1] 38/1 reassuring [1] 69/4 151/11 33/21 73/1 74/6 150/21 retrials [1] 28/5 recall [10] 22/3 22/15 **referenced [3]** 49/19 relies [1] 13/16 reputation [3] 46/5 retrospective [2] 26/18 26/20 30/9 42/8 150/15 151/4 rely [3] 70/12 73/15 111/2 111/9 46/11 51/4 82/23 111/6 138/12 **references** [1] 99/16 97/2 request [4] 65/23 retrospectively [1] 146/21 referred [9] 2/12 21/6 relying [3] 50/23 115/22 136/13 159/1 39/18 recalled [1] 40/22 return [1] 108/9 60/25 82/25 89/12 134/7 134/15 requested [2] 80/1 receipt [2] 107/20 121/4 155/22 155/25 remain [1] 62/7 108/6 revert [3] 80/1 86/9 108/6 158/4 remember [51] 10/17 require [1] 144/1 96/7 receive [2] 51/11 referring [16] 22/7 10/21 13/5 27/15 29/9 research [1] 26/12 review [22] 25/25 80/8 23/4 27/15 33/22 29/13 30/12 31/17 **researched** [1] 26/15 26/6 26/9 26/20 29/12 received [4] 48/17 33/6 41/21 41/24 42/9 resigned [1] 72/20 34/23 37/3 43/2 45/13 70/7 114/20 114/22 80/15 95/17 107/18 54/3 73/10 105/2 43/6 43/8 43/11 43/19 resilient [1] 123/25 115/17 115/22 116/6 recent [1] 115/16 109/14 109/16 111/23 45/15 55/16 56/1 116/18 116/18 131/9 resolution [3] 42/6 recently [3] 59/20 133/12 140/14 66/15 66/20 69/14 42/20 78/21 133/20 135/22 135/24 89/15 96/6 resolve [9] 24/24 reflect [2] 44/25 73/19 75/4 75/22 136/13 136/17 137/9 recognise [1] 110/25 79/16 79/18 79/19 25/6 36/17 65/19 104/2 138/8 138/14 recognised [1] 69/12 78/17 79/4 81/20 92/3 reviewed [2] 26/22 reflected [2] 30/22 82/20 87/9 95/4 99/22 recognising [4] 105/10 99/23 103/13 104/22 140/24 29/3 18/15 51/20 103/25 111/18 111/21 112/19 resolved [6] 22/1 reflection [1] 136/23 revised [1] 9/25 104/17 112/24 113/3 116/16 22/23 69/10 76/15 reflections [1] 7/12 revisited [2] 107/22 recognition [2] 59/25 117/11 118/17 131/14 109/6 109/25 refused [1] 20/24 108/3 78/19 regarded [1] 73/22 136/6 138/17 139/24 resolving [2] 79/6 Richard [5] 9/20 9/24 recollection [6] 10/7 51/13 51/14 140/2 145/16 148/12 regarding [4] 63/19 82/13 45/22 93/13 114/24 65/5 66/14 81/17 148/15 resort [1] 48/1 right [78] 1/24 5/17 136/19 137/11 137/20 register [6] 127/24 6/4 6/7 6/8 6/14 7/3 remembered [2] resources [1] 161/8 recommence [1] 128/9 128/17 129/17 43/20 114/4 7/12 7/18 8/8 10/15 respect [5] 95/15 130/18 130/8 130/11 14/1 18/4 18/13 20/20 remembering [4] 95/24 96/2 97/25 recommencing [1] registered [1] 130/5 11/20 19/23 42/11 98/13 23/17 30/23 31/25 130/24 36/21 40/18 43/24 registers [2] 127/17 62/23 respond [2] 76/6 recommend [2] 128/19 remote [2] 32/24 108/23 45/16 45/24 49/5

106/11 111/11 118/16 100/14 100/22 100/25 seismic [1] 44/22 R 83/23 87/17 87/18 103/25 104/18 118/23 119/12 120/10 101/4 101/14 101/24 select [8] 112/5 right... [54] 51/17 122/18 123/17 126/23 102/4 102/6 102/13 113/6 113/10 113/16 53/16 55/24 57/20 127/16 131/17 134/5 102/15 102/17 102/19 113/18 114/2 147/10 58/5 75/14 76/16 79/9 safe [2] 12/11 105/15 134/25 135/14 135/16 103/9 103/11 103/16 147/13 83/2 86/22 90/15 said [47] 3/5 9/16 136/9 137/1 139/11 103/23 104/4 104/12 self [8] 14/10 15/18 92/22 94/23 96/1 10/6 10/23 11/23 144/14 150/13 150/16 104/20 104/23 106/11 17/5 17/23 19/14 100/17 100/21 100/24 12/19 12/22 21/15 151/5 151/6 151/10 110/11 111/3 111/8 24/10 59/2 130/3 103/15 103/22 110/13 21/17 31/2 37/15 153/25 117/13 121/24 131/24 self-absorbed [4] 114/8 115/4 115/5 45/24 47/3 48/6 53/7 147/5 154/4 158/5 15/18 17/5 17/23 saying [30] 15/22 115/25 117/2 118/8 55/16 61/10 67/18 15/22 35/23 43/3 158/7 159/13 160/18 24/10 119/25 121/17 124/25 75/4 77/1 81/13 82/6 43/19 47/7 49/17 **Secondly [4]** 13/10 self-evidently [1] 126/12 127/19 133/13 83/11 88/25 98/20 49/24 68/3 71/13 90/3 131/23 132/10 130/3 138/16 143/8 144/21 103/16 113/9 121/16 74/15 77/5 79/12 section [3] 23/24 self-serving [2] 147/17 149/8 149/11 124/1 125/22 126/16 79/24 80/11 85/20 23/25 139/9 14/10 19/14 149/20 149/22 150/9 126/16 126/17 126/19 88/16 89/13 91/1 see [63] 1/3 6/25 selling [1] 153/7 150/9 150/25 152/21 126/20 132/4 143/15 102/6 104/16 106/7 10/18 11/15 17/4 sending [1] 107/17 153/1 154/8 154/8 147/15 148/15 151/15 109/14 113/24 132/17 20/15 22/25 24/2 sends [1] 94/16 154/18 156/3 156/5 154/6 154/7 155/21 134/19 135/10 139/3 28/23 45/3 46/12 senior [8] 6/19 20/17 159/22 160/5 160/7 156/22 157/17 157/21 155/9 161/7 46/23 46/25 52/12 67/23 108/22 109/25 163/21 159/11 says [16] 2/2 65/6 145/6 145/18 145/19 52/20 57/21 57/22 rightly [3] 32/17 69/8 salary [1] 149/1 65/9 76/2 76/21 77/22 64/8 65/2 65/10 67/9 sense [22] 9/5 13/4 108/20 sales [10] 116/21 78/10 81/15 85/15 69/3 69/23 76/24 29/22 30/15 31/23 rile [1] 74/19 116/23 116/25 117/3 95/13 96/13 101/15 76/25 77/5 77/7 77/8 46/18 51/15 51/18 ring [1] 27/25 117/7 118/19 119/4 113/13 115/21 116/18 77/21 81/11 81/13 51/23 59/9 60/4 60/9 ripped [1] 37/9 119/10 119/12 120/9 84/10 85/13 86/11 155/6 69/5 81/16 83/16 rise [1] 98/3 Sam [1] 146/2 91/24 91/25 94/11 93/13 132/2 143/3 scanned [2] 91/20 risk [18] 6/13 6/17 same [18] 34/7 34/8 108/6 94/14 95/22 101/19 148/13 148/16 149/1 29/15 127/1 127/14 48/13 48/18 49/7 scans [1] 107/20 103/20 104/15 108/13 155/5 127/17 127/24 128/9 70/10 72/1 76/6 79/23 111/21 113/9 114/13 scenario [1] 96/16 sensible [1] 103/12 128/16 128/19 128/21 91/5 108/16 118/10 scenarios [1] 64/12 114/19 115/15 116/9 **sensitive [4]** 94/18 129/1 129/17 130/4 141/6 141/7 147/15 scheme [9] 36/15 134/1 134/22 138/3 95/19 111/1 111/9 130/8 130/9 130/11 149/2 163/2 163/12 39/24 40/24 41/20 138/14 138/17 140/10 sent [7] 60/2 69/22 163/7 satisfaction [1] 140/17 147/18 158/6 54/22 67/1 102/21 79/15 85/25 96/12 risks [1] 98/4 89/22 111/10 136/15 162/12 162/12 162/15 108/2 108/5 road [2] 42/18 54/15 satisfactory [1] schemes [1] 28/14 162/17 163/9 sentence [4] 2/24 **Rob [2]** 75/20 124/22 130/13 26/4 26/5 132/3 school [2] 40/12 84/6 seeing [11] 18/25 robbery [1] 132/20 satisfied [4] 9/8 34/10 46/19 68/22 scope [1] 102/17 sentiments [1] 59/19 robustness [1] 25/12 67/16 69/13 81/4 81/4 82/20 82/21 separate [6] 37/19 scratch [1] 49/8 113/12 saw [14] 18/24 41/13 scratchcards [1] 92/5 136/24 159/18 39/17 63/17 105/3 Rod [9] 76/2 100/21 71/7 76/20 94/10 65/15 seek [3] 97/2 111/15 135/21 135/23 100/24 103/22 110/6 97/10 101/4 102/14 screaming [1] 34/3 134/6 **September [6]** 5/19 144/24 145/3 145/15 111/20 121/11 135/24 screen [2] 61/21 62/8 seeking [5] 28/5 96/1 5/24 6/6 8/4 78/1 96/8 145/22 135/25 136/5 136/7 scroll [27] 19/6 32/23 98/5 98/14 143/12 **September 2019 [1] Rodric [1]** 75/17 say [92] 4/3 4/3 4/4 62/22 65/20 70/1 5/24 seeks [2] 96/14 role [6] 79/21 86/17 8/12 9/1 9/3 9/5 10/3 78/10 79/11 80/14 96/15 series [3] 24/2 66/22 95/3 96/7 125/6 125/9 10/10 12/6 15/14 18/5 80/19 81/11 84/10 seem [4] 28/16 77/24 70/20 roles [3] 6/19 64/3 19/21 20/21 22/6 23/8 serious [2] 76/8 85/13 85/15 85/18 83/17 98/2 144/20 23/23 25/21 26/5 seemed [7] 9/1 18/18 85/19 85/24 86/4 86/7 113/19 **Rolfe [1]** 136/14 26/10 26/17 27/10 86/13 87/11 101/11 31/11 37/14 53/8 seriously [3] 33/16 rolled [1] 72/14 28/25 29/25 30/8 33/3 108/14 111/24 116/10 53/11 71/8 113/6 113/24 rollout [1] 70/9 33/9 33/20 36/12 116/19 119/4 131/3 seems [7] 29/1 74/9 serve [2] 24/20 58/17 room [1] 62/7 36/24 39/5 39/22 40/4 88/20 89/19 97/4 scrolling [1] 108/15 served [1] 28/4 Rose [3] 94/20 94/22 40/19 44/17 45/3 146/20 163/16 **scrutiny [2]** 106/3 **Services [2]** 80/11 95/15 45/23 48/4 49/5 51/5 134/16 seen [27] 11/25 83/21 **Rose's [1]** 95/3 52/23 56/5 58/19 searches [1] 57/17 17/11 18/20 31/22 serving [3] 12/12 route [1] 115/18 second [60] 2/2 2/9 59/20 60/23 61/23 32/2 32/3 37/14 45/11 14/10 19/14 **Royal [6]** 37/9 37/19 62/22 63/12 65/16 2/12 2/18 9/16 16/21 48/14 54/20 55/9 session [1] 106/16 38/1 63/16 117/17 68/16 72/21 73/13 17/12 19/20 21/24 55/19 55/21 88/23 set [16] 14/6 18/12 141/10 74/21 74/24 76/6 25/17 26/5 30/1 31/2 91/2 105/10 106/5 19/10 31/9 37/4 37/19 run [8] 17/1 35/16 76/12 87/22 89/9 111/18 113/11 120/15 40/14 40/25 42/24 39/24 40/1 64/13 83/4 84/1 84/21 85/2 90/21 93/2 97/25 46/16 48/9 55/8 57/22 125/8 125/12 125/17 74/13 103/25 104/17 88/18 123/24 100/9 101/4 103/2 61/15 65/17 66/23 126/6 128/4 129/4 120/15 125/2 125/3 running [7] 60/6 78/1 103/21 104/17 105/5 67/1 68/5 93/24 94/13 136/6 143/6

103/11 103/16 104/4 124/14 S **sheets [1]** 158/3 113/5 115/10 119/22 shift [2] 63/7 124/10 104/12 104/23 106/11 **Smiths [1]** 99/18 122/12 124/25 125/12 setting [6] 39/10 **shifted [1]** 19/5 110/11 111/4 114/2 so [282] 125/20 129/5 135/9 106/17 121/4 122/22 **Shirley [1]** 80/13 154/4 158/5 159/13 software [6] 34/12 135/10 142/10 147/8 135/1 135/3 **shocking [1]** 19/2 160/18 34/14 34/22 37/13 148/19 settle [10] 40/7 42/1 Sight's [4] 101/14 70/8 70/17 sorts [1] 158/23 **shops [2]** 20/1 42/3 42/8 43/3 43/13 102/17 111/8 158/7 some [54] 4/22 7/8 124/20 sought [1] 105/14 54/16 54/17 55/12 **short [8]** 29/17 37/10 signal [1] 147/9 9/24 10/8 10/18 11/9 **sound [1]** 105/19 158/20 signature [1] 3/19 52/10 62/18 94/4 15/4 15/5 17/12 18/16 sounds [1] 16/9 settled [6] 11/4 14/17 114/11 144/12 155/12 19/10 20/25 28/1 signed [4] 54/21 source [3] 22/23 39/11 42/23 50/12 57/23 129/13 143/9 34/10 36/2 40/11 148/22 148/23 shortage [1] 22/21 55/3 **shortages** [1] 88/3 42/20 46/10 50/19 sourced [1] 104/24 significant [1] 89/16 settlement [18] 8/22 **shortfall [15]** 25/3 significantly [1] 19/5 51/14 57/16 57/17 **sources [1]** 129/11 29/10 29/11 29/12 150/13 151/2 151/13 61/24 64/24 65/25 signs [1] 85/12 **space [3]** 29/17 40/2 40/6 42/15 42/23 151/25 152/12 152/16 silent [1] 25/9 68/11 68/13 69/3 125/1 155/12 43/9 43/25 50/4 53/25 **silly [1]** 103/2 spare [1] 78/16 153/1 153/7 153/11 69/16 70/15 80/18 54/9 54/12 54/24 154/16 154/19 155/4 81/19 81/22 83/19 **similarly [1]** 125/4 **Sparrow [6]** 65/17 54/25 55/2 90/6 157/2 157/11 Simon [1] 74/4 87/5 96/3 98/4 98/19 109/8 109/15 110/8 settlements [1] **shortfalls [9]** 16/12 simple [1] 61/8 99/25 101/10 106/15 110/9 110/21 54/21 107/2 112/7 114/16 23/19 27/23 34/9 simple-minded [1] Sparrow/Second [1] settling [4] 12/25 105/9 106/3 127/8 115/7 125/5 125/13 61/8 65/17 41/19 43/22 54/5 132/19 152/19 simpler [1] 124/5 133/23 139/25 142/18 speak [10] 21/2 seven [2] 7/7 32/12 should [73] 1/16 2/5 simply [8] 16/18 39/1 143/19 144/1 150/1 21/10 64/19 98/12 seven pages [1] 7/7 2/6 2/14 2/21 3/2 3/6 50/1 65/8 75/13 157/19 99/2 117/21 122/1 seven years [1] 3/14 12/10 12/14 132/17 151/10 154/16 somebody [2] 20/16 123/6 127/22 137/21 32/12 14/17 16/24 17/14 sin [2] 15/15 16/6 74/9 speaking [2] 20/16 seventh [1] 51/6 21/11 26/1 26/24 since [9] 6/2 15/1 somehow [1] 102/1 51/11 **several [2]** 32/15 27/12 27/20 30/16 30/19 36/6 51/1 60/14 someone [13] 20/6 **specialist [2]** 135/1 107/19 30/21 31/2 31/5 32/18 78/1 107/16 113/11 21/18 38/14 48/25 135/3 Sewell [1] 71/18 39/11 40/7 40/14 50/7 73/6 101/19 106/20 single [8] 13/23 **species [1]** 126/7 **shackle [2]** 148/5 24/20 61/8 69/1 91/7 50/12 50/13 50/14 118/16 119/17 125/12 specific [9] 74/21 148/6 50/15 52/18 61/23 92/11 118/7 134/7 134/22 156/9 163/3 87/9 111/6 114/24 **shall [3]** 140/20 63/8 67/10 82/22 sir [16] 1/3 52/5 119/13 120/9 120/11 something [16] 4/2 141/12 146/13 88/25 89/4 90/3 92/17 52/12 62/14 93/25 9/15 34/1 36/6 37/21 139/2 156/2 shape [2] 77/4 115/2 94/2 94/6 114/6 114/9 95/20 96/5 96/25 49/17 55/17 56/12 specifically [10] **share [1]** 58/14 97/25 98/6 98/7 98/8 114/13 143/22 144/5 67/21 105/10 125/23 27/16 66/6 66/15 shared [11] 10/12 102/6 102/24 104/14 144/11 163/20 164/5 129/20 132/9 151/7 66/20 67/3 74/23 99/7 10/23 11/13 30/17 127/16 127/17 128/10 164/7 159/25 163/8 100/4 110/22 154/3 30/21 59/9 80/11 128/19 131/18 136/23 situation [3] 84/23 **sometimes [3]** 12/13 **specifics [1]** 90/12 136/19 137/3 137/9 142/7 144/18 146/23 98/3 155/22 135/5 135/6 spectacularly [1] 137/24 149/20 149/21 149/25 six [7] 1/20 17/20 somewhere [3] 30/19 45/21 shareholder [5] 150/3 150/4 150/17 18/12 18/20 25/12 106/18 133/25 speculating [1] 128/2 93/17 96/11 98/10 151/22 155/6 155/6 32/2 32/11 soon [3] 80/2 86/9 **speculation** [1] 29/21 122/6 122/23 155/21 158/14 160/20 six years [1] 32/2 100/11 **speech [4]** 37/5 shareholder's [1] 161/3 161/4 sixth [3] 3/16 39/5 sorry [20] 2/17 2/21 125/3 126/15 146/22 90/5 speed [1] 129/13 **Shouldham [1]** 84/15 4/5 4/10 15/10 38/5 146/15 **shark [1]** 154/11 43/11 62/20 71/13 **speedy [1]** 81/21 shouldn't [1] 65/8 size [3] 35/16 46/7 she [38] 7/20 42/24 **show [4]** 13/18 39/18 46/8 73/19 76/17 108/19 **spend [2]** 7/8 81/19 43/24 44/1 46/2 49/4 sized [1] 35/12 69/22 78/4 119/1 126/6 126/14 spending [1] 106/20 49/5 49/5 53/7 53/7 spent [3] 53/3 124/22 **showing [2]** 47/13 skewed [3] 14/11 127/22 131/3 135/15 53/10 53/13 57/16 80/20 18/7 120/23 139/8 143/22 148/20 58/7 65/6 65/9 68/25 sort [54] 10/19 17/1 **spoke [1]** 82/5 **shown [3]** 57/6 74/2 **skill [1]** 135/13 79/20 84/1 84/4 84/6 **Skills [3]** 112/4 112/8 | 20/16 21/13 30/13 163/2 **spoken [2]** 84/25 84/6 85/15 86/14 shut [2] 40/24 42/1 141/10 30/20 31/20 32/11 123/16 86/15 86/19 109/14 **shutting [1]** 126/13 skip [2] 32/22 97/23 34/6 34/24 35/13 sponsorship [2] 112/13 124/15 124/16 skipped [1] 52/16 38/12 38/17 41/2 115/24 116/2 **sick [1]** 161/3 124/21 124/22 124/24 45/20 46/4 48/24 49/9 spreadsheet [1] sides [1] 44/15 slightly [5] 38/20 124/24 137/12 137/15 sight [32] 16/21 42/11 72/10 104/21 50/21 51/15 51/19 118/12 163/1 163/2 17/12 21/24 40/14 147/13 53/7 53/11 56/5 61/7 spreadsheets [1] **she'd [1]** 53/18 40/25 65/17 66/23 61/8 69/9 70/24 71/6 slow [1] 63/24 117/16 she's [2] 49/5 109/16 square [2] 30/7 30/23 67/1 100/14 100/22 **slowed [1]** 129/13 72/22 81/5 82/19 **sheet [5]** 120/3 smallish [1] 135/5 staff [3] 34/20 123/14 100/25 101/4 101/24 83/11 91/11 93/6 129/12 129/14 153/21 102/4 102/6 102/13 103/6 103/16 104/21 **Smith [6]** 50/3 87/18 123/15 162/6 102/15 102/19 103/9 94/22 95/9 99/12 104/21 106/22 113/4 stage [4] 55/18 66/3

67/25 73/3 75/7 77/3 70/24 73/1 73/10 S stick [3] 54/9 54/19 subpostmasters [16] 54/25 28/9 64/4 96/2 105/22 78/17 79/21 83/8 73/15 78/3 78/18 stage... [2] 81/6 still [12] 20/7 25/6 114/18 120/8 123/11 84/20 91/4 102/18 78/20 81/4 84/17 156/9 28/8 28/9 33/19 35/11 125/6 125/8 139/19 107/4 110/3 111/20 116/4 118/14 118/20 stages [1] 106/14 63/25 85/24 99/7 150/10 150/17 151/5 115/7 128/21 140/7 119/1 127/24 129/5 staggered [1] 11/9 108/2 120/13 143/7 152/18 153/2 160/11 145/23 154/4 130/2 130/2 130/4 stakeholder [1] 64/5 stock [2] 78/4 89/20 134/12 149/15 149/16 subpostmistress [2] **surplus** [1] 80/20 stakeholders [2] stolen [5] 20/6 20/6 149/25 151/1 155/6 81/12 84/20 **surprised [3]** 62/11 14/5 141/9 28/1 134/14 134/22 subs [1] 147/18 62/12 82/10 155/21 156/7 156/19 **stamp [1]** 91/21 stone [1] 70/16 subsequent [5] 18/8 **survey [1]** 147/5 157/5 160/13 **stamps [17]** 22/25 stood [1] 143/15 78/5 96/22 97/1 **survived [1]** 145/21 system's [1] 63/23 23/1 23/17 91/15 **stop [7]** 1/23 49/15 120/24 **suspect [6]** 11/6 systematic [1] 22/24 91/17 91/23 92/1 49/17 71/3 121/1 subsequently [2] 11/11 36/17 83/25 systematically [1] 92/14 92/16 98/23 131/16 149/13 2/25 6/16 96/25 98/11 91/16 149/22 149/24 150/2 **stopped [11]** 15/19 subsidy [1] 122/10 suspend [2] 90/2 systems [8] 20/1 150/16 151/6 152/2 20/22 24/10 25/22 90/24 37/10 38/2 62/4 62/5 **substance** [5] 15/5 155/25 30/4 34/2 60/14 119/8 43/17 46/14 46/23 131/22 133/13 152/16 suspending [2] stamps' [1] 152/3 120/18 122/2 126/15 87/3 12/13 87/25 stand [2] 44/24 stopping [6] 15/21 substantive [1] 129/8 suspense [51] 33/14 134/16 41/21 44/17 79/14 100/6 100/15 100/25 tables [1] 57/9 success [1] 38/25 standard [1] 117/5 tackle [2] 125/5 101/15 101/20 102/2 97/4 122/16 successful [1] 48/6 standing [3] 8/24 127/5 stories [3] 31/17 32/4 such [6] 12/14 82/13 102/22 103/4 104/7 147/23 148/3 104/14 104/15 109/17 tackling [2] 52/18 32/5 124/19 140/24 141/9 stands [1] 120/13 straight [1] 131/21 144/1 109/18 109/19 109/22 127/13 start [15] 5/7 6/22 110/12 110/14 110/24 tactical [1] 39/9 **sucking [1]** 123/19 straightforward [7] 48/25 49/10 61/20 111/5 111/7 133/18 tactics [2] 31/12 15/20 24/11 36/16 suddenly [1] 84/22 64/15 65/1 77/18 31/15 60/20 119/9 120/19 136/21 139/3 153/13 suffer [1] 13/21 83/12 93/3 100/8 tail [1] 36/14 153/16 153/20 154/3 121/3 **sufficient [3]** 35/3 101/11 107/5 114/18 tainted [1] 74/6 strategic [1] 115/20 90/1 90/23 154/5 157/9 157/10 145/5 157/12 157/20 157/21 **Tait [1]** 70/2 strategies [2] 141/4 sufficiently [1] 51/6 started [9] 4/12 take [20] 29/20 31/13 141/16 suggest [1] 98/2 158/3 158/3 158/7 38/21 72/3 84/22 158/11 158/15 158/25 52/5 54/16 55/7 76/2 strategy [4] 48/21 **suggested [5]** 32/20 93/15 121/17 124/4 159/4 159/9 159/12 76/11 78/18 81/5 98/6 54/15 55/6 123/9 36/15 40/1 129/19 145/1 152/22 159/13 159/16 159/25 113/6 113/24 118/3 strengthened [1] 158/24 starting [6] 9/4 13/7 134/19 134/21 145/1 44/4 suggestion [4] 89/18 160/8 161/12 162/4 39/3 49/8 52/17 147/1 150/19 152/14 Strictly [1] 94/17 109/16 113/25 138/20 162/5 162/11 149/15 156/1 strike [1] 128/2 sum [1] 78/19 suspension [1] starts [2] 84/11 96/8 taken [6] 79/4 91/5 strong [7] 41/14 summarised [1] 74/3 121/15 state [2] 20/10 141/7 98/2 102/2 124/1 summarises [1] 76/3 suspensions [3] 42/12 42/22 58/25 state's [1] 31/7 161/22 67/6 105/21 132/1 **summary [12]** 12/19 121/13 121/20 121/21 **stated [1]** 53/10 takes [4] 43/15 75/3 14/6 19/8 23/22 23/23 suspicion [1] 85/6 stronger [1] 145/18 statement [31] 1/14 sustainable [4] 42/16 80/7 113/22 strongly [1] 132/9 23/24 23/25 24/15 3/22 4/1 4/14 10/3 struck [1] 129/22 31/3 78/11 87/24 43/9 122/15 122/25 taking [5] 106/2 26/14 33/8 61/20 62/3 108/17 123/21 132/7 **structures** [2] 63/18 138/10 sustainably [1] 62/22 63/11 68/6 163/15 summer [7] 5/5 70/21 122/13 74/14 76/12 76/12 talk [10] 17/16 20/24 22/11 22/20 72/16 **struggling [1]** 117/23 **Swift [2]** 135/22 100/9 105/4 107/21 21/1 38/10 71/15 73/3 91/12 124/23 159/8 **studies [1]** 13/18 138/5 119/5 119/15 120/21 84/3 98/25 145/3 stuff [2] 66/6 123/20 supplier [2] 71/14 **Swift's [2]** 137/9 122/2 124/6 126/22 154/5 **stumping [2]** 157/2 72/25 138/14 136/8 139/8 139/10 talking [12] 10/4 160/11 supply [2] 73/14 **Swindon [1]** 23/18 144/13 146/25 159/5 27/14 31/18 32/11 subcommittee [1] 117/16 switch [1] 62/5 163/23 46/14 81/5 90/11 97/8 4/10 support [17] 24/21 switched [2] 62/8 **statements** [1] 4/19 144/22 146/6 156/15 subject [2] 85/10 34/16 37/20 63/6 101/20 statistics [1] 64/9 162/19 113/8 63/17 64/7 70/20 **switching** [1] 62/4 **status [1]** 15/22 talks [1] 111/19 subordinate [2] 72/15 83/21 105/21 sympathetic [2] stay [2] 60/11 153/1 task [2] 39/1 158/6 125/6 125/9 124/9 124/13 124/19 134/7 134/8 stayed [1] 25/9 tasks [2] 38/19 38/23 subpostmaster [15] 124/19 124/22 141/8 **syntax [1]** 1/23 steal [1] 73/7 tax [2] 107/13 110/19 23/5 35/8 65/5 77/19 156/24 synthesis [3] 20/17 steer [3] 112/22 taxpayers [1] 133/8 77/22 78/10 102/1 20/19 138/10 **supporting [2]** 58/23 114/2 115/19 107/8 109/21 111/4 **Taylor [4]** 9/20 9/24 134/12 system [44] 27/24 Stein [4] 143/20 33/24 34/7 35/3 37/16 10/7 11/18 152/15 153/4 154/20 suppose [1] 62/10 146/1 146/2 165/8 38/5 61/17 62/5 62/11 team [28] 10/9 22/22 156/7 157/2 supposition [1] 51/4 step [2] 152/14 153/4 23/16 32/17 44/9 sure [23] 13/20 15/10 63/2 63/20 64/19 subpostmaster's [1] steps [2] 98/6 115/18 74/17 75/18 81/3 151/25 41/13 49/5 66/17 64/20 66/14 70/12

126/21 127/10 131/21 68/22 69/14 71/11 151/23 154/15 155/7 147/24 T 144/18 145/11 145/21 71/21 77/1 87/13 91/8 159/15 they're [9] 28/22 team... [20] 82/19 91/10 91/12 92/4 95/6 therefore [22] 28/5 146/20 149/14 163/4 38/11 64/18 77/4 81/4 86/15 88/9 91/10 thank [67] 1/4 1/13 99/1 102/8 102/21 28/18 29/18 30/18 81/5 118/14 144/2 91/24 101/1 101/20 2/23 3/16 3/25 4/5 104/14 113/21 128/22 36/10 42/17 53/24 154/11 112/14 116/14 122/7 4/17 4/18 6/4 6/22 135/14 135/16 135/17 72/8 83/25 84/4 86/25 they've [1] 45/25 128/21 135/1 135/3 8/10 12/3 16/6 18/23 135/19 147/23 148/3 90/10 90/19 93/19 thing [11] 25/8 42/1 135/5 144/13 144/24 148/11 158/16 162/12 19/6 19/20 20/20 100/5 104/25 118/16 49/19 68/13 69/11 145/6 145/19 145/20 25/17 51/10 51/10 162/12 162/21 132/7 132/11 142/5 72/2 72/6 72/10 158/11 52/4 52/8 52/13 52/20 144/7 156/17 106/22 143/8 162/24 theme [2] 69/17 team's [2] 48/10 55/22 57/14 58/24 102/14 these [26] 4/12 13/23 things [26] 4/12 145/10 59/16 60/23 61/15 18/14 18/23 18/24 11/10 11/25 12/23 themes [2] 65/17 teams [15] 18/11 62/2 62/14 62/20 124/24 34/15 50/19 52/18 33/11 34/15 34/22 38/22 44/5 50/25 64/6 65/20 73/13 75/10 61/24 67/8 68/6 68/7 39/6 40/21 60/2 67/8 themselves [2] 31/24 64/6 83/18 83/22 75/15 77/17 79/3 86/8 101/21 68/20 82/25 83/12 82/25 89/21 111/11 87/19 117/6 128/12 89/5 93/23 94/2 95/14 then [114] 2/16 2/24 90/6 93/6 105/25 115/4 116/17 118/7 128/16 131/11 135/12 105/3 107/2 108/15 6/9 6/19 10/7 10/10 107/25 115/12 124/24 127/19 131/21 132/5 144/17 108/17 111/13 114/5 11/4 11/12 12/3 14/3 135/12 139/18 151/17 139/1 147/15 153/8 technically [3] 114/9 114/14 116/17 14/6 15/13 16/20 153/22 157/9 153/9 157/1 159/14 101/20 119/20 119/22 they [141] 3/24 9/24 119/3 120/14 130/15 16/21 18/12 19/6 think [230] technology [1] 139/5 143/17 144/11 19/10 21/4 21/17 12/1 12/2 12/11 14/22 thinking [5] 16/11 117/20 145/24 145/25 163/17 23/13 23/20 26/13 15/9 16/23 16/23 23/15 56/4 128/18 tell [11] 43/2 45/13 163/18 163/25 164/2 32/22 32/25 36/24 16/25 20/3 22/21 25/3 144/21 57/11 81/25 108/10 164/6 164/7 39/17 39/22 40/4 27/20 28/13 28/21 third [17] 12/8 31/1 114/21 119/1 119/5 42/19 44/7 50/5 51/2 29/4 33/15 34/8 34/19 31/5 36/8 63/17 65/9 thanks [3] 55/19 120/21 124/6 126/22 51/23 52/22 53/20 36/19 37/14 37/21 79/13 80/12 106/19 117/13 119/21 telling [6] 44/15 47/8 54/12 54/22 55/3 55/3 38/3 38/3 38/4 38/23 125/12 127/9 129/11 that [831] 47/16 49/16 93/10 38/23 39/2 39/2 40/8 that's [54] 2/23 3/5 56/2 61/16 62/13 63/4 132/20 141/17 141/20 145/15 6/3 6/8 10/15 12/19 63/10 64/2 64/15 65/9 42/19 44/16 46/1 47/3 141/23 141/25 tells [2] 118/13 18/4 19/7 19/16 22/18 65/25 68/25 70/1 70/1 47/9 48/1 48/1 48/13 **Thirdly [2]** 3/4 13/13 118/14 25/17 28/23 30/10 49/6 49/7 49/9 49/25 71/15 77/4 78/25 this [299] **temporary [2]** 88/5 45/1 46/1 47/16 54/12 79/11 79/23 80/3 51/20 55/16 65/18 **Thomas [2]** 87/13 91/14 62/24 72/12 74/12 80/10 80/13 80/14 68/23 70/25 71/1 71/9 87/18 ten [2] 126/15 144/2 75/6 75/14 79/11 80/18 81/22 82/17 71/22 72/3 74/12 79/9 thorough [1] 33/15 tend [1] 82/25 94/12 94/12 95/23 85/12 85/18 85/24 83/8 83/12 87/22 those [32] 1/19 3/21 tended [1] 64/8 96/12 100/5 105/1 86/7 86/10 87/7 88/20 89/15 89/15 91/17 4/16 5/1 5/5 14/21 tenor [1] 67/4 105/10 108/25 112/5 92/4 95/5 95/8 95/10 92/12 93/7 94/11 19/18 25/10 25/14 tension [1] 140/21 112/10 126/12 127/1 94/16 98/18 100/19 100/3 101/1 102/21 27/13 32/22 39/22 tenure [1] 64/13 131/12 132/25 133/12 101/3 102/2 104/9 102/22 103/17 103/18 41/4 51/21 76/25 term [2] 115/18 136/11 137/11 137/19 106/16 107/3 117/13 104/13 107/18 111/11 95/12 103/14 110/24 146/10 138/16 143/8 144/21 118/13 128/22 134/6 118/3 118/4 123/17 112/25 118/7 123/21 terminating [1] 12/13 146/10 150/9 151/5 134/9 134/11 135/12 125/11 125/17 125/18 128/12 132/21 140/9 terminology [1] 153/24 153/25 153/25 135/18 139/6 144/3 125/20 125/24 126/6 140/22 145/22 145/24 153/19 154/15 156/15 157/4 145/11 146/15 147/12 126/8 129/7 129/7 151/21 157/20 158/1 terms [10] 13/5 66/10 164/5 147/19 147/23 149/10 129/8 133/1 133/23 161/13 161/16 92/18 98/22 99/15 134/1 134/1 134/23 theft [5] 27/24 70/12 150/17 150/18 153/17 though [2] 32/19 111/7 118/24 138/22 154/13 155/12 155/14 108/12 131/21 132/20 138/16 143/4 144/6 155/18 158/2 162/5 155/17 155/19 156/9 their [25] 4/9 12/15 144/18 146/7 147/1 thought [41] 9/11 terrible [1] 49/23 20/1 22/3 22/10 24/18 157/4 157/8 158/13 147/5 147/9 147/12 10/19 11/25 15/4 terribly [1] 113/6 24/19 36/19 66/19 147/13 147/14 147/16 17/17 21/11 28/21 158/19 159/1 159/9 test [7] 10/13 33/16 79/9 96/11 104/13 159/14 162/11 147/18 147/19 147/20 39/18 44/24 46/2 42/17 51/7 99/2 110/19 118/12 123/3 theoretical [1] 156/6 147/22 147/22 148/13 51/17 54/17 54/19 129/11 156/24 124/20 125/19 125/19 theoretically [1] 148/25 149/6 150/19 56/2 70/15 71/14 93/8 tested [1] 29/23 147/13 150/10 150/11 150/20 151/6 151/6 103/2 104/8 104/11 151/1 testimony [3] 11/10 150/18 150/18 152/7 theory [1] 156/16 151/7 152/10 153/11 106/17 111/11 112/13 49/4 61/12 160/12 153/23 154/5 154/6 113/3 121/16 121/22 there [168] testing [5] 4/11 56/14 there's [30] 2/2 2/12 154/7 154/16 155/10 123/21 125/10 126/20 them [52] 11/22 129/9 129/12 129/14 12/15 15/4 16/25 17/1 3/4 4/1 4/2 9/5 23/20 155/18 155/19 156/14 126/21 130/24 137/7 than [28] 13/8 27/18 18/13 22/2 23/2 24/3 25/10 38/15 56/25 156/18 158/13 158/14 140/8 142/25 145/4 31/20 34/22 36/16 24/24 37/19 37/19 68/7 69/15 78/9 80/18 159/8 159/10 159/11 145/8 147/4 147/9 41/19 42/1 45/19 59/6 37/21 38/4 38/24 159/16 159/17 160/12 157/18 158/18 160/24 81/22 87/22 92/16 61/9 72/6 87/1 90/11 41/13 44/16 52/6 93/7 106/17 111/25 160/14 160/24 161/22 thoughtfully [1] 101/24 102/7 110/24 55/16 57/19 65/19 118/5 124/6 132/4 162/8 162/9 132/8 119/17 120/12 121/9

133/25 149/2 150/13

they'd [2] 51/19

67/3 68/11 68/20

thoughts [1] 146/7

119/13 124/23 131/15 161/10 161/14 152/5 153/3 154/15 59/12 89/24 95/14 time-consuming [1] 154/21 155/1 155/23 150/12 150/20 153/2 97/21 107/25 109/13 thousands [1] 35/14 113/19 155/25 156/11 157/3 110/16 115/10 122/18 three [11] 3/13 11/17 timely [1] 81/21 transactions [12] **Tuesday [3]** 164/3 131/15 133/15 143/12 11/22 20/21 55/1 68/8 times [3] 32/16 34/2 34/8 79/7 129/24 164/5 164/10 149/14 151/9 154/23 68/21 68/22 95/12 133/17 156/13 129/25 129/25 150/4 turn [13] 1/19 4/2 157/15 157/25 160/6 106/14 132/4 151/17 151/21 151/22 10/2 25/17 61/15 161/18 161/25 162/1 timetable [2] 132/1 three paragraphs [1] 153/22 162/23 132/14 94/11 106/2 113/20 understandably [1] 20/21 tiny [1] 27/5 transcript [1] 99/16 114/16 120/21 124/7 12/8 three years [3] 55/1 title [2] 9/16 112/3 understanding [28] 126/23 149/8 transfers [1] 106/21 68/8 68/21 today [11] 4/14 5/2 turned [1] 147/12 26/16 37/8 41/7 47/6 transitioned [1] through [32] 1/19 two [16] 14/24 47/19 23/7 57/18 88/11 96/8 47/15 64/19 70/5 136/17 14/24 17/25 28/14 108/22 109/25 152/22 transparency [1] 52/14 55/1 70/16 74/24 89/25 90/22 39/17 47/18 50/17 154/5 163/24 24/23 89/24 92/15 98/22 91/6 91/13 98/10 99/1 50/21 55/5 56/5 58/3 together [4] 17/1 transparent [1] 25/5 106/16 106/18 107/1 99/2 102/16 109/10 64/6 64/8 68/9 70/19 34/4 41/13 124/24 119/24 123/7 131/21 134/3 136/24 137/5 transparently [1] 74/13 74/19 96/21 137/6 137/23 138/1 told [34] 21/13 31/21 22/1 143/22 159/14 129/3 129/5 129/10 33/16 49/5 54/20 56/6 transported [1] 56/8 two-day [1] 107/1 139/22 140/3 143/1 129/11 130/1 130/14 57/15 58/4 73/17 74/2 treadmill [1] 104/25 types [1] 144/6 154/1 158/5 151/1 151/21 152/21 treat [2] 124/18 74/9 82/2 82/4 82/8 typically [2] 76/5 understood [17] 154/10 159/18 162/21 84/6 85/4 85/8 90/17 124/20 80/7 15/10 18/15 26/12 162/23 163/9 92/3 93/14 98/18 treated [3] 59/11 **typo [1]** 3/16 63/7 64/1 70/22 71/1 throughout [3] 20/10 101/1 103/1 107/23 120/7 127/9 74/16 76/15 77/2 106/7 119/14 U 108/4 121/14 121/19 treating [3] 58/22 95/16 102/18 110/15 throw [1] 147/7 137/8 137/22 138/16 119/16 163/11 UK [1] 25/8 133/23 136/10 142/11 throwing [1] 93/20 **Um [4]** 99/7 148/12 151/6 151/7 154/2 trial [5] 28/17 28/21 145/16 tight [1] 44/11 153/15 154/25 154/6 44/11 47/19 48/22 undertake [3] 70/9 tightly [1] 34/19 unable [1] 65/19 trials [6] 14/24 27/21 98/7 141/18 tomorrow [1] 86/11 till [2] 91/7 152/5 unacceptable [2] too [22] 14/2 16/16 30/14 47/20 54/18 undertaken [1] 105/7 Tim [7] 17/16 20/23 42/14 50/2 51/7 79/4 14/9 19/13 undertaking [4] 31/8 49/20 77/5 136/10 141/14 141/17 144/20 unacceptable' [1] 85/11 112/22 116/21 triangle [1] 116/11 136/11 137/21 116/22 116/25 117/3 tricky [3] 35/22 36/6 31/13 undertook [1] 13/3 time [103] 7/8 7/17 uncashed [1] 108/10 117/15 118/11 119/3 38/2 Unfortunately [2] 8/2 8/7 8/17 11/14 uncomfortable [1] 123/18 123/18 123/19 tried [4] 17/11 37/16 84/23 95/17 13/5 14/22 14/25 15/4 89/10 126/14 134/8 138/5 40/6 156/14 unhelpful [3] 109/8 15/13 15/16 15/23 uncommon [1] trigger [5] 42/24 109/15 110/14 156/16 17/10 17/19 17/24 114/25 took [15] 2/3 13/20 42/25 43/4 54/2 87/3 uniformly [1] 116/5 18/15 20/25 22/12 unconscious [1] 15/13 22/23 37/18 triggered [1] 68/24 **United [1]** 59/14 26/12 26/16 26/18 13/21 38/6 69/8 78/23 92/4 true [12] 3/22 9/6 9/7 Unless [1] 156/2 27/20 29/18 30/17 under [19] 9/16 14/6 102/10 102/19 103/8 17/25 18/1 27/25 unlike [1] 91/16 34/5 34/13 36/2 39/20 19/6 19/20 74/25 85/6 unnecessarily [1] 125/21 132/6 145/9 35/11 46/22 48/3 43/19 49/21 49/22 94/17 96/20 97/3 top [6] 3/12 8/10 80/25 119/22 147/8 53/3 50/17 53/7 55/8 56/13 115/21 115/23 116/2 69/23 76/22 86/7 true' [1] 33/19 unpaid [1] 108/11 60/6 63/13 63/22 116/20 130/23 131/6 117/23 truly [1] 38/6 unpicked [1] 142/14 66/18 69/1 69/10 70/6 **Truss [3]** 84/12 85/14 135/7 140/17 152/18 **topic [3]** 61/15 105/3 unpolitical [1] 59/8 70/10 72/16 73/9 153/4 139/6 85/16 unreasonable [1] 73/20 74/2 74/14 underestimate [1] Truss' [1] 88/11 total [1] 12/25 40/13 74/15 74/19 75/8 77/7 36/25 touch [2] 61/25 110/4 trust [2] 12/7 145/13 unreliable [1] 73/23 79/19 80/21 80/23 unresolved [3] 105/8 Touche [1] 6/9 trusted [4] 21/2 underinvested [1] 81/19 83/16 86/17 63/14 tough [1] 59/3 21/14 49/10 88/17 106/3 153/21 90/14 91/23 92/24 underinvestigated [1] unsafe [4] 28/3 28/20 towards [5] 2/1 6/22 trustworthy [1] 21/3 95/3 95/10 95/14 36/22 95/12 114/18 truth [6] 4/16 115/3 37/11 29/4 63/3 97/10 104/10 105/25 117/15 117/21 118/11 underlying [9] 24/24 track [1] 98/5 unsuccessful [2] 106/9 106/13 106/20 86/23 87/1 89/3 91/25 96/6 97/5 trading [3] 120/1 145/15 108/17 108/18 111/1 101/10 103/1 107/2 122/9 131/20 truthful [2] 163/4 until [23] 5/24 18/3 111/17 111/21 112/2 162/22 trained [2] 83/4 163/6 20/11 26/18 28/19 113/14 113/19 113/22 148/19 undermined [1] 49/15 51/7 52/6 53/16 try [8] 40/7 78/6 120/10 122/11 123/6 139/18 trainee [1] 6/5 150/18 151/9 155/2 61/11 61/12 79/21 123/12 124/16 126/1 underneath [1] 156/13 157/25 160/6 81/24 93/25 114/7 training [10] 20/2 126/13 130/16 132/21 116/11 24/21 34/17 105/18 trying [23] 17/3 38/3 123/6 125/7 128/3 136/2 145/16 148/11 38/17 49/1 60/4 60/22 underpinning [1] 105/20 106/14 106/15 131/21 140/7 155/9 149/2 151/15 151/16 127/5 106/19 106/25 149/9 60/23 61/10 74/24 156/18 164/9 155/13 157/16 157/17 85/1 88/9 93/15 97/22 understand [25] transaction [11] unusual [3] 96/16 159/16 160/4 160/18 104/22 110/19 115/10 11/13 15/21 21/4 34/9 150/3 151/5 151/11 98/3 129/3

97/19 103/5 104/11 97/15 135/12 150/1 153/19 159/2 159/5 U weeks [4] 15/2 22/3 151/2 160/3 163/22 163/23 104/14 124/21 132/7 100/18 108/6 unwavering [2] usually [1] 79/6 163/25 164/6 was [580] well [60] 11/9 12/10 42/22 53/13 20/2 22/10 28/21 37/4 utterly [1] 48/3 via [2] 107/13 131/20 wasn't [38] 11/18 up [63] 4/2 4/24 10/2 vice [1] 41/15 26/10 33/25 34/11 37/5 37/15 41/2 41/25 20/11 31/9 37/19 victim [1] 38/12 34/13 34/14 34/17 42/3 45/25 50/8 56/8 39/24 44/15 52/14 vague [1] 97/16 37/9 41/12 47/13 58/23 59/11 59/24 victims [2] 38/10 53/16 61/21 65/20 value [10] 116/21 53/18 60/22 65/14 67/11 68/19 71/8 38/11 76/20 78/4 79/11 80/3 116/23 116/25 117/3 victory [1] 36/20 68/1 68/22 75/11 74/16 74/23 74/25 80/14 80/17 81/7 118/22 118/25 119/4 75/11 76/24 93/15 75/4 87/5 87/8 89/1 view [51] 13/8 13/16 85/13 85/18 85/24 119/10 147/19 163/15 14/22 14/25 15/5 95/5 95/9 106/24 91/2 100/3 101/17 86/7 86/13 91/18 valued [1] 58/22 15/11 15/13 16/4 110/16 118/19 121/23 109/11 113/1 117/8 93/23 94/8 97/21 values [3] 58/24 16/12 17/7 27/17 28/8 129/3 130/11 130/12 118/13 119/20 119/24 97/22 103/20 107/23 118/20 118/21 28/12 28/13 29/7 32/1 130/14 145/20 147/7 121/16 124/19 126/17 108/24 108/24 113/20 van [7] 65/21 79/8 38/6 42/12 42/22 43/1 151/3 152/1 152/2 127/18 131/14 132/17 120/22 123/6 123/19 79/12 79/24 82/25 43/4 43/14 43/24 44/4 155/19 159/19 160/23 132/25 133/2 134/19 124/7 126/23 128/9 83/13 163/1 44/9 44/14 46/18 53/4 163/11 135/10 137/7 143/3 128/16 128/19 132/25 variation [3] 142/15 54/19 61/5 61/8 61/11 waste [3] 14/19 148/13 148/16 148/25 133/2 134/16 135/1 142/21 143/9 64/20 66/19 67/6 39/14 50/9 149/3 149/14 153/18 135/3 143/15 144/14 variations [1] 69/16 74/16 75/10 97/21 158/2 158/18 160/20 wave [1] 42/24 145/1 146/11 147/11 variety [3] 83/3 96/21 160/21 161/6 163/22 104/13 115/11 117/4 wavered [1] 43/24 147/12 147/23 148/3 132/18 118/7 124/2 128/18 way [36] 15/20 24/11 well-oiled [1] 101/17 152/12 152/19 154/19 various [1] 6/19 31/25 34/11 35/16 128/23 144/16 148/19 Wendy [2] 79/24 157/2 157/22 159/15 varying [1] 71/21 151/14 151/25 152/7 38/20 42/18 47/18 80/17 160/11 163/8 vast [1] 119/20 68/23 69/22 88/21 went [16] 6/23 7/14 152/10 update [3] 49/20 vastly [2] 50/20 views [9] 18/24 18/25 92/12 97/7 97/16 12/17 32/14 51/3 80/12 115/16 145/11 19/5 20/17 22/17 99/22 107/9 115/5 52/15 93/11 102/21 updated [1] 88/11 Vennells [22] 7/17 115/9 116/6 118/10 44/12 55/13 148/18 105/12 120/15 128/3 **upgrade [1]** 37/16 41/6 41/9 41/17 53/4 155/5 119/9 120/7 120/19 159/18 160/7 160/11 urgency [1] 59/9 53/24 55/25 56/21 virtually [1] 108/12 121/1 121/3 121/8 160/13 162/21 urgent [1] 100/13 122/4 122/5 134/12 57/4 58/4 61/6 65/3 visit [3] 84/3 125/15 were [204] us [69] 1/3 1/11 4/24 65/6 76/4 77/20 79/1 125/16 145/8 148/7 151/24 weren't [17] 16/22 9/8 10/17 12/10 12/16 85/19 107/6 107/10 152/23 155/11 161/13 16/24 34/8 34/18 visited [1] 81/25 15/19 16/16 20/7 108/16 109/13 112/1 voiced [1] 109/10 161/15 46/21 70/13 73/16 20/22 21/4 21/12 Vennells' [1] 57/15 voices [1] 13/24 ways [2] 118/2 118/5 73/17 74/10 74/12 21/16 21/24 23/3 verbal [1] 144/5 volume [8] 116/21 77/8 101/5 125/17 we [369] 24/10 24/19 31/14 verdict [3] 23/9 49/23 135/4 138/17 153/23 116/23 116/25 117/7 we'd [5] 9/6 51/2 33/2 33/16 42/2 42/15 61/13 119/4 119/10 119/12 54/13 93/18 156/2 159/17 43/2 43/16 45/10 versa [1] 41/15 what [189] 120/9 we'll [10] 21/8 23/7 45/11 45/13 45/19 verse [1] 86/11 volume/value [5] 24/2 45/3 62/8 73/3 what's [6] 118/4 45/24 47/1 47/24 version [3] 71/23 116/21 116/23 116/25 74/20 93/23 144/3 120/3 120/3 120/6 52/12 70/6 72/4 72/16 115/3 117/21 119/4 119/10 164/3 148/18 156/17 75/5 84/6 89/16 90/1 versions [3] 37/16 we're [18] 45/1 57/18 whatever [10] 11/11 volumes [5] 117/3 90/23 95/8 95/10 117/15 118/11 118/19 118/19 118/21 62/4 62/9 74/18 75/4 20/1 20/7 70/16 114/13 114/21 116/15 versus [5] 46/13 76/22 89/1 92/12 104/10 121/5 125/25 118/25 119/5 119/8 120/21 46/17 119/12 120/12 135/11 137/13 140/19 147/7 151/17 154/11 volumes/value [1] 121/14 124/6 126/20 120/12 143/3 148/13 148/16 when [72] 4/5 14/13 117/3 126/22 128/14 131/24 very [63] 1/4 4/18 voluntarily [1] 155/9 155/23 160/4 16/13 16/22 18/17 132/2 132/7 132/16 11/12 15/16 21/19 147/17 we've [17] 51/1 55/8 19/23 20/5 20/23 21/5 132/24 143/5 148/4 22/25 31/24 31/24 57/15 66/7 69/5 77/2 vulnerable [2] 37/18 23/23 25/19 29/14 148/14 150/25 151/9 36/4 41/13 42/12 45/8 63/15 77/3 91/2 94/14 29/18 30/2 30/3 30/4 155/10 156/18 159/6 46/9 47/1 49/3 49/13 105/10 118/23 120/15 30/8 30/10 31/17 160/6 161/5 W 50/6 52/4 52/8 53/9 151/23 153/7 162/2 33/16 38/20 40/5 use [9] 16/8 30/22 53/10 56/5 63/24 67/6 waived [2] 98/24 162/7 162/19 40/19 40/22 41/21 31/15 40/18 93/13 67/6 72/21 76/6 79/6 142/10 weaker [1] 144/18 43/7 44/15 47/2 48/5 140/20 140/23 148/5 83/17 83/24 86/8 walk [1] 148/14 weakness [1] 51/2 48/8 49/3 49/19 58/4 149/22 89/10 93/4 93/14 want [16] 55/2 64/18 62/9 62/23 66/21 67/2 weaknesses [2] used [10] 21/16 34/7 64/24 93/3 93/5 97/12 14/14 25/20 100/11 102/18 103/7 67/21 69/2 70/19 70/13 73/14 83/5 90/7 104/25 105/24 109/19 week [9] 35/19 35/19 106/13 108/19 111/1 71/17 72/14 74/21 96/14 118/21 118/23 112/8 113/19 117/6 113/16 115/1 118/6 57/19 61/12 100/16 74/25 75/3 76/14 146/10 118/19 120/2 123/13 131/24 148/5 148/6 112/20 115/23 118/24 81/25 87/2 91/17 95/6 useful [1] 118/25 123/16 143/17 143/25 154/5 129/25 105/19 116/15 118/11 user [1] 80/24 wanted [10] 42/5 144/12 145/6 145/18 121/16 123/16 125/21 week/bad [1] 35/19 using [6] 31/12 83/24 145/19 147/10 148/19 48/25 58/14 93/21 Weekly [1] 66/21 130/16 137/11 137/21 (69) unwavering - when W when... [13] 145/1 145/17 147/12 149/13 150/12 150/25 153/13 154/9 154/18 155/4 157/21 158/10 160/13 where [58] 7/16 12/5 13/4 13/5 13/9 16/25 17/7 19/5 22/6 26/5 26/25 30/9 30/13 31/7 31/11 31/14 33/4 38/19 42/19 64/18 71/11 93/6 94/8 96/19 98/19 98/24 102/21 103/14 109/14 110/5 111/19 115/7 121/11 124/2 128/8 130/22 130/24 131/15 131/19 133/25 134/15 134/21 137/6 139/1 143/1 146/19 148/20 153/18 154/22 155/20 156/5 156/19 157/4 157/10 160/7 160/10 160/13 160/15 Where's [1] 127/19 whereas [9] 2/13 15/25 28/19 46/3 48/2 60/7 91/19 102/21 118/25 whereby [2] 139/14 149/2 wherever [3] 150/19 157/3 160/12 whether [27] 26/2 32/16 35/19 35/20 45/7 45/15 46/12 47/23 52/5 55/12 56/12 56/16 71/9 80/25 82/23 98/8 99/11 99/20 105/25 110/12 114/6 118/4 134/18 134/23 140/4 142/14 143/25 which [127] 2/2 2/13 3/12 4/4 4/8 4/16 4/24 9/4 9/23 10/3 10/19 10/20 14/22 15/1 15/23 16/13 17/15 19/1 19/24 21/17 22/25 25/14 30/4 30/7 30/8 30/15 30/16 30/20 32/24 33/3 34/20 35/1 35/10 35/13 36/15 37/5 38/13 42/3 42/13 46/2 50/23 52/15 54/7 54/16 54/16 55/6 59/19 63/8 63/21 64/13 64/21 65/3 66/9 70/2 76/17 76/21 77/5 77/6 78/3 78/6 80/18

81/7 87/9 87/16 88/16

92/10 92/11 94/9 95/16 96/2 96/3 96/22 98/3 100/2 100/9 100/19 101/3 101/5 102/24 102/25 103/3 106/15 106/16 112/12 113/13 115/19 116/4 116/6 119/8 120/7 122/1 122/2 124/3 125/5 125/18 125/23 127/3 127/20 129/13 132/9 132/16 132/17 132/18 135/5 138/25 139/22 140/14 140/21 141/14 142/3 142/17 142/23 145/5 145/9 145/11 145/12 145/20 146/10 146/17 147/16 win [6] 42/18 44/5 153/21 158/4 158/11 158/16 159/4 160/19 162/18 while [2] 89/23 103/24 whilst [4] 16/16 82/1 104/17 147/6 whistleblowing [8] 90/8 92/19 95/18 95/23 96/14 96/19 96/20 97/16 who [54] 9/19 12/10 12/12 21/11 21/18 21/22 37/20 38/11 38/23 39/1 40/20 41/1 69/1 69/22 70/10 72/19 73/17 73/23 75/17 75/25 75/25 75/25 76/9 79/16 82/8 WITN09840100 [1] 83/13 83/22 85/1 85/6 92/13 94/19 96/23 97/25 100/21 101/2 101/20 107/7 110/3 112/9 112/17 115/6 116/13 118/12 122/4 125/15 125/15 135/6 135/7 160/20 161/2 161/3 161/4 161/7 161/15 who'd [1] 67/7 whole [7] 47/17 70/21 76/3 106/25 111/9 129/9 152/12 wholly [1] 29/2 whom [4] 9/2 12/8 22/6 82/7 whose [1] 33/24 why [39] 10/16 11/8 11/13 11/18 16/8 17/16 21/10 28/8 35/10 39/2 39/3 39/18 65/14 66/1 74/12 79/14 83/15 86/21 88/21 99/2 100/24 103/8 103/16 104/6 110/8 110/10 113/16

119/19 128/1 129/16 137/3 137/8 137/19 148/4 148/6 148/7 148/10 157/25 163/15 40/16 45/25 55/5 wider [3] 9/13 120/13 146/20 will [26] 5/5 13/17 13/21 28/1 65/10 75/18 77/21 79/9 80/1 81/7 86/8 95/22 96/7 97/2 98/12 101/19 108/21 108/22 109/7 112/19 134/9 134/11 135/2 140/21 144/7 156/19 Williams [2] 75/17 76/2 54/10 54/11 54/11 70/23 winning [1] 44/16 wiser [1] 143/5 wish [3] 1/18 4/3 4/4 withdrawing [1] 71/10 withdrawn [1] 71/1 withdrew [1] 71/17 within [10] 25/13 28/9 31/8 38/10 48/18 25/13 28/14 33/11 81/17 128/8 149/25 152/16 154/23 without [14] 4/6 14/1 26/12 33/11 35/6 59/4 59/10 59/15 72/8 88/18 90/7 99/1 126/2 world [3] 58/13 126/19 1/16 witness [33] 1/13 3/22 3/25 4/19 10/2 33/8 61/20 62/3 62/21 63/11 68/6 73/21 73/23 74/6 74/13 75/6 126/21 76/11 76/12 88/19 100/8 119/5 119/15 120/21 122/2 124/6 126/22 134/2 136/8 139/7 139/10 144/13 159/5 163/23 witnesses [2] 163/11 163/12 Womble [5] 44/9 44/19 45/7 46/12 46/16 **won [2]** 71/22 72/3 won't [4] 112/18 137/17 146/11 147/21 wonder [4] 52/5 62/7 77/24 114/6 wondering [1] 143/25 word [3] 97/15 103/15 148/5 words [2] 159/21

161/12 work [57] 7/16 17/1 19/4 26/7 26/13 36/5 60/11 60/16 67/8 67/17 70/10 72/19 74/19 83/21 89/23 93/15 95/8 98/21 98/23 99/25 102/17 114/25 118/22 129/2 129/6 129/15 130/10 131/22 133/11 133/12 133/18 133/19 133/20 133/21 133/23 134/1 134/6 136/16 136/18 136/21 136/24 137/1 139/2 147/4 149/10 153/2 158/10 158/11 158/13 158/21 161/8 162/3 162/7 162/20 worked [17] 12/12 34/7 37/25 38/3 38/7 59/7 68/23 72/8 83/5 83/18 84/1 112/14 112/14 116/15 124/15 write [3] 9/11 35/23 135/6 146/4 worker [1] 85/15 working [16] 12/10 75/8 95/10 105/15 106/8 106/10 131/8 134/12 147/17 works [2] 37/24 70/8 117/20 118/7 worlds [1] 46/10 worried [4] 42/11 49/2 114/4 159/14 worry [3] 35/14 98/20 145/1 worse [2] 85/6 worst [1] 46/10 would [112] 9/13 9/14 10/25 11/4 11/7 11/12 16/25 17/1 20/17 21/15 21/21 22/12 23/2 25/23 29/4 29/5 29/23 37/21 42/10 42/19 42/23 45/11 46/5 50/19 51/3 53/25 54/1 55/3 55/5 56/9 56/12 56/13 58/4 59/1 59/10 60/21 62/12 65/7 66/7 66/15 66/17 70/23 71/14 71/25 71/25 72/1 72/22 73/9 75/1 75/5 77/6 78/6 79/4 81/19 82/17 86/21 90/6 90/19 91/4 104/23 105/6 108/1 108/9 108/20 109/5 109/14

109/25 110/9 110/13 110/14 112/13 113/7 113/16 113/23 119/1 122/11 123/6 123/17 124/20 128/8 128/10 130/12 130/17 130/23 132/15 133/1 133/11 134/1 134/5 134/16 134/18 135/7 139/15 143/15 147/17 147/18 147/23 148/2 150/11 150/12 150/13 150/15 150/16 150/18 150/19 151/10 151/19 153/14 153/16 156/23 160/25 161/11 wouldn't [14] 12/1 26/14 54/9 54/19 54/25 55/17 66/5 68/19 72/18 87/6 90/18 127/16 147/19 152/11 **Wow [2]** 56/5 137/18 Wright [1] 112/8 107/20 writing [8] 8/7 8/24 26/11 58/1 77/23 80/17 81/16 93/11 33/25 36/7 60/19 72/3 written [8] 9/22 47/6 51/25 55/17 58/9 74/4 78/19 155/14 wrong [46] 6/23 7/14 8/14 9/9 9/12 12/17 12/24 13/16 13/17 24/9 30/1 31/1 31/2 31/5 32/8 32/9 33/10 35/23 39/5 40/14 43/22 48/5 48/22 51/6 52/2 52/15 53/9 56/11 56/13 60/5 67/18 68/4 74/18 75/13 83/7 86/18 105/12 111/12 112/15 120/15 128/7 138/25 140/1 149/13 152/11 163/16 wrongly [2] 69/9 125/6 wrongs [2] 24/2 24/5 wrote [6] 8/2 9/3 9/23 53/16 62/1 101/6

yeah [83] 2/8 2/11 7/4 8/1 8/3 11/1 19/9 20/12 22/14 22/19 23/14 23/22 23/22 24/1 27/1 27/9 27/20 28/7 29/6 31/4 32/13 34/25 35/9 38/8 41/18 43/7 50/15 55/10 56/22 56/22 57/5 61/2 61/4 61/19 66/25 67/22 68/14 69/14

Υ	157/20 159/20 161/15		
yeah [45] 69/18	Young [1] 2/25		
69/21 69/25 70/3	your [110] 1/11 3/19 3/23 3/25 4/19 5/7 7/1		
70/19 71/17 74/13	7/11 10/2 10/16 10/23		
75/21 77/10 77/12 81/14 84/8 89/14	11/2 14/21 15/5 15/11		
90/25 92/21 92/23	16/4 18/20 18/24 19/7		
99/7 100/18 102/16	23/21 24/7 25/12		
103/19 113/1 113/15	27/17 30/22 32/1 32/2		
116/1 116/12 117/8	48/17 52/15 53/4 54/4 57/25 58/1 58/23		
121/16 124/11 131/5	58/24 50/2 50/2 50/2		
133/17 135/17 136/12 138/23 142/19 146/9	59/3 61/5 61/17 61/20		
147/25 148/2 148/9	62/21 63/10 64/19		
149/5 149/7 149/19	65/7 65/23 66/10		
150/3 150/5 150/8	68/15 70/1 75/10 76/11 76/12 89/1		
157/8 162/25	89/12 94/10 94/14		
year [11] 26/8 26/18 49/2 80/7 91/5 123/21	94/16 95/14 96/3 97/6		
123/22 129/8 129/25	98/16 98/17 99/2		
144/16 163/2	99/23 100/8 101/16		
years [35] 9/10 9/11	101/19 103/20 104/2 105/4 105/11 107/12		
14/18 17/20 18/21	112/21 115/2 116/2		
19/24 32/2 32/12 37/1 37/18 38/14 39/12	117/4 119/5 120/3		
40/12 43/6 45/25	120/3 120/15 120/16		
50/14 52/18 55/1 55/4	120/21 122/2 124/6		
58/16 67/16 68/8	126/22 127/22 129/16 134/3 134/5 136/2		
68/21 68/21 68/22	136/8 138/7 138/10		
84/2 84/22 88/17 119/24 125/16 145/9	138/15 139/7 139/10		
145/21 154/3 162/3	139/22 140/3 144/13		
162/7	146/7 146/25 148/22		
years' [1] 25/13	149/9 149/10 152/21 157/18 157/21 159/21		
yes [204]	163/22 163/25		
yesterday [2] 85/9 131/18	yours [1] 131/4		
yet [1] 89/21	yourself [1] 162/21		
you [682]			
you'd [3] 47/7 54/25			
126/22 you'll [7] 6/25 56/18			
65/1 81/11 115/15			
116/9 156/25			
you're [34] 10/4			
15/22 27/14 28/18 32/11 34/23 35/17			
35/17 35/19 35/20			
43/2 45/13 54/3 67/23			
73/10 77/21 91/19			
92/5 92/9 93/3 109/1			
111/23 115/4 115/4 115/8 117/25 120/2			
140/14 144/22 148/21			
148/22 157/1 158/18			
161/2			
you've [24] 6/2 10/6 11/10 15/7 19/8 19/10			
20/15 47/6 59/13			
61/25 115/7 117/24			
118/9 118/11 118/12			
118/13 148/7 148/10			
150/23 152/21 156/5			
-	•		(71) yeah yourself