1		Wednesday, 24 July 2024
2	(10	.05 am)
3	MS	PRICE: Good morning, sir. Can you see and hear us?
4	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you.
5	MS	PRICE: Can we now call Margot James, who, as you now
6		know, is now attending remotely this morning?
7	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Yes.
8	MS	PRICE: Can you see the witness, sir?
9	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: I can indeed.
10		Can you see me, Ms James?
11	THI	E WITNESS: Yes, good morning. I can see you, Sir Wyn.
12	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you. Over to you, Ms Price.
13		MARGOT CATHLEEN JAMES (affirmed)
14		Questioned by MS PRICE
15	MS	PRICE: Can you confirm your full name, please, Ms James?
16	Α.	Yes. It is Margot Cathleen James.
17	Q.	As you know, my name is Emma Price and I ask questions
18		on behalf of the Inquiry. Thank you for attending to
19		assist the Inquiry in its work and for providing the
20		witness statement which you have ahead of today. Do you
21		have a hard copy of that witness statement with you?
22	Α.	Yes, I do.
23	Q.	It is dated 26 June 2024. If you could turn to page 28
24		of the statement, please.
25	Α.	Yes, I have 28.
		1
1		I am perfectly physically able to do so. Thank you.
2	Q.	I'd like to start, please, with an overview of your
3		professional background and career in Government. You
4		explain in your statement that in 1985 you co-founded
5		and were Chief Executive Officer of a company providing
6		public relations and medical education services to
7		pharmaceutical companies and healthcare providers; is
8		that right?
0	۸	Van that's correct

- 9 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 10 Q. In 1999, that company was sold and you managed the
 change to it becoming a subsidiary of a large
 multinational?
- 13 A. Yes, that's right.
- 14 Q. You acted as chair of that subsidiary until 2002?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. Then you joined an advertising agency in 2003 as Vice17 President, Europe, with responsibility for the
- 18 integration and growth of its healthcare assets?
- 19 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 20 Q. You were first elected as a Member of Parliament in
 2010 --
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. -- and you served until 2019 when you stood down at the24 general election?
- 25 A. Yes, that's right.

- Q. Do you have a copy of the statement with a visible
 signature with you?
- 3 A. The hard copy doesn't have the original signature but
- 4 I did have emailed my hard copy with the signature, and
- 5 I have looked at it this morning and I can attest to the
- 6 fact that it is my signature.
- 7 **Q.** Thank you. Are the contents of your statement true to
- 8 the best of your knowledge and belief?
- 9 A. Yes, they are.
- 10 **Q.** For the purposes of the transcript, the reference for
- 11 Ms James' statement is WITN10910100. Ms James, your
- 12 witness statement is now in evidence and will be
- 13 published on the Inquiry's website in due course. As
- 14 such, I will not be asking you about every aspect of
- 15 your statement this morning, just specific issues which
- 16 are addressed in it. Okay?
- 17 A. Yes, thank you.
- 18 Q. I understand that there's something you wanted to say at19 the outset of your evidence?
- 20 A. Well, thank you very much for giving me the opportunity,
- 21 Ms Price, to apologise to Sir Wyn and to everybody
- 22 present that I am not in the room. Unfortunately, I got
- 23 Covid at the end of last week, and I respect the fact
- 24 that the rules that the Inquiry are following preclude
- 25 me from being able to give evidence in person, although 2
- 1 **Q.** Whilst a Member of Parliament, you served as
- 2 an Assistant Whip from 13 May 2015 to 17 July 2016?
- 3 A. Yes, I did.
- **Q.** Then from 17 July 2016 to the 9 January 2018 you served
 as Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Small
- 6 Business, Consumers and Corporate Responsibility with
- 7 the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial
- 8 Strategy; is that right?
- 9 A. Yes, that's right.
- 10 Q. It was in this role that you became involved in some of
- 11 the matters relevant to the work of this Inquiry?
- 12 A. Yes, correct.
- 13 **Q.** After you left the Department for Business, Energy and
- 14 Industrial Strategy, you held a further ministerial post
- 15 for as Minister of State for Digital and the Creative
- 16 Industries with the Department for Digital, Culture,
- 17 Media and Sport, from 9 January 2018 to 18 July 2019?
- 18 A. Yes, that's right.
- 19 Q. Since leaving Parliament, you have held number of roles,20 including being the Executive Chair of the Warwick
- 21 Manufacturing Group at the University of Warwick, and
- 22 two non-executive board roles in the financial services
- 23 and technology sector?
- 24 A. That's correct.
- 25 **Q.** You now do independent consultancy and *pro bono* work in 4

8

1	the areas of decarbonisation and climate change?	1		weren't already pre-identified as being needing of
	Yes, that's right.	2		a significant amount of attention, over and above what
	You are also an Emeritus Governor of the London School	3		you might distribute if you were distributing your time
4 5 1	of Economics and Political Science?	4	~	evenly across everything in your portfolio.
	Yes, I am.	5	Q.	
6 Q.		6		of your statement. Could we have that on screen,
7	Parliamentary Under-Secretary at BEIS, and the Post	7		please, it's page 15.
8	Office brief in particular, you describe your portfolio	8		Here you describe the postal affairs
9	in this role as broad in your statement and you have set	9		responsibilities as themselves quite broad, and you say
0	out the areas for which you were responsible at	10		this:
1	paragraphs 11 to 14. You describe postal affairs and	11		"The core of the brief was to ensure that BEIS held
2	the Post Office as one of eight policy areas and	12		the [Post Office Limited] Board to account for meeting
3	statutory bodies for which you had responsibility, all	13		financial and non-financial targets and delivery of work
4 5	of which were responsibilities held in addition to the	14		that was agreed to be central to the Government's
5	three main areas of responsibility: small businesses,	15		manifesto commitments. This included securing the
6	consumers and corporate responsibility; is that right?	16		future of 3,000 rural branches and branches in lower
7 A.		17		income urban neighbours, modernising the network,
8 Q		18		meeting access criteria, and expanding services (in
9	ability to provide effective oversight of the Post	19		particular a digital verification and identification
20	Office?	20		system, banking services and services to SMEs). Some of
21 A .		21		the central work to that brief was to ensure all routine
22 23	to the question, is no, in normal times. But I think	22		small businesses and consumer banking services were
	that if one were to be it made it very difficult	23 24		available throughout post office branches, and in
24 25	the breadth of the portfolio made it very difficult to drill down into any areas within the overall brief that	24 25		particular in rural areas and lower income urban areas." Then at 16, you say this:
.0	5	20		6
1	"Apart from this there was significant focus within	4		in such branches, played an integral part in the
2	"Apart from this there was significant focus within the postal affairs brief on planning and securing [Post	1 2		in such branches, played an integral part in the delivery of the Post Office's social role?
<u>-</u> 3	Office] funding. The Government provides funding to	2	•	An absolutely crucial part. It certainly couldn't have
	[Post Office Limited] in the form of a subsidy (which	3 4	А.	been delivered without them.
4 5	recognises the wider social purpose of the network that	4 5	Q.	
	goes beyond that which would be commercially viable)."	6	ω.	contractual matters on the one hand and policy or
6 7		0 7		
, 8	Picking up on the reference to the wider social role, would you agree that the maintenance of the Post			strategy matters on the other, at paragraphs 20 to 23 of your statement. Could we go to paragraph 20, please,
		8		it's page 6. By way of background, you say this:
9 IO A .	Office's social role was a Government policy objective?	9 10		"It was the intention of successive governments
		10		that, although publicly owned, the Post Office should
1 Q				have commercial freedom to raise funds, invest in new
12	make financial sense to keep Post Office branches open	12		
3	in rural and low income urban areas, the social value of	13		technology, diversify its offering, and operate as
4	doing so justified it?	14 15		a retail company in a competitive market. It was thought that these commercial freedoms were crucial to
5 A .				-
16 17	that we'd protect the network and, by saying that,	16		the sustainability of the Post Office. The legislation
17	I mean particularly those services in rural areas and	17		underpinning [Post Office Limited] (the Postal Services
8	poorer urban areas, which would otherwise not be	18		Act 2000 and the Postal Services Act 2011) therefore
19	commercially viable. So the subsidy was in respect of	19		separated the functions of ownership and management.
20	the need for Post Office to deliver a service,	20		The executives of [Post Office Limited] owed their
21	significant parts of which would not be commercially	21		duties to the company, and were accountable to the [Post
22	viable if operated purely in the free market.	22		Office Limited] Board, not directly to the Government of
23 Q.		23		the day."
24	branches in rural areas and low income urban areas, as	24		You go on in paragraph 21 over the page to say:
25	well as their staff and Post Office employees employed 7	25		"The Government's role is as sole shareholder. It

7

(2) Pages 5 - 8

1		is responsible for setting the overall strategy, policy
2		or objectives for the Post Office, as well as ensuring
3		that [Post Office Limited] works to deliver on those
4		objectives, but not to have any involvement in the
5		day-to-day running of the operations of the business.
6		It was accepted that [Post Office Limited] would operate
7		at arm's length from Government, that such freedom was
8		crucial to its ability to grow and over time reduce its
9		dependence on the public finances. As shareholder the
10		Government would only get more involved (through UKGI,
11		who undertook the shareholder function on behalf of
12		Government) if the strategic aims or objectives
13		looked as if they might not be met, such as if a key
14		milestone had not been achieved."
15		Would you agree that there may be times when the way
16		in which an arm's-length body conducts itself at
17		an operational or contractual level can cause concern
18		for ministers at a policy or strategy level?
19	Α.	Yes, I can think of instances where that would be the
20		case. I've set out my answers, I hope with some
21		clarity, but there is a slightly theoretical nature to
22		those answers, I think. It is not always that the
23		line between strategy and execution and policy, it's
24		a grey area, and the lines sometimes can get rather
25		blurred. But, ideally, I think that the way that we've
		9

1	Α.	Yes, I think that the information about operational
2		matters should be at quite a high level. I don't think
3		it does the distinction between ownership and management
4		any favours if shareholders are getting a massive volume
5		of information about operational matters. That's not
6		appropriate but I think certainly the there's got to
7		be high-quality information at a high level about both
8		operational and strategic issues that are affecting the
9		company at any one time.
10	Q.	Ministers need to be adequately briefed?
11	Α.	Yes, they do. They certainly do.
12	Q.	And ministers must provide effective challenge to the
13		arm's-length body's approach to key
14	Α.	Yes.
15	Q.	operational and contractual matters which have the
16		potential to impact upon policy and strategy?
17	Α.	Yes. I think that there's a role for both ministers
18		and, in a government-owned entity, the shareholder
19		representative function, which, when I was a minister,
20		was undertaken by UKGI. It's most important that they
21		are in a position to challenge on a day-to-day basis but
22		that doesn't remove the responsibility of ministers to
23		challenge maybe less frequently. But, you know, when
24		on the appropriate occasions when ministers meet
25		directors of the company for updates and things like 11

1		set it out I've set it out probably works best, as
2		long as you have a board of directors that are acting in
3		good faith and owners that know enough about the
4		business to be able to make exercise their judgement
5		as to when they need to perhaps blur those lines
6		a little bit and get involved in something that might be
7		normally classified as operational, and when they can
8		draw back and act in the normal way that owners of
9		companies are supposed to act.
10	Q.	Particularly where, as a matter of policy, there is
11		a social role performed by a government-owned asset,
12		would you agree that it is vital that there is effective
13		oversight of key operational and contractual matters
14		which might have a policy or strategy impact?
15	Α.	Yes, I think the social purpose heightens the need for
16		both the Board and the shareholders to ensure that the
17		highest standards of corporate governance and corporate
18		responsibility pertain, but I think, actually, those
19		standards should be respected, whether or not the
20		company has a specific social purpose, essentially
21		within its constitution.
22	Q.	Would you agree that, in order for there to be such
23		effective oversight, the Government must have access to
24		adequate information about key operational and
25		contractual matters?
		10
1		that, then ministers should also be challenging the
2		board. But on the day to day, that would be delegated
3		to UKGI in this instance.
4	Q.	At paragraph 23 of your statement, further down the

5 page, please, you give your view on which side of the 6 albeit blurry line between contractual and operation and 7 policy and strategy Horizon IT issues fell. Starting three lines down at paragraph 23 you say: 8 "The legislation assigned the management functions,

9 10 including the operations of the company, to [Post Office 11 Limited]. This meant that issues concerning [Post 12 Office Limited's] IT systems, aside from the issue of 13 further investment in it and budgeting for that 14 investment, were questions of day-to-day operation of 15 the company. Issues surrounding whether Horizon was 16 functioning as it should were matters for [Post Office 17 Limited] to resolve as part of its operations."

18 The complaints about the Horizon IT system, about 19 which you were briefed when you took up the role, were 20 that the way the system was functioning had led to 21 people who had run and staffed Post Office branches 22 being wrongfully prosecuted and/or their contracts being 23 wrongfully terminated. Were allegations like this not 24 relevant to the wider policy and strategy goals for the 25 Post Office?

1	Α.	Yes, I think that allegations like that were relevant to
2		the strategic the delivery of the strategic goals of
3		the Post Office. I don't feel, when I started in the
4		role, that that was the way in which I was briefed on
5		the Horizon issue. But, yes, in answer to your
6		question, had I been briefed in that way, yes. The
7		answer is yes, it should have been.
8	Q.	Well, looking at it in a number of ways, first
9		considering the social role which the Government wished
10		to maintain as a matter of policy, which relied on the
11		people who had run and staffed Post Office branches,
12		there was a potential impact on that directly, wasn't
13		there?
14	Α.	Yes. Yes, there was. Based on what I now know,
15		certainly.
16	Q.	We'll come on to that first briefing but, just taken at
17		the high level, whether the allegations were right or
18		wrong, the nature of those allegations were, on their
19		face, weren't they, relevant in that wider sense?
20	Α.	I think, when we come on to discuss the nature and scale
21		of the allegations which were briefed to me in the
22		early in my early days as minister with
23		responsibility, did not strike me immediately as
24		requiring in-depth oversight from myself as a minister
25		at that point in time.
		13
1		
•		you as Parliamentary Under-Secretary?
2	Α.	you as Parliamentary Under-Secretary? No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly
	Α.	
2	A. Q.	No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly
2 3		No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister.
2 3 4		No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James'
2 3 4 5		No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10.
2 3 4 5 6		No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the
2 3 4 5 6 7		No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the role and responsibility of the Department and you as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8		No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the role and responsibility of the Department and you as responsible Minister when acting as a shareholder and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the role and responsibility of the Department and you as responsible Minister when acting as a shareholder and when acting as a Government Department. Can I ask, why
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the role and responsibility of the Department and you as responsible Minister when acting as a shareholder and when acting as a Government Department. Can I ask, why do you draw a distinction between the Government as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the role and responsibility of the Department and you as responsible Minister when acting as a shareholder and when acting as a Government Department. Can I ask, why do you draw a distinction between the Government as shareholder and the Government as a Department?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q.	No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the role and responsibility of the Department and you as responsible Minister when acting as a shareholder and when acting as a Government Department. Can I ask, why do you draw a distinction between the Government as shareholder and the Government as a Department? The shareholder role obviously is the ownership role,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q.	No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the role and responsibility of the Department and you as responsible Minister when acting as a shareholder and when acting as a Government Department. Can I ask, why do you draw a distinction between the Government as shareholder and the Government as a Department? The shareholder role obviously is the ownership role, and that is where I think we delegated the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the role and responsibility of the Department and you as responsible Minister when acting as a shareholder and when acting as a Government Department. Can I ask, why do you draw a distinction between the Government as shareholder and the Government as a Department? The shareholder role obviously is the ownership role, and that is where I think we delegated the responsibility for acting as an agent, if you like, on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q.	No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the role and responsibility of the Department and you as responsible Minister when acting as a shareholder and when acting as a Government Department. Can I ask, why do you draw a distinction between the Government as shareholder and the Government as a Department? The shareholder role obviously is the ownership role, and that is where I think we delegated the responsibility for acting as an agent, if you like, on behalf of the Department to UKGI and UKGI was there to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the role and responsibility of the Department and you as responsible Minister when acting as a shareholder and when acting as a Government Department. Can I ask, why do you draw a distinction between the Government as shareholder and the Government as a Department? The shareholder role obviously is the ownership role, and that is where I think we delegated the responsibility for acting as an agent, if you like, on behalf of the Department to UKGI and UKGI was there to perform the normal responsibilities associated with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q.	No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the role and responsibility of the Department and you as responsible Minister when acting as a shareholder and when acting as a Government Department. Can I ask, why do you draw a distinction between the Government as shareholder and the Government as a Department? The shareholder role obviously is the ownership role, and that is where I think we delegated the responsibility for acting as an agent, if you like, on behalf of the Department to UKGI and UKGI was there to perform the normal responsibilities associated with the shareholders. I did wonder when I wrote this, I did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q.	No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the role and responsibility of the Department and you as responsible Minister when acting as a shareholder and when acting as a Government Department. Can I ask, why do you draw a distinction between the Government as shareholder and the Government as a Department? The shareholder role obviously is the ownership role, and that is where I think we delegated the responsibility for acting as an agent, if you like, on behalf of the Department to UKGI and UKGI was there to perform the normal responsibilities associated with the shareholders. I did wonder when I wrote this, I did consider that the Government Department, particularly as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q.	No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the role and responsibility of the Department and you as responsible Minister when acting as a shareholder and when acting as a Government Department. Can I ask, why do you draw a distinction between the Government as shareholder and the Government as a Department? The shareholder role obviously is the ownership role, and that is where I think we delegated the responsibility for acting as an agent, if you like, on behalf of the Department to UKGI and UKGI was there to perform the normal responsibilities associated with the shareholders. I did wonder when I wrote this, I did consider that the Government Department, particularly as it had, even in my own portfolio, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q.	No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the role and responsibility of the Department and you as responsible Minister when acting as a shareholder and when acting as a Government Department. Can I ask, why do you draw a distinction between the Government as shareholder and the Government as a Department? The shareholder role obviously is the ownership role, and that is where I think we delegated the responsibility for acting as an agent, if you like, on behalf of the Department to UKGI and UKGI was there to perform the normal responsibilities associated with the shareholders. I did wonder when I wrote this, I did consider that the Government Department, particularly as it had, even in my own portfolio, you know, responsibility for corporate responsibility and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q.	No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the role and responsibility of the Department and you as responsible Minister when acting as a shareholder and when acting as a Government Department. Can I ask, why do you draw a distinction between the Government as shareholder and the Government as a Department? The shareholder role obviously is the ownership role, and that is where I think we delegated the responsibility for acting as an agent, if you like, on behalf of the Department to UKGI and UKGI was there to perform the normal responsibilities associated with the shareholders. I did wonder when I wrote this, I did consider that the Government Department, particularly as it had, even in my own portfolio, you know, responsibility for corporate responsibility and corporate governance and the labour markets, that there
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q.	No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the role and responsibility of the Department and you as responsible Minister when acting as a shareholder and when acting as a Government Department. Can I ask, why do you draw a distinction between the Government as shareholder and the Government as a Department? The shareholder role obviously is the ownership role, and that is where I think we delegated the responsibility for acting as an agent, if you like, on behalf of the Department to UKGI and UKGI was there to perform the normal responsibilities associated with the shareholders. I did wonder when I wrote this, I did consider that the Government Department, particularly as it had, even in my own portfolio, you know, responsibility for corporate responsibility and corporate governance and the labour markets, that there was a wider remit that my Department had, given its
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q.	No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the role and responsibility of the Department and you as responsible Minister when acting as a shareholder and when acting as a Government Department. Can I ask, why do you draw a distinction between the Government as shareholder and the Government as a Department? The shareholder role obviously is the ownership role, and that is where I think we delegated the responsibility for acting as an agent, if you like, on behalf of the Department to UKGI and UKGI was there to perform the normal responsibilities associated with the shareholders. I did wonder when I wrote this, I did consider that the Government Department, particularly as it had, even in my own portfolio, you know, responsibility for corporate responsibility and corporate governance and the labour markets, that there was a wider remit that my Department had, given its responsibility for those areas of business policy that were affecting all businesses, particularly publicly quoted companies but also large private companies and,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q.	No, not at the time. No. If you're yes, certainly not in the first sort of half of my time as minister. Could we have on screen please paragraph 29 of Ms James' statement, page 10. You discuss here a potential distinction between the role and responsibility of the Department and you as responsible Minister when acting as a shareholder and when acting as a Government Department. Can I ask, why do you draw a distinction between the Government as shareholder and the Government as a Department? The shareholder role obviously is the ownership role, and that is where I think we delegated the responsibility for acting as an agent, if you like, on behalf of the Department to UKGI and UKGI was there to perform the normal responsibilities associated with the shareholders. I did wonder when I wrote this, I did consider that the Government Department, particularly as it had, even in my own portfolio, you know, responsibility for corporate responsibility and corporate governance and the labour markets, that there was a wider remit that my Department had, given its responsibility for those areas of business policy that were affecting all businesses, particularly publicly

on I1	「 Inq	uiry 24 July 2024
1	Q.	Looking at it in another way, wouldn't IT failings
2		resulting in wrongful prosecutions and terminations of
3		contract have been inconsistent with any valid policy or
4		strategy applying to the Post Office?
5	Α.	Yes, I believe so. I believe so. I wasn't aware
6		I don't think I was aware that there were wrongful
7		convictions. It may have been that I misunderstood my
8		early briefings but, in my early briefings, I was
9		advised that a number of people had gone to prison, but
10		that was as a result of being convicted of a criminal
11		offence in the courts.
12	Q.	At this stage, I'm just talking about the allegations,
13		rather than whether those allegations were right or not,
14		and we'll come on to those prosecutions. But just in
15		terms of those allegations, you'd agree, wouldn't you,
16		that were those allegations correct, that would of
17		course be inconsistent?
18	Α.	Yes, it would.
19	Q.	This is not to mention the impact on the future of the
20		Post Office of potentially expensive and reputationally
21		damaging litigation arising out of the allegations being
22		lost or the litigation being lost; would you agree that
23		that was a wider impact that needed to be considered?
24	Α.	Most definitely.
25	Q.	Were those wider impact points considered at the time by 14
1		by inference, large public bodies publicly-owned
2		bodies like the Post Office.
3		So I felt that my department and myself as
4		a minister should be more focused on those aspects than
5		perhaps the shareholder function, which was acting
6		purely as an agent of the owner.
7		That statement can come down now. Thank you.
8		I'd like to come, please, to the officials who
9		assisted you in the part of your role which related to
10		the Post Office and how, in general terms, they provided
11		information and advice. If I have understood your
12		written evidence correctly, there were, broadly
13		speaking, two pools of officials who provided you with
14		assistance on Post Office matters: first private
15		secretaries from the Department's private office, who
16 17		assisted in preparing paperwork for your ministerial box
17		and managed your diary; and second, officials who were
18		subject matter experts in particular policy areas who,
19 20		for the Post Office part of your role, worked for UKGI;
20 21	A.	is that right? Yes. That's right.
21	Q.	Of these two groups, you say it was UKGI who prepared
23		advice to you on the Post Office?
	•	

- 24 A. Yes, they did.
- 25 **Q.** You describe UKGI officials as conduits of information 16

1		between the Post Office and BEIS and that, if you needed
2		a briefing on Post Office issues or wanted to raise
3		questions of the Post Office, this would be through UKGI
4		in the first instance?
5	Α.	Yes, that's right.
6	Q.	You say at paragraph 25 of your statement that they also
7		look the lead in challenging the Post Office Executives,
8		and accounting for Post Office activities to BEIS. How
9		did you understand those officials to challenge the Post
10		Office Executives?
11	Α.	I saw most of the challenge during the time where we
12		were discussing budgetary matters, remuneration issues,
13		the level of subsidy and investment were two distinct
14		things that Government were providing. It was
15		a particularly busy time on that issue, because we were
16		approaching the negotiations around the next three years
17		of Government investment and subsidy. So I saw most of
18		the challenge in those terms because the early budgets
19		that we received from the Post Office Board were quite
20		considerably higher, or needing of more resource, than
21		once UKGI had finished its various levels of challenge.
22		So I took it to mean that UKGI had a representative
23		on the Board of POL and, in addition to that, a lot of
24		work goes on behind the scenes within UKGI to provide
25		good analysis, financial support, et cetera, and that 17
		17
1		recipient of the advice. So I think that's what
1 2		recipient of the advice. So I think that's what I regard as important when it came to impartiality:
		•
2		I regard as important when it came to impartiality: I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact
2 3		I regard as important when it came to impartiality: I required that the person providing the advice did not
2 3 4 5 6		I regard as important when it came to impartiality: I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact
2 3 4 5		I regard as important when it came to impartiality: I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8		I regard as important when it came to impartiality: I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given. And, throughout my ministerial career, I would say that most of the advice, the vast majority of my advice, met those criteria. On more than one occasion, though,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		I regard as important when it came to impartiality: I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given. And, throughout my ministerial career, I would say that most of the advice, the vast majority of my advice, met those criteria. On more than one occasion, though, it didn't.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	I regard as important when it came to impartiality: I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given. And, throughout my ministerial career, I would say that most of the advice, the vast majority of my advice, met those criteria. On more than one occasion, though, it didn't. The part in brackets, are you saying here that you would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given. And, throughout my ministerial career, I would say that most of the advice, the vast majority of my advice, met those criteria. On more than one occasion, though, it didn't. The part in brackets, are you saying here that you would follow advice given by officials in the absence of good
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		I regard as important when it came to impartiality: I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given. And, throughout my ministerial career, I would say that most of the advice, the vast majority of my advice, met those criteria. On more than one occasion, though, it didn't. The part in brackets, are you saying here that you would follow advice given by officials in the absence of good reason to challenge it?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	I regard as important when it came to impartiality: I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given. And, throughout my ministerial career, I would say that most of the advice, the vast majority of my advice, met those criteria. On more than one occasion, though, it didn't. The part in brackets, are you saying here that you would follow advice given by officials in the absence of good reason to challenge it? Yes. I normally the advice if it's advising you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		I regard as important when it came to impartiality: I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given. And, throughout my ministerial career, I would say that most of the advice, the vast majority of my advice, met those criteria. On more than one occasion, though, it didn't. The part in brackets, are you saying here that you would follow advice given by officials in the absence of good reason to challenge it? Yes. I normally the advice if it's advising you to take some action, the advice is usually provided in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given. And, throughout my ministerial career, I would say that most of the advice, the vast majority of my advice, met those criteria. On more than one occasion, though, it didn't. The part in brackets, are you saying here that you would follow advice given by officials in the absence of good reason to challenge it? Yes. I normally the advice if it's advising you to take some action, the advice is usually provided in a way that provides you with some options and very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		I regard as important when it came to impartiality: I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given. And, throughout my ministerial career, I would say that most of the advice, the vast majority of my advice, met those criteria. On more than one occasion, though, it didn't. The part in brackets, are you saying here that you would follow advice given by officials in the absence of good reason to challenge it? Yes. I normally the advice if it's advising you to take some action, the advice is usually provided in a way that provides you with some options and very cogent explanation of the implications of each option
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		I regard as important when it came to impartiality: I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given. And, throughout my ministerial career, I would say that most of the advice, the vast majority of my advice, met those criteria. On more than one occasion, though, it didn't. The part in brackets, are you saying here that you would follow advice given by officials in the absence of good reason to challenge it? Yes. I normally the advice if it's advising you to take some action, the advice is usually provided in a way that provides you with some options and very cogent explanation of the implications of each option and I would normally, especially when I was new in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		I regard as important when it came to impartiality: I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given. And, throughout my ministerial career, I would say that most of the advice, the vast majority of my advice, met those criteria. On more than one occasion, though, it didn't. The part in brackets, are you saying here that you would follow advice given by officials in the absence of good reason to challenge it? Yes. I normally the advice if it's advising you to take some action, the advice is usually provided in a way that provides you with some options and very cogent explanation of the implications of each option and I would normally, especially when I was new in post I think you have to have a very good reason to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19		I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given. And, throughout my ministerial career, I would say that most of the advice, the vast majority of my advice, met those criteria. On more than one occasion, though, it didn't. The part in brackets, are you saying here that you would follow advice given by officials in the absence of good reason to challenge it? Yes. I normally the advice if it's advising you to take some action, the advice is usually provided in a way that provides you with some options and very cogent explanation of the implications of each option and I would normally, especially when I was new in post I think you have to have a very good reason to challenge advice when you're learning your brief.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20		I regard as important when it came to impartiality: I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given. And, throughout my ministerial career, I would say that most of the advice, the vast majority of my advice, met those criteria. On more than one occasion, though, it didn't. The part in brackets, are you saying here that you would follow advice given by officials in the absence of good reason to challenge it? Yes. I normally the advice if it's advising you to take some action, the advice is usually provided in a way that provides you with some options and very cogent explanation of the implications of each option and I would normally, especially when I was new in post I think you have to have a very good reason to challenge advice when you're learning your brief. I mean, there are some exceptions to that but, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		I regard as important when it came to impartiality: I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given. And, throughout my ministerial career, I would say that most of the advice, the vast majority of my advice, met those criteria. On more than one occasion, though, it didn't. The part in brackets, are you saying here that you would follow advice given by officials in the absence of good reason to challenge it? Yes. I normally the advice if it's advising you to take some action, the advice is usually provided in a way that provides you with some options and very cogent explanation of the implications of each option and I would normally, especially when I was new in post I think you have to have a very good reason to challenge advice when you're learning your brief. I mean, there are some exceptions to that but, in general, I would follow the advice given, you know,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		I regard as important when it came to impartiality: I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given. And, throughout my ministerial career, I would say that most of the advice, the vast majority of my advice, met those criteria. On more than one occasion, though, it didn't. The part in brackets, are you saying here that you would follow advice given by officials in the absence of good reason to challenge it? Yes. I normally the advice if it's advising you to take some action, the advice is usually provided in a way that provides you with some options and very cogent explanation of the implications of each option and I would normally, especially when I was new in post I think you have to have a very good reason to challenge advice when you're learning your brief. I mean, there are some exceptions to that but, in general, I would follow the advice given, you know, early on in any job I had in Government and,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given. And, throughout my ministerial career, I would say that most of the advice, the vast majority of my advice, met those criteria. On more than one occasion, though, it didn't. The part in brackets, are you saying here that you would follow advice given by officials in the absence of good reason to challenge it? Yes. I normally the advice if it's advising you to take some action, the advice is usually provided in a way that provides you with some options and very cogent explanation of the implications of each option and I would normally, especially when I was new in post I think you have to have a very good reason to challenge advice when you're learning your brief. I mean, there are some exceptions to that but, in general, I would follow the advice given, you know, early on in any job I had in Government and, occasionally, you do have good reason to challenge that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24		I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given. And, throughout my ministerial career, I would say that most of the advice, the vast majority of my advice, met those criteria. On more than one occasion, though, it didn't. The part in brackets, are you saying here that you would follow advice given by officials in the absence of good reason to challenge it? Yes. I normally the advice if it's advising you to take some action, the advice is usually provided in a way that provides you with some options and very cogent explanation of the implications of each option and I would normally, especially when I was new in post I think you have to have a very good reason to challenge advice when you're learning your brief. I mean, there are some exceptions to that but, in general, I would follow the advice given, you know, early on in any job I had in Government and, occasionally, you do have good reason to challenge that advice, yes. Generally not in the early days, I don't
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		I required that the person providing the advice did not have his or her own agenda that would potentially impact the nature of that advice given. And, throughout my ministerial career, I would say that most of the advice, the vast majority of my advice, met those criteria. On more than one occasion, though, it didn't. The part in brackets, are you saying here that you would follow advice given by officials in the absence of good reason to challenge it? Yes. I normally the advice if it's advising you to take some action, the advice is usually provided in a way that provides you with some options and very cogent explanation of the implications of each option and I would normally, especially when I was new in post I think you have to have a very good reason to challenge advice when you're learning your brief. I mean, there are some exceptions to that but, in general, I would follow the advice given, you know, early on in any job I had in Government and, occasionally, you do have good reason to challenge that

1		was the nature of challenge that was going on that
2		didn't need my day-to-day involvement.
3		I dare say, by the way, that challenge was going on
4		in other areas as well. I just answered the question by
5		means of an illustration of an area where I was
6	-	particularly aware.
7	Q.	You deal with the standards you expected from your
8		officials at paragraph 26 of your statement. Could we
9		have that on screen, please. It's page 8. You see:
10		"As with the advice I received on all areas of my
11		policy portfolio, I relied on officials for objective
12		and honest advice. They were bound by the Civil Service
13		Code and so I expected the advice given to be of this
14		character. Given the breadth of all ministerial
15		portfolios, it is necessary that Ministers make
16		decisions on the basis of the advice given (except in
17		those cases where I had good reason to challenge that
18		advice) and we are reliant on its impartiality and
19		accuracy."
20		Why was impartiality in particular so important?
21	Α.	Well, I mean, the Civil Service Code requires advice to
22		be impartial and objective, and it's very important, the
23		impartiality aspect of it, for the advice to be given in
24		good faith, without whoever is giving it having
25		an agenda which may or may not be known to the intended
		18
1	Q.	What would constitute good reason to challenge advice?
2	Α.	When you feel that the when you feel there's some
3		partiality, for a start. If you don't trust the advice,
4		that is a very good reason to challenge it. And when
5		you think that it's contrary to the public interest is
6		usually the other reason. There can sometimes be you
7		have to have an eye on the Government and the impact
8		you're having on other Departments, Number 10, all these
9		other stakeholders within Government. That might be
10		a reason to challenge advice. You might feel that the
11		advice is all well and fine but you know that a key
12		player, whether that's the Chancellor or the Prime
13		Minister or your own Secretary of State, is going to
14		have an issue with it, then that might be a reason to
15		challenge it, against the public interest or you feel
16		that there's some partiality involved and you doubt its
17		integrity. Those are the reasons, really, that I would
18		have challenged advice.
19	Q.	At the time did you ever feel there was partiality in
20		the advice being provided to you and the briefings being
21		provided to you about the Post Office?
22	Α.	No, I didn't. I didn't.
23	~	You go on at paragraph 26 to say this:
	Q.	
24	Q.	"I would, for example, rely on the officials to
24 25	Q.	"I would, for example, rely on the officials to review and analyse the information provided to them and
	Q.	"I would, for example, rely on the officials to

1		provide me with sensible steers on action and draft
2		responses to correspondence or Parliamentary Questions
3		which advanced the Government's manifesto commitments
4		and policy more broadly."
5		You go on to deal with the process for dealing with
6		correspondence at paragraph 27, and you explain this:
7		"Correspondence would be received by my private
8		office and directed to me in a bundle a few times
9		a week. It would initially be triaged by my private
10		secretaries and I trusted them to deal with
11		correspondence on my behalf. Documents which they
12		referred to officials for analysis or advice would be
13		returned to me with a submission or note of advice and
14		often with a draft response for my consideration.
15		I would read the correspondence and documents returned
16		to me, but I relied on officials to direct me to the
17		paperwork that required my close attention."
18		How did you ensure that your private secretaries
19		knew how to respond to correspondence appropriately on
20		your behalf?
21	Α.	There would be a sort of Government position the
22		Department position, the policy position, would be
23		cleared and subject to review whenever circumstances
24		changed, so that the correspondence would be would
25		come in and people not in my private office would draft
		21
1		and some of it that would fall into that category would
2		not reach me. It would be replied to by a private
3		sector on behalf of the Minister sorry, a private
4		secretary on behalf of the Minister. But I think, for
5		the I think I'm understanding your questioning right:
6		you're talking about correspondence that did come
7		through me personally.
8	Q.	I am talking about correspondence of substance, if I can
9		put it that way.
10	Α.	Yes. Correspondence of substance, it would be prepared
11		in the way I outlined and it would then reach me in
12		a big folder with the draft response for me to just
13	_	sign.
14	Q.	5 5 1 5
15		paperwork which required your close attention: was that
16		your private secretaries or the UKGI officials?
17	Α.	It might be both. It might be either or both, really.
18		It was exceptional. Normally it was just letters, they
19		spoke for themselves, they didn't need any particular
20		briefing but, occasionally, there might be a briefing or
21		an explanatory note and that would be provided to me
22		either by my private secretary with responsibility for
23		Postal Services or by an official from UKGI, depending
24	~	on the nature of it.
25	Q.	You go on: 23

	-	
4		
1 2		responses using current Government approved lines in
2		order to respond to the key points raised by the letter writer.
4		And they would then come into my private office,
4 5		they would be checked over by the private secretary in
6		my private office responsible for correspondence, and
7		then she would arrange the correspondence with the MP's
, 8		letter, and then the response, and then the
9		constituent's letter, if indeed there had been
10		a constituent's letter attached. Not all MPs sent them:
11		some did, some didn't. Occasionally you would get
12		letters from the public directly to the Department, to
13		the Minister for whatever you were, and that would be
14		dealt with in the same way, except there wouldn't be
15		an MP between you and the letter writer.
16	Q.	So when you say you trusted your private secretaries to
17		deal with correspondence on your behalf, you're not
18		saying that they were replying on your behalf, you were
19		saying they were dealing with the correspondence before
20		it came to you?
21	A.	Yes. I mean, I think that the private office would
22		reply to some forms of correspondence without checking
23		with the Minister. Usually things like meeting
24		requests, diary requests, lobbying campaigns, that sort
25		of thing. There was a vast volume of correspondence,
		22
1		"There would be standard responses, based on agreed
2		policy lines, to a large proportion of correspondence on
3		any brief. Officials worked hard to draft those
4		responses in line with government policy and they were
5		updated over time and as circumstances changed."
6		Was it UKGI officials who provided the substance of
7		draft replies to correspondence in Post Office matters?
8	Α.	Yes, I'm pretty sure it would have been. I can't think
9		that they acted sort of in lieu of a normal BEIS team
10		of officials on the Post Office brief so, yes, it would
11		have been them.
12	Q.	In relation to the standard responses based on agreed
13		policy lines, who proposed policy lines to take to you?
14	Α.	The policy lines were approved, I would imagine in the
15		early days, by the previous ministerial team and,
16		periodically, if they had to change, they would require
17		my approval. So you inherit, if you like, you
18		inherit because a minister comes in and it's very
19		automatic: the work continues and it's the identity
20		of the Minister is completely irrelevant for some of the
21		
		time, particularly in the early days, and the work just
22		time, particularly in the early days, and the work just churns through and, instead of your predecessor signing

- it all, you're signing it all.
- 24 So you don't start afresh, looking at policies from
- 25 the moment you sit down in your new ministerial seat.

²⁴

1		Not at all. You just carry on what's gone before. And
2		then, when circumstances change, of course, there may
3		well be a change and that would then be yours to
4		approve.
5	Q.	In the absence of a change in circumstances, would you
6		routinely sit down and approve or consider whether you
7		wanted to approve standard lines on agreed policy lines
8		when you took up a role?
9	Α.	Not as a rule, no. The way I tended to work would be
10		to, if there was something I didn't like about a line or
11		the tone, sometimes regrettably not always
12		sometimes I made time to amend them myself and this
13		would either be, as I say a little bit later in the
14		evidence, I think, by adding a PS or by rewriting it and
15		sending it back, and, if I felt the change should be
16		made in perpetuity, I would ask officials to make sure
17		that the people responsible for the draft know that
18		there's a change here, and that they should make it
19		all future correspondence on that point. That's how
20		I tended to amend it.
21	Q.	Looking a little further up the page, please, at
22		paragraph 26. Starting four lines from the top. You
23		say this:
24		"After I had been in office for six to nine months
25		it became clear to me that advice given by officials was
		25
1		case?
2	Q.	That perhaps answers the question. In relation to the
3		postal affairs brief, did you ever challenge that or
4		forgive me, let me ask a different question: did you
5		ever observe that in your postal affairs brief?
6	Α.	Right. I understand your question. If I could just
7		give myself a minute to think.
8	Q.	So a perception that officials were being constrained by
9		the expectations of what might and might not be
10		agreeable to Number 10 and the Treasury or another
11		department?
12	Α.	I think I I don't think so, no. I don't think there
13		is an example of the advice I received from the Post
14		Office team that was contingent on what might be
15		agreeable to another department, HMT or Number 10, no.
16		No.
17	Q.	In the specific context of replies to subpostmasters in
18		correspondence, in the last two sentences of
19		paragraph 27, a little further down the page again,
20		please, you say this:
21		"I sometimes edited these responses myself [and
22		these are the draft responses to correspondence] or
23		added a postscript, when I had time and when the
24		response drafted for me struck, in my view, the wrong
24 25		response drafted for me struck, in my view, the wrong tone. This began to happen with my replies to

27

often constrained by expectations on the part of

- 2 officials of what might and might not be agreeable to
- 3 Number 10, Treasury, or to another department which
- 4 might be taking the lead on a particular issue.
- 5 Officials would require challenge from the Minister in
- 6 these circumstances if decisions were to be taken in
 - what the Minister determined to be the public interest."
- 7 8 Was this specific to the Post Office brief or the
- 9 entire portfolio while you were at BEIS?
- 10 Α. It's actually not particular to the Post Office, it's
- 11 what I learnt interesting my time as a minister in both
- departments. The only thing that jars with me there 12
- 13 really is the last sentence "officials would require
- 14 challenge", I mean "might require challenge". I think
- 15 that was a bit of an overstatement in those
- 16 circumstances. Yes, I did become aware of the great
- 17 frustration, actually, of advice being limited by what
- 18 the officials thought the Treasury would wear. It was
- 19 mostly the Treasury.
- 20 Q. What did you do to challenge this when you became aware 21 of it?
- 22 Α. Well, I don't think it's -- I'm very happy to answer 23 that question. I don't think I can give you an example
- 24 from my postal affairs brief. Do you still want me to
- 25 give you an answer to -- an example of what could be the 26
- 1 [subpostmasters] as I became increasingly uncomfortable 2 with the line we were taking." 3 When did you start becoming increasingly 4 uncomfortable with the line which was being taken? 5 A. I think, after approximately six months in the role. 6 I couldn't give you a precise date. I can't -- it 7 wasn't sort of contingent on a particular event. It was the letters I just occasionally received from 8 9 subpostmasters, who -- the ones who tended to write to 10 me directly as Minister for Postal Services at BEIS and, 11 after I had received a few of those letters, I started 12 to think that the advice I was getting did not reflect 13 what seemed to be happening to the people who were 14 writing to me. 15 **Q.** What aspect of the standard response or agreed policy line were you increasingly uncomfortable with? 16 A. I was -- well, I was certainly uncomfortable with the 17 18 tone, and -- yes, it started out as I was uncomfortable with the tone of the response that I was being asked to 19 20 send the letter writer, by way of a reply and it 21 gradually grew into a concern that the line that I was 22 being given on Horizon was -- I started to doubt it. 23 I mean, there's quite a bit in the line that I was being 24 given whenever I -- whenever the subject of Horizon came 25 up for discussion in meetings. The thing that I started 28

1		to doubt was the fact that all of the complainants were
2		guilty of some sort of incompetence or theft or false
3		accounting, or the things that I'd been told were
4		causing the criticism of the Post Office and its
5		computer system.
6	Q.	Starting with the discomfort you felt about the line
7		that was being taken in response to subpostmasters, did
8		you raise that discomfort with anyone?
9	Α.	Initially, I rewrote to deal with the tonal aspect,
10		I did what I said I did up there: I either edited it or
11		added a PS. When I started to be concerned that there
12		were innocent people being caught up in something that
13		was presented to me at the time as being a blanket
14		problem with the complainant and not with the computer
15		system, I started to raise Horizon more actively in my
16		meetings with both UKGI and the Post Office, when I met
17		the Post Office Board representatives, which happened
18		sort of I think I say there quarterly: three or four
19		times a year, I suppose.
20	Q.	What was the response when you raised things more
21		actively?
22	Α.	The response was essentially a repeat in a different way
23		of the lines that they always relied on and they
24		I mean, they conceded that there would be cases where
25		something might be wrong that was nothing to do with 29
1		a new copy of correspondence with my changes
2		incorporated, and I would sign it and it would go, or,
3		if I felt the person had waited for long enough for
4		a response or I wanted to put it in my own words there
5		and then and get the thing off, I might literally write
6		in my own writing "PS" under my signature, and I might
7		write three lines, I might write sometimes seven or
8 9		eight lines, clarifying whatever was above and making the point that I wanted to make to the recipient.
9 10	^	Could we have on screen, please, UKGI00016320. This
11	Q.	
12		appears to be a draft letter, given the "Dear xxx" to the constituent of a fellow Member of Parliament. It is
12		dated 12 October 2016 and we can see that it's drafted
13 14		in your name, by the top right-hand corner and the
14 15		bottom of the second page. If we can just go to that
16		quickly, please. Going back to the first page, the
17		penultimate paragraph here says:
17		

18 "[The individual] mentions the Post Office's IT system. This system has over 50,000 users successfully 19 20 undertaking transactions every day and there is no 21 reason to consider that it is not fit for purpose. Your 22 constituent refers to current legal proceedings which 23 have been issued against the Post Office on the matter 24 of the Horizon IT system; this is a legal matter and 25 I am unable to comment further." 31

1		dishonesty but, in general, they stuck to their line,
2		which was that, you know well, I don't know whether
3		you're coming on to talk about that. I can go through
4		it now if you wish me to.
5	Q.	We will be coming on to that. Just sticking for the
6		moment with the question of draft replies to
7		subpostmasters, the Inquiry has not seen any draft
8		replies which show edits, as such, on them. What would
9		your process have been if you wanted to make those
10		changes? You've described a postscript, would that be
11		on a document?
12	Α.	It would be on the letter itself. I haven't seen any
13		either. It's frustrating that so few letters have been
14		retained. It's a curious situation because you would
15		think that the Department either retained all
16		correspondence or no correspondence but they seemed to
17		retain a few bits of correspondence. Who knows why.
18		But anyway, I don't know how many letters I sent out on
19		postal matters but certainly more than the three, four
20		or five that were included in the pack of information
21		that we received from the Department, for the purposes
22		of the Inquiry and I agree: none of them contain any
23		edits at all.
24		What I would do is I would either alter the copy and
25		then it would go back and be returned, you know, as
		30
1		Then the last paragraph:

1		i nen the last paragraph:
2		"Whilst the Post Office is publicly owned, it is
3		a commercial business operating in competitive markets,
4		and the Government allows it the freedom to operate
5		commercially on a day-to-day basis. Post Office places
6		great importance on the relationship it has with
7		postmasters, and I would encourage [the postmaster] to
8		discuss any concerns he has with his contacts at the
9		Post Office. [He] can also make use of the National
10		Federation of SubPostmasters, who remain the
11		representative body working for postmasters."
12		Does anything in those two paragraphs contain
13		anything which made you uncomfortable at the time?
14	Α.	I don't remember that particular letter and I think the
15		date was October 2016, so I don't think I would have
16		been uncomfortable about that response at that time.
17		But it would depend slightly on the nature of the letter
18		that the MP had received. Sometimes, MPs didn't attach
19		the letter that you were actually answering, which was
20		annoying but so I would caveat my response by saying,
21		if the letter had been a handwritten letter all about
22		the Horizon system and the problems the individual was
23		suffering, I think I would have found the tone of that
24		response a bit impersonal and abrupt. But if, however,
25		the letter had been of a more general nature as some 32

The Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry

1		letters were, criticising, you know, some of the other	1		e
2		aspects of Post Office policy and throwing in the	2		â
3		dispute over Horizon as an additional item, ie not from	3		(
4		somebody who was actually personally affected by it,	4		I
5		then I would have found that line acceptable.	5	Α.	`
6		I hope that was a clear answer? As I gave it,	6	Q.	
7		I started to feel it sounded a little bit convoluted.	7		
8	Q.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	8		(
9		you've picked up already on the October 2016 date, so	9		C
10		you don't think you were editing draft replies by this	10		ŝ
11		point in a substantial way?	11		ι
12	Α.		12)
13	Q.		13		
14		complaints and legal action relating to the Horizon IT	14		r
15		system, when you first took up the role of Parliamentary	15		S
16		Under-Secretary. You explain at paragraph 30 of your	16		
17		statement that, upon your appointment to the role, you	17		r
18		were given a Day One briefing pack relating to the Post	18		5
19		Office. Could we have that on screen, please. It's	19		1
20		UKGI00020328. This has the date July 2016, so when you	20		i
21		took up the role. It is described as an overview and is	21		ł
22 23		it right that you consider that this was the first time	22		(
	•	that you became aware of the litigation? Yes.	23		
24 25	A.	Going over the first page, please, the first slide is	24 25		
25	Q.	33	25		S
1		and Legal Action", and this was the information which	1		
2		was provided to you:	2		i
3		"Following complaints from a small number of (mostly	3		2
4		former) subpostmasters about the Horizon IT system, in	4		0
5		2012 [Post Office Limited] commissioned an independent	5		(
6		firm, Second Sight, to examine the system for systemic	6		
7		flaws that could cause accounting discrepancies.	7		t
8		"Second Sight's Interim Report, published in July	8		s
9		2013, and Final Report, published in April 2015, both	9		2
10		make clear that there is no evidence of system-wide	10		c
11		problems with Horizon."	11		a
12		That's underlined:	12		
13		"The Interim Report raised some questions about the	13		
14		training and support offered to some subpostmasters, and	14		s
15		[Post Office Limited] implemented a series of measures	15		r
16		to improve its processes. It also created a mediation	16		i
17		to consider individual subpostmasters' cases."	17		
18		The next paragraph addresses that Mediation Scheme	18		t
19		and it says:	19		F
20		"While some cases were resolved through mediation,	20		r
21		a number were not in particular, cases where	21	Α.	I
22		individuals had received criminal convictions (eg theft	22		F
23		or false accounting), since mediation cannot overturn	23	Q.	۱
24		a court judgment.	24	Α.	E
25		"Earlier this year, group civil litigation on behalf	25		r
		35			

1		entitled "Summary and Key Issues", and this was
2		a document, wasn't it, that related to the whole Post
3		Office brief not specifically to Horizon issues or the
4		litigation?
5	A.	Yes, that's correct.
6	Q.	The third paragraph on the slide says this:
7	-	"This pack gives a high-level overview of how [Post
8		Office Limited] is set up, the areas in which it
9		operates, and its long-term strategy. There are also
10		some short-term matters (below) which you need to
11		understand and may require prompt action. We recommend
12		you receive more detailed advice on each."
13		Then the last paragraph is headed "Horizon" and
14		refers you to a later slide for more information but the
14		summary here says:
16		"A small number of mostly former subpostmasters have
17		raised concerns about [Post Office Limited's] Horizon IT
18		system, which they claim has caused their businesses
19 20		losses. Over two years' worth of independent
20		investigation has founding no systemic faults in
21		Horizon, but campaigning and media interest persists.
22		As well litigation has been commenced against [Post
23		Office Limited]."
24		Then going to page 14 of this document, which is
25		slide 13, the heading is "Horizon IT System: Complaints 34
		54
1		of 91 claimants was commenced at the High Court. This
1 2		of 91 claimants was commenced at the High Court. This is at an early stage and precise details of the claim
		C C
2		is at an early stage and precise details of the claim
2 3		is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway,
2 3 4		is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of
2 3 4 5		is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law.
2 3 4 5 6		is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood
2 3 4 5 6 7		is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood to be considering [circa] 20 cases raised on this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8		is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood to be considering [circa] 20 cases raised on this subject. This review has been underway since early
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood to be considering [circa] 20 cases raised on this subject. This review has been underway since early 2015; we have no indication of when the CCRC may reach
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood to be considering [circa] 20 cases raised on this subject. This review has been underway since early 2015; we have no indication of when the CCRC may reach conclusions on any of the cases. [Post Office Limited]
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood to be considering [circa] 20 cases raised on this subject. This review has been underway since early 2015; we have no indication of when the CCRC may reach conclusions on any of the cases. [Post Office Limited] are engaging fully with the CCRC's work."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood to be considering [circa] 20 cases raised on this subject. This review has been underway since early 2015; we have no indication of when the CCRC may reach conclusions on any of the cases. [Post Office Limited] are engaging fully with the CCRC's work." Then in bold at the bottom:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood to be considering [circa] 20 cases raised on this subject. This review has been underway since early 2015; we have no indication of when the CCRC may reach conclusions on any of the cases. [Post Office Limited] are engaging fully with the CCRC's work." Then in bold at the bottom: "We recommend you receive further briefing on this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood to be considering [circa] 20 cases raised on this subject. This review has been underway since early 2015; we have no indication of when the CCRC may reach conclusions on any of the cases. [Post Office Limited] are engaging fully with the CCRC's work." Then in bold at the bottom: "We recommend you receive further briefing on this subject, and [Post Office Limited] would be happy to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood to be considering [circa] 20 cases raised on this subject. This review has been underway since early 2015; we have no indication of when the CCRC may reach conclusions on any of the cases. [Post Office Limited] are engaging fully with the CCRC's work." Then in bold at the bottom: "We recommend you receive further briefing on this subject, and [Post Office Limited] would be happy to meet with you and provide any further briefing or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood to be considering [circa] 20 cases raised on this subject. This review has been underway since early 2015; we have no indication of when the CCRC may reach conclusions on any of the cases. [Post Office Limited] are engaging fully with the CCRC's work." Then in bold at the bottom: "We recommend you receive further briefing on this subject, and [Post Office Limited] would be happy to meet with you and provide any further briefing or information."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17		is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood to be considering [circa] 20 cases raised on this subject. This review has been underway since early 2015; we have no indication of when the CCRC may reach conclusions on any of the cases. [Post Office Limited] are engaging fully with the CCRC's work." Then in bold at the bottom: "We recommend you receive further briefing on this subject, and [Post Office Limited] would be happy to meet with you and provide any further briefing or information."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood to be considering [circa] 20 cases raised on this subject. This review has been underway since early 2015; we have no indication of when the CCRC may reach conclusions on any of the cases. [Post Office Limited] are engaging fully with the CCRC's work." Then in bold at the bottom: "We recommend you receive further briefing on this subject, and [Post Office Limited] would be happy to meet with you and provide any further briefing or information." The second paragraph here flagged up that there were two reports from an independent firm which had been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Α.	is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood to be considering [circa] 20 cases raised on this subject. This review has been underway since early 2015; we have no indication of when the CCRC may reach conclusions on any of the cases. [Post Office Limited] are engaging fully with the CCRC's work." Then in bold at the bottom: "We recommend you receive further briefing on this subject, and [Post Office Limited] would be happy to meet with you and provide any further briefing or information." The second paragraph here flagged up that there were two reports from an independent firm which had been produced. Did you ask to see those reports when you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Α.	is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood to be considering [circa] 20 cases raised on this subject. This review has been underway since early 2015; we have no indication of when the CCRC may reach conclusions on any of the cases. [Post Office Limited] are engaging fully with the CCRC's work." Then in bold at the bottom: "We recommend you receive further briefing on this subject, and [Post Office Limited] would be happy to meet with you and provide any further briefing or information." The second paragraph here flagged up that there were two reports from an independent firm which had been produced. Did you ask to see those reports when you read this slide?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q.	is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood to be considering [circa] 20 cases raised on this subject. This review has been underway since early 2015; we have no indication of when the CCRC may reach conclusions on any of the cases. [Post Office Limited] are engaging fully with the CCRC's work." Then in bold at the bottom: "We recommend you receive further briefing on this subject, and [Post Office Limited] would be happy to meet with you and provide any further briefing or information." The second paragraph here flagged up that there were two reports from an independent firm which had been produced. Did you ask to see those reports when you read this slide? I doubt very much that I would have done that. I can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood to be considering [circa] 20 cases raised on this subject. This review has been underway since early 2015; we have no indication of when the CCRC may reach conclusions on any of the cases. [Post Office Limited] are engaging fully with the CCRC's work." Then in bold at the bottom: "We recommend you receive further briefing on this subject, and [Post Office Limited] would be happy to meet with you and provide any further briefing or information." The second paragraph here flagged up that there were two reports from an independent firm which had been produced. Did you ask to see those reports when you read this slide? I doubt very much that I would have done that. I can pretty much say no, I wouldn't have done.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q.	is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood to be considering [circa] 20 cases raised on this subject. This review has been underway since early 2015; we have no indication of when the CCRC may reach conclusions on any of the cases. [Post Office Limited] are engaging fully with the CCRC's work." Then in bold at the bottom: "We recommend you receive further briefing on this subject, and [Post Office Limited] would be happy to meet with you and provide any further briefing or information." The second paragraph here flagged up that there were two reports from an independent firm which had been produced. Did you ask to see those reports when you read this slide? I doubt very much that I would have done that. I can pretty much say no, I wouldn't have done. Why would you not have done? Because I was being briefed at that point across many,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q.	is at an early stage and precise details of the claim are unclear. As there are legal proceedings underway, our advice is that this should remain independent of Government. It is a matter of law. "The Criminal Cases Review Commission is understood to be considering [circa] 20 cases raised on this subject. This review has been underway since early 2015; we have no indication of when the CCRC may reach conclusions on any of the cases. [Post Office Limited] are engaging fully with the CCRC's work." Then in bold at the bottom: "We recommend you receive further briefing on this subject, and [Post Office Limited] would be happy to meet with you and provide any further briefing or information." The second paragraph here flagged up that there were two reports from an independent firm which had been produced. Did you ask to see those reports when you read this slide? I doubt very much that I would have done that. I can pretty much say no, I wouldn't have done. Why would you not have done?

		take in sort of top-line advice and move on, absorb as	1		We can see here the email was copied to Richard
		much as I could, and get to grips with my role. So	2		Callard and Gareth Evans, that was Richard Callard who
		I wouldn't have requested any additional information,	3		went on to give you a verbal briefing on 4 August; is
		I was going to say at this stage, and that's how it	4		that right?
		should have been and I should definitely have asked for	5	Α.	Yes.
		it at a later date, and I don't think I did. And	6	Q.	Ms Thompson says this:
		I very, very much regret not asking for it.	7		"There is currently civil litigation underway in the
	Q.	Did you understand from the information here that there	8		High Court against the Post Office by a group of [circa]
		were people challenging the safety of their convictions	9		200 individuals, mostly former postmasters (postmasters
)		on the basis of discrepancies they said had been caused	10		are essentially 'franchisees'). The claims relate
		by the computer system?	11		to the Post Office's 'Horizon' IT system, and
-	Α.	I thought that the 20 cases being reviewed by the	12		accusations that Post Office has treated its agents
3		Criminal Cases Review Commission must have been a group	13		unfairly. There is a chance that there could be some
ļ		of people in that category, yes.	14		media interest in this issue over the weekend, because
5	Q.	Did you ask for any further information about how these	15		Post Office have today sent a letter to the claimants'
5		individuals had come to be prosecuted at this time?	16		solicitor, which will be shared with the claimants and
	Α.	I'm afraid I didn't. I think I thought that I would	17		could therefore be made public.
}		have thought that the CCRC would investigate and justice	18		"This is a legal matter and the operational
)		would be delivered via that route. I didn't see it as	19		responsibility of Post Office Limited, the company which
)	_	a minister's role to get involved in that.	20		manages the Post Office Network. As such our advice
	Q.	In relation to the advice that this should remain	21		would be not to comment, and for Press Office to pass
2		independent of Government, on 29 July 2016, Laura	22		any media enquiries to Post Office directly. This is
5		Thompson from UKGI sent an email to your private office	23		the approach we have taken previously on this issue
•		about the litigation. Could we have that on screen,	24		please let me know if you think SpAds or ministers would
)		please, the reference is UKGI00006961. 37	25		disagree. 38
		"We will provide full briefing on this issue to	1	Α.	No, I didn't but I did have access to Special Advisers
		ministers this is flagged in the Day One briefing	2		to the Department who advised the Secretary of State and
		pack, and we have also included in our briefing to	3		there were three of them and, with the benefit of
		Margot James."	4 5		hindsight, actually, I think one was a lawyer and I could have I should have asked him. But we didn't
		Picking up in the middle paragraph here	5 6		
		specifically, were you told at the time that your private office had been asked if they considered you	7		have Special Advisers at my level in the ministerial sort of hierarchy.
		would disagree with the proposed approach that this was	8	SID	WYN WILLIAMS: That's fine. Thank you.
		a legal matter and the operational responsibility of the	8 9	SIR	Yes, Ms Price?
,		Post Office?	10	мс	PRICE: Thank you, sir.
,	Α.	I wouldn't have disagreed with that, so whether I was	10	1010	Could we have on screen please paragraph 35 of
,	Α.	told or whether I wasn't, because I can see that is	12		Ms James' statement. It's page 11. Starting four lines
-		an email that I wouldn't have seen, I would have been	13		down, you note the advice provided by UKGI that the
Ĺ		content with the advice. But I wouldn't have seen that	14		proceedings "should remain independent of Government: it
5		but I think it would have come to me in a different	15		is a matter of law", and you're referring here, aren't
5		form, potentially you have it in another form shortly,	16		you, to the Day One briefing that we've just looked at?
,		but it would have come to me. But I didn't see that	17	A.	Yes.
3		particular email.	18	Q.	You provide this comment:
)	Q.	But in any event, your response would have been that you	19	,	"I took this to mean, as I would do in any
)		were content with that device, would it?	20		litigation relating to the Government, that BEIS should
	Α.	Yes. It would have been.	21		not look to interfere with it or comment on the process
)	Q.	Could we have	22		until it was concluded."
;		WYN WILLIAMS: At that point in time, did you have	23		What do you mean here by "interfere"?
		a Special Adviser who had any well, did you have	24	Α.	That's a poor choice of word because it's obvious that
ł.				 .	
5		a Special Adviser, first of all?	25	Α.	Government shouldn't be interfering in legal process.
				Α.	

(10) Pages 37 - 40

The Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry

1		I think I took it to mean that we have to be careful, as
2		ministers, not to say anything that might prejudice
3		legal outcomes of cases that are live within our court
4		system, and that's a general principle that most
5		Parliamentarians are aware of, whether you're a minister
6		or not. Of course, it doesn't preclude you from taking
7		a view but you have to be alive to the consequences,
8		which can interfere with the outcome of the trial.
9		I think also, an appreciation that once matters have
10		reached the courts, the courts are in the best position
11		to well, it's their job to adjudicate the outcome,
12		and they get to see all the evidence and all the
13		witnesses and, as a minister, you don't, so it's unwise
14		to opine, I think, on cases that are going through the
15		courts. As a general principle.
16	Q.	By "comment", do you mean internal comment or public
17		comment?
18	Α.	Public comment. And, of course, that doesn't I might
19		go on to say this sorry, I'm not good at reading
20		while I'm talking but, yes, it's that constraint, if you
21		like does not preclude you, of course, from discussing
22		litigation in private, particularly with one of the
23		parties.
24	Q.	Exploring a little what you say here, because you make
25		wider reference to "any litigation relating to the
		41
1		defendant is a government-owned asset but would you
1 2		defendant is a government-owned asset but would you agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of
2		agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of
2 3		agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not
2 3 4		agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from
2 3 4 5	А.	agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the
2 3 4 5 6	А.	agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the claim?
2 3 4 5 6 7	A. Q.	agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the claim? Yeah, you're right. I mean, it shouldn't just preclude,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8		agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the claim? Yeah, you're right. I mean, it shouldn't just preclude, it should happen as a matter of course, really.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the claim? Yeah, you're right. I mean, it shouldn't just preclude, it should happen as a matter of course, really. So that that minister can fully understand the case
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q. A.	agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the claim? Yeah, you're right. I mean, it shouldn't just preclude, it should happen as a matter of course, really. So that that minister can fully understand the case Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Q. A.	agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the claim? Yeah, you're right. I mean, it shouldn't just preclude, it should happen as a matter of course, really. So that that minister can fully understand the case Yes. or, whether or not comes to it, the proposed defence
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q. A. Q.	agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the claim? Yeah, you're right. I mean, it shouldn't just preclude, it should happen as a matter of course, really. So that that minister can fully understand the case Yes. or, whether or not comes to it, the proposed defence and the proposed litigation strategy?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A. Q. A.	agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the claim? Yeah, you're right. I mean, it shouldn't just preclude, it should happen as a matter of course, really. So that that minister can fully understand the case Yes. or, whether or not comes to it, the proposed defence and the proposed litigation strategy? Yes. You are right. And we didn't, in this case.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A. Q. A.	agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the claim? Yeah, you're right. I mean, it shouldn't just preclude, it should happen as a matter of course, really. So that that minister can fully understand the case Yes. or, whether or not comes to it, the proposed defence and the proposed litigation strategy? Yes. You are right. And we didn't, in this case. Looking again at paragraph 35 of your statement, six
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A. Q. A.	agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the claim? Yeah, you're right. I mean, it shouldn't just preclude, it should happen as a matter of course, really. So that that minister can fully understand the case Yes. or, whether or not comes to it, the proposed defence and the proposed litigation strategy? Yes. You are right. And we didn't, in this case. Looking again at paragraph 35 of your statement, six lines up from the bottom, you say:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A. Q. A.	agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the claim? Yeah, you're right. I mean, it shouldn't just preclude, it should happen as a matter of course, really. So that that minister can fully understand the case Yes. or, whether or not comes to it, the proposed defence and the proposed litigation strategy? Yes. You are right. And we didn't, in this case. Looking again at paragraph 35 of your statement, six lines up from the bottom, you say: "Perhaps due to this position being taken [and that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A. Q. A.	agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the claim? Yeah, you're right. I mean, it shouldn't just preclude, it should happen as a matter of course, really. So that that minister can fully understand the case Yes. or, whether or not comes to it, the proposed defence and the proposed litigation strategy? Yes. You are right. And we didn't, in this case. Looking again at paragraph 35 of your statement, six lines up from the bottom, you say: "Perhaps due to this position being taken [and that is the position that it was a matter for the courts,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A.	agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the claim? Yeah, you're right. I mean, it shouldn't just preclude, it should happen as a matter of course, really. So that that minister can fully understand the case Yes. or, whether or not comes to it, the proposed defence and the proposed litigation strategy? Yes. You are right. And we didn't, in this case. Looking again at paragraph 35 of your statement, six lines up from the bottom, you say: "Perhaps due to this position being taken [and that is the position that it was a matter for the courts, a matter of law] not many details were provided [and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A. Q. A.	agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the claim? Yeah, you're right. I mean, it shouldn't just preclude, it should happen as a matter of course, really. So that that minister can fully understand the case Yes. or, whether or not comes to it, the proposed defence and the proposed litigation strategy? Yes. You are right. And we didn't, in this case. Looking again at paragraph 35 of your statement, six lines up from the bottom, you say: "Perhaps due to this position being taken [and that is the position that it was a matter for the courts, a matter of law] not many details were provided [and this is in the Day One briefing pack]. Whilst the Day
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A. Q. A.	agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the claim? Yeah, you're right. I mean, it shouldn't just preclude, it should happen as a matter of course, really. So that that minister can fully understand the case Yes. or, whether or not comes to it, the proposed defence and the proposed litigation strategy? Yes. You are right. And we didn't, in this case. Looking again at paragraph 35 of your statement, six lines up from the bottom, you say: "Perhaps due to this position being taken [and that is the position that it was a matter for the courts, a matter of law] not many details were provided [and this is in the Day One briefing pack]. Whilst the Day One briefing pack did mention the litigation, it did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A. Q. A.	agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the claim? Yeah, you're right. I mean, it shouldn't just preclude, it should happen as a matter of course, really. So that that minister can fully understand the case Yes. or, whether or not comes to it, the proposed defence and the proposed litigation strategy? Yes. You are right. And we didn't, in this case. Looking again at paragraph 35 of your statement, six lines up from the bottom, you say: "Perhaps due to this position being taken [and that is the position that it was a matter for the courts, a matter of law] not many details were provided [and this is in the Day One briefing pack]. Whilst the Day One briefing pack did mention the litigation, it did not, for example, contain any details about there being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q. A.	agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the claim? Yeah, you're right. I mean, it shouldn't just preclude, it should happen as a matter of course, really. So that that minister can fully understand the case Yes. or, whether or not comes to it, the proposed defence and the proposed litigation strategy? Yes. You are right. And we didn't, in this case. Looking again at paragraph 35 of your statement, six lines up from the bottom, you say: "Perhaps due to this position being taken [and that is the position that it was a matter for the courts, a matter of law] not many details were provided [and this is in the Day One briefing pack]. Whilst the Day One briefing pack did mention the litigation, it did not, for example, contain any details about there being concerns around remote access to Horizon or the deletion and replacement of files. Whilst it referred to the Second Sight Interim Report and Final Report, it did not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q. A.	agree that the fact that an issue is the subject of litigation against a government-owned asset should not prevent a minister holding the brief for that asset from being fully briefed on the underlying issues in the claim? Yeah, you're right. I mean, it shouldn't just preclude, it should happen as a matter of course, really. So that that minister can fully understand the case Yes. or, whether or not comes to it, the proposed defence and the proposed litigation strategy? Yes. You are right. And we didn't, in this case. Looking again at paragraph 35 of your statement, six lines up from the bottom, you say: "Perhaps due to this position being taken [and that is the position that it was a matter for the courts, a matter of law] not many details were provided [and this is in the Day One briefing pack]. Whilst the Day One briefing pack did mention the litigation, it did not, for example, contain any details about there being concerns around remote access to Horizon or the deletion and replacement of files. Whilst it referred to the

rizon IT	' Inq	uiry 24 July 2024
1		Government", where a Government department is the
2		defendant in civil litigation, it's right, isn't it,
3		that instructions need to be provided by the Department
4		to lawyers acting for the Government, both as to the
5		substance of the claim and litigation strategy?
6	Α.	In general, yes, that's true but I don't think that
7		happened in this case.
8	Q.	We'll come on to why this case might be different but
9		I'd just like to ask you some general questions about
10		that because it seems to influence your approach in this
11		particular instance.
12		So if litigation against Government is high-profile
13		enough, it's right, isn't it, that both the substance of
14		the defence and the litigation strategy may need to be
15		signed off by senior civil servants and potentially
16		ministers, would you agree?
17	Α.	Yes, I would agree.
18	Q.	So, as a matter of principle, whilst a Government
19		Department which is a party to litigation may choose not
20		to comment publicly on the litigation, as you've just
21		referred to, it's not right to say that the relevant
22		Department will not be involved in the legal process
23		until it's concluded, is it?
24	Α.	No, I agree with what you've said, yes.
25	Q.	Of course the position is one step removed where the
		42
1		actions taken by [Post Office Limited]. It did not
2		contain any information on the Simon Clarke Advice, any
3		of the Deloitte reports or the Swift Review. With the
4		benefit of hindsight this briefing, even making
5		allowance for the fact it was a high-level summary, was
6		very selective and omitted several important
7		developments."
8		So to your mind, even taking the approach that this
9		was an operational matter for the Post Office and with
10		the courts, is it your view that this briefing did not
11		provide you with adequate information about the issues
12		underlying the litigation?
13	Α.	100 per cent. I mean it certainly I think they
14		included reference to the Second Sight Reports, because
15		the Second Sight Reports, I presume, had been in the
16		public domain for so long that they had to include them.
17		But there'd been other reports and you just
18		summarised by name which reports are relevant that
19		were not mentioned at all, ever.
20	Q.	We saw, on the "Summary and Key Issues" slide of the Day
21		One briefing on page 2, that there was a recommendation
22		that you receive more detailed advice on Horizon. There
23		was then a recommendation in bold, at the bottom of the
24		"Horizon IT System Complaints and Legal Actions" slide,
25		which recommended you receive further briefing on the
		44

1		subject, noting that the Post Office was happy to meet
2		with you to provide any further information or briefing.
3		You deal with this at paragraph 38 of your
4		statement. Could we go to that, please. It is page 12,
5		please, towards the bottom of the page on page 12.
6		You refer to a promise that UKGI would provide
7		a full briefing on the issue to ministers. Is that the
8		promise in the email we looked at dated 29 July from
9		Laura Thompson?
10	Α.	Yes, I think so.
11	Q.	Then you say this:
12		"It is correct that the Horizon IT system issues
13		were flagged in the Day One briefing pack as explained
14		above. But to the best of my recollection I never did
15		receive what might be termed a 'full briefing'.
16		I regret not asking for one and that my private office
17		did not follow up on this promise."
18	Α.	Well, that's true, I do very much regret not asking for
19		one. I had a briefing when I met with the Board, when
20		I asked questions, but it didn't build very much on what
21		I'd already been told, if at all.
22	Q.	Well, we'll come on to what came next but, just for now,
23		thinking about those recommendations, which had been
24		made twice in the briefing pack, once in bold
25	Α.	Yes, I know.
		45
1	MS	PRICE: Thank you, sir.
2		Ms James, you received a verbal briefing from UKGI
3		on 4 August 2016 is that right
4	Α.	Yes.
5	Q.	from Mr Callard and Ms Thompson from UKGI?
6	Α.	
7		Yes.
1	Q.	·
8		Yes.
		Yes. This was another briefing spanning the whole of the Post
8		Yes. This was another briefing spanning the whole of the Post Office brief, rather than being specific to the
8 9	Q.	Yes. This was another briefing spanning the whole of the Post Office brief, rather than being specific to the litigation and the issues underlying it; is that right?
8 9 10	Q. A.	Yes. This was another briefing spanning the whole of the Post Office brief, rather than being specific to the litigation and the issues underlying it; is that right? Yes, that's right.
8 9 10 11	Q. A.	Yes. This was another briefing spanning the whole of the Post Office brief, rather than being specific to the litigation and the issues underlying it; is that right? Yes, that's right. Could we have on screen, please, UKGI00000015. This is
8 9 10 11 12	Q. A.	Yes. This was another briefing spanning the whole of the Post Office brief, rather than being specific to the litigation and the issues underlying it; is that right? Yes, that's right. Could we have on screen, please, UKGI00000015. This is the note which you say in your statement you were
8 9 10 11 12 13	Q. A.	Yes. This was another briefing spanning the whole of the Post Office brief, rather than being specific to the litigation and the issues underlying it; is that right? Yes, that's right. Could we have on screen, please, UKGI00000015. This is the note which you say in your statement you were provided with ahead of this meeting. It is a three-page
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q. A.	Yes. This was another briefing spanning the whole of the Post Office brief, rather than being specific to the litigation and the issues underlying it; is that right? Yes, that's right. Could we have on screen, please, UKGI00000015. This is the note which you say in your statement you were provided with ahead of this meeting. It is a three-page document and Horizon IT issues are addressed on the
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q. A.	Yes. This was another briefing spanning the whole of the Post Office brief, rather than being specific to the litigation and the issues underlying it; is that right? Yes, that's right. Could we have on screen, please, UKGI00000015. This is the note which you say in your statement you were provided with ahead of this meeting. It is a three-page document and Horizon IT issues are addressed on the second page. Could we go to that second page, please,
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q. A.	Yes. This was another briefing spanning the whole of the Post Office brief, rather than being specific to the litigation and the issues underlying it; is that right? Yes, that's right. Could we have on screen, please, UKGI00000015. This is the note which you say in your statement you were provided with ahead of this meeting. It is a three-page document and Horizon IT issues are addressed on the second page. Could we go to that second page, please, and it is listed first under "Things you need to know".
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q. A.	Yes. This was another briefing spanning the whole of the Post Office brief, rather than being specific to the litigation and the issues underlying it; is that right? Yes, that's right. Could we have on screen, please, UKGI00000015. This is the note which you say in your statement you were provided with ahead of this meeting. It is a three-page document and Horizon IT issues are addressed on the second page. Could we go to that second page, please, and it is listed first under "Things you need to know". The notes say this:
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q. A.	Yes. This was another briefing spanning the whole of the Post Office brief, rather than being specific to the litigation and the issues underlying it; is that right? Yes, that's right. Could we have on screen, please, UKGI00000015. This is the note which you say in your statement you were provided with ahead of this meeting. It is a three-page document and Horizon IT issues are addressed on the second page. Could we go to that second page, please, and it is listed first under "Things you need to know". The notes say this: ""Project Sparrow'
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A.	Yes. This was another briefing spanning the whole of the Post Office brief, rather than being specific to the litigation and the issues underlying it; is that right? Yes, that's right. Could we have on screen, please, UKGI00000015. This is the note which you say in your statement you were provided with ahead of this meeting. It is a three-page document and Horizon IT issues are addressed on the second page. Could we go to that second page, please, and it is listed first under "Things you need to know". The notes say this: "Project Sparrow' "Alleged problems with IT system seeing postmasters
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q. A.	Yes. This was another briefing spanning the whole of the Post Office brief, rather than being specific to the litigation and the issues underlying it; is that right? Yes, that's right. Could we have on screen, please, UKGI00000015. This is the note which you say in your statement you were provided with ahead of this meeting. It is a three-page document and Horizon IT issues are addressed on the second page. Could we go to that second page, please, and it is listed first under "Things you need to know". The notes say this: "'Project Sparrow' "Alleged problems with IT system seeing postmasters suffer losses and in some cases imprisonment.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A.	Yes. This was another briefing spanning the whole of the Post Office brief, rather than being specific to the litigation and the issues underlying it; is that right? Yes, that's right. Could we have on screen, please, UKGI00000015. This is the note which you say in your statement you were provided with ahead of this meeting. It is a three-page document and Horizon IT issues are addressed on the second page. Could we go to that second page, please, and it is listed first under "Things you need to know". The notes say this: "Project Sparrow' "Alleged problems with IT system seeing postmasters suffer losses and in some cases imprisonment. "No evidence of bugs in the system despite three
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A.	Yes. This was another briefing spanning the whole of the Post Office brief, rather than being specific to the litigation and the issues underlying it; is that right? Yes, that's right. Could we have on screen, please, UKGI00000015. This is the note which you say in your statement you were provided with ahead of this meeting. It is a three-page document and Horizon IT issues are addressed on the second page. Could we go to that second page, please, and it is listed first under "Things you need to know". The notes say this: "'Project Sparrow' "Alleged problems with IT system seeing postmasters suffer losses and in some cases imprisonment. "No evidence of bugs in the system despite three years of investigation.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	Yes. This was another briefing spanning the whole of the Post Office brief, rather than being specific to the litigation and the issues underlying it; is that right? Yes, that's right. Could we have on screen, please, UKGI00000015. This is the note which you say in your statement you were provided with ahead of this meeting. It is a three-page document and Horizon IT issues are addressed on the second page. Could we go to that second page, please, and it is listed first under "Things you need to know". The notes say this: "Project Sparrow' "Alleged problems with IT system seeing postmasters suffer losses and in some cases imprisonment. "No evidence of bugs in the system despite three years of investigation. "High Court proceedings have begun.

47

- **Q.** -- why didn't you ask for the briefing when you read those recommendations?
- 3 A. I might have said, "Well, we must get that", but I might
- 4 not have specifically asked for it. I think I'm saying
- 5 that because I don't recall ever getting one and
- 6 I think, to be fair to UKGI, that they would have given
- 7 me one, had I pressed for it, but whether -- how full it
- 8 would have been, no one would know, but fuller than
- 9 perhaps had been included to date.
- 10 MS PRICE: Sir, I wonder if that might be a convenient
- 11 moment for the first morning break.
- 12 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes.
- 13 MS PRICE: I think it is 11.25 now, so if we were to come
- 14 back at 11.35, please.
- 15 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right.
- 16 MS PRICE: Thank you, sir.
- 17 (11.24 am)
- (A short break)
- 19 (**11.36 am)**

18

- 20 MS PRICE: Hello, sir. Can you still see and hear us
- 21 clearly?
- 22 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can.
- 23 MS PRICE: Is the link still working to the witness as well,
- 24 sir?
- 25 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: As far as I'm concerned, it is. 46
- 1 Can you recall now what you were told about Project 2 Sparrow at the meeting? 3 A. I can't recall what I was told at the meeting -- at that 4 particular meeting, no. I would think that I was not 5 told very much. It was, as you say, an introductory 6 meeting for the whole of the Postal Services brief, 7 probably excluding the Royal -- oh, actually, Royal Mail 8 is down there. So I doubt I was told much more than 9 what appears there. 10 Q. There is here a further suggestion that you have a fuller briefing. On this occasion, did you ask for 11 12 a fuller briefing specific to the Horizon IT issues? 13 Α. Not on that occasion, no. 14 Q. Can you recall why not? A. Because I was content with the briefings I was getting 15 on the issues which were, I suppose I thought at the 16 17 time, were the highest priority issues for the 18 responsibility I had for the Post Office and I wouldn't have pursued a fuller briefing on something that fell 19 20 into the category of things I need to know. I would 21 hope for a fuller briefing on something I needed to know 22 when it became more of a priority matter for my 23 consideration, if you follow the distinction.
 - 24 **Q.** Yes, could we have on screen, please, paragraph 40 of
 - 25 Ms James' statement. It's page 13. Here you say this:

The Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry

1 2					
		"I do not remember the detail of that verbal	1		and the CFO and, although I referred to meeting the Post
		briefing on 4 August. I believe it covered the topics	2		Office Board three or four times a year, I don't think
3		outlined in the July2016 Day One briefing pack. My	3		I ever met the whole Board, that wouldn't have been
4		understanding was that there may be occasional faults in	4		a good use of their time. What I meant was I would meet
5		the IT system, but nothing that was a structural flaw	5		the key people from the Board: the CFO, the CEO,
6		across the system."	6		possibly they might have with them the Government
7		Did you understand at the time the occasional faults	7		Affairs Director.
8		in the system to be capable of causing accounting	8	Q.	
9		discrepancies?	9		occasional faults, what were you told?
10	A.	No, I wouldn't have understood that at the time. No.	10	Α.	I was told that this had been the longstanding problem,
11	Q.	Did you ask for any further information about what those	11		that there'd been independent investigations into
12		occasional faults were?	12		Horizon over two, if not three, years, that some faults
13	Α.	Not at the introductory meetings, no. I asked for more	13		might be found but nothing systemic, nothing
14		information about what the occasional faults might be	14		system-wide, capable of causing a significant problem
15		later on in my time as Minister but I wouldn't have done	15		for a large number of postmasters. I was told that
16		during the meetings that you're talking about, the	16		a number of postmasters had been convicted and there
17	-	introductory meetings.	17		were very few of them affected. Given the fact that
18	Q.	When later on in the time you held the role did you ask	18		65,000 people used the Horizon system, the numbers
19		about the nature of the faults?	19		involved were very small indeed.
20	Α.	I would have asked after a few months, after six months	20		And I would say that the demeanour of the Post
21		or so, once I started getting concerned that there was	21		Office was they were very good at presenting themselves
22	~	more to the Horizon issue than I had been briefed about.	22		as the victim in all this. They came across as
23			23		beleaguered; what more could they have done; they'd set
24	Α.	I asked at one of my meetings with Board	24		up this Mediation Scheme; they'd improved their training
25		representatives. That would probably have been the CEO 49	25		processes; they did acknowledge that there were 50
1		occasional faults, as with any computer system and	1		It is dated 30 August 2016. It appears to be Paula
2		, , , ,			
		nothing capable of causing the amount of harm alleged.			
3		nothing capable of causing the amount of harm alleged. So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was	2		Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead
3 4		So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was	2		Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath
		So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when	2 3		Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this:
4		So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked	2 3 4		Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have
4 5		So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my	2 3 4 5		Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this
4 5 6 7		So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my biggest mistake, especially the second one, if I'd ever	2 3 4 5 6		Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this evening.
4 5 6 7 8	Q.	So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my biggest mistake, especially the second one, if I'd ever been able to get the second one out of them.	2 3 4 5 6 7		Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this evening. "Their advice was"
4 5 6 7	Q.	So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my biggest mistake, especially the second one, if I'd ever been able to get the second one out of them. Could we go, please, to paragraph 49 of Ms James'	2 3 4 5 6 7 8		Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this evening.
4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my biggest mistake, especially the second one, if I'd ever been able to get the second one out of them. Could we go, please, to paragraph 49 of Ms James' statement, that's page 15. Here you deal with a meeting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this evening. "Their advice was" Then at the fourth bullet point:
4 5 7 8 9 10	Q.	So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my biggest mistake, especially the second one, if I'd ever been able to get the second one out of them. Could we go, please, to paragraph 49 of Ms James' statement, that's page 15. Here you deal with a meeting you had with Paula Vennells on 1 September 2016, and you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this evening. "Their advice was" Then at the fourth bullet point: "The Minister has been briefed on Sparrow but is content that this is best left to the Courts no need
4 5 7 8 9 10 11	Q.	So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my biggest mistake, especially the second one, if I'd ever been able to get the second one out of them. Could we go, please, to paragraph 49 of Ms James' statement, that's page 15. Here you deal with a meeting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this evening. "Their advice was" Then at the fourth bullet point: "The Minister has been briefed on Sparrow but is
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q.	So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my biggest mistake, especially the second one, if I'd ever been able to get the second one out of them. Could we go, please, to paragraph 49 of Ms James' statement, that's page 15. Here you deal with a meeting you had with Paula Vennells on 1 September 2016, and you say this:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this evening. "Their advice was" Then at the fourth bullet point: "The Minister has been briefed on Sparrow but is content that this is best left to the Courts no need to cover the issue in the meeting."
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q.	So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my biggest mistake, especially the second one, if I'd ever been able to get the second one out of them. Could we go, please, to paragraph 49 of Ms James' statement, that's page 15. Here you deal with a meeting you had with Paula Vennells on 1 September 2016, and you say this: "I was briefed in advance of that meeting by Michael Dollin of UKGI This was a routine introductory	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this evening. "Their advice was" Then at the fourth bullet point: "The Minister has been briefed on Sparrow but is content that this is best left to the Courts no need to cover the issue in the meeting." Had you agreed by this point that this was a matter best left to the courts which should be dealt with
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my biggest mistake, especially the second one, if I'd ever been able to get the second one out of them. Could we go, please, to paragraph 49 of Ms James' statement, that's page 15. Here you deal with a meeting you had with Paula Vennells on 1 September 2016, and you say this: "I was briefed in advance of that meeting by Michael	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13		Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this evening. "Their advice was" Then at the fourth bullet point: "The Minister has been briefed on Sparrow but is content that this is best left to the Courts no need to cover the issue in the meeting." Had you agreed by this point that this was a matter
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q.	So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my biggest mistake, especially the second one, if I'd ever been able to get the second one out of them. Could we go, please, to paragraph 49 of Ms James' statement, that's page 15. Here you deal with a meeting you had with Paula Vennells on 1 September 2016, and you say this: "I was briefed in advance of that meeting by Michael Dollin of UKGI This was a routine introductory meeting to help me understand the current issues facing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A.	Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this evening. "Their advice was" Then at the fourth bullet point: "The Minister has been briefed on Sparrow but is content that this is best left to the Courts no need to cover the issue in the meeting." Had you agreed by this point that this was a matter best left to the courts which should be dealt with independently of Government; that was the advice we saw
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my biggest mistake, especially the second one, if I'd ever been able to get the second one out of them. Could we go, please, to paragraph 49 of Ms James' statement, that's page 15. Here you deal with a meeting you had with Paula Vennells on 1 September 2016, and you say this: "I was briefed in advance of that meeting by Michael Dollin of UKGI This was a routine introductory meeting to help me understand the current issues facing [Post Office Limited]. I do not recall the Horizon IT	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A.	Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this evening. "Their advice was" Then at the fourth bullet point: "The Minister has been briefed on Sparrow but is content that this is best left to the Courts no need to cover the issue in the meeting." Had you agreed by this point that this was a matter best left to the courts which should be dealt with independently of Government; that was the advice we saw in the Day One briefing?
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q.	So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my biggest mistake, especially the second one, if I'd ever been able to get the second one out of them. Could we go, please, to paragraph 49 of Ms James' statement, that's page 15. Here you deal with a meeting you had with Paula Vennells on 1 September 2016, and you say this: "I was briefed in advance of that meeting by Michael Dollin of UKGI This was a routine introductory meeting to help me understand the current issues facing [Post Office Limited]. I do not recall the Horizon IT system issues, the SPM complaints or the Group	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A.	Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this evening. "Their advice was" Then at the fourth bullet point: "The Minister has been briefed on Sparrow but is content that this is best left to the Courts no need to cover the issue in the meeting." Had you agreed by this point that this was a matter best left to the courts which should be dealt with independently of Government; that was the advice we saw in the Day One briefing? I don't think that would be an unfair summary of
4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q.	So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my biggest mistake, especially the second one, if I'd ever been able to get the second one out of them. Could we go, please, to paragraph 49 of Ms James' statement, that's page 15. Here you deal with a meeting you had with Paula Vennells on 1 September 2016, and you say this: "I was briefed in advance of that meeting by Michael Dollin of UKGI This was a routine introductory meeting to help me understand the current issues facing [Post Office Limited]. I do not recall the Horizon IT system issues, the SPM complaints or the Group Litigation being discussed in that matter. I was	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A.	Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this evening. "Their advice was" Then at the fourth bullet point: "The Minister has been briefed on Sparrow but is content that this is best left to the Courts no need to cover the issue in the meeting." Had you agreed by this point that this was a matter best left to the courts which should be dealt with independently of Government; that was the advice we saw in the Day One briefing? I don't think that would be an unfair summary of a view I might have expressed at a meeting if, given the
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q.	So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my biggest mistake, especially the second one, if I'd ever been able to get the second one out of them. Could we go, please, to paragraph 49 of Ms James' statement, that's page 15. Here you deal with a meeting you had with Paula Vennells on 1 September 2016, and you say this: "I was briefed in advance of that meeting by Michael Dollin of UKGI This was a routine introductory meeting to help me understand the current issues facing [Post Office Limited]. I do not recall the Horizon IT system issues, the SPM complaints or the Group Litigation being discussed in that matter. I was certainly not briefed specifically on those issues and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A.	Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this evening. "Their advice was" Then at the fourth bullet point: "The Minister has been briefed on Sparrow but is content that this is best left to the Courts no need to cover the issue in the meeting." Had you agreed by this point that this was a matter best left to the courts which should be dealt with independently of Government; that was the advice we saw in the Day One briefing? I don't think that would be an unfair summary of a view I might have expressed at a meeting if, given the advice that, "Now the litigation is underway, it would
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q.	So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my biggest mistake, especially the second one, if I'd ever been able to get the second one out of them. Could we go, please, to paragraph 49 of Ms James' statement, that's page 15. Here you deal with a meeting you had with Paula Vennells on 1 September 2016, and you say this: "I was briefed in advance of that meeting by Michael Dollin of UKGI This was a routine introductory meeting to help me understand the current issues facing [Post Office Limited]. I do not recall the Horizon IT system issues, the SPM complaints or the Group Litigation being discussed in that matter. I was certainly not briefed specifically on those issues and matters relating to Horizon were not included in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A.	Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this evening. "Their advice was" Then at the fourth bullet point: "The Minister has been briefed on Sparrow but is content that this is best left to the Courts no need to cover the issue in the meeting." Had you agreed by this point that this was a matter best left to the courts which should be dealt with independently of Government; that was the advice we saw in the Day One briefing? I don't think that would be an unfair summary of a view I might have expressed at a meeting if, given the advice that, "Now the litigation is underway, it would be best to wait for the outcome of that litigation
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q.	So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my biggest mistake, especially the second one, if I'd ever been able to get the second one out of them. Could we go, please, to paragraph 49 of Ms James' statement, that's page 15. Here you deal with a meeting you had with Paula Vennells on 1 September 2016, and you say this: "I was briefed in advance of that meeting by Michael Dollin of UKGI This was a routine introductory meeting to help me understand the current issues facing [Post Office Limited]. I do not recall the Horizon IT system issues, the SPM complaints or the Group Litigation being discussed in that matter. I was certainly not briefed specifically on those issues and matters relating to Horizon were not included in the meeting agenda."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A.	Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this evening. "Their advice was" Then at the fourth bullet point: "The Minister has been briefed on Sparrow but is content that this is best left to the Courts no need to cover the issue in the meeting." Had you agreed by this point that this was a matter best left to the courts which should be dealt with independently of Government; that was the advice we saw in the Day One briefing? I don't think that would be an unfair summary of a view I might have expressed at a meeting if, given the advice that, "Now the litigation is underway, it would be best to wait for the outcome of that litigation before taking any further steps with relation to the
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q.	So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my biggest mistake, especially the second one, if I'd ever been able to get the second one out of them. Could we go, please, to paragraph 49 of Ms James' statement, that's page 15. Here you deal with a meeting you had with Paula Vennells on 1 September 2016, and you say this: "I was briefed in advance of that meeting by Michael Dollin of UKGI This was a routine introductory meeting to help me understand the current issues facing [Post Office Limited]. I do not recall the Horizon IT system issues, the SPM complaints or the Group Litigation being discussed in that matter. I was certainly not briefed specifically on those issues and matters relating to Horizon were not included in the meeting agenda."	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A.	Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this evening. "Their advice was" Then at the fourth bullet point: "The Minister has been briefed on Sparrow but is content that this is best left to the Courts no need to cover the issue in the meeting." Had you agreed by this point that this was a matter best left to the courts which should be dealt with independently of Government; that was the advice we saw in the Day One briefing? I don't think that would be an unfair summary of a view I might have expressed at a meeting if, given the advice that, "Now the litigation is underway, it would be best to wait for the outcome of that litigation before taking any further steps with relation to the Horizon issue". I don't think that would be
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q.	So I wasn't wholly satisfied with this but that was the sort of tenor of the conversation I got when I probed more. And I said before, I should have asked for the Second Sight documents and that was possibly my biggest mistake, especially the second one, if I'd ever been able to get the second one out of them. Could we go, please, to paragraph 49 of Ms James' statement, that's page 15. Here you deal with a meeting you had with Paula Vennells on 1 September 2016, and you say this: "I was briefed in advance of that meeting by Michael Dollin of UKGI This was a routine introductory meeting to help me understand the current issues facing [Post Office Limited]. I do not recall the Horizon IT system issues, the SPM complaints or the Group Litigation being discussed in that matter. I was certainly not briefed specifically on those issues and matters relating to Horizon were not included in the meeting agenda." There is a document which may assist on why Horizon	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A.	Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath points 1 to 4, there is this: "Since the base material was pulled together we have had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this evening. "Their advice was" Then at the fourth bullet point: "The Minister has been briefed on Sparrow but is content that this is best left to the Courts no need to cover the issue in the meeting." Had you agreed by this point that this was a matter best left to the courts which should be dealt with independently of Government; that was the advice we saw in the Day One briefing? I don't think that would be an unfair summary of a view I might have expressed at a meeting if, given the advice that, "Now the litigation is underway, it would be best to wait for the outcome of that litigation before taking any further steps with relation to the Horizon issue". I don't think that would be an unfair I don't recall actually saying that,

	Once board three or four times a year, i don't think
	I ever met the whole Board, that wouldn't have been
	a good use of their time. What I meant was I would meet
	the key people from the Board: the CFO, the CEO,
	possibly they might have with them the Government
	Affairs Director.
Q.	When you asked for more information about these
	occasional faults, what were you told?
A.	I was told that this had been the longstanding problem,
	that there'd been independent investigations into
	Horizon over two, if not three, years, that some faults
	might be found but nothing systemic, nothing
	system-wide, capable of causing a significant problem
	for a large number of postmasters. I was told that
	a number of postmasters had been convicted and there
	were very few of them affected. Given the fact that
	65,000 people used the Horizon system, the numbers
	involved were very small indeed.
	And I would say that the demeanour of the Post
	Office was they were very good at presenting themselves
	as the victim in all this. They came across as
	beleaguered; what more could they have done; they'd set
	up this Mediation Scheme; they'd improved their training
	processes; they did acknowledge that there were
	50
	It is dated 30 August 2016. It appears to be Paula
	Vennells' briefing, or referring to her briefing, ahead
	of the meeting with you on 1 September. Underneath
	points 1 to 4, there is this:
	"Since the base material was pulled together we have
	had some additional feedback from UKGI, including this
	evening.
	"Their advice was"
	Then at the fourth bullet point:
	"The Minister has been briefed on Sparrow but is
	content that this is best left to the Courts no need
	to cover the issue in the meeting."
	Had you agreed by this point that this was a matter
	best left to the courts which should be dealt with
	independently of Government; that was the advice we saw
	in the Day One briefing?
Α.	I don't think that would be an unfair summary of
	a view I might have expressed at a meeting if, given the
	advice that, "Now the litigation is underway, it would
	be best to wait for the outcome of that litigation

- Horizon issue". I don't think that would be an unfair -- I don't recall actually saying that,
- proactively, at that time. I might have agreed the
- advice. It's a moot point.
 - 52

1 A. No.

2 Q.

3 4

5 6

7 **A**.

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 **Q**.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 **Q**.

17

18 **A**.

19 **Q**.

20

21 A. Yes.

22 **Q**.

23

24

25

Α.

A. Yes.

not.

with the CEO.

the issue.

that right?

Thank you.

A. Huge range of issues, yes.

(The witness nodded)

What would your reaction have been, at the time, if you had learned that you agreeing this was a matter best

resolved by the courts meant you were not going to be given any information on the issues underlying the

I think that would have been wrong. I think it would have been wrong for them to assume that, because

I seemed content with that advice, that that meant that

no further information was required. I mean, it should really have been covered in the meeting. But it also

should have -- I should have been given a proper

briefing. If I can remind you of our discussion earlier

about the Civil Service Code and the importance of

impartial and objective advice, to have information

Second Sight Reports that they disclosed they had, and

not provide ministers with the same level, if you like,

of information at the very least as they were providing

the Post Office never to mention Horizon or anything

We will come on to the press lines which were agreed 54

It was a selective briefing, as I think I have

lulled me into a false state of security, I think, on

Q. That document can come down now. Thank you.

already communicated and, therefore, the slant was --

You were given some information on Horizon IT issues

ahead of Parliamentary debates on the future of the Post Office in November 2016 and March 2017; is that right?

These are covered in your paragraphs in your statement.

Q. The information that you were provided with was part of

a wider briefing pack covering a range of issues; is

You deal with this at paragraphs 51, 52 and 61 of your

You say that the briefing pack repeated the information

and advice you had previously received; is that right?

Parliamentary debates being of particular value to you

You describe at paragraph 22 of your statement

56

about it to that minister ever again, no, definitely

So I wouldn't think that bullet 4 is a free pass for

as -- well, as the Post Office did, well beyond the

about Second Sight, was very wrong.

litigation by the CEO of the Post Office?

		The Post Onice II
1	Q.	Why do you say it's a moot point?
2	Α.	Because I think, at best, it's an overstatement of
3		a view that I had. I might have agreed advice, yes, it
4		is indeed best left to the courts, but that does not
5		need that does not mean, ergo, that the issue
6		shouldn't be covered.
7	Q.	Of course, if I can just stop you there, my question at
8		the moment is limited to whether, regardless of the
9		consequences, you had agreed at that point that it was
10		a matter best left to the courts, independent of the
11		Government, which was the advice set out in the Day One
12		briefing pack?
13	Α.	All I can say was that I didn't disagree with it.
14		I wouldn't have disagreed with it. I doubt my agreement
15		was sought. Introductory meetings are not places
16		they're not times where ministers give guidance and
17		advice. They are the Minister is in reactive mode,
18		it's he or she is absorbing information. If something
19		strikes you, I think, as extraordinary or something you
20		wouldn't agree with, you would say that, but you
21		wouldn't be actively giving a view on an area of policy
22		in an introductory meeting.
23	Q.	Were you aware at the time that this was the reason that
24		the issue was not covered in the meeting with Paula
25		Vennells?
		53
1		about the litigation but, just looking at this document
2		alone, do you think that your early agreement, or at
3		least lack of objection, to the approach that this was
4		an operational matter for Post Office best resolved by
5		the courts may have led to you receiving less
6		information from UKGI and the Post Office about
7		complaints and legal action relating to the Horizon
8		system?
9	Α.	Well, I think that yes, I think there is a partial
10		explanation for it gives I think it possibly gives
11		them an excuse to feel, "Well, she's happy for this to
12		be decided by the courts, so we're not going to provide
13		any further information". I think it gives them cover
14		for that, unfortunately. So
15	Q.	Would you agree, though, that this should not have been
16		the case because a decision not to comment publicly on
17		an ongoing legal case should not prevent effective
18		oversight by the Government of such important matters,
19		which were the subject of those legal proceedings?
20	Α.	Yeah, I agree strongly with that. I agree strongly with
21		that and, indeed, had the initial briefing pack, which

- 22 you had on the screen an hour or so ago, had that
- 23 contained a comprehensive -- brief but comprehensive
- 24 briefing on the Horizon issue, then I would definitely
- 25 have expected to have covered it in my first meeting 55

in keeping yourself informed independently.

statement, if you need to refer to them.

4	~	
1	Q.	Whilst neither of these debates focused specifically on
2		Horizon issues, would it have been helpful for you to
3 4		have had more fulsome information about Horizon issues for those debates?
4 5	•	
	Α.	
6 7		because Horizon didn't come up in either of the debates.
-		If it had done, if one of the MPs who was very
8		knowledgeable about the matter had decided to attend the
9		debate and hold forth, then a briefing would have been
10		useful. But, in the absence of such a member, it
11	~	wouldn't have been useful because no one raised it.
12	Q.	
13		with these written briefings. Did they themselves not
14		serve a purpose in terms of you becoming more
15	•	independently informed, or more informed, about the
16	Α.	
17	~	I apologise, what was your last sentence?
18	Q.	My question is whether, regardless of what questions you
19		were asked in the debate, the briefings themselves
20		served a purpose for making sure you were informed in
21	•	relation to briefs you held?
22 23	Α.	
23 24		purpose. One would hope that the Minister was informed enough, certainly by the time of these debates, but you
24 25		still need a comprehensive briefing, you know, to remind
25		57
4		Office I would not even extra comment on long
1		Office. I would not suggest we comment on legal
2		action but welcome thoughts from Press Office."
2 3		action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to
2 3 4		action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is
2 3 4 5	•	action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to?
2 3 4 5 6	А.	action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my
2 3 4 5 6 7		action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	A. Q.	action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to. Yes, after consultation with the BEIS Press Office.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to. Yes, after consultation with the BEIS Press Office. Then you deal at paragraph 58 with an email dated
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9		action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to. Yes, after consultation with the BEIS Press Office. Then you deal at paragraph 58 with an email dated 31 January 2017, in which Laura Thompson confirmed
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to. Yes, after consultation with the BEIS Press Office. Then you deal at paragraph 58 with an email dated 31 January 2017, in which Laura Thompson confirmed UKGI's advice that:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to. Yes, after consultation with the BEIS Press Office. Then you deal at paragraph 58 with an email dated 31 January 2017, in which Laura Thompson confirmed UKGI's advice that: " 'we're content with the suggested lines pass
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13		action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to. Yes, after consultation with the BEIS Press Office. Then you deal at paragraph 58 with an email dated 31 January 2017, in which Laura Thompson confirmed UKGI's advice that: " 'we're content with the suggested lines pass to Post Office in the first instance, 'operational
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14		action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to. Yes, after consultation with the BEIS Press Office. Then you deal at paragraph 58 with an email dated 31 January 2017, in which Laura Thompson confirmed UKGI's advice that: " 'we're content with the suggested lines pass to Post Office in the first instance, 'operational matter/legal proceedings', if needed"
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15		action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to. Yes, after consultation with the BEIS Press Office. Then you deal at paragraph 58 with an email dated 31 January 2017, in which Laura Thompson confirmed UKGI's advice that: " 'we're content with the suggested lines pass to Post Office in the first instance, 'operational matter/legal proceedings', if needed" Was this the established line by this point: that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16		action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to. Yes, after consultation with the BEIS Press Office. Then you deal at paragraph 58 with an email dated 31 January 2017, in which Laura Thompson confirmed UKGI's advice that: " 'we're content with the suggested lines pass to Post Office in the first instance, 'operational matter/legal proceedings', if needed" Was this the established line by this point: that this matter was an operational matter for Post Office
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q.	action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to. Yes, after consultation with the BEIS Press Office. Then you deal at paragraph 58 with an email dated 31 January 2017, in which Laura Thompson confirmed UKGI's advice that: " 'we're content with the suggested lines pass to Post Office in the first instance, 'operational matter/legal proceedings', if needed" Was this the established line by this point: that this matter was an operational matter for Post Office and being resolved in court?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18		action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to. Yes, after consultation with the BEIS Press Office. Then you deal at paragraph 58 with an email dated 31 January 2017, in which Laura Thompson confirmed UKGI's advice that: " 'we're content with the suggested lines pass to Post Office in the first instance, 'operational matter/legal proceedings', if needed" Was this the established line by this point: that this matter was an operational matter for Post Office and being resolved in court? Yes, that was the position, and I noticed the email came
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q.	action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to. Yes, after consultation with the BEIS Press Office. Then you deal at paragraph 58 with an email dated 31 January 2017, in which Laura Thompson confirmed UKGI's advice that: " 'we're content with the suggested lines pass to Post Office in the first instance, 'operational matter/legal proceedings', if needed" Was this the established line by this point: that this matter was an operational matter for Post Office and being resolved in court? Yes, that was the position, and I noticed the email came from Claire French. I think she was the lead person
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q.	action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to. Yes, after consultation with the BEIS Press Office. Then you deal at paragraph 58 with an email dated 31 January 2017, in which Laura Thompson confirmed UKGI's advice that: " 'we're content with the suggested lines pass to Post Office in the first instance, 'operational matter/legal proceedings', if needed" Was this the established line by this point: that this matter was an operational matter for Post Office and being resolved in court? Yes, that was the position, and I noticed the email came from Claire French. I think she was the lead person from the Press Office of what was BEIS at the time, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q.	action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to. Yes, after consultation with the BEIS Press Office. Then you deal at paragraph 58 with an email dated 31 January 2017, in which Laura Thompson confirmed UKGI's advice that: " 'we're content with the suggested lines pass to Post Office in the first instance, 'operational matter/legal proceedings', if needed" Was this the established line by this point: that this matter was an operational matter for Post Office and being resolved in court? Yes, that was the position, and I noticed the email came from Claire French. I think she was the lead person from the Press Office of what was BEIS at the time, and that was the established position, yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A. Q.	action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to. Yes, after consultation with the BEIS Press Office. Then you deal at paragraph 58 with an email dated 31 January 2017, in which Laura Thompson confirmed UKGI's advice that: " 'we're content with the suggested lines pass to Post Office in the first instance, 'operational matter/legal proceedings', if needed" Was this the established line by this point: that this matter was an operational matter for Post Office and being resolved in court? Yes, that was the position, and I noticed the email came from Claire French. I think she was the lead person from the Press Office of what was BEIS at the time, and that was the established position, yes. At the time, were you satisfied with that line?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q.	action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to. Yes, after consultation with the BEIS Press Office. Then you deal at paragraph 58 with an email dated 31 January 2017, in which Laura Thompson confirmed UKGI's advice that: " 'we're content with the suggested lines pass to Post Office in the first instance, 'operational matter/legal proceedings', if needed" Was this the established line by this point: that this matter was an operational matter for Post Office and being resolved in court? Yes, that was the position, and I noticed the email came from Claire French. I think she was the lead person from the Press Office of what was BEIS at the time, and that was the established position, yes. At the time, were you satisfied with that line? Yes, I would have been, I would have been satisfied with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A. Q.	action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to. Yes, after consultation with the BEIS Press Office. Then you deal at paragraph 58 with an email dated 31 January 2017, in which Laura Thompson confirmed UKGI's advice that: " 'we're content with the suggested lines pass to Post Office in the first instance, 'operational matter/legal proceedings', if needed" Was this the established line by this point: that this matter was an operational matter for Post Office and being resolved in court? Yes, that was the position, and I noticed the email came from Claire French. I think she was the lead person from the Press Office of what was BEIS at the time, and that was the established position, yes. At the time, were you satisfied with that line? Yes, I would have been, I would have been satisfied with that line. I didn't suspect the Post Office of acting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A. Q.	action but welcome thoughts from Press Office." You then say at paragraph 57 that you decided to accept this advice, the advice about media lines; is that what you're referring to? Yes, I think that's the only thing they're asking my agreement to. Yes, after consultation with the BEIS Press Office. Then you deal at paragraph 58 with an email dated 31 January 2017, in which Laura Thompson confirmed UKGI's advice that: " 'we're content with the suggested lines pass to Post Office in the first instance, 'operational matter/legal proceedings', if needed" Was this the established line by this point: that this matter was an operational matter for Post Office and being resolved in court? Yes, that was the position, and I noticed the email came from Claire French. I think she was the lead person from the Press Office of what was BEIS at the time, and that was the established position, yes. At the time, were you satisfied with that line? Yes, I would have been, I would have been satisfied with

Q.	you so that you can refer to stuff during the debate. If the debate had been about the Horizon issue or the Mediation Scheme, about something relevant to the Horizon issue, then I think that would have put UKGI a real bothersome position because they would have had to have briefed me more. I couldn't have gone into the a Parliamentary debate with the usual ten lines or five lines ten, if you were lucky. They'd have had to have briefed a whole briefing pack on the matter. But, alas, while I was Minister, the only issue that really generated noise in Parliament was potential Post Office closures. That was the thing that was alive in Parliament during my 18 months in the role. Turning, then, to the press lines which were agreed about litigation, could we have on screen, please, page 18 of Ms James' statement. At paragraph 56, you deal with an update on the litigation, which you received on 20 January 2017. This discussed an upcoming hearing at the High Court on 26 January 2017. Towards the end of the paragraph that you quote here from that document, is a section on media interest. It says this: "If there is any media interest, I would suggest our usual approach of referring any enquiries to Post 58
	that they comment than the Government comments on
	something which, yes, we did regard at the time as
_	an operational matter for the Post Office.
Q.	Was this also the line which was being given to
	subpostmasters in correspondence at this stage, so early 2017?
Α.	Yes, it would have been. It would have been.
Q.	Did you think that that was a satisfactory response to
	be given to subpostmasters in correspondence at that
	time?
Α.	Early in January, yes, I probably would have done.
	I would say that my feelings altered during Quarter 1 of
	2017, I think.
Q.	Do you accept now that the litigation and the underlying
	Horizon allegations were not simply operational matters for the Post Office?
Α.	I do. I do accept that, yes. They should have been.
Α.	If they'd been handled appropriately, they should have
	been an operational matter for the Post Office but,
	because of the way the Post Office was behaving, they
	most certainly should have been a matter for the
	Government, for the owner.
Q.	Would you agree that the effect of this line, passed to

Q. Would you agree that the effect of this line, passed to

25 Post Office in the first instance, was to defer to the 60

1 2	Post Office on issues concerning the integrity of Horizon?	1 2	Α.	Post Office in this way? No. No, definitely not. I think that we would have
			А.	
3 A		3		had we wouldn't be at this position at that point in
4 Q	5	4		time, had we had all that information that you've just
5	one and the same as the Government's?	5		mentioned by virtue of those reports. I suspect the
6 A		6		Government's the BEIS Legal Department, myself, as
7 Q	•	7		Minister, and the Secretary of State, would have been
8 A		8		all over it, demanding change I mean well, I mean
9	suspicion on the part of myself I can only speak for	9		you can start by demanding the implementation of
10	myself at the time, there was nothing wrong in my	10		Jonathan Swift's recommendations. That would have been
11	view with that position. But anybody anybody who	11		a good place to have started.
12	knew what was going on at that point within the Post	12	Q.	Do you think that this line, "operational matter, legal
13	Office on this issue, to anyone who was in possession of	13		proceedings", may have had the continued effect of you
14	that knowledge, it would not have been an appropriate or	14		being provided with limited information about the
15	adequate response because what was going on was	15		allegations which underpinned the litigation?
16	potentially so damaging, obviously, to the victims of	16	Α.	Sorry, I don't quite I don't really
17	the behaviour but also to the Post Office itself, and to	17	Q.	Well, going back to the discussion we had earlier about
18	its owner, that you wouldn't allow you wouldn't	18		the early lack of disagreement to this being
19	delegate everything about the matter to the organisation	19		an operational matter and a matter for the courts, and
20	that was behaving in all the wrong ways in its	20		what the consequences of that might be, and we looked in
21	management of the matter.	21		particular at the email to Paula Vennells, which appears
22 Q		22		to have led to that issue not being discussed at that
23	been provided with and we went to that list earlier,	23		meeting
24	including the Deloitte reports, the Swift Report and the	24		Yeah, I see what you mean.
25	Clarke Advice would you have agreed to defer to the 61	25	Q.	we talked at that stage in the context of your early 62
1	briefings. My question is: looking at this line which	1		is a blurred line between strategy and execution and
2	continues to be used throughout 2017, I'm asking whether	2		operations, and to deny any overlap can have the reverse
3	you think that continued potentially to have the effect	3		effect, whereby shareholders are completely blindsided,
4	that less information was coming to you than should have	4		on the basis that "This is an operational matter,
5	done?	5		therefore you don't need to know anything about it
6 A	. Well, I mean, possibly they would use that as an excuse	6		whatsoever".
7	to not provide the information but, of course, as we	7		I should add, though, that when you're in
8	just discussed and I think you just mentioned briefly	8		Government and indeed in the private sector, it's no
9	then, it all goes back to the partial briefing that was	9		different, really you do expect the people you're
10	included in my Day One pack and the first meeting I had	10		dealing with to be complying with the law at the very
11	with UKGI.	11		least and certainly to be acting in good faith and, of
12 Q	. Does this serve to underline the fact that the	12		course, that was not the case.
13	distinction between operational and contractual matters	13	Q.	The standard line to this effect was provided in further
14	and policy and strategy matters is necessarily blurred	14		briefings for you for an MP drop-in session, and you
15	and should have been blurred, and there is a danger in	15		deal with that at paragraph 65; a cribsheet on the Post
16	putting things in a sealed box marked "Operational,	16		Office, which you deal with at paragraph 66; and a Hot
17	contractual, legal"?	17		Topics pack, which you deal with at paragraph 67; all of
18 A	. Yes, I think so. I think you have to accept that you	18		those being in 2017; is that right?
19	use your best endeavours as a shareholder to hold the	19	Α.	Yes, I think so.
20	Executive to account and, in general, that means leaving	20	Q.	Did that standard line continue to be used in
21	the Executive with responsibility for execution and	21		correspondence to subpostmasters throughout 2017, as fa
22	operations because, obviously, if you interfere too	22		as you can recall?
	much, then the Executive can rightly challenge you back	23	Α.	As far as I can recall, it would have done, yes.
23				
23 24	when objectives aren't met. And too much blurring	24	SIR	RWYN WILLIAMS: Can I just ask you, I'm not sure and
	when objectives aren't met. And too much blurring compromises accountability. But having said that, there	24 25	SIR	R WYN WILLIAMS: Can I just ask you, I'm not sure and this is my ignorance, all right if Ms Price is going

(16) Pages 61 - 64

1	to show you particular letters from subpostmasters
2	during this period but I'm slightly querying the extent
3	to which you would have received letters from
4	subpostmasters when there is active litigation ongoing,
5	all right? On the one hand, you've got the Group
6	Litigation I think it was made Group Litigation in
7	March 2017. So there's a legal process going on and, on
8	the face of it, I'm a little surprised if individual
9	postmasters were writing either to you or to ShEx or
10	whoever UKGI, I'm sorry while that litigation is
11	going on.
12	I mean, what is your memory of actual letters either
13	from subpostmasters or MPs on their behalf?
14	A. Don't recall receiving a letter from a subpostmaster who
15	was among the Group Litigation Order, one of the
16	complainants in that case. I don't recall anybody
17	writing to me who was themselves going through that
18	litigation.
19	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes.
20	A. I do recall postmasters writing to me about the Horizon
21	issue in more detail and describing the experiences that
22	they were having with Horizon.
23	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right.
24	A. And that that would have been, I think, whilst this
25	litigation was going on but coincident to it.
	65
1	MS PRICE: I will be very nearly finished by lunchtime. But
2	I think I will still have a little to go after lunch,
3	probably no more than 15 minutes or so after lunch, plus
4	Core Participant questions.
5	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I was going to ask you to check
6	about whether we actually need to have a full lunch
7	break, especially given that Ms James is recovering from
8	Covid. If it's the case that we could complete the
9	evidence by, say, 1.30 to 2.00, with just further short
10	beaks, that may be a preferable way of dealing with
11	things, so have a chat to Core Participants and see what
12	they say. All right?
13	MS PRICE: Yes, sir. I will do. Thank you.
14	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you very much. So what time shall
15	we resume?
16	MS PRICE: 12.25, sir, please?
17	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Fine.
18	(12.14 pm)
19	(A short break)
20	(12.25 pm)
21	MS PRICE: Hello, sir.
22	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Hello.
23	MS PRICE: I've discussed with Core Participants the likely
24	time estimate for questions, and there should be a total
25	of around 15 minutes, made up of five minutes from
	6/

- 1 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right. Well, if there are particular
- 2 letters that Ms Price wishes to refer to, no doubt she
- 3 will. But can you just give me an approximation of
- 4 a number of such letters you received, say in the last
- 5 12 months that you were relevant minister?
- 6 A. I would probably have received maybe ten-ish, I would7 say.
- 8 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right, thank you.
- 9 **A.** Almost one a month. But not quite.
- 10 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Fine. Thank you.
- 11 Sorry, Ms Price.
- 12 MS PRICE: Not at all, sir. If it assists, the letters that
- 13 I have for the purposes of this witness, the latest one
- 14 is in October 2016, so it was very much a question
- 15 without the documents providing a clear answer.
- 16 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Without wishing to have a chat to you,
- 17 Ms Price, I rather suspected that, if there were
- 18 specific letters, you would have put them by now. Hence
- 19 my questions to try to clear my mind.
- 20 MS PRICE: Yes, sir. Thank you.
- 21 Sir, would that be a convenient moment for our
- 22 second morning break, please?
- 23 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. Just so that I can manage what goes
- 24 on, what are you anticipating in terms of the further
- 25 time necessary to examine Ms James? 66

1	Mr Stein and ten minutes from Mr Henry. So it should be
2	possible to conclude, I would hope, if we go through
3	now, by about 1.15.
4	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: That's perfect, Ms Price. You carry on
5	then, please.
6	MS PRICE: Thank you, sir.
7	I'd like to come, please, Ms James, to your
, 8	impression about the Post Office Board and the Chief
9	•
	Executive Officer's willingness to discuss Horizon
10	issues. Could we have on screen, please, paragraph 49
11	of Ms James' statement. That's page 15.
12	Towards the bottom of the page, starting three lines
13	up, you say:
14	"Later in my time as Minister (it is hard to
15	remember exactly when) I formed an impression that
16	Horizon was the last thing that the [Post Office
17	Limited] Board or CEO ever wanted to discuss, that they
18	would never bring it up proactively and, if I asked
19	questions about it, they were reluctant to speak about
20	it in detail. To begin with, I simply put this down to
21	it a difficult issue which was subject to ongoing
22	litigation, but as time went on and as I started to get
23	number of letters from MPs raising complaints from
24	[subpostmasters] in their constituencies, and some
25	letters from [subpostmasters] themselves which contained 68

1		accounts of their personal experience of Horizon which
2		was at odds with the minimal details disclosed to me by
3		the CEO of [Post Office Limited]. I started to feel
4		that there might be more to the Horizon issues than
5		I was being told."
6		Starting, please, with the way you had contact with
7		the Post Office Board and the CEO, in your statement at
8		paragraph 22, you say that you would challenge the Post
9		Office Board where appropriate by questioning them at
10		quarterly meetings. Who attended those quarterly
11		meetings? You referred earlier to the CEO and the CFO;
12		did anyone else ever attend?
13	Α.	Yes. Others did attend but I'm afraid I can't remember
14		which individuals from the Board attended with the CEO
15		and CFO. I would imagine it would have been the
16		Government Affairs Director but I can't say for sure.
17		Occasionally, I would meet the CEO just on her own, and
18		I think there were occasions where it would just be the
19		CEO and CFO, and then there were occasions where they
20		might be accompanied by another Board Director.
21		I think the first time I met representatives of the
22		Board there were probably about four of them I met on
23		the first instance, but it was a reduced number after
24		that initial meeting.
25	Q.	Those quarterly meetings, how long did they last?

Those quarterly meetings, how long did they last? 69

- 1 manage all the diary requirements for such a wide and 2 varied brief, really.
- 3 Q. If you didn't ask for Horizon issues to be on the agenda 4 for your quarterly meetings, do you think you did, in
- 5 fact, raise Horizon issues at those meetings or not?
- 6 A. I did, certainly at one of them, probably two of them, 7 I would say. Yes.
- Q. Can you recall when you raised those Horizon issues? 8
- 9 A. It would have been, I think, probably after the funding issues were resolved. So that would have been in the 10 second half of 2017. 11
- 12 Q. Did you say it was on one or two occasions at which you 13 raised Horizon issues at those meetings?
- 14 A. I can only really be sure of saying at least one,
- 15 probably two occasions because, inexplicably, although,
- 16 as you've seen, because you have the documentation in
- 17 front of you and you put some of it on the screen,
- 18 I have been given, you know, copies of meeting briefs,
- 19 agendas, even, but not one meeting minute. So there was
- no readout or report, or whatever you want to call it, 20
- 21 from any of the meetings through the whole time I was at
- 22 the Department, which is strange. Not for now, but it
- 23 is of interest what is retained and what isn't. It
- 24 seems verv random.
- 25 If you think that you raised Horizon issues only once, Q.

71

- They probably lasted 45 minutes. 1 Α.
- 2 Q. That was to cover all Post Office issues during that
 - time, was it?
- 4 A Yes

- Q. Were Horizon issues ever on the agenda for those 5 6 meetings?
- 7
- A. I think I can safely say no. 8
- Q. Did you ever ask for Horizon issues to be put on
- 9 an agenda for those meetings? 10
- A. Not to my knowledge.
- Q. Did you ever attend a Post Office Board meeting? 11
- I don't think I did, actually. I'm quite surprised but, 12 Α.
- 13 I mean, I should have done. But then, diary management
- 14 was extremely, extremely difficult and I think there
- 15 would have been an intention to have attended a Post 16
- Office Board meeting but I don't recall ever attending 17 one and I suspect that it was a matter of diary
- 18 management, I think. I mean, certainly it was in the
- 19 case of other institutions for which I was responsible
- 20 for, for example, I wanted to attend a meeting of the
- 21 Board of the British Business Bank, and I failed to do
- 22 that. They were in Sheffield, which didn't help, in
- 23 terms of the lengthy travel time involved but, even so,
- 24 I would go up north quite regularly with my portfolio.
- 25 It's just -- it was a very, very difficult thing to
 - 70
- 1 possibly twice, at your meetings with the CEO and the 2 CFO, what was it that led you to form the view that the 3 CFO and the Post Office Board were reluctant to discuss 4 issues to do with Horizon in detail? 5 A. Because occasionally I would meet with the CEO one to 6 one, in addition to the Board members which we're now 7 discussing, and I raised it with her as well, separately 8 from the Board meeting, and on all occasions, there was 9 a change in demeanour, a wish to shut the conversation 10 down as soon as could be done politely, and a general 11 reluctance to discuss further. And that would be the 12 same, whether it was one to one or as part of the update 13 I had with the Board. 14 Q. When, roughly, speaking to, in your time in the role, 15 did you first ask directly about Horizon issues to the CEO? 16 17 A. I would say earlier than I would have raised it at the 18 Board. So probably either towards the end of 2016 or early in 2017. 19 20 Q. On how many occasions in total do you think you asked 21 directly about Horizon issues? 22 A. I would say probably four, I would say we'd be safe to 23
- say. Yeah, a good four times.
- 24 Q. The Inquiry has been unable to find any documentary
- 25 evidence that your concerns about this reluctance to 72

•	1		I did it did form some of the discussion that I had
	2		with the Secretary of State, probably the Permanent
	3		Secretary, and probably with UKGI, as well, but I can't
],	4		be sure about them because I can't remember. But I do
	5		remember discussing it with the Secretary of State,
	6		probably fairly later on. I wouldn't have raised
	7		a misgiving or I wouldn't have raised that kind of
	8		feeling with the Secretary of State, unless it grew in
	9		substance.
	10		So I would I suspect I didn't raise it with him,
	11		probably until the second half certainly well into
	12		2017.
	13	Q.	Was there any particular question that you asked the
	14		Post Office Limited Board or the CEO that you didn't get
	15		an answer to?
	16	Α.	I can't really remember. I whether I felt I was
	17		fobbed off because, in general, they would find
	18		different things of saying the same thing in response to
	19		my questions, and the best question I could have asked
	20		them was "I want a copy of the Second Sight Report, both
	21		of them, please", and that's and I didn't ask that
	22		question, unfortunately. But I did ask other questions
	23		about the computer system, why it was that the
	24		assumption was that all of the subpostmasters in making
	25		those complaints were guilty of misconduct or
			74
	1		the way that the Post Office were behaving when it came
	2		to matters of disclosure and the quality of evidence
	3		that they were allowing to be brought, and the matters
m.	4		raised in the Cartwright King and Swift papers.
	5		I wasn't aware of all of that so I didn't challenge them
	6		about that.
	7		I think the most effective challenge I made was to
	8		their wish to cap the amount of compensation that they
	9		were prepared to put into the Mediation Scheme, or any
ded	10		of its successors, in terms of the compensation that
	11		might be offered to subpostmasters because I was aware,
out.	12		of course, of the of the Criminal Case Review
	13		Compensation team, who were looking at I think it was
	14		about 20 cases when I first came into my position.
	15		So I was aware that compensation might be required
	16		for all sorts of things and I wasn't sympathetic to the
	17		Post Office Board's recommendation that they cap the
>	18		overall amount at what I suspected was a level below
	19		what might transpire to be required.
	20	Q.	You wrote a letter to Tim Parker, the then Chair of Post
	20	ς.	Office, on 20 December 2017, and you address this at
	21		paragraph 68 of your statement. You describe it as
	22		a standard letter drafted by UKGI, which reminded him of
	23 24		the Government's strategic priorities for the Post
	24 25		Office and confirmed the level of subsidy and investment
	20		76

1	discuss Horizon issues were raised at the time you were
2	Parliamentary Under-Secretary. Did you raise those

- 2 Parliamentary Under-Secretary. Did you raise those3 concerns with anyone?
- 4 A. Do you mean with the people we've just been discussing.
 5 the Post Office Board --
- 6 Q. Either directly with Paula Vennells, or with anyone else7 from the Board, or more widely?
- 8 A. Certainly. I'm sorry if I wasn't -- if I wasn't clear
- 9 when you asked me how many times I had raised the10 Horizon --
- 11 **Q.** Forgive me, I think we may be talking at cross purposes.
- 12 A. I wondered, sorry.
- 13 $\,$ Q. $\,$ My question was: if you were concerned that there was
- a reluctance to talk about Horizon issues on the part of
 the Post Office Board and the CEO, whether you raised
 the fact that you were concerned, either directly with
- 17 the CEO, or anyone from the Board, or more widely?
- 18 A. I -- I don't recall ever alleging to the Board that
 19 I felt they were trying to close down the discussion,
- no. I persevered in the discussion against this kind of
- 21 pushback, when it came to discussion with the Board or
- 22 representatives of the Board of Post Office. So, on the
- 23 question of -- so I didn't raise directly with them that
- 24 I was concerned that they didn't want to seem to raise
- 25 this issue, I would just persevere with them. But 73

1		incompetence, because I have explained that I had
2		received letters which I felt were very bona fide from
3		people who didn't appear to be in either camp but
4		nevertheless were experiencing problems with the system.
5		And those were the sort of questions I was asking,
6		and I didn't get good answers to my questions. I got
7		really a reiteration of how, you know, two or three
8		years of independent scrutiny had not actually come up
9		with anything system wide. They did give way that
10		sometimes there were occasional faults and they conceded
11		that that might cause some of the problems that the
12		campaigning group of postmasters were complaining about.
13	Q.	One of your reflections on matters is that you wish you
14		had challenged the Post Office Board more vigorously
15		than you did, and you say that at paragraph 37 of your
16		statement. Looking back, what did you challenge the
17		Post Office Board on; the "more vigorously than [you]
18		did" suggests there was some challenge, what was that?
19	Α.	I think the challenge was that I wanted more information
20		about the system of Horizon and what it was capable of
21		doing in relation to subpostmasters who were not in the
22		camp of even being taken to court. I wanted more
23		information about that, the system. That was my main
24		challenge. I didn't challenge on the litigation
25		strategy and, I must say, I had no idea at the time of
		75

1		Board was reluctant to discuss Horizon issues?
2	Α.	No, I didn't, which I certainly should have done.
3	Q.	Could we have paragraph 70 of Ms James' statement on
4		screen, please. That's page 23. You deal here with
5		what you did after you became concerned that there may
6		be more to Horizon than had been communicated to you,
7		and you say that you decided to meet the outgoing leader
8		of the National Federation of SubPostmasters. Nine
9		lines down you say this:
10		"I decided to meet the outgoing leader of the
11		National Federation of SubPostmasters and took the
12		opportunity of questioning him about the alleged impact
13		of Horizon on some [subpostmasters]. Somewhat to my
14		surprise I was reassured by the representative of the
15		NFSP, who concurred with the line taken by the [Post
16		Office Limited] in response to my questions. This had
17		the effect of allaying my concerns which had been
18		growing prior to the meeting. This state of reassurance
19		was reinforced by Horizon never coming up during my
20		meetings with the leadership of the CWU."
21 22		You found reassurance in the stance taken by the
22	Α.	NFSP; is that right? Yes, I did.
23 24	Q.	You say you found that surprising at the time. Did you
24 25	ω.	discuss your surprise about this with anyone at BEIS or
25		78
1		had been compromised?
1	٨	had been compromised?
2	Α.	It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think
2 3	A.	It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as
2 3 4	A.	It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with
2 3 4 5	A.	It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and
2 3 4 5 6	A.	It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that
2 3 4 5 6 7	А.	It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that I'd had several meetings with the leadership of the CWU,
2 3 4 5 6	Α.	It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that I'd had several meetings with the leadership of the CWU, and they had not raised Horizon at all with me. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Α.	It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that I'd had several meetings with the leadership of the CWU, and they had not raised Horizon at all with me. And I asked them about it and they were not concerned,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Α.	It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that I'd had several meetings with the leadership of the CWU, and they had not raised Horizon at all with me. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Α.	It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that I'd had several meetings with the leadership of the CWU, and they had not raised Horizon at all with me. And I asked them about it and they were not concerned, I would say, would be the general tenor of what I got
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A.	It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that I'd had several meetings with the leadership of the CWU, and they had not raised Horizon at all with me. And I asked them about it and they were not concerned, I would say, would be the general tenor of what I got back.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Α.	It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that I'd had several meetings with the leadership of the CWU, and they had not raised Horizon at all with me. And I asked them about it and they were not concerned, I would say, would be the general tenor of what I got back. So a good reading of that briefing paper prior to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Α.	It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that I'd had several meetings with the leadership of the CWU, and they had not raised Horizon at all with me. And I asked them about it and they were not concerned, I would say, would be the general tenor of what I got back. So a good reading of that briefing paper prior to my I must have had a briefing on NFSP before I met
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Α.	It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that I'd had several meetings with the leadership of the CWU, and they had not raised Horizon at all with me. And I asked them about it and they were not concerned, I would say, would be the general tenor of what I got back. So a good reading of that briefing paper prior to my I must have had a briefing on NFSP before I met them because that was the standard process, if you were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Α.	It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that I'd had several meetings with the leadership of the CWU, and they had not raised Horizon at all with me. And I asked them about it and they were not concerned, I would say, would be the general tenor of what I got back. So a good reading of that briefing paper prior to my I must have had a briefing on NFSP before I met them because that was the standard process, if you were going in for a meeting, you had a briefing first, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Α.	It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that I'd had several meetings with the leadership of the CWU, and they had not raised Horizon at all with me. And I asked them about it and they were not concerned, I would say, would be the general tenor of what I got back. So a good reading of that briefing paper prior to my I must have had a briefing on NFSP before I met them because that was the standard process, if you were going in for a meeting, you had a briefing first, and that would have contained some background information on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Α.	It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that I'd had several meetings with the leadership of the CWU, and they had not raised Horizon at all with me. And I asked them about it and they were not concerned, I would say, would be the general tenor of what I got back. So a good reading of that briefing paper prior to my I must have had a briefing on NFSP before I met them because that was the standard process, if you were going in for a meeting, you had a briefing first, and that would have contained some background information on the NFSP. Whether it would have been identical by then
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Α.	It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that I'd had several meetings with the leadership of the CWU, and they had not raised Horizon at all with me. And I asked them about it and they were not concerned, I would say, would be the general tenor of what I got back. So a good reading of that briefing paper prior to my I must have had a briefing on NFSP before I met them because that was the standard process, if you were going in for a meeting, you had a briefing first, and that would have contained some background information on the NFSP. Whether it would have been identical by then to the two paragraphs you have up on the screen is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19		It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that I'd had several meetings with the leadership of the CWU, and they had not raised Horizon at all with me. And I asked them about it and they were not concerned, I would say, would be the general tenor of what I got back. So a good reading of that briefing paper prior to my I must have had a briefing on NFSP before I met them because that was the standard process, if you were going in for a meeting, you had a briefing first, and that would have contained some background information on the NFSP. Whether it would have been identical by then to the two paragraphs you have up on the screen is another matter. Quite possibly not.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20		It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that I'd had several meetings with the leadership of the CWU, and they had not raised Horizon at all with me. And I asked them about it and they were not concerned, I would say, would be the general tenor of what I got back. So a good reading of that briefing paper prior to my I must have had a briefing on NFSP before I met them because that was the standard process, if you were going in for a meeting, you had a briefing first, and that would have contained some background information on the NFSP. Whether it would have been identical by then to the two paragraphs you have up on the screen is another matter. Quite possibly not. I'd like to turn, please, to your impression that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21		It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that I'd had several meetings with the leadership of the CWU, and they had not raised Horizon at all with me. And I asked them about it and they were not concerned, I would say, would be the general tenor of what I got back. So a good reading of that briefing paper prior to my I must have had a briefing on NFSP before I met them because that was the standard process, if you were going in for a meeting, you had a briefing first, and that would have contained some background information on the NFSP. Whether it would have been identical by then to the two paragraphs you have up on the screen is another matter. Quite possibly not. I'd like to turn, please, to your impression that certain things were deliberately withheld from you. Can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22		It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that I'd had several meetings with the leadership of the CWU, and they had not raised Horizon at all with me. And I asked them about it and they were not concerned, I would say, would be the general tenor of what I got back. So a good reading of that briefing paper prior to my I must have had a briefing on NFSP before I met them because that was the standard process, if you were going in for a meeting, you had a briefing first, and that would have contained some background information on the NFSP. Whether it would have been identical by then to the two paragraphs you have up on the screen is another matter. Quite possibly not. I'd like to turn, please, to your impression that certain things were deliberately withheld from you. Can we have on screen, please, paragraph 42 of Ms James'
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23		It's a very good question that you ask and I don't think I did consider that. It didn't strike me as an explanation for the content of the meeting I had with the outgoing Chair or Chief Exec of the NFSP, and I think it was also sort of amplified by the fact that I'd had several meetings with the leadership of the CWU, and they had not raised Horizon at all with me. And I asked them about it and they were not concerned, I would say, would be the general tenor of what I got back. So a good reading of that briefing paper prior to my I must have had a briefing on NFSP before I met them because that was the standard process, if you were going in for a meeting, you had a briefing first, and that would have contained some background information on the NFSP. Whether it would have been identical by then to the two paragraphs you have up on the screen is another matter. Quite possibly not. I'd like to turn, please, to your impression that certain things were deliberately withheld from you. Can we have on screen, please, paragraph 42 of Ms James' statement, that's page 13. It's just the last sentence

- 2 You note in your statement that there was no mention
- 3 of Horizon issues. You had been in the role for
- 4 18 months by this point, was this not an opportunity to
- 5 explain to the Chair the importance of ministers being
- 6 fully aware of developments in the litigation,
- 7 particularly if you had concerns that the Board was
- 8 reluctant to discuss Horizon?
- 9 A. Yes, it would have been a good opportunity, now you
 10 point it out. Would you -- could you remind me of the
- 11 date of that letter?
- 12 **Q.** 20 December 2017.
- 13 A. Yes, it would have --
- 14 **Q.** We can go to that if you'd like to.
- 15 A. No, I had forgotten the date and where it fitted into
- 16 the whole scheme of things. But, yes, you are right:
- 17 I should have brought his attention to my concerns
- 18 actually earlier than that. He was the Chairman and
- 19 I should have possibly sought a meeting one to one with
- 20 him to discuss the matter. I think that would have been
- a -- and then possibly included a follow-up in the
- 22 letter to which you refer. I should have done that,
- 23 I didn't do that. But I -- with the benefit of
- 24 hindsight, I should have done that.
- 25 **Q.** Did you ever raise with Tim Parker a concern that the 77
- 1 UKGI?
- 2 A. I can't remember doing that, no.
- 3 Q. Could we have on screen, please, the Day One briefing 4 for the Post Office, UKGI00020328. That's page 13 of 5 that document, thank you. This is a slide about key 6 stakeholders, and covered here was the National 7 Federation of SubPostmasters. There is an explanation 8 here that: 9 "[Post Office Limited] has recently started funding 10 the NFSP directly, to enable it to transform into 11 a trade association working in partnership with [Post 12 Office Limited] and not a union-like organisation often
- 13 in conflict with it. Although this has been widely
- 14 welcomed there has been tensions in the group's
- 15 relationship with [Post Office Limited] (eg the NFSP
- negotiates with [Post Office Limited] on subpostmasterremuneration).
- 18 "In addition some subpostmasters ... believe the
 19 NFSP is now compromised as it received funding direct
 20 from [Post Office Limited]."
- 21 Did you consider, at the time you met with the NFSP,
- 22 whether its stance might have been influenced by the
- 23 fact it was being directly funded by the Post Office,
- 24 especially considering the information contained in this
- 25 briefing that some subpostmasters considered the NFSP

(20) Pages 77 - 80

1		"Having now read these reports I have concluded that
2		they were withheld from me deliberately."
3		Who do you think was withholding the reports
4		deliberately?
5	Α.	Well, it depends on the report. Any of the any of
6		those reports I mention that were that had been
7		disclosed to UKGI, I would say they withheld it from me.
8		But I gathered, from watching a previous evidence
9		session, approximately a week or ten days ago, to my
10		absolute astonishment, it came out at that previous
11		evidence session that the Chairman of Post Office didn't
12		even share the Swift Report within his own Board, so
13		obviously I wasn't going to get a copy.
14		And if the Board weren't seeing it, then I presume
15		UKGI didn't see it either. So I'm not quite sure who,
16		in answer to your question, was withholding the
17		information from me. Either the Post Office were
18		withholding it from UKGI and, therefore, it didn't reach
19		me, or UKGI were aware of it, and excluded it from the
20		original briefing which, as I mentioned, did give me
21		a couple of lines on the Second Sight Report.
22		So my point would be that the Simon Clarke Advice,
23		Deloitte, you know, Bramble, et cetera, and the Swift
24		Review, any of those that UKGI knew about should have
25		been bullet pointed with the reference to Second Sight.
25		been bullet pointed with the reference to Second Sight. 81
		81
1		81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it.
1 2	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is
1 2 3	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are
1 2 3 4	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are addressed in columns D and E. Then in column K, there
1 2 3 4 5	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are addressed in columns D and E. Then in column K, there is this and to read the full text you need to cast
1 2 3 4 5 6	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are addressed in columns D and E. Then in column K, there is this and to read the full text you need to cast your eyes up to the long bar at the top because of the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are addressed in columns D and E. Then in column K, there is this and to read the full text you need to cast your eyes up to the long bar at the top because of the nature of the boxes:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are addressed in columns D and E. Then in column K, there is this and to read the full text you need to cast your eyes up to the long bar at the top because of the nature of the boxes: "Responsibility rests with [Post Office Limited] to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are addressed in columns D and E. Then in column K, there is this and to read the full text you need to cast your eyes up to the long bar at the top because of the nature of the boxes: "Responsibility rests with [Post Office Limited] to manage both the Mediation Scheme and stakeholders
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are addressed in columns D and E. Then in column K, there is this and to read the full text you need to cast your eyes up to the long bar at the top because of the nature of the boxes: "Responsibility rests with [Post Office Limited] to manage both the Mediation Scheme and stakeholders generally. [Post Office Limited] Chair undertaking
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are addressed in columns D and E. Then in column K, there is this and to read the full text you need to cast your eyes up to the long bar at the top because of the nature of the boxes: "Responsibility rests with [Post Office Limited] to manage both the Mediation Scheme and stakeholders generally. [Post Office Limited] Chair undertaking review with independent QC. We are managing Ministers'
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are addressed in columns D and E. Then in column K, there is this and to read the full text you need to cast your eyes up to the long bar at the top because of the nature of the boxes: "Responsibility rests with [Post Office Limited] to manage both the Mediation Scheme and stakeholders generally. [Post Office Limited] Chair undertaking review with independent QC. We are managing Ministers' involvement, with the intention of keeping the issue
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are addressed in columns D and E. Then in column K, there is this and to read the full text you need to cast your eyes up to the long bar at the top because of the nature of the boxes: "Responsibility rests with [Post Office Limited] to manage both the Mediation Scheme and stakeholders generally. [Post Office Limited] Chair undertaking review with independent QC. We are managing Ministers' involvement, with the intention of keeping the issue independent of Government."
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are addressed in columns D and E. Then in column K, there is this and to read the full text you need to cast your eyes up to the long bar at the top because of the nature of the boxes: "Responsibility rests with [Post Office Limited] to manage both the Mediation Scheme and stakeholders generally. [Post Office Limited] Chair undertaking review with independent QC. We are managing Ministers' involvement, with the intention of keeping the issue independent of Government."
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are addressed in columns D and E. Then in column K, there is this and to read the full text you need to cast your eyes up to the long bar at the top because of the nature of the boxes: "Responsibility rests with [Post Office Limited] to manage both the Mediation Scheme and stakeholders generally. [Post Office Limited] Chair undertaking review with independent QC. We are managing Ministers' involvement, with the intention of keeping the issue independent of Government." Then in column P, which is further mitigating actions, there is this:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are addressed in columns D and E. Then in column K, there is this and to read the full text you need to cast your eyes up to the long bar at the top because of the nature of the boxes: "Responsibility rests with [Post Office Limited] to manage both the Mediation Scheme and stakeholders generally. [Post Office Limited] Chair undertaking review with independent QC. We are managing Ministers' involvement, with the intention of keeping the issue independent of Government." Then in column P, which is further mitigating actions, there is this:
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are addressed in columns D and E. Then in column K, there is this and to read the full text you need to cast your eyes up to the long bar at the top because of the nature of the boxes: "Responsibility rests with [Post Office Limited] to manage both the Mediation Scheme and stakeholders generally. [Post Office Limited] Chair undertaking review with independent QC. We are managing Ministers' involvement, with the intention of keeping the issue independent of Government." Then in column P, which is further mitigating actions, there is this: "Ensure [Post Office Limited] are proactively managing interest and noise, and are aware of Ministers'
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are addressed in columns D and E. Then in column K, there is this and to read the full text you need to cast your eyes up to the long bar at the top because of the nature of the boxes: "Responsibility rests with [Post Office Limited] to manage both the Mediation Scheme and stakeholders generally. [Post Office Limited] Chair undertaking review with independent QC. We are managing Ministers' involvement, with the intention of keeping the issue independent of Government." Then in column P, which is further mitigating actions, there is this: "Ensure [Post Office Limited] are proactively managing interest and noise, and are aware of Ministers' expectations. Manage interest and wobbles from
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are addressed in columns D and E. Then in column K, there is this and to read the full text you need to cast your eyes up to the long bar at the top because of the nature of the boxes: "Responsibility rests with [Post Office Limited] to manage both the Mediation Scheme and stakeholders generally. [Post Office Limited] Chair undertaking review with independent QC. We are managing Ministers' involvement, with the intention of keeping the issue independent of Government." Then in column P, which is further mitigating actions, there is this: "Ensure [Post Office Limited] are proactively managing interest and noise, and are aware of Ministers' expectations. Manage interest and wobbles from Ministers or the centre, including prepared fallback
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are addressed in columns D and E. Then in column K, there is this and to read the full text you need to cast your eyes up to the long bar at the top because of the nature of the boxes: "Responsibility rests with [Post Office Limited] to manage both the Mediation Scheme and stakeholders generally. [Post Office Limited] Chair undertaking review with independent QC. We are managing Ministers' involvement, with the intention of keeping the issue idependent of Government." Then in column P, which is further mitigating actions, there is this: "Ensure [Post Office Limited] are proactively managing interest and noise, and are aware of Ministers' expectations. Manage interest and wobbles from Ministers or the centre, including prepared fallback options if current arm's-length position becomes
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q.	81 made aware of highlights, I guess, from it. Under item 6, which is line 40, Project Sparrow is addressed. The risks associated with the litigation are addressed in columns D and E. Then in column K, there is this and to read the full text you need to cast your eyes up to the long bar at the top because of the nature of the boxes: "Responsibility rests with [Post Office Limited] to manage both the Mediation Scheme and stakeholders generally. [Post Office Limited] Chair undertaking review with independent QC. We are managing Ministers' involvement, with the intention of keeping the issue independent of Government." Then in column P, which is further mitigating actions, there is this: "Ensure [Post Office Limited] are proactively managing interest and noise, and are aware of Ministers' expectations. Manage interest and wobbles from Ministers or the centre, including prepared fallback

22 What is your view of this express management of23 Ministers by officials?

- 24 A. Alarmed. I find that very alarming. First of all,
- 25 would you mind reminding me of the date of this 83

Q. Why do you conclude that it was deliberate? 1 2 Α. Because there's no logic to advising a minister about 3 the presence of one report when there are other reports which develop the thinking of the report mentioned 4 further, add to the volume of knowledge on the same 5 6 matter. It doesn't -- it's partial, in my view, to give 7 the Minister reference to one report and then remain completely silent on the presence of further work to 8 9 of -- in the same vein which adds to the body of 10 knowledge Q. Could we have on screen, please, UKGI00016898. This is 11 a UKGI risk register dated 31 July 2016, so around the 12 13 time you took up the role, and going, please, to the --14 I think we already have it open -- the risk register tab, which related to the Post Office. First of all, 15 16 have you ever seen a risk register like this from UKGI 17 before? 18 A. No, no. You sent me a copy of it as an additional 19 document approximately ten days ago, and I am 20 99 per cent sure that it was the first time I had seen 21 a copy of these risk registers, which doesn't 22 necessarily surprise me. I mean, it's -- they were 23 produced, I gathered from the reports that you sent me, 24 on a monthly basis from UKGI and I would expect them to 25 be internal management documents and ministers to be 82 1 particular risk register? Q. 31 July 2016. 2 3 A. Right. Well, I was very surprised to read, on your 4 previous slide -- when you put up the full copy in 5 column -- I think it was column D, where it said that 6 the Chair is --7 Q. I think the column I showed you first was K. 8 A. Right. I mean, I'm very surprised, because I couldn't 9 see on my -- I did see this and I read it, but couldn't 10 see beneath, you know, what you're showing me above. 11 I could only see the first three lines; I was very surprised to see, "POL Chair undertaking a review with 12

independent QC", which indicates to me that UKGI must

- 14 have known about that, because they are the ones
- maintaining this risk register. So must -- they musthave known bit.

13

That doesn't mean to say they had a copy of it
because, of course, my understanding of the previous
evidence session was that the Chair didn't share it with
the Board and that would presumably include the UKGI
representative on the Board. But there it is.

- Anyway, back to your the question about managing,
 you know, to make sure there's no ministerial wobble,
 and things like that, and maintain the arm's-length
- 25 position here, sort of -- it's not -- what is written 84

1		there and your previous statement about ministerial
2		wobbles and preserving the arms-length position that
3		is not really consistent with the Civil Service values
4		of integrity, honesty, impartiality and objectivity, in
5		my opinion.
6		I think it is an example of a team of people who
7		should be following those principles but who have gone
8		rogue and abandoned those principles.
9	Q.	Do you agree that preparing fallback options, in case
10		the arms-length position becomes untenable, casts some
11		doubt on whether there was ever a justified basis for
12		saying that this was a reason for Ministers not to
13		become more involved?
14	Α.	Probably. As I might have mentioned right at the
15		beginning of our exchanges this morning, if the Post
16		Office had been managing this issue in an appropriate
17		manner, within the law and in good faith, it should
18		indeed have been the case that it was an operational
19		matter for the Post Office. But the fact that they
20		weren't meant that it should definitely have been on the
21		Government's radar.
22	MS	PRICE: Sir, just at this juncture, I need to confess
23		that my time estimate was ambitious and I'm going to
24		need a little more time than I had budgeted for. Given
25		that that is the case, and with an eye to the
		85
1		party to either the Letter of Claim from the claimants
1 2		party to either the Letter of Claim from the claimants or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office
		or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal
2 3 4		or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance,
2 3 4 5		or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to
2 3 4 5 6		or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance,
2 3 4 5 6 7		or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had
2 3 4 5 6 7 8		or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had been made on your behalf and refused, in effect?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	А.	or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had been made on your behalf and refused, in effect? I don't think I was, no.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had been made on your behalf and refused, in effect? I don't think I was, no. Would it have concerned you, had you been aware?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11		or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had been made on your behalf and refused, in effect? I don't think I was, no. Would it have concerned you, had you been aware? Not at that stage, it wouldn't have done. I think later
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q.	or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had been made on your behalf and refused, in effect? I don't think I was, no. Would it have concerned you, had you been aware? Not at that stage, it wouldn't have done. I think later on, with my growing knowledge of the situation it would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q.	or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had been made on your behalf and refused, in effect? I don't think I was, no. Would it have concerned you, had you been aware? Not at that stage, it wouldn't have done. I think later on, with my growing knowledge of the situation it would have done. I think it was a good call on the part of my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had been made on your behalf and refused, in effect? I don't think I was, no. Would it have concerned you, had you been aware? Not at that stage, it wouldn't have done. I think later on, with my growing knowledge of the situation it would have done. I think it was a good call on the part of my private secretary. I think he did it on his own account
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q.	or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had been made on your behalf and refused, in effect? I don't think I was, no. Would it have concerned you, had you been aware? Not at that stage, it wouldn't have done. I think later on, with my growing knowledge of the situation it would have done. I think it was a good call on the part of my private secretary. I think he did it on his own account and, unfortunately, he left during my time in the job,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had been made on your behalf and refused, in effect? I don't think I was, no. Would it have concerned you, had you been aware? Not at that stage, it wouldn't have done. I think later on, with my growing knowledge of the situation it would have done. I think it was a good call on the part of my private secretary. I think he did it on his own account and, unfortunately, he left during my time in the job, so I lost his continuity, unfortunately, because he
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Q.	or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had been made on your behalf and refused, in effect? I don't think I was, no. Would it have concerned you, had you been aware? Not at that stage, it wouldn't have done. I think later on, with my growing knowledge of the situation it would have done. I think it was a good call on the part of my private secretary. I think he did it on his own account and, unfortunately, he left during my time in the job, so I lost his continuity, unfortunately, because he might have brought it back up again later, as my
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q.	or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had been made on your behalf and refused, in effect? I don't think I was, no. Would it have concerned you, had you been aware? Not at that stage, it wouldn't have done. I think later on, with my growing knowledge of the situation it would have done. I think it was a good call on the part of my private secretary. I think he did it on his own account and, unfortunately, he left during my time in the job, so I lost his continuity, unfortunately, because he might have brought it back up again later, as my interest in Horizon grew. But, at the time, I'm afraid
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q. A.	or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had been made on your behalf and refused, in effect? I don't think I was, no. Would it have concerned you, had you been aware? Not at that stage, it wouldn't have done. I think later on, with my growing knowledge of the situation it would have done. I think it was a good call on the part of my private secretary. I think he did it on his own account and, unfortunately, he left during my time in the job, so I lost his continuity, unfortunately, because he might have brought it back up again later, as my interest in Horizon grew. But, at the time, I'm afraid I probably would have been accepting of that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q.	or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had been made on your behalf and refused, in effect? I don't think I was, no. Would it have concerned you, had you been aware? Not at that stage, it wouldn't have done. I think later on, with my growing knowledge of the situation it would have done. I think it was a good call on the part of my private secretary. I think he did it on his own account and, unfortunately, he left during my time in the job, so I lost his continuity, unfortunately, because he might have brought it back up again later, as my interest in Horizon grew. But, at the time, I'm afraid I probably would have been accepting of that. We looked at one of the UKGI risk registers. If we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q. A.	or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had been made on your behalf and refused, in effect? I don't think I was, no. Would it have concerned you, had you been aware? Not at that stage, it wouldn't have done. I think later on, with my growing knowledge of the situation it would have done. I think it was a good call on the part of my private secretary. I think he did it on his own account and, unfortunately, he left during my time in the job, so I lost his continuity, unfortunately, because he might have brought it back up again later, as my interest in Horizon grew. But, at the time, I'm afraid I probably would have been accepting of that. We looked at one of the UKGI risk registers. If we could please have on screen the one from January 2017.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q. A.	or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had been made on your behalf and refused, in effect? I don't think I was, no. Would it have concerned you, had you been aware? Not at that stage, it wouldn't have done. I think later on, with my growing knowledge of the situation it would have done. I think it was a good call on the part of my private secretary. I think he did it on his own account and, unfortunately, he left during my time in the job, so I lost his continuity, unfortunately, because he might have brought it back up again later, as my interest in Horizon grew. But, at the time, I'm afraid I probably would have been accepting of that. We looked at one of the UKGI risk registers. If we could please have on screen the one from January 2017. That's UKGI00042795, and this the risk register for Post
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had been made on your behalf and refused, in effect? I don't think I was, no. Would it have concerned you, had you been aware? Not at that stage, it wouldn't have done. I think later on, with my growing knowledge of the situation it would have done. I think it was a good call on the part of my private secretary. I think he did it on his own account and, unfortunately, he left during my time in the job, so I lost his continuity, unfortunately, because he might have brought it back up again later, as my interest in Horizon grew. But, at the time, I'm afraid I probably would have been accepting of that. We looked at one of the UKGI risk registers. If we could please have on screen the one from January 2017. That's UKG100042795, and this the risk register for Post Office specifically. Item 21 deals with Project
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Q. A.	or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had been made on your behalf and refused, in effect? I don't think I was, no. Would it have concerned you, had you been aware? Not at that stage, it wouldn't have done. I think later on, with my growing knowledge of the situation it would have done. I think it was a good call on the part of my private secretary. I think he did it on his own account and, unfortunately, he left during my time in the job, so I lost his continuity, unfortunately, because he might have brought it back up again later, as my interest in Horizon grew. But, at the time, I'm afraid I probably would have been accepting of that. We looked at one of the UKGI risk registers. If we could please have on screen the one from January 2017. That's UKGI00042795, and this the risk register for Post Office specifically. Item 21 deals with Project Sparrow. The risks are addressed in columns D and E.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q. A.	or [Post Office Limited's] response [Post Office Limited's] response in particular is subject to legal privilege. I recommend we maintain that distance, certainly at this stage in the proceedings. Happy to chat through of course." Were you aware at the time that this request had been made on your behalf and refused, in effect? I don't think I was, no. Would it have concerned you, had you been aware? Not at that stage, it wouldn't have done. I think later on, with my growing knowledge of the situation it would have done. I think it was a good call on the part of my private secretary. I think he did it on his own account and, unfortunately, he left during my time in the job, so I lost his continuity, unfortunately, because he might have brought it back up again later, as my interest in Horizon grew. But, at the time, I'm afraid I probably would have been accepting of that. We looked at one of the UKGI risk registers. If we could please have on screen the one from January 2017. That's UKG100042795, and this the risk register for Post Office specifically. Item 21 deals with Project

1	transcriber, I wonder whether we want to take another
2	short break and then complete all of the questioning
3	after that, or whether you'd like me to continue to the
4	end of my questions and then do that.
5	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, we started at 12.25, did we not?
6	MS PRICE: Yes, sir.
7	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Just ask if I can ask the transcriber
8	through you, whether, if we continue until about 1.30,
9	as opposed to 1.15, which I assume would be enough
10	time
11	MS PRICE: Yes, sir.
12	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: is that okay with her.
13	MS PRICE: Yes, I'm seeing nods.
14	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Fine. Well, then, let's do that.
15	MS PRICE: Thank you, sir.
16	Could we have on screen, please, UKGI00006991.
17	Starting on page 2, please, this is an email from your
18	private office to Laura Thompson from UKGI, it's dated
19	23 August 2016. The last paragraph of this says:
20	"I also wondered if you could send me a copy of the
21	group civil litigation letter (and our response) on
22	Horizon? Just for further background for me."
23	The response from Ms Thompson is on page 1 and, in
24	her penultimate paragraph, she says:
25	"On the Horizon issue, we (Government) have not been 86
1	here is:
2	"Civil litigation and/or Court of Appeal processes
3	
	judge that [Post Office Limited] has acted
4	
4 5	judge that [Post Office Limited] has acted

- perceived to have acted in that way."
- Then the next box:
- "Potential for significant compensation claims, if
- 9 civil or criminal courts rule against [Post Office
- 10 Limited]. More likely however, and certainly in the
- short-term, is that this continues to be a significant 11
- 12 distraction (and cost) to the business as they defend
- their actions." 13 14
 - Were the risks of the litigation ever expressed to you in those terms?
- 15 16 A. No.

- 17 Q. That can come down now. Thank you.
- 18 A. Certainly not the first one. I think it was evident to everybody that it could become a costly distraction, but 19 20 certainly not that the Post Office, you know, might have 21 acted illegally. 22
- **Q.** You explain in your statement that you were not aware,
- 23 when you were Parliamentary Under-Secretary, that the
- 24 Post Office had brought private prosecutions against
- 25 subpostmasters and others, and you deal with this at 88

1		paragraph 44, and if I can summarise, you say, in	1
2		effect, you would have exerted greater challenge had you	2
3		been aware that prosecutions had been brought privately.	3
4		Why is that?	4
5	Α.	I was really shocked when I did discover, very	5
6		belatedly, that these had been private prosecutions	6
7		because I had assumed which is a very bad thing to	7
8		do, in the role I had, but I had assumed that the	8
9		prosecutions had gone through the normal process of	9
10		being cleared by the CPS and mounted in the normal way,	10
11		and that was why I allowed myself to be persuaded of	11
12		an important part of the Post Office's line to me, which	12
13		was, you know, and where people have been charged, they	13
14		have been found guilty, which was an important part of	14
15		the line that I was given by the Post Office.	15
16		But what I've since discovered, obviously the whole	16
17		issue of disclosure and the quality of evidence being	17
18		brought was thrown into doubt, as far as back as,	18
19		I think, 2013.	19
20	Q.	Could we have on screen, please, paragraph 74 of	20
21		Ms James' statement. That's page 25. Towards the	21
22		bottom of that paragraph, you acknowledge here that you	22
23		should have asked for a copy of the Second Sight	23
24		Reports, but you say:	24
25		"These were held very close by [Post Office Limited]	25
		89	
1		slowly. Basically the first the Interim Report was	1
2		one thing but the I think Second Sight were dismissed	2
3		at or around the time they reported the second time, and	3
4		I think they had many complaints, which was certainly	4
5		not shared with me at the time, about the Post Office	5
6		withholding information, and obstructing their inquiries	6
7		when it came to their follow-up work, having produced	7
8		their Interim Report. And I think that I was imagining	8
9		that, given those conditions, I think it likely that the	9
10		Post Office would have been reluctant to reveal or	10
11		disclose the second or final report.	11
12	Q.	•	12
13	·	that you say would have been a red flag to you and to	13
14		give context, you say at paragraph 71 of your statement	14
15		that you had a generally favourable impression of the	15
16		Post Office around the time your concerns about Horizon	16
17		issues were increasing, so it would have taken a red	17
18		flag for you to become more proactive in relation to the	18
19		issues but one of the things you say would have been	19
20		a red flag was exposure to now Lord Arbuthnot's	20
20		campaign.	20
22		When you took up the role, did you ask which	22
			~~

- Parliamentarians had an interest in the issue of Horizonchallenges?
- 25 A. No, I didn't.

- but I could probably have had access to them and
- I should have read them rather than taken as read the
- only message [Post Office Limited] wanted the reports to convey."
- You were, in your first briefing, told about the
- 6 Second Sight Reports and you obviously regret not having
 - asked for them. It's right that you didn't ever ask for
- 8 copies of those reports, is it?
- 9 A. I'm pretty sure I didn't. I think I would have got
- 0 them, if I had have asked for them, and I think if I'd
- asked for them and they hadn't been forthcoming, I would
- 12 have, you know, asked for them again.
 - 13 Q. Why is it, therefore, that you say these were held very14 close by Post Office Limited?
 - 15 A. Oh, I think I meant the second Second Sight -- sorry,
 - 6 it's a bit confusing, isn't it? The Second Sight Report
 - 17 number Two, or final, or whatever it was. There's a bit
 - 18 of a -- I think I should have said the final report
 - 9 was -- I had the impression was held very close.
 - 20 Q. How did you gain that impression, if you never asked for21 it?
 - A. Yes. Um ... I think that might have been with thebenefit of hindsight. I think I might have read
 - somewhere in the evidence that I've been given to
- 25 prepare for this Inquiry -- it's coming back to me 90
- 1 Q. Did you request a briefing on any recent Parliamentary
- 2 debates which concerned the Post Office?
- 3 **A.** No.
- 4 Q. Did you ask your private office staff to provide you
 5 with previous ministerial responses to Parliament on key
 6 Post Office issues?
- 7 A. No. All of these would have been good things to ask for
 8 but I'm afraid I didn't ask for any of them.
- 9 Q. At the time, was there any mechanism for incoming
- ministers to be briefed on past relevant Parliamentarydebates?
- 12 A. No, I don't think there would have been no, no.
- 3 Q. Did that change at any point when you were in
- a ministerial role, having gone on to be Minister ofState in a different department?
- 16 A. No, I don't think it did, actually. I gave my
- 7 predecessor -- sorry, my successor at BEIS a briefing on
- 8 all the kind of top line issues within my brief about
- 19 two weeks after he had assumed what were my
- 20 responsibilities. But I did that informally, without
- any officials present. So, that's not really what
- you're talking about, I don't think. There's no formal
- 23 handover process which enables the new Minister to
- 24 capture the top line, be it Parliamentary or any other
- 25 aspect of the brief, what had gone before. Which is 92

96

1		curious, I suppose, really, but it is that's my	1		oversight are first that there are too many players
2		experience.	2		involved", and you list UKGI, HMT and DBT:
3 S	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: I understand that might be the case as	3		"This gives rise to communication challenges"
4		between the respective ministers. Does not the Civil	4		You go off to list other issues there.
5		Service provide a kind of handover in the sense of	5		Is the essence of the problem that you're getting at
6		highlighting important points which were being dealt	6		here that nobody grips the problem, because there are so
7		with by the previous minister and which now catch your	7		many players involved?
8		attention? I take it you're going to say "Well, that	8	Α.	There's the potential for that. I don't think it
9		was the initial briefing"?	9		automatically follows but I think that the potential for
10 A	۹.	Yes, I was going to say, Sir Wyn, that does happen, and	10		that is heightened by the number of players involved.
11		that is your introductory pack and all the introductory	11		And the agenda I think this whole the point about
12		meetings. I think one unfortunate aspect of when	12		stakeholders developing their own agendas is heightened
13		I assumed this role was that it did coincide with a new	13		by the more there are in the mix.
14		Government and an entirely new ministerial team and	14	Q.	Going over the page, please, you say:
15		private office team. I don't think my private office	15		"The other problem with the status quo is that UKGI
16		had experience of handling any aspects of my brief left	16		as the representative of Government on the Board of
17		over from my predecessor, unfortunately. That wouldn't	17		[Post Office Limited] reports directly to HMT."
18		always be the case but when it's a new government,	18		You talk about:
19		I think it is the case.	19		"[The] power wielded by HMT across Government, which
20 N	MS	PRICE: Turning finally to your reflections on the	20		can be absolute and heightens the risk that UKGI focuses
21		governance structure in relation to the Post Office,	21		purely on the achievement of financial objectives with
22		could we have on screen, please, paragraph 79 of	22		the sole goal of reducing public subsidy."
23		Ms James' statement. That's page 26. It's towards the	23		I think you've seen in the documents provided to you
24		bottom of page 26. You say:	24		more recently two Memorandums of Understanding about the
25		"The structural problems of the current system of 93	25		role of UKGI officials. Have you had an opportunity to 94
1	_	look at those?	1		official, it was an official of the UKGI who would
		Yes, I have.	2		support me in those matters. Yes.
	Q.	Without displaying them, for the purposes of time, would	3		I mean, they were interchangeable in most senses
4		you agree that the Memorandum of Understanding which was	4		with Department officials for that particular brief. It
5		in place at the time, and the Memorandum of	5		is just that, although they are supposed to comply with
6		Understanding in place now, states that UKGI formally	6		the Civil Service Code, they are not civil servants and
7		acts as an agent of the Department that is what was	7		I can imagine it might be quite difficult to act, you
8		at the time BEIS as opposed to the Treasury?	8		know, in as a civil servant, if you haven't had the
	Α.	Well, it did act as an agent of the Department, I would	9		training to be one.
10		agree with that. But it doesn't change the position	10	Q.	Looking, then, to paragraph 81, a little further down
11		that it is wholly owned by HMT. So whilst it might act	11		this page, there are two options, which you moot in your
12		as an agent of the Department, it is accountable really	12		statement, that might improve matters, and one is that
13		to the people who own it, and that's HMT.	13		the Post Office should be taken essentially under DBT,
	Q.	There is a section in the Memorandum of Understanding	14		and the other is that the role of Ofcom should be
15		relating to the accountability to Parliament for the	15		extended to give regulatory oversight, independent
16		activities of UKGI, and the levels are BEIS ministers,	16		regulatory oversight. Which of those two options, with
17		the Principal Accounting Officer level, BEIS Permanent	17		the benefit of having considered this matter with the
18		Secretary, and the senior official level, UKGI and BEIS.	18		benefit of hindsight, do you consider to be the better?
19		Would you agree from that there is a degree of	19	Α.	•
20		accountability between UKGI and the Department already	20		cultural crisis within the Post Office. In order to
21		in existence that was there at the time?	21		resolve that, I think the machinery of Government is
22 A	Α.	Yes. Yes, I would agree with that. Yes, whenever	22		probably adequate without a change. But long term
23		I gave evidence or attended a debate in Parliament, led	23		long term, I think I would favour the latter. If the
20					Deat Office can be been what into an accountable state
24		a debate, answered a debate, I was always UKGI	24		Post Office can be brought into an acceptable state,

95

(24) Pages 93 - 96

The Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry

1		regulated route rather than the DBT owned route.
2		l mean, we did, as l know you are aware, have
3		a long-term consideration that it might be mutualised as
4		a service, and that's another option. I didn't mention
5		that there, but that is another option, although it does
6		have to be, I think, to qualify for mutual status it
7		would have to be not in receipt of public subsidy,
8		I think. So that's an issue. The subsidy issue is
9		a bit of a that kind of leads more to the DBT-owned
10		model. But, I mean, none of this will solve the
11		cultural crisis in the Post Office, I suspect. That has
12		to be subject to radical surgery, I would imagine.
13	MS	PRICE: Sir, those are all the questions I have for
14		Ms James.
15	SIR	WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you, yes.
16	MS	PRICE: Shall I hand over to Mr Henry first.
17		Questioned by MR HENRY
18	MR	HENRY: Ms James, thank you so much.
19		I don't want to go back to the document but it's
20		UKGI00016898 and it's column D of the risk register of
21		31 July 2016, allocated to risk number 6, which was
22		entitled "Project Sparrow". Therein, one reads:
23		" increasingly orchestrated campaign against the
24		[Post Office Limited] on alleged faults with the Horizon
25		system, including attempts to derail the Mediation
		97
		97
1	Q.	97 Now, again
1 2	Q. A.	
		Now, again
2	Α.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in.
2 3	Α.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56
2 3 4	Α.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56 of your statement but that is that on 20 January 2017,
2 3 4 5	Α.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56 of your statement but that is that on 20 January 2017, Laura Thompson of UKGI provided your private office with an update on the Group Litigation, and you remember the passage that you were taken to by Ms Price. And
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Α.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56 of your statement but that is that on 20 January 2017, Laura Thompson of UKGI provided your private office with an update on the Group Litigation, and you remember
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Α.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56 of your statement but that is that on 20 January 2017, Laura Thompson of UKGI provided your private office with an update on the Group Litigation, and you remember the passage that you were taken to by Ms Price. And then, in the following paragraph, paragraph 57, you said:
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Α.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56 of your statement but that is that on 20 January 2017, Laura Thompson of UKGI provided your private office with an update on the Group Litigation, and you remember the passage that you were taken to by Ms Price. And then, in the following paragraph, paragraph 57, you said: "I would have taken this email as an update only,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Α.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56 of your statement but that is that on 20 January 2017, Laura Thompson of UKGI provided your private office with an update on the Group Litigation, and you remember the passage that you were taken to by Ms Price. And then, in the following paragraph, paragraph 57, you said: "I would have taken this email as an update only, and not a request for action or decision of any sort.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Α.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56 of your statement but that is that on 20 January 2017, Laura Thompson of UKGI provided your private office with an update on the Group Litigation, and you remember the passage that you were taken to by Ms Price. And then, in the following paragraph, paragraph 57, you said: "I would have taken this email as an update only, and not a request for action or decision of any sort. I decided to accept this advice [in other words the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Α.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56 of your statement but that is that on 20 January 2017, Laura Thompson of UKGI provided your private office with an update on the Group Litigation, and you remember the passage that you were taken to by Ms Price. And then, in the following paragraph, paragraph 57, you said: "I would have taken this email as an update only, and not a request for action or decision of any sort. I decided to accept this advice [in other words the advice not to get involved] after consultation with the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13	Α.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56 of your statement but that is that on 20 January 2017, Laura Thompson of UKGI provided your private office with an update on the Group Litigation, and you remember the passage that you were taken to by Ms Price. And then, in the following paragraph, paragraph 57, you said: "I would have taken this email as an update only, and not a request for action or decision of any sort. I decided to accept this advice [in other words the advice not to get involved] after consultation with the BEIS Press Office."
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Α.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56 of your statement but that is that on 20 January 2017, Laura Thompson of UKGI provided your private office with an update on the Group Litigation, and you remember the passage that you were taken to by Ms Price. And then, in the following paragraph, paragraph 57, you said: "I would have taken this email as an update only, and not a request for action or decision of any sort. I decided to accept this advice [in other words the advice not to get involved] after consultation with the BEIS Press Office." Why the Press Office, Ms James? Is this concern, as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Α.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56 of your statement but that is that on 20 January 2017, Laura Thompson of UKGI provided your private office with an update on the Group Litigation, and you remember the passage that you were taken to by Ms Price. And then, in the following paragraph, paragraph 57, you said: "I would have taken this email as an update only, and not a request for action or decision of any sort. I decided to accept this advice [in other words the advice not to get involved] after consultation with the BEIS Press Office." Why the Press Office, Ms James? Is this concern, as it were, about optics as opposed to substance; why the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Α.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56 of your statement but that is that on 20 January 2017, Laura Thompson of UKGI provided your private office with an update on the Group Litigation, and you remember the passage that you were taken to by Ms Price. And then, in the following paragraph, paragraph 57, you said: "I would have taken this email as an update only, and not a request for action or decision of any sort. I decided to accept this advice [in other words the advice not to get involved] after consultation with the BEIS Press Office." Why the Press Office, Ms James? Is this concern, as it were, about optics as opposed to substance; why the Press Office, as opposed to a more considered briefing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A. Q.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56 of your statement but that is that on 20 January 2017, Laura Thompson of UKGI provided your private office with an update on the Group Litigation, and you remember the passage that you were taken to by Ms Price. And then, in the following paragraph, paragraph 57, you said: "I would have taken this email as an update only, and not a request for action or decision of any sort. I decided to accept this advice [in other words the advice not to get involved] after consultation with the BEIS Press Office." Why the Press Office, Ms James? Is this concern, as it were, about optics as opposed to substance; why the Press Office, as opposed to a more considered briefing on strategy?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Α.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56 of your statement but that is that on 20 January 2017, Laura Thompson of UKGI provided your private office with an update on the Group Litigation, and you remember the passage that you were taken to by Ms Price. And then, in the following paragraph, paragraph 57, you said: "I would have taken this email as an update only, and not a request for action or decision of any sort. I decided to accept this advice [in other words the advice not to get involved] after consultation with the BEIS Press Office." Why the Press Office, Ms James? Is this concern, as it were, about optics as opposed to substance; why the Press Office, as opposed to a more considered briefing on strategy? That's a very fair question. I think I didn't often
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A. Q.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56 of your statement but that is that on 20 January 2017, Laura Thompson of UKGI provided your private office with an update on the Group Litigation, and you remember the passage that you were taken to by Ms Price. And then, in the following paragraph, paragraph 57, you said: "I would have taken this email as an update only, and not a request for action or decision of any sort. I decided to accept this advice [in other words the advice not to get involved] after consultation with the BEIS Press Office." Why the Press Office, Ms James? Is this concern, as it were, about optics as opposed to substance; why the Press Office, as opposed to a more considered briefing on strategy? That's a very fair question. I think I didn't often seek advice from the Press Office. But I think, correct
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56 of your statement but that is that on 20 January 2017, Laura Thompson of UKGI provided your private office with an update on the Group Litigation, and you remember the passage that you were taken to by Ms Price. And then, in the following paragraph, paragraph 57, you said: "I would have taken this email as an update only, and not a request for action or decision of any sort. I decided to accept this advice [in other words the advice not to get involved] after consultation with the BEIS Press Office." Why the Press Office, Ms James? Is this concern, as it were, about optics as opposed to substance; why the Press Office, as opposed to a more considered briefing on strategy? That's a very fair question. I think I didn't often seek advice from the Press Office. But I think, correct me if I'm wrong because I don't have the document
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A. Q.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56 of your statement but that is that on 20 January 2017, Laura Thompson of UKGI provided your private office with an update on the Group Litigation, and you remember the passage that you were taken to by Ms Price. And then, in the following paragraph, paragraph 57, you said: "I would have taken this email as an update only, and not a request for action or decision of any sort. I decided to accept this advice [in other words the advice not to get involved] after consultation with the BEIS Press Office." Why the Press Office, Ms James? Is this concern, as it were, about optics as opposed to substance; why the Press Office, as opposed to a more considered briefing on strategy? That's a very fair question. I think I didn't often seek advice from the Press Office. But I think, correct me if I'm wrong because I don't have the document absolutely to hand, but I think that that was advice in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A. Q.	Now, again To be so was she, of course, when she came in. Yes, of course. Now, I don't need to go to paragraph 56 of your statement but that is that on 20 January 2017, Laura Thompson of UKGI provided your private office with an update on the Group Litigation, and you remember the passage that you were taken to by Ms Price. And then, in the following paragraph, paragraph 57, you said: "I would have taken this email as an update only, and not a request for action or decision of any sort. I decided to accept this advice [in other words the advice not to get involved] after consultation with the BEIS Press Office." Why the Press Office, Ms James? Is this concern, as it were, about optics as opposed to substance; why the Press Office, as opposed to a more considered briefing on strategy? That's a very fair question. I think I didn't often seek advice from the Press Office. But I think, correct me if I'm wrong because I don't have the document

"If there is any media interest, I would suggest our 99

1		Scheme set up to address individual cases."
2		The author of that being Mr Callard.
3		Was that clearly communicated to you when you
4		assumed ministerial responsibility that month?
5	Α.	Not in those words, no. Not in those words. In fact,
6		I don't ever recall being told that there were attempts
7		to being made to derail the Mediation Scheme.
8		I wasn't informed of that. I was informed that there
9		was I think that term was almost used in an ongoing
10		to campaign against Horizon, in spite of the fact that
11		two or three years of independent scrutiny had found
12		there to be no systemic problems. That was
13		communicated, yes.
14	Q.	That was communicated to you.
15		When you succeeded Baroness Neville-Rolfe, did she
16		brief you informally, as you did your successor?
17	Α.	No, I don't think she did. No.
18	Q.	So, consequently, it seems, that the suspicions that she
19		harboured about the Post Office's reliability or
20		veracity over Horizon got lost on the handover to you
21		and you were starting from scratch?
22	Α.	I'm afraid so. I'm afraid so.
23	Q.	You were, of course, depend upon your officials and
24		dependent upon ShEx?
25	Α.	Yes, I was.
		98

1		usual approach of referring any enquiries to Post
2		Office. I would not suggest we comment on legal action,
3		but welcome thoughts from Press Office."
4	Α.	I think that's probably why on that occasion I was
5		seeking guidance from the BEIS Press Office because I
6		you're quite right, I wouldn't normally, on matters of
7		substance, seek guidance from the Press office.
8	Q.	I now want to move on to what you might have done
9		differently had you been properly apprised in a timely
10		fashion about material issues. No need to get it up on
11		screen, but your paragraph 74 begins:
12		"I should have been briefed on the scope and purpose
13		of Tim Parker's review and especially the conclusions as
14		set out in the report of 8 February 2016 by Jonathan
15		Swift, [Queen's Counsel]."
16		I then omit words, and you refer to Project Zebra of
17		June 2014, that you should have been told about, and
18		further work by Deloitte, Project Bramble, again, you
19		should have been told about. Then you say this:
20		"If I had known about these reports, we might have
21		been able to put pressure on POL to implement the
22		recommendations of the Swift Report, rather than just
23		commission yet more reports that served to delay the day
24		of reckoning for the [Post Office Limited]."
25		Had you been properly briefed in a timely fashion 100

1		and seen the writing on the wall, might you have gone	1
2		further at that stage than simply requiring the Post	2
3		Office to implement the Swift recommendations?	3
4	Α.	That's a very, very good question, and I am not sure	4
5		what well, I was going to say I'm not quite sure what	5
6		more I could have done at that point but, if I'd been	6
7		armed with all the knowledge that is contained within	7
8		the reports that you mentioned just now, then I suppose	8
9		what I should have done would be to go to my Secretary	9
10		of State, first of all, and the Permanent Secretary, and	10
11		say that we've got a massive problem here with the	11
12		leadership of the Post Office, and corners within the	12
13		Post Office who are behaving possibly illegally,	13
14		certainly unethically, in a substantial way.	14
15		I suppose I should have done that, had I had all	15
16		that information, as well as I think the	16
17		recommendations of the Swift Report were very sound and	17
18		that should have been done, but you are right in,	18
19		I think, what's behind your question: would that have	19
20		been enough based on what I would have then known?	20
21		Probably not.	21
22	Q.	But, basically, Government could have been made aware	22
23		that the Post Office was staring disaster in the face,	23
24		and that the litigation was going to be a ruinous,	24
25		degrading failure?	25
		101	
1		what I meant was that the Post Office, rather than	1
2		continuing to commission yet more reports, should	2
2 3		continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal	2 3
2 3 4		continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday.	2 3 4
2 3 4 5	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been	2 3 4 5
2 3 4 5 6	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is	2 3 4 5 6
2 3 4 5 6 7	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is an exchange of messages from 2017, when you raise the	2 3 4 5 6 7
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is an exchange of messages from 2017, when you raise the case of a subpostmaster directly with Paula Vennells,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is an exchange of messages from 2017, when you raise the case of a subpostmaster directly with Paula Vennells, and you were later told by Ms Vennells that she had been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is an exchange of messages from 2017, when you raise the case of a subpostmaster directly with Paula Vennells, and you were later told by Ms Vennells that she had been the postmaster audited, which led to a loss being	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is an exchange of messages from 2017, when you raise the case of a subpostmaster directly with Paula Vennells, and you were later told by Ms Vennells that she had been the postmaster audited, which led to a loss being identified of £130,000, and Ms Vennells told you that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is an exchange of messages from 2017, when you raise the case of a subpostmaster directly with Paula Vennells, and you were later told by Ms Vennells that she had been the postmaster audited, which led to a loss being identified of £130,000, and Ms Vennells told you that the subpostmaster was vociferous and has been sharing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is an exchange of messages from 2017, when you raise the case of a subpostmaster directly with Paula Vennells, and you were later told by Ms Vennells that she had been the postmaster audited, which led to a loss being identified of £130,000, and Ms Vennells told you that the subpostmaster was vociferous and has been sharing various and varying accounts of what has happened.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is an exchange of messages from 2017, when you raise the case of a subpostmaster directly with Paula Vennells, and you were later told by Ms Vennells that she had been the postmaster audited, which led to a loss being identified of £130,000, and Ms Vennells told you that the subpostmaster was vociferous and has been sharing various and varying accounts of what has happened. We can pick it up there where you contact her over	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is an exchange of messages from 2017, when you raise the case of a subpostmaster directly with Paula Vennells, and you were later told by Ms Vennells that she had been the postmaster audited, which led to a loss being identified of £130,000, and Ms Vennells told you that the subpostmaster was vociferous and has been sharing various and varying accounts of what has happened. We can pick it up there where you contact her over the weekend, because you're concerned about the Post	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is an exchange of messages from 2017, when you raise the case of a subpostmaster directly with Paula Vennells, and you were later told by Ms Vennells that she had been the postmaster audited, which led to a loss being identified of £130,000, and Ms Vennells told you that the subpostmaster was vociferous and has been sharing various and varying accounts of what has happened. We can pick it up there where you contact her over the weekend, because you're concerned about the Post Office and the postmaster, and then can we go to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 77	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is an exchange of messages from 2017, when you raise the case of a subpostmaster directly with Paula Vennells, and you were later told by Ms Vennells that she had been the postmaster audited, which led to a loss being identified of £130,000, and Ms Vennells told you that the subpostmaster was vociferous and has been sharing various and varying accounts of what has happened. We can pick it up there where you contact her over the weekend, because you're concerned about the Post Office and the postmaster, and then can we go to the next page, please, and you're on the matter, you agree	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is an exchange of messages from 2017, when you raise the case of a subpostmaster directly with Paula Vennells, and you were later told by Ms Vennells that she had been the postmaster audited, which led to a loss being identified of £130,000, and Ms Vennells told you that the subpostmaster was vociferous and has been sharing various and varying accounts of what has happened. We can pick it up there where you contact her over the weekend, because you're concerned about the Post Office and the postmaster, and then can we go to the next page, please, and you're on the matter, you agree to speak, and then you give the details of the Post	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is an exchange of messages from 2017, when you raise the case of a subpostmaster directly with Paula Vennells, and you were later told by Ms Vennells that she had been the postmaster audited, which led to a loss being identified of £130,000, and Ms Vennells told you that the subpostmaster was vociferous and has been sharing various and varying accounts of what has happened. We can pick it up there where you contact her over the weekend, because you're concerned about the Post Office and the postmaster, and then can we go to the next page, please, and you're on the matter, you agree to speak, and then you give the details of the Post Office, it's Moresby, in Cumbria.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is an exchange of messages from 2017, when you raise the case of a subpostmaster directly with Paula Vennells, and you were later told by Ms Vennells that she had been the postmaster audited, which led to a loss being identified of £130,000, and Ms Vennells told you that the subpostmaster was vociferous and has been sharing various and varying accounts of what has happened. We can pick it up there where you contact her over the weekend, because you're concerned about the Post Office and the postmaster, and then can we go to the next page, please, and you're on the matter, you agree to speak, and then you give the details of the Post Office, it's Moresby, in Cumbria. Then can we go down to:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is an exchange of messages from 2017, when you raise the case of a subpostmaster directly with Paula Vennells, and you were later told by Ms Vennells that she had been the postmaster audited, which led to a loss being identified of £130,000, and Ms Vennells told you that the subpostmaster was vociferous and has been sharing various and varying accounts of what has happened. We can pick it up there where you contact her over the weekend, because you're concerned about the Post Office and the postmaster, and then can we go to the next page, please, and you're on the matter, you agree to speak, and then you give the details of the Post Office, it's Moresby, in Cumbria. Then can we go down to: "Hi Margot.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is an exchange of messages from 2017, when you raise the case of a subpostmaster directly with Paula Vennells, and you were later told by Ms Vennells that she had been the postmaster audited, which led to a loss being identified of £130,000, and Ms Vennells told you that the subpostmaster was vociferous and has been sharing various and varying accounts of what has happened. We can pick it up there where you contact her over the weekend, because you're concerned about the Post Office and the postmaster, and then can we go to the next page, please, and you're on the matter, you agree to speak, and then you give the details of the Post Office, it's Moresby, in Cumbria. Then can we go down to: "Hi Margot. "We briefed Trudy Harrison in June as to exactly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is an exchange of messages from 2017, when you raise the case of a subpostmaster directly with Paula Vennells, and you were later told by Ms Vennells that she had been the postmaster audited, which led to a loss being identified of £130,000, and Ms Vennells told you that the subpostmaster was vociferous and has been sharing various and varying accounts of what has happened. We can pick it up there where you contact her over the weekend, because you're concerned about the Post Office and the postmaster, and then can we go to the next page, please, and you're on the matter, you agree to speak, and then you give the details of the Post Office, it's Moresby, in Cumbria. Then can we go down to: "Hi Margot. "We briefed Trudy Harrison in June as to exactly what was happening [I omit words].	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Q.	continuing to commission yet more reports, should actually face up to what's in front of them and deal with it yesterday. Thank you. My final issue is a document that has been provided by Ms Vennells, and it's PVEN00000503. This is an exchange of messages from 2017, when you raise the case of a subpostmaster directly with Paula Vennells, and you were later told by Ms Vennells that she had been the postmaster audited, which led to a loss being identified of £130,000, and Ms Vennells told you that the subpostmaster was vociferous and has been sharing various and varying accounts of what has happened. We can pick it up there where you contact her over the weekend, because you're concerned about the Post Office and the postmaster, and then can we go to the next page, please, and you're on the matter, you agree to speak, and then you give the details of the Post Office, it's Moresby, in Cumbria. Then can we go down to: "Hi Margot. "We briefed Trudy Harrison in June as to exactly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

1	Α.	Yes, I think you put that very well.
2	Q.	Could I just pick up one sentence in that paragraph,
3		paragraph 74, where you say:
1		"If I had known about these reports, we might have
5		been able to put pressure [et cetera, et cetera] rather
3		than just commission, [that is the Post Office] yet more
7		reports that served to delay the day of reckoning for
3		the Post Office."
9		You see it might be said by some Board members that
0		they were being open and commissioning reports to get at
1		the truth but from your assay of the issue, having
2		looked at it now and being fully briefed on the matter,
3		it looked like they were commissioning reports in
4		accordance with a policy of obfuscation and delay,
5		putting off the evil day, covering the reports in
6		privilege and failing to detect or disclose the red
7		flags within them. Is that what you mean when you say,
8		"Rather than just commission yet more reports that
9		served to delay the day of reckoning"?
0	Α.	Yes, I think you put that extremely well. Yes, exactly
1		what I think, yes. Because I was anxious, when you
2		first read that quote out, that it looked as if I was
3		saying that we should be the Government should be
4		commissioning more reports or not just commissioning
5		more, because we hadn't commissioned any reports. But
		102
1		possibly explains why she was putting in her own money.
2		
		She has since lodged a request to join the Group
3 1		Litigation not unusual in this kind of situation.
+ 5		"I don't want to put more details into a text but
2		I am happy to explain.
) 7		"The location has been supported by a temporary post office
3		"The postmaster is vociferous and has been sharing
))		various and varying accounts of what has happened."
, 0		Then referring to Trudy, who I think is the local MP
1		because it concerns her constituent.
2		From the papers that the Inquiry has seen, the Post
23		Office in general used dismissive language like this to
4		denigrate and discredit subpostmasters who suffered
4 5		losses. Did you experience this in any other settings
6		when you were liaising with the Post Office, that there
0 7		was a generally dismissive and highly robust approach
8 0		taken to subpostmasters who were complaining about Horizon?
9 0	^	
0 1	Α.	I would say that there was definitely an assumption on the part of the Board members of the Post Office that
2		the postmasters were in the wrong. But there was
~		and postandotoro moro in the mong. Dut more was

covered all of that. But you asked about the sort of
 demeanour and attitude towards the Post Office -- the
 104

I mean, there was nothing wrong with Horizon. We've

The Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry

1	postmasters. I think that they sadly tragically, the	
2	Post Office Board did regard them as criminal at best,	
3	incompetent at worst, yes, and that was the assumption.	
4	And, as I mentioned earlier, they were extraordinarily	
5	good at seeing themselves as the victim.	
6	You know, this campaign and it's not just	
7	a campaign, it was an "orchestrated campaign", as if to	
8	say there was absolutely legitimacy to this campaign	
9	whatsoever. That sort of thing. The language would be	
10	based on an assumption that postmasters were in general	
11	guilty of something. It might be fraud, it might be	
12	theft, it might be joining an illegitimate campaign to	
13	undermine something that the Post Office was doing, like	
14	putting the Mediation Scheme in place.	
15	Yes, the postmasters were always in the wrong in any	
16	conversation you had with representatives of the Post	
17	Office.	
18	MR HENRY: Well, those are my questions for you, Ms James.	
19	Thank you so much.	
20	THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.	
21	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Mr Stein?	
22	Questioned by MR STEIN	
23	MR STEIN: Sir, I do have questions that are less than five	
24	minutes but I note the time is 1.35.	
25	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Then I will give you to 1.40 since you	
	105	
4	for all a state have been as the state and a star the	
1	families who have been subject to such a terribly	
2	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you	
2 3	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at	
2 3 4	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office.	
2 3 4 5	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy	
2 3 4 5 6	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis	
2 3 4 5 6 7	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that post from February 2002 to July 2006. Now, that's well	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that post from February 2002 to July 2006. Now, that's well before your time in your dealings with the Post Office.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that post from February 2002 to July 2006. Now, that's well before your time in your dealings with the Post Office. What happened in his Post Office branch, though, is	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that post from February 2002 to July 2006. Now, that's well before your time in your dealings with the Post Office. What happened in his Post Office branch, though, is perhaps important on this question of the victims and	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that post from February 2002 to July 2006. Now, that's well before your time in your dealings with the Post Office. What happened in his Post Office branch, though, is perhaps important on this question of the victims and who have been affected. He had the usual litany of	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that post from February 2002 to July 2006. Now, that's well before your time in your dealings with the Post Office. What happened in his Post Office branch, though, is perhaps important on this question of the victims and who have been affected. He had the usual litany of shortfalls that he had to account for, and he had to pay	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	 miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that post from February 2002 to July 2006. Now, that's well before your time in your dealings with the Post Office. What happened in his Post Office branch, though, is perhaps important on this question of the victims and who have been affected. He had the usual litany of shortfalls that he had to account for, and he had to pay on a regular basis out of their own funds. He employed 	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that post from February 2002 to July 2006. Now, that's well before your time in your dealings with the Post Office. What happened in his Post Office branch, though, is perhaps important on this question of the victims and who have been affected. He had the usual litany of shortfalls that he had to account for, and he had to pay on a regular basis out of their own funds. He employed his wife within the branch. What happened was that,	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that post from February 2002 to July 2006. Now, that's well before your time in your dealings with the Post Office. What happened in his Post Office branch, though, is perhaps important on this question of the victims and who have been affected. He had the usual litany of shortfalls that he had to account for, and he had to pay on a regular basis out of their own funds. He employed his wife within the branch. What happened was that, when trying to reconcile the amounts on any given week,	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that post from February 2002 to July 2006. Now, that's well before your time in your dealings with the Post Office. What happened in his Post Office branch, though, is perhaps important on this question of the victims and who have been affected. He had the usual litany of shortfalls that he had to account for, and he had to pay on a regular basis out of their own funds. He employed his wife within the branch. What happened was that, when trying to reconcile the amounts on any given week, he would spend evenings and into the late night in the	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that post from February 2002 to July 2006. Now, that's well before your time in your dealings with the Post Office. What happened in his Post Office branch, though, is perhaps important on this question of the victims and who have been affected. He had the usual litany of shortfalls that he had to account for, and he had to pay on a regular basis out of their own funds. He employed his wife within the branch. What happened was that, when trying to reconcile the amounts on any given week, he would spend evenings and into the late night in the post office branches. They find it funny now, they	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that post from February 2002 to July 2006. Now, that's well before your time in your dealings with the Post Office. What happened in his Post Office branch, though, is perhaps important on this question of the victims and who have been affected. He had the usual litany of shortfalls that he had to account for, and he had to pay on a regular basis out of their own funds. He employed his wife within the branch. What happened was that, when trying to reconcile the amounts on any given week, he would spend evenings and into the late night in the post office branches. They find it funny now, they certainly didn't find it at the time: Cindy actually	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that post from February 2002 to July 2006. Now, that's well before your time in your dealings with the Post Office. What happened in his Post Office branch, though, is perhaps important on this question of the victims and who have been affected. He had the usual litany of shortfalls that he had to account for, and he had to pay on a regular basis out of their own funds. He employed his wife within the branch. What happened was that, when trying to reconcile the amounts on any given week, he would spend evenings and into the late night in the post office branches. They find it funny now, they certainly didn't find it at the time: Cindy actually thought he was having an affair because he was spending	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that post from February 2002 to July 2006. Now, that's well before your time in your dealings with the Post Office. What happened in his Post Office branch, though, is perhaps important on this question of the victims and who have been affected. He had the usual litany of shortfalls that he had to account for, and he had to pay on a regular basis out of their own funds. He employed his wife within the branch. What happened was that, when trying to reconcile the amounts on any given week, he would spend evenings and into the late night in the post office branches. They find it funny now, they certainly didn't find it at the time: Cindy actually thought he was having an affair because he was spending so much time working at the Post Office branch.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that post from February 2002 to July 2006. Now, that's well before your time in your dealings with the Post Office. What happened in his Post Office branch, though, is perhaps important on this question of the victims and who have been affected. He had the usual litany of shortfalls that he had to account for, and he had to pay on a regular basis out of their own funds. He employed his wife within the branch. What happened was that, when trying to reconcile the amounts on any given week, he would spend evenings and into the late night in the post office branches. They find it funny now, they certainly didn't find it at the time: Cindy actually thought he was having an affair because he was spending so much time working at the Post Office branch. At the end of days, it got to the point whereby he,	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that post from February 2002 to July 2006. Now, that's well before your time in your dealings with the Post Office. What happened in his Post Office branch, though, is perhaps important on this question of the victims and who have been affected. He had the usual litany of shortfalls that he had to account for, and he had to pay on a regular basis out of their own funds. He employed his wife within the branch. What happened was that, when trying to reconcile the amounts on any given week, he would spend evenings and into the late night in the post office branches. They find it funny now, they certainly didn't find it at the time: Cindy actually thought he was having an affair because he was spending so much time working at the Post Office branch. At the end of days, it got to the point whereby he, Terry Seeney was searching the bags of the people he	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that post from February 2002 to July 2006. Now, that's well before your time in your dealings with the Post Office. What happened in his Post Office branch, though, is perhaps important on this question of the victims and who have been affected. He had the usual litany of shortfalls that he had to account for, and he had to pay on a regular basis out of their own funds. He employed his wife within the branch. What happened was that, when trying to reconcile the amounts on any given week, he would spend evenings and into the late night in the post office branches. They find it funny now, they certainly didn't find it at the time: Cindy actually thought he was having an affair because he was spending so much time working at the Post Office branch. At the end of days, it got to the point whereby he, Terry Seeney was searching the bags of the people he employed within the branch. So I go back to your	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	miscarriage of justice. Later on in your evidence, you spoke about the Post Office victims you said that at just gone 12.00 today the victims of the Post Office. Now, at the Inquiry today, there is Terry and Cindy Seeney. Terry was the subpostmaster at the Bere Regis branch of the Post Office in the Dorset. He held that post from February 2002 to July 2006. Now, that's well before your time in your dealings with the Post Office. What happened in his Post Office branch, though, is perhaps important on this question of the victims and who have been affected. He had the usual litany of shortfalls that he had to account for, and he had to pay on a regular basis out of their own funds. He employed his wife within the branch. What happened was that, when trying to reconcile the amounts on any given week, he would spend evenings and into the late night in the post office branches. They find it funny now, they certainly didn't find it at the time: Cindy actually thought he was having an affair because he was spending so much time working at the Post Office branch. At the end of days, it got to the point whereby he, Terry Seeney was searching the bags of the people he	

1		will be less than five minutes. Off you go.
2	MR	STEIN: Thank you, sir.
3		Ms James, you once heard questions very early on
4		from Ms Price in relation to when you first came in to
5		deal with matters concerning the Post Office, and you
6		were referring to the May 2015 manifesto pledge which
7		was to retain the Post Office for all of its purposes,
8		including the social purposes that it serves; do you
9		recall giving that evidence?
10	Α.	Yes, I do.
11	Q.	You, like all of us, no doubt understand that the people
12		that operated these branches, the Post Office branches,
13		also felt that what they were doing was operating the
14		branch for purposes of supporting their own families,
15		but also an important place within the local community;
16		do you agree with that?
17	Α.	l agree strongly with that.
18	Q.	Because the post of a subpostmaster or a subpostmistress
19		is a prestigious one in the local community. It has
20		meaning socially; do you accept that?
21 22	A.	I totally endorse that.
22	Q.	You've discussed in your statement, paragraph 2 I don't need to take you to it because I can simply
23 24		refer to it you wish to express your deepest sympathy
25		for all subpostmasters and subpostmistresses and their
20		106
1		and in the excellent questions you have been asked by
1		and in the excellent questions you have been asked by
2		Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my
2 3		Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the
2 3 4		Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government.
2 3 4 5		Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office,
2 3 4 5 6		Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include
2 3 4 5 6 7		Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include not just the subpostmasters, subpostmistresses but the
2 3 4 5 6		Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include not just the subpostmasters, subpostmistresses but the partners, the children, the wider family effects?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8		Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include not just the subpostmasters, subpostmistresses but the
2 3 5 6 7 8 9	А.	Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include not just the subpostmasters, subpostmistresses but the partners, the children, the wider family effects? Could you say yes or no to that, so we have a record
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A.	Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include not just the subpostmasters, subpostmistresses but the partners, the children, the wider family effects? Could you say yes or no to that, so we have a record here?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A.	Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include not just the subpostmasters, subpostmistresses but the partners, the children, the wider family effects? Could you say yes or no to that, so we have a record here? I most certainly agree with you and I would add
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	A.	Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include not just the subpostmasters, subpostmistresses but the partners, the children, the wider family effects? Could you say yes or no to that, so we have a record here? I most certainly agree with you and I would add I don't know whether you include the staff in branches,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A.	Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include not just the subpostmasters, subpostmistresses but the partners, the children, the wider family effects? Could you say yes or no to that, so we have a record here? I most certainly agree with you and I would add I don't know whether you include the staff in branches, as well as family members. Yes, and a whole network,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A.	Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include not just the subpostmasters, subpostmistresses but the partners, the children, the wider family effects? Could you say yes or no to that, so we have a record here? I most certainly agree with you and I would add I don't know whether you include the staff in branches, as well as family members. Yes, and a whole network, I would imagine, of family, friends. Your statement did
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A.	Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include not just the subpostmasters, subpostmistresses but the partners, the children, the wider family effects? Could you say yes or no to that, so we have a record here? I most certainly agree with you and I would add I don't know whether you include the staff in branches, as well as family members. Yes, and a whole network, I would imagine, of family, friends. Your statement did touch on some of the consequences that are not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A.	Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include not just the subpostmasters, subpostmistresses but the partners, the children, the wider family effects? Could you say yes or no to that, so we have a record here? I most certainly agree with you and I would add I don't know whether you include the staff in branches, as well as family members. Yes, and a whole network, I would imagine, of family, friends. Your statement did touch on some of the consequences that are not automatically visible to people from this tragedy. When
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A.	Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include not just the subpostmasters, subpostmistresses but the partners, the children, the wider family effects? Could you say yes or no to that, so we have a record here? I most certainly agree with you and I would add I don't know whether you include the staff in branches, as well as family members. Yes, and a whole network, I would imagine, of family, friends. Your statement did touch on some of the consequences that are not automatically visible to people from this tragedy. When you mention the length of time Mr Seeney was spending in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A.	Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include not just the subpostmasters, subpostmistresses but the partners, the children, the wider family effects? Could you say yes or no to that, so we have a record here? I most certainly agree with you and I would add I don't know whether you include the staff in branches, as well as family members. Yes, and a whole network, I would imagine, of family, friends. Your statement did touch on some of the consequences that are not automatically visible to people from this tragedy. When you mention the length of time Mr Seeney was spending in the Post Office let his wife to doubt him, it can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A.	Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include not just the subpostmasters, subpostmistresses but the partners, the children, the wider family effects? Could you say yes or no to that, so we have a record here? I most certainly agree with you and I would add I don't know whether you include the staff in branches, as well as family members. Yes, and a whole network, I would imagine, of family, friends. Your statement did touch on some of the consequences that are not automatically visible to people from this tragedy. When you mention the length of time Mr Seeney was spending in the Post Office let his wife to doubt him, it can have and I'm sure has had so many effects on people's friendship groups and, you know, their esteem within the community. You didn't mention that, that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A.	Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include not just the subpostmasters, subpostmistresses but the partners, the children, the wider family effects? Could you say yes or no to that, so we have a record here? I most certainly agree with you and I would add I don't know whether you include the staff in branches, as well as family members. Yes, and a whole network, I would imagine, of family, friends. Your statement did touch on some of the consequences that are not automatically visible to people from this tragedy. When you mention the length of time Mr Seeney was spending in the Post Office let his wife to doubt him, it can have and I'm sure has had so many effects on people's friendship groups and, you know, their esteem within the community. You didn't mention that, that's people's personal reputations.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A.	Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include not just the subpostmasters, subpostmistresses but the partners, the children, the wider family effects? Could you say yes or no to that, so we have a record here? I most certainly agree with you and I would add I don't know whether you include the staff in branches, as well as family members. Yes, and a whole network, I would imagine, of family, friends. Your statement did touch on some of the consequences that are not automatically visible to people from this tragedy. When you mention the length of time Mr Seeney was spending in the Post Office let his wife to doubt him, it can have and I'm sure has had so many effects on people's friendship groups and, you know, their esteem within the community. You didn't mention that, that's people's personal reputations. All of this has obviously been widely commented on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A.	Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include not just the subpostmasters, subpostmistresses but the partners, the children, the wider family effects? Could you say yes or no to that, so we have a record here? I most certainly agree with you and I would add I don't know whether you include the staff in branches, as well as family members. Yes, and a whole network, I would imagine, of family, friends. Your statement did touch on some of the consequences that are not automatically visible to people from this tragedy. When you mention the length of time Mr Seeney was spending in the Post Office let his wife to doubt him, it can have and I'm sure has had so many effects on people's friendship groups and, you know, their esteem within the community. You didn't mention that, that's people's personal reputations. All of this has obviously been widely commented on and I know, and I hope, it's well understood but I agree
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A.	Ms Price, and also the great questions being asked by my learned friend Mr Henry, you have also considered the question of the failures in governance by Government. Do you agree the victims of both the Post Office, Fujitsu and Government failures, those victims include not just the subpostmasters, subpostmistresses but the partners, the children, the wider family effects? Could you say yes or no to that, so we have a record here? I most certainly agree with you and I would add I don't know whether you include the staff in branches, as well as family members. Yes, and a whole network, I would imagine, of family, friends. Your statement did touch on some of the consequences that are not automatically visible to people from this tragedy. When you mention the length of time Mr Seeney was spending in the Post Office let his wife to doubt him, it can have and I'm sure has had so many effects on people's friendship groups and, you know, their esteem within the community. You didn't mention that, that's people's personal reputations. All of this has obviously been widely commented on

1	MR STEIN: Thank you, Ms James. One last point before	INDEX	
2	I finish just about within the time limit set by the	MARGOT CATHLEEN JAMES (affirmed)	1
3	Chair.		
4	Those individuals, the partners, the family members,	Questioned by MS PRICE	1
5	do you agree they are no less deserving of recompense		
6	and redress and compensation?	Questioned by MR HENRY	97
7	A. I do agree that they are deserving. Of course, yes,		
8	I do. Most certainly. I mean, that obviously	Questioned by MR STEIN	105
9	MR STEIN: Thank you.		
10	A. is not for me to judge but that is my opinion, yes.		
11	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right. Thank you very much.		
12	Is that it, Ms Price?		
13	MS PRICE: Yes, sir. It is.		
14	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, thank you, Ms James, for giving		
15	evidence today in circumstances where you are recovering		
16	from an illness. You've been extremely helpful to the		
17	Inquiry in facilitating our work, both in providing your		
18	evidence and in doing so in a manner which you would		
19	have preferred not to do. So thank you very much.		
20	THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.		
21	SIR WYN WILLIAMS: We'll resume again at 9.45 tomorrow.		
22	MS PRICE: Yes, sir. Thank you.		
23	(1.42 pm)		
24	(The hearing adjourned until 9.45 am the following day)		

25

(29) MR HENRY: - advice

Α	82/19	45/21 56/3 82/14	anybody [3] 61/11	areas [18] 5/1 5/10
	agree [29] 7/8 9/15	95/20	61/11 65/16	5/12 5/15 5/25 6/24
advice [60] 16/23	10/12 10/22 14/15	also [18] 5/3 12/1	anyone [7] 29/8	6/24 7/13 7/17 7/18
18/10 18/12 18/13 18/16 18/18 18/21	14/22 30/22 42/16	15/25 17/6 32/9 34/9	61/13 69/12 73/3 73/6	7/24 7/24 15/23 16/18
18/23 19/1 19/3 19/5	42/17 42/24 43/2	35/16 39/3 41/9 54/11	73/17 78/25	18/4 18/10 34/8 36/25
19/7 19/7 19/11 19/13	53/20 55/15 55/20	60/5 61/17 80/6 86/20	anything [6] 32/12	aren't [2] 40/15 63/24
19/14 19/19 19/21	55/20 60/24 85/9 95/4	106/13 106/15 108/2	32/13 41/2 54/22 64/5	
19/24 20/1 20/3 20/10	95/10 95/19 95/22	108/3	75/9	arm's [5] 9/7 9/16
20/11 20/18 20/20	103/17 106/16 106/17	alter [1] 30/24	anyway [2] 30/18	11/13 83/20 84/24
21/12 21/13 25/25	108/5 108/11 108/24	altered [1] 60/13	84/22	arm's-length [3]
26/17 27/13 28/12	109/5 109/7	although [8] 2/25	Apart [1] 7/1	11/13 83/20 84/24
34/12 36/4 37/1 37/21	agreeable [3] 26/2	8/11 50/1 57/22 71/15		armed [1] 101/7
38/20 39/14 40/13	27/10 27/15	79/13 96/5 97/5	57/17	arms [2] 85/2 85/10
44/2 44/22 52/8 52/15	agreed [12] 6/14 24/1		Appeal [1] 88/2	arms-length [2] 85/2
52/19 52/25 53/3	24/12 25/7 28/15	29/23 93/18 95/24	appear [1] 75/3	85/10
53/11 53/17 54/9	52/13 52/24 53/3 53/9		appears [4] 31/11	around [6] 17/16
54/15 56/20 59/4 59/4	54/25 58/15 61/25	am [12] 1/2 2/22 3/1	48/9 52/1 62/21	43/22 67/25 82/12
59/11 61/25 80/24	agreeing [1] 54/3	5/5 23/8 31/25 46/17	applying [1] 14/4	91/3 91/16
81/22 99/12 99/13	agreement [3] 53/14	46/19 82/19 101/4	appointment [1]	arrange [1] 22/7
99/20 99/22	55/2 59/7	104/5 109/24	33/17	as [151]
advised [2] 14/9 40/2	ahead [5] 1/20 47/13	ambitious [1] 85/23	appreciation [1] 41/9	aside [1] 12/12
Adviser [2] 39/24	52/2 56/8 57/12	amend [2] 25/12	apprised [1] 100/9	ask [27] 1/17 15/9
39/25	aims [1] 9/12	25/20	approach [9] 11/13 38/23 39/8 42/10 44/8	25/16 27/4 36/19 37/15 42/9 46/1 48/11
Advisers [2] 40/1	Alarmed [1] 83/24	among [1] 65/15	55/3 58/25 100/1	49/11 49/18 49/23
40/6	alarming [1] 83/24 alas [1] 58/10	amount [4] 6/2 51/2 76/8 76/18	104/17	64/24 67/5 70/8 71/3
advising [2] 19/13	albeit [1] 12/6	amounts [1] 107/16	approaching [1]	72/15 74/21 74/22
82/2	alive [2] 41/7 58/13	amplified [1] 80/6	17/16	80/2 86/7 86/7 90/7
affair [1] 107/20	all [59] 5/13 6/21	analyse [1] 20/25	appropriate [5] 11/6	91/22 92/4 92/7 92/8
affairs [9] 5/11 6/5	15/24 18/10 18/14	analysis [2] 17/25	11/24 61/14 69/9	asked [27] 28/19
6/8 7/2 26/24 27/3	20/8 20/11 22/10	21/12	85/16	37/5 39/7 40/5 45/20
27/5 50/7 69/16	24/23 24/23 25/1	annoying [1] 32/20	appropriately [2]	46/4 49/13 49/20
affected [3] 33/4	25/19 29/1 30/15	another [11] 14/1	21/19 60/19	49/24 50/8 51/5 57/19
50/17 107/12	30/23 32/21 39/25	26/3 27/10 27/15	approval [1] 24/17	68/18 72/20 73/9
affecting [2] 11/8	41/12 41/12 44/19	39/16 47/7 69/20	approve [3] 25/4 25/6	
15/24	45/21 46/15 50/22	80/19 86/1 97/4 97/5	25/7	89/23 90/7 90/10
affirmed [2] 1/13	53/13 61/20 62/4 62/8	answer [9] 5/21 13/5	approved [2] 22/1	90/11 90/12 90/20
110/2 afraid [6] 37/17 69/13	AND ANAT ANDE AFIE	13/7 26/22 26/25 33/6		104/24 108/1 108/2
87/18 92/8 98/22	65/23 66/1 66/8 66/12	66/15 74/15 81/16	approximately [3]	asking [7] 2/14 37/7
98/22	67/12 70/2 71/1 72/8	answered [2] 18/4	28/5 81/9 82/19	45/16 45/18 59/6 63/2
afresh [1] 24/24	74/24 76/5 76/16 80/8		approximation [1]	75/5
after [15] 4/13 25/24	82/15 83/24 86/2 92/7		66/3	aspect [6] 2/14 18/23
28/5 28/11 49/20	92/18 93/11 97/13	answers [4] 9/20	April [1] 35/9	28/15 29/9 92/25
49/20 59/8 67/2 67/3	101/7 101/10 101/15	9/22 27/2 75/6	Arbuthnot's [1]	93/12
69/23 71/9 78/5 86/3	104/24 106/7 106/11	anticipating [1]	91/20	aspects [3] 16/4 33/2
92/19 99/13	106/25 108/23 109/11		are [59] 2/7 2/9 2/16	93/16
again [8] 27/19 43/14	allaying [1] 78/17	anxious [1] 102/21	2/24 5/3 10/2 10/9	assay [1] 102/11
54/23 87/17 90/12	allegations [12]	any [55] 5/25 9/4		assessment [1] 61/3
99/1 100/18 109/21	12/23 13/1 13/17	11/4 11/9 14/3 19/22	19/10 19/20 20/17	asset [4] 10/11 43/1
against [11] 20/15	13/18 13/21 14/12 14/13 14/15 14/16	23/19 24/3 30/7 30/12 30/22 32/8 36/10	27/22 34/9 36/3 36/3 36/11 38/10 41/3 41/5	43/3 43/4
31/23 34/22 38/8	14/13 14/15 14/16	36/15 37/3 37/15	41/10 41/14 43/13	assets [1] 3/18 assigned [1] 12/9
42/12 43/3 73/20 88/9	alleged [4] 47/19	38/22 39/19 39/24	44/18 47/14 53/15	assist [2] 1/19 51/22
88/24 97/23 98/10	51/2 78/12 97/24	40/19 41/25 43/21	53/17 56/10 64/3 66/1	assistance [1] 16/14
agency [1] 3/16	alleging [1] 73/18	43/25 44/2 44/2 45/2	66/24 77/16 82/3 83/3	
agenda [7] 18/25	allocated [1] 97/21	49/11 51/1 52/21 54/5		assisted [2] 16/9
19/4 51/21 70/5 70/9	allow [1] 61/18	55/13 58/24 58/25	84/14 87/24 94/1 94/1	16/16
71/3 94/11	allowance [1] 44/5	64/2 71/21 72/24	94/6 94/13 95/16 96/5	
agendas [2] 71/19	allowed [1] 89/11	74/13 76/9 81/5 81/5		associated [2] 15/16
94/12	allowing [1] 76/3	81/24 92/1 92/8 92/9	101/13 101/18 105/18	
agent [5] 15/14 16/6 95/7 95/9 95/12	allows [1] 32/4	92/13 92/21 92/24	105/23 108/15 109/5	association [1] 79/11
agents [1] 38/12	almost [2] 66/9 98/9	93/16 99/11 99/25	109/7 109/15	assume [2] 54/8 86/9
ago [3] 55/22 81/9	alone [1] 55/2	100/1 102/25 104/15	area [3] 9/24 18/5	assumed [5] 89/7
"30 [0] 00/22 01/3	already [6] 6/1 33/9	105/15 107/16	53/21	89/8 92/19 93/13 98/4
				(30) advice - assumed

(30) advice... - assumed

Α	be [165]	92/17 95/8 95/16	bona [1] 75/2	briefings [8] 14/8
assumption [4]	beaks [1] 67/10	95/17 95/18 95/25	bono [1] 4/25	14/8 20/20 48/15
74/24 104/20 105/3	became [7] 4/10	99/14 100/5	both [14] 10/16 11/7	57/13 57/19 63/1
105/10	25/25 26/20 28/1	belatedly [1] 89/6	11/17 23/17 23/17	64/14
astonishment [1]	33/23 48/22 78/5	beleaguered [1]	26/11 29/16 35/9 42/4	
81/10	because [47] 17/15	50/23	42/13 74/20 83/9	briefs [2] 57/21 71/18
at [163]	17/18 24/18 30/14	belief [1] 2/8	108/5 109/17	bring [1] 68/18
attach [1] 32/18	36/24 38/14 39/12 40/24 41/24 42/10	believe [4] 14/5 14/5 49/2 79/18		British [1] 70/21
attached [1] 22/10	44/14 46/5 48/15 53/2		bottom [8] 31/15 36/12 43/15 44/23	broad [3] 5/9 6/9 61/6 broadly [2] 16/12
attempts [2] 97/25	54/8 55/16 57/6 57/11	76/18	45/5 68/12 89/22	21/4
98/6	58/5 60/21 61/15	beneath [1] 84/10	93/24	brought [7] 76/3
attend [5] 57/8 69/12	63/22 71/15 71/16	benefit [6] 40/3 44/4	bound [1] 18/12	77/17 87/17 88/24
69/13 70/11 70/20	72/5 74/4 74/17 75/1	77/23 90/23 96/17	box [3] 16/16 63/16	89/3 89/18 96/24
attended [4] 69/10 69/14 70/15 95/23	76/11 80/14 82/2 83/6	96/18	88/7	budgetary [1] 17/12
attending [3] 1/6	84/8 84/14 84/18	Bere [1] 107/6	boxes [1] 83/7	budgeted [1] 85/24
1/18 70/16	87/16 89/7 94/6 99/21		brackets [1] 19/10	budgeting [1] 12/13
attention [5] 6/2	100/5 102/21 102/25	41/10 45/14 52/11	Bramble [2] 81/23	budgets [1] 17/18
21/17 23/15 77/17	103/15 104/11 106/18	52/14 52/20 53/2 53/4		bugs [1] 47/21
93/8	106/23 107/20	53/10 54/3 55/4 59/25		build [1] 45/20
attest [1] 2/5	become [4] 26/16	63/19 74/19 105/2	107/7 107/10 107/15	bullet [3] 52/9 54/21
attitude [1] 104/25	85/13 88/19 91/18	better [2] 60/1 96/18	107/21 107/24	81/25
audit [1] 103/25	becomes [2] 83/20 85/10	between [12] 8/5 9/23 11/3 12/6 15/6	branches [12] 6/16 6/16 6/23 7/12 7/24	bullet 4 [1] 54/21 bundle [1] 21/8
audited [1] 103/10	becoming [3] 3/11	15/10 17/1 22/15	8/1 12/21 13/11	business [9] 4/6 4/7
August [5] 38/3 47/3	28/3 57/14		106/12 106/12 107/18	
49/2 52/1 86/19	been [126]	beyond [2] 7/6 54/16	108/12	32/3 70/21 88/12
author [1] 98/2	before [9] 22/19 25/1	big [2] 23/12 96/25	breadth [3] 5/18 5/24	
automatic [1] 24/19	51/5 52/21 80/13	biggest [1] 51/7	18/14	6/22 15/24 34/18
automatically [2] 94/9 108/16	82/17 92/25 107/9	bit [10] 10/6 25/13	break [6] 46/11 46/18	busy [1] 17/15
available [2] 6/23	109/1	26/15 28/23 32/24	66/22 67/7 67/19 86/2	but [131]
95/25	began [1] 27/25	33/7 84/16 90/16	brief [24] 5/8 5/25 6/5	C
aware [21] 14/5 14/6	begin [1] 68/20	90/17 97/9	0/11 0/21 1/2 13/13	
18/6 26/16 26/20	beginning [1] 85/15	bits [1] 30/17	24/3 24/10 26/8 26/24 27/3 27/5 34/3 43/4	87/13
33/23 41/5 53/23 76/5	begins [1] 100/11 begun [1] 47/23	blanket [1] 29/13 blindsided [1] 64/3	47/8 48/6 55/23 71/2	Callard [4] 38/2 38/2
76/11 76/15 77/6	behalf [12] 1/18 9/11	blur [1] 10/5	92/18 92/25 93/16	47/5 98/2
81/19 83/1 83/17 87/7	15/15 01/11 01/00	blurred [4] 9/25	96/4 98/16	came [13] 19/2 22/20
87/10 88/22 89/3 97/2	22/17 22/18 23/3 23/4	63/14 63/15 64/1	briefed [18] 11/10	28/24 45/22 50/22
101/22	35/25 65/13 87/8	blurring [1] 63/24	12/19 13/4 13/6 13/21	59/18 73/21 76/1
В	behaving [4] 60/21	blurry [1] 12/6	36/24 43/5 49/22	76/14 81/10 91/7 99/2
back [16] 10/8 25/15	61/20 76/1 101/13	board [49] 4/22 6/12	51/13 51/19 52/10	106/4
30/25 31/16 46/14	behaviour [1] 61/17	8/22 10/2 10/16 12/2	58/6 58/9 92/10	camp [2] 75/3 75/22
62/17 63/9 63/23	behind [3] 17/24	17/19 17/23 29/17		
75/16 80/11 84/22	101/19 108/25	45/19 49/24 50/2 50/3		97/23 98/10 105/6
87/17 89/18 90/25	being [47] 2/25 4/20	50/5 68/8 68/17 69/7	briefing [58] 13/16	105/7 105/7 105/8 105/12
97/19 107/24	6/1 12/22 12/22 14/10 14/21 14/22 20/20	69/9 69/14 69/20 69/22 70/11 70/16	17/2 23/20 23/20 33/18 36/13 36/15	campaigning [2]
background [4] 3/3	20/20 26/17 27/8 28/4	70/21 72/3 72/6 72/8	38/3 39/1 39/2 39/3	34/21 75/12
8/9 80/16 86/22	28/19 28/22 28/23	72/13 72/18 73/5 73/7	40/16 43/19 43/20	campaigns [1] 22/24
bad [2] 59/25 89/7	29/7 29/12 29/13	73/15 73/17 73/18	44/4 44/10 44/21	can [62] 1/3 1/5 1/8
bags [1] 107/23 Bank [1] 70/21	36/24 37/12 43/5	73/21 73/22 74/14	44/25 45/2 45/7 45/13	1/9 1/10 1/11 1/15 2/5
banking [2] 6/20 6/22	43/16 43/21 47/8	75/14 75/17 77/7 78/1		
bar [1] 83/6	51/18 56/23 59/17	81/12 81/14 84/20	47/7 47/24 48/11	15/9 16/7 20/6 23/8
Baroness [1] 98/15	60/5 62/14 62/18	84/21 94/16 102/9	48/12 48/19 48/21	26/23 30/3 31/13
base [1] 52/5	62/22 64/18 69/5	104/21 105/2	49/2 49/3 52/2 52/2	31/15 32/9 36/21 38/1
based [5] 13/14 24/1	75/22 77/5 79/23	Board's [1] 76/17	52/16 53/12 54/13	39/12 41/8 43/9 46/20
24/12 101/20 105/10	89/10 89/17 93/6 98/2		55/21 55/24 56/2 56/13 56/10 57/0	46/22 48/1 48/14 53/7 53/13 54/13 56/6 58/1
basically [2] 91/1	98/6 98/7 102/10 102/12 103/10 108/2	16/2	56/13 56/19 57/9 57/25 58/9 63/9 79/3	61/9 62/9 63/23 64/2
101/22	BEIS [20] 5/7 6/11	body [3] 9/16 32/11 82/9	79/25 80/12 80/13	64/22 64/23 64/24
basis [8] 11/21 18/16	17/1 17/8 24/9 26/9	body's [1] 11/13	80/15 81/20 90/5 92/1	66/3 66/23 70/7 71/8
32/5 37/10 64/4 82/24	28/10 40/20 59/8	bold [3] 36/12 44/23	92/17 93/9 99/17	71/14 77/14 80/21
85/11 107/14	59/20 62/6 78/25	45/24	briefing' [1] 45/15	86/7 87/25 88/17 89/1
				(31) assumption - can

(31) assumption - can

can. [9] 91/12 94/20 997 90/24 1010/13 997 90/24 100/13 997 90/24 100/13 907 90/14 100/14 100/14 100/15 907 90/14 100/15 90	С	88/18 88/20 91/4 101/14 107/19 108/11	claim [5] 34/18 36/2 42/5 43/6 87/1	35/5 102/25	91/16 104/11
9907 9024 1001 10 cetra [14] 1725 38/16 371 ⁻⁷ 10224 concluded [13] 4022 108/16 1032/01028 670 77 5007 507 cetra [14] 1725 38/16 871 ⁻⁷ commitments [12] concluded [14] 4022 48/3 69/16 743 99/1 99/56 9919 6/15 27/3 communicated [5] concluded [17] 78/15 contrine [1] 78/15 contrine [17] 78/15 contrine [17] 78/15 contrine [17] 78/15 contrine [18] 78/15	can [9] 91/12 94/20			commissioning [4]	conclude [2] 68/2 82/1
100/16 0.00/20 81/23 102/5 102/5 calmins [1] 38/16 conclusions [2] 36/10 0.00/17 36/10 0.00/17 36/10 0.00/17 36/10 0.00/17 36/10 0.00/17 36/10 0.00/17 36/10 0.00/17 36/10 0.00/17 36/10 0.00/17 36/10 0.00/17 36/10 0.00/17 36/10 0.00/17 36/10 0.00/17 36/10					
1000 24/8 23/6 CFO [7] 50/1 50/5 claim [2] 36/10 88/6 committents [2] concursions [2] concursions [2] 36/10 100/13 43/3 69/16 74/6 76/10 77/5 50/16 53/10 Claim [1] 30/23 concursions [2] 36/10 100/13 camp [1] 36/23 chaim [1] 91/34 Concursions [2] 36/10 100/13 concursions [2] 36/10 100/13 camp [1] 36/23 chaim [1] 91/34 Concursions [2] 36/10 100/13 concursions [2] 36/10 100/13 camp [1] 36/12 Concursions [2] 36/10 100/13 Concursions [2] 36/10 100/13 concursions [2] 36/10 100/13 concursions [2] 36/10 100/13 concursions [2] concursions [2] concursions [2] scint [1] 91/16 scint [1] 91/16 concursions [2] <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
4436 36/13 66/16 743 66/17 66/13 66/16 743 50/15 2173 <td></td> <td>CFO [7] 50/1 50/5</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>conclusions [2]</td>		CFO [7] 50/1 50/5			conclusions [2]
74/a 74/6 79/2 74/a 74/6 79/2 72/a 72/3 Clarify [19] 31/8 Communication [1] 26/15 Conditions [1] 91/9 Condit				6/15 21/3	36/10 100/13
cannot [1] 3523 cap [2] 768 / 758 /					
cap big 1/4 with a start big 1/4/2 of 1/2 start conduits [1] with a start big 1/4/2 of 1/2 start conduits [1] with a start big 1/4/2 of 1/2 start 50/14 5/12 75/20 109/3 109/3 60/24 8/12 24/19 source 1/1 start communication [1] with a start big 1/4/2 of 1/2 start communication [1] with a start big 1/4/2 of 1/2 start communication [1] with a start big 1/4/2 of 1/2 start communication [1] with a start big 1/4/2 of 1/2 start communication [1] with a start big 1/4/2 of 1/2 start communication [1] with a start big 1/4/2 of 1/2 start communication [1] with a start big 1/4/2 start conduits 1/1 with a start big 1/4/2 start big 1/4/2 start conduits 1/1 with a start big 1/					
capabil (4) 43/3 50/14 51/2 73/20 classified (1) 10/7 94/3 community (3) carer [2] 33/19 chaineg [22] 11/15 25/25 community (3) community (3) community (3) community (3) comsequences [4] carer [2] 33/16 66/19 10/91 10/91 10/92 community (3) comsequences [4] care [21] 11/11					
Chairman [2] Chairman [2] 77/18 citer [8] 77/15 27/16 27/15 27/16 27/15 27/16 27/16 27/16 27/16 27/16 27/17 27/17 27/17 27/17 27/17 27/17 27/17 27/17 27/17 27/17 27/17 27/17					
Laplie 11 33.6 33.710 66/15 106/15<					
Carler [12] 35/14 52/14 72/25					
Cardin [1] 4:11 11/21 11/23 17/2 Ceared [2] 21/23 10/31 5/25 5/25 conflict [1] 79/13 Cartwright [1] 76/4 18/14 18/3 18/17 19/12 Cearel [2] 71/12 3/10 8/14 8/21 10/20 consequences [4] 43/13 55/16 65/17 20/10 20/15 26/5 Colsarly [2] 48/21 98/3 3/10 8/14 8/21 10/20 10/81 75/16 consequences [4] 43/13 55/16 65/17 26/14 26/14 26/20 73/19 88/25 90/14 Colsarly [2] 48/21 98/3 76/15 88/8 109/6 consequently [1] 70/19 76/12 68/9 75/18 75/19 75/24 closures [1] 58/12 company 10/67/13 gamma [1] 3/10 8/12 25/6 3/12 3/22 25/6 3/12 3/22 25/6 3/12 3/22 25/6 3/12 3/22 25/6 3/12 3/22 25/6 3/12 3/22 25/6 3/12 3/22 25/6 3/16 26/6 3/16 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
Cartwright [1] 76/4 I//1 18/3 18/17 19/22 Control 18/1 18/17 19/22 Control 18/18 18/27 Control 18/18 18/27 Control 18/18 18/17 19/22 Control 18/18 18/17 19/12 Control 18/18 18/17 19/12 <thcotrol 12<="" 17="" 18="" 19="" th=""> Control 18/18 18/18/18</thcotrol>			cleared [2] 21/23		conflict [1] 79/13
case [21] 7/11 9/2 Consequences [4] 7/14<					
27/1 42/7 42/8 43/9 19/19 19/22 20/1 20/15 26/5 climate [1] 3/1 19/17 39/12 32/17 12/15 38/19 10/15 19/12 12/10 64/12 65/16 67/8 26/14 26/12 62/2 26/14 26/12 62/2 climate [1] 3/1 19/17 39/12 37/13 12/15 38/19 10/15 19/12 12/10 70/19 76/12 85/9 75/18 75/16 76/7 80/2 cols reg [1] 13/4 compentive [2] 8/14 consider [3] 13/1 75/12 36/7 36/10 75/14 75/14 76/17 76/13 75/14 6/13 19/12 32/13 36/16 63/12 33/12 33/22 35/21 36/6 36/7 36/10 19/17 37/12 75/14 75/14 96/18 consider [2] 13/4 32/3 35/17 79/21 80/3 35/21 36/6 36/7 36/10 96/17 80/17 11/12 50/27 consider [1] 13/14 consider [1] 13/14 consider [1] 13/14 consider [1] 14/14 consider [1] 14/23 consider [1] 14/23 consider [1] 14/23 consider [1] 14/23 consider [1] 14/24 consider [2] 14/16 consider [2] 14/16 consider [2] 14/16 consider [2] 14/2 consider [2] 6/2					
43/3 50/16 50/17 26/14 26/14 26/20 73/19 80/25 90/14 compensation [6] consequently [1] 70/19 76/12 85/9 75/18 75/19 75/24 75/18 75/19 75/24 colsures [1] 58/12 76/15 80/8 109/6 consider [8] 15/18 93/18 93/19 103/8 75/18 75/19 75/24 75/18 75/19 75/24 colsures [1] 58/12 76/15 80/8 109/6 consider [8] 15/18 29/24 35/17 35/20 75/14 73/20 colsures [1] 93/13 colsures [1] 93/13 compatinant [2] 29/14 48/23 97/3 35/21 36/6 36/7 36/20 challenged [2] 91/24 54/14 96/6 compatinant [2] consider [8] 15/18 29/24 35/17 35/20 challengig [3] 12/1 coincidel [1] 93/13 coincide [1] 93/13 consider [2] 27/14 48/25 97/7 97/25 consider [2] 27/14 48/25 97/7 97/25 7/14 87/20 chance [1] 33/15 97/20 23/14 82/52 21/29 87/4 consider [3] 3/14 34/25 96/17 99/17 108/3 37/14 48/20 21/15 52/16 82/8 72/9 27/24 compatinant [2] consider [3] 3/12 consider [3] 3/12 consider [3] 3/13 consider [3] 3/14 consider [3] 3/14 consider [3] 3/12					
164/12 80/16 07/19 76/12 86/9 27/3 63/23 63/8 75/16 90/19 76/15 76/12 86/9 90/19 76/15 76/12 86/9 90/19 76/15 76/12 86/9 90/19 76/15 88/8 109/6 consider [8] 15/16 consider [1] 3/12 32/13 63/23 97/3 32/13 63/23 97/3 32/13 63/23 97/3 32/13 63/23 97/3 32/13 63/23 97/3 consider [1] 93/13 consider [1] 14/23 21/14 48/20 21/14 48/20 21/14 48/20 21/14 48/20 98/18 consider [1] 14/23 21/14 48/20 21/14 48/2					
1/0179 16/12 85/9 75/18 75/25 93/3 75/18 75/25 93/3 75/18 75/25 93/3 Consider [3] 15/18 Competitive [2] 8/14 25/6 31/21 33/22 29/24 35/17 35/20 75/14 76/19 78/2 Colume [1] 3/4 Code [4] 18/13 18/21 competitive [2] 8/14 25/6 31/21 33/22 29/24 35/17 35/20 75/14 76/27 80/2 Code [4] 18/13 18/21 complainant [1] 25/6 31/21 33/22 37/12 37/13 41/3 Challenges [2] 91/2 consider 30/2 consider 30/2 consider 30/2 41/14 47/20 76/14 71/7 37/9 coincident [1] 66/2 complainant [2] consider 30/2					
65/16 65/17 75/24 75/24 76/24 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
13/16 93/19 103/17 13/17 13/17 23/12 3/17					
29/24 35/17 35/20 75/14 -50/64 [4] 16/15 16/2 complainant [1] 90/16 35/21 36/6 36/7 36/10 6hallengs [2] 91/24 50/14 96/6 29/14 considerably [1] 35/21 36/6 36/7 36/10 94/3 considerably [1] 17/7 37/9 considerably [1] 31/1 4 47/20 76/14 96/1 considerably [1] 29/14 considerably [1] cast [1] 85/10 chancellor [1] 20/12 chancellor [1] 20/12 considerably [1] 21/14 48/23 97/3 casts [1] 85/10 chancellor [1] 20/12 chancellor [1] 20/12 considerably [2] 21/14 48/23 97/3 casts [1] 85/10 chancellor [1] 20/12 chancellor [1] 20/12 considerably [2] 21/14 48/23 97/3 casts [1] 85/10 chanegle [2] 3/16 31/14 84/5 84/5 84/5 84/7 complaints [10] 14/25 397/7 caught [1] 29/12 change [2] 30/10 31/24 66/23 74/25 91/4 66/2 considerably [3] 24/20 caught [1] 29/12 change [2] 30/10 37/16 39/15 39/17 considerably [3] 24/20 considerably [3] 24/20 66/2 caught [1] 29/12 change [2] 30/10 37/16 39/15 39/17 consitult [1] 64		challenged [2] 20/18			35/17 79/21 80/3
35/21 36/6 36/7 36/10 Challenges [2] 91/2 53/14 90/0 29/14 Considerably [1] 37/12 37/13 41/3 Challenging [3] 12/1 Challenging [3] 12/1 Considerably [1] 29/16 5/16 Considerably [1] 98/1 Challenging [3] 12/1 Considerably [1] 29/17 29/16 5/16 Considerably [1] 98/1 Chance [1] 38/13 Considerably [1] 29/17 Considerably [2] 21/14 48/23 97/3 casts [1] 85/10 Chance [1] 20/12 83/4 84/5 84/5 84/7 Complainants [2] 21/14 48/23 97/3 catch [1] 93/7 Change [13] 3/11 5/1 Solve [22] 13/16 Solve [23] 13/16 Considerably [1] 21/18 48/20 Solve [23] 13/16 CATHLEEN [3] 11/13 24/16 25/2 25/3 25/15 Columns [2] 83/4 Solve [3] 3/17 Gomplete [2] 67/8 Considerably [3] 24/20 Gonsiderably [3] 24/20 Gonsiderably [3] 13/9 Causes [3] 9/17 35/7 Changes [2] 30/10 Solve [2] 13/16 Solve [3] 80/17 Gomplete [2] 67/8 Consituent [3] 31/12 causes [3] 9/17 35/7 Charged [1] 80/13 Charged [1] 80/13 Consec [2] 24/18 Consituent [3] 51/12 Consit					
37/12 37/13 4/13 37/14 47/13 37/14 47/13 29/1 65/16 consideration [3] 21/14 44/25 37/14 44/25 21/14 44/25 46/17 21/14 44/25 46/17 46/17 46/18 44/25 46/17 44/25 46/17 46/18 46/18					
11/1 4/1/20 / 0/14 17/7 37/9 coincident [1] 65/2 complaints [10] 21/14 48/23 97/3 cast [1] 83/5 chance [1] 38/13 coincident [1] 20/12 75/12 104/18 considered [7] 14/23 catch [1] 93/7 cate [1] 83/5 chance [1] 38/13 83/14 84/5 84/5 84/7 75/12 104/18 considered [7] 14/23 cate [1] 93/7 cate [1] 83/15 21/16 25/2 52/3 25/5 column [6] 83/4 83/14 84/5 84/5 84/7 12/18 33/14 34/25 96/17 99/17 108/3 37/14 48/20 24/16 25/2 25/3 25/5 columns [2] 83/4 35/3 44/24 51/17 55/7 considered [7] 14/23 considered [7] 9/72 cauge [1] 9/17 35/17 52/18 62/8 72/9 87/24 complaints [40] considered [7] 9/72 considered [7] 9/72 cauge [1] 9/17 35/17 52/18 62/8 72/9 87/24 complaints [40] considered [7] 42/3 considered [7] 42/3 cauge [1] 9/17 35/17 53/17 changed [2] 21/24 13/20 14/14 16/7 16/8 86/2 considered [3] 3/12 considered [3] 3/12 cauge [1] 32/20 charged [1] 89/13 come [2] 3/14 complaints [4] 3/12 complaints [4] 3/12 constituent's [2] constituent's [2] constituent's [2] constituent's [2] constituent's [2]	37/12 37/13 41/3				
3001 cast [1] 83/5 chance [1] 38/13 coumn [6] 83/4 75/12 10/18 considered [7] 14/23 cate [1] 85/10 chance [1] 31/1 5/1 97/20 complaints [10] 12/18 33/14 34/25 96/17 99/17 108/3 cate ory [3] 23/1 23/14 62/52 25/3 25/5 coumns [2] 83/4 35/3 44/24 51/17 55/7 considered [7] 14/23 37/14 48/20 25/15 25/18 62/8 72/9 97/20 complete [2] 67/8 consistent [1] 85/3 cause [3] 9/17 35/7 chances [1] 89/13 chances [1] 89/13 37/16 39/15 39/17 13/8 86/2 consistent [3] 85/3 cause [3] 9/17 35/7 chances [1] 89/13 charcet [1] 18/14 charcet [1] 89/13 complete [2] 67/8 consituent [3] 31/12 37/10 451/2 charcet [1] 89/13 charcet [1] 89/13 consituent [3] 30/5 88/17 91/12 compremises [3] constituent [3] 31/12 caveat [1] 32/20 check [1] 67/5 comming [5] 30/3 30/5 compremises [1] constitue [1] 20/1 constitue [1] 20/1 caveat [1] 83/12 conter [1] 12/22 commerced [2] constituer [5] 29/5 constituet [1] 20/1 constituet [1] 20/2 con					
Casts [1] 30.57 Chancelior [1] 20/12 83/14 84/5 84/5 84/7 complaints [10] 14/25 39/7 79/25 cate [1] 93/7 Change [13] 3/11 5/1 97/20 12/18 33/14 34/25 96/17 99/17 08/3 cate [01] 93/7 23/1 3/11 43/20 23/1 3/16 7 9/24 20/17 99/17 08/3 CATHLEEN [3] 1/13 1/16 10/2 completel [2] 67/8 completel [2] 67/8 consitient [1] 85/3 Caught [1] 29/12 change [2] 30/10 37/14 41/7 16/16 completel [2] 67/8 constituencies [1] Cause [2] 3/11 24/5 23/12 13/20 14/14 16/7 16/18 86/2 constituencies [1] 68/24 Cause [2] 3/10 37/16 39/15 39/17 completel [3] 24/20 64/3 82/8 comstituent [3] 31/12 constituent [3] 31/12 constituent [3] 31/12 constituent [3] 31/12 constituent [3] 22/9 22/9 22/10 constituent [3] 22/9 22/9 22/10 constituent [3] 22/9 constituent [3] 31/12 constituent [3] 31/12 constituent [3] 22/9 constituent [3] 31/12 constituent [3] 31/12 constituent [3] 31/12 constituent [3] 22/9 constituent [3] 22/9 constituent [3] 22/9 constituent [3] 31/12 constituent [3] 31/12 constituent [3] 31/12 constituent [3] 31/12 constituent					
cate [1] 93/7 change [13] 5/11/5/1 columns [2] 83/4 for any for an				complaints [10]	
category [3] 23/1 24/16 26/2 26/3 26/3 26/15 26/18 62/8 72/9 36/7 79/24 37/14 48/20 26/15 26/18 62/8 72/9 87/24 36/7 79/24 CATHLEEN [3] 1/13 1/16 10/2 changed [2] 21/24 21/316 complete [2] 67/8 consistent [1] 85/3 Cause [3] 9/17 35/7 75/11 changes [2] 30/10 37/16 39/15 39/17 complete [2] 67/8 constituencies [1] Cause [3] 9/17 35/7 75/11 charaget [1] 89/13 74/24 23/6 33/12 completely [3] 24/20 68/24 Causing [4] 29/4 49/8 charaget [1] 89/13 75/8 88/17 91/12 comstituencies [1] 66/16 Cause [1] 32/20 charaget [1] 89/14 75/8 88/17 91/12 commercel [2] constituent [3] 31/12 Cause [1] 32/20 charaget [1] 22/25 check [1] 67/5 commercel [2] constituent [2] 26/1 constituent [2] 26/1 Carc [2] 36/9 37/18 check [1] 22/25 chief [3] 35 68/8 34/22 36/1 constituent [2] 26/1 constituent [2] 26/1 Central [2] 6/14 6/21 chief [3] 35 68/8 34/22 36/1 constatint [1] 41/20 consultation [2] 29/24 consultation [2] 26/1 constituents [2] 26/1 constituents [2] 26/1 constituent [3] 31/2 constituent [3] 31/2<					
37/14 48/20 25/13 25/16 06/27 12/5 or/24 complete [2] 13/16 complete [2] 67/8 complete [2] 67/8 constituent [3] 85/3 CATHLEEN [3] 1/13 1/13 changed [2] 21/24 24/5 complete [2] 67/8 complete [2] 67/8 constituent [3] 31/12 cause [3] 9/17 35/7 75/11 character [1] 18/14 character [1] 89/13 complete [2] 67/8 complete [2] 67/8 constituent [3] 31/12 caused [2] 29/4 49/8 character [1] 18/14 character [1] 18/14 character [1] 18/14 complete [2] 67/8 complete [2] 67/8 constituent [3] 31/12 caused [2] 34/18 character [1] 18/14 character [1] 18/14 comster [2] 44/18 constituent [3] constatituent [3] constituent [3					
CHAINLEEN [2] 1/16 1/17 1/16 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
1/16 110/2 24/5 21/25 22/4 23/6 33/13 completely [3] 24/20 68/24 cause [1] 29/12 changes [2] 30/10 37/16 37/16 39/15 39/17 4/3 82/8 constituent [3] 31/12 cause [2] 34/18 37/10 11/1 18/14 12/8 45/22 46/13 comply [1] 96/5 31/22 104/11 cause [2] 34/18 charges [2] 30/10 54/25 56/6 57/6 68/7 comply [1] 96/5 31/22 104/11 cause [2] 34/18 charge [1] 89/13 54/25 56/6 57/6 68/7 comply [1] 96/5 constituent [3] 21/2 cause [1] 32/20 comes [2] 24/18 55/33 57/25 constituent [1] 20/1 comstituent [2] caveat [1] 36/11 check [1] 67/5 comes [2] 24/18 33/10 comprehensive [3] constituent [1] 20/1 centre [1] 83/19 check [1] 40/24 63/4 78/19 90/25 constitution [1] constitution [1] consultation [2] 29/5 centre [1] 83/19 choice [1] 40/24 41/16 41/17 conset[2] 29/24 consultation [2] 59/8 consultation [2] 59/8 69/7 69/11 69/14 cinal [2] 61/4 6/21 conset[1] 20/1 consultation [2] 59/8 consultation [2] 59/8 69/17 69/19 72/1 72/5 cind [2] 26/7 consultation [2] 29/2					
cause [3] 9/17 35/7 75/11 changes [2] 30/10 31/1 37/16 39/15 39/17 42/8 45/22 46/13 compt [1] 96/5 54/25 56/6 57/6 68/7 75/8 88/17 91/12 comprehensive [3] 50/14 51/2 caveat [1] 32/20 check [1] 66/16 67/11 s7/6 37/16 39/15 39/17 42/8 45/22 46/13 compt [1] 96/5 character [1] 8/14 charaged [1] 89/13 chat [3] 66/16 67/11 check [1] 67/5 check [1] 67/5 check [1] 67/5 check [1] 22/5 check [1] 22/5 check [1] 22/2 comter [1] 8/14 charaged [1] 22/2 check [1] 42/19 choice [1] 40/24 choise [1] 42/19 choise [1] 42/19 choise [1] 42/19 choise [1] 42/12 choise [1] 42/19 choise [1] 42/12 choise [1] 42/12 chois					
Caused [2] 3/17 3/17 31/1 42/8 45/22 46/13 comply [1] 96/5 31/2 104/11 Caused [2] 34/18 37/10 character [1] 18/14 54/25 56/6 57/6 68/7 comply [1] 96/5 constitute [1] 20/1 Causing [4] 29/4 49/8 character [1] 18/14 comply [1] 96/5 constitute [1] 20/1 Causing [4] 29/4 49/8 check [1] 67/5 check [1] 67/5 check [1] 22/5 comes [2] 24/18 compromised [2] constitute [1] 20/1 CCRC's [1] 36/11 check [1] 22/5 check [1] 22/5 commencel [2] commencel [2] compromises [1] constrained [2] 26/1 Central [2] 6/14 6/21 chief [3] 3/5 68/8 30/5 comment [14] 31/25 comment [14] 31/25 consultancy [1] 4/25 central [2] 6/14 6/21 choose [1] 42/19 children [1] 108/8 choose [1] 42/19 children [1] 108/8 concerned [1] concerned [1] consultation [2] 59/8 g9/13 69/7 69/17 69/17 72/17 72/17 cinad [2] 36/7 38/8 cinad [2] 36/7 38/8 concerned [1] concerned [1] concerned [1] contact [2] 69/6 f1/6 69/17		changes [2] 30/10			
caused [2] 34/18 character [1] 18/14 54/25 56/6 57/6 68/7 comproprint [1] 64/10 constituent's [2] 37/10 character [1] 18/14 75/8 88/17 91/12 comproprint [2] comproprint [2] 22/9 22/10 constitutent's [2] causing [4] 29/4 49/8 54/25 56/6 57/6 68/7 comproprint [2] comproprint [2] constitutent's [2]					I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
37/10 Charged [1] 89/13 75/8 88/17 91/12 Compremensive [3] 22/9 22/10 causing [4] 29/4 49/8 Char [3] 66/16 67/11 87/6 comes [2] 24/18 55/23 55/23 57/25 constitution [1] 20/9 22/10 caveat [1] 32/20 check [1] 67/5 checked [1] 22/5 63/4 78/19 90/25 compromised [2] 63/25 constitution [1] 10/21 centre [2] 6/14 6/21 cheif [3] 3/5 68/8 34/22 36/1 commende [2] 63/4 78/19 90/25 constrained [2] 26/1 27/8 constrained [2] 26/1 27/8 centra [2] 6/14 6/21 Chief [3] 3/5 68/8 38/21 40/18 40/21 commentel [1] 31/25 consutancy [1] 4/25 consutancy [1] 6/22 consutancy [1] 6/2 consutancy [1] 6/2 consutancy [1] 6/2 consutancy [1] 6/2 c					
Causing [4] 29/4 49/8 87/6 43/11 compromised [2] constitution [1] 50/14 51/2 caveat [1] 32/20 check [1] 67/5 check [1] 22/5 check [1] 22/2 compromised [2] 79/19 80/1 10/21 constrained [2] 26/1 CCRC's [1] 36/11 check [1] 22/2 check [1] 22/2 check [1] 22/2 compromises [1] 63/25 constrained [2] 26/1 27/8 Central [2] 6/14 6/21 children [1] 108/8 choice [1] 40/24 children [1] 108/8 34/22 36/1 consuttation [2] 29/5 consultancy [1] 4/25 54/6 56/1 68/17 69/3 choice [1] 40/24 choice [1] 40/24 41/16 41/17 74/23 consuttation [2] 29/24 75/10 consuttation [2] 59/8 59/7 69/11 69/14 choice [1] 40/24 choice [1] 40/24 41/16 41/16 41/17 74/23 consuttation [2] 59/8 consuttation [2] 59/8 69/17 69/19 72/1 72/5 choise [1] 42/19 churst [1] 61/2 consumers [1] 60/2 consumers [1] 60/2 consumers [1] 60/2 contact [2] 69/6 contact [2] 69/6 74/14 certain [1] 80/21 circumstances [7] commercial [3] 8/12 73/13 73/16 73/24 78/5 80/9 87/10 92/2 contact [1] 30/22 contact [2] 69/6 contact [1] 30/22					I I
50/14 51/2 caveat [1] 32/20 check [1] 67/5 coming [5] 30/3 30/5 79/19 80/1 10/21 CCRC [2] 36/9 37/18 checking [1] 22/5 checking [1] 22/2 63/4 78/19 90/25 compromises [1] 63/25 CCRC [2] 44/13 82/20 checking [1] 22/2 Chief [3] 3/5 68/8 34/22 36/1 commenced [2] 34/22 36/1 constraint [1] 41/20 central [2] 6/14 6/21 children [1] 108/8 60/5 comment [14] 31/25 29/14 37/11 51/1 constraint [2] 59/8 6/5 choice [1] 40/24 choice [1] 42/19 41/16 41/16 41/17 concerned [2] 20/24 75/10 consultation [2] 59/8 69/7 69/11 69/14 choize [1] 42/19 choize [1] 42/19 41/18 42/20 55/16 75/10 concerned [1] 9/17 consultation [2] 59/8 69/7 69/11 69/14 circa [2] 36/7 38/8 circa [2] 36/7 38/8 comments [1] 60/2 contact [1] 9/17 contact [2] 69/6 contact [2] 69/6 74/14 circa [2] 36/7 38/8 circumstances [7] commercial [3] 8/12 73/13 73/16 73/24 73/13 73/16 73/24 73/13 73/16 73/24 contacts [1] 30/22 32/12 43/21 44/2 contact [2] 69/6 contact [2] 69/6 contact [2] 55/23 68/25 79/24 80/16 103/14 contact [2]	causing [4] 29/4 49/8				
cavear [1] 32/20 CCRC [2] checked [1] 22/5 checking [1] 63/4 78/19 90/25 commenced [2] compromises [1] 63/25 computer [5] constrained [2] 26/1 CRC's [1] 36/11 centre [1] 83/19 CEO [17] 44/13 82/20 chief [3] 3/5 68/8 80/5 children [1] 63/4 78/19 90/25 commenced [2] compromises [1] 63/25 commenced [2] constrained [2] 26/1 Central [2] 6/14 6/27 children [1] 108/8 80/5 children [1] 108/8 choice [1] 40/14 41/16 41/17 consertain [1] 63/25 commenced [2] 29/14 37/11 51/16 54/6 56/1 68/17 69/3 choice [1] 40/24 choose [1] 41/18 42/20 55/16 75/10 consumers [1] 6/22 consumers [2] consumers [2] 4/6 59/17 69/19 72/17 73/15 73/17 107/19 commercial [3] 8/12 73/13 73/13 73/13 73/16 73/24 5/16 contact [2] 6/6 71/16 11/11 13/15 26/6 26/16 109/15 commercial [3] 8/12 73/13 73/13					
CCRC [2] 30/9 37/16 CCRC's [1] 36/11 centr [2] 44/13 82/20 central [2] 6/14 6/21 centre [1] 83/19 CEO [17] 49/25 50/5 54/6 56/1 68/17 69/3 69/7 69/11 69/14 69/17 69/19 72/1 72/5 72/16 73/15 73/17 74/14 certain [1] 80/21 certain [1] 18/12 18/21 35/25 38/7 42/2 42/15 54/14 85/3 86/21 88/2 88/9 93/4 96/6 96/6 96/8 commented [1] commission [6] 36/6 102/18 103/2 commission [6] 36/6 102/18 103/2 commission [6] 37/3 77/7 77/17 78/17 27/8 contain [1] 41/20 contain [1] 41/20 contain [1] 6/22 contain [1] 32/8 37/13 100/23 102/6 102/18 103/2 commission [6] 36/6 96/8 27/8 concerns [10] 32/8 34/17 43/22 72/25 73/3 77/7 77/17 78/17					
cent [2] 44/13 82/20 central [2] 6/14 6/21 centre [1] 83/19 CEO [17] 49/25 50/5 54/6 56/1 68/17 69/3 69/7 69/11 69/14 69/17 69/19 72/1 72/5 72/16 73/15 73/17 74/14 children [1] 108/8 choice [1] 40/24 choose [1] 42/19 churns [1] 24/22 59/1 59/25 60/2 100/2 59/1 59/25 60/2 100/2 59/1 59/25 60/2 100/2 59/1 59/25 60/2 100/2 59/1 59/25 60/2 100/2 commented [1] 108/23 computer [5] 29/5 29/14 37/11 51/1 74/23 consultancy [1] 4/20 consultation [2] 59/8 99/13 69/7 69/11 69/14 69/17 69/19 72/1 72/5 72/16 73/15 73/17 74/14 cindy [2] 36/7 38/8 circumstances [7] 21/23 24/5 25/2 25/5 8/15 32/3 41/18 42/20 55/16 commented [1] 108/23 concern [4] 9/17 28/21 77/25 99/15 concerned [11] contact [2] 69/6 103/14 certain [1] 80/21 certain [2] 8/3 11/6 11/11 13/15 15/2 28/17 30/19 44/13 51/19 57/24 60/22 64/11 70/18 71/6 73/8 74/11 78/2 87/5 88/10 condes [1] 8/2 21/23 24/5 25/2 25/5 8/15 38/7 42/2 42/15 comments [1] 60/2 commercial [3] 8/12 7/19 7/21 32/5 commission [6] 36/6 102/18 103/2 commissioned [2] concerns [10] 32/8 34/17 43/22 72/25 73/3 77/7 77/17 78/17 contanted [5] 55/23 68/25 79/24 80/16 101/7 content [7] 39/14 39/20 48/15 52/11		checking [1] 22/22	commenced [2]		
central [2] 6/14 6/21 centre [1] 83/19 CEO [17] 49/25 50/5 54/6 56/1 68/17 69/3 69/7 69/11 69/14 69/17 69/19 72/1 72/5 72/16 73/15 73/17 74/14 certain [1] 80/21 certain [1] 80/21 21/23 24/5 25/2 25/5 51/19 57/24 60/22 64/11 70/18 71/6 73/8 74/11 78/2 87/5 88/10 comment [14] 31/25 38/21 40/18 40/21 41/16 41/16 41/17 41/18 42/20 55/16 59/1 59/25 60/2 100/2 commental [1] 38/21 40/18 40/21 41/16 41/16 41/17 75/10 concernel [1] 9/17 commental [1] 60/2 concernel [1] 9/17 21/23 24/5 25/2 25/5 26/6 26/16 109/15 civil [15] 18/12 18/21 35/25 38/7 42/2 42/15 64/11 70/18 71/6 73/8 74/11 78/2 87/5 88/10 comment [14] 31/25 28/17 30/19 41/16 41/17 concernel [1] 31/25 60/2 100/2 comments [1] 60/2 comments [1] 60/2 comments [1] 60/2 commercial [3] 8/12 7/19 7/21 32/5 commercial [3] 8/12 7/19 7/21 32/5 commissionel [3] 60/2 7/19 7/21 32/5 commissionel [3] 60/2 concernel [11] 21/23 24/5 25/2 25/5 26/6 26/16 109/15 civil [15] 18/12 18/21 35/25 38/7 42/2 42/15 commissionel [3] 60/2 7/19 7/21 32/5 commissionel [2] consuitancy [1] 4/25 concernel [4] 9/17 concernel [1] 28/21 77/25 99/15 contacts [1] 60/2 29/11 46/25 49/21 73/13 73/16 73/24 78/5 80/9 87/10 92/2 103/15 concernig [3] 12/11 61/1 106/5 concerns [10] 32/8 34/17 43/22 72/25 containel [5] 55/23 68/25 79/24 80/16 101/7 content [7] 39/14 39/20 48/15 52/11					
centre [1] 83/19 children [1] 108/8 38/21 40/18 40/21 74/23 consultation [2] 59/8 CEO [17] 49/25 50/5 choose [1] 42/19 41/16 41/17 conceded [2] 29/24 99/13 69/7 69/11 69/14 69/17 69/19 72/17 72/16 73/15 73/17 74/14 commental [1] 108/23 concerned [1] 28/21 77/125 5/16 5/16 5/16 5/16 consumers [2] 4/6 Certain [1] 80/21 certain[2] 36/7 38/8 comments [1] 60/2 29/11 46/25 49/17 5/16 consumers [2] 4/6 Certain [1] 80/21 corcal [2] 36/7 38/8 commercial [3] 8/12 73/13 73/13 73/14 contact [2] 69/6 Certain [1] 80/21 24/5 25/2 25/5 8/7 28/15 73/13 73/13 73/13 73/13 73/14 23/24 24/24 24/24 23/24 24/24 24/24 23/24 24/24 24/24 24/24 24/24 24/24					
CEO [17] 49/25 50/5 54/6 56/1 68/17 69/3 69/7 69/11 69/14 69/17 69/19 72/1 72/5 72/16 73/15 73/17 74/14 Conce [1] 42/19 churns [1] 24/22 Cindy [2] 107/5 107/19 41/16 41/17 41/18 42/20 55/16 59/1 59/25 60/2 100/2 commented [1] 50/16 28/21 77/25 99/15 concerned [1] 50/16 5/16 72/16 73/15 73/17 74/14 Cincustances [7] 21/23 24/5 25/2 25/5 26/6 26/16 109/15 Comments [1] 60/2 comments [1] 60/2 29/11 46/25 49/21 103/14 Certain [1] 80/21 certainly [26] 8/3 11/6 11/11 13/15 15/2 28/17 30/19 44/13 51/19 57/24 60/22 64/11 70/18 71/6 73/8 21/23 24/5 25/2 25/5 26/6 26/16 109/15 8/15 32/3 commercially [4] 7/6 54/14 85/3 86/21 88/2 71/19 7/21 32/5 commission [6] 36/6 54/14 85/3 86/21 88/2 71/19 7/21 32/5 concerns [10] 32/8 contain [4] 30/22 32/12 43/21 44/2 61/1 106/5 54/14 85/3 86/21 88/2 96/8 37/13 100/23 102/6 102/18 103/2 61/1 106/5 concerns [10] 32/8 34/17 43/22 72/25 68/25 79/24 80/16 101/7					
54/0 30/11/03/14 69/16/03/14 69/16/03/14 69/17/69/14 59/15/25/9/15 50/15/25/9/15 50/15/25/9/15 50/15/25/9/14 50/15/25/9/14 50/15/25/9/14 50/15/25/25/2 50/15/25/2 60/2 100/2 concerned [11] 29/11/46/25/49/21 103/14 contacts [1]/13/2 30/22 32/12/43/21/44/2 contain [4]/13/2 30/22 32/12/43/21/44/2 32/12/43/21/44/2 32/12/43/21/44/2 32/12/43/21/44/2 32/12/43/21/44/2 32/12/43/21/44/2 32/12/43/21/44/2 32/12/43/21/44/2 61/1/106/5 61/1/106/5 68/25/79/24/80/16 68/25/79/24/80/16 68/25/79/24/80/16 101/7 68/25/79/24/80/16 101/7 68/25/79/24/80/16 101/7 68/25/79/24/80/16 101/7 68/25/79/24/80/16 101/7 68/25/79/24/80/16 101/7 68/25/79/24/80/16 101/7 68/25/79/24/80/16 101/7 68/25/79/24/80/16 101/7 68/25/79	CEO [17] 49/25 50/5				
69/7 69/11 09/114 Cindy [2] 107/5 commented [1] 28/21 77/25 99/15 5/16 69/17 69/19 72/1 72/5 107/19 circa [2] 36/7 38/8 commercial [3] 8/12 73/13 73/16 73/24 103/14 Certainly [26] 8/3 21/23 24/5 25/2 25/5 26/6 26/16 109/15 commercial [3] 8/12 78/5 80/9 87/10 92/2 103/14 contacts [1] 30/22 28/17 30/19 44/13 51/19 57/24 60/22 civil [15] 18/12 18/21 71/9 7/21 32/5 commission [6] 36/6 61/1 106/5 contained [5] 55/23 68/25 79/24 80/16 101/7 54/14 85/3 86/21 88/2 38/9 93/4 96/6 96/6 96/8 37/13 100/23 102/6 34/17 43/22 72/25 61/1 13/2 39/20 48/15 52/11 64/11 70/18 71/6 73/8 96/8 96/8 commissioned [2] 73/3 77/7 77/17 78/17 39/14 39/20 48/15 52/11					
09/17/09/72/16 73/15 73/17 107/19 108/23 concerned [11] contact [2] 69/6 74/14 certain [1] 80/21 circumstances [7] 21/23 24/5 25/2 25/5 commercial [3] 8/12 29/11 46/25 49/21 73/13 73/16 73/24 certainly [26] 8/3 21/23 24/5 25/2 25/5 26/6 26/16 109/15 8/15 32/3 commercial [4] 30/22 30/22 28/17 30/19 44/13 51/19 57/24 60/22 64/11 70/18 71/6 73/8 54/14 85/3 86/21 88/2 37/13 100/23 102/6 concerns [10] 32/8 64/17 43/22 72/25 64/11 70/18 71/6 73/8 74/11 78/2 87/5 88/10 88/9 93/4 96/6 96/6 37/13 100/23 102/6 34/17 43/22 72/25 64/17 43/22 72/25 64/11 70/18 71/6 73/8 74/11 78/2 87/5 88/10 96/8 commissioned [2] 73/3 77/7 77/17 78/17 39/20 48/15 52/11					
74/14 circa [2] 36/7 38/8 comments [1] 60/2 29/11 46/25 49/21 103/14 certain [1] 80/21 circumstances [7] 21/23 24/5 25/2 25/5 commercial [3] 8/12 73/13 73/16 73/24 73/13 73/16 73/24 11/6 11/11 13/15 15/2 26/6 26/16 109/15 6/6 26/16 109/15 8/15 32/3 74/14 73/13 73/16 73/24 78/5 80/9 87/10 92/2 32/12 43/21 44/2 28/17 30/19 44/13 51/19 57/24 60/22 6/4/11 70/18 71/6 73/8 35/25 38/7 42/2 42/15 54/14 85/3 86/21 88/2 71/19 7/21 32/5 commission [6] 36/6 61/1 106/5 68/25 79/24 80/16 68/25 79/24 80/16 101/7 74/11 78/2 87/5 88/10 96/8 ommissioned [2] 73/3 77/7 77/17 78/17 39/20 48/15 52/11		107/19	108/23		
certain [1] 80/21 circumstances [7] commercial [3] 8/12 73/13 73/16 73/24 contacts [1] 32/8 certainly [26] 8/3 21/23 24/5 25/2 25/5 8/15 32/3 78/5 80/9 87/10 92/2 contain [4] 30/22 28/17 30/19 44/13 51/19 57/24 60/22 civil [15] 18/12 18/21 7/19 7/21 32/5 commission [6] 36/6 37/13 100/23 102/6 concerning [3] 12/11 68/25 79/24 80/16 64/11 70/18 71/6 73/8 54/14 85/3 86/21 88/2 88/9 93/4 96/6 96/6 37/13 100/23 102/6 concerns [10] 32/8 68/25 79/24 80/16 74/11 78/2 87/5 88/10 96/8 commissioned [2] 73/3 77/7 77/17 78/17 39/20 48/15 52/11					
certainly [26] 8/3 11/6 11/1 13/15 15/2 28/17 30/19 44/13 51/19 57/24 60/22 64/11 70/18 71/6 73/8 74/11 78/5 80/9 87/10 92/2 32/12 43/21 44/2 commercially [4] 7/6 7/8/5 80/9 87/10 92/2 32/12 43/21 44/2 28/17 30/19 44/13 5/25 38/7 42/2 42/15 5 commission [6] 36/6 61/1 106/5 68/25 79/24 80/16 101/7 54/14 85/3 86/21 88/2 37/13 100/23 102/6 64/17 43/22 72/25 68/25 79/24 80/16 101/7 64/11 78/2 87/5 88/10 96/8 06/6 96/6 37/13 100/23 102/6 34/17 43/22 72/25 60/11/7 60/11/7 60/11/7 60/11/7 60/11/7 60/11/7 60/11/7 60/11/7 60/11/7 60/11/7 60/11/7					
11/6 11/11 13/15 15/2 civil [15] 18/12 18/21 7/19 7/21 32/5 concerning [3] 12/11 contained [5] 55/23 28/17 30/19 44/13 35/25 38/7 42/2 42/15 35/25 38/7 42/2 42/15 commission [6] 36/6 61/1 106/5 68/25 79/24 80/16 51/19 57/24 60/22 64/11 70/18 71/6 73/8 38/9 93/4 96/6 96/6 37/13 100/23 102/6 61/1 106/5 68/25 79/24 80/16 74/11 78/2 87/5 88/10 88/9 93/4 96/6 96/6 96/8 commissioned [2] 73/3 77/7 77/17 78/17 39/20 48/15 52/11					
28/17 30/19 44/13 35/25 38/7 42/2 42/15 commission [6] 36/6 61/1 106/5 68/25 79/24 80/16 51/19 57/24 60/22 54/14 85/3 86/21 88/2 37/13 100/23 102/6 61/1 106/5 101/7 64/11 70/18 71/6 73/8 54/14 85/3 86/21 88/2 37/13 100/23 102/6 34/17 43/22 72/25 68/25 79/24 80/16 74/11 78/2 87/5 88/10 96/8 ommissioned [2] 73/3 77/7 77/17 78/17 39/20 48/15 52/11					
51/19 57/24 60/22 54/14 85/3 86/21 88/2 37/13 100/23 102/6 concerns [10] 32/8 101/7 64/11 70/18 71/6 73/8 54/14 85/3 86/21 88/2 37/13 100/23 102/6 34/17 43/22 72/25 101/7 74/11 78/2 87/5 88/10 96/8 ommissioned [2] 73/3 77/7 77/17 78/17 39/20 48/15 52/11					
74/11 78/2 87/5 88/10 88/9 93/4 96/6 96/6 102/18 103/2 34/17 43/22 72/25 content [7] 39/14 74/11 78/2 87/5 88/10 96/8 commissioned [2] 73/3 77/7 77/17 78/17 39/20 48/15 52/11		54/14 85/3 86/21 88/2	37/13 100/23 102/6	concerns [10] 32/8	101/7
96/8 commissioned [2] 73/3 77/7 78/17 39/20 48/15 52/11					
		96/8	commissioned [2]	/ 3/3 / / / / / / 17 78/17	39/20 48/15 52/11

(32) can... - content

	0/0 4 5 /4 4 0/0 0 6 /0 5		40/4	44/00
<u>C</u>	8/8 15/4 18/8 26/25	D	43/1	44/22
content [3] 54/9	27/6 31/10 33/19 35/7	damaging [2] 14/21	defer [2] 60/25 61/25	details [6] 36/2 43/18
59/12 80/4	37/2 37/24 38/13	61/16	definitely [8] 7/10	43/21 69/2 103/18
contents [1] 2/7	38/17 39/22 40/5	danger [1] 63/15	14/24 37/5 54/23	104/4
context [4] 27/17	40/11 45/4 47/11	dare [1] 18/3	55/24 62/2 85/20	detect [1] 102/16
61/7 62/25 91/14	47/15 48/24 50/23	date [9] 28/6 32/15	104/20	determined [1] 26/7
contingent [2] 27/14	51/9 51/23 58/16 67/8	33/9 33/20 37/6 46/9	degrading [1] 101/25	develop [1] 82/4
28/7	68/10 72/10 74/19	77/11 77/15 83/25	degree [1] 95/19	developing [1] 94/12
continue [4] 64/20	77/10 78/3 79/3 82/11	dated [7] 1/23 31/13	delay [4] 100/23	developments [2]
86/3 86/8 88/5	84/11 86/16 86/20	45/8 52/1 59/9 82/12	102/7 102/14 102/19	44/7 77/6
continued [2] 62/13	87/21 88/19 89/20	86/18	delegate [1] 61/19	device [1] 39/20
63/3	90/1 93/22 101/6	day [31] 8/23 9/5 9/5	delegated [2] 12/2	diary [5] 16/17 22/24
continues [3] 24/19	101/22 102/2 108/9		15/13	70/13 70/17 71/1
63/2 88/11	couldn't [5] 8/3 28/6	12/14 12/14 18/2 18/2	deletion [1] 43/22	did [95] 2/4 4/3 5/18
continuing [1] 103/2	58/6 84/8 84/9	31/20 32/5 32/5 33/18	deliberate [1] 82/1	7/11 13/23 15/17
	Counsel [1] 100/15	39/2 40/16 43/19	deliberately [3] 80/21	15/17 16/24 17/9 19/3
continuity [1] 87/16	couple [1] 81/21	43/19 44/20 45/13	81/2 81/4	20/19 21/18 22/11
contract [1] 14/3	course [18] 2/13		deliver [2] 7/20 9/3	23/6 23/14 26/16
contracts [1] 12/22	14/17 25/2 41/6 41/18	49/3 52/16 53/11	delivered [2] 8/4	26/20 27/3 27/4 28/3
contractual [8] 8/6	41/21 42/25 43/8 53/7	63/10 79/3 100/23	37/19	28/12 29/7 29/10
9/17 10/13 10/25	63/7 64/12 76/12	102/7 102/15 102/19	delivery [3] 6/13 8/2	29/10 36/19 37/6 37/8
11/15 12/6 63/13	84/18 87/6 98/23 99/2	109/24	13/2	37/15 39/23 39/24
63/17	99/3 109/7	days [7] 13/22 19/24	Deloitte [5] 44/3	40/1 43/20 43/20
contrary [1] 20/5	court [9] 35/24 36/1	24/15 24/21 81/9	61/24 80/25 81/23	43/24 44/1 44/10
convenient [2] 46/10	38/8 41/3 47/23 58/20	82/19 107/22	100/18	45/14 45/17 48/11
66/21	59/17 75/22 88/2	DBT [4] 94/2 96/13	demanding [2] 62/8	49/7 49/11 49/18
conversation [3]	courts [15] 14/11	97/1 97/9	62/9	49/23 50/25 54/16
51/4 72/9 105/16	41/10 41/10 41/15	DBT-owned [1] 97/9	demeanour [3] 50/20	57/13 57/22 60/3 60/9
convey [1] 90/4	43/17 44/10 52/11	deal [19] 6/5 8/5 18/7	72/9 104/25	64/20 69/12 69/13
convicted [2] 14/10	52/14 53/4 53/10 54/4	21/5 21/10 22/17 29/9	denigrate [1] 104/14	69/25 70/8 70/11
50/16	55/5 55/12 62/19 88/9	45/3 51/10 56/16	deny [1] 64/2	70/12 71/4 71/6 71/12
convictions [3] 14/7	cover [3] 52/12 55/13	58/18 59/9 64/15	department [30] 4/7	72/15 73/2 74/1 74/1
35/22 37/9	70/2	64/16 64/17 78/4	4/13 4/16 15/7 15/9	74/22 75/9 75/15
convoluted [1] 33/7	covered [8] 49/2 53/6	88/25 103/3 106/5	15/11 15/15 15/18	75/16 75/18 77/25
copied [2] 38/1 51/25	53/24 54/11 55/25		15/22 16/3 21/22	78/5 78/23 78/24
copies [2] 71/18 90/8	56/10 79/6 104/24	22/19 64/10 67/10	22/12 26/3 27/11	79/21 80/3 81/20 84/9
copy [14] 1/21 2/1	covering [2] 56/13	dealings [1] 107/9	27/15 30/15 30/21	86/5 87/14 89/5 90/20
2/3 2/4 30/24 31/1	102/15	deals [1] 87/23	40/2 42/1 42/3 42/19	91/22 92/1 92/4 92/13
74/20 81/13 82/18	Covid [2] 2/23 67/8	dealt [3] 22/14 52/14	42/22 62/6 71/22	92/16 92/20 93/13
82/21 84/4 84/17	CPS [1] 89/10	93/6	92/15 95/7 95/9 95/12	95/9 97/2 98/15 98/16
86/20 89/23	created [1] 35/16	Dear [1] 31/11	95/20 96/4	98/17 104/15 105/2
core [4] 6/11 67/4	Creative [1] 4/15	debate [8] 57/9 57/19	Department's [1]	108/14
67/11 67/23	cribsheet [1] 64/15	58/1 58/2 58/7 95/23	16/15	didn't [45] 18/2 19/9
corner [1] 31/14	criminal [7] 14/10	95/24 95/24	departments [2] 20/8	
corners [1] 101/12	35/22 36/6 37/13	debates [9] 56/8	26/12	23/19 25/10 32/18
corporate [6] 4/6	76/12 88/9 105/2	56/23 57/1 57/4 57/6	depend [2] 32/17	37/17 37/19 39/17
5/16 10/17 10/17	crisis [2] 96/20 97/11	57/12 57/24 92/2	98/23	40/1 40/5 43/13 45/20
15/20 15/21	criteria [2] 6/18 19/8	92/11	dependence [1] 9/9	46/1 53/13 57/6 59/24
correct [8] 3/9 3/19	criticising [1] 33/1	decarbonisation [1]	dependent [1] 98/24	70/22 71/3 73/23
4/12 4/24 14/16 34/5	criticism [1] 29/4	5/1 Base (2) 70/24	depending [1] 23/23	73/24 74/10 74/14
45/12 99/20	cross [1] 73/11	December [2] 76/21	depends [1] 81/5	74/21 75/3 75/6 75/24
correctly [1] 16/12	crucial [3] 8/3 8/15	77/12	depth [1] 13/24	76/5 77/23 78/2 80/3
correspondence [28]	9/8	decided [6] 55/12	derail [2] 97/25 98/7	81/11 81/15 81/18
21/2 21/6 21/7 21/11	cultural [2] 96/20	57/8 59/3 78/7 78/10	describe [6] 5/8 5/11	84/19 90/7 90/9 91/25
21/15 21/19 21/24	97/11 -	99/12	6/8 16/25 56/22 76/22	92/8 97/4 99/19
	Culture [1] 4/16	decision [2] 55/16	described [2] 30/10	107/19 108/21
	Cumbria [1] 103/10	99/11	33/21	different [8] 27/4
23/10 24/2 24/7 25/19	curious [2] 30/14	decisions [2] 18/16	describing [1] 65/21	29/22 36/25 39/15
27/18 27/22 30/16	03/1	26/6	deserving [2] 109/5	42/8 64/9 74/18 92/15
30/16 30/17 31/1 60/6	current [5] 22/1	deepest [1] 106/24	109/7	differently [1] 100/9
60/10 64/21	31/22 51/15 83/20	defence [2] 42/14	despite [1] 47/21	difficult [6] 5/23 5/24
cost [1] 88/12	93/25	43/11	detail [4] 49/1 65/21	68/21 70/14 70/25
costly [1] 88/19	currently [1] 38/7	defend [1] 88/12	68/20 72/4	96/7
could [45] 1/23 6/6	CWU [2] 78/20 80/7	defendant [2] 42/2	detailed [2] 34/12	digital [3] 4/15 4/16
				(33) content - digital

(33) content... - digital

D	do [52] 1/20 1/22 2/1	28/22 29/1 36/21 48/8	else [2] 69/12 73/6	70/16 73/18 77/25
digital [1] 6/19	3/1 4/25 11/11 11/11	53/14 66/2 85/11	email [11] 37/23 38/1	82/16 85/11 88/14
direct [3] 21/16 23/14	15/10 19/23 26/20	89/18 106/11 108/18	39/13 39/18 45/8	90/7 98/6
79/19	26/24 29/25 30/24	down [19] 3/23 5/25	51/24 59/9 59/18	every [2] 2/14 31/20
directed [1] 21/8	40/19 40/23 41/16 45/18 49/1 51/16 53/1	12/4 12/8 16/7 24/25 25/6 27/19 40/13 48/8	62/21 86/17 99/10	everybody [2] 2/21 88/19
directly [14] 8/22	55/2 60/15 60/18	56/6 68/20 72/10	Emeritus [1] 5/3	everything [2] 6/4
13/12 22/12 28/10	60/18 62/12 64/9	73/19 78/9 88/17	Emma [1] 1/17	61/19
38/22 72/15 72/21	65/20 67/13 70/21	91/12 96/10 103/20	employed [3] 7/25	evidence [22] 2/12
73/6 73/16 73/23	71/4 72/4 72/20 73/4	draft [12] 21/1 21/14	107/14 107/24	2/19 2/25 16/12 25/14
79/10 79/23 94/17 103/8	74/4 77/23 81/3 82/1	21/25 23/12 24/3 24/7	employees [1] 7/25	35/10 41/12 47/21
Director [3] 50/7	85/9 86/4 86/14 89/8	25/17 27/22 30/6 30/7	enable [1] 79/10	67/9 72/25 76/2 81/8
69/16 69/20	96/18 105/23 106/8	31/11 33/10	enables [1] 92/23	81/11 84/19 89/17
directors [2] 10/2	106/10 106/16 106/20		encourage [1] 32/7	90/24 95/23 106/9
11/25	108/5 109/5 109/7	31/13 76/23	end [5] 2/23 58/21	107/2 107/25 109/15
disagree [3] 38/25	109/8 109/19 document [13] 30/11	draw [2] 10/8 15/10 drill [1] 5/25	72/18 86/4 107/22 endeavours [1]	109/18 evident [1] 88/18
39/8 53/13	34/2 34/24 47/14	drop [1] 64/14	63/19	evil [1] 102/15
disagreed [2] 39/11	51/22 55/1 56/6 58/22		endorse [1] 106/21	exactly [3] 68/15
53/14	79/5 82/19 97/19	due [2] 2/13 43/16	Energy [2] 4/7 4/13	102/20 103/22
disagreement [1] 62/18	99/21 103/5	during [9] 17/11	engaging [1] 36/11	examine [2] 35/6
disaster [1] 101/23	documentary [1]	49/16 58/1 58/13	enough [6] 10/3 31/3	66/25
disclose [2] 91/11	72/24	60/13 65/2 70/2 78/19		example [7] 20/24
102/16	documentation [1]	87/15	101/20	26/23 26/25 27/13
disclosed [3] 54/17	71/16	duties [1] 8/21	enquiries [3] 38/22	43/21 70/20 85/6
69/2 81/7	documents [6] 21/11 21/15 51/6 66/15	E	58/25 100/1 ensure [5] 6/11 6/21	excellent [1] 108/1 except [2] 18/16
disclosure [2] 76/2	82/25 94/23	each [2] 19/16 34/12	10/16 21/18 83/16	22/14
89/17	does [10] 11/3 32/12	earlier [8] 35/25	ensuring [1] 9/2	exceptional [1] 23/18
discomfort [2] 29/6	41/21 53/4 53/5 63/12	54/13 61/23 62/17	entire [1] 26/9	exceptions [1] 19/20
29/8 discover [1] 89/5	93/4 93/10 97/5 99/24		entirely [1] 93/14	exchange [1] 103/7
discovered [1] 89/16	doesn't [8] 2/3 11/22	105/4	entitled [2] 34/1	exchanges [1] 85/15
discredit [1] 104/14	41/6 41/18 82/6 82/21	early [18] 13/22	97/22	excluded [1] 81/19
discrepancies [3]	84/17 95/10	13/22 14/8 14/8 17/18 19/22 19/24 24/15		excluding [1] 48/7
35/7 37/10 49/9	doing [6] 7/14 75/21 79/2 105/13 106/13	24/21 36/2 36/8 55/2	equipped [1] 59/25 ergo [1] 53/5	excuse [2] 55/11 63/6
discuss [12] 13/20	109/18	60/6 60/12 62/18	especially [5] 19/17	Exec [1] 80/5
15/6 32/8 68/9 68/17	Dollin [1] 51/14	62/25 72/19 106/3	51/7 67/7 79/24	execution [3] 9/23
72/3 72/11 73/1 77/8	domain [1] 44/16	Economics [1] 5/4	100/13	63/21 64/1
77/20 78/1 78/25 discussed [6] 51/18	don't [47] 11/2 13/3	edited [2] 27/21	essence [1] 94/5	executive [7] 3/5
58/19 62/22 63/8	14/6 19/24 20/3 24/24		essentially [4] 10/20	4/20 4/22 63/20 63/21
67/23 106/22	26/22 26/23 27/12	editing [1] 33/10	29/22 38/10 96/13	63/23 68/9
discussing [5] 17/12	27/12 30/2 30/18	edits [2] 30/8 30/23 education [1] 3/6	established [2] 59/15	
41/21 72/7 73/4 74/5	32/14 32/15 33/10 37/6 41/13 42/6 46/5	effect [8] 60/24 62/13	59/21	17/7 17/10 exercise [1] 10/4
discussion [7] 28/25	50/2 52/17 52/22	63/3 64/3 64/13 78/17	estimate [2] 67/24	exerted [1] 89/2
54/13 62/17 73/19	52/23 62/16 62/16	87/8 89/2	85/23	existence [1] 95/21
73/20 73/21 74/1	64/5 65/14 65/16	effective [6] 5/19	et [4] 17/25 81/23	expanding [1] 6/18
dishonesty [1] 30/1 dismissed [1] 91/2	70/12 70/16 73/18	10/12 10/23 11/12	102/5 102/5	expect [2] 64/9 82/24
dismissive [2]	80/2 87/9 92/12 92/16		et cetera [4] 17/25	expectations [3]
104/13 104/17	92/22 93/15 94/8	effects [2] 108/8	81/23 102/5 102/5	26/1 27/9 83/18
displaying [1] 95/3	96/19 97/19 98/6	108/19 eg [2] 35/22 79/15	Europe [1] 3/17	expected [3] 18/7
dispute [1] 33/3	98/17 99/3 99/21 104/4 106/23 108/12	eg the [1] 79/15	Evans [1] 38/2 even [9] 7/11 15/19	18/13 55/25 expensive [1] 14/20
distance [1] 87/4	done [21] 36/21	eg theft [1] 35/22	44/4 44/8 70/23 71/19	
distinct [1] 17/13	36/22 36/23 49/15	eight [2] 5/12 31/8	75/22 81/12 88/4	93/2 93/16 104/15
distinction [6] 8/5 11/3 15/6 15/10 48/23	50/23 57/7 60/12 63/5		evening [1] 52/7	experiences [1]
63/13	64/23 70/13 72/10	23/22 25/13 29/10	evenings [1] 107/17	65/21
distraction [2] 88/12	77/22 77/24 78/2	30/13 30/15 30/24	evenly [1] 6/4	experiencing [1]
88/19	87/11 87/13 100/8	57/6 65/9 65/12 72/18 73/6 73/16 75/3 81/15	event [2] 28/7 39/19	75/4
distribute [1] 6/3	101/6 101/9 101/15 101/18	81/17 87/1 96/19	ever [21] 20/19 27/3 27/5 44/19 46/5 50/3	experts [1] 16/18 explain [6] 3/4 21/6
distributing [1] 6/3	Dorset [1] 107/7	elected [1] 3/20	51/7 54/23 68/17	33/16 77/5 88/22
diversify [1] 8/13	doubt [11] 20/16	election [1] 3/24	69/12 70/5 70/8 70/11	104/5
L				(34) digital - explain

(34) digital... - explain

E	favour [2] 96/23	flaws [1] 35/7	funding [5] 7/3 7/3	94/4 97/19 99/3 101/9
explained [2] 45/13	96/25	fobbed [1] 74/17	71/9 79/9 79/19	103/16 103/20 106/1
75/1	favourable [1] 91/15		funds [2] 8/12 107/14	
explains [1] 104/1	favours [1] 11/4	focused [2] 16/4 57/1		goal [1] 94/22
explanation [4] 19/16	February [2] 100/14 107/8		further [27] 4/14 12/4 12/13 25/21 27/19	
55/10 79/7 80/4	Federation [4] 32/10	folder [1] 23/12	31/25 36/13 36/15	goes [4] 7/6 17/24 63/9 66/23
explanatory [1]	78/8 78/11 79/7	19/21 45/17 48/23	37/15 44/25 45/2	going [28] 18/1 18/3
23/21	feedback [1] 52/6	77/21 91/7	48/10 49/11 52/21	20/13 31/16 33/25
Exploring [1] 41/24	feel [9] 13/3 20/2	follow-up [1] 91/7	54/10 55/13 64/13	34/24 37/4 41/14 54/4
exposure [1] 91/20	20/2 20/10 20/15	following [5] 2/24	66/24 67/9 72/11 82/5	55/12 61/12 61/15
express [2] 83/22	20/19 33/7 55/11 69/3		82/8 83/14 86/22	62/17 64/25 65/7
106/24	feeling [1] 74/8	follows [1] 94/9	96/10 100/18 101/2	65/11 65/17 65/25
expressed [2] 52/18 88/14	feelings [1] 60/13	forgive [2] 27/4 73/11	future [4] 6/16 14/19	67/5 80/15 81/13
extended [1] 96/15	fell [2] 12/7 48/19	forgotten [1] 77/15	25/19 56/8	82/13 85/23 93/8
extent [1] 65/2	fellow [1] 31/12	form [5] 7/4 39/16	G	93/10 94/14 101/5
extraordinarily [1]	felt [8] 16/3 25/15	39/16 72/2 74/1		101/24
105/4	29/6 31/3 73/19 74/16		gain [1] 90/20	gone [9] 14/9 25/1
extraordinary [1]	75/2 106/13	formally [1] 95/6	Gareth [1] 38/2 gathered [2] 81/8	58/6 85/7 89/9 92/14 92/25 101/1 107/4
53/19	few [6] 21/8 28/11 30/13 30/17 49/20	formed [1] 68/15 former [3] 34/16 35/4	82/23	good [26] 1/3 1/11
extremely [4] 70/14	50/13 50/17 49/20	38/9	gave [3] 33/6 92/16	10/3 17/25 18/17
70/14 102/20 109/16	fide [1] 75/2	forms [1] 22/22	95/23	18/24 19/11 19/18
eye [2] 20/7 85/25	files [1] 43/23	forth [1] 57/9	general [15] 3/24	19/23 20/1 20/4 41/19
eyes [1] 83/6	final [6] 35/9 43/24	forthcoming [2] 77/1	16/10 19/21 30/1	50/4 50/21 62/11
F	90/17 90/18 91/11	90/11	32/25 41/4 41/15 42/6	64/11 72/23 75/6 77/9
face [4] 13/19 65/8	103/5	found [7] 32/23 33/5	42/9 63/20 72/10	80/2 80/12 85/17
101/23 103/3	finally [1] 93/20	50/13 78/21 78/24	74/17 80/10 104/13	87/13 92/7 101/4
facilitating [1] 109/17	finances [1] 9/9	89/14 98/11	105/10	105/5
facing [1] 51/15	financial [6] 4/22	founded [1] 3/4	generally [4] 19/24	got [10] 2/22 11/6
fact [14] 2/6 2/23	6/13 6/13 7/12 17/25	founding [1] 34/20	83/10 91/15 104/17	51/4 65/5 75/6 80/10
29/1 43/2 44/5 50/17	94/21 find [5] 72/24 74/17	four [8] 25/22 29/18 30/19 40/12 50/2	generated [1] 58/11 get [17] 9/10 9/24	90/9 98/20 101/11 107/22
63/12 71/5 73/16	83/24 107/18 107/19	69/22 72/22 72/23	10/6 22/11 31/5 37/2	governance [4]
79/23 80/6 85/19 98/5	finding [1] 88/5	fourth [1] 52/9	37/20 41/12 46/3 51/8	10/17 15/21 93/21
98/10	fine [5] 20/11 40/8	fraud [1] 105/11	68/22 74/14 75/6	108/4
failed [1] 70/21	66/10 67/17 86/14	free [2] 7/22 54/21	81/13 99/13 100/10	government [55] 3/3
failing [1] 102/16 failings [1] 14/1	finish [1] 109/2	freedom [3] 8/12 9/7	102/10	7/3 7/9 8/22 9/7 9/10
failure [1] 101/25	finished [2] 17/21	32/4	getting [6] 11/4 28/12	9/12 10/11 10/23
failures [2] 108/4	67/1	freedoms [1] 8/15	46/5 48/15 49/21 94/5	11/18 13/9 15/9 15/10
108/6	firm [2] 35/6 36/18	French [1] 59/19	give [17] 2/25 12/5	15/11 15/18 17/14
fair [4] 7/23 46/6 61/3	first [36] 3/20 13/8	frequently [1] 11/23	26/23 26/25 27/7 28/6	17/17 19/22 20/7 20/9
99/19	13/16 15/3 16/14 17/4		38/3 47/24 53/16 66/3	21/21 22/1 24/4 32/4
fairly [1] 74/6	31/16 33/15 33/22 33/25 33/25 39/25	friends [1] 108/14	75/9 81/20 82/6 91/14 96/15 103/18 105/25	36/5 37/22 40/14 40/20 40/25 42/1 42/1
faith [5] 10/3 18/24	46/11 47/16 55/25	friendship [1] 108/20 front [2] 71/17 103/3	given [29] 15/22	40/20 40/25 42/1 42/1 42/1 42/1 42/1 42/12 42/18 43/1
59/25 64/11 85/17	59/13 60/25 63/10	frustrating [1] 30/13	18/13 18/14 18/16	43/3 50/6 52/15 53/11
fall [1] 23/1	69/21 69/23 72/15	frustration [1] 26/17	18/23 19/5 19/11	55/18 60/2 60/23 64/8
fallback [2] 83/19 85/9	76/14 80/15 82/15	Fujitsu [1] 108/6	19/21 25/25 28/22	69/16 83/13 86/25
false [3] 29/2 35/23	82/20 83/24 84/7	full [7] 1/15 39/1 45/7	28/24 31/11 33/18	93/14 93/18 94/16
56/4	84/11 88/18 90/5 91/1	46/7 67/6 83/5 84/4	46/6 50/17 52/18 54/5	94/19 96/21 101/22
families [2] 106/14	94/1 97/16 101/10	fuller [6] 46/8 47/24	54/12 56/7 60/5 60/10	
107/1	102/22 106/4	48/11 48/12 48/19	61/8 67/7 71/18 85/24	Government's [7]
family [4] 108/8	fit [1] 31/21	48/21	89/15 90/24 91/9	6/14 8/25 21/3 61/5
108/13 108/14 109/4	fitted [1] 77/15	fully [5] 36/11 43/5	107/16 gives [5] 34/7 55/10	62/6 76/24 85/21
far [5] 46/25 60/1	five [5] 30/20 58/7 67/25 105/23 106/1	43/9 77/6 102/12 fulsome [1] 57/3	55/10 55/13 94/3	governments [1] 8/10
64/21 64/23 89/18	flag [3] 91/13 91/18	function [3] 9/11	giving [5] 2/20 18/24	Governor [1] 5/3
fashion [2] 100/10	91/20	11/19 16/5	53/21 106/9 109/14	gradually [1] 28/21
100/25 faults [11] 34/20 49/4	flagged [3] 36/17	functioning [2] 12/16		great [3] 26/16 32/6
49/7 49/12 49/14	39/2 45/13	12/20	20/23 21/5 23/25 30/3	108/2
49/19 50/9 50/12 51/1	flags [1] 102/17	functions [2] 8/19	30/25 31/2 31/15	greater [1] 89/2
75/10 97/24	flares [1] 47/25	12/9	41/19 45/4 47/15 51/9	grew [3] 28/21 74/8
	flaw [1] 49/5	funded [1] 79/23	67/2 68/2 70/24 77/14	87/18
•				(35) explained - grew

(35) explained - grew

G	96/8	him [6] 40/5 74/10	101/4 104/5	l either [1] 29/10
grey [1] 9/24	having [11] 18/24	76/23 77/20 78/12	I apologise [1] 57/17	
grips [2] 37/2 94/6	20/8 63/25 65/22 81/1	108/18		I expected [1] 18/13
group [12] 4/21	90/6 91/7 92/14 96/17			I failed [1] 70/21
35/25 37/13 38/8	102/11 107/20	44/4 77/24 90/23		I felt [5] 25/15 31/3
51/17 65/5 65/6 65/15	he [18] 32/8 32/9 53/18 77/18 87/14	96/18 his [9] 19/4 32/8	80/9 I assume [1] 86/9	73/19 74/16 75/2 I find [1] 83/24
75/12 86/21 99/6	87/15 87/16 92/19	77/17 81/12 87/14	l assumed [1] 93/13	I finish [1] 109/2
104/2	107/7 107/12 107/13	87/16 107/10 107/15		l first [1] 76/14
group's [1] 79/14	107/13 107/14 107/17	108/18	I been [1] 13/6	I formed [1] 68/15
groups [2] 16/22 108/20	107/20 107/20 107/22		I believe [3] 14/5	I gathered [2] 81/8
grow [1] 9/8	107/23	94/17 94/19 95/11	14/5 49/2	82/23
growing [2] 78/18	headed [1] 34/13	95/13	I can [22] 1/9 1/11	I gave [3] 33/6 92/16
87/12	heading [1] 34/25	hold [2] 57/9 63/19	2/5 9/19 23/8 26/23	95/23
growth [1] 3/18	healthcare [2] 3/7 3/18	holding [1] 43/4 honest [1] 18/12	30/3 36/21 39/12 46/22 53/7 53/13	l go [1] 107/24 l got [4] 2/22 51/4
guess [1] 83/1	hear [2] 1/3 46/20	honesty [1] 85/4	54/13 61/9 64/23	75/6 80/10
guidance [3] 53/16	heard [1] 106/3	hope [6] 9/20 33/6	66/23 70/7 71/14 86/7	
100/5 100/7	hearing [2] 58/20	48/21 57/23 68/2		I had [27] 18/17
guilty [4] 29/2 74/25 89/14 105/11	109/24	108/24	I can't [9] 24/8 28/6	19/22 25/24 27/23
·	heightened [2] 94/10		48/3 69/13 69/16 74/3	28/11 45/19 48/18
Н	94/12	12/15 12/18 13/5	74/4 74/16 79/2	49/22 53/3 63/10
had [122]	heightens [2] 10/15	28/22 28/24 29/15 31/24 32/22 33/3	I certainly [1] 78/2	72/13 73/9 74/1 75/1
hadn't [2] 90/11	94/20 held [10] 4/14 4/19	31/24 32/22 33/3 33/14 34/3 34/13	I could [7] 27/6 37/2 40/5 74/19 84/11 90/1	75/25 77/15 80/4 82/20 85/24 89/7 89/8
102/25	5/14 6/11 49/18 57/21	34/17 34/21 34/25	101/6	89/8 90/10 90/19
half [3] 15/3 71/11 74/11	89/25 90/13 90/19	35/4 35/11 43/22	l couldn't [3] 28/6	100/20 101/15 102/4
hand [5] 8/6 31/14	107/7	44/22 44/24 45/12	58/6 84/8	I hand [1] 97/16
65/5 97/16 99/22	Hello [3] 46/20 67/21	47/14 48/12 49/22	I dare [1] 18/3	I have [10] 1/25 2/5
handled [1] 60/19	67/22	50/12 50/18 51/16	I decided [2] 78/10	16/11 56/2 66/13
handling [2] 93/16	help [2] 51/15 70/22	51/20 51/22 52/22	99/12	71/18 75/1 81/1 95/2
99/23	helped [1] 57/5	54/22 55/7 55/24 56/7		97/13
handover [3] 92/23	helpful [2] 57/2 109/16	57/2 57/3 57/6 58/2 58/4 60/16 61/2 65/20	15/17 15/17 26/16 29/10 29/10 37/6 40/1	I haven't [1] 30/12
93/5 98/20	Hence [1] 66/18		70/12 71/6 74/1 74/22	108/24
handwritten [1] 32/21	Henry [5] 68/1 97/16	69/4 70/5 70/8 71/3		l just [4] 18/4 28/8
happen [3] 27/25	97/17 108/3 110/6	71/5 71/8 71/13 71/25		64/24 102/2
43/8 93/10	her [9] 19/4 52/2	72/4 72/15 72/21 73/1		I know [3] 45/25 97/2
happened [6] 29/17	69/17 72/7 86/12	73/10 73/14 75/20	20/22 25/10 37/17	108/24
42/7 103/13 104/9	86/24 103/14 104/1	77/3 77/8 78/1 78/6		I learnt [1] 26/11
107/10 107/15	104/11 here [27] 6/8 15/6	78/13 78/19 80/8 86/22 86/25 87/18		I lost [1] 87/16 I made [2] 25/12 76/7
happening [2] 28/13	19/10 25/18 31/17	91/16 91/23 97/24	75/24 76/5 77/23 78/2	
103/23 happy [6] 26/22	34/15 36/17 37/8 38/1	98/10 98/20 104/19	90/9 91/25 92/8 97/4	18/21 19/20 22/21
36/14 45/1 55/11 87/5	39/5 40/15 40/23	104/23	99/19	26/14 28/23 29/24
104/5	41/24 48/10 48/25	Hot [1] 64/16	I do [11] 1/22 45/18	43/7 44/13 54/10 62/8
harboured [1] 98/19	51/10 58/21 78/4 79/6		49/1 51/16 60/18	62/8 63/6 65/12 70/13
hard [5] 1/21 2/3 2/4	79/8 80/24 84/25 88/1		60/18 65/20 74/4	70/18 82/22 84/8 96/3
24/3 68/14	89/22 94/6 101/11 108/10	21/18 21/19 25/19 30/18 34/7 37/4 37/15	105/23 109/7 109/8	97/2 97/10 104/23 109/8
harm [1] 51/2	Hi [1] 103/21	46/7 69/25 72/20 73/9	I don't [41] 11/2 13/3 14/6 19/24 26/22	I meant [3] 50/4
Harrison [1] 103/22	hierarchy [1] 40/7	75/7 90/20	26/23 27/12 27/12	90/15 103/1
has [29] 10/20 30/7 31/19 32/6 32/8 33/20	high [11] 11/2 11/7	however [3] 32/24		I mention [1] 81/6
34/18 34/20 34/22	11/7 13/17 34/7 36/1	88/10 103/24		I mentioned [2]
36/8 38/12 52/10	38/8 42/12 44/5 47/23	Huge [1] 56/15	50/2 52/17 52/22	81/20 105/4
72/24 79/9 79/13	58/20			I met [5] 29/16 45/19
79/14 88/3 97/11	high-profile [1] 42/12	l agree [6] 30/22	65/16 70/12 70/16	69/21 69/22 80/13
103/5 103/12 103/13	high-quality [1] 11/7 higher [1] 17/20	42/24 55/20 55/20	73/18 80/2 87/9 92/12 92/16 92/22 93/15	I might [11] 31/5 31/6 31/7 41/18 46/3 46/3
104/2 104/6 104/8	highest [2] 10/17	106/17 108/24	92/10 92/22 93/13 94/8 96/19 97/19 98/6	
104/9 104/12 106/19 108/19 108/23	48/17	I allowed [1] 89/11	98/17 99/3 99/21	85/14 90/23
have [258]	highlighting [1] 93/6	l also [1] 86/20	104/4 106/23 108/12	I misunderstood [1]
haven't [2] 30/12	highlights [1] 83/1	l am [8] 2/22 3/1 5/5	I doubt [3] 36/21 48/8	14/7
	highly [1] 104/17	23/8 31/25 82/19	53/14	I most [1] 108/11
L				(36) grev - I most

(36) grey - I most

	25/20	l wasn't [9] 14/5	30/4 30/9 31/3 31/15	improved [1] 50/24
<u>I</u>	I then [1] 100/16	39/12 51/3 73/8 73/8	32/21 32/24 38/24	inappropriately [1]
I must [2] 75/25	I think [110] 5/21	76/5 76/16 81/13 98/8		88/4
80/13	5/21 5/22 9/22 9/25	I will [5] 2/14 67/1	45/21 46/10 46/13	include [4] 44/16
I need [2] 48/20	10/15 10/18 11/1 11/6		48/23 50/12 51/7	84/20 108/6 108/12
85/22	11/17 13/1 13/20	I wonder [1] 86/1	52/18 53/7 53/18 54/2	
I needed [1] 48/21		I wondered [1] 73/12	54/13 54/18 56/17	30/20 39/3 44/14 46/9
I never [1] 45/14	22/21 23/4 23/5 25/14		57/7 57/7 58/2 58/8	51/20 63/10 77/21
I note [1] 105/24	26/14 28/5 29/18	19/17 19/21 20/17	58/24 59/14 60/19	including [7] 4/20
I noticed [1] 59/18	32/14 32/23 37/17	20/24 21/15 24/14	63/22 64/25 65/8 66/1	12/10 52/6 61/24
I now [2] 13/14 100/8	39/15 40/4 41/1 41/9	25/16 30/24 30/24	66/12 66/17 67/8 68/2	
I omit [1] 103/23	41/14 44/13 45/10	31/2 32/7 32/15 32/20		income [4] 6/17 6/24
I outlined [1] 23/11	46/4 46/6 46/13 53/2	32/23 33/5 36/21	73/8 73/13 77/7 77/14	
I persevered [1]	53/19 54/7 54/7 55/9	37/17 39/13 40/19	80/14 81/14 83/20	incoming [1] 92/9
73/20	55/9 55/10 55/13 56/2	42/17 48/4 48/20	85/15 86/7 86/8 86/20	
I pressed [1] 46/7	56/4 58/4 59/6 59/19	49/20 50/4 50/20	87/20 87/25 88/8 89/1	29/2 75/1
I presume [2] 44/15	60/14 61/3 62/2 63/8	55/24 58/24 59/1	90/10 90/10 90/20	incompetent [1]
81/14	63/18 63/18 64/19	59/23 59/23 60/13	96/8 96/23 96/25	105/3
I probably [2] 60/12	65/6 65/24 67/2 69/18	66/6 66/6 68/2 69/15	99/21 99/25 100/20	inconsistent [2] 14/3
87/19	69/21 70/7 70/14	69/17 70/24 71/7 72/5		14/17
I probed [1] 51/5	70/18 71/9 73/11	72/17 72/17 72/22	105/7	incorporated [1] 31/2
I raised [1] 72/7	75/19 76/7 76/13	72/22 74/10 80/10	ignorance [1] 64/25	increasing [1] 91/17
I rather [1] 66/17	77/20 80/6 82/14 84/5	81/7 82/24 90/9 90/11	illegally [3] 88/4	increasingly [4] 28/1
I read [1] 84/9	84/7 85/6 87/11 87/13		88/21 101/13	28/3 28/16 97/23
I received [2] 18/10	87/14 88/18 89/19	96/25 97/12 99/10	illegitimate [1]	indeed [7] 1/9 22/9
27/13	90/9 90/10 90/15	99/25 100/2 101/20	105/12	50/19 53/4 55/21 64/8
I recommend [1]	90/18 90/22 90/23	104/20 108/11 108/14		85/18
87/4	91/2 91/4 91/8 91/9		illustration [1] 18/5	independent [15]
I referred [1] 50/1	93/12 93/19 94/9	37/3 39/11 39/13	imagine [5] 24/14	4/25 34/19 35/5 36/4
I regard [1] 19/2	94/11 94/23 96/21	39/14 48/18 49/10	69/15 96/7 97/12	36/18 37/22 40/14
I regret [1] 45/16	96/23 97/6 97/8 98/9	49/15 53/14 54/21	108/14	50/11 53/10 75/8
I relied [2] 18/11	99/19 99/20 99/22	74/6 74/7 100/6	imagining [1] 91/8	83/11 83/13 84/13
21/16	100/4 101/16 101/19	I wrote [1] 15/17	immediately [1]	96/15 98/11
I required [1] 19/3	102/1 102/20 102/21	l'd [12] 3/2 16/8 29/3	13/23	independently [3]
I respect [1] 2/23	104/10 105/1		impact [10] 5/18	52/15 56/24 57/15
I rewrote [1] 29/9 I said [2] 29/10 51/5	I thought [3] 37/12	68/7 80/7 80/20 90/10		indicates [1] 84/13
I said [2] 29/10 51/5 I saw [2] 17/11 17/17	37/17 48/16	101/6	14/19 14/23 14/25	indication [1] 36/9
I say [2] 25/13 29/18	I took [3] 17/22 40/19	l'm [29] 14/12 23/5	19/4 20/7 78/12	individual [5] 31/18
I see [2] 61/8 62/24	41/1	24/8 26/22 37/17	impartial [2] 18/22	32/22 35/17 65/8 98/1
I seemed [1] 54/9	I totally [1] 106/21	41/19 41/20 46/4	54/15	individuals [5] 35/22
I sent [1] 30/18	I trusted [1] 21/10		impartiality [5] 18/18	37/16 38/9 69/14
I should [15] 37/5	I understand [3] 2/18		18/20 18/23 19/2 85/4	
40/5 51/5 54/12 64/7	27/6 93/3			
70/13 77/17 77/19	I very [1] 37/7	85/23 86/13 87/18	implement [2]	4/14
77/22 77/24 90/2	I want [1] 74/20	90/9 92/8 98/22 98/22		Industries [1] 4/16
90/18 100/12 101/9	I wanted [5] 31/4	99/21 101/5 108/19	implementation [1]	inexplicably [1]
101/15	31/9 70/20 75/19	l've [5] 9/20 10/1	62/9	71/15
I shouldn't [1] 57/16	75/22	67/23 89/16 90/24	implemented [1]	inference [1] 16/1
I showed [1] 84/7	I was [51] 11/19 13/4		35/15	influence [1] 42/10
I simply [1] 68/20		ideally [1] 9/25	implications [1]	influenced [1] 79/22
I sometimes [1]	28/12 28/17 28/17	identical [1] 80/17	19/16	informally [2] 92/20
27/21	28/18 28/19 28/21	identification [1]	importance [3] 32/6	98/16
I started [10] 13/3	28/23 36/24 36/25	6/19	54/14 77/5	information [42]
28/11 28/22 28/25	37/4 39/11 48/3 48/4	identified [3] 6/1	important [11] 11/20	10/24 11/1 11/5 11/7
29/11 29/15 33/7	48/8 48/15 48/15	87/25 103/11	18/20 18/22 19/2 44/6	16/11 16/25 20/25
49/21 68/22 69/3	50/10 50/15 51/13	identity [1] 24/19	55/18 89/12 89/14	30/20 34/14 35/1
I suppose [4] 29/19	51/18 58/10 67/5 69/5		93/6 106/15 107/11	36/16 37/3 37/8 37/15
93/1 101/8 101/15	70/19 71/21 73/24	ie not [1] 33/3	impression [6] 68/8	44/2 44/11 45/2 49/11
I suspect [4] 62/5	74/16 75/5 76/11	if [93] 1/23 5/23 6/3	68/15 80/20 90/19	49/14 50/8 53/18 54/5
70/17 74/10 97/11	76/15 78/14 84/3	7/11 7/22 9/12 9/13	90/20 91/15	54/10 54/15 54/19
I suspected [1] 76/18	84/11 87/9 89/5 89/15		imprisonment [1]	55/6 55/13 56/7 56/12
I take [1] 93/8	91/8 93/10 95/24 98/8			56/19 57/3 62/4 62/14
I tended [2] 25/9	98/25 100/4 101/5	22/9 23/8 24/16 24/17		63/4 63/7 75/19 75/23
	102/21 102/22	25/10 25/15 26/6 27/6	90/12	79/24 80/16 81/17
L				(37) I must - information

(37) I must - information

Ι	investigations [1]	87/23	justified [2] 7/14	lawyers [1] 42/4
information [2]	50/11	Item 21 [1] 87/23	85/11	lead [3] 17/7 26/4
91/6 101/16			К	59/19
informed [7] 56/24	12/14 17/13 17/17 76/25	its [20] 1/19 3/18 8/13 9/8 9/8 10/21	keep [1] 7/12	leader [2] 78/7 78/10 leadership [3] 78/20
57/15 57/15 57/20	involved [13] 4/10	12/17 15/22 17/21	keeping [2] 56/24	80/7 101/12
57/23 98/8 98/8	9/10 10/6 20/16 37/20	18/18 20/16 29/4 34/9	83/12	leads [1] 97/9
inherit [2] 24/17	42/22 50/19 70/23	35/16 38/12 61/18	key [11] 9/13 10/13	learned [2] 54/3
24/18	85/13 94/2 94/7 94/10	61/20 76/10 79/22	10/24 11/13 20/11	108/3
initial [3] 55/21 69/24 93/9	99/13	106/7	22/2 34/1 44/20 50/5	learning [1] 19/19
initially [2] 21/9 29/9	involvement [3] 9/4	itself [3] 9/16 30/12	79/5 92/5	learnt [1] 26/11
innocent [1] 29/12	18/2 83/12	61/17	kind [6] 73/20 74/7	least [4] 54/19 55/3
inquiries [1] 91/6	irrelevant [1] 24/20	J	92/18 93/5 97/9 104/3	•
Inquiry [11] 1/18 1/19	is [190]		King [1] 76/4	leaving [2] 4/19
2/24 4/11 30/7 30/22	ish [1] 66/6	James [19] 1/5 1/10 1/13 1/15 1/16 2/11	knew [3] 21/19 61/12 81/24	63/20
72/24 90/25 104/12	isn't [4] 42/2 42/13 71/23 90/16	39/4 47/2 66/25 67/7	know [36] 1/6 1/17	led [6] 12/20 55/5 62/22 72/2 95/23
107/5 109/17	issue [34] 12/12 13/5	68/7 97/14 97/18	10/3 11/23 13/14	103/10
Inquiry's [1] 2/13	17/15 20/14 26/4	99/15 105/18 106/3	15/19 19/21 20/11	left [7] 4/13 52/11
instance [6] 12/3	38/14 38/23 39/1 43/2	109/1 109/14 110/2	25/17 30/2 30/2 30/18	52/14 53/4 53/10
17/4 42/11 59/13	45/7 49/22 52/12	James' [11] 2/11	30/25 33/1 38/24	87/15 93/16
60/25 69/23	52/22 53/5 53/24	15/4 40/12 48/25 51/9	45/25 46/8 47/16	legal [22] 31/22
instances [1] 9/19 instead [1] 24/22	55/24 56/5 58/2 58/4	58/17 68/11 78/3	48/20 48/21 57/25	31/24 33/14 35/1 36/3
institutions [1] 70/19	58/11 61/13 62/22	80/22 89/21 93/23	64/5 71/18 75/7 81/23	38/18 39/9 40/25 41/3
instructions [1] 42/3	65/21 68/21 73/25	January [8] 4/4 4/17	84/10 84/23 88/20	42/22 44/24 55/7
integral [1] 8/1	83/12 85/16 86/25	58/19 58/20 59/10	89/13 90/12 96/8 97/2	55/17 55/19 59/1
integration [1] 3/18	89/17 91/23 97/8 97/8		105/6 108/12 108/20 108/24	59/14 62/6 62/12
integrity [3] 20/17	102/11 103/5	jars [1] 26/12 job [3] 19/22 41/11	knowledge [7] 2/8	63/17 65/7 87/3 100/2
61/1 85/4	issued [1] 31/23 issues [55] 2/15 11/8	87/15	61/14 70/10 82/5	legislation [2] 8/16 12/9
intended [1] 18/25	12/7 12/11 12/15 17/2		82/10 87/12 101/7	legitimacy [1] 105/8
intention [3] 8/10		joined [1] 3/16	knowledgeable [1]	length [8] 9/7 9/16
70/15 83/12	44/11 44/20 45/12	joining [1] 105/12	57/8	11/13 83/20 84/24
interchangeable [1] 96/3	47/9 47/14 48/12	Jonathan [2] 62/10	known [6] 18/25	85/2 85/10 108/17
interest [13] 20/5	48/16 48/17 51/15	100/14	84/14 84/16 100/20	lengthy [1] 70/23
20/15 26/7 34/21	51/17 51/19 51/23	judge [2] 88/3 109/10		less [6] 11/23 55/5
38/14 58/22 58/24	54/5 56/7 56/13 56/15		knows [1] 30/17	63/4 105/23 106/1
71/23 83/17 83/18		judgment [1] 35/24	L	109/5
87/18 91/23 99/25	61/7 68/10 69/4 70/2	July [12] 1/1 4/2 4/4 4/17 33/20 35/8 37/22		let [3] 27/4 38/24
interesting [1] 26/11	70/5 70/8 71/3 71/5 71/8 71/10 71/13	45/8 82/12 84/2 97/21	lack [3] 55/3 61/8	108/18 let's [1] 86/14
interests [1] 61/4	71/25 72/4 72/15	107/8	62/18	letter [22] 22/2 22/8
interfere [4] 40/21	72/21 73/1 73/14 77/3		language [2] 104/13	22/9 22/10 22/15
40/23 41/8 63/22	78/1 91/17 91/19 92/6		105/9	28/20 30/12 31/11
interfering [1] 40/25	92/18 94/4 100/10	June [3] 1/23 100/17	large [5] 3/11 15/25	32/14 32/17 32/19
Interim [5] 35/8 35/13 43/24 91/1 91/8	it [326]	103/22	16/1 24/2 50/15	32/21 32/21 32/25
internal [2] 41/16	it's [51] 6/7 8/9 9/23	just [49] 2/15 13/16	last [12] 2/23 26/13	38/15 65/14 76/20
82/25	11/20 18/9 18/22	14/12 14/14 18/4	27/18 32/1 34/13 57/17 66/4 68/16	76/23 77/11 77/22
interrupted [1] 57/16	19/13 20/5 24/18	23/12 23/18 24/21 25/1 27/6 28/8 30/5	69/25 80/23 86/19	86/21 87/1
into [17] 5/25 22/4	24/19 26/10 26/10 26/22 30/13 30/14	31/15 36/25 40/16	109/1	letters [17] 22/12 23/18 28/8 28/11
23/1 28/21 48/20	31/13 33/19 40/12	42/9 42/20 43/7 44/17	lasted [1] 70/1	30/13 30/18 33/1 65/1
50/11 56/4 58/6 74/11	40/24 41/11 41/13	45/22 53/7 55/1 62/4	late [1] 107/17	65/3 65/12 66/2 66/4
76/9 76/14 77/15	41/20 42/2 42/13	63/8 63/8 64/24 66/3	later [11] 25/13 34/14	66/12 66/18 68/23
79/10 89/18 96/24	42/21 42/23 48/25	66/23 67/9 69/17	37/6 49/15 49/18	68/25 75/2
104/4 107/17	52/25 53/1 53/2 53/18		68/14 74/6 87/11	level [14] 9/17 9/18
introductory [8] 48/5 49/13 49/17 51/14	64/8 67/8 70/25 80/2	73/25 80/23 85/22	87/17 103/9 107/2	11/2 11/7 13/17 17/13
53/15 53/22 93/11	80/23 82/6 82/22	86/7 86/22 96/5	latest [1] 66/13	34/7 40/6 44/5 54/18
93/11	84/25 86/18 90/7	100/22 101/8 102/2	latter [1] 96/23	76/18 76/25 95/17
invest [1] 8/12	90/16 90/25 93/18	102/6 102/18 102/24	Laura [5] 37/22 45/9 59/10 86/18 99/5	95/18
investigate [1] 37/18	93/23 97/19 97/20	105/6 107/4 108/7 109/2	law [5] 36/5 40/15	levels [2] 17/21
investigation [2]	103/6 103/19 105/6 108/24	justice [2] 37/18	43/18 64/10 85/17	95/16
34/20 47/22	item [3] 33/3 83/2	107/2	lawyer [1] 40/4	liaising [1] 104/16 lieu [1] 24/9
				(38) information lieu

(38) information... - lieu

L	65/25 68/22 75/24	make [11] 7/12 10/4	100/6 106/5	70/11 70/16 70/20
	77/6 83/3 86/21 88/2	18/15 25/16 25/18	may [19] 4/2 9/15	71/18 71/19 72/8
like [25] 3/2 11/25	88/14 99/6 101/24	30/9 31/9 32/9 35/10	14/7 18/25 18/25 25/2	77/19 78/18 80/4
12/23 13/1 15/14 16/2	104/3	41/24 84/23	34/11 36/9 42/14	80/15
16/8 22/23 24/17	little [10] 10/6 25/13	making [4] 31/8 44/4	42/19 49/4 51/22 55/5	meetings [20] 28/25
25/10 33/13 41/21	25/21 27/19 33/7	57/20 74/24	62/13 67/10 73/11	29/16 49/13 49/16
42/9 54/18 68/7 77/14	41/24 65/8 67/2 85/24		78/5 103/24 106/6	49/17 49/24 53/15
79/12 80/20 82/16	96/10	71/1 83/9 83/18	maybe [2] 11/23 66/6	69/10 69/11 69/25
84/24 86/3 102/13	live [1] 41/3	managed [2] 3/10	me [63] 1/10 2/20	70/6 70/9 71/4 71/5
104/13 105/13 106/11	lobbying [1] 22/24	16/17	2/25 13/21 13/23 21/1	71/13 71/21 72/1
likely [3] 67/23 88/10	local [3] 104/10	management [8]	21/8 21/13 21/16	78/20 80/7 93/12
91/9	106/15 106/19	8/19 11/3 12/9 61/21	21/16 23/2 23/7 23/11	
limit [1] 109/2	location [1] 104/6	70/13 70/18 82/25	23/12 23/21 25/25	31/12 57/10
limited [41] 6/12 7/4	lodged [1] 104/2	83/22	26/12 26/24 27/4 27/4	members [5] 72/6
8/17 8/20 8/22 9/3 9/6 12/11 12/17 26/17	logic [1] 82/2	manages [1] 38/20	27/24 28/10 28/14	102/9 104/21 108/13
34/8 34/23 35/5 35/15	London [1] 5/3	managing [4] 83/11	29/13 30/4 38/24	109/4
36/10 36/14 38/19	long [9] 10/2 31/3	83/17 84/22 85/16	39/15 39/17 46/7	Memorandum [3]
44/1 51/16 53/8 62/14	34/9 44/16 69/25 83/6	manifesto [4] 6/15	51/15 56/4 57/5 58/6	95/4 95/5 95/14
68/17 69/3 74/14	96/22 96/23 97/3	7/15 21/3 106/6	65/17 65/20 66/3 69/2	Memorandums [1]
78/16 79/9 79/12	long-term [1] 34/9	manner [2] 85/17	73/9 73/11 77/10 80/3	94/24
79/15 79/16 79/20	longstanding [1]	109/18	80/8 81/2 81/7 81/17	memory [1] 65/12
83/8 83/10 83/16 88/3	50/10	Manufacturing [1]	81/19 81/20 82/18	mention [8] 14/19
88/10 89/25 90/3	look [3] 17/7 40/21	4/21	82/22 82/23 83/25	43/20 54/22 77/2 81/6
90/14 94/17 97/24	95/1	many [10] 30/18	84/10 84/13 86/3	97/4 108/17 108/21
100/24	looked [9] 2/5 9/13	36/24 36/25 43/18	86/20 86/22 89/12	mentioned [8] 44/19
Limited's [4] 12/12	40/16 45/8 62/20	72/20 73/9 91/4 94/1	90/25 91/5 95/25 96/2	
34/17 87/2 87/3	87/20 102/12 102/13	94/7 108/19	99/21 109/10	85/14 101/8 105/4
line [29] 9/23 12/6	102/22	March [2] 56/9 65/7	mean [33] 7/17 17/22	
24/4 25/10 28/2 28/4	looking [10] 13/8	March 2017 [1] 65/7	18/21 19/20 22/21	message [1] 90/3
28/16 28/21 28/23	14/1 24/24 25/21	Margot [6] 1/5 1/13	26/14 28/23 29/24	messages [1] 103/7
29/6 30/1 33/5 37/1	43/14 55/1 63/1 75/16		40/19 40/23 41/1	met [10] 9/13 19/8
59/15 59/22 59/24	76/13 96/10	110/2	41/16 43/7 44/13 53/5	
60/5 60/24 62/12 63/1	Lord [1] 91/20	marked [1] 63/16	54/10 62/8 62/8 62/24	
64/1 64/13 64/20	Lord Arbuthnot's [1]	market [2] 7/22 8/14	63/6 65/12 70/13	79/21 80/13
78/15 83/2 89/12	91/20	markets [2] 15/21	70/18 73/4 82/22 84/8	
89/15 92/18 92/24	loss [1] 103/10	32/3	84/17 96/3 97/2 97/10	
line 40 [1] 83/2	losses [3] 34/19 47/20 104/15	massive [2] 11/4 101/11	102/17 104/23 109/8	might [60] 6/3 9/13 10/6 10/14 20/9 20/10
lines [26] 9/24 10/5	lost [4] 14/22 14/22	material [2] 52/5	meaning [1] 106/20 means [2] 18/5 63/20	
12/8 22/1 24/2 24/13	87/16 98/20	100/10	meant [7] 12/11 50/4	23/20 26/2 26/2 26/4
24/13 24/14 25/7 25/7	lot [1] 17/23	matter [42] 10/10	54/4 54/9 85/20 90/15	
25/22 29/23 31/7 31/8	low [2] 7/13 7/24	13/10 16/18 31/23	103/1	29/25 31/5 31/6 31/7
40/12 43/15 54/25	lower [2] 6/16 6/24	31/24 36/5 38/18 39/9		41/2 41/18 42/8 45/15
58/7 58/8 58/15 59/4	lucky [1] 58/8	40/15 42/18 43/8	mechanism [1] 92/9	46/3 46/3 46/10 49/14
59/12 68/12 78/9	lulled [1] 56/4	43/17 43/18 44/9	media [9] 4/17 34/21	50/6 50/13 52/18
81/21 84/11	lunch [3] 67/2 67/3	48/22 51/18 52/13	38/14 38/22 58/22	52/24 53/3 62/20 69/4
link [1] 46/23	67/6	53/10 54/3 55/4 57/8	58/24 59/4 99/23	69/20 75/11 76/11
list [3] 61/23 94/2	lunchtime [1] 67/1	58/10 59/14 59/16	99/25	76/15 76/19 79/22
94/4		59/16 60/4 60/20	mediation [11] 35/16	85/14 87/17 88/20
listed [1] 47/16	M	60/22 61/19 61/21	35/18 35/20 35/23	90/22 90/23 93/3
litany [1] 107/12 literally [1] 31/5	machinery [1] 96/21	62/12 62/19 62/19	50/24 58/3 76/9 83/9	95/11 96/7 96/12 97/3
litigation [48] 14/21	made [14] 5/23 5/24	64/4 70/17 77/20	97/25 98/7 105/14	100/8 100/20 101/1
14/22 33/23 34/4	25/12 25/16 32/13	80/19 82/6 85/19	medical [1] 3/6	102/4 102/9 105/11
34/22 35/25 37/24	38/17 45/24 65/6	96/17 102/12 103/17	meet [8] 11/24 36/15	105/11 105/12
38/7 40/20 41/22	67/25 76/7 83/1 87/8	matter/legal [1]	45/1 50/4 69/17 72/5	milestone [1] 9/14
41/25 42/2 42/5 42/12	98/7 101/22	59/14	78/7 78/10	mind [3] 44/8 66/19
42/14 42/19 42/20	Mail [1] 48/7	matters [27] 4/11 8/6	meeting [34] 6/12	83/25
43/3 43/12 43/20	main [2] 5/15 75/23	8/7 10/13 10/25 11/2	6/18 22/23 47/13 48/2	minimal [1] 69/2
44/12 47/9 51/18	maintain [3] 13/10	11/5 11/15 12/16	48/3 48/4 48/6 50/1	minister [36] 4/15
52/19 52/20 54/6 55/1	84/24 87/4	16/14 17/12 24/7	51/10 51/13 51/15	11/19 13/22 13/24
58/16 58/18 60/15	maintaining [1] 84/15	30/19 34/10 41/9	51/21 51/23 52/3	15/3 15/8 16/4 20/13
62/15 65/4 65/6 65/6	maintenance [1] 7/8	51/20 55/18 60/16	52/12 52/18 53/22	22/13 22/23 23/3 23/4
65/10 65/15 65/18	majority [1] 19/7	63/13 63/14 75/13 76/2 76/3 96/2 96/12	53/24 54/11 55/25 62/23 63/10 69/24	24/18 24/20 26/5 26/7 26/11 28/10 41/5
		1012 1013 9012 90/12	02/23 03/10 09/24	20/11/20/10/41/3
				(20) like minister

(39) like - minister

[
M	97/9 99/17 100/23	Ms Vennells [3]	need [23] 7/20 10/5	6/13
	101/6 102/6 102/18	103/6 103/9 103/11	10/15 11/10 18/2	none [2] 30/22 97/10
minister [17] 41/13	102/24 102/25 103/2		23/19 34/10 42/3	
43/4 43/9 49/15 52/10		much [20] 2/20 36/21		normal [6] 5/22 10/8
53/17 54/23 57/23	104/4	36/22 37/2 37/7 45/18	42/14 47/16 48/20	15/16 24/9 89/9 89/10
	Moresby [1] 103/19	45/20 48/5 48/8 63/23	52/11 53/5 56/17	normally [5] 10/7
58/10 62/7 66/5 68/14	morning [8] 1/3 1/6	63/24 66/14 67/14	57/25 64/5 67/6 83/5	19/13 19/17 23/18
82/2 82/7 92/14 92/23				
93/7	1/11 2/5 2/15 46/11	97/18 105/19 105/20	85/22 85/24 99/3	100/6
	66/22 85/15	107/21 109/11 109/19	100/10 106/23	north [1] 70/24
minister's [1] 37/20	most [12] 7/10 11/20	109/20	needed [4] 14/23	not [139]
ministerial [13] 4/14				
16/16 18/14 19/6	14/24 17/11 17/17	multinational [1]	17/1 48/21 59/14	note [6] 21/13 23/21
24/15 24/25 40/6	19/7 41/4 60/22 76/7	3/12	needing [2] 6/1 17/20	40/13 47/12 77/2
	96/3 108/11 109/8	must [9] 10/23 11/12	negotiates [1] 79/16	105/24
84/23 85/1 92/5 92/14	mostly [4] 26/19	37/13 46/3 75/25	negotiations [1]	notes [1] 47/17
93/14 98/4				
ministers [23] 9/18	34/16 35/3 38/9	80/13 84/13 84/15	17/16	nothing [7] 29/25
	mounted [1] 89/10	84/15	neighbours [1] 6/17	49/5 50/13 50/13 51/2
11/10 11/12 11/17	move [2] 37/1 100/8	mutual [1] 97/6	neither [1] 57/1	61/10 104/23
11/22 11/24 12/1				
18/15 38/24 39/2 41/2	MP [4] 22/15 32/18	mutualised [1] 97/3	network [5] 6/17 7/5	noticed [1] 59/18
42/16 45/7 53/16	64/14 104/10	my [96] 1/17 2/4 2/6	7/16 38/20 108/13	noting [1] 45/1
	MP's [1] 22/7	9/20 13/22 14/7 14/8	never [5] 45/14 54/22	November [1] 56/9
54/18 77/5 82/25	MPs [5] 22/10 32/18	15/3 15/19 15/22 16/3	68/18 78/19 90/20	now [34] 1/5 1/5 1/6
83/19 83/23 85/12				
92/10 93/4 95/16	57/7 65/13 68/23	18/2 18/10 19/6 19/7	nevertheless [1]	2/12 4/25 13/14 16/7
	Mr [12] 47/5 68/1	21/7 21/9 21/11 21/14	75/4	30/4 45/22 46/13 48/1
Ministers' [2] 83/11	68/1 97/16 97/17 98/2	21/17 21/25 22/4 22/6	Neville [1] 98/15	52/19 56/6 60/15
83/17	105/21 105/22 100/2	23/22 24/17 26/11		66/18 68/3 71/22 72/6
minute [2] 27/7 71/19			Neville-Rolfe [1]	
minutes [7] 67/3	100/17 110/0 110/0	26/24 27/24 27/25	98/15	77/9 79/19 81/1 88/17
	Mr Callard [2] 47/5	29/15 31/1 31/4 31/6	new [8] 8/12 19/17	91/12 91/20 93/7 95/6
67/25 67/25 68/1 70/1	98/2	31/6 32/20 37/2 40/6	24/25 31/1 92/23	99/1 99/3 100/8 101/8
105/24 106/1				
miscarriage [1]	Mr Henry [5] 68/1	45/14 45/16 48/22	93/13 93/14 93/18	102/12 107/5 107/8
107/2	97/16 97/17 108/3	49/3 49/15 49/24 51/6	next [5] 17/16 35/18	107/18
	110/6	53/7 53/14 55/25	45/22 88/7 103/17	number [18] 4/19
misconduct [1]	Mr Seeney [1]	57/18 58/13 59/6	NFSP [10] 78/15	13/8 14/9 20/8 26/3
74/25				
misgiving [1] 74/7	108/17	60/13 61/10 63/1	78/22 79/10 79/15	27/10 27/15 34/16
missing [1] 103/25	Mr Stein [4] 68/1	63/10 64/25 66/19	79/19 79/21 79/25	35/3 35/21 50/15
	105/21 105/22 110/8	66/19 68/14 70/10	80/5 80/13 80/17	50/16 66/4 68/23
mistake [1] 51/7	Ms [45] 1/10 1/12	70/24 73/13 74/19	night [1] 107/17	69/23 90/17 94/10
misunderstood [1]				1 1
14/7	1/14 1/15 2/11 2/11	75/6 75/23 76/14	nine [2] 25/24 78/8	97/21
	2/21 15/4 38/6 40/9	77/17 78/13 78/16	no [67] 5/22 15/2	Number 10 [4] 20/8
mitigating [1] 83/14	40/12 47/2 47/5 48/25	78/17 78/19 80/13	15/2 20/22 25/9 27/12	26/3 27/10 27/15
mix [1] 94/13	51/9 58/17 64/25 66/2	81/9 81/22 82/6 84/9	27/15 27/16 30/16	number 6 [1] 97/21
mode [1] 53/17				
model [1] 97/10	66/11 66/17 66/25	84/18 85/5 85/23 86/4		number Two [1]
modernising [1] 6/17	67/7 68/4 68/7 68/11	87/12 87/13 87/15	33/12 34/20 35/10	90/17
	78/3 80/22 86/23	87/17 92/16 92/17	36/9 36/22 40/1 42/24	numbers [1] 50/18
moment [5] 24/25	89/21 93/23 97/14	92/18 92/19 93/1	46/8 47/21 48/4 48/13	
30/6 46/11 53/8 66/21				0
money [1] 104/1	97/18 99/7 99/15	93/15 93/16 93/17	49/10 49/10 49/13	
month [2] 66/9 98/4	103/6 103/9 103/11	101/9 103/5 105/18	52/11 54/1 54/10	obfuscation [1]
	105/18 106/3 106/4	108/2 109/10	54/23 57/5 57/11 62/2	102/14
monthly [1] 82/24	108/2 109/1 109/12	myself [9] 13/24 16/3		objection [1] 55/3
months [7] 25/24				objective [4] 7/9
28/5 49/20 49/20	109/14 110/4	25/12 27/7 27/21 61/9		
58/13 66/5 77/4	Ms James [14] 1/10	61/10 62/6 89/11	75/25 77/2 77/15 78/2	
	1/15 2/11 47/2 66/25	N	79/2 82/2 82/18 82/18	objectives [5] 9/2 9/4
moot [3] 52/25 53/1	67/7 68/7 97/14 97/18	N	84/23 87/9 88/16	9/12 63/24 94/21
96/11		name [4] 1/15 1/17		
more [49] 9/10 16/4	99/15 105/18 106/3		91/25 92/3 92/7 92/12	
17/20 19/8 21/4 29/15	109/1 109/14	31/14 44/18	92/12 92/12 92/16	observe [1] 27/5
	Ms James' [11] 2/11	National [4] 32/9	92/22 98/5 98/12	obstructing [1] 91/6
29/20 30/19 32/25	15/4 40/12 48/25 51/9		98/17 98/17 100/10	obvious [1] 40/24
34/12 34/14 44/22		nature [10] 9/21		obviously [8] 15/12
48/8 48/22 49/13	58/17 68/11 78/3		106/11 108/9 109/5	
49/22 50/8 50/23 51/5	80/22 89/21 93/23	13/18 13/20 18/1 19/5	nobody [1] 94/6	61/16 63/22 81/13
	Ms Price [13] 1/12	23/24 32/17 32/25	nodded [1] 56/25	89/16 90/6 108/23
57/3 57/14 57/15 58/6	1/14 2/21 40/9 64/25	49/19 83/7	nods [1] 86/13	109/8
65/21 67/3 69/4 73/7	66/2 66/11 66/17 68/4			
73/17 75/14 75/17			noise [2] 58/11 83/17	
75/19 75/22 78/6	99/7 108/2 109/12	necessarily [2] 63/14		48/11 48/13 100/4
	110/4	82/22	non-executive [1]	occasional [7] 49/4
85/13 85/24 88/10	Ms Thompson [3]	necessary [2] 18/15	4/22	49/7 49/12 49/14 50/9
91/18 94/13 94/24	38/6 47/5 86/23	66/25	non-financial [1]	51/1 75/10
	00/0 +7/0 00/20			
	1	1	1	

(40) minister... - occasional

	87/21 88/18 91/2	66/21 85/15 86/21	51/10 58/17 68/11	paragraph 20 [4]
0	91/12 91/19 93/12	99/25 109/17	68/12 78/4 79/4 80/23	paragraph 30 [1] 33/16
occasionally [6]	96/996/1297/22	out [14] 5/10 9/20	86/17 86/23 89/21	paragraph 35 [2]
19/23 22/11 23/20	102/2 106/19 109/1	10/1 10/1 14/21 28/18		40/11 43/14
28/8 69/17 72/5	ones [2] 28/9 84/14	30/18 51/8 53/11	96/11 103/17	paragraph 37 [1]
occasions [7] 11/24	ongoing [5] 55/17	77/10 81/10 100/14	page 1 [1] 86/23	75/15
69/18 69/19 71/12	65/4 68/21 88/5 98/9	102/22 107/14	page 10 [1] 15/5	paragraph 38 [1]
71/15 72/8 72/20	only [10] 9/10 26/12	outcome [3] 41/8	page 11 [1] 40/12	45/3
October [4] 31/13 32/15 33/9 66/14	58/11 59/6 61/9 71/14	41/11 52/20	page 12 [2] 45/4 45/5	paragraph 40 [1]
October 2016 [1]	71/25 84/11 90/3	outcomes [1] 41/3	page 13 [3] 48/25	48/24
33/9	99/10	outgoing [3] 78/7	79/4 80/23	paragraph 42 [1]
odds [1] 69/2	open [3] 7/12 82/14	78/10 80/5	page 14 [1] 34/24	80/22
Ofcom [1] 96/14	102/10	outlined [2] 23/11	page 15 [3] 6/7 51/10	
off [6] 31/5 42/15	operate [3] 8/13 9/6	49/3	68/11	89/1
74/17 94/4 102/15	32/4	outset [1] 2/19	page 18 [1] 58/17	paragraph 49 [2]
106/1	operated [2] 7/22 106/12	over [19] 1/12 6/2 8/24 9/8 22/5 24/5	page 2 [2] 44/21 86/17	51/9 68/10
offence [1] 14/11	operates [1] 34/9	31/19 33/3 33/25	page 23 [1] 78/4	paragraph 56 [1] 58/17
offered [2] 35/14	operating [2] 32/3	34/19 38/14 50/12	page 25 [1] 89/21	paragraph 57 [2]
76/11	106/13	62/8 93/17 94/14	page 26 [2] 93/23	59/3 99/8
offering [1] 8/13	operation [2] 12/6	97/16 98/20 103/14	93/24	paragraph 58 [1]
office [214]	12/14	103/25	page 28 [1] 1/23	59/9
Office's [7] 7/9 8/2	operational [23] 8/5	overall [3] 5/25 9/1	page 6 [1] 8/9	paragraph 65 [1]
31/18 38/11 61/4 89/12 98/19	9/17 10/7 10/13 10/24		page 8 [1] 18/9	64/15
Officer [2] 3/5 95/17	11/1 11/5 11/8 11/15	overlap [1] 64/2	paper [1] 80/12	paragraph 66 [1]
Officer's [1] 68/9	38/18 39/9 44/9 55/4	oversight [8] 5/19	papers [2] 76/4	64/16
official [4] 23/23	59/16 60/4 60/16	10/13 10/23 13/24	104/12	paragraph 67 [1]
95/18 96/1 96/1	60/20 62/12 62/19	55/18 94/1 96/15	paperwork [3] 16/16	64/17
officials [28] 16/8	63/13 63/16 64/4	96/16	21/17 23/15	paragraph 68 [1]
16/13 16/17 16/25	85/18	overstatement [2]	paragraph [54] 6/5	76/22
17/9 18/8 18/11 19/11	operations [6] 9/5 12/10 12/17 60/1	26/15 53/2	8/8 8/24 12/4 12/8 15/4 17/6 18/8 20/23	paragraph 70 [1] 78/3
20/24 21/12 21/16	63/22 61/2	overturn [1] 35/23 overview [4] 3/2 5/6	21/6 25/22 27/19	paragraph 71 [1]
23/14 23/16 24/3 24/6	opine [1] 41/14	33/21 34/7	31/17 32/1 33/16 34/6	
24/10 25/16 25/25	oninion [2] 95/5	owed [1] 8/20	34/13 35/18 36/17	paragraph 74 [3]
26/2 26/5 26/13 26/18	109/10	own [14] 15/19 19/4	39/5 40/11 43/14 45/3	
27/8 83/23 92/21	opportunity [5] 2/20	20/13 31/4 31/6 60/1	48/24 51/9 56/22	paragraph 79 [1]
94/25 96/4 98/23	77/4 77/9 78/12 94/25		58/17 58/21 59/3 59/9	
often [4] 21/14 26/1 79/12 99/19	opposed [4] 86/9	94/12 95/13 104/1	64/15 64/16 64/17	paragraph 81 [1]
oh [2] 48/7 90/15	95/8 99/16 99/17	106/14 107/14	68/10 69/8 75/15	96/10
okay [2] 2/16 86/12	optics [1] 99/16	owned [10] 8/11	76/22 78/3 80/22	paragraphs [6] 5/11
omit [2] 100/16	option [4] 19/16	10/11 11/18 16/1 32/2		8/7 32/12 56/10 56/16
103/23	96/19 97/4 97/5	43/1 43/3 95/11 97/1	89/20 89/22 91/14	80/18
omitted [1] 44/6	options [5] 19/15	97/9	93/22 96/10 99/3 99/8	
on [250]	83/20 85/9 96/11 96/16	owner [3] 16/6 60/23 61/18	99/8 100/11 102/2 102/3 106/22	5/11
once [6] 17/21 41/9	or [120]		paragraph 15 [1] 6/5	paragraphs 20 [1] 8/7
45/24 49/21 71/25	orchestrated [2]	ownership [3] 8/19	paragraph 2 [1]	paragraphs 51 [1]
106/3	97/23 105/7	11/3 15/12	106/22	56/16
one [63] 5/12 5/23	order [4] 10/22 22/2		paragraph 20 [1] 8/8	
8/6 11/9 19/8 33/18	65/15 96/20	P	paragraph 21 [1]	77/25
39/2 40/4 40/16 41/22 42/25 43/19 43/20	organisation [2]	pack [17] 30/20	8/24	Parker's [1] 100/13
44/21 45/13 45/16	61/19 79/12	33/18 34/7 39/3 43/19	P J P L_1	Parliament [9] 3/20
45/19 46/5 46/7 46/8	original [2] 2/3 81/20	43/20 45/13 45/24	56/22 69/8	4/1 4/19 31/12 58/11
49/3 49/24 51/7 51/8	other [16] 8/7 18/4	49/3 53/12 55/21	paragraph 23 [2]	58/13 92/5 95/15
52/16 53/11 57/7	20/6 20/8 20/9 33/1	56/13 56/19 58/10	12/4 12/8	95/23
57/11 57/23 61/5	44/17 70/19 74/22	63/10 64/17 93/11	paragraph 25 [1]	Parliamentarians [2]
63/10 65/5 65/15 66/9	82/3 92/24 94/4 94/15	page [37] 1/23 6/7 8/9 8/24 12/5 15/5	17/6	41/5 91/23
66/13 70/17 71/6	96/14 99/12 104/15 others [3] 51/25	18/9 25/21 27/19	paragraph 26 [3] 18/8 20/23 25/22	Parliamentary [14] 4/5 5/7 15/1 21/2
71/12 71/14 71/19	69/13 88/25	31/15 31/16 33/25	paragraph 27 [2]	33/15 56/8 56/23
	otherwise [1] 7/18	34/24 40/12 44/21	21/6 27/19	57/12 58/7 73/2 88/23
75/13 77/19 77/19	our [11] 36/4 38/20	45/4 45/5 45/5 47/13	paragraph 29 [1]	92/1 92/10 92/24
79/3 82/3 82/7 87/20	39/3 41/3 54/13 58/24	47/15 47/15 48/25	15/4	part [15] 8/1 8/3
1	1			

(41) occasionally - part

Р	95/17 101/10	8/6 9/1 9/18 9/23	prepared [4] 16/22	pro bono [1] 4/25
		10/10 10/14 11/16	23/10 76/9 83/19	proactive [1] 91/18
part [13] 12/17 16/9	persevere [1] 73/25	12/7 12/24 13/10 14/3		proactively [3] 52/24
16/19 19/10 26/1 56/12 61/9 72/12	persevered [1] 73/20	15/23 16/18 18/11	85/9	68/18 83/16
73/14 87/13 89/12	persists [1] 34/21	21/4 21/22 24/2 24/4	presence [2] 82/3	probably [23] 10/1
	person [4] 2/25 19/3	24/13 24/13 24/14	82/8	48/7 49/25 60/12 66/6
89/14 104/21	31/3 59/19	25/7 28/15 33/2 36/25	present [2] 2/22	67/3 69/22 70/1 71/6
partial [3] 55/9 63/9 82/6	personal [2] 69/1	53/21 63/14 102/14	92/21	71/9 71/15 72/18
	108/22	politely [1] 72/10	presented [1] 29/13	72/22 74/2 74/3 74/6
partiality [3] 20/3 20/16 20/19	personally [2] 23/7	Political [1] 5/4	presenting [1] 50/21	74/11 85/14 87/19
Participant [1] 67/4	33/4	pools [1] 16/13	preserving [1] 85/2	90/1 96/22 100/4
Participants [2]	persuaded [1] 89/11	poor [1] 40/24	President [1] 3/17	101/21
67/11 67/23	pertain [1] 10/18	poorer [1] 7/18	press [13] 38/21	probed [1] 51/5
particular [22] 5/8	pertaining [1] 60/1	portfolio [9] 5/6 5/8	54/25 58/15 59/2 59/8	problem [7] 29/14
6/19 6/24 16/18 18/20	pharmaceutical [1]	5/18 5/24 6/4 15/19	59/20 99/14 99/15	50/10 50/14 94/5 94/6
23/19 26/4 26/10 28/7	3/7	18/11 26/9 70/24	99/17 99/20 100/3	94/15 101/11
32/14 35/21 39/18	physically [1] 3/1	portfolios [1] 18/15	100/5 100/7	problems [7] 32/22
42/11 48/4 56/23	pick [2] 102/2 103/14		pressed [1] 46/7	35/11 47/19 75/4
62/21 65/1 66/1 74/13	picked [1] 33/9	21/21 21/22 21/22	pressure [2] 100/21	75/11 93/25 98/12
84/1 87/3 96/4	Picking [2] 7/7 39/5	41/10 42/25 43/16	102/5	proceedings [7]
particularly [9] 7/17	place [5] 62/11 95/5	43/17 58/5 59/18	prestigious [1]	31/22 36/3 40/14
10/10 15/18 15/24	95/6 105/14 106/15	59/21 61/11 62/3	106/19	47/23 55/19 62/13
17/15 18/6 24/21	places [2] 32/5 53/15	76/14 83/20 84/25	presumably [1]	87/5
41/22 77/7	planning [1] 7/2	85/2 85/10 95/10	84/20	proceedings' [1]
parties [1] 41/23	played [1] 8/1	possession [1] 61/13		59/14
partners [2] 108/8	player [1] 20/12	possible [1] 68/2	81/14	process [9] 21/5 30/9
109/4	players [3] 94/1 94/7	possibly [10] 50/6	pretty [3] 24/8 36/22	40/21 40/25 42/22
partnership [1] 79/11	94/10	51/6 55/10 63/6 72/1	90/9	65/7 80/14 89/9 92/23
parts [1] 7/21	please [49] 1/15 1/24	77/19 77/21 80/19	prevent [2] 43/4	processes [3] 35/16
party [2] 42/19 87/1	3/2 6/7 8/8 12/5 15/4	101/13 104/1	55/17	50/25 88/2
pass [3] 38/21 54/21	16/8 18/9 25/21 27/20 31/10 31/16 33/13		previous [8] 24/15 81/8 81/10 84/4 84/18	produced [3] 36/19 82/23 91/7
59/12	33/19 33/25 37/25	postal [13] 5/11 6/5 6/8 7/2 8/17 8/18	85/1 92/5 93/7	
passage [1] 99/7	38/24 40/11 45/4 45/5			professional [1] 3/3 profile [1] 42/12
passed [1] 60/24	46/14 47/11 47/15	28/10 30/19 48/6	56/20	Project [6] 48/1 83/2
past [1] 92/10	48/24 51/9 51/24	postmaster [5] 32/7	Price [15] 1/12 1/14	87/23 97/22 100/16
Paula [7] 51/11 51/25	58/16 66/22 67/16	103/10 103/16 103/24		100/18
52/1 53/24 62/21 73/6	68/5 68/7 68/10 69/6	104/8	66/2 66/11 66/17 68/4	
103/8	74/21 78/4 79/3 80/20		99/7 106/4 108/2	45/8 45/17
pay [1] 107/13	80/22 82/11 82/13	32/7 32/11 38/9 38/9	109/12 110/4	prompt [1] 34/11
penultimate [2]	86/16 86/17 87/21	47/19 50/15 50/16	prime [2] 20/12 57/22	proper [1] 54/12
31/17 86/24	87/25 89/20 93/22	65/9 65/20 75/12	Principal [1] 95/17	properly [2] 100/9
people [20] 12/21	94/14 103/17	104/22 105/1 105/10	principle [3] 41/4	100/25
13/11 14/9 21/25	pledge [1] 106/6	105/15	41/15 42/18	proportion [1] 24/2
25/17 28/13 29/12	plus [1] 67/3	postscript [2] 27/23	principles [2] 85/7	proposed [4] 24/13
37/9 37/14 50/5 50/18 64/9 73/4 75/3 85/6	pm [3] 67/18 67/20	30/10	85/8	39/8 43/11 43/12
89/13 95/13 106/11	109/23	potential [7] 11/16	prior [2] 78/18 80/12	prosecuted [2] 12/22
107/23 108/16	point [22] 13/25	13/12 15/6 58/12 88/8		37/16
people's [2] 108/20	25/19 31/9 33/11	94/8 94/9	priority [2] 48/17	prosecutions [6]
108/22	36/24 39/23 52/9	potentially [6] 14/20	48/22	14/2 14/14 88/24 89/3
per [2] 44/13 82/20	52/13 52/25 53/1 53/9		prison [1] 14/9	89/6 89/9
perceived [1] 88/6	59/15 61/12 62/3 77/4		private [29] 15/25	protect [1] 7/16
perception [1] 27/8	77/10 81/22 92/13	power [1] 94/19		
perfect [1] 68/4	94/11 101/6 107/22	pre [1] 6/1	21/18 21/25 22/4 22/5	
perfectly [1] 3/1	109/1	pre-identified [1] 6/1	22/6 22/16 22/21 23/2	
perform [1] 15/16	pointed [1] 81/25	precise [2] 28/6 36/2	23/3 23/16 23/22	44/11 45/2 45/6 54/18
performed [1] 10/11	points [4] 14/25 22/2	preclude [4] 2/24	37/23 39/7 41/22	55/12 63/7 92/4 93/5
perhaps [6] 10/5	52/4 93/6	41/6 41/21 43/7	45/16 64/8 86/18	provided [21] 16/10
16/5 27/2 43/16 46/9	POL [3] 17/23 84/12	predecessor [3]	87/14 88/24 89/6 92/4	16/13 19/14 20/20
107/11	100/21 POL 00244227 [4]	24/22 92/17 93/17	93/15 93/15 99/5	20/21 20/25 23/21
period [1] 65/2	POL00244227 [1] 51/24	preferable [1] 67/10 preferred [1] 109/19	privately [1] 89/3 privilege [2] 87/4	24/6 35/2 40/13 42/3 43/18 47/13 56/12
periodically [1] 24/16	policies [1] 24/24	prejudice [1] 41/2	102/16	57/12 61/23 62/14
Permanent [3] 74/2	policy [30] 5/12 7/9	prepare [1] 90/25	pro [1] 4/25	64/13 94/23 99/5
		hichaic [1] 30123		0 1 10 0 1 20 0010
				(12) port provided

(42) part... - provided

P	81/16 84/22 99/19	54/11 58/11 62/16	100/16 106/24	remain [5] 32/10 36/4
provided [1] 103/6	101/4 101/19 107/11	64/9 71/2 71/14 74/16		37/21 40/14 82/7
providers [1] 3/7	108/4 108/25	75/7 85/3 89/5 92/21	7/7 37/25 41/25 44/14	
provides [2] 7/3	Questioned [6] 1/14	93/1 95/12	80/24 81/25 82/7	49/1 68/15 69/13 74/4
19/15	97/17 105/22 110/4	reason [12] 18/17	referred [5] 21/12	74/5 74/16 79/2 99/6
providing [7] 1/19	110/6 110/8	19/12 19/18 19/23	42/21 43/23 50/1	remind [3] 54/13
3/5 17/14 19/3 54/19	questioning [4] 23/5	20/1 20/4 20/6 20/10	69/11	57/25 77/10
66/15 109/17	69/9 78/12 86/2 questions [24] 1/17	20/14 31/21 53/23 85/12	referring [7] 40/15 52/2 58/25 59/5 100/1	reminded [1] 76/23
PS [3] 25/14 29/11	12/14 17/3 21/2 35/13		104/10 106/6	reminding [1] 83/25 remit [1] 15/22
31/6	42/9 45/20 57/18	reassurance [2]	refers [2] 31/22	remote [1] 43/22
public [13] 3/6 9/9	66/19 67/4 67/24	78/18 78/21	34/14	remotely [1] 1/6
16/1 20/5 20/15 22/12	68/19 74/19 74/22	reassured [1] 78/14	reflect [1] 28/12	remove [1] 11/22
26/7 38/17 41/16	75/5 75/6 78/16 86/4	recall [16] 46/5 48/1	reflections [2] 75/13	removed [1] 42/25
41/18 44/16 94/22 97/7	97/13 105/18 105/23	48/3 48/14 51/16	93/20	remuneration [2]
publicly [6] 8/11	106/3 108/1 108/2	52/23 64/22 64/23	refused [1] 87/8	17/12 79/17
15/24 16/1 32/2 42/20	quickly [1] 31/16	65/14 65/16 65/20	regard [3] 19/2 60/3	repeat [1] 29/22
55/16	quite [15] 6/9 11/2	70/16 71/8 73/18 98/6		repeated [1] 56/19
publicly-owned [1]	17/19 28/23 61/6	106/9	regardless [2] 53/8	replacement [1]
16/1	62/16 66/9 70/12	receipt [1] 97/7	57/18 Bagia [4] 107/6	43/23
published [3] 2/13	70/24 80/19 81/15 96/7 99/24 100/6	receive [5] 34/12 36/13 44/22 44/25	Regis [1] 107/6	replied [1] 23/2
35/8 35/9	101/5	45/15	register [7] 82/12 82/14 82/16 84/1	replies [6] 24/7 27/17 27/25 30/6 30/8 33/10
pulled [1] 52/5	quo [1] 94/15	received [17] 17/19	84/15 87/22 97/20	reply [2] 22/22 28/20
purely [3] 7/22 16/6	quote [2] 58/21	18/10 21/7 27/13 28/8		replying [1] 22/18
94/21	102/22	28/11 30/21 32/18	87/20	report [22] 35/8 35/9
purpose [8] 7/5 10/15 10/20 31/21	quoted [1] 15/25	35/22 47/2 56/20	regret [4] 37/7 45/16	35/13 43/24 43/24
57/14 57/20 57/23		58/19 65/3 66/4 66/6	45/18 90/6	61/24 71/20 74/20
100/12	R	75/2 79/19	regrettable [1] 61/8	81/5 81/12 81/21 82/3
purposes [8] 2/10	radar [1] 85/21	receiving [2] 55/5	regrettably [1] 25/11	82/4 82/7 90/16 90/18
30/21 66/13 73/11	radical [1] 97/12	65/14	regular [1] 107/14	91/1 91/8 91/11
95/3 106/7 106/8	raise [11] 8/12 17/2 29/8 29/15 71/5 73/2	recent [1] 92/1	regularly [2] 47/25	100/14 100/22 101/17
106/14	73/23 73/24 74/10	recently [2] 79/9 94/24	70/24	reported [1] 91/3 reports [35] 36/18
pursued [1] 48/19	77/25 103/7	94/24 recipient [2] 19/1	regulated [1] 97/1 regulatory [2] 96/15	36/19 43/25 44/3
pushback [1] 73/21	raised [18] 22/2	31/9	96/16	44/14 44/15 44/17
put [15] 7/11 23/9	29/20 34/17 35/13	reckoning [3] 100/24		44/18 54/17 61/22
31/4 58/4 66/18 68/20	36/7 57/11 71/8 71/13	102/7 102/19	reiteration [1] 75/7	61/24 62/5 80/25 81/1
70/8 71/17 76/9 84/4 100/21 102/1 102/5	71/25 72/7 72/17 73/1		relate [1] 38/10	81/3 81/6 82/3 82/23
102/20 104/4	73/9 73/15 74/6 74/7	recollection [1]	related [3] 16/9 34/2	89/24 90/3 90/6 90/8
putting [4] 63/16	76/4 80/8	45/14	82/15	94/17 100/20 100/23
102/15 104/1 105/14	raising [1] 68/23	recommend [3]	relating [7] 33/14	101/8 102/4 102/7
PVEN00000503 [1]	random [1] 71/24 range [2] 56/13 56/15	34/11 36/13 87/4	33/18 40/20 41/25	
103/6	rather [10] 9/24	recommendation [3] 44/21 44/23 76/17	51/20 55/7 95/15	102/18 102/24 102/25 103/2
Q	14/13 47/8 66/17 90/2		relation [10] 24/12 27/2 37/21 52/21	representative [6]
	97/1 100/22 102/5	[6] 45/23 46/2 62/10	57/21 75/21 91/18	11/19 17/22 32/11
QC [2] 83/11 84/13	102/18 103/1	100/22 101/3 101/17	93/21 99/23 106/4	78/14 84/21 94/16
qualify [1] 97/6 quality [3] 11/7 76/2	reach [4] 23/2 23/11	recommended [1]	relations [1] 3/6	representatives [5]
89/17	36/9 81/18	44/25	relationship [2] 32/6	29/17 49/25 69/21
Quarter [1] 60/13	reached [1] 41/10	recompense [1]	79/15	73/22 105/16
Quarter 1 [1] 60/13	reaction [1] 54/2	109/5	relevant [9] 4/11	reputationally [1]
quarterly [5] 29/18	reactive [1] 53/17	reconcile [1] 107/16	12/24 13/1 13/19	14/20
69/10 69/10 69/25	read [11] 21/15 36/20 46/1 81/1 83/5 84/3		42/21 44/18 58/3 66/5	
71/4	84/9 90/2 90/2 90/23	recovering [2] 67/7 109/15	92/10 reliability [1] 98/19	108/22 request [4] 87/7 92/1
Queen's [1] 100/15	102/22	red [4] 91/13 91/17	reliant [1] 18/18	99/11 104/2
querying [1] 65/2	reading [2] 41/19	91/20 102/16	relied [4] 13/10 18/11	requested [1] 37/3
question [27] 5/22 13/6 18/4 26/23 27/2	80/12	redress [1] 109/6	21/16 29/23	requests [2] 22/24
27/4 27/6 30/6 53/7	readout [1] 71/20	reduce [1] 9/8	reluctance [3] 72/11	22/24
57/18 61/6 63/1 66/14	reads [1] 97/22	reduced [1] 69/23	72/25 73/14	require [5] 24/16
73/13 73/23 74/13	real [1] 58/5	reducing [1] 94/22	reluctant [5] 68/19	26/5 26/13 26/14
74/19 74/22 80/2	really [17] 20/17	refer [8] 43/25 45/6	72/3 77/8 78/1 91/10	34/11
	23/17 26/13 43/8	56/17 58/1 66/2 77/22	rely [2] 20/24 23/14	required [6] 19/3
	•	•	•	(43) provided - required

(43) provided... - required

R	rewrote [1] 29/9	107/3	31/15 35/6 35/8 36/17	September [2] 51/11
required [5] 21/17		same [7] 22/14 54/18		52/3
23/15 54/10 76/15	right [49] 3/8 3/13	61/5 72/12 74/18 82/5		series [1] 35/15
76/19	3/25 4/8 4/9 4/18 5/2	82/9	51/8 54/17 54/20	servant [1] 96/8
requirements [1]	5/16 5/17 13/17 14/13		66/22 71/11 74/11	servants [2] 42/15
71/1	16/20 16/21 17/5 23/5		74/20 81/21 81/25	96/6
requires [1] 18/21	27/6 31/14 33/22 38/4		89/23 90/6 90/15	serve [2] 57/14 63/12
requiring [2] 13/24	42/2 42/13 42/21 43/7	saw [4] 17/11 17/17	90/15 90/16 91/2 91/3	served [7] 3/23 4/1
101/2	43/13 46/15 47/3 47/9	44/20 52/15	91/11	4/4 57/20 100/23
resolve [3] 12/17	47/10 56/9 56/14	say [80] 2/18 6/9 6/25		102/7 102/19
96/19 96/21	56/20 61/4 64/18	7/23 8/9 8/24 12/8	21/10 21/18 22/16	serves [1] 106/8
resolved [5] 35/20	64/25 65/5 65/23 66/1	16/22 17/6 18/3 19/6	23/16	service [8] 7/20
54/4 55/4 59/17 71/10	66/8 67/12 77/16	20/23 22/16 25/13	secretary [20] 4/5	18/12 18/21 54/14
resource [1] 17/20	78/22 84/3 84/8 85/14		5/7 15/1 20/13 22/5	85/3 93/5 96/6 97/4
respect [2] 2/23 7/19	90/7 99/24 100/6	36/22 37/4 41/2 41/19		services [12] 3/6
respected [1] 10/19	101/18 109/11	41/24 42/21 43/15	62/7 73/2 74/2 74/3	4/22 6/18 6/20 6/20
respective [1] 93/4	right-hand [1] 31/14	45/11 47/12 47/17	74/5 74/8 87/14 88/23	
respond [2] 21/19	rightly [1] 63/23	48/5 48/25 50/20	95/18 101/9 101/10	23/23 28/10 48/6
22/2	rise [1] 94/3	51/12 53/1 53/13	section [2] 58/22	session [4] 64/14
response [22] 21/14	risk [13] 82/12 82/14	53/20 56/19 59/3	95/14	81/9 81/11 84/19
22/8 23/12 27/24	82/16 82/21 84/1	60/13 61/22 66/4 66/7 67/9 67/12 68/13 69/8	sector [3] 4/23 23/3	set [10] 5/9 9/20 10/1
28/15 28/19 29/7	84/15 87/20 87/22			10/1 34/8 50/23 53/11
29/20 29/22 31/4	87/25 88/5 94/20 97/20 97/21	72/17 72/22 72/22	securing [2] 6/15 7/2	98/1 100/14 109/2
32/16 32/20 32/24	risks [3] 83/3 87/24	72/23 75/15 75/25	security [1] 56/4 see [23] 1/3 1/8 1/10	setting [1] 9/1
39/19 60/9 61/15	risks [3] 83/3 87/24 88/14	78/7 78/9 78/24 80/10		settings [1] 104/15 seven [1] 31/7
74/18 78/16 86/21	robust [1] 104/17	80/25 81/7 84/17 89/1		several [2] 44/6 80/7
86/23 87/2 87/3	rogue [1] 85/8	89/24 90/13 91/13	39/17 41/12 46/20	shall [2] 67/14 97/16
responses [8] 21/2	role [34] 4/10 5/9 7/8	91/14 91/19 93/8	61/8 62/24 67/11	share [2] 81/12 84/19
22/1 24/1 24/4 24/12	7/9 8/2 8/25 10/11	93/10 93/24 94/14	81/15 84/9 84/9 84/10	shared [2] 38/16 91/5
27/21 27/22 92/5	11/17 12/19 13/4 13/9		84/11 84/12 102/9	shareholder [9] 8/25
responsibilities [4]	15/7 15/12 15/12 16/9		seeing [4] 47/19	9/9 9/11 11/18 15/8
5/14 6/9 15/16 92/20	16/19 25/8 28/5 33/15		81/14 86/13 105/5	15/11 15/12 16/5
responsibility [20]	33/17 33/21 37/2	saying [11] 7/16	seek [2] 99/20 100/7	63/19
3/17 4/6 5/13 5/15	37/20 49/18 58/14	19/10 22/18 22/19	seeking [1] 100/5	shareholders [4]
5/16 10/18 11/22	72/14 77/3 82/13 89/8		seem [1] 73/24	10/16 11/4 15/17 64/3
13/23 15/7 15/14	91/22 92/14 93/13	71/14 74/18 85/12	seemed [3] 28/13	sharing [2] 103/12
15/20 15/20 15/23	94/25 96/14	102/23	30/16 54/9	104/8
23/22 38/19 39/9 48/18 63/21 83/8 98/4	roles [2] 4/19 4/22	says [8] 31/17 34/6	seems [3] 42/10	she [14] 22/7 53/18
responsible [6] 5/10	Rolfe [1] 98/15	34/15 35/19 38/6	71/24 98/18	59/19 66/2 86/24
9/1 15/8 22/6 25/17	room [1] 2/22	58/23 86/19 86/24	seen [11] 30/7 30/12	98/15 98/17 98/18
70/19	roughly [1] 72/14	scale [1] 13/20	39/13 39/14 61/22	99/2 99/2 103/9
rests [1] 83/8	route [3] 37/19 97/1	scenes [1] 17/24	71/16 82/16 82/20	103/25 104/1 104/2
result [1] 14/10	97/1	scheme [9] 35/18	94/23 101/1 104/12	she's [1] 55/11
resulting [1] 14/2	routine [2] 6/21	50/24 58/3 76/9 77/16		Sheffield [1] 70/22
resume [2] 67/15	51/14	83/9 98/1 98/7 105/14		ShEx [2] 65/9 98/24
109/21	routinely [1] 25/6	School [1] 5/3	selective [2] 44/6	shocked [1] 89/5
retail [1] 8/14	Royal [2] 48/7 48/7	Science [1] 5/4	56/2	short [6] 34/10 46/18
retain [2] 30/17 106/7	ruinous [1] 101/24	scope [1] 100/12	send [2] 28/20 86/20	67/9 67/19 86/2 88/11
retained [3] 30/14	rule [2] 25/9 88/9	scratch [1] 98/21	sending [1] 25/15	short-term [2] 34/10
30/15 71/23	rules [1] 2/24	screen [24] 6/6 15/4	senior [2] 42/15	88/11
returned [3] 21/13	run [2] 12/21 13/11	18/9 31/10 33/19	95/18	shortfalls [1] 107/13
21/15 30/25	running [2] 7/23 9/5	37/24 40/11 47/11	sense [3] 7/12 13/19	shortly [1] 39/16
reveal [1] 91/10	rural [5] 6/16 6/24	48/24 51/24 55/22	93/5	should [58] 8/11
reverse [1] 64/2	7/13 7/17 7/24	58/16 68/10 71/17	senses [1] 96/3	
review [12] 20/25	S	78/4 79/3 80/18 80/22		
21/23 36/6 36/8 37/13		82/11 86/16 87/21	sent [6] 22/10 30/18	36/4 37/5 37/5 37/21
44/3 76/12 80/25	sadly [1] 105/1	89/20 93/22 100/11	37/23 38/15 82/18	
81/24 83/11 84/12	safe [1] 72/22 safely [1] 70/7	scrutiny [2] 75/8	82/23	
100/13	safety [1] 37/9	98/11	sentence [4] 26/13	54/12 54/12 55/15
reviewed [1] 37/12	said [11] 29/10 37/10	sealed [1] 63/16	57/17 80/23 102/2	55/17 60/18 60/19 60/22 61/22 63/4
reviews [1] 43/25	42/24 46/3 51/5 63/25	searching [1] 107/23 seat [1] 24/25	sentences [1] 27/18 separated [1] 8/19	63/15 64/7 67/24 68/1
rewriting [1] 25/14	84/5 90/18 99/9 102/9		separately [1] 72/7	70/13 77/17 77/19
				(14) required should

(44) required... - should

S	6/22 34/16 35/3 50/19	57/16 62/16 65/10	starting [8] 12/7	29/7 30/7 32/10 34/16
should [21] 77/22	SMEs [1] 6/20	66/11 73/8 73/12	25/22 29/6 40/12	35/4 35/14 60/6 60/10
77/24 78/2 81/24 85/7	so [85] 3/1 7/14 7/19	90/15 92/17	68/12 69/6 86/17	64/21 65/1 65/4 65/13
85/17 85/20 89/23	14/5 14/5 16/3 17/17	sort [16] 15/3 21/21	98/21	68/24 68/25 74/24
90/2 90/18 96/13	17/22 18/13 18/20	22/24 24/9 28/7 29/2	state [13] 4/5 4/15	75/21 76/11 78/8
96/14 100/12 100/17	19/1 21/24 22/16	29/18 37/1 40/7 51/4	20/13 40/2 56/4 62/7	78/11 78/13 79/7
100/19 101/9 101/15	24/10 24/17 24/24	75/5 80/6 84/25 99/11	74/2 74/5 74/8 78/18	79/18 79/25 88/25
101/18 102/23 102/23	27/8 27/12 30/13	104/24 105/9	92/15 96/24 101/10	104/14 104/18 106/25
103/2	32/15 32/20 33/9	sorts [1] 76/16	statement [44] 1/20	108/7
shouldn't [4] 40/25	33/20 37/2 39/11 41/13 42/12 42/18	sought [2] 53/15 77/19	1/21 1/24 2/1 2/7 2/11 2/12 2/15 3/4 5/9 6/6	subpostmasters' [1] 35/17
43/7 53/6 57/16	43/9 44/8 44/16 45/10		8/8 12/4 15/5 16/7	subpostmistress [1]
show [2] 30/8 65/1	46/13 48/8 49/21 51/3		17/6 18/8 33/17 40/12	
showed [2] 84/7	54/21 55/12 55/14	SpAds [1] 38/24	43/14 45/4 47/12	subpostmistresses
103/25	55/22 58/1 60/6 61/16		48/25 51/10 56/10	[2] 106/25 108/7
showing [1] 84/10	63/18 64/19 65/7	Sparrow [5] 48/2	56/17 56/22 58/17	subsequent [1]
shut [1] 72/9 side [1] 12/5	66/14 66/23 67/3	52/10 83/2 87/24	68/11 69/7 75/16	43/25
Sight [15] 35/6 43/24	67/11 67/14 68/1	97/22	76/22 77/2 78/3 80/23	subsidiary [2] 3/11
44/14 44/15 51/6	70/23 71/10 71/19	Sparrow' [1] 47/18	85/1 88/22 89/21	3/14
54/17 54/20 74/20	72/18 73/22 73/23	speak [4] 61/9 68/19	91/14 93/23 96/12	subsidy [8] 7/4 7/19
81/21 81/25 89/23	74/10 76/5 76/15	103/18 107/25	99/4 106/22 108/14	17/13 17/17 76/25
90/6 90/15 90/16 91/2	80/12 81/12 81/15	speaking [2] 16/13	states [1] 95/6	94/22 97/7 97/8
Sight's [1] 35/8	81/22 82/12 84/15	72/14	status [2] 94/15 97/6	substance [8] 23/8
sign [2] 23/13 31/2	87/16 91/17 92/21	Special [4] 39/24	statutory [1] 5/13	23/10 24/6 42/5 42/13
signature [5] 2/2 2/3	94/6 95/11 97/8 97/18 98/18 98/22 98/22	39/25 40/1 40/6	steers [1] 21/1	74/9 99/16 100/7
2/4 2/6 31/6	99/2 105/19 107/21	specific [8] 2/15 10/20 26/8 27/17 47/8	Stein [4] 68/1 105/21 105/22 110/8	substantial [3] 33/11 33/12 101/14
signed [1] 42/15	107/24 108/9 108/19	48/12 61/7 66/18	step [1] 42/25	succeeded [1] 98/15
significant [6] 6/2 7/1	109/18 109/19	specifically [6] 34/3	steps [1] 52/21	successfully [1]
7/21 50/14 88/8 88/11	social [10] 7/5 7/7	39/6 46/4 51/19 57/1	sticking [1] 30/5	31/19
signing [2] 24/22	7/9 7/13 8/2 10/11	87/23	still [5] 26/24 46/20	successive [1] 8/10
24/23	10/15 10/20 13/9	spend [1] 107/17	46/23 57/25 67/2	successor [2] 92/17
silent [1] 82/8	106/8	spending [2] 107/20	stood [1] 3/23	98/16
Simon [3] 44/2 80/24 81/22	socially [1] 106/20	108/17	stop [1] 53/7	successors [1] 76/10
simply [5] 7/11 60/16	sold [1] 3/10	spite [1] 98/10	strange [1] 71/22	such [14] 2/14 8/1
68/20 101/2 106/23	sole [2] 8/25 94/22	SPM [1] 51/17	strategic [5] 9/12	9/7 9/13 10/22 30/8
since [7] 4/19 35/23	solicitor [1] 38/16	spoke [2] 23/19	11/8 13/2 13/2 76/24	38/20 55/18 57/10
36/8 52/5 89/16 104/2	solve [1] 97/10	107/3	strategy [19] 4/8 4/14	
105/25	some [38] 4/10 6/20	Sport [1] 4/17	8/7 9/1 9/18 9/23	107/1
sir [27] 1/3 1/8 1/11	9/20 19/14 19/15 19/20 20/2 20/16	staff [3] 7/25 92/4 108/12	10/14 11/16 12/7 12/24 14/4 34/9 42/5	suffer [1] 47/20 suffered [1] 104/14
2/21 40/10 46/10	22/11 22/11 22/22	staffed [2] 12/21	42/14 43/12 63/14	suffering [1] 32/23
46/16 46/20 46/24	23/1 24/20 29/2 32/25		64/1 75/25 99/18	suggest [5] 47/24
47/1 66/12 66/20	33/1 34/10 35/13	stage [8] 14/12 36/2	strike [2] 13/23 80/3	58/24 59/1 99/25
66/21 67/13 67/16	35/14 35/20 38/13	37/4 60/6 62/25 87/5	strikes [1] 53/19	100/2
67/21 68/6 85/22 86/6	42/9 47/20 50/12 52/6	87/11 101/2	strongly [3] 55/20	suggested [1] 59/12
86/11 86/15 93/10 97/13 105/23 106/2	56/7 68/24 71/17 74/1		55/20 106/17	suggestion [1] 48/10
109/13 109/22	75/11 75/18 78/13	20/9 79/6 83/9 94/12	struck [1] 27/24	suggests [1] 75/18
Sir Wyn [3] 1/11 2/21	79/18 79/25 80/16	stance [2] 78/21	structural [2] 49/5	summarise [1] 89/1
93/10	85/10 102/9 108/15	79/22	93/25	summarised [1]
sit [2] 24/25 25/6	somebody [1] 33/4	standard [8] 24/1	structure [1] 93/21	44/18
situation [3] 30/14	something [13] 2/18	24/12 25/7 28/15	stuck [1] 30/1	summary [5] 34/1
87/12 104/3	10/6 25/10 29/12	64/13 64/20 76/23 80/14	stuff [1] 58/1	34/15 44/5 44/20
six [4] 25/24 28/5	29/25 48/19 48/21 53/18 53/19 58/3 60/3		subject [12] 16/18 21/23 28/24 36/8	52/17 support [4] 17/25
43/14 49/20	105/11 105/13	10/19 18/7	36/14 43/2 45/1 55/19	
slant [1] 56/3	sometimes [8] 9/24	staring [1] 101/23	68/21 87/3 97/12	supported [1] 104/6
slide [9] 33/25 34/6	20/6 25/11 25/12	start [6] 3/2 20/3	107/1	supporting [1]
34/14 34/25 36/20	27/21 31/7 32/18		submission [1] 21/13	
44/20 44/24 79/5 84/4	75/10	started [14] 13/3	subpostmaster [6]	suppose [5] 29/19
slightly [3] 9/21 32/17 65/2	Somewhat [1] 78/13	28/11 28/18 28/22	65/14 79/16 103/8	48/16 93/1 101/8
slowly [1] 91/1	somewhere [1] 90/24		103/12 106/18 107/6	101/15
small [6] 4/5 5/15	soon [1] 72/10	33/7 49/21 62/11	subpostmasters [32]	supposed [2] 10/9
	sorry [10] 23/3 41/19	68/22 69/3 79/9 86/5	7/23 27/17 28/1 28/9	96/5
L	1	l	1	(45) should supposed

(45) should... - supposed

S	talk [3] 30/3 73/14	79/4 80/23 87/22	50/16 50/25 51/22	107/18 107/18 109/5
sure [14] 24/8 25/16	94/18	89/21 92/21 93/1	52/4 53/7 55/9 58/24	109/7
57/20 64/24 69/16	talked [1] 62/25	93/23 95/13 97/4 97/8	61/10 63/15 63/25	they'd [4] 50/23
71/14 74/4 81/15	talking [7] 14/12 23/6	99/19 100/4 101/4	65/4 66/1 66/17 67/24	50/24 58/9 60/19
82/20 84/23 90/9	23/8 41/20 49/16	107/8 108/21	69/4 69/18 69/19	they're [2] 53/16 59/6
101/4 101/5 108/19	73/11 92/22	theft [3] 29/2 35/22	69/22 70/14 71/19	thing [12] 22/25
surgery [1] 97/12	targets [1] 6/13	105/12	72/8 73/13 74/13	26/12 28/25 31/5
surprise [3] 78/14	team [7] 24/9 24/15	their [26] 7/25 8/20	75/10 75/18 77/2 78/5	58/12 59/6 68/16
78/25 82/22	27/14 76/13 85/6	10/4 12/22 13/18 30/1		70/25 74/18 89/7 91/2
surprised [5] 65/8	93/14 93/15	34/18 37/9 41/11 50/4		105/9
70/12 84/3 84/8 84/12	technology [2] 4/23	50/24 52/8 60/1 65/13		
surprising [1] 78/24	8/13	68/24 69/1 76/8 88/13		
surrounding [1]	temporary [1] 104/6	91/6 91/7 91/8 94/12	95/19 95/21 96/11	29/20 47/16 48/20
12/15	ten [6] 58/7 58/8 66/6	106/14 106/25 107/14		63/16 67/11 74/18
suspect [5] 59/24	68/1 81/9 82/19	108/20	99/25 103/14 104/16	76/16 77/16 80/21
62/5 70/17 74/10	ten-ish [1] 66/6	them [43] 8/4 20/25	104/20 104/22 104/23	
97/11	tended [3] 25/9 25/20		105/8 107/5	92/7
suspected [2] 66/17	28/9	25/12 30/8 30/22 40/3		think [152]
76/18	tenor [2] 51/4 80/10	44/16 50/6 50/17 51/8		thinking [2] 45/23
suspended [1]	tensions [1] 79/14	54/8 55/11 55/13	there's [13] 2/18 11/6	
103/24	term [7] 34/9 34/10	56/17 66/18 69/9	11/17 20/2 20/16	third [1] 34/6
suspicion [1] 61/9	88/11 96/22 96/23	69/22 71/6 71/6 73/23	25/18 28/23 65/7 82/2 84/23 90/17 92/22	this [173]
suspicions [1] 98/18	97/3 98/9	73/25 74/4 74/20 74/21 76/5 80/9 80/14		Thompson [8] 37/23 38/6 45/9 47/5 59/10
sustainability [1]	termed [1] 45/15	74/21 76/5 80/9 80/14 82/24 90/1 90/2 90/7		86/18 86/23 99/5
8/16	terminated [1] 12/23 terminations [1] 14/2	82/24 90/1 90/2 90/7 90/10 90/10 90/11	therefore [6] 8/18 38/17 56/3 64/5 81/18	
Swift [10] 44/3 61/24	terms [9] 14/15 16/10		90/13	9/22 10/5 10/18 13/18
76/4 80/25 81/12	17/18 33/8 57/14	102/17 103/3 105/2	Therein [1] 97/22	14/13 14/14 14/15
81/23 100/15 100/22	66/24 70/23 76/10	themselves [8] 6/9	these [22] 8/15 16/22	14/16 14/25 15/23
101/3 101/17	88/15	23/19 50/21 57/13	20/8 26/6 27/21 27/22	1
Swift's [1] 62/10	terribly [1] 107/1	57/19 65/17 68/25	37/15 50/8 56/10 57/1	1
sympathetic [1]	Terry [3] 107/5 107/6	105/5	57/13 57/24 61/7 81/1	28/11 30/9 32/12
76/16	107/23	then [57] 3/16 4/4 5/6		36/19 45/23 46/2
sympathy [1] 106/24	text [2] 83/5 104/4	6/25 12/1 20/14 22/4	90/13 92/7 100/20	49/11 51/19 55/19
system [37] 6/20	than [28] 14/13 16/4	22/7 22/8 22/8 23/11	102/4 106/12	57/4 62/5 64/18 69/10
12/18 12/20 29/5	17/20 19/8 30/19 46/8		they [97] 2/9 9/13	69/25 70/5 70/9 71/5
29/15 31/19 31/19	47/8 48/8 49/22 60/2	32/1 33/5 34/13 34/24		71/8 71/13 73/2 74/25
31/24 32/22 33/15	63/4 67/3 69/4 72/17	36/12 44/23 45/11	11/20 13/19 16/10	75/5 81/6 81/24 85/7
34/18 34/25 35/4 35/6 35/10 37/11 38/11	75/15 75/17 77/18	52/9 55/24 57/9 58/4	16/24 17/6 18/12	85/8 88/15 90/8 91/9
41/4 44/24 45/12	78/6 85/24 90/2 97/1	58/15 59/3 59/9 63/9	21/11 22/4 22/5 22/18	95/1 96/2 96/16 97/13
47/19 47/21 49/5 49/6	100/22 101/2 102/6	63/23 68/5 69/19	22/19 23/18 23/19	98/5 98/5 105/18
49/8 50/14 50/18 51/1	102/18 103/1 105/23	70/13 76/20 77/21	24/4 24/9 24/16 24/16	108/6 109/4
51/17 55/8 74/23 75/4	106/1	80/17 81/14 82/7 83/4		though [4] 19/8
75/9 75/20 75/23	thank [37] 1/4 1/12	83/14 86/2 86/4 86/14		55/15 64/7 107/10
93/25 97/25	1/18 2/7 2/17 2/20 3/1	88/7 96/10 96/25 99/8		thought [7] 8/15
system-wide [2]	16/7 40/8 40/10 46/16		41/12 44/13 44/16	26/18 37/12 37/17
35/10 50/14	47/1 56/6 56/18 66/8	101/20 103/16 103/18		
systemic [4] 34/20	66/10 66/20 67/13	103/20 104/10 105/25		thoughts [2] 59/2
35/6 50/13 98/12	67/14 68/6 79/5 86/15		54/17 54/17 54/19	100/3
systems [1] 12/12	88/17 91/12 97/15	there [106] 7/1 9/15	57/13 57/22 58/5	three [15] 5/15 12/8 17/16 29/18 30/19
T	97/18 103/5 105/19 105/20 106/2 109/1	9/21 10/10 10/12 10/22 13/12 13/13	59/25 60/2 60/18 60/19 60/21 63/6	31/7 40/3 47/13 47/21
	109/9 109/11 109/14	13/14 14/6 15/15	65/22 67/12 68/17	50/2 50/12 68/12 75/7
tab [1] 82/15	109/19 109/11 109/14	15/21 16/12 19/20	68/19 69/19 69/25	84/11 98/11
take [6] 19/14 24/13	414 [040]	20/6 20/19 21/21 22/9		three years [1] 98/11
37/1 86/1 93/8 106/23	that's [48] 3/9 3/13	22/14 22/25 23/20	73/24 74/17 75/9	through [13] 9/10
taken [16] 13/16 26/6	2/40 2025 4/0 4/40	24/1 25/2 25/10 26/12		17/3 23/7 24/22 30/3
28/4 29/7 38/23 43/16	4/24 5/2 5/17 11/5	27/12 29/10 29/11	80/8 80/9 81/2 81/7	35/20 41/14 65/17
44/1 75/22 78/15	16/21 17/5 19/1 20/12	29/18 29/24 31/4	82/22 84/14 84/15	68/2 71/21 86/8 87/6
78/21 90/2 91/17 96/13 99/7 99/10	25/19 33/8 34/5 35/12	31/20 34/9 35/10 36/3		89/9
104/18	37/4 40/8 40/24 41/4	36/17 37/8 38/7 38/13		throughout [4] 6/23
taking [5] 26/4 28/2	42/6 45/18 47/10	38/13 40/3 43/21	91/3 91/4 96/3 96/5	19/6 63/2 64/21
41/6 44/8 52/21	51/10 59/6 61/3 61/6	44/21 44/22 48/8 48/9		throwing [1] 33/2
	68/4 68/11 74/21 78/4	48/10 49/4 49/21	105/1 105/4 106/13	thrown [1] 89/18
L				(46) sure - thrown

(46) sure - thrown

Т	trade [1] 79/11	47/11	untenable [2] 83/21	verification [1] 6/19
Tim [3] 76/20 77/25	tragedy [1] 108/16	UKGI00006961 [1]	85/10	very [52] 2/20 5/23
100/13	tragically [1] 105/1	37/25	until [7] 3/14 3/23	5/24 7/15 18/22 19/15
time [75] 6/3 9/8 11/9	training [3] 35/14 50/24 96/9	UKGI00006991 [1] 86/16	40/22 42/23 74/11 86/8 109/24	19/18 20/4 24/18 26/22 36/21 37/7 37/7
13/25 14/25 15/2 15/3	transactions [1]	UKGI00016320 [1]	unusual [1] 104/3	44/6 45/18 45/20 48/5
17/11 17/15 20/19	31/20	31/10	unwise [1] 41/13	50/17 50/19 50/21
24/5 24/21 25/12	transcriber [2] 86/1	UKGI00016898 [2]	up [37] 7/7 12/19	54/19 54/20 57/7
26/11 27/23 29/13 32/13 32/16 33/22	86/7	82/11 97/20	25/8 25/21 28/25	64/10 66/14 67/1
37/16 39/6 39/23	transcript [1] 2/10	UKGI00020328 [2]	29/10 29/12 33/9	67/14 70/25 70/25
48/17 49/7 49/10	transform [1] 79/10	33/20 79/4	33/15 33/21 34/8	71/24 75/2 80/2 83/24
49/15 49/18 50/4	transpire [1] 76/19	UKGI00042795 [1]	36/17 39/5 43/15	84/3 84/8 84/11 89/5
52/24 53/23 54/2	travel [1] 70/23 Treasury [5] 26/3	87/22 Um [2] 57/16 90/22	45/17 47/25 50/24 57/6 67/25 68/13	89/7 89/25 90/13 90/19 96/25 99/19
57/24 59/20 59/22	26/18 26/19 27/10	unable [2] 31/25	68/18 70/24 75/8	101/4 101/4 101/17
60/3 60/11 61/10 62/4	95/8	72/24	77/21 78/19 80/18	102/1 105/20 106/3
66/25 67/14 67/24 68/14 68/22 69/21	treated [1] 38/12	unclear [1] 36/3	82/13 83/6 84/4 87/17	109/11 109/19 109/20
70/3 70/23 71/21	triaged [1] 21/9	uncomfortable [7]	91/7 91/22 98/1	via [1] 37/19
72/14 73/1 75/25	trial [1] 41/8	28/1 28/4 28/16 28/17		viable [3] 7/6 7/19
78/24 79/21 82/13	Trudy [2] 103/22	28/18 32/13 32/16	103/14	7/22 Vice [4] 3/16
82/20 85/23 85/24	104/10 true [3] 2/7 42/6	under [10] 4/5 5/7 15/1 31/6 33/16 47/16	upcoming [1] 58/19	Vice [1] 3/16 victim [2] 50/22
86/10 87/7 87/15	45/18	73/2 83/2 88/23 96/13		105/5
87/18 91/3 91/3 91/5	trust [1] 20/3	Under-Secretary [6]	updated [1] 24/5	victims [7] 61/16
91/16 92/9 95/3 95/5 95/8 95/21 105/24	trusted [2] 21/10	4/5 5/7 15/1 33/16	updates [1] 11/25	107/3 107/4 107/11
107/9 107/19 107/21	22/16	73/2 88/23	upon [6] 5/18 11/16	107/25 108/5 108/6
108/17 109/2	truth [1] 102/11	underline [1] 63/12	23/14 33/17 98/23	view [11] 12/5 27/24
timely [2] 100/9	try [1] 66/19	underlined [1] 35/12	98/24	41/7 44/10 52/18 53/3
100/25	trying [2] 73/19	underlying [5] 43/5	urban [5] 6/17 6/24	53/21 61/11 72/2 82/6 83/22
times [8] 5/22 9/15	107/16 turn [2] 1/23 80/20	44/12 47/9 54/5 60/15 undermine [1]	us [3] 1/3 46/20	vigorously [2] 75/14
21/8 29/19 50/2 53/16	Turning [3] 5/6 58/15	105/13	106/11	75/17
72/23 73/9	93/20	Underneath [1] 52/3	use [4] 32/9 50/4	virtue [1] 62/5
timings [1] 33/8 today [5] 1/20 38/15	twice [2] 45/24 72/1	underpinned [1]	63/6 63/19	visible [2] 2/1 108/16
107/4 107/5 109/15	two [20] 4/22 16/13	62/15	used [5] 50/18 63/2	vital [1] 10/12
together [1] 52/5	16/22 17/13 27/18	underpinning [1]	64/20 98/9 104/13	vociferous [2]
told [19] 29/3 33/13	32/12 34/19 36/18 50/12 71/6 71/12	8/17 understand [10] 2/18	useful [2] 57/10	103/12 104/8 volume [3] 11/4
39/6 39/12 45/21 48/1	71/15 75/7 80/18	17/9 27/6 34/11 37/8	users [1] 31/19	22/25 82/5
48/3 48/5 48/8 50/9	90/17 92/19 94/24	43/9 49/7 51/15 93/3	using [1] 22/1	
50/10 50/15 69/5 90/5 98/6 100/17 100/19	96/11 96/16 98/11	106/11	usual [4] 58/7 58/25	W
103/9 103/11	two paragraphs [1]	understanding [7]	100/1 107/12	wait [1] 52/20
Tom [1] 51/25	32/12	23/5 49/4 84/18 94/24		waited [1] 31/3
tomorrow [1] 109/21	U	95/4 95/6 95/14	20/6 22/23	wall [1] 101/1
tonal [1] 29/9	UKGI [54] 9/10 11/20	understood [4] 16/11 36/6 49/10 108/24	V	want [8] 26/24 71/20 73/24 74/20 86/1
tone [5] 25/11 27/25	12/3 15/15 15/15	undertaken [1] 11/20		97/19 100/8 104/4
28/18 28/19 32/23	16/19 16/22 16/25	undertaking [3]	value [2] 7/13 56/23	wanted [11] 2/18
too [3] 63/22 63/24 94/1	17/3 17/21 17/22	31/20 83/10 84/12	values [1] 85/3	17/2 25/7 30/9 31/4
took [10] 12/19 17/22	17/24 23/16 23/23	undertook [1] 9/11	varied [1] 71/2	31/9 68/17 70/20
25/8 33/15 33/21	24/6 29/16 37/23	underway [4] 36/3	various [3] 17/21	75/19 75/22 90/3
40/19 41/1 78/11	40/13 45/6 46/6 47/2 47/5 51/14 52/6 55/6	36/8 38/7 52/19	103/13 104/9	wanting [1] 36/25
82/13 91/22	58/4 63/11 65/10 74/3	unethically [1] 101/14	varying [2] 103/13 104/9	Warwick [2] 4/20 4/21
top [6] 25/22 31/14	76/23 79/1 81/7 81/15		vast [2] 19/7 22/25	was [288]
37/1 83/6 92/18 92/24	81/18 81/19 81/24	52/23	vein [1] 82/9	wasn't [14] 13/12
top-line [1] 37/1 topics [2] 49/2 64/17	82/12 82/16 82/24	unfairly [1] 38/13	Vennells [9] 51/11	14/5 28/7 34/2 39/12
total [2] 67/24 72/20	84/13 84/20 86/18	unfortunate [1] 93/12		51/3 57/22 73/8 73/8
totally [1] 106/21	87/20 94/2 94/15	unfortunately [7]	73/6 103/6 103/8	76/5 76/16 81/13
touch [1] 108/15	94/20 94/25 95/6 95/16 95/18 95/20	2/22 55/14 57/5 74/22		95/25 98/8
towards [7] 45/5	95/24 96/1 99/5	87/15 87/16 93/17 union [1] 79/12	Vennells' [1] 52/2 veracity [1] 98/20	watching [1] 81/8 way [27] 8/9 9/15
58/21 68/12 72/18	UKGI's [1] 59/11	University [1] 4/21	verbal [3] 38/3 47/2	9/25 10/8 12/20 13/4
89/21 93/23 104/25	UKGI0000015 [1]	unless [1] 74/8	49/1	13/6 14/1 18/3 19/15
L			I	(47) Tim - way

(47) Tim - way

W	67/5 72/7 74/3 74/11	whenever [4] 21/23	30/17 32/10 33/4 38/2	wobble [1] 84/23
way [17] 22/14 23/9	81/5 84/3 86/5 86/14	28/24 28/24 95/22	39/24 40/2 49/23 57/7	
23/11 25/9 28/20	93/8 95/9 96/19 101/5	where [21] 9/19	61/11 61/13 65/14	85/2
29/22 33/11 33/12	101/16 102/1 102/20	10/10 15/13 17/11	65/17 69/10 75/3	wonder [3] 15/17
60/21 62/1 67/10 69/6	105/18 107/8 108/13	18/5 18/17 29/24	75/21 76/13 78/15	46/10 86/1
75/9 76/1 88/6 89/10	108/24 109/14	35/21 42/1 42/25	81/3 81/15 85/6 85/7	wondered [2] 73/12
101/14	went [3] 38/3 61/23	53/16 69/9 69/18	95/13 96/1 101/13	86/20
wave [2] 13/8 61/20	68/22	69/19 77/15 84/5	104/10 104/14 104/18	
wo [02] 1/5 6/6 8/8	were [157]	89/13 102/3 103/14	107/1 107/12	words [6] 31/4 98/5
13/20 15/4 15/13	weren't [4] 6/1 13/19	107/25 109/15	whoever [2] 18/24	98/5 99/12 100/16
17/11 17/15 17/19	81/14 85/20	whereby [2] 64/3	65/10	103/23
18/8 18/18 28/2 30/5	what [80] 6/2 13/14	107/22	whole [10] 34/2 47/7	work [14] 1/19 4/11
30/21 31/10 31/13	19/1 20/1 26/2 26/7	whether [26] 10/19	48/6 50/3 58/9 71/21	4/25 6/13 6/21 17/24
31/15 33/19 34/11	26/11 26/17 26/20 26/25 27/9 27/14	12/15 13/17 14/13 20/12 25/6 30/2 39/11	77/16 89/16 94/11 108/13	24/19 24/21 25/9 36/11 82/8 91/7
36/9 36/13 37/24 38/1	28/13 28/15 29/10		wholly [2] 51/3 95/11	100/18 109/17
38/23 39/1 39/3 39/22	29/20 30/8 30/24	53/8 57/18 63/2 67/6	why [18] 15/9 18/20	worked [2] 16/19
40/5 40/11 41/1 43/13	33/13 40/23 41/24	72/12 73/15 74/16	30/17 36/23 42/8 46/1	
44/20 45/4 45/8 46/3	42/24 45/15 45/20	79/22 80/17 85/11	48/14 51/22 53/1	working [4] 32/11
46/13 47/11 47/15	45/22 48/1 48/3 48/9	86/1 86/3 86/8 108/12		46/23 79/11 107/21
47/24 48/24 51/9			90/13 99/15 99/16	works [2] 9/3 10/1
51/23 52/5 52/15	50/23 54/2 57/17	2/15 5/10 5/13 5/14	100/4 104/1	worst [1] 105/3
54/25 58/16 59/1 60/3	57/18 59/5 59/20	7/4 7/6 7/18 7/21 9/16	wide [4] 35/10 50/14	worth [1] 34/19
61/23 62/2 62/3 62/4 62/17 62/20 62/25	61/12 61/15 62/20	10/14 11/15 11/19	71/1 75/9	would [208]
63/7 67/6 67/8 67/15	62/24 65/12 66/23	12/5 12/19 13/4 13/9	widely [4] 73/7 73/17	wouldn't [27] 14/1
68/2 68/10 73/11	66/24 67/11 67/14	13/10 13/21 16/5 16/9		14/15 22/14 33/12
77/14 78/3 79/3 80/22	71/23 71/23 72/2	18/25 21/3 21/11	wider [10] 7/5 7/7	36/22 37/3 39/11
82/11 82/14 83/11	75/16 75/18 75/20	23/14 23/15 26/3 28/4		39/13 39/14 48/18
86/1 86/5 86/5 86/8	76/18 76/19 78/5	29/17 30/2 30/8 31/22		49/10 49/15 50/3
86/16 86/25 87/4	80/10 83/22 84/10	32/13 32/19 34/8	56/13 108/8	53/14 53/20 53/21
87/20 87/20 87/25	84/25 89/16 92/19	34/10 34/18 34/24	wielded [1] 94/19	54/21 57/5 57/11
89/20 93/22 97/2	92/21 92/25 95/7	35/1 36/18 38/16	wife [2] 107/15	61/18 61/18 62/3 74/6
100/2 100/20 102/4	100/8 101/5 101/5 101/9 101/20 102/17	38/19 41/8 42/19 44/18 44/25 45/23	108/18	74/7 87/11 93/17 100/6
102/23 102/25 103/14	102/21 103/1 103/13	47/12 48/16 51/22	will [15] 2/12 2/14 30/5 38/16 39/1 42/22	
103/16 103/20 103/22	103/23 104/9 106/13	52/14 53/11 54/25	54/25 66/3 67/1 67/2	31/7 31/7
108/9	107/10 107/15 108/25	55/19 55/21 58/15	67/13 96/19 97/10	writer [3] 22/3 22/15
we'd [2] 7/16 72/22	what's [3] 25/1	58/18 59/10 60/3 60/5		28/20
wen[5] 13/10 14/14	101/19 103/3	61/22 62/15 62/21	willingness [1] 68/9	writing [6] 28/14 31/6
42/8 45/22 109/21	whatever [4] 22/13	63/1 64/16 64/17 65/3		65/9 65/17 65/20
were[z] 55/12/2/0	31/8 71/20 90/17	68/21 68/25 69/1	75/13 76/8 106/24	101/1
we've [5] 9/25 40/16 73/4 101/11 104/23	whatsoever [2] 64/6	69/14 70/19 70/22	wished [1] 13/9	written [3] 16/12
woar [1] 26/18	105/9	71/12 71/22 72/6 75/2		57/13 84/25
website [1] 2/13	when [69] 3/23 9/15	76/23 77/22 78/2	wishing [1] 66/16	wrong [12] 13/18
Wechsler [1] 51/25	10/5 10/7 11/19 11/23	78/17 81/20 82/4 82/9		27/24 29/25 54/7 54/8
Wednesday [1] 1/1	11/24 12/19 13/3	82/15 82/21 83/2	81/2 81/7	54/20 61/10 61/20
week [4] 2/23 21/9	13/20 15/8 15/9 15/17	83/14 84/13 86/9 89/7		99/21 104/22 104/23
81/9 107/16	19/2 19/17 19/19 20/2 20/2 20/4 22/16 25/2	89/12 89/14 91/4 91/22 92/2 92/23	81/16 81/18 91/6	105/15
weekend [2] 38/14	25/8 26/20 27/23	91/22 92/2 92/23 92/25 93/6 93/7 94/19	within [19] 5/25 7/1 10/21 17/24 20/9 41/3	wrongful [2] 14/2 14/6
103/15	27/23 28/3 29/11	95/4 96/11 96/16	61/12 81/12 85/17	wrongfully [2] 12/22
weeks [1] 92/19	29/16 29/20 33/15	96/25 97/21 103/10	92/18 96/20 101/7	12/23
welcome [2] 59/2	33/20 36/9 36/19	106/6 109/18		wrote [2] 15/17 76/20
100/3	45/19 45/19 46/1	while [5] 26/9 35/20	107/15 107/24 108/21	
welcomed [1] 79/14	48/22 49/18 50/8 51/4		109/2	93/10
well [49] 2/20 7/25 9/2 13/8 18/4 18/21	63/24 64/7 65/4 68/15	whilst [8] 4/1 32/2	without [8] 8/4 18/24	v
20/11 25/3 26/22	71/8 72/14 73/9 73/21	42/18 43/19 43/23	22/22 66/15 66/16	X
28/17 30/2 34/22	76/1 76/14 82/3 84/4	57/1 65/24 95/11	92/20 95/3 96/22	xxx [1] 31/11
39/24 41/11 45/18			WITN10910100 [1]	Υ
45/22 46/3 46/23	92/13 93/12 93/18	who [44] 1/5 9/11	2/11	
54/16 54/16 55/9	98/3 98/15 99/2	12/21 13/11 16/8	witness [7] 1/8 1/20	Yeah [4] 43/7 55/20 62/24 72/23
55/11 57/5 57/22 61/8	102/17 102/21 103/7 104/16 106/4 107/16	16/13 16/15 16/17 16/18 16/22 24/6	1/21 2/12 46/23 56/25 66/13	year [4] 29/19 35/25
62/8 62/17 63/6 66/1	108/16	24/13 28/9 28/9 28/13		50/2 77/1
				(48) way - year

(48) way... - year

V		
Y		
years [5] 17/16 47/22		
50/12 75/8 98/11		
years' [1] 34/19		
yes [128]		
yesterday [1] 103/4		
yet [4] 100/23 102/6 102/18 103/2		
you [549]		
you [3] you'd [3] 14/15 77/14		
86/3		
you're [21] 15/2		
19/19 20/8 22/17 23/6		
24/23 30/3 40/15 41/5		
43/7 49/16 59/5 64/7		
64/9 84/10 92/22 93/8		
94/5 100/6 103/15		
103/17		
you've [10] 30/10 33/9 42/20 42/24 62/4		
65/5 71/16 94/23		
106/22 109/16		
your [109] 1/15 2/7		
2/8 2/11 2/15 2/19 3/2		
3/4 5/8 5/9 5/18 6/3		
6/4 6/6 8/8 12/4 12/5		
13/5 16/9 16/11 16/16		
16/17 16/19 17/6 18/7		
18/8 19/19 20/13		
21/18 21/20 22/16		
22/17 22/18 23/5		
23/15 23/16 24/22		
24/25 27/5 27/6 30/9 31/14 31/21 33/16		
33/17 37/23 39/6		
39/19 42/10 43/14		
44/8 44/10 45/3 47/12		
54/2 55/2 56/10 56/10		
56/16 56/22 57/17		
62/25 63/19 65/12		
68/7 69/7 71/4 72/1		
72/14 72/25 75/13		
75/15 76/22 77/2		
78/25 80/20 81/16 83/6 83/22 84/3 84/22		
85/1 86/17 87/8 88/22		
90/5 91/14 91/16 92/4		
93/7 93/11 93/20		
96/11 98/16 98/23		
99/4 99/5 100/11		
101/19 102/11 106/22		
106/24 107/2 107/9		
107/9 107/24 108/14		
108/25 109/17		
yours [1] 25/3		
yourself [1] 56/24		
Z		
Zebra [1] 100/16		
		(49) vears - Zebra