| 2 (10.00 am) 3 MR BEER: Sir, good morning, can you see and hear 4 me? 5 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you. 6 MR BEER: Thank you very much. As you know, you 7 directed this hearing today to investigate 8 a series of disclosure failings by the Post 9 Office and also to hear evidence about what has 10 been done to put those disclosure failings 11 right. The Inquiry asked for five witnesses to 12 produce written evidence and duly received five 13 witness statements from those witnesses. |
|--|
| 4 me? 5 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you. 6 MR BEER: Thank you very much. As you know, you 7 directed this hearing today to investigate 8 a series of disclosure failings by the Post 9 Office and also to hear evidence about what has 10 been done to put those disclosure failings 11 right. The Inquiry asked for five witnesses to 12 produce written evidence and duly received five 13 witness statements from those witnesses. |
| 5 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you. 6 MR BEER: Thank you very much. As you know, you 7 directed this hearing today to investigate 8 a series of disclosure failings by the Post 9 Office and also to hear evidence about what has 10 been done to put those disclosure failings 11 right. The Inquiry asked for five witnesses to 12 produce written evidence and duly received five 13 witness statements from those witnesses. |
| MR BEER: Thank you very much. As you know, you directed this hearing today to investigate a series of disclosure failings by the Post Office and also to hear evidence about what has been done to put those disclosure failings right. The Inquiry asked for five witnesses to produce written evidence and duly received five witness statements from those witnesses. |
| 7 directed this hearing today to investigate 8 a series of disclosure failings by the Post 9 Office and also to hear evidence about what has 10 been done to put those disclosure failings 11 right. The Inquiry asked for five witnesses to 12 produce written evidence and duly received five 13 witness statements from those witnesses. |
| a series of disclosure failings by the Post Office and also to hear evidence about what has been done to put those disclosure failings right. The Inquiry asked for five witnesses to produce written evidence and duly received five witness statements from those witnesses. |
| 9 Office and also to hear evidence about what has 10 been done to put those disclosure failings 11 right. The Inquiry asked for five witnesses to 12 produce written evidence and duly received five 13 witness statements from those witnesses. |
| been done to put those disclosure failings right. The Inquiry asked for five witnesses to produce written evidence and duly received five witness statements from those witnesses. |
| right. The Inquiry asked for five witnesses to produce written evidence and duly received five witness statements from those witnesses. |
| produce written evidence and duly received five witness statements from those witnesses. |
| 13 witness statements from those witnesses. |
| |
| 14 You'll hear evidence from four of those |
| 15 today: Fintan Canavan, who Mr Blake will be |
| 16 asking questions of firstly; Diane Wills, who |
| 17 I will be asking questions of; Paul Tombleson, |
| who Mr Blake will ask questions of; and then |
| 19 finally Gregg Rowan, who I will examine. |
| 20 The fifth witness was Mr Ben Foat from whom |
| 21 you heard previously, the Post Office's general |
| 22 counsel. The Inquiry took the view, as a result |
| 23 of reviewing the contents of his witness |
| 24 statement, that more meaningful and detailed |
| 25 ovidence could be obtained from the other form |
| evidence could be obtained from the other four |
| 25 evidence could be obtained from the other four 1 |
| 1 |
| 1 1 is an amended version of a table that was |
| 11is an amended version of a table that was2disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to |
| 11is an amended version of a table that was2disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to3date, sir. |
| 11is an amended version of a table that was2disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to |
| is an amended version of a table that was disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to date, sir. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. All right then, |
| is an amended version of a table that was disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to date, sir. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. All right then, over to Mr Blake. MR BEER: Thank you. |
| is an amended version of a table that was disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to date, sir. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. All right then, over to Mr Blake. MR BEER: Thank you. |
| is an amended version of a table that was disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to date, sir. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. All right then, over to Mr Blake. MR BEER: Thank you. MR BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can I call Mr Canavan, |
| 1is an amended version of a table that was2disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to3date, sir.4SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. All right then,5over to Mr Blake.6MR BEER: Thank you.7MR BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can I call Mr Canavan,8please. |
| 1is an amended version of a table that wasdisclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up todate, sir.SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. All right then,over to Mr Blake.MR BEER: Thank you.MR BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can I call Mr Canavan,please.FINTAN CANAVAN (affirmed) |
| 1is an amended version of a table that was2disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to3date, sir.4SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. All right then,5over to Mr Blake.6MR BEER: Thank you.7MR BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can I call Mr Canavan,8please.9FINTAN CANAVAN (affirmed)10Questioned by MR BLAKE |
| 1is an amended version of a table that was2disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to3date, sir.4SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. All right then,5over to Mr Blake.6MR BEER: Thank you.7MR BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can I call Mr Canavan,8please.9FINTAN CANAVAN (affirmed)10Questioned by MR BLAKE11MR BLAKE: Thank you very much, can you give your12full name please?13A. Fintan John Canavan. |
| 1is an amended version of a table that was2disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to3date, sir.4SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. All right then,5over to Mr Blake.6MR BEER: Thank you.7MR BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can I call Mr Canavan,8please.9FINTAN CANAVAN (affirmed)10Questioned by MR BLAKE11MR BLAKE: Thank you very much, can you give your12full name please?13A. Fintan John Canavan.14Q. Mr Canavan, you should have in front of |
| 1is an amended version of a table that was2disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to3date, sir.4SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. All right then,over to Mr Blake.6MR BEER: Thank you.7MR BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can I call Mr Canavan,please.9FINTAN CANAVAN (affirmed)10Questioned by MR BLAKE11MR BLAKE: Thank you very much, can you give your12full name please?13A. Fintan John Canavan.14Q. Mr Canavan, you should have in front of15a witness statement dated 22 August 2023; is |
| 1is an amended version of a table that was2disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to3date, sir.4SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. All right then,5over to Mr Blake.6MR BEER: Thank you.7MR BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can I call Mr Canavan,8please.9FINTAN CANAVAN (affirmed)10Questioned by MR BLAKE11MR BLAKE: Thank you very much, can you give your12full name please?13A. Fintan John Canavan.14Q. Mr Canavan, you should have in front of15a witness statement dated 22 August 2023; is16that correct? |
| 1is an amended version of a table that was2disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to3date, sir.4SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. All right then,5over to Mr Blake.6MR BEER: Thank you.7MR BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can I call Mr Canavan,9FINTAN CANAVAN (affirmed)10Questioned by MR BLAKE11MR BLAKE: Thank you very much, can you give your12full name please?13A. Fintan John Canavan.14Q. Mr Canavan, you should have in front of15a witness statement dated 22 August 2023; is16that correct?17A. It is. |
| 1is an amended version of a table that was2disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to3date, sir.4SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. All right then,5over to Mr Blake.6MR BEER: Thank you.7MR BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can I call Mr Canavan,8please.9FINTAN CANAVAN (affirmed)10Questioned by MR BLAKE11MR BLAKE: Thank you very much, can you give your12full name please?13A. Fintan John Canavan.14Q. Mr Canavan, you should have in front of15a witness statement dated 22 August 2023; is16that correct?17A. It is.18Q. If you turn to the final page of that statement |
| 1is an amended version of a table that was2disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to3date, sir.4SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. All right then,5over to Mr Blake.6MR BEER: Thank you.7MR BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can I call Mr Canavan,8please.9FINTAN CANAVAN (affirmed)10Questioned by MR BLAKE11MR BLAKE: Thank you very much, can you give your12full name please?13A. Fintan John Canavan.14Q. Mr Canavan, you should have in front of15a witness statement dated 22 August 2023; is16that correct?17A. It is.18Q. If you turn to the final page of that statement19can you confirm that that is your signature? |
| 1is an amended version of a table that was2disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to3date, sir.4SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. All right then,5over to Mr Blake.6MR BEER: Thank you.7MR BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can I call Mr Canavan,8please.9FINTAN CANAVAN (affirmed)10Questioned by MR BLAKE11MR BLAKE: Thank you very much, can you give your12full name please?13A. Fintan John Canavan.14Q. Mr Canavan, you should have in front of15a witness statement dated 22 August 2023; is16that correct?17A. It is.18Q. If you turn to the final page of that statement19can you confirm that that is your signature?20It's on page 17 of 17. |
| 1is an amended version of a table that was2disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to3date, sir.4SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. All right then,5over to Mr Blake.6MR BEER: Thank you.7MR BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can I call Mr Canavan,8please.9FINTAN CANAVAN (affirmed)10Questioned by MR BLAKE11MR BLAKE: Thank you very much, can you give your12full name please?13A. Fintan John Canavan.14Q. Mr Canavan, you should have in front of15a witness statement dated 22 August 2023; is16that correct?17A. It is.18Q. If you turn to the final page of that statement19can you confirm that that is your signature?20It's on page 17 of 17.21A. It is. |
| 1is an amended version of a table that wasdisclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up todate, sir.SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. All right then,over to Mr Blake.MR BEER: Thank you.MR BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can I call Mr Canavan,please.FINTAN CANAVAN (affirmed)Questioned by MR BLAKEMR BLAKE: Thank you very much, can you give yourfull name please?A. Fintan John Canavan.Q. Mr Canavan, you should have in front ofa witness statement dated 22 August 2023; isthat correct?A. It is.Q. If you turn to the final page of that statementcan you confirm that that is your signature?it's on page 17 of 17.A. It is.Q. Is that statement true to the best of your |
| 1is an amended version of a table that was2disclosed at 4.26 pm yesterday. You are up to3date, sir.4SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. All right then,5over to Mr Blake.6MR BEER: Thank you.7MR BLAKE: Thank you, sir. Can I call Mr Canavan,9FINTAN CANAVAN (affirmed)10Questioned by MR BLAKE11MR BLAKE: Thank you very much, can you give your12full name please?13A. Fintan John Canavan.14Q. Mr Canavan, you should have in front of15a witness statement dated 22 August 2023; is1617A. It is.18Q. If you turn to the final page of that statement1910202121223233343435353637373839393030303031323435353637373838393930303132333434353536373 |

1 witnesses that I have mentioned and, therefore, 2 he is not to be called today to give oral evidence. His witness statement will be 3 uploaded, as will the other four witness 4 5 statements, to the Inquiry website today. 6 So, sir, can we start then, please, with 7 Mr Blake and Mr Canavan. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Certainly, but can I just make 8 9 sure that I'm up to date with the documentation. 10 I received this morning a letter or an email 11 from Mr Henry, which he sent in the middle of the night, and I received further information in 12 13 a letter from the Post Office which arrived at 14 8.20 this morning. Am I up to date, Mr Beer? MR BEER: Yes, you are, sir. The 3.10 am email from 15 16 Mr Henry was itself a response to a 22-page 17 letter received from the Post Office yesterday, 18 which the Inquiry distributed. In summary, 19 Mr Henry says it's difficult to digest complex 20 22-page letters on the eve of a hearing. Please 21 can you impose a deadline in future that the 22 Post Office should, if they wish to update the 23 Inquiry with information, do so not less than 24 48 hours before a hearing. 25 Then the 8.20 am communication this morning 2 1 statement will go on to the Inquiry's website. 2 It's unique reference number is WITN09970100. 3 It doesn't need to be brought on to the screen 4 just yet. I'm going to start just by asking you 5 a brief career history. You're a qualified 6 solicitor and I think you've been practising for 7 over 30 years; is that right? 8 A. That's correct, I was admitted into the Law 9 Society of England and Wales. I then transferred and I'm admitted to the Law Society 10 of Northern Ireland. 11 Q. You've acted for Core Participants in a number 12 13 of public inquiries including, for example, the 14 Bloody Sunday Inquiry? A. That's correct. 15 Q. You're currently a partner at DAC Beachcroft 16 17 solicitors and have been in that position since 18 September 2020; is that right? A. That's correct. 19 20 Q. In July 2021 you were asked by a colleague 21 whether you'd be willing to be seconded to the 22 Post Office to assist with their internal 23 Inquiry Team; is that correct? 24 A. That's correct. 25 Q. Were you aware at that stage, so in July 2021, 4

| 1 | | that on 1 June 2021, the previous month, the |
|---|----------------|--|
| 2 | | Terms of Reference for this Inquiry had been |
| 3 | | announced? |
| 4 | Α. | No. |
| 5 | Q. | You were eventually contacted by the Post Office |
| 6 | | in October; is that correct? |
| 7 | Α. | It was around October, yes. |
| 8 | Q. | Were you aware that, over the course of the |
| 9 | | summer before that October, before you were |
| 10 | | contacted, the Post Office and 218 others had |
| 11 | | become Core Participants in this Inquiry? |
| 12 | Α. | No, I had not followed the Inquiry at all until |
| 13 | | I actually became involved with it. |
| 14 | Q. | When you were contacted in October, were you |
| 15 | | briefed on that kind of background? So, for |
| 16 | | example, by October a provisional list of issues |
| 17 | | had already been published, including some 184 |
| 18 | | issues? |
| 19 | Α. | No, I had a number of phone calls with parties |
| 20 | | from the Post Office and it was much more about |
| 21 | | my own background, what my understanding of |
| 22 | | inquiries was, what my experience with inquiries |
| 23 | | had been and to indicate that the Post Office |
| 24 | | needed some assistance with an internal team to |
| 25 | | assist the Inquiry. But we hadn't got into any |
| | | 5 |
| | | |
| 1 | Α. | Correct. |
| | | |
| 2 | Q. | You've spoken about Mr Foat. You reported |
| 2 3 | Q. | You've spoken about Mr Foat. You reported directly to Mr Foat, who was the general |
| | Q. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general |
| 3 4 | | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? |
| 3 4 5 | Α. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. |
| 3 4 5 6 | | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually |
| 3 4 5 6 7 | A. Q. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Α. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. Q. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. I wasn't I haven't I wasn't SRA registered |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | A. Q. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. I wasn't I haven't I wasn't SRA registered at the time. I am admitted to the role but |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | A. Q. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. I wasn't I haven't I wasn't SRA registered at the time. I am admitted to the role but I wasn't SRA registered and the discussion was |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 | A. Q. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. I wasn't I haven't I wasn't SRA registered at the time. I am admitted to the role but I wasn't SRA registered and the discussion was clear that my role was the Inquiry Director; the |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A. Q. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. I wasn't I haven't I wasn't SRA registered at the time. I am admitted to the role but I wasn't SRA registered and the discussion was clear that my role was the Inquiry Director; the legal advice and legal representation was by the |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13 | A. Q. A. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. I wasn't I haven't I wasn't SRA registered at the time. I am admitted to the role but I wasn't SRA registered and the discussion was clear that my role was the Inquiry Director; the legal advice and legal representation was by the external firm, who were Herbert Smith Freehills. |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. Q. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. I wasn't I haven't I wasn't SRA registered at the time. I am admitted to the role but I wasn't SRA registered and the discussion was clear that my role was the Inquiry Director; the legal advice and legal representation was by the external firm, who were Herbert Smith Freehills. Can you briefly talk us through where you sat |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. Q. A. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. I wasn't I haven't I wasn't SRA registered at the time. I am admitted to the role but I wasn't SRA registered and the discussion was clear that my role was the Inquiry Director; the legal advice and legal representation was by the external firm, who were Herbert Smith Freehills. Can you briefly talk us through where you sat within the company in respect of, say, the group |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. Q. A. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. I wasn't I haven't I wasn't SRA registered at the time. I am admitted to the role but I wasn't SRA registered and the discussion was clear that my role was the Inquiry Director; the legal advice and legal representation was by the external firm, who were Herbert Smith Freehills. Can you briefly talk us through where you sat within the company in respect of, say, the group executive, various steering committees and the |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. Q. A. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. I wasn't I haven't I wasn't SRA registered at the time. I am admitted to the role but I wasn't SRA registered and the discussion was clear that my role was the Inquiry Director; the legal advice and legal representation was by the external firm, who were Herbert Smith Freehills. Can you briefly talk us through where you sat within the company in respect of, say, the group executive, various steering committees and the external legal firms. |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | A. Q. A. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. I wasn't I haven't I wasn't SRA registered at the time. I am admitted to the role but I wasn't SRA registered and the discussion was clear that my role was the Inquiry Director; the legal advice and legal representation was by the external firm, who were Herbert Smith Freehills. Can you briefly talk us through where you sat within the company in respect of, say, the group executive, various steering committees and the external legal firms. Without trying to give a very detailed |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. Q. A. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. I wasn't I haven't I wasn't SRA registered at the time. I am admitted to the role but I wasn't SRA registered and the discussion was clear that my role was the Inquiry Director; the legal advice and legal representation was by the external firm, who were Herbert Smith Freehills. Can you briefly talk us through where you sat within the company in respect of, say, the group executive, various steering committees and the external legal firms. Without trying to give a very detailed description of it, the General Executive |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. Q. A. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. I wasn't I haven't I wasn't SRA registered at the time. I am admitted to the role but I wasn't SRA registered and the discussion was clear that my role was the Inquiry Director; the legal advice and legal representation was by the external firm, who were Herbert Smith Freehills. Can you briefly talk us through where you sat within the company in respect of, say, the group executive, various steering committees and the external legal firms. Without trying to give a very detailed description of it, the General Executive Mr Foat was a member of the General Executive |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. Q. A. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. I wasn't I haven't I wasn't SRA registered at the time. I am admitted to the role but I wasn't SRA registered and the discussion was clear that my role was the Inquiry Director; the legal advice and legal representation was by the external firm, who were Herbert Smith Freehills. Can you briefly talk us through where you sat within the company in respect of, say, the group executive, various steering committees and the external legal firms. Without trying to give a very detailed description of it, the General Executive Mr Foat was a member of the General Executive and I reported directly to him. So we were |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. Q. A. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. I wasn't I haven't I wasn't SRA registered at the time. I am admitted to the role but I wasn't SRA registered and the discussion was clear that my role was the Inquiry Director; the legal advice and legal representation was by the external firm, who were Herbert Smith Freehills. Can you briefly talk us through where you sat within the company in respect of, say, the group executive, various steering committees and the external legal firms. Without trying to give a very detailed description of it, the General Executive Mr Foat was a member of the General Executive and I reported directly to him. So we were the Inquiry Team was based in Mr Foat's area, |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | A. Q. A. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. I wasn't I haven't I wasn't SRA registered at the time. I am admitted to the role but I wasn't SRA registered and the discussion was clear that my role was the Inquiry Director; the legal advice and legal representation was by the external firm, who were Herbert Smith Freehills. Can you briefly talk us through where you sat within the company in respect of, say, the group executive, various steering committees and the external legal firms. Without trying to give a very detailed description of it, the General Executive Mr Foat was a member of the General Executive and I reported directly to him. So we were the Inquiry Team was based in Mr Foat's area, the sort of the legal and governance side of the |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. Q. A. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. I wasn't I haven't I wasn't SRA registered at the time. I am admitted to the role but I wasn't SRA registered and the discussion was clear that my role was the Inquiry Director; the legal advice and legal representation was by the external firm, who were Herbert Smith Freehills. Can you briefly talk us through where you sat within the company in respect of, say, the group executive, various steering committees and the external legal firms. Without trying to give a very detailed description of it, the General Executive Mr Foat was a member of the General Executive and I reported directly to him. So we were the Inquiry Team was based in Mr Foat's area, the sort of the legal and governance side of the business. I chaired the Inquiry SteerCo, which |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | A. Q. A. | directly to Mr Foat, who was the general counsel; is that right? Correct. Although you are a lawyer, you weren't actually acting in a legal role; is that right? That is correct. It was quite clear. I wasn't I haven't I wasn't SRA registered at the time. I am admitted to the role but I wasn't SRA registered and the discussion was clear that my role was the Inquiry Director; the legal advice and legal representation was by the external firm, who were Herbert Smith Freehills. Can you briefly talk us through where you sat within the company in respect of, say, the group executive, various steering committees and the external legal firms. Without trying to give a very detailed description of it, the General Executive Mr Foat was a member of the General Executive and I reported directly to him. So we were the Inquiry Team was based in Mr Foat's area, the sort of the legal and governance side of the |

| | • | |
|---------|----|---|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | discussions about what the extent of the Inquiry |
| 2 | Q. | itself was at that initial point. |
| 4 | ц. | Did you know why it wasn't until October 2021, so four months after the Terms of Reference had |
| 4 5 | | |
| 6 | ٨ | been published, that you were contacted? |
| 0 7 | Α. | No, it was I'd been contacted in July. |
| 7 8 | | I think one of my colleagues in London who works with had done some work with the Post Office |
| о 9 | | had indicated to me that there was a desire to |
| 9 10 | | bring somebody in. I indicated I would be happy |
| 11 | | to do so and then it was a number of months |
| 12 | | later when the actual contact to see if I would |
| 12 | | be available took place. So no, there was no |
| 14 | | discussion about what had taken place during |
| 14 | | that period. |
| 16 | Q. | How long after the phone call did you actually |
| 17 | ω. | join the Post Office team? |
| 18 | Α. | Probably within about a week or so. It was |
| 19 | А. | there were a number of calls, one initially with |
| 20 | | the Mr Mark Underwood, who was the compliance |
| 20 | | director, I can't remember his exact title but |
| 21 | | he worked in the compliance team and then |
| 22 | | a second call with Mr Foat. |
| 24 | Q. | Your title was Inquiry Director; is that |
| 25 | ч. | correct? |
| 20 | | 6 |
| | | |
| 1 | | initially met every week, or it would have |
| 2 | | met as much as we needed it to meet but it was |
| 3 | | listed for a hearing or a meeting every week and |
| 4 | | on the steering committee were a number of GE |
| 5 | | members. |
| 6 | | It was chaired by me and then was attended |
| 7 | | by whoever needed to attend. So there would |
| 8 | | have been Inquiry Team members; HSF would have |
| 9 | | attended on a number of occasions; Peters & |
| 10 | | Peters. As and when an issue arose, the |
| 11 | | relevant people were invited to attend. That |
| 12 | | would have sat regularly. |
| 13 | | I would also have sat in the Freedom of |
| 14 | | Information, the FOIA SteerCo but my role on |
| 15 | | that was a secondee into that role. I didn't |
| 16 | | have any voting or quorum rights within that |
| 17 | | steering committee. My role was to ensure that |
| 18 | | if we were aware of information that might be |
| 19 | | relevant to a Freedom of Information request or |
| 20 | | if a Freedom of Information request addressed |
| 21 | | something that we would need to be aware of, |
| 22 | | there was a link in that regard. |
| 23 | ~ | You've mentioned two external legal firms: |
| | Q. | |
| 24 | Q. | Herbert Smith Freehills and Peters & Peters. |

What do you see as the difference between their $$8\ensuremath{8}$$

(2) Pages 5 - 8

| 1 | | two roles? | 1 |
|--|----|--|--|
| 2 3 | Α. | Herbert Smith Freehills were the lawyers | 2 |
| 3 4 | | representing Post Office with the Inquiry. Their role was to advise to link between the | 3 |
| 4 5 | | Post Office and the Inquiry Team. They were our | 4 5 |
| 6 | | advisers and representatives. Peters & Peters, | 6 |
| 7 | | as I understood it, they dealt with a lot of the | 7 |
| , 8 | | prosecutions historically, they had a lot of | 8 |
| 9 | | material available in regard to the prosecutions | 9 |
| 10 | | and they would have assisted particularly in | 10 |
| 11 | | regard to those that aspect and the phases | 11 |
| 12 | | which would have dealt with prosecution | 12 |
| 13 | | decisions. | 13 |
| 14 | Q. | You've spoken about the various steering | 14 |
| 15 | | committees, the Group Executive, et cetera. Was | 15 |
| 16 | | there anyone other than yourself with | 16 |
| 17 | | significant experience in public inquiry work? | 17 |
| 18 | Α. | Not as far as I'm aware. | 18 |
| 19 | Q. | I want to ask you about the length of the | 19 |
| 20 | | Inquiry. You've said in your statement it was | 20 |
| 21 | | anticipated the Inquiry would only last for | 21 |
| 22 | | three to four months. Who was it that told you | 22 |
| 23 | | that? | 23 |
| 24 | Α. | That was the indication when I was contacted in | 24 |
| 25 | | July to see I have a full a fairly | 25 |
| | | 9 | |
| 1 | | able to attend those. But that discussion was | 1 |
| 2 | | internal. It wasn't externally with the Post | 2 |
| 3 | | Office. | 3 |
| 4 | Q. | | 4 |
| 5 | Ξ. | example the Bloody Sunday Inquiry lasted | 5 |
| 6 | | 12 years did you think that that was | 6 |
| 7 | | a realistic time frame? | 7 |
| 8 | Α. | Initially, I didn't question it because I hadn't | 8 |
| 9 | | had any involvement, so I wasn't aware of what | 9 |
| 10 | | conversations and discussions had gone on. | 10 |
| 11 | | I wasn't aware of the extent and nature of the | 11 |
| 12 | | matters under this Inquiry. When I first came | 12 |
| 13 | | | 10 |
| | | in, within a very short space of time, it was | 13 |
| 14 | | in, within a very short space of time, it was quite clear that the team we had was too small, | 13 |
| | | | |
| 14 | | quite clear that the team we had was too small, | 14 |
| 14 15 | | quite clear that the team we had was too small, that the expectation of time was too small and | 14 15 |
| 14 15 16 | | quite clear that the team we had was too small, that the expectation of time was too small and that the budget we had was just too small, that | 14 15 16 |
| 14 15 16 17 | Q. | quite clear that the team we had was too small, that the expectation of time was too small and that the budget we had was just too small, that it was always going to expand and that even initial expansion expectations were too short. | 14 15 16 17 |
| 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. | quite clear that the team we had was too small, that the expectation of time was too small and that the budget we had was just too small, that it was always going to expand and that even initial expansion expectations were too short. | 14 15 16 17 18 |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. | quite clear that the team we had was too small, that the expectation of time was too small and that the budget we had was just too small, that it was always going to expand and that even initial expansion expectations were too short. You address this to some extent in your witness | 14 15 16 17 18 19 |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. | quite clear that the team we had was too small, that the expectation of time was too small and that the budget we had was just too small, that it was always going to expand and that even initial expansion expectations were too short. You address this to some extent in your witness statement. I'd just like that to be brought on | 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. | quite clear that the team we had was too small, that the expectation of time was too small and that the budget we had was just too small, that it was always going to expand and that even initial expansion expectations were too short. You address this to some extent in your witness statement. I'd just like that to be brought on to screen. It's WITN09970100. Can we look at | 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. | quite clear that the team we had was too small, that the expectation of time was too small and that the budget we had was just too small, that it was always going to expand and that even initial expansion expectations were too short. You address this to some extent in your witness statement. I'd just like that to be brought on to screen. It's WITN09970100. Can we look at the bottom of page 2, it's paragraph 8, please. You say there: "It was immediately apparent that the scope | 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. | quite clear that the team we had was too small, that the expectation of time was too small and that the budget we had was just too small, that it was always going to expand and that even initial expansion expectations were too short. You address this to some extent in your witness statement. I'd just like that to be brought on to screen. It's WITN09970100. Can we look at the bottom of page 2, it's paragraph 8, please. You say there: | 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 |

| on II | Inq | ury 5 September |
|----------|-----|--|
| | | |
| 1 | | substantial caseload. My background, I do a lot |
| 2 | | of Legacy litigation and public inquiry work, so |
| 3 | | I had a fairly extensive caseload, and the |
| 4 | | indication was to me it would only be three or |
| 5 | | four months, so there would be no need for me to |
| 6 | | try to offload my caseload or to try to make |
| 7 | | arrangements within the practice. And then when |
| 8 | | I spoke in October, I think the anticipation |
| 9 | | still then was that it wouldn't be running for |
| 10 | | an awful lot longer than that. |
| 11 | | So initially when I came in, I did not make |
| 12 | | any arrangements or alterations to my caseload |
| 13 | _ | and I was still trying to manage that. |
| 14 | Q. | Who was it within the Post Office that gave you |
| 15 | | that impression? |
| 16 | Α. | My conversations were initially with |
| 17 | | Mr Underwood and with Mr Foat and those initial |
| 18 | | discussions were that it wouldn't be a long |
| 19 | - | period of secondment within the Post Office. |
| 20 | Q. | Did you have a conversation then about retaining |
| 21 | • | your current caseload? |
| 22 | Α. | Only internally within the business that I had |
| 23 24 | | to speak to my line management team to make sure that there was sufficient cover if court |
| 24 25 | | hearings, whatever, came up, that I would not be |
| 20 | | 10 |
| | | |
| 1 | | and the issues involved meant that the |
| 2 | | anticipated timescale and the team within POL |
| 3 | | was inadequate. This created an immediate issue |
| 4 | | with the budget provided for this project |
| 5 | | (a theme which underpinned much of the following |
| 6 | | work in the following 15 months)." |
| 7 | | You say there it was "immediately apparent"; |
| 8 | | was that to you or to others as well? |
| 9 | Α. | With the conversations we were having, that was |
| 10 | | one of the initial discussions that we would |
| 11 | | have had, that this isn't going to work: (a) |
| 12 | | three to four months was not going to be |
| 13 | | sufficient. There was no way that bearing in |
| 14 | | mind the Inquiry hadn't even started having |
| 15 | | hearings we were not going to complete in |
| 16 | | January/February of the following year. That |
| 17 | | did become apparent very quickly and steps were |
| 18 | | being taken very quickly at that point. |
| 19 | Q. | Did it come as a surprise to those you were |
| 20 | | having conversations with? |
| 21 | Α. | I don't think people within Post Office |
| 22 | | understood the nature and I that's not |
| 23 | | a criticism of the Post Office. I don't think |
| 24 | | many people understand the nature of an inquiry |
| 05 | | |

as opposed to a trial, in that a trial can be

with HSF and looking at ways to achieve the same outcomes at lower cost. This meant less and less of my time was spent on the actual

"Again this goes to the budget allocations and the need for those heading each business area or sub-area within those workstreams did not allow for much leeway to allocate staff, time or money to document retention,

Can we turn over to page 13 and in paragraph 50, so later on in your statement, you come back to the theme of budget. You're addressing there the rectification of legacy

document storage and you say it: "... does not feature highly in the priorities of any area and there is a degree of passing the buck hoping other areas will take up

processes themselves."

the responsibility." You say:

identification and storage."

| 1 | | listed months in advance for five days, maybe | 1 | |
|----------|----|--|----------|----|
| 2 | | goes to six or seven, but you know what your | 2 | |
| 3 | | timescales are. | 3 | |
| 4 | | Inquiries by their nature are much more | 4 | |
| 5 | | fluid and I don't think there is | 5 | |
| 6 | | an understanding of the nature of that fluidity | 6 | |
| 7 | | and the organic nature of an inquiry, which can | 7 | |
| 8 | | change direction simply because of information | 8 | |
| 9 | | which comes to light. So I don't think it was | 9 | |
| 10 | | understood and I think it did come as a surprise | 10 | |
| 11 12 | | to those within the management level of the Post | 11 | |
| 12 | | Office as to the extent that the Inquiry could expand and how long it was going to take. | 12 13 | |
| 13 | Q. | | 13 | |
| 14 | Q. | to your witness statement, paragraph 13. It's | 14 | |
| 16 | | page 4. You say there: | 15 | |
| 17 | | "As the Inquiry developed and grew, the | 10 | |
| 18 | | issues around the projected budget and the need | 18 | |
| 19 | | to secure a higher budget became the core focus | 19 | |
| 20 | | and took up a significant part of the time | 20 | |
| 21 | | I spent in the role. A very significant amount | 21 | |
| 22 | | of my time was spent amending budgets, | 22 | |
| 23 | | forecasting and projecting different scenario | 23 | |
| 24 | | budgets, seeking approvals for increased budgets | 24 | |
| 25 | | and drawdown, discussing ways to reduce fees | 25 | |
| | | 13 | | |
| | | | | |
| 1 | | volumes of material. Boxes were found to | 1 | |
| 2 | | contain lottery receipts, memos, advertising | 2 | |
| 3 | | brochures all in one space and if time and money | - 3 | |
| 4 | | were available much of the material could be | 4 | |
| 5 | | reviewed and destroyed but that is not | 5 | |
| 6 | | possible." | 6 | |
| 7 | | In your view, were there sufficient funds | 7 | Q. |
| 8 | | available at the Post Office for a comprehensive | 8 | |
| 9 | | disclosure exercise? | 9 | |
| 10 | Α. | I actually don't think that's a simple question | 10 | |
| 11 | | to answer, in that the Inquiry's budget came | 11 | |
| 12 | | from within the general Post Office budget. The | 12 | |
| 13 | | general Post Office budget was partially | 13 | |
| 14 | | controlled by the Government department, but | 14 | |
| 15 | | partly they were a private company who had to | 15 | |
| 16 | | generate a certain amount of their own income. | 16 | Α. |
| 17 | | And projecting budgets, I don't think any | 17 | |
| 18 | | business could have anticipated the expenditure | 18 | |
| 19 | | that would have been needed to rectify | 19 | |
| 20 | | years/decades of document disclosure and I | 20 | |
| 21 | | I have a lot of sympathy for those within the | 21 | |
| 22 | | Post Office themselves who were expected to run | 22 | |
| 23 | | their departments, continue the operation of the | 23 | |
| 24 | | Post Office but then also find time and the | 24 | |
| 25 | | money out of limited budgets to assist me in | 25 | |
| | | 15 | | |

| a charage. |
|--|
| Further down in paragraph 52, you give |
| an example of the storage facility in Winchester |
| and you say: |
| "Much [of it] has not been accurately |
| indexed requiring manual searches of high |
| 14 |
| |
| finding other documents. |
| I think, in short, no, there wasn't |
| sufficient money within the Post Office to both |
| run the business and deal with the legacy |
| aspects that were highlighted during the process |
| of the Inquiry. |
| Mr Canavan, you talk about the process of the |
| Inquiry but there had, of course, before that |
| been Court of Appeal proceedings, there had been |
| Group Litigation, all of those required |
| disclosure to the courts. Looking back at the |
| funding that was in place for simply maintaining |
| and resourcing the document management within |
| the Post Office, do you think that there was |
| sufficient resourcing and, if not, why not? |
| No, I don't. I think that possibly the |
| consideration hadn't been given to the legacy of |
| material that existed and I think that example |
| of when we were required to go into Winchester |
| and we found thousands of boxes which hadn't |
| been indexed at all, other boxes were indexed |
| inaccurately, and when you started going through |
| it, the material and, in a way, the defects |
| have assisted this Inquiry. |
| Had there been a proper process of document |
| 16 |
| |
| (4) Pages 13 - |
| |

| 1 | | retention, disclosure, organisation and |
|--|----------|--|
| 2 | | destruction, many of these documents would have |
| 3 | | been destroyed within a reasonable a policy |
| 4 | | of destruction after, say, 10 years because |
| 5 | | material was no longer used. A lot of that |
| 6 | | material, had it been retained in a structured |
| 7 | | way, may not have existed now. |
| 8 | | But I do think the issue of document |
| 9 | | identification, location and storage is not |
| 10 | | a priority, and it may well be now, because of |
| 11 | | the issues which have arisen but I don't think |
| 12 | | it was and I think the issues that we |
| 13 | | identified, with boxes being found in different |
| 14 | | offices and different storage areas, highlighted |
| 15 | | that there wasn't an understanding within the |
| 16 | | business as to where all of their material was |
| 17 | | stored. |
| 18 | Q. | In your view, who was responsible for that? |
| 19 | Α. | I think it's a legacy thing. To say who was |
| 20 | | responsible, you would need to go back to when |
| 21 | | the material was being initially stored, so go |
| 22 | | back to the Royal Mail period where someone is |
| 23 | | in the Postal Museum, someone is in Winchester, |
| 24 | | the material we found in the Londonderry Crown |
| 25 | | Office, which as I said, from my memory, when we |
| | | 17 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | those fairly easily, in that they were the |
| 1 2 | | those fairly easily, in that they were the older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of |
| - | | |
| 2 | | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of |
| 2 3 | Q. | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the |
| 2 3 4 | Q. | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. |
| 2 3 4 5 | Q. | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Q. A. | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement "fractured and disjointed". Can you elaborate |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement "fractured and disjointed". Can you elaborate on that a little bit? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement "fractured and disjointed". Can you elaborate on that a little bit? Exactly what I'm saying where you have some |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement "fractured and disjointed". Can you elaborate on that a little bit? Exactly what I'm saying where you have some material in the Postal Museum, you have some |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement "fractured and disjointed". Can you elaborate on that a little bit? Exactly what I'm saying where you have some material in the Postal Museum, you have some material in Winchester, you have some material |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement "fractured and disjointed". Can you elaborate on that a little bit? Exactly what I'm saying where you have some material in the Postal Museum, you have some material in Winchester, you have some material that was in Finsbury Dials, you had material |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement "fractured and disjointed". Can you elaborate on that a little bit? Exactly what I'm saying where you have some material in the Postal Museum, you have some material in Winchester, you have some material that was in Finsbury Dials, you had material held in large regional Post Office hubs, and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement "fractured and disjointed". Can you elaborate on that a little bit? Exactly what I'm saying where you have some material in the Postal Museum, you have some material in Winchester, you have some material that was in Finsbury Dials, you had material held in large regional Post Office hubs, and there wasn't a single point of contact where you |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement "fractured and disjointed". Can you elaborate on that a little bit? Exactly what I'm saying where you have some material in the Postal Museum, you have some material in Winchester, you have some material that was in Finsbury Dials, you had material held in large regional Post Office hubs, and there wasn't a single point of contact where you could contact one person and say, "I'm looking |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement "fractured and disjointed". Can you elaborate on that a little bit? Exactly what I'm saying where you have some material in the Postal Museum, you have some material in Winchester, you have some material that was in Finsbury Dials, you had material held in large regional Post Office hubs, and there wasn't a single point of contact where you could contact one person and say, "I'm looking for A, B and C", and they'd be able to say, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement "fractured and disjointed". Can you elaborate on that a little bit? Exactly what I'm saying where you have some material in the Postal Museum, you have some material in Winchester, you have some material that was in Finsbury Dials, you had material held in large regional Post Office hubs, and there wasn't a single point of contact where you could contact one person and say, "I'm looking for A, B and C", and they'd be able to say, "That's stored in this location". It did involve them having to conduct very |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement "fractured and disjointed". Can you elaborate on that a little bit? Exactly what I'm saying where you have some material in the Postal Museum, you have some material in Winchester, you have some material that was in Finsbury Dials, you had material held in large regional Post Office hubs, and there wasn't a single point of contact where you could contact one person and say, "I'm looking for A, B and C", and they'd be able to say, "That's stored in this location". It did involve them having to conduct very widespread searches physically and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Α. | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement "fractured and disjointed". Can you elaborate on that a little bit? Exactly what I'm saying where you have some material in the Postal Museum, you have some material in Winchester, you have some material that was in Finsbury Dials, you had material held in large regional Post Office hubs, and there wasn't a single point of contact where you could contact one person and say, "I'm looking for A, B and C", and they'd be able to say, "That's stored in this location". It did involve them having to conduct very widespread searches physically and electronically to try to locate material. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement "fractured and disjointed". Can you elaborate on that a little bit? Exactly what I'm saying where you have some material in the Postal Museum, you have some material in Winchester, you have some material that was in Finsbury Dials, you had material held in large regional Post Office hubs, and there wasn't a single point of contact where you could contact one person and say, "I'm looking for A, B and C", and they'd be able to say, "That's stored in this location". It did involve them having to conduct very widespread searches physically and electronically to try to locate material. This Inquiry had been on a non-statutory footing |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Α. | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement "fractured and disjointed". Can you elaborate on that a little bit? Exactly what I'm saying where you have some material in the Postal Museum, you have some material in Winchester, you have some material that was in Finsbury Dials, you had material held in large regional Post Office hubs, and there wasn't a single point of contact where you could contact one person and say, "I'm looking for A, B and C", and they'd be able to say, "That's stored in this location". It did involve them having to conduct very widespread searches physically and electronically to try to locate material. This Inquiry had been on a non-statutory footing for quite some time and then, in June 2021, the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Α. | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement "fractured and disjointed". Can you elaborate on that a little bit? Exactly what I'm saying where you have some material in the Postal Museum, you have some material in Winchester, you have some material that was in Finsbury Dials, you had material held in large regional Post Office hubs, and there wasn't a single point of contact where you could contact one person and say, "I'm looking for A, B and C", and they'd be able to say, "That's stored in this location". It did involve them having to conduct very widespread searches physically and electronically to try to locate material. This Inquiry had been on a non-statutory footing for quite some time and then, in June 2021, the Terms of Reference were announced as a Statutory |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Α. | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement "fractured and disjointed". Can you elaborate on that a little bit? Exactly what I'm saying where you have some material in the Postal Museum, you have some material in Winchester, you have some material that was in Finsbury Dials, you had material held in large regional Post Office hubs, and there wasn't a single point of contact where you could contact one person and say, "I'm looking for A, B and C", and they'd be able to say, "That's stored in this location". It did involve them having to conduct very widespread searches physically and electronically to try to locate material. This Inquiry had been on a non-statutory footing for quite some time and then, in June 2021, the Terms of Reference were announced as a Statutory Inquiry. You joined in October of that year. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Α. | older ones were in the Postal Museum and many of the others were then locatable within the company secretariat. You've described in your witness statement "fractured and disjointed". Can you elaborate on that a little bit? Exactly what I'm saying where you have some material in the Postal Museum, you have some material in Winchester, you have some material that was in Finsbury Dials, you had material held in large regional Post Office hubs, and there wasn't a single point of contact where you could contact one person and say, "I'm looking for A, B and C", and they'd be able to say, "That's stored in this location". It did involve them having to conduct very widespread searches physically and electronically to try to locate material. This Inquiry had been on a non-statutory footing for quite some time and then, in June 2021, the Terms of Reference were announced as a Statutory |

| 1 | | had the safes cracked open, predated Horizon. |
|----------------------------|----------|--|
| 2 | | So that was material that people didn't even |
| 3 | | know they had. |
| 4 | | So I don't think you can blame or allocate |
| 5 | | responsibility to a small number of people. |
| 6 | | I think it is a legacy across all of the running |
| 7 | | of the business. But I think ultimately the |
| 8 | | General Executive should have an understanding |
| 9 | | of what material is in their business and I say |
| 10 | | that in a global context, not as a criticism of |
| 11 | | any member of the current General Executive who |
| 12 | | have inherited this issue, as opposed to created |
| 13 | | it. |
| 14 | Q. | |
| 15 | ч. | recordkeeping, in broad terms, as |
| 16 | | an organisation, can you describe the state of |
| 17 | | the repositories that you found? |
| 18 | Α. | I have no personal involvement. I didn't |
| 19 | | actually attend any of the sites. The reports |
| 20 | | that were coming in to us would suggest that |
| 20 21 | | there wasn't a single repository of any |
| | | 0 1 5 5 |
| 22 | | particular material. So it was scattergun in |
| 23 | | its storage. I think the core corporate |
| 24 | | material, so the board meeting minutes, we |
| 25 | | did from memory, I think we were able to find |
| | | 18 |
| | | |
| 1 | | first to make the suggestion? |
| 2 | Α. | I think it was an organic process, where, as the |
| 3 | | requests came in for material, the level of |
| 4 | | disjointed storage became known and it wasn't |
| 5 | | apparent immediately that from day one, you had |
| 6 | | arrived and when I arrived, my first core |
| 7 | | objectives were that the team was too small and |
| • | | , |
| 8 | | the budget was too small. So we weren't hit |
| 9 | | immediately with a lot of the disclosure |
| 10 | | requests. |
| 11 | | I think maybe some of those came in |
| 12 | | around I remember there were some around |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | December but I think at that point, even then, |
| 15 | | we were more internally concerned with getting |
| 15 | | we were more internally concerned with getting the team in place and a lot of the disclosure |
| 16 | _ | we were more internally concerned with getting the team in place and a lot of the disclosure requests were dealt with externally. |
| 16 17 | Q. | we were more internally concerned with getting the team in place and a lot of the disclosure requests were dealt with externally. Were you aware, for example, that Mr Justice |
| 16 17 18 | Q. | we were more internally concerned with getting the team in place and a lot of the disclosure requests were dealt with externally. Were you aware, for example, that Mr Justice Fraser in the Group Litigation had made |
| 16 17 | Q. | we were more internally concerned with getting the team in place and a lot of the disclosure requests were dealt with externally. Were you aware, for example, that Mr Justice Fraser in the Group Litigation had made criticisms of Post Office's disclosure? |
| 16 17 18 | Q. A. | we were more internally concerned with getting the team in place and a lot of the disclosure requests were dealt with externally. Were you aware, for example, that Mr Justice Fraser in the Group Litigation had made criticisms of Post Office's disclosure? I had read the judgments, the two core Fraser |
| 16 17 18 19 | | we were more internally concerned with getting the team in place and a lot of the disclosure requests were dealt with externally. Were you aware, for example, that Mr Justice Fraser in the Group Litigation had made criticisms of Post Office's disclosure? |
| 16 17 18 19 20 | | we were more internally concerned with getting the team in place and a lot of the disclosure requests were dealt with externally. Were you aware, for example, that Mr Justice Fraser in the Group Litigation had made criticisms of Post Office's disclosure? I had read the judgments, the two core Fraser |

24 who you worked with at the Post Office? 25 A. Yes, it was -- the issue of disclosure was very 20

Q. Had those criticisms permeated throughout those

22

23

24

25

| 1 | | prevalent, it was of high priority within those |
|--|----------|--|
| 2 | | that I dealt with. I think I raised the point |
| 3 | | in my statement where discussions took place |
| 4 | | about how did we ensure that there was no issue |
| 5 | | on disclosure, and there were suggestions of |
| 6 | | should we not just hand the keys to Relativity |
| 7 | | over to the Inquiry so they had access to |
| 8 | | everything or can we not just if they want |
| 9 | | boxes from Winchester, can we not just bring the |
| 10 | | boxes, so there was no suggestion of anything |
| 11 | | being hidden, and that was not appropriate. |
| 12 | | It's not appropriate because the Inquiry |
| 13 | | does not have the resource to go through that |
| 14 | | amount of material. But, likewise, there would |
| 15 | | be a concern that there was an attempt to hide |
| 16 | | information, by simply blizzarding the Inquiry |
| 17 | | with disclosure that they would miss material. |
| 18 | | So it was understood that there was a duty |
| 19 | | on us to provide everything the Inquiry wanted |
| 20 | | to see and there was a clear desire within the |
| 21 | | GE members that I spoke with that we did need to |
| 22 | _ | make sure that you had everything you wanted. |
| 23 | Q. | Given that there was that desire, why was it |
| 24 | | that it wasn't sufficiently funded? |
| 25 | Α. | I think you can only make money go so far. The 21 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | had to be found from other resources and I think |
| 2 | | that was just difficult to do. |
| 2 3 | Q. | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and |
| 2 3 4 | Q. | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had |
| 2 3 4 5 | Q. | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Q. | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and get more resources? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. A. | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and get more resources? I think a lot of work was done in my time, up to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and get more resources? I think a lot of work was done in my time, up to the point when I left, where we were doing |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and get more resources? I think a lot of work was done in my time, up to the point when I left, where we were doing different scenarios where, if we could increase |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and get more resources? I think a lot of work was done in my time, up to the point when I left, where we were doing different scenarios where, if we could increase the Inquiry's internal team and reduce the |
| 2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 | | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and get more resources? I think a lot of work was done in my time, up to the point when I left, where we were doing different scenarios where, if we could increase the Inquiry's internal team and reduce the external cost, what would that be? Where would |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and get more resources? I think a lot of work was done in my time, up to the point when I left, where we were doing different scenarios where, if we could increase the Inquiry's internal team and reduce the external cost, what would that be? Where would we get the funding? And that debate about the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and get more resources? I think a lot of work was done in my time, up to the point when I left, where we were doing different scenarios where, if we could increase the Inquiry's internal team and reduce the external cost, what would that be? Where would we get the funding? And that debate about the different ways and different processes was under |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and get more resources? I think a lot of work was done in my time, up to the point when I left, where we were doing different scenarios where, if we could increase the Inquiry's internal team and reduce the external cost, what would that be? Where would we get the funding? And that debate about the different ways and different processes was under way. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and get more resources? I think a lot of work was done in my time, up to the point when I left, where we were doing different scenarios where, if we could increase the Inquiry's internal team and reduce the external cost, what would that be? Where would we get the funding? And that debate about the different ways and different processes was under way. I think maybe if Diane has increased her |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and get more resources? I think a lot of work was done in my time, up to the point when I left, where we were doing different scenarios where, if we could increase the Inquiry's internal team and reduce the external cost, what would that be? Where would we get the funding? And that debate about the different ways and different processes was under way. I think maybe if Diane has increased her funding since I left, then that work was |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and get more resources? I think a lot of work was done in my time, up to the point when I left, where we were doing different scenarios where, if we could increase the Inquiry's internal team and reduce the external cost, what would that be? Where would we get the funding? And that debate about the different ways and different processes was under way. I think maybe if Diane has increased her funding since I left, then that work was probably done before I left, and it was clear |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and get more resources? I think a lot of work was done in my time, up to the point when I left, where we were doing different scenarios where, if we could increase the Inquiry's internal team and reduce the external cost, what would that be? Where would we get the funding? And that debate about the different ways and different processes was under way. I think maybe if Diane has increased her funding since I left, then that work was probably done before I left, and it was clear that steps had to be taken to increase the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and get more resources? I think a lot of work was done in my time, up to the point when I left, where we were doing different scenarios where, if we could increase the Inquiry's internal team and reduce the external cost, what would that be? Where would we get the funding? And that debate about the different ways and different processes was under way. I think maybe if Diane has increased her funding since I left, then that work was probably done before I left, and it was clear that steps had to be taken to increase the funding. I think we had regular meetings and we |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and get more resources? I think a lot of work was done in my time, up to the point when I left, where we were doing different scenarios where, if we could increase the Inquiry's internal team and reduce the external cost, what would that be? Where would we get the funding? And that debate about the different ways and different processes was under way. I think maybe if Diane has increased her funding since I left, then that work was probably done before I left, and it was clear that steps had to be taken to increase the funding. I think we had regular meetings and we had debates of budget forecasts that went to the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and get more resources? I think a lot of work was done in my time, up to the point when I left, where we were doing different scenarios where, if we could increase the Inquiry's internal team and reduce the external cost, what would that be? Where would we get the funding? And that debate about the different ways and different processes was under way. I think maybe if Diane has increased her funding since I left, then that work was probably done before I left, and it was clear that steps had to be taken to increase the funding. I think we had regular meetings and we had debates of budget forecasts that went to the Department. We had to go to the board. The |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and get more resources? I think a lot of work was done in my time, up to the point when I left, where we were doing different scenarios where, if we could increase the Inquiry's internal team and reduce the external cost, what would that be? Where would we get the funding? And that debate about the different ways and different processes was under way. I think maybe if Diane has increased her funding since I left, then that work was probably done before I left, and it was clear that steps had to be taken to increase the funding. I think we had regular meetings and we had debates of budget forecasts that went to the Department. We had to go to the board. The board themselves were generally very supportive, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | | that was just difficult to do. Diane Wills has said in her statement and we'll hear from her shortly that the team had been under-resourced for a long period of time. Were you unsuccessful in your efforts to try and get more resources? I think a lot of work was done in my time, up to the point when I left, where we were doing different scenarios where, if we could increase the Inquiry's internal team and reduce the external cost, what would that be? Where would we get the funding? And that debate about the different ways and different processes was under way. I think maybe if Diane has increased her funding since I left, then that work was probably done before I left, and it was clear that steps had to be taken to increase the funding. I think we had regular meetings and we had debates of budget forecasts that went to the Department. We had to go to the board. The |

23

| 01111 | mq | uny 5 Septemb |
|--------|----|---|
| | | |
| 1 | | Post Office's budget was, as I understood, there |
| 2 | | was a Government-set budget. The Post Office |
| 3 | | has specific duties and responsibilities that |
| 4 | | they have to comply with. They have to keep |
| 5 | | a certain number of post offices open, they |
| 6 | | still have to recruit and train postmasters, |
| 7 | | they still have to replace the Horizon System. |
| 8 | | So there was an element of prioritising and |
| 9 | | there were efforts to move budgets and that |
| 10 | | was a constant theme throughout my time was |
| 11 | | how do we how much money does the Inquiry |
| 12 | | need? How much money does the Inquiry Team |
| 13 | | need? Where can we find the money? |
| 14 | | And the message is going out to the BAU |
| 15 | | departments that, if there were processes that |
| 16 | | they could stop and save money they should do |
| 17 | | so. But they only had a limited budget that |
| 18 | | they could apply to the entire Inquiry process. |
| 19 | | That budget had to cover not only the document |
| 20 | | retention but the Inquiry Team, HSF, Peters & |
| 21 | | Peters, maintaining the Relativity platform. |
| 22 | | That all came under the same budget. So finding |
| 23 | | extra money to do investigative processes, such |
| 24 | | as going out to Winchester, re-indexing and |
| 25 | | doing tours around all of the offices to locate, 22 |
| | | |
| 4 | | |
| 1 2 | 0 | the budgets that they had available. |
| 2 | Q. | I want to ask you about the role of Herbert Smith Freehills. You've addressed that in your |
| 3 4 | | statement at paragraph 25 onwards. You say that |
| 4 5 | | the instruction predated your role at the Post |
| 6 | | Office but you say you believe it was influenced |
| 7 | | by their previous involvement in Post Office |
| 8 | | related litigation and also the anticipated |
| 9 | | short duration of the Inquiry. I want to take |
| 10 | | those one by one. |
| 11 | | So taking the first of those, what did you |
| 12 | | believe the relevance of Herbert Smith's |
| 13 | | previous involvement to be in their instruction |
| 14 | | in the Inquiry? |
| 15 | Α. | When I arrived, they had they were already in |
| 16 | - | place and, as I understood, the process earlier |
| 17 | | in the year of appointing external lawyers had |
| 18 | | been influenced by the already present position |
| 19 | | within Post Office regarding the legacy |
| 20 | | matters excuse me that Herbert Smith |
| | | |

Freehills -- I believe they were involved in the

compensation process, that they had already

become involved in a compensation process and,

from memory, I haven't gone back to it, but they

may have been involved in the 555 process --

24

(6) Pages 21 - 24

| 1 | | So they had some deeper understanding of |
|--|----------|--|
| 2 | | some of the issues that were going to come up in |
| 3 | | the Inquiry and, as I understood it then, the |
| 4 | | decision at senior level was it made sense to |
| 5 | | utilise the information which was already |
| 6 | | available to Herbert Smith Freehills, than to |
| 7 | | bring in a new firm who would then have to come |
| 8 | | up to speed with all of the issues that they had |
| 9 | | already become involved with. |
| 10 | Q. | Were you aware, for example, that the Group |
| 11 | | Litigation was going to be something that was |
| 12 | | going to be investigated by the Inquiry? |
| 13 | Α. | When I started, no. But it was a clear issue |
| 14 | | that would obviously be of relevance to the |
| 15 | | Inquiry to understand the previous trials, |
| 16 | | although when I first started, I think the |
| 17 | | understanding was that the Inquiry would not be |
| 18 | | seeking to go back into the previous litigation. |
| 19 | | So I may not then have appreciated that taking |
| 20 | | the Fraser trials from one side and the Group |
| 21 | | Litigation as a separate process, that they |
| 22 | | would all have been in my head one earlier |
| 23 | | process, and it did make sense that Herbert |
| 24 | | Smith Freehills had that prior knowledge. |
| 25 | Q. | In terms of the second factor, why would the |
| | | 25 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | negotiations would have been to any process. |
| 1 2 | Q. | |
| | Q. | |
| 2 | Q. | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the |
| 2 3 | Q. | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the |
| 2 3 4 | Q. A. | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more |
| 2 3 4 5 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? Well, it was apparent and I had conversations |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? Well, it was apparent and I had conversations with Mr Foat, who was frustrated, and his |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? Well, it was apparent and I had conversations with Mr Foat, who was frustrated, and his approach was very much "We need to get this |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? Well, it was apparent and I had conversations with Mr Foat, who was frustrated, and his approach was very much "We need to get this done, we will have to find the money". But |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? Well, it was apparent and I had conversations with Mr Foat, who was frustrated, and his approach was very much "We need to get this done, we will have to find the money". But again, that's easy to say, "We will just have to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? Well, it was apparent and I had conversations with Mr Foat, who was frustrated, and his approach was very much "We need to get this done, we will have to find the money". But again, that's easy to say, "We will just have to find the money". The money then has to come |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? Well, it was apparent and I had conversations with Mr Foat, who was frustrated, and his approach was very much "We need to get this done, we will have to find the money". But again, that's easy to say, "We will just have to find the money". The money then has to come from somewhere. So the issue of funding was |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? Well, it was apparent and I had conversations with Mr Foat, who was frustrated, and his approach was very much "We need to get this done, we will have to find the money". But again, that's easy to say, "We will just have to find the money". The money then has to come from somewhere. So the issue of funding was a constant theme and, whilst it may not have |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? Well, it was apparent and I had conversations with Mr Foat, who was frustrated, and his approach was very much "We need to get this done, we will have to find the money". But again, that's easy to say, "We will just have to find the money". The money then has to come from somewhere. So the issue of funding was a constant theme and, whilst it may not have been openly dealt with, it was a constant |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? Well, it was apparent and I had conversations with Mr Foat, who was frustrated, and his approach was very much "We need to get this done, we will have to find the money". But again, that's easy to say, "We will just have to find the money". The money then has to come from somewhere. So the issue of funding was a constant theme and, whilst it may not have been openly dealt with, it was a constant process of "How much will this cost, what do we |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? Well, it was apparent and I had conversations with Mr Foat, who was frustrated, and his approach was very much "We need to get this done, we will have to find the money". But again, that's easy to say, "We will just have to find the money". The money then has to come from somewhere. So the issue of funding was a constant theme and, whilst it may not have been openly dealt with, it was a constant process of "How much will this cost, what do we have to spend to do that?" |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? Well, it was apparent and I had conversations with Mr Foat, who was frustrated, and his approach was very much "We need to get this done, we will have to find the money". But again, that's easy to say, "We will just have to find the money". The money then has to come from somewhere. So the issue of funding was a constant theme and, whilst it may not have been openly dealt with, it was a constant process of "How much will this cost, what do we have to spend to do that?" And one of the points that I think I did |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? Well, it was apparent and I had conversations with Mr Foat, who was frustrated, and his approach was very much "We need to get this done, we will have to find the money". But again, that's easy to say, "We will just have to find the money". The money then has to come from somewhere. So the issue of funding was a constant theme and, whilst it may not have been openly dealt with, it was a constant process of "How much will this cost, what do we have to spend to do that?" And one of the points that I think I did raise was when HSF would have said to us "We |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? Well, it was apparent and I had conversations with Mr Foat, who was frustrated, and his approach was very much "We need to get this done, we will have to find the money". But again, that's easy to say, "We will just have to find the money". The money then has to come from somewhere. So the issue of funding was a constant theme and, whilst it may not have been openly dealt with, it was a constant process of "How much will this cost, what do we have to spend to do that?" And one of the points that I think I did raise was when HSF would have said to us "We need to send five people to Winchester for five |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? Well, it was apparent and I had conversations with Mr Foat, who was frustrated, and his approach was very much "We need to get this done, we will have to find the money". But again, that's easy to say, "We will just have to find the money". The money then has to come from somewhere. So the issue of funding was a constant theme and, whilst it may not have been openly dealt with, it was a constant process of "How much will this cost, what do we have to spend to do that?" And one of the points that I think I did raise was when HSF would have said to us "We need to send five people to Winchester for five days", they would have come to SteerCo and said, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? Well, it was apparent and I had conversations with Mr Foat, who was frustrated, and his approach was very much "We need to get this done, we will have to find the money". But again, that's easy to say, "We will just have to find the money". The money then has to come from somewhere. So the issue of funding was a constant theme and, whilst it may not have been openly dealt with, it was a constant process of "How much will this cost, what do we have to spend to do that?" And one of the points that I think I did raise was when HSF would have said to us "We need to send five people to Winchester for five days", they would have come to SteerCo and said, "This is going to cost roughly this much", that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? Well, it was apparent and I had conversations with Mr Foat, who was frustrated, and his approach was very much "We need to get this done, we will have to find the money". But again, that's easy to say, "We will just have to find the money". The money then has to come from somewhere. So the issue of funding was a constant theme and, whilst it may not have been openly dealt with, it was a constant process of "How much will this cost, what do we have to spend to do that?" And one of the points that I think I did raise was when HSF would have said to us "We need to send five people to Winchester for five days", they would have come to SteerCo and said, "This is going to cost roughly this much", that would then have been approved. And I'm not |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | | Was anyone at this stage raising it with the Group Executive or somebody senior within the Post Office that they urgently needed more funding? Well, it was apparent and I had conversations with Mr Foat, who was frustrated, and his approach was very much "We need to get this done, we will have to find the money". But again, that's easy to say, "We will just have to find the money". The money then has to come from somewhere. So the issue of funding was a constant theme and, whilst it may not have been openly dealt with, it was a constant process of "How much will this cost, what do we have to spend to do that?" And one of the points that I think I did raise was when HSF would have said to us "We need to send five people to Winchester for five days", they would have come to SteerCo and said, "This is going to cost roughly this much", that would then have been approved. And I'm not aware, I don't recall any instance when that |

| 11201111 | μη | uny 5 Septembe |
|----------|----|---|
| | | |
| 1 | | length of the Inquiry be relevant to Herbert |
| 2 | | Smith's instruction? |
| 3 | Α. | As became clear, the budgetary aspect of the |
| 4 | | Inquiry, in that I don't believe there was any |
| 5 | | negotiation of a budget or a fee process with |
| 6 | | Herbert Smith before I arrived, that was already |
| 7 | | in place by the time I took up my role. So |
| 8 | | a shorter duration would not have had |
| 9 | | a significant budgetary impact on the wider Post |
| 10 | | Office. But a longer duration, it would have |
| 11 | | made more sense to look at other alternatives |
| 12 | | that may have been less expensive or perhaps |
| 13 | | some kind of fee negotiation with Herbert Smiths |
| 14 | | that may have taken place. |
| 15 | Q. | Is this because, as you've previously described, |
| 16 | | there was this fixed pot of money that wasn't |
| 17 | | expanding? |
| 18 | Α. | I think the Post Office's budget is fixed across |
| 19 | | its entire and then the internal allocation |
| 20 | | of that budget. There had been a small budget |
| 21 | | allocated to the Inquiry process which did |
| 22 | | continue to expand but I think the shorter the |
| 23 | | duration, the less relevant the budgetary |
| 24 | | implications would have been. The longer the |
| 25 | | process, the more relevant budgetary |
| | | 26 |
| | | |
| 1 | | budget was essential because there was a limited |
| 2 | _ | budget. |
| 3 | Q. | You say at paragraph 26 of your witness |
| 4 | | statement that the approach to each disclosure |
| 5 | | request was designed by Herbert Smith Freehills. |
| 6 | | Perhaps we can look at paragraph 53, it's |
| 7 | | page 14. Thank you. You say at paragraph 53: |
| 8 | | "HSF sought to identify relevant search |
| 9 | | criteria based on each R9 request. Those terms |
| 10 | | were devised by and applied by HSF and were not |
| 11 | | discussed with POL." |
| 12 | | Looking back, do you think that was |
| 13 | | an appropriate action to take? |
| 14 15 | Α. | Yes, I do. The team within Post Office would not have understood what the the search |
| 15 | | |
| 16 17 | | criteria were set up by the external advisers, |
| | | who were immersed in the process. They would |
| 18 | | have set the criteria to what the Rule 9 Request |
| 19 20 | | was looking for. Some Rule 9 Requests were very |
| 20 21 | | simple, you could identify a specific document. |
| 21 22 | | That was easy. But if it was wider requests, we |
| 22 | | relied on HSF to tell us they have received |
| 23 | | a Rule 9 Request, it relates to and they will |
| 24 25 | | have disclosed the Rule 9 Request to myself, but |
| 25 | | they would have devised then what they needed, 28 |

(7) Pages 25 - 28

| 1 | | what they felt was the appropriate search, and |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | they did so under the direction that it was to |
| 3 | | be as wide as possible and it wasn't to be |
| 4 | | a restrictive search. |
| 5 | Q. | But in terms of providing assistance to the |
| 6 | | Inquiry, getting the right documents that the |
| 7 | | document wanted, do you think it is appropriate |
| 8 | | for an external law firm to devise and apply |
| 9 | | search terms and not to discuss them with their |
| 10 | | client? |
| 11 | Α. | When I say they weren't discussed, they wouldn't |
| 12 | | have sent a note to us saying, "We are applying, |
| 13 | | 'Horizon', 'Horizon litigation'". They didn't |
| 14 | | necessarily set them out. They would have |
| 15 | | each Rule 9 Request would have been brought up |
| 16 | | at a SteerCo, they would have identified where |
| 17 | | they had identified relevant areas that they |
| 18 | | needed to search, be that Postal Museum, |
| 19 | | Winchester or Relativity searches. They would |
| 20 | | have indicated to us that we received |
| 21 | | I think sometimes there were hundreds of |
| 22 | | thousands of hits that went to first level |
| 23 | | review, that was reduced then to a second level |
| 24 | | review and then the disclosures were then sent |
| 25 | | to the Inquiry when the relevant material was |
| | | 29 |
| | | |
| 1 | | would have had contact with HSF and HSF would |
| 2 | | have utilised that knowledge about questions |
| 3 | | they could have said "Have you looked at", or |
| 4 | | "I remember that incident", or "I remember |
| 5 | | a person who was involved in that department". |
| 6 | | So there was contact |
| 7 | Q. | So although you've said in your witness |
| 8 | | statement there those term were devised by and |
| 9 | | applied by HSF and were not discussed with Post |
| 10 | | Office Limited, your evidence is that there were |
| 11 | | people within Post Office Limited, in the |
| 12 | | operational side, that did have discussions with |
| 13 | | Herbert Smith Freehills? |
| 14 | Α. | They the discussions would have been about |
| 15 | | the process, not the terms. Herbert Smith |

| 1 | | id | ent | |
|---|--|----|-----|--|
| | | | | |

| 1 | | identified. |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | Q. | Did they too had on every occasion? |
| 3 | Α. | My memory is that yes, they did. I don't |
| 4 | | believe there were any requests where we were |
| 5 | | not aware of the Rule 9 or the nature of the |
| 6 | | searches, primarily because any budget |
| 7 | | requirement to send people out to the hard copy |
| 8 | | repositories would have had to have been |
| 9 | | approved. |
| 10 | Q. | In terms of human involvement, though, from the |
| 11 | | Post Office, in terms of somebody with |
| 12 | | experience, with knowledge of Post Office |
| 13 | | policies, procedures, it sounds from paragraph |
| 14 | | 53 of your statement that there wasn't that kind |
| 15 | | of involvement in, for example, search terms? |
| 16 | Α. | It may well have been I assume that may be |
| 17 | | slightly misleading in that they did not discuss |
| 18 | | the phrasing of the search terms or how they |
| 19 | | would have framed and carried them out. The |
| 20 | | Inquiry Team was kind of two layered. There was |
| 21 | | the legal side where we had legal counsel who |
| 22 | | would have been involved with certain work, but |
| 23 | | there was also an operations side, and there |
| 24 | | were members on the operations side who were |
| 25 | | longstanding Post Office employees, and they |
| | | 30 |
| | | |
| 1 | Q. | So you have said that they had access to people |
| 2 | | at the Post Office? |
| 3 | Α. | Yes. |
| 4 | Q. | Did they routinely consult people in the Post |
| 5 | | Office with regards to requests that had been |
| 6 | | made? |
| 7 | Α. | There was consistent two-way conversations going |
| 8 | | on that the contact would have been made through |
| 9 | | both SteerCo and through requests for |
| 10 | | information and any information which we devised |
| 11 | | or located. So if one of our processes located |
| 12 | | material we would have immediately notified HSF |

12 material, we would have immediately notified HSF

- 13 and if they had needed access or if they had
- 14 requested any access, it would have been
- 15 granted. And I do recall instances when people
- 16 within the operations team did speak with HSF. 17
- I couldn't give you information as to how
- 18 regular or consistent that was.
- 19 Q. Was there a policy in place as to in what 20 circumstances to speak to somebody at the Post 21 Office?
- 22 A. No, there was no formal policy.
- 23 Q. Perhaps we can take an example, and that's the
- 24 request for prosecution policies and
- investigation policies. Can we look at 25 32

search criteria should be. 31

Freehills devised what searches were required,

what the -- what the Rule 9 was requesting, how

to conduct those searches, what they would be

looking for, but they would have had access to

anyone within the Post Office had they needed

where to go looking for material. There would

have been no -- Post Office did not dictate or

direct what the search terms were or what the

access to anyone in particular for advice on

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

| 1 | | INQ00002007, please. This is 28 February, 2022, |
|---|----|--|
| 2 | | Rule 9 Request. It's Rule 9(11). This was |
| 3 | | a request while you were in post and can we look |
| 4 | | at paragraph 15 of this request. Thank you. |
| 5 | | This request says: |
| 6 | | "The Minutes of the Audit, Risk and |
| 7 | | Compliance Subcommittee of 11 February 2014 |
| 8 | | refer to a report which outlined the proposed |
| 9 | | changes to the prosecutions policy and a paper |
| 10 | | to explain the most appropriate way to |
| 11 | | communicate the prosecutions policy. Please |
| 12 | | provide copies of the same and copies of <u>all</u> |
| 13 | | iterations of the prosecutions policy since 1999 |
| 14 | | that are in POL's custody or control." |
| 15 | | If we move down the same request |
| 16 | | paragraph 46, please. Sorry, it's a bit above |
| 17 | | that. Thank you. There's a reference there to |
| 18 | | the "Minutes of the Audit, Risk and Compliance |
| 19 | | Committee", and it says: |
| 20 | | "These refer to an investigations policy |
| 21 | | that was circulated. Please provide copies of |
| 22 | | the same and copies of all iterations of the |
| 23 | | investigations policy since 1999 that are in |
| 24 25 | | POL's custody or control." |
| 25 | | There was a later Rule 9 asking for much the 33 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | |
| ~ | | post. The Inquiry's understanding was that the |
| 2 | | process that followed that was that Herbert |
| 3 | | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the |
| 3 4 | | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end |
| 3 4 5 | | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that |
| 3 4 5 6 | | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling |
| 3 4 5 6 7 | | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was ultimately produced. |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was ultimately produced. Is your evidence then that there was |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was ultimately produced. Is your evidence then that there was a discussion about prosecution policies with |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was ultimately produced. Is your evidence then that there was a discussion about prosecution policies with somebody in the Post Office, between them and |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | ۸ | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was ultimately produced. Is your evidence then that there was a discussion about prosecution policies with somebody in the Post Office, between them and Herbert Smith Freehills? |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A. | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was ultimately produced. Is your evidence then that there was a discussion about prosecution policies with somebody in the Post Office, between them and Herbert Smith Freehills? I can't answer that question in that I don't |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | A. | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was ultimately produced. Is your evidence then that there was a discussion about prosecution policies with somebody in the Post Office, between them and Herbert Smith Freehills? I can't answer that question in that I don't have any specific memory of this individual |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was ultimately produced. Is your evidence then that there was a discussion about prosecution policies with somebody in the Post Office, between them and Herbert Smith Freehills? I can't answer that question in that I don't have any specific memory of this individual request. My understanding would be that Herbert |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was ultimately produced. Is your evidence then that there was a discussion about prosecution policies with somebody in the Post Office, between them and Herbert Smith Freehills? I can't answer that question in that I don't have any specific memory of this individual request. My understanding would be that Herbert Smith would contact Post Office identifying |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was ultimately produced. Is your evidence then that there was a discussion about prosecution policies with somebody in the Post Office, between them and Herbert Smith Freehills? I can't answer that question in that I don't have any specific memory of this individual request. My understanding would be that Herbert Smith would contact Post Office identifying particular search areas, so the hard copy/soft |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was ultimately produced. Is your evidence then that there was a discussion about prosecution policies with somebody in the Post Office, between them and Herbert Smith Freehills? I can't answer that question in that I don't have any specific memory of this individual request. My understanding would be that Herbert Smith would contact Post Office identifying particular search areas, so the hard copy/soft copy repositories. If there was a specific |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Α. | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was ultimately produced. Is your evidence then that there was a discussion about prosecution policies with somebody in the Post Office, between them and Herbert Smith Freehills? I can't answer that question in that I don't have any specific memory of this individual request. My understanding would be that Herbert Smith would contact Post Office identifying particular search areas, so the hard copy/soft copy repositories. If there was a specific issue, in this case looking at governance |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was ultimately produced. Is your evidence then that there was a discussion about prosecution policies with somebody in the Post Office, between them and Herbert Smith Freehills? I can't answer that question in that I don't have any specific memory of this individual request. My understanding would be that Herbert Smith would contact Post Office identifying particular search areas, so the hard copy/soft copy repositories. If there was a specific issue, in this case looking at governance policies and procedures, that would have been |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was ultimately produced. Is your evidence then that there was a discussion about prosecution policies with somebody in the Post Office, between them and Herbert Smith Freehills? I can't answer that question in that I don't have any specific memory of this individual request. My understanding would be that Herbert Smith would contact Post Office identifying particular search areas, so the hard copy/soft copy repositories. If there was a specific issue, in this case looking at governance policies and procedures, that would have been referred to the Inquiry team. That, I would |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was ultimately produced. Is your evidence then that there was a discussion about prosecution policies with somebody in the Post Office, between them and Herbert Smith Freehills? I can't answer that question in that I don't have any specific memory of this individual request. My understanding would be that Herbert Smith would contact Post Office identifying particular search areas, so the hard copy/soft copy repositories. If there was a specific issue, in this case looking at governance policies and procedures, that would have been referred to the Inquiry team. That, I would believe, would have been referred to the |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was ultimately produced. Is your evidence then that there was a discussion about prosecution policies with somebody in the Post Office, between them and Herbert Smith Freehills? I can't answer that question in that I don't have any specific memory of this individual request. My understanding would be that Herbert Smith would contact Post Office identifying particular search areas, so the hard copy/soft copy repositories. If there was a specific issue, in this case looking at governance policies and procedures, that would have been referred to the Inquiry team. That, I would believe, would have been referred to the Secretariat, the company secretaries department, |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | A. | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was ultimately produced. Is your evidence then that there was a discussion about prosecution policies with somebody in the Post Office, between them and Herbert Smith Freehills? I can't answer that question in that I don't have any specific memory of this individual request. My understanding would be that Herbert Smith would contact Post Office identifying particular search areas, so the hard copy/soft copy repositories. If there was a specific issue, in this case looking at governance policies and procedures, that would have been referred to the Inquiry team. That, I would believe, would have been referred to the Secretariat, the company secretaries department, and any responses would have been identified, |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. | process that followed that was that Herbert Smith Freehills would set search terms, the repositories would be searched and the end product would come back. We know that a significant document, the racial profiling document, was not contained in what was ultimately produced. Is your evidence then that there was a discussion about prosecution policies with somebody in the Post Office, between them and Herbert Smith Freehills? I can't answer that question in that I don't have any specific memory of this individual request. My understanding would be that Herbert Smith would contact Post Office identifying particular search areas, so the hard copy/soft copy repositories. If there was a specific issue, in this case looking at governance policies and procedures, that would have been referred to the Inquiry team. That, I would believe, would have been referred to the Secretariat, the company secretaries department, |

| 1 | | same. That's INQ00002008. So that was |
|--------|----------|---|
| 2 | | a request of 15 June 2022. Perhaps we can look |
| 3 | | at paragraph 18. That request asked for: |
| 4 | | "Policies and guidelines relating to the |
| 5 | | bringing of private prosecutions against |
| 6 | | subpostmasters and other end users" |
| 7 | | Request 22 says: |
| 8 | | "Any guidance, training or instruction |
| 9 | | given to those responsible for conducting |
| 10 | | criminal investigations" |
| 11 | | Paragraph 26, scrolling down, similarly asks |
| 12 | | for: |
| 13 | | "Any guidance, training or instruction given |
| 14 | | to those responsible for making charging |
| 15 | | decisions" |
| 16 | | Paragraph 30: |
| 17 | | "Any guidance, training or instruction given |
| 18 | | to those responsible for conducting the |
| 19 | | prosecution of subpostmasters" |
| 20 | | Just by way of one more example, paragraph |
| 21 | | 34: |
| 22 | | "Any guidance, training or instruction given |
| 23 | | to those responsible for disclosure in criminal |
| 24 | | proceedings brought against subpostmasters" |
| 25 | | These requests were made while you were in 34 |
| 1 2 | Q. A. | Your evidence is that it would have happened? That would be my belief. |
| 2 | Q. | How involved in this process were you as Inquiry |
| 4 | હ. | Director? |
| 5 | Α. | I was I had very little direct involvement in |
| 6 | | any of the specific processes, particularly by |
| 7 | | the time we came to June of last year, we were |
| 8 | | heavily involved in trying to expand, even in |
| 9 | | June last year, the process had been that we |
| 10 | | would have been ending the Inquiry by sort of |
| 11 | | Christmas and then it was quite clear it wasn't |
| 12 | | going to end, and budgets were severely |
| 13 | | constrained by that point. |
| 14 | | The process, I think maybe when I came |
| 15 | | into post it was a very small team, we expanded |
| 16 | | the team both on the legal and operational side |
| 17 | | and, just before I departed, an Operations |
| 18 | | Director had been appointed. The Head of Legal |
| 19 | | who had been on maternity leave was due back and |
| 20 | | my understanding would have been that I would |
| 21 | | have then moved into the role of overseeing |
| 22 | | rather than being hands on, day to day, dealing |
| 23 | | with the finance team, and drafting of the |
| 24 | | processes. I would have been a much more |
| 25 | | oversight role. |
| | | 36 |

| 1 | | The majority of the requests would have been |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | dealt with by the individual teams that were |
| 3 | | created. The process we had, Phases 2 and 3 |
| 4 | | were allocated to two counsel, Phases 3 and 4 |
| 5 | | were allocated to two counsel, 5 and 6 were |
| 6 | | is it yeah, were allocated then to |
| 7 | | a different set of counsel, and then they would |
| 8 | | have been tasked to deal with their counterpart |
| 9 | | in HSF about any requests that were relevant to |
| 10 | | their area, that they would have assisted in |
| 11 | | that process. |
| 12 | | I would not have had any day-to-day or even |
| 13 | | detailed responses or updates on specific |
| 14 | | documents that were located. |
| 15 | | I think had the racial profiling document |
| 16 | | been identified, I would have been aware of it |
| 17 | | and I would have been made aware of it because |
| 18 | | of the gross nature of the material which had |
| 19 | | been produced. |
| 20 | Q. | So as Inquiry Director, your role was not to get |
| 21 | | involved in the nitty-gritty of the Rule 9 |
| 22 | | requests? |
| 23 | Α. | No. |
| 24 | Q. | That was left to legal counsel? |
| 25 | Α. | Yes. |
| | | 37 |
| | | |
| | | |

because I would -- there were frustrations

1

| • | | |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | expressed by the operational side, where they |
| 3 | | would say, "I've sent material to HSF and |
| 4 | | they've asked for it again and I've already sent |
| 5 | | this". So there were definitely ongoing |
| 6 | | discussions and ongoing exchanges, and that was |
| 7 | | taking place. But the exact nature of who was |
| 8 | | speaking to who and what they were asking for |
| 9 | | and what was being produced was not reported up |
| 10 | | to me. I was aware of the frustrations both |
| 11 | | from HSF saying, "We've asked for certain |
| 12 | | material which hasn't arrived". I would then |
| 13 | | say, "Look what are we doing?" and then from our |
| 14 | | side saying, "I've sent this three times" and |
| 15 | | then me going to HSF saying, "Apparently this |
| 16 | | has already been three occasions". |
| 17 | | So there were conversations at the lawyer |
| 18 | | level, either between the lawyers and the |
| 19 | | internal lawyers, or the lawyers and HSF and the |
| 20 | | operational team within Post Office. |
| 21 | Q. | In order to assist those who are currently |
| 22 | | working for the Post Office on their disclosure, |
| 23 | | can you tell us why you think that kind of |
| 24 | | a breakdown would happen? |
| 25 | Α. | I think it's just partly, I think it is the |
| | | 39 |
| | | |
| | | |

| 1 | Ο | So those are gualified lawyers | |
|---|----|--------------------------------|--|
| | ч. | So those are qualified lawyers | |

- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. -- who you assume or your evidence is they would 4 have discussed those with people who worked at POL? 5
- 6 A. To the extent that HSF would have had their --7 they would have identified teams dealing with
- each Rule 9 Request, with each area and they 8
- 9 would then have liaised with the relevant person
- 10 in the Post Office team. It wasn't dealt on
- 11 a basis where the partners in HSF would deal
- with me, I would then allocate it down to 12
- 13 somebody within Post Office who then reported
- 14 back to me and I reported back to HSF. It
- wasn't that relationship. 15
- 16 The relationship between myself and HSF was 17 much more at the higher level as to what we were
- 18 doing, what our strategic approaches were, what
- 19 our priorities were going to be for upcoming
- 20 phases.
- 21 Q. Is it possible that those conversations with the 22 people involved on the operational side of the 23 Post Office simply weren't taking place and that 24 you weren't aware of that?
- 25 Α. No, because I was aware of conversations then, 38
- 1 size of the team within Post Office. There was 2 a limited number of people and some of the 3 operational staff had other BAU duties and 4 responsibilities, so they weren't dedicated 5 solely to the Post Office. And I also think 6 partly -- I'm criticising our own profession 7 here -- but I don't think lawyers sometimes 8 understand and can explain to non-lawyers what 9 they are asking for as clearly as maybe they should. 10 11 But I also do think part of the problem can
- be something the size of this Inquiry where one 12 member of the Post Office is responding to one 13 14 person in HSF, and there are three different 15 teams in HSF doing three different jobs, but the Venn diagram arrangement of inquiries is certain 16 17 matters do overlap, and getting repeated 18 requests for a document you sent to person A from person B or person C, the Post Office staff 19 get frustrated because "I've already sent that",
- 20 21 but it was to a different team for a different 22 purpose.
- 23 Q. So was there a lack of communication between the 24 various Herbert Smith teams rather than a lack
- 25 of communication between Herbert Smith and the 40

| 1 | | Post Office? |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | Α. | I think there was there may well have been |
| 3 | | a lack of clear understanding but, again, the |
| 4 | | sheer volume of what's being dealt with |
| 5 | | understanding what document has come in and |
| 6 | | having a central repository of all of that |
| 7 | | information, plus how you name it. I name it |
| 8 | | "Board meeting, 12 January", somebody names it |
| 9 | | "Board meeting re Horizon", a third person names |
| 10 | | it "Board meeting" they're asking for the |
| 11 | | same document but they've called it a different |
| 12 | | name because of the distinction within the |
| 13 | | Rule 9 Request as to what it is you're actually |
| 14 | | looking for. |
| 15 | | So there may well be a lack of clarity in |
| 16 | | what is being requested, consistency in namings |
| 17 | | or even just an understanding within the teams, |
| 18 | | Herbert Smith asking for one thing and Post |
| 19 | | Office thinking they're asking for something |
| 20 | | else, and I think that it is quite likely that |
| 21 | | there were instances where that did happen. |
| 22 | Q. | When you were in post, is it your view that Post |
| 23 | | Office was lacking a central individual to |
| 24 | | filter those kinds of requests or was it |
| 25 | | a general understaffing or something else? |
| | | 41 |
| | | |
| 1 | | recall instances when documents were brought up, |
| 2 | | that were going to go on Freedom of Information |
| 3 | | requests and we immediately ensured HSF advised |
| 4 | | the Inquiry that material was going to come out |
| 5 | | because we didn't want the Inquiry's first it |
| 6 | | may not have been relevant to an existing Rule 9 |
| 7 | | but it was clearly relevant to facts in issue in |
| 8 | | the Inquiry and we did not want the first |
| 9 | | knowledge to be the front page of the Daily |
| 10 | | Mail. |
| 11 | | We wanted to make sure, even if it was only |
| 12 | | a day or two's knowledge, that you would have |
| 13 | | known. So we did, on a number of occasions, |
| 14 | | identify material that had been requested under |
| 15 | | Freedom of Information requests and we bought |
| 16 | | them to the attention of the Inquiry. So I know |
| 17 | | that that did happen. I do not know how that |
| 18 | | did not happen on this occasion. |
| 19 | Q. | Did you, during your period, recognise any |
| 20 | | difference in, for example, the quality of the |
| 21 | | product from Freedom of Information searches, |
| 22 | | vis à vis the quality that was produced for |
| 23 | | Inquiry's disclosure? |
| | | |

- 24 **A.** No. I think my feeling was that the Freedom of
- 25 Information was much more directed, because they 43

| 1 | A. | I think the team was generally understaffed, in |
|--------|----|--|
| 2 | | that there was a huge job to be done but there |
| 3 | | weren't enough people to do all of the tasks, |
| 4 | | which meant that you had to prioritise within |
| 5 | | the teams, and that may well have led to some |
| 6 | | requests or some understanding falling between |
| 7 | | the cracks. |
| 8 | Q. | Looking at that racial characteristics document, |
| 9 | | we've dealt with it with Mr Foat, so I'm not |
| 10 | | going to deal with it in depth with you today, |
| 11 | | but you've said that you sat on a steering |
| 12 | | committee that related to Freedom of Information |
| 13 | | Act requests and that there was liaison in fact |
| 14 | | between the Freedom of Information people and |
| 15 | | the Inquiry people, and that I think you were |
| 16 | | that figure that sat on both committees, for |
| 17 | | example. |
| 18 | A. | Yes. |
| 19 | Q. | How, in your view, do you think it is that that |
| 20 | | document, having been disclosed under the |
| 21 | | Freedom of Information Act, wasn't brought to |
| 22 | | the relevant people's attention promptly? |
| 23 | A. | I don't I have no comprehension as to how |
| 24 | | that did not. That would have been after my |
| 25 | | time, so I don't know how that happened. I do |
| 20 | | 42 |
| | | |
| 1 | | were the requests would have been much more |
| 2 | | specific, where the Inquiry's scope is much |
| 2 | | wider and the request would be a much broader |
| 4 | | brush. So what we would be looking for would be |
| 4 5 | | a lot wider than what a Freedom of Information |
| - | | |
| 6 7 | | request would be looking for. So it may well |
| 7 | | have been that a Freedom of Information request |
| 8 | | would divulge 14/20 documents, we would be |
| 9 | | locating 15,000/20,000 documents. |
| 10 | | So I do not as I say, I do not understand |
| 11 | | how that one was located by Freedom of |
| 12 | | Information when it hadn't been located |
| 13 | | previously, nor how we the Inquiry Team were |
| 14 | | not able to notify the Inquiry in advance that |
| 15 | | this was coming. |
| 16 | Q. | In terms of your ultimate departure, can you |
| 17 | | tell us why you left the Post Office? |
| 18 | Α. | I think from my understanding is it was quite |
| 19 | | simply budgetary, that the cost of seconding |
| 20 | | a partner from a law firm in was extensive and, |
| 21 | | therefore, they had to try to manage the |
| 22 | | long-term budget of how to manage the fees and |
| 23 | | bringing somebody in to manage the team long |

- bringing somebody in to manage the team longterm. And I think possibly then again the
- 25 initial view of you were brought in for

| 1 | a short-term to deal with a certain aspect and |
|--|---|
| 2 | it has just blown up out of all proportion from |
| 3 | what we understood. |
| 4 | Q. We will shortly hear from Mrs Wills, who has |
| 5 | described some successes she has had in terms of |
| 6 | increasing the budget. Why do you think it is |
| 7 | or do you think it is that Mrs Wills has had |
| - | |
| 8 | more success in increasing the budget than you |
| 9 | did during your time in post? |
| 10 | A. I think reality has come to play but, at the end |
| 11 | of my time, there was a much longer and much |
| 12 | more detailed understanding that small increases |
| 13 | of a bit here and a bit there were not going to |
| 14 | do it, that the Inquiry was and the Inquiry's |
| 15 | timetable itself had been much clearly set out, |
| 16 | that we knew then that we were looking at this |
| 17 | period, this period, this period, and hopefully |
| 18 | that the wearing down I had done during my time |
| 19 | and the work that I had done had softened the |
| | |
| 20 | way for a much clearer understanding, that the |
| 21 | budgets that had been discussed were simply not |
| 22 | valid. |
| 23 | And we had presented scenarios of increasing |
| 24 | the internal team, changing terms, changing the |
| 25 | approach. A lot of that had been done setting |
| | 45 |
| | |
| | |
| 1 | MD DI AKE, Thenk you you much air Wolfe going to |
| 1 | MR BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. We're going to |
| 2 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could |
| 2 3 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. |
| 2 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. |
| 2 3 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. |
| 2 3 4 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. |
| 2 3 4 5 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) (A short break) |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) (A short break) (11.15 am) |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) (A short break) (11.15 am) MR BEER: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear me? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) (A short break) (11.15 am) MR BEER: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you very much. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) (A short break) (11.15 am) MR BEER: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you very much. MR BEER: May I call Mrs Diane Wills, please. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) (A short break) (11.15 am) MR BEER: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you very much. MR BEER: May I call Mrs Diane Wills, please. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) (A short break) (11.15 am) MR BEER: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you very much. MR BEER: May I call Mrs Diane Wills, please. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. DIANE WILLS (sworn) |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) (A short break) (11.15 am) MR BEER: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you very much. MR BEER: May I call Mrs Diane Wills, please. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. DIANE WILLS (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) (A short break) (11.15 am) MR BEER: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you very much. MR BEER: May I call Mrs Diane Wills, please. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. DIANE WILLS (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Thank you, Mrs Wills. As you know, my |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) (A short break) (11.15 am) MR BEER: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you very much. MR BEER: May I call Mrs Diane Wills, please. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. DIANE WILLS (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Thank you, Mrs Wills. As you know, my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) (A short break) (11.15 am) MR BEER: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you very much. MR BEER: May I call Mrs Diane Wills, please. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. DIANE WILLS (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Thank you, Mrs Wills. As you know, my |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) (A short break) (11.15 am) MR BEER: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you very much. MR BEER: May I call Mrs Diane Wills, please. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. DIANE WILLS (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Thank you, Mrs Wills. As you know, my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) (A short break) (11.15 am) MR BEER: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you very much. MR BEER: May I call Mrs Diane Wills, please. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. DIANE WILLS (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Thank you, Mrs Wills. As you know, my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry. Can you give us your full name |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) (A short break) (11.15 am) MR BEER: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you very much. MR BEER: May I call Mrs Diane Wills, please. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. DIANE WILLS (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Thank you, Mrs Wills. As you know, my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry. Can you give us your full name please? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) (A short break) (11.15 am) MR BEER: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you very much. MR BEER: May I call Mrs Diane Wills, please. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. DIANE WILLS (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Thank you, Mrs Wills. As you know, my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry. Can you give us your full name please? A. Diane Wills. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) (A short break) (11.15 am) MR BEER: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you very much. MR BEER: May I call Mrs Diane Wills, please. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. DIANE WILLS (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Thank you, Mrs Wills. As you know, my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry. Can you give us your full name please? A. Diane Wills. Q. Thank you for coming to assist us in our work, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) (A short break) (11.15 am) MR BEER: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you very much. MR BEER: May I call Mrs Diane Wills, please. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. DIANE WILLS (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Thank you, Mrs Wills. As you know, my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry. Can you give us your full name please? A. Diane Wills. Q. Thank you for coming to assist us in our work, and for previously providing a witness statement to the Inquiry. You should have in front of you |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | hear from Mrs Wills next but perhaps we could take a 15-minute break, so to 11.15. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, by all means. Fine. MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. (11.00 am) (A short break) (11.15 am) MR BEER: Good morning, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you very much. MR BEER: May I call Mrs Diane Wills, please. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. DIANE WILLS (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Thank you, Mrs Wills. As you know, my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry. Can you give us your full name please? A. Diane Wills. Q. Thank you for coming to assist us in our work, and for previously providing a witness statement |

| 1 | | out various avenues and I would hope possibly |
|----|-----|--|
| 2 | | then that there was a I've no idea, I'm |
| 3 | | speculating here, which is probably incorrect |
| 4 | | for me to do so that hopefully more funding |
| 5 | | was provided from Government resources to ensure |
| 6 | | that the Post Office could comply with its |
| 7 | | duties and responsibilities to the Inquiry. |
| 8 | MR | BLAKE: Thank you very much. |
| 9 | | Sir, do you have any questions? |
| 10 | | Questioned by SIR WYN WILLIAMS |
| 11 | SIR | WYN WILLIAMS: Just one, if I may. Well, it may |
| 12 | | be more than one but it's one discrete issue. |
| 13 | | Mr Canavan, you spoke about the role of |
| 14 | | counsel in the various teams which was set up. |
| 15 | | I just wanted to understand what you meant by |
| 16 | | that. Were you meaning that these people were |
| 17 | | members of the independent bar in private |
| 18 | | practice instructed by a solicitor or were you |
| 19 | | talking about in-house employees? |
| 20 | Α. | 5 , 5 , |
| 21 | | qualified staff internally, not external members |
| 22 | | of the bar. |
| 23 | SIR | WYN WILLIAMS: Right. Okay. Well, it was only |
| 24 | | one question. Thank you. Yes, thank you very |
| 25 | | much. 46 |
| | | 40 |
| | | |
| 1 | | the last page of it, which is I think page 37, |
| 2 | | is that your signature? |
| 3 | A. | It is. |
| 4 | Q. | Before I ask you whether it is true, can you go |
| 5 | | back to page 29, please, and look at |
| 6 | | paragraph 92 at the foot of the page. I think |
| 7 | | you wish to make two corrections to |
| 8 | | paragraph 92; is that right? |
| 9 | Α. | Yes, please. |
| 10 | Q. | Is the first of them by crossing out in the |
| 11 | | first line the words "was agreed with" |
| 12 | Α. | Yes. |
| 13 | Q. | and inserting instead the words "guide has |
| 14 | | been designed by POL, having consulted the", |
| 15 | | I'll read that again slowly: |
| 16 | | " guide has been designed by POL having |
| 17 | | consulted the" |
| 18 | A. | Correct. |
| 19 | Q. | Then secondly inserting the word "internally" at |
| 20 | | the end of that sentence after the word "used"? |
| 21 | A. | Yes. |
| 22 | Q. | So the sentence would read: |
| 23 | | "A revised Rule 9 Request process guide has |
| 24 | | been designed by POL having consulted the |
| 25 | | external advisers and is now being used 48 |
| | | |

(12) Pages 45 - 48

| 1 | 1 | internally." |
|--------|--------------|---|
| 2 | 2 A . | Yes. |
| 3 | 3 Q. | Thank you. |
| 4 | 1 | With those corrections, are the contents of |
| 5 | 5 | that witness statement true to the best of your |
| 6 | 6 | knowledge and belief? |
| 7 | 7 A . | Yes, they are. |
| 8 | 3 Q. | I am going to ask you questions about a range of |
| ę | 9 | matters referred to in your witness statement |
| 1 | 0 | but not all of them and that's because the Chair |
| 1 | 1 | of the Inquiry has read your witness statement |
| 1 | 2 | and it will be uploaded to the Inquiry's website |
| 1 | 3 | today so that everyone can see what it session. |
| 1 | 4 | I am going to focus on two principal issues, |
| 1 | 5 | firstly to seek to understand more about how |
| 1 | 6 | three disclosure failings occurred concerning |
| | 7 | search terms, reviewing families of documents, |
| | 8 | and the de-duplication of documents. So that's |
| | 9 | a look backwards? |
| | 0 A . | |
| 2 | | , |
| | 2 | what the Post Office and its advisers have done |
| | 3 | to put things right. |
| | 4 A. | - , |
| 2 | 5 Q . | Can start though with your career qualifications 49 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | about 75 per cent of your time undertaking that |
| | 2 | role and 25 per cent of the time undertaking the |
| 3 | | existing role; is that right? |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | nature of the issues that are arising at the |
| 6 | | time but that's roughly right. |
| 7 8 | | When you became the Public Inquiry Director, that was a role previously occupied by Fintan |
| |)) | Canavan, from whom we've just heard; is that |
| | , 0 | right? |
| 1 | | |
| | 2 Q. | |
| | 2 . | to turn it up, at paragraph 31, that you are the |
| | 4 | accountable director within the Post Office for |
| - | 5 | its Inquiry programme? |
| | 6 A . | |
| | 7 Q. | |
| | 8 | Firstly, accountable to whom? Accountable to |
| | 9 | the Inquiry or accountable within the Post |
| | 0 | Office? |
| | 1 A . | |
| | 2 Q. | |
| | 3 | director within and to the Post Office? |
| 2 | 4 A . | So I'm the person that would is responsible |
| 2 | 5 | for making sure that the Group Executive, that |
| | | 51 |
| | | |

| 1 | and experience | I think you're a solicitor |
|---|----------------|----------------------------|
| | | |

- having qualified in October 1997; is that right?
- 3 A. That's correct.
- 4 Q. You previously worked in the Government Legal
- 5 Department until in April 2012 (sic) you joined
- 6 the Post Office as its Legal Services Director
- 7 in the Remediation Unit?
- 8 A. April 2022.
- 9 **Q.** Did I say "2012"?
- 10 **A.** You did.
- 11 Q. April 2022.
- 12 A. Correct.
- 13 Q. You appear to have had two functions from April
- 14 2022 onwards, firstly to seek to deliver timely
- 15 and fair compensation to subpostmasters affected
- 16 by the failings of the Horizon System and
- 17 secondly to support the Post Office's response
- 18 to criminal appeals arising from the operation
- 19 of the Horizon System; is that right?
- 20 A. Correct, yes.
- 21 Q. With effect from beginning of January 2023 and22 upon a promotion, you became the Post Office's
- 23 Public Inquiry Director; is that right?
- 24 A. Yes, in addition to the other role.
- 25 Q. You tell us in your statement that you spend 50

| 1 | | the board, the Inquiry Steering Committee are |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | aware of all of the issues that are going on, |
| 3 | | that I'm driving the programme forward in the |
| 4 | | way I believe is needed to deliver what's |
| 5 | | required for the Inquiry and so I'm, I suppose |
| 6 | | internally, the face of the Inquiry, if you |
| 7 | | like, for Post Office, in terms of people know |
| 8 | | that I'll be there to lead the work. |
| 9 | Q. | But what does accountability involve? |
| 10 | Α. | It's my job to deliver and, if I was not |
| 11 | | delivering, then presumably that would be looked |
| 12 | | at in terms of performance. |
| 13 | Q. | What does the Inquiry programme mean? |
| 14 | Α. | So it's all the work that we're delivering |
| 15 | | connected with the Post Office Horizon Inquiry. |
| 16 | Q. | If we turn up your witness statement, please, |
| 17 | | it's WITN09940200, and go to page 26, please. |
| 18 | | At paragraph 83, you say: |
| 19 | | "I inherited a very highly motivated team |
| 20 | | who had been under-resourced for a long period |
| 21 | | of time." |
| 22 | | Yes? By "for a long period of time", do you |
| 23 | | mean for the life of the Statutory Inquiry, |
| 24 | | ie since at least June 2021? |
| 25 | Α. | So I had in mind my knowledge since I joined 52 |
| | | |

| 1 | Post Office, which was from April 2022 and not |
|---|--|
| | |

- 2 being directly involved with the Inquiry Team
- 3 but just based on general knowledge and
- 4 understanding of the pressures that the team
- 5 were facing.
- 6 Q. So you're referring to "it had been
- 7 under-resourced for a long period of time",
- 8 meaning since at least April 2022?
- 9 A. From my perspective, yes.
- 10 **Q.** Because that's when you had knowledge?
- 11 **A.** Yes.
- 12 $\,$ Q. So it had been under-resourced for at least
- 13 eight months by the time you arrived?
- 14 A. In my view, yes.
- 15 Q. To your knowledge, had issues as to the
- under-resourcing of the Inquiry Team previouslybeen brought to the attention of others within
- been brought to the attentionthe Post Office?
- 19 A. So I don't know the specific details of what had
- 20 been brought to the attention of others.
- 21 I know, just from general conversations with
- 22 Mr Canavan, that there had been concerns about
- 23 whether the budget was at the right level but
- 24 I don't know more detail than that.
- 25 Q. To your knowledge, had issues as to the
 - 53
- Q. When was the under-resourcing of the team first
 bought to the attention of the Group Executive
 by you?
- 4 A. So I think it would have been in either February
 5 or March, ahead of taking a paper to the board
- 6 in March, at which we focused on additional --
- sorry an increase in the budget and as part of
 that additional resourcing and there would have
- 8 that additional resourcing and there would have9 been discussions at the Group Executive level
- 10 prior to that. There would have also been
- 11 discussions prior to that at the Inquiry
- 12 Steering Committee, which itself has number of
- 13 members of the Group Executive.
- 14 Q. Can we look, please, at paragraph 58(d) onpage 18 of your witness statement?
- 16 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Before you do that, unless
- 17 I missed it, you said February or March but
- 18 didn't give a year. I'm assuming it's 2023.
- 19 A. 2023, yes, sorry, yes.
- 20 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thanks.
- 21 **MR BEER:** You're here dealing with part of the
- 22 response to the Inquiry's question to explain
- 23 the events that led to the three disclosure
- 24 failings that had been identified. At (d), at
- 25 the foot of the page, you're dealing with the
 - 55

- 1 under-resourcing of the Inquiry Team been
- 2 brought to the attention of the Group
- 3 Executive --
- 4 A. I don't know.
- 5 Q. -- and to the board?
- 6 A. I don't know.
- 7 $\hfill Q.$ What was your understanding of the response from
- 8 within the Post Office as to issues as to
- 9 under-resourcing having been raised?
- 10 A. So, as I said, I don't know that they were
- 11 focused specifically on under-resourcing. My
- 12 sense was that Mr Canavan had found it difficult
- 13 to enable the Post Office fully to understand
- 14 the extent of the obligations required, in terms
- 15 of a response to the Inquiry and what that would
- 16 entail, and that had therefore been the
- 17 difficulty in securing the right level of
- 18 budget.
- 19 Q. So he hadn't understood --
- A. Sorry, not he. He had found it hard to get the
 rest of the Post Office to understand the nature
 of the challenge, sorry.
- 23 **Q.** Is that the explanation for why the
- 24 under-resourcing had been allowed to continue?
- 25 **A.** So far as I know, yes. 54
- 1 issues of searches that have been undertaken, 2 and you say: 3 "My understanding from discussions with 4 colleagues is that Fintan Canavan and some 5 others with relevant responsibilities had 6 an ongoing dialogue with POL's external advisers 7 to seek to ensure that the searches for 8 documents and document review strategies were 9 reasonable in all the circumstances and 10 comprehensive, thorough and rigorous." 11 Then this: 12 "POL wanted to achieve cost and process 13 efficiencies if they were achievable alongside 14 fully meeting its obligations to the Inquiry and 15 its ambition to drive improvement going 16 forward " 17 So you're referring here to conversations 18 that you had with Mr Canavan about search terms 19 and review of document strategies, yes? 20 Α. At a very high level. 21 Q. That's what I wanted to ask you about. This is 22 expressed at a very high level. You say on the 23 previous page the Post Office -- at the foot of 24 the page: 25 "POL [the Post Office] wanted to achieve 56

| 1 | cost and | process efficiencies if they were | |
|---|----------|-----------------------------------|--|
| | COSLAIIU | process eniciencies in they were | |

- 2 achievable alongside fully meeting its
- 3 obligations to the Inquiry ..."
- 4 Can you explain exactly what that means, "we
- 5 want to fully meet our obligations to the
- 6 Inquiry and achieve cost and process
- 7 efficiencies"?
- 8 A. So there has never been any doubt as to Post
- 9 Office's support, full support for delivering
- 10 what's needed for the Inquiry and that
- 11 underpinned everything. So the board has been
- 12 very clear throughout, in terms of wanting to
- 13 ensure that everything possible was done to meet
- 14 the disclosure obligations. But sometimes there
- 15 are ways of doing things which can achieve the
- 16 same outcome but in a more cost efficient way
- 17 and that's what that's focused on.
- 18 **Q.** Can you give some examples?
- 19 A. So probably the biggest example I can give is
- 20 the -- that cost was part of the driver to
- 21 change the decision -- sorry, part of the
- 22 decision to move the recognised legal
- 23 representative role from Herbert Smith Freehills
- 24 to Burges Salmon and Fieldfisher.
- 25 **Q.** This is talking about a stage before then.
 - 57
- 1 into effect or was described to you?
- 2 **A.** Perhaps the process followed -- that
- 3 I understood -- was followed in relation to some
- 4 of the hard copy work, where it was done in
- 5 stages, so that, for example, in the review of
- 6 the back-up tapes, which were discovered at
- 7 a site, rather than going straight into a full
- 8 process review, instead, the work was started to
- 9 identify the policies which led to them being
- 10 designated as back-up tapes. There was work
- 11 done to identify indices, so there was a high
- 12 level understanding of what might be on there.
- 13 There was then a sampling done, so it was
- 14 done in stages to try to achieve some
- efficiencies whilst still being mindful of ouroverall obligations.
- 17 Q. In relation to the three issues that we're18 concerned with, the use of search terms or the
- 19 misuse of search terms, reviews of family
- 20 documents and the de-duplication exercise, was
- 21 the Post Office's desire to achieve cost and
- 22 process efficiencies relevant to any of those?
- 23 A. I've never heard it described in terms of a cost
- 24 efficiency. It was always about what was
- 25 reasonable to do in the circumstances, which
 - 59

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. This long before then.
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Can you give any examples about the Post Office
 5 wanting to achieve cost efficiencies concerning
- 6 disclosure?
- 7 A. Only at a high level, in terms of examining, for
- 8 example, things like how many associates would9 attend each of the Inquiry hearings.
- 10 **Q.** I'm talking about disclosure? This is in the 11 context --
- A. Disclosure, sorry. Yes, I don't have any specific examples.
- 14 Q. What were you referring to then of POL wanting
 15 to achieve cost and process efficiencies in the
 16 context of disclosure?
- 17 A. That was how it had been explained to me in
- 18 terms of looking hard at how disclosure is
- 19 approached and seeing whether, through working
- 20 with Relativity, working with KPMG, there is
- a different way that we can achieve the sameoutcomes but at a less cost.
- 23 Q. Again, other than expressing it in that very24 high level way, can you think of any practical
- 25 examples or actual events where that was carried 58
- 1 inevitably has some implications for cost. 2 Q. By that answer, Mrs Wills, do I understand you 3 to mean that desires to save costs are relevant 4 to the three disclosure failings that we're 5 looking at? 6 A. No, I mean that it's an inevitable output, in 7 terms of decisions taken as to what is 8 reasonable, and the approach taken, depending on 9 how wide or not that approach is taken, will 10 have different cost implications. 11 Q. Okay, I'll move on. That can come down from the 12 screen, please. One of the principal issues 13 which the Inquiry -- I think you'll 14 understand -- we're investigating, is, in the 15 substance of our hearings, the non-disclosure of 16 documents by the Post Office in civil litigation 17 and in criminal litigation, which the Post 18 Office bought against subpostmasters? 19 A. Mm-hm. 20 Q. I think you will realise, is this right, that 21 the Post Office was significantly criticised by 22 both the High Court and the Court of Appeal for 23 what was described as obstructive conduct in 24 relation to disclosure? 25 A. Yes.

| 1 | Q. | Against that background, we're investigating | 1 | |
|----|----|--|----|---|
| 2 | | it ie non-disclosure and it's been the | 2 | |
| 3 | | subject of significant criticism in the past. | 3 | |
| 4 | | Would you agree that the disclosure which the | 4 | |
| 5 | | Post Office gives to this Inquiry must, in the | 5 | |
| 6 | | circumstances, be full, accurate and timely? | 6 | |
| 7 | Α. | Yes. | 7 | Α |
| 8 | Q. | That's essentially a commitment that various | 8 | Q |
| 9 | | senior executives in the Post Office have been | 9 | |
| 10 | | committed to giving in the Inquiry; is that | 10 | |
| 11 | | right? | 11 | Α |
| 12 | Α. | Yes. | 12 | |
| 13 | Q. | And it's what the law requires? | 13 | |
| 14 | Α. | Yes. | 14 | Q |
| 15 | Q. | Can we look, please, at paragraph 43 of your | 15 | |
| 16 | | witness statement on page 13. Just explaining | 16 | |
| 17 | | the abbreviations, HSF is a reference to Herbert | 17 | |
| 18 | | Smith Freehills | 18 | |
| 19 | Α. | Yes. | 19 | |
| 20 | Q. | the Inquiry lawyers and, until recently, the | 20 | Α |
| 21 | | Inquiry recognised legal representatives | 21 | |
| 22 | Α. | Yes. | 22 | Q |
| 23 | Q. | for the Post Office. P&P are Peters & | 23 | |
| 24 | | Peters. We will come to each of those in | 24 | |
| 25 | | a moment. You say: | 25 | |
| | | 61 | | |
| 1 | | "Although ultimate responsibility rests with us, | 1 | |
| 2 | | Post Office, to give proper disclosure, in fact | 2 | |
| 3 | | the errors and mistakes were not made by us they | 3 | |
| 4 | | were made by others"? | 4 | |
| 5 | Α. | I don't think that was ever the intention behind | 5 | |
| 6 | | it. | 6 | |
| 7 | Q. | That's the consequence of it? | 7 | |
| 8 | Α. | Yes. | 8 | |
| 9 | Q. | Indeed, I think that's exactly what you do in | 9 | |
| 10 | | your witness statement, isn't it? | 10 | |
| 11 | Α. | Yes. | 11 | |
| 12 | Q. | If we just look at paragraph 10 on page 4. | 12 | |
| 13 | | You're dealing with Request 1 at paragraph 10, | 13 | |
| 14 | | which was: | 14 | |
| 15 | | "Please explain the events which led to the | 15 | Α |
| 16 | | three disclosure issues, explaining in detail | 16 | Q |
| 17 | | all relevant decisions and communications that | 17 | |
| 18 | | led to the errors and identifying those | 18 | |
| 19 | | involved." | 19 | |
| 20 | | You say: | 20 | |
| 21 | | "The relevant decisions and communications | 21 | |
| 22 | | took place between POL's external advisers. | 22 | |
| 23 | | [The Post Office] did not direct these | 23 | Α |
| 24 | | communications or take these decisions. | 24 | Q |
| 25 | | Consequently the witnesses from [the Post | 25 | |
| | | 63 | | |

| 1 | | "[Herbert Smith Freehills] and [Peters & |
|----------|----------|---|
| 2 | | Peters] had a broad, general authority from [the |
| 3 | | Post Office] as its instructed representatives |
| 4 | | to progress disclosure, in conjunction KPMG |
| 5 | | International, without reverting to [the Post |
| 6 | | Office] for specific instructions." |
| 7 | Α. | Yes. |
| 8 | Q. | You're here referring to, I think, the past, |
| 9 | | ie the period before you took up office on the |
| 10 | | 1 January 2023; is that right? |
| 11 | Α. | That's the system I inherited on joining, and |
| 12 | | which, to an extent, is continued until more |
| 13 | | recently. |
| 14 | Q. | To your knowledge, was the decision taken by the |
| 15 | | Post Office to give Herbert Smith Freehills and |
| 16 | | Peters & Peters a broad, general authority, |
| 17 | | without reverting to the Post Office for |
| 18 | | specific instructions in relation to disclosure |
| 19 | | issues, a deliberate decision? |
| 20 | Α. | I don't think I can answer that. I wasn't |
| 21 | | involved in those discussions. |
| 22 | Q. | The consequence of the decision, would you |
| 23 | | agree, that if there are issues or problems with |
| 24 | | the way that disclosure is undertaken by those |
| 25 | | external advisers, then the Post Office can say, |
| | | 62 |
| | | |
| 1 | | Office's] external advisers will be able to |
| 2 | | provide closer accounts." |
| 3 | | Then over the page at page 12, you're |
| 4 | | dealing with Request 2.b. Request 2.b was: |
| 5 | | "Please set out where you consider |
| 6 | | responsibility for the errors lie." |
| 7 | | You say at 12: |
| 8 | | "As I have explained in relation to |
| 9 | | Request 1, the relevant decisions and |
| 10 | | communications took place between [the Post |
| 11 | | Office's] external advisers. Accordingly, any |
| 12 | | responsibility primarily sits with [the Post |
| 13 | | Office's] external advisers." |
| 14 | | Yes? |
| 15 | A. | Yes. |
| 16 | Q. | In relation to other issues, signing off |
| 17 | | proposed communications to the Inquiry, signing |
| 18 | | off written, closing and oral submissions to the |
| 19 20 | | Inquiry, signing off submissions in relation to |
| 20 21 | | compensation issues, you indicate in your |
| 21 22 | | witness statement that by contrast, you were |
| 22 23 | • | involved very directly with those? Yes, either I or my team. |
| 23 24 | A. Q. | You tell us that, in relation to those issues, |
| 24 25 | ખ. | communications with the Inquiry, signing off |
| 20 | | 64 |
| | | |

| 1 | | submissions and signing off communications in |
|--|--|--|
| 2 | | relation to compensation issues, you have |
| 3 | | frequent and direct contact with Herbert Smith |
| 4 | | Freehills lawyers? |
| 5 | Α. | Yes. |
| 6 | Q. | You receive updates from them via email? |
| 7 | A. | And through oral conversations. |
| 8 | Q. | You say that in your witness statement you |
| 9 10 | A. | attend a series of standing meetings with them? Yes. |
| 10 | Q. | Why, to your knowledge, was a different, more |
| 12 | પ્લ. | hands-off approach taken in relation to |
| 13 | | disclosure issues? |
| 14 | Α. | So reference to the communications with the |
| 15 | | Inquiry, I had in mind the production letters |
| 16 | | that go to the Inquiry so that Post Office has |
| 17 | | visibility at that stage of what is being |
| 18 | | produced to the Inquiry. We have the earlier |
| 19 | | visibility of the Rule 9s coming in. Those |
| 20 | | discussions |
| 21 | Q. | Sorry to interrupt. |
| 22 | Α. | Sorry. |
| 23 | Q. | What about the bit in the middle? |
| 24 | Α. | That's what I was just going to come to. The |
| 25 | | regular calls that we have with Herbert Smith go 65 |
| | | 00 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | Post Office that have responsibility for the |
| 2 | | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of |
| 2 3 | | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the |
| 2 3 4 | | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at |
| 2 3 4 5 | | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project managers. Is it right that that had no |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project managers. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of any |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Α. | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project managers. Is it right that that had no |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | A. Q. | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project managers. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of any disclosure issues? No, that's not correct. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project managers. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of any disclosure issues? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project managers. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of any disclosure issues? No, that's not correct. There was and is an Inquiry Steering Committee? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. A. | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project managers. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of any disclosure issues? No, that's not correct. There was and is an Inquiry Steering Committee? Yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. A. | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project managers. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of any disclosure issues? No, that's not correct. There was and is an Inquiry Steering Committee? Yes. Is it right that that had no responsibility for |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. A. Q. | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project managers. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of any disclosure issues? No, that's not correct. There was and is an Inquiry Steering Committee? Yes. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of disclosure issues? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. A. Q. A. | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project managers. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of any disclosure issues? No, that's not correct. There was and is an Inquiry Steering Committee? Yes. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of disclosure issues? No, it did have. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. A. Q. A. | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project managers. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of any disclosure issues? No, that's not correct. There was and is an Inquiry Steering Committee? Yes. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of disclosure issues? No, it did have. Sorry? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project managers. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of any disclosure issues? No, that's not correct. There was and is an Inquiry Steering Committee? Yes. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of disclosure issues? No, it did have. Sorry? It did have. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. Q. | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project managers. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of any disclosure issues? No, that's not correct. There was and is an Inquiry Steering Committee? Yes. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of disclosure issues? No, it did have. Sorry? It did have. It did have? Yes. Can you tell us, in relation to each of those, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project managers. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of any disclosure issues? No, that's not correct. There was and is an Inquiry Steering Committee? Yes. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of disclosure issues? No, it did have. Sorry? It did have. It did have. It did have? Yes. Can you tell us, in relation to each of those, the levels of firstly the Inquiry Team, the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project managers. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of any disclosure issues? No, that's not correct. There was and is an Inquiry Steering Committee? Yes. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of disclosure issues? No, it did have. Sorry? It did have. It did have? Yes. Can you tell us, in relation to each of those, the levels of firstly the Inquiry Team, the oversight of and responsibility for disclosure |
| 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. Q. A. Q. | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project managers. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of any disclosure issues? No, that's not correct. There was and is an Inquiry Steering Committee? Yes. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of disclosure issues? No, it did have. Sorry? It did have. It did have? Yes. Can you tell us, in relation to each of those, the levels of firstly the Inquiry Team, the oversight of and responsibility for disclosure issues? |
| 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. Q. A. | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project managers. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of any disclosure issues? No, that's not correct. There was and is an Inquiry Steering Committee? Yes. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of disclosure issues? No, it did have. Sorry? It did have. It did have? Yes. Can you tell us, in relation to each of those, the levels of firstly the Inquiry Team, the oversight of and responsibility for disclosure issues? So within the team, each of the lawyers had |
| 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. Q. A. Q. | Inquiry programme. If I can deal with each of those in turn, there's something called the Inquiry Team capital "I", capital "T" at the Post Office made up of lawyers and project managers. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of any disclosure issues? No, that's not correct. There was and is an Inquiry Steering Committee? Yes. Is it right that that had no responsibility for or oversight of disclosure issues? No, it did have. Sorry? It did have. It did have? Yes. Can you tell us, in relation to each of those, the levels of firstly the Inquiry Team, the oversight of and responsibility for disclosure issues? |

| 1 | | through the Rule 9s that are currently |
|----------|-----|--|
| 2 | | outstanding. There is a high level discussion |
| 3 | | so that I'm aware of any resourcing issues, any |
| 4 | | major issues. What I didn't have, and I think |
| 5 | | my team only had a limited knowledge of, was |
| 6 | | precise details, such as things like search |
| 7 | | terms and how de-duplication was being applied. |
| 8 | Q. | My question was: you get sight of the Rule 9 |
| 9 | | that comes in, you get sight of the production |
| 10 | | at the end that goes back to the Inquiry, why |
| 11 | | was a more hands-off approach taken in relation |
| 12 | | to the part in the middle? |
| 13 | Α. | So I think it's a combination of two reasons. |
| 14 | 7.0 | One is that the reason we appointed the firms we |
| 15 | | did was because of their expertise and we wanted |
| 16 | | to be able to make good use of that and also |
| 17 | | their greater resource levels than we had, but |
| 18 | | also that there wasn't sufficient capacity |
| 19 | | within the team to have the level of engagement |
| 20 | | on these issues that I would have liked. |
| 20 | Q. | So it comes back to the resourcing of the |
| 22 | ω. | internal POL Inquiry function? |
| 23 | Α. | In part, yes. |
| 23 | Q. | You speak in your witness statement about |
| 25 | ч. | a series of committees and groups within the |
| 20 | | 66 |
| | | |
| 1 | | arose in relation to that phase, they would have |
| 2 | | the day-to-day responsibility for contact with |
| 2 | | the external lawyers. They were supported in |
| 4 | | that role by the project management team and |
| 4 5 | | a specific person in the team who had |
| 6 | | responsibility due to their longstanding |
| 7 | | corporate memory of helping us understand who, |
| | | |
| 8 9 | | across the business, we may want to engage with, in order to gain information corporate |
| 9 10 | | knowledge from subject matter experts. |
| 10 | ^ | If your paragraph 43 is right, that Herbert |
| 12 | Q. | |
| | | Smiths and Peters & Peters had a broad, general |
| 13 | | authority in relation to disclosure, without |
| 14 15 | | having to revert to the Post Office for specific |
| 15 16 | | instructions, what oversight and responsibility |
| 10 | | was it necessary for these Inquiry lawyers within the Post Office's Inquiry Team to |
| 17 | | |
| | | undertake? What were they doing about |
| 19 20 | | disclosure? |
| | Α. | So my understanding is that the team's main role |
| 21 22 | | was in order to help HSF understand who may have |
| 22 | | the relevant data that was relevant, where that |
| 23 | | might be held, to try to find relevant |
| 24 25 | | custodians within the department. We didn't, |
| 25 | | for example, have any knowledge about |

9

| | | ~ |
|---|--|----|
| 1 | an approach being taken on family documents. | So |

- 2 that wasn't something that we would have had
- 3 knowledge or oversight of nor, as I say, the
- 4 de-duplication, other than, I guess, at a high
- 5 level, that it makes sense to try and avoid
- 6 providing duplicates of something, but no more
- 7 than that. But the team's role was much
- 8 involved in just helping source the material.
- 9 **Q.** Where are the documents; what are our
- repositories; which buildings need to be lookedat; that kind of thing?
- 12 A. Yes, but then also through discussions with
- 13 those individuals to try to help build the
- 14 information necessary to -- for HSF to then
- 15 determine search terms. So, for example, what
- 16 project names were used, you know, what common
- 17 acronyms or abbreviations were used within
- 18 a team, so that that would then help HSF to make
- 19 the more technical decision about precisely what
- 20 search terms would be used.
- 21 **Q.** I see. So narrowing it down, then, the Inquiry
- 22 Team didn't have any involvement in or knowledge
- 23 of the detail of decisions taken as to the
- 24 review of family documents, which is one of the
 - areas we're looking at --
 - 69
- 1 Q. In relation to the de-duplication issue?
- 2 A. Again, no knowledge.
- 3 Q. And search terms?
- 4 A. I wouldn't expect them to have any knowledge of
- 5 that either. The knowledge for SteerCo about
- 6 the Rule 9s was a broad sense of what was coming
- 7 in, what was being looked at, what we were
- 8 finding, any challenges in that, timescales,
- 9 whether it had impact on resources. It was more
- 10 strategic involvement than day to day.
- 11 Q. Same answers in relation to the Group Executive?
- 12 **A.** Yes.

25

- 13 Q. Still further up the tree, same answers in
- 14 relation to the Post Office Board itself?
- 15 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 16 **Q.** Would you say that through the Inquiry team
- 17 within the Post Office, it -- the Post Office --
- 18 exercised intrusive supervision and intrusive
- 19 oversight of the disclosure process that was20 being carried out in its name?
- 21 A. I don't think I could categorise it as that, no.
- 22 $\,$ **Q**. Can we turn to paragraph 13 of your witness
- 23 statement, please, which is on page 5. We've
- 24 dealt with paragraph 12, responsibility
- 25 primarily resting with external advisers. You

- A. That's correct.
- 2 Q. -- and didn't have any knowledge of or
 3 involvement in decisions concerning the
 4 de-duplication of datasets, other than to know
 5 in general terms it's a good idea that things
- 6 are de-duplicated --
- 7 A. Correct.
- 8 Q. -- the second error we're looking at.
 - On the third issue, search terms, I think
- 10 you just told us that they did -- the Inquiry
- 11 lawyers within the Post Office -- have
- 12 discussion and liaison with the external
- advisers over the appropriate search terms touse; is that right?
- 15 A. No, I think it's more that they acted as
- 16 a conduit for HSF to engage directly with the
- 17 business and may have been present on calls, for
- 18 example, but were not themselves, so far as I'm
- 19 aware, directing the nature of the precise
- 20 search terms.
- 21 Q. Can we ask the same set of questions in relation
 22 to the Steering Committee, then? Any
 23 involvement on or responsibility for the family
- 24 review issue?
- 25 A. They'd have had no knowledge of that.70
- 1 say in 13:

| 2 | | "However, that doesn't change the fact that |
|----|----|---|
| 3 | | [the Post Office] remains responsible for its |
| 4 | | own disclosure to the Inquiry. [You] hope it is |
| 5 | | made clear from the rest of this statement that |
| 6 | | [the Post Office] takes that responsibility |
| 7 | | extremely seriously." |
| 8 | | So you rightly say that the Post Office |
| 9 | | remains responsible for its disclosure to the |
| 10 | | Inquiry and you say that it takes the |
| 11 | | responsibility "extremely seriously". Why, |
| 12 | | given those two things, did the Post Office not |
| 13 | | exercise intrusive supervision or oversight of |
| 14 | | the disclosure that we're being given or not |
| 15 | | being given? |
| 16 | Α. | I think until recently, until the issues have |
| 17 | | come to light, it wasn't understood that there |
| 18 | | were issues of the scale that we've now come to |
| 19 | | realise and so I don't think there was it was |
| 20 | | understood that there was a concern about the |
| 21 | | approach being taken, that meant more intrusive |
| 22 | | supervision was required. |
| 23 | Q. | But Mrs Wills, in a case concerning significant |
| 24 | | non-disclosure to criminal courts in the past, |
| 25 | | which has been extensively and deeply criticised 72 |
| | | |

| 1 | | by both the High Court and the Court of Appeal, |
|---|----------------|--|
| 2 | | wouldn't the disclosure being given to this |
| 3 | | Inquiry naturally require intrusive supervision |
| 4 | | and oversight, whether or not you knew there was |
| 5 | | a problem? |
| 6 | Α. | Yes, I can see that but I believe Post Office |
| 7 | | considered it was meeting its obligations by |
| 8 | | having appointed the firms it had. |
| 9 | Q. | One of the issues we're investigating is |
| 10 | | delegation of functions to a supposedly expert |
| 11 | | contractor, Fujitsu |
| 12 | Α. | Mm-hm. |
| 13 | Q. | and whether washing one's hands of a problem |
| 14 | | and saying, "It's down to our external |
| 15 | | contractor", was an appropriate way to go. Are |
| 16 | | there shades of that on this occasion in |
| 17 | | relation to disclosure? |
| 18 | Α. | It's not how I'd see it. The team had regular |
| 19 20 | | engagement with Herbert Smiths, it had regular |
| 20 21 | | engagement with KPMG and Peters & Peters and |
| 21 22 | | I think the belief was we had sufficient |
| 22 23 | 0 | knowledge of how disclosure was being conducted. Can we turn to page 10 of your witness |
| 23 24 | Q. | statement, please. You say in paragraph 34: |
| 24 25 | | "My focus has been in 3 main areas" |
| 20 | | 73 |
| | | |
| 1 | | the risks that that involves" or "We've decided |
| • | | |
| 2 | | to leave it to the discretion of an individual |
| 2 3 | | to leave it to the discretion of an individual low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case |
| | | |
| 3 | | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case |
| 3 4 | | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, |
| 3 4 5 | | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? |
| 3 4 5 6 | | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? Those things need to be identified, don't |
| 3 4 5 6 7 | | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? Those things need to be identified, don't they, they need to be bubbled up to the surface |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 | А. | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? Those things need to be identified, don't they, they need to be bubbled up to the surface in order that risk governance can take place, |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. Q. | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? Those things need to be identified, don't they, they need to be bubbled up to the surface in order that risk governance can take place, don't they? |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? Those things need to be identified, don't they, they need to be bubbled up to the surface in order that risk governance can take place, don't they? Yes, they do. |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? Those things need to be identified, don't they, they need to be bubbled up to the surface in order that risk governance can take place, don't they? Yes, they do. By the time of your arrival, that hadn't |
| 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? Those things need to be identified, don't they, they need to be bubbled up to the surface in order that risk governance can take place, don't they? Yes, they do. By the time of your arrival, that hadn't happened, had it? |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? Those things need to be identified, don't they, they need to be bubbled up to the surface in order that risk governance can take place, don't they? Yes, they do. By the time of your arrival, that hadn't happened, had it? I can't speak about what had happened before my arrival. Can we turn to paragraph 40 on page 12, please. |
| 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. A. | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? Those things need to be identified, don't they, they need to be bubbled up to the surface in order that risk governance can take place, don't they? Yes, they do. By the time of your arrival, that hadn't happened, had it? I can't speak about what had happened before my arrival. Can we turn to paragraph 40 on page 12, please. In the middle of the paragraph here, and you're |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? Those things need to be identified, don't they, they need to be bubbled up to the surface in order that risk governance can take place, don't they? Yes, they do. By the time of your arrival, that hadn't happened, had it? I can't speak about what had happened before my arrival. Can we turn to paragraph 40 on page 12, please. In the middle of the paragraph here, and you're talking about the current day, you say: |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? Those things need to be identified, don't they, they need to be bubbled up to the surface in order that risk governance can take place, don't they? Yes, they do. By the time of your arrival, that hadn't happened, had it? I can't speak about what had happened before my arrival. Can we turn to paragraph 40 on page 12, please. In the middle of the paragraph here, and you're talking about the current day, you say: "I attend twice weekly standing meetings |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. A. | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? Those things need to be identified, don't they, they need to be bubbled up to the surface in order that risk governance can take place, don't they? Yes, they do. By the time of your arrival, that hadn't happened, had it? I can't speak about what had happened before my arrival. Can we turn to paragraph 40 on page 12, please. In the middle of the paragraph here, and you're talking about the current day, you say: "I attend twice weekly standing meetings with the 3 partners responsible within [Herbert |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? Those things need to be identified, don't they, they need to be bubbled up to the surface in order that risk governance can take place, don't they? Yes, they do. By the time of your arrival, that hadn't happened, had it? I can't speak about what had happened before my arrival. Can we turn to paragraph 40 on page 12, please. In the middle of the paragraph here, and you're talking about the current day, you say: "I attend twice weekly standing meetings with the 3 partners responsible within [Herbert Smith Freehills] for leading the Inquiry work as |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? Those things need to be identified, don't they, they need to be bubbled up to the surface in order that risk governance can take place, don't they? Yes, they do. By the time of your arrival, that hadn't happened, had it? I can't speak about what had happened before my arrival. Can we turn to paragraph 40 on page 12, please. In the middle of the paragraph here, and you're talking about the current day, you say: "I attend twice weekly standing meetings with the 3 partners responsible within [Herbert Smith Freehills] for leading the Inquiry work as well as regular detailed strategy meetings. |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? Those things need to be identified, don't they, they need to be bubbled up to the surface in order that risk governance can take place, don't they? Yes, they do. By the time of your arrival, that hadn't happened, had it? I can't speak about what had happened before my arrival. Can we turn to paragraph 40 on page 12, please. In the middle of the paragraph here, and you're talking about the current day, you say: "I attend twice weekly standing meetings with the 3 partners responsible within [Herbert Smith Freehills] for leading the Inquiry work as well as regular detailed strategy meetings. These meetings are used to discuss priority |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? Those things need to be identified, don't they, they need to be bubbled up to the surface in order that risk governance can take place, don't they? Yes, they do. By the time of your arrival, that hadn't happened, had it? I can't speak about what had happened before my arrival. Can we turn to paragraph 40 on page 12, please. In the middle of the paragraph here, and you're talking about the current day, you say: "I attend twice weekly standing meetings with the 3 partners responsible within [Herbert Smith Freehills] for leading the Inquiry work as well as regular detailed strategy meetings. These meetings are used to discuss priority issues and risks as they are identified and to |
| 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. | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? Those things need to be identified, don't they, they need to be bubbled up to the surface in order that risk governance can take place, don't they? Yes, they do. By the time of your arrival, that hadn't happened, had it? I can't speak about what had happened before my arrival. Can we turn to paragraph 40 on page 12, please. In the middle of the paragraph here, and you're talking about the current day, you say: "I attend twice weekly standing meetings with the 3 partners responsible within [Herbert Smith Freehills] for leading the Inquiry work as well as regular detailed strategy meetings. These meetings are used to discuss priority issues and risks as they are identified and to establish matters that require escalation" |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. | low-level reviewer to decide on a case-by-case basis whether to look at a family of documents, that carries the following risks"? Those things need to be identified, don't they, they need to be bubbled up to the surface in order that risk governance can take place, don't they? Yes, they do. By the time of your arrival, that hadn't happened, had it? I can't speak about what had happened before my arrival. Can we turn to paragraph 40 on page 12, please. In the middle of the paragraph here, and you're talking about the current day, you say: "I attend twice weekly standing meetings with the 3 partners responsible within [Herbert Smith Freehills] for leading the Inquiry work as well as regular detailed strategy meetings. These meetings are used to discuss priority issues and risks as they are identified and to |

| 0.111 | mq | |
|-------|----|--|
| | | |
| 1 | | Then at (c), you say: |
| 2 | | "Ensuring the ISC [that's the Inquiry |
| 3 | | Steering Committee] and [the Post Office's] |
| 4 | | Group Executive and Board are appropriately |
| 5 | | aware of and consulted on risk issues relating |
| 6 | | to the Inquiry as they are identified. This is |
| 7 | | obviously essential to thorough risk governance |
| 8 | | " |
| 9 | | In order for thorough risk governance to |
| 10 | | take place, don't you have to know what the |
| 11 | | risks are in the first place? |
| 12 | Α. | Yes. |
| 13 | Q. | Does that not necessarily involve conversations |
| 14 | | and written communications with your advisers |
| 15 | | that seek to identify what the risks are? |
| 16 | Α. | I believe Post Office thought it understood the |
| 17 | | nature of the risks and it's only really since |
| 18 | | June, with all the extensive work that's been |
| 19 | | undertaken, that we've identified additional |
| 20 | | matters. |
| 21 | Q. | So if it's the case that the external advisers |
| 22 | | have adopted a disclosure strategy that's mainly |
| 23 | | focused on keyword searches, the conversation |
| 24 | | is, "We've adopted a disclosure strategy that's |
| 25 | | mainly focused on keyword searches, these are |
| | | 74 |
| | | |
| 1 | Q. | Between January and the discovery of problems |
| 2 | | with disclosure, in late May and early June |
| 3 | | 2023, were the risks associated with the way in |
| 4 | | which Herbert Smith Freehills, Peters & Peters |
| 5 | | and KPMG were approaching disclosure ever |
| 6 | | discussed in the meetings you refer to here? |
| 7 | Α. | Yes. |
| 8 | Q. | What risks were identified? |
| 9 | Α. | So there was frequent discussions about the |
| 10 | | ongoing work in relation to hard copy data and |
| 11 | | some of the repositories that had been found |
| 12 | | there, including electronic data. I was also |
| 13 | | aware, around April time, of concerns that as |
| 14 | | to whether or not the right repositories had |
| 15 | | been searched in relation to one particular |
| 16 | | Rule 9. I can't immediately think of other |
| 17 | | specific risks. |
| 18 | Q. | Again, that's focused on places and vaults of |
| 19 | | material |
| 20 | Α. | Yes. |
| 21 | Q. | rather than the three issues we are looking |
| 22 | | at. Had any discussion occurred between January |
| 23 | | and late May/early June 2023 about any risks |
| 24 | | being associated with the way in which those |
| 05 | | |

25 three advisers were approaching disclosure 76

2

| 1 | | concerning the three risks that have now been | | |
|----|----|---|--|--|
| 2 | | identified? | | |
| 3 | Α. | I had been made aware of some concerns as to | | |
| 4 | | resourcing challenges within KPMG, that could | | |
| 5 | | have impacted on disclosure and we'd been | | |
| 6 | | addressing those but I'd not been made aware of | | |
| 7 | | any as far as I can recall certainly | | |
| 8 | | nothing about family documents or | | |
| 9 | | de-duplication. I don't recall being made aware | | |
| 10 | | of any specific concerns about search terms. | | |
| 11 | Q. | What were the resourcing concerns within KPMG | | |
| 12 | | that were drawn to your attention between | | |
| 13 | | January and end of May 2023? | | |
| 14 | Α. | I think in about February or March, concerns | | |
| 15 | | were reported through to my operations and | | |
| 16 | | strategy director that the time being taken by | | |
| 17 | | KPMG to respond to certain requests was slowing | | |
| 18 | | things down and impacting the ability of HSF to | | |
| 19 | | carry out the reviews that were needed. So Post | | |
| 20 | | Office worked with KPMG to develop two | | |
| 21 | | solutions: one an offshoring resource centre in | | |
| 22 | | India that KPMG could then call on to boost | | |
| 23 | | their resources where required; and also | | |
| 24 | | a system in place to ensure that it had the | | |
| 25 | | capability sorry, the capacity to do weekend | | |
| | | 77 | | |
| | | | | |
| 1 | | will be able to answer that this afternoon. | | |
| 2 | Q. | Can we turn forward, please, to page 30 of your | | |
| 3 | | witness statement and paragraph 93. You're | | |
| 4 | | again talking in the present here. You say: | | |
| 5 | | "The [Inquiry Steering Committee], which | | |
| 6 | | I chair, meets at least fortnightly and | | |
| 7 | | disclosure ([both] remediation and going | | |
| 8 | | forward) is part of the regular agenda." | | |
| 9 | | When you joined, is it right that disclosure | | |
| | | | | |

- 10 was not part of the regular agenda of the ISC?
- A. It wasn't a standing agenda item, in the way 11
- 12 it's become since June but, certainly, any 13 issues that were arising, such as in relation to 14 hard copy data, were brought to the attention of SteerCo, as was needed.
- Q. Do you know why disclosure was not part of the 16 17 standing agenda before the disclosure failures which have been revealed were revealed? 18
- So the papers that go to SteerCo comprise 19 Α.

15

- 20 a number of components. There are papers which
- 21 are for noting on issues we just want to make
- 22 SteerCo aware of, there are decision papers, and
- 23 then there's a full suite of management
- 24 information, which includes, for example,
- 25 progress on Rule 9s and also has management

- working and late evenings where particular Rule 9s required it.
- 3 Q. At that time, were KPMG not working in the 4 evenings or at weekends?
- 5 A. I don't know the detail, I'm afraid, but
- 6 I assume there was a need for more, given the 7 conversations that we had.
- 8 Q. Was the offshoring to India solution taken up?
- 9 Α. Yes
- 10 Q. What is the nature of the offshoring to India solution? What is done? 11
- I don't know the technical detail of the work 12 Α.
- they do but I know there is an additional team 13
- based out there, I think in the region of around 14
- about 12 people, who supplement the work of the 15
- 16 London-based office, dealing with some of the
- 17 more simple tasks, as I understand it.
- 18 Q. Do you know what that is?
- 19 A. I don't. I'm afraid.
- 20 Q. Have you any clue as to even the realm within
- 21 which the offshore India team is operating?
- 22 Α. Sorry, could you clarify your question?
- 23 Q. Yes, are they doing de-duplication? Are they 24 doing data reconciliation?
- 25 A. I'm sorry, I don't know. Hopefully Mr Tombleson 78
- 1 information relating to progress generally, in relation to disclosure. So the papers were 2 3 always there; they just may not have always been 4 discussed. 5 Q. Why was that? 6 A. If there was a particular issue that we needed 7 a view on, we would have discussed it. If 8 members of SteerCo had any questions in relation 9 to the papers we were providing, we would have discussed it. Otherwise, it was there for their 10 11 general awareness. 12 Q. Standing back, the disclosure given by the Post 13 Office to this Inquiry is one of the main 14 features of its engagement with the Inquiry. 15 It's not necessarily the advocacy that Post 16 Office does within the Inquiry. The provision 17 of witness statements and disclosure are the 18 main touchpoints between the Post Office and the 19 Inquiry. The impression that I am getting from reading your witness statement -- please correct 20 21 me if I'm wrong -- is that there was a -- before 22 your arrival and to some extent for a period 23 after your arrival, disclosure, although it was 24 spoken about in terms of being an important and 25 high priority, a rather laissez-faire attitude 80

| 1 | | was taken to it in terms of that's the |
|--|----------|---|
| 2 | | responsibility of the external advisers and not |
| 3 | | us; is that unfair? |
| 4 | Α. | I think it is unfair. I think I categorise it |
| 5 | | is that part of our relationship with the |
| 6 | | external advisers is we would expect them to be |
| 7 | | bringing to our attention any issues which we |
| 8 | | needed to address or be concerned about and then |
| 9 | | we'd have the regular updates and then, between |
| 10 | | those two things, we felt we were getting |
| 11 | | sufficient oversight of information. |
| 12 | Q. | 5 |
| 13 | | problems with their own work? |
| 14 | Α. | Problems with their own work but also challenges |
| 15 | | they may have been facing within Post Office, |
| 16 | | for example. Getting access to right |
| 17 | | repositories, et cetera. |
| 18 | Q. | Putting it frankly, isn't this the case, isn't |
| 19 | | this the Inquiry where the internal Post Office |
| 20 | | team should be all over disclosure from the top |
| 21 | | and the bottom of it, day in, day out? |
| 22 | Α. | |
| 23 | | now driving towards and it's a wholesale change |
| 24 | _ | since June. |
| 25 | Q. | I appreciate that you're, to some extent, 81 |
| | | 01 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | page 17 of your witness statement. |
| 1 2 | Α. | page 17 of your witness statement. Yes. |
| | A. Q. | Yes. |
| 2 | | Yes. |
| 2 3 | | Yes. You tell us: |
| 2 3 4 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with |
| 2 3 4 5 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post Office's] external advisers, is that the POL |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post Office's] external advisers, is that the POL employees/contractors were not involved in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post Office's] external advisers, is that the POL employees/contractors were not involved in data-strategy discussions at a detailed level. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post Office's] external advisers, is that the POL employees/contractors were not involved in data-strategy discussions at a detailed level. In general: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post Office's] external advisers, is that the POL employees/contractors were not involved in data-strategy discussions at a detailed level. In general: "(a) [The Post Office] was updated about |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post Office's] external advisers, is that the POL employees/contractors were not involved in data-strategy discussions at a detailed level. In general: "(a) [The Post Office] was updated about <u>some</u> of its external advisers' search parameters |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post Office's] external advisers, is that the POL employees/contractors were not involved in data-strategy discussions at a detailed level. In general: "(a) [The Post Office] was updated about <u>some</u> of its external advisers' search parameters and review strategy choices as part of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post Office's] external advisers, is that the POL employees/contractors were not involved in data-strategy discussions at a detailed level. In general: "(a) [The Post Office] was updated about <u>some</u> of its external advisers' search parameters and review strategy choices as part of business-as-usual client reporting. My |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post Office's] external advisers, is that the POL employees/contractors were not involved in data-strategy discussions at a detailed level. In general: "(a) [The Post Office] was updated about <u>some</u> of its external advisers' search parameters and review strategy choices as part of business-as-usual client reporting. My understanding is that [the Post Office's] |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post Office's] external advisers, is that the POL employees/contractors were not involved in data-strategy discussions at a detailed level. In general: "(a) [The Post Office] was updated about <u>some</u> of its external advisers' search parameters and review strategy choices as part of business-as-usual client reporting. My understanding is that [the Post Office's] external advisers' decisions about search |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post Office's] external advisers, is that the POL employees/contractors were not involved in data-strategy discussions at a detailed level. In general: "(a) [The Post Office] was updated about <u>some</u> of its external advisers' search parameters and review strategy choices as part of business-as-usual client reporting. My understanding is that [the Post Office's] external advisers' decisions about search parameters and review strategies largely developed iteratively in response to feedback and knowledge obtained through document searches |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post Office's] external advisers, is that the POL employees/contractors were not involved in data-strategy discussions at a detailed level. In general: "(a) [The Post Office] was updated about <u>some</u> of its external advisers' search parameters and review strategy choices as part of business-as-usual client reporting. My understanding is that [the Post Office's] external advisers' decisions about search parameters and review strategies largely developed iteratively in response to feedback |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post Office's] external advisers, is that the POL employees/contractors were not involved in data-strategy discussions at a detailed level. In general: "(a) [The Post Office] was updated about <u>some</u> of its external advisers' search parameters and review strategy choices as part of business-as-usual client reporting. My understanding is that [the Post Office's] external advisers' decisions about search parameters and review strategies largely developed iteratively in response to feedback and knowledge obtained through document searches and document review. [Post Office] employees/contractors were not substantively |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post Office's] external advisers, is that the POL employees/contractors were not involved in data-strategy discussions at a detailed level. In general: "(a) [The Post Office] was updated about <u>some</u> of its external advisers' search parameters and review strategy choices as part of business-as-usual client reporting. My understanding is that [the Post Office's] external advisers' decisions about search parameters and review strategies largely developed iteratively in response to feedback and knowledge obtained through document searches and document review. [Post Office] |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post Office's] external advisers, is that the POL employees/contractors were not involved in data-strategy discussions at a detailed level. In general: "(a) [The Post Office] was updated about <u>some</u> of its external advisers' search parameters and review strategy choices as part of business-as-usual client reporting. My understanding is that [the Post Office's] external advisers' decisions about search parameters and review strategies largely developed iteratively in response to feedback and knowledge obtained through document searches and document review. [Post Office] employees/contractors were not substantively |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post Office's] external advisers, is that the POL employees/contractors were not involved in data-strategy discussions at a detailed level. In general: "(a) [The Post Office] was updated about <u>some</u> of its external advisers' search parameters and review strategy choices as part of business-as-usual client reporting. My understanding is that [the Post Office's] external advisers' decisions about search parameters and review strategies largely developed iteratively in response to feedback and knowledge obtained through document searches and document review. [Post Office] employees/contractors were not substantively involved in discussions about those detailed |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post Office's] external advisers, is that the POL employees/contractors were not involved in data-strategy discussions at a detailed level. In general: "(a) [The Post Office] was updated about <u>some</u> of its external advisers' search parameters and review strategy choices as part of business-as-usual client reporting. My understanding is that [the Post Office's] external advisers' decisions about search parameters and review strategies largely developed iteratively in response to feedback and knowledge obtained through document searches and document review. [Post Office] employees/contractors were not substantively involved in discussions about those detailed matters because [the Post Office's] external |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | | Yes. You tell us: "My understanding, based on discussions with colleagues and information provided by [the Post Office's] external advisers, is that the POL employees/contractors were not involved in data-strategy discussions at a detailed level. In general: "(a) [The Post Office] was updated about <u>some</u> of its external advisers' search parameters and review strategy choices as part of business-as-usual client reporting. My understanding is that [the Post Office's] external advisers' decisions about search parameters and review strategies largely developed iteratively in response to feedback and knowledge obtained through document searches and document review. [Post Office] employees/contractors were not substantively involved in discussions about those detailed matters because [the Post Office's] external advisers had the specialist experience and |

| 1 | | speaking of the past here and that places you in |
|--|----------------|---|
| 2 | | some difficulty but shouldn't that have been |
| 3 | | obvious from the start? Why did it take these |
| 4 | | three disclosure failings to move disclosure up |
| 5 | | the agenda? |
| 6 | Α. | So I think it's been a trajectory of |
| 7 | | understanding on the part of the Post Office, in |
| 8 | | the way Mr Canavan described, in terms of Post |
| 9 | | Office not having that initial understanding of |
| 10 | | what's required by an Inquiry and that gradually |
| 11 | | increasing, and the scale of the issues getting |
| 12 | | broader, the scale of the challenges being faced |
| 13 | | getting bigger and it coming right up the |
| 14 | | agenda. |
| 15 | Q. | Can I turn, then, to the three issues identified |
| 16 | | by the Chair in his previous decisions and |
| 17 | | directions on disclosure failings by the Post |
| 18 | | Office: firstly the use of search terms; |
| 19 | | secondly, decisions made to review or not to |
| 20 | | review families of documents; and, thirdly, |
| 21 | | de-duplication exercises carried out on behalf |
| 22 | | of the Post Office. |
| 23 | | So, firstly, the approach taken to the use |
| 24 | | of search terms and the searching strategy. Can |
| 25 | | we begin by looking at paragraph 58(a) on |
| | | 82 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | the detailed knowledge required to make those |
| 1 2 | | the detailed knowledge required to make those choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." |
| | | 0 1 |
| 2 | | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers |
| 2 3 | | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters |
| 2 3 4 | | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers |
| 2 3 4 5 | А. | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters and review strategies, yes? Yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A. Q. | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters and review strategies, yes? Yes. Secondly, Post Office employees were not |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters and review strategies, yes? Yes. Secondly, Post Office employees were not involved in the substance of such decisions |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters and review strategies, yes? Yes. Secondly, Post Office employees were not involved in the substance of such decisions although they were sometimes told about them? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters and review strategies, yes? Yes. Secondly, Post Office employees were not involved in the substance of such decisions although they were sometimes told about them? So, as I said earlier, they may have been |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters and review strategies, yes? Yes. Secondly, Post Office employees were not involved in the substance of such decisions although they were sometimes told about them? So, as I said earlier, they may have been involved in discussions to help the external |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters and review strategies, yes? Yes. Secondly, Post Office employees were not involved in the substance of such decisions although they were sometimes told about them? So, as I said earlier, they may have been involved in discussions to help the external advisers understand what search terms they |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters and review strategies, yes? Yes. Secondly, Post Office employees were not involved in the substance of such decisions although they were sometimes told about them? So, as I said earlier, they may have been involved in discussions to help the external advisers understand what search terms they should apply in terms of, for example, a project |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters and review strategies, yes? Yes. Secondly, Post Office employees were not involved in the substance of such decisions although they were sometimes told about them? So, as I said earlier, they may have been involved in discussions to help the external advisers understand what search terms they should apply in terms of, for example, a project name but I don't believe they were involved in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters and review strategies, yes? Yes. Secondly, Post Office employees were not involved in the substance of such decisions although they were sometimes told about them? So, as I said earlier, they may have been involved in discussions to help the external advisers understand what search terms they should apply in terms of, for example, a project name but I don't believe they were involved in very specific search terms to be used generally |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters and review strategies, yes? Yes. Secondly, Post Office employees were not involved in the substance of such decisions although they were sometimes told about them? So, as I said earlier, they may have been involved in discussions to help the external advisers understand what search terms they should apply in terms of, for example, a project name but I don't believe they were involved in very specific search terms to be used generally in relation to a Rule 9. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters and review strategies, yes? Yes. Secondly, Post Office employees were not involved in the substance of such decisions although they were sometimes told about them? So, as I said earlier, they may have been involved in discussions to help the external advisers understand what search terms they should apply in terms of, for example, a project name but I don't believe they were involved in very specific search terms to be used generally in relation to a Rule 9. Thirdly, they weren't so involved at any |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters and review strategies, yes? Yes. Secondly, Post Office employees were not involved in the substance of such decisions although they were sometimes told about them? So, as I said earlier, they may have been involved in discussions to help the external advisers understand what search terms they should apply in terms of, for example, a project name but I don't believe they were involved in very specific search terms to be used generally in relation to a Rule 9. Thirdly, they weren't so involved at any detailed level because it was believed that the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters and review strategies, yes? Yes. Secondly, Post Office employees were not involved in the substance of such decisions although they were sometimes told about them? So, as I said earlier, they may have been involved in discussions to help the external advisers understand what search terms they should apply in terms of, for example, a project name but I don't believe they were involved in very specific search terms to be used generally in relation to a Rule 9. Thirdly, they weren't so involved at any detailed level because it was believed that the external advisers had the requisite knowledge |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters and review strategies, yes? Yes. Secondly, Post Office employees were not involved in the substance of such decisions although they were sometimes told about them? So, as I said earlier, they may have been involved in discussions to help the external advisers understand what search terms they should apply in terms of, for example, a project name but I don't believe they were involved in very specific search terms to be used generally in relation to a Rule 9. Thirdly, they weren't so involved at any detailed level because it was believed that the external advisers had the requisite knowledge and the Post Office didn't? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters and review strategies, yes? Yes. Secondly, Post Office employees were not involved in the substance of such decisions although they were sometimes told about them? So, as I said earlier, they may have been involved in discussions to help the external advisers understand what search terms they should apply in terms of, for example, a project name but I don't believe they were involved in very specific search terms to be used generally in relation to a Rule 9. Thirdly, they weren't so involved at any detailed level because it was believed that the external advisers had the requisite knowledge and the Post Office didn't? Yes. |
| 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. | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters and review strategies, yes? Yes. Secondly, Post Office employees were not involved in the substance of such decisions although they were sometimes told about them? So, as I said earlier, they may have been involved in discussions to help the external advisers understand what search terms they should apply in terms of, for example, a project name but I don't believe they were involved in very specific search terms to be used generally in relation to a Rule 9. Thirdly, they weren't so involved at any detailed level because it was believed that the external advisers had the requisite knowledge and the Post Office didn't? Yes. Can we look at an example. It's, in fact, the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. | choices, whereas [the Post Office] did not." So you're essentially saying three things there. Firstly, it was the external advisers that made the decisions about search parameters and review strategies, yes? Yes. Secondly, Post Office employees were not involved in the substance of such decisions although they were sometimes told about them? So, as I said earlier, they may have been involved in discussions to help the external advisers understand what search terms they should apply in terms of, for example, a project name but I don't believe they were involved in very specific search terms to be used generally in relation to a Rule 9. Thirdly, they weren't so involved at any detailed level because it was believed that the external advisers had the requisite knowledge and the Post Office didn't? Yes. |

The Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry

| Q. Can we look, please, at POL00114170DS, page 82 We'll see this is the first interim disclosure statement dated 27 May 2022 and if we can go to page 82 and look at the bottom, please. So we'll see in the third column across, under A, a copy of the relevant request. Here: | 2. |
|---|----|
| 4 statement dated 27 May 2022 and if we can go to 5 page 82 and look at the bottom, please. 6 So we'll see in the third column across, | |
| 5 page 82 and look at the bottom, please. 6 So we'll see in the third column across, | |
| 6 So we'll see in the third column across, | |
| | |
| 7 under A a copy of the relevant request. Here: | |
| | |
| 8 "Copy of [Post Office] Investigations Policy | |
| 9 (together with all iterations of the same since | |
| 10 1999 that are within [Post Office's] custody and | |
| 11 control)." | |
| 12 That was the Inquiry's request, yes? | |
| 13 A. Yes. | |
| 14 Q. Then we'll see the explanation of what is given | |
| 15 against A in the far right-hand column: | |
| 16 "The [Post Office] produced approximately | |
| 17 260 documents in response to the Inquiry's | |
| 18 request for all iterations of the investigations | |
| 19 policy from 1999 to date. In order to identify | |
| 20 these materials, the following search was | |
| 21 conducted over all of the materials which the | |
| 22 Post Office had at that time harvested from the | |
| 23 Postal Museum and Oasis archives" | |
| 24 Over the page, if you look in the right-hand | |
| 25 column: | |
| 85 | |
| | |
| 1 Q. or if they were called "guidance"? | |
| 2 A. No, I think that's correct. What I don't know | |
| 3 is whether other searches were being done to try | |
| 4 to identify those materials. | |

| 5 | Q. | Not so far as we've been told. Isn't that the |
|---|----|---|
| | | |

- 6 kind of thing that a Post Office people might be
- 7 able to tell the lawyer, "But hold on, I've got
- 8 some knowledge of these things and, in the Post
- 9 Office, we didn't call things policies or we did
- 10 call things policies but there was this other
- 11 level of document as well that was called
- a guidance. You need to use the truncated termguide or guidance".
- A. So that's my understanding of the role of oursubject matter experts within the business, is
- that's how we would use them. I'm not familiar
- 17 with any particular discussions that were
- 18 conducted in relation to this or other searches.
- 19 **Q.** What you told us earlier in your statement was
- 20 that there wasn't any detailed liaison over21 search terms involving Post Office employees,
- 22 subject matter experts?
- 23 A. I think what I tried to explain was that the
- 24 role of the subject matter expert would be, as
- 25 you've said, to sort of say, did we use policy,

87

| 1 | | "Search Terms: 'Policy' AND ('Investigat*' | | | | |
|---|----------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | | or 'Prosecut*' or 'Whistle')." | | | | |
| 3 | | So they were the search terms that were | | | | |
| 4 | | used, yes? | | | | |
| 5 | Α. | Yes. | | | | |
| 6 | Q. | So the search term that the adviser, the lawyer, | | | | |
| 7 | | used here was the word policy, where it appeared | | | | |
| 8 | | in the same document as "Investigat*" or | | | | |
| 9 10 | • | "Prosecut*" or "Whistle", yes? | | | | |
| 10 11 | Α. | That's my understanding based on that document, | | | | |
| 12 | Q. | yes. Yes. So what has been done is the truncated | | | | |
| 13 | α. | words of "investigate", "investigation", | | | | |
| 14 | | "investigator", or "prosecution", or | | | | |
| 15 | | "prosecutor" or "Prosecuting" have been used. | | | | |
| 16 | Α. | Yes. | | | | |
| 17 | Q. | You can see the little "*" after the T, yes? | | | | |
| 18 | Α. | Yes. | | | | |
| 19 | Q. | So these search terms wouldn't catch documents | | | | |
| 20 | | if they were called "protocols"? | | | | |
| 21 | Α. | If these were the only search terms used, that's | | | | |
| 22 | | correct. | | | | |
| 23 | Q. | They wouldn't catch documents if they were | | | | |
| 24 | | called "guides" | | | | |
| 27 | | called guides | | | | |
| 25 | Α. | No. | | | | |
| | Α. | • | | | | |
| 25 | Α. | No. 86 | | | | |
| 25 1 | Α. | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect | | | | |
| 25 1 2 | Α. | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect them to do is advise, "That means you therefore | | | | |
| 25 1 2 3 | Α. | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect them to do is advise, "That means you therefore need to use this truncated word in order to find | | | | |
| 25 1 2 3 4 | | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect them to do is advise, "That means you therefore need to use this truncated word in order to find all the documents". It's that balance. | | | | |
| 25 1 2 3 4 5 | A. Q. | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect them to do is advise, "That means you therefore need to use this truncated word in order to find all the documents". It's that balance. To your knowledge, did that first part of the | | | | |
| 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 | | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect them to do is advise, "That means you therefore need to use this truncated word in order to find all the documents". It's that balance. To your knowledge, did that first part of the conversation ever occur? I know you won't know | | | | |
| 25 1 2 3 4 5 | | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect them to do is advise, "That means you therefore need to use this truncated word in order to find all the documents". It's that balance. To your knowledge, did that first part of the conversation ever occur? I know you won't know in relation to this but, at a general level, | | | | |
| 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect them to do is advise, "That means you therefore need to use this truncated word in order to find all the documents". It's that balance. To your knowledge, did that first part of the conversation ever occur? I know you won't know | | | | |
| 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect them to do is advise, "That means you therefore need to use this truncated word in order to find all the documents". It's that balance. To your knowledge, did that first part of the conversation ever occur? I know you won't know in relation to this but, at a general level, "We've got this Rule 9 in, we need to get the | | | | |
| 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect them to do is advise, "That means you therefore need to use this truncated word in order to find all the documents". It's that balance. To your knowledge, did that first part of the conversation ever occur? I know you won't know in relation to this but, at a general level, "We've got this Rule 9 in, we need to get the subject matter expert into the room, let's sit | | | | |
| 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect them to do is advise, "That means you therefore need to use this truncated word in order to find all the documents". It's that balance. To your knowledge, did that first part of the conversation ever occur? I know you won't know in relation to this but, at a general level, "We've got this Rule 9 in, we need to get the subject matter expert into the room, let's sit down with them for a day and talk through it, | | | | |
| 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect them to do is advise, "That means you therefore need to use this truncated word in order to find all the documents". It's that balance. To your knowledge, did that first part of the conversation ever occur? I know you won't know in relation to this but, at a general level, "We've got this Rule 9 in, we need to get the subject matter expert into the room, let's sit down with them for a day and talk through it, work out which search terms they would suggest | | | | |
| 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect them to do is advise, "That means you therefore need to use this truncated word in order to find all the documents". It's that balance. To your knowledge, did that first part of the conversation ever occur? I know you won't know in relation to this but, at a general level, "We've got this Rule 9 in, we need to get the subject matter expert into the room, let's sit down with them for a day and talk through it, work out which search terms they would suggest are used because, after all, they've spent their | | | | |
| 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect them to do is advise, "That means you therefore need to use this truncated word in order to find all the documents". It's that balance. To your knowledge, did that first part of the conversation ever occur? I know you won't know in relation to this but, at a general level, "We've got this Rule 9 in, we need to get the subject matter expert into the room, let's sit down with them for a day and talk through it, work out which search terms they would suggest are used because, after all, they've spent their life dealing with investigations policy or | | | | |
| 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect them to do is advise, "That means you therefore need to use this truncated word in order to find all the documents". It's that balance. To your knowledge, did that first part of the conversation ever occur? I know you won't know in relation to this but, at a general level, "We've got this Rule 9 in, we need to get the subject matter expert into the room, let's sit down with them for a day and talk through it, work out which search terms they would suggest are used because, after all, they've spent their life dealing with investigations policy or prosecution policy"? | | | | |
| 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect them to do is advise, "That means you therefore need to use this truncated word in order to find all the documents". It's that balance. To your knowledge, did that first part of the conversation ever occur? I know you won't know in relation to this but, at a general level, "We've got this Rule 9 in, we need to get the subject matter expert into the room, let's sit down with them for a day and talk through it, work out which search terms they would suggest are used because, after all, they've spent their life dealing with investigations policy or prosecution policy"? Yes. | | | | |
| 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. Q. | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect them to do is advise, "That means you therefore need to use this truncated word in order to find all the documents". It's that balance. To your knowledge, did that first part of the conversation ever occur? I know you won't know in relation to this but, at a general level, "We've got this Rule 9 in, we need to get the subject matter expert into the room, let's sit down with them for a day and talk through it, work out which search terms they would suggest are used because, after all, they've spent their life dealing with investigations policy or prosecution policy"? Yes. Did that occur? So I've never been directly involved in any of those discussions but that's certainly the | | | | |
| 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. A. Q. | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect them to do is advise, "That means you therefore need to use this truncated word in order to find all the documents". It's that balance. To your knowledge, did that first part of the conversation ever occur? I know you won't know in relation to this but, at a general level, "We've got this Rule 9 in, we need to get the subject matter expert into the room, let's sit down with them for a day and talk through it, work out which search terms they would suggest are used because, after all, they've spent their life dealing with investigations policy or prosecution policy"? Yes. Did that occur? So I've never been directly involved in any of those discussions but that's certainly the I've always understood those to happen. What | | | | |
| 25 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. Q. | No. 86 did we use guidance? What I wouldn't expect them to do is advise, "That means you therefore need to use this truncated word in order to find all the documents". It's that balance. To your knowledge, did that first part of the conversation ever occur? I know you won't know in relation to this but, at a general level, "We've got this Rule 9 in, we need to get the subject matter expert into the room, let's sit down with them for a day and talk through it, work out which search terms they would suggest are used because, after all, they've spent their life dealing with investigations policy or prosecution policy"? Yes. Did that occur? So I've never been directly involved in any of those discussions but that's certainly the | | | | |

- 22 matter experts across the business who I believe
- 23 would be able to help us and, whenever any new
- 24 requests for information now comes in, one of
- 25 the very first things we do in an initial

| 1 | | strategy meeting is to discuss with them to |
|--|--|---|
| 2 | | have those kind of discussions. |
| 3 | | So I understand it was happening, but |
| 4 | | I don't know whether it happened in every single |
| 5 | _ | case. |
| 6 | Q. | Hold on. You told us back in paragraph 58(a) of |
| 7 | | your witness statement that, although the Post |
| 8 | | Office was updated about some of the search |
| 9 | | parameters and review strategies, the Post |
| 10 | | Office was not substantively involved in |
| 11 | | discussions about any detailed matters |
| 12 | | concerning search parameters and review |
| 13 | | strategies, because the lawyers, the expert |
| 14 | | advisers, had the specialist knowledge and Post |
| 15 16 | | Office did not. I think you've just said that, |
| 16 17 | | in fact, on occasion, Post Office people did |
| | | have such specialist knowledge and they were |
| 18 19 | • | brought into the conversations? |
| 20 | Α. | So I'm sorry if I'm not explaining this clearly. I am seeing this in two levels. One, that |
| 20 21 | | there's a general discussion with the people |
| 21 | | whose role it was to know about these sorts of |
| 22 | | documents, so that conversations could be had to |
| 23 24 | | enable the lawyers to understand what sort of |
| 25 | | things they should look for. What I wouldn't |
| 20 | | 89 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | 0 | Why has it increased in frequency more recently? |
| 1 | Q. | Why has it increased in frequency more recently? |
| 2 | Q. A. | Because the nature of the as we move forward |
| 2 3 | | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within |
| 2 3 4 | | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate |
| 2 3 4 5 | | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Α. | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. Why, as we move forward in time, is there more |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A. Q. | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. Why, as we move forward in time, is there more likely to be people with corporate knowledge? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Α. | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. Why, as we move forward in time, is there more likely to be people with corporate knowledge? Just because other people might have left, in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A. Q. | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. Why, as we move forward in time, is there more likely to be people with corporate knowledge? Just because other people might have left, in some of the very earlier stages. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. Q. A. | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. Why, as we move forward in time, is there more likely to be people with corporate knowledge? Just because other people might have left, in some of the very earlier stages. Oh, I see. So you're not saying that the longer |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | A. Q. A. | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. Why, as we move forward in time, is there more likely to be people with corporate knowledge? Just because other people might have left, in some of the very earlier stages. Oh, I see. So you're not saying that the longer the Inquiry goes on, the more knowledge? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | A. Q. A. Q. | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. Why, as we move forward in time, is there more likely to be people with corporate knowledge? Just because other people might have left, in some of the very earlier stages. Oh, I see. So you're not saying that the longer |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A. Q. A. Q. A. | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. Why, as we move forward in time, is there more likely to be people with corporate knowledge? Just because other people might have left, in some of the very earlier stages. Oh, I see. So you're not saying that the longer the Inquiry goes on, the more knowledge? No, no, no. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. Why, as we move forward in time, is there more likely to be people with corporate knowledge? Just because other people might have left, in some of the very earlier stages. Oh, I see. So you're not saying that the longer the Inquiry goes on, the more knowledge? No, no, no. will be obtained? No, sorry. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. Why, as we move forward in time, is there more likely to be people with corporate knowledge? Just because other people might have left, in some of the very earlier stages. Oh, I see. So you're not saying that the longer the Inquiry goes on, the more knowledge? No, no, no. will be obtained? No, sorry. Understood. Can we look please at paragraph 21 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. Why, as we move forward in time, is there more likely to be people with corporate knowledge? Just because other people might have left, in some of the very earlier stages. Oh, I see. So you're not saying that the longer the Inquiry goes on, the more knowledge? No, no, no. will be obtained? No, sorry. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. Why, as we move forward in time, is there more likely to be people with corporate knowledge? Just because other people might have left, in some of the very earlier stages. Oh, I see. So you're not saying that the longer the Inquiry goes on, the more knowledge? No, no, no. will be obtained? No, sorry. Understood. Can we look please at paragraph 21 on page 38 of your witness statement. We should |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. Why, as we move forward in time, is there more likely to be people with corporate knowledge? Just because other people might have left, in some of the very earlier stages. Oh, I see. So you're not saying that the longer the Inquiry goes on, the more knowledge? No, no, no. will be obtained? No, sorry. Understood. Can we look please at paragraph 21 on page 38 of your witness statement. We should look at the foot of page 30, please, to get some |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. Why, as we move forward in time, is there more likely to be people with corporate knowledge? Just because other people might have left, in some of the very earlier stages. Oh, I see. So you're not saying that the longer the Inquiry goes on, the more knowledge? No, no, no. will be obtained? No, sorry. Understood. Can we look please at paragraph 21 on page 38 of your witness statement. We should look at the foot of page 30, please, to get some context. Page 63 at the foot. You're here |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. Why, as we move forward in time, is there more likely to be people with corporate knowledge? Just because other people might have left, in some of the very earlier stages. Oh, I see. So you're not saying that the longer the Inquiry goes on, the more knowledge? No, no, no. will be obtained? No, sorry. Understood. Can we look please at paragraph 21 on page 38 of your witness statement. We should look at the foot of page 30, please, to get some context. Page 63 at the foot. You're here dealing with Rule 9 Requests 11 and 14. These |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. Why, as we move forward in time, is there more likely to be people with corporate knowledge? Just because other people might have left, in some of the very earlier stages. Oh, I see. So you're not saying that the longer the Inquiry goes on, the more knowledge? No, no, no. will be obtained? No, sorry. Understood. Can we look please at paragraph 21 on page 38 of your witness statement. We should look at the foot of page 30, please, to get some context. Page 63 at the foot. You're here dealing with Rule 9 Requests 11 and 14. These are the relevant requests, certainly the second |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. Why, as we move forward in time, is there more likely to be people with corporate knowledge? Just because other people might have left, in some of the very earlier stages. Oh, I see. So you're not saying that the longer the Inquiry goes on, the more knowledge? No, no, no. will be obtained? No, sorry. Understood. Can we look please at paragraph 21 on page 38 of your witness statement. We should look at the foot of page 30, please, to get some context. Page 63 at the foot. You're here dealing with Rule 9 Requests 11 and 14. These are the relevant requests, certainly the second of them that ought to have it's accepted, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. | Because the nature of the as we move forward in time, there's more likely to be people within Post Office that do have that corporate knowledge, and so are able to bring more assistance. Why, as we move forward in time, is there more likely to be people with corporate knowledge? Just because other people might have left, in some of the very earlier stages. Oh, I see. So you're not saying that the longer the Inquiry goes on, the more knowledge? No, no, no. will be obtained? No, sorry. Understood. Can we look please at paragraph 21 on page 38 of your witness statement. We should look at the foot of page 30, please, to get some context. Page 63 at the foot. You're here dealing with Rule 9 Requests 11 and 14. These are the relevant requests, certainly the second of them that ought to have it's accepted, I think turned up not only Appendix 3 but |

- 1 expect them to have been involved in is the
- 2 actual construct of the search terms on the back
- 3 of that, and that's -- it's that different layer
- 4 that I was trying to get across.
- 5 Q. Okay. So how frequently were they involved in 6 discussions over the appropriate search terms to
- 7 use, in relation to all --
- So the second layer that I'm --8 Α.
- No, the first layer? 9 Q.
- 10 The first layer? Α.
- 11 Q. Yeah.
- I couldn't quantify it because I think it would 12 Α.
- 13 depend entirely on the nature of the Rule 9, the
- 14 extent to which there were people within the
- Post Office that had the right corporate 15
- 16 knowledge, the earlier in time things go back, 17
- obviously the harder that was. I'd expect it to 18
 - be much more frequent, going forward, as the
- 19 date range moves forward.
- 20 Q. So if we wanted to, we could drill down into
- 21 each Rule 9, if we asked for disclosure, to see
- 22 the extent to which a subject matter was brought
- 23 in to the room, and did help the lawyers to
- 24 develop search terms?
- 25 Α. Would assume those records would exist, yes. 90
- 1 that both firms were involved in deciding the 2 search terms in relation to ... requests 11 and 3 14, with HSF having primary responsibility in 4 respect of some of the questions and [Peters & 5 Peters] having primary responsibility in respect 6 of others. The search terms used to seek to 7 identify [the Post Office's] policies and 8 procedures relating to prosecutions and criminal 9 investigations (ie broadly those relevant to questions 15 and 46 of [Rule 9(11)] and question 10 11 18 of Rule 9 Request 14) were significantly 12 informed by work [Peters & Peters] had done in 13 connection with the post-conviction disclosure 14 exercise (utilising their pre-existing knowledge 15 and understanding of [Post Office's] documents). 16 I understand there was also liaison between HSF 17 and [Peters & Peters] in relation to appropriate 18 search terms, particularly in relation to questions 15 and 46 of Rule 9 Request 11." 19 20 What you don't say there is that there was 21 any involvement by anyone from the Post Office? 22 A. I'm not aware of whether there was. 23 Q. Did you ask? 24 Α. (Pause) 25 I think I must have done. I don't know why 92

| 1 | | I haven't mentioned it here, I'm sorry. |
|--|----|---|
| 2 | Q. | Does the absence of any positive return in this |
| 3 | | paragraph suggest that there was no involvement |
| 4 | | by the Post Office in the development of search |
| 5 | | terms concerning these parts of Rule 9 requests |
| 6 | | 11 and 14? |
| 7 | Α. | So I know there were discussions with the |
| 8 | | security team but I don't know whether that was |
| 9 | | done as part of the remediation process or |
| 10 | | whether it was done originally. I'm afraid |
| 11 | | I can't I'm not entirely sure. |
| 12 | Q. | You say here that the search terms used were |
| 13 | | significantly informed by the work Peters & |
| 14 | | Peters had done with the post-conviction |
| 15 | | disclosure exercise. The search terms that were |
| 16 | | used were truncating the word "investigation" to |
| 17 | | the word "investigat". How was the work that |
| 18 | | they had done in connection with the |
| 19 | | post-conviction disclosure exercise utilised in |
| 20 | | order to truncate the word "investigation" to |
| 21 | | the word "investigat"? |
| 22 | Α. | l don't know, l'm sorry. |
| 23 | Q. | You've said here that it's because of their past |
| 24 | | knowledge of the post-conviction disclosure |
| 25 | | exercise that they developed these search terms. |
| | | 93 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | specific aspect. |
| 1 2 | Q. | specific aspect. I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of |
| | Q. | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so |
| 2 | Q. | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: |
| 2 3 | Q. | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so |
| 2 3 4 | Q. | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration |
| 2 3 4 5 | Q. | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration between the 2 firms) and implemented by |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration between the 2 firms) and implemented by KPMG." |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration between the 2 firms) and implemented by KPMG." Then you make this slightly more positive |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | Q. | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration between the 2 firms) and implemented by KPMG." Then you make this slightly more positive assertion: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration between the 2 firms) and implemented by KPMG." Then you make this slightly more positive assertion: "[The Post Office] was not involved in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration between the 2 firms) and implemented by KPMG." Then you make this slightly more positive assertion: "[The Post Office] was not involved in substantive discussions about what search terms |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration between the 2 firms) and implemented by KPMG." Then you make this slightly more positive assertion: "[The Post Office] was not involved in substantive discussions about what search terms should be used" |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13 | Q. | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration between the 2 firms) and implemented by KPMG." Then you make this slightly more positive assertion: "[The Post Office] was not involved in substantive discussions about what search terms should be used" So that does sound like you asked the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration between the 2 firms) and implemented by KPMG." Then you make this slightly more positive assertion: "[The Post Office] was not involved in substantive discussions about what search terms should be used" So that does sound like you asked the question in relation to these Rule 9 requests |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration between the 2 firms) and implemented by KPMG." Then you make this slightly more positive assertion: "[The Post Office] was not involved in substantive discussions about what search terms should be used" So that does sound like you asked the question in relation to these Rule 9 requests and were given the answer, that the Post Office |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration between the 2 firms) and implemented by KPMG." Then you make this slightly more positive assertion: "[The Post Office] was not involved in substantive discussions about what search terms should be used" So that does sound like you asked the question in relation to these Rule 9 requests and were given the answer, that the Post Office wasn't involved in discussions about what search |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration between the 2 firms) and implemented by KPMG." Then you make this slightly more positive assertion: "[The Post Office] was not involved in substantive discussions about what search terms should be used" So that does sound like you asked the question in relation to these Rule 9 requests and were given the answer, that the Post Office wasn't involved in discussions about what search terms should be used? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration between the 2 firms) and implemented by KPMG." Then you make this slightly more positive assertion: "[The Post Office] was not involved in substantive discussions about what search terms should be used" So that does sound like you asked the question in relation to these Rule 9 requests and were given the answer, that the Post Office wasn't involved in discussions about what search terms should be used? Possibly. It may be back to the same point |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration between the 2 firms) and implemented by KPMG." Then you make this slightly more positive assertion: "[The Post Office] was not involved in substantive discussions about what search terms should be used" So that does sound like you asked the question in relation to these Rule 9 requests and were given the answer, that the Post Office wasn't involved in discussions about what search terms should be used? Possibly. It may be back to the same point I was trying to make earlier about the higher |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration between the 2 firms) and implemented by KPMG." Then you make this slightly more positive assertion: "[The Post Office] was not involved in substantive discussions about what search terms should be used" So that does sound like you asked the question in relation to these Rule 9 requests and were given the answer, that the Post Office wasn't involved in discussions about what search terms should be used? Possibly. It may be back to the same point I was trying to make earlier about the higher level of involvement of Post Office in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration between the 2 firms) and implemented by KPMG." Then you make this slightly more positive assertion: "[The Post Office] was not involved in substantive discussions about what search terms should be used" So that does sound like you asked the question in relation to these Rule 9 requests and were given the answer, that the Post Office wasn't involved in discussions about what search terms should be used? Possibly. It may be back to the same point I was trying to make earlier about the higher level of involvement of Post Office in understanding the nature of work to enable those |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration between the 2 firms) and implemented by KPMG." Then you make this slightly more positive assertion: "[The Post Office] was not involved in substantive discussions about what search terms should be used" So that does sound like you asked the question in relation to these Rule 9 requests and were given the answer, that the Post Office wasn't involved in discussions about what search terms should be used? Possibly. It may be back to the same point I was trying to make earlier about the higher level of involvement of Post Office in understanding the nature of work to enable those search terms to then be devised by the lawyers, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | | I understand. Can we lastly, on this part of the issue, look at paragraph 62 on page 20 so the previous page. Thank you. You say: "Search terms were selected by HSF or [Peters & Peters] (or through collaboration between the 2 firms) and implemented by KPMG." Then you make this slightly more positive assertion: "[The Post Office] was not involved in substantive discussions about what search terms should be used" So that does sound like you asked the question in relation to these Rule 9 requests and were given the answer, that the Post Office wasn't involved in discussions about what search terms should be used? Possibly. It may be back to the same point I was trying to make earlier about the higher level of involvement of Post Office in understanding the nature of work to enable those |

| on IT | Inq | uiry 5 Septemb |
|-------|-----|--|
| | | |
| 1 | | What we've seen is that, for two words, they cut |
| 2 | | the end off. What's the relationship between |
| 3 | | this past specialist expertise and cutting the |
| 4 | | end of the word? |
| 5 | Α. | So I don't know if there's a relationship with |
| 6 | | cutting the end of the word. I imagine it's |
| 7 | | with identifying the word initially, so the word |
| 8 | | "investigation", not that it would appear to |
| 9 | | require much specialist knowledge. |
| 10 | Q. | We asked for "investigations policy"? |
| 11 | Α. | I can't answer that, I'm sorry. |
| 12 | Q. | What did you mean by this, that the search terms |
| 13 | | used to seek to identify policies and procedures |
| 14 | | relating to prosecutions and investigations were |
| 15 | | informed by the work they'd already done? |
| 16 | | Because we've seen the search terms and all they |
| 17 | | did was cut the end off a couple of words? |
| 18 | Α. | Yes, so probably a more accurate description is |
| 19 | | that the work, generally, that Peters & Peters |
| 20 | | had done, for the post-conviction disclosure |
| 21 | | exercise, had been utilised in order to find |
| 22 | | requisite documents, build repositories, and |
| 23 | | their knowledge of that work was then used in |
| 24 | | terms of helping to develop search terms |
| 25 | | generally, not necessarily in relation to this |
| | | 94 |
| 1 | | search terms should then be used. |
| 2 | Q. | So the cutting the end off words? |
| 3 | A. | Yes. |
| 4 | Q. | You say in brackets at the end there: |
| 5 | ч. | "(I have been informed by colleagues |
| 6 | | that some lists of search terms were shared with |
| 7 | | POL)." |
| 8 | | What was the purpose of sharing some lists |
| 9 | | of search terms with the Post Office? Why were |
| 10 | | they being shared? |
| 11 | A. | I assume so that there was a record for Post |
| 12 | | Office so that it could see what had been done. |
| 13 | Q. | Was there ever any request from the external |
| 14 | | advisers, "These are the search terms that we've |
| 15 | | settled on, have you any comments to make"? |
| 16 | Α. | I'm not aware of any. |
| 17 | Q. | Here you're saying that the Post Office was not |
| 18 | | involved in substantive discussions about search |
| 19 | | terms. Do you accept or acknowledge that now to |
| 20 | | have been a mistake? |
| 21 | Α. | So I think there will always be a certain level |
| | | of expertise that weld expect on to rely on |

- of expertise that we'd expect -- or to rely on
- our external advisers for in terms of the best
- way to construct search terms to deliver the
- best results from Relativity. Should we be as

| 1 | | involved as we can be in terms of identifying in | 1 |
|--------|-----|---|--------|
| 2 | | the first place what search terms to use? | 2 |
| 3 | | Absolutely. | 3 |
| 4 | Q. | Do you know why it didn't happen? | 4 |
| 5 | Α. | No. | 5 |
| 6 | Q. | In paragraph 64 over the page, please, you say: | 6 |
| 7 | | "I understand from [the Post Office's] | 7 |
| 8 | | external advisers that Appendix 6 [that's the | 8 |
| 9 | | identification codes document] was not returned | 9 |
| 10 | | by any of those search terms (or, indeed, any | 10 |
| 11 | | other search terms that have been implemented). | 11 |
| 12 | | From information I have been provided with by | 12 |
| 13 | | [the Post Office's] external advisers as part of | 13 |
| 14 | | the remediation process, I understand that this | 14 |
| 15 | | is because the document really is quite | 15 |
| 16 | | exceptional and does not contain any of the | 16 |
| 17 | | words that would normally be seen in a policy or | 17 |
| 18 | | procedural guidance." | 18 |
| 19 | | Is that the explanation that has been sort | 19 |
| 20 | | of settled and accepted between the Post Office | 20 |
| 21 | | and its external advisers, because the | 21 |
| 22 | | identification codes documents doesn't contain | 22 |
| 23 | | words that you would expect to see in a policy | 23 |
| 24 | | or procedural guidance, we couldn't reasonably | 24 |
| 25 | | expect to have found it? 97 | 25 |
| | | | |
| 1 | | with aukiast matter avaata which lad to it | 1 |
| 1 2 | | with subject matter experts which led to it | 1 |
| 2 | 0 | particularly being identified. Well, to that extent, this explanation here | 2 |
| 4 | ω. | misses the point, doesn't it, because, as you've | 4 |
| 4 5 | | rightly said, Appendix 6 was part of a suite of | 4 5 |
| 6 | | policy and procedure documents. | 6 |
| 7 | Α. | Yes. | 7 |
| 8 | Q. | One part of the suite was responsive to a search | 8 |
| 9 | ч. | term but nobody looked, it seems, at the other | 9 |
| 10 | | documents in the suite of which the responsive | 10 |
| 11 | | document was a part? | 10 |
| 12 | Α. | Yes, but I was tying to answer the question in | 12 |
| 13 | 7.0 | relation to search terms. | 13 |
| 14 | Q. | But, overall, would you accept that the real | 10 |
| 15 | · | lesson to be taken from this episode concerns | 15 |
| 16 | | the need to look at other documents within | 16 |
| 17 | | a suite of or a family of documents of which | 17 |
| 18 | | a responsive document is a part? | 18 |
| 19 | Α. | Yes, and I understand that, you know, there was | 19 |
| 20 | | no hard and fast rule that families would never | 20 |
| 21 | | be looked at. It was always decisions were | 21 |
| 22 | | taken as to the circumstances in which it would | 22 |
| 23 | | be appropriate. I'd expect that to be looked at | 23 |
| 24 | | hard, and even harder now, as to the right | 24 |
| 25 | | approach. | 25 |
| | | 00 | |

| Q. | What about the other part of the explanation? |
|----------|--|
| Α. | So I think that then takes you to the need to |
| | discuss with subject matter experts and then |
| | also in relation to the approach to family |
| | documents. |
| Q. | So a discussion with the subject matter expert |
| | might have revealed, for example, "Well, hold |
| | on, we have these compliance standards that we |
| | had to achieve in the security team, and they |
| | were sent out regularly by email in a series of |
| | attachments in a zip file. Some of them |
| | concerned file completion, some of them |
| | concerned the need to insert an identification |
| | |
| | code. You need to look for the zip file which |
| | has got that suite of documents in it". |
| | That's the kind of thing that might have |
| | been discovered if you bring people whose day |
| | job it was for decades to conduct investigations |
| | and prosecutions into the room, isn't it? |
| Α. | Yes. The reason I'm hesitating is because that |
| | document was on Relativity, so it had been |
| | harvested. I don't know the circumstances which |
| | had led to that document being harvested, so |
| | I don't know if it was the failure to discuss |
| | 98 |
| | |
| | |
| Q. | So you would expect what to have been looked at |
| | hard? |
| Q. A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. |
| | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can lastly look at paragraph 114 of your witness |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can lastly look at paragraph 114 of your witness statement, which is on page 36. You're here |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can lastly look at paragraph 114 of your witness statement, which is on page 36. You're here summarising your position on where |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can lastly look at paragraph 114 of your witness statement, which is on page 36. You're here summarising your position on where responsibility lies for the non-disclosure by |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can lastly look at paragraph 114 of your witness statement, which is on page 36. You're here summarising your position on where responsibility lies for the non-disclosure by reason of search terms. At paragraph 114, you |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can lastly look at paragraph 114 of your witness statement, which is on page 36. You're here summarising your position on where responsibility lies for the non-disclosure by reason of search terms. At paragraph 114, you say: |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can lastly look at paragraph 114 of your witness statement, which is on page 36. You're here summarising your position on where responsibility lies for the non-disclosure by reason of search terms. At paragraph 114, you say: "I do not have the knowledge or technical |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can lastly look at paragraph 114 of your witness statement, which is on page 36. You're here summarising your position on where responsibility lies for the non-disclosure by reason of search terms. At paragraph 114, you say: "I do not have the knowledge or technical expertise to express a view on whether they were |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can lastly look at paragraph 114 of your witness statement, which is on page 36. You're here summarising your position on where responsibility lies for the non-disclosure by reason of search terms. At paragraph 114, you say: "I do not have the knowledge or technical expertise to express a view on whether they were suitable or whether anyone designing the |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can lastly look at paragraph 114 of your witness statement, which is on page 36. You're here summarising your position on where responsibility lies for the non-disclosure by reason of search terms. At paragraph 114, you say: "I do not have the knowledge or technical expertise to express a view on whether they were suitable or whether anyone designing the searches, who did not already know that |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can lastly look at paragraph 114 of your witness statement, which is on page 36. You're here summarising your position on where responsibility lies for the non-disclosure by reason of search terms. At paragraph 114, you say: "I do not have the knowledge or technical expertise to express a view on whether they were suitable or whether anyone designing the searches, who did not already know that Appendix 6 existed and the nature of its |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can lastly look at paragraph 114 of your witness statement, which is on page 36. You're here summarising your position on where responsibility lies for the non-disclosure by reason of search terms. At paragraph 114, you say: I do not have the knowledge or technical expertise to express a view on whether they were suitable or whether anyone designing the searches, who did not already know that Appendix 6 existed and the nature of its content, reasonably could have selected |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can lastly look at paragraph 114 of your witness statement, which is on page 36. You're here summarising your position on where responsibility lies for the non-disclosure by reason of search terms. At paragraph 114, you say: "I do not have the knowledge or technical expertise to express a view on whether they were suitable or whether anyone designing the searches, who did not already know that Appendix 6 existed and the nature of its content, reasonably could have selected additional search terms that would have returned |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can lastly look at paragraph 114 of your witness statement, which is on page 36. You're here summarising your position on where responsibility lies for the non-disclosure by reason of search terms. At paragraph 114, you say: "I do not have the knowledge or technical expertise to express a view on whether they were suitable or whether anyone designing the searches, who did not already know that Appendix 6 existed and the nature of its content, reasonably could have selected additional search terms that would have returned that document." |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can lastly look at paragraph 114 of your witness statement, which is on page 36. You're here summarising your position on where responsibility lies for the non-disclosure by reason of search terms. At paragraph 114, you say: "I do not have the knowledge or technical expertise to express a view on whether they were suitable or whether anyone designing the searches, who did not already know that Appendix 6 existed and the nature of its content, reasonably could have selected additional search terms that would have returned that document." So you're essentially making the same point |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can lastly look at paragraph 114 of your witness statement, which is on page 36. You're here summarising your position on where responsibility lies for the non-disclosure by reason of search terms. At paragraph 114, you say: "I do not have the knowledge or technical expertise to express a view on whether they were suitable or whether anyone designing the searches, who did not already know that Appendix 6 existed and the nature of its content, reasonably could have selected additional search terms that would have returned that document." So you're essentially making the same point that we saw earlier in your paragraph 64 but in |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can lastly look at paragraph 114 of your witness statement, which is on page 36. You're here summarising your position on where responsibility lies for the non-disclosure by reason of search terms. At paragraph 114, you say: "I do not have the knowledge or technical expertise to express a view on whether they were suitable or whether anyone designing the searches, who did not already know that Appendix 6 existed and the nature of its content, reasonably could have selected additional search terms that would have returned that document." So you're essentially making the same point that we saw earlier in your paragraph 64 but in a less direct way. Are you essentially asking |
| A. | hard? In relation to whether or not the full suite of documents needed to be reviewed. We're going to come to that in just a moment but just finishing off search terms, if we can lastly look at paragraph 114 of your witness statement, which is on page 36. You're here summarising your position on where responsibility lies for the non-disclosure by reason of search terms. At paragraph 114, you say: "I do not have the knowledge or technical expertise to express a view on whether they were suitable or whether anyone designing the searches, who did not already know that Appendix 6 existed and the nature of its content, reasonably could have selected additional search terms that would have returned that document." So you're essentially making the same point that we saw earlier in your paragraph 64 but in |

A. I think it's one part of the explanation.

Q. What about the other part of the explanation?

99

(25) Pages 97 - 100

| reasonal | hlv hava salı | acted a sear | ch term to pick |
|----------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|
| IEasulla | UIV HAVE SEI | euleu a sean | |

- 2 Appendix 6 up, without knowing the existence of
- 3 the document beforehand?4 A. I'm saying I don't know whether such search

- 5 terms could have been devised to do that, but
- 6 the information I've seen or the information
- 7 I've been provided with is that there's nothing
- 8 within the face of that document that would
- 9 immediately lend itself to being identified by
- 10 the search terms that would have normally been
- 11 used in such circumstances.
- 12 **Q.** Is that how the Post Office thinks that search
- 13 terms work, that it's all about the design of
- 14 the search terms. If search terms are
- 15 reasonably selected and settled upon, they will
- 16 likely turn up the relevant documents?
- 17 A. Yes, except that search terms is not the only
- device that's used to try to identify the rightdocuments.
- 20 Q. What if I suggest to you that search terms are
- 21 merely part or the start of an exploration for
- 22 relevant material in which search terms may lead
- 23 a reviewer to a relevant document? The document
- 24 itself needs to be read to see whether it is
- 25 associated with other documents which may also 101
- 1 requests, various approaches have been taken to 2 reviewing family documents. 3 "Depending on the nature of the relevant 4 disclosure request and what HSF or [Peters & 5 Peters] considered to be reasonable in the 6 circumstances, in some instances HSF or [Peters 7 & Peters] reviewed whole families of documents 8 ... and assessed whether each (or all) should be 9 produced to the Inquiry. 10 "However, in other cases, HSF or [Peters & 11 Peters] only reviewed the documents that were 12 returned by the search terms ... 13 "[The Post Office] was not involved in the 14 operational decisions about review approaches 15 for family documents. These were taken under 16 HSF's and [Peters & Peters'] general authority 17 to progress disclosure." 18 Α. Yes. So, again, just to summarise all the threads 19 Q. 20 together, different approaches were taken by
- 21 your advisers to different requests, as to
- 22 whether they reviewed a family of documents or
- 23 not, or whether they just looked at the document
- that was a hit, was responsive to the searchterm?

- be relevant but are non-responsive to the search
 terms?
- 3 A. Yes, I think you've described it more eloquently
- 4 than I had but I think it's the same point that
- 5 I just made: it's not the start and finish.
- 6 Q. So it's a train of enquiry --
- 7 A. (The witness nodded)
- 8 Q. -- starting with search terms but not ending9 with search terms?
- 10 A. Well, that the train of enquiry starts with
- identifying the relevant custodians where the
 data may be held, et cetera, before the search
- 13 terms can be applied.
- 14 **Q.** But, essentially, I think you're agreeing with
- 15 me that the use of search terms can only be part
- 16 of a disclosure strategy. They will lead you on
- 17 a train of enquiry and the train must be
- 18 followed?
- 19 **A.** Yes.
- 20 **Q.** Can we turn, then, to the Post Office's approach
- 21 to reviewing family documents, and can we turn
- 22 to page 22 of your witness statement. Can we
- 23 read together paragraphs 67 to 70. You say:
- 24 "I have been informed by HSF and [Peters &
- 25 Peters] that, across the Inquiry's disclosure 102
- 1 **A.** Yes.

| 2 | Q. | The choice was made by your advisers according |
|----|----|--|
| 3 | | to what was considered by them to be reasonable? |
| 4 | Α. | Yes. |
| 5 | Q. | The Post Office was not involved at all, such |
| 6 | | decisions were taken under a general authority |
| 7 | | given to the lawyers? |
| 8 | Α. | Yes. |
| 9 | Q. | So, until this whole issue blew up, neither you |
| 10 | | nor, to your knowledge, anyone else in the Post |
| 11 | | Office, knew what was going on in this regard? |
| 12 | Α. | Correct. |
| 13 | Q. | Is your understanding that this approach adopted |
| 14 | | by the lawyers was done on a Rule 9 by Rule 9 |
| 15 | | basis, ie "For this Rule 9, we are going to |
| 16 | | review families, but for this Rule 9, we're not |
| 17 | | going to review families", which is how your |
| 18 | | witness statement reads? |
| 19 | Α. | I'm not sure I would see it as being done just |

- 20 at the level of the Rule 9. I think it would
- 21 depend on the nature of the investigations in
- 22 relation to each Rule 9. So you would start
- 23 your investigations as we have just discussed
- 24 and, depending on where that took you, might
- 25 lead to approach, so rather than getting the 104

| 1 | | Rule 9 at the start and saying, "We just won't |
|----------|------|---|
| 2 | | look at family documents", I don't think there |
| 3 | | was ever any question of that. |
| 4 | Q. | So there might be different approaches to |
| 5 | | reviewing families within a Rule 9? |
| 6 | Α. | Yes. |
| 7 | Q. | So "For this bit, questions 1 and to 20, we will |
| 8 | | review families but for questions 21 to 40, we |
| 9 | | won't". |
| 10 | Α. | I'm not sure it's as black and white as that, |
| 11 | | even at that level either. I think it would |
| 12 | | depend on the nature of the investigations that |
| 13 | | were ongoing and the way responsive documents |
| 14 | | were being identified and, at that level, |
| 15 | | decisions would then be taken. But I'm sorry, |
| 16 | | I'm not familiar with the detail. |
| 17 | Q. | Can we just look at paragraph 115 of your |
| 18 | | witness statement on page 36. Again, this is |
| 19 | | answering the "Who's responsible" question and |
| 20 | | you're dealing in this part of the witness |
| 21 | | statement with family documents. You say: |
| 22 | | "As set out above in response to Request 1, |
| 23 | | HSF did not require or instruct its reviewers to |
| 24 | | review family documents (although reviewers had |
| 25 | | the functionality to review family documents and 105 |
| | | 100 |
| | | |
| 1 | Q. | So it goes a bit beyond what's mentioned in |
| 2 | | paragraph 115 here, which reads as if it was up |
| 3 | | to the individual reviewer to decide? |
| 4 | Α. | I think that's probably unfair, yes. I think |
| 5 | | there was there would have been discussions |
| 6 | | going on but, ultimately, the documents were |
| 7 | | there and could have been looked at if the |
| 8 | | course of enquiry had suggested to that |
| 9 | | individual reviewer that they should be looked |
| 10 | ~ | at. To your local data was there are standing |
| 11 12 | Q. | To your knowledge, were there any standing instructions about when and in what |
| 12 | | circumstances family documents were or were not |
| 13 | | to be looked at by a reviewer? |
| 14 | Α. | I'm not aware of any. |
| 16 | Q. | Would you agree that such standing instructions |
| 17 | ч. | would engender consistency across the disclosure |
| 18 | | exercise? |
| 10 | Α. | Yes, provided they also allowed for discretion |
| 20 | | where that was needed in relation to |
| 21 | | a particular request. |
| 22 | Q. | They would allow somebody looking back after the |
| 23 | - 4- | event to see the rationale recorded for when |
| 24 | | families were to be reviewed and when they were |
| 25 | | not? |
| | | 107 |

| 1 | | so could do so where they considered it would |
|--|----------------|---|
| 2 | | assist them). To the extent that documents were |
| 3 | | not identified and produced to the Inquiry |
| 4 | | because of that decision, primary responsibility |
| 5 | | logically sits with [Herbert Smith Freehills]." |
| 6 | | This reads slightly differently, that your |
| 7 | | understanding is there was no general |
| 8 | | instruction to review family documents but there |
| 9 | | was a function available to a reviewer and the |
| 10 | | individual reviewer could decide to review the |
| 11 | | family or not. Is that your understanding of |
| 12 | | what went on? |
| 13 | Α. | So I think the my understanding is that the |
| 14 | | individual reviewer had the capability, |
| 15 | | something to do with the reviewing pane and how |
| 16 | | it might have been shown. |
| 17 | Q. | So a panel on the screen? |
| 18 | Α. | A panel on the screen. But there would have |
| 19 | | been a prior discussion as to whether or not, as |
| 20 | | a sort of a starting point, the family documents |
| 21 | | should be looked at for that particular aspect, |
| 22 | | which was presumably based on discussions |
| 23 | | internally on what was being seen and advice |
| 24 | | from more senior colleagues as to whether that |
| 25 | | was an appropriate course of action. |
| | | 106 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | Α. | Which seems to me a different point as to |
| 1 2 | A. | Which seems to me a different point as to I mean, there's a difference between a general |
| | Α. | • |
| 2 | A. | l mean, there's a difference between a general |
| 2 3 | А. | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the |
| 2 3 4 | A. Q. | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct |
| 2 3 4 5 | | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. Yes. Sticking with the guidance then, you're |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. Yes. Sticking with the guidance then, you're right to pick me up on it, instructions to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. Yes. Sticking with the guidance then, you're right to pick me up on it, instructions to reviewers that say, "These are the benefits of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. Yes. Sticking with the guidance then, you're right to pick me up on it, instructions to reviewers that say, "These are the benefits of looking at families of documents, you shouldn't |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. Yes. Sticking with the guidance then, you're right to pick me up on it, instructions to reviewers that say, "These are the benefits of looking at families of documents, you shouldn't just think that because you're looking at a hit, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. Yes. Sticking with the guidance then, you're right to pick me up on it, instructions to reviewers that say, "These are the benefits of looking at families of documents, you shouldn't just think that because you're looking at a hit, a responsive search term document, that's the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. Yes. Sticking with the guidance then, you're right to pick me up on it, instructions to reviewers that say, "These are the benefits of looking at families of documents, you shouldn't just think that because you're looking at a hit, a responsive search term document, that's the end of the exercise". |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. A. | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. Yes. Sticking with the guidance then, you're right to pick me up on it, instructions to reviewers that say, "These are the benefits of looking at families of documents, you shouldn't just think that because you're looking at a hit, a responsive search term document, that's the end of the exercise". Yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13 | Q. A. | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. Yes. Sticking with the guidance then, you're right to pick me up on it, instructions to reviewers that say, "These are the benefits of looking at families of documents, you shouldn't just think that because you're looking at a hit, a responsive search term document, that's the end of the exercise". Yes. You should consider, by reading the document in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. A. | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. Yes. Sticking with the guidance then, you're right to pick me up on it, instructions to reviewers that say, "These are the benefits of looking at families of documents, you shouldn't just think that because you're looking at a hit, a responsive search term document, that's the end of the exercise". Yes. You should consider, by reading the document in detail to see whether it refers in its the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. A. | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. Yes. Sticking with the guidance then, you're right to pick me up on it, instructions to reviewers that say, "These are the benefits of looking at families of documents, you shouldn't just think that because you're looking at a hit, a responsive search term document, that's the end of the exercise". Yes. You should consider, by reading the document in detail to see whether it refers in its the body of the document to other documents, you |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. Yes. Sticking with the guidance then, you're right to pick me up on it, instructions to reviewers that say, "These are the benefits of looking at families of documents, you shouldn't just think that because you're looking at a hit, a responsive search term document, that's the end of the exercise". Yes. You should consider, by reading the document in detail to see whether it refers in its the body of the document to other documents, you should check to see whether it's an attachment |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. Yes. Sticking with the guidance then, you're right to pick me up on it, instructions to reviewers that say, "These are the benefits of looking at families of documents, you shouldn't just think that because you're looking at a hit, a responsive search term document, that's the end of the exercise". Yes. You should consider, by reading the document in detail to see whether it refers in its the body of the document to other documents, you should check to see whether it's an attachment to an email and go back to the parent email. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. A. | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. Yes. Sticking with the guidance then, you're right to pick me up on it, instructions to reviewers that say, "These are the benefits of looking at families of documents, you shouldn't just think that because you're looking at a hit, a responsive search term document, that's the end of the exercise". Yes. You should consider, by reading the document in detail to see whether it refers in its the body of the document to other documents, you should check to see whether it's an attachment to an email and go back to the parent email. You should see whether it is part of a file, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. Yes. Sticking with the guidance then, you're right to pick me up on it, instructions to reviewers that say, "These are the benefits of looking at families of documents, you shouldn't just think that because you're looking at a hit, a responsive search term document, that's the end of the exercise". Yes. You should consider, by reading the document in detail to see whether it refers in its the body of the document to other documents, you should check to see whether it's an attachment to an email and go back to the parent email. You should see whether it is part of a file, a zip file, for example, and see whether any of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. Yes. Sticking with the guidance then, you're right to pick me up on it, instructions to reviewers that say, "These are the benefits of looking at families of documents, you shouldn't just think that because you're looking at a hit, a responsive search term document, that's the end of the exercise". Yes. You should consider, by reading the document in detail to see whether it refers in its the body of the document to other documents, you should check to see whether it's an attachment to an email and go back to the parent email. You should see whether it is part of a file, a zip file, for example, and see whether any of the other documents are relevant to the Rule 9 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. Yes. Sticking with the guidance then, you're right to pick me up on it, instructions to reviewers that say, "These are the benefits of looking at families of documents, you shouldn't just think that because you're looking at a hit, a responsive search term document, that's the end of the exercise". Yes. You should consider, by reading the document in detail to see whether it refers in its the body of the document to other documents, you should check to see whether it's an attachment to an email and go back to the parent email. You should see whether it is part of a file, a zip file, for example, and see whether any of the other documents are relevant to the Rule 9 that you're considering. Was there anything of |
| 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. | I mean, there's a difference between a general guidance and then someone recording the rationale, and I'd see those as two distinct steps. Yes. Sticking with the guidance then, you're right to pick me up on it, instructions to reviewers that say, "These are the benefits of looking at families of documents, you shouldn't just think that because you're looking at a hit, a responsive search term document, that's the end of the exercise". Yes. You should consider, by reading the document in detail to see whether it refers in its the body of the document to other documents, you should check to see whether it's an attachment to an email and go back to the parent email. You should see whether it is part of a file, a zip file, for example, and see whether any of the other documents are relevant to the Rule 9 that you're considering. Was there anything of that nature? |

(27) Pages 105 - 108

| 1 | Α. | Not again, I'm not aware of any. |
|----------|----|--|
| 2 | Q. | Can we go back to paragraph 68, please, which is |
| 3 | | on page 22. You say: |
| 4 | | "Depending on the nature of the relevant |
| 5 | | disclosure request and what [Herbert Smith |
| 6 | | Freehills] or [Peters & Peters] considered to be |
| 7 | | reasonable in some instances [they] reviewed |
| 8 | | whole families" |
| 9 | | Yes? |
| 10 | Α. | That's the information I've been provided with, |
| 11 | | yes. |
| 12 | Q. | So whether families were or were not looked at, |
| 13 | | was all down to what the lawyers considered |
| 14 | | reasonable in the circumstances? |
| 15 | Α. | Yes. |
| 16 | Q. | What informed the issue of reasonableness? |
| 17 | Α. | I don't know what they considered. |
| 18 | Q. | Well, was it the number of documents that you |
| 19 | | might have to look at if you decided to have to |
| 20 | | look at the parent email, the costs of doing it, |
| 21 | | the time it might take? |
| 22 | Α. | Yes, all of which are normal considerations in |
| 23 | | any disclosure exercise to consider the range of |
| 24 | | documents to be considered in the time available |
| 25 | | that's going to produce the most relevant |
| | | 109 |
| | | |
| 1 | | of a zip file or within a suite of other policy |
| 2 | | documents and the whole set of appendices |
| 3 | | constituting the procedure which investigators |
| 4 | | were to apply, because a decision had been made |
| 5 | | not to look at families in this instance, |
| 6 | | a reviewer would simply not look at those other |
| 7 | | documents; is that right? |
| 8 | Α. | That's my understanding. |
| 9 | Q. | I've got a hit, it's got the word "policy" and |
| 10 | | "investigate" and "prosecute" in it, that's the |
| 11 | | end of the matter. I don't see where this |
| 12 | | document came from and whether it's part of a |
| 13 | | or what's in the rest of the family; I just move |
| 14 | | on to the next document? |
| 15 | Α. | I just don't feel able to comment on that |
| 16 | | further, I'm afraid. |
| 17 | Q. | Can we turn to paragraph 115 of your witness |
| 18 | | statement, please. You deal with sorry, |
| 19 | | we've looked at 115. |
| 20 | | In terms of remediation, you tell us, |
| 21 | | , , , |
| 21 | | I think, that a decision has been now taken to |
| 22 | | |
| | А. | I think, that a decision has been now taken to |
| 22 | Α. | I think, that a decision has been now taken to review all family documents; is that right? |
| 22 23 | A. | I think, that a decision has been now taken to review all family documents; is that right? That was done in relation to as part of the |

- documents.
- 2 Q. But what were they told, to your knowledge?
- By Post Office? 3 Α.
- 4 Q. You've, as part of the remediation exercise,
- I think taken a look backwards to see what was 5
- 6 going on. What was going on in relation to
- 7 family documents? You've explained it in
- general terms here in paragraph 68 -- it all 8
- depended on what the lawyers considered to be 9 10 reasonable -- I'm asking for some more detail on
- 11 that, please?
- I'm sorry, I don't have any more detail. 12 Α.
- 13 Q. So if we took Appendices 3 and 6 as examples,
- 14 Appendix 3 was responsive to a search term,
- 15 presumably because it had the word "policy" in
- 16 it ---17 A. Mm-hm.
- Q. -- and "Investigation" and "prosecution" in it? 18 19 That appendix, Appendix 3, was part of a family 20 of documents, in fact many families of 21 documents --22 Α. Yes 23 Q. -- across the archive. It was often sent, as 24 I've said, as a zip file as part of a series of 25 appendices. So despite that document being part 110 1 Q. Why was the decision taken to review all family 2 documents if previously it was thought that it 3 was unreasonable to have to do so? 4 A. Such was the level of concern that I think we 5 just felt we couldn't take the risk that 6 something else might have been missed and so we 7 wanted to go back and make absolutely certain as 8 to whether there was anything else relevant. Q. Can I turn to de-duplication, please, and go to 9 pages 24 and 25 of your witness statement. If 10 we can read 78 at the bottom. Just by way of 11 explanation, at 78 you say: 12 "There are ... 2 relevant levels at which 13 14 de-duplication can be applied: 15 (a) family-level de-duplication --16 duplication is analysed as between complete 17 families of documents, excluding duplicate 18 families and ensuring only 1 copy of a family survives computer processing to be manually 19 20 reviewed or produced ..." 21 Then secondly at (b): 22 "item-level de-duplication -- only 1 copy of
- 23 a document survives computer processing to be
- 24 manually reviewed or produced, even if it 25
 - appears in different family contexts."

| 1 | | Just stopping there, so that we understand |
|----------|----------|--|
| 2 | | it in a simple example, if I've got one email |
| 3 | | with five attachments to it and I've got another |
| 4 | | email, which is in exactly the same terms, with |
| 5 | | the same five attachments to it, family level |
| 6 | | de-duplication will de-duplicate that? |
| 7 | Α. | Yes. |
| 8 | Q. | |
| 9 | | and another email with seven attachments to it, |
| 10 | | one of which is the same attachment as one of |
| 11 | | the attachments to the first email, item-level |
| 12 | | de-duplication will de-duplicate the second |
| 13 | | family as well? |
| 14 | A. | If both emails were exactly the same, yes. |
| 15 | Q. | Yes. So if both attachments were exactly the same? |
| 16 17 | Α. | Yes. |
| 18 | A. Q. | |
| 10 | Q. | Thank you. You say: "I now understand that item-level |
| 20 | | de-duplication is rarely used in eDisclosure |
| 20 | | because it can have significant unpredictable |
| 22 | | and potentially undesirable impacts on document |
| 23 | | review." |
| 24 | | Who told you this? |
| 25 | Α. | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| | | 113 |
| | | |
| 1 | | a reviewer would not see the other documents in |
| 2 | | the family, but also that the other documents in |
| 3 | | the family were excluded from other keyword |
| 4 | | searches being undertaken as part of the |
| 5 | | disclosure exercise? |
| 6 | Α. | Yes, I believe that's correct. |
| 7 | Q. | So this non-standard approach, which is rarely |
| 8 | | used, and which has a series of significant |
| 9 | | undesirable and unpredictable consequences, was |
| 10 | | used, but all without the Post Office's |
| 11 | | knowledge? |
| 12 | Α. | Yes. |
| 13 | Q. | Aside from who, as between Herbert Smith |
| 14 | | Freehills and Peters & Peters on the one hand |
| 15 | | and KPMG on the other, was responsible for that |
| 16 | | decision, do you know why, in this Inquiry, |
| 17 | | which is itself investigating non-disclosure and |
| 18 | | indeed, in the very Rule 9 we're looking at, was |
| 19 | | searching for documents about the Post Office's |
| 20 | | policy of giving or withholding documents in |
| 21 22 | | investigations and proceedings, this |
| 22 23 | | non-standard, rarely used approach was in fact used? |
| 23 24 | Α. | No. |
| 24 | м. | NO. |
| 25 | Q. | Presumably when it was discovered, it caused |

| 1 | | Herbert Smith Freehills. |
|--|----------|---|
| 2 | Q. | Why might item-level de-duplication have |
| 3 | | significant consequences and therefore is rarely |
| 4 | | used? |
| 5 | Α. | Because it could result in family documents not |
| 6 | | being available for a reviewer to see, so that |
| 7 | | reviewing pane we spoke about earlier, they |
| 8 | | wouldn't appear there. |
| 9 | Q. | So it hides from the reviewer's view, not only |
| 10 | | the single document, which is the duplicate of |
| 11 | | the document he or she is looking at, but it |
| 12 | | hides from the reviewer's view the other |
| 13 | | documents within the family? |
| 14 | Α. | That's my understanding, yes. |
| 15 | Q. | Why might it have unpredictable consequences? |
| 16 | Α. | Well, it would depend on the nature of the |
| 17 | | document as to precisely what was lost and you |
| 18 | | wouldn't know that in advance. |
| 19 | Q. | Why might there be undesirable consequences of |
| 20 | | this type of item level de-duplication? |
| 21 | Α. | Because it removes the ability of the reviewer |
| 22 | | to see the relevant documents. |
| 23 | Q. | Is it your understanding that the approach that |
| 24 | | was, in fact, taken, the item-level |
| 25 | | de-duplication, on occasions, meant that |
| | | |
| | | 114 |
| | | 114 |
| 1 | | 114 more than a minor ruffling of feathers? |
| 1 2 | А. | |
| - | A. Q. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? |
| 2 | | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. |
| 2 3 | Q. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication by Herbert Smith Freehills or a misunderstanding |
| 2 3 4 | Q. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication |
| 2 3 4 5 | Q. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication by Herbert Smith Freehills or a misunderstanding by KPMG. I think both appear to have had different understandings of what was being |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication by Herbert Smith Freehills or a misunderstanding by KPMG. I think both appear to have had different understandings of what was being instructed or what was being asked of them, and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication by Herbert Smith Freehills or a misunderstanding by KPMG. I think both appear to have had different understandings of what was being instructed or what was being asked of them, and I haven't, to date, been able to understand it |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication by Herbert Smith Freehills or a misunderstanding by KPMG. I think both appear to have had different understandings of what was being instructed or what was being asked of them, and I haven't, to date, been able to understand it beyond that. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication by Herbert Smith Freehills or a misunderstanding by KPMG. I think both appear to have had different understandings of what was being instructed or what was being asked of them, and I haven't, to date, been able to understand it beyond that. Can we look at paragraph 80 which is further |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. A. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication by Herbert Smith Freehills or a misunderstanding by KPMG. I think both appear to have had different understandings of what was being instructed or what was being asked of them, and I haven't, to date, been able to understand it beyond that. Can we look at paragraph 80 which is further down the page, please. You say: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. A. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication by Herbert Smith Freehills or a misunderstanding by KPMG. I think both appear to have had different understandings of what was being instructed or what was being asked of them, and I haven't, to date, been able to understand it beyond that. Can we look at paragraph 80 which is further down the page, please. You say: "I understand that instructions to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. A. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication by Herbert Smith Freehills or a misunderstanding by KPMG. I think both appear to have had different understandings of what was being instructed or what was being asked of them, and I haven't, to date, been able to understand it beyond that. Can we look at paragraph 80 which is further down the page, please. You say: "I understand that instructions to de-duplicate were given to KPMG by [Herbert |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. A. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication by Herbert Smith Freehills or a misunderstanding by KPMG. I think both appear to have had different understandings of what was being instructed or what was being asked of them, and I haven't, to date, been able to understand it beyond that. Can we look at paragraph 80 which is further down the page, please. You say: "I understand that instructions to de-duplicate were given to KPMG by [Herbert Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. A. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication by Herbert Smith Freehills or a misunderstanding by KPMG. I think both appear to have had different understandings of what was being instructed or what was being asked of them, and I haven't, to date, been able to understand it beyond that. Can we look at paragraph 80 which is further down the page, please. You say: "I understand that instructions to de-duplicate were given to KPMG by [Herbert Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from [Herbert |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication by Herbert Smith Freehills or a misunderstanding by KPMG. I think both appear to have had different understandings of what was being instructed or what was being asked of them, and I haven't, to date, been able to understand it beyond that. Can we look at paragraph 80 which is further down the page, please. You say: "I understand that instructions to de-duplicate were given to KPMG by [Herbert Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from [Herbert Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] that they |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication by Herbert Smith Freehills or a misunderstanding by KPMG. I think both appear to have had different understandings of what was being instructed or what was being asked of them, and I haven't, to date, been able to understand it beyond that. Can we look at paragraph 80 which is further down the page, please. You say: "I understand that instructions to de-duplicate were given to KPMG by [Herbert Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from [Herbert Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. A. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication by Herbert Smith Freehills or a misunderstanding by KPMG. I think both appear to have had different understandings of what was being instructed or what was being asked of them, and I haven't, to date, been able to understand it beyond that. Can we look at paragraph 80 which is further down the page, please. You say: "I understand that instructions to de-duplicate were given to KPMG by [Herbert Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from [Herbert Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication by Herbert Smith Freehills or a misunderstanding by KPMG. I think both appear to have had different understandings of what was being instructed or what was being asked of them, and I haven't, to date, been able to understand it beyond that. Can we look at paragraph 80 which is further down the page, please. You say: "I understand that instructions to de-duplicate were given to KPMG by [Herbert Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from [Herbert Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication by Herbert Smith Freehills or a misunderstanding by KPMG. I think both appear to have had different understandings of what was being instructed or what was being asked of them, and I haven't, to date, been able to understand it beyond that. Can we look at paragraph 80 which is further down the page, please. You say: "I understand that instructions to de-duplicate were given to KPMG by [Herbert Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from [Herbert Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14 (or at all). My current understanding is |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication by Herbert Smith Freehills or a misunderstanding by KPMG. I think both appear to have had different understandings of what was being instructed or what was being asked of them, and I haven't, to date, been able to understand it beyond that. Can we look at paragraph 80 which is further down the page, please. You say: "I understand that instructions to de-duplicate were given to KPMG by [Herbert Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from [Herbert Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14 (or at all). My current understanding is that item-level de-duplication was applied as |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. | more than a minor ruffling of feathers? Yes. Do you now know who was responsible for it? No, it appears to be either a miscommunication by Herbert Smith Freehills or a misunderstanding by KPMG. I think both appear to have had different understandings of what was being instructed or what was being asked of them, and I haven't, to date, been able to understand it beyond that. Can we look at paragraph 80 which is further down the page, please. You say: "I understand that instructions to de-duplicate were given to KPMG by [Herbert Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from [Herbert Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14 (or at all). My current understanding is |

25 didn't intend it to be applied) or

| 1 | | a misunderstanding by KPMG (who have explained |
|---|----------|---|
| 2 | | that they understood that their instructions |
| 3 | | were to apply item-level de-duplication)." |
| 4 | | So the lawyers say they didn't intend and |
| 5 | | didn't instruct item-level de-duplication to be |
| 6 | | used in any Rule 9 searches, yes? |
| 7 | Α. | I'm just pausing as to whether it's in any. |
| 8 | | There may have been some in which it was |
| 9 | | appropriate, I don't know, but my understanding |
| 10 | | is it wasn't instructed in relation to these |
| 11 | | Rule 9s. |
| 12 | Q. | It was the addition of the words "or at all" in |
| 13 | | the fifth line |
| 14 | Α. | Okay. |
| 15 | Q. | that led me to ask that question, because |
| 16 | | your witness statement speaks of, essentially, |
| 17 | | all Rule 9 requests, not just 11 and 14. |
| 18 | Α. | Yes. In which case, that would have been my |
| 19 | | understanding. Yeah. |
| 20 | Q. | So the lawyers say they didn't intend item-level |
| 21 | | de-duplication to be used in any Rule 9 Request, |
| 22 | | and KPMG say they understood their instructions |
| 23 | | to be to apply item-level de-duplication? |
| 24 | Α. | Yes, that's what I've been told. |
| 25 | Q. | Isn't this kind of unattractive squabble between 117 |
| | | 117 |
| | | |
| 1 | | going forward, I think it will still be taken on |
| 2 | | a case-by-case basis. |
| 3 | Q. | That's what I was about to ask you. Is it in |
| 4 | | |
| | | relation to all new Rule 9 requests that family |
| 5 | | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation |
| 5 6 | | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and |
| 5 6 7 | _ | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? |
| 5 6 7 8 | A. | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? So the decision was taken to remediate in |
| 5 6 7 8 9 | A. | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? So the decision was taken to remediate in relation to all previous ones out of |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 | А. | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? So the decision was taken to remediate in relation to all previous ones out of an abundance of caution, because of the level of |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | А. | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? So the decision was taken to remediate in relation to all previous ones out of an abundance of caution, because of the level of concern. In terms of as we move forward, there |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Α. | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? So the decision was taken to remediate in relation to all previous ones out of an abundance of caution, because of the level of concern. In terms of as we move forward, there will be much closer analysis as to how those |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Α. | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? So the decision was taken to remediate in relation to all previous ones out of an abundance of caution, because of the level of concern. In terms of as we move forward, there will be much closer analysis as to how those decisions are taken as to when to review family |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | A. | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? So the decision was taken to remediate in relation to all previous ones out of an abundance of caution, because of the level of concern. In terms of as we move forward, there will be much closer analysis as to how those decisions are taken as to when to review family documents. But my understanding is that the way |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? So the decision was taken to remediate in relation to all previous ones out of an abundance of caution, because of the level of concern. In terms of as we move forward, there will be much closer analysis as to how those decisions are taken as to when to review family documents. But my understanding is that the way it could multiply the amount of documents that |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? So the decision was taken to remediate in relation to all previous ones out of an abundance of caution, because of the level of concern. In terms of as we move forward, there will be much closer analysis as to how those decisions are taken as to when to review family documents. But my understanding is that the way it could multiply the amount of documents that need to be reviewed, it still needs to be looked |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? So the decision was taken to remediate in relation to all previous ones out of an abundance of caution, because of the level of concern. In terms of as we move forward, there will be much closer analysis as to how those decisions are taken as to when to review family documents. But my understanding is that the way it could multiply the amount of documents that need to be reviewed, it still needs to be looked at on an individual, case-by-case basis, as to |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? So the decision was taken to remediate in relation to all previous ones out of an abundance of caution, because of the level of concern. In terms of as we move forward, there will be much closer analysis as to how those decisions are taken as to when to review family documents. But my understanding is that the way it could multiply the amount of documents that need to be reviewed, it still needs to be looked at on an individual, case-by-case basis, as to whether or not that's the appropriate outcome. |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | A. Q. | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? So the decision was taken to remediate in relation to all previous ones out of an abundance of caution, because of the level of concern. In terms of as we move forward, there will be much closer analysis as to how those decisions are taken as to when to review family documents. But my understanding is that the way it could multiply the amount of documents that need to be reviewed, it still needs to be looked at on an individual, case-by-case basis, as to whether or not that's the appropriate outcome. Again, as we sit here today, has any guidance |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? So the decision was taken to remediate in relation to all previous ones out of an abundance of caution, because of the level of concern. In terms of as we move forward, there will be much closer analysis as to how those decisions are taken as to when to review family documents. But my understanding is that the way it could multiply the amount of documents that need to be reviewed, it still needs to be looked at on an individual, case-by-case basis, as to whether or not that's the appropriate outcome. Again, as we sit here today, has any guidance been developed to tell the reviewers when to |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? So the decision was taken to remediate in relation to all previous ones out of an abundance of caution, because of the level of concern. In terms of as we move forward, there will be much closer analysis as to how those decisions are taken as to when to review family documents. But my understanding is that the way it could multiply the amount of documents that need to be reviewed, it still needs to be looked at on an individual, case-by-case basis, as to whether or not that's the appropriate outcome. Again, as we sit here today, has any guidance been developed to tell the reviewers when to look at a family and when not to look at |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? So the decision was taken to remediate in relation to all previous ones out of an abundance of caution, because of the level of concern. In terms of as we move forward, there will be much closer analysis as to how those decisions are taken as to when to review family documents. But my understanding is that the way it could multiply the amount of documents that need to be reviewed, it still needs to be looked at on an individual, case-by-case basis, as to whether or not that's the appropriate outcome. Again, as we sit here today, has any guidance been developed to tell the reviewers when to look at a family and when not to look at a family? |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? So the decision was taken to remediate in relation to all previous ones out of an abundance of caution, because of the level of concern. In terms of as we move forward, there will be much closer analysis as to how those decisions are taken as to when to review family documents. But my understanding is that the way it could multiply the amount of documents that need to be reviewed, it still needs to be looked at on an individual, case-by-case basis, as to whether or not that's the appropriate outcome. Again, as we sit here today, has any guidance been developed to tell the reviewers when to look at a family and when not to look at a family? I'm not aware of any specific guidance. |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? So the decision was taken to remediate in relation to all previous ones out of an abundance of caution, because of the level of concern. In terms of as we move forward, there will be much closer analysis as to how those decisions are taken as to when to review family documents. But my understanding is that the way it could multiply the amount of documents that need to be reviewed, it still needs to be looked at on an individual, case-by-case basis, as to whether or not that's the appropriate outcome. Again, as we sit here today, has any guidance been developed to tell the reviewers when to look at a family and when not to look at a family? I'm not aware of any specific guidance. So, in relation to Rule 9s that the Inquiry is |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. | documents will be reviewed, or is it in relation to past Rule 9s and, if past Rule 9s, which and why? So the decision was taken to remediate in relation to all previous ones out of an abundance of caution, because of the level of concern. In terms of as we move forward, there will be much closer analysis as to how those decisions are taken as to when to review family documents. But my understanding is that the way it could multiply the amount of documents that need to be reviewed, it still needs to be looked at on an individual, case-by-case basis, as to whether or not that's the appropriate outcome. Again, as we sit here today, has any guidance been developed to tell the reviewers when to look at a family and when not to look at a family? I'm not aware of any specific guidance. |

| 1 | | highly paid city advisers why it is essential |
|--|----------|---|
| 2 | | for the client itself to be involved to |
| 3 | | a sufficient degree to ensure an understanding |
| 4 | | of what's being done in its name? |
| 5 | Α. | Yes, though whether Post Office being actively |
| 6 | | involved in discussions would have enabled us to |
| 7 | | understand that a misunderstanding had occurred, |
| 8 | | l don't know. |
| 9 | Q. | But by subcontracting the disclosure issue out, |
| 10 | | you run exactly the kind of risk that has played |
| 11 | | out in this case, don't you? By "you", I mean |
| 12 | | the Post Office. |
| 13 | Α. | Yes. |
| 14 | Q. | Can I turn, then, to remediation and, by |
| 15 | | "remediation", I mean correcting past mistakes |
| 16 | | and ensuring that other, similar mistakes do not |
| 17 | | happen again. |
| 18 | | In relation to the family issue, review of |
| 19 | | family documents issue, as we've established |
| 20 | | already, the remediation in relation to family |
| 21 | | documents is essentially complete because, as |
| 22 | | you've explained, a decision has now been taken |
| 23 | | to review all family documents. |
| 24 25 | Α. | A decision was taken to review all the family |
| 25 | | documents that had previously been produced. So 118 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | any guidance to reviewers about when they should |
| 2 | | look at a family of documents and when they |
| 2 3 | | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? |
| 2 3 4 | A. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm |
| 2 3 4 5 | A. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | A. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | A. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from the Inquiry. I'm sorry, I don't know whether |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from the Inquiry. I'm sorry, I don't know whether they may have seen any. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. Q. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from the Inquiry. I'm sorry, I don't know whether they may have seen any. In relation to the search terms issue, can you |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from the Inquiry. I'm sorry, I don't know whether they may have seen any. In relation to the search terms issue, can you explain briefly what has been done in relation |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from the Inquiry. I'm sorry, I don't know whether they may have seen any. In relation to the search terms issue, can you explain briefly what has been done in relation to remediation of that problem? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from the Inquiry. I'm sorry, I don't know whether they may have seen any. In relation to the search terms issue, can you explain briefly what has been done in relation to remediation of that problem? So in relation to the specific issue that was |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from the Inquiry. I'm sorry, I don't know whether they may have seen any. In relation to the search terms issue, can you explain briefly what has been done in relation to remediation of that problem? So in relation to the specific issue that was identified, which I understand was in relation |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from the Inquiry. I'm sorry, I don't know whether they may have seen any. In relation to the search terms issue, can you explain briefly what has been done in relation to remediation of that problem? So in relation to the specific issue that was identified, which I understand was in relation to the I think the failure to shorten the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from the Inquiry. I'm sorry, I don't know whether they may have seen any. In relation to the search terms issue, can you explain briefly what has been done in relation to remediation of that problem? So in relation to the specific issue that was identified, which I understand was in relation to the I think the failure to shorten the word "guidance" to "guide", that was done and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from the Inquiry. I'm sorry, I don't know whether they may have seen any. In relation to the search terms issue, can you explain briefly what has been done in relation to remediation of that problem? So in relation to the specific issue that was identified, which I understand was in relation to the I think the failure to shorten the word "guidance" to "guide", that was done and the remediation of that is complete. There's |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from the Inquiry. I'm sorry, I don't know whether they may have seen any. In relation to the search terms issue, can you explain briefly what has been done in relation to remediation of that problem? So in relation to the specific issue that was identified, which I understand was in relation to the I think the failure to shorten the word "guidance" to "guide", that was done and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from the Inquiry. I'm sorry, I don't know whether they may have seen any. In relation to the search terms issue, can you explain briefly what has been done in relation to remediation of that problem? So in relation to the specific issue that was identified, which I understand was in relation to the I think the failure to shorten the word "guidance" to "guide", that was done and the remediation of that is complete. There's been a more broad exercise in terms of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from the Inquiry. I'm sorry, I don't know whether they may have seen any. In relation to the search terms issue, can you explain briefly what has been done in relation to remediation of that problem? So in relation to the specific issue that was identified, which I understand was in relation to the I think the failure to shorten the word "guidance" to "guide", that was done and the remediation of that is complete. There's been a more broad exercise in terms of I regard it more as quality assurance rather |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from the Inquiry. I'm sorry, I don't know whether they may have seen any. In relation to the search terms issue, can you explain briefly what has been done in relation to remediation of that problem? So in relation to the specific issue that was identified, which I understand was in relation to the I think the failure to shorten the word "guidance" to "guide", that was done and the remediation of that is complete. There's been a more broad exercise in terms of I regard it more as quality assurance rather than it necessarily being a mistake, but to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from the Inquiry. I'm sorry, I don't know whether they may have seen any. In relation to the search terms issue, can you explain briefly what has been done in relation to remediation of that problem? So in relation to the specific issue that was identified, which I understand was in relation to the I think the failure to shorten the word "guidance" to "guide", that was done and the remediation of that is complete. There's been a more broad exercise in terms of I regard it more as quality assurance rather than it necessarily being a mistake, but to whether or not, on the basis of all the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from the Inquiry. I'm sorry, I don't know whether they may have seen any. In relation to the search terms issue, can you explain briefly what has been done in relation to remediation of that problem? So in relation to the specific issue that was identified, which I understand was in relation to the I think the failure to shorten the word "guidance" to "guide", that was done and the remediation of that is complete. There's been a more broad exercise in terms of I regard it more as quality assurance rather than it necessarily being a mistake, but to whether or not, on the basis of all the additional information that has been accrued up |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from the Inquiry. I'm sorry, I don't know whether they may have seen any. In relation to the search terms issue, can you explain briefly what has been done in relation to remediation of that problem? So in relation to the specific issue that was identified, which I understand was in relation to the I think the failure to shorten the word "guidance" to "guide", that was done and the remediation of that is complete. There's been a more broad exercise in terms of I regard it more as quality assurance rather than it necessarily being a mistake, but to whether or not, on the basis of all the additional information that has been accrued up until now, different search terms should now be |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. | look at a family of documents and when they shouldn't? I'm not saying it doesn't exist, I'm saying I'm not personally aware. My team are certainly more much more actively involved in discussions in relation to current requests from the Inquiry. I'm sorry, I don't know whether they may have seen any. In relation to the search terms issue, can you explain briefly what has been done in relation to remediation of that problem? So in relation to the specific issue that was identified, which I understand was in relation to the I think the failure to shorten the word "guidance" to "guide", that was done and the remediation of that is complete. There's been a more broad exercise in terms of I regard it more as quality assurance rather than it necessarily being a mistake, but to whether or not, on the basis of all the additional information that has been accrued up until now, different search terms should now be gone back and applied and that's the extensive |

(30) Pages 117 - 120

| 1 | Q. | Is that part of what you describe in your |
|---|----------------|--|
| 2 | | witness statement we needn't go there, it's |
| 3 | | 108 and following as part of the structural |
| 4 | | review or does it sit outside that? |
| 5 | Α. | It sits outside that. |
| 6 | Q. | Who is undertaking that work in relation to |
| 7 | | search terms? |
| 8 | A. | Herbert Smiths and Peters & Peters. |
| 9 10 | Q. | Whilst I touch upon it, can you explain in |
| 10 11 | | summary terms what the structural review is, please? |
| 12 | Α. | Sure, if you just give me a moment to refresh my |
| 12 | А. | mind. |
| 14 | Q. | It's 108 on page 34. |
| 15 | A. | Thank you, yes. I know I've made a note for |
| 16 | Π. | myself but I can't immediately find it. Thank |
| 17 | | you, yes. So it's centred around the use of the |
| 18 | | electronic discovery reference model, which |
| 19 | | I have annexed to my statement, and it's |
| 20 | | checking, to the best level of achievable, |
| 21 | | whether all relevant documents that make up |
| 22 | | disclosure so it's checking that to see |
| 23 | | what's been collected already, what still needs |
| 24 | | to be collected, how it's held on Relativity, |
| 25 | | whether there's any potential to restructure the |
| | | 121 |
| | | |
| 1 | | appointed someone as yet. In the interim, what |
| 2 | | we have had is two senior lawyers from Burges |
| 3 | | Salmon and Fieldfisher who have worked |
| 4 | | effectively in-house as part of the team since |
| 4 | | , , |
| 4 5 | | June to help us provide that extra challenge |
| - | | |
| 5 | | June to help us provide that extra challenge |
| 5 6 | | June to help us provide that extra challenge function, and the idea is that the recruitment |
| 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. | June to help us provide that extra challenge function, and the idea is that the recruitment permanently will take the place of those lawyers. Is that new post, the disclosure specialist |
| 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. | June to help us provide that extra challenge function, and the idea is that the recruitment permanently will take the place of those lawyers. Is that new post, the disclosure specialist lawyer, as has been reported in the media, to be |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | | June to help us provide that extra challenge function, and the idea is that the recruitment permanently will take the place of those lawyers. Is that new post, the disclosure specialist lawyer, as has been reported in the media, to be paid, in part, by reference to a bonus? |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Α. | June to help us provide that extra challenge function, and the idea is that the recruitment permanently will take the place of those lawyers. Is that new post, the disclosure specialist lawyer, as has been reported in the media, to be paid, in part, by reference to a bonus? Yes. |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A. Q. | June to help us provide that extra challenge function, and the idea is that the recruitment permanently will take the place of those lawyers. Is that new post, the disclosure specialist lawyer, as has been reported in the media, to be paid, in part, by reference to a bonus? Yes. What is the bonus metric? |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Α. | June to help us provide that extra challenge function, and the idea is that the recruitment permanently will take the place of those lawyers. Is that new post, the disclosure specialist lawyer, as has been reported in the media, to be paid, in part, by reference to a bonus? Yes. What is the bonus metric? So Post Office, like many organisations, runs |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. Q. | June to help us provide that extra challenge function, and the idea is that the recruitment permanently will take the place of those lawyers. Is that new post, the disclosure specialist lawyer, as has been reported in the media, to be paid, in part, by reference to a bonus? Yes. What is the bonus metric? So Post Office, like many organisations, runs a bonus scheme to which its senior manager |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. Q. | June to help us provide that extra challenge function, and the idea is that the recruitment permanently will take the place of those lawyers. Is that new post, the disclosure specialist lawyer, as has been reported in the media, to be paid, in part, by reference to a bonus? Yes. What is the bonus metric? So Post Office, like many organisations, runs a bonus scheme to which its senior manager professionals and management are entitled to |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. Q. | June to help us provide that extra challenge function, and the idea is that the recruitment permanently will take the place of those lawyers. Is that new post, the disclosure specialist lawyer, as has been reported in the media, to be paid, in part, by reference to a bonus? Yes. What is the bonus metric? So Post Office, like many organisations, runs a bonus scheme to which its senior manager professionals and management are entitled to participate in, which has business-wide |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. Q. | June to help us provide that extra challenge function, and the idea is that the recruitment permanently will take the place of those lawyers. Is that new post, the disclosure specialist lawyer, as has been reported in the media, to be paid, in part, by reference to a bonus? Yes. What is the bonus metric? So Post Office, like many organisations, runs a bonus scheme to which its senior manager professionals and management are entitled to participate in, which has business-wide objectives, which is set for the whole |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | A. Q. | June to help us provide that extra challenge function, and the idea is that the recruitment permanently will take the place of those lawyers. Is that new post, the disclosure specialist lawyer, as has been reported in the media, to be paid, in part, by reference to a bonus? Yes. What is the bonus metric? So Post Office, like many organisations, runs a bonus scheme to which its senior manager professionals and management are entitled to participate in, which has business-wide objectives, which is set for the whole organisation, including things like financial |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. Q. | June to help us provide that extra challenge function, and the idea is that the recruitment permanently will take the place of those lawyers. Is that new post, the disclosure specialist lawyer, as has been reported in the media, to be paid, in part, by reference to a bonus? Yes. What is the bonus metric? So Post Office, like many organisations, runs a bonus scheme to which its senior manager professionals and management are entitled to participate in, which has business-wide objectives, which is set for the whole organisation, including things like financial targets. The team is entitled to take part in |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. Q. | June to help us provide that extra challenge function, and the idea is that the recruitment permanently will take the place of those lawyers. Is that new post, the disclosure specialist lawyer, as has been reported in the media, to be paid, in part, by reference to a bonus? Yes. What is the bonus metric? So Post Office, like many organisations, runs a bonus scheme to which its senior manager professionals and management are entitled to participate in, which has business-wide objectives, which is set for the whole organisation, including things like financial targets. The team is entitled to take part in that in the same way that other parts of Post |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. Q. | June to help us provide that extra challenge function, and the idea is that the recruitment permanently will take the place of those lawyers. Is that new post, the disclosure specialist lawyer, as has been reported in the media, to be paid, in part, by reference to a bonus? Yes. What is the bonus metric? So Post Office, like many organisations, runs a bonus scheme to which its senior manager professionals and management are entitled to participate in, which has business-wide objectives, which is set for the whole organisation, including things like financial targets. The team is entitled to take part in that in the same way that other parts of Post Office are. There are in the current scheme |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. Q. | June to help us provide that extra challenge function, and the idea is that the recruitment permanently will take the place of those lawyers. Is that new post, the disclosure specialist lawyer, as has been reported in the media, to be paid, in part, by reference to a bonus? Yes. What is the bonus metric? So Post Office, like many organisations, runs a bonus scheme to which its senior manager professionals and management are entitled to participate in, which has business-wide objectives, which is set for the whole organisation, including things like financial targets. The team is entitled to take part in that in the same way that other parts of Post |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. Q. | June to help us provide that extra challenge function, and the idea is that the recruitment permanently will take the place of those lawyers. Is that new post, the disclosure specialist lawyer, as has been reported in the media, to be paid, in part, by reference to a bonus? Yes. What is the bonus metric? So Post Office, like many organisations, runs a bonus scheme to which its senior manager professionals and management are entitled to participate in, which has business-wide objectives, which is set for the whole organisation, including things like financial targets. The team is entitled to take part in that in the same way that other parts of Post Office are. There are in the current scheme and in any future schemes, there are no metrics |
| 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | A. Q. A. | June to help us provide that extra challenge function, and the idea is that the recruitment permanently will take the place of those lawyers. Is that new post, the disclosure specialist lawyer, as has been reported in the media, to be paid, in part, by reference to a bonus? Yes. What is the bonus metric? So Post Office, like many organisations, runs a bonus scheme to which its senior manager professionals and management are entitled to participate in, which has business-wide objectives, which is set for the whole organisation, including things like financial targets. The team is entitled to take part in that in the same way that other parts of Post Office are. There are in the current scheme and in any future schemes, there are no metrics related directly to the Inquiry. |

| 1 | | Relativity system to enable better search |
|--|----|--|
| 2 | | functions. |
| 3 | | It's looking at how we might increase |
| 4 | | technological options in Relativity, which might |
| 5 | | allow, for example, some computer assisted |
| 6 | | searches to be done and it's also looking at all |
| 7 | | the steps in the process. So what's done by |
| 8 | | whom and looking at how we might reduce risks |
| 9 | | and make achievable improvements. |
| 10 | Q. | As part of that, you refer to the fact that the |
| 11 | | Public Inquiry Team is presently advertising for |
| 12 | | a disclosure specialist lawyer who would engage |
| 13 | | in the granularity of the disclosure processes? |
| 14 | Α. | Yes. |
| 15 | Q. | Does it follow that there has not been a person |
| 16 | | within the Post Office who has been engaged with |
| 17 | | the granularity of the disclosure processes? |
| 18 | Α. | So the lawyers that are in the team have |
| 19 | | experience of either public inquiries or similar |
| 20 | | work but I don't believe they have specific |
| 21 | | expertise in disclosure matters in the way that |
| 22 | | I think I need in the team. |
| 23 | Q. | That disclosure specialist lawyer hasn't been |
| 24 | | appointed yet; is that right? |
| 25 | Α. | So in the no, it hasn't. So we haven't |
| | | 100 |
| | | 122 |
| | | 122 |
| 1 | | are not being paid bonuses that are related to |
| 1 2 | | |
| | А. | are not being paid bonuses that are related to |
| 2 | A. | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? |
| 2 3 | A. | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. |
| 2 3 4 | A. | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is |
| 2 3 4 5 | A. | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is taken by the remuneration committee as to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | A. | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is taken by the remuneration committee as to whether or not the corporate-wide objectives |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Α. | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is taken by the remuneration committee as to whether or not the corporate-wide objectives have been met and that triggers the entitlement in principle to payment of a bonus. At a team |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A. | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is taken by the remuneration committee as to whether or not the corporate-wide objectives have been met and that triggers the entitlement |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is taken by the remuneration committee as to whether or not the corporate-wide objectives have been met and that triggers the entitlement in principle to payment of a bonus. At a team level, as you'd expect, there are personal |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is taken by the remuneration committee as to whether or not the corporate-wide objectives have been met and that triggers the entitlement in principle to payment of a bonus. At a team level, as you'd expect, there are personal objectives for each member of the team, which |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | A. | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is taken by the remuneration committee as to whether or not the corporate-wide objectives have been met and that triggers the entitlement in principle to payment of a bonus. At a team level, as you'd expect, there are personal objectives for each member of the team, which are focused on, in the Inquiry Team, support for |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | A. | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is taken by the remuneration committee as to whether or not the corporate-wide objectives have been met and that triggers the entitlement in principle to payment of a bonus. At a team level, as you'd expect, there are personal objectives for each member of the team, which are focused on, in the Inquiry Team, support for the Inquiry. Their performance is then looked |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Α. | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is taken by the remuneration committee as to whether or not the corporate-wide objectives have been met and that triggers the entitlement in principle to payment of a bonus. At a team level, as you'd expect, there are personal objectives for each member of the team, which are focused on, in the Inquiry Team, support for the Inquiry. Their performance is then looked at in the round at the end of the year, looking |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Α. | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is taken by the remuneration committee as to whether or not the corporate-wide objectives have been met and that triggers the entitlement in principle to payment of a bonus. At a team level, as you'd expect, there are personal objectives for each member of the team, which are focused on, in the Inquiry Team, support for the Inquiry. Their performance is then looked at in the round at the end of the year, looking at what they've delivered and in what context, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Α. | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is taken by the remuneration committee as to whether or not the corporate-wide objectives have been met and that triggers the entitlement in principle to payment of a bonus. At a team level, as you'd expect, there are personal objectives for each member of the team, which are focused on, in the Inquiry Team, support for the Inquiry. Their performance is then looked at in the round at the end of the year, looking at what they've delivered and in what context, with what standards of behaviour, et cetera. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is taken by the remuneration committee as to whether or not the corporate-wide objectives have been met and that triggers the entitlement in principle to payment of a bonus. At a team level, as you'd expect, there are personal objectives for each member of the team, which are focused on, in the Inquiry Team, support for the Inquiry. Their performance is then looked at in the round at the end of the year, looking at what they've delivered and in what context, with what standards of behaviour, et cetera. Higher levels of performance could lead to the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is taken by the remuneration committee as to whether or not the corporate-wide objectives have been met and that triggers the entitlement in principle to payment of a bonus. At a team level, as you'd expect, there are personal objectives for each member of the team, which are focused on, in the Inquiry Team, support for the Inquiry. Their performance is then looked at in the round at the end of the year, looking at what they've delivered and in what context, with what standards of behaviour, et cetera. Higher levels of performance could lead to the achievement of a higher bonus award. But the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Α. | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is taken by the remuneration committee as to whether or not the corporate-wide objectives have been met and that triggers the entitlement in principle to payment of a bonus. At a team level, as you'd expect, there are personal objectives for each member of the team, which are focused on, in the Inquiry Team, support for the Inquiry. Their performance is then looked at in the round at the end of the year, looking at what they've delivered and in what context, with what standards of behaviour, et cetera. Higher levels of performance could lead to the achievement of a higher bonus award. But the decision has to be taken in the first place that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is taken by the remuneration committee as to whether or not the corporate-wide objectives have been met and that triggers the entitlement in principle to payment of a bonus. At a team level, as you'd expect, there are personal objectives for each member of the team, which are focused on, in the Inquiry Team, support for the Inquiry. Their performance is then looked at in the round at the end of the year, looking at what they've delivered and in what context, with what standards of behaviour, et cetera. Higher levels of performance could lead to the achievement of a higher bonus award. But the decision has to be taken in the first place that it's payable at all. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is taken by the remuneration committee as to whether or not the corporate-wide objectives have been met and that triggers the entitlement in principle to payment of a bonus. At a team level, as you'd expect, there are personal objectives for each member of the team, which are focused on, in the Inquiry Team, support for the Inquiry. Their performance is then looked at in the round at the end of the year, looking at what they've delivered and in what context, with what standards of behaviour, et cetera. Higher levels of performance could lead to the achievement of a higher bonus award. But the decision has to be taken in the first place that it's payable at all. Lastly, and in less than five minutes, can we |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is taken by the remuneration committee as to whether or not the corporate-wide objectives have been met and that triggers the entitlement in principle to payment of a bonus. At a team level, as you'd expect, there are personal objectives for each member of the team, which are focused on, in the Inquiry Team, support for the Inquiry. Their performance is then looked at in the round at the end of the year, looking at what they've delivered and in what context, with what standards of behaviour, et cetera. Higher levels of performance could lead to the achievement of a higher bonus award. But the decision has to be taken in the first place that it's payable at all. Lastly, and in less than five minutes, can we look at the hard-copy document review. This is |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | | are not being paid bonuses that are related to their performance in Inquiry work? So I think we have to look at it at two levels. So, first of all, there's a decision which is taken by the remuneration committee as to whether or not the corporate-wide objectives have been met and that triggers the entitlement in principle to payment of a bonus. At a team level, as you'd expect, there are personal objectives for each member of the team, which are focused on, in the Inquiry Team, support for the Inquiry. Their performance is then looked at in the round at the end of the year, looking at what they've delivered and in what context, with what standards of behaviour, et cetera. Higher levels of performance could lead to the achievement of a higher bonus award. But the decision has to be taken in the first place that it's payable at all. Lastly, and in less than five minutes, can we look at the hard-copy document review. This is a discrete issue in the sense that it's not |

25 decisions. That is the hard copy document 124

(31) Pages 121 - 124

| 1 | | review being undertaken by the Post Office and |
|--|----|--|
| 2 | | its advisers. Can you explain to us in summary |
| 3 | | form what the hard-copy document review is? |
| 4 | Α. | So there was, I think after concerns had been |
| 5 | | raised previously in the way that some of |
| 6 | | what Fintan has described about the slightly |
| 7 | | haphazard way that data had been stored, there |
| 8 | | was a review undertaken of where all data, |
| 9 | | hard-copy data, was stored. That was then |
| 10 | | audited by an external firm, which reviewed all |
| 11 | | the sites to see what was there. That's led to |
| 12 | | the discovery of some additional hard-copy |
| 13 | | material which has been produced to the Inquiry. |
| 14 | | It also led to the discovery of some additional |
| 15 | | electronic material such as back-up tapes, where |
| 16 | | some of the work is still ongoing. |
| 17 | Q. | |
| 18 | | a letter from Herbert Smith Freehills to the |
| 19 | | Inquiry of 22 August that deals with the hard |
| 20 | | copy document review and, under the heading |
| 21 | | "Back-up tapes", if we scroll down, please, the |
| 22 | | author says: |
| 23 | | "As set out [in a previous document] in |
| 24 | | October/November 2002, [the Post Office] |
| 25 | | identified 42" |
| 20 | | 125 |
| | | |
| 1 | Q. | Paragraph 10: |
| 2 | ω. | "Processing the data onto the Relativity |
| 3 | | workplace has taken much longer than |
| 4 | | anticipated." |
| 5 | | Paragraph 11: |
| 6 | | "De-duplication, at the 'parent' document |
| 7 | | |
| 7 8 | | level, has been applied at the processing stage across the 19 datasets There is very |
| 9 | | 2 |
| 9 10 | | significant duplication as between the datasets/sessions" |
| | | |
| 11 | | A reduction from 19 million documents to |
| 12 | | 4.8 million documents. Over the page, please, |
| 40 | | -+ 40 |
| 13 | | at 13: |
| 14 | | "POL recognises the importance of continuing |
| 14 15 | | "POL recognises the importance of continuing to assess the likelihood of new Inquiry relevant |
| 14 15 16 | | "POL recognises the importance of continuing to assess the likelihood of new Inquiry relevant documents being backed up on the 21 |
| 14 15 16 17 | | "POL recognises the importance of continuing to assess the likelihood of new Inquiry relevant documents being backed up on the 21 datasets/sessions. [Your] current plan is as |
| 14 15 16 17 18 | | "POL recognises the importance of continuing to assess the likelihood of new Inquiry relevant documents being backed up on the 21 datasets/sessions. [Your] current plan is as follows" |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 | | "POL recognises the importance of continuing to assess the likelihood of new Inquiry relevant documents being backed up on the 21 datasets/sessions. [Your] current plan is as follows" That's set out in the remainder of |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | | "POL recognises the importance of continuing to assess the likelihood of new Inquiry relevant documents being backed up on the 21 datasets/sessions. [Your] current plan is as follows" That's set out in the remainder of paragraph 13. |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | | "POL recognises the importance of continuing to assess the likelihood of new Inquiry relevant documents being backed up on the 21 datasets/sessions. [Your] current plan is as follows" That's set out in the remainder of paragraph 13. Then there's an update, please. Can we look |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | | "POL recognises the importance of continuing to assess the likelihood of new Inquiry relevant documents being backed up on the 21 datasets/sessions. [Your] current plan is as follows" That's set out in the remainder of paragraph 13. |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | | "POL recognises the importance of continuing to assess the likelihood of new Inquiry relevant documents being backed up on the 21 datasets/sessions. [Your] current plan is as follows" That's set out in the remainder of paragraph 13. Then there's an update, please. Can we look |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | | "POL recognises the importance of continuing to assess the likelihood of new Inquiry relevant documents being backed up on the 21 datasets/sessions. [Your] current plan is as follows" That's set out in the remainder of paragraph 13. Then there's an update, please. Can we look at POL00126338. This is a letter that came last |

| nce of continuing | 14 | | Then |
|-------------------|----|----|-------------|
| quiry relevant | 15 | | take appro |
| ne 21 | 16 | | terms and |
| t plan is as | 17 | | two weeks |
| | 18 | | migrated to |
| er of | 19 | | 13: |
| | 20 | | "The r |
| se. Can we look | 21 | | de-duplica |
| that came last | 22 | | That's |
| :k-up tapes". | 23 | | what you'v |
| e know, they | 24 | Α. | Yes. |
| | | - | |

were found in Chesterfield. 127

25

| 1 | | Just stopping there, I think that's |
|----|----|---|
| 2 | | subsequently corrected to 37. |
| 3 | Α. | Correct, yes. |
| 4 | Q. | " [37] back-up tapes with unknown contents at |
| 5 | | its Chesterfield site." |
| 6 | | So this is telling us that nearly a year ago |
| 7 | | now, 37 back-up tapes were found in |
| 8 | | Chesterfield. |
| 9 | Α. | Correct. |
| 10 | Q. | If we go over the page, please, at paragraph 7: |
| 11 | | " in December and again in February |
| 12 | | [the Post Office] instructed KPMG to prepare |
| 13 | | indices of data stored on the tapes" |
| 14 | | In paragraph 8 KPMG prepared a total of 91 |
| 15 | | indices. |
| 16 | | In paragraph 9: |
| 17 | | " following investigation of the |
| 18 | | files, POL decided to process the files |
| 19 | | remembered to in [some of the] indices onto |
| 20 | | a separate, dedicated, Relativity workspace for |
| 21 | | further examination." |
| 22 | | Is that what you referred to earlier, |
| 23 | | separating something out for a smaller scale |
| 24 | | review? |
| 25 | Α. | Yes. |
| | | 126 |
| | | |

| 1 | | If we go to page 3 of the letter, please. |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | At the top of the page I should say on the |
| 3 | | previous page there's a summary of some of the |
| 4 | | steps that were set out in the previous letter. |
| 5 | Α. | Yes. |
| 6 | Q. | "Whilst POL is not yet able to confirm with |
| 7 | | certainty how long these steps will take, POL |
| 8 | | currently estimates it may take between one to |
| 9 | | two months before POL has identified a potential |
| 10 | | review pool. This will be subject to required |
| 11 | | machine time which will be dependent on the |
| 12 | | eventual data sizes which need to be migrated |
| 13 | | and de-duplicated." |
| 14 | | Then search terms will be applied. It will |
| 15 | | take approximately two days to run the search |
| 16 | | terms and KPMG say it will take approximately |
| 17 | | two weeks for the responsive documents to be |
| 18 | | migrated to the Inquiry platform. |
| 19 | | 13: |
| 20 | | "The migrated documents will then need to be |
| 21 | | de-duplicated." |
| 22 | | That's essentially de-duplicated against |
| 23 | | what you've already disclosed to the Inquiry. |
| 24 | Α. | Yes. |
| 25 | Q. | 14: |
| | | 128 |

(32) Pages 125 - 128

3

4

5

7

8

| 1 | | . POL will then assess the data that is |
|----------|------------|--|
| 2 | | and consider targeted searches" |
| 3 | 15 | |
| 4 | | . given the large amount of data from |
| 5 | | 21 datasets, further consideration will |
| 6 | | o be made to ensure any review is |
| 7 | • • | tionate [The Post Office] will keep |
| 8 | the Inc | uiry informed" |
| 9 | A. Correc | |
| 10 | | entially, it's this: it's going to be |
| 11 | | r one to two months before the data that |
| 12 | | scovered last October/November, is even |
| 13 | | bled into a pool that can be searched? |
| 14 | | correct but my understanding is that the |
| 15 | • | hat have been taken have been essential |
| 16 | | r to get the data down to even any kind |
| 17 | | ageable size so that that review could |
| 18 | take pl | |
| 19 | | ere been any assessment as to the |
| 20 | | od that the data that has not yet been |
| 21 | | ed is of relevance to the three phases of |
| 22 | | uiry that have already been completed and |
| 23 | mome | 4, that we are part way through at the |
| 24 25 | | a starting point, my understanding is |
| 25 | A. So, as | 129 |
| | | |
| 4 | معطا التعا | |
| 1 2 | | ak until 2.05. rs Wills, thank you very much for your |
| 2 | | d statement and the detailed answers to |
| 4 | | iny questions put to you. |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | Thank you very much. |
| 7 | (1.05 pm) | |
| 8 | (1.00 pm) | (The Short Adjournment) |
| 9 | (2.12 pm) | |
| 10 | MR BLAKE | : Good afternoon sir, can you see and hear |
| 11 | me? | ·, , ···· |
| 12 | | /ILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you very much. |
| 13 | MR BLAKE | |
| 14 | having | a little difficulty with the transcript. |
| 15 | lt is, I t | pelieve, now fixed but, if there is |
| 16 | a diffic | ulty with the transcript during this |
| 17 | afterno | oon's evidence, we will just continue and |
| 18 | then a | transcript will be available at the end |
| 19 | of the | day. |
| 20 | SIR WYN W | /ILLIAMS: Yes, that's fine, Mr Blake. |
| | | |
| 21 | MR BLAKE | : Thank you. Can I call Mr Tombleson, |
| 21 22 | MR BLAKE | • |
| | | • |
| 22 | | |
| 22 23 | | PAUL JOHN TOMBLESON (sworn) Questioned by MR BLAKE |

MR BLAKE: Thank you, can you give your full name, 131

- that, by their very nature, as back-up tapes, 2 the expectation is that they won't contain new information. But I don't understand us to be at the stage of being able to work out what may or may not be relevant. 6 Q. Is that because there isn't an understanding of what they are a back-up of? Α. Yes, correct. 9 Q. Finally, on the remediation exercise, has the 10 Post Office got a target date which it can now 11 inform the Inquiry of completion? So my understanding is the vast majority of the 12 Α. 13 work has been done. There are some further 14 target dates over the course of September, so 14 September, some more on 29 September, but 15 16 then an overall expectation that any remaining 17 work will have been achieved in good time before 18 hearing dates are set for the criminal case
- 19 studies work.
- 20 MR BEER: Mrs Wills, thank you very much.
- THE WITNESS: Thank you. 21
- 22 MR BEER: Sir, apologies for going slightly into the
- 23 lunch break. I wonder if you have any questions 24 or if not, might we break until 2.05.
- 25 SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I don't have any questions so we 130
- 1 please.
- 2 Paul John Tombleson. Δ.
- 3 Q. You should have in front of you a witness statement, it is dated 22 August 2023; is that 4 5 correct?
- 6 A. That's correct.
- 7 Q. Can I ask you to look at page 14 of that
- 8 statement. Is that your signature at the bottom there? 9
- A. Yes, it is. 10
- Q. Can you confirm that statement is true to the 11 12 best of your knowledge and belief?
- 13
- Α. Yes, I can confirm that. 14 Q. Thank you very much, Mr Tombleson. That
- 15 statement which, for the purpose of the
- transcript is WITN09960100 will be published by 16
- 17 the Inquiry and I'm just going to build on
- 18 what's already in that statement, rather than
- ask you to set it all out again. 19
 - By way of a brief career history you are
- 21 a partner in the forensic practice at KPMG; is
- 22 that correct?

20

- 23 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 24 Q. You've been with KPMG for over 33 years; is that 25 right?

| 1 | Α. | Since 1990, yes. |
|--|----------------------|---|
| 2 | Q. | You've been leading in eDisclosure since 2005? |
| 3 | Α. | That's correct. |
| 4 | Q. | In your statement, you said you were engaged by |
| 5 | | the Post Office from January 2021, so that's |
| 6 | | during the non-statutory phase of the Inquiry; |
| 7 | _ | is that right? |
| 8 | Α. | That's correct, yes. |
| 9 | Q. | You're described as being engaged by the Post |
| 10 | | Office. Who was or is your client: is it the |
| 11 | | Post Office, is it Herbert Smith Freehills or |
| 12 | | somebody else? |
| 13 | Α. | From a contractual perspective, it's the Post |
| 14 | ~ | Office. |
| 15 | Q. | From a day-to-day relationship perspective? |
| 16 | Α. | From a day-to-day perspective, we took instructions from the external solicitors in |
| 17 | | |
| 18 19 | | relation to the various requests and responding |
| 19 20 | ^ | to those. |
| 20 21 | Q. | Do you have standing instructions with regards to disclosure, provided by either the Post |
| 21 | | Office or Herbert Smiths or is disclosure |
| 22 | | addressed on a more <i>ad hoc</i> basis? |
| 23 24 | Α. | We discuss with the external solicitors that |
| 24 | ~ . | we're working with the various steps we take |
| 20 | | 133 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 4 | | |
| 1 | | today that there is no standard approach to, for |
| 2 | | example, what to do about family documents, what |
| 2 3 | | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on |
| 2 3 4 | ۸ | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? |
| 2 3 4 5 | А. | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | А. | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | A. | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on a request-by-request basis. I can't really |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on a request-by-request basis. I can't really comment on the family review side of things. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on a request-by-request basis. I can't really comment on the family review side of things. Why is that? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on a request-by-request basis. I can't really comment on the family review side of things. Why is that? Because we're not doing the review. I can |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on a request-by-request basis. I can't really comment on the family review side of things. Why is that? Because we're not doing the review. I can comment on how we present the documents for |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on a request-by-request basis. I can't really comment on the family review side of things. Why is that? Because we're not doing the review. I can comment on how we present the documents for review, which would be that we would present |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on a request-by-request basis. I can't really comment on the family review side of things. Why is that? Because we're not doing the review. I can comment on how we present the documents for review, which would be that we would present only the responsive documents for review but |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on a request-by-request basis. I can't really comment on the family review side of things. Why is that? Because we're not doing the review. I can comment on how we present the documents for review, which would be that we would present only the responsive documents for review but I think your question was a bit broader than |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on a request-by-request basis. I can't really comment on the family review side of things. Why is that? Because we're not doing the review. I can comment on how we present the documents for review, which would be that we would present only the responsive documents for review but |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on a request-by-request basis. I can't really comment on the family review side of things. Why is that? Because we're not doing the review. I can comment on how we present the documents for review, which would be that we would present only the responsive documents for review but I think your question was a bit broader than that, whether we've got guidance for the family document review and we don't. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. A. | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on a request-by-request basis. I can't really comment on the family review side of things. Why is that? Because we're not doing the review. I can comment on how we present the documents for review, which would be that we would present only the responsive documents for review but I think your question was a bit broader than that, whether we've got guidance for the family |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on a request-by-request basis. I can't really comment on the family review side of things. Why is that? Because we're not doing the review. I can comment on how we present the documents for review, which would be that we would present only the responsive documents for review but I think your question was a bit broader than that, whether we've got guidance for the family document review and we don't. Do you have sight of, for example, Herbert Smith |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on a request-by-request basis. I can't really comment on the family review side of things. Why is that? Because we're not doing the review. I can comment on how we present the documents for review, which would be that we would present only the responsive documents for review but I think your question was a bit broader than that, whether we've got guidance for the family document review and we don't. Do you have sight of, for example, Herbert Smith Freehills' own internal guidance as to what to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. A. Q. | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on a request-by-request basis. I can't really comment on the family review side of things. Why is that? Because we're not doing the review. I can comment on how we present the documents for review, which would be that we would present only the responsive documents for review but I think your question was a bit broader than that, whether we've got guidance for the family document review and we don't. Do you have sight of, for example, Herbert Smith Freehills' own internal guidance as to what to do with particular documents? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. Q. | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on a request-by-request basis. I can't really comment on the family review side of things. Why is that? Because we're not doing the review. I can comment on how we present the documents for review, which would be that we would present only the responsive documents for review but I think your question was a bit broader than that, whether we've got guidance for the family document review and we don't. Do you have sight of, for example, Herbert Smith Freehills' own internal guidance as to what to do with particular documents? No, I don't. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on a request-by-request basis. I can't really comment on the family review side of things. Why is that? Because we're not doing the review. I can comment on how we present the documents for review, which would be that we would present only the responsive documents for review but I think your question was a bit broader than that, whether we've got guidance for the family document review and we don't. Do you have sight of, for example, Herbert Smith Freehills' own internal guidance as to what to do with particular documents? No, I don't. We've heard, before the lunch break, about cost |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on a request-by-request basis. I can't really comment on the family review side of things. Why is that? Because we're not doing the review. I can comment on how we present the documents for review, which would be that we would present only the responsive documents for review but I think your question was a bit broader than that, whether we've got guidance for the family document review and we don't. Do you have sight of, for example, Herbert Smith Freehills' own internal guidance as to what to do with particular documents? No, I don't. We've heard, before the lunch break, about cost pressures. Were you aware of any cost |
| 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. Q. | example, what to do about family documents, what to do about duplicate documents. Those are on a request-by-request basis? Certainly the de-duplication, that is an eDisclosure process that we discuss on a request-by-request basis. I can't really comment on the family review side of things. Why is that? Because we're not doing the review. I can comment on how we present the documents for review, which would be that we would present only the responsive documents for review but I think your question was a bit broader than that, whether we've got guidance for the family document review and we don't. Do you have sight of, for example, Herbert Smith Freehills' own internal guidance as to what to do with particular documents? No, I don't. We've heard, before the lunch break, about cost pressures. Were you aware of any cost pressures? |

| 1 | | throughout the disclosure process, the |
|--|----------|---|
| 2 | | eDiscovery process, starting from the collection |
| 3 | | of data through to how it's processed, how it's |
| 4 | | searched, how it's presented to them to review |
| 5 | | and ultimately how it is produced. I think it |
| 6 | | would be fair to say we don't have a single |
| 7 | | document currently that we use as the basis for |
| 8 | | that. We use internal standard procedures |
| 9 | | within KPMG and, for every request that comes |
| 10 | | in, we have a clear audit trail of discussions |
| 11 | | and confirmations between us. |
| 12 | Q. | When you say every request that comes in, we |
| 13 | | know that the Inquiry issues Rule 9 Requests or |
| 14 | | now it issues section 21 notices, are those |
| 15 | | discussed on an individual basis as to how |
| 16 | | they're approached, are they discussed on |
| 17 | | a question-by-question basis or is there some |
| 18 | | broader guidance in terms of, for example, |
| 19 | | families, duplicates, et cetera? |
| 20 | Α. | I'd say they're discussed on |
| 21 | | a request-by-request basis and sometimes on |
| 22 | | a question-by-question basis within those |
| 23 | | requests, if there are a lot of different |
| 24 | | questions within the requests. |
| 25 | Q. | ' I think it's the evidence we've already heard |
| | | , |
| | | 134 |
| | | 134 |
| 1 | | |
| 1 | | with the Post Office around things that could be |
| 2 | | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the |
| 2 3 | 0 | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. |
| 2 3 4 | Q. | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing |
| 2 3 4 5 | Q. | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Q. | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have you ever been given the impression that there is |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Q. | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have you ever been given the impression that there is insufficient funding to carry out |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have you ever been given the impression that there is insufficient funding to carry out a comprehensive disclosure exercise? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have you ever been given the impression that there is insufficient funding to carry out a comprehensive disclosure exercise? No, never been given that impression. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have you ever been given the impression that there is insufficient funding to carry out a comprehensive disclosure exercise? No, never been given that impression. We heard about changes between January and May |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | A. | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have you ever been given the impression that there is insufficient funding to carry out a comprehensive disclosure exercise? No, never been given that impression. We heard about changes between January and May 2023, some work being carried out in India; can |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | A. Q. | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have you ever been given the impression that there is insufficient funding to carry out a comprehensive disclosure exercise? No, never been given that impression. We heard about changes between January and May 2023, some work being carried out in India; can you please tell us a little bit about that? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A. | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have you ever been given the impression that there is insufficient funding to carry out a comprehensive disclosure exercise? No, never been given that impression. We heard about changes between January and May 2023, some work being carried out in India; can you please tell us a little bit about that? Yes, so one of the the conversations started |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | A. Q. | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have you ever been given the impression that there is insufficient funding to carry out a comprehensive disclosure exercise? No, never been given that impression. We heard about changes between January and May 2023, some work being carried out in India; can you please tell us a little bit about that? Yes, so one of the the conversations started around cost rather than resourcing. One of the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. Q. | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have you ever been given the impression that there is insufficient funding to carry out a comprehensive disclosure exercise? No, never been given that impression. We heard about changes between January and May 2023, some work being carried out in India; can you please tell us a little bit about that? Yes, so one of the the conversations started around cost rather than resourcing. One of the advantages of a firm like ours is that we have |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. Q. | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have you ever been given the impression that there is insufficient funding to carry out a comprehensive disclosure exercise? No, never been given that impression. We heard about changes between January and May 2023, some work being carried out in India; can you please tell us a little bit about that? Yes, so one of the the conversations started around cost rather than resourcing. One of the advantages of a firm like ours is that we have a dedicated team in India, an offshore team. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. Q. | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have you ever been given the impression that there is insufficient funding to carry out a comprehensive disclosure exercise? No, never been given that impression. We heard about changes between January and May 2023, some work being carried out in India; can you please tell us a little bit about that? Yes, so one of the the conversations started around cost rather than resourcing. One of the advantages of a firm like ours is that we have a dedicated team in India, an offshore team. These are forensic technology eDisclosure |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. Q. | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have you ever been given the impression that there is insufficient funding to carry out a comprehensive disclosure exercise? No, never been given that impression. We heard about changes between January and May 2023, some work being carried out in India; can you please tell us a little bit about that? Yes, so one of the the conversations started around cost rather than resourcing. One of the advantages of a firm like ours is that we have a dedicated team in India, an offshore team. These are forensic technology eDisclosure professionals who work, for all intents and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | A. Q. | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have you ever been given the impression that there is insufficient funding to carry out a comprehensive disclosure exercise? No, never been given that impression. We heard about changes between January and May 2023, some work being carried out in India; can you please tell us a little bit about that? Yes, so one of the the conversations started around cost rather than resourcing. One of the advantages of a firm like ours is that we have a dedicated team in India, an offshore team. These are forensic technology eDisclosure professionals who work, for all intents and purposes, as part of our KPMG UK team, they're |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. Q. | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have you ever been given the impression that there is insufficient funding to carry out a comprehensive disclosure exercise? No, never been given that impression. We heard about changes between January and May 2023, some work being carried out in India; can you please tell us a little bit about that? Yes, so one of the the conversations started around cost rather than resourcing. One of the advantages of a firm like ours is that we have a dedicated team in India, an offshore team. These are forensic technology eDisclosure professionals who work, for all intents and purposes, as part of our KPMG UK team, they're a dedicated team that works with us and, in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. Q. | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have you ever been given the impression that there is insufficient funding to carry out a comprehensive disclosure exercise? No, never been given that impression. We heard about changes between January and May 2023, some work being carried out in India; can you please tell us a little bit about that? Yes, so one of the the conversations started around cost rather than resourcing. One of the advantages of a firm like ours is that we have a dedicated team in India, an offshore team. These are forensic technology eDisclosure professionals who work, for all intents and purposes, as part of our KPMG UK team, they're a dedicated team that works with us and, in certain circumstances, we're able to bring them |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. Q. | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have you ever been given the impression that there is insufficient funding to carry out a comprehensive disclosure exercise? No, never been given that impression. We heard about changes between January and May 2023, some work being carried out in India; can you please tell us a little bit about that? Yes, so one of the the conversations started around cost rather than resourcing. One of the advantages of a firm like ours is that we have a dedicated team in India, an offshore team. These are forensic technology eDisclosure professionals who work, for all intents and purposes, as part of our KPMG UK team, they're a dedicated team that works with us and, in certain circumstances, we're able to bring them on to undertake tasks in the same way as we |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. Q. | with the Post Office around things that could be done to manage costs without compromising the quality of the service we provide. Mrs Wills, for example, talked about resourcing concerns that have been raised with KPMG. Have you ever been given the impression that there is insufficient funding to carry out a comprehensive disclosure exercise? No, never been given that impression. We heard about changes between January and May 2023, some work being carried out in India; can you please tell us a little bit about that? Yes, so one of the the conversations started around cost rather than resourcing. One of the advantages of a firm like ours is that we have a dedicated team in India, an offshore team. These are forensic technology eDisclosure professionals who work, for all intents and purposes, as part of our KPMG UK team, they're a dedicated team that works with us and, in certain circumstances, we're able to bring them |

25 may have been earlier this year, and the Post 136

3

| 1 | | Office gave us security clearance to bring those |
|----------|----------|---|
| 2 | | individuals on in around March and April time. |
| 3 | | So they undertake some of the activity around |
| 4 | | searching, moving data between workspaces but |
| 5 | | always with a level of quality control that's |
| 6 | | provided by a member of our senior onshore team. |
| 7 | Q. | Are you aware of any document review taking |
| 8 | <u> </u> | place outside of this jurisdiction? |
| 9 | Α. | No. I'm not. |
| 10 | Q. | We've heard that you were involved in the |
| 11 | ч. | non-statutory phase and then in the statutory |
| 12 | | phase. Mr Canavan's evidence this morning |
| 13 | | suggested there was a lack of understanding at |
| 14 | | the Post Office with regards to what a statutory |
| 14 | | Inquiry might involve. Were you aware of that |
| 16 | | at all? |
| 17 | Α. | No, I wasn't, no. |
| 18 | Q. | Do you feel you were sufficiently resourced |
| 19 | ω. | throughout the lifetime of this Inquiry? |
| 20 | A. | Mean I would say the level of activity has |
| 20 | А. | certainly picked up in the last few months and |
| 21 | | Mrs Wills referred to a conversation we had |
| 22 | | where I think we did start to increase the size |
| 23 24 | | |
| | | of our team at that point in time because there |
| 25 | | was numerous requests. Just by indication, 137 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | Smiths as the RLR. I wasn't aware of the |
| 2 | | process before we received them that those |
| 3 | | search terms had gone through, whether there had |
| 4 | | been a consultation process with the Post Office |
| 5 | | or not. |
| 6 | Q. | You may not have been aware in this particular |
| 7 | | case but you have been involved in a number of |
| 8 | | significant pieces of litigation, public |
| 9 | | inquiries, perhaps. Are you aware from other |
| 10 | | experience that you have, of there being visibly |
| 11 | | closer liaison between the law firm and the |
| 12 | | client than there is perhaps in this particular |
| 13 | | case? |
| 14 | Α. | I think it would only be fair to say I've seen |
| 15 | | it happen both ways. I've seen it with external |
| 16 | | solicitors taking the primary role or more |
| 17 | | consultation with the client. It's difficult to |
| 18 | | give a definitive answer to that, I'm afraid. |
| 19 | Q. | In your view, which has worked better? |
| 20 | Α. | I think it really depends on the subject matter |
| 21 | | of the case and where the knowledge and |
| 22 | | experience in order to structure the search |
| 23 | | terms resides. |
| 24 | Q. | Given your experience in this particular case. |

24 Q. Given your experience in this particular case,25 do you think that there was insufficient liaison

- we -- our team was about 15 strong in May and is
- 2 close to 30 strong at the moment but that's, in
 - large part, to also support the work on the
- 4 remediation.
- 5 **Q.** So it's doubled since May. If we look back to
- 6 the summer of 2021, how many people made up your7 team?
- 8 A. Probably six. Six or seven.
- 9 Q. Over what period did it increase from six to10 double that?
- 11 A. Well, the workspace for the Inquiry was set up
- 12 in October 2021 and I would have thought
- November/December '21 was when it really startedto increase in size.
- 15 Q. I want to ask you about keyword searches.
- 16 You've explained that your instructions came
- 17 from Herbert Smith Freehills and not from the
- 18 Post Office. As someone with significant
- 19 experience in eDiscovery matters, do you think
- 20 it's a good idea for law firms to closely liaise
- with their clients in respect of identifyingsearch criteria?
- 23 A. I don't know how to answer that question,
- 24 really. I mean, in terms of our role, our role
- was to receive the search terms from Herbert138

| 1 | | with the lay client, from what you've seen? |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | Α. | As I said before, I haven't seen, but my answer |
| 3 | | to that would be, given the subject matter, |
| 4 | | I think there should have been liaison but |
| 5 | | I don't know what liaison there had been. |
| 6 | Q. | Let's take the prosecution ID codes document as |
| 7 | | an example. |
| 8 | Α. | Yeah. |
| 9 | Q. | Do you see it as important to liaise with |
| 10 | | a client in the kind of cases that we've seen |
| 11 | | there, where the request is for a policy, |
| 12 | | historic policies, that may not be searchable by |
| 13 | | way of, for example, a keyword for "policy" |
| 14 | | because they may have used, as Mr Beer |
| 15 | | highlighted earlier, a different word, such as |
| 16 | | a "guide"? Do you see it as important in those |
| 17 | | kinds of circumstances for there to be close |
| 18 | | liaison with the client? |
| 19 | Α. | That particular request, I didn't see the |
| 20 | | wording of the request until relatively |
| 21 | | recently. I saw the search criteria that were |
| 22 | | constructed and the search terms that were |
| 23 | | constructed but I didn't see the underlying |
| 24 | | wording from the Rule 9 Request. |
| 25 | | So I think I am answering your question by 140 |

| 1 | saying I don't know whether the construction of | 1 | | make a judgment on that. |
|---|--|---|----------------|---|
| 2 | the search term was sufficient to find what the | 2 | Q. | Have there been circumstances in this Inquiry |
| 3 | Inquiry was looking for with that request. | 3 | | where your team at KPMG have seen a request or |
| 4 Q . | With your now large team of individuals working | 4 | | have are aware of the contents of a request, |
| 5 | for KPMG on this project, is there no one who | 5 | | have seen the proposed search terms and have had |
| 6 | applies their mind to the wording of a Rule 9 to | 6 | | a view as to whether those search terms are or |
| 7 | the search terms that are applied or decided by | 7 | | are not appropriate? |
| 8 | the law firm and whether those are appropriate | 8 | Α. | Not appropriate. Whether they are generating |
| 9 | or not? | 9 | | too many responsive documents or a high number |
| 0 A . | So our role is not to develop the search | 10 | | of responsive documents, that's the sort of |
| 1 | criteria and the search terms themselves. Our | 11 | | analysis that we're doing, which of the search |
| 2 | role is to help construct the syntax of those | 12 | | terms is generating the most hits, and then |
| 3 | terms, so they're as precise as possible and, in | 13 | | a dialogue with the external solicitors and if |
| 4 | the example you showed a little while ago with | 14 | | they want to revise those terms in any way. |
| 5 | truncated the use of a wild card character | 15 | Q. | |
| 6 | and a truncated word, that's the sort of advice | 16 | | Freehills, but are you aware of anybody within |
| 7 | that my team would give, rather than the does | 17 | | your team ever having a view as to whether |
| 8 | it address the question in the underlying Rule 9 | 18 | | search terms are effective or appropriate? |
| 9 | Request which, as I said, we don't see. | 19 | Α. | No, I'm not aware of that. |
| 20 Q . | | 20 | Q. | I want to ask about family documents. At |
| .0 1 | surely people who work in your team might have | 20 | ч. | paragraph 19 of your witness statement you say |
| 22 | a view on whether keywords are appropriate in | 22 | | that in the vast majority of cases the |
| 23 | particular circumstances. | 23 | | instructions were to provide only responsive |
| .3 24 A . | Again, in this case, because we haven't seen the | 23 | | documents and not their families. Depending on |
| .4 A. 25 | - | 24 | | the request and let's take the ID codes case |
| .5 | underlying Rule 9 Request, I don't think we can 141 | 25 | | 142 |
| 1 | as an example can you see the benefit of | 1 | | without just purely speculating. |
| 2 | reviewing family documents? | 2 | Q. | You're not being asked to answer that as |
| 3 A . | Clearly, with hindsight, yes, in that particular | 3 | | a lawyer, but you're being asked to answer that |
| 4 | case. The balance is always one of a number of | 4 | | as someone who knows about data, about what |
| | | | | |
| 5 | documents to review within a very limited amount | 5 | | documents might or might not be responsive to |
| 5 6 | documents to review within a very limited amount of time and it's usually well recognised that | | | documents might or might not be responsive to particular hits, the levels, numbers of |
| | - | 5 | | |
| 6 | of time and it's usually well recognised that documents that are responsive to search terms | 5 6 | А. | particular hits, the levels, numbers of |
| 6 7 8 | of time and it's usually well recognised that | 5 6 7 | A. Q. | particular hits, the levels, numbers of documents that you might receive. Yeah. |
| 6 7 | of time and it's usually well recognised that documents that are responsive to search terms tend to have a higher relevance rate than those which are not. | 5 6 7 8 | | particular hits, the levels, numbers of documents that you might receive. Yeah. In those circumstances, if you're being asked |
| 6 7 8 9 0 | of time and it's usually well recognised that documents that are responsive to search terms tend to have a higher relevance rate than those which are not. I'm not saying that doesn't mean you | 5 6 7 8 9 | | particular hits, the levels, numbers of documents that you might receive. Yeah. In those circumstances, if you're being asked for, for example, policy documents, which may |
| 6 7 8 9 0 1 | of time and it's usually well recognised that documents that are responsive to search terms tend to have a higher relevance rate than those which are not. I'm not saying that doesn't mean you shouldn't review family items but what I'm | 5 6 7 8 9 10 | Q. | particular hits, the levels, numbers of documents that you might receive. Yeah. In those circumstances, if you're being asked |
| 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 | of time and it's usually well recognised that documents that are responsive to search terms tend to have a higher relevance rate than those which are not. I'm not saying that doesn't mean you shouldn't review family items but what I'm saying is that there is a balance and decision | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. A. | particular hits, the levels, numbers of documents that you might receive. Yeah. In those circumstances, if you're being asked for, for example, policy documents, which may have annexes, for example Yeah. |
| 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 | of time and it's usually well recognised that documents that are responsive to search terms tend to have a higher relevance rate than those which are not. I'm not saying that doesn't mean you shouldn't review family items but what I'm saying is that there is a balance and decision that needs to be taken about where to prioritise | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. | particular hits, the levels, numbers of documents that you might receive. Yeah. In those circumstances, if you're being asked for, for example, policy documents, which may have annexes, for example Yeah. and you were being asked to give advice, not |
| 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 | of time and it's usually well recognised that documents that are responsive to search terms tend to have a higher relevance rate than those which are not. I'm not saying that doesn't mean you shouldn't review family items but what I'm saying is that there is a balance and decision that needs to be taken about where to prioritise the review effort. | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13 | Q. A. | particular hits, the levels, numbers of documents that you might receive. Yeah. In those circumstances, if you're being asked for, for example, policy documents, which may have annexes, for example Yeah. and you were being asked to give advice, not in a legal context but just being asked whether |
| 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 Q . | of time and it's usually well recognised that documents that are responsive to search terms tend to have a higher relevance rate than those which are not. I'm not saying that doesn't mean you shouldn't review family items but what I'm saying is that there is a balance and decision that needs to be taken about where to prioritise the review effort. You're sitting there with your 33 years of | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. A. | particular hits, the levels, numbers of documents that you might receive. Yeah. In those circumstances, if you're being asked for, for example, policy documents, which may have annexes, for example Yeah. and you were being asked to give advice, not in a legal context but just being asked whether it would be helpful, more helpful, less helpful, |
| 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 Q . | of time and it's usually well recognised that documents that are responsive to search terms tend to have a higher relevance rate than those which are not. I'm not saying that doesn't mean you shouldn't review family items but what I'm saying is that there is a balance and decision that needs to be taken about where to prioritise the review effort. You're sitting there with your 33 years of experience, significant experience in public | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. A. | particular hits, the levels, numbers of documents that you might receive. Yeah. In those circumstances, if you're being asked for, for example, policy documents, which may have annexes, for example Yeah. and you were being asked to give advice, not in a legal context but just being asked whether it would be helpful, more helpful, less helpful, what would your position have been in respect of |
| 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 Q . 6 7 | of time and it's usually well recognised that documents that are responsive to search terms tend to have a higher relevance rate than those which are not. I'm not saying that doesn't mean you shouldn't review family items but what I'm saying is that there is a balance and decision that needs to be taken about where to prioritise the review effort. You're sitting there with your 33 years of experience, significant experience in public inquiry work or high-level litigation. If you | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. Q. | particular hits, the levels, numbers of documents that you might receive. Yeah. In those circumstances, if you're being asked for, for example, policy documents, which may have annexes, for example Yeah. and you were being asked to give advice, not in a legal context but just being asked whether it would be helpful, more helpful, less helpful, what would your position have been in respect of family documents? |
| 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 Q . 7 8 | of time and it's usually well recognised that documents that are responsive to search terms tend to have a higher relevance rate than those which are not. I'm not saying that doesn't mean you shouldn't review family items but what I'm saying is that there is a balance and decision that needs to be taken about where to prioritise the review effort. You're sitting there with your 33 years of experience, significant experience in public inquiry work or high-level litigation. If you were told that the request is for historic | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. | particular hits, the levels, numbers of documents that you might receive. Yeah. In those circumstances, if you're being asked for, for example, policy documents, which may have annexes, for example Yeah. and you were being asked to give advice, not in a legal context but just being asked whether it would be helpful, more helpful, less helpful, what would your position have been in respect of family documents? I think I would have started with a set of |
| 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 Q . 6 7 8 9 | of time and it's usually well recognised that documents that are responsive to search terms tend to have a higher relevance rate than those which are not. I'm not saying that doesn't mean you shouldn't review family items but what I'm saying is that there is a balance and decision that needs to be taken about where to prioritise the review effort. You're sitting there with your 33 years of experience, significant experience in public inquiry work or high-level litigation. If you were told that the request is for historic prosecutions policies and investigations | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. A. Q. | particular hits, the levels, numbers of documents that you might receive. Yeah. In those circumstances, if you're being asked for, for example, policy documents, which may have annexes, for example Yeah. and you were being asked to give advice, not in a legal context but just being asked whether it would be helpful, more helpful, less helpful, what would your position have been in respect of family documents? I think I would have started with a set of search terms, I would have commenced the review |
| 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 Q . 6 7 8 9 9 | of time and it's usually well recognised that documents that are responsive to search terms tend to have a higher relevance rate than those which are not. I'm not saying that doesn't mean you shouldn't review family items but what I'm saying is that there is a balance and decision that needs to be taken about where to prioritise the review effort. You're sitting there with your 33 years of experience, significant experience in public inquiry work or high-level litigation. If you were told that the request is for historic prosecutions policies and investigations policies, dating back over a ten-year or more | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. Q. | particular hits, the levels, numbers of documents that you might receive. Yeah. In those circumstances, if you're being asked for, for example, policy documents, which may have annexes, for example Yeah. and you were being asked to give advice, not in a legal context but just being asked whether it would be helpful, more helpful, less helpful, what would your position have been in respect of family documents? I think I would have started with a set of search terms, I would have commenced the review based on documents that are responsive to those |
| 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 Q . 6 7 8 9 20 21 | of time and it's usually well recognised that documents that are responsive to search terms tend to have a higher relevance rate than those which are not. I'm not saying that doesn't mean you shouldn't review family items but what I'm saying is that there is a balance and decision that needs to be taken about where to prioritise the review effort. You're sitting there with your 33 years of experience, significant experience in public inquiry work or high-level litigation. If you were told that the request is for historic prosecutions policies and investigations policies, dating back over a ten-year or more period, what decision would you have been | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. | particular hits, the levels, numbers of documents that you might receive. Yeah. In those circumstances, if you're being asked for, for example, policy documents, which may have annexes, for example Yeah. and you were being asked to give advice, not in a legal context but just being asked whether it would be helpful, more helpful, less helpful, what would your position have been in respect of family documents? I think I would have started with a set of search terms, I would have commenced the review based on documents that are responsive to those search terms and, if, through that review, other |
| 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 Q . 7 8 9 20 21 22 | of time and it's usually well recognised that documents that are responsive to search terms tend to have a higher relevance rate than those which are not. I'm not saying that doesn't mean you shouldn't review family items but what I'm saying is that there is a balance and decision that needs to be taken about where to prioritise the review effort. You're sitting there with your 33 years of experience, significant experience in public inquiry work or high-level litigation. If you were told that the request is for historic prosecutions policies and investigations policies, dating back over a ten-year or more period, what decision would you have been would you personally have made in respect of the | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. | particular hits, the levels, numbers of documents that you might receive. Yeah. In those circumstances, if you're being asked for, for example, policy documents, which may have annexes, for example Yeah. and you were being asked to give advice, not in a legal context but just being asked whether it would be helpful, more helpful, less helpful, what would your position have been in respect of family documents? I think I would have started with a set of search terms, I would have commenced the review based on documents that are responsive to those search terms and, if, through that review, other things appeared relevant in terms of words which |
| 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 Q . 6 7 8 9 20 21 22 3 | of time and it's usually well recognised that documents that are responsive to search terms tend to have a higher relevance rate than those which are not. I'm not saying that doesn't mean you shouldn't review family items but what I'm saying is that there is a balance and decision that needs to be taken about where to prioritise the review effort. You're sitting there with your 33 years of experience, significant experience in public inquiry work or high-level litigation. If you were told that the request is for historic prosecutions policies and investigations policies, dating back over a ten-year or more period, what decision would you have been would you personally have made in respect of the reviewing of family documents? | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. Q. | particular hits, the levels, numbers of documents that you might receive. Yeah. In those circumstances, if you're being asked for, for example, policy documents, which may have annexes, for example Yeah. and you were being asked to give advice, not in a legal context but just being asked whether it would be helpful, more helpful, less helpful, what would your position have been in respect of family documents? I think I would have started with a set of search terms, I would have commenced the review based on documents that are responsive to those search terms and, if, through that review, other things appeared relevant in terms of words which weren't included in the search terms that we'd |
| 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 Q . 7 8 9 20 21 22 | of time and it's usually well recognised that documents that are responsive to search terms tend to have a higher relevance rate than those which are not. I'm not saying that doesn't mean you shouldn't review family items but what I'm saying is that there is a balance and decision that needs to be taken about where to prioritise the review effort. You're sitting there with your 33 years of experience, significant experience in public inquiry work or high-level litigation. If you were told that the request is for historic prosecutions policies and investigations policies, dating back over a ten-year or more period, what decision would you have been would you personally have made in respect of the | 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. | particular hits, the levels, numbers of documents that you might receive. Yeah. In those circumstances, if you're being asked for, for example, policy documents, which may have annexes, for example Yeah. and you were being asked to give advice, not in a legal context but just being asked whether it would be helpful, more helpful, less helpful, what would your position have been in respect of family documents? I think I would have started with a set of search terms, I would have commenced the review based on documents that are responsive to those search terms and, if, through that review, other things appeared relevant in terms of words which |

| | ~ | |
|--|----------------------|---|
| 1 | Q. | So is it fair to say that your approach would be |
| 2 3 | | to review the documents, understand them, and |
| 3 4 | | perhaps look further, depending on what you have received? |
| 4 5 | Α. | Potentially. |
| 6 | д. Q. | If families had been reviewed in this particular |
| 7 | α. | case, what would have happened in respect of |
| , 8 | | that ID codes document? |
| 9 | Α. | That would have been identified in April 2022. |
| 10 | Q. | I want to ask you about de-duplication. |
| 11 | ч. | Mrs Wills has said that item-level |
| 12 | | de-duplication is rarely used in eDisclosure |
| 13 | | because it can have significant unpredictable |
| 14 | | and potentially undesirable impact on document |
| 15 | | review; do you agree with that? |
| 16 | Α. | I agree with the first part of the document that |
| 17 | | it's uncommon in eDisclosure. The set up of the |
| 18 | | data and the structure of the workspaces in this |
| 19 | | Inquiry is uncommon in so many ways. Typically, |
| 20 | | you would have your de-duplication done at the |
| 21 | | processing stage, right at the beginning, by |
| 22 | | a single vendor. In this particular case, data |
| 23 | | has arrived at various points from various |
| 24 | | different matters, and it's been necessary to |
| 25 | | consolidate that all in one place and then apply |
| | | 145 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | Q. | But you've said it's rarely used and it occurred |
| 1 2 | Q. | But you've said it's rarely used and it occurred because, in this particular case, it required |
| | Q. | |
| 2 | Q. | because, in this particular case, it required |
| 2 3 | Q. | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is |
| 2 3 4 | Q. | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant |
| 2 3 4 5 | Q. A. | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant decision to make then, a departure from the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant decision to make then, a departure from the usual position; do you agree with that? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant decision to make then, a departure from the usual position; do you agree with that? Well, if the decision involved the discussion |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant decision to make then, a departure from the usual position; do you agree with that? Well, if the decision involved the discussion and the clarification of the requirements, involved the senior manager and the manager who were the day-to-day leads on our work. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant decision to make then, a departure from the usual position; do you agree with that? Well, if the decision involved the discussion and the clarification of the requirements, involved the senior manager and the manager who were the day-to-day leads on our work. So it required managerial approval on the KPMG |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Α. | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant decision to make then, a departure from the usual position; do you agree with that? Well, if the decision involved the discussion and the clarification of the requirements, involved the senior manager and the manager who were the day-to-day leads on our work. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Α. | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant decision to make then, a departure from the usual position; do you agree with that? Well, if the decision involved the discussion and the clarification of the requirements, involved the senior manager and the manager who were the day-to-day leads on our work. So it required managerial approval on the KPMG side of the work; is that correct? Involved managers and senior managers on our |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | A. Q. | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant decision to make then, a departure from the usual position; do you agree with that? Well, if the decision involved the discussion and the clarification of the requirements, involved the senior manager and the manager who were the day-to-day leads on our work. So it required managerial approval on the KPMG side of the work; is that correct? Involved managers and senior managers on our team understanding the requirements and making |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. Q. | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant decision to make then, a departure from the usual position; do you agree with that? Well, if the decision involved the discussion and the clarification of the requirements, involved the senior manager and the manager who were the day-to-day leads on our work. So it required managerial approval on the KPMG side of the work; is that correct? Involved managers and senior managers on our team understanding the requirements and making sure we were clear on the requirements before we |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. Q. A. | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant decision to make then, a departure from the usual position; do you agree with that? Well, if the decision involved the discussion and the clarification of the requirements, involved the senior manager and the manager who were the day-to-day leads on our work. So it required managerial approval on the KPMG side of the work; is that correct? Involved managers and senior managers on our team understanding the requirements and making sure we were clear on the requirements before we implemented a solution, yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. Q. | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant decision to make then, a departure from the usual position; do you agree with that? Well, if the decision involved the discussion and the clarification of the requirements, involved the senior manager and the manager who were the day-to-day leads on our work. So it required managerial approval on the KPMG side of the work; is that correct? Involved managers and senior managers on our team understanding the requirements and making sure we were clear on the requirements before we implemented a solution, yes. How about on the Post Office or Herbert Smith |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. Q. A. Q. | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant decision to make then, a departure from the usual position; do you agree with that? Well, if the decision involved the discussion and the clarification of the requirements, involved the senior manager and the manager who were the day-to-day leads on our work. So it required managerial approval on the KPMG side of the work; is that correct? Involved managers and senior managers on our team understanding the requirements and making sure we were clear on the requirements before we implemented a solution, yes. How about on the Post Office or Herbert Smith Freehills side of the fence? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. Q. A. | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant decision to make then, a departure from the usual position; do you agree with that? Well, if the decision involved the discussion and the clarification of the requirements, involved the senior manager and the manager who were the day-to-day leads on our work. So it required managerial approval on the KPMG side of the work; is that correct? Involved managers and senior managers on our team understanding the requirements and making sure we were clear on the requirements before we implemented a solution, yes. How about on the Post Office or Herbert Smith Freehills side of the fence? So we my team was dealing with senior |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. Q. A. Q. | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant decision to make then, a departure from the usual position; do you agree with that? Well, if the decision involved the discussion and the clarification of the requirements, involved the senior manager and the manager who were the day-to-day leads on our work. So it required managerial approval on the KPMG side of the work; is that correct? Involved managers and senior managers on our team understanding the requirements and making sure we were clear on the requirements before we implemented a solution, yes. How about on the Post Office or Herbert Smith Freehills side of the fence? So we my team was dealing with senior associates on the Herbert Smiths side and not |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. Q. A. Q. | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant decision to make then, a departure from the usual position; do you agree with that? Well, if the decision involved the discussion and the clarification of the requirements, involved the senior manager and the manager who were the day-to-day leads on our work. So it required managerial approval on the KPMG side of the work; is that correct? Involved managers and senior managers on our team understanding the requirements and making sure we were clear on the requirements before we implemented a solution, yes. How about on the Post Office or Herbert Smith Freehills side of the fence? So we my team was dealing with senior associates on the Herbert Smiths side and not dealing with the Post Office in relation to this |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. Q. A. Q. | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant decision to make then, a departure from the usual position; do you agree with that? Well, if the decision involved the discussion and the clarification of the requirements, involved the senior manager and the manager who were the day-to-day leads on our work. So it required managerial approval on the KPMG side of the work; is that correct? Involved managers and senior managers on our team understanding the requirements and making sure we were clear on the requirements before we implemented a solution, yes. How about on the Post Office or Herbert Smith Freehills side of the fence? So we my team was dealing with senior associates on the Herbert Smiths side and not dealing with the Post Office in relation to this matter. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. Q. A. Q. | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant decision to make then, a departure from the usual position; do you agree with that? Well, if the decision involved the discussion and the clarification of the requirements, involved the senior manager and the manager who were the day-to-day leads on our work. So it required managerial approval on the KPMG side of the work; is that correct? Involved managers and senior managers on our team understanding the requirements and making sure we were clear on the requirements before we implemented a solution, yes. How about on the Post Office or Herbert Smith Freehills side of the fence? So we my team was dealing with senior associates on the Herbert Smiths side and not dealing with the Post Office in relation to this matter. So am I right to understand that this rarely |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. Q. A. Q. | because, in this particular case, it required a more nuanced solution. Presumably, that is quite a significant step and significant decision to make then, a departure from the usual position; do you agree with that? Well, if the decision involved the discussion and the clarification of the requirements, involved the senior manager and the manager who were the day-to-day leads on our work. So it required managerial approval on the KPMG side of the work; is that correct? Involved managers and senior managers on our team understanding the requirements and making sure we were clear on the requirements before we implemented a solution, yes. How about on the Post Office or Herbert Smith Freehills side of the fence? So we my team was dealing with senior associates on the Herbert Smiths side and not dealing with the Post Office in relation to this matter. |

| 0111 | mq | uny 5 September |
|------|----|--|
| | | |
| 1 | | de-duplication prior to review, so at a stage |
| 2 | | you wouldn't ordinarily do de-duplication. |
| 3 | | So a more nuanced solution has been |
| 4 | | necessary. But I would still item-level |
| 5 | | de-duplication is uncommon because it's |
| 6 | | a workflow that is appropriate for a review of |
| 7 | | responsive documents. |
| 8 | Q. | The problem that you've identified in this |
| 9 | | particular case, which you say required a more |
| 10 | | nuanced solution, does that go back to the |
| 11 | | evidence we heard from Mr Canavan about the Post |
| 12 | | Office's repositories and historic data storage |
| 13 | | and the discovery, for example, of further |
| 14 | | repositories? |
| 15 | Α. | Not specifically. It's a more general point |
| 16 | | that the data does not reside in one single |
| 17 | | database. It resides in four very large |
| 18 | | databases, each with tens of millions of |
| 19 | | documents in them and so the disclosure process, |
| 20 | | the eDisclosure process, requires us to run the |
| 21 | | same searches in three or four different places, |
| 22 | | then migrate that data into a single location, |
| 23 | | and then de-duplicate in that location if |
| 24 | | we're asked to, I should say. De-duplication |
| 25 | | only happened when we were instructed to do so. |
| | | 146 |
| | | |
| 1 | | side, dealt with only by senior associates at |
| 2 | | Herbert Smith Freehills liaising on your side |
| 3 | | with quite senior management? |
| 4 | Α. | Correct. |
| 5 | Q. | Can you see a problem in that? |
| 6 | Α. | The team that we have working from I can only |
| 7 | | comment from the KPMG side, but I've complete |
| 8 | | confidence in the senior manager and the manager |
| 9 | | on our side and subsequent senior members of my |
| 10 | | team who have been working on this particular |
| 11 | | workflow. |
| 12 | Q. | But for this particular solution their |
| 13 | | instructions came from people who are relatively |
| 14 | | junior; do you agree with that? |
| 15 | Α. | I don't know what senior day-to-day our |
| 16 | | senior associate within a law firm can cover, |
| 17 | | you know, a wide range of experience, many years |
| 18 | | post-qualified as well. My experience of |
| 19 | | working with some of these people was that they, |
| 20 | | you know, they were experienced and |
| 20 | | knowledgeable lawyers who'd worked in the |
| 22 | | eDisclosure space before. |
| 22 | ~ | |

24 was carefully recorded, for example?
25 A. There's an audit trail of the conversations that 148

Q. In your view, was this a careful decision that

23

(37) Pages 145 - 148

| 1 | | happened and confirmation between us, as to what | 1 | | look at the families that the responsive |
|--|----------------------|---|--|----|--|
| 2 | | the workflow would look like in order to execute | 2 | | documents were in and de-duplicate any that were |
| 3 | | on this de-duplication strategy, yes. | 3 | | identical. In this particular case, Family 4, |
| 4 | Q. | Can we look at page 7 of your witness statement. | 4 | | and Family 5 are identical and, therefore, one |
| 5 | - | There's a table on page 7. It's halfway down | 5 | | of those two families would be de-duplicated and |
| 6 | | the page. If we look at that table, can you | 6 | | one would remain in the review set. |
| 7 | | talk us through the problems that can occur, | 7 | Q. | Pausing there, if we had family-level |
| 8 | | using the ID codes as an example, in item-level | 8 | - | de-duplication, the only document that would be |
| 9 | | de-duplication in this particular case? | 9 | | removed from view would be Family 5 because they |
| 10 | Α. | Yes. So this is a table which shows five | 10 | | are identical to Family 4? |
| 11 | | families of documents. In total there are 19 | 11 | Α. | Yes, I mean, there's a way in which decisions |
| 12 | | documents within this set of data. The emails | 12 | | are made between whether it's 4 or 5, but |
| 13 | | represent the parent documents, the attachments | 13 | | broadly that's correct. There would be 14 |
| 14 | | represent the child documents to those families. | 14 | | documents left in the dataset after family-level |
| 15 | | The way that family-level de-duplication | 15 | | de-duplication. |
| 16 | | works sorry, before I say that, I should | 16 | Q. | |
| 17 | | point out that you can't see it in this image | 17 | | de-duplication? |
| 18 | | here but Attachment 1, in this particular | 18 | Α. | So item level de-duplication, rather than |
| 19 | | example, is the document which is responsive to | 19 | | looking down the vertical, looks across the |
| 20 | | the search terms and has been highlighted red | 20 | | horizontal, and it says there are five identical |
| 21 | Q. | So that is the policy document, I think we call | 21 | | responsive documents, which is Attachment 1, and |
| 22 | - | it, is it Annex 3 or | 22 | | it de-duplicates that so only one version of |
| 23 | Α. | Correct, so that's the equivalent to Appendix 3. | 23 | | an attachment is presented to the reviewers and, |
| 24 | Q. | Appendix 3. | 24 | | once again, there is a decision that needs to be |
| 25 | Α. | Under family-level de-duplication, one would | 25 | | made about which one of those four families |
| | | 149 | | | 150 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 1 | | or sorry five families is the master and | 1 | | de-duplicate were given to KPMG by [Herbert |
| 1 2 | | or, sorry, five families is the master and which one is the duplicates | 1 | | de-duplicate were given to KPMG by [Herbert Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were |
| 2 | 0. | which one is the duplicates. | 2 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were |
| 2 3 | Q. | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were | 2 3 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and |
| 2 3 4 | Q. | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this | 2 3 4 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level |
| 2 3 4 5 | Q. | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, | 2 3 4 5 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Q. | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get | 2 3 4 5 6 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get nearly every document in that table? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14" |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. A. | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get nearly every document in that table? Yes, so the example I've given is where Family 1 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14" Those are the requests for the prosecution |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get nearly every document in that table? Yes, so the example I've given is where Family 1 has been selected as the master and that means | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14" Those are the requests for the prosecution policies, investigations policies: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get nearly every document in that table? Yes, so the example I've given is where Family 1 has been selected as the master and that means that you wouldn't see the attachments that | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14" Those are the requests for the prosecution policies, investigations policies: " (or at all). My current understanding |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Α. | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get nearly every document in that table? Yes, so the example I've given is where Family 1 has been selected as the master and that means that you wouldn't see the attachments that you've just named. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14" Those are the requests for the prosecution policies, investigations policies: " (or at all). My current understanding is that item-level de-duplication was applied as |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get nearly every document in that table? Yes, so the example I've given is where Family 1 has been selected as the master and that means that you wouldn't see the attachments that you've just named. So a decision to carry out item-level | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14" Those are the requests for the prosecution policies, investigations policies: " (or at all). My current understanding is that item-level de-duplication was applied as the consequence of each a miscommunication by |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Α. | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get nearly every document in that table? Yes, so the example I've given is where Family 1 has been selected as the master and that means that you wouldn't see the attachments that you've just named. So a decision to carry out item-level de-duplication, we see the significance of such | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14" Those are the requests for the prosecution policies, investigations policies: " (or at all). My current understanding is that item-level de-duplication was applied as the consequence of each a miscommunication by [Herbert Smith Freehills/Peters & Peters] (who |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Α. | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get nearly every document in that table? Yes, so the example I've given is where Family 1 has been selected as the master and that means that you wouldn't see the attachments that you've just named. So a decision to carry out item-level de-duplication, we see the significance of such a decision in that particular table; do you | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14" Those are the requests for the prosecution policies, investigations policies: " (or at all). My current understanding is that item-level de-duplication was applied as the consequence of each a miscommunication by [Herbert Smith Freehills/Peters & Peters] (who have told me that they did not intend it to be |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Α. | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get nearly every document in that table? Yes, so the example I've given is where Family 1 has been selected as the master and that means that you wouldn't see the attachments that you've just named. So a decision to carry out item-level de-duplication, we see the significance of such | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14" Those are the requests for the prosecution policies, investigations policies: " (or at all). My current understanding is that item-level de-duplication was applied as the consequence of each a miscommunication by [Herbert Smith Freehills/Peters & Peters] (who have told me that they did not intend it to be applied) or a misunderstanding by KPMG (who have |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. Q. | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get nearly every document in that table? Yes, so the example I've given is where Family 1 has been selected as the master and that means that you wouldn't see the attachments that you've just named. So a decision to carry out item-level de-duplication, we see the significance of such a decision in that particular table; do you agree with that? That's correct. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14" Those are the requests for the prosecution policies, investigations policies: " (or at all). My current understanding is that item-level de-duplication was applied as the consequence of each a miscommunication by [Herbert Smith Freehills/Peters & Peters] (who have told me that they did not intend it to be applied) or a misunderstanding by KPMG (who have explained that they understood that their |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. Q. | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get nearly every document in that table? Yes, so the example I've given is where Family 1 has been selected as the master and that means that you wouldn't see the attachments that you've just named. So a decision to carry out item-level de-duplication, we see the significance of such a decision in that particular table; do you agree with that? That's correct. That is perhaps why you have carefully recorded | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14" Those are the requests for the prosecution policies, investigations policies: " (or at all). My current understanding is that item-level de-duplication was applied as the consequence of each a miscommunication by [Herbert Smith Freehills/Peters & Peters] (who have told me that they did not intend it to be applied) or a misunderstanding by KPMG (who have explained that they understood that their instructions were to apply item-level |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. Q. | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get nearly every document in that table? Yes, so the example I've given is where Family 1 has been selected as the master and that means that you wouldn't see the attachments that you've just named. So a decision to carry out item-level de-duplication, we see the significance of such a decision in that particular table; do you agree with that? That's correct. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14" Those are the requests for the prosecution policies, investigations policies: " (or at all). My current understanding is that item-level de-duplication was applied as the consequence of each a miscommunication by [Herbert Smith Freehills/Peters & Peters] (who have told me that they did not intend it to be applied) or a misunderstanding by KPMG (who have explained that they understood that their instructions were to apply item-level de-duplication)." |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. Q. A. Q. | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get nearly every document in that table? Yes, so the example I've given is where Family 1 has been selected as the master and that means that you wouldn't see the attachments that you've just named. So a decision to carry out item-level de-duplication, we see the significance of such a decision in that particular table; do you agree with that? That's correct. That is perhaps why you have carefully recorded the decision that was made in that respect? That's correct. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14" Those are the requests for the prosecution policies, investigations policies: " (or at all). My current understanding is that item-level de-duplication was applied as the consequence of each a miscommunication by [Herbert Smith Freehills/Peters & Peters] (who have told me that they did not intend it to be applied) or a misunderstanding by KPMG (who have explained that they understood that their instructions were to apply item-level de-duplication)." Now, if it was such a significant decision, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | A. Q. A. Q. | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get nearly every document in that table? Yes, so the example I've given is where Family 1 has been selected as the master and that means that you wouldn't see the attachments that you've just named. So a decision to carry out item-level de-duplication, we see the significance of such a decision in that particular table; do you agree with that? That's correct. That is perhaps why you have carefully recorded the decision that was made in that respect? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14" Those are the requests for the prosecution policies, investigations policies: " (or at all). My current understanding is that item-level de-duplication was applied as the consequence of each a miscommunication by [Herbert Smith Freehills/Peters & Peters] (who have told me that they did not intend it to be applied) or a misunderstanding by KPMG (who have explained that they understood that their instructions were to apply item-level de-duplication)." Now, if it was such a significant decision, a nuanced solution to a particular problem, one |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. Q. A. Q. | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get nearly every document in that table? Yes, so the example I've given is where Family 1 has been selected as the master and that means that you wouldn't see the attachments that you've just named. So a decision to carry out item-level de-duplication, we see the significance of such a decision in that particular table; do you agree with that? That's correct. That is perhaps why you have carefully recorded the decision that was made in that respect? That's correct. Thank you. Can we have look at paragraph 80 of Mrs Wills' statement, that's WITN09940200. It's | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14" Those are the requests for the prosecution policies, investigations policies: " (or at all). My current understanding is that item-level de-duplication was applied as the consequence of each a miscommunication by [Herbert Smith Freehills/Peters & Peters] (who have told me that they did not intend it to be applied) or a misunderstanding by KPMG (who have explained that they understood that their instructions were to apply item-level de-duplication)." Now, if it was such a significant decision, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. Q. A. Q. | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get nearly every document in that table? Yes, so the example I've given is where Family 1 has been selected as the master and that means that you wouldn't see the attachments that you've just named. So a decision to carry out item-level de-duplication, we see the significance of such a decision in that particular table; do you agree with that? That's correct. That is perhaps why you have carefully recorded the decision that was made in that respect? That's correct. That's correct. That's correct. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Α. | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14" Those are the requests for the prosecution policies, investigations policies: " (or at all). My current understanding is that item-level de-duplication was applied as the consequence of each a miscommunication by [Herbert Smith Freehills/Peters & Peters] (who have told me that they did not intend it to be applied) or a misunderstanding by KPMG (who have explained that they understood that their instructions were to apply item-level de-duplication)." Now, if it was such a significant decision, a nuanced solution to a particular problem, one that was carefully recorded, how might it be that the answer to that is not straightforward? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. Q. A. Q. | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get nearly every document in that table? Yes, so the example I've given is where Family 1 has been selected as the master and that means that you wouldn't see the attachments that you've just named. So a decision to carry out item-level de-duplication, we see the significance of such a decision in that particular table; do you agree with that? That's correct. That is perhaps why you have carefully recorded the decision that was made in that respect? That's correct. Thank you. Can we have look at paragraph 80 of Mrs Wills' statement, that's WITN09940200. It's page 25 of that statement. Thank you, if we | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | А. | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14" Those are the requests for the prosecution policies, investigations policies: " (or at all). My current understanding is that item-level de-duplication was applied as the consequence of each a miscommunication by [Herbert Smith Freehills/Peters & Peters] (who have told me that they did not intend it to be applied) or a misunderstanding by KPMG (who have explained that they understood that their instructions were to apply item-level de-duplication)." Now, if it was such a significant decision, a nuanced solution to a particular problem, one that was carefully recorded, how might it be that the answer to that is not straightforward? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. Q. A. Q. | which one is the duplicates. Am I right to say, then, that if you were carrying out item-level de-duplication on this particular table, you wouldn't get Attachment 2, Attachment 3, Attachment 4 and you wouldn't get nearly every document in that table? Yes, so the example I've given is where Family 1 has been selected as the master and that means that you wouldn't see the attachments that you've just named. So a decision to carry out item-level de-duplication, we see the significance of such a decision in that particular table; do you agree with that? That's correct. That is perhaps why you have carefully recorded the decision that was made in that respect? That's correct. Thank you. Can we have look at paragraph 80 of Mrs Wills' statement, that's WITN09940200. It's page 25 of that statement. Thank you, if we scroll down, thank you. So Mrs Wills' evidence | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | А. | Smith Freehills] and [Peters & Peters] and were implemented by KPMG. I understand from HSF and P&P that they did not intend item-level de-duplication to be applied in connection with the document searches associated with responding to Rule 9 requests 11 and 14" Those are the requests for the prosecution policies, investigations policies: " (or at all). My current understanding is that item-level de-duplication was applied as the consequence of each a miscommunication by [Herbert Smith Freehills/Peters & Peters] (who have told me that they did not intend it to be applied) or a misunderstanding by KPMG (who have explained that they understood that their instructions were to apply item-level de-duplication)." Now, if it was such a significant decision, a nuanced solution to a particular problem, one that was carefully recorded, how might it be that the answer to that is not straightforward? I think because I don't think my team or |

(38) Pages 149 - 152

| 1 | | again in a minute but, before I do that, we were |
|--|----------------------|---|
| 2 | | asked to provide statistics on the number of |
| 3 | | hits that a search term had identified, in other |
| 4 | | words how many responsive documents were there. |
| 5 | | We weren't typically being asked to provide |
| 6 | | statistics on the number of hits and their |
| 7 | | associated families. The conversations that |
| 8 | | would happen about de-duplication would then |
| 9 | | start with, "This number of hits seems too |
| 10 | | high", and the first set of conversations would |
| 11 | | be around are there things around the search |
| 12 | | terms that need refining, and the second set of |
| 13 | | conversations would be about de-duplicating the |
| 14 | | responsive documents, de-duplicating the hits, |
| 15 | | so that the external solicitors only see one |
| 16 | | version of a document. |
| 17 | | And, as you can see from the worked example |
| 18 | | here, the only way that works when you're doing |
| 19 | | a review of only responsive documents is at |
| 20 | | an item level, otherwise you leave lots of |
| 21 | | versions of the same document in the dataset |
| 22 | | which need to get reviewed time and again. |
| 23 | Q. | You've said that the decision was recorded, what |
| 24 | | does that record say, then? |
| 25 | Α. | The decision recorded in the communications |
| | | 153 |
| | | 155 |
| | | 100 |
| 1 | | |
| 1 2 | | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, |
| 2 | | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be |
| 2 3 | | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back |
| 2 3 4 | A. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? |
| 2 3 4 5 | А. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | A. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We dealt with a number of senior associates and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | А. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We dealt with a number of senior associates and associates. Every single request and question |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Α. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We dealt with a number of senior associates and associates. Every single request and question was dealt with separately. There was no |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We dealt with a number of senior associates and associates. Every single request and question was dealt with separately. There was no standard approach to de-duplication. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. Q. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We dealt with a number of senior associates and associates. Every single request and question was dealt with separately. There was no standard approach to de-duplication. So that was a question that you expected some |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We dealt with a number of senior associates and associates. Every single request and question was dealt with separately. There was no standard approach to de-duplication. So that was a question that you expected some reasonable consideration to have been given to. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. A. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We dealt with a number of senior associates and associates. Every single request and question was dealt with separately. There was no standard approach to de-duplication. So that was a question that you expected some reasonable consideration to have been given to. Yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We dealt with a number of senior associates and associates. Every single request and question was dealt with separately. There was no standard approach to de-duplication. So that was a question that you expected some reasonable consideration to have been given to. Yes. Was the question based on statistics? So would |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. A. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We dealt with a number of senior associates and associates. Every single request and question was dealt with separately. There was no standard approach to de-duplication. So that was a question that you expected some reasonable consideration to have been given to. Yes. Was the question based on statistics? So would you, for example, say, "If we don't de-duplicate |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. A. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We dealt with a number of senior associates and associates. Every single request and question was dealt with separately. There was no standard approach to de-duplication. So that was a question that you expected some reasonable consideration to have been given to. Yes. Was the question based on statistics? So would you, for example, say, "If we don't de-duplicate we'll have to review this number of documents, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. A. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We dealt with a number of senior associates and associates. Every single request and question was dealt with separately. There was no standard approach to de-duplication. So that was a question that you expected some reasonable consideration to have been given to. Yes. Was the question based on statistics? So would you, for example, say, "If we don't de-duplicate we'll have to review this number of documents, if we do, we'll have to review this number of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We dealt with a number of senior associates and associates. Every single request and question was dealt with separately. There was no standard approach to de-duplication. So that was a question that you expected some reasonable consideration to have been given to. Yes. Was the question based on statistics? So would you, for example, say, "If we don't de-duplicate we'll have to review this number of documents", and the option was given to them as |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. Q. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We dealt with a number of senior associates and associates. Every single request and question was dealt with separately. There was no standard approach to de-duplication. So that was a question that you expected some reasonable consideration to have been given to. Yes. Was the question based on statistics? So would you, for example, say, "If we don't de-duplicate we'll have to review this number of documents, if we do, we'll have to review this number of documents", and the option was given to them as to how many documents they wish to consider? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. A. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We dealt with a number of senior associates and associates. Every single request and question was dealt with separately. There was no standard approach to de-duplication. So that was a question that you expected some reasonable consideration to have been given to. Yes. Was the question based on statistics? So would you, for example, say, "If we don't de-duplicate we'll have to review this number of documents, if we do, we'll have to review this number of documents", and the option was given to them as to how many documents they wish to consider? That's correct. Our role is to provide the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. Q. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We dealt with a number of senior associates and associates. Every single request and question was dealt with separately. There was no standard approach to de-duplication. So that was a question that you expected some reasonable consideration to have been given to. Yes. Was the question based on statistics? So would you, for example, say, "If we don't de-duplicate we'll have to review this number of documents, if we do, we'll have to review this number of documents", and the option was given to them as to how many documents they wish to consider? That's correct. Our role is to provide the statistics pre-de-duplication and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. A. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We dealt with a number of senior associates and associates. Every single request and question was dealt with separately. There was no standard approach to de-duplication. So that was a question that you expected some reasonable consideration to have been given to. Yes. Was the question based on statistics? So would you, for example, say, "If we don't de-duplicate we'll have to review this number of documents, if we do, we'll have to review this number of documents", and the option was given to them as to how many documents they wish to consider? That's correct. Our role is to provide the statistics pre-de-duplication and post-de-duplication. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We dealt with a number of senior associates and associates. Every single request and question was dealt with separately. There was no standard approach to de-duplication. So that was a question that you expected some reasonable consideration to have been given to. Yes. Was the question based on statistics? So would you, for example, say, "If we don't de-duplicate we'll have to review this number of documents, if we do, we'll have to review this number of documents", and the option was given to them as to how many documents they wish to consider? That's correct. Our role is to provide the statistics pre-de-duplication and post-de-duplication. Having considered Mrs Wills' evidence on this |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. A. | Smith Freehills, for the significant decision, "Do you want the responsive documents to be de-duplicated?" and the answer that came back was "Yes"? That's correct and it wasn't one individual. We dealt with a number of senior associates and associates. Every single request and question was dealt with separately. There was no standard approach to de-duplication. So that was a question that you expected some reasonable consideration to have been given to. Yes. Was the question based on statistics? So would you, for example, say, "If we don't de-duplicate we'll have to review this number of documents, if we do, we'll have to review this number of documents", and the option was given to them as to how many documents they wish to consider? That's correct. Our role is to provide the statistics pre-de-duplication and post-de-duplication. |

25 the simple answer that you have given?

| 1 | | and the conversations between our teams, where |
|----------------|----|---|
| 2 | | the requirements are set out, what they would |
| 3 | | like, which is a reduction in the number of hits |
| 4 | | by only giving us unique documents, one version |
| 5 | | of a document for review, and our team |
| 6 | | clarifying whether they would like us to |
| 7 | | de-duplicate on the basis of an MD5# algorithm |
| 8 | | just the responsive documents, that being |
| 9 | | confirmed, and then the statistics then showing |
| 10 | | that in a series of tables. |
| 11 | Q. | So is your evidence that KPMG asked Herbert |
| 12 | | Smith Freehills whether they wanted item-level |
| 13 | | de-duplication and the answer that came back was |
| 14 | | 'Yes"? |
| 15 | Α. | That isn't no, that isn't my my statement |
| 16 | | is that that expression, "item-level |
| 17 | | de-duplication" was never really used until |
| 18 | | March/April time this year. What we were |
| 19 | | talking about was responsive document |
| 20 | | de-duplication, which is the same thing. |
| 21 | Q. | So you may not have used the words that I've |
| 22 | | used, but you asked somebody at Herbert Smith |
| 23 | | Freehills, presumably you know who it is, |
| 24 | | presumably based on your previous earlier |
| 25 | | evidence it was a senior associate at Herbert |
| | | 154 |
| | | |
| 1 | Α. | Vac. I do understand that was |
| | | Yes, I do understand that, yes. |
| 2 | Q. | You understand why it may be put as |
| 3 | • | a miscommunication? |
| 4 | Α. | So I understand that we were very clear in what |
| 5 | | we were doing, based on the instructions we were |
| 6 | | given, the consequence of that is related to the |
| 7 | | family items of duplicates of the documents that |
| 8 | | were being reviewed. I don't know what the |
| 9 10 | | intention of any of the lawyers was but, if a review of family items of all versions of |
| 10 | | documents was necessary, then there would be |
| | | |
| 12 13 | | consequences from this, clearly, as we've seen. But I didn't see that documented in that level |
| 13 14 | | of detail at that time. |
| 14 | ^ | Do you see it as a problem that KPMG doesn't |
| 15 16 | Q. | |
| 10 | | apply its mind at all to the problem and only provides statistics, an A or a B option, for |
| | | provides statistics, all A ULA D Uption, 101 |
| 10 | | example? |
| 18 19 | ۸ | example? I think you still apply in your mind in |
| 18 19 20 | Α. | example? I think you still apply in your mind in delivering some of the technology solutions that |

- 21 we are. I just felt like we have different
- 22 roles, and our role is, in this particular
- 23 Inquiry, not to interpret the wording of the
- 24 request and convert that into the wording that
- 25 needs to be then searched across the database. 156

| 1 | | Our role is the more technical side of |
|---|----|--|
| 2 | | establishing which work spaces is the syntax |
| 3 | | correct, and making sure from the quality |
| 4 | | control perspective we're getting accurate |
| 5 | | results. |
| 6 | Q. | Do you think that KPMG should be, for example, |
| 7 | | advising on the pros and cons of different |
| 8 | | approaches? So the con in this case being or |
| 9 | | the pro being, yes, you exclude a large number |
| 10 | | of documents, the con being you might actually |
| 11 | | need to read some of those documents? |
| 12 | Α. | I mean, I don't think we were asked for our view |
| 13 | | on that. Again, with hindsight, if we went back |
| 14 | | to March last year, would I have encouraged the |
| 15 | | team to have a different conversation about the |
| 16 | | full impact of both pros and cons? Then, yes, |
| 17 | | probably I would. But, you know, I strongly |
| 18 | | believe, looking at the wording of the request |
| 19 | | that was made, that the team executed as they |
| 20 | | were asked to. |
| 21 | Q. | In other inquiries or other significant |
| 22 | | litigation that you're involved in, do those |
| 23 | | conversations happen from the KPMG side? So do |
| 24 | | you advise clients as to the pros and cons of |
| 25 | | the different courses of action? |
| | | 157 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | external solicitors. The external solicitors |
| 1 2 | | external solicitors. The external solicitors would have said "These numbers still look |
| | | |
| 2 | | would have said "These numbers still look |
| 2 3 | | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have |
| 2 3 4 | | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not |
| 2 3 4 5 | | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, about de-duplication. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, about de-duplication. When the conversation about de-duplication |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, about de-duplication. When the conversation about de-duplication happened, the clarification would be around what |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, about de-duplication. When the conversation about de-duplication happened, the clarification would be around what would you like to be duplicated against |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, about de-duplication. When the conversation about de-duplication happened, the clarification would be around what would you like to be duplicated against de-duplicated against what? And in this |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, about de-duplication. When the conversation about de-duplication happened, the clarification would be around what would you like to be duplicated against de-duplicated against what? And in this particular case, because you had data sitting in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, about de-duplication. When the conversation about de-duplication happened, the clarification would be around what would you like to be duplicated against de-duplicated against what? And in this particular case, because you had data sitting in different cases, there was two types of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, about de-duplication. When the conversation about de-duplication happened, the clarification would be around what would you like to be duplicated against de-duplicated against what? And in this particular case, because you had data sitting in different cases, there was two types of de-duplication of responsive items, one within |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, about de-duplication. When the conversation about de-duplication happened, the clarification would be around what would you like to be duplicated against de-duplicated against what? And in this particular case, because you had data sitting in different cases, there was two types of de-duplication of responsive items, one within a dataset itself and then subsequently when you |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, about de-duplication. When the conversation about de-duplication happened, the clarification would be around what would you like to be duplicated against de-duplicated against what? And in this particular case, because you had data sitting in different cases, there was two types of de-duplication of responsive items, one within a dataset itself and then subsequently when you move the data from various datasets to another |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, about de-duplication. When the conversation about de-duplication happened, the clarification would be around what would you like to be duplicated against de-duplicated against what? And in this particular case, because you had data sitting in different cases, there was two types of de-duplication of responsive items, one within a dataset itself and then subsequently when you move the data from various datasets to another place, a second set of de-duplication in that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 | | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, about de-duplication. When the conversation about de-duplication happened, the clarification would be around what would you like to be duplicated against de-duplicated against what? And in this particular case, because you had data sitting in different cases, there was two types of de-duplication of responsive items, one within a dataset itself and then subsequently when you move the data from various datasets to another place, a second set of de-duplication in that centralised location. But those conversations |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, about de-duplication. When the conversation about de-duplication happened, the clarification would be around what would you like to be duplicated against de-duplicated against what? And in this particular case, because you had data sitting in different cases, there was two types of de-duplication of responsive items, one within a dataset itself and then subsequently when you move the data from various datasets to another place, a second set of de-duplication in that centralised location. But those conversations were always about de-duplication of responsive |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, about de-duplication. When the conversation about de-duplication happened, the clarification would be around what would you like to be duplicated against de-duplicated against what? And in this particular case, because you had data sitting in different cases, there was two types of de-duplication of responsive items, one within a dataset itself and then subsequently when you move the data from various datasets to another place, a second set of de-duplication in that centralised location. But those conversations were always about de-duplication of responsive documents. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, about de-duplication. When the conversation about de-duplication happened, the clarification would be around what would you like to be duplicated against de-duplicated against what? And in this particular case, because you had data sitting in different cases, there was two types of de-duplication of responsive items, one within a dataset itself and then subsequently when you move the data from various datasets to another place, a second set of de-duplication in that centralised location. But those conversations were always about de-duplication of responsive documents. I'd like to get a little bit of clarity in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, about de-duplication. When the conversation about de-duplication happened, the clarification would be around what would you like to be duplicated against de-duplicated against what? And in this particular case, because you had data sitting in different cases, there was two types of de-duplication of responsive items, one within a dataset itself and then subsequently when you move the data from various datasets to another place, a second set of de-duplication in that centralised location. But those conversations were always about de-duplication of responsive documents. I'd like to get a little bit of clarity in respect of something we've heard this morning, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 23 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 7 8 9 20 21 22 | Q. | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, about de-duplication. When the conversation about de-duplication happened, the clarification would be around what would you like to be duplicated against de-duplicated against what? And in this particular case, because you had data sitting in different cases, there was two types of de-duplication of responsive items, one within a dataset itself and then subsequently when you move the data from various datasets to another place, a second set of de-duplication in that centralised location. But those conversations were always about de-duplication of responsive documents. I'd like to get a little bit of clarity in respect of something we've heard this morning, and that was about the effect that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 20 21 22 23 | Q. | would have said "These numbers still look slightly too high", and then there would have been a conversation, first about whether or not the search terms were amended and, secondly, about de-duplication. When the conversation about de-duplication happened, the clarification would be around what would you like to be duplicated against de-duplicated against what? And in this particular case, because you had data sitting in different cases, there was two types of de-duplication of responsive items, one within a dataset itself and then subsequently when you move the data from various datasets to another place, a second set of de-duplication in that centralised location. But those conversations were always about de-duplication of responsive documents. I'd like to get a little bit of clarity in respect of something we've heard this morning, and that was about the effect that de-duplication might have on further searches |

| 1 | A. | In some respects we do. With de-duplication, |
|----------|----|--|
| 2 | | which I think is the topic we're talking about, |
| 3 | | you would almost always be involved at the |
| 4 | | outset, which means that you could apply |
| 5 | | de-duplication during the processing phase, |
| 6 | | which has not been possible here. So we are in |
| 7 | | a we're in a unique situation with the |
| 8 | | dataset we have here. |
| 9 | Q. | |
| 10 | · | you think it would have been better for KPMG to |
| 11 | | have advised on the pros and cons of that |
| 12 | | particular course of action? |
| 13 | Α. | I think the clarification questions that we |
| 14 | | asked were very clear and, yet again, I'm |
| 15 | | comfortable that what we were asked to do, we |
| 16 | | delivered on. Should we again, with |
| 17 | | hindsight, would I have liked to have |
| 18 | | highlighted some other implications or one major |
| 19 | | implication of using this approach? Yes, |
| 20 | | I would. |
| 21 | Q. | When you say the clarification questions, can |
| 22 | | you give us some examples of the kinds of |
| 23 | | clarification questions that were posed? |
| 24 | Α. | Yes. So some searches would have been run. We |
| 25 | | would have provided the results back to the |
| | | 158 |
| | | |
| 1 | Q. | It seemed to be suggested that it affects the |
| 2 | | body of available documents for other searches, |
| 3 | | whether it be in respect of the particular |
| 4 | | Rule 9 Request, let's say the de-duplication is |
| 5 | | carry out in respect of question 11 but actually |
| 6 | | we've got a question 12 that those documents |
| 7 | | might be responsive to, or perhaps, in the |
| 8 | | future, a further Rule 9 Request comes in and |
| 9 | | the excluded document might be responsive to |
| 10 | | that particular request but has been excluded as |
| 11 | | a duplicate; can you tell us about that? Does |
| 12 | | that actually happen? |
| 13 | Α. | No, it doesn't. So the de-duplication happens |
| 14 | | only on a request or a question within a request |
| 15 | | basis. It applies for that question within |
| 16 | | a request and then no longer exists, |
| 17 | | effectively, when the next question or the next |
| 18 | ~ | search is applied. |
| 19 20 | Q. | Thank you. I want to move on to remediation. |
| 20 | | Sorry, just before I do, though, in terms of the |
| 21 | | numbers, you've said that often the response |
| 22 | | from Herbert Smith Freehills would be to go for |
| 23 24 | | a smaller number, to go for the one that has the |
| 24 25 | A. | de-duplication applied, for example. Yeah. |
| 20 | А. | 160 |
| | | |

(40) Pages 157 - 160

| 1 | Q. | In this particular Inquiry, have you experienced | 1 | recognised that the form of de-duplication is |
|--|------------------|---|--|--|
| 2 | | a move towards reducing the number of documents | 2 | also important and, if a review is not based on |
| 3 | | disclosed, as opposed to gathering the largest | 3 | responsive documents only, then it has |
| 4 | | number or a larger number? | 4 | shortcomings. |
| 5 | Α. | Do you mean disclosed or | 5 | Q. Have you noticed any change in respect of the |
| 6 | Q. | | 6 | involvement of the Post Office in underlying |
| 7 | | smaller numbers rather than larger numbers? | 7 | decision making? |
| 8 | Α. | - | 8 | A. Well, absolutely, with my interactions with |
| 9 | | conscious of not overwhelming the Inquiry with | 9 | them, I have daily calls related to the |
| 10 | | irrelevant data. That's the only reason they | 10 | remediation and at least weekly or biweekly |
| 11 | | would be lower. But absolutely not how you've | 11 | calls related to the ongoing non-remediation |
| 12 | ~ | presented it. | 12 | based activity. |
| 13 | Q. | | 13 | Q. In respect of, for example, search terms and |
| 14 | | problems that have occurred in this particular | 14 | future requests, have you seen any change in the |
| 15 | | case. What conclusions have you drawn, as KPMG, | 15 | approach from the Post Office? |
| 16 17 | | as to the failings within the Post Office or within Herbert Smith Freehills or somewhere | 16 17 | A. Well, I don't have interaction I don't have visibility of the interaction between HSF and |
| 18 | | | 17 | - |
| 10 | | else, in respect of disclosure which ultimately | 18 | the Post Office, but I have been on calls |
| 20 | | led to the issues that we are considering and have been considering? | 20 | regularly where it's been mentioned that those have been shared for sign-off. |
| 20 | Α. | | 20 | Q. Do you have confidence that the issues that we |
| 22 | | witness statement, it's the search terms and the | 21 | have seen to date will not happen again and, if |
| 23 | | review of family documents which is ultimately | 23 | so, why? |
| 24 | | the reason why Appendix 6 didn't get picked up | 20 | A. De-duplication, absolutely. We are only doing |
| 25 | | back in April 2022. However, I clearly | 25 | family-level de-duplication now and we won't be |
| 20 | | 161 | 20 | 162 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 4 | | and a share been been been been been been and an | 4 | |
| 1 | | going back to item-level de-duplication, unless | 1 | MR BLAKE: Thank you very much. |
| 2 | | there's a particular reason why that's | 2 | (2.55 pm) |
| 2 3 | | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family | 2 3 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) |
| 2 3 4 | | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed | 2 3 4 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) |
| 2 3 4 5 | | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed | 2 3 4 5 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you | 2 3 4 5 6 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you a guarantee on that, because the problem with | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you a guarantee on that, because the problem with search terms is that they are not always precise | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you. MR BEER: May I call Gregg Rowan. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you a guarantee on that, because the problem with search terms is that they are not always precise and it's difficult to know what you're looking | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you. MR BEER: May I call Gregg Rowan. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you a guarantee on that, because the problem with search terms is that they are not always precise and it's difficult to know what you're looking for until you find it sometimes. But I know | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you. MR BEER: May I call Gregg Rowan. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. GREGG NICHOLAS ROWAN (sworn) |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you a guarantee on that, because the problem with search terms is that they are not always precise and it's difficult to know what you're looking for until you find it sometimes. But I know there's a lot of work being done to reflect on | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you. MR BEER: May I call Gregg Rowan. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. GREGG NICHOLAS ROWAN (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you a guarantee on that, because the problem with search terms is that they are not always precise and it's difficult to know what you're looking for until you find it sometimes. But I know there's a lot of work being done to reflect on the terms that have been used for previous | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you. MR BEER: May I call Gregg Rowan. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. GREGG NICHOLAS ROWAN (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Mr Rowan, as you know my name is Jason |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you a guarantee on that, because the problem with search terms is that they are not always precise and it's difficult to know what you're looking for until you find it sometimes. But I know there's a lot of work being done to reflect on the terms that have been used for previous requests and whether they appeared appropriate | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you. MR BEER: May I call Gregg Rowan. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. GREGG NICHOLAS ROWAN (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Mr Rowan, as you know my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | MR | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you a guarantee on that, because the problem with search terms is that they are not always precise and it's difficult to know what you're looking for until you find it sometimes. But I know there's a lot of work being done to reflect on the terms that have been used for previous requests and whether they appeared appropriate and fulsome enough. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you. MR BEER: May I call Gregg Rowan. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. GREGG NICHOLAS ROWAN (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Mr Rowan, as you know my name is Jason |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | MR | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you a guarantee on that, because the problem with search terms is that they are not always precise and it's difficult to know what you're looking for until you find it sometimes. But I know there's a lot of work being done to reflect on the terms that have been used for previous requests and whether they appeared appropriate | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you. MR BEER: May I call Gregg Rowan. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. GREGG NICHOLAS ROWAN (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Mr Rowan, as you know my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry. Can you give is your full name please? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | MR | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you a guarantee on that, because the problem with search terms is that they are not always precise and it's difficult to know what you're looking for until you find it sometimes. But I know there's a lot of work being done to reflect on the terms that have been used for previous requests and whether they appeared appropriate and fulsome enough. BLAKE: Thank you. I don't have any further | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you. MR BEER: May I call Gregg Rowan. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. GREGG NICHOLAS ROWAN (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Mr Rowan, as you know my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry. Can you give is your full name please? A. Gregg Nicholas Rowan. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you a guarantee on that, because the problem with search terms is that they are not always precise and it's difficult to know what you're looking for until you find it sometimes. But I know there's a lot of work being done to reflect on the terms that have been used for previous requests and whether they appeared appropriate and fulsome enough. BLAKE: Thank you. I don't have any further questions. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you. MR BEER: May I call Gregg Rowan. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. GREGG NICHOLAS ROWAN (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Mr Rowan, as you know my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry. Can you give is your full name please? A. Gregg Nicholas Rowan. Q. Thank you for coming to the Inquiry today to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you a guarantee on that, because the problem with search terms is that they are not always precise and it's difficult to know what you're looking for until you find it sometimes. But I know there's a lot of work being done to reflect on the terms that have been used for previous requests and whether they appeared appropriate and fulsome enough. BLAKE: Thank you. I don't have any further questions. Sir, do you have any questions? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you. MR BEER: May I call Gregg Rowan. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. GREGG NICHOLAS ROWAN (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Mr Rowan, as you know my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry. Can you give is your full name please? A. Gregg Nicholas Rowan. Q. Thank you for coming to the Inquiry today to help us in our work and for previously providing |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you a guarantee on that, because the problem with search terms is that they are not always precise and it's difficult to know what you're looking for until you find it sometimes. But I know there's a lot of work being done to reflect on the terms that have been used for previous requests and whether they appeared appropriate and fulsome enough. BLAKE: Thank you. I don't have any further questions. Sir, do you have any questions? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you. MR BEER: May I call Gregg Rowan. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. GREGG NICHOLAS ROWAN (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Mr Rowan, as you know my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry. Can you give is your full name please? A. Gregg Nicholas Rowan. Q. Thank you for coming to the Inquiry today to help us in our work and for previously providing a witness statement and a long annex. You |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | SIR | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you a guarantee on that, because the problem with search terms is that they are not always precise and it's difficult to know what you're looking for until you find it sometimes. But I know there's a lot of work being done to reflect on the terms that have been used for previous requests and whether they appeared appropriate and fulsome enough. BLAKE: Thank you. I don't have any further questions. Sir, do you have any questions? WYN WILLIAMS: No, I don't, thank you very much. Thank you for your witness statement and for | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you. MR BEER: May I call Gregg Rowan. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. GREGG NICHOLAS ROWAN (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Mr Rowan, as you know my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry. Can you give is your full name please? A. Gregg Nicholas Rowan. Q. Thank you for coming to the Inquiry today to help us in our work and for previously providing a witness statement and a long annex. You should have in front of you a copy of that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | SIR THI | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you a guarantee on that, because the problem with search terms is that they are not always precise and it's difficult to know what you're looking for until you find it sometimes. But I know there's a lot of work being done to reflect on the terms that have been used for previous requests and whether they appeared appropriate and fulsome enough. BLAKE: Thank you. I don't have any further questions. Sir, do you have any questions? WYN WILLIAMS: No, I don't, thank you very much. Thank you for your witness statement and for coming to give evidence. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you. MR BEER: May I call Gregg Rowan. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. GREGG NICHOLAS ROWAN (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Mr Rowan, as you know my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry. Can you give is your full name please? A. Gregg Nicholas Rowan. Q. Thank you for coming to the Inquiry today to help us in our work and for previously providing a witness statement and a long annex. You should have in front of you a copy of that witness statement, dated 23 August 2023. If you |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | SIR THI | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you a guarantee on that, because the problem with search terms is that they are not always precise and it's difficult to know what you're looking for until you find it sometimes. But I know there's a lot of work being done to reflect on the terms that have been used for previous requests and whether they appeared appropriate and fulsome enough. BLAKE: Thank you. I don't have any further questions. Sir, do you have any questions? WYN WILLIAMS: No, I don't, thank you very much. Thank you for your witness statement and for coming to give evidence. E WITNESS: Thank you, sir. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you. MR BEER: May I call Gregg Rowan. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. GREGG NICHOLAS ROWAN (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Mr Rowan, as you know my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry. Can you give is your full name please? A. Gregg Nicholas Rowan. Q. Thank you for coming to the Inquiry today to help us in our work and for previously providing a witness statement and a long annex. You should have in front of you a copy of that witness statement, dated 23 August 2023. If you look at page 63, you should see your signature? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | SIR THI | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you a guarantee on that, because the problem with search terms is that they are not always precise and it's difficult to know what you're looking for until you find it sometimes. But I know there's a lot of work being done to reflect on the terms that have been used for previous requests and whether they appeared appropriate and fulsome enough. BLAKE: Thank you. I don't have any further questions. Sir, do you have any questions? WYN WILLIAMS: No, I don't, thank you very much. Thank you for your witness statement and for coming to give evidence. EWITNESS: Thank you, sir. BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. Can we take | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you. MR BEER: May I call Gregg Rowan. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. GREGG NICHOLAS ROWAN (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Mr Rowan, as you know my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry. Can you give is your full name please? A. Gregg Nicholas Rowan. Q. Thank you for coming to the Inquiry today to help us in our work and for previously providing a witness statement and a long annex. You should have in front of you a copy of that witness statement, dated 23 August 2023. If you look at page 63, you should see your signature? A. I do. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | SIR THI MR | there's a particular reason why that's appropriate. I believe the review of family items is ongoing and the workflow has changed accordingly or the review workflow has changed accordingly. Search terms I cannot give you a guarantee on that, because the problem with search terms is that they are not always precise and it's difficult to know what you're looking for until you find it sometimes. But I know there's a lot of work being done to reflect on the terms that have been used for previous requests and whether they appeared appropriate and fulsome enough. BLAKE: Thank you. I don't have any further questions. Sir, do you have any questions? WYN WILLIAMS: No, I don't, thank you very much. Thank you for your witness statement and for coming to give evidence. E WITNESS: Thank you, sir. BLAKE: Thank you very much, sir. Can we take a break for 15 minutes now, so to return at | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | (2.55 pm) (A short break) (3.10 pm) MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir, can you see and hear me? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can thank you. MR BEER: May I call Gregg Rowan. SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. GREGG NICHOLAS ROWAN (sworn) Questioned by MR BEER MR BEER: Mr Rowan, as you know my name is Jason Beer and I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry. Can you give is your full name please? A. Gregg Nicholas Rowan. Q. Thank you for coming to the Inquiry today to help us in our work and for previously providing a witness statement and a long annex. You should have in front of you a copy of that witness statement, dated 23 August 2023. If you look at page 63, you should see your signature? A. I do. Q. Are the contents of that statement true to the |

(41) Pages 161 - 164

5 6

| 1 | Q. | For the purpose of the transcript, the URN is |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | WITN09950100, there's no need to display that. |
| 3 | | I am going to ask you about a range of matters |
| 4 | | referred to in your witness statement but not |
| 5 | | all of them. The Chairman has read your witness |
| 6 | | statement and it will be introduced to the |
| 7 | | public through disclosure on the Inquiry's |
| 8 | | website. I am going to ask questions on two |
| 9 | | principal issues: firstly, to understand more |
| 10 | | about how and why discrete disclosure failings |
| 11 | | occurred, concerning search terms, reviewing |
| 12 | | families of documents and the de-duplication of |
| 13 | | documents, so that's a backward look; then, |
| 14 | | secondly, to seek to understand a little more |
| 15 | | about what the Post Office and its advisers have |
| 16 | | done to put things right for the future. |
| 17 | | Can I start with your career qualifications |
| 18 | | and expertise. You're a solicitor; is that |
| 19 | | right? |
| 20 | Α. | A barrister. |
| 21 | Q. | You're a barrister. You joined HSF in 2007; is |
| 22 | | that right? |
| 23 | Α. | Yes, that's right. |
| 24 | Q. | Becoming a partner in 2014? |
| 25 | Α. | Yes. |
| | | 165 |
| | | |
| 1 | | to the Inquiry? |

- 2 A. Yes, Peters & Peters, having advised on all of
- 3 the criminal proceedings, appeals and related
- 4 matters, were instructed by Post Office to
- 5 advise in relation to the criminal aspects of
- 6 the Inquiry. Typically, that will involve --
- 7 a substantial part of it involves responding to
- 8 Rule 9 Requests that relate to prosecutions but
- 9 there's a host of other work in addition to
- 10 that
- Q. So where does their role differ from that of 11 12 your own firm?
- 13 Α. Until recently, I was the recognised legal
- 14 representative so my firm were the solicitors of 15 record in the Inquiry, and we would engage with
- the Inquiry, receive the Inquiry's 16
- 17 correspondence, respond to its correspondence,
- receive Rule 9 requests and respond to them. 18
- Peters & Peters, I suppose their role is 19
- 20 a little bit more behind the scenes but doing
- 21 very similar work to the work we're doing,
- 22 albeit in the context of private prosecutions.
- 23 How many lawyers do they have working on the Q. 24 Inquiry.
- 25 I don't know, it's a relatively small team Α.

- Q. I think you first began work on the Inquiry on 1
 - behalf of the Post Office in October 2021?
- Yes, that's right. 3 Α.
- 4 Q. You took over from Andrew Lidbetter as the
 - designated or recognised legal representative
 - for the Post Office in April 2022; is that
- 7 right?
- 8 Α. Yes.
- 9 Q. You are, I think, supported by a substantial
- 10 team within HSF, presently -- is this right -three partners? 11
- Three more partners in addition to myself, yes. 12 Α.
- Q. Yes. You're supported by project management 13 specialists, legal analysts, paralegals, 14
- trainees, lawyers, of whom there are presently 15 16 150; is that right?
- 17 A. Yes, I think the number is slightly larger than
- 18 that, I think it's possibly increased towards
- 19 160, since I gave my statement.
- 20 Q. The legal team also consists of eight counsel,
- 21 including two silks; is that right?
- 22 Α. Yes, that's right.
- 23 Q. Can we look at other advisers please, firstly
- 24 Peters & Peters. Can you summarise for us,
- 25 please, the role of Peters & Peters in relation 166
- 1 supported by a larger junior barrister team. Q. How large is the junior barrister team? 2 3 Α. I don't know. 4 Are we talking three, four, five or 10, 20, 30? Q. A. I think it's towards the lower end of that scale 5 6 rather than the --7 Q. Two, three, four, five? 8 A. That's right. 9 Q. Can we look, please, at something that Peters & 10 Peters undertook. It's on page 9 of your 11 witness statement and it's paragraphs 29 to 31. 12 I just want to spend some time narrating this, 13 almost, because it has relevance to later 14 events. I think that's right, isn't it? A. Yes, it does. 15 Q. You tell us that: 16 17 "In late 2021, [Peters & Peters] were instructed by [the Post Office] to undertake 18 preparatory work relating to issues 109 to 161 19 20 in the Inquiry's Completed List of Issues ..."
- 21 "CLI", as you call them. Just summarising
- 22 109 to 161 in our list of issues, all concern
- 23 the conduct of private prosecutions by the Post
- 24 Office.
- 25 A. Yes.
- 168

| 5 September | 20 | 23 |
|-------------|----|----|
|-------------|----|----|

| | _ | |
|--|----------------------|---|
| 1 | Q. | Carrying on with the statement: |
| 2 | | "This work comprised the identification of |
| 3 | | material already available as part of the PCDE |
| 4 5 | | Convey just evaluated what the DCDE is |
| 6 | | Can you just explained what the PCDE is, please? |
| 7 | Α. | That stands for the Post-Conviction Disclosure |
| 8 | | Exercise, that's a substantial piece of work in |
| 9 | | identifying documents relevant to the criminal |
| 10 | | appeals, that includes case-specific documents |
| 11 | | but also more general documents that have the |
| 12 | | potential to cast doubt on a conviction. |
| 13 | Q. | The PCDE was itself an exercise undertaken by |
| 14 | | Peters & Peters? |
| 15 | Α. | Yes. |
| 16 | Q. | So it continued as part of the PCDE that was |
| 17 | | relevant to those issues: |
| 18 | | " preparing narrative documents that |
| 19 | | provided information relevant to the issues; |
| 20 | | obtaining additional documents and information; |
| 21 | | and conducting the further application of search |
| 22 | | terms and/or review of material related to |
| 23 | | expects of the PCDE as necessary to collate |
| 24 | | materials relevant to the issues. [Peters & |
| 25 | | Peters] began this work in January 2022." 169 |
| | | 109 |
| | | |
| 1 | | running searches." |
| 2 | | So just stopping there, I'm not going to |
| 3 | | deal with the exception that you then don't deal |
| 4 | | with. |
| 5 | | Just stopping there, are you saying there |
| 6 7 | | that, until recently, by which I take to mean |
| 8 | | after discovery of the disclosure issues that we're looking at today, your firm did not have |
| 9 | | visibility on what Peters & Peters had done in |
| 10 | | terms of the settling of search terms, the |
| 11 | | |
| | | - |
| 12 | | reviewing of family documents or their |
| | A. | - |
| 12 | Α. | reviewing of family documents or their interactions with KPMG on de-duplication. |
| 12 13 | A. Q. | reviewing of family documents or their interactions with KPMG on de-duplication. Generally not. It's possible that we had sight |
| 12 13 14 | | reviewing of family documents or their interactions with KPMG on de-duplication. Generally not. It's possible that we had sight of some of their search terms. |
| 12 13 14 15 | | reviewing of family documents or their interactions with KPMG on de-duplication. Generally not. It's possible that we had sight of some of their search terms. Sight of them meaning incidentally they might |
| 12 13 14 15 16 | | reviewing of family documents or their interactions with KPMG on de-duplication. Generally not. It's possible that we had sight of some of their search terms. Sight of them meaning incidentally they might have been disclosed in an email or a letter, as |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 | | reviewing of family documents or their interactions with KPMG on de-duplication. Generally not. It's possible that we had sight of some of their search terms. Sight of them meaning incidentally they might have been disclosed in an email or a letter, as opposed to "We're proposing to apply these |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | | reviewing of family documents or their interactions with KPMG on de-duplication. Generally not. It's possible that we had sight of some of their search terms. Sight of them meaning incidentally they might have been disclosed in an email or a letter, as opposed to "We're proposing to apply these search terms, do you think they're good, have |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. | reviewing of family documents or their interactions with KPMG on de-duplication. Generally not. It's possible that we had sight of some of their search terms. Sight of them meaning incidentally they might have been disclosed in an email or a letter, as opposed to "We're proposing to apply these search terms, do you think they're good, have you improvements to make"? Yes, that's right. That kind of visibility? |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. A. | reviewing of family documents or their interactions with KPMG on de-duplication. Generally not. It's possible that we had sight of some of their search terms. Sight of them meaning incidentally they might have been disclosed in an email or a letter, as opposed to "We're proposing to apply these search terms, do you think they're good, have you improvements to make"? Yes, that's right. That kind of visibility? Yes. |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. Q. | reviewing of family documents or their interactions with KPMG on de-duplication. Generally not. It's possible that we had sight of some of their search terms. Sight of them meaning incidentally they might have been disclosed in an email or a letter, as opposed to "We're proposing to apply these search terms, do you think they're good, have you improvements to make"? Yes, that's right. That kind of visibility? Yes. What has changed, therefore, recently in |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. A. Q. Q. | reviewing of family documents or their interactions with KPMG on de-duplication. Generally not. It's possible that we had sight of some of their search terms. Sight of them meaning incidentally they might have been disclosed in an email or a letter, as opposed to "We're proposing to apply these search terms, do you think they're good, have you improvements to make"? Yes, that's right. That kind of visibility? Yes. What has changed, therefore, recently in relation to those three issues? |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. Q. A. | reviewing of family documents or their interactions with KPMG on de-duplication. Generally not. It's possible that we had sight of some of their search terms. Sight of them meaning incidentally they might have been disclosed in an email or a letter, as opposed to "We're proposing to apply these search terms, do you think they're good, have you improvements to make"? Yes, that's right. That kind of visibility? Yes. What has changed, therefore, recently in |

| 1 | | Paragraph 30: |
|--|----------|--|
| 2 | | "When [the Post Office] received [Rule 9s] |
| 3 | | from the Inquiry relating to private |
| 4 | | prosecutions, my firm worked with [Peters & |
| 5 | | Peters] to prepare [the Post Office's] responses |
| 6 | | to the requests. The level of involvement of |
| 7 | | [Peters & Peters] has varied, depending in |
| 8 | | particular on the information and/or documents |
| 9 | | sought by the Rule 9 Requests. For certain |
| 10 | | Rule 9 Requests, [the Post Office] and my firm |
| 11 | | have utilised [Peters & Peters'] prior work |
| 12 | | product." |
| 13 | | Then 31: |
| 14 | | "For the Rule 9 Requests in which [Peters & |
| 15 | | Peters] have been involved, members of my team |
| 16 | | have worked closely with members of theirs, both |
| 17 | | in terms of agreeing the general approach on how |
| 18 | | to respond to the requests and in advising [the |
| 19 | | Post Office] as our mutual client. Until very |
| 20 | | recently, my firm has not generally been |
| 21 | | involved with [Peters & Peters'] conduct of |
| 22 | | reviews, including their devising of search |
| 23 | | terms, their consideration of whether or not to |
| 24 | | review family documents, or their instructions |
| 25 | | to KPMG in respect of de-duplication when 170 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | recently is the remediation and the accurance |
| 1 | | recently is the remediation and the assurance |
| 2 | | work and as part of aspects of that, we have |
| 2 3 | | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search |
| 2 3 4 | | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active |
| 2 3 4 5 | 0 | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Q. | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | - | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work that they are doing? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. A. | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work that they are doing? Well, I think because the approach to family |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | - | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work that they are doing? Well, I think because the approach to family documents is largely now settled, there's |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | - | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work that they are doing? Well, I think because the approach to family documents is largely now settled, there's an established approach, there can be variation |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | - | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work that they are doing? Well, I think because the approach to family documents is largely now settled, there's an established approach, there can be variation in it but, generally, the approach is to review |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | - | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work that they are doing? Well, I think because the approach to family documents is largely now settled, there's an established approach, there can be variation in it but, generally, the approach is to review family documents. I think that's common ground |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Α. | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work that they are doing? Well, I think because the approach to family documents is largely now settled, there's an established approach, there can be variation in it but, generally, the approach is to review family documents. I think that's common ground and understood. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | - | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work that they are doing? Well, I think because the approach to family documents is largely now settled, there's an established approach, there can be variation in it but, generally, the approach is to review family documents. I think that's common ground and understood. I'm winding forward to another topic but whilst |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Α. | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work that they are doing? Well, I think because the approach to family documents is largely now settled, there's an established approach, there can be variation in it but, generally, the approach is to review family documents. I think that's common ground and understood. I'm winding forward to another topic but whilst you've mentioned it, you said that the approach |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Α. | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work that they are doing? Well, I think because the approach to family documents is largely now settled, there's an established approach, there can be variation in it but, generally, the approach is to review family documents. I think that's common ground and understood. I'm winding forward to another topic but whilst you've mentioned it, you said that the approach to family documents is now firmly established. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Α. | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work that they are doing? Well, I think because the approach to family documents is largely now settled, there's an established approach, there can be variation in it but, generally, the approach is to review family documents. I think that's common ground and understood. I'm winding forward to another topic but whilst you've mentioned it, you said that the approach |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Α. | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work that they are doing? Well, I think because the approach to family documents is largely now settled, there's an established approach, there can be variation in it but, generally, the approach is to review family documents. I think that's common ground and understood. I'm winding forward to another topic but whilst you've mentioned it, you said that the approach to family documents is now firmly established. When we heard from Mrs Wills this morning, she said that it was for a backward look, it was |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Α. | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work that they are doing? Well, I think because the approach to family documents is largely now settled, there's an established approach, there can be variation in it but, generally, the approach is to review family documents. I think that's common ground and understood. I'm winding forward to another topic but whilst you've mentioned it, you said that the approach to family documents is now firmly established. When we heard from Mrs Wills this morning, she |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Α. | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work that they are doing? Well, I think because the approach to family documents is largely now settled, there's an established approach, there can be variation in it but, generally, the approach is to review family documents. I think that's common ground and understood. I'm winding forward to another topic but whilst you've mentioned it, you said that the approach to family documents is now firmly established. When we heard from Mrs Wills this morning, she said that it was for a backward look, it was established that family documents were now to be |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Α. | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work that they are doing? Well, I think because the approach to family documents is largely now settled, there's an established approach, there can be variation in it but, generally, the approach is to review family documents. I think that's common ground and understood. I'm winding forward to another topic but whilst you've mentioned it, you said that the approach to family documents is now firmly established. When we heard from Mrs Wills this morning, she said that it was for a backward look, it was established that family documents were now to be reviewed where they hadn't been reviewed in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Α. | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work that they are doing? Well, I think because the approach to family documents is largely now settled, there's an established approach, there can be variation in it but, generally, the approach is to review family documents. I think that's common ground and understood. I'm winding forward to another topic but whilst you've mentioned it, you said that the approach to family documents is now firmly established. When we heard from Mrs Wills this morning, she said that it was for a backward look, it was established that family documents were now to be reviewed where they hadn't been reviewed in previous Rule 9s but, in the future, an approach |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Α. | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work that they are doing? Well, I think because the approach to family documents is largely now settled, there's an established approach, there can be variation in it but, generally, the approach is to review family documents. I think that's common ground and understood. I'm winding forward to another topic but whilst you've mentioned it, you said that the approach to family documents is now firmly established. When we heard from Mrs Wills this morning, she said that it was for a backward look, it was established that family documents were now to be reviewed where they hadn't been reviewed in previous Rule 9s but, in the future, an approach hadn't been settled and it was going to be done |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Α. | work and as part of aspects of that, we have worked with Peters & Peters to devise search terms. Broadly speaking, we've had more active involvement. What about family documents in relation to work that they are doing? Well, I think because the approach to family documents is largely now settled, there's an established approach, there can be variation in it but, generally, the approach is to review family documents. I think that's common ground and understood. I'm winding forward to another topic but whilst you've mentioned it, you said that the approach to family documents is now firmly established. When we heard from Mrs Wills this morning, she said that it was for a backward look, it was established that family documents were now to be reviewed where they hadn't been reviewed in previous Rule 9s but, in the future, an approach hadn't been settled and it was going to be done on a case-by-case basis. Is that correct or |

| 1 | | speaking, the approach will be to review |
|--|----------|--|
| 2 | | families but, within that proposition, there are |
| 3 | | different ways of going about it and each Rule 9 |
| 4 | | Request will have to be considered on its merits |
| 5 | | to decide precisely how to approach it. But, |
| 6 | | broadly speaking, yes, the approach going |
| 7 | | forward will be to review families, and, if |
| 8 | | I may, I would clarify that may be the families |
| 9 | | only of keyword responsive documents that are |
| 10 | | identified as being relevant or it may be all |
| 11 | | families, depending on the circumstances. So |
| 12 | | they're two of the main alternatives that might |
| 13 | | be pursued. |
| 14 | Q. | We'll come back to that a little later. You say |
| 15 | | here that your firm was not, until recently, |
| 16 | | aware of the instructions given to KPMG by |
| 17 | | Peters & Peters about de-duplication. Did you |
| 18 | | know that Peters & Peters were giving |
| 19 | | instructions to KPMG about de-duplication? |
| 20 | Α. | Personally, I wouldn't have I wouldn't have |
| 21 | | known that. I think, whether the HSF team were |
| 22 | | aware of that specifically, I don't know. |
| 23 | | I think it could be inferred that they would be |
| 24 | | giving instructions about de-duplication because |
| 25 | | that's precisely the sort of thing that, in 173 |
| 1 | | have had to understand from KPMG this the |
| 2 | | occasions on which they applied item-level |
| 3 | | de-duplication. I think that would always have |
| 4 | _ | been necessary. |
| 5 | Q. | Has that been a very simple and straightforward |
| 6 | | task in understanding from KPMG when they |
| 7 | | de-duplicated and, if they did, which form of |
| 8 | | de-duplication they applied? |
| 9 | A. | No, it hasn't. |
| 10 | Q. | Has it been the precise opposite of that? Yes, it has. |
| 11 12 | Α. | |
| 12 | ^ | , |
| 12 | Q. | Can you explain why that is? Why it has been |
| 13 14 | | Can you explain why that is? Why it has been problematic and difficult? |
| 14 | Q. A. | Can you explain why that is? Why it has been problematic and difficult? My understanding is that there hasn't been |
| 14 15 | | Can you explain why that is? Why it has been problematic and difficult? My understanding is that there hasn't been a clear auditable record of the occasions on |
| 14 15 16 | | Can you explain why that is? Why it has been problematic and difficult? My understanding is that there hasn't been a clear auditable record of the occasions on which item-level de-duplication was applied, so |
| 14 15 16 17 | | Can you explain why that is? Why it has been problematic and difficult? My understanding is that there hasn't been a clear auditable record of the occasions on which item-level de-duplication was applied, so it's had to be ascertained from a very forensic |
| 14 15 16 17 18 | | Can you explain why that is? Why it has been problematic and difficult? My understanding is that there hasn't been a clear auditable record of the occasions on which item-level de-duplication was applied, so it's had to be ascertained from a very forensic and detailed review of contemporaneous |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 | | Can you explain why that is? Why it has been problematic and difficult? My understanding is that there hasn't been a clear auditable record of the occasions on which item-level de-duplication was applied, so it's had to be ascertained from a very forensic and detailed review of contemporaneous materials, and that has taken a long period of |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Α. | Can you explain why that is? Why it has been problematic and difficult? My understanding is that there hasn't been a clear auditable record of the occasions on which item-level de-duplication was applied, so it's had to be ascertained from a very forensic and detailed review of contemporaneous materials, and that has taken a long period of time. |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | | Can you explain why that is? Why it has been problematic and difficult? My understanding is that there hasn't been a clear auditable record of the occasions on which item-level de-duplication was applied, so it's had to be ascertained from a very forensic and detailed review of contemporaneous materials, and that has taken a long period of time. We just heard from Mr Tombleson who sat in the |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Α. | Can you explain why that is? Why it has been problematic and difficult? My understanding is that there hasn't been a clear auditable record of the occasions on which item-level de-duplication was applied, so it's had to be ascertained from a very forensic and detailed review of contemporaneous materials, and that has taken a long period of time. We just heard from Mr Tombleson who sat in the same chair as you saying that there was a clear |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Α. | Can you explain why that is? Why it has been problematic and difficult? My understanding is that there hasn't been a clear auditable record of the occasions on which item-level de-duplication was applied, so it's had to be ascertained from a very forensic and detailed review of contemporaneous materials, and that has taken a long period of time. We just heard from Mr Tombleson who sat in the |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Α. | Can you explain why that is? Why it has been problematic and difficult? My understanding is that there hasn't been a clear auditable record of the occasions on which item-level de-duplication was applied, so it's had to be ascertained from a very forensic and detailed review of contemporaneous materials, and that has taken a long period of time. We just heard from Mr Tombleson who sat in the same chair as you saying that there was a clear record disclosed by because of the unusual |
| 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Α. | Can you explain why that is? Why it has been problematic and difficult? My understanding is that there hasn't been a clear auditable record of the occasions on which item-level de-duplication was applied, so it's had to be ascertained from a very forensic and detailed review of contemporaneous materials, and that has taken a long period of time. We just heard from Mr Tombleson who sat in the same chair as you saying that there was a clear record disclosed by because of the unusual nature of the request for item-level |

| 1 | | an eDisclosure exercise, would be part of the |
|--|----------|---|
| 2 | | instructions. |
| 3 | Q. | Surely, you would want to ensure a consistent |
| 4 | | approach between the firms? |
| 5 | Α. | I think it's difficult to speak in such general |
| 6 | | terms. Each Rule 9 Request and often questions |
| 7 | | within Rule 9 requests have to be dealt with on |
| 8 | | their own merits and it's a multifactorial |
| 9 | | assessment where there are so many different |
| 10 | | inputs. We certainly shared a common objective |
| 11 | | of fulfilling Post Office's disclosure |
| 12 | | obligations but how to do that will vary so much |
| 13 | | between requests that I think it's difficult to |
| 14 15 | Q. | speak of a common approach. |
| 15 16 | Q. | Wouldn't you at least wish to know what each firm was doing in terms of de-duplication? |
| 17 | Α. | Not necessarily, no, I don't think so. |
| 18 | Q. | Well, in the absence of knowledge or is this |
| 10 | α. | absence of knowledge of what Peters & Peters |
| 20 | | were instructing KPMG to do, one of the reasons |
| 21 | | why the de-duplication of errors has taken |
| 22 | | a significant time to put right, because you |
| 23 | | have had needed to find out from KPMG exactly |
| 24 | | what had happened in the first place? |
| 25 | Α. | Yes, between ourselves and Peters & Peters, we |
| | | 174 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | evchances between associates and senior |
| 1 | | exchanges between associates and senior |
| 2 | | associates and his managers and senior managers. |
| | Α. | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? |
| 2 3 | A. | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see |
| 2 3 4 | A. | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | A. | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the dialogue between our senior associates and |
| 2 3 4 5 | A. | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | A. Q. | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the dialogue between our senior associates and KPMG's managers. So, to that extent, there is |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the dialogue between our senior associates and KPMG's managers. So, to that extent, there is a record, yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the dialogue between our senior associates and KPMG's managers. So, to that extent, there is a record, yes. Given that there is a record, why has it been |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the dialogue between our senior associates and KPMG's managers. So, to that extent, there is a record, yes. Given that there is a record, why has it been difficult and problematic to work out when |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the dialogue between our senior associates and KPMG's managers. So, to that extent, there is a record, yes. Given that there is a record, why has it been difficult and problematic to work out when de-duplication has occurred and, if so, what |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the dialogue between our senior associates and KPMG's managers. So, to that extent, there is a record, yes. Given that there is a record, why has it been difficult and problematic to work out when de-duplication has occurred and, if so, what form that de-duplication has taken? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the dialogue between our senior associates and KPMG's managers. So, to that extent, there is a record, yes. Given that there is a record, why has it been difficult and problematic to work out when de-duplication has occurred and, if so, what form that de-duplication has taken? My understanding is that simply to find the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the dialogue between our senior associates and KPMG's managers. So, to that extent, there is a record, yes. Given that there is a record, why has it been difficult and problematic to work out when de-duplication has occurred and, if so, what form that de-duplication has taken? My understanding is that simply to find the emails in between ourselves and KPMG, there |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the dialogue between our senior associates and KPMG's managers. So, to that extent, there is a record, yes. Given that there is a record, why has it been difficult and problematic to work out when de-duplication has occurred and, if so, what form that de-duplication has taken? My understanding is that simply to find the emails in between ourselves and KPMG, there are probably hundreds, possibly many hundreds, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the dialogue between our senior associates and KPMG's managers. So, to that extent, there is a record, yes. Given that there is a record, why has it been difficult and problematic to work out when de-duplication has occurred and, if so, what form that de-duplication has taken? My understanding is that simply to find the emails in between ourselves and KPMG, there are probably hundreds, possibly many hundreds, of emails on a daily basis. It's a constant |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the dialogue between our senior associates and KPMG's managers. So, to that extent, there is a record, yes. Given that there is a record, why has it been difficult and problematic to work out when de-duplication has occurred and, if so, what form that de-duplication has taken? My understanding is that simply to find the emails in between ourselves and KPMG, there are probably hundreds, possibly many hundreds, of emails on a daily basis. It's a constant dialogue. And my understanding is that for KPMG |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the dialogue between our senior associates and KPMG's managers. So, to that extent, there is a record, yes. Given that there is a record, why has it been difficult and problematic to work out when de-duplication has occurred and, if so, what form that de-duplication has taken? My understanding is that simply to find the emails in between ourselves and KPMG, there are probably hundreds, possibly many hundreds, of emails on a daily basis. It's a constant dialogue. And my understanding is that for KPMG to identify the relevant instructions from those |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the dialogue between our senior associates and KPMG's managers. So, to that extent, there is a record, yes. Given that there is a record, why has it been difficult and problematic to work out when de-duplication has occurred and, if so, what form that de-duplication has taken? My understanding is that simply to find the emails in between ourselves and KPMG, there are probably hundreds, possibly many hundreds, of emails on a daily basis. It's a constant dialogue. And my understanding is that for KPMG to identify the relevant instructions from those emails has taken time. I should say, I'm |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the dialogue between our senior associates and KPMG's managers. So, to that extent, there is a record, yes. Given that there is a record, why has it been difficult and problematic to work out when de-duplication has occurred and, if so, what form that de-duplication has taken? My understanding is that simply to find the emails in between ourselves and KPMG, there are probably hundreds, possibly many hundreds, of emails on a daily basis. It's a constant dialogue. And my understanding is that for KPMG to identify the relevant instructions from those emails has taken time. I should say, I'm explaining my understanding. Obviously KPMG |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the dialogue between our senior associates and KPMG's managers. So, to that extent, there is a record, yes. Given that there is a record, why has it been difficult and problematic to work out when de-duplication has occurred and, if so, what form that de-duplication has taken? My understanding is that simply to find the emails in between ourselves and KPMG, there are probably hundreds, possibly many hundreds, of emails on a daily basis. It's a constant dialogue. And my understanding is that for KPMG to identify the relevant instructions from those emails has taken time. I should say, I'm explaining my understanding. Obviously KPMG would be they would be able to explain |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the dialogue between our senior associates and KPMG's managers. So, to that extent, there is a record, yes. Given that there is a record, why has it been difficult and problematic to work out when de-duplication has occurred and, if so, what form that de-duplication has taken? My understanding is that simply to find the emails in between ourselves and KPMG, there are probably hundreds, possibly many hundreds, of emails on a daily basis. It's a constant dialogue. And my understanding is that for KPMG to identify the relevant instructions from those emails has taken time. I should say, I'm explaining my understanding. Obviously KPMG would be they would be able to explain precisely what steps they've taken. I think we just heard from Mr Tombleson, who said actually it was quite straightforward. Has |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. | associates and his managers and senior managers. From your perspective, is that correct? Certainly when you find the emails you can see what has been instructed and you can see the dialogue between our senior associates and KPMG's managers. So, to that extent, there is a record, yes. Given that there is a record, why has it been difficult and problematic to work out when de-duplication has occurred and, if so, what form that de-duplication has taken? My understanding is that simply to find the emails in between ourselves and KPMG, there are probably hundreds, possibly many hundreds, of emails on a daily basis. It's a constant dialogue. And my understanding is that for KPMG to identify the relevant instructions from those emails has taken time. I should say, I'm explaining my understanding. Obviously KPMG would be they would be able to explain precisely what steps they've taken. I think we just heard from Mr Tombleson, who |

| 1 | Α. | |
|----------|----------|---|
| 2 | Q. | |
| 3 | | witness statement at paragraph 25. You say that |
| 4 | | the Post Office's eDiscovery provider is KPMG, |
| 5 | | who are directly accountable to the Post Office |
| 6 | | for their work. Does that first sentence mean |
| 7 | | that KPMG liaise directly with the Post Office |
| 8 | | about eDisclosure directly, because they were |
| 9 | | directly accountable to them? |
| 10 | Α. | 5 |
| 11 | | relation to resourcing, as others have mentioned |
| 12 | | today, that dialogue would take place |
| 13 | | principally between KPMG and Post Office. |
| 14 | | Forgive me, in terms of instructions on |
| 15 | | specific items of eDiscovery workflow, those |
| 16 | | instructions would come from ourselves or from |
| 17 | ~ | Peters & Peters. |
| 18 | Q. | 5 5 |
| 19 | | to them by HSF on a Rule 9 by Rule 9 basis? |
| 20 | A. | Yes, and Peters & Peters, yes. |
| 21 22 | Q. | If KPMG were working to your instructions and those of Peters & Peters, rather than from |
| 22 | | instructions given on a detailed basis by the |
| 23 24 | | Post Office, how did the Post Office maintain |
| 24 | | oversight and supervision of what was being |
| 20 | | 177 |
| | | |
| 1 | | Post Office evaluating in detail the stars that |
| 1 2 | | Post Office explaining in detail the steps that |
| | | we were taking in the conduct of their |
| 3 4 | | disclosure and, in those emails, we identified that we were reviewing keyword responsive |
| 4 5 | | documents. |
| 6 | Q. | I missed a word there, you were reviewing? |
| 7 | Q. A. | Keyword responsive documents, hits. |
| 8 | Q. | Thank you. |
| 9 | Q. A. | So to that extent, we explained the position to |
| 10 | | Post Office. |
| 11 | Q. | But nothing telling them of the nature of the |
| 12 | ч. | de-duplication that had happened before your |
| 13 | | review nor of |
| 14 | Α. | No. |
| 15 | Q. | the extent to which a reviewer might search |
| 16 | ч. | for or not search for family documents, as part |
| 17 | | of their review? |
| 18 | Α. | |
| 19 | | de-duplication and I think I've answered the |
| 20 | | question in relation to family documents. What |
| 21 | | we explained was that we were reviewing keyword |
| 22 | | responsive documents. |
| 23 | Q. | So you didn't tell the Post Office that you were |
| 24 | | not reviewing family documents? |
| 25 | Α. | Yes, yes. |
| | | 179 |
| | | |

| zon IT | [Inq | uiry 5 September |
|--------|-------|--|
| 1 | | carried out in its name? |
| 2 | Α. | I can only speak to our engagement with Post |
| 2 | А. | Office in relation to eDiscovery and KPMG's role |
| 4 | | and eDiscovery issues were a subject that we |
| 5 | | discussed intermittently when there were points |
| 6 | | to discuss. |
| 7 | Q. | To your knowledge, was there any intrusive |
| 8 | | oversight and supervision directly from the Post |
| 9 | | Office of the way that KPMG was carrying out its |
| 10 | | work? |
| 11 | Α. | No, there wasn't. I should say nor would |
| 12 | | I expect there to see that sort of |
| 13 | | examination of what an eDiscovery provider is |
| 14 | | doing. |
| 15 | Q. | To your knowledge, were there any communications |
| 16 | | before these issues were discovered from either |
| 17 | | Peters & Peters or HSF back to the Post Office, |
| 18 | | explaining the way in which de-duplication was |
| 19 | | being carried out? |
| 20 | Α. | No. |
| 21 | Q. | Same question in relation to whether or not |
| 22 | | families of documents were being reviewed? |
| 23 | Α. | Generally speaking, the approach of my firm |
| 24 | | I can't speak for Peters & Peters, but for my |
| 25 | | firm was to send regular email updates to |
| | | 178 |
| 1 | Q. | Was there any reason for that, for not telling |
| 2 | Q. | them this? |
| 2 | Α. | I don't think there was a particular reason. |
| 4 | А. | I think that the explanation that we were |
| 5 | | reviewing keyword responsive documents, that |
| 6 | | indicated the approach that we were taking. |
| 7 | Q. | But you could say to a client, "Look, there's |
| 8 | ч. | two ways of conducting a de-duplication |
| 9 | | exercise, or at least two ways of conducting |
| 10 | | a de-duplication exercise. We've got a very |
| 11 | | difficult dataset here because of the sources of |
| 12 | | it, that adds a layer of complexity. We could |
| 13 | | do or instruct KPMG to do item-level |
| 14 | | de-duplication, that's has these consequences, |
| 15 | | or we could instruct them to do family level |
| 16 | | de-duplication, that has these consequences |
| 17 | | a larger pool of documents" |
| 18 | Α. | Yes. |
| 19 | Q. | "that will have these cost consequences". |
| 20 | | From what I'm understanding, none of that |
| 21 | | happened in relation to de-duplication? |
| 22 | Α. | No, and, in fact, I don't think members of my |
| 23 | | team had in mind that there were different types |
| 24 | | of de-duplication that might be applied. |
| 25 | ~ | Wall come to examine that in a memort In |

25 **Q.** We'll come to examine that in a moment. In 180

| | relation to the review of family documents, | 1 | | statement. |
|----|---|----|----|--|
| | again, have I understood you correctly to say | 2 | | If we scroll down please, and I'm picking |
| | that there wasn't communication back to the | 3 | | this up partway through the exercise and you're |
| | client about when and in what circumstances that | 4 | | telling us here about after a de-duplication |
| | was occurring? | 5 | | exercise has happened, irrespective of the |
| Α. | Yes, that's right. | 6 | | species of de-duplication, when the pool of |
| Q. | What was the reason for that? | 7 | | documents is given back to your firm, what then |
| Α. | I think that the way the updates were drafted | 8 | | happens; is that right? |
| | was simply the updates generally were | 9 | Α. | Yes. |
| | incredibly detailed and I think the way that the | 10 | Q. | You say: |
| | approach was expressed was that we're reviewing | 11 | | "The first level review is typically |
| | keyword responsive documents and it was a form | 12 | | conducted by reviewers in our ALT (Alternative |
| | of drafting more than anything else. | 13 | | Legal Services) team or an associate team in |
| Q. | It was a form of? | 14 | | London and/or elsewhere in my firm's global |
| Α. | Drafting. It was the way in which the | 15 | | network." |
| | explanations were drafted. | 16 | | So this is the first level of review. The |
| Q. | That only tells half a story, doesn't it? It | 17 | | Alternative Legal Services team, where are they |
| | says what you are doing but it assumes that the | 18 | | located? |
| | client knows what you're not doing. | 19 | Α. | They have hubs around the world, principally the |
| Α. | I think, with the benefit of hindsight, I think | 20 | | team working on this matter has been based in |
| | that's fair. | 21 | | Belfast and Johannesburg. More recently, we've |
| Q. | Can we move forward to the stage when you get to | 22 | | involved resource in Melbourne, Australia. |
| | the review, please, so after a de-duplication | 23 | Q. | So Belfast, Johannesburg and more recently |
| | exercise has taken place, and look at | 24 | | Australia? |
| | paragraph 48(e) on page 18 of your witness 181 | 25 | Α. | Yes. 182 |
| | | | | |
| Q. | Are the members of the Alternative Legal | 1 | Q. | In a moment we're going to come to look at the |
| | Services team conducting the reviews for the | 2 | | reviews of families of documents and, in |
| | Post Office lawyers? | 3 | | particular, whether these reviewers were |
| Α. | Sorry, I don't entirely understand the question. | 4 | | instructed to look at documents that were within |
| Q. | Are they lawyers? | 5 | | a family of which a responsive document was |
| Α. | The first level reviewers are typically made up | 6 | | a part. Can we just jump ahead to that issue |
| | of what we call legal analysts and senior legal | 7 | | now and see what you say about it, in |
| | analysts. They tend to be law graduates, | 8 | | paragraph 95 on page 37 of your witness |
| _ | they're supervised by lawyers. | 9 | | statement. You say: |
| Q. | So law graduates but not qualified in their | 10 | | "It should be noted that when a decision is |
| | jurisdiction or our own? | 11 | | taken that family documents need not be reviewed |
| Α. | Yes. | 12 | | that does not mean that they cannot be |
| Q. | So they don't hold a practising certificate? | 13 | | considered. Unless they have been removed in |
| Α. | No. | 14 | | the de-duplication process, the entire family of |
| Q. | Are they dedicated to working on this Inquiry or | 15 | | each document to be reviewed is still available |
| | might they be working on a number of disclosure | 16 | | to our reviewers whilst not reviewing family |
| | exercises at once? | 17 | | members will be the default when that decision |
| Α. | Generally, we had a core team that was committed | 18 | | has been made. If the reviewer considers the |
| | to working on the Inquiry. There were occasions | 19 | | content of a document within a family is such |
| | where there were lulls, in which case members of | 20 | | that there might be other documents within that |
| | the team would work on other things. There were | 21 | | family which should be reviewed to understand |
| | occasions where, such as the present one, where | 22 | | the context of responsive document, then they |
| | we needed to drawn in more resource, in which | 23 | | will proceed to conduct that further review." |

- we needed to drawn in more resource, in which case we bring in people from -- that may have
- been working on different things.

Α.

Α.

Q.

Q.

Q.

Α.

Q.

Α. Yes.

Q.

Α. No.

Q.

(46) Pages 181 - 184

The reviewer that's being referred to here,

is that right, the individual within, in the

| 1 | | first instance, the Alternative Legal Services |
|--|----------------------|---|
| 2 | | team? |
| 3 | Α. | In the first instance, yes. |
| 4 | Q. | So you've got these people in other parts of the |
| 5 | | world who were graduates in law, but not legally |
| 6 | | qualified, making decisions on whether to look |
| 7 | | at family documents or not? |
| 8 | Α. | For the purpose of assessing whether the |
| 9 10 | | document they're actually looking at is |
| 10 11 | ^ | responsive or possibly privileged. |
| 12 | Q. | Not for the purpose of establishing whether there are other documents within the family that |
| 12 | | might be relevant to the request that they are |
| 14 | | addressing? |
| 15 | Α. | Generally, that wouldn't be their role as first |
| 16 | Λ. | level reviewers no. |
| 17 | Q. | Why wouldn't it be their role? |
| 18 | Α. | The way that reviews are set up, generally |
| 19 | | speaking they conduct linear reviews of |
| 20 | | documents that are batched to them, documents |
| 21 | | might be batched in, say, sets of 50, and the |
| 22 | | expectation of the reviewers is that they review |
| 23 | | the documents in front of them and they're not, |
| 24 | | if you like, going on a train of enquiry. If |
| 25 | | they see a particular document, it's not their |
| | | 185 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | they think that will be helpful to determine |
| 1 2 | | they think that will be helpful to determine whether a document is relevant or privileged for |
| | | |
| 2 | | whether a document is relevant or privileged for |
| 2 3 | | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they |
| 2 3 4 | | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. |
| 2 3 4 5 | | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. I have to say, I don't know whether that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. I have to say, I don't know whether that instruction is in writing or given verbally but, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Q. | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. I have to say, I don't know whether that instruction is in writing or given verbally but, from the enquiries that I've made, I'm satisfied |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. I have to say, I don't know whether that instruction is in writing or given verbally but, from the enquiries that I've made, I'm satisfied that it's given. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. A. | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. I have to say, I don't know whether that instruction is in writing or given verbally but, from the enquiries that I've made, I'm satisfied that it's given. But they're not the people we should be expecting to go on a train of enquiry? No. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. I have to say, I don't know whether that instruction is in writing or given verbally but, from the enquiries that I've made, I'm satisfied that it's given. But they're not the people we should be expecting to go on a train of enquiry? No. Who are the people we should be expected to go |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A. Q. | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. I have to say, I don't know whether that instruction is in writing or given verbally but, from the enquiries that I've made, I'm satisfied that it's given. But they're not the people we should be expecting to go on a train of enquiry? No. Who are the people we should be expected to go on the train of enquiry? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Α. | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. I have to say, I don't know whether that instruction is in writing or given verbally but, from the enquiries that I've made, I'm satisfied that it's given. But they're not the people we should be expecting to go on a train of enquiry? No. Who are the people we should be expected to go on the train of enquiry? If anybody goes on a train of enquiry, it would |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. Q. | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. I have to say, I don't know whether that instruction is in writing or given verbally but, from the enquiries that I've made, I'm satisfied that it's given. But they're not the people we should be expecting to go on a train of enquiry? No. Who are the people we should be expected to go on the train of enquiry? If anybody goes on a train of enquiry, it would be at the second-level review stage. So, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. Q. | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. I have to say, I don't know whether that instruction is in writing or given verbally but, from the enquiries that I've made, I'm satisfied that it's given. But they're not the people we should be expecting to go on a train of enquiry? No. Who are the people we should be expected to go on the train of enquiry? If anybody goes on a train of enquiry, it would be at the second-level review stage. So, typically, the documents that are identified at |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. Q. | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. I have to say, I don't know whether that instruction is in writing or given verbally but, from the enquiries that I've made, I'm satisfied that it's given. But they're not the people we should be expecting to go on a train of enquiry? No. Who are the people we should be expected to go on the train of enquiry? If anybody goes on a train of enquiry, it would be at the second-level review stage. So, typically, the documents that are identified at first-level review as being relevant are then |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. Q. | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. I have to say, I don't know whether that instruction is in writing or given verbally but, from the enquiries that I've made, I'm satisfied that it's given. But they're not the people we should be expecting to go on a train of enquiry? No. Who are the people we should be expected to go on the train of enquiry? If anybody goes on a train of enquiry, it would be at the second-level review stage. So, typically, the documents that are identified at first-level review as being relevant are then reviewed by lawyers, principally based in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | А. Q. А. | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. I have to say, I don't know whether that instruction is in writing or given verbally but, from the enquiries that I've made, I'm satisfied that it's given. But they're not the people we should be expecting to go on a train of enquiry? No. Who are the people we should be expected to go on the train of enquiry? If anybody goes on a train of enquiry, it would be at the second-level review stage. So, typically, the documents that are identified at first-level review as being relevant are then reviewed by lawyers, principally based in London, almost inclusively based in London. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. Q. | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. I have to say, I don't know whether that instruction is in writing or given verbally but, from the enquiries that I've made, I'm satisfied that it's given. But they're not the people we should be expecting to go on a train of enquiry? No. Who are the people we should be expected to go on the train of enquiry? If anybody goes on a train of enquiry, it would be at the second-level review stage. So, typically, the documents that are identified at first-level review as being relevant are then reviewed by lawyers, principally based in London. But, by that stage, a lot of documents will have |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | А. Q. А. | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. I have to say, I don't know whether that instruction is in writing or given verbally but, from the enquiries that I've made, I'm satisfied that it's given. But they're not the people we should be expecting to go on a train of enquiry? No. Who are the people we should be expected to go on the train of enquiry? If anybody goes on a train of enquiry, it would be at the second-level review stage. So, typically, the documents that are identified at first-level review as being relevant are then reviewed by lawyers, principally based in London, almost inclusively based in London. But, by that stage, a lot of documents will have been excluded including their families by the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | А. Q. А. | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. I have to say, I don't know whether that instruction is in writing or given verbally but, from the enquiries that I've made, I'm satisfied that it's given. But they're not the people we should be expecting to go on a train of enquiry? No. Who are the people we should be expected to go on the train of enquiry? If anybody goes on a train of enquiry, it would be at the second-level review stage. So, typically, the documents that are identified at first-level review as being relevant are then reviewed by lawyers, principally based in London, almost inclusively based in London. But, by that stage, a lot of documents will have been excluded including their families by the first tier of reviewers, won't they? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. Q. A. Q. | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. I have to say, I don't know whether that instruction is in writing or given verbally but, from the enquiries that I've made, I'm satisfied that it's given. But they're not the people we should be expecting to go on a train of enquiry? No. Who are the people we should be expected to go on the train of enquiry? If anybody goes on a train of enquiry, it would be at the second-level review stage. So, typically, the documents that are identified at first-level review as being relevant are then reviewed by lawyers, principally based in London, almost inclusively based in London. But, by that stage, a lot of documents will have been excluded including their families by the first tier of reviewers, won't they? Yes, that's right. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | А. Q. А. | whether a document is relevant or privileged for context, possibly. That is something that they routinely do when conducting hits-only reviews. I have to say, I don't know whether that instruction is in writing or given verbally but, from the enquiries that I've made, I'm satisfied that it's given. But they're not the people we should be expecting to go on a train of enquiry? No. Who are the people we should be expected to go on the train of enquiry? If anybody goes on a train of enquiry, it would be at the second-level review stage. So, typically, the documents that are identified at first-level review as being relevant are then reviewed by lawyers, principally based in London, almost inclusively based in London. But, by that stage, a lot of documents will have been excluded including their families by the first tier of reviewers, won't they? |

| 1 | | role to look at that document and to see where |
|--|--|--|
| 2 | _ | it takes them, as it were. |
| 3 | Q. | So although what you said in paragraph 95 is |
| 4 | | correct, that the reviewing pane displayed to |
| 5 | | the reviewer would allow them to go and look at |
| 6 | | the family, in practice, that's not their |
| 7 | | function? |
| 8 | Α. | Well, they would look at the families, actually. |
| 9 | | They're encouraged to look at families in order |
| 10 | | to determine the relevance of the document |
| 11 | | they're actually looking at. It may be that |
| 12 | | it's it may be that they want to understand |
| 13 | | something more about the documents and they |
| 14 | | think it is helpful to go and look at a family |
| 15 | | member. So, in those circumstances, they're |
| 16 | | encouraged to do that. Whether or not they do |
| 17 | | it will depend on the judgement of the |
| 18 | | individual reviewer in the given case. |
| 19 | Q. | Were written instructions given to these people |
| 20 | | within the ALT about when and in what |
| 21 | | circumstances they should access the facility |
| 22 | | within the reviewing pane to look at family |
| 23 | | documents? |
| 24 | Α. | Part of their workflow, when we're conducting |
| 25 | | a hits-only review, is to look to families when |
| | | 186 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | they, because they don't know that they exist, |
| 1 2 | | they, because they don't know that they exist, they're not within their batch? |
| | А. | |
| 2 | А. | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have |
| 2 3 | A. | they're not within their batch? |
| 2 3 4 | A. Q. | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. |
| 2 3 4 5 | | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level reviewers are appropriately following a train of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level reviewers are appropriately following a train of enquiry? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. A. | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level reviewers are appropriately following a train of enquiry? (<i>The witness shook his head</i>) |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. A. Q. | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level reviewers are appropriately following a train of enquiry? (<i>The witness shook his head</i>) No, because that's what their job? No, precisely. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. A. Q. A. | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level reviewers are appropriately following a train of enquiry? (<i>The witness shook his head</i>) No, because that's what their job? No, precisely. So the QCing process is not going to bring more |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. A. Q. A. | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level reviewers are appropriately following a train of enquiry? (<i>The witness shook his head</i>) No, because that's what their job? No, precisely. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. A. Q. A. | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level reviewers are appropriately following a train of enquiry? (<i>The witness shook his head</i>) No, because that's what their job? No, precisely. So the QCing process is not going to bring more documents back within the pool on the basis of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. A. Q. Q. | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level reviewers are appropriately following a train of enquiry? (<i>The witness shook his head</i>) No, because that's what their job? No, precisely. So the QCing process is not going to bring more documents back within the pool on the basis of a failure to look at families? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. A. Q. Q. A. | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level reviewers are appropriately following a train of enquiry? (<i>The witness shook his head</i>) No, because that's what their job? No, precisely. So the QCing process is not going to bring more documents back within the pool on the basis of a failure to look at families? No, that's right. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. Q. Q. A. | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level reviewers are appropriately following a train of enquiry? (<i>The witness shook his head</i>) No, because that's what their job? No, precisely. So the QCing process is not going to bring more documents back within the pool on the basis of a failure to look at families? No, that's right. So if the second and perhaps third-level |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. Q. Q. A. | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level reviewers are appropriately following a train of enquiry? (<i>The witness shook his head</i>) No, because that's what their job? No, precisely. So the QCing process is not going to bring more documents back within the pool on the basis of a failure to look at families? No, that's right. So if the second and perhaps third-level reviews which is lawyers in London, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level reviewers are appropriately following a train of enquiry? (<i>The witness shook his head</i>) No, because that's what their job? No, precisely. So the QCing process is not going to bring more documents back within the pool on the basis of a failure to look at families? No, that's right. So if the second and perhaps third-level reviews which is lawyers in London, essentially? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q. | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level reviewers are appropriately following a train of enquiry? (<i>The witness shook his head</i>) No, because that's what their job? No, precisely. So the QCing process is not going to bring more documents back within the pool on the basis of a failure to look at families? No, that's right. So if the second and perhaps third-level reviews which is lawyers in London, essentially? Yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q. | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level reviewers are appropriately following a train of enquiry? (<i>The witness shook his head</i>) No, because that's what their job? No, precisely. So the QCing process is not going to bring more documents back within the pool on the basis of a failure to look at families? No, that's right. So if the second and perhaps third-level reviews which is lawyers in London, essentially? Yes. Do they include, amongst their tasks, reviewing |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. Q. A. Q. | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level reviewers are appropriately following a train of enquiry? (<i>The witness shook his head</i>) No, because that's what their job? No, precisely. So the QCing process is not going to bring more documents back within the pool on the basis of a failure to look at families? No, that's right. So if the second and perhaps third-level reviews which is lawyers in London, essentially? Yes. Do they include, amongst their tasks, reviewing whether the ALT staff abroad have appropriately |
| 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. Q. A. Q. | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level reviewers are appropriately following a train of enquiry? (<i>The witness shook his head</i>) No, because that's what their job? No, precisely. So the QCing process is not going to bring more documents back within the pool on the basis of a failure to look at families? No, that's right. So if the second and perhaps third-level reviews which is lawyers in London, essentially? Yes. Do they include, amongst their tasks, reviewing whether the ALT staff abroad have appropriately looked at family documents? They can't, can |
| 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. A. Q. A. Q. | they're not within their batch? Well, there is some QC over documents that have been tagged as not being relevant. So people do look at those documents but for QC purposes. But is the QC process, the quality control process, picking up whether the first-level reviewers are appropriately following a train of enquiry? (<i>The witness shook his head</i>) No, because that's what their job? No, precisely. So the QCing process is not going to bring more documents back within the pool on the basis of a failure to look at families? No, that's right. So if the second and perhaps third-level reviews which is lawyers in London, essentially? Yes. Do they include, amongst their tasks, reviewing whether the ALT staff abroad have appropriately looked at family documents? They can't, can they? |

| 1 | | documents"? |
|--|----------|---|
| 2 | Q. | Yes, whether they have found a document that's |
| 3 | | responsive to a search term, a hit, looked at |
| 4 | | the reviewing panel, seen that there are |
| 5 | | 25 other documents of which that's a family, |
| 6 | | gone into those other documents, seen that |
| 7 | | they're actually relevant to this Rule 9 |
| 8 | | Request, "We'd better disclose those"? |
| 9 | Α. | No, they wouldn't be looking they wouldn't be |
| 10 | | conducting their analysis of the document for |
| 11 | | that purpose. |
| 12 | Q. | So who does, then? Who checks families for |
| 13 | | relevant material? |
| 14 | Α. | Well, it is open to the second-level reviewers |
| 15 | | to turn to review the families of keyword |
| 16 | | responsive documents that come through to |
| 17 | | second-level review. So if they're to be |
| 18 | | reviewed, it would be at that stage. |
| 19 | Q. | But they're looking at an already narrowed pool? |
| 20 | Α. | Yes, they are. |
| 21 | Q. | Is that still the position today? |
| 22 | Α. | The there are different approaches to |
| 23 | | reviewing family documents. Either the two |
| 24 | | main ones and I mentioned this earlier, are |
| 25 | | two when conducting a review, to look at all 189 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | bolow wo will? |
| 1 | ٨ | below, we will"? |
| 2 | Α. | No, it's really not as simple as that. There |
| 2 3 | A. | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform |
| 2 3 4 | A. | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and |
| 2 3 4 5 | A. | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Α. | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Α. | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. There's no hard and fast rule and there really |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Α. | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. There's no hard and fast rule and there really shouldn't be. It's a much more thoughtful and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. There's no hard and fast rule and there really shouldn't be. It's a much more thoughtful and careful exercise. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | A. Q. | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. There's no hard and fast rule and there really shouldn't be. It's a much more thoughtful and careful exercise. Can we return to keyword searches before again |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. There's no hard and fast rule and there really shouldn't be. It's a much more thoughtful and careful exercise. Can we return to keyword searches before again going back to the family issue because the two |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. There's no hard and fast rule and there really shouldn't be. It's a much more thoughtful and careful exercise. Can we return to keyword searches before again going back to the family issue because the two feed into each other. If we turn up |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. There's no hard and fast rule and there really shouldn't be. It's a much more thoughtful and careful exercise. Can we return to keyword searches before again going back to the family issue because the two feed into each other. If we turn up paragraph 48(a) of your witness statement which |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. There's no hard and fast rule and there really shouldn't be. It's a much more thoughtful and careful exercise. Can we return to keyword searches before again going back to the family issue because the two feed into each other. If we turn up paragraph 48(a) of your witness statement which is on page 17. If we just scroll down, you set |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. There's no hard and fast rule and there really shouldn't be. It's a much more thoughtful and careful exercise. Can we return to keyword searches before again going back to the family issue because the two feed into each other. If we turn up paragraph 48(a) of your witness statement which is on page 17. If we just scroll down, you set out the process. At the beginning of the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. There's no hard and fast rule and there really shouldn't be. It's a much more thoughtful and careful exercise. Can we return to keyword searches before again going back to the family issue because the two feed into each other. If we turn up paragraph 48(a) of your witness statement which is on page 17. If we just scroll down, you set |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. There's no hard and fast rule and there really shouldn't be. It's a much more thoughtful and careful exercise. Can we return to keyword searches before again going back to the family issue because the two feed into each other. If we turn up paragraph 48(a) of your witness statement which is on page 17. If we just scroll down, you set out the process. At the beginning of the process, you say: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. There's no hard and fast rule and there really shouldn't be. It's a much more thoughtful and careful exercise. Can we return to keyword searches before again going back to the family issue because the two feed into each other. If we turn up paragraph 48(a) of your witness statement which is on page 17. If we just scroll down, you set out the process. At the beginning of the process, you say: "We send each request [Rule 9 Request] to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. There's no hard and fast rule and there really shouldn't be. It's a much more thoughtful and careful exercise. Can we return to keyword searches before again going back to the family issue because the two feed into each other. If we turn up paragraph 48(a) of your witness statement which is on page 17. If we just scroll down, you set out the process. At the beginning of the process, you say: "We send each request [Rule 9 Request] to [the Post Office] and discuss with [the Post |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. There's no hard and fast rule and there really shouldn't be. It's a much more thoughtful and careful exercise. Can we return to keyword searches before again going back to the family issue because the two feed into each other. If we turn up paragraph 48(a) of your witness statement which is on page 17. If we just scroll down, you set out the process. At the beginning of the process, you say: "We send each request [Rule 9 Request] to [the Post Office] and discuss with [the Post Office] what is likely to be required, including |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. There's no hard and fast rule and there really shouldn't be. It's a much more thoughtful and careful exercise. Can we return to keyword searches before again going back to the family issue because the two feed into each other. If we turn up paragraph 48(a) of your witness statement which is on page 17. If we just scroll down, you set out the process. At the beginning of the process, you say: "We send each request [Rule 9 Request] to [the Post Office] and discuss with [the Post Office] what is likely to be required, including which of the relevant methods above are likely |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. There's no hard and fast rule and there really shouldn't be. It's a much more thoughtful and careful exercise. Can we return to keyword searches before again going back to the family issue because the two feed into each other. If we turn up paragraph 48(a) of your witness statement which is on page 17. If we just scroll down, you set out the process. At the beginning of the process, you say: "We send each request [Rule 9 Request] to [the Post Office] and discuss with [the Post Office] what is likely to be required, including which of the relevant methods above are likely to yield relevant documents, identifying the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. There's no hard and fast rule and there really shouldn't be. It's a much more thoughtful and careful exercise. Can we return to keyword searches before again going back to the family issue because the two feed into each other. If we turn up paragraph 48(a) of your witness statement which is on page 17. If we just scroll down, you set out the process. At the beginning of the process, you say: "We send each request [Rule 9 Request] to [the Post Office] and discuss with [the Post Office] what is likely to be required, including which of the relevant methods above are likely to yield relevant documents, identifying the repositories that need to be searched the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | | No, it's really not as simple as that. There are so many different factors that inform a decision as to how to approach a review and it's a very dynamic situation, decisions have to be made iteratively and sometimes revisited. There's no hard and fast rule and there really shouldn't be. It's a much more thoughtful and careful exercise. Can we return to keyword searches before again going back to the family issue because the two feed into each other. If we turn up paragraph 48(a) of your witness statement which is on page 17. If we just scroll down, you set out the process. At the beginning of the process, you say: "We send each request [Rule 9 Request] to [the Post Office] and discuss with [the Post Office] what is likely to be required, including which of the relevant methods above are likely to yield relevant documents, identifying the repositories that need to be searched the extent to which harvests of potentially relevant |

| 1 | | of the keyword responsive documents and all of |
|------|----|---|
| 2 | | their families. The alternative is to look at |
| 3 | | the keyword responsive documents that are tagged |
| 4 | | as being relevant and their families. Both of |
| 5 | | those options are being used. The teams have to |
| 6 | | judge in individual circumstances which of those |
| 7 | | options to pursue. |
| 8 | Q. | What determines that judgement? What are the |
| 9 | | relevant factors? |
| 10 | Α. | There are a host of factors. Obviously a key |
| 11 | | one is the expectation based on the knowledge |
| 12 | | that the senior associate setting up the review |
| 13 | | have of the dataset and the issues, but the |
| 14 | | expectation is to the likelihood of identifying |
| 15 | | relevant documents in the family document set. |
| 16 | | And, again, that will vary case by case. It |
| 17 | | will also depend very significantly on the |
| 18 | | number of family documents that exist. |
| 19 | | In this matter, what we call the family |
| 20 | | multiplier has been very high, that's the number |
| 21 | | of additional family documents you get in |
| 22 | | addition to the keyword responsive documents. |
| 23 | Q. | The family multiplier question, how is that |
| 24 | | answered? Is it "If the family multiplier is X |
| 25 | | or above, we won't do it, whereas if it's Y or |
| | | 190 |
| | | |
| 4 | | how continue and an approximate and up to adjust to |
| 1 | | harvesting and processing and uploading to |
| 2 | | Relativity of any additional materials." |
| 3 | | That suggests that currently you discuss |
| 4 | | with the Post Office the formulation of keyword |
| 5 | | searches, correct? |
| 6 | A. | Yes. |
| 7 | Q. | Would you agree that that's the sensible and |
| 8 | | indeed necessary approach, because the Post |
| 9 | | Office and its employees are most likely to be |
| 10 | | in possession of relevant knowledge to be able |
| 11 | | to develop accurate and reliable search terms? |
| 12 | Α. | No, I don't think I would agree with that. |
| 13 | | Often, when we devise keyword searches, it's |
| 14 | | based on prior discussions with subject matter |
| 15 | | experts within the Post Office business. So if |
| 16 | | I could give you an example, in the context of |
| 17 | | the civil proceedings aspect of this phase, one |
| 18 | | of the early things that members of my team did |
| 19 | | was to go out and speak to a large number of |
| 20 | | people, subject matter experts in the Post |
| 21 | | Office business, I think there were about 14 of |
| 22 | | them, and obviously that's a multifaceted |
| .,,, | | conversation tellung about desuments truing to |

conversation, talking about documents, trying to

It's those sorts of conversations that are

understand the issues.

(48) Pages 189 - 192

| 1 | | the basis for members of my team and I should |
|---|----------------------|---|
| 2 | | say there are many other things as well, |
| 3 | | familiarity with documents being another obvious |
| 4 | | one. There are many different inputs but it's |
| 5 | | on the basis of those inputs they would then |
| 6 | | devise search terms and then sent those search |
| 7 | | terms to the Post Office. |
| 8 | Q. | Has that always been the case: that you've |
| 9 | | involved, to the maximum extent possible, as |
| 10 | | a firm, the Post Office in the development of |
| 11 | | search terms? |
| 12 | Α. | Look, I wouldn't like to say to the maximum |
| 13 | | extent possible. That's I think that |
| 14 | | probably puts it too high. But certainly what |
| 15 16 | | we have always sought to do is engage |
| 10 | | extensively with people within the Post Office business to understand the issues that are the |
| 18 | | subject matter of the Inquiry, issues on which |
| 19 | | they have background or expertise, and they will |
| 20 | | inform the approach that we take. |
| 21 | | We would also obviously be in dialogue with |
| 22 | | members of the Post Office Inquiry Team. |
| 23 | Q. | So it's the case that in the Rule 9 Requests |
| 24 | | that have been served on the Post Office by this |
| 25 | | Inquiry, the Post Office has been involved |
| | | 193 |
| | | |
| 1 | | the Post Office in relation to the search terms |
| | | |
| 2 | | now under discussion." |
| 2 3 | | now under discussion." When you say "The search terms are generally |
| | | |
| 3 | | When you say "The search terms are generally |
| 3 4 | | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that |
| 3 4 5 | | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that on some occasions your firm does share search |
| 3 4 5 6 | А. | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that on some occasions your firm does share search terms with the Post Office and other terms (<i>sic</i>) |
| 3 4 5 6 7 | А. | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that on some occasions your firm does share search terms with the Post Office and other terms <i>(sic)</i> keeps them to themselves and doesn't share them. |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A. | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that on some occasions your firm does share search terms with the Post Office and other terms <i>(sic)</i> keeps them to themselves and doesn't share them. I would say that we share them in all or nearly |
| 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 | A. Q. | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that on some occasions your firm does share search terms with the Post Office and other terms (<i>sic</i>) keeps them to themselves and doesn't share them. I would say that we share them in all or nearly all circumstances. I can't say absolutely that |
| 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that on some occasions your firm does share search terms with the Post Office and other terms (<i>sic</i>) keeps them to themselves and doesn't share them. I would say that we share them in all or nearly all circumstances. I can't say absolutely that they have always been shared. So generally should be read as all or nearly all? |
| 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. A. | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that on some occasions your firm does share search terms with the Post Office and other terms <i>(sic)</i> keeps them to themselves and doesn't share them. I would say that we share them in all or nearly all circumstances. I can't say absolutely that they have always been shared. So generally should be read as all or nearly all? Yes. |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that on some occasions your firm does share search terms with the Post Office and other terms (<i>sic</i>) keeps them to themselves and doesn't share them. I would say that we share them in all or nearly all circumstances. I can't say absolutely that they have always been shared. So generally should be read as all or nearly all? Yes. Okay. What determines whether search terms are |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. A. | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that on some occasions your firm does share search terms with the Post Office and other terms (<i>sic</i>) keeps them to themselves and doesn't share them. I would say that we share them in all or nearly all circumstances. I can't say absolutely that they have always been shared. So generally should be read as all or nearly all? Yes. Okay. What determines whether search terms are not shared or would it just be oversight if they |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. A. Q. | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that on some occasions your firm does share search terms with the Post Office and other terms (<i>sic</i>) keeps them to themselves and doesn't share them. I would say that we share them in all or nearly all circumstances. I can't say absolutely that they have always been shared. So generally should be read as all or nearly all? Yes. Okay. What determines whether search terms are not shared or would it just be oversight if they haven't? |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that on some occasions your firm does share search terms with the Post Office and other terms <i>(sic)</i> keeps them to themselves and doesn't share them. I would say that we share them in all or nearly all circumstances. I can't say absolutely that they have always been shared. So generally should be read as all or nearly all? Yes. Okay. What determines whether search terms are not shared or would it just be oversight if they haven't? I think I would be, yes. The intention would be |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. Q. A. | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that on some occasions your firm does share search terms with the Post Office and other terms (<i>sic</i>) keeps them to themselves and doesn't share them. I would say that we share them in all or nearly all circumstances. I can't say absolutely that they have always been shared. So generally should be read as all or nearly all? Yes. Okay. What determines whether search terms are not shared or would it just be oversight if they haven't? I think I would be, yes. The intention would be to share search terms. |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. A. Q. | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that on some occasions your firm does share search terms with the Post Office and other terms (<i>sic</i>) keeps them to themselves and doesn't share them. I would say that we share them in all or nearly all circumstances. I can't say absolutely that they have always been shared. So generally should be read as all or nearly all? Yes. Okay. What determines whether search terms are not shared or would it just be oversight if they haven't? I think I would be, yes. The intention would be to share search terms. You say: |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. Q. A. | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that on some occasions your firm does share search terms with the Post Office and other terms <i>(sic)</i> keeps them to themselves and doesn't share them. I would say that we share them in all or nearly all circumstances. I can't say absolutely that they have always been shared. So generally should be read as all or nearly all? Yes. Okay. What determines whether search terms are not shared or would it just be oversight if they haven't? I think I would be, yes. The intention would be to share search terms. You say: " I do not believer that we received |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. A. | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that on some occasions your firm does share search terms with the Post Office and other terms (<i>sic</i>) keeps them to themselves and doesn't share them. I would say that we share them in all or nearly all circumstances. I can't say absolutely that they have always been shared. So generally should be read as all or nearly all? Yes. Okay. What determines whether search terms are not shared or would it just be oversight if they haven't? I think I would be, yes. The intention would be to share search terms. You say: " I do not believer that we received specific input of feedback from POL in relation |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. A. | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that on some occasions your firm does share search terms with the Post Office and other terms (<i>sic</i>) keeps them to themselves and doesn't share them. I would say that we share them in all or nearly all circumstances. I can't say absolutely that they have always been shared. So generally should be read as all or nearly all? Yes. Okay. What determines whether search terms are not shared or would it just be oversight if they haven't? I think I would be, yes. The intention would be to share search terms. You say: " I do not believer that we received specific input of feedback from POL in relation to the search terms now under discussion." |
| 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. | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that on some occasions your firm does share search terms with the Post Office and other terms (<i>sic</i>) keeps them to themselves and doesn't share them. I would say that we share them in all or nearly all circumstances. I can't say absolutely that they have always been shared. So generally should be read as all or nearly all? Yes. Okay. What determines whether search terms are not shared or would it just be oversight if they haven't? I think I would be, yes. The intention would be to share search terms. You say: " I do not believer that we received specific input of feedback from POL in relation to the search terms now under discussion." Are you relating that sentence, ie "under |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. A. | When you say "The search terms are generally shared with [Post Office]" does that mean that on some occasions your firm does share search terms with the Post Office and other terms (<i>sic</i>) keeps them to themselves and doesn't share them. I would say that we share them in all or nearly all circumstances. I can't say absolutely that they have always been shared. So generally should be read as all or nearly all? Yes. Okay. What determines whether search terms are not shared or would it just be oversight if they haven't? I think I would be, yes. The intention would be to share search terms. You say: " I do not believer that we received specific input of feedback from POL in relation to the search terms now under discussion." |

| 1 | | appropriately at all stages in the development |
|--|----------------------|--|
| 2 | | of search terms to respond to them, and it's not |
| 3 | | a matter where the Post Office can say, "That's |
| 4 | | down to our legal advisers and not us"? |
| 5 | Α. | I think there's a lot in that question. |
| 6 | | Certainly, we have, necessarily in our role, had |
| 7 | | extensive engagement with the Post Office |
| 8 | | business and, again, as I've said, we've sought |
| 9 | | to understand documents issues, and a part of |
| 10 | | that has been informing the content of search |
| 11 | | terms. I have to say, I wouldn't necessarily |
| 12 | | expect Post Office as a client to be commenting |
| 13 | | in detail on the search terms that we devise. |
| 14 | | Some clients might but others might not. So |
| 15 | | I don't think it necessarily follows that |
| 16 | | because Post Office weren't actively commenting |
| 17 | | on search terms, that or that a client isn't |
| 18 | | actually commenting on search terms, that that |
| 19 | - | should be seen as being inappropriate. |
| 20 | Q. | Can we look at paragraph 61, please on page 23 |
| 21 | | of your witness statement. It's the last |
| 22 | | sentence, you say: |
| 23 | | "The search terms are generally shared with |
| 24 | | [the Post Office], although I do not believe |
| 25 | | that we received specific input or feedback from 194 |
| | | 104 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | a section of your witness statement, I should |
| 2 | | say, which is talking about the use of search |
| 2 3 | | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look |
| 2 3 4 | • | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? |
| 2 3 4 5 | A. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | A. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | A. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions 15 and 46(a) which were the ones that my firm |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions 15 and 46(a) which were the ones that my firm devised. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. Q. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions 15 and 46(a) which were the ones that my firm devised. So that sentence there "now under discussion" |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions 15 and 46(a) which were the ones that my firm devised. So that sentence there "now under discussion" means "insofar as I'm discussing the relevant |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions 15 and 46(a) which were the ones that my firm devised. So that sentence there "now under discussion" means "insofar as I'm discussing the relevant parts of Rule 9(11) and (14)"? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. A. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions 15 and 46(a) which were the ones that my firm devised. So that sentence there "now under discussion" means "insofar as I'm discussing the relevant parts of Rule 9(11) and (14)"? Yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions 15 and 46(a) which were the ones that my firm devised. So that sentence there "now under discussion" means "insofar as I'm discussing the relevant parts of Rule 9(11) and (14)"? Yes. Okay. You say that you don't believe that there |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. A. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions 15 and 46(a) which were the ones that my firm devised. So that sentence there "now under discussion" means "insofar as I'm discussing the relevant parts of Rule 9(11) and (14)"? Yes. Okay. You say that you don't believe that there was any specific input or feedback from POL in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. A. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions 15 and 46(a) which were the ones that my firm devised. So that sentence there "now under discussion" means "insofar as I'm discussing the relevant parts of Rule 9(11) and (14)"? Yes. Okay. You say that you don't believe that there was any specific input or feedback from POL in relation to those. How frequently did the Post |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions 15 and 46(a) which were the ones that my firm devised. So that sentence there "now under discussion" means "insofar as I'm discussing the relevant parts of Rule 9(11) and (14)"? Yes. Okay. You say that you don't believe that there was any specific input or feedback from POL in relation to those. How frequently did the Post Office give input or feedback in relation to the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. Q. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions 15 and 46(a) which were the ones that my firm devised. So that sentence there "now under discussion" means "insofar as I'm discussing the relevant parts of Rule 9(11) and (14)"? Yes. Okay. You say that you don't believe that there was any specific input or feedback from POL in relation to those. How frequently did the Post Office give input or feedback in relation to the search terms that were shared with it? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. A. Q. A. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions 15 and 46(a) which were the ones that my firm devised. So that sentence there "now under discussion" means "insofar as I'm discussing the relevant parts of Rule 9(11) and (14)"? Yes. Okay. You say that you don't believe that there was any specific input or feedback from POL in relation to those. How frequently did the Post Office give input or feedback in relation to the search terms that were shared with it? I don't recall whether that happened at all. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. Q. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions 15 and 46(a) which were the ones that my firm devised. So that sentence there "now under discussion" means "insofar as I'm discussing the relevant parts of Rule 9(11) and (14)"? Yes. Okay. You say that you don't believe that there was any specific input or feedback from POL in relation to those. How frequently did the Post Office give input or feedback in relation to the search terms that were shared with it? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. Q. A. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions 15 and 46(a) which were the ones that my firm devised. So that sentence there "now under discussion" means "insofar as I'm discussing the relevant parts of Rule 9(11) and (14)"? Yes. Okay. You say that you don't believe that there was any specific input or feedback from POL in relation to those. How frequently did the Post Office give input or feedback in relation to the search terms that were shared with it? I don't recall whether that happened at all. So for the last couple of years, despite sharing search terms with the Post Office on all or |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. A. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions 15 and 46(a) which were the ones that my firm devised. So that sentence there "now under discussion" means "insofar as I'm discussing the relevant parts of Rule 9(11) and (14)"? Yes. Okay. You say that you don't believe that there was any specific input or feedback from POL in relation to those. How frequently did the Post Office give input or feedback in relation to the search terms that were shared with it? I don't recall whether that happened at all. So for the last couple of years, despite sharing |
| 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. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions 15 and 46(a) which were the ones that my firm devised. So that sentence there "now under discussion" means "insofar as I'm discussing the relevant parts of Rule 9(11) and (14)"? Yes. Okay. You say that you don't believe that there was any specific input or feedback from POL in relation to those. How frequently did the Post Office give input or feedback in relation to the search terms that were shared with it? I don't recall whether that happened at all. So for the last couple of years, despite sharing search terms with the Post Office on all or nearly all occasions, say for oversight, the |
| 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. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions 15 and 46(a) which were the ones that my firm devised. So that sentence there "now under discussion" means "insofar as I'm discussing the relevant parts of Rule 9(11) and (14)"? Yes. Okay. You say that you don't believe that there was any specific input or feedback from POL in relation to those. How frequently did the Post Office give input or feedback in relation to the search terms that were shared with it? I don't recall whether that happened at all. So for the last couple of years, despite sharing search terms with the Post Office on all or nearly all occasions, say for oversight, the Post Office has never come back and said, "Hold |
| 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. A. | say, which is talking about the use of search terms generally, not when you turn later to look at Rule 9(11) and 14? Yes. I think I am and I think I probably have I have in mind, in particular, the search terms relating to request 11, questions 15 and 46(a) which were the ones that my firm devised. So that sentence there "now under discussion" means "insofar as I'm discussing the relevant parts of Rule 9(11) and (14)"? Yes. Okay. You say that you don't believe that there was any specific input or feedback from POL in relation to those. How frequently did the Post Office give input or feedback in relation to the search terms that were shared with it? I don't recall whether that happened at all. So for the last couple of years, despite sharing search terms with the Post Office on all or nearly all occasions, say for oversight, the Post Office has never come back and said, "Hold on, what about X or Y? I don't think that's |

The Post Office Horizon IT Inquiry

| 1 | | word"? | 1 |
|----|----|--|----|
| 2 | Α. | No. Save, I should clarify, that recently, as | 2 |
| 2 | | these issues have come to light, and we've been | 3 |
| 4 | | focusing on remediation, the Post Office team, | 4 |
| 5 | | in the way that Mrs Wills described, has been | 5 |
| 6 | | more active and engaged in relation to search | 6 |
| 7 | | terms. | 7 |
| 8 | Q. | ls your impression that's because of the issues | 8 |
| 9 | ч. | that have been uncovered or maybe even a change | 9 |
| 10 | | of personnel? | 10 |
| 11 | Α. | I think it's the issues that have been | 11 |
| 12 | | uncovered is certainly a factor. | 12 |
| 13 | Q. | So a more proactive and involved client, would | 13 |
| 14 | - | that be a fair way of describing it? | 14 |
| 15 | Α. | Very much so. | 15 |
| 16 | Q. | Turning from the general, then, to the specific | 16 |
| 17 | | and the use of the search terms in relation to | 17 |
| 18 | | parts of Rule 9(11) and (14). I wonder whether | 18 |
| 19 | | we can turn to paragraph 65 on page 24, which is | 19 |
| 20 | | over the page. It's the foot of the page. You | 20 |
| 21 | | say: | 21 |
| 22 | | "The particular sub-questions relating to | 22 |
| 23 | | prosecutions or investigations policies were 15 | 23 |
| 24 | | and 46(a)" | 24 |
| 25 | | This is Rule 9(11). Then over the page to | 25 |
| | | 197 | |
| 1 | | can see it on the page: | 1 |
| 2 | | "This was part of the preparatory work | 2 |
| 3 | | relating to issues 109 to 161 in the [Concluded | 3 |
| 4 | | List of Issues] that [the Post Office] | 4 |
| 5 | | instructed [Peters & Peters] to undertake, and | 5 |
| 6 | | one of a number of workstreams that [the Post | 6 |
| 7 | | Office] has instructed [Peters & Peters] to | 7 |
| 8 | | carry out in connection with criminal matters | 8 |
| 9 | | that are relevant to Phase 4. | 9 |
| 10 | | "69. As part of [that, Peters & Peters] | 10 |
| 11 | | utilised the work that they had undertaken as | 11 |
| 12 | | part of the PCDE I understand that the | 12 |
| 13 | | approach to the Policy Review was adopted in | 13 |
| 14 | | anticipation of [the Post Office] receiving | 14 |
| 15 | | Rule 9 Requests When [the first request was | 15 |
| 16 | | issued Peters & Peters] were in the early stages | 16 |
| 17 | | of the Policy Review, and we liaised with them | 17 |
| 18 | | in order to draw upon their work when | 18 |
| 19 | | responding to Questions 15 and 46(a)." | 19 |
| 20 | | So essentially saying the first method was | 20 |
| 21 | | that work had already been undertaken or was | 21 |
| 22 | | being undertaken by Peters & Peters by reference | 22 |
| 23 | | to the concluded list of issues, paragraph 109. | 23 |
| 24 | | Had that turned up Appendix 3? | 24 |
| 25 | Α. | Yes, I think it had. My recollection is that it | 25 |

| 1 | | page 25, please, you set them out and if I just |
|-------------------|----|--|
| 2 | | read the relevant parts. 15, last sentence: |
| 3 | | "Please provide copies of the same [that's |
| 4 | | prosecutions policy] and copies of all |
| 5 | | iterations of the prosecutions policy since 1999 |
| 6 | | that are in POL's custody or control." |
| 7 | | Then 46(a): |
| 8 | | "Please provide copies of the same [that's |
| 9 | | an investigations policy] and copies of all |
| 10 | | iterations of the investigations policy since |
| 11 | | 1999 that are in POL's custody or control." |
| 12 | | You say that you used, or your firm used, |
| 13 | | three principal methods to identify documents |
| 14 | | that were responsive to those two requests. If |
| 15 | | you go to the foot of the page, please. At 68, |
| 16 | | method one, you say: |
| 17 | | "First, it was clear that these documents |
| 18 | | would be sought by the Inquiry, so in January |
| 10 | | 2022 a workstream (the 'Policy Review'), was |
| | | |
| 20 | | scoped by [Peters & Peters] together with [the |
| 21 | | Post Office], and on which my team was asked to |
| 22 | | comment, one aspect of which was targeting the |
| 23 | | documents referred to in CLI [that's the |
| 24 | | Concluded List of Issues] 109." |
| 25 | | That is set out in paragraph 66 above. We 198 |
| | | 100 |
| 1 | | had done, and we actually wrote to the Inquiry |
| 2 | | setting out a list of documents that we'd |
| 2 | | identified that we didn't think were responsive |
| 4 | | to the particular requests. The requests were |
| - 5 | | focusing on very specific documents, the |
| | | |
| 6 7 | | prosecutions policy and the investigations |
| 7 | | policy. We knew what those documents were, we |
| 8 | | had various iterations, so did Peters & Peters. |
| 9 | | So we knew what we were looking for. |
| 10 | | But in the process of the exercise that |
| 11 | | I describe in these paragraphs of my statement, |
| 12 | | miscellaneous other documents had been |
| 13 | | identified, and I think I'm right in saying it |
| 14 | | that I think it was Peters & Peters who |
| 15 | | identified Appendix 3 and, again, we wrote to |
| 16 | | the Inquiry drawing |
| 17 | Q. | Was that part of a suite of documents, a family |
| 18 | | of documents, when it was identified? |
| 19 | Α. | If it was in Peters & Peters forgive me, |
| 20 | | I don't recall which there are a number of |
| 21 | | iterations of Appendix 3 and I don't recall, as |
| 22 | | l sit here, which one specifically was |
| 23 | | identified. What we know, though, is that the |
| 24 | | iteration of Appendix 3 that formed part of the |
| 25 | | PCDE was a standalone version, so it didn't |
| | | 200 |

(50) Pages 197 - 200

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10 **A**.

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13 **A**.

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

team, and the individual who subsequently

[sic] Appendix 6 ... At that time, we were provided with various iterations of the

of criminal investigations' policy."

a version of Appendix 3?

identified the suite of appendices concerning

prosecutions policy and versions of a 'conduct

approaches -- or did those approaches turn over

By that, are you saying that those

No, I think the work that I'm describing there,

responding to the Freedom of Information Act

prosecutions, I think it was concerned with the

Q. Nobody that was approached said "Hold on, there

is this collection of documents which we used

when we prosecuted anyone. They're part of

a collection of documents, and they're all in

a zip file that was commonly distributed to all

and sundry and, by the way, there's this

racially offensive document within them"?

A. I don't think that happened in the FOIA context.

I think in the policy review that I describe at

paragraph 69, as part of that exercise, Peters & 202

now calling the suite of documents -- existed. They satisfied themselves in conversation with

they'd harvested it and I think it was believed

insofar as they'd harvested it and it was in any

that, because of the breadth of the PCDE,

way relevant, it would have been in there.

That's my understanding of the position.

Q. So the answer is that there was a belief that

responding to the Inquiry's request? Yes, neither Peters & Peters nor my firm

Q. Then the third method, if we follow down at paragraph 71, is the use of search terms, and

search criteria, whilst I appreciate that

paragraph 72, please. You say:

you set out what they are. We've looked at that

"Looking back at the search terms and the

Appendix 6 was not responsive to them, even with

now about Appendix 6 and the suite of documents

the benefit of hindsight and knowing what I do

to which it belonged, doing my best to be

204

already so I'm going to skip over the page to

reviewed Appendix 6.

they must have had it but, in fact, it wasn't accessed or reviewed for the purposes of

the member of the Post Office Security Team that

prosecutions and investigations policy and I don't think it had turned up Appendix 3.

request that was concerned with the

| 1 | | have |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | Q. | It didn't have Appendix 6 as part of its family? |
| 3 | Α. | No, it didn't have any family members. |
| 4 | Q. | So do you think that's the version of Appendix 3 |
| 5 | | you're talking about now? |
| 6 | Α. | I think it is but if I misremembered then I'll |
| 7 | | correct that subsequently. |
| 8 | Q. | You say in paragraph 70, if we scroll down, the |
| 9 | | second method was liaising with the Post Office |
| 10 | | to try to find relevant documents. This |
| 11 | | included consideration of a FOIA request in 2020 |
| 12 | | that the Post Office had received seeking the |
| 13 | | "current guidance and/or rules provided to POL |
| 14 | | prosecutors and investigators": |
| 15 | | "As part of our work we liaised |
| 16 | | extensively with POL and others to try to |
| 17 | | understand the policies that were in place at |
| 18 | | various times. We had been in contact with |
| 19 | | POL's Head of Security Operations and we also |
| 20 | | sought information directly from [Peters & |
| 21 | | Peters] and Cartwright King Members of [the |
| 22 | | Post Office's FOIA] request team also spoke |
| 23 | | directly with individuals in POL's business |
| 24 | | including the team lead investigator, the |
| 25 | | manager of the intelligence and administration |
| | | 201 |
| | | |
| 1 | | Peters spoke with various people within Post |
| 2 | | Office's Security team. I understand that in |
| 3 | | one of those conversations, the suite of |
| 4 | | documents was referred to in general terms, no |
| 5 | | reference to racist or offensive language, but |
| 6 | | it was referred into general terms. |
| 7 | Q. | Was that chased down or not? I assume not? |
| 8 | Α. | Well, it was established in the context of that |
| 9 | | conversation that Peters & Peters already had |
| 10 | | harvested the suite of documents, as they did. |
| 11 | | What goes wrong is that the version of the |
| 12 | | suite or the version of Appendix 3 in the |
| 13 | | PCDE just so happens not to have any family |
| 14 | | members. |
| 15 | Q. | So did nobody put two and two together and say, |
| 16 | | "Hold on, we've been told about a suite of |
| 17 | | documents which was essentially a compliance |
| 18 | | requirement, you had to do the things in the |
| 19 | | suite if you wanted to prosecute a person. |
| 20 | | We've got a bit of that, but we haven't got the |
| 21 | | rest of it"? |
| 22 | Α. | My understanding, and, again, this is work that |
| 23 | | Peters & Peters did, is that they'd understood |
| 24 | | that the suite of documents and I don't think |
| 25 | | it was described in those terms, but what we're |
| | | 202 |

| (51) | Pages | 201 | - 20 |
|------|-------|-----|------|

the word?

| 1 | | objective, I consider these to be a reasonable |
|---|----------------|---|
| 2 | | set of search terms The Inquiry's request |
| 3 | | was for two specific documents and the |
| 4 | | search terms sought to home in specifically on |
| 5 | | prosecution or investigation policies. |
| 6 | | Appendix 6 is in many ways an extraordinary |
| 7 | | document. It contains no words about policy, |
| 8 | | procedures or guidance. Using search terms |
| 9 | | targeting policies and procedures, it would only |
| 10 | | be possible to generate search terms to which |
| 11 | | Appendix 6 responded if one knew about the |
| 12 | | existence of the document first." |
| 13 | | So that's essentially the same point that |
| 14 | | Mrs Wills was making this morning, in a slightly |
| 15 | | less direct way. But what you said there only |
| 16 | | focuses on the reasonableness of the search |
| 17 | | terms, doesn't it? |
| 18 | Α. | Yes. |
| 19 | Q. | I think you would agree that search terms, or |
| 20 | | viewing search terms as being the beginning and |
| 21 | | the end of a search for relevant materials is |
| 22 | | a folly? |
| 23 | Α. | Not necessarily, no, I wouldn't agree with that. |
| 24 | Q. | You wouldn't? You think that can be appropriate |
| 25 | | to use and only to use search terms and only |
| | | 205 |
| | | |
| 1 | | At the foot of the page, paragraph 83, |
| 0 | | Request 14 materially asks at question 18 for: |
| 2 | | Request 14 materially asks at question 10 lor. |
| 2 3 | | "Policies and guidelines relating to the |
| | | |
| 3 | | "Policies and guidelines relating to the |
| 3 4 | | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against |
| 3 4 5 | | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against subpostmasters and other end users alleged |
| 3 4 5 6 | | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against subpostmasters and other end users alleged to be responsible for shortfalls shown by |
| 3 4 5 6 7 | | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against subpostmasters and other end users alleged to be responsible for shortfalls shown by Horizon during the relevant period." |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 | А. | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against subpostmasters and other end users alleged to be responsible for shortfalls shown by Horizon during the relevant period." That's not seeking a specific document nor |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. Q. | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against subpostmasters and other end users alleged to be responsible for shortfalls shown by Horizon during the relevant period." That's not seeking a specific document nor iterations of that specific document, is it? |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against subpostmasters and other end users alleged to be responsible for shortfalls shown by Horizon during the relevant period." That's not seeking a specific document nor iterations of that specific document, is it? No |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against subpostmasters and other end users alleged to be responsible for shortfalls shown by Horizon during the relevant period." That's not seeking a specific document nor iterations of that specific document, is it? No It's more broadly crafted? |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 11 | Q. A. | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against subpostmasters and other end users alleged to be responsible for shortfalls shown by Horizon during the relevant period." That's not seeking a specific document nor iterations of that specific document, is it? No It's more broadly crafted? Yes, I agree. |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. A. | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against subpostmasters and other end users alleged to be responsible for shortfalls shown by Horizon during the relevant period." That's not seeking a specific document nor iterations of that specific document, is it? No It's more broadly crafted? Yes, I agree. What did your firm do in response to the receipt of paragraph 18 of Rule 9 Request 14? In respect of the questions in Request 14 that |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13 | Q. A. Q. | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against subpostmasters and other end users alleged to be responsible for shortfalls shown by Horizon during the relevant period." That's not seeking a specific document nor iterations of that specific document, is it? No It's more broadly crafted? Yes, I agree. What did your firm do in response to the receipt of paragraph 18 of Rule 9 Request 14? |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. A. Q. | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against subpostmasters and other end users alleged to be responsible for shortfalls shown by Horizon during the relevant period." That's not seeking a specific document nor iterations of that specific document, is it? No It's more broadly crafted? Yes, I agree. What did your firm do in response to the receipt of paragraph 18 of Rule 9 Request 14? In respect of the questions in Request 14 that |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. A. Q. | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against subpostmasters and other end users alleged to be responsible for shortfalls shown by Horizon during the relevant period." That's not seeking a specific document nor iterations of that specific document, is it? No It's more broadly crafted? Yes, I agree. What did your firm do in response to the receipt of paragraph 18 of Rule 9 Request 14? In respect of the questions in Request 14 that were focused on prosecutions, they were led by |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. Q. | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against subpostmasters and other end users alleged to be responsible for shortfalls shown by Horizon during the relevant period." That's not seeking a specific document nor iterations of that specific document, is it? No It's more broadly crafted? Yes, I agree. What did your firm do in response to the receipt of paragraph 18 of Rule 9 Request 14? In respect of the questions in Request 14 that were focused on prosecutions, they were led by Peters & Peters. So, on receipt of the request, we shared it with Peters & Peters. As always, when a request comes in, there's a frenzy of |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. Q. | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against subpostmasters and other end users alleged to be responsible for shortfalls shown by Horizon during the relevant period." That's not seeking a specific document nor iterations of that specific document, is it? No It's more broadly crafted? Yes, I agree. What did your firm do in response to the receipt of paragraph 18 of Rule 9 Request 14? In respect of the questions in Request 14 that were focused on prosecutions, they were led by Peters & Peters. So, on receipt of the request, we shared it with Peters & Peters. As always, |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against subpostmasters and other end users alleged to be responsible for shortfalls shown by Horizon during the relevant period." That's not seeking a specific document nor iterations of that specific document, is it? No It's more broadly crafted? Yes, I agree. What did your firm do in response to the receipt of paragraph 18 of Rule 9 Request 14? In respect of the questions in Request 14 that were focused on prosecutions, they were led by Peters & Peters. So, on receipt of the request, we shared it with Peters & Peters. As always, when a request comes in, there's a frenzy of activity and dialogue as to how to respond to it. Peters & Peters then, I think by this |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against subpostmasters and other end users alleged to be responsible for shortfalls shown by Horizon during the relevant period." That's not seeking a specific document nor iterations of that specific document, is it? No It's more broadly crafted? Yes, I agree. What did your firm do in response to the receipt of paragraph 18 of Rule 9 Request 14? In respect of the questions in Request 14 that were focused on prosecutions, they were led by Peters & Peters. So, on receipt of the request, we shared it with Peters & Peters. As always, when a request comes in, there's a frenzy of activity and dialogue as to how to respond to it. Peters & Peters then, I think by this stage, the policy review exercise that |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. Q. | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against subpostmasters and other end users alleged to be responsible for shortfalls shown by Horizon during the relevant period." That's not seeking a specific document nor iterations of that specific document, is it? No It's more broadly crafted? Yes, I agree. What did your firm do in response to the receipt of paragraph 18 of Rule 9 Request 14? In respect of the questions in Request 14 that were focused on prosecutions, they were led by Peters & Peters. So, on receipt of the request, we shared it with Peters & Peters. As always, when a request comes in, there's a frenzy of activity and dialogue as to how to respond to it. Peters & Peters then, I think by this stage, the policy review exercise that I described earlier in my statement, I think had |
| 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. | "Policies and guidelines relating to the bringing of private prosecutions against subpostmasters and other end users alleged to be responsible for shortfalls shown by Horizon during the relevant period." That's not seeking a specific document nor iterations of that specific document, is it? No It's more broadly crafted? Yes, I agree. What did your firm do in response to the receipt of paragraph 18 of Rule 9 Request 14? In respect of the questions in Request 14 that were focused on prosecutions, they were led by Peters & Peters. So, on receipt of the request, we shared it with Peters & Peters. As always, when a request comes in, there's a frenzy of activity and dialogue as to how to respond to it. Peters & Peters then, I think by this stage, the policy review exercise that |

| 1 | | disclose the documents that are responsive to |
|--|----------------------------------|--|
| 2 | | the search terms? |
| 3 | Α. | Yes, I do. |
| 4 | Q. | Why? |
| 5 | Α. | For example, if the request is for a specific |
| 6 | | document, and many of the Inquiry's requests |
| 7 | | were for specific documents, you devise a set of |
| 8 | | search terms that you think will identify the |
| 9 | | document and you run the search terms and you |
| 10 | | find the document, then in those circumstances, |
| 11 | | my view would be that the search terms are |
| 12 | | appropriate or, taking the questions 15 and |
| 13 | | 46(a), the request was for all iterations of two |
| 14 | | documents, the prosecutions policy and the |
| 15 | | investigations policy. It seemed to us that, in |
| 16 | | that context, as part of a broader set of steps |
| 17 | | that were appropriate to take, in terms of |
| 18 | | catching all iterations, search terms really had |
| 19 | | an essential role. |
| 20 | | We had the policy, we knew what it was |
| 21 | | called, we knew the words that were contained in |
| 22 | | it, and we were confident that using certain |
| 23 | | search terms would find other iterations of it. |
| 24 | Q. | So what about Request 14? If we go forwards, |
| 25 | | please, to page 31 of your witness statement. |
| | | 206 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | was that the PCDE would be sufficient for the |
| 1 2 | | was that the PCDE would be sufficient for the purpose of responding to issue I think it was |
| | | |
| 2 | | purpose of responding to issue I think it was |
| 2 3 | | purpose of responding to issue I think it was 109 in the Inquiry's list of issues. |
| 2 3 4 | | purpose of responding to issue I think it was 109 in the Inquiry's list of issues. So my understanding is that Peters & Peters |
| 2 3 4 5 | | purpose of responding to issue I think it was 109 in the Inquiry's list of issues. So my understanding is that Peters & Peters then focused on the contents of the PCDE, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Q. | purpose of responding to issue I think it was 109 in the Inquiry's list of issues. So my understanding is that Peters & Peters then focused on the contents of the PCDE, insofar as it relates to policies and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Q. | purpose of responding to issue I think it was 109 in the Inquiry's list of issues. So my understanding is that Peters & Peters then focused on the contents of the PCDE, insofar as it relates to policies and guidelines. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. | purpose of responding to issue I think it was 109 in the Inquiry's list of issues. So my understanding is that Peters & Peters then focused on the contents of the PCDE, insofar as it relates to policies and guidelines. So is the answer that your firm didn't do |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. A. | purpose of responding to issue I think it was 109 in the Inquiry's list of issues. So my understanding is that Peters & Peters then focused on the contents of the PCDE, insofar as it relates to policies and guidelines. So is the answer that your firm didn't do anything in relation to this request, it was |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | purpose of responding to issue I think it was 109 in the Inquiry's list of issues. So my understanding is that Peters & Peters then focused on the contents of the PCDE, insofar as it relates to policies and guidelines. So is the answer that your firm didn't do anything in relation to this request, it was passed to Peters & Peters to administer? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Α. | purpose of responding to issue I think it was 109 in the Inquiry's list of issues. So my understanding is that Peters & Peters then focused on the contents of the PCDE, insofar as it relates to policies and guidelines. So is the answer that your firm didn't do anything in relation to this request, it was passed to Peters & Peters to administer? Yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Α. | purpose of responding to issue I think it was 109 in the Inquiry's list of issues. So my understanding is that Peters & Peters then focused on the contents of the PCDE, insofar as it relates to policies and guidelines. So is the answer that your firm didn't do anything in relation to this request, it was passed to Peters & Peters to administer? Yes. You don't know, I think, the search terms that Peters & Peters were running. You didn't know? I don't think we did at the time. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. Q. A. Q. | purpose of responding to issue I think it was 109 in the Inquiry's list of issues. So my understanding is that Peters & Peters then focused on the contents of the PCDE, insofar as it relates to policies and guidelines. So is the answer that your firm didn't do anything in relation to this request, it was passed to Peters & Peters to administer? Yes. You don't know, I think, the search terms that Peters & Peters were running. You didn't know? I don't think we did at the time. Has a problem with those been identified? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. Q. A. Q. A. | purpose of responding to issue I think it was 109 in the Inquiry's list of issues. So my understanding is that Peters & Peters then focused on the contents of the PCDE, insofar as it relates to policies and guidelines. So is the answer that your firm didn't do anything in relation to this request, it was passed to Peters & Peters to administer? Yes. You don't know, I think, the search terms that Peters & Peters were running. You didn't know? I don't think we did at the time. Has a problem with those been identified? Yes, it has. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. Q. A. Q. | purpose of responding to issue I think it was 109 in the Inquiry's list of issues. So my understanding is that Peters & Peters then focused on the contents of the PCDE, insofar as it relates to policies and guidelines. So is the answer that your firm didn't do anything in relation to this request, it was passed to Peters & Peters to administer? Yes. You don't know, I think, the search terms that Peters & Peters were running. You didn't know? I don't think we did at the time. Has a problem with those been identified? Yes, it has. What's the nature of the problem that has now |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | purpose of responding to issue I think it was 109 in the Inquiry's list of issues. So my understanding is that Peters & Peters then focused on the contents of the PCDE, insofar as it relates to policies and guidelines. So is the answer that your firm didn't do anything in relation to this request, it was passed to Peters & Peters to administer? Yes. You don't know, I think, the search terms that Peters & Peters were running. You didn't know? I don't think we did at the time. Has a problem with those been identified? Yes, it has. What's the nature of the problem that has now been identified? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | A. Q. A. Q. A. | purpose of responding to issue I think it was 109 in the Inquiry's list of issues. So my understanding is that Peters & Peters then focused on the contents of the PCDE, insofar as it relates to policies and guidelines. So is the answer that your firm didn't do anything in relation to this request, it was passed to Peters & Peters to administer? Yes. You don't know, I think, the search terms that Peters & Peters were running. You didn't know? I don't think we did at the time. Has a problem with those been identified? Yes, it has. What's the nature of the problem that has now been identified? The ordinarily with a request such as this, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | purpose of responding to issue I think it was 109 in the Inquiry's list of issues. So my understanding is that Peters & Peters then focused on the contents of the PCDE, insofar as it relates to policies and guidelines. So is the answer that your firm didn't do anything in relation to this request, it was passed to Peters & Peters to administer? Yes. You don't know, I think, the search terms that Peters & Peters were running. You didn't know? I don't think we did at the time. Has a problem with those been identified? Yes, it has. What's the nature of the problem that has now been identified? The ordinarily with a request such as this, that seeks policies and guidelines, as a minimum |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | purpose of responding to issue I think it was 109 in the Inquiry's list of issues. So my understanding is that Peters & Peters then focused on the contents of the PCDE, insofar as it relates to policies and guidelines. So is the answer that your firm didn't do anything in relation to this request, it was passed to Peters & Peters to administer? Yes. You don't know, I think, the search terms that Peters & Peters were running. You didn't know? I don't think we did at the time. Has a problem with those been identified? Yes, it has. What's the nature of the problem that has now been identified? The ordinarily with a request such as this, that seeks policies and guidelines, as a minimum the search terms would contain a stem of the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | purpose of responding to issue I think it was 109 in the Inquiry's list of issues. So my understanding is that Peters & Peters then focused on the contents of the PCDE, insofar as it relates to policies and guidelines. So is the answer that your firm didn't do anything in relation to this request, it was passed to Peters & Peters to administer? Yes. You don't know, I think, the search terms that Peters & Peters were running. You didn't know? I don't think we did at the time. Has a problem with those been identified? Yes, it has. What's the nature of the problem that has now been identified? The ordinarily with a request such as this, that seeks policies and guidelines, as a minimum |

24 Q. What I've described as the truncated version of

(52) Pages 205 - 208

| 1 | Α. | Yes, precisely, and the search terms that were |
|--|----------------|--|
| 2 | | used in that context, in the context of the PCDE |
| 3 | | that were relied upon for Request 14 didn't |
| 4 | | contain the truncated version of the word |
| 5 | | "guidelines". |
| 6 | Q. | Has that been rectified? |
| 7 | Α. | Yes, it has. |
| 8 | Q. | Now, you address in paragraphs 79 and 80 on |
| 9 | | page 30 of your witness statement what in fact |
| 10 | | happened when Appendix 3 was discovered and how |
| 11 | | Appendix 6, which was part of the same family of |
| 12 | | documents, was not discovered. If we can turn |
| 13 | | that up please. So 79 first: |
| 14 15 | | "I have sought to understand the |
| 15 16 | | circumstances which led to Appendix 3 but not Appendix 6 being disclosed to the Inquiry |
| 17 | | and my firm's involvement. I have done so |
| 18 | | having particular regard to the fact that my |
| 10 | | firm reviewed Appendix 3 in context of our work |
| 20 | | on this Request and therefore, on the face of |
| 20 | | things, Appendix 6 was within our reach. |
| 22 | | "I understand the position to be as follows. |
| 23 | | A number of versions of Appendix 3 were reviewed |
| 24 | | by my firm's ALT team and marked irrelevant as |
| 25 | | part of the initial review of search-term |
| | | 209 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | paragraph 73 above" |
| 1 2 | | paragraph 73 above" Just cutting to the guick on that, a data |
| | | paragraph 73 above" Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the |
| 2 | | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data |
| 2 3 | А. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the |
| 2 3 4 | A. Q. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? Yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 | | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Q. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? Yes. This time in London by lawyers? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Q. A. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? Yes. This time in London by lawyers? Yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. A. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? Yes. This time in London by lawyers? Yes. You say: |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. A. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? Yes. This time in London by lawyers? Yes. You say: " a senior associate [at my firm] |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | Q. A. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? Yes. This time in London by lawyers? Yes. You say: " a senior associate [at my firm] reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. A. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? Yes. This time in London by lawyers? Yes. You say: " a senior associate [at my firm] reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3, some of which were in families containing |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. A. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? Yes. This time in London by lawyers? Yes. You say: " a senior associate [at my firm] reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3, some of which were in families containing Appendix 6." |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. A. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? Yes. This time in London by lawyers? Yes. You say: " a senior associate [at my firm] reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3, some of which were in families containing Appendix 6." So this happened essentially by chance because of the data error. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13 | Q. A. Q. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? Yes. This time in London by lawyers? Yes. You say: " a senior associate [at my firm] reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3, some of which were in families containing Appendix 6." So this happened essentially by chance because of the data error. Yes, yes it did. The first search that had been reviewed in March had been the subject of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. A. Q. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? Yes. This time in London by lawyers? Yes. You say: " a senior associate [at my firm] reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3, some of which were in families containing Appendix 6." So this happened essentially by chance because of the data error. Yes, yes it did. The first search that had been reviewed in March had been the subject of item-level de-duplication, so my understanding, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. Q. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? Yes. This time in London by lawyers? Yes. You say: " a senior associate [at my firm] reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3, some of which were in families containing Appendix 6." So this happened essentially by chance because of the data error. Yes, yes it did. The first search that had been reviewed in March had been the subject of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. A. Q. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? Yes. This time in London by lawyers? Yes. You say: " a senior associate [at my firm] reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3, some of which were in families containing Appendix 6." So this happened essentially by chance because of the data error. Yes, yes it did. The first search that had been reviewed in March had been the subject of item-level de-duplication, so my understanding, de-duplicated out of the iterations of Appendix 3 that were reviewed in that context |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. Q. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? Yes. This time in London by lawyers? Yes. You say: " a senior associate [at my firm] reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3, some of which were in families containing Appendix 6." So this happened essentially by chance because of the data error. Yes, yes it did. The first search that had been reviewed in March had been the subject of item-level de-duplication, so my understanding, de-duplicated out of the iterations of Appendix 3 that were reviewed in that context were versions that contained Appendix 6 as |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? Yes. This time in London by lawyers? Yes. You say: " a senior associate [at my firm] reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3, some of which were in families containing Appendix 6." So this happened essentially by chance because of the data error. Yes, yes it did. The first search that had been reviewed in March had been the subject of item-level de-duplication, so my understanding, de-duplicated out of the iterations of Appendix 3 that were reviewed in that context were versions that contained Appendix 6 as a family member. But yes, you're right, the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? Yes. This time in London by lawyers? Yes. You say: " a senior associate [at my firm] reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3, some of which were in families containing Appendix 6." So this happened essentially by chance because of the data error. Yes, yes it did. The first search that had been reviewed in March had been the subject of item-level de-duplication, so my understanding, de-duplicated out of the iterations of Appendix 3 that were reviewed in that context were versions that contained Appendix 6 as a family member. But yes, you're right, the subsequent review was it was necessitated by |
| 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. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? Yes. This time in London by lawyers? Yes. You say: " a senior associate [at my firm] reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3, some of which were in families containing Appendix 6." So this happened essentially by chance because of the data error. Yes, yes it did. The first search that had been reviewed in March had been the subject of item-level de-duplication, so my understanding, de-duplicated out of the iterations of Appendix 3 that were reviewed in that context were versions that contained Appendix 6 as a family member. But yes, you're right, the subsequent review was it was necessitated by an error. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. | Just cutting to the quick on that, a data error had been discovered and therefore the exercise was carried out again? Yes. This time in London by lawyers? Yes. You say: " a senior associate [at my firm] reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3, some of which were in families containing Appendix 6." So this happened essentially by chance because of the data error. Yes, yes it did. The first search that had been reviewed in March had been the subject of item-level de-duplication, so my understanding, de-duplicated out of the iterations of Appendix 3 that were reviewed in that context were versions that contained Appendix 6 as a family member. But yes, you're right, the subsequent review was it was necessitated by an error. |

| 1 | | responsive documents in March 2022. It is |
|--|----------------------------|---|
| 2 | | apparent from data on Relativity that none of |
| 3 | | these were in families containing Appendix 6." |
| 4 | | Just stopping there, what you're saying is |
| 5 | | that the Appendix 3 document existed in multiple |
| 6 | | versions that were reviewed by the lawyers in |
| 7 | | the ALT team abroad? |
| 8 | Α. | Yes, not lawyers, generally law graduates, but |
| 9 | | yes. |
| 10 | Q. | How many versions of Appendix 3 were discovered? |
| 11 | Α. | On that occasion, I think nine is the right |
| 12 | | number. Mr Tombleson's statement, I think, |
| 13 | | explains how many there were and I think it was |
| 14 | | nine. |
| 15 | Q. | Were all of them reviewed by your firm's ALT |
| 16 | | team? |
| 17 | Α. | Yes. |
| 18 | Q. | Were they reviewed by different people? |
| 19 | Α. | Yes. |
| 20 | Q. | They were all marked as "irrelevant"? |
| 21 | A. | Yes. |
| 22 | Q. | Then if we turn to paragraph 81, which is over |
| 23 24 | | the page, thank you: |
| 24 25 | | "Subsequently, as part of the further review |
| 20 | | of materials in April 2022 that I describe at 210 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | Δ | Not in response to Request 11 no |
| 1 2 | A. Q. | Not in response to Request 11, no. So the senior associate reviewed a number of |
| 2 | A. Q. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of |
| | | |
| 2 3 | | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many |
| 2 3 4 | Q. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? I don't recall. I think perhaps six or seven. |
| 2 3 4 5 | Q. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Q. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? I don't recall. I think perhaps six or seven. Again, I think it might be in Mr Tombleson's |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Q. A. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? I don't recall. I think perhaps six or seven. Again, I think it might be in Mr Tombleson's statement. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. A. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? I don't recall. I think perhaps six or seven. Again, I think it might be in Mr Tombleson's statement. The reviewer tagged one version of Appendix 3 as |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. A. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? I don't recall. I think perhaps six or seven. Again, I think it might be in Mr Tombleson's statement. The reviewer tagged one version of Appendix 3 as relevant and the document was produced to us in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. A. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? I don't recall. I think perhaps six or seven. Again, I think it might be in Mr Tombleson's statement. The reviewer tagged one version of Appendix 3 as relevant and the document was produced to us in May 2022. So here, some of these versions of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. A. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? I don't recall. I think perhaps six or seven. Again, I think it might be in Mr Tombleson's statement. The reviewer tagged one version of Appendix 3 as relevant and the document was produced to us in May 2022. So here, some of these versions of Appendix 3 were in families containing |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. A. Q. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? I don't recall. I think perhaps six or seven. Again, I think it might be in Mr Tombleson's statement. The reviewer tagged one version of Appendix 3 as relevant and the document was produced to us in May 2022. So here, some of these versions of Appendix 3 were in families containing Appendix 6, yes? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. A. Q. A. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? I don't recall. I think perhaps six or seven. Again, I think it might be in Mr Tombleson's statement. The reviewer tagged one version of Appendix 3 as relevant and the document was produced to us in May 2022. So here, some of these versions of Appendix 3 were in families containing Appendix 6, yes? Yes. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. A. Q. A. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? I don't recall. I think perhaps six or seven. Again, I think it might be in Mr Tombleson's statement. The reviewer tagged one version of Appendix 3 as relevant and the document was produced to us in May 2022. So here, some of these versions of Appendix 3 were in families containing Appendix 6, yes? Yes. So here, de-duplication wasn't an issue, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. A. Q. A. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? I don't recall. I think perhaps six or seven. Again, I think it might be in Mr Tombleson's statement. The reviewer tagged one version of Appendix 3 as relevant and the document was produced to us in May 2022. So here, some of these versions of Appendix 3 were in families containing Appendix 6, yes? Yes. So here, de-duplication wasn't an issue, whatever KPMG may have been doing in relation to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. A. Q. A. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? I don't recall. I think perhaps six or seven. Again, I think it might be in Mr Tombleson's statement. The reviewer tagged one version of Appendix 3 as relevant and the document was produced to us in May 2022. So here, some of these versions of Appendix 3 were in families containing Appendix 6, yes? Yes. So here, de-duplication wasn't an issue, whatever KPMG may have been doing in relation to other Rule 9s or other parts of Rule 9s, so far |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. Q. A. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? I don't recall. I think perhaps six or seven. Again, I think it might be in Mr Tombleson's statement. The reviewer tagged one version of Appendix 3 as relevant and the document was produced to us in May 2022. So here, some of these versions of Appendix 3 were in families containing Appendix 6, yes? Yes. So here, de-duplication wasn't an issue, whatever KPMG may have been doing in relation to other Rule 9s or other parts of Rule 9s, so far as de-duplication was concerned. That's not the problem here? No. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? I don't recall. I think perhaps six or seven. Again, I think it might be in Mr Tombleson's statement. The reviewer tagged one version of Appendix 3 as relevant and the document was produced to us in May 2022. So here, some of these versions of Appendix 3 were in families containing Appendix 6, yes? Yes. So here, de-duplication wasn't an issue, whatever KPMG may have been doing in relation to other Rule 9s or other parts of Rule 9s, so far as de-duplication was concerned. That's not the problem here? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? I don't recall. I think perhaps six or seven. Again, I think it might be in Mr Tombleson's statement. The reviewer tagged one version of Appendix 3 as relevant and the document was produced to us in May 2022. So here, some of these versions of Appendix 3 were in families containing Appendix 6, yes? Yes. So here, de-duplication wasn't an issue, whatever KPMG may have been doing in relation to other Rule 9s or other parts of Rule 9s, so far as de-duplication was concerned. That's not the problem here? No. Then if we look at paragraph 82: "I have spoken with the reviewer He |
| 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. Q. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? I don't recall. I think perhaps six or seven. Again, I think it might be in Mr Tombleson's statement. The reviewer tagged one version of Appendix 3 as relevant and the document was produced to us in May 2022. So here, some of these versions of Appendix 3 were in families containing Appendix 6, yes? Yes. So here, de-duplication wasn't an issue, whatever KPMG may have been doing in relation to other Rule 9s or other parts of Rule 9s, so far as de-duplication was concerned. That's not the problem here? No. Then if we look at paragraph 82: "I have spoken with the reviewer He explained he was familiar with both the |
| 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. Q. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? I don't recall. I think perhaps six or seven. Again, I think it might be in Mr Tombleson's statement. The reviewer tagged one version of Appendix 3 as relevant and the document was produced to us in May 2022. So here, some of these versions of Appendix 3 were in families containing Appendix 6, yes? Yes. So here, de-duplication wasn't an issue, whatever KPMG may have been doing in relation to other Rule 9s or other parts of Rule 9s, so far as de-duplication was concerned. That's not the problem here? No. Then if we look at paragraph 82: "I have spoken with the reviewer He explained he was familiar with both the Prosecutions Policy and the Investigations |
| 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. Q. | So the senior associate reviewed a number of versions of Appendix 3. Do you know how many the senior reviewer reviewed? I don't recall. I think perhaps six or seven. Again, I think it might be in Mr Tombleson's statement. The reviewer tagged one version of Appendix 3 as relevant and the document was produced to us in May 2022. So here, some of these versions of Appendix 3 were in families containing Appendix 6, yes? Yes. So here, de-duplication wasn't an issue, whatever KPMG may have been doing in relation to other Rule 9s or other parts of Rule 9s, so far as de-duplication was concerned. That's not the problem here? No. Then if we look at paragraph 82: "I have spoken with the reviewer He explained he was familiar with both the |

| 1 | | not responsive to [Rule 9(11)] because it |
|--|----------------------|--|
| 2 | | was not an iteration of either of those |
| 3 | | policies. However, he considered that the |
| 4 | | document might be of interest to the Inquiry, |
| 5 | | and he tagged the document as relevant on that |
| 6 | | basis. [You] believe that [this] was correct. |
| 7 | | He did not look at the family documents of |
| 8 | | Appendix 3, and did not review Appendix 6. In |
| 9 | | fact, as far as [you are] aware, no member of |
| 10 | | [your] team reviewed Appendix 6 until May 2023." |
| 11 | | So you say you didn't look at the family |
| 12 | | documents of which Appendix 3 was a part, why |
| 13 | | not? |
| 14 | Α. | I think principally it was due to the approach |
| 15 | | that was being taken in the context of that |
| 16 | | review, which was again seeking the two specific |
| 17 | _ | documents, not to look at families. |
| 18 | Q. | But here, he wasn't, on what he's told you, |
| 19 | | discovering a document that was responsive to |
| 20 | | the request. He was finding a document, |
| 21 | | rightly, in which the Inquiry would be |
| 22 | | interested, and saying it's relevant. Why not |
| 23 | • | look at the family of which it's a part? |
| 24 25 | Α. | I fear I'll be repeating the answer I gave, but |
| 25 | | the approach that was being taken in the context 213 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | I think it's a difference of view. In terms |
| 1 | | I think it's a difference of view. In terms |
| 2 | 0 | of |
| 2 3 | Q. | of So there's a difference of view as to who made |
| 2 3 4 | | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? |
| 2 3 4 5 | Q. A. | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, |
| 2 3 4 | | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, yes. No question on there's no disagreement |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, yes. No question on there's no disagreement as to the occasions on which de-duplication was |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, yes. No question on there's no disagreement as to the occasions on which de-duplication was instructed. The difference of view relates to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, yes. No question on there's no disagreement as to the occasions on which de-duplication was instructed. The difference of view relates to the nature of the de-duplication that ought to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Α. | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, yes. No question on there's no disagreement as to the occasions on which de-duplication was instructed. The difference of view relates to the nature of the de-duplication that ought to have been applied. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Α. | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, yes. No question on there's no disagreement as to the occasions on which de-duplication was instructed. The difference of view relates to the nature of the de-duplication that ought to have been applied. Would you agree that it's unsatisfactory, to say |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Α. | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, yes. No question on there's no disagreement as to the occasions on which de-duplication was instructed. The difference of view relates to the nature of the de-duplication that ought to have been applied. Would you agree that it's unsatisfactory, to say the least, that there is a difference of view, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Α. | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, yes. No question on there's no disagreement as to the occasions on which de-duplication was instructed. The difference of view relates to the nature of the de-duplication that ought to have been applied. Would you agree that it's unsatisfactory, to say the least, that there is a difference of view, using your language, between two of the Post |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 13 | Α. | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, yes. No question on there's no disagreement as to the occasions on which de-duplication was instructed. The difference of view relates to the nature of the de-duplication that ought to have been applied. Would you agree that it's unsatisfactory, to say the least, that there is a difference of view, using your language, between two of the Post Office's service suppliers on such a critical |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Α. | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, yes. No question on there's no disagreement as to the occasions on which de-duplication was instructed. The difference of view relates to the nature of the de-duplication that ought to have been applied. Would you agree that it's unsatisfactory, to say the least, that there is a difference of view, using your language, between two of the Post Office's service suppliers on such a critical issue as this, which has had such consequences |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Α. | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, yes. No question on there's no disagreement as to the occasions on which de-duplication was instructed. The difference of view relates to the nature of the de-duplication that ought to have been applied. Would you agree that it's unsatisfactory, to say the least, that there is a difference of view, using your language, between two of the Post Office's service suppliers on such a critical issue as this, which has had such consequences for both the Post Office and the efficient and |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. Q. | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, yes. No question on there's no disagreement as to the occasions on which de-duplication was instructed. The difference of view relates to the nature of the de-duplication that ought to have been applied. Would you agree that it's unsatisfactory, to say the least, that there is a difference of view, using your language, between two of the Post Office's service suppliers on such a critical issue as this, which has had such consequences for both the Post Office and the efficient and effective conduct of this Inquiry? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. Q. | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, yes. No question on there's no disagreement as to the occasions on which de-duplication was instructed. The difference of view relates to the nature of the de-duplication that ought to have been applied. Would you agree that it's unsatisfactory, to say the least, that there is a difference of view, using your language, between two of the Post Office's service suppliers on such a critical issue as this, which has had such consequences for both the Post Office and the efficient and effective conduct of this Inquiry? Mr Beer, we have different views on a point. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | A. Q. | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, yes. No question on there's no disagreement as to the occasions on which de-duplication was instructed. The difference of view relates to the nature of the de-duplication that ought to have been applied. Would you agree that it's unsatisfactory, to say the least, that there is a difference of view, using your language, between two of the Post Office's service suppliers on such a critical issue as this, which has had such consequences for both the Post Office and the efficient and effective conduct of this Inquiry? Mr Beer, we have different views on a point. I think |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. Q. A. Q. | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, yes. No question on there's no disagreement as to the occasions on which de-duplication was instructed. The difference of view relates to the nature of the de-duplication that ought to have been applied. Would you agree that it's unsatisfactory, to say the least, that there is a difference of view, using your language, between two of the Post Office's service suppliers on such a critical issue as this, which has had such consequences for both the Post Office and the efficient and effective conduct of this Inquiry? Mr Beer, we have different views on a point. I think Do you think it's a good thing? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. Q. A. Q. | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, yes. No question on there's no disagreement as to the occasions on which de-duplication was instructed. The difference of view relates to the nature of the de-duplication that ought to have been applied. Would you agree that it's unsatisfactory, to say the least, that there is a difference of view, using your language, between two of the Post Office's service suppliers on such a critical issue as this, which has had such consequences for both the Post Office and the efficient and effective conduct of this Inquiry? Mr Beer, we have different views on a point. I think Do you think it's a good thing? No, it's not a good thing. It's regrettable. I'm sorry? I say it's regrettable. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. Q. A. Q. | of So there's a difference of view as to who made the decision? In relation to the latter part of your question, yes. No question on there's no disagreement as to the occasions on which de-duplication was instructed. The difference of view relates to the nature of the de-duplication that ought to have been applied. Would you agree that it's unsatisfactory, to say the least, that there is a difference of view, using your language, between two of the Post Office's service suppliers on such a critical issue as this, which has had such consequences for both the Post Office and the efficient and effective conduct of this Inquiry? Mr Beer, we have different views on a point. I think Do you think it's a good thing? No, it's not a good thing. It's regrettable. I'm sorry? |

| on IT | Inq | uiry 5 Septemb |
|-------|-----|---|
| 1 | | of that review was to focus on the keyword |
| 2 | | responsive documents, again the objective being |
| 3 | | to find iterations of these two policies. The |
| 4 | | approach that we've always taken has been where |
| 5 | | we see a document incidentally that we think is |
| 6 | | not responsive to a particular Rule 9 Request, |
| 7 | | but we think that it will be of interest to the |
| 8 | | Inquiry, that it relates to the terms of |
| 9 | | reference, then we will also produce it. |
| 10 | | That's what he wasn't doing sorry, that's |
| 11 | | what he was doing here but he wasn't following |
| 12 | | the train of enquiry. As I recall it, these |
| 13 | | searches were conducted very shortly before we |
| 14 | | gave disclosure and sorry, the review was |
| 15 | | conducted very shortly before we gave this |
| 16 | | tranche of disclosure. |
| 17 | Q. | Can I turn to de-duplication. I think it's fair |
| 18 | | to say that there is a dispute between your |
| 19 | | firm, on the one hand, and KPMG, on the other, |
| 20 | | as to who made decisions as to whether |
| 21 | | de-duplication was to occur in relation to |
| 22 | | a particular Rule 9 and, if so, the nature of |
| 23 | | the de-duplication that was to be undertaken; is |
| 24 | | that right? |
| 25 | Α. | l wouldn't have characterised it as a dispute. 214 |
| 1 | | unsatisfactory? |
| 2 | Α. | No, I'm not, actually, I think, because the |
| 3 | | views are genuinely held, and it's a regrettable |
| 4 | | situation. |
| 5 | Q. | Who made the decision to carry out item-level |
| 6 | | de-duplication? |
| 7 | Α. | I believe that KPMG made the decision. |
| 8 | Q. | And why do you believe that? |
| 9 | Α. | Because I have reviewed some of the instructions |
| 10 | | that members of my team gave to KPMG and the |

- 10 that members of my team gave to KPMG and the 11 back and forth that occurred with KPMG in
- relation to the application of de-duplication,
- 12 13 and I don't think that the instructions that
- 14 were given can fairly be characterised as
- 15 instructions to carry out item-level
- 16 de-duplication.
- 17 Q. We have just heard evidence from Mr Tombleson,
- 18 who said he'd done pretty much the same exercise
- within KPMG, that KPMG undertook searches based 19
- on search terms provided by HSF, provided 20
- 21 statistics as to the number of responsive hits.
- 22 There was then liaison between HSF and KPMG in
- 23 which, in some respects, HSF said the number of
- 24 hits seemed high, or too high. And then a table
- 25 was given, if de-duplication was applied at an 216

| 1 | | item level, although that phrase was not used. |
|--|----|---|
| 2 | | And then instructions came back from your |
| 3 | | associates or senior associates saying yes, |
| 4 | | carry out the de-duplication. Is that a fair |
| 5 | | summary of the correspondence that you've read? |
| 6 | Α. | I would describe it differently. I think, for |
| 7 | | one thing, there are many different email chains |
| 8 | | with instructions made, given in different |
| 9 | | contexts, from different people to different |
| 10 | | people, with different terminology used. |
| 11 | | I think what's clear is that members of my team |
| 12 | | did not wish to review multiple iterations of |
| 13 | | the same keyword responsive document. If |
| 14 | | they're reviewing one iteration of a document, |
| 15 | | it's not necessary to review 15 others. So they |
| 16 | | didn't want |
| 17 | Q. | That sounds reasonable. |
| 18 | Α. | Well, quite, and I think no one would argue with |
| 19 | | that. That was the objective that was being |
| 20 | | articulated in various different ways in the |
| 21 | | instructions that were given to KPMG. My |
| 22 | | understanding and I should say that I have no |
| 23 | | expertise in these issues, but I'm familiar with |
| 24 | | eDiscovery from having practised for many years, |
| 25 | | and I've also discussed these issues with my own |
| | | 217 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | lowers in the team, depending on their level of |
| 1 | | lawyers in the team, depending on their level of |
| 2 | | experience, whether they've happened upon this |
| 2 3 | | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be |
| 2 3 4 | | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be |
| 2 3 4 5 | | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. Did KPMG say in any of the communications that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. Did KPMG say in any of the communications that you've reviewed "There are two types or at least |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. Did KPMG say in any of the communications that you've reviewed "There are two types or at least two types of de-duplication. If you do |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. Did KPMG say in any of the communications that you've reviewed "There are two types or at least two types of de-duplication. If you do item-level de-duplication, you'll get a much |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. Did KPMG say in any of the communications that you've reviewed "There are two types or at least two types of de-duplication. If you do item-level de-duplication, you'll get a much smaller number of documents that are responsive, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. Did KPMG say in any of the communications that you've reviewed "There are two types or at least two types of de-duplication. If you do item-level de-duplication, you'll get a much smaller number of documents that are responsive, fewer hits, which is good, but you will occlude |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. Did KPMG say in any of the communications that you've reviewed "There are two types or at least two types of de-duplication. If you do item-level de-duplication, you'll get a much smaller number of documents that are responsive, fewer hits, which is good, but you will occlude from view a very large number of family |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. Did KPMG say in any of the communications that you've reviewed "There are two types or at least two types of de-duplication. If you do item-level de-duplication, you'll get a much smaller number of documents that are responsive, fewer hits, which is good, but you will occlude from view a very large number of family documents"? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. Did KPMG say in any of the communications that you've reviewed "There are two types or at least two types of de-duplication. If you do item-level de-duplication, you'll get a much smaller number of documents that are responsive, fewer hits, which is good, but you will occlude from view a very large number of family documents"? If I may, I don't think it's so much just |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. Did KPMG say in any of the communications that you've reviewed "There are two types or at least two types of de-duplication. If you do item-level de-duplication, you'll get a much smaller number of documents that are responsive, fewer hits, which is good, but you will occlude from view a very large number of family documents"? If I may, I don't think it's so much just removing the documents from view; it's the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. Did KPMG say in any of the communications that you've reviewed "There are two types or at least two types of de-duplication. If you do item-level de-duplication, you'll get a much smaller number of documents that are responsive, fewer hits, which is good, but you will occlude from view a very large number of family documents"? If I may, I don't think it's so much just removing the documents from view; it's the actual it's the exclusion of those documents |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. Did KPMG say in any of the communications that you've reviewed "There are two types or at least two types of de-duplication. If you do item-level de-duplication. If you do item-level de-duplication, you'll get a much smaller number of documents that are responsive, fewer hits, which is good, but you will occlude from view a very large number of family documents"? If I may, I don't think it's so much just removing the documents from view; it's the actual it's the exclusion of those documents from the dataset in a way that makes them, as |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. Did KPMG say in any of the communications that you've reviewed "There are two types or at least two types of de-duplication. If you do item-level de-duplication, you'll get a much smaller number of documents that are responsive, fewer hits, which is good, but you will occlude from view a very large number of family documents"? If I may, I don't think it's so much just removing the documents from view; it's the actual it's the exclusion of those documents from the dataset in a way that makes them, as we've seen, very difficult to retrieve and to go |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. Did KPMG say in any of the communications that you've reviewed "There are two types or at least two types of de-duplication. If you do item-level de-duplication. If you do item-level de-duplication, you'll get a much smaller number of documents that are responsive, fewer hits, which is good, but you will occlude from view a very large number of family documents"? If I may, I don't think it's so much just removing the documents from view; it's the actual it's the exclusion of those documents from the dataset in a way that makes them, as |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. Did KPMG say in any of the communications that you've reviewed "There are two types or at least two types of de-duplication. If you do item-level de-duplication, you'll get a much smaller number of documents that are responsive, fewer hits, which is good, but you will occlude from view a very large number of family documents"? If I may, I don't think it's so much just removing the documents from view; it's the actual it's the exclusion of those documents from the dataset in a way that makes them, as we've seen, very difficult to retrieve and to go |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. Did KPMG say in any of the communications that you've reviewed "There are two types or at least two types of de-duplication. If you do item-level de-duplication, you'll get a much smaller number of documents that are responsive, fewer hits, which is good, but you will occlude from view a very large number of family documents"? If I may, I don't think it's so much just removing the documents from view; it's the actual it's the exclusion of those documents from the dataset in a way that makes them, as we've seen, very difficult to retrieve and to go back to the position before item-level |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. Did KPMG say in any of the communications that you've reviewed "There are two types or at least two types of de-duplication. If you do item-level de-duplication, you'll get a much smaller number of documents that are responsive, fewer hits, which is good, but you will occlude from view a very large number of family documents"? If I may, I don't think it's so much just removing the documents from view; it's the actual it's the exclusion of those documents from the dataset in a way that makes them, as we've seen, very difficult to retrieve and to go back to the position before item-level de-duplication was applied. So it's that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | | experience, whether they've happened upon this before. I, for my part, I don't think it can be fairly expected of solicitors that they would be familiar with different forms of different eDiscovery techniques for achieving that objective. Did KPMG say in any of the communications that you've reviewed "There are two types or at least two types of de-duplication. If you do item-level de-duplication. If you do item-level de-duplication, you'll get a much smaller number of documents that are responsive, fewer hits, which is good, but you will occlude from view a very large number of family documents"? If I may, I don't think it's so much just removing the documents from view; it's the actual it's the exclusion of those documents from the dataset in a way that makes them, as we've seen, very difficult to retrieve and to go back to the position before item-level de-duplication was applied. So it's that consequence, that's the particularly severe |

| on IT | Inq | uiry 5 Septemb |
|-------|----------|---|
| | | |
| 1 | | firm's eDiscovery specialists. In those |
| 2 | | circumstances, there are a number of different |
| 3 | | options that might be pursued, of which |
| 4 | | item-level de-duplication is the most extreme, |
| 5 | | and very extreme. And that was the option that |
| 6 | | was pursued. |
| 7 | Q. | l mean, if you Google "item-level |
| 8 | | de-duplication" and "MD5#", you can see quite |
| 9 | | quickly that it's rather deprecated. |
| 10 | Α. | Yes. |
| 11 | Q. | I think the first three hits you get tell you |
| 12 | | it's rarely used and can have disastrous |
| 13 | | consequences. Did you know that? |
| 14 | Α. | I did when I ran the same Google search as you, |
| 15 | _ | evidently have done. |
| 16 | Q. | But is the problem here that you're saying that |
| 17 | | you and your firm didn't know that it was being |
| 18 | _ | done in your firm's name |
| 19 | Α. | Yes. |
| 20 | Q. | or the Post Office's name? |
| 21 | Α. | Yes, I think it is. I think the level of |
| 22 | | understanding of the different forms of |
| 23 | | de-duplication and the different techniques that |
| 24 | | one can apply to achieve the objective |
| 25 | | I described, that will differ amongst different 218 |
| | | 210 |
| 1 | Q. | Well, it's a severe consequence if you're trying |
| 2 | . | to do a remediation exercise. For the Inquiry, |
| 3 | | the severe consequence is that those documents |
| 4 | | aren't reviewed for disclosure, the |
| 5 | | de-duplicated families |
| 6 | Α. | Forgive me. |
| 7 | Q. | If you apply item-level de-duplication |
| 8 | A. | Yes. |
| 9 | Q. | the other documents that are part of the |
| 10 | | families are occluded from view. They're not |
| 11 | | part of the search |
| 12 | Α. | Yes. |
| 13 | Q. | and therefore can't be part of a review, and |
| 14 | | therefore can't be disclosed to this Inquiry in |
| 15 | | response to a Rule 9 Request. That's the |
| 16 | | principal vice, isn't it, of an item-level |
| 17 | | de-duplication exercise? |
| 18 | Α. | It's an aspect, but the point I was trying to |
| 19 | | make was that another significant aspect is the |
| 20 | | difficulty with getting the documents back. And |
| 21 | | putting that crudely, there's more complexity |
| 22 | Q. | That's only an issue if you realise the mistake |
| 23 | | later down the line and you have to scrabble |
| 24 | | around and do a remediation exercise, isn't it? |
| 05 | | KI I IIN MININ IN IN INTE |

25 A. No, I wouldn't agree with that. It might be 220

| 1 | | an issue a few days later. You may review the |
|--|----------------------------------|---|
| 2 | | documents set that has been made available |
| 3 | | following the de-duplication having been run, |
| 4 | | and you may take the view that you want to |
| 5 | | review more documents. |
| 6 | Q. | But in any event, KPMG didn't say, in any of the |
| 7 | | communications, "There are these different |
| 8 | | species of de-duplication, and they have these |
| 9 | | consequences, which would you prefer, HSF?" |
| 10 | Α. | No, they didn't. There was an email in June |
| 11 | | this year explaining the setting out the |
| 12 | ~ | different types of de-duplication. |
| 13 | Q. | Which is all a bit late, isn't it? |
| 14 | A. | Yes. |
| 15 16 | Q. | You say about this in paragraph 121(j), which is |
| 17 | | on page 48 of your witness statement, (j). That's it: |
| 18 | | "As to the impact of de-duplication more |
| 10 | | generally, I've noted above that there |
| 20 | | appears to [be] a misalignment between my team |
| 21 | | and KPMG as to the approach to de-duplication |
| 22 | | and its implications." |
| 23 | | That's a rather enigmatic phrase, if I may |
| 24 | | say so, "a misalignment as to approach". Are |
| 25 | | you describing, by the use of the phrase |
| | | 221 |
| | | |
| 1 | | it, that the chairman directed that disclosure |
| 2 | | for witnesses commencing their evidence on |
| 3 | | 19 September this year and following must be |
| 4 | | complete by 14 August 2023. They were his |
| 5 | | directions? |
| 6 | Α. | Yes. |
| 7 | Q. | So that gave the Inquiry a little over a month |
| 8 | | to digest the disclosure, to analyse it, to |
| 9 | | disclose it to Core Participants, to allow Core |
| 10 | | Participants to digest and to analyse it and to |
| 11 | | propose questions to upcoming witnesses? |
| 12 | Α. | In relation to these |
| 13 | | |
| | Q. | The first witnesses? |
| 14 | Q. A. | Yes, the first witnesses in the case study, yes. |
| 15 | | Yes, the first witnesses in the case study, yes. It appears from the annex and updates to the |
| 15 16 | Α. | Yes, the first witnesses in the case study, yes. It appears from the annex and updates to the annex which we have received recently that that |
| 15 16 17 | Α. | Yes, the first witnesses in the case study, yes. It appears from the annex and updates to the annex which we have received recently that that deadline was not met and is not going to be met |
| 15 16 17 18 | A. Q. | Yes, the first witnesses in the case study, yes. It appears from the annex and updates to the annex which we have received recently that that deadline was not met and is not going to be met by the Post Office; is that right? |
| 15 16 17 18 19 | A. Q. A. | Yes, the first witnesses in the case study, yes. It appears from the annex and updates to the annex which we have received recently that that deadline was not met and is not going to be met by the Post Office; is that right? No, the work is ongoing. |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. Q. | Yes, the first witnesses in the case study, yes. It appears from the annex and updates to the annex which we have received recently that that deadline was not met and is not going to be met by the Post Office; is that right? No, the work is ongoing. Instead, a principal deadline of 14 September |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. Q. A. Q. | Yes, the first witnesses in the case study, yes. It appears from the annex and updates to the annex which we have received recently that that deadline was not met and is not going to be met by the Post Office; is that right? No, the work is ongoing. Instead, a principal deadline of 14 September has been set |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | А. Q. А. Q. | Yes, the first witnesses in the case study, yes. It appears from the annex and updates to the annex which we have received recently that that deadline was not met and is not going to be met by the Post Office; is that right? No, the work is ongoing. Instead, a principal deadline of 14 September has been set Yes. |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | А. Q. А. Q. | Yes, the first witnesses in the case study, yes. It appears from the annex and updates to the annex which we have received recently that that deadline was not met and is not going to be met by the Post Office; is that right? No, the work is ongoing. Instead, a principal deadline of 14 September has been set Yes. by the Post Office itself, or a deadline that |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | Yes, the first witnesses in the case study, yes. It appears from the annex and updates to the annex which we have received recently that that deadline was not met and is not going to be met by the Post Office; is that right? No, the work is ongoing. Instead, a principal deadline of 14 September has been set Yes. by the Post Office itself, or a deadline that it is working to? |
| 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | А. Q. А. Q. | Yes, the first witnesses in the case study, yes. It appears from the annex and updates to the annex which we have received recently that that deadline was not met and is not going to be met by the Post Office; is that right? No, the work is ongoing. Instead, a principal deadline of 14 September has been set Yes. by the Post Office itself, or a deadline that |

| 1 | | "misalignment", a misunderstanding between those |
|--|----------|---|
| 2 | | giving the instructions and those receiving |
| 3 4 | • | them? |
| 4 5 | A. Q. | Yes, in part, I am. Can I turn to remediation work, then, please. |
| 6 | Q. | If we can turn up in your witness statement |
| 7 | | page 64, please. This is the start of the annex |
| 8 | | to your witness statement; is that right, |
| 9 | | Mr Rowan? |
| 10 | Α. | Yes, it is. |
| 11 | Q. | If you go to the foot of the page, please, |
| 12 | | you'll see that the annex is 136 pages long. |
| 13 | | You've kindly set out for us in detail the |
| 14 | | remediation exercise that has been undertaken in |
| 15 | | relation to the three issues that we have been |
| 16 | | discussing but, additionally, a disclosure |
| 17 | | assurance exercise that has been undertaken in |
| 18 | | conjunction with the Post Office; is that right? |
| 19 | Α. | Yes. |
| 20 | Q. | I'm not going to go through any of that, it's |
| 21 | | there for anyone that's interested to read it |
| 22 | | but, just in relation to the timescales of some |
| 23 | | of it and the implications for Phase 4 of the |
| 24 | | Inquiry, which starts in a fortnight or it |
| 25 | | continues in a fortnight it's right, isn't 222 |
| | | 222 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 1 | | call it a realistically achievable target date |
| 2 | | that the entire teams my own, Peters & |
| 2 3 | | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to |
| 2 3 4 | | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. |
| 2 3 4 5 | Q. | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. So that's Thursday, 14 September, with us |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Q. | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. So that's Thursday, 14 September, with us commencing our witnesses on Tuesday, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Q. | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. So that's Thursday, 14 September, with us commencing our witnesses on Tuesday, 19 September, giving us the two working days to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. So that's Thursday, 14 September, with us commencing our witnesses on Tuesday, 19 September, giving us the two working days to look at any material that arrives on the 14th? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. A. | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. So that's Thursday, 14 September, with us commencing our witnesses on Tuesday, 19 September, giving us the two working days to look at any material that arrives on the 14th? The way we have approached the exercise is to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. So that's Thursday, 14 September, with us commencing our witnesses on Tuesday, 19 September, giving us the two working days to look at any material that arrives on the 14th? The way we have approached the exercise is to try to prioritise by reference to the Inquiry's |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. So that's Thursday, 14 September, with us commencing our witnesses on Tuesday, 19 September, giving us the two working days to look at any material that arrives on the 14th? The way we have approached the exercise is to try to prioritise by reference to the Inquiry's running order for the rest of the year. So in |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. So that's Thursday, 14 September, with us commencing our witnesses on Tuesday, 19 September, giving us the two working days to look at any material that arrives on the 14th? The way we have approached the exercise is to try to prioritise by reference to the Inquiry's |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. So that's Thursday, 14 September, with us commencing our witnesses on Tuesday, 19 September, giving us the two working days to look at any material that arrives on the 14th? The way we have approached the exercise is to try to prioritise by reference to the Inquiry's running order for the rest of the year. So in relation to I think I'm right in saying it's |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. So that's Thursday, 14 September, with us commencing our witnesses on Tuesday, 19 September, giving us the two working days to look at any material that arrives on the 14th? The way we have approached the exercise is to try to prioritise by reference to the Inquiry's running order for the rest of the year. So in relation to I think I'm right in saying it's the case study that comes first that was |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. So that's Thursday, 14 September, with us commencing our witnesses on Tuesday, 19 September, giving us the two working days to look at any material that arrives on the 14th? The way we have approached the exercise is to try to prioritise by reference to the Inquiry's running order for the rest of the year. So in relation to I think I'm right in saying it's the case study that comes first that was prioritised and closed out some time ago. So my |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. So that's Thursday, 14 September, with us commencing our witnesses on Tuesday, 19 September, giving us the two working days to look at any material that arrives on the 14th? The way we have approached the exercise is to try to prioritise by reference to the Inquiry's running order for the rest of the year. So in relation to I think I'm right in saying it's the case study that comes first that was prioritised and closed out some time ago. So my hope is and there was a relatively small |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. So that's Thursday, 14 September, with us commencing our witnesses on Tuesday, 19 September, giving us the two working days to look at any material that arrives on the 14th? The way we have approached the exercise is to try to prioritise by reference to the Inquiry's running order for the rest of the year. So in relation to I think I'm right in saying it's the case study that comes first that was prioritised and closed out some time ago. So my hope is and there was a relatively small number of documents produced in relation to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. So that's Thursday, 14 September, with us commencing our witnesses on Tuesday, 19 September, giving us the two working days to look at any material that arrives on the 14th? The way we have approached the exercise is to try to prioritise by reference to the Inquiry's running order for the rest of the year. So in relation to I think I'm right in saying it's the case study that comes first that was prioritised and closed out some time ago. So my hope is and there was a relatively small number of documents produced in relation to that, so my hope is that, in relation to the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. So that's Thursday, 14 September, with us commencing our witnesses on Tuesday, 19 September, giving us the two working days to look at any material that arrives on the 14th? The way we have approached the exercise is to try to prioritise by reference to the Inquiry's running order for the rest of the year. So in relation to I think I'm right in saying it's the case study that comes first that was prioritised and closed out some time ago. So my hope is and there was a relatively small number of documents produced in relation to that, so my hope is that, in relation to the case study, that would allow sufficient time for |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. So that's Thursday, 14 September, with us commencing our witnesses on Tuesday, 19 September, giving us the two working days to look at any material that arrives on the 14th? The way we have approached the exercise is to try to prioritise by reference to the Inquiry's running order for the rest of the year. So in relation to I think I'm right in saying it's the case study that comes first that was prioritised and closed out some time ago. So my hope is and there was a relatively small number of documents produced in relation to that, so my hope is that, in relation to the case study, that would allow sufficient time for the documents to be reviewed, and certainly more |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Α. | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. So that's Thursday, 14 September, with us commencing our witnesses on Tuesday, 19 September, giving us the two working days to look at any material that arrives on the 14th? The way we have approached the exercise is to try to prioritise by reference to the Inquiry's running order for the rest of the year. So in relation to I think I'm right in saying it's the case study that comes first that was prioritised and closed out some time ago. So my hope is and there was a relatively small number of documents produced in relation to that, so my hope is that, in relation to the case study, that would allow sufficient time for the documents to be reviewed, and certainly more than a couple of days. In relation to the documents that have been disclosed as a result of the remediation |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Α. | that the entire teams my own, Peters & Peters, Post Office are working very hard to meet. So that's Thursday, 14 September, with us commencing our witnesses on Tuesday, 19 September, giving us the two working days to look at any material that arrives on the 14th? The way we have approached the exercise is to try to prioritise by reference to the Inquiry's running order for the rest of the year. So in relation to I think I'm right in saying it's the case study that comes first that was prioritised and closed out some time ago. So my hope is and there was a relatively small number of documents produced in relation to that, so my hope is that, in relation to the case study, that would allow sufficient time for the documents to be reviewed, and certainly more than a couple of days. In relation to the documents that have been |

- 25 A. Yes.

| 1 | Q. I'm going to work over the one that was | |
|----|---|---|
| 2 | disclosed last night rather than the one at 8.21 | |
| 3 | this morning. Is it right that the total number | |
| 4 | of documents produced to the Inquiry as a result | |
| 5 | of the remediation exercise is 7,753? | |
| 6 | A. Yes, it is. | |
| 7 | Q. That includes a number of duplicates and near | |
| 8 | duplicates | |
| 9 | A. Yes. | |
| 10 | Q despite the remediation of the de-duplication | |
| 11 | errors? | |
| 12 | A. Yes. | |
| 13 | Q. Could you explain, please, why a re-duplication | |
| 14 | exercise has been undertaken only for duplicates | |
| 15 | and near duplicates then to be disclosed to the | |
| 16 | Inquiry? | |
| 17 | A. The exercise of remediating item-level | |
| 18 | de-duplication has involved reviewing the | |
| 19 | documents that were excluded by item-level | |
| 20 | de-duplication, which would have included, as | : |
| 21 | we've discussed, duplicates of keyword | : |
| 22 | responsive documents and their families. So | : |
| 23 | a significant part of the production, certainly | : |
| 24 | the production that's to remediate item-level | : |
| 25 | de-duplication, will contain, to that extent, | : |
| | 225 | |
| | | |
| 1 | evidence and for the detailed answers you've | |
| 2 | given to Mr Beer. | |
| 3 | I don't propose to say anything at all this | |
| 4 | afternoon about the evidence which I've heard | |
| 5 | during the course of today or, indeed, to make | |
| 6 | any kind of comment about what I intend to do by | |
| 7 | way of making known my views, if any, upon that | |
| 8 | evidence. I want to reflect on what I do over | |
| 9 | the next day or two and then I will, at that | |
| 10 | stage, make a short statement in writing as to | |
| 11 | how I intend to proceed. | |
| 12 | MR BEER: Thank you very much, sir. That aside, we | |
| 13 | next see each other, I think, on Tuesday, | |
| 14 | 19 September | |
| 15 | SIR WYN WILLIAMS: That is true. | |
| 16 | MR BEER: albeit there may be a hearing in the | |
| 17 | week before. | |
| 18 | SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes. There is the possibility | |
| 19 | let me use that word as neutrally as possible | |
| 20 | of a hearing, I believe, on Thursday, | : |
| 21 | 14 September. Is that the correct date? | : |
| 22 | MR BEER: It is, sir. But you've not taken | : |
| 23 | a decision on that because you're waiting for | : |
| 24 | some submissions on that discrete issue. | : |
| 25 | SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Exactly so. So again, I say no 227 | : |
| | <u></u> 1 | |

| 0 | |
|----|--|
| | |
| 1 | duplicate documents, albeit they sit in |
| 2 | different families. |
| 3 | More generally, by duplicate, the way we've |
| 4 | actually characterised duplicates here is to |
| 5 | talk about duplicates or near duplicates. |
| 6 | Relativity has functionality that enables |
| 7 | documents that don't have the same MD5# value, |
| 8 | but which are nevertheless substantively the |
| 9 | same or substantively very similar, to be |
| 10 | identified. So what we have done is used that |
| 11 | functionality, to run that over the documents |
| 12 | that have been produced and to draw to the |
| 13 | Inquiry's attention the extent of the near |
| 14 | duplicacy that exists in the document set, which |
| 15 | is very significant. |
| 16 | MR BEER: Thank you very much. |
| 17 | Sir, they're all the questions that I ask of |
| 18 | Mr Rowan. |
| 19 | Oh, I'm just having something shown to me. |
| 20 | They're all the questions I ask of Mr Rowan. |
| 21 | Do you have any questions? |
| 22 | SIR WYN WILLIAMS: No, thank you. |
| 23 | So that concludes the evidence that we set |
| 24 | out to hear today. |
| 25 | Thank you, Mr Rowan, for your very detailed 226 |
| | |
| 1 | more about that possibility. Right, that's |
| 2 | fine. |
| 3 | So thank you all for participating and, |
| 4 | unless we meet on 14 September, I will see you |
| 5 | all on 19 September. |
| 6 | MR BEER: Thank you very much, sir. |
| 7 | (4.36 pm) |
| 8 | (The hearing adjourned until a future date) |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| | 228 |

INDEX

| FINTAN CANAVAN (affirmed) | 3 |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| Questioned by MR BLAKE | 3 |
| Questioned by SIR WYN WILLIAMS | 46 |
| DIANE WILLS (sworn) | 47 |
| Questioned by MR BEER | 47 |
| PAUL JOHN TOMBLESON (sworn) | 131 |
| Questioned by MR BLAKE | 131 |
| GREGG NICHOLAS ROWAN (sworn) | 164 |
| Questioned by MR BEER | 164 |

(59) MR BEER: - absence

| Α | 58/25 90/2 219/18 | 166/23 194/4 | 88/12 90/7 94/16 | alternatives [2] |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| absolutely [6] 97/3 | actually [18] 5/13 | advisers' [2] 83/11 | 101/13 103/8 103/19 | 26/11 173/12 |
| 112/7 161/11 162/8 | 6/16 7/6 15/10 18/19 | 83/15 | 104/5 109/13 109/22 | although [11] 7/6 |
| 162/24 195/9 | 41/13 157/10 160/5 | advising [2] 157/7 | | 25/16 31/7 63/1 80/23 |
| abundance [1] | 160/12 176/24 185/9 186/8 186/11 189/7 | 170/18 advocacy [1] 80/15 | 115/10 116/21 117/12 117/17 118/23 118/24 | |
| 119/10 | 194/18 200/1 216/2 | affected [1] 50/15 | 119/4 119/9 120/21 | always [19] 11/17 |
| accept [2] 96/19 | 226/4 | affects [1] 160/1 | 121/21 122/6 124/4 | 27/24 59/24 80/3 80/3 |
| 99/14 | ad [1] 133/23 | affirmed [2] 3/9 | 124/19 125/8 125/10 | 88/19 96/21 99/21 |
| accepted [2] 91/22 | ad hoc [1] 133/23 | 229/2 | 132/19 136/18 137/16 | |
| 97/20 | addition [5] 50/24 | afraid [5] 78/5 78/19 | 145/25 152/10 156/10 | 159/18 163/8 175/3 |
| access [8] 21/7 31/19 31/21 32/1 | 117/12 166/12 167/9 | 93/10 111/16 139/18 | 156/16 161/8 165/5 | 193/8 193/15 195/10 |
| 32/13 32/14 81/16 | 190/22 | after [14] 6/4 6/16 | 167/2 168/22 173/10 | 207/18 214/4 |
| 186/21 | additional [11] 55/6 | 17/4 42/24 48/20 | 189/25 190/1 194/1 | am [18] 1/2 2/14 2/15 |
| accessed [1] 204/11 | 55/8 74/19 78/13 | 80/23 86/17 88/12 | 195/8 195/9 195/11 | |
| according [2] 104/2 | 100/19 120/22 125/12 125/14 169/20 190/21 | | 195/12 196/19 196/21 196/22 198/4 198/9 | 49/8 49/14 80/19 89/20 140/25 147/23 |
| 177/18 | 192/2 | afternoon [4] 79/1 | 202/19 202/20 206/13 | |
| accordingly [3] | additionally [1] | 131/10 164/5 227/4 | 206/18 210/15 210/20 | |
| 64/11 163/5 163/6 | 222/16 | afternoon's [1] | 221/13 226/17 226/20 | |
| accountability [1] 52/9 | address [4] 11/19 | 131/17 | 227/3 228/3 228/5 | amended [2] 3/1 |
| accountable [8] | 81/8 141/18 209/8 | again [37] 13/14 | alleged [1] 207/5 | 159/5 |
| 51/14 51/18 51/18 | addressed [3] 8/20 | 14/15 27/10 39/4 41/3 | | amending [1] 13/22 |
| 51/19 51/21 51/22 | 24/3 133/23 | 44/24 48/15 58/23 | 18/4 38/12 | amongst [2] 188/21 |
| 177/5 177/9 | addressing [3] 14/8 77/6 185/14 | 71/2 76/18 79/4 103/19 105/18 109/1 | allocated [4] 26/21 37/4 37/5 37/6 | 218/25 |
| accounts [1] 64/2 | adds [1] 180/12 | 118/17 119/19 126/11 | allocation [1] 26/19 | amount [6] 13/21 15/16 21/14 119/15 |
| accrued [1] 120/22 | adjourned [1] 228/8 | | allocations [1] 14/15 | 129/4 143/5 |
| accurate [4] 61/6 | Adjournment [1] | 153/1 153/22 157/13 | allow [6] 14/18 | analyse [2] 223/8 |
| 94/18 157/4 192/11 accurately [1] 14/24 | 131/8 | 158/14 158/16 162/22 | | 223/10 |
| achievable [5] 56/13 | administer [1] | 181/2 190/16 191/10 | 223/9 224/18 | analysed [1] 112/16 |
| 57/2 121/20 122/9 | 208/10 | 194/8 200/15 203/22 | allowed [2] 54/24 | analysis [3] 119/12 |
| 224/1 | administration [1] 201/25 | 211/4 212/6 213/16 214/2 227/25 | 107/19 | 142/11 189/10 |
| achieve [12] 14/1 | admitted [3] 4/8 4/10 | | almost [3] 158/3 168/13 187/19 | analysts [3] 166/14 183/7 183/8 |
| 56/12 56/25 57/6 | 7/10 | 34/24 60/18 61/1 | alongside [2] 56/13 | Andrew [1] 166/4 |
| 57/15 58/5 58/15 58/21 59/14 59/21 | adopted [4] 74/22 | 85/15 128/22 159/9 | 57/2 | annex [6] 149/22 |
| 98/10 218/24 | 74/24 104/13 199/13 | 159/10 207/4 | already [25] 5/17 | 164/18 222/7 222/12 |
| achieved [1] 130/17 | advance [3] 13/1 | agenda [6] 79/8 | 19/24 24/15 24/18 | 223/15 223/16 |
| achievement [1] | 44/14 114/18 | 79/10 79/11 79/17 | 24/22 25/5 25/9 26/6 | Annex 3 [1] 149/22 |
| 124/17 | advanced [1] 207/25 | 82/5 82/14 ago [3] 126/6 141/14 | 39/4 39/16 40/20 94/15 100/16 118/20 | annexed [1] 121/19 annexes [1] 144/11 |
| achieving [1] 219/6 | advantages [1] 136/15 | 224/14 | 121/23 128/23 129/22 | |
| acknowledge [1] | advertising [2] 15/2 | agree [15] 61/4 62/23 | | 19/22 |
| 96/19 acronyms [1] 69/17 | 122/11 | 107/16 145/15 145/16 | | another [7] 113/3 |
| across [13] 18/6 | advice [6] 7/13 31/21 | 147/6 148/14 151/15 | 203/9 204/18 | 113/9 129/11 159/15 |
| 26/18 68/8 85/6 88/22 | 106/23 141/16 141/20 | | also [33] 1/9 8/13 | 172/14 193/3 220/19 |
| 90/4 102/25 107/17 | 144/13 | 205/23 207/12 215/11 | | |
| 110/23 127/8 144/25 | advise [4] 9/4 88/2 157/24 167/5 | 220/25 agreed [1] 48/11 | 40/11 55/10 66/16 66/18 69/12 76/12 | 35/13 60/2 62/20 79/1 94/11 95/16 99/12 |
| 150/19 156/25 | advised [3] 43/3 | agreeing [2] 102/14 | 77/23 79/25 81/14 | 138/23 139/18 140/2 |
| Act [3] 42/13 42/21 | 158/11 167/2 | 170/17 | 92/16 98/5 101/25 | 143/25 144/2 144/3 |
| 202/11 | adviser [1] 86/6 | ahead [2] 55/5 184/6 | 107/19 115/2 122/6 | 152/22 154/13 155/3 |
| acted [2] 4/12 70/15 acting [1] 7/7 | advisers [36] 9/6 | albeit [3] 167/22 | 125/14 138/3 144/25 | 155/25 204/9 208/8 |
| action [4] 28/13 | 28/16 48/25 49/22 | 226/1 227/16 | 162/2 166/20 169/11 | 213/24 |
| 106/25 157/25 158/12 | 56/6 62/25 63/22 64/1 | algorithm [1] 154/7 | | |
| active [2] 172/4 | 64/11 64/13 70/13 71/25 74/14 74/21 | all [91] 3/4 5/12 15/3 16/10 16/21 17/16 | 201/22 214/9 217/25 ALT [6] 182/12 | 190/24 answering [2] 105/19 |
| 197/6 | 76/25 81/2 81/6 81/12 | 18/6 22/22 22/25 25/8 | | |
| actively [3] 118/5 | 83/6 83/23 84/4 84/13 | 25/22 33/12 33/22 | 210/7 210/15 | answers [4] 71/11 |
| 120/6 194/16 | 84/20 89/14 96/14 | 41/6 42/3 45/2 47/4 | alterations [1] 10/12 | 71/13 131/3 227/1 |
| activity [4] 137/3 137/20 162/12 207/20 | 96/23 97/8 97/13 | 49/10 52/2 52/14 56/9 | | anticipated [5] 9/21 |
| actual [5] 6/12 14/3 | 97/21 103/21 104/2 | 63/17 74/18 81/20 | 182/12 182/17 183/1 | 12/2 15/18 24/8 127/4 |
| | 118/1 125/2 165/15 | 85/9 85/18 85/21 88/4 | 185/1 190/2 | anticipation [2] 10/8 |
| | | | (00 |) absolutely - anticipation |

(60) absolutely - anticipation

| Α | appendices [4] | 204/21 | 61/23 62/23 66/1 69/9 | 22/25 76/13 78/14 |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| anticipation [1] | 110/13 110/25 111/2 | appreciated [1] | 69/9 70/6 73/15 74/4 | 121/17 136/1 136/14 |
| 199/14 | 202/2 | 25/19 | 74/6 74/11 74/15 | 136/24 137/2 137/3 |
| any [113] 5/25 8/16 | appendix [52] 84/25 | approach [46] 27/8 | 74/25 75/22 75/23 | 153/11 153/11 159/8 |
| 10/12 11/9 14/11 | 91/23 91/24 97/8 99/5 100/17 101/2 110/14 | 28/4 45/25 60/8 60/9 65/12 66/11 69/1 | 76/21 78/23 78/23 79/20 79/21 79/22 | 182/19 220/24 arrangement [1] |
| 15/17 18/11 18/19 | 110/19 110/19 149/23 | | 80/17 85/10 88/12 | 40/16 |
| 18/21 26/4 27/1 27/23 | 149/24 161/24 199/24 | 99/25 102/20 104/13 | 91/5 91/21 96/14 | arrangements [2] |
| 30/4 30/6 32/10 32/14 | 200/15 200/21 200/24 | 104/25 114/23 115/7 | 100/23 101/14 101/20 | 10/7 10/12 |
| 34/8 34/13 34/17 34/22 35/14 35/24 | 201/2 201/4 202/3 | 115/22 135/1 145/1 | 102/1 104/15 108/8 | arrival [4] 75/11 |
| 36/6 37/9 37/12 43/19 | 202/9 202/15 203/12 | 155/9 158/19 162/15 | 108/21 109/22 112/13 | |
| 46/9 57/8 58/4 58/12 | 204/14 204/22 204/24 | | 119/13 120/5 122/18 | arrived [8] 2/13 20/6 |
| 58/24 59/22 64/11 | 205/6 205/11 209/10 | | 123/16 123/22 123/22 | 20/6 24/15 26/6 39/12 |
| 66/3 66/3 67/7 67/25 | 209/11 209/15 209/16 209/19 209/21 209/23 | | 123/23 124/1 124/1 124/9 124/11 129/23 | 53/13 145/23 arrives [1] 224/8 |
| 67/25 68/25 69/22 | 210/3 210/5 210/10 | 180/6 181/11 191/4 | 130/7 130/13 130/18 | articulated [1] |
| 70/2 70/22 71/4 71/8 | 211/10 211/12 211/19 | | 132/20 134/14 134/16 | |
| 76/22 76/23 77/7 | 211/20 211/25 212/3 | 213/14 213/25 214/4 | 134/23 135/3 136/17 | as [266] |
| 77/10 78/20 79/12 80/8 81/7 84/18 87/17 | 212/8 212/11 212/12 | 221/21 221/24 | 137/7 139/9 141/7 | ascertained [1] |
| 87/20 88/17 88/23 | 212/25 213/8 213/8 | approached [4] | 141/8 141/22 142/4 | 175/17 |
| 89/11 92/21 93/2 | 213/10 213/12 | 58/19 134/16 202/16 | 142/6 142/7 142/8 | aside [2] 115/13 |
| 96/13 96/15 96/16 | Appendix 3 [28] | 224/9 | 142/16 142/18 143/7 | 227/12 |
| 97/10 97/10 97/16 | 84/25 91/23 110/14 110/19 149/23 149/24 | approaches [9] 38/18 103/1 103/14 | 143/9 144/20 148/13 | ask [21] 1/18 9/19 |
| 105/3 107/11 107/15 | 199/24 200/15 200/21 | 103/20 105/4 157/8 | 149/11 150/4 150/10 150/12 150/20 152/8 | 24/2 47/17 48/4 49/8 56/21 70/21 92/23 |
| 108/20 109/1 109/23 | 200/24 201/4 202/9 | 189/22 202/8 202/8 | 153/11 154/2 156/21 | 117/15 119/3 132/7 |
| 110/12 117/6 117/7 | | approaching [2] 76/5 | | 132/19 138/15 142/20 |
| 117/21 119/19 119/23 | 209/15 209/23 210/5 | 76/25 | 161/19 162/24 163/8 | 145/10 164/13 165/3 |
| 120/1 120/9 121/25 123/23 129/6 129/16 | 210/10 211/10 211/19 | appropriate [26] | 164/23 164/25 166/9 | 165/8 226/17 226/20 |
| 129/19 130/16 130/23 | 211/25 212/3 212/8 | 21/11 21/12 28/13 | 166/15 168/4 171/5 | asked [25] 1/11 4/20 |
| 130/25 135/22 137/7 | 212/11 212/25 213/8 | 29/1 29/7 33/10 70/13 | | 34/3 39/4 39/11 90/21 |
| 142/14 150/2 156/9 | 213/12 | 73/15 90/6 92/17 | 174/9 176/15 177/5 | 94/10 95/14 116/8 |
| 162/5 162/14 163/15 | Appendix 6 [21] 91/24 97/8 99/5 | 99/23 106/25 117/9 119/18 141/8 141/22 | 181/18 182/17 183/1 183/5 183/6 183/15 | 144/2 144/3 144/9 144/13 144/14 146/24 |
| 163/17 178/7 178/15 | 100/17 101/2 161/24 | 142/7 142/8 142/18 | 185/12 185/13 185/18 | 152/24 153/2 153/5 |
| 180/1 192/2 196/15 | 201/2 202/3 204/14 | 146/6 163/3 163/13 | 185/20 187/12 187/16 | 154/11 154/22 157/12 |
| 201/3 203/13 204/6 | 204/22 204/24 205/6 | 196/25 205/24 206/12 | | 157/20 158/14 158/15 |
| 219/8 221/6 221/6 222/20 224/8 226/21 | 205/11 209/11 209/21 | 206/17 | 189/20 189/22 189/24 | |
| 227/6 227/7 | 210/3 211/12 211/20 | appropriately [5] | 190/3 190/5 190/8 | asking [11] 1/16 1/17 |
| anybody [2] 142/16 | 212/12 213/8 213/10 | 74/4 188/8 188/22 | 190/10 191/3 191/20 | 4/4 33/25 39/8 40/9 |
| 187/14 | application [2] | 188/25 194/1 | 192/9 192/25 193/2 | 41/10 41/18 41/19 |
| anyone [9] 9/16 27/2 | 169/21 216/12 applied [25] 28/10 | approval [1] 147/11 approvals [1] 13/24 | 193/4 193/17 194/23 195/3 195/14 195/23 | 100/23 110/10 asks [2] 34/11 207/2 |
| 31/20 31/21 92/21 | 31/9 66/7 102/13 | approved [3] 27/22 | 198/6 198/11 199/9 | aspect [9] 9/11 26/3 |
| 100/15 104/10 202/18 | 112/14 116/19 116/22 | 27/25 30/9 | 200/20 202/7 204/17 | 45/1 95/1 106/21 |
| 222/21 | 116/25 120/24 127/7 | approximately [3] | 206/1 206/11 213/9 | 192/17 198/22 220/18 |
| anything [6] 21/10 108/22 112/8 181/13 | 128/14 141/7 144/24 | 85/16 128/15 128/16 | 215/24 216/3 217/7 | 220/19 |
| 208/9 227/3 | 152/5 152/11 152/15 | April [13] 50/5 50/8 | 218/2 219/9 219/12 | aspects [3] 16/5 |
| apologies [1] 130/22 | 160/18 160/24 175/2 | 50/11 50/13 53/1 53/8 | | 167/5 172/2 |
| apparent [6] 11/24 | 175/8 175/16 180/24 | 76/13 137/2 145/9 | 221/24 224/3 226/8 | assembled [1] |
| 12/7 12/17 20/5 27/6 | 215/10 216/25 219/22 | 154/18 161/25 166/6 210/25 | area [6] 7/23 14/11 | 129/13 |
| 210/2 | applies [2] 141/6 160/15 | April 2012 [1] 50/5 | 14/17 14/17 37/10 38/8 | assertion [1] 95/10 assess [2] 127/15 |
| Apparently [1] 39/15 | apply [14] 22/18 29/8 | | areas [6] 14/12 17/14 | 129/1 |
| Appeal [3] 16/9 60/22 | 84/14 111/4 117/3 | 50/11 53/1 53/8 145/9 | | assessed [1] 103/8 |
| 73/1 | 117/23 145/25 152/17 | | 73/25 | assessing [1] 185/8 |
| appeals [3] 50/18 167/3 169/10 | 156/16 156/19 158/4 | archive [1] 110/23 | aren't [1] 220/4 | assessment [3] |
| appear [4] 50/13 94/8 | 171/17 218/24 220/7 | archives [1] 85/23 | argue [1] 217/18 | 129/19 174/9 212/24 |
| 114/8 116/6 | applying [1] 29/12 | | arisen [1] 17/11 | assist [6] 4/22 5/25 |
| appeared [3] 86/7 | appointed [5] 36/18 | 13/3 13/4 29/12 33/14 | arising [3] 50/18 51/5 | 15/25 39/21 47/21 |
| 144/22 163/13 | 66/14 73/8 122/24 123/1 | 33/23 38/1 39/13 39/21 40/9 40/14 49/4 | 79/13 arose [2] 8/10 68/1 | 106/2 assistance [3] 5/24 |
| appears [4] 112/25 | appointing [1] 24/17 | 49/7 51/5 51/13 51/22 | | 29/5 91/6 |
| 116/4 221/20 223/15 | appreciate [2] 81/25 | 52/1 52/2 57/15 60/3 | 13/18 20/12 20/12 | assisted [4] 9/10 |
| | | | | |
| | | | |) anticipation accieted |

(61) anticipation... - assisted

| assisted[3] 16/12 25/10 172/23 176/16 177/19 Denart [4] 47/17 Bonart [4] 47/17 30/18 | Α | 8/18 8/21 9/18 11/9 | 135/7 154/7 160/15 | 145/21 191/15 205/20 | 76/1 76/22 77/12 |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---|
| asserved [1] 25/10 27/23 28/10 27/23 18/24 19/21 16/21 27/21 16/21 12/21 16/21 12/21 16/21 12/21 | | | | | |
| 371.01 122/3 371.6 371.6 371.6 127.7 127.6 127.7 127.7 127.6 127.7 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<> | | | | | |
| Baseciate [b] Baseciat | | | | | |
| 13/19/2 102/1 3/2017 70/19 7/45 76/13 77/3 patched [2] 185/20 167/20 136/10 3774 139/11 13/02/1 102/1 5/116/20 96/16 107/15 108/24 BAU [2] 22/14 40/3 17/13 17/21 21/11 149/1 150/12 154/1 15/24 101/25 116/20 136/2 1377 137/6 139/6 33/9 Baccatas [1] 11/23 136/2 137/7 137/15 Becknord [1] 11/3 149/1 150/12 154/1 125/7 137/16 125/8 13/7 125/8 12/8 12/8 12/8 12/8 12/8 12/8 12/8 12 | | | | | |
| 2119 2119 2119 1716 1716 1716 1716 1716 1716 1716 1716 1716 1717 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<> | | | | | |
| associated [6] e6/16 109/24 101/25 116/21 117/13 17/13 17/13 17/14 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | | | | | |
| 10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/10/1 | | | | | |
| 1350 1352/137/137/16 Beacheroft [1] 4/16 48/25 532 59/9 59/16 17/14 17/17 21/31 21/32 14/12/0 148/1 135/6 139/6 30/2 139/6 30/2 13/18 20/2 71/10 71/10 71/17 21/31 21/32 became [6] 5/13 71/10< | | | | | |
| associates [10] 543 1391 1391 1391 1391 1391 1391 1391 1391 1391 1391 1391 1391 1391 1391 1391 1391 1391 1391 2001 2221 1391 2001 1391 2001 2211 1391 2001 2211 1391 2001 1391 1391 2001 1391 | | | | | |
| 14/12 10/1401 14/24 | | | | | |
| 1307 1706 1737 2173 1736 21737 2173 | | | | | |
| Tobs 21/72 ±1/73 ±1/73 awareness [1] BOI1 First 21/72 First 21/73 ±1/73 bigger [1] BOI1 Bigger [1] Bigger [1] <thbigger [1]<<="" td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></thbigger> | | | | | |
| assume [b] 30/16 avful [1] 10/10 because [73] 11/8 80/24 82/12 87/3 bigger [1] 82/13 38/3 7/8 0925 96/11 B 22/15 28/13 06 37/17 10/19 104/19 105/14 bigger [1] 57/18 assumate [1] 15/18 back [57] 12/14 14/7 38/25 39/1 40/20 106/23 110/25 114/6 bigger [1] 57/18 assurance [3] 12/019 24/12 42/14 32/5 43/25 115/4 116/7 116/8 105/7 107/1 135/14 assurance [3] 12/019 23/8 7/48 29/12 41/12 43/5 43/25 115/4 116/7 116/8 105/7 107/1 135/14 10/8/7 113/01 149/18 38/14 55/96 59/10 88/12 88/12 89/13 90/12 13/04 14/21 14/15 13/04 12/14/43 105/7 107/1 13/5/14 10/8/7 113/01 149/18 89/6 90/2 90/16 95/19 97/15 97/12 189/21 13/04 14/21 44/3 13/04 22/24/44/3 13/04 22/24/44/3 13/04 22/29/14 13/04 14/24 14/21 13/04 14/24 14/24 13/04 14/24 14/24 13/04 14/24 13/04 14/24 13/04 14/24 14/04 14/24 13/04 14/24 13/04 14/24 13/04 14/24 13/04 14/24 12/04 20/24 13/04 14/24 13/04 14/24 14/04/14/24 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<> | | | | | |
| Biolog Biolog Biogest [1] String 2037 28/15 | | | | | |
| B Cost/ assumes [1] 181/16 assumes [1] 181/16 assumes [1] 120/19 B Cost/S1 1/20/17/22 Cost/S1 1/20/17/27/27/27 Cost/S1 1/20/17/27/27 Cost/S1 1/20/17/27/27/27/27 Cost/S1 1/20/17/27/27/27/27/27/27/27/27/27/27/27/27/27 | | | | | |
| assuming [1] back [57] 13/14 14/7 38/25 39/1 40/20 106/23 110/25 114/6 45/13 45/13 65/23 assuming [3] 25/16 55/16 11/1 17/20 17/22 41/12 43/5 43/25 11/14 16/1 17/20 17/21 13/21 13/6/12 15/20 16/71 13/20 17/21 at [249] 35/5 36/19 38/14 35/5 56/19 38/14 35/5 36/19 38/14 13/6/12 15/20 </td <td></td> <td>B</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | | B | | | |
| assurance [3] 120/19 16/11 17/20 17/22 41/12 43/5 43/25 115/4 116/7 116/8 105/7 107/1 135/14 assurance [3] 120/19 24/2 25/18 26/19 38/14 89/10 63/10 66/17 130/4 133/9 136/11 105/7 107/1 135/14 attachment [8] 36/10 66/21 80/12 91/2 91/9 39/22 94/16 130/4 13/9 136/11 biweekty [1] 162/10 108/7 113/10 149/18 89/6 90/2 90/16 95/19 97/15 97/21 98/21 130/4 13/9 136/11 biweekty [1] 162/10 108/7 113/10 149/18 89/6 90/2 90/16 95/19 97/15 97/21 98/21 130/4 13/9 136/11 131/22 29/44 22/14 151/16 151/6 112/7 120/24 125/15 1100/5 111/4 113/11 152/24 135/14 137/14 131/24 29/44 29/14 131/24 29/44 29/14 151/16 151/6 133/11 13/14 151/10 137/24 140/14 180/24 187/17 188/4 180/24 187/17 188/4 180/24 187/17 188/4 133/16 13/11 133/16 13/24 131/24 149/14 11/14 131/24 29/14 11/2 131/24 29/14 11/2 131/24 29/14 11/2 133/16 13/14 130/11 13/14 130/11 13/14 130/14 130/14 130/14 130/14 130/14 130/14 130/14 130/14 130/14 | | back [57] 13/14 14/7 | | | |
| assurance [3] 120/1 22/17 35/5 36/19 36/12 63/10 66/16 113/4 113/6 120/17 13/14 | | | | | |
| 17/21/222/17 35/5 36/19 38/14 83/22 83/24 84/15 124/1 125/1 127/16 203/20 221/13 attachment [8] 38/14 48/5 59/65 9/10 88/12 89/13 90/12 130/41 130/9 136/11 biveekty [1] 62/10 108/17 113/10 140/18 89/6 90/2 90/16 95/19 97/15 97/21 98/21 130/41 130/9 136/11 biveekty [1] 165/10 151/16 151/6 112/7 120/24 125/15 110/15 11/14/21 117/15 113/5 15/16 131/20 131/24 229/44 229/14 151/15 112/7 120/24 125/15 110/15 111/4/11 13/10 150/26 15/78 15/79 131/24 229/44 229/14 151/15 113/17 13/16 114/5 114/21 117/15 157/10 163/11 177/10 biane [1] 131/22 229/14 113/15 113/9 113/97 138/5 143/20 135/10 137/24 145/13 146/5 190/4 190/55 139/3 bioxeck [1] 127/12 31/27 113/15 113/9 113/97 138/5 143/20 135/10 137/24 145/31 34/12 129/14 221/56 120/12 160/20 (21 4/14 11/57 123/25 bioxec/13/11 131/2 113/15 113/9 113/97 138/54 142/20 135/10 137/14 159/14 163/11 139/14 20/16 23/15 20/16 20/16 21/15 21/15 20/16 21/15 21/15 20/16 20/16 21/15 21/15 20/16 20/16 21/15 21/15 20/16 20/16 21/15 21/15 21/15 20/16 20/16 21/15 21/15 20/1 | | | | | |
| att 249] 38/14 48/5 59/6 59/10 88/12 80/12 38/14 48/5 59/6 59/10 88/12 80/12 38/14 48/5 59/6 59/10 13/10 14/21 21/413 binecky [1] 162/10 108/17 113/10 14/13 16/16 66/12 80/12 91/2 91/9 93/23 94/16 13/10 14/21 21/413 binecky [1] 162/10 150/21 150/23 151/5 17/12 102/41 125/15 10/16 13/11 13/12 14/13 14/13 14/14 Blake [9] 1/15 1/18 Attachments [9] 99/4 152/13 11/12 11/10 15/16 151/16 17/12 17/14 14/13 14/12 14/17 15/16 151/16 17/12 17/14 14/13 14/12 15/16 151/16 17/12 17/14 18/17 13/12 229/12 229/14 11/14/14 18/12 229/14 229/14 11/14/14 18/12 229/14 229/14 11/14/14 18/12 229/14 11/14/14 18/12 229/14 11/14/14 18/12 229/14 11/14/14 18/12 229/14 11/14/14 18/14 89/14 11/14/14 18/14 89/14 11/14/14 18/14 89/14 11/14/14 18/14 89/14 11/14/14 18/14 89/14 11/14/14 18/14 89/14 11/14/14 18/14 89/14 11/14/14 18/14 89/14 11/14/14 11/14/14 11/14/14 11/14/14 11/14/14 11/14/14 11/14/14 11/14/14 11/14/14 11/14/14 11/14/14 11/14/14 | | | | | |
| attachment [8] 66/10.66/21.80/12 57/2.917.93/23.94/16 130/10.144/21.44/3 black [1] 150/10 150/21.150/23.151/13 66/10.66/21.80/12 97/15.97/21.98/21 144/9.144/21.44/3 black [1] 150/10 151/6 110/15.111/4 113/21.198/21 156/8.157/8.157/8 151/8 131/24.229/ | | | | | |
| 108/71 113/0 149/18 89/6 90/2 90/6 95/19 97/5 97/21 98/21 144/9 144/13 144/41 Biake [9] 11/5 1/8 150/21 150/21 150/21 150/21 107/22 108/18 109/2 99/4 108/10 152/24 153/6 157/8 157/9 27/3 152/3 20/10 131/20 Attachment 2 [1] 125/21 126/4 126/7 110/15 111/4 113/21 157/10 163/11 173/40 Dame [1] 8/4 98/12 113/3 113/5 133/5 113/5 130/7 138/5 143/20 135/10 137/24 140/14 184/24 187/17 188/4 Dame [1] 8/4 98/12 113/3 113/5 133/5 113/5 141/24 145/13 146/5 190/4 190/5 133/5 17/8 15/2 Bioody [2] 4/14 11/4 Bioody [2] 4/14 11/4 Bioody [2] 4/14 11/4 Bioody [2] 4/14 11/5 113/15 149/13 151/10 161/25 163/1 173/14 159/11 163/1 173/14 159/11 163/1 173/14 159/11 163/1 173/14 159/11 163/1 173/14 169/12 120/20 12/2 159/2 12/2 159/2 12/2 159/2 12/2 159/2 12/2 159/2 12/2 159/2 12/2 169/2 23/72 16/8/14 19/11 19/2 12/2 14/8 19/4 1/10 2/2 14/2 13/2 14/2 13/2 12/2 14/2 13/2 14/10 2/2 16/2 23/72 16/8/14 10/1 12/17 16/2 12/17 11/1 14/1 11/1 11/1 19/17 14/2 12/17 13/2 12/11 12/11 12/17 24/2 23 26/9 16/2 12/17/1 14/1 16/2 12/17/1 14/1 | | | | | |
| 150/21 150/23 151/5 107/22 108/18 109/2 99/4 106/4 108/10 152/24 153/5 154/8 27.3/5 3/10 131/20 Attachment 2 [1] 12/7 120/24 125/15 110/15 111/4 113/21 156/8 157/8 157/8 157/8 131/24 229/4 229/4 Attachments [9] 130/7 138/5 149/12 131/24 127/2 130/1 113/2 113/21 131/24 229/4 229/4 13/8 113/9 113/11 130/7 138/5 149/13 131/24 146/10 154/13 141/24 146/10 154/13 141/24 148/17 178/22 Dew [1] 104/9 attentments [9] 100/71 38/5 149/13 131/24 146/10 154/13 141/24 146/10 154/13 141/24 148/17 188/24 180/4 19/11/10 156/13 190/4 190/5 193/3 190/4 190/5 193/3 190/4 190/5 193/3 190/4 190/5 193/3 190/4 190/5 193/3 190/4 190/5 193/3 190/4 100/5 193/3 190/4 100/5 193/3 190/4 100/5 193/3 190/4 100/5 193/3 190/4 100/5 193/3 190/4 100/5 193/3 190/4 100/5 193/3 190/4 100/5 193/3 190/4 100/5 193/3 190/4 100/5 193/3 190/4 100/5 193/3 190/4 100/5 193/3 190/4 100/5 193/3 180/24 140/6 130/16 1/1 05/11 140/5 2/1 130/2 140/10 5/1 140/4 148/4 140/4 140/10 5/1 140/4 52/2 140/4 148/4 140/4 140/5 2/1 140/6 130/6 1/1 05/21 140/6 130/6 1/1 05/21 140/6 130/6 1/1 05/21 140/6 1/1 05/21 140/6 | | | | | |
| 151/5 112/7 120/24 125/15 110/15 111/4 113/21 156/8 157/8 157/9 131/24 220/4 220/14 Attachments [9] 12/7 120/24 126/7 11/4/5 114/21 117/15 156/8 157/8 157/9 131/24 220/4 220/14 attachments [9] 12/7 120/24 126/7 11/4/5 114/21 117/15 157/15 17/9 131/24 220/4 220/14 attachments [9] 12/7 120/24 126/7 11/4/5 114/21 117/15 157/15 17/9 131/24 220/4 220/14 130/7 138/5 143/20 135/10 137/24 140/14 184/24 187/17 188/4 156/8 157/8 157/9 131/24 220/4 220/14 131/1 14/9 13/13 151/0 130/7 138/5 143/20 135/10 137/24 140/14 184/24 187/17 188/4 blowl [1] 13/16 131/1 14/9 13/1 13/5 130/7 138/5 143/20 135/10 137/24 140/14 184/24 187/17 188/4 blowl [1] 13/16 131/2 12/21 13/21 156/3 157/13 158/25 147/2 150/9 152/23 19/14/19 19/12 21/2 21/19 21/12 131/24 220/4 220/14 11/1 18/19 50/65/9 161/25 163/1 173/14 159/11 163/7 168/73 19/14/22 137/14 159/11 163/7 18/22 131/24 220/4 220/12 131/24 220/4 220/12 131/24 220/42 20/12 131/24 220/42 20/12 131/24 220/42 131/24 131/24 131/24 131/24 131/24 131/24 131/24 131/24 | | | | | |
| Attachment 2 [1] 125/21 126/4 126/7 114/5 114/21 117/15 157/10 163/11 173/10 blame [1] 18/4 98/12 113/3 113/5 113/5 143/20 132/71 318/5 143/20 114/5 114/21 117/15 157/10 163/11 173/10 blame [1] 18/4 98/12 113/3 113/5 113/6 113/9 113/11 130/7 138/5 143/20 136/11 16/21 16/21 111/21 145/13 140/14 141/24 145/13 140/14 141/24 145/13 140/14 141/24 145/13 140/14 141/24 145/13 140/14 190/4 190/5 193/3 blizzarding [1] 21/16 161/25 163/1 173/14 159/11 163/1 16/25 161/25 163/1 173/14 159/11 163/1 16/25 160/2 13/15 213/25 board [1] 16/2 13/16 13/1 16/2 14/6 41/1 16/2 16/2 13/15 213/25 board [1] 16/2 16/2 13/15 213/25 16/2 13/15 213/25 16/2 13/15 213/25 16/2 13/15 213/25 16/2 13/15 213/25 16/2 13/15 213/25 16/2 13/15 | | | | | |
| 151/5 attachments [9] 127/23 127/24 130/1 118/21 119/10 130/6 177/25 178/19 178/22 blow [1] 104/9 98/12 113/3 113/5 130/7 138/5 143/20 135/7 1412/10 137/5 140/13 151/2 blow [1] 104/9 113/15 149/13 151/10 144/24 146/10 154/13 141/24 146/11 153/25 147/2 150/9 152/23 194/19 199/22 205/20 blow [1] 44/2 414/11 attempt [1] 21/15 161/25 163/1 173/14 178/17 181/3 158/27 147/2 150/9 152/23 194/19 199/22 205/20 blow [1] 14/2 attempt [1] 21/15 161/25 163/1 173/14 178/17 181/3 158/27 175/23 177/8 168/13 204/2 216/19 21/14 213/1 204/2 216/19 21/14 213/1 214/2 217/19 218/17 23/22 23/23 23/24 attempt [1] 21/17 18/75 53/20 175/25 177/12 79/14 178/17 180/11 186/14 197/8 186/14 197/8 186/14 197/8 186/14 197/8 164/24 204/9 106/2 73/21 13/2/1 106/2 12/12 24/21 26/2 16/9 227/23 164/24 204/9 106/2 163/2 13/2/1 160/2 163/2 13/2/1 160/2 163/2 13/2/1 160/2 163/2 13/2/1 163/2 13/2/1 160/2 163/2 14/2/1 163/2 163/2 163/2 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | | | | | |
| attachments [9] 130/7 138/s 143/20 135/10 137/24 140/14 184/24 187/17 188/4 bitzzarding [1] 21/16 113/15 149/13 113/1 144/24 146/10 154/13 144/24 146/13 146/15 190/4 190/5 193/3 Bitody [2] 4/14 11/5 113/15 149/13 151/10 155/3 157/13 158/25 150/1 173/14 147/24 146/13 146/15 190/4 190/5 193/3 Bitody [2] 4/14 11/5 attempt [1] 21/15 161/25 163/1 173/14 159/3 157/13 158/25 159/11 163/7 168/13 209/16 21/31/5 21/325 board [1] 45/2 attempt [1] 21/15 188/14 191/11 196/23 175/23 177/18 18/1 190/11 105/21 23/22 32/32 3/24 41/14 11/5 188/14 191/11 196/23 175/23 177/18 18/11 188/14 191/11 182/22 24/12 217/19 218/17 23/22 23/23 23/24 41/15 101 61/1 22/02 0 128/14 191/11 196/23 175/23 177/18 18/11 181/2 21/2 21/14 21/11 182/23 16/22 74/4 43/16 53/17 53/20 59/10 125/15 125/21 126/2 126/17 127/23 166/22 16/97 13/25 160/2 74/4 123/13 123/15 124/18 34/17 25/12 10/16 11/1 193/19 126/4 126/17 127/23 166/21 126/17 79/12 160/21 130/15 160/2 160/2 160/2 160/2 160/2 160/2 1 | 151/5 | | | | |
| 98/12 113/8 <td< td=""><td>attachments [9]</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<> | attachments [9] | | | | |
| 113/81 13/15 13/15 13/15 14/12 15/12 14/12 15/12 14/12 15/12 14/12 15/12 14/12 15/12 14/12 15/12 14/12 15/12 14/12 15/12 14/12 15/12 14/12 15/12 <t< td=""><td>98/12 113/3 113/5</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<> | 98/12 113/3 113/5 | | | | |
| 113/15 149/13 151/10 161/12 563/1 173/14 159/11 163/7 168/13 209/16 213/15 213/25 board [13] 16/24 attempt [1] 21/15 178/17 181/3 182/7 172/8 173/24 174/22 214/2 21/19 218/17 23/22 23/23 23/24 11/1 18/15 58/9 65/9 188/14 191/11 196/27 176/23 17/28 180/11 Befast [2] 182/21 18/14 191/10 52/1 attended [2] 8/6 8/9 back-up [9] 59/6 204/5 211/14 213/1 18/24 197/8 18/14 191/11 12/17 226/13 12/17 127/23 126/4 126/7 127/23 204/5 211/14 213/1 18/2/3 74/4 13/10 148/25 12/17 12/12 12/17 24/23 25/9 20/45 211/14 213/1 16/24 204/9 160/2 100/2 12/17 12/14 13/10 148/25 auditabe [1] 15/51 backward [2] 165/13 Becoming [1] 165/24 84/15 88/22 113/22 boinus [5] 12/11 bootset [1] 77/22 29/10 229/18 backward [2] 461/7 46/2 16/17 18/16 22/17 20 13/15 bootset [1] 77/72 36/16 39/10 42/16 13/10 148/25 113/14 113/15 15/18 227/2 15/18 227/2 16/22 13/15 bootset [1] 77/22 36/16 39/10 42/16 13/12 12/18 backward [2] 461/7 46/2 36/17 78/16 78/16 24/12 24/12 13/6 22/17 36/16 39/10 | 113/8 113/9 113/11 | | | | |
| attempt [1] 21/15 178/17 181/3 182/27 172/8 172/8 173/24 174/2 214/2 211/9 214/2 211/9 23/22 23/23 23/24 attendo [7] 8/7 18/14 191/11 196/23 175/23 177/8 180/11 Befast [2] 182/21 41/8 41/9 <td>113/15 149/13 151/10</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | 113/15 149/13 151/10 | | | | |
| attend [7] 8/1 188/14 191/1 196/23 175/23 175/23 177/28 180/11 Belfast [2] 182/21 41/8 41/9 41/10 52/1 11/1 18/19 204/20 216/11 217/2 188/1 188/11 188/1 18/1 | attempt [1] 21/15 | | | | |
| 1111 18/19 58/9 65/9 204/20 216/11 217/2 188/1 18/11 19/111 182/23 55/5 57/11 71/14 75/18 attended [2] 8/6 8/9 attention [10] 42/22 43/16 53/17 53/20 59/10 125/15 125/21 120/2 216/9 227/23 49/6 73/21 132/12 body [2] 108/16 64/2 55/2 77/12 79/14 180/25 audit [4] 30/6 33/18 56/5 57/11 72/72 126/4 126/7 127/23 120/2 216/9 227/23 123/13 123/15 124/8 140/2 127/24 130/1 127/24 130/1 121/17 24/23 25/9 74/4 body [2] 108/16 140/2 audit [4] 33/6 33/18 130/1 127/12 10/1 61/1 193/19 become [5] 5/11 become [5] 5/15 becomig [1] 165/24 84/15 88/22 113/25 both [18] 16/3 32/9 auditable [1] 125/10 audite [1] 125/16 backward [2] 165/13 Beer [10] 2/14 47/15 157/18 163/3 194/24 both [18] 16/3 32/9 42/24 2023/4 backward [2] 165/13 Beer [23] 2/24 5/9 56/13 13/4 13/14 13/15 116/6 60/22 73/1 79/7 92/1 105/2 128/24 143/4 143/12 56/17 48/4 55/16 believed [2] 84/19 13/14 13/15 116/6 139/15 157/16 170/16 104/6 129/24 165/21 168/1 168/2 57/25 58/2 62/9 75/13 believed [2] 120/22 139/15 157/16 1 | attend [7] 8/7 8/11 | | | | |
| 7/5/18 219/21 220/20 192/3 194/16 197/8 belief [7] 3/23 36/2 74/4 attention [10] 42/22 43/16 53/17 53/20 59/6 20/5 211/14 213/1 196/7 32/12 132/12 160/2 54/2 55/2 77/12 79/14 126/4 126/7 127/23 20/5 211/14 213/1 216/2 216/9 227/23 belief [7] 3/23 36/2 74/4 attitude [1] 80/25 126/4 126/7 127/23 20/5 211/14 213/1 216/2 216/9 227/23 belief [2] 24/24 20/9 boous [5] 123/11 attitude [1] 80/25 auditable [1] 175/15 backed [1] 127/16 backwards [2] 165/13 beer [10] 2/14 47/15 156/122/20 131/15 boous [1] 77/22 47/25 125/19 132/4 backwards [2] 49/19 164/13 215/18 227/2 165/21 168/1 168/2 79/12 216/8 23/18 26/4 136/14 39/10 42/16 47/25 125/19 132/4 balance [3] 88/4 164/13 215/18 227/2 216/8 227/20 60/22 73/1 79/7 92/1 136/14 30/16 170/16 104/6 author [1] 125/22 narrister [4] 165/20 36/17 48/4 55/16 below [1] 191/1 139/15 157/16 170/16 21/24 222 183/14 478/16 83/4 135/21 139/2 140/2 36/17 48/2 52/16 below [1] 191/1 132/8 39/9 15/4 15/8 21/19 165/21 168/1 168/2 79/17 80/21 102/12 | 11/1 18/19 58/9 65/9 | | | | |
| attended [2] 8/8 /8 /9 attention [10] 42/22 43/16 53/17 53/2 54/2 55/2 77/12 79/12 54/2 55/2 77/12 79/12 73/16 31/7 226/3 21/1/4 21/3 23/12 12/2/2 autitude [1] 80/25 audited [1] 12/72 13/16 12/72/2 12/3/2< | 75/18 | | | | |
| attention 14/16 53/17 53/20 59/10 125/15 125/21 216/2 216/2 216/2 2216/2 164/24 204/9 borus [5] 123/11 81/7 25/2 77/12 79/12 126/4 121/17 24/12 24/12 24/12 24/12 24/12 24/12 24/12 24/12 24/17 123/13 123/15 123/11 123/13 123/15 123/11 123/13 123/13 123/13 123/13 123/13 123/15 123/11 123/13 123/15 123/11 123/13 123/15 123/11 123/13 123/15 123/11 123/15 | attended [2] 8/6 8/9 | | | | |
| 43/16 53/17 53/20 126/4 126/7 127/23 126/4 126/7 127/23 126/4 126/7 127/23 54/2 55/2 77/12 79/14 127/24 130/1 12/17 24/23 25/9 24/12 24/21 26/4 30/4 123/13 123/15 124/8 attitude [1] 80/25 auditable [1] 127/15 backeground [5] 5/15 5/21 10/1 61/1 193/19 backward [2] 165/13 35/22 52/4 73/6 74/16 124/17 auditable [1] 175/15 backward [2] 165/13 backward [2] 165/13 Beer [10] 2/14 47/15 157/18 163/3 194/24 boots [1] 77/22 auditable [1] 125/10 backwards [2] 49/19 164/13 215/18 227/2 157/18 163/3 194/24 16/3 39/10 42/16 Australia [2] 182/22 110/5 backwards [2] 49/19 16/4 174 81/4 55/16 believed [2] 84/19 113/14 113/15 116/6 164/20 223/4 143/12 5/9 16/8 23/18 26/6 belonged [1] 204/25 belonged [1] 204/25 author [1] 125/22 165/21 168/1 168/2 79/17 80/21 102/12 benerits [1] 108/8 boottom [5] 11/22 62/16 68/13 103/16 155/13 156/5 153/1 160/20 178/16 benerits [1] 108/8 boertits [1] 108/8 boertits [1] 108/8 boertits [1] 43/1 104/6 available [14] 6/13 154/24 155/13 156/5 153/1 160/20 178/16 benerits [1] 108/8 boertits [1 | attention [10] 42/22 | | | | |
| 54/2 55/2 77/12 79/14 127/24 130/1 127/24 130/1 127/24 130/1 127/2 4130/1 127/2 4130/1 123/13 123/15 124/8 81/7 226/13 attitude [1] 80/25 audit [4] 33/6 33/18 12/17 24/23 25/9 24/12 24/21 26/4 30/4 123/13 123/15 124/8 134/10 148/25 background [5] 5/15 5/21 10/1 61/1 193/19 been [250] 115/6 122/20 13/115 bousse [1] 124/1 audited [1] 125/10 backward [2] 165/13 backwards [2] 49/19 110/5 47/17 140/14 164/11 196/14 213/6 216/7 36/16 39/10 42/16 41/2 22 32/4 backwards [2] 49/19 100/5 229/10 229/18 believed [2] 84/19 39/15 157/16 170/16 42/24 author [1] 125/20 bar [2] 46/17 46/22 36/17 48/4 55/16 believer [1] 195/20 139/15 157/16 170/16 42/24 author [1] 125/22 bar [2] 46/17 46/22 36/17 48/4 55/16 believer [1] 195/20 139/15 157/16 170/16 5/2 61/6 68/13 103/16 165/21 168/1 168/2 77/17 80/21 102/12 belowg [1] 191/1 81/21 85/5 112/11 104/6 33/3 78/14 78/16 83/4 135/1 160/20 178/16 benefit [3] 143/1 55/2 60/18 104/4 131/18 186/2 139/14 151/12 139/12 12/17/16 131/16/20 <td>43/16 53/17 53/20</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | 43/16 53/17 53/20 | | | | |
| 81/7 226/13 backed [1] 127/16 79/12 35/22 52/4 73/6 74/16 124/17 attitude [1] 80/25 background [5] 5/15 Becoming [1] 165/24 84/15 88/22 113/25 bonuses [1] 124/1 audit [4] 125/10 backward [2] 165/13 Beer [10] 2/14 47/15 15/718 163/3 194/24 both [18] 16/3 32/9 audited [1] 125/10 backward [2] 165/13 Beer [10] 2/14 47/15 15/718 163/3 194/24 both [18] 16/3 32/9 August [6] 3/15 172/18 backwards [2] 49/19 164/13 215/18 227/2 216/8 227/20 60/22 73/1 79/7 92/1 August [6] 3/15 balance [3] 88/4 before [35] 2/24 5/9 204/4 139/15 157/16 170/16 413/2 12/24 143/4 143/12 5/9 16/8 23/18 26/6 believer [1] 195/20 190/4 212/22 215/16 author [1] 125/22 barrister [4] 165/20 36/17 48/4 55/16 belonged [1] 204/25 bottom [5] 11/22 available [14] 6/13 99 15/4 15/8 24/1 165/21 168/1 168/2 135/21 139/2 140/2 181/20 204/23 bottom [5] 14/24 5/6 106/9 109/24 154/24 155/13 156/5 153/1 160/20 178/16 benefits [1] 108/8 boxses [6] 15/1 16/20 9/9 15/4 15/8 221/2 18/17 18 187/19 190/11 132/12 164/24 204/25 brackets [1] 96/ | 54/2 55/2 77/12 79/14 | | | | |
| attitude [1] 80/25 audit [4] 33/6 33/18 background [5] 5/15 auditable [1] 175/15 auditable [1] 175/15 auditable [1] 175/15 audited [1] 125/10 August [6] 3/15 47/25 125/19 132/4 background [5] 5/15 backwards [2] 49/19 110/5 Becoming [1] 165/24 been [250] 84/15 88/22 113/25 115/6 122/20 131/15 backwards [2] 49/19 145/13 215/18 227/2 bonuses [1] 124/1 boots [1] 77/22 both [18] 163/3 32/9 47/17 140/14 164/11 196/14 213/6 216/7 boots [1] 77/22 both [18] 163/3 32/9 60/22 73/1 79/7 92/1 10/5 August [6] 3/15 47/25 125/19 132/4 Australia [2] 182/22 182/24 author [1] 125/22 authority [5] 62/2 62/16 68/13 103/16 104/6 110/5 based [20] 7/23 28/9 165/21 168/1 168/2 Before [35] 2/24 5/9 57/25 58/2 62/9 75/13 believed [2] 84/19 204/4 113/14 113/15 116/6 belonged [1] 204/25 barrister [4] 165/20 165/21 168/1 168/2 available [14] 6/13 9/9 15/4 15/8 24/1 25/6 106/9 109/24 114/6 131/18 160/2 159/15 162/2 162/12 182/20 166/12 162/1 168/1 168/2 135/21 139/2 140/2 135/21 139/21 102/12 based [20] 7/23 28/9 163/3 78/14 78/16 83/4 135/21 139/2 140/2 135/21 139/21 102/12 135/21 139/21 102/12 132/1 132/24 9/5 16/21 17/13 21/9 119/17 120/21 133/23 169/25 bought [3] 43/15 55/2 60/18 bought [3] 43/15 55/2 60/18 boxes [6] 15/1 16/20 16/21 17/13 21/9 21/10 available [14] 6/13 9/9 15/4 15/8 24/1 25/6 106/9 109/24 114/6 131/18 160/2 159/14 216/19 192/14 216/25 86/10 108/8 betre [4] 122/1 betre [4] 122/1 bre | 81/7 226/13 | | | | |
| audit [1] 38/25 5/21 10/1 61/1 193/19 been [250] 115/6 122/20 131/15 boost [1] 77/22 auditable [1] 175/15 auditable [1] 175/15 backward [2] 165/13 Beer [10] 2/14 47/15 157/18 163/3 194/24 both [18] 16/3 32/9 August [6] 3/15 172/18 backwards [2] 49/19 164/13 215/18 227/2 216/8 227/20 60/22 73/1 79/7 92/1 47/25 125/19 132/4 balance [3] 88/4 110/5 229/10 229/18 believed [2] 84/19 113/14 113/15 116/6 443/24 143/4 143/12 balance [3] 88/4 165/21 168/1 168/2 5/9 16/8 23/18 26/6 believer [1] 195/20 190/4 212/22 215/16 84/24 bar [2] 46/17 46/22 36/17 48/4 55/16 below [1] 191/1 13/14 113/15 116/6 139/15 157/16 170/16 104/6 165/21 168/1 168/2 53/3 78/14 78/16 83/4 135/21 139/21 102/12 Bene [1] 120 81/21 85/5 112/1 25/6 106/9 109/24 162/2 162/12 182/20 153/1 160/20 178/16 best [8] 3/22 49/5 16/21 17/13 21/9 169/21 82/17 avenues [1] 46/1 19/17 120/21 133/23 179/12 191/10 214/13 96/23 96/25 121/20 16/21 17/13 21/9 25/6 106/9 109/24 187/18 187/19 190/11 162/21 162/12 182/20 179/12 191/10 214/13 | attitude [1] 80/25 | | | | |
| 134/10 146/23 backward [2] 165/13 Beer [10] 2/14 47/15 157/18 163/3 194/24 both [18] 16/3 32/9 auditable [1] 125/10 August [6] 3/15 47/17 140/14 164/13 215/18 22/12 216/8 22/12 216/8 22/12 216/8 22/12 216/8 22/12 216/8 22/14 139/15 157/16 60/22 73/17 79/7 92/14 139/15 157/16 60/22 73/17 79/7 92/14 139/15 157/16 160/22 23/17 97/79 92/14 139/15 157/16 160/22 139/15 157/16 170/79 92/14 139/15 157/16 170/79 139/15 157/16 160/22 190/4 143/14 131/15 157/16 170/16 190/4 12/2/22 190/4 12/2/22 191/16 139/15 157/16 170/16 139/15 157/16 170/16 139/15 157/16 170/16 139/15 157/16 170/16 139/15 157/16 170/16 130/24 131/12 130/24 160/1 <td></td> <td>5/21 10/1 61/1 193/19</td> <td>boon [250]</td> <td></td> <td></td> | | 5/21 10/1 61/1 193/19 | boon [250] | | |
| auditable [1] 172/18 172/18 47/17 140/14 164/11 196/14 213/6 216/7 36/16 39/10 42/16 August [6] 3/15 47/17 140/14 164/11 196/14 213/6 216/7 216/8 227/20 60/22 73/1 79/7 92/1 47/25 125/19 132/4 143/4 143/12 59/16/8 22/24 59/9 139/15 15/7/16 170/16 Australia [2] 182/22 143/4 143/12 59/16/8 20/14 20/4 139/15 15/7/16 170/16 41/2 125/21 165/21 165/21 165/21 165/21 165/21 165/21 10/7 13/14 13/15 55/2 60/18 55/2 60/18 55/2 60/18 55/2 60/18 55/2 60/18 55/2 60/18 55/2 60/18 55/2 60/18 55/2 60/18 55/2 60/18 55/2 60/18 55/2 60/18 55/2 60/18 55/2 60/18 55/2 60/18 55/2 60/18 55/2 | 134/10 148/25 | | | | |
| audited [1] 125/10 backwards [2] 49/19 164/13 215/18 227/2 216/8 227/20 60/22 73/1 79/7 92/1 47/25 125/19 132/4 110/5 balance [3] 88/4 143/4 143/12 229/10 229/18 believed [2] 84/19 113/14 113/15 116/6 Australia [2] 182/22 182/24 143/4 143/12 5/9 16/8 23/18 26/6 believed [2] 84/19 139/15 157/16 170/16 author [1] 125/22 165/21 168/1 168/2 5/9 16/8 23/18 26/6 belonged [1] 204/25 balonce [3] 88/4 143/4 143/12 author [1] 125/22 165/21 168/1 168/2 5/725 58/2 62/9 75/13 belowgel [1] 191/1 81/21 85/5 112/11 62/16 68/13 103/16 165/21 168/1 168/2 79/17 80/21 102/12 Ben [1] 1/20 81/21 85/5 112/11 available [14] 6/13 6/10 106/22 144/20 135/21 139/2 140/2 181/20 204/23 bought [3] 43/15 55/2 60/18 153/1 160/20 178/16 benefits [1] 108/8 boxes [6] 15/1 16/20 16/21 17/13 21/9 25/6 106/9 109/24 184/15 221/2 187/18 187/19 190/11 132/12 164/24 204/25 better [4] 122/1 brackets [1] 96/4 16/21 16/1 192/14 216/19 214/15 219/3 219/21 132/12 164/24 204/25 brackets [1] 96/4 19/3 1 124/17 awarus [1 | auditable [1] 175/15 | | | | |
| August [6] 3/15 47/25 125/19 132/4 164/20 223/4 110/5 balance [3] 88/4 143/4 143/12 229/10 229/18 before [35] 2/24 5/9 5/9 16/8 23/18 26/6 before [35] 2/24 5/9 5/9 16/8 23/18 26/6 belonged [1] 204/25 belonged [1] 1/20 bassed [20] 7/23 28/9 128/9 129/11 130/17 53/3 78/14 78/16 83/4 135/21 139/2 140/2 86/10 106/22 144/20 147/15 148/22 149/16 benefits [1] 108/8 best [8] 3/22 49/5 162/2 162/12 182/20 179/12 191/10 214/13 96/23 96/25 121/20 162/1 17/13 21/9 162/2 162/12 182/20 179/12 191/10 214/13 96/23 96/25 121/20 162/1 17/13 21/9 214/15 219/3 219/21 132/12 164/24 204/25 breakt [8] 47/3 47/7 139/19 158/10 189/8 between [46] 8/25 9/4 35/11 38/16 39/18 135/21 163/23 164/3 breakt [8] 47/3 47/7 130/23 130/24 131/1 135/21 163/23 164/3 breaktown [1] 39/24 brief [2] 4/5 132/20 | | | | | |
| 47/25 125/19 132/4 164/20 223/4 Australia [2] 182/22 182/24 143/4 143/2 author [1] 125/22 author [1] 165/21 166/21 168/1 104/6 165/21 available [14] 6/13 9/9 15/4 15/3 53/3 78/14 78/16 165/21 128/24 104/6 129/15 135/21 available [14] 6/13 9/9 15/4 15/3 166/22 162/2 162/2 162/2 162/2 162/2 162/2 162/2 162/2 162/2 162/2 162/2 181/18 160/2 179/12 191/10 181/2 139/14 166/2 162/2 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<> | | | | | |
| 164/20 223/4 143/4 143/12 5/9 16/8 23/18 26/6 believer [1] 195/20 190/4 212/22 215/16 Australia [2] 182/22 bar [2] 46/17 46/22 36/17 48/4 55/16 36/17 48/4 55/16 believer [1] 195/20 190/4 212/22 215/16 author [1] 125/22 barrister [4] 165/20 57/25 58/2 62/9 75/13 36/17 48/4 55/16 believer [1] 195/20 190/4 212/22 215/16 bar [2] 46/17 46/22 barrister [4] 165/20 57/25 58/2 62/9 75/13 believer [1] 195/20 132/8 author [1] 125/22 based [20] 7/23 28/9 128/9 129/11 130/17 benefit [3] 143/1 132/8 62/16 68/13 103/16 53/3 78/14 78/16 83/4 135/21 139/2 140/2 187/18 187/19 190/11 153/1 160/20 178/16 benefits [1] 108/8 bought [3] 43/15 6/16 10 106/22 142/12 147/15 148/22 149/16 153/1 160/20 178/16 162/2 162/12 182/20 179/12 191/10 214/13 96/23 96/25 121/20 16/21 17/13 21/9 169/3 184/15 221/2 187/18 187/19 190/11 192/14 216/19 227/17 beforehand [1] 101/3 96/23 96/25 121/20 130/23 130/24 131/1 192/14 216/19 23/25 104/15 119/2 138/17 134/15 134/17 begin [1] 82/25 9/4 35/11 38/16 39/18 130/23 130/24 131/1 130/23 130/24 131/1 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<> | | | | | |
| Australia [2] 182/22 bar [2] 46/17 46/22 36/17 48/4 55/16 belonged [1] 204/25 bottom [5] 11/22 author [1] 125/22 authority [5] 62/2 62/16 68/13 103/16 165/21 165/21 168/1 68/2 79/17 80/21 102/12 belonged [1] 204/25 bottom [5] 11/22 62/16 68/13 103/16 165/21 168/1 68/2 79/17 80/21 102/12 belonged [1] 12/2 81/21< | | | | | |
| 182/24 barrister [4] 165/20 57/25 58/2 62/9 75/13 below [1] 191/1 81/21 85/5 112/11 author [1] 125/22 165/21 168/1 168/2 79/17 80/21 102/12 Ben [1] 1/20 132/8 62/16 68/13 103/16 165/21 168/1 168/2 128/9 129/11 130/17 benefit [3] 143/1 bought [3] 43/15 104/6 savailable [14] 6/13 53/3 78/14 78/16 83/4 135/21 139/2 140/2 181/20 204/23 55/2 60/18 86/10 106/22 144/20 154/24 155/13 156/5 153/1 160/20 178/16 best [8] 3/22 49/5 16/21 17/13 21/9 25/6 106/9 109/24 141/6 131/18 160/2 162/2 162/12 182/20 179/12 191/10 214/13 96/23 96/25 121/20 21/10 169/3 184/15 221/2 avenues [1] 46/1 sa/55 104/15 119/2 132/11 101/3 139/19 158/10 189/8 better [4] 122/1 basis [25] 38/11 75/4 beforehand [1] 101/3 139/19 158/10 189/8 between [46] 8/25 130/23 130/24 131/1 30/23 130/24 131/17 134/21 134/22 135/4 begin [1] 82/25 9/4 35/11 38/16 39/18 break [8] 47/3 47/7 averues [1] 4/25 5/8 134/21 134/22 135/4 begin [1] 82/25 9/2 35/21 42/6 between [46] 8/25 break [8] 47/3 47/7 avarue [45] 4/25 5/8 134/21 134/22 135/4 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | | | | | |
| author [1] 125/22 authority [5] 62/2 62/16 68/13 103/16 104/6 based [20] 7/23 28/9 available [14] 6/13 53/3 78/14 78/16 83/4 9/9 15/4 15/8 214/15 135/21 139/2 140/2 147/15 148/22 149/16 16/21 15/1 16/20 16/21 17/13 16/21 15/1 16/20 16/21 17/13 21/9 21/10 16/21 16/21 17/13 21/9 21/10 132/12 16/21 16/21 17/13 21/9 21/10 16/21 | | | | | |
| authority [5] 62/2 based [20] 7/23 28/9 128/9 129/11 130/17 benefit [3] 143/1 bought [3] 43/15 104/6 available [14] 6/13 53/3 78/14 78/16 83/4 135/21 139/2 140/2 benefit [3] 143/1 bought [3] 43/15 available [14] 6/13 9/9 15/4 15/8 24/1 154/24 155/13 156/5 153/1 160/20 178/16 best [8] 3/22 49/5 55/2 60/18 162/2 162/12 182/20 179/12 191/10 214/13 96/23 96/25 121/20 16/21 17/13 21/9 162/2 162/12 182/20 179/12 191/10 214/13 96/23 96/25 121/20 16/21 17/13 21/9 187/18 187/19 190/11 192/14 216/19 214/15 219/3 219/21 132/12 164/24 204/25 better [4] 122/1 192/14 216/19 227/17 beforehand [1] 101/3 139/19 158/10 189/8 between [46] 8/25 avanues [1] 46/1 191/7 120/21 133/23 169/25 9/4 35/11 38/16 39/18 135/21 163/23 164/3 aware [45] 4/25 5/8 134/7 134/15 134/17 begin [1] 82/25 9/2 340/25 42/6 42/14 63/22 64/10 breakdown [1] 39/24 | | | | | |
| 62/16 68/13 103/16 104/6 53/3 78/14 78/16 83/4 135/21 139/2 140/2 181/20 204/23 55/2 60/18 available [14] 6/13 9/9 15/4 15/8 24/1 66/10 106/22 144/20 147/15 148/22 149/16 benefits [1] 108/8 boxes [6] 15/1 16/20 154/24 155/13 156/5 154/24 155/13 156/5 153/1 160/20 178/16 best [8] 3/22 49/5 16/21 17/13 21/9 25/6 106/9 109/24 187/18 187/19 190/11 179/12 191/10 214/13 96/23 96/25 121/20 16/21 17/13 21/9 169/3 184/15 221/2 187/18 187/19 190/11 192/14 216/19 214/15 219/3 219/21 132/12 164/24 204/25 better [4] 122/1 avenues [1] 46/1 83/25 104/15 119/2 186/20 113/2 beforehand [1] 101/3 139/19 158/10 189/8 between [46] 8/25 break [8] 47/3 47/7 award [1] 124/17 134/7 134/15 134/17 134/21 134/22 135/4 begin [1] 82/25 40/23 40/25 42/6 breakdown [1] 39/24 beginning [4] 50/21 42/14 63/22 64/10 brief [2] 4/5 132/20 | | | | | |
| 104/6 86/10 106/22 144/20 147/15 148/22 149/16 benefits [1] 108/8 boxes [6] 15/1 16/20 available [14] 6/13 154/24 155/13 156/5 152/2 162/12 182/20 153/1 160/20 178/16 best [8] 3/22 49/5 16/21 17/13 21/9 25/6 106/9 109/24 147/15 148/22 149/16 153/1 160/20 178/16 best [8] 3/22 49/5 16/21 17/13 21/9 114/6 131/18 160/2 187/18 187/19 190/11 147/15 219/3 219/21 132/12 164/24 204/25 better [4] 122/1 192/14 216/19 basis [25] 38/11 75/4 beforehand [1] 101/3 139/19 158/10 189/8 between [46] 8/25 avenues [1] 46/1 83/25 104/15 119/2 119/17 120/21 133/23 began [2] 166/1 139/19 158/10 189/8 between [46] 8/25 award [1] 124/17 134/21 134/22 135/4 begin [1] 82/25 40/23 40/25 42/6 135/21 163/23 164/3 begin [1] 82/25 begin [1] 82/25 begin [1] 82/25 begin [1] 39/24 14/14 63/22 64/10 brief [2] 4/5 132/20 | | | | | |
| available [14] 6/13 9/9 15/4 154/24 155/13 156/5 9/9 15/4 15/2 162/2 | 104/6 | | | | |
| 9/9 15/4 15/8 24/1 162/2 162/12 182/20 179/12 191/10 214/13 96/23 96/25 121/20 21/10 25/6 106/9 109/24 187/18 187/19 190/11 214/15 219/3 219/21 132/12 164/24 204/25 brackets [1] 96/4 114/6 131/18 160/2 192/14 216/19 227/17 better [4] 122/1 breakt [8] 47/3 47/7 avenues [1] 46/1 33/25 104/15 119/2 119/17 120/21 133/23 beforehand [1] 101/3 139/19 158/10 189/8 break [8] 47/3 47/7 award [1] 124/17 134/7 134/15 134/17 134/21 134/22 135/4 begin [1] 82/25 9/4 35/11 38/16 39/18 135/21 163/23 164/3 begin [1] 82/25 begin [1] 82/25 begin [1] 82/25 begin [1] 39/24 breakdown [1] 39/24 | | | | | |
| 25/6 106/9 109/24 187/18 187/19 190/11 214/15 219/3 219/21 132/12 164/24 204/25 brackets [1] 96/4 114/6 131/18 160/2 192/14 216/19 227/17 beforehand [1] 101/3 139/19 158/10 189/8 breakt [8] 47/3 47/7 avenues [1] 46/1 33/25 104/15 119/2 beforehand [1] 101/3 beforehand [1] 101/3 between [46] 8/25 break [8] 47/3 47/7 award [1] 124/17 134/7 134/15 134/17 169/25 9/4 35/11 38/16 39/18 breakdown [1] 39/24 aware [45] 4/25 5/8 134/21 134/22 135/4 beginning [4] 50/21 42/14 63/22 64/10 brief [2] 4/5 132/20 | 9/9 15/4 15/8 24/1 | | | | |
| 114/6 131/18 160/2 192/14 216/19 227/17 169/3 184/15 221/2 192/14 216/19 227/17 avenues [1] 46/1 basis [25] 38/11 75/4 beforehand [1] 101/3 better [4] 122/1 139/19 158/10 189/8 avoid [1] 69/5 33/25 104/15 119/2 14/15 134/17 119/17 120/21 133/23 began [2] 166/1 139/19 158/10 189/8 break [8] 47/3 47/7 award [1] 124/17 134/7 134/15 134/17 134/21 134/22 135/4 begin [1] 82/25 9/4 35/11 38/16 39/18 breakdown [1] 39/24 beginning [4] 50/21 42/14 63/22 64/10 brief [2] 4/5 132/20 | | | | | |
| 169/3 184/15 221/2 avenues [1] 46/1 avoid [1] 69/5 award [1] 124/17 aware [45] 4/25 5/8 basis [25] 38/11 75/4 83/25 104/15 119/2 119/17 120/21 133/23 134/7 134/15 134/17 134/21 134/22 135/4 beforehand [1] 101/3 began [2] 166/1 169/25 139/19 158/10 189/8 between [46] 8/25 9/4 35/11 38/16 39/18 40/23 40/25 42/6 42/14 63/22 64/10 break [8] 47/3 47/7 130/23 130/24 131/1 135/21 163/23 164/3 breakdown [1] 39/24 | | | | | |
| avenues [1] 46/1 avoid [1] 69/5 award [1] 124/17 aware [45] 4/25 5/8 avare [45] 4/25 5/8 began [2] 166/1 began [2] 166/1 109/25 130/23 aware [45] 4/25 5/8 began [2] 166/1 169/25 9/4 35/11 9/4 35/11 38/16 9/4 35/11 38/16 130/23 130/24 135/21 166/25 begin [1] 82/25 begin [1] 50/21 42/14 63/22 brief [2] 4/5 | 169/3 184/15 221/2 | | | | |
| avoid [1] 69/5 award [1] 124/17 aware [45] 4/25 34/2 134/2 134/2 135/2 134/2 135/2 134/2 135/2 134/2 135/2 134/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 169/25 9/4 40/23 40/25 40/23 40/25 42/14 63/22 63/25 6 134/2 135/2 134/2 135/2 134/2 135/2 135/2 169/25 6 6 12 6 12 12 134/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 135/2 | | | | | |
| award [1] 124/17 aware [45] 4/25 34/21 134/21 134/21 134/22 134/21 134/22 134/21 134/22 134/21 134/22 134/21 134/22 134/21 134/22 134/21 134/22 134/22 135/4 beginning [4] 50/21 40/23 40/25 42/14 63/22 64/10 brief [2] 4/5 132/20 | | | | | |
| aware [45] 4/25 5/8 134/21 134/22 135/4 beginning [4] 50/21 42/14 63/22 64/10 brief [2] 4/5 132/20 | | | | | |
| | aware [45] 4/25 5/8 | | | | |
| | | | ~~yy [+] 00/21 | | |
| | | | | | (00) and the line line line line line line line lin |

(62) assisted... - brief

| В | 11/1 13/2 15/5 15/14 | 67/3 86/20 86/24 87/1 | Canavan [17] 1/15 | 159/17 |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| | 15/24 16/8 17/8 17/11 | 87/11 206/21 | 2/7 3/7 3/9 3/13 3/14 | centre [1] 77/21 |
| briefed [1] 5/15 | 18/7 20/13 21/14 | calling [1] 204/1 | 3/25 16/7 46/13 51/9 | centred [1] 121/17 |
| briefly [2] 7/15 | | | | |
| 120/11 | 22/17 22/20 23/25 | calls [7] 5/19 6/19 | 53/22 54/12 56/4 | certain [12] 15/16 |
| | 24/6 24/24 25/13 | 65/25 70/17 162/9 | 56/18 82/8 146/11 | 22/5 30/22 39/11 |
| bring [9] 6/10 21/9 | 26/10 26/22 27/9 | 162/11 162/18 | 229/2 | 40/16 45/1 77/17 |
| 25/7 91/5 98/18 | 27/25 28/21 28/24 | | | |
| 136/21 137/1 183/24 | | came [17] 10/11 | Canavan's [1] 137/12 | |
| 188/13 | 29/5 30/22 31/19 39/7 | 10/25 11/12 15/11 | cannot [2] 163/6 | 170/9 206/22 |
| | 40/7 40/11 40/15 | 20/3 20/11 22/22 36/7 | 184/12 | certainly [17] 2/8 |
| bringing [4] 34/5 | 40/21 41/3 41/11 42/2 | | | 77/7 79/12 88/18 |
| 44/23 81/7 207/4 | | | capability [2] 77/25 | |
| broad [6] 18/15 62/2 | 42/11 43/7 45/10 | 127/22 138/16 148/13 | 106/14 | 91/21 120/5 135/5 |
| | 46/12 47/2 49/10 51/6 | 154/13 155/3 217/2 | capacity [2] 66/18 | 137/21 163/25 174/10 |
| 62/16 68/12 71/6 | | | 77/25 | 176/4 179/18 193/14 |
| 120/18 | 52/9 53/3 53/23 55/17 | | | |
| broader [5] 44/3 | 57/14 57/16 58/22 | 2/8 2/21 3/7 3/11 3/19 | capital [2] 67/4 67/4 | 194/6 197/12 224/19 |
| | 66/17 69/6 69/7 69/12 | 7/15 11/21 12/25 13/7 | card [1] 141/15 | 225/23 |
| 82/12 134/18 135/14 | 70/18 72/23 73/6 77/6 | 14/5 18/4 18/16 19/6 | career [4] 4/5 49/25 | certainty [1] 128/7 |
| 206/16 | | | | |
| broadly [6] 92/9 | 78/5 78/13 79/12 | 21/8 21/9 21/25 22/13 | | certificate [1] 183/13 |
| | 81/14 82/2 84/15 87/7 | 28/6 32/23 32/25 33/3 | careful [2] 148/23 | cetera [5] 9/15 81/17 |
| 150/13 172/4 172/25 | 87/10 88/7 88/18 89/3 | 34/2 39/23 40/8 40/11 | | 102/12 124/15 134/19 |
| 173/6 207/11 | | | | |
| brochures [1] 15/3 | 91/23 93/8 99/9 99/12 | 44/16 47/9 47/11 | carefully [3] 148/24 | chains [1] 217/7 |
| | 99/14 100/5 100/22 | 47/18 48/4 49/13 | 151/17 152/21 | chair [5] 49/10 79/6 |
| brought [13] 4/3 | 101/5 102/1 102/4 | 49/25 51/17 55/14 | carried [8] 30/19 | 82/16 124/24 175/22 |
| 11/20 29/15 34/24 | | | | |
| 42/21 43/1 44/25 | 102/8 102/14 104/16 | 57/4 57/15 57/18 | 58/25 71/20 82/21 | chaired [2] 7/25 8/6 |
| | 105/8 105/15 106/8 | 57/19 58/4 58/21 | 136/11 178/1 178/19 | chairman [2] 165/5 |
| 53/17 53/20 54/2 | 106/18 107/6 110/2 | 58/24 60/11 61/15 | 211/4 | 223/1 |
| 79/14 89/18 90/22 | | | | |
| brush [1] 44/4 | 114/11 115/2 115/10 | 62/20 62/25 67/2 | carries [1] 75/5 | challenge [2] 54/22 |
| bubbled [1] 75/7 | 117/9 118/9 119/14 | 67/19 70/21 71/22 | carry [8] 77/19 136/7 | 123/5 |
| | 120/20 121/16 122/20 | 73/6 73/23 75/8 75/15 | 151/12 160/5 199/8 | challenges [4] 71/8 |
| buck [1] 14/12 | 124/17 129/14 130/3 | 77/7 79/2 82/15 82/24 | | 77/4 81/14 82/12 |
| budget [30] 11/16 | | | | |
| 12/4 13/14 13/18 | 130/15 131/15 135/13 | 84/23 85/2 85/4 86/17 | carrying [3] 151/4 | chance [2] 187/25 |
| | 137/4 138/2 139/7 | 91/16 95/2 97/1 100/6 | 169/1 178/9 | 211/13 |
| 13/19 14/7 14/15 | 140/2 140/4 140/23 | 102/13 102/15 102/20 | | change [7] 13/8 |
| 15/11 15/12 15/13 | | | | |
| 20/8 22/1 22/2 22/17 | 141/20 142/16 143/11 | 102/21 102/22 105/17 | 201/21 | 57/21 72/2 81/23 |
| | 144/3 144/14 146/4 | 109/2 111/17 112/9 | case [44] 35/19 | 162/5 162/14 197/9 |
| 22/19 22/22 23/21 | 147/1 148/7 148/12 | | 72/23 74/21 75/3 75/3 | |
| 26/5 26/18 26/20 | | | | U U U U |
| 26/20 28/1 28/2 30/6 | 149/18 150/12 153/1 | 116/11 118/14 120/10 | | 163/5 171/23 |
| | 154/22 156/9 156/13 | 121/9 124/20 125/2 | 118/11 119/2 119/2 | changes [2] 33/9 |
| 44/22 45/6 45/8 53/23 | 157/17 159/17 160/5 | 125/17 127/21 129/13 | 119/17 119/17 130/18 | |
| 54/18 55/7 | | | | |
| budgetary [5] 26/3 | 160/10 161/11 162/18 | 130/10 131/10 131/12 | | changing [2] 45/24 |
| | 163/10 165/4 167/8 | 131/21 131/25 132/7 | 139/24 141/24 142/25 | 45/24 |
| 26/9 26/23 26/25 | 167/20 169/11 172/11 | 132/11 132/13 135/10 | 143/4 145/7 145/22 | character [1] 141/15 |
| 44/19 | 172/14 172/21 173/2 | | | |
| budgets [9] 13/22 | | 136/11 141/25 143/1 | 146/9 147/2 149/9 | characterised [3] |
| 13/24 13/24 15/17 | 173/5 174/12 178/24 | 145/13 148/5 148/6 | 150/3 157/8 158/9 | 214/25 216/14 226/4 |
| | 179/11 180/7 181/18 | 148/16 149/4 149/6 | 159/11 161/15 169/10 | characteristics [1] |
| 15/25 22/9 24/1 36/12 | 183/10 185/5 187/6 | 149/7 150/16 151/20 | 172/23 172/23 183/20 | |
| 45/21 | | | | |
| build [3] 69/13 94/22 | 187/9 187/20 188/5 | 153/17 158/21 160/11 | | |
| | 188/6 189/19 190/13 | 163/22 164/5 164/7 | 190/16 193/8 193/23 | chased [1] 203/7 |
| 132/17 | 193/4 193/14 194/14 | 164/14 165/17 166/23 | | |
| buildings [1] 69/10 | | | | |
| Burges [2] 57/24 | 200/10 201/6 203/5 | 166/24 168/9 169/5 | case-specific [1] | checking [2] 121/20 |
| 123/2 | 203/20 203/25 204/10 | 172/10 175/12 176/4 | 169/10 | 121/22 |
| | 205/15 209/15 210/8 | 176/5 177/2 178/2 | caseload [5] 10/1 | checks [1] 189/12 |
| business [19] 7/25 | 211/21 213/18 213/24 | 181/22 184/6 188/23 | 10/3 10/6 10/12 10/21 | |
| 10/22 14/16 15/18 | | | | |
| 16/4 17/16 18/7 18/9 | 214/7 214/11 217/23 | 191/10 194/3 194/20 | cases [4] 103/10 | 126/5 126/8 127/25 |
| | 218/16 219/13 220/18 | 197/19 199/1 205/24 | 140/10 142/22 159/12 | child [1] 149/14 |
| 68/8 70/17 83/13 | 221/6 222/16 222/22 | 209/12 212/24 214/17 | cast [1] 169/12 | choice [1] 104/2 |
| 87/15 88/22 123/17 | | | | |
| 192/15 192/21 193/17 | 226/8 227/22 | 216/14 218/8 218/12 | catch [2] 86/19 86/23 | choices [2] 83/12 |
| 194/8 201/23 | <u> </u> | 218/24 219/3 222/5 | catching [1] 206/18 | 84/2 |
| | C | 222/6 | categorise [2] 71/21 | Christmas [1] 36/11 |
| business-as-usual | call [15] 3/7 6/16 | can't [15] 6/21 35/13 | 81/4 | |
| [1] 83/13 | | | | circulated [1] 33/21 |
| business-wide [1] | 6/23 47/12 77/22 87/9 | 75/13 76/16 93/11 | caused [1] 115/25 | circumstances [24] |
| | 87/10 131/21 149/21 | 94/11 121/16 135/7 | caution [1] 119/10 | 32/20 56/9 59/25 61/6 |
| 123/17 | 164/8 168/21 183/7 | 143/25 149/17 178/24 | | 98/23 99/22 101/11 |
| but [184] 2/8 5/25 | 190/19 223/25 224/1 | | | |
| 6/21 7/10 8/2 8/14 | | 188/23 195/9 220/13 | central [2] 41/6 41/23 | |
| | called [8] 2/2 41/11 | 220/14 | centralised [1] | 136/21 140/17 141/23 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | 101 |) briefed - circumstances |

(63) briefed - circumstances

| circumstances[tr] come [24] [21/9] complexity [2] conjunction [2] 62/4 32/8 35/16 65/3 68/2 14/20 14/9 173/11 13/11 147 25/16 65/3 68/2 201/18 connected [1] 52/15 57/16 65/3 68/2 15/9/1 14/9/1 12/7/2 35/6 41/5 62/2 33/7 31/8 98/9 connection [6] 92/2 93/18 116/19 152/5 57/16 57/2 68/2 56/12 35/12 57/16 57/2 68/2 208/15 218/2 17/16 190/25 18/4/1 compy [2] 22/4 46/6 19/8 208/15 97/2 | С | 66/13 | complex [1] 2/19 | confirmed [1] 154/9 | 19/13 19/14 31/1 31/6 |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1422 1449 1371 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<> | | | | | |
| 100/s 100/s <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<> | | | | | |
| 1906 1907 200115 1907 200115 | | | | | |
| 20910 21692 72/18 100/5 173/14 compols [2] 22/4 46/6 1998 97/16 97/22 1302 Civil [2] 60/16 192/17 77/16 160/25 149/1 78/20 components [1] components [1] 208/21 209/4 225/25 Carffictation [6] 66/21 80/64 134/0 66/21 80/64 134/0 42/22 56/37 116/23 208/21 211/20 Carffity [3] 78/22 207/19 22/41/3 15/8 66/10 136/8 15/21 2156/6 211/9 consequences [9] fo/14 13/4 fo | | | | | |
| Liny (1) 177/16 180/25 184/1 components [1] 157/16 157/2 158/21 156/21 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<> | | | | | |
| clarification [5] 147/16 158/12 159/24 159/21 001116/12 20072 197/3 147/16 158/21 159/22 159/26 comprehension [1] 158/23 159/2 147/16 158/21 159/22 159/26 147/16 159/22 159/26 147/16 159/22 159/26 147/16 159/22 159/26 159/26 159/26 159/ | | 177/16 180/25 184/1 | | cons [4] 157/7 | 208/21 209/4 225/25 |
| 1478 158/13 158/23 comes [10] 15/9 60/9 Comprehension [1] consequence [10] consequence [10] consequence [10] consequence [10] containing [3] 2103 clarifying [1] 15/8 15/8 56/15 comprise [11] 70/9 consequence [11] 15/8 56/15 consequence [11] 15/8 56/15 containing [3] 12057 clarifying [1] 15/8 comfortable [1] comprise [11] 70/9 consequence [11] 15/8 56/15 consequence [11] 15/8 56/15 containing [3] 12057 clarifying [1] 15/8 commond [1] 18/20 comprise [11] 70/7 consequence [11] 15/8 56/15 containing [3] 100/8 clarifying [20] 7/8 71/12 commencing [21] consequence [2] 11/11 15/8 57/16 consequence [3] 20/14 15/8 12 0/15 consider [6] 64/5 5/8/15 89/19 1/19 15/8 12 0/14 16/8/12 22 22 22/2 20/9 20/9 22 20/9 22 20/9 19 5/8/15 89/19 1/19 15/8 89/19 1/19 15/8 89/19 1/19 15/8 89/19 1/19 15/8 89/19 1/19 15/8 89/19 1/19 15/8 89/19 1/19 15/8 89/19 1/19 15/8 89/19 1/19 15/8 89/19 1/19 15/8 89/19 1/19 15/8 20/11 16/8/17 29/17 16/8/17 29/17 16/8/17 29/27 16/8/17 29/17 16/8/17 29/17 1 | | | | 157/16 157/24 158/11 | contained [3] 35/7 |
| 168/23 169/6 060/21 89/24 134/9 22/23 consequence [9] containing [3] 21/03 21/11 12/11 173/8 197/2 126/12 160/8 195/25 comprised [1] 79/19 22/21 33 21/11 12/21 11 21/11 12/21 11 159/20 159/2 20/19 21/11 22/11 159/12 166/6 219/23 containing [1] 20/7 159/20 159/2 20/19 164/16 comprised [1] 12/91 11/43 114/15 14/114/19 containing [1] 12/91 12/12 12/12 128/13 22/13 26/3 20/14 159/12 50/14 containing [1] 20/7 11/42 314/16 14/19 11/43 114/15 14/114/19 context [3] 10/18 11/14 21/20 23/18 164/16 context [6] 21/15 context [6] 12/25 context [6] 11/16 concernel [6] 21/15 context [6] 14/16 consideration [6] 20/21 20/21 20/21 20/14 155/12 20/14 155/12 20/12 consideration [6] 20/22 20/28 20/61 context [9] 14/14 16/22 156/12 16/17 14/07 context [2] 14/14 16/72 20/27 20/71 16/71 20/71 consideration [6] 20/22 20/28 20/61 context [7] 16/71 16/71 20/71 context [7] 16/71 20/22 20/28 20/61 context [7] 16/71 16/71 20/71 context [7] 16/71 | | | | | |
| Clam IV [3] 207/19 224/13 15/8 56/10 1368 ⁻¹ 11/1 21/2 156/6 21/2/3 contains [1] 205/7 159/20 71/9 224/13 15/8 56/10 1368 ⁻¹ 11/8 13 156/12 180/14 int 13/9 156/11 int 13/9 18/22 20/13 int 13/9 18/22 20/ | | | | | |
| 173/8 197/2 comfortable [1] comprise [1] 79/19 219/24 220/1 220/3 contemporaneous 159/20 coming [8] 18/20 comprise [1] 79/19 219/24 220/1 220/3 [1] 157/16 1142 2120 23/18 116 22/13 163/20 comprise [1] 79/19 114/3 114/15 114/19 content [3] 100/18 25/13 26/3 36/11 44/15 164/16 112/23 122/5 218/13 221/9 164/16 content [6] 12/3 25/13 26/3 36/11 44/19 144/19 concern [5] 21/15 consider [6] 64/5 content [6] 12/3 content [6] 12/3 content [7] 18/10 17/15 15/5/12 2175/25 23/2 224/6 concern [7] 22/11/24 119/11 consider [6] 64/5 58/11 58/16 91/19 17/16 17/17 19/12 22/76 99/14 202/12 20/13 16/17 129/5 155/11 20/22 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/23 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/22 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/22 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/22 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/22 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/22 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/22 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/22 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/22 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/22 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/22 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/22 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/22 20/32 20/32 20/32 20/32 <td>clarify [3] 78/22</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | clarify [3] 78/22 | | | | |
| Clarity [2] 41/15 158/15 comprised [1] 169/2 comprised [1] 169/2 comprised [1] 169/2 comprised [1] 14/3 14/15 11/4/19 comprised [1] 14/3 14/15 11/4/19 comprised [1] 14/3 14/15 11/4/19 comprised [1] 11/15 comprised [1] 12/19 11/14/3 14/15 11/4/19 comprised [1] 12/19 11/14/3 14/15 11/4/19 comprised [1] 12/19 11/14/3 14/15 11/4/19 comprised [1] 12/19 11/12/3 12/25 comprised [1] 12/19 11/14/3 14/14 15 11/4/19 comprised [1] 12/23 12/17 11/14/3 14/14 15/14/19 16/17 12/3 12/25 comprised [1] 12/3 12/17 11/14/3 14/14 14/14 11/12/3 12/25 content [6] 11/17 10/14 14/14 14/14 15/17 10/14/23 12/9/2 12/17 14/14/14 14/14 14/14 16/17 12/35 15/11 12/17 10/14/14/14 14/14 14/14 15/17 12/25 15/11 20/12 20/12 20/17 10/14 14/14 14/14 14/14 14/14 15/18 20/11 11/12/3 12/17 10/14 14/14 14/14 14/14 14/14 11/12/3 12/14 11/12/3 12/14 10/14 14/14 14/14 14/14 14/14 14/14 11/12/3 12/14 11/14/14 14/14 14/14 14/14 11/12/3 12/14 11/14/14 14/14 14/14 14/14 11/12/3 12/14 11/14/14 14/14 14/14 11/12/3 12/14 11/14/14 14/14 14/14 14/14 11/12/3 12/14 11/14/14 14/14 14/14 11/12/14 14/14 11/14/14 11/14/14 | | | | | |
| Clarity (L) Coming [8] 18/20 compromising [1] 114/3 11/15 154/15 content [3] 100/18 Clear [20] 7/8 7/12 7/16 82/13 163/20 13/8/20 13/8/20 11/8/9 156/12 180/14 18/9/19 194/10 25/13 26/3 36/11 41/3 164/16 11/2/3 122/5 21/3/3 221/9 18/9/19 194/10 25/13 26/3 36/11 41/3 164/16 11/2/3 122/5 21/3/3 221/9 16/2/2 18/2/5 contents [6] 1/2/3 14/715 156/4 158/14 14/4/19 concern [5] 21/15 Consequently [1] 16/2/2 20/8/5 contents [1] 18/10 16/2/2 20/8/5 content [1] 18/10 18/17 14/2/4 | | | | | |
| 138/2 138/2 138/2 115/9 156/12 141/9 14/16 141/9 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<> | | | | | |
| 11/14 21/20 23/18 71/0 52/13 (5/2) Computer (3) 11/2 | | 44/15 47/21 65/19 | | | 184/19 194/10 |
| 2613 2673 3611 41/3 194/16 112/23 12/25 218/13 22/19 49/4 120/4 142/4 57/12 72/5 134/10 144/19 concerne [6] 21/15 Consequently [1] 63/25 147/15 156/4 158/14 commenced [1] concerne [6] 21/15 concerne [6] 21/15 concerne [6] 21/15 context [19] 18/10 123/12 19/17 140/1 commenting [2] 223/2 22/16 concerne [8] 20/14 consider [6] 64/5 consider [6] 64/5 156/12 161/25 commenting [3] 21/17 109/12 20/11 210/23 203/8 20/16 156/12 161/25 commenting [3] 21/17 109/22 20/11 209/2 20/92 20/91 156/12 161/25 commenting [3] 21/17 109/16 20/13 109/17 201/2 202/2 20/14 139/12 139/17 140/1 commitment [1] 61/8 89/12 93/5 165/11 109/22 consideration [5] 202/2 20/24 20/17 139/12 139/17 140/1 commitment [1] 61/8 89/12 93/5 165/11 109/24 109/13 109/17 continued [2] 61/10 202/2 54/24 131/17 139/14 139/14 commitment [1] 61/8 89/12 93/15 13/77/10 109/24 11/9 14/24 109/16 10/13 continued [2] 62/12 14 | | | | | |
| S/1/12/15/16/4 156/4 | | | | | |
| 147/15 156/16 20/12 12/1 | | | | | |
| 179/19 17/3122 122/2 224/6 168/2 108/14 109/23 129/2 124/14 144/14 167/2 clearer [1] 137/1 comment [6] 111/15 concerned [8] 20/14 155/18 205/1 138/22 187/3 192/16 clearer [1] 45/20 138/2 227/6 98/14 202/12 20/12 16/17 129/5 155/11 209/22 209/2 209/2 209/2 156/12 161/25 commenting [3] 12/17 170/23 201/11 170/23 201/11 209/2 209/2 209/2 209/2 CLI [2] 168/21 198/23 commenting [3] 21/17 170/23 201/11 109/22 21/19 21/19 21/15 21/32/ Client [6] 29/10 38/13 118/2 133/10 committee [1] 6/15 58/5 70/3 72/23 77/1 109/22 considerations [1] 109/22 21/19 21/19 21/15/2 13/2/1 13/12 139/17 140/11 committee [1] 8/4 concerns [9] 54/22 109/24 110/9 144/24 169/16 continued [3] 198/24 108/27 16/19 16/17 20/22 54/24 13/17 140/10 140/17 197/15 138/18 concluded [3] 198/24 108/24 16/19 16/17 consideration [3] 12/14 12/14 12/14 14/14 12/14 12/14 12/14 13/18 concludes [1] 22/62/3 consisters [2] 18/18 12/14 13/18 contracting [3] 12/14 12/14/14 12/14/14 <t< td=""><td></td><td>commonoing [2]</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<> | | commonoing [2] | | | |
| 196/01/12/11/11 comment [6] 111/15 concerned [8] 20/14 155/18 205/1 184/22 187/3 192/16 cleary [7] 40/94 3/3 135/8 135/11 148/7 59/18 81/8 98/13 consideration [5] 20/22 32/3/8 206/16 cleary [7] 40/94 3/3 196/12 120/11 170/23 201/11 20/22 32/3/8 206/16 client [16] 20/14 20/22 20/12 16/17 129/16 20/22 32/3/8 206/16 considerations [1] 20/12 202/13 16/17 129/16 20/22 32/3/8 206/16 considerations [1] 20/12 202/12 considerations [1] 20/12 209/209/10 20/22 209/209/10 considerations [1] considerations [1] 109/12 109/12 20/12 109/22 21/19 180/7 181/4 181/19 20/17 consideratig [3] 20/22 consideratig [3] 20/22 42/14 31/17 109/14 144/23 169/16 169/16 180/7 181/4 181/19 183/18 concludes [1] 109/24 109/14 144/23 109/14 144/23 169/16 contludes [1] 20/22 contludes [1] 20/24 13/17 169/16 169/17 109/24 109/ | | | | | 124/14 144/14 167/22 |
| Clear [1] 145/20 135/8 135/1 148/7 59/18 81/8 69/13 consideration [5] 202/23 203/2 209/2 | | | | | |
| Clearty [7] 40/9 43/7 196/12 22/16 96/14 202/12 20/13 1017/12 20/13 1017/12 20/11 200/2 20/13 200/2 20/13 45/15 89/19 143/3 commenting [3] 212/17 170/23 20/11 210/12 201/12 20/11 210/12 201/12 20/11 210/12 201/12 20/11 210/12 201/12 20/11 210/12 201/12 20/11 210/12 201/12 20/11 211/19 213/15 213/22 201/11 211/19 213/15 213/22 201/12 201/14 201/2 20/14 201/22 201/14 201/22 201/14 201/22 201/14 201/14 201/21 201/2 | | 135/8 135/11 148/7 | | consideration [5] | 202/23 203/8 206/16 |
| 45/15 86/19 143/3 commenting [3] 212177 170/23 20171 217179 21315 213/25 156/12 161/25 194/12 194/16 194/18 considerations [1] 20171 170/23 20171 considerations [1] considerations [1] considerations [1] 20172 21719 21315 213/25 Clie [1 68/21 198/23 138/12 commitment [1] 61/8 89/12 93/5 165/11 considerations [1] 202/2 considerations [1] 20172 217/9 continue [4] 15/23 39/12 139/17 140/1 140/14 183/18 committee [1] 8/4 76/13 77137 7710 109/24 1109/13 109/17 continue [2] 62/12 139/12 194/17 197/13 131/13 94 2/12 52/1 77/11 77/1714 99/15 155/22 173/4 184/13 continue [1] 22/25 139/12 194/14 committee [1] 71/7 125/14 136/5 conclude [3] 198/24 consistering [3] 127/14 contractor [2] 73/11 160ser [3] 138/21 rd/14 21/14 10717/14 contraction [1] 207/25 consistency [2] 83/12 consistency [2] 83/12 contractor [2] 73/11 119/12 139/11 communication [1] 202/20 conclusion [1] 201/21 179/12 consistency [2] 148/18 contractor [2] 73/11 119/12 1 | | | | | |
| 130/12 16//23 comments [1] 96/15 58/5 70/3 72/23 77/1 109/22 217/9 217/9 2011 [21 168/21 198/23 commitment [1] 61/8 89/12 93/5 165/11 103/5 104/3 106/1 202/2 continue [1] 73/7 202/2 continue [1] 73/7 202/2 continue [1] 73/7 202/2 continue [1] 73/7 continue [2] 62/12 109/24 110/9 144/24 continue [2] 62/12 109/24 110/9 144/24 109/24 110/9 144/24 109/16 continue [2] 62/12 109/16 109/16 continue [1] 22/25 contractor [2] 73/11 108/22 161/19 161/20 contractor [2] 73/11 108/22 161/19 161/20 contractor [2] 73/11 108/22 161/19 161/20 contractor [2] 73/11 108/21 87/11 contractor [2] 73/11 108/22 161/19 161/20 contractor [2] 73/11 108/22 161/26 contractor [2] 73/11 108/21 87/14 contractor [2] 73/11 108/21 87/14 contractor [2] 73/11 108/21 87/14 108/21 87/14 contractor [2] 73/11 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | | | | | |
| CLI [2] 168/21 198/23 committed [2] 61/12 considered [14] 73/7 continue [4] 15/23 33/13 118/2 133/10 committed [2] 61/10 202/2 103/5 104/3 106/11 20/22 26/22 54/24 131/1 20/22 26/22 | | commonto [1] 06/15 | | | |
| Client [16] Committed [2] 61/10 202/2 103/5 103/5 104/3 108/1 26/22 54/24 131/17 139/12 139/17 140/1 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | | | | | |
| 139/12 139/17 140/1 183/18 concerns [9] 53/22 109/6 109/13 109/17 continued [2] 62/12 139/12 139/17 140/1 140/10 140/18 170/19 1417 139/19 42/12 52/1 76/13 77/3 77/10 155/22 173/4 184/13 continues [1] 222/25 194/12 194/17 197/13 55/12 67/10 70/22 74/3 79/5 124/5 contludes [1] 125/4 136/5 213/3 continues [1] 222/25 continues [1] 22/15 continues [1] 7/17 199/3 199/23 concludes [1] 226/23 considering [3] 127/14 contractors [2] 73/11 close [2] 138/2 74/3 79/5 124/5 conmunicates [4] 7/17 199/3 199/23 concludes [1] 226/23 considering [3] contractors [2] 73/11 close [2] 138/2 74/10 74/10 74/14 207/25 consistency [2] contractors [2] 83/17 closer [3] 64/2 communication [4] 31/18 60/23 98/19 consistency [2] contract [1] 64/21 closer [3] 64/2 contractors [13] contract [13] 64/2 contract [13] 64/2 contract [14] 22/10 closer [3] 64/2 181/3 contact [6] 73/22 consistent [3] 32/7 contract [3] 33/14 contract [3] 33/14 contract [4] 22/10 closer [3] 64/2 13/17 63/21 63/24 64/10 64/17 64/25 65/14 74/14 | | | | | |
| 140/10 140/18 170/19 committee [1] 8/4 7/17/10 19/24 110/17 consider [3] 140/14 140/17 158/22 177/14 176/14 12/2/5 consistent [3] 20/7 consistent [3] 32/7 consistent [3] 32/7 consistent [3] 32/7 control [8] 33/14 control [8] 33/14 control [9] 11/3/2 control [1] 13/14 control [1] 13/14 control [1] 13/14/2 control [1] 13/14/2 control [1] 15/14 control [2] 148/8 10/20 74/23 88/6 control [1] 15/14 control [2] 12/15 control [1] | | | concerns [9] 53/22 | | |
| 180/7 181/4 181/19 194/12 194/17 197/13 81/7 33/19 42/12 52/1 7/711 7/714 99/15 155/22 17/34 184/13 continues [1] 222/25 clients [3] 138/2 74/3 79/5 124/5 125/4 136/5 213/3 considering [3] 127/14 clients [3] 138/2 74/3 79/5 124/5 concluded [3] 198/24 considering [3] 127/14 close [2] 138/2 9/15 42/16 66/25 concludes [1] 226/23 considers [2] 184/8 73/15 closed [1] 224/14 19/14 10 17/11 71/14 17/14 108/22 161/19 161/20 contractors [2] 73/11 closed [1] 224/14 12/14 120/12 concludes [1] 226/23 considers [2] 184/8 73/15 closed [1] 224/14 172/12 174/10 174/14 207/25 consistency [2] 83/20 contractors [2] 83/7 closer [3] 64/2 communicate [1] 31/18 60/23 98/19 consistent [3] 32/7 contractor [8] 33/14 closer [3] 97/9 97/22 ramunications [13] conduct [10] 19/17 32/18 174/3 control [8] 33/14 closer [3] 97/9 97/22 ramunications [13] conduct [10] 19/17 32/18 174/3 control [8] 33/14 closer [3] 97/9 97/22 ramunications [13] conduct [10] 19/17 consistent [3] 92/10 control [8] 33/14 | | | | | |
| 194/12 194/17 197/13 55/12 67/10 70/22 125/4 136/5 213/3 continuing [1] clients [3] 138/21 74/3 79/5 124/5 considering [3] 127/14 157/24 194/14 9/15 42/16 66/25 concluded [3] 198/24 considering [3] 127/14 close [1] 224/14 9/15 42/16 66/25 conclusion [1] consistent [2] 184/18 73/15 closed [1] 224/14 9/15 42/16 66/25 common [4] 69/16 conclusion [1] consistent [3] 32/7 consistent [3] 32/7 closer [3] 64/2 172/14 communicate [1] 161/15 consistent [3] 32/7 133/13 communicate [1] 31/18 60/23 98/19 consistent [3] 32/7 consistent [3] 32/7 contractor [8] 33/14 closer [3] 64/2 181/3 conmunication [4] 31/18 60/23 98/19 consistent [3] 32/7 control [8] 33/14 closer [3] 64/2 communication [4] 31/18 60/23 98/19 consistent [3] 22/10 control [8] 33/14 closer [3] 97/9 7/22 fo/16 6/14 74/14 conducted [6] 73/22 constant [4] 22/10 198/11 codes [6] 7/9 7/22 fo/16 6/14 74/14 conducted [6] 73/22 construct [3] 90/2 96/24 14/16 control [1] 15/14 fol | | | | | |
| Clients [3] 135/21 committees [4] 7/17 199/3 199/23 108/22 161/19 161/20 contractor [2] 73/11 157/24 194/14 9/15 42/16 66/25 concludes [1] 226/23 considers [2] 184/18 73/15 contractors [2] 73/11 108/22 161/19 161/19 161/19 161/19 161/19 considers [2] 184/18 73/15 contractors [2] 73/11 108/22 138/20 172/16 172/10 174/14 207/25 consistency [2] 83/20 contractual [1] contractual [1] 133/13 contractual [1] 133/13 contractual [1] 133/13 contractual [1] 133/14 contractual [1] 132/24 control [8] 33/14 | | | | | |
| 10/124 194/14 9/15 42/16 66/25 conclusion [1] 212/22 considers [2] 184/18 73/15 140/17 Close [1] 224/14 common [4] 69/16 217/25 consistency [2] 83/20 140/17 Closely [2] 138/20 common [4] 202/20 conclusions [1] 212/25 consistency [2] 83/20 170/16 commonicate [1] 202/20 consistency [2] 14/16 107/17 consistency [2] 83/20 100/17 commonicate [1] 202/20 conduct [10] 19/17 32/18 174/3 consistency [2] 83/20 119/12 139/11 communicate [1] 202/25 40/23 40/25 168/23 170/21 179/2 consolidate [1] 33/14 contractual [1] 33/14 codes [6] 97/9 97/22 181/3 communications [13] conducting [12] 34/9 145/25 constant [4] 22/10 198/11 control [8] 33/14 control [8] 33/14 control [8] 33/14 149/8 codes [6] 97/9 97/22 181/3 conducting [12] 34/9 145/25 constant [4] 22/10 198/11 control [8] 137/2 157/15 159/4 157/4 188/6 198/6 149/8 collague [1] 169/23 company [4] 7/16 163/17 63/21 63/24 66/22 constractual | clients [3] 138/21 | | | | |
| common [4] 69/16 conclusion [1] 212/25 contractors [2] 83/7 140/17 172/12 174/10 174/14 207/25 consistency [2] 83/20 commonly [1] 202/20 conclusions [1] consistency [2] 41/16 107/17 83/20 communicate [1] 33/11 conduct [10] 19/17 32/18 174/3 consistent [3] 32/7 33/13 closer [3] 64/2 33/11 conduct [10] 19/17 31/18 60/23 98/19 consistent [3] 32/7 33/14 closer [3] 64/2 33/11 conduct [10] 19/17 31/18 60/23 98/19 consistent [3] 32/7 33/14 closer [3] 97/9 2/25 40/23 40/25 184/23 185/19 215/17 145/25 constant [4] 22/10 constant [4] 22/10 code [1] 98/15 communications [13] 63/17 63/21 63/24 65/1 65/14 74/14 214/13 214/15 constant [4] 22/10 198/11 collaboration [1] 153/25 178/15 219/8 36/13 2 constrained [1] 10/20 74/23 88/6 137/22 157/15 159/4 collected [2] 121/23 compensation [5] confidence [2] 148/8 169/21 180/8 180/9 163/23 163/2 constructel [2] 10/16 11/10 1/2 collected [2] 121/23 complete [6] 12/15 164/20 65/2 | | | | | |
| 140/17 172/12 174/10 174/14 207/25 consistency [2] 83/20 closed [1] 224/14 commonly [1] 202/20 conclusions [1] 101/15 consistency [2] 83/20 closer [3] 64/2 33/11 conmunicate [1] 161/15 consistency [2] 41/16 107/17 contractual [1] closer [3] 64/2 communication [4] 2/25 40/23 40/25 181/3 conduct [10] 19/17 32/18 174/3 contrast [1] 64/21 closer [3] 64/2 communication [4] 2/25 40/23 40/25 31/18 60/23 98/19 consistency [2] 43/14 60/20 contrast [1] 64/21 closer [6] 97/9 97/22 63/17 63/24 63/24 65/17 63/24 65/17 65/14 74/14 85/21 87/18 182/12 constituting [1] constituting [1] control [6] 13/14 collaboration [1] 95/6 compensation [5] compensation [5] conduct [1] 70/16 construct [3] 90/2 construct [3] 90/2 204/2 colleagues [5] 6/7 56/4 83/5 96/5 106/24 completa [6] 12/15 confidence [2] 14/86 140/22 140/23 construct [3] 90/2 204/2 collected [2] 121/23 completa [6] 12/15 confidence [2] 14/86 141/12 construct [3] 90/2 204/2 col | | | | | |
| closely [2] 138/20 commonity [1] 202/20 conclusions [1] 41/16 107/17 contractual [1] 133/13 closer [3] 64/2 139/11 33/11 conduct [10] 19/17 32/18 174/3 consistent [3] 32/17 32/18 174/3 contractual [1] 133/13 contractual [1] 133/14 contractual [1] 133/13 contractual [1] 133/14 contractual [1] 133/14 contractual [1] 133/14 contractual [1] 133/14 contractual [1] 131/14 161/14 contractual [1] 131/14 161/14 contractual [1] 131/14 161/14 | | | | | |
| 170/16 communicate [1] 16/15 consistent [3] 32/7 133/15 closer [3] 64/2 33/11 conduct [10] 19/17 2/18 174/3 contrast [1] 64/21 closing [1] 64/18 2/25 40/23 40/25 168/23 170/21 179/2 consistent [3] 22/7 145/25 code [1] 98/15 communications [13] conduct [6] 73/22 consolidate [1] 33/24 85/11 137/5 codes [6] 97/9 97/22 63/17 63/21 63/24 85/21 87/18 182/12 constant [4] 22/10 constant [4] 22/10 149/8 company [4] 7/16 conducting [12] 34/9 111/3 constructing [1] construct [3] 90/2 collaague [1] 4/20 company [4] 7/16 183/2 186/24 187/4 construct [3] 90/2 construct [2] construct [2] 10/16 11/10 12/9 colleagues [5] 6/7 56/4 83/5 96/5 106/24 complete [6] 12/15 confident [1] 206/22 construct [2] 10/16 11/10 12/9 10/16 11/10 12/9 collected [2] 121/23 112/16 118/21 120/17 confirm [4] 3/19 construct [1] 32/4 89/18 89/23 136/13 collected [3] confirmation [1] consultation [2] 13/2/2 15/17 136/24 148/25 153/7 collected [2] 121/23 completed [3] confirmation [1] <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<> | | | | | |
| closer [3] 64/2 33/11 conduct [10] 19/17 32/18 174/3 contrast [1] 64/21 119/12 139/11 communication [4] 31/18 60/23 98/19 consists [1] 166/20 control [8] 33/14 closing [1] 64/18 2/25 40/23 40/25 168/23 170/21 179/2 consists [1] 166/20 control [8] 33/14 closing [1] 78/20 communications [13] conducted [6] 73/22 constant [4] 22/10 33/24 85/11 137/5 code [1] 98/15 communications [13] conducted [6] 73/22 constant [4] 22/10 198/11 collaboration [1] 65/1 65/14 74/14 85/21 87/18 182/12 constraint [1] 02/23 controlled [1] 15/14 collaboration [1] 153/25 178/15 219/8 34/18 83/24 143/24 constraintel [1] 10/20 74/23 88/6 collade [1] 169/23 company [4] 7/16 188/2 186/24 187/4 construct [3] 90/2 137/22 157/15 159/4 colleagues [5] 6/7 compensation [5] conduct [1] 70/16 construct [2] 10/16 11/10 12/9 collection [3] 134/2 122/12 complete [6] 12/15 confident [1] 206/22 construct [1] 38/18 89/32 136/13 collection [3] 134/2 122/12 completed [3] confident [1] 206/22 construct [1] 32/4 89/18 8 | | | | | |
| 119/12 139/11 2/25 40/23 40/25 168/23 170/21 179/2 consolidate [1] 33/24 85/11 137/5 clue [1] 78/20 181/3 184/23 185/19 215/17 145/25 157/4 188/6 198/6 code [1] 98/15 63/17 63/21 63/24 85/21 87/18 182/12 27/13 27/14 176/16 198/11 codes [6] 97/9 97/22 63/17 63/21 63/24 85/21 87/18 182/12 27/13 27/14 176/16 198/11 codes [6] 97/9 97/22 63/17 63/21 63/24 85/21 87/18 182/12 27/13 27/14 176/16 constant [4] 22/10 149/8 153/25 178/15 219/8 214/13 214/15 conducting [12] 34/9 111/3 10/20 74/23 88/6 collaboration [1] 95/6 company [4] 7/16 183/2 186/24 187/4 constrained [1] 137/22 157/15 159/4 colleagues [5] 6/7 56/4 83/5 96/5 106/24 compensation [5] conduit [1] 70/16 construct [3] 90/2 204/2 collection [3] 134/2 202/17 202/19 complete [6] 12/15 12/20 27/6 32/7 38/21 162/21 141/1 56/17 65/7 74/13 78/2 collection [3] 85/6 85/25 completed [3] confirmation [1] 139/4 139/17 136/24 148/24 15/3/1 139/4 139/17 136/24 148/24 15/3/1 collection [3] <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td> </td></td<> | | | | | |
| Closing [1] 64/18 181/3 184/23 185/19 215/17 145/25 157/4 188/6 198/6 code [1] 98/15 communications [13] 63/17 63/21 63/24 63/17 63/21 63/24 63/17 63/17 63/21 63/24 63/17 63/17 63/21 63/24 63/17 63/17 63/21 63/24 63/17 63/17 63/21 63/17 63/21 63/17 63/21 63/17 63/21 63/17 63/21 63/17 63/21 63/17 63/17 63/21 63/17 63/21 63/17 63/21 63/17 63/21 63/17 63/21 63/17 63/21 63/17 63/21 63/17 63/21 63/17 63/21 63/17 63/21 63/21 63/21 63/21 63/21 63/21 63/21 63/21 63/21 63/21 63/21 63/21 63/23 63/13 63/13 159/7 192/23 203/2 204/2 construct [3] 90/2 90/2 204/2 construct [3] 90/2 20/2 20/2 20/2 20/2 20/2 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> | | | | | |
| Cille [1] 78/20 communications [13] conducted [6] 73/22 constant [4] 22/10 198/11 code [1] 98/15 63/17 63/21 63/24 85/21 87/18 182/12 27/13 27/14 176/16 controlled [1] 15/14 149/8 64/10 64/17 64/25 214/13 214/15 constituting [1] 111/3 10/20 74/23 88/6 collaboration [1] 95/6 153/25 178/15 219/8 34/18 83/24 143/24 constrained [1] 137/22 157/15 159/4 collate [1] 169/23 company [4] 7/16 183/2 186/24 187/4 construct [3] 90/2 204/2 collaegues [5] 6/7 56/4 83/5 96/5 106/24 compensation [5] conduct [1] 70/16 construct [2] 10/16 11/10 12/9 collected [2] 121/23 complete [6] 12/15 confidence [2] 148/8 140/22 140/23 12/20 27/6 32/7 38/2 collectin [3] 134/2 202/17 202/19 complete [6] 12/15 confident [1] 206/22 141/1 56/17 65/7 74/13 78/2 collectin [3] 134/2 202/17 202/19 completed [3] confirm [4] 3/19 consult [1] 32/4 89/18 89/23 136/13 consult [1] 129/22 168/20 207/24 completed [3] confirmation [1] 139/4 139/17 153/10 153/13 154/1 consultation [2] 129/22 168/20 207/24 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<> | | | | | |
| code [1] 98/15 63/17 63/21 63/24 85/21 87/18 182/12 27/13 27/14 176/16 controlled [1] 15/14 140/6 142/25 145/8 64/10 64/17 64/25 61/17 61/25 constituting [1] 111/3 10/20 74/23 88/6 149/8 153/25 178/15 219/8 34/18 83/24 143/24 as/21 180/8 180/9 36/13 10/20 74/23 88/6 collaboration [1] 153/25 178/15 219/8 34/18 83/24 143/24 as/21 180/8 180/9 36/13 159/7 192/23 203/9 colladgue [1] 4/20 company [4] 7/16 153/2 186/24 187/4 construct [3] 90/2 96/24 141/12 construct [3] 90/2 204/2 colleagues [5] 6/7 56/4 83/5 96/5 106/24 64/20 65/2 confidence [2] 148/8 140/22 140/23 12/20 27/6 32/7 38/2 constructed [2] 10/16 11/10 12/9 10/16 11/10 12/9 12/20 27/6 32/7 38/2 collected [2] 121/23 complete [6] 12/15 162/21 confidence [2] 148/8 140/22 140/23 construction [1] 38/25 39/17 53/21 collection [3] 134/2 202/17 202/19 complete [6] 12/15 confidence [1] 206/22 141/1 consultation [2] 136/24 148/25 153/7 collection [3] 85/6 85/15 85/25 completed [3] confirmation [1] 139/4 139/17 153/10 1 | | | | | |
| 140/6 142/25 145/8 64/10 65/1 64/10 65/1 64/10 64/10 65/1 64/10 65/1 64/10 65/1 64/10 65/1 64/10 66/11 64/11 66/11 64/11 66/11 66/11 66/11 66/11 66/11 66/11 66/11 66/11 66/1 | | | 85/21 87/18 182/12 | | |
| 149/8 65/1 65/14 74/14 conducting [12] 34/9 111/3 10/20 74/23 88/6 collaboration [1] 153/25 178/15 219/8 34/18 83/24 143/24 constrained [1] 137/22 157/15 159/4 95/6 221/7 company [4] 7/16 169/21 180/8 180/9 36/13 159/7 192/23 203/9 colleague [1] 4/20 company [4] 7/16 183/2 186/24 187/4 construct [3] 90/2 96/24 141/12 conversations [27] colleagues [5] 6/7 56/4 83/5 96/5 106/24 compensation [5] conduit [1] 70/16 constructed [2] 10/16 11/10 12/9 24/22 24/23 50/15 64/20 65/2 confidence [2] 148/8 162/21 constructed [2] 10/16 11/10 12/9 collection [3] 134/2 112/16 118/21 120/17 confident [1] 206/22 construction [1] 38/25 39/17 53/21 collection [3] 85/6 112/16 118/21 120/17 confirm [4] 3/19 consult [1] 32/4 89/18 89/23 136/13 column [3] 85/6 85/15 85/25 completed [3] confirmation [1] 139/4 139/17 153/10 153/13 154/1 consulted [4] 48/14 157/23 159/17 192/28 confirmations [1] 48/17 48/24 74/5 203/3 | | | | | |
| collaboration [1] 153/25 178/15 219/8 34/18 83/24 143/24 constrained [1] 137/22 157/15 159/4 95/6 221/7 169/21 180/8 180/9 36/13 159/7 192/23 203/9 collaague [1] 4/20 company [4] 7/16 183/2 186/24 187/4 36/13 159/7 192/23 203/9 colleagues [5] 6/7 56/4 83/5 96/5 106/24 compensation [5] conduit [1] 70/16 constructed [2] 10/16 11/10 12/9 24/22 24/23 50/15 confidence [2] 148/8 162/21 construction [1] 38/25 39/17 53/21 collected [2] 121/23 complete [6] 12/15 confident [1] 206/22 141/1 56/17 65/7 74/13 78/7 collection [3] 134/2 202/17 202/19 complete [6] 12/15 confident [1] 3/4 3/19 39/18 89/23 136/13 column [3] 85/6 85/15 85/25 completed [3] confirmation [1] 139/4 139/17 136/24 148/25 153/7 completion [2] 98/13 confirmations [1] 48/17 48/24 74/5 203/3 | | | | | |
| 95/6 221/7 169/21 180/8 180/9 36/13 159/7 192/23 203/9 collate [1] 169/23 company [4] 7/16 183/2 186/24 187/4 construct [3] 90/2 204/2 colleagues [5] 6/7 compensation [5] conduit [1] 70/16 constructed [2] 10/16 11/10 12/9 24/22 24/23 50/15 compensation [5] confidence [2] 148/8 140/22 140/23 12/20 27/6 32/7 38/27 collected [2] 121/23 complete [6] 12/15 confident [1] 206/22 construction [1] 38/25 39/17 53/21 collection [3] 134/2 complete [6] 12/15 confident [1] 206/22 141/1 56/17 65/7 74/13 78/7 column [3] 85/6 12/16 118/21 120/17 confirm [4] 3/19 consult [1] 32/4 89/18 89/23 136/13 column [3] 85/6 completed [3] confirmation [1] 139/4 139/17 153/10 153/13 154/1 completion [2] 98/13 confirmations [1] 48/17 48/24 74/5 203/3 | | | | | |
| collate [1] 169/23 15/15 19/4 35/23 189/10 189/25 96/24 141/12 conversations [27] colleagues [5] 6/7 56/4 83/5 96/5 106/24 14/20 constructed [2] 140/22 140/23 12/20 27/6 32/7 38/25 collected [2] 121/23 64/20 65/2 confidence [2] 148/8 140/22 140/23 12/20 27/6 32/7 38/25 collected [2] 121/23 64/20 65/2 confidence [2] 148/8 141/1 56/17 65/7 74/13 78/7 collection [3] 134/2 112/16 118/21 120/17 confident [1] 206/22 141/1 56/17 65/7 74/13 78/7 collection [3] 134/2 112/16 118/21 120/17 confirm [4] 3/19 consult [1] 32/4 89/18 89/18 89/23 136/13 collection [3] 85/6 s5/15 85/25 completed [3] confirmations [1] 139/4 139/17 153/10 153/13 154/1 < | 95/6 | | | | |
| colleague [1] 4/20 compensation [5] conduit [1] 70/16 constructed [2] 10/16 11/10 12/9 colleagues [5] 6/7 24/22 24/23 50/15 conduit [1] 70/16 constructed [2] 140/22 140/23 12/20 27/6 32/7 38/2 collected [2] 121/23 64/20 65/2 complete [6] 12/15 162/21 construction [1] 38/25 39/17 53/21 collection [3] 134/2 112/16 118/21 120/17 confident [1] 206/22 141/1 56/17 65/7 74/13 78/2 collection [3] 134/2 112/16 118/21 120/17 confirm [4] 3/19 consult [1] 32/4 89/18 89/23 136/13 column [3] 85/6 completed [3] confirmation [1] 139/4 139/17 153/10 153/13 154/1 29/22 168/20 207/24 149/1 consulted [4] 48/14 157/23 159/17 192/25 completion [2] 98/13 confirmations [1] 48/17 48/24 74/5 203/3 | | | | | |
| colleagues [5] 6/7 24/22 24/23 50/15 confidence [2] 148/8 140/22 140/23 12/20 27/6 32/7 38/27 56/4 83/5 96/5 106/24 64/20 65/2 162/21 confidence [2] 148/8 140/22 140/23 12/20 27/6 32/7 38/27 collected [2] 121/23 64/20 65/2 complete [6] 12/15 162/21 confidence [1] 206/22 141/1 38/25 39/17 53/21 collection [3] 134/2 112/16 118/21 120/17 148/7 223/4 confirm [4] 3/19 consult [1] 32/4 89/18 89/23 136/13 column [3] 85/6 completed [3] confirmation [1] 139/4 139/17 153/10 153/13 154/1 29/22 168/20 207/24 149/1 consulted [4] 48/14 157/23 159/17 192/25 completion [2] 98/13 confirmations [1] 48/17 48/24 74/5 203/3 | | | | | |
| collected [2] 121/23 121/24 64/20 65/2 162/21 construction [1] 141/1 38/25 39/17 53/21 collection [3] 134/2 202/17 202/19 112/16 118/21 120/17 148/7 223/4 confident [1] 206/22 148/7 223/4 141/1 56/17 65/7 74/13 78/7 collection [3] 85/6 85/15 85/25 completed [3] 129/22 168/20 207/24 confirmation [1] 149/1 139/4 139/17 153/10 153/13 154/1 completion [2] 98/13 confirmations [1] 48/17 48/24 74/5 203/3 | | 24/22 24/23 50/15 | confidence [2] 148/8 | | 12/20 27/6 32/7 38/21 |
| 121/24 complete [6] 12/15 confident [1] 206/22 141/1 56/17/65/774/13/8/7 collection [3] 134/2 112/16 118/21 120/17 confirm [4] 3/19 consult [1] 32/4 89/18 89/23 136/13 202/17 202/19 148/7 223/4 128/6 132/11 132/13 consultation [2] 136/24 148/25 153/7 column [3] 85/6 s5/25 completed [3] confirmation [1] 139/4 139/17 153/10 153/13 154/1 129/22 168/20 207/24 149/1 consulted [4] 48/17 48/17 157/23 159/17 192/25 completion [2] 98/13 confirmations [1] 48/17 48/17 48/17 203/3 | | | | | |
| collection [3] 134/2 112/16 118/21 120/17 confirm [4] 3/19 consult [1] 32/4 89/18 89/23 136/13 202/17 202/19 148/7 223/4 128/6 132/11 132/13 consultation [2] 136/24 148/25 153/7 column [3] 85/6 85/15 85/25 completion [2] 98/13 confirmations [1] 139/4 139/17 153/10 153/13 154/1 combination [1] 129/22 168/20 207/24 149/1 consulted [4] 48/14 157/23 159/17 192/25 | | | | | |
| 202/17/202/19 completed [3] confirmation [1] 139/4 139/17 153/10 153/13 154/1 column [3] 85/6 85/15 85/25 129/22 168/20 207/24 149/1 consulted [4] 48/14 157/23 159/17 192/25 combination [1] completion [2] 98/13 confirmations [1] 48/17 48/24 74/5 203/3 | | | | | |
| Column [3] 85/0 129/22 168/20 207/24 149/1 consulted [4] 48/14 157/23 159/17 192/25 combination [1] completion [2] 98/13 confirmations [1] 48/17 48/24 74/5 203/3 | | | | | I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I |
| 85/15 85/25 combination [1] completion [2] 98/13 confirmations [1] 48/17 48/24 74/5 203/3 | | | | | 157/23 159/17 192/25 |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | contact [10] 6/12 | convert [1] 156/24 |
| | | | | | |

(64) circumstances... - convert

| | 70/00 00/00 00/00 | | 110/11 110/10 110/00 | 125/5 145/10 145/12 |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| С | 78/22 89/23 90/20 | cutting [4] 94/3 94/6 | | |
| conviction [7] 92/13 | 96/12 100/18 100/25 | 96/2 211/2 | 117/3 117/5 117/21 | 145/20 146/1 146/2 |
| 93/14 93/19 93/24 | 101/5 106/1 106/10 | D | 117/23 127/6 128/13 | 146/5 146/24 149/3 |
| 94/20 169/7 169/12 | 107/7 114/5 119/15 | DAC [1] 4/16 | | 149/9 149/15 149/25 |
| copies [8] 33/12 | 124/16 129/17 136/1 | DAC [1] 4/10 DAC Beachcroft [1] | | I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I |
| 33/12 33/21 33/22 | 158/4 173/23 180/7 | | 146/1 146/2 146/5 | 150/18 151/4 151/13 |
| 198/3 198/4 198/8 | 180/12 180/15 192/16 | | 146/23 146/24 149/3 | 152/5 152/11 152/18 |
| 198/9 | 225/13 | daily [3] 43/9 162/9 176/16 | 149/9 149/15 149/25 | |
| copy [18] 30/7 35/17 | couldn't [4] 32/17 | | 150/2 150/5 150/8 | 154/20 155/9 158/1 |
| 35/18 47/24 59/4 | 90/12 97/24 112/5 | data [34] 68/22 76/10 76/12 78/24 79/14 | | |
| 76/10 79/14 85/7 85/8 | counsel [9] 1/22 7/4 | 83/8 102/12 125/7 | 150/22 151/4 151/13 | 159/13 159/16 159/18 |
| 112/18 112/22 124/21 | 30/21 37/4 37/5 37/7 | 125/8 125/9 126/13 | 152/1 152/5 152/11 | 159/23 160/4 160/13 |
| 124/25 125/3 125/9 | 37/24 46/14 166/20 | 125/8 125/9 120/13 | 152/18 153/8 153/13 | 160/24 162/1 162/24 |
| 125/12 125/20 164/19 | counterpart [1] 37/8 | 129/4 129/11 129/16 | 153/14 154/7 154/13 | 162/25 163/1 165/12 |
| copy/soft [1] 35/17 | couple [3] 94/17 | 129/20 134/3 137/4 | 154/17 154/20 155/3 | 170/25 171/12 173/17 |
| core [9] 4/12 5/11 | 196/20 224/20 | 144/4 145/18 145/22 | 155/9 155/14 155/20 155/21 158/1 158/5 | 173/19 173/24 174/16 174/21 175/3 175/8 |
| 13/19 18/23 20/6 | course [7] 5/8 16/8 106/25 107/8 130/14 | 146/12 146/16 146/22 | 159/6 159/7 159/10 | 175/16 175/25 176/11 |
| 20/20 183/18 223/9 | 158/12 227/5 | 149/12 159/11 159/15 | 159/13 159/16 159/18 | 176/12 178/18 179/12 |
| 223/9 | | 161/10 210/2 211/2 | 159/23 160/4 160/13 | 179/19 180/14 180/16 |
| corporate [8] 18/14 | courses [1] 157/25 | 211/14 211/24 | 160/24 162/1 162/24 | 180/21 180/24 182/6 |
| 18/23 68/7 68/9 90/15 | court [6] 10/24 16/9 60/22 60/22 73/1 73/1 | data-strategy [1] | 160/24 162/1 162/24 | 184/14 211/17 212/14 |
| 91/4 91/8 124/6 | courts [2] 16/11 | 83/8 | 170/25 171/12 173/17 | 212/17 214/17 214/21 |
| corporate-wide [1] | 72/24 | database [2] 146/17 | 173/19 173/24 174/16 | |
| 124/6 | cover [3] 10/24 22/19 | | 173/19 175/24 174/10 | 216/6 216/12 216/16 |
| correct [53] 3/16 4/8 | 148/16 | databases [1] 146/18 | | 216/25 217/4 218/4 |
| 4/15 4/19 4/23 4/24 | cracked [1] 18/1 | dataset [8] 144/25 | 176/11 176/12 178/18 | |
| 5/6 6/25 7/1 7/5 7/8 | cracks [1] 42/7 | 150/14 153/21 158/8 | 179/12 179/19 180/8 | 219/11 219/22 219/25 |
| 48/18 50/3 50/12 | crafted [1] 207/11 | 159/14 180/11 190/13 | | |
| 50/20 51/11 67/9 70/1 | created [3] 12/3 | 219/19 | 180/21 180/24 181/23 | |
| 70/7 71/15 80/20 | 18/12 37/3 | datasets [6] 70/4 | 182/4 182/6 184/14 | 221/21 225/10 225/18 |
| 86/22 87/2 104/12 | criminal [12] 34/10 | 127/8 127/10 127/17 | 211/17 211/18 212/14 | |
| 115/6 126/3 126/9 | 34/23 50/18 60/17 | 129/5 159/15 | 212/17 214/17 214/21 | deadline [5] 2/21 |
| 129/9 129/14 130/8 | 72/24 92/8 130/18 | datasets/sessions | 214/23 215/7 215/9 | 223/17 223/20 223/23 |
| 132/5 132/6 132/22 | 167/3 167/5 169/9 | [2] 127/10 127/17 | 216/6 216/12 216/16 | 223/25 |
| 132/23 133/3 133/8 | 199/8 202/6 | date [11] 2/9 2/14 3/3 | 216/25 217/4 218/4 | deal [9] 16/4 37/8 |
| 147/12 148/4 149/23 | criteria [8] 28/9 | 85/19 90/19 116/9 | 218/8 218/23 219/10 | 38/11 42/10 45/1 67/2 |
| 150/13 151/16 151/19 | 28/16 28/18 31/25 | 130/10 162/22 224/1 | 219/11 219/22 219/25 | |
| 155/5 155/19 157/3 | 138/22 140/21 141/11 | 227/21 228/8 | 220/5 220/7 220/17 | dealing [12] 36/22 |
| 172/23 172/25 176/3 | 204/21 | dated [5] 3/15 47/25 | 221/3 221/8 221/12 | 38/7 55/21 55/25 |
| 186/4 192/5 201/7 | critical [1] 215/14 | 85/4 132/4 164/20 | 221/18 221/21 225/10 | |
| 213/6 227/21 | criticised [2] 60/21 | dates [2] 130/14 | 225/18 225/20 225/25 | |
| corrected [1] 126/2 | 72/25 | 130/18 | de-duplicate [8] | 147/19 147/21 |
| correcting [1] 118/15 | criticising [1] 40/6 | dating [1] 143/20 | 113/6 113/12 116/14 | deals [1] 125/19 |
| corrections [2] 48/7 | criticism [4] 12/23 | day [27] 20/5 36/22 | 146/23 150/2 152/1 | dealt [14] 9/7 9/12 |
| 49/4 | 18/10 20/22 61/3 | 36/22 37/12 37/12 | 154/7 155/14 | 20/16 21/2 27/14 37/2 |
| correctly [1] 181/2 correspondence [3] | criticisms [2] 20/19 | 43/12 68/2 68/2 71/10 | de-duplicated [10] | 38/10 41/4 42/9 71/24 |
| 167/17 167/17 217/5 | 20/23 | 71/10 75/17 81/21 | 70/6 128/13 128/21 | 148/1 155/6 155/8 |
| cost [22] 14/2 23/12 | crossing [1] 48/10 | 81/21 83/25 83/25 | 128/22 150/5 155/3 | 174/7 |
| 27/15 27/21 44/19 | Crown [1] 17/24 | 88/10 98/18 131/19 | 159/10 175/7 211/18 | debate [1] 23/13 |
| 56/12 57/1 57/6 57/16 | crudely [1] 220/21 | 133/15 133/15 133/16 | | debates [1] 23/21 |
| 57/20 58/5 58/15 | current [9] 10/21 | 133/16 147/10 147/10 | de-duplicates [1] | decades [2] 15/20 |
| 58/22 59/21 59/23 | 18/11 75/17 116/21 | 148/15 148/15 227/9 | 150/22 | 98/19 |
| 60/1 60/10 135/21 | 120/7 123/22 127/17 | day one [1] 20/5 | de-duplicating [2] | December [3] 20/13 |
| 135/22 136/14 177/10 | 152/10 201/13 | days [6] 13/1 27/20 | 153/13 153/14 | 126/11 138/13 |
| 180/19 | currently [6] 4/16 | 128/15 221/1 224/7 | de-duplication [121] | decide [4] 75/3 |
| costs [3] 60/3 109/20 | 39/21 66/1 128/8 | 224/20 | 49/18 59/20 66/7 69/4 | |
| 136/2 | 134/7 192/3 | de [148] 49/18 59/20 | 70/4 71/1 77/9 78/23 | decided [4] 75/1 |
| could [37] 1/25 13/12 | custodians [2] 68/24 | 66/7 69/4 70/4 70/6 | 82/21 112/9 112/14 | 109/19 126/18 141/7 |
| 15/4 15/18 19/14 | 102/11 | 71/1 77/9 78/23 82/21 | 112/15 112/22 113/6 | deciding [1] 92/1 |
| 22/16 22/18 23/10 | custody [5] 33/14 | 112/9 112/14 112/15 | 113/12 113/20 114/2 | decision [39] 25/4 |
| 28/20 31/3 46/6 47/2 | 33/24 85/10 198/6 | 112/22 113/6 113/6 | 114/20 114/25 116/18 | |
| 71/21 77/4 77/22 | 198/11 | 113/12 113/12 113/20 | | 62/19 62/22 69/19 |
| | cut [2] 94/1 94/17 | 114/2 114/20 114/25 | 117/21 117/23 127/6 | 79/22 106/4 111/4 |
| | | | | |
| L | I | | | (65) conviction - decision |

(65) conviction - decision

| D | describe [6] 18/16 | 176/17 177/12 193/21 | 191/3 193/4 210/18 | 73/17 73/22 74/22 |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| | 121/1 200/11 202/24 | 207/20 | 215/18 217/7 217/8 | 74/24 76/2 76/5 76/25 |
| decision [29] 111/21 112/1 115/16 | 210/25 217/6 | Dials [1] 19/11 | 217/9 217/9 217/10 | 77/5 79/7 79/9 79/16 |
| 118/22 118/24 119/8 | described [15] 19/5 | Diane [7] 1/16 23/3 | 217/20 218/2 218/22 | 79/17 80/2 80/12 |
| 124/4 124/18 143/12 | 26/15 45/5 59/1 59/23 | 23/16 47/12 47/14 | 218/23 218/25 219/5 | 80/17 80/23 81/20 |
| 143/21 147/5 147/7 | 60/23 82/8 102/3 | 47/20 229/8 | 219/5 221/7 221/12 | 82/4 82/4 82/17 83/25 |
| 148/23 150/24 151/12 | 125/6 133/9 197/5 | dictate [1] 31/23 | 226/2 | 85/3 90/21 92/13 |
| 151/14 151/18 152/19 | 203/25 207/23 208/24 | | differently [2] 106/6 | 93/15 93/19 93/24 |
| 153/23 153/25 155/1 | 218/25 | 10/11 10/20 11/6 | 217/6 | 94/20 100/10 102/16 |
| 162/7 184/10 184/17 | describing [3] | 12/17 12/19 13/10 | difficult [11] 2/19 | 102/25 103/4 103/17 |
| 191/4 215/4 216/5 | 197/14 202/10 221/25 | | 23/2 54/12 139/17 | 107/17 109/5 109/23 |
| 216/7 227/23 | description [2] 7/20 94/18 | 21/4 21/21 24/11 25/23 26/21 27/17 | 163/9 174/5 174/13 175/13 176/10 180/11 | 115/5 115/17 118/9 121/22 122/12 122/13 |
| decisions [24] 9/13 | design [1] 101/13 | 29/2 30/2 30/3 30/17 | 219/20 | 122/17 122/21 122/23 |
| 34/15 60/7 63/17 | designated [2] 59/10 | 31/12 31/23 32/4 | difficulty [5] 54/17 | 123/9 124/23 133/21 |
| 63/21 63/24 64/9 | 166/5 | 32/16 41/21 42/24 | 82/2 131/14 131/16 | 133/22 134/1 136/8 |
| 69/23 70/3 82/16 | designed [4] 28/5 | 43/8 43/13 43/17 | 220/20 | 146/19 161/18 165/7 |
| 82/19 83/15 84/5 84/9 | 48/14 48/16 48/24 | | digest [3] 2/19 223/8 | 165/10 169/7 171/7 |
| 99/21 103/14 104/6 105/15 119/13 124/25 | designing [1] 100/15 | 50/10 63/23 66/15 | 223/10 | 174/11 179/3 183/16 |
| 105/15 119/13 124/25 | desire [4] 6/9 21/20 | 67/14 67/16 67/17 | direct [6] 31/24 36/5 | 214/14 214/16 220/4 |
| 214/20 | 21/23 59/21 | 70/10 72/12 82/3 84/2 | | 222/16 223/1 223/8 |
| declined [1] 27/24 | desires [1] 60/3 | 87/9 87/25 88/1 88/5 | 205/15 | disclosures [1] |
| dedicated [5] 40/4 | despite [3] 110/25 | 88/16 89/15 89/16 | directed [3] 1/7 | 29/24 |
| 126/20 136/16 136/20 | 196/20 225/10 | 90/23 92/23 94/12 | 43/25 223/1 | discovered [9] 59/6 |
| 183/15 | destroyed [2] 15/5 | 94/17 100/16 105/23 | directing [1] 70/19 | 98/18 115/25 129/12 |
| deeper [1] 25/1 | 17/3 | 116/18 137/23 138/9 | direction [2] 13/8 | 178/16 209/10 209/12 210/10 211/3 |
| deeply [1] 72/25 | destruction [2] 17/2 17/4 | 152/4 152/14 171/8 173/17 175/7 177/24 | 29/2 directions [2] 82/17 | |
| default [1] 184/17 | detail [13] 53/24 | 192/18 196/16 200/8 | directions [2] 82/17 223/5 | discovering [1] 213/19 |
| defects [1] 16/23 | 63/16 69/23 78/5 | 202/8 203/10 203/15 | directly [14] 7/3 7/22 | discovery [6] 76/1 |
| definitely [1] 39/5 | 78/12 105/16 108/15 | 203/23 207/13 208/14 | | 121/18 125/12 125/14 |
| definitive [1] 139/18 | 110/10 110/12 156/14 | | 88/17 123/24 177/5 | 146/13 171/7 |
| degree [2] 14/11 | 179/1 194/13 222/13 | 217/12 218/13 218/14 | | discrete [4] 46/12 |
| 118/3 | detailed [18] 1/24 | 219/8 | 178/8 201/20 201/23 | 124/22 165/10 227/24 |
| delay [1] 131/13 delegation [1] 73/10 | 7/19 37/13 45/12 | didn't [35] 8/15 11/8 | director [12] 6/21 | discretion [2] 75/2 |
| deliberate [1] 62/19 | 75/21 83/8 83/21 84/1 | | | 107/19 |
| deliver [4] 50/14 52/4 | 84/19 87/20 89/11 | 55/18 66/4 68/24 | 37/20 50/6 50/23 51/7 | discuss [11] 29/9 |
| 52/10 96/24 | 131/3 131/3 175/18 | 69/22 70/2 84/21 87/9 | | 30/17 75/22 89/1 98/4 |
| delivered [2] 124/14 | 177/23 181/10 226/25 | | disagreement [1] | 98/25 133/24 135/6 |
| 158/16 | 227/1 details [2] 53/19 66/6 | 117/5 117/20 140/19 140/23 156/13 161/24 | 215/6 | 178/6 191/18 192/3 |
| delivering [4] 52/11 | determine [3] 69/15 | 179/23 200/3 200/25 | 218/12 | discussed [16] 28/11 29/11 31/9 38/4 45/21 |
| 52/14 57/9 156/20 | 186/10 187/1 | 201/2 201/3 208/8 | disclose [4] 161/6 | 76/6 80/4 80/7 80/10 |
| departed [1] 36/17 | determines [2] 190/8 | 208/13 209/3 213/11 | 189/8 206/1 223/9 | 104/23 134/15 134/16 |
| department [6] 15/14 | 105/1/ | 217/16 218/17 221/6 | disclosed [14] 3/2 | 134/20 178/5 217/25 |
| 23/22 31/5 35/23 50/5 | develop [5] 77/20 | 221/10 | 28/24 42/20 111/25 | 225/21 |
| 68/24 departments [2] | 90/24 94/24 141/10 | differ [2] 167/11 | 128/23 161/3 161/5 | discussing [4] 13/25 |
| 15/23 22/15 | 192/11 | 218/25 | 171/16 175/23 209/16 | |
| departure [2] 44/16 | developed [4] 13/17 | difference [7] 8/25 | 220/14 224/22 225/2 | discussion [15] 6/14 |
| 147/5 | 83/17 93/25 119/20 | 43/20 108/2 215/1 | 225/15 | 7/11 11/1 35/10 66/2 |
| depend [7] 51/4 | development [3] | 215/3 215/8 215/12 | disclosure [112] 1/8 | 70/12 76/22 89/21 |
| 90/13 104/21 105/12 | 93/4 193/10 194/1 | different [56] 13/23 | 1/10 15/9 15/20 16/11 | |
| 114/16 186/17 190/17 | device [1] 101/18 devise [6] 29/8 172/3 | 17/13 17/14 23/10 23/14 23/14 37/7 | 17/1 20/9 20/15 20/19 20/25 21/5 21/17 28/4 | 195/2 195/22 195/24 196/10 |
| depended [1] 110/9 | 192/13 193/6 194/13 | 40/14 40/15 40/21 | 34/23 39/22 43/23 | discussions [35] 6/1 |
| dependent [1] | 206/7 | 40/21 41/11 58/21 | 49/16 55/23 57/14 | 10/18 11/10 12/10 |
| 128/11 | devised [8] 28/10 | 60/10 65/11 90/3 | 58/6 58/10 58/12 | 21/3 31/12 31/14 39/6 |
| depending [9] 60/8 | 28/25 31/8 31/16 | 103/20 103/21 105/4 | 58/16 58/18 60/4 | 55/9 55/11 56/3 62/21 |
| 103/3 104/24 109/4 | 32/10 95/23 101/5 | 108/1 112/25 116/7 | 60/15 60/24 61/2 61/4 | 65/20 69/12 76/9 83/4 |
| 142/24 145/3 170/7 173/11 219/1 | 196/9 | 120/23 134/23 140/15 | | 83/8 83/21 84/12 |
| depends [1] 139/20 | devising [1] 170/22 | 145/24 146/21 156/21 | | 87/17 88/18 89/2 |
| deprecated [1] 218/9 | diagram [1] 40/16 | 157/7 157/15 157/25 | 67/13 67/21 68/13 | 89/11 90/6 93/7 95/12 |
| depth [1] 42/10 | dialogue [8] 56/6 | 159/12 173/3 174/9 | 68/19 71/19 72/4 72/9 | I I |
| | 135/25 142/13 176/6 | 180/23 183/25 189/22 | 72/14 72/24 73/2 | 107/5 113/25 118/6 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | docision discussions |

(66) decision... - discussions

| D | 101/3 101/8 101/23 | 78/25 84/15 87/2 89/4 | drive [1] 56/15 | 219/22 219/25 220/7 |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| | 101/23 103/23 108/11 | 92/20 92/25 93/8 | driver [1] 57/20 | 220/17 221/3 221/8 |
| discussions [3] 120/7 134/10 192/14 | 108/14 108/16 110/25 | 93/22 94/5 98/23 | driving [2] 52/3 81/23 | 1 |
| disjointed [2] 19/6 | 111/12 111/14 112/23 | 98/25 101/4 105/2 | due [3] 36/19 68/6 | 225/10 225/13 225/18 |
| 20/4 | 113/22 114/10 114/11 | 109/17 110/12 111/11 | | 225/20 225/25 |
| display [1] 165/2 | 114/17 116/19 124/21 124/25 125/3 125/20 | 111/15 117/9 118/8 118/11 120/8 122/20 | duly [1] 1/12 duplicacy [1] 226/14 | duration [4] 24/9 26/8 26/10 26/23 |
| displayed [1] 186/4 | 125/23 127/6 134/7 | 130/3 130/25 134/6 | duplicacy [1] 220/14 duplicate [14] 112/17 | during [10] 6/14 16/5 |
| dispute [2] 214/18 | 135/16 137/7 140/6 | | 113/6 113/12 114/10 | 43/19 45/9 45/18 |
| 214/25 | 145/8 145/14 145/16 | 140/5 141/1 141/19 | 116/14 135/3 146/23 | 131/16 133/6 158/5 |
| distinct [1] 108/4 distinction [1] 41/12 | 149/19 149/21 150/8 | 141/25 148/15 152/23 | | 207/7 227/5 |
| distributed [2] 2/18 | 151/7 152/6 153/16 | 155/14 156/8 157/12 | 155/14 160/11 226/1 | duties [3] 22/3 40/3 |
| 202/20 | 153/21 154/5 154/19 | 162/16 162/16 163/15 | | 46/7 |
| divulge [1] 44/8 | 160/9 184/5 184/15 184/19 184/22 185/9 | 163/18 167/25 168/3 171/3 173/22 174/17 | duplicated [11] 70/6 128/13 128/21 128/22 | duty [1] 21/18 |
| do [118] 2/23 6/11 | 185/25 186/1 186/10 | 180/3 180/22 183/4 | 150/5 155/3 159/9 | |
| 8/25 10/1 16/14 17/8 | 187/2 189/2 189/10 | 183/13 187/5 187/24 | 159/10 175/7 211/18 | E |
| 22/11 22/16 22/23 | 190/15 202/22 205/7 | 188/1 192/12 194/15 | 220/5 | each [24] 14/16 28/4 |
| 23/2 27/15 27/16 28/12 28/14 29/7 | 205/12 206/6 206/9 | | duplicates [13] 69/6 | 28/9 29/15 38/8 38/8 |
| 32/15 40/11 40/17 | 206/10 207/8 207/9 | 200/20 200/21 202/15 | | 58/9 61/24 67/2 67/19 |
| 42/3 42/19 42/25 | 210/5 212/9 213/4 | 202/23 203/24 208/12 | | 67/23 90/21 103/8 104/22 124/10 146/18 |
| 43/17 44/10 44/10 | 213/5 213/19 213/20 214/5 217/13 217/14 | 208/14 212/5 216/13 219/3 219/16 226/7 | 225/14 225/15 225/21 226/4 226/5 226/5 | 152/12 173/3 174/6 |
| 45/6 45/7 45/14 46/4 | 214/5217/15217/14 226/14 | 219/3 219/10 220/7 | duplicating [2] | 174/15 184/15 191/12 |
| 46/9 52/22 55/16 | documentation [1] | done [48] 1/10 6/8 | 153/13 153/14 | 191/17 227/13 |
| 59/25 60/2 63/9 75/10 77/25 78/13 78/18 | 2/9 | 23/8 23/18 27/9 42/2 | duplication [130] | earlier [16] 24/16 |
| 79/16 88/2 88/20 | documented [1] | 45/18 45/19 45/25 | 49/18 59/20 66/7 69/4 | 25/22 65/18 84/11 |
| 88/25 91/4 96/19 97/4 | 156/13 | 49/22 57/13 59/4 | 70/4 71/1 77/9 78/23 | 87/19 90/16 91/10 |
| 100/13 101/5 106/1 | documents [241] | 59/11 59/13 59/14 | 82/21 112/9 112/14 | 95/20 100/22 114/7 126/22 136/25 140/15 |
| 106/15 112/3 115/16 | does [26] 14/10 21/13 22/11 22/12 | 78/11 86/12 87/3 92/12 92/25 93/9 | 112/15 112/16 112/22 113/6 113/12 113/20 | 154/24 189/24 207/23 |
| 116/3 118/16 133/20 | 51/22 52/9 52/13 | 93/10 93/14 93/18 | 114/2 114/20 114/25 | early [4] 76/2 76/23 |
| 135/2 135/3 135/17 | 74/13 80/16 93/2 | 94/15 94/20 96/12 | 116/18 116/22 117/3 | 192/18 199/16 |
| 135/19 137/18 138/19 139/25 140/9 140/16 | 95/14 97/16 121/4 | 104/14 104/19 111/23 | 117/5 117/21 117/23 | easily [1] 19/1 |
| 145/15 146/2 146/25 | 122/15 141/17 146/10 | | 127/6 127/9 135/5 | easy [2] 27/10 28/21 |
| 147/6 148/14 151/14 | 146/16 153/24 160/11 | 122/6 122/7 130/13 | | |
| 152/24 153/1 155/2 | 167/11 168/15 177/6 184/12 189/12 195/4 | 136/2 145/20 163/11 165/16 171/9 172/22 | 146/1 146/2 146/5 146/24 149/3 149/9 | 113/20 133/2 135/6 136/17 145/12 145/17 |
| 155/16 155/23 156/1 | 195/5 | 200/1 209/17 216/18 | 149/15 149/25 150/8 | 146/20 148/22 174/1 |
| 156/15 157/6 157/22 | doesn't [12] 4/3 72/2 | 218/15 218/18 226/10 | | |
| 157/23 158/1 158/9 158/15 160/20 161/5 | 97/22 99/4 119/25 | double [1] 138/10 | 151/4 151/13 152/5 | eDiscovery [10] |
| 162/21 163/17 164/22 | 120/4 143/10 156/15 | doubled [1] 138/5 | 152/11 152/18 153/8 | 134/2 138/19 177/4 |
| 167/23 171/18 174/12 | 160/13 181/17 195/7 | doubt [2] 57/8 169/12 | | |
| 174/20 180/13 180/13 | 205/17 doing [27] 22/25 23/0 | down [26] 14/21 | 155/9 155/20 155/21 | 178/13 217/24 218/1 219/6 |
| 180/15 186/16 186/16 | doing [27] 22/25 23/9 38/18 39/13 40/15 | 23/24 33/15 34/11 38/12 45/18 60/11 | 158/1 158/5 159/6 159/7 159/13 159/16 | effect [3] 50/21 59/1 |
| 187/4 188/4 188/21 | 57/15 68/18 78/23 | 69/21 73/14 77/18 | 159/18 159/23 160/4 | 159/22 |
| 190/25 193/15 194/24 195/20 201/4 203/18 | 78/24 109/20 135/10 | 88/10 90/20 109/13 | 160/13 160/24 162/1 | effective [2] 142/18 |
| 204/23 206/3 207/13 | 142/11 153/18 156/5 | 116/12 125/21 129/16 | | 215/17 |
| 208/8 212/3 215/20 | 162/24 167/20 167/21 | 149/5 150/19 151/23 | 165/12 170/25 171/12 | |
| 216/8 219/10 220/2 | 171/25 172/7 174/16 178/14 181/18 181/19 | 182/2 191/14 194/4 | 173/17 173/19 173/24 | 160/17 efficiencies [7] 56/13 |
| 220/24 226/21 227/6 | 204/25 212/15 214/10 | | 174/16 174/21 175/3 175/8 175/16 175/25 | 57/1 57/7 58/5 58/15 |
| 227/8 | 214/11 | drafted [2] 181/8 | 176/11 176/12 178/18 | |
| document [101] 14/9 14/19 15/20 16/13 | don't [104] 12/21 | 181/16 | 179/12 179/19 180/8 | efficiency [1] 59/24 |
| 16/25 17/8 22/19 | 12/23 13/5 13/9 15/10 | | 180/10 180/14 180/16 | |
| 28/20 29/7 35/6 35/7 | 15/17 16/16 17/11 | 181/13 181/15 | 180/21 180/24 181/23 | |
| 37/15 40/18 41/5 | 18/4 26/4 27/23 30/3 | draw [3] 23/24 | 182/4 182/6 184/14 | effort [1] 143/14 efforts [3] 19/24 22/9 |
| 41/11 42/8 42/20 56/8 | 35/13 40/7 42/23 42/25 53/19 53/24 | 199/18 226/12 drawdown [1] 13/25 | 211/17 212/14 212/17 214/17 214/21 214/23 | · - |
| 56/19 83/18 83/19 | 54/4 54/6 54/10 58/12 | | 215/7 215/9 216/6 | eight [2] 53/13 |
| 86/8 86/10 87/11 97/9 | 62/20 63/5 71/21 | drawn [3] 77/12 | 216/12 216/16 216/25 | |
| 97/15 98/22 98/24 99/11 99/18 100/20 | 72/19 74/10 75/6 75/9 | 161/15 183/23 | 217/4 218/4 218/8 | either [12] 39/18 55/4 |
| | 77/9 78/5 78/12 78/19 | drill [1] 90/20 | 218/23 219/10 219/11 | 64/23 71/5 105/11 |
| | | | | |
| · | | | l | (67) discussionsoithor |

(67) discussions... - either

| E | 46/5 56/7 57/13 77/24 | 57/13 111/24 | 108/12 109/23 110/4 | 98/4 99/1 192/15 |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| either [7] 116/4 | 118/3 129/6 174/3 | evidence [24] 1/9 | 111/24 115/5 120/18 | 192/20 |
| 116/23 122/19 133/21 | ensured [1] 43/3 | 1/12 1/14 1/25 2/3 | 130/9 136/8 169/8 | explain [12] 33/10 |
| 178/16 189/23 213/2 | ensuring [3] 74/2 | 31/10 35/9 36/1 38/3 | 169/13 174/1 180/9 | 40/8 55/22 57/4 63/15 |
| elaborate [1] 19/6 | 112/18 118/16 | 131/17 134/25 137/12 | | 87/23 120/11 121/9 |
| electronic [3] 76/12 | entail [1] 54/16 | 146/11 151/23 154/11 | | 125/2 175/12 176/21 |
| 121/18 125/15 | entire [4] 22/18 26/19 | | | 225/13 |
| electronically [1] | 184/14 224/2 | 216/17 223/2 226/23 | 216/18 220/2 220/17 | explained [11] 58/17 |
| 19/19 | entirely [3] 90/13 93/11 183/4 | 227/1 227/4 227/8 evidently [1] 218/15 | 220/24 222/14 222/17 224/9 224/23 225/5 | 64/8 110/7 117/1 118/22 138/16 152/16 |
| element [1] 22/8 | entitled [2] 123/16 | exact [2] 6/21 39/7 | 225/14 225/17 | 169/5 179/9 179/21 |
| eloquently [1] 102/3 | 123/20 | exactly [9] 19/8 57/4 | exercised [1] 71/18 | 212/22 |
| else [8] 41/20 41/25 | entitlement [1] 124/7 | 63/9 113/4 113/14 | exercises [2] 82/21 | explaining [7] 61/16 |
| 104/10 112/6 112/8 | episode [1] 99/15 | 113/15 118/10 174/23 | | 63/16 89/19 176/20 |
| 133/12 161/18 181/13 | equivalent [1] 149/23 | | exist [5] 90/25 | 178/18 179/1 221/11 |
| elsewhere [1] 182/14 email [16] 2/10 2/15 | error [5] 70/8 211/3 | examination [2] | 119/25 120/4 188/1 | explains [1] 210/13 |
| 65/6 98/11 108/18 | 211/14 211/23 211/24 | | 190/18 | explanation [8] 54/23 |
| 108/18 109/20 113/2 | errors [5] 63/3 63/18 | examine [2] 1/19 | existed [5] 16/18 | 85/14 97/19 98/1 98/2 |
| 113/4 113/8 113/9 | 64/6 174/21 225/11 | 180/25 | 17/7 100/17 204/1 | 99/3 112/12 180/4 |
| 113/11 171/16 178/25 | escalation [1] 75/24 | examining [1] 58/7 | 210/5 | explanations [1] |
| 217/7 221/10 | essential [5] 28/1 | example [50] 4/13 | existence [2] 101/2 | 181/16 |
| emails [7] 113/14 | 74/7 118/1 129/15 206/19 | 5/16 11/5 14/22 16/18 18/14 20/17 25/10 | | exploration [1] 101/21 |
| 149/12 176/4 176/14 | essentially [14] 61/8 | 30/15 32/23 34/20 | existing [3] 43/6 51/3 92/14 | express [2] 100/14 |
| 176/16 176/19 179/3 | 84/3 100/21 100/23 | 42/17 43/20 57/19 | exists [2] 160/16 | 142/15 |
| employees [7] 30/25 | 100/14 117/16 110/01 | 58/8 59/5 68/25 69/15 | | expressed [3] 39/2 |
| 46/19 83/7 83/20 84/8 | 128/22 129/10 188/19 | 70/18 79/24 81/16 | expand [4] 11/17 | 56/22 181/11 |
| 87/21 192/9 | 199/20 203/17 205/13 | 84/14 84/23 98/8 | 13/13 26/22 36/8 | expressing [1] 58/23 |
| employees/contracto | 211/13 | 108/20 113/2 122/5 | expanded [1] 36/15 | expression [1] |
| rs [2] 83/7 83/20 enable [4] 54/13 | establish [1] 75/24 | 134/18 135/2 135/17 | expanding [1] 26/17 | 154/16 |
| 89/24 95/22 122/1 | established [5] | 136/4 140/7 140/13 | expansion [1] 11/18 | extensive [5] 10/3 |
| enabled [1] 118/6 | 118/19 172/10 172/16 | | expect [13] 71/4 81/6 | 44/20 74/18 120/24 |
| enables [1] 226/6 | 172/19 203/8 | | 88/1 90/1 90/17 96/22 | 194/7 |
| encouraged [3] | establishing [2] | 149/8 149/19 151/8 | 97/23 97/25 99/23 | extensively [3] 72/25 |
| 157/14 186/9 186/16 | 157/2 185/11 | 153/17 155/14 156/18 | 100/1 124/9 178/12 194/12 | 193/16 201/16 |
| end [21] 34/6 35/4 | estimates [1] 128/8 et [5] 9/15 81/17 | 157/6 160/24 162/13 192/16 206/5 | expectation [6] | extent [21] 6/1 11/11 11/19 13/12 38/6 |
| 36/12 45/10 48/20 | 102/12 124/15 134/10 | | 11/15 130/2 130/16 | 54/14 62/12 80/22 |
| 66/10 77/13 94/2 94/4 | at a stars [2] 0/15 | 58/4 58/13 58/25 | 185/22 190/11 190/14 | I I |
| 94/6 94/17 95/25 96/2 | 81/17 102/12 | 110/13 158/22 | expectations [1] | 99/3 106/2 176/7 |
| 96/4 108/12 111/11 124/13 131/18 168/5 | eve [1] 2/20 | except [1] 101/17 | 11/18 | 179/9 179/15 191/23 |
| 205/21 207/5 | even [17] 11/17 | exception [1] 171/3 | expected [4] 15/22 | 193/9 193/13 225/25 |
| ending [2] 36/10 | 12/14 18/2 20/13 36/8 | exceptional [1] 97/16 | | 226/13 |
| 102/8 | 37/12 41/17 43/11 | exchanges [2] 39/6 | expecting [1] 187/10 | external [43] 7/14 |
| engage [5] 68/8 | 78/20 99/24 105/11 | 176/1 | expects [1] 169/23 | 7/18 8/23 23/12 24/17 |
| 70/16 122/12 167/15 | 112/24 129/12 129/16 | | expenditure [2] | 28/16 29/8 46/21 |
| 193/15 | 197/9 204/22 211/25 | excluded [5] 115/3 160/9 160/10 187/21 | 15/18 27/24 | 48/25 56/6 62/25 63/22 64/1 64/11 |
| engaged [4] 122/16 | evenings [2] 78/1 78/4 | 225/19 | expensive [1] 26/12 experience [17] 5/22 | 64/13 68/3 70/12 |
| 133/4 133/9 197/6 | event [2] 107/23 | excluding [1] 112/17 | | 71/25 73/14 74/21 |
| engagement [6] | 221/6 | exclusion [1] 219/18 | | 81/2 81/6 81/12 83/6 |
| 66/19 73/19 73/20 | events [4] 55/23 | excuse [1] 24/20 | 139/10 139/22 139/24 | 83/11 83/15 83/22 |
| 80/14 178/2 194/7 | 58/25 63/15 168/14 | execute [1] 149/2 | 143/16 143/16 148/17 | 84/4 84/12 84/20 |
| engender [1] 107/17 England [1] 4/9 | eventual [1] 128/12 | executed [1] 157/19 | 148/18 176/25 219/2 | 96/13 96/23 97/8 |
| enigmatic [1] 221/23 | eventually [1] 5/5 | executive [14] 7/17 | experienced [2] | 97/13 97/21 125/10 |
| enough [2] 42/3 | ever [8] 27/24 63/5 | 7/20 7/21 9/15 18/8 | 148/20 161/1 | 133/17 133/24 139/15 |
| 163/14 | 76/5 88/6 96/13 105/3 | 18/11 27/3 51/25 54/3 | | 142/13 153/15 159/1 |
| enquiries [1] 187/7 | 136/6 142/17 | 55/2 55/9 55/13 71/11 | | 159/1 |
| enquiry [10] 102/6 | every [8] 8/1 8/3 30/2 | 74/4 | expertise [8] 66/15 | externally [2] 11/2 |
| 102/10 102/17 107/8 | 89/4 134/9 134/12 151/7 155/7 | executives [1] 61/9 exercise [42] 15/9 | 94/3 96/22 100/14 122/21 165/18 193/19 | 20/16 extra [2] 22/23 123/5 |
| 185/24 187/10 187/13 | everyone [1] 49/13 | 59/20 72/13 83/25 | 217/23 | extra [2] 22/23 123/5 |
| 187/14 188/9 214/12 | everything [6] 21/8 | 92/14 93/15 93/19 | experts [8] 68/10 | 205/6 |
| ensure [9] 8/17 21/4 | 21/19 21/22 57/11 | 93/25 94/21 107/18 | 87/15 87/22 88/22 | extreme [2] 218/4 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | (68) either - extreme |

(68) either... - extreme

| E | 105/24 105/25 106/8 | fifth [2] 1/20 117/13 | firstly [10] 1/16 49/15 | fortnightly [1] 79/6 |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| extreme [1] 218/5 | 106/11 106/20 107/13 | figure [1] 42/16 | 50/14 51/18 67/20 | forward [13] 52/3 |
| extremely [2] 72/7 | 110/7 110/19 111/13 | file [8] 98/12 98/13 | 82/18 82/23 84/4 | 56/16 79/2 79/8 90/18 |
| 72/11 | 111/22 112/1 112/15 | 98/15 108/19 108/20 | 165/9 166/23 | 90/19 91/2 91/7 119/1 |
| | 112/18 112/25 113/5 | 110/24 111/1 202/20 | five [14] 1/11 1/12 | 119/11 172/14 173/7 |
| F | 113/13 114/5 114/13 | files [2] 126/18 | 13/1 27/19 27/19 | 181/22 |
| face [3] 52/6 101/8 | 115/2 115/3 118/18 | 126/18 | 113/3 113/5 113/8 | forwards [1] 206/24 |
| 209/20 | 118/19 118/20 118/23 | | | |
| faced [1] 82/12 | 118/24 119/4 119/13 | final [1] 3/18 | 151/1 168/4 168/7 | 17/13 17/24 18/17 |
| facility [2] 14/22 | 119/21 119/22 120/2 | finally [2] 1/19 130/9 | fixed [3] 26/16 26/18 | 23/1 54/12 54/20 |
| 186/21 | 135/2 135/8 135/15 | finance [1] 36/23 | 131/15 | 76/11 97/25 126/7 |
| facing [2] 53/5 81/15 | 142/20 143/2 143/11 | financial [1] 123/19 | fluid [1] 13/5 | 127/25 189/2 |
| fact [14] 42/13 63/2 | 149/25 150/3 150/4 | find [18] 15/24 18/25 22/13 27/9 27/11 | fluidity [1] 13/6 Foat [8] 1/20 6/23 7/2 | four [12] 1/14 1/25 2/4 6/4 9/22 10/5 |
| 72/2 84/23 89/16 | 150/7 150/9 150/10 | 68/23 88/3 94/21 | | 12/12 146/17 146/21 |
| 110/20 114/24 115/22 | 150/14 151/8 156/7 | 121/16 141/2 163/10 | 42/9 | 150/25 168/4 168/7 |
| 122/10 180/22 204/10 | 156/10 161/23 162/25 | | Foat's [1] 7/23 | fractured [1] 19/6 |
| 209/9 209/18 213/9 | 163/3 170/24 171/11 | | focus [4] 13/19 49/14 | |
| factor [2] 25/25 | 172/6 172/8 172/12 | 214/3 | 73/25 214/1 | framed [1] 30/19 |
| 197/12 factors [3] 190/9 | | finding [4] 16/1 22/22 | | frankly [1] 81/18 |
| factors [3] 190/9 190/10 191/3 | 179/20 179/24 180/15 | | 55/6 57/17 74/23 | Fraser [3] 20/18 |
| facts [1] 43/7 | 181/1 184/5 184/11 | fine [3] 47/4 131/20 | 74/25 76/18 124/11 | 20/20 25/20 |
| failings [10] 1/8 1/10 | 184/14 184/16 184/19 | | 207/16 208/5 | Freedom [14] 8/13 |
| 49/16 50/16 55/24 | 184/21 185/7 185/12 | finish [1] 102/5 | focuses [1] 205/16 | 8/19 8/20 42/12 42/14 |
| 60/4 82/4 82/17 | 186/6 186/14 186/22 | finishing [1] 100/6 | focusing [2] 197/4 | 42/21 43/2 43/15 |
| 161/16 165/10 | 188/23 188/25 189/5 | Finsbury [1] 19/11 | 200/5 | 43/21 43/24 44/5 44/7 |
| failure [3] 98/25 | 189/23 190/15 190/18 | | FOIA [4] 8/14 201/11 | 44/11 202/11 |
| 120/15 188/15 | 190/19 190/21 190/23 | 3/13 51/8 56/4 125/6 | 201/22 202/23 | Freehills [39] 7/14 |
| failures [1] 79/17 | 190/24 191/11 200/17 | 229/2 | follow [2] 122/15 | 8/24 9/2 24/3 24/21 |
| fair [8] 50/15 134/6 | 201/2 201/3 203/13 | firm [31] 7/14 25/7 | 204/15 | 25/6 25/24 28/5 31/13 |
| 139/14 145/1 181/21 | 209/11 211/21 213/7 | 29/8 44/20 125/10 | followed [5] 5/12 | 31/16 35/3 35/12 |
| 197/14 214/17 217/4 | 213/11 213/23 219/14 | | 35/2 59/2 59/3 102/18 | |
| faire [1] 80/25 | Family 1 [1] 151/8 family-level [6] | 148/16 167/12 167/14 170/4 170/10 170/20 | 12/6 12/16 75/5 85/20 | 62/15 65/4 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/6 114/1 |
| fairly [5] 9/25 10/3 | 112/15 149/15 149/25 | | 12/0 12/10 75/5 85/20 | 115/14 116/5 116/15 |
| 19/1 216/14 219/4 | 150/7 150/14 162/25 | 178/23 178/25 182/7 | 214/11 221/3 223/3 | 116/17 125/18 133/11 |
| falling [1] 42/6 | far [11] 9/18 21/25 | 193/10 195/5 196/8 | follows [4] 127/18 | 138/17 142/16 147/18 |
| familiar [5] 87/16 | 51/25 70/18 77/7 | | 151/24 194/15 209/22 | |
| 105/16 212/22 217/23 | 85/15 87/5 212/16 | | folly [1] 205/22 | 154/12 154/23 155/1 |
| 219/5 | 212/24 213/9 215/25 | 214/19 218/17 | foot [9] 48/6 55/25 | 160/22 161/17 |
| familiarity [1] 193/3 families [51] 49/17 | fast [2] 99/20 191/7 | firm's [6] 182/14 | 56/23 91/18 91/19 | Freehills' [1] 135/18 |
| 82/20 99/20 103/7 | fear [1] 213/24 | 209/17 209/24 210/15 | 197/20 198/15 207/1 | Freehills/Peters [1] |
| 104/16 104/17 105/5 | feathers [1] 116/1 | 218/1 218/18 | 222/11 | 152/13 |
| 105/8 107/24 108/9 | feature [1] 14/10 | firmly [1] 172/16 | footing [1] 19/20 | frenzy [1] 207/19 |
| 109/8 109/12 110/20 | features [1] 80/14 | firms [8] 7/18 8/23 | forecasting [1] 13/23 | frequency [1] 91/1 |
| 111/5 112/17 112/18 | February [7] 12/16 | 66/14 73/8 92/1 95/7 | forecasts [1] 23/21 | frequent [3] 65/3 |
| 134/19 142/24 145/6 | 33/1 33/7 55/4 55/17 | 138/20 174/4 | forensic [3] 132/21 | 76/9 90/18 |
| 149/11 149/14 150/1 | 77/14 126/11 | first [46] 11/12 20/1 | 136/17 175/17 | frequently [2] 90/5 |
| 150/5 150/25 151/1 | fee [2] 26/5 26/13 | 20/6 24/11 25/16 | forgive [3] 177/14 | 196/16 |
| 153/7 165/12 173/2 | feed [1] 191/12 | 29/22 43/5 43/8 48/10 | | front [6] 3/14 43/9 |
| 173/7 173/8 173/11 | feedback [5] 83/17 | 48/11 55/1 74/11 85/3 | | 47/23 132/3 164/19 |
| 178/22 184/2 186/8 | 194/25 195/21 196/15 | | | 185/23 |
| 186/9 186/25 187/21 | 196/17 | 97/2 113/11 124/4 124/18 145/16 153/10 | 176/12 181/12 181/14 | 40/20 |
| 101/20 100/10 100/12 | feel [2] 111/15 137/18 | 159/4 166/1 174/24 | formal [1] 32/22 | frustrations [2] 39/1 |
| 189/15 190/2 190/4 | feeling [1] 43/24 | | formed [1] 200/24 | 39/10 |
| 210/3 211/11 212/11 | fees [2] 13/25 44/22 | 183/6 185/1 185/3 | forms [2] 218/22 | Fujitsu [1] 73/11 |
| 213/17 220/5 220/10 | felt [4] 29/1 81/10 | 185/15 187/17 187/22 | | fulfilling [1] 174/11 |
| 225/22 226/2 | 112/5 156/21 | | formulating [1] | full [11] 3/12 9/25 |
| family [110] 59/19 69/1 69/24 70/23 75/4 | fence [1] 147/18 | 199/20 205/12 209/13 | | 47/18 57/9 59/7 61/6 |
| 77/8 98/5 99/17 | few [2] 137/21 221/1 | | formulation [1] 192/4 | |
| 102/21 103/2 103/15 | fewer [1] 219/13 | 223/14 224/13 | forth [1] 216/11 | 157/16 164/14 |
| 103/22 105/2 105/21 | Fieldfisher [2] 57/24 | first-level [2] 187/17 | fortnight [2] 222/24 | fully [4] 54/13 56/14 |
| | 123/3 | 188/7 | 222/25 | 57/2 57/5 |
| | | | | |
| L | 1 | 1 | 1 | (60) extreme fully |

(69) extreme... - fully

| | 00/0 40/47 00/40 | 470/00 470/0 470/0 | 40/2 40/22 44/4 44/2 | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|--|--|-----------------------|
| F | 29/6 40/17 80/19 | 172/22 173/3 173/6 | 10/3 10/22 11/4 11/9 | hand [5] 21/6 85/15 |
| fulsome [1] 163/14 | 81/10 81/16 82/11 | 184/1 185/24 188/13 | 11/10 11/14 11/16 | 85/24 115/14 214/19 |
| function [4] 66/22 | 82/13 104/25 157/4 | 191/11 204/18 222/20 | | hands [4] 36/22 |
| 106/9 123/6 186/7 | 220/20 | 223/17 225/1 | 16/25 17/6 18/1 18/3 | 65/12 66/11 73/13 |
| functionality [3] | give [24] 2/2 3/11 | gone [5] 11/10 24/24 | 19/11 19/20 20/5 | hands-off [2] 65/12 |
| 105/25 226/6 226/11 | 7/19 14/21 32/17 | 120/24 139/3 189/6 | 20/18 20/20 20/23 | 66/11 |
| functions [3] 50/13 | 47/18 55/18 57/18 | good [12] 1/3 47/9 | 21/7 21/22 22/17 | haphazard [1] 125/7 |
| 73/10 122/2 | 57/19 58/4 62/15 63/2 | 66/16 70/5 130/17 | 22/19 23/1 23/4 23/19 | happen [12] 39/24 |
| | 121/12 131/25 139/18 | 131/10 138/20 164/5 | 23/20 23/21 23/22 | 41/21 43/17 43/18 |
| funded [1] 21/24 | 141/17 141/20 144/13 | 171/18 215/20 215/21 | 24/1 24/15 24/17 | 88/19 97/4 118/17 |
| funding [8] 16/12 | 158/22 163/6 163/20 | 219/13 | 24/22 25/1 25/8 25/24 | 139/15 153/8 157/23 |
| 23/13 23/17 23/20 | 164/14 192/16 196/17 | Google [2] 218/7 | 26/8 26/20 27/6 29/17 | 160/12 162/22 |
| 27/5 27/12 46/4 136/7 | given [43] 11/4 16/17 | 218/14 | 30/2 30/8 30/21 31/1 | happened [19] 36/1 |
| funds [1] 15/7 | 21/23 34/9 34/13 | got [16] 5/25 87/7 | 31/19 31/20 32/1 32/5 | 42/25 75/12 75/13 |
| further [17] 2/12 | 34/17 34/22 72/12 | 88/8 98/16 111/9 | 32/13 32/13 36/5 36/9 | 89/4 145/7 146/25 |
| 14/21 71/13 111/16 | 72/14 72/15 73/2 78/6 | 111/9 113/2 113/3 | 36/18 36/19 37/3 | 149/1 159/8 174/24 |
| 116/11 126/21 129/5 | 80/12 85/14 95/16 | 130/10 135/15 160/6 | 37/12 37/15 37/18 | 179/12 180/21 182/5 |
| 130/13 145/3 146/13 | 104/7 116/14 129/4 | 180/10 185/4 203/20 | 38/6 40/3 42/4 43/14 | 196/19 202/23 209/10 |
| 159/23 159/24 160/8 | 136/6 136/9 139/24 | 203/20 211/25 | 44/21 45/5 45/7 45/15 | 211/13 211/24 219/2 |
| 163/15 169/21 184/23 | 140/3 151/8 152/1 | governance [5] 7/24 | 45/18 45/19 45/19 | happening [1] 89/3 |
| 210/24 | 155/11 155/17 155/25 | | 45/21 45/23 45/25 | happens [3] 160/13 |
| future [7] 2/21 | 156/6 158/9 173/16 | | 45/21 45/23 45/25 50/13 52/20 52/25 | 182/8 203/13 |
| 123/23 160/8 162/14 | 176/9 177/18 177/23 | Government [4] 15/14 22/2 46/5 50/4 | 53/6 53/10 53/12 | |
| 165/16 172/21 228/8 | 182/7 186/18 186/19 | | | happy [1] 6/10 |
| <u> </u> | | gradually [1] 82/10 | 53/15 53/19 53/22 | hard [19] 30/7 35/17 |
| G | 187/6 187/8 216/14 | graduates [4] 183/8 | 53/25 54/12 54/16 | 51/4 54/20 58/18 59/4 |
| gain [1] 68/9 | 216/25 217/8 217/21 | 183/10 185/5 210/8 | 54/20 54/24 55/24 | 76/10 79/14 99/20 |
| gathering [1] 161/3 | 227/2 | granted [1] 32/15 | 56/5 56/18 58/17 62/2 | 99/24 100/2 124/21 |
| gave [8] 10/14 137/1 | gives [1] 61/5 | granularity [2] | 65/15 66/5 66/17 67/6 | 124/25 125/3 125/9 |
| 166/19 213/24 214/14 | giving [7] 61/10 | 122/13 122/17 | 67/12 67/23 68/5 | 125/12 125/19 191/7 |
| 214/15 216/10 223/7 | 115/20 154/4 173/18 | greater [1] 66/17 | 68/12 69/2 70/25 71/9 | 224/3 |
| GE [3] 8/4 21/21 | 173/24 222/2 224/7 | Gregg [5] 1/19 164/8 | 73/8 73/18 73/19 | hard-copy [4] 124/21 |
| 23/25 | global [2] 18/10 | 164/10 164/15 229/16 | | 125/3 125/9 125/12 |
| general [31] 1/21 7/3 | 182/14 | grew [1] 13/17 | 76/11 76/14 76/22 | harder [2] 90/17 |
| 7/20 7/21 15/12 15/13 | go [39] 4/1 16/19 | gritty [1] 37/21 | 77/3 77/24 78/7 80/8 | 99/24 |
| 18/8 18/11 41/25 53/3 | 17/20 17/21 21/13 | gross [1] 37/18 | 83/23 83/25 84/20 | harvested [6] 85/22 |
| 53/21 62/2 62/16 | 21/25 23/22 25/18 | ground [1] 172/12 | 85/22 89/14 89/23 | 98/23 98/24 203/10 |
| 68/12 70/5 80/11 83/9 | 31/22 43/2 48/4 52/17 | group [14] 7/16 9/15 | 90/15 92/12 93/14 | 204/4 204/6 |
| 88/7 89/21 103/16 | 65/16 65/25 73/15 | 16/10 20/18 25/10 | 93/18 94/20 94/21 | harvesting [1] 192/1 |
| 104/6 106/7 108/2 | 79/19 85/4 90/16 | 25/20 27/3 51/25 54/2 | | harvests [1] 191/23 |
| 110/8 146/15 169/11 | 108/18 109/2 112/7 | 55/2 55/9 55/13 71/11 | | has [108] 1/9 14/24 |
| 170/17 174/5 197/16 | 112/9 121/2 126/10 | 74/4 | 106/14 107/8 110/15 | 22/3 23/3 23/16 27/11 |
| 203/4 203/6 | 128/1 146/10 160/22 | groups [1] 66/25 | 111/4 111/24 116/6 | 39/16 41/5 45/2 45/4 |
| generally [22] 23/23 | 160/23 186/5 186/14 | guarantee [1] 163/7 | 118/7 118/25 123/2 | 45/5 45/7 45/10 48/13 |
| 42/1 80/1 84/16 94/19 | 187/10 187/12 192/19 | | 125/4 125/7 137/22 | 48/16 48/23 49/11 |
| 94/25 170/20 171/13 | 198/15 206/24 215/25 | | 139/3 139/3 140/5 | 55/12 57/8 57/11 60/1 |
| 172/11 172/25 178/23 | 219/20 222/11 222/20 | | 142/5 145/6 150/7 | 65/16 72/25 73/25 |
| 181/9 183/18 185/15 | goes [7] 13/2 14/15 | 87/1 87/12 87/13 88/1 | | 79/25 86/12 91/1 |
| 185/18 194/23 195/3 | 66/10 91/12 107/1 | 97/18 97/24 108/3 | 171/13 172/4 174/23 | 97/19 98/16 111/21 |
| 195/11 196/3 210/8 | 187/14 203/11 | 108/6 119/19 119/23 | 174/24 175/1 175/17 | 115/8 118/10 118/22 |
| 221/19 226/3 | going [58] 4/4 11/17 | 120/1 120/16 134/18 | 179/12 180/23 183/18 | 119/19 120/11 120/22 |
| generate [2] 15/16 | 12/11 12/12 12/15 | 135/15 135/18 201/13 | 194/6 199/11 199/21 | 120/25 122/15 122/16 |
| 205/10 | 13/13 16/22 22/14 | 205/8 | 199/24 199/25 200/1 | 123/10 123/17 124/18 |
| generating [2] 142/8 | 22/24 25/2 25/11 | guide [6] 48/13 48/16 | 200/8 200/12 201/12 | 125/6 125/13 127/3 |
| 142/12 | 25/12 27/21 32/7 | 48/23 87/13 120/16 | 201/18 202/15 203/9 | 127/7 128/9 129/19 |
| genuinely [1] 216/3 | 36/12 38/19 39/15 | 140/16 | 203/18 204/10 206/18 | 129/20 130/9 130/13 |
| get [21] 23/7 23/13 | 42/10 43/2 43/4 45/13 | guidelines [6] 34/4 | 206/20 207/23 211/3 | 137/20 139/19 145/11 |
| 27/8 37/20 40/20 | 47/1 49/8 49/14 52/2 | 207/3 208/7 208/20 | 211/15 211/16 215/15 | 145/23 146/3 149/20 |
| 54/20 66/8 66/9 88/8 | 56/15 59/7 65/24 79/7 | 208/23 209/5 | hadn't [12] 5/25 11/8 | 151/9 158/6 160/10 |
| 90/4 91/18 129/16 | 90/18 100/5 104/11 | guides [1] 86/24 | 12/14 16/17 16/20 | 160/23 162/3 163/4 |
| 151/5 151/6 153/22 | 104/15 104/17 107/6 | <u> </u> | 44/12 54/19 75/11 | 163/5 165/5 168/13 |
| 159/20 161/24 181/22 | 109/25 110/6 110/6 | Н | 172/20 172/22 207/24 | 170/7 170/20 171/23 |
| 190/21 218/11 219/11 | 119/1 129/10 130/22 | had [197] 5/2 5/10 | 211/24 | 174/21 175/5 175/10 |
| | 132/17 144/24 163/1 | 5/12 5/17 5/19 5/23 | half [1] 181/17 | 175/11 175/12 175/19 |
| getting [11] 20/14 | 165/3 165/8 171/2 | 6/4 6/8 6/9 6/14 9/8 | halfway [1] 149/5 | 176/5 176/9 176/11 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | (70) fulsome - has |

(70) fulsome - has

| | 407/4 | 470/0 400/40 040/04 | 00/40 00/0 00/44 | |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|
| H | 187/1 | 176/2 188/10 212/24 | 38/16 39/3 39/11 | I could [2] 71/21 |
| has [30] 176/12 | helping [3] 68/7 69/8 | 223/4 | 39/15 39/19 40/14 | 192/16 |
| 176/19 176/24 180/14 | 94/24 | historic [3] 140/12 | 40/15 43/3 61/17 | I couldn't [2] 32/17 |
| | Henry [3] 2/11 2/16 | 143/18 146/12 | 68/21 69/14 69/18 | 90/12 |
| 180/16 181/24 182/5 | 2/19 | historically [1] 9/8 | 70/16 77/18 91/25 | I dealt [1] 21/2 |
| 182/20 184/18 190/20 | her [3] 23/3 23/4 | | | |
| 193/8 193/25 194/10 | | history [2] 4/5 132/20 | | I departed [1] 36/17 |
| 196/23 197/5 199/7 | 23/16 | hit [5] 20/8 103/24 | 102/24 103/4 103/6 | I describe [3] 200/11 |
| 208/15 208/16 208/17 | Herbert [56] 7/14 | 108/10 111/9 189/3 | 103/10 105/23 116/24 | 202/24 210/25 |
| | 8/24 9/2 24/2 24/12 | hits [15] 29/22 | 152/3 162/17 165/21 | I described [2] |
| 209/6 209/7 214/4 | 24/20 25/6 25/23 26/1 | | 166/10 173/21 177/19 | 207/23 218/25 |
| 215/15 221/2 222/14 | 26/6 26/13 28/5 31/13 | | 178/17 216/20 216/22 | |
| 222/17 223/21 225/14 | 31/15 35/2 35/12 | 154/3 179/7 186/25 | 216/23 221/9 | 218/14 |
| 225/18 226/6 | | | | |
| hasn't [6] 39/12 | 35/15 35/25 40/24 | 187/4 216/21 216/24 | HSF's [1] 103/16 | I didn't [7] 8/15 11/8 |
| 122/23 122/25 175/9 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 | 218/11 219/13 | HSF/Peters [1] | 18/18 66/4 140/19 |
| 175/14 177/1 | 61/17 62/1 62/15 65/3 | hits-only [1] 187/4 | 116/24 | 140/23 156/13 |
| | 65/25 68/11 73/19 | hm [4] 49/20 60/19 | hubs [2] 19/12 | I do [16] 10/1 17/8 |
| have [363] | 75/19 76/4 106/5 | 73/12 110/17 | 182/19 | 32/15 42/25 43/17 |
| haven't [9] 7/9 24/24 | | | | |
| 93/1 116/9 122/25 | 109/5 114/1 115/13 | hoc [1] 133/23 | huge [1] 42/2 | 44/10 44/10 100/13 |
| 140/2 141/24 195/16 | 116/5 116/14 116/16 | hold [7] 87/7 89/6 | human [1] 30/10 | 153/1 156/1 160/20 |
| 203/20 | 121/8 125/18 133/11 | 98/8 183/13 196/23 | hundreds [3] 29/21 | 164/22 194/24 195/20 |
| | 133/22 135/17 138/17 | 202/16 203/16 | 176/15 176/15 | 204/23 227/8 |
| having [24] 12/9 | 138/25 142/15 147/17 | home [1] 205/4 | | I don't [63] 12/23 |
| 12/14 12/20 19/17 | 147/20 148/2 152/1 | hope [4] 46/1 72/4 | I | 15/17 16/16 17/11 |
| 41/6 42/20 48/14 | 152/13 154/11 154/22 | 224/15 224/17 | I actually [2] 5/13 | 18/4 26/4 27/23 30/3 |
| 48/16 48/24 50/2 54/9 | | | | |
| 68/14 73/8 82/9 92/3 | 154/25 160/22 161/17 | | 15/10 | 35/13 40/7 42/23 |
| 92/5 131/14 142/17 | here [38] 40/7 45/13 | 46/4 78/25 | I agree [2] 145/16 | 42/25 53/19 53/24 |
| | 46/3 55/21 56/17 62/8 | hoping [1] 14/12 | 207/12 | 54/4 54/6 58/12 72/19 |
| 155/22 167/2 209/18 | 75/16 76/6 79/4 82/1 | Horizon [7] 18/1 22/7 | l also [2] 40/5 40/11 | 77/9 78/19 84/15 89/4 |
| 217/24 221/3 226/19 | 85/7 86/7 91/19 93/1 | 41/9 50/16 50/19 | l am [10] 7/10 49/8 | 93/8 98/25 101/4 |
| he [19] 2/2 2/11 6/22 | | 52/15 207/7 | 49/14 80/19 89/20 | 105/2 110/12 111/11 |
| 54/19 54/20 54/20 | 93/12 93/23 96/17 | | | |
| 114/11 212/21 212/22 | 99/3 100/8 107/2 | horizontal [1] 150/20 | 140/25 165/3 165/8 | 118/8 120/8 122/20 |
| 212/24 212/25 213/3 | 110/8 119/19 149/18 | host [2] 167/9 190/10 | 196/5 222/4 | 130/3 130/25 135/20 |
| | 153/18 158/6 158/8 | hours [1] 2/24 | I appreciate [2] | 138/23 140/5 141/1 |
| 213/5 213/7 213/18 | 173/15 180/11 182/4 | house [3] 46/19 | 81/25 204/21 | 141/25 148/15 152/23 |
| 213/20 214/10 214/11 | 184/24 200/22 212/10 | | I arrived [3] 20/6 | 156/8 157/12 162/16 |
| 214/11 | | | 24/15 26/6 | |
| he'd [1] 216/18 | 212/14 212/18 213/18 | | | 162/16 163/15 163/18 |
| he's [1] 213/18 | 214/11 218/16 226/4 | 21/4 22/11 22/11 | l ask [6] 47/17 48/4 | 167/25 168/3 174/17 |
| head [4] 25/22 26/19 | hesitating [1] 98/21 | 22/12 27/15 30/18 | 132/7 164/13 226/17 | 180/22 183/4 187/5 |
| head [4] 25/22 36/18 | hidden [1] 21/11 | 31/17 32/17 36/3 41/7 | 226/20 | 192/12 194/15 196/19 |
| 188/10 201/19 | hide [1] 21/15 | 42/19 42/23 42/25 | l assume [4] 30/16 | 196/24 200/20 200/21 |
| heading [3] 14/16 | | | 78/6 96/11 203/7 | 202/15 203/24 212/5 |
| 125/20 127/23 | hides [2] 114/9 | 43/17 44/11 44/13 | | |
| hear [10] 1/3 1/9 1/14 | 114/12 | 44/22 49/15 58/8 | l attend [1] 75/18 | 216/13 227/3 |
| 23/4 45/4 47/2 47/9 | high [20] 14/25 21/1 | 58/17 58/18 60/9 66/7 | I believe [10] 24/21 | I expect [1] 178/12 |
| | 56/20 56/22 58/7 | 73/18 73/22 87/16 | 52/4 73/6 74/16 88/22 | I fear [1] 213/24 |
| 131/10 164/5 226/24 | 58/24 59/11 60/22 | 90/5 93/17 101/12 | 113/25 115/6 131/15 | I first [2] 11/12 25/16 |
| heard [14] 1/21 51/9 | 66/2 69/4 73/1 80/25 | 104/17 106/15 119/12 | 163/3 216/7 | I gave [2] 166/19 |
| 59/23 134/25 135/21 | | | I call [4] 3/7 47/12 | |
| 136/10 137/10 146/11 | 142/9 143/17 153/10 | 121/24 122/3 122/8 | | 213/24 |
| 159/21 172/17 175/21 | 159/3 190/20 193/14 | 128/7 134/3 134/3 | 131/21 164/8 | I guess [1] 69/4 |
| 176/23 216/17 227/4 | 216/24 216/24 | 134/4 134/5 134/15 | I came [2] 10/11 | I had [12] 5/12 5/19 |
| | high-level [1] 143/17 | 135/11 138/6 138/23 | 36/14 | 10/3 20/20 27/6 36/5 |
| hearing [8] 1/7 2/20 | higher [6] 13/19 | 147/17 152/21 153/4 | I can [11] 1/5 57/19 | 45/18 45/19 52/25 |
| 2/24 8/3 130/18 | 38/17 95/20 124/16 | 155/18 161/11 165/10 | | 65/15 77/3 102/4 |
| 227/16 227/20 228/8 | | | | |
| hearings [4] 10/25 | 124/17 143/8 | 167/23 168/2 170/17 | 131/12 132/13 135/10 | |
| 12/15 58/9 60/15 | highlighted [5] 16/5 | 173/5 174/12 177/24 | 148/6 164/7 178/2 | I have [20] 2/1 9/25 |
| | 17/14 140/15 149/20 | 190/23 191/4 196/16 | I can't [10] 6/21 | 15/21 18/18 42/23 |
| heavily [1] 36/8 | 158/18 | 207/20 209/10 210/10 | 35/13 75/13 76/16 | 64/8 96/5 97/12 113/8 |
| held [5] 19/12 68/23 | highly [3] 14/10 | 210/13 212/3 227/11 | 93/11 94/11 121/16 | 121/19 157/14 158/17 |
| 102/12 121/24 216/3 | 52/19 118/1 | | 143/25 178/24 195/9 | 162/9 162/18 187/5 |
| help [9] 68/21 69/13 | | However [4] 72/2 | | |
| 69/18 84/12 88/23 | him [1] 7/22 | 103/10 161/25 213/3 | I cannot [1] 163/6 | 194/11 196/6 212/21 |
| 90/23 123/5 141/12 | hindsight [5] 143/3 | HSF [51] 8/8 14/1 | I categorise [1] 81/4 | 216/9 217/22 |
| 164/17 | 157/13 158/17 181/20 | | l chair [1] 79/6 | I haven't [4] 7/9 |
| | 204/23 | 28/10 28/22 31/1 31/1 | I chaired [1] 7/25 | 24/24 93/1 116/9 |
| helpful [5] 144/15 | his [10] 1/23 2/3 6/21 | 31/9 32/12 32/16 37/9 | | l imagine [1] 94/6 |
| 144/15 144/15 186/14 | 27/7 82/16 124/24 | 38/6 38/11 38/14 | I consider [1] 205/1 | I indicated [1] 6/10 |
| | 21/1 02/10 124/24 | 55/0 50/11 50/14 | | |
| | | | | |
| L | l | | | |

(71) has... - I indicated

| l | I start [1] 165/17 | 60/2 89/3 91/25 92/16 | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| | I started [1] 25/13 | 95/2 97/7 97/14 99/19 | | 46/11 47/25 52/6 |
| 62/11 | I strongly [1] 157/17 | 116/13 116/16 120/14 151/25 152/3 156/4 | | 52/10 52/16 56/13 |
| | I suggest [1] 101/20 I suppose [2] 52/5 | 199/12 203/2 209/22 | 176/19 180/20 182/2 187/7 196/11 200/13 | 57/1 62/23 63/12 67/2 68/11 74/21 80/6 80/7 |
| 221/11 | 167/19 | I understand it [1] | 202/10 204/18 215/22 | 80/21 85/4 85/24 |
| I joined [1] 52/25 | I take [1] 171/6 | 78/17 | 216/2 217/23 222/20 | 86/20 86/21 86/23 |
| I JUST [0] 2/0 40/15 | I then [1] 4/9 | l understood [6] 9/7 | 224/12 225/1 226/19 | 87/1 89/19 90/20 |
| 102/5 111/15 111/15 | I think [157] 4/6 6/7 | 22/1 24/16 25/3 59/3 | l've [31] 39/3 39/4 | 90/21 94/5 98/18 |
| 156/21 168/12 198/1 I know [8] 43/16 | 13/10 16/2 16/16 | 181/2 | 39/14 40/20 46/2 | 98/25 100/6 101/14 |
| 53/21 54/25 78/13 | 16/18 17/12 17/19 | l up [1] 2/14 | 59/23 87/7 88/17 | 101/20 107/2 107/7 |
| 88/6 93/7 121/15 | 18/6 18/7 18/23 18/25 | | 88/19 88/20 101/6 | 109/19 110/13 112/2 |
| 163/10 | 20/2 20/11 20/13 21/2 | 24/9 138/15 142/20 | 101/7 109/10 110/24 | 112/10 112/24 113/2 |
| I left [3] 23/9 23/17 | 21/25 23/1 23/8 23/16 | 145/10 160/19 227/8 | 111/9 113/2 113/3 | 113/8 113/14 113/15 |
| 23/18 | 23/20 25/16 26/18 26/22 27/17 29/21 | I wanted [1] 56/21 I was [16] 4/8 9/24 | 117/24 121/15 139/14 139/15 148/7 151/8 | 119/6 121/12 125/21 126/10 128/1 130/23 |
| I may [6] 25/19 46/11 | 36/14 37/15 39/25 | 10/13 20/21 36/5 | 154/21 179/19 187/7 | 130/24 131/15 134/23 |
| 152/25 173/8 219/16 | 39/25 41/2 41/20 42/1 | 38/25 39/10 52/10 | 194/8 208/24 217/25 | 138/5 142/13 143/17 |
| 221/23 | 42/15 43/24 44/18 | 76/12 90/4 95/20 | 221/19 227/4 | 144/9 144/21 145/6 |
| I mean [8] 60/6 108/2 | 44/24 45/10 48/1 48/6 | 95/24 99/12 119/3 | ID [4] 140/6 142/25 | 146/23 147/7 149/6 |
| 118/11 118/15 138/24 150/11 157/12 218/7 | 50/1 55/4 60/13 60/20 | 167/13 220/18 | 145/8 149/8 | 150/7 151/3 151/22 |
| I mentioned [1] | 62/8 63/9 66/4 66/13 | l wasn't [8] 7/9 7/9 | idea [4] 46/2 70/5 | 152/19 152/25 155/14 |
| 189/24 | 70/9 70/15 72/16 | 7/11 11/9 11/11 62/20 | | 155/16 156/9 157/13 |
| I misremembered [1] | 73/21 77/14 81/4 81/4 | 137/17 139/1 | ideal [1] 81/22 | 162/2 162/22 164/20 |
| 201/6 | 81/22 82/6 87/2 87/23 | | identical [4] 150/3 | 173/7 175/7 176/11 |
| I missed [2] 55/17 | 89/15 90/12 91/23 92/25 96/21 98/1 98/3 | 227/9 228/4 | 150/4 150/10 150/20 identification [6] | 177/21 182/2 184/18 185/24 185/24 187/14 |
| 179/6 | 102/3 102/4 102/14 | 197/18 | 14/20 17/9 97/9 97/22 | 188/17 189/17 190/24 |
| I misunderstood [1] | 104/20 105/11 106/13 | | 98/14 169/2 | 190/25 191/12 191/14 |
| 152/24 | 107/4 107/4 110/5 | 6/12 8/13 10/25 36/20 | | 192/15 195/15 198/1 |
| I must [1] 92/25 | 111/21 112/4 116/6 | 36/24 37/16 37/17 | 29/16 29/17 30/1 | 198/14 200/19 201/6 |
| I name [1] 41/7 I need [1] 122/22 | 119/1 120/15 122/22 | 38/12 39/1 39/12 | 35/24 37/16 38/7 | 201/8 203/19 204/15 |
| I now [1] 113/19 | 124/3 125/4 126/1 | 66/20 104/19 137/20 | 55/24 74/6 74/19 75/6 | |
| l or [1] 64/23 | 134/5 134/25 135/14 | | 75/23 76/8 77/2 82/15 | 207/24 209/12 210/22 |
| I probably [1] 196/5 | 137/23 139/14 139/20 140/4 140/25 144/18 | 146/4 157/17 158/20 | 88/21 99/2 101/9 | 211/24 212/20 214/22 216/25 217/13 218/7 |
| I raised [1] 21/2 | 140/21 152/23 156/19 | 173/8 192/12 195/17 217/6 | 105/14 106/3 120/14 124/24 125/25 128/9 | 219/10 219/16 220/1 |
| I ran [1] 218/14 | 158/2 161/8 166/1 | I wouldn't [10] 71/4 | 145/9 146/8 153/3 | 220/7 220/22 221/23 |
| I recall [1] 214/12 | 166/9 166/17 166/18 | 88/1 89/25 173/20 | 173/10 179/3 187/16 | 222/6 222/11 227/7 |
| I received [2] 2/10 2/12 | 168/5 168/14 172/8 | 173/20 193/12 194/11 | 200/3 200/13 200/15 | image [1] 149/17 |
| I regard [1] 120/19 | 172/25 173/21 173/23 | 214/25 220/25 223/25 | | imagine [1] 94/6 |
| I remember [3] 20/12 | 174/5 174/13 175/3 | l'd [10] 6/6 11/20 | 208/15 208/18 226/10 | |
| 31/4 31/4 | 176/23 179/19 180/4 | 73/18 77/6 90/17 | identify [15] 28/8 | immediately [9] |
| I reported [2] 7/22 | 181/8 181/10 181/20 | 99/23 108/4 134/20 | 28/20 43/14 59/9 | 11/24 12/7 20/5 20/9 |
| 38/14 | 181/20 192/21 193/13 194/5 195/17 196/5 | 159/20 223/25 I'II [7] 13/14 48/15 | 59/11 74/15 81/12 85/19 87/4 92/7 94/13 | 32/12 43/3 76/16 101/9 121/16 |
| I right [2] 147/23 | 196/5 197/11 199/25 | 52/8 60/11 152/25 | 101/18 176/18 198/13 | |
| 151/3 | 200/13 200/14 201/6 | 201/6 213/24 | 206/8 | impact [5] 26/9 71/9 |
| I said [5] 17/25 54/10 84/11 140/2 141/19 | 202/10 202/13 202/24 | | identifying [9] 35/16 | 145/14 157/16 221/18 |
| I saw [1] 140/21 | 204/4 205/19 207/21 | 9/18 19/8 19/14 27/22 | 63/18 94/7 97/1 | impacted [1] 77/5 |
| I say [8] 18/9 29/11 | 207/23 208/2 208/12 | 40/6 42/9 46/2 51/24 | 102/11 138/21 169/9 | impacting [1] 77/18 |
| 44/10 50/9 69/3 | 210/11 210/12 210/13 | 52/3 52/5 55/18 58/10 | | impacts [1] 113/22 |
| 149/16 215/23 227/25 | 212/5 212/6 213/14 214/17 215/1 215/19 | 66/3 70/18 78/5 78/19 78/25 80/21 81/22 | ie [6] 52/24 61/2 62/9 92/9 104/15 195/23 | implemented [5] 95/7 97/11 116/16 |
| I see [2] 69/21 91/11 | 216/2 217/6 217/11 | 87/16 89/19 89/19 | ie broadly [1] 92/9 | 147/16 152/3 |
| I set [1] 161/21 | 217/18 218/11 218/21 | | ie non-disclosure [1] | implication [1] |
| I should [9] 128/2 146/24 149/16 176/19 | 218/21 224/12 224/23 | 93/11 93/22 94/11 | 61/2 | 158/19 |
| 178/11 103/1 106/1 | 227/13 | 96/16 98/21 101/4 | ie since [1] 52/24 | implications [6] |
| 197/2 217/22 | I took [1] 26/7 | 104/19 105/10 105/15 | | 26/24 60/1 60/10 |
| I sit [1] 200/22 | I touch [1] 121/9 | 105/16 107/15 108/24 | | 158/18 221/22 222/23 |
| I spent [1] 13/21 | I tried [1] 87/23 | 109/1 110/10 110/12 111/16 117/7 119/23 | 6/12 8/18 8/20 10/24 15/3 16/15 21/8 22/15 | importance [1] 127/14 |
| | l turn [3] 82/15 118/14 214/17 | 120/4 120/4 120/4 | 23/10 23/16 28/21 | important [4] 80/24 |
| 21/21 | I understand [17] | 120/8 132/17 137/9 | 32/11 32/13 32/13 | 140/9 140/16 162/2 |
| | | | | |
| | | | L | 72) Liphoritod - important |

(72) I inherited - important

| | 155/5 184/25 186/18 | 36/10 37/20 40/12 | instructed [13] 46/18 | introduced [1] 165/6 |
|---|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| I Imm a s s [4] - 0/04 | 190/6 202/1 | 42/15 43/4 43/8 43/16 | | intrusive [6] 71/18 |
| impose [1] 2/21 | individuals [4] 69/13 | 44/13 44/14 45/14 | 126/12 146/25 167/4 | 71/18 72/13 72/21 |
| impression [5] 10/15 80/19 136/6 136/9 | 137/2 141/4 201/23 | 46/7 47/18 47/23 | 168/18 176/5 184/4 | 73/3 178/7 |
| 197/8 | inevitable [1] 60/6 | 49/11 50/23 51/7 | 199/5 199/7 215/8 | investigat [3] 86/8 |
| | inevitably [1] 60/1 | 51/15 51/19 52/1 52/5 | instructing [1] | 93/17 93/21 |
| improve [1] 19/25 | inferred [1] 173/23 | 52/6 52/13 52/15 | 174/20 | investigate [3] 1/7 |
| improvement [1] 56/15 | influenced [2] 24/6 | 52/23 53/2 53/16 54/1 | instruction [9] 24/5 | 86/13 111/10 |
| | 24/18 | 54/15 55/11 56/14 | 24/13 26/2 34/8 34/13 | investigated [1] |
| improvements [2] 122/9 171/19 | inform [3] 130/11 | 57/3 57/6 57/10 58/9 | 34/17 34/22 106/8 | 25/12 |
| | 191/3 193/20 | 60/13 61/5 61/10 | 187/6 | investigating [4] |
| inaccurately [1] 16/22 | information [41] 2/12 | 61/20 61/21 64/17 | instructions [36] | 60/14 61/1 73/9 |
| inadequate [1] 12/3 | 2/23 8/14 8/18 8/19 | 64/19 64/25 65/15 | 62/6 62/18 68/15 | 115/17 |
| inappropriate [1] | 8/20 13/8 21/16 25/5 | 65/16 65/18 66/10 | 107/12 107/16 108/7 | investigation [9] |
| 194/19 | 32/10 32/10 32/17 | 66/22 67/2 67/4 67/10 | | 11/25 32/25 86/13 |
| incident [1] 31/4 | 41/7 42/12 42/14 | 67/20 67/25 68/16 | 133/17 133/20 138/16 | |
| incidentally [2] | 42/21 43/2 43/15 | 68/17 69/21 70/10 | 142/23 148/13 151/25 | 110/18 126/17 205/5 |
| 171/15 214/5 | 43/21 43/25 44/5 44/7 | 71/16 72/4 72/10 73/3 | | investigations [23] |
| include [1] 188/21 | 44/12 68/9 69/14 | 74/2 74/6 75/20 79/5 | 173/16 173/19 173/24 | 33/20 33/23 34/10 |
| included [3] 144/23 | 79/24 80/1 81/11 83/5 | 80/13 80/14 80/16 | 174/2 176/18 177/14 | 85/8 85/18 88/13 92/9 |
| 201/11 225/20 | 88/24 97/12 101/6 | 80/19 81/19 82/10 | 177/16 177/18 177/21 | 94/10 94/14 98/19 |
| includes [3] 79/24 | 101/6 109/10 120/22 | 91/12 103/9 106/3 | 177/23 186/19 216/9 | 104/21 104/23 105/12 |
| 169/10 225/7 | 130/3 169/19 169/20 | 115/16 119/24 120/8 | 216/13 216/15 217/2 | 115/21 143/19 152/9 |
| including [9] 4/13 | 170/8 201/20 202/11 | 122/11 123/24 124/2 | 217/8 217/21 222/2 | 197/23 198/9 198/10 |
| 5/17 76/12 123/19 | informed [7] 92/12 | | insufficient [2] 136/7 | 200/6 202/14 206/15 |
| 166/21 170/22 187/21 | 93/13 94/15 96/5 | 125/19 127/15 128/18 | | 212/23 |
| 191/19 201/24 | 102/24 109/16 129/8 | 128/23 129/8 129/22 130/11 132/17 133/6 | intelligence [1] 201/25 | investigations' [1] 202/6 |
| inclusively [1] | informing [1] 194/10 | 134/13 137/15 137/19 | | |
| 187/19 | inherited [3] 18/12 52/19 62/11 | 138/11 141/3 142/2 | 116/25 117/4 117/20 | investigative [1] 22/23 |
| income [1] 15/16 | initial [8] 6/2 10/17 | 143/17 143/25 145/19 | | investigator [2] |
| incorrect [2] 46/3 | 11/18 12/10 44/25 | 156/23 161/1 161/9 | 227/11 | 86/14 201/24 |
| 172/24 | 82/9 88/25 209/25 | 164/14 164/16 166/1 | intention [3] 63/5 | investigators [2] |
| increase [7] 23/10 | initially [7] 6/19 8/1 | 167/1 167/6 167/15 | 156/9 195/17 | 111/3 201/14 |
| 23/19 55/7 122/3 | 10/11 10/16 11/8 | 167/16 167/24 170/3 | intents [1] 136/18 | invited [1] 8/11 |
| 137/23 138/9 138/14 | 17/21 94/7 | 183/15 183/19 193/18 | | involve [5] 19/17 |
| increased [4] 13/24 | input [4] 194/25 | 193/22 193/25 198/18 | | 52/9 74/13 137/15 |
| 23/16 91/1 166/18 | | 200/1 200/16 209/16 | interactions [2] | 167/6 |
| increases [1] 45/12 | inputs [3] 174/10 | 213/4 213/21 214/8 | 162/8 171/12 | involved [51] 5/13 |
| increasing [4] 45/6 | 193/4 193/5 | 215/17 220/2 220/14 | interest [2] 213/4 | 12/1 24/21 24/23 |
| 45/8 45/23 82/11 | INQ00002007 [1] | 222/24 223/7 225/4 | 214/7 | 24/25 25/9 30/22 31/5 |
| incredibly [1] 181/10 | 33/1 | 225/16 | interested [2] 213/22 | 36/3 36/8 37/21 38/22 |
| indeed [5] 63/9 97/10 115/18 192/8 227/5 | INQ00002008 [1] | Inquiry's [22] 4/1 | 222/21 | 53/2 62/21 63/19 |
| independent [1] | 34/1 | 15/11 23/11 35/1 43/5 | | 64/22 69/8 83/7 83/21 |
| 46/17 | inquiries [8] 4/13 | 43/23 44/2 45/14 | 123/1 | 84/9 84/12 84/15 |
| indexed [3] 14/25 | 5/22 5/22 13/4 40/16 | 49/12 55/22 85/12 | intermittently [1] | 84/18 88/17 89/10 |
| 16/21 16/21 | 122/19 139/9 157/21 | 85/17 102/25 165/7 | 178/5 | 90/1 90/5 92/1 95/11 |
| indexing [1] 22/24 | inquiry [189] 1/11 | 167/16 168/20 204/12 | | 95/17 96/18 97/1 |
| India [6] 77/22 78/8 | 1/22 2/5 2/18 2/23 | 205/2 206/6 208/3 | 5/24 11/2 23/11 26/19 | 103/13 104/5 118/2 |
| 78/10 78/21 136/11 | 4/14 4/23 5/2 5/11 | 224/10 226/13 | 39/19 45/24 66/22 | 118/6 120/6 137/10 |
| 136/16 | 5/12 5/25 6/1 6/24 | insert [1] 98/14 | 81/19 134/8 135/18 | 139/7 147/7 147/9 |
| indicate [2] 5/23 | 7/12 7/23 7/25 8/8 9/3 | | internally [7] 10/22 | 147/13 157/22 158/3 |
| 64/20 | 9/5 9/17 9/20 9/21 | 48/19 | 20/14 46/21 48/19 | 170/15 170/21 182/22 |
| indicated [4] 6/9 6/10 | 10/2 11/5 11/12 11/25 12/14 12/24 13/7 | 204/6 208/6 | 49/1 52/6 106/23 | 193/9 193/25 197/13 225/18 |
| 29/20 180/6 | 12/14 12/24 13/7 13/12 13/17 16/6 16/8 | | International [1] 62/5 interpret [1] 156/23 | involvement [19] |
| indication [3] 9/24 | 16/24 19/20 19/23 | 111/5 185/1 185/3 | interpret [1] 156/23 | 11/9 18/18 24/7 24/13 |
| 10/4 137/25 | 21/7 21/12 21/16 | instances [5] 32/15 | into [20] 4/8 5/25 | 30/10 30/15 36/5 |
| indices [4] 59/11 | 21/10 22/11 22/12 | 41/21 43/1 103/6 | 8/15 16/19 25/18 | 69/22 70/3 70/23 |
| 126/13 126/15 126/19 | 22/18 22/20 24/9 | 109/7 | 36/15 36/21 59/1 59/7 | 71/10 92/21 93/3 |
| individual [15] 35/14 | 24/14 25/3 25/12 | instead [3] 48/13 | 88/9 89/18 90/20 | 95/21 95/24 162/6 |
| 37/2 41/23 75/2 | 25/15 25/17 26/1 26/4 | | 98/20 129/13 130/22 | 170/6 172/5 209/17 |
| 106/10 106/14 107/3 | 26/21 29/6 29/25 | instruct [4] 105/23 | 146/22 156/24 189/6 | involves [2] 75/1 |
| 107/9 119/17 134/15 | 30/20 35/21 36/3 | 117/5 180/13 180/15 | 191/12 203/6 | 167/7 |
| 1 | | | | |
| | | | | |

(73) impose - involves

| | 02/22 04/6 00/4 | 15017 150110 150110 | Lucha 0004 [4] 4/25 | 104/11 200/7 200/0 |
|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| | 93/23 94/6 98/1 | 156/7 156/10 159/13 | July 2021 [1] 4/25 | 104/11 200/7 200/9 |
| involving [1] 87/21 | 101/13 102/4 102/5 | 163/4 177/15 | jump [1] 184/6 | 205/11 206/20 206/21 |
| Ireland [1] 4/11 | 102/6 105/10 108/17 | iteration [3] 200/24 | June [13] 5/1 19/21 | know [77] 1/6 6/3 |
| irrelevant [3] 161/10 | 111/9 111/12 117/7 | 213/2 217/14 | 34/2 36/7 36/9 52/24 | 13/2 18/3 35/5 42/25 |
| 209/24 210/20 | 121/2 121/14 121/17 | iterations [16] 33/13 | 74/18 76/2 76/23 | 43/16 43/17 47/16 |
| irrespective [1] | 121/19 121/22 121/24 | 33/22 85/9 85/18 | 79/12 81/24 123/5 | 52/7 53/19 53/21 |
| 182/5 | 122/3 122/6 124/19 | 198/5 198/10 200/8 | 221/10 | 53/24 54/4 54/6 54/10 |
| | 124/22 129/10 129/10 | 200/21 202/4 206/13 | June 2021 [1] 52/24 | 54/25 69/16 70/4 |
| is [397] | 133/13 134/3 134/3 | 206/18 206/23 207/9 | June 2023 [1] 76/23 | 74/10 78/5 78/12 |
| ISC [2] 74/2 79/10 | 134/4 134/25 138/5 | 211/18 214/3 217/12 | junior [3] 148/14 | 78/13 78/18 78/25 |
| isn't [16] 12/11 63/10 | 138/20 139/17 143/6 | iteratively [2] 83/17 | 168/1 168/2 | 79/16 87/2 88/6 88/6 |
| 81/18 81/18 87/5 | 145/17 145/24 146/5 | 191/6 | jurisdiction [2] 137/8 | 89/4 89/22 92/25 93/7 |
| 98/20 117/25 130/6 | 146/15 147/1 149/5 | its [34] 18/23 26/19 | 183/11 | 93/8 93/22 94/5 97/4 |
| 154/15 154/15 168/14 | 150/12 151/21 161/22 | | | 98/23 98/25 99/19 |
| 194/17 220/16 220/24 | 162/19 163/9 166/18 | 56/14 56/15 57/2 62/3 | | 100/16 101/4 109/17 |
| 221/13 222/25 | 167/25 168/5 168/10 | 71/20 72/3 72/9 73/7 | 21/9 23/2 27/10 34/20 | 114/18 115/16 116/3 |
| issue [32] 8/10 12/3 | 168/11 171/13 172/25 | | 36/17 39/25 41/17 | 117/9 118/8 120/8 |
| 17/8 18/12 20/25 21/4 | 174/5 174/8 174/13 | 100/17 105/23 108/15 | | 121/15 127/24 134/13 |
| 25/13 27/12 35/19 | | | | |
| 43/7 46/12 70/9 70/24 | | | 53/3 53/21 61/16 | 138/23 140/5 141/1 |
| 71/1 80/6 95/3 104/9 | 186/12 187/8 190/25 | 126/5 156/16 165/15 | 63/12 65/24 69/8 | 148/15 148/17 148/20 |
| 109/16 118/9 118/18 | 191/2 191/5 191/8 | 167/17 173/4 178/1 | 70/10 79/21 80/3 | 154/23 156/8 157/17 |
| 118/19 120/10 120/13 | 192/13 192/25 193/4 | 178/9 192/9 201/2 | 89/15 91/9 100/5 | 163/9 163/10 164/12 |
| 124/22 184/6 191/11 | 193/23 194/2 194/21 | 207/25 221/22 | 100/6 102/5 103/19 | 167/25 168/3 173/18 |
| 208/2 212/14 215/15 | 197/11 197/20 207/11 | itself [12] 2/16 6/2 | 103/23 104/19 104/23 | 173/22 174/15 187/5 |
| 220/22 221/1 227/24 | 213/22 213/23 214/17 | 45/15 55/12 71/14 | 105/1 105/17 108/10 | 188/1 200/23 208/12 |
| issued [1] 199/16 | 215/1 215/11 215/20 | 101/9 101/24 115/17 | 111/13 111/15 112/5 | 208/13 212/3 218/13 |
| | 215/21 215/21 215/23 | 118/2 159/14 169/13 | 112/11 113/1 117/7 | 218/17 |
| issues [75] 5/16 5/18 | 215/25 216/3 217/15 | 223/23 | 117/17 121/12 126/1 | knowing [2] 101/2 |
| | 218/9 218/12 219/16 | | 131/17 132/17 137/25 | 204/23 |
| 17/12 25/2 25/8 49/14 | 219/17 219/18 219/22 | J | 144/1 144/14 151/11 | knowledge [54] 3/23 |
| 51/5 52/2 53/15 53/25 | 220/1 220/18 222/20 | January [11] 12/16 | 154/8 156/21 160/20 | 25/24 30/12 31/2 43/9 |
| 54/8 56/1 59/17 60/12 | 222/25 224/12 | 41/8 50/21 62/10 76/1 | 168/12 168/21 169/5 | 43/12 49/6 52/25 53/3 |
| 62/19 62/23 63/16 | item [45] 79/11 | 76/22 77/13 133/5 | 171/2 171/5 175/21 | 53/10 53/15 53/25 |
| 64/16 64/20 64/24 | 112/22 113/11 113/19 | 136/10 169/25 198/18 | | 62/14 65/11 66/5 |
| 65/2 65/13 66/3 66/4 | 114/2 114/20 114/24 | January 2021 [1] | | 68/10 68/25 69/3 |
| 66/20 67/8 67/13 | | 133/5 | 195/15 198/1 203/13 | |
| 67/22 67/25 72/16 | 116/18 116/22 117/3 | | 210/4 211/2 216/17 | 69/22 70/2 70/25 71/2 |
| 72/18 73/9 74/5 75/23 | 117/5 117/20 117/23 | January 2022 [1] | 219/16 222/22 226/19 | 71/4 71/5 73/22 83/18 |
| 76/21 79/13 79/21 | 145/11 146/4 149/8 | 169/25 | Justice [1] 20/17 | 84/1 84/20 87/8 88/5 |
| 81/7 82/11 82/15 | 150/16 150/18 151/4 | January 2023 [1] | κ | 89/14 89/17 90/16 |
| 124/23 134/13 134/14 | 151/12 152/4 152/11 | 50/21 | | 91/5 91/8 91/12 92/14 |
| 161/19 162/21 165/9 | 152/17 153/20 154/12 | | keep [2] 22/4 129/7 | 93/24 94/9 94/23 |
| 168/19 168/20 168/22 | 154/16 163/1 175/2 | 12/16 | keeps [1] 195/7 | 100/13 104/10 107/11 |
| 169/17 169/19 169/24 | 175/16 175/24 180/13 | | key [1] 190/10 | 110/2 115/11 132/12 |
| 171/7 171/24 178/4 | 211/17 216/5 216/15 | 164/12 | keys [1] 21/6 | 139/21 164/24 174/18 |
| 178/16 190/13 192/24 | 217/1 218/4 218/7 | job [4] 42/2 52/10 | keyword [22] 74/23 | 174/19 178/7 178/15 |
| | 219/11 219/21 219/24 | | 74/25 115/3 138/15 | 190/11 192/10 |
| 193/17 193/18 194/9 | 220/7 220/16 225/17 | jobs [1] 40/15 | 140/13 173/9 179/4 | knowledgeable [1] |
| 197/3 197/8 197/11 | 225/19 225/24 | Johannesburg [2] | 179/7 179/21 180/5 | 148/21 |
| 198/24 199/3 199/4 | item-level [40] | 182/21 182/23 | 181/12 189/15 190/1 | known [5] 20/4 43/13 |
| 199/23 208/3 217/23 | 112/22 113/11 113/19 | John [4] 3/13 131/23 | 190/3 190/22 191/10 | 84/24 173/21 227/7 |
| 217/25 222/15 | 114/2 114/24 116/18 | 132/2 229/12 | 191/25 192/4 192/13 | knows [2] 144/4 |
| it [447] | 116/22 117/3 117/5 | join [1] 6/17 | 214/1 217/13 225/21 | 181/19 |
| It'll [1] 51/4 | 117/20 117/23 145/11 | | keywords [1] 141/22 | KPMG [69] 58/20 |
| it's [131] 2/19 3/20 | 146/4 149/8 150/16 | 19/24 50/5 52/25 79/9 | | 62/4 73/20 76/5 77/4 |
| 4/2 11/21 11/22 13/15 | 151/4 151/12 152/4 | 165/21 | 30/14 30/20 39/23 | 77/11 77/17 77/20 |
| 17/19 21/12 28/6 33/2 | 152/11 152/17 154/12 | | 69/11 87/6 89/2 98/17 | 77/22 78/3 95/8 |
| 33/16 39/25 46/12 | 154/16 163/1 175/2 | judge [1] 190/6 | 117/25 118/10 129/16 | 115/15 116/6 116/14 |
| 51/4 52/10 52/14 | 175/16 175/24 180/13 | | 140/10 171/21 227/6 | 116/16 117/1 117/22 |
| 52/17 55/18 60/6 61/2 | | 186/17 190/8 | kindly [2] 222/13 | |
| 61/13 66/13 70/5 | 211/17 216/5 216/15 | | 224/23 | |
| 70/15 73/14 73/18 | 218/4 218/7 219/11 | judgment [1] 142/1 | | 132/21 132/24 134/9 |
| 74/17 74/21 79/12 | 219/21 219/24 220/7 | judgments [2] 20/20 | kinds [3] 41/24 | 136/5 136/19 141/5 |
| 80/15 81/23 82/6 | 220/16 225/17 225/19 | | 140/17 158/22 | 142/3 147/11 148/7 |
| 84/23 88/4 90/3 91/22 | 225/24 | July [4] 4/20 4/25 6/6 | | 152/1 152/3 152/15 |
| | items [6] 143/11 | 9/25 | knew [8] 45/16 73/4 | 154/11 156/15 157/6 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | (74) involving - KPMG |

(74) involving - KPMG

| K | 67/23 68/3 68/16 | level [103] 13/11 | likely [7] 41/20 91/3 | 105/17 109/19 109/20 |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| KDMC [24] 157/22 | 70/11 89/13 89/24 | 20/3 25/4 29/22 29/23 | 91/8 101/16 191/19 | 110/5 111/5 111/6 |
| KPMG [34] 157/23 | 90/23 95/23 104/7 | 38/17 39/18 53/23 | 191/20 192/9 | 116/11 119/21 119/21 |
| 158/10 161/15 170/25 | 104/14 109/13 110/9 | 54/17 55/9 56/20 | | 120/2 124/3 124/21 |
| 171/12 173/16 173/19 | | | likewise [1] 21/14 | |
| 174/20 174/23 175/1 | 117/4 117/20 122/18 | 56/22 58/7 58/24 | limited [8] 15/25 | 125/17 127/21 132/7 |
| | 123/2 123/8 123/25 | 59/12 66/2 66/19 69/5 | 22/17 28/1 31/10 | 138/5 145/3 149/2 |
| 175/6 176/14 176/17 | 148/21 156/9 166/15 | 75/3 83/8 84/19 87/11 | 31/11 40/2 66/5 143/5 | |
| 176/20 177/2 177/4 | | | | |
| 177/7 177/13 177/18 | 167/23 183/3 183/5 | 88/7 95/21 96/21 | line [4] 10/23 48/11 | 151/20 159/2 164/21 |
| 177/21 178/9 180/13 | 183/9 187/18 188/18 | 104/20 105/11 105/14 | 117/13 220/23 | 165/13 166/23 168/9 |
| | 210/6 210/8 211/6 | 112/4 112/15 112/22 | linear [1] 185/19 | 172/18 180/7 181/24 |
| 212/15 214/19 216/7 | 219/1 | 113/5 113/11 113/19 | link [2] 8/22 9/4 | 184/1 184/4 185/6 |
| 216/10 216/11 216/19 | | | | |
| 216/19 216/22 217/21 | lay [1] 140/1 | 114/2 114/20 114/24 | list [9] 5/16 88/21 | 186/1 186/5 186/8 |
| | layer [5] 90/3 90/8 | 116/18 116/22 117/3 | 168/20 168/22 198/24 | 186/9 186/14 186/22 |
| 219/8 221/6 221/21 | 90/9 90/10 180/12 | 117/5 117/20 117/23 | 199/4 199/23 200/2 | 186/25 188/5 188/15 |
| KPMG's [3] 135/25 | | 119/10 121/20 124/9 | 208/3 | 189/25 190/2 193/12 |
| 176/7 178/3 | layered [1] 30/20 | | | |
| | lead [6] 52/8 101/22 | 127/7 137/5 137/20 | listed [2] 8/3 13/1 | 194/20 196/3 196/25 |
| | 102/16 104/25 124/16 | 143/17 145/11 146/4 | lists [2] 96/6 96/8 | 212/20 213/7 213/11 |
| | 201/24 | 149/8 149/15 149/25 | litigation [12] 10/2 | 213/17 213/23 224/8 |
| lack [5] 40/23 40/24 | | | | |
| 41/3 41/15 137/13 | leading [2] 75/20 | 150/7 150/14 150/16 | 16/10 20/18 24/8 | looked [22] 31/3 |
| lacking [1] 41/23 | 133/2 | 150/18 151/4 151/12 | 25/11 25/18 25/21 | 52/11 69/10 71/7 99/9 |
| | leads [1] 147/10 | 152/4 152/11 152/17 | 60/16 60/17 139/8 | 99/21 99/23 100/1 |
| laissez [1] 80/25 | least [9] 52/24 53/8 | 153/20 154/12 154/16 | 143/17 157/22 | 103/23 106/21 107/7 |
| laissez-faire [1] | | | | |
| 80/25 | 53/12 79/6 162/10 | 156/13 162/25 163/1 | litigation' [1] 29/13 | 107/9 107/14 109/12 |
| | 174/15 180/9 215/12 | 170/6 175/2 175/16 | little [11] 19/7 36/5 | 111/19 119/16 124/12 |
| language [2] 203/5 | 219/9 | 175/24 177/10 180/13 | | 161/13 188/23 188/25 |
| 215/13 | | | | |
| large [9] 19/12 129/4 | leave [3] 36/19 75/2 | 180/15 182/11 182/16 | | |
| 138/3 141/4 146/17 | 153/20 | 183/6 185/16 187/15 | 167/20 173/14 223/7 | looking [41] 14/1 |
| 157/9 168/2 192/19 | led [13] 42/5 55/23 | 187/17 188/7 188/17 | locatable [1] 19/3 | 16/11 18/14 19/14 |
| | 59/9 63/15 63/18 | | locate [2] 19/19 | 28/12 28/19 31/19 |
| 219/14 | | | | |
| largely [2] 83/16 | 98/24 99/1 117/15 | 216/5 216/15 217/1 | 22/25 | 31/22 35/19 41/14 |
| 172/9 | 125/11 125/14 161/19 | 218/4 218/7 218/21 | located [6] 32/11 | 42/8 44/4 44/6 45/16 |
| larger [5] 161/4 | 207/16 209/15 | 219/1 219/11 219/21 | 32/11 37/14 44/11 | 58/18 60/5 69/25 70/8 |
| | leeway [1] 14/18 | 219/24 220/7 220/16 | 44/12 182/18 | 76/21 82/25 107/22 |
| 161/7 166/17 168/1 | | | | |
| 180/17 | left [8] 23/9 23/17 | 225/17 225/19 225/24 | | 108/9 108/10 114/11 |
| largest [1] 161/3 | 23/18 37/24 44/17 | levels [7] 66/17 | location [5] 17/9 | 115/18 122/3 122/6 |
| last [12] 9/21 36/7 | 91/9 129/2 150/14 | 67/20 89/20 112/13 | 19/16 146/22 146/23 | 122/8 124/13 141/3 |
| | legacy [7] 10/2 14/8 | 124/3 124/16 144/6 | 159/17 | 150/19 157/18 163/9 |
| 36/9 48/1 127/22 | | | | 171/8 185/9 186/11 |
| 129/12 137/21 157/14 | 16/4 16/17 17/19 18/6 | | logically [1] 106/5 | |
| 194/21 196/20 198/2 | 24/19 | 140/9 177/7 | London [7] 6/7 78/16 | 187/25 189/9 189/19 |
| 225/2 | legal [27] 7/7 7/13 | liaised [3] 38/9 | 182/14 187/19 187/19 | 200/9 204/20 |
| | 7/13 7/18 7/24 8/23 | 199/17 201/15 | 188/18 211/6 | looks [1] 150/19 |
| lasted [1] 11/5 | | | | |
| lastly [3] 95/2 100/7 | 30/21 30/21 36/16 | liaising [2] 148/2 | London-based [1] | lost [1] 114/17 |
| 124/20 | 36/18 37/24 50/4 50/6 | 201/9 | 78/16 | lot [15] 9/7 9/8 10/1 |
| | 57/22 61/21 144/14 | liaison [10] 42/13 | Londonderry [1] | 10/10 15/21 17/5 20/9 |
| late [5] 76/2 76/23 | 166/5 166/14 166/20 | 70/12 87/20 92/16 | 17/24 | 20/15 23/8 44/5 45/25 |
| 78/1 168/17 221/13 | | | | |
| later [8] 6/12 14/6 | 167/13 182/13 182/17 | 139/11 139/25 140/4 | long [14] 6/16 10/18 | 134/23 163/11 187/20 |
| 33/25 168/13 173/14 | 183/1 183/7 183/7 | 140/5 140/18 216/22 | 13/13 23/5 44/22 | 194/5 |
| | 185/1 194/4 | Lidbetter [1] 166/4 | 44/23 52/20 52/22 | lots [1] 153/20 |
| 196/3 220/23 221/1 | | lie [1] 64/6 | 53/7 58/2 128/7 | lottery [1] 15/2 |
| latter [1] 215/5 | legally [2] 46/20 | | | |
| law [13] 4/8 4/10 29/8 | 185/5 | lies [1] 100/10 | 164/18 175/19 222/12 | |
| 44/20 61/13 138/20 | lend [1] 101/9 | life [2] 52/23 88/13 | long-term [1] 44/22 | low-level [1] 75/3 |
| | length [2] 9/19 26/1 | lifetime [1] 137/19 | longer [8] 10/10 17/5 | |
| 139/11 141/8 148/16 | | light [3] 13/9 72/17 | 26/10 26/24 45/11 | 168/5 |
| 183/8 183/10 185/5 | less [10] 2/23 14/2 | | | |
| 210/8 | 14/3 26/12 26/23 | 197/3 | 91/11 127/3 160/16 | lulis [1] 183/20 |
| Law Society [1] 4/10 | 58/22 100/23 124/20 | like [16] 11/20 52/7 | longstanding [2] | lunch [2] 130/23 |
| | 144/15 205/15 | 58/8 66/6 95/14 | 30/25 68/6 | 135/21 |
| lawyer [10] 7/6 39/17 | lesson [1] 99/15 | | look [79] 11/21 26/11 | |
| 86/6 87/7 122/12 | | | | M |
| 122/23 123/10 123/25 | let [1] 227/19 | 149/2 154/3 154/6 | 28/6 32/25 33/3 34/2 | |
| 143/24 144/3 | let's [4] 88/9 140/6 | 156/21 159/9 159/20 | 39/13 48/5 49/19 | machine [1] 128/11 |
| | 142/25 160/4 | 185/24 193/12 | 55/14 61/15 63/12 | made [37] 20/18 25/4 |
| lawyers [43] 9/2 | letter [8] 2/10 2/13 | liked [2] 66/20 | 75/4 84/23 85/2 85/5 | 26/11 32/6 32/8 34/25 |
| 24/17 38/1 39/18 | | | | 37/17 63/3 63/4 67/5 |
| 39/19 39/19 40/7 40/8 | 2/17 125/18 127/22 | 158/17 | 85/24 89/25 91/16 | |
| 46/20 61/20 65/4 67/5 | 128/1 128/4 171/16 | likelihood [3] 127/15 | 91/18 95/3 98/15 | 72/5 77/3 77/6 77/9 |
| | letters [2] 2/20 65/15 | 129/20 190/14 | 99/16 100/7 105/2 | 82/19 84/5 102/5 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | (75) KPMG made |

(75) KPMG... - made

| Μ | 193/2 193/4 205/6 | 152/25 154/21 155/23 | 203/14 216/10 217/11 | 201/6 |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| made [20] 104/2 | 206/6 210/10 210/13 | 156/2 164/8 173/8 | memory [6] 17/25 | miss [1] 21/17 |
| 111/4 121/15 129/6 | 212/3 217/7 217/24 | 173/8 173/10 183/24 | 18/25 24/24 30/3 | missed [3] 55/17 |
| 138/6 143/22 150/12 | March [9] 55/5 55/6 | 186/11 186/12 212/10 | | 112/6 179/6 |
| 150/25 151/18 157/19 | 55/17 77/14 137/2 | 212/15 213/10 219/16 | | misses [1] 99/4 |
| 183/6 184/18 187/7 | 154/18 157/14 210/1 | 221/1 221/4 221/23 | mentioned [8] 2/1 | mistake [3] 96/20 |
| 191/6 214/20 215/3 | 211/16 | 227/16 | 8/23 93/1 107/1 | 120/20 220/22 |
| 216/5 216/7 217/8 | March 2022 [1] 210/1 March/April [1] | 213/10 | 162/19 172/15 177/11 189/24 | mistakes [3] 63/3 118/15 118/16 |
| 221/2 | 154/18 | May/early [1] 76/23 | merely [1] 101/21 | misunderstanding |
| Mail [2] 17/22 43/10 | Mark [1] 6/20 | maybe [7] 13/1 20/11 | merits [2] 173/4 | [5] 116/5 117/1 |
| main [6] 68/20 73/25 | marked [2] 209/24 | 23/16 36/14 40/9 | 174/8 | 118/7 152/15 222/1 |
| 80/13 80/18 173/12 189/24 | 210/20 | 152/25 197/9 | message [1] 22/14 | misunderstood [1] |
| mainly [2] 74/22 | master [2] 151/1 | MD5 [3] 154/7 218/8 | met [5] 8/1 8/2 124/7 | 152/24 |
| 74/25 | 151/9 | 226/7 | 223/17 223/17 | misuse [1] 59/19 |
| maintain [1] 177/24 | material [39] 9/9 15/1 | | method [4] 198/16 | Mm [4] 49/20 60/19 |
| maintaining [2] | 15/4 16/18 16/23 17/5 | | | 73/12 110/17 |
| 16/12 22/21 | | 38/12 38/14 39/10 | methods [2] 191/20 | Mm-hm [4] 49/20 |
| major [2] 66/4 158/18 | 17/24 18/2 18/9 18/22 | 39/15 46/4 47/10 | 198/13 | 60/19 73/12 110/17 |
| majority [3] 37/1 | 18/24 19/9 19/10 19/10 19/11 19/19 | 58/17 80/21 102/15 108/1 108/7 116/24 | metric [1] 123/13 metrics [1] 123/23 | model [1] 121/18 moment [7] 61/25 |
| 130/12 142/22 | 20/3 21/14 21/17 | | middle [4] 2/11 65/23 | |
| make [27] 2/8 10/6 | 29/25 31/22 32/12 | 152/14 164/6 177/14 | 66/12 75/16 | 138/2 180/25 184/1 |
| 10/11 10/23 20/1 | 37/18 39/3 39/12 43/4 | 200/19 220/6 226/19 | might [45] 8/18 59/12 | |
| 21/22 21/25 25/23 | 43/14 69/8 76/19 | 227/19 | 68/23 87/6 91/9 98/8 | 15/3 15/25 16/3 21/25 |
| 43/11 48/7 66/16 | 101/22 125/13 125/15 | | 98/17 104/24 105/4 | 22/11 22/12 22/13 |
| 69/18 79/21 84/1 88/20 95/9 95/20 | 169/3 169/22 189/13 | 52/13 52/23 60/3 60/6 | 106/16 109/19 109/21 | 22/16 22/23 23/24 |
| 96/15 112/7 121/21 | 224/8 | 94/12 108/2 118/11 | 112/6 114/2 114/15 | 26/16 27/9 27/11 |
| 122/9 142/1 147/5 | materially [1] 207/2 | 118/15 137/20 138/24 | | 27/11 |
| 171/19 220/19 227/5 | materials [8] 85/20 | 143/10 150/11 157/12 | | monitoring [1] 27/25 |
| 227/10 | 85/21 87/4 169/24 | 161/5 171/6 177/6 | 141/21 144/5 144/5 | month [2] 5/1 223/7 |
| makes [2] 69/5 | 175/19 192/2 205/21 210/25 | 184/12 195/4 218/7 | 144/7 152/21 157/10 | months [11] 6/4 6/11 |
| 219/19 | maternity [1] 36/19 | meaning [4] 46/16 53/8 95/24 171/15 | 159/23 160/7 160/9 171/15 173/12 179/15 | 9/22 10/5 12/6 12/12 13/1 53/13 128/9 |
| making [9] 34/14 | matter [20] 68/10 | meaningful [1] 1/24 | 180/24 183/16 184/20 | |
| 51/25 100/21 147/14 | 87/15 87/22 87/24 | means [7] 47/4 51/17 | | |
| 157/3 162/7 185/6 | 88/9 88/22 90/22 98/4 | 57/4 88/2 151/9 158/4 | | 13/4 20/14 23/7 26/11 |
| 205/14 227/7 | 98/7 99/1 111/11 | 196/11 | 213/4 218/3 220/25 | 26/25 27/4 34/20 |
| manage [5] 10/13 44/21 44/22 44/23 | 139/20 140/3 147/22 | meant [6] 12/1 14/2 | migrate [1] 146/22 | 36/24 38/17 43/25 |
| 136/2 | 182/20 190/19 192/14 | 42/4 46/15 72/21 | migrated [3] 128/12 | 44/1 45/8 45/12 46/4 |
| manageable [1] | 192/20 193/18 194/3 | 114/25 | 128/18 128/20 | 46/12 49/15 49/21 |
| 129/17 | matters [14] 11/12 | media [1] 123/10 | million [2] 127/11 | 53/24 57/16 62/12 |
| management [9] | 24/20 40/17 49/9 | meet [5] 8/2 57/5 | 127/12 | 65/11 66/11 69/6 |
| 10/23 13/11 16/13 | 74/20 75/24 83/22 | 57/13 224/4 228/4 | millions [1] 146/18 | 69/19 70/15 71/9 72/21 78/6 78/17 |
| 68/4 79/23 79/25 | 89/11 122/21 138/19 145/24 165/3 167/4 | meeting [9] 8/3 18/24 41/8 41/9 41/10 56/14 | | 88/20 90/18 91/1 91/3 |
| 123/16 148/3 166/13 | 199/8 | 57/2 73/7 89/1 | 156/16 156/19 180/23 | |
| manager [6] 123/15 | maximum [2] 193/9 | meetings [6] 23/20 | 196/6 | 95/9 102/3 106/24 |
| 147/9 147/9 148/8 | 193/12 | 65/9 75/18 75/21 | mindful [1] 59/15 | 110/10 110/12 116/1 |
| 148/8 201/25 | may [65] 17/7 17/10 | 75/22 76/6 | minimum [1] 208/20 | 120/6 120/6 120/18 |
| managerial [1] | 24/25 25/19 26/12 | meets [1] 79/6 | minor [1] 116/1 | 120/19 130/15 133/23 |
| managers [6] 67/6 | 26/14 27/13 30/16 | Melbourne [1] | minute [2] 47/3 153/1 | |
| 147/13 147/13 176/2 | 30/16 41/2 41/15 42/5 | | minutes [5] 18/24 | 146/3 146/9 146/15 |
| 176/2 176/7 | 43/6 44/6 46/11 46/11 | | 33/6 33/18 124/20 | 147/3 157/1 165/9 |
| manual [1] 14/25 | 47/12 68/8 68/21 | 18/11 40/13 124/10 | 163/23 | 165/14 166/12 167/20 |
| manually [2] 112/19 | 70/17 76/2 76/23 77/13 80/3 81/15 | 137/6 186/15 204/3 211/21 213/9 | misalignment [3] 221/20 221/24 222/1 | 169/11 172/4 181/13 182/21 182/23 183/23 |
| 112/24 | 84/11 85/4 95/19 | members [23] 8/5 | miscellaneous [1] | 186/13 188/13 191/8 |
| many [26] 12/24 17/2 | 101/22 101/25 102/12 | 8/8 21/21 30/24 46/17 | 200/12 | 197/6 197/13 207/11 |
| 19/2 58/8 110/20 | 117/8 120/9 128/8 | 46/21 55/13 80/8 | miscommunication | 220/21 221/5 221/18 |
| 123/14 131/4 138/6 | 130/4 130/5 136/10 | 148/9 170/15 170/16 | [5] 116/4 116/23 | 224/19 226/3 228/1 |
| 142/9 145/19 148/17 153/4 155/18 167/23 | 136/25 138/1 138/5 | 180/22 183/1 183/20 | 152/12 155/24 156/3 | morning [10] 1/3 |
| 174/9 176/15 191/3 | 139/6 140/12 140/14 | 184/17 192/18 193/1 | misleading [1] 30/17 | 2/10 2/14 2/25 47/9 |
| | 141/20 142/15 144/10 | 193/22 201/3 201/21 | misremembered [1] | 137/12 159/21 172/17 |
| | | | | |
| L | 1 | | 1 | (76) made - morning |

(76) made ... - morning

| Μ | 10/17 | 129/25 130/12 135/24 | 211/22 | 137/9 137/17 137/17 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| morning [2] 205/14 | Mrs [18] 45/4 45/7 | 140/2 141/17 147/19 | need [33] 4/3 8/21 | 141/5 142/19 154/15 |
| 225/3 | 47/2 47/12 47/16 60/2 | 148/9 148/18 152/10 | 10/5 13/18 14/16 | 155/8 160/13 160/16 |
| most [5] 33/10 | 72/23 130/20 131/2 | 152/23 152/25 154/15 | | 161/8 163/18 165/2 |
| 109/25 142/12 192/9 | 136/4 137/22 145/11 | 154/15 161/21 162/8 | 22/13 27/8 27/19 | 174/17 175/9 177/1 |
| 218/4 | 151/21 151/23 155/22 | 164/12 166/19 167/14 | 51/12 69/10 75/6 75/7 | 178/11 178/20 179/14 |
| motivated [1] 52/19 | 172/17 197/5 205/14 | 170/4 170/10 170/15 | 78/6 87/12 88/3 88/8 | 180/22 183/14 185/16 |
| move [13] 22/9 33/15 | Mrs Diane [1] 47/12 | 170/20 175/14 176/13 | 98/3 98/14 98/15 | 187/11 188/11 188/12 |
| 57/22 60/11 82/4 91/2 | Mrs Wills [14] 45/4 | 176/17 176/20 178/23 | | 188/16 189/9 191/2 |
| 91/7 111/13 119/11 | 45/7 47/2 47/16 60/2 | 178/24 180/22 182/14 | | 191/7 192/12 197/2 |
| 159/15 160/19 161/2 | 72/23 130/20 131/2 | 192/18 193/1 196/8 | 153/22 157/11 165/2 | 201/3 202/10 203/4 |
| 181/22 | 136/4 137/22 145/11 | 198/21 199/25 200/11 | 184/11 191/22 | 205/7 205/23 207/10 |
| moved [1] 36/21 | 172/17 197/5 205/14 | 203/22 204/8 204/13 | needed [20] 5/24 8/2 | 212/1 212/19 213/9 |
| moves [1] 90/19 | Mrs Wills' [3] 151/21 | 204/25 206/11 207/23 | | 215/6 215/6 215/21 |
| moving [2] 13/14 | 151/23 155/22 | 208/4 209/17 209/18 | 28/25 29/18 31/20 | 216/2 217/18 217/22 |
| 137/4 | much [54] 1/6 3/11 | 209/24 211/9 211/17 | 32/13 52/4 57/10 | 220/25 221/10 223/19 |
| Mr [57] 1/15 1/18 | 3/25 5/20 8/2 12/5 | 215/24 216/10 217/11 217/21 217/25 219/3 | 77/19 79/15 80/6 81/8 | |
| 1/20 2/7 2/7 2/11 2/14 | 13/4 14/18 14/24 15/4 | | 100/4 107/20 174/23 183/23 | nobody [3] 99/9 |
| 2/16 2/19 3/5 3/7 3/10 | 22/11 22/12 27/8 27/15 27/21 33/25 | 221/20 224/2 224/14 224/17 227/7 | | 202/16 203/15 |
| 3/14 3/25 6/20 6/23 | 36/24 38/17 43/25 | | needn't [1] 121/2 | nodded [1] 102/7 |
| 7/2 7/3 7/21 7/23 | 30/24 38/17 43/25 44/1 44/2 44/3 45/11 | myself [4] 28/24 38/16 121/16 166/12 | needs [6] 101/24 119/16 121/23 143/13 | non [13] 19/20 40/8 60/15 61/2 72/24 |
| 10/17 10/17 16/7 | 45/11 45/15 45/20 | · | 150/24 156/25 | 100/10 102/1 115/7 |
| 20/17 27/7 42/9 46/13 | 46/8 46/25 47/1 47/5 | Ν | negotiation [2] 26/5 | 115/17 115/22 133/6 |
| 47/15 53/22 54/12 | 47/11 69/7 90/18 94/9 | name [16] 3/12 41/7 | 26/13 | 137/11 162/11 |
| 56/18 78/25 82/8 | 119/12 120/6 127/3 | 41/7 41/12 47/17 | negotiations [1] 27/1 | |
| 131/20 131/21 131/24 | 130/20 131/2 131/6 | 47/18 47/24 71/20 | neither [2] 104/9 | 60/15 72/24 100/10 |
| 132/14 137/12 140/14 | 131/12 132/14 163/18 | 84/15 118/4 131/25 | 204/13 | 115/17 |
| | 163/22 164/1 174/12 | 164/12 164/14 178/1 | network [1] 182/15 | non-lawyers [1] 40/8 |
| | 191/8 197/15 216/18 | 218/18 218/20 | neutrally [1] 227/19 | non-remediation [1] |
| 212/6 215/18 216/17 | 219/11 219/16 226/16 | | never [7] 57/8 59/23 | 162/11 |
| 222/9 226/18 226/20 | 227/12 228/6 | names [3] 41/8 41/9 | 88/17 99/20 136/9 | non-responsive [1] |
| 226/25 227/2 229/4 | multifaceted [1] | 69/16 | 154/17 196/23 | 102/1 |
| 229/10 229/14 229/18 | 192/22 | namings [1] 41/16 | nevertheless [1] | non-standard [2] |
| Mr Beer [8] 2/14 47/15 140/14 164/11 | multifactorial [1] | narrating [1] 168/12 | 226/8 | 115/7 115/22 |
| 215/18 227/2 229/10 | 174/8 | narrative [1] 169/18 | new [6] 25/7 88/23 | non-statutory [2] |
| 229/18 | multiple [2] 210/5 | narrowed [1] 189/19 | 119/4 123/9 127/15 | 133/6 137/11 |
| Mr Ben [1] 1/20 | 217/12 | narrowing [1] 69/21 | 130/2 | none [2] 180/20 |
| Mr Blake [5] 1/15 | multiplier [3] 190/20 | naturally [1] 73/3 | next [6] 47/2 111/14 | 210/2 |
| 1/18 2/7 3/5 131/20 | 190/23 190/24 | nature [30] 11/11 | 160/17 160/17 227/9 | nor [7] 44/13 69/3 |
| Mr Canavan [11] 2/7 | multiply [1] 119/15 | 12/22 12/24 13/4 13/6 | 227/13 | 104/10 178/11 179/13 |
| 3/7 3/14 3/25 16/7 | Museum [5] 17/23 | 13/7 30/5 37/18 39/7 | NICHOLAS [3] | 204/13 207/8 |
| 46/13 53/22 54/12 | 19/2 19/9 29/18 85/23 | 51/5 54/21 70/19 | 164/10 164/15 229/16 | |
| 56/18 82/8 146/11 | must [5] 61/5 92/25 | 74/17 78/10 90/13 91/2 95/22 100/17 | night [2] 2/12 225/2 | normally [2] 97/17 |
| Mr Canavan's [1] | 102/17 204/10 223/3 | 103/3 104/21 105/12 | nine [2] 210/11 | 101/10 |
| 137/12 | mutual [1] 170/19 | 108/23 109/4 114/16 | 210/14 nitty [1] 37/21 | Northern [1] 4/11 |
| Mr Foat [7] 6/23 7/2 | my [118] 5/21 5/21 5/22 6/7 7/12 8/14 | 130/1 175/24 179/11 | nitty [1] 37/21 | not [249] |
| 7/3 7/21 10/17 27/7 | 8/17 10/1 10/6 10/12 | 208/17 214/22 215/9 | nitty-gritty [1] 37/21 no [103] 5/4 5/12 | note [2] 29/12 121/15 noted [2] 184/10 |
| 42/9 | | | | |
| | | near [4] 225/7 225/15 | | 221/19 |
| Mr Foat's [1] 7/23 | 10/16 10/23 13/22 | near [4] 225/7 225/15 226/5 226/13 | 5/19 6/6 6/13 6/13 | 221/19 nothing [3] 77/8 |
| Mr Foat's [1] 7/23 Mr Henry [3] 2/11 | 10/16 10/23 13/22 14/3 17/25 20/6 21/3 | 226/5 226/13 | 5/19 6/6 6/13 6/13 10/5 12/13 16/2 16/16 | nothing [3] 77/8 |
| Mr Foat's [1] 7/23 Mr Henry [3] 2/11 2/16 2/19 | 10/16 10/23 13/22 14/3 17/25 20/6 21/3 22/10 23/8 25/22 26/7 | 226/5 226/13 | 5/19 6/6 6/13 6/13 10/5 12/13 16/2 16/16 17/5 18/18 21/4 21/10 | nothing [3] 77/8 101/7 179/11 |
| Mr Foat's [1] 7/23 Mr Henry [3] 2/11 2/16 2/19 Mr Justice [1] 20/17 | 10/16 10/23 13/22 14/3 17/25 20/6 21/3 | 226/5 226/13 nearly [5] 126/6 | 5/19 6/6 6/13 6/13 10/5 12/13 16/2 16/16 | nothing [3] 77/8 101/7 179/11 noticed [1] 162/5 |
| Mr Foat's [1] 7/23 Mr Henry [3] 2/11 2/16 2/19 Mr Justice [1] 20/17 Mr Mark [1] 6/20 | 10/16 10/23 13/22 14/3 17/25 20/6 21/3 22/10 23/8 25/22 26/7 30/3 35/15 36/2 36/20 | 226/5 226/13 nearly [5] 126/6 151/7 195/8 195/11 | 5/19 6/6 6/13 6/13 10/5 12/13 16/2 16/16 17/5 18/18 21/4 21/10 25/13 31/23 32/22 | nothing [3] 77/8 101/7 179/11 noticed [1] 162/5 notices [1] 134/14 |
| Mr Foat's [1] 7/23 Mr Henry [3] 2/11 2/16 2/19 Mr Justice [1] 20/17 Mr Mark [1] 6/20 Mr Rowan [5] 164/12 | 10/16 10/23 13/22 14/3 17/25 20/6 21/3 22/10 23/8 25/22 26/7 30/3 35/15 36/2 36/20 42/24 43/24 44/18 | 226/5 226/13 nearly [5] 126/6 151/7 195/8 195/11 196/22 necessarily [10] 29/14 74/13 80/15 | 5/19 6/6 6/13 6/13 10/5 12/13 16/2 16/16 17/5 18/18 21/4 21/10 25/13 31/23 32/22 32/22 37/23 38/25 | nothing [3] 77/8 101/7 179/11 noticed [1] 162/5 |
| Mr Foat's [1] 7/23 Mr Henry [3] 2/11 2/16 2/19 Mr Justice [1] 20/17 Mr Mark [1] 6/20 Mr Rowan [5] 164/12 222/9 226/18 226/20 | 10/16 10/23 13/22 14/3 17/25 20/6 21/3 22/10 23/8 25/22 26/7 30/3 35/15 36/2 36/20 42/24 43/24 44/18 45/11 45/18 47/16 | 226/5 226/13 nearly [5] 126/6 151/7 195/8 195/11 196/22 necessarily [10] | 5/19 6/6 6/13 6/13 10/5 12/13 16/2 16/16 17/5 18/18 21/4 21/10 25/13 31/23 32/22 32/22 37/23 38/25 42/23 43/24 46/2 | nothing [3] 77/8 101/7 179/11 noticed [1] 162/5 notices [1] 134/14 notified [1] 32/12 |
| Mr Foat's [1] 7/23 Mr Henry [3] 2/11 2/16 2/19 Mr Justice [1] 20/17 Mr Mark [1] 6/20 Mr Rowan [5] 164/12 222/9 226/18 226/20 226/25 | 10/16 10/23 13/22 14/3 17/25 20/6 21/3 22/10 23/8 25/22 26/7 30/3 35/15 36/2 36/20 42/24 43/24 44/18 45/11 45/18 47/16 52/10 52/25 53/9 | 226/5 226/13 nearly [5] 126/6 151/7 195/8 195/11 196/22 necessarily [10] 29/14 74/13 80/15 94/25 120/20 174/17 194/6 194/11 194/15 | 5/19 6/6 6/13 6/13 10/5 12/13 16/2 16/16 17/5 18/18 21/4 21/10 25/13 31/23 32/22 32/22 37/23 38/25 42/23 43/24 46/2 51/12 60/6 67/6 67/9 | nothing [3] 77/8 101/7 179/11 noticed [1] 162/5 notices [1] 134/14 notified [1] 32/12 notify [1] 44/14 |
| Mr Foat's [1] 7/23 Mr Henry [3] 2/11 2/16 2/19 Mr Justice [1] 20/17 Mr Mark [1] 6/20 Mr Rowan [5] 164/12 222/9 226/18 226/20 226/25 Mr Tombleson [6] | 10/16 10/23 13/22 14/3 17/25 20/6 21/3 22/10 23/8 25/22 26/7 30/3 35/15 36/2 36/20 42/24 43/24 44/18 45/11 45/18 47/16 52/10 52/25 53/9 53/14 54/11 56/3 | 226/5 226/13 nearly [5] 126/6 151/7 195/8 195/11 196/22 necessarily [10] 29/14 74/13 80/15 94/25 120/20 174/17 | 5/19 6/6 6/13 6/13 10/5 12/13 16/2 16/16 17/5 18/18 21/4 21/10 25/13 31/23 32/22 32/22 37/23 38/25 42/23 43/24 46/2 51/12 60/6 67/6 67/9 67/12 67/14 69/6 | nothing [3] 77/8 101/7 179/11 noticed [1] 162/5 notices [1] 134/14 notified [1] 32/12 notify [1] 44/14 noting [1] 79/21 November [3] 125/24 |
| Mr Foat's [1] 7/23 Mr Henry [3] 2/11 2/16 2/19 Mr Justice [1] 20/17 Mr Mark [1] 6/20 Mr Rowan [5] 164/12 222/9 226/18 226/20 226/25 Mr Tombleson [6] 78/25 131/21 132/14 | 10/16 10/23 13/22 14/3 17/25 20/6 21/3 22/10 23/8 25/22 26/7 30/3 35/15 36/2 36/20 42/24 43/24 44/18 45/11 45/18 47/16 52/10 52/25 53/9 53/14 54/11 56/3 64/23 66/5 66/8 68/20 73/25 75/13 77/15 83/4 83/13 86/10 | 226/5 226/13 nearly [5] 126/6 151/7 195/8 195/11 196/22 necessarily [10] 29/14 74/13 80/15 94/25 120/20 174/17 194/6 194/11 194/15 205/23 necessary [9] 68/16 | 5/19 6/6 6/13 6/13 10/5 12/13 16/2 16/16 17/5 18/18 21/4 21/10 25/13 31/23 32/22 32/22 37/23 38/25 42/23 43/24 46/2 51/12 60/6 67/6 67/9 67/12 67/14 69/6 70/15 70/25 71/2 71/21 86/25 87/2 90/9 91/13 91/13 91/13 | nothing [3] 77/8 101/7 179/11 noticed [1] 162/5 notices [1] 134/14 notified [1] 32/12 notify [1] 44/14 noting [1] 79/21 November [3] 125/24 129/12 138/13 November/December |
| Mr Foat's [1] 7/23 Mr Henry [3] 2/11 2/16 2/19 Mr Justice [1] 20/17 Mr Mark [1] 6/20 Mr Rowan [5] 164/12 222/9 226/18 226/20 226/25 Mr Tombleson [6] 78/25 131/21 132/14 175/21 176/23 216/17 | 10/16 10/23 13/22 14/3 17/25 20/6 21/3 22/10 23/8 25/22 26/7 30/3 35/15 36/2 36/20 42/24 43/24 44/18 45/11 45/18 47/16 52/10 52/25 53/9 53/14 54/11 56/3 64/23 66/5 66/8 68/20 73/25 75/13 77/15 83/4 83/13 86/10 87/14 106/13 111/8 | 226/5 226/13 nearly [5] 126/6 151/7 195/8 195/11 196/22 necessarily [10] 29/14 74/13 80/15 94/25 120/20 174/17 194/6 194/11 194/15 205/23 necessary [9] 68/16 69/14 145/24 146/4 | 5/19 6/6 6/13 6/13 10/5 12/13 16/2 16/16 17/5 18/18 21/4 21/10 25/13 31/23 32/22 32/22 37/23 38/25 42/23 43/24 46/2 51/12 60/6 67/6 67/9 67/12 67/14 69/6 70/15 70/25 71/2 71/21 86/25 87/2 90/9 91/13 91/13 91/13 91/15 93/3 97/5 99/20 | nothing [3] 77/8 101/7 179/11 noticed [1] 162/5 notices [1] 134/14 notified [1] 32/12 notify [1] 44/14 noting [1] 79/21 November [3] 125/24 129/12 138/13 November/December |
| Mr Foat's [1] 7/23 Mr Henry [3] 2/11 2/16 2/19 Mr Justice [1] 20/17 Mr Mark [1] 6/20 Mr Rowan [5] 164/12 222/9 226/18 226/20 226/25 Mr Tombleson [6] 78/25 131/21 132/14 175/21 176/23 216/17 Mr Tombleson's [2] | 10/16 10/23 13/22 14/3 17/25 20/6 21/3 22/10 23/8 25/22 26/7 30/3 35/15 36/2 36/20 42/24 43/24 44/18 45/11 45/18 47/16 52/10 52/25 53/9 53/14 54/11 56/3 64/23 66/5 66/8 68/20 73/25 75/13 77/15 83/4 83/13 86/10 87/14 106/13 111/8 114/14 116/21 117/9 | 226/5 226/13 nearly [5] 126/6 151/7 195/8 195/11 196/22 necessarily [10] 29/14 74/13 80/15 94/25 120/20 174/17 194/6 194/11 194/15 205/23 necessary [9] 68/16 69/14 145/24 146/4 156/11 169/23 175/4 | 5/19 6/6 6/13 6/13 10/5 12/13 16/2 16/16 17/5 18/18 21/4 21/10 25/13 31/23 32/22 32/22 37/23 38/25 42/23 43/24 46/2 51/12 60/6 67/6 67/9 67/12 67/14 69/6 70/15 70/25 71/2 71/21 86/25 87/2 90/9 91/13 91/13 91/13 91/15 93/3 97/5 99/20 100/25 106/7 115/24 | nothing [3] 77/8 101/7 179/11 noticed [1] 162/5 notices [1] 134/14 notified [1] 32/12 notify [1] 44/14 noting [1] 79/21 November [3] 125/24 129/12 138/13 November/December '21 [1] 138/13 now [40] 17/7 17/10 |
| Mr Foat's [1] 7/23 Mr Henry [3] 2/11 2/16 2/19 Mr Justice [1] 20/17 Mr Mark [1] 6/20 Mr Rowan [5] 164/12 222/9 226/18 226/20 226/25 Mr Tombleson [6] 78/25 131/21 132/14 175/21 176/23 216/17 Mr Tombleson's [2] 210/12 212/6 | 10/16 10/23 13/22 14/3 17/25 20/6 21/3 22/10 23/8 25/22 26/7 30/3 35/15 36/2 36/20 42/24 43/24 44/18 45/11 45/18 47/16 52/10 52/25 53/9 53/14 54/11 56/3 64/23 66/5 66/8 68/20 73/25 75/13 77/15 83/4 83/13 86/10 87/14 106/13 111/8 114/14 116/21 117/9 117/18 119/14 120/5 | 226/5 226/13 nearly [5] 126/6 151/7 195/8 195/11 196/22 necessarily [10] 29/14 74/13 80/15 94/25 120/20 174/17 194/6 194/11 194/15 205/23 necessary [9] 68/16 69/14 145/24 146/4 156/11 169/23 175/4 192/8 217/15 | 5/19 6/6 6/13 6/13 10/5 12/13 16/2 16/16 17/5 18/18 21/4 21/10 25/13 31/23 32/22 32/22 37/23 38/25 42/23 43/24 46/2 51/12 60/6 67/6 67/9 67/12 67/14 69/6 70/15 70/25 71/2 71/21 86/25 87/2 90/9 91/13 91/13 91/13 91/15 93/3 97/5 99/20 100/25 106/7 115/24 116/4 122/25 123/23 | nothing [3] 77/8 101/7 179/11 noticed [1] 162/5 notices [1] 134/14 notified [1] 32/12 notify [1] 44/14 noting [1] 79/21 November [3] 125/24 129/12 138/13 November/December '21 [1] 138/13 now [40] 17/7 17/10 48/25 72/18 77/1 |
| Mr Foat's [1] 7/23 Mr Henry [3] 2/11 2/16 2/19 Mr Justice [1] 20/17 Mr Mark [1] 6/20 Mr Rowan [5] 164/12 222/9 226/18 226/20 226/25 Mr Tombleson [6] 78/25 131/21 132/14 175/21 176/23 216/17 Mr Tombleson's [2] | 10/16 10/23 13/22 14/3 17/25 20/6 21/3 22/10 23/8 25/22 26/7 30/3 35/15 36/2 36/20 42/24 43/24 44/18 45/11 45/18 47/16 52/10 52/25 53/9 53/14 54/11 56/3 64/23 66/5 66/8 68/20 73/25 75/13 77/15 83/4 83/13 86/10 87/14 106/13 111/8 114/14 116/21 117/9 | 226/5 226/13 nearly [5] 126/6 151/7 195/8 195/11 196/22 necessarily [10] 29/14 74/13 80/15 94/25 120/20 174/17 194/6 194/11 194/15 205/23 necessary [9] 68/16 69/14 145/24 146/4 156/11 169/23 175/4 192/8 217/15 | 5/19 6/6 6/13 6/13 10/5 12/13 16/2 16/16 17/5 18/18 21/4 21/10 25/13 31/23 32/22 32/22 37/23 38/25 42/23 43/24 46/2 51/12 60/6 67/6 67/9 67/12 67/14 69/6 70/15 70/25 71/2 71/21 86/25 87/2 90/9 91/13 91/13 91/13 91/15 93/3 97/5 99/20 100/25 106/7 115/24 | nothing [3] 77/8 101/7 179/11 noticed [1] 162/5 notices [1] 134/14 notified [1] 32/12 notify [1] 44/14 noting [1] 79/21 November [3] 125/24 129/12 138/13 November/December '21 [1] 138/13 now [40] 17/7 17/10 |
| Mr Foat's [1] 7/23 Mr Henry [3] 2/11 2/16 2/19 Mr Justice [1] 20/17 Mr Mark [1] 6/20 Mr Rowan [5] 164/12 222/9 226/18 226/20 226/25 Mr Tombleson [6] 78/25 131/21 132/14 175/21 176/23 216/17 Mr Tombleson's [2] 210/12 212/6 | 10/16 10/23 13/22 14/3 17/25 20/6 21/3 22/10 23/8 25/22 26/7 30/3 35/15 36/2 36/20 42/24 43/24 44/18 45/11 45/18 47/16 52/10 52/25 53/9 53/14 54/11 56/3 64/23 66/5 66/8 68/20 73/25 75/13 77/15 83/4 83/13 86/10 87/14 106/13 111/8 114/14 116/21 117/9 117/18 119/14 120/5 | 226/5 226/13 nearly [5] 126/6 151/7 195/8 195/11 196/22 necessarily [10] 29/14 74/13 80/15 94/25 120/20 174/17 194/6 194/11 194/15 205/23 necessary [9] 68/16 69/14 145/24 146/4 156/11 169/23 175/4 192/8 217/15 | 5/19 6/6 6/13 6/13 10/5 12/13 16/2 16/16 17/5 18/18 21/4 21/10 25/13 31/23 32/22 32/22 37/23 38/25 42/23 43/24 46/2 51/12 60/6 67/6 67/9 67/12 67/14 69/6 70/15 70/25 71/2 71/21 86/25 87/2 90/9 91/13 91/13 91/13 91/15 93/3 97/5 99/20 100/25 106/7 115/24 116/4 122/25 123/23 | nothing [3] 77/8 101/7 179/11 noticed [1] 162/5 notices [1] 134/14 notified [1] 32/12 notify [1] 44/14 noting [1] 79/21 November [3] 125/24 129/12 138/13 November/December '21 [1] 138/13 now [40] 17/7 17/10 48/25 72/18 77/1 |

(77) morning... - now

| N | 183/22 195/5 196/22 | 46/12 46/12 46/24 | 156/17 218/5 | ours [1] 136/15 |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| | 215/7 | 60/12 66/14 69/24 | options [4] 122/4 | ourselves [3] 174/25 |
| now [32] 88/24 96/19 99/24 108/25 | occlude [1] 219/13 | 73/9 76/15 77/21 | 190/5 190/7 218/3 | 176/14 177/16 |
| 111/21 111/25 113/19 | occluded [1] 220/10 | 80/13 88/24 89/20 | or [240] | out [59] 15/25 22/14 |
| 116/3 118/22 120/23 | occupied [1] 51/8 | 98/1 99/8 100/25 | oral [3] 2/2 64/18 | 22/24 29/14 30/7 |
| 120/23 126/7 130/10 | occur [4] 88/6 88/16 | 113/2 113/8 113/10 | 65/7 | 30/19 43/4 45/2 45/15 |
| 131/15 134/14 141/4 | 149/7 214/21 | 113/10 115/14 128/8 | order [15] 39/21 68/9 | 46/1 48/10 64/5 71/20 |
| 152/19 162/25 163/23 | occurred [8] 49/16 | | 68/21 74/9 75/8 85/19 | 77/19 78/14 81/21 |
| 172/9 172/16 172/19 | 76/22 118/7 147/1 | 136/14 141/5 143/4 | 88/3 93/20 94/21 | 82/21 88/11 98/11 |
| 184/7 195/2 195/22 | 161/14 165/11 176/11 | 145/25 146/16 149/25 | | 105/22 113/25 118/9 |
| 196/10 201/5 204/1 | 216/11 | 150/4 150/6 150/22 | 186/9 199/18 224/11 | 118/11 119/9 125/23 |
| 204/24 208/17 209/8 | occurring [1] 181/5 | 150/25 151/2 152/20 | ordinarily [2] 146/2 | 126/23 127/19 128/4 |
| 212/25 | October [13] 5/6 5/7 | 153/15 154/4 155/5 | 208/19 | 130/4 132/19 136/7 |
| nuanced [5] 146/3 | 5/9 5/14 5/16 6/3 10/8 | | organic [2] 13/7 20/2 | 136/11 149/17 151/4 |
| 146/10 147/3 147/24 | 19/23 50/2 125/24 | | organisation [3] 17/1 | |
| 152/20 | 129/12 138/12 166/2 | 190/11 192/17 193/4 198/16 198/22 199/6 | 18/16 123/19 | 161/21 174/23 176/10 178/1 178/9 178/19 |
| number [48] 4/2 4/12 | October 1997 [1] 50/2 | 200/22 203/3 205/11 | organisations [1] 123/14 | 191/15 192/19 198/1 |
| 5/19 6/11 6/19 8/4 8/9 | October 2021 [2] | 212/8 214/19 217/7 | Origin [1] 127/24 | 198/25 199/8 200/2 |
| 18/5 22/5 40/2 43/13 | 138/12 166/2 | 217/14 217/18 218/24 | | 204/17 211/4 211/18 |
| 55/12 79/20 109/18 | October/November | 219/24 225/1 225/2 | other [64] 1/25 2/4 | 216/5 216/15 217/4 |
| 139/7 142/9 143/4 | [2] 125/24 129/12 | one's [1] 73/13 | 9/16 14/12 16/1 16/21 | 221/11 222/13 224/14 |
| 153/2 153/6 153/9 | off [12] 64/16 64/18 | ones [4] 19/2 119/9 | 23/1 26/11 34/6 40/3 | 226/24 |
| 154/3 155/6 155/15 | 64/19 64/25 65/1 | 189/24 196/8 | 50/24 58/23 64/16 | outcome [2] 57/16 |
| 155/16 157/9 160/23 | 65/12 66/11 94/2 | ongoing [9] 39/5 | 69/4 70/4 76/16 87/3 | 119/18 |
| 161/2 161/4 161/4 | 94/17 96/2 100/6 | 39/6 56/6 76/10 | 87/10 87/18 91/9 | outcomes [2] 14/2 |
| 166/17 183/16 190/18 190/20 192/19 199/6 | 162/20 | 105/13 125/16 162/11 | | |
| 200/20 209/23 210/12 | offensive [2] 202/22 | 163/4 223/19 | 101/25 103/10 108/16 | outlined [1] 33/8 |
| 211/10 212/2 216/21 | 203/5 | only [47] 9/21 10/4 | 108/21 111/1 111/6 | output [1] 60/6 |
| 216/23 218/2 219/12 | office [231] | 10/22 21/25 22/17 | 114/12 115/1 115/2 | outset [1] 158/4 |
| 219/14 224/16 225/3 | Office's [33] 1/21 | 22/19 43/11 46/23 | 115/3 115/15 118/16 | outside [3] 121/4 |
| 225/7 | 20/19 22/1 26/18 | 58/7 66/5 74/17 86/21 | | 121/5 137/8 |
| numbers [5] 144/6 | 50/17 50/22 57/9 | 91/23 101/17 102/15 | 144/21 153/3 157/21 | outstanding [1] 66/2 |
| 159/2 160/21 161/7 | 59/21 64/1 64/11 | 103/11 112/18 112/22 | | over [30] 3/5 4/7 5/8 |
| 161/7 | 64/13 68/17 74/3 83/6 | | 166/23 167/9 183/21 | 14/5 21/7 64/3 70/13 |
| numerous [1] 137/25 | 83/14 83/22 85/10 92/7 92/15 97/7 97/13 | 142/23 146/25 148/1 148/6 150/8 150/22 | 184/20 185/4 185/12 189/5 189/6 191/12 | 81/20 85/21 85/24 87/20 90/6 97/6 |
| 0 | | 153/15 153/18 153/19 | | 126/10 127/12 130/14 |
| | 146/12 147/25 170/5 | 154/4 156/16 160/14 | 206/23 207/5 212/16 | 132/24 138/9 143/20 |
| Oasis [1] 85/23 | 174/11 177/4 201/22 | 161/10 162/3 162/24 | 212/16 214/19 220/9 | 166/4 188/3 197/20 |
| objective [6] 174/10 | 203/2 215/14 218/20 | 173/9 178/2 181/17 | 227/13 | 197/25 202/8 204/18 |
| 205/1 214/2 217/19 218/24 219/7 | offices [3] 17/14 22/5 | 186/25 187/4 205/9 | others [12] 5/10 12/8 | 210/22 223/7 225/1 |
| objectives [4] 20/7 | 22/25 | | 19/3 53/17 53/20 56/5 | |
| 123/18 124/6 124/10 | offload [1] 10/6 | 220/22 225/14 | 63/4 92/6 177/11 | overall [3] 59/16 |
| obligations [8] 54/14 | offshore [2] 78/21 | onshore [1] 137/6 | 194/14 201/16 217/15 | |
| 56/14 57/3 57/5 57/14 | 136/16 | onto [2] 126/19 127/2 | | overlap [1] 40/17 |
| 59/16 73/7 174/12 | offshoring [3] 77/21 | onwards [2] 24/4 | 153/20 | overseeing [1] 36/21 |
| obstructive [1] 60/23 | 78/8 78/10 | 50/14 | ought [2] 91/22 215/9 | |
| obtained [3] 1/25 | often [4] 110/23 | open [3] 18/1 22/5 | our [49] 9/5 32/11 | 67/7 67/13 67/21 |
| 83/18 91/14 | 160/21 174/6 192/13 | 189/14 | 38/18 38/19 39/13 | 68/15 69/3 71/19 |
| obtaining [1] 169/20 | Oh [2] 91/11 226/19 | openly [1] 27/14 | 40/6 47/21 57/5 59/15 | |
| obvious [2] 82/3 | | operating [1] 78/21 | 60/15 69/9 73/14 81/5 | |
| 193/3 | 60/11 90/5 117/14 195/14 196/14 | operation [2] 15/23 50/18 | 81/7 87/14 96/23 136/19 136/23 137/6 | 196/22 |
| obviously [8] 25/14 | older [1] 19/2 | operational [7] 31/12 | | overwhelming [1] 161/9 |
| 74/7 90/17 161/13 | | 36/16 38/22 39/2 | 138/24 141/10 141/11 | own [12] 5/21 15/16 |
| 176/20 190/10 192/22 | once [2] 150/24 | 39/20 40/3 103/14 | 147/10 147/13 148/9 | 40/6 72/4 81/13 81/14 |
| 193/21 | 183/17 | operations [6] 30/23 | 148/15 154/1 154/5 | 135/18 167/12 174/8 |
| occasion [5] 30/2 | one [81] 6/7 6/19 | 30/24 32/16 36/17 | 155/19 156/22 157/1 | 183/11 217/25 224/2 |
| 43/18 73/16 89/16 210/11 | 12/10 15/3 19/14 20/5 | 77/15 201/19 | 157/12 164/17 168/22 | |
| occasions [11] 8/9 | 24/10 24/10 25/20 | opposed [4] 12/25 | 170/19 176/6 178/2 | Р |
| 39/16 43/13 114/25 | 25/22 27/17 32/11 | 18/12 161/3 171/17 | 182/12 183/11 184/16 | page [74] 2/16 2/20 |
| 175/2 175/15 183/19 | 34/20 40/12 40/13 | opposite [1] 175/10 | 194/4 194/6 201/15 | 3/18 3/20 11/22 13/16 |
| | 41/18 44/11 46/11 | option [3] 155/17 | 209/19 209/21 224/6 | 14/5 28/7 43/9 48/1 |
| | | | | |
| L | | | | (78) now - nago |

(78) now... - page

| Р | page 82 [2] 85/2 85/5 | 28/3 34/11 | 184/8 186/3 | particularly [5] 9/10 |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| page [64] 48/1 48/5 | page 9 [1] 168/10 | Paragraph 30 [2] | paragraphs [5] | 36/6 92/18 99/2 |
| 48/6 52/17 55/15 | pages [2] 112/10 | 34/16 170/1 | 102/23 161/21 168/11 | 219/23 |
| 55/25 56/23 56/24 | 222/12 | paragraph 31 [1] | 200/11 209/8 | parties [1] 5/19 |
| 61/16 63/12 64/3 64/3 | pages 24 [1] 112/10 paid [3] 118/1 123/11 | 51/13 paragraph 34 [1] | paragraphs 29 [1] 168/11 | partly [3] 15/15 39/25 40/6 |
| 71/23 73/23 75/15 | 124/1 | 73/24 | paragraphs 67 [1] | partner [5] 4/16 |
| 79/2 83/1 85/2 85/5 | pane [4] 106/15 | paragraph 40 [1] | 102/23 | 44/20 132/21 135/24 |
| 85/24 91/17 91/18 91/19 95/3 95/4 97/6 | 114/7 186/4 186/22 | 75/15 | paragraphs 79 [1] | 165/24 |
| 100/8 102/22 105/18 | panel [3] 106/17 | paragraph 43 [2] | 209/8 | partners [4] 38/11 |
| 109/3 116/12 121/14 | 106/18 189/4 | 61/15 68/11 | paralegals [1] 166/14 | |
| 126/10 127/12 128/1 | paper [2] 33/9 55/5 | paragraph 46 [1] | parameters [5] 83/11 | parts [7] 93/5 123/21 |
| 128/2 128/3 132/7 | papers [5] 79/19 79/20 79/22 80/2 80/9 | 33/16 | 83/16 84/5 89/9 89/12 | 185/4 196/12 197/18 198/2 212/16 |
| 149/4 149/5 149/6 | paragraph [73] 11/22 | | parent [3] 108/18 109/20 149/13 | partway [1] 182/3 |
| 151/22 164/21 168/10 | 13/15 14/6 14/21 24/4 | | part [77] 13/20 40/11 | passed [3] 35/25 |
| 177/2 181/25 184/8 191/14 194/20 197/19 | 28/3 28/6 28/7 30/13 | 14/6 | 55/7 55/21 57/20 | 35/25 208/10 |
| 197/20 197/20 197/25 | 33/4 33/16 34/3 34/11 | | 57/21 66/12 66/23 | passing [1] 14/12 |
| 198/1 198/15 199/1 | 34/16 34/20 48/6 48/8 | | 79/8 79/10 79/16 81/5 | |
| 204/18 206/25 207/1 | 51/13 52/18 55/14 | paragraph 53 [2] | 82/7 83/12 88/5 93/9 | 72/24 82/1 93/23 94/3 |
| 209/9 210/23 221/16 | 61/15 63/12 63/13 | 28/6 28/7 | 95/2 97/13 98/1 98/2 | 118/15 119/6 119/6 |
| 222/7 222/11 | 68/11 71/22 71/24 73/24 75/15 75/16 | paragraph 58 [3] 55/14 82/25 89/6 | 99/5 99/8 99/11 99/18 101/21 102/15 105/20 | |
| page 10 [1] 73/23 | 79/3 82/25 89/6 91/16 | | 108/19 110/4 110/19 | Pause [1] 92/24 |
| page 12 [2] 64/3 | 93/3 95/3 97/6 100/7 | 194/20 | | |
| 75/15 page 13 [2] 14/5 | 100/11 100/22 105/17 | | 111/23 115/4 121/1 | 150/7 |
| 61/16 | 107/2 109/2 110/8 | 95/3 | 121/3 122/10 123/4 | payable [1] 124/19 |
| page 14 [2] 28/7 | 111/17 116/11 126/10 | | 123/11 123/20 129/23 | payment [1] 124/8 |
| 132/7 | 126/14 126/16 127/1 | 97/6 100/22 | 136/19 138/3 145/16 | PCDE [12] 169/3 |
| page 17 [3] 3/20 83/1 | 127/5 127/20 142/21 151/20 170/1 177/3 | paragraph 65 [1] 197/19 | 167/7 169/3 169/16 172/2 174/1 179/16 | 169/5 169/13 169/16 169/23 199/12 200/25 |
| 191/14 | 181/25 184/8 186/3 | paragraph 66 [1] | 184/6 186/24 194/9 | 203/13 204/5 208/1 |
| page 18 [2] 55/15 | 191/13 194/20 197/19 | | 195/25 199/2 199/10 | 208/5 209/2 |
| 181/25 | 198/25 199/23 201/8 | paragraph 68 [2] | 199/12 200/17 200/24 | I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I |
| page 2 [1] 11/22 page 20 [1] 95/3 | 202/25 204/16 204/19 | | 201/2 201/15 202/18 | 12/21 12/24 18/2 18/5 |
| page 20 [1] 30/3 page 22 [2] 102/22 | 207/1 207/14 210/22 | paragraph 69 [1] | 202/25 206/16 209/11 | |
| 109/3 | 211/1 212/20 221/15 | 202/25 | 209/25 210/24 213/12 | |
| page 23 [1] 194/20 | paragraph 10 [3] 63/12 63/13 127/1 | paragraph 7 [1] 126/10 | 213/23 215/5 219/3 220/9 220/11 220/13 | 40/2 42/3 42/14 42/15 46/16 52/7 78/15 87/6 |
| page 24 [1] 197/19 | paragraph 109 [1] | paragraph 70 [1] | 220/9/220/11/220/13 | 89/16 89/21 90/14 |
| page 25 [2] 151/22 | 199/23 | 201/8 | partially [1] 15/13 | 91/3 91/8 91/9 98/18 |
| 198/1 | Paragraph 11 [1] | paragraph 71 [1] | Participants [4] 4/12 | 138/6 141/21 148/13 |
| page 26 [1] 52/17 page 29 [1] 48/5 | 127/5 | 204/16 | 5/11 223/9 223/10 | 148/19 183/24 185/4 |
| page 3 [1] 128/1 | paragraph 114 [2] | paragraph 72 [1] | participate [1] | 186/19 187/9 187/12 |
| page 30 [3] 79/2 | 100/7 100/11 | 204/19 | 123/17 | 188/4 192/20 193/16 |
| 91/18 209/9 | paragraph 115 [3] 105/17 107/2 111/17 | paragraph 73 [1] 211/1 | participating [1] 228/3 | 203/1 210/18 217/9 217/10 |
| page 31 [1] 206/25 | paragraph 12 [1] | paragraph 8 [2] | particular [50] 18/22 | people's [1] 42/22 |
| page 34 [1] 121/14 | 71/24 | 11/22 126/14 | 31/21 35/17 67/24 | per [2] 51/1 51/2 |
| page 36 [2] 100/8 105/18 | paragraph 121 [1] | paragraph 80 [2] | 76/15 78/1 80/6 87/17 | performance [4] |
| page 37 [2] 48/1 | 221/15 | 116/11 151/20 | 106/21 107/21 135/19 | 52/12 124/2 124/12 |
| 184/8 | paragraph 13 [3] | paragraph 81 [1] | 139/6 139/12 139/24 | 124/16 |
| page 38 [1] 91/17 | 13/15 71/22 127/20 | 210/22 | 140/19 141/23 143/3 | perhaps [13] 26/12 |
| page 4 [2] 13/16 | paragraph 15 [1] 33/4 | paragraph 82 [1] 212/20 | 144/6 145/6 145/22 146/9 147/2 147/25 | 28/6 32/23 34/2 47/2 59/2 139/9 139/12 |
| 63/12 | paragraph 18 [2] | paragraph 83 [2] | 148/10 148/12 149/9 | 145/3 151/17 160/7 |
| page 48 [1] 221/16 | 34/3 207/14 | 52/18 207/1 | 149/18 150/3 151/5 | 188/17 212/5 |
| page 5 [1] 71/23 | paragraph 19 [1] | paragraph 9 [1] | | |
| page 63 [2] 91/19 164/21 | 142/21 | 126/16 | 158/9 158/12 159/11 | 10/19 11/25 17/22 |
| page 64 [1] 222/7 | paragraph 21 [1] | paragraph 92 [2] | 160/3 160/10 161/1 | 23/5 43/19 45/17 |
| page 7 [2] 149/4 | 91/16 | 48/6 48/8 | 161/14 163/2 170/8 | 45/17 45/17 52/20 |
| 149/5 | paragraph 25 [2] 24/4 177/3 | paragraph 93 [1] 79/3 | 180/3 184/3 185/25 196/6 197/22 200/4 | 52/22 53/7 62/9 80/22 138/9 143/21 175/19 |
| page 8 [1] 177/2 | paragraph 26 [2] | paragraph 95 [2] | 209/18 214/6 214/22 | 207/7 |
| | L | | | = |
| | | | | |

(79) page... - period

| Р | 208/10 208/13 208/13 | | positive [2] 93/2 95/9 | presently [5] 119/25 |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| permanently [1] | 224/2 224/3 | pm [6] 3/2 131/7 | possession [1] | 119/25 122/11 166/10 |
| 123/7 | Peters' [3] 103/16 170/11 170/21 | 131/9 164/2 164/4 228/7 | 192/10 possibility [2] 227/18 | 166/15 |
| permeated [1] 20/23 | phase [11] 67/24 | point [21] 6/2 12/18 | 228/1 | 135/22 135/23 161/6 |
| person [12] 19/14 | 68/1 129/23 133/6 | 19/13 20/13 21/2 23/9 | possible [11] 15/6 | presumably [7] |
| 31/5 38/9 40/14 40/18 | 137/11 137/12 158/5 | 36/13 95/19 99/4 | 29/3 38/21 57/13 | 52/11 106/22 110/15 |
| 40/19 40/19 41/9 51/24 68/5 122/15 | 192/17 199/9 215/24 | 100/21 102/4 106/20 | 141/13 158/6 171/13 | 115/25 147/3 154/23 |
| 203/19 | 222/23 | 108/1 129/25 137/24 | 193/9 193/13 205/10 | 154/24 |
| personal [2] 18/18 | Phase 4 [3] 129/23 | 146/15 149/17 155/23 | | pretty [1] 216/18 |
| 124/9 | 199/9 222/23 | 205/13 215/18 220/18 | | prevalent [1] 21/1 |
| personally [3] 120/5 | phases [5] 9/11 37/3 37/4 38/20 129/21 | points [3] 27/17 145/23 178/5 | 44/24 46/1 95/19 166/18 176/15 185/10 | previous [16] 5/1 24/7 24/13 25/15 |
| 143/22 173/20 | Phases 2 [1] 37/3 | POL [22] 12/2 28/11 | 187/3 | 25/18 56/23 82/16 |
| personnel [1] 197/10 | phone [2] 5/19 6/16 | 38/5 48/14 48/16 | post [276] | 95/4 119/9 124/24 |
| perspective [6] 53/9 133/13 133/15 133/16 | phrase [3] 217/1 | 48/24 56/12 56/25 | post-conviction [6] | 125/23 128/3 128/4 |
| 157/4 176/3 | 221/23 221/25 | 58/14 66/22 83/6 96/7 | 92/13 93/14 93/19 | 154/24 163/12 172/21 |
| Peters [147] 8/9 8/10 | phrasing [1] 30/18 | 126/18 127/14 128/6 | 93/24 94/20 169/7 | previously [11] 1/21 |
| 8/24 8/24 9/6 9/6 | physically [1] 19/18 | 128/7 128/9 129/1 | post-de-duplication | 26/15 44/13 47/22 |
| 22/20 22/21 61/23 | pick [2] 101/1 108/7 | 195/21 196/15 201/13 201/16 | | 50/4 51/8 53/16 112/2 118/25 125/5 164/17 |
| 61/24 62/1 62/2 62/16 | picked [2] 137/21 161/24 | POL's [8] 33/14 | post-qualified [1] 148/18 | primarily [3] 30/6 |
| 62/16 68/12 68/12 | picking [2] 182/2 | 33/24 56/6 63/22 | Postal [5] 17/23 19/2 | 64/12 71/25 |
| 73/20 73/20 76/4 76/4 | 100/7 | 198/6 198/11 201/19 | 19/9 29/18 85/23 | primary [4] 92/3 92/5 |
| 91/25 91/25 92/4 92/5 92/12 92/12 92/17 | piece [1] 169/8 | 201/23 | postmasters [1] 22/6 | |
| 92/17 93/13 93/14 | pieces [1] 139/8 | POL00114170DS [1] | pot [1] 26/16 | principal [6] 49/14 |
| 94/19 94/19 95/6 95/6 | place [29] 6/13 6/14 | 85/2 | potential [3] 121/25 | 60/12 165/9 198/13 |
| 102/24 102/25 103/4 | 16/12 19/24 20/15 | POL00124517 [1] | 128/9 169/12 | 220/16 223/20 |
| 103/5 103/6 103/7 | 21/3 24/16 26/7 26/14 32/19 38/23 39/7 | 125/17 POL00126338 [1] | potentially [4] 113/22 | principally [5] 171/25 177/13 182/19 187/18 |
| 103/10 103/11 103/16 | 63/22 64/10 74/10 | 127/22 | practical [1] 58/24 | 213/14 |
| 109/6 109/6 115/14 | 74/11 75/8 77/24 97/2 | | practice [4] 10/7 | principle [1] 124/8 |
| 115/14 116/15 116/15 116/17 116/17 116/24 | 123/7 124/18 129/18 | 32/24 32/25 34/4 | 46/18 132/21 186/6 | prior [7] 25/24 55/10 |
| 116/24 121/8 121/8 | 137/8 145/25 159/16 | | practised [1] 217/24 | 55/11 106/19 146/1 |
| 152/2 152/2 152/13 | 174/24 177/12 181/24 | | practising [2] 4/6 | 170/11 192/14 |
| 152/13 166/24 166/24 | 201/17 | 140/12 143/19 143/20 | | priorities [2] 14/11 |
| 166/25 166/25 167/2 | places [3] 76/18 82/1 | | pre [2] 92/14 155/20 | 38/19 |
| 167/2 167/19 167/19 | 146/21 plan [1] 127/17 | 201/17 205/5 205/9 207/3 208/6 208/20 | pre-de-duplication [1] 155/20 | prioritise [3] 42/4 143/13 224/10 |
| 168/9 168/10 168/17 | platform [2] 22/21 | 213/3 214/3 | pre-existing [1] | prioritised [1] 224/14 |
| 168/17 169/14 169/14 | 128/18 | policy [46] 17/3 | 92/14 | prioritising [1] 22/8 |
| 169/24 169/25 170/4 170/5 170/7 170/7 | play [1] 45/10 | 32/19 32/22 33/9 | precise [5] 66/6 | priority [4] 17/10 |
| 170/11 170/14 170/15 | played [1] 118/10 | 33/11 33/13 33/20 | 70/19 141/13 163/8 | 21/1 75/22 80/25 |
| 170/21 171/9 171/9 | please [66] 2/6 2/20 | 33/23 85/8 85/19 86/7 | 175/10 | private [7] 15/15 34/5 |
| 172/3 172/3 173/17 | 3/8 3/12 11/22 33/1 33/11 33/16 33/21 | 87/25 88/13 88/14 94/10 97/17 97/23 | precisely [8] 69/19 | 46/17 167/22 168/23 |
| 173/17 173/18 173/18 | 47/12 47/19 48/5 48/9 | | 95/25 114/17 173/5 | 170/3 207/4 privileged [2] 185/10 |
| 174/19 174/19 174/25 | 52/16 52/17 55/14 | 111/9 115/20 140/11 | 209/1 | 187/2 |
| | 60/12 61/15 63/15 | | | pro [1] 157/9 |
| 177/20 177/20 177/22 177/22 178/17 178/17 | 64/5 71/23 73/24 | 198/4 198/5 198/9 | 24/5 | proactive [1] 197/13 |
| 178/24 178/24 198/20 | 75/15 79/2 80/20 85/2 | | prefer [1] 221/9 | probably [11] 6/18 |
| 198/20 199/5 199/5 | 85/5 91/16 91/18 97/6 | | pregnant [1] 100/25 | 23/18 46/3 57/19 |
| 199/7 199/7 199/10 | 109/2 110/11 111/18 | 202/6 202/14 202/24 | preparatory [2] | 94/18 107/4 138/8 |
| 199/10 199/16 199/16 | 112/9 116/12 121/11 125/17 125/21 126/10 | 205/7 206/14 206/15 206/20 207/22 208/22 | 168/19 199/2 prepare [2] 126/12 | 157/17 176/15 193/14 196/5 |
| 199/22 199/22 200/8 | 127/12 127/21 128/1 | 212/23 212/24 | 170/5 | problem [15] 40/11 |
| 200/8 200/14 200/14 | 131/22 132/1 136/12 | pool [6] 128/10 | prepared [2] 126/14 | 73/5 73/13 120/12 |
| 200/19 200/19 201/20 201/21 202/25 203/1 | 163/24 164/14 166/23 | | 224/23 | 146/8 147/25 148/5 |
| 203/9 203/9 203/23 | 166/25 168/9 169/6 | 188/14 189/19 | preparing [1] 169/18 | 152/20 156/15 156/16 |
| 203/23 204/13 204/13 | 177/2 181/23 182/2 | posed [1] 158/23 | present [6] 24/18 | 163/7 208/15 208/17 |
| 207/17 207/17 207/18 | 194/20 198/1 198/3 | position [10] 4/17 | 70/17 79/4 135/11 | 212/18 218/16 |
| 207/18 207/21 207/21 | 198/8 198/15 204/19 206/25 209/13 222/5 | 24/18 100/9 144/16 147/6 179/9 189/21 | 135/12 183/22 | problematic [2] 175/13 176/10 |
| 208/4 208/4 208/10 | 200/25/209/15/222/5 | 204/8 209/22 219/21 | presented [4] 45/23 134/4 150/23 161/12 | problems [6] 62/23 |
| | | | | |
| | | | |)) permanantly problems |

(80) permanently - problems

| Р | project [7] 12/4 67/5 | public [10] 4/13 9/17 | 207/15 223/11 226/17 | 98/21 100/11 161/10 |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| problems [5] 76/1 | 68/4 69/16 84/14 | 10/2 50/23 51/7 | 226/20 226/21 | 161/24 163/2 180/1 |
| 81/13 81/14 149/7 | 141/5 166/13 | 122/11 122/19 139/8 | quick [1] 211/2 | 180/3 181/7 |
| 161/14 | projected [1] 13/18 | 143/16 165/7 | quickly [3] 12/17 | reasonable [12] 17/3 |
| procedural [2] 97/18 | projecting [2] 13/23 | published [3] 5/17 | 12/18 218/9 | 56/9 59/25 60/8 103/5 |
| 97/24 | 15/17 | 6/5 132/16 | quite [12] 7/8 11/14 | 104/3 109/7 109/14 |
| procedure [2] 99/6 | promotion [1] 50/22 | purely [1] 144/1 | 19/21 36/11 41/20 | 110/10 155/11 205/1 |
| 111/3 | promptly [1] 42/22 | purpose [8] 40/22 | 44/18 97/15 147/4 | 217/17 |
| procedures [7] 30/13 | proper [2] 16/25 63/2 | 96/8 132/15 165/1 185/8 185/11 189/11 | 148/3 176/24 217/18 218/8 | reasonableness [2] 109/16 205/16 |
| 35/20 92/8 94/13 | proportion [1] 45/2 proportionate [1] | 208/2 | quorum [1] 8/16 | reasonably [4] 97/24 |
| 134/8 205/8 205/9 | 129/7 | purposes [3] 136/19 | <u> </u> | 100/18 101/1 101/15 |
| proceed [2] 184/23 | propose [2] 223/11 | 188/5 204/11 | R | reasons [2] 66/13 |
| 227/11 | 227/3 | pursue [1] 190/7 | R9 [1] 28/9 | 174/20 |
| proceedings [5] 16/9 | proposed [3] 33/8 | pursued [3] 173/13 | racial [3] 35/6 37/15 | recall [11] 27/23 |
| 34/24 115/21 167/3 192/17 | 64/17 142/5 | 218/3 218/6 | 42/8 | 32/15 43/1 77/7 77/9 |
| process [51] 16/5 | proposing [1] 171/17 | put [7] 1/10 49/23 | racially [1] 202/22 | 196/19 200/20 200/21 |
| 16/7 16/25 20/2 22/18 | proposition [1] 173/2 | 131/4 156/2 165/16 | racist [1] 203/5 | 212/5 212/25 214/12 |
| 24/16 24/22 24/23 | pros [4] 157/7 157/16 | | raise [1] 27/18 | receipt [2] 207/13 |
| 24/25 25/21 25/23 | 157/24 158/11 | puts [1] 193/14 | raised [4] 21/2 54/9 | 207/17 |
| 26/5 26/21 26/25 27/1 | Prosecut [1] 86/9 | putting [2] 81/18 | 125/5 136/5 | receipts [1] 15/2 |
| 27/15 28/17 31/15 | prosecute [2] 111/10 | 220/21 | raising [1] 27/2 ran [1] 218/14 | receive [5] 65/6 |
| 35/2 36/3 36/9 36/14 | 203/19 prosecuted [1] | Q | range [5] 49/8 90/19 | 138/25 144/7 167/16 167/18 |
| 37/3 37/11 48/23 | 202/18 | QC [3] 188/3 188/5 | 109/23 148/17 165/3 | received [13] 1/12 |
| 56/12 57/1 57/6 58/15 | Prosecuting [1] | 188/6 | rarely [8] 113/20 | 2/10 2/12 2/17 28/22 |
| 59/2 59/8 59/22 71/19 | 86/15 | QCing [1] 188/13 | 114/3 115/7 115/22 | 29/20 139/2 145/4 |
| 93/9 97/14 122/7 | prosecution [10] | qualifications [2] | 145/12 147/1 147/23 | 170/2 194/25 195/20 |
| 126/18 134/1 134/2 135/6 139/2 139/4 | 9/12 32/24 34/19 | 49/25 165/17 | 218/12 | 201/12 223/16 |
| 146/19 146/20 184/14 | 35/10 86/14 88/14 | qualified [7] 4/5 38/1 | rate [1] 143/8 | receiving [2] 199/14 |
| 188/6 188/7 188/13 | 110/18 140/6 152/8 | 46/21 50/2 148/18 | rather [18] 36/22 | 222/2 |
| 191/15 191/16 200/10 | 205/5 | 183/10 185/6 | 40/24 59/7 76/21 | recently [15] 61/20 |
| processed [1] 134/3 | prosecutions [25] | quality [7] 43/20 | 80/25 104/25 120/19 | 62/13 72/16 91/1 |
| processes [9] 14/4 | 9/8 9/9 33/9 33/11 | 43/22 120/19 136/3 137/5 157/3 188/6 | 132/18 136/14 141/17 150/18 155/24 161/7 | 140/21 167/13 170/20 |
| 22/15 22/23 23/14 | 33/13 34/5 92/8 94/14 98/20 143/19 167/8 | quantify [1] 90/12 | 168/6 177/22 218/9 | 171/6 171/23 172/1 173/15 182/21 182/23 |
| 32/11 36/6 36/24 | 167/22 168/23 170/4 | question [38] 11/8 | 221/23 225/2 | 197/2 223/16 |
| 122/13 122/17 | 197/23 198/4 198/5 | 15/10 35/13 46/24 | rationale [2] 107/23 | recognise [1] 43/19 |
| processing [7] | 200/6 202/5 202/13 | 55/22 66/8 78/22 | 108/4 | recognised [6] 57/22 |
| | 202/14 206/14 207/4 | 92/10 95/15 99/12 | re [3] 22/24 41/9 | 61/21 143/6 162/1 |
| 127/7 145/21 158/5 192/1 | 207/16 212/23 | 100/24 105/3 105/19 | 225/13 | 166/5 167/13 |
| produce [3] 1/12 | prosecutor [1] 86/15 | | re-indexing [1] 22/24 | recognises [1] |
| 109/25 214/9 | prosecutors [1] | 134/22 134/22 135/14 | reach [1] 209/21 | 127/14 |
| produced [17] 35/8 | 201/14 | | read [13] 20/20 48/15 | |
| 37/19 39/9 43/22 | protocols [1] 86/20 | 155/7 155/10 155/13 | 48/22 49/11 101/24 | 199/25 |
| 65/18 85/16 103/9 | provide [12] 21/19 | 160/5 160/6 160/14 160/15 160/17 178/21 | 102/23 112/11 157/11 | |
| 106/3 112/20 112/24 | 33/12 33/21 64/2 123/5 136/3 142/23 | 179/20 183/4 190/23 | 217/5 222/21 | 78/24 |
| 118/25 125/13 134/5 | 153/2 153/5 155/19 | 194/5 207/2 215/5 | reading [2] 80/20 | record [8] 96/11 153/24 167/15 175/15 |
| 212/9 224/16 225/4 | 198/3 198/8 | 215/6 | 108/14 | 175/23 175/25 176/8 |
| 226/12 | provided [15] 12/4 | Questioned [10] 3/10 | | 176/9 |
| product [4] 35/5 | 46/5 83/5 97/12 101/7 | 46/10 47/15 131/24 | 106/6 107/2 | recorded [6] 107/23 |
| 43/21 95/25 170/12 | 107/19 109/10 133/21 | 164/11 229/4 229/6 | real [1] 99/14 | 148/24 151/17 152/21 |
| production [4] 65/15 66/9 225/23 225/24 | 137/6 158/25 169/19 | 229/10 229/14 229/18 | | 153/23 153/25 |
| profession [1] 40/6 | 201/13 202/4 216/20 | questions [35] 1/16 | 72/19 220/22 | recording [1] 108/3 |
| professionals [2] | 216/20 | 1/17 1/18 31/2 46/9 | realistic [1] 11/7 | recordkeeping [1] |
| 123/16 136/18 | provider [2] 177/4 | | realistically [1] 224/1 | 18/15 |
| profiling [2] 35/6 | 178/13 | 92/4 92/10 92/19 105/7 105/8 130/23 | reality [1] 45/10 | records [1] 90/25 |
| 37/15 | provides [1] 156/17 | 130/25 131/4 134/24 | really [10] 74/17 97/15 135/7 138/13 | recruit [1] 22/6 |
| programme [4] 51/15 | providing [5] 29/5 47/22 69/6 80/9 | | 138/24 139/20 154/17 | recruitment [1] 123/6 rectification [1] 14/8 |
| 52/3 52/13 67/2 | 164/17 | 163/16 163/17 164/13 | | rectified [1] 209/6 |
| progress [4] 62/4 | provision [1] 80/16 | 165/8 174/6 196/7 | realm [1] 78/20 | rectify [1] 15/19 |
| 79/25 80/1 103/17 | provisional [1] 5/16 | 197/22 199/19 206/12 | | red [1] 149/20 |
| | - | | | |
| | | | | (81) problems - red |

(81) problems... - red

| R | 76/10 76/15 79/13 | remainder [1] 127/19 | | resides [2] 139/23 |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| reduce [3] 13/25 | 80/2 80/8 84/17 87/18 | remaining [1] 130/16 | | 146/17 |
| 23/11 122/8 | 88/7 90/7 92/2 92/17 | remains [2] 72/3 72/9 | 135/7 140/11 140/19 | resource [6] 21/13 |
| reduced [1] 29/23 | 92/18 94/25 95/15 | remediate [2] 119/8 | 140/20 140/24 141/3 | 66/17 77/21 83/24 |
| reducing [1] 161/2 | 98/5 99/13 100/3 | 225/24 | 141/19 141/25 142/3 | 182/22 183/23 |
| reduction [2] 127/11 | 104/22 107/20 110/6 | remediating [1] | 142/4 142/25 143/18 | resourced [5] 23/5 |
| 154/3 | 111/23 117/10 118/18 | 225/17 | 155/7 156/24 157/18 | 52/20 53/7 53/12 |
| refer [5] 33/8 33/20 | 118/20 119/4 119/5 | remediation [27] | 160/4 160/8 160/10 | 137/18 |
| 76/6 122/10 152/25 | 119/9 119/24 120/7 120/10 120/11 120/13 | 50/7 79/7 93/9 97/14 | 160/14 160/14 160/16 | |
| reference [13] 4/2 | 120/10 120/11 120/13 | 110/4 111/20 111/24 118/14 118/15 118/20 | 173/4 174/6 175/24 185/13 189/8 191/17 | 23/7 46/5 71/9 77/23 136/23 |
| 5/2 6/4 19/22 33/17 | 147/21 166/25 167/5 | 120/12 120/17 130/9 | 191/17 196/7 199/15 | resourcing [16] |
| 61/17 65/14 121/18 | 171/24 172/6 177/10 | 138/4 160/19 161/13 | 201/11 201/22 202/12 | 16/13 16/15 53/16 |
| 123/11 199/22 203/5 | 177/11 178/3 178/21 | 162/10 162/11 172/1 | 204/12 205/2 206/5 | 54/1 54/9 54/11 54/24 |
| 214/9 224/10 | 179/18 179/20 180/21 | 197/4 220/2 220/24 | 206/13 206/24 207/2 | 55/1 55/8 66/3 66/21 |
| referred [10] 35/21 35/22 49/9 126/22 | 181/1 195/1 195/21 | 222/5 222/14 224/22 | 207/14 207/15 207/17 | 77/4 77/11 136/4 |
| 137/22 165/4 184/24 | 196/16 196/17 197/6 | 225/5 225/10 | 207/19 208/9 208/19 | 136/14 177/11 |
| 198/23 203/4 203/6 | 197/17 208/9 212/15 | remember [4] 6/21 | 209/3 209/20 212/1 | respect [16] 7/16 |
| referring [4] 53/6 | 214/21 215/5 216/12 | 20/12 31/4 31/4 | 213/20 214/6 220/15 | 92/4 92/5 138/21 |
| 56/17 58/14 62/8 | 222/15 222/22 223/12 | | Request 1 [1] 64/9 | 143/22 144/16 145/7 |
| refers [1] 108/15 | 224/12 224/16 224/17 | 126/19 | Request 14 [2] 92/11 | 151/18 159/21 160/3 |
| refining [1] 153/12 | 224/21 | removed [2] 150/9 | 207/2 | 160/5 161/18 162/5 162/13 170/25 207/15 |
| reflect [2] 163/11 | relationship [6] | 184/13 | requested [3] 32/14 | |
| 227/8 | 38/15 38/16 81/5 94/2 94/5 133/15 | removes [1] 114/21 removing [1] 219/17 | 41/16 43/14 requesting [1] 31/17 | respect of [2] 7/16 162/13 |
| refresh [1] 121/12 | relatively [4] 140/20 | remuneration [1] | requests [57] 20/3 | respects [3] 51/17 |
| regard [6] 8/22 9/9 | 148/13 167/25 224/15 | | 20/10 20/16 28/19 | 158/1 216/23 |
| 9/11 104/11 120/19 | Relativity [14] 21/6 | repeated [1] 40/17 | 28/21 30/4 32/5 32/9 | respond [6] 77/17 |
| 209/18 | 22/21 29/19 58/20 | repeating [1] 213/24 | 34/25 37/1 37/9 37/22 | 167/17 167/18 170/18 |
| regarding [1] 24/19 | 96/25 98/22 121/24 | replace [1] 22/7 | 40/18 41/24 42/6 | 194/2 207/20 |
| regards [3] 32/5 133/20 137/14 | 122/1 122/4 126/20 | report [1] 33/8 | 42/13 43/3 43/15 44/1 | |
| region [1] 78/14 | 127/2 192/2 210/2 | reported [7] 7/2 7/22 | 77/17 88/24 91/20 | 205/11 |
| regional [1] 19/12 | 226/6 | 38/13 38/14 39/9 | | responding [9] 40/13 |
| registered [2] 7/9 | relevance [6] 24/12 | 77/15 123/10 | 103/1 103/21 116/20 | 116/20 133/18 152/6 |
| 7/11 | 25/14 129/21 143/8 | reporting [1] 83/13 | 117/17 119/4 120/7 | 167/7 199/19 202/11 |
| regrettable [3] | 168/13 186/10 | reports [1] 18/19 | 133/18 134/13 134/23 134/24 137/25 152/7 | 204/12 208/2 |
| 215/21 215/23 216/3 | relevant [71] 8/11 | repositories [12] 18/17 30/8 35/4 35/18 | | response [12] 2/16 50/17 54/7 54/15 |
| regular [11] 23/20 | 28/8 29/17 29/25 37/9 | | 163/13 167/8 167/18 | 55/22 83/17 85/17 |
| 32/18 65/25 73/18 | 38/9 42/22 43/6 43/7 | 81/17 94/22 146/12 | 170/6 170/9 170/10 | 105/22 160/21 207/13 |
| 73/19 75/21 79/8 | 56/5 59/22 60/3 63/17 | 146/14 191/22 | 170/14 170/18 174/7 | 212/1 220/15 |
| 79/10 81/9 135/25 178/25 | 63/21 64/9 68/22 | repository [2] 18/21 | 174/13 193/23 198/14 | responses [3] 35/24 |
| regularly [3] 8/12 | 68/22 68/23 85/7 | 41/6 | 199/15 200/4 200/4 | 37/13 170/5 |
| 98/11 162/19 | 91/21 92/9 101/16 | represent [2] 149/13 | 206/6 | responsibilities [4] |
| relate [1] 167/8 | 101/22 101/23 102/1 | 149/14 | require [4] 73/3 | 22/3 40/4 46/7 56/5 |
| related [10] 24/8 | 102/11 103/3 108/21 | representation [1] | 75/24 94/9 105/23 | responsibility [22] |
| 42/12 123/24 124/1 | 109/4 109/25 112/8 | 7/13 | required [15] 16/10 | 14/13 18/5 63/1 64/6 |
| 124/23 156/6 162/9 | 112/13 114/22 121/21 127/15 130/5 144/22 | 57/23 166/5 167/14 | 16/19 31/16 52/5 54/14 72/22 77/23 | 64/12 67/1 67/7 67/12 67/21 67/24 68/2 68/6 |
| 162/11 167/3 169/22 | 169/9 169/17 169/19 | representatives [3] | 78/2 82/10 84/1 | 68/15 70/23 71/24 |
| relates [4] 28/23 | 169/24 173/10 176/18 | | 128/10 146/9 147/2 | 72/6 72/11 81/2 92/3 |
| 208/6 214/8 215/8 | 185/13 187/2 187/17 | representing [1] 9/3 | 147/11 191/19 | 92/5 100/10 106/4 |
| relating [12] 34/4 | 188/4 189/7 189/13 | request [97] 8/19 | requirement [2] 30/7 | responsible [15] |
| 74/5 80/1 92/8 94/14 168/19 170/3 195/23 | 190/4 190/9 190/15 | 8/20 28/5 28/9 28/18 | 203/18 | 17/18 17/20 34/9 |
| 196/7 197/22 199/3 | 191/20 191/21 191/23 | | requirements [4] | 34/14 34/18 34/23 |
| 207/3 | 192/10 195/25 196/11 | 32/24 33/2 33/3 33/4 | 147/8 147/14 147/15 | 51/24 72/3 72/9 75/19 |
| relation [85] 59/3 | 198/2 199/9 201/10 | 33/5 33/15 34/2 34/3 | 154/2 | 105/19 115/15 116/3 |
| 59/17 60/24 62/18 | 204/7 205/21 207/7 | 34/7 35/15 38/8 41/13 | | 135/24 207/6 |
| 64/8 64/16 64/19 | 212/9 213/5 213/22 | 44/3 44/6 44/7 48/23 | 146/20 | responsive [58] 99/8 |
| 64/24 65/2 65/12 | reliable [1] 192/11 | 63/13 64/4 64/4 64/9 85/7 85/12 85/18 | requiring [1] 14/25 | 99/10 99/18 102/1 103/24 105/13 108/11 |
| 66/11 67/19 68/1 | reliance [1] 81/12 relied [2] 28/22 209/3 | 92/11 92/19 96/13 | requisite [2] 84/20 94/22 | 110/14 128/17 135/13 |
| 68/13 70/21 71/1 | rely [1] 96/22 | 103/4 105/22 107/21 | rerunning [1] 144/25 | 142/9 142/10 142/23 |
| 71/11 71/14 73/17 | remain [1] 150/6 | 109/5 117/21 134/9 | reside [1] 146/16 | 143/7 144/5 144/20 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | (92) reduce reconcision |

(82) reduce - responsive

| R | 163/3 163/5 169/22 | right [74] 1/11 3/4 4/7 | 226/20 226/25 229/16 | 158/24 206/9 221/3 |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | 170/24 172/11 173/1 | 4/18 7/4 7/7 29/6 | Royal [1] 17/22 | 226/11 |
| responsive [42] | 173/7 175/18 179/13 | | ruffling [1] 116/1 | running [5] 10/9 18/6 |
| 146/7 149/19 150/1 | 179/17 181/1 181/23 | 50/19 50/23 51/3 51/6 | | 171/1 208/13 224/11 |
| 150/21 153/4 153/14 | 182/11 182/16 184/23 | | 28/23 28/24 29/15 | runs [1] 123/14 |
| 153/19 154/8 154/19 155/2 159/13 159/18 | 185/22 186/25 187/15 | 60/20 61/11 62/10 | 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 | |
| 160/7 160/9 162/3 | 187/17 189/15 189/17 | 67/6 67/12 68/11 | 33/25 37/21 38/8 | S |
| 173/9 179/4 179/7 | 189/25 190/12 191/4 | 70/14 76/14 79/9 | 41/13 43/6 48/23 | safes [1] 18/1 |
| 179/22 180/5 181/12 | 199/13 199/17 202/24 | | 65/19 66/1 66/8 67/25 | |
| 184/5 184/22 185/10 | 207/22 209/25 210/24 | | 71/6 76/16 78/2 79/25 | 23/3 27/18 27/20 31/3 |
| 189/3 189/16 190/1 | 211/22 213/8 213/16 | 101/18 108/7 111/7 | 84/17 88/8 90/13 | 31/7 32/1 42/11 54/10 |
| 190/3 190/22 198/14 | 214/1 214/14 217/12 | 111/22 122/24 123/25 | 90/21 91/20 92/10 | 55/17 84/11 87/25 |
| 200/3 204/22 206/1 | 217/15 220/13 221/1 | 132/25 133/7 145/21 | 92/11 92/19 93/5 | 89/15 93/23 99/5 110/24 133/4 140/2 |
| 210/1 213/1 213/19 | 221/5 Review' [1] 198/19 | 147/23 151/3 165/16 165/19 165/22 165/23 | 95/15 99/20 104/14 104/14 104/15 104/16 | 141/19 145/11 147/1 |
| 214/2 214/6 216/21 | reviewed [41] 15/5 | 166/3 166/7 166/10 | 104/20 104/22 105/1 | 153/23 159/2 160/21 |
| 217/13 219/12 225/22 | 100/4 103/7 103/11 | 166/16 166/21 166/22 | 105/5 108/21 115/18 | 172/15 172/18 176/24 |
| rest [5] 54/21 72/5 | 103/22 107/24 109/7 | 168/8 168/14 171/20 | 116/20 117/6 117/11 | 186/3 194/8 196/23 |
| 111/13 203/21 224/11 | 112/20 112/24 119/5 | 174/22 181/6 182/8 | 117/17 117/21 119/4 | 202/16 205/15 216/18 |
| resting [1] 71/25 | 119/16 125/10 129/21 | 184/25 187/23 188/16 | | 216/23 |
| restrictive [1] 29/4 restructure [1] | 145/6 153/22 156/8 | 200/13 210/11 211/21 | 134/13 140/24 141/6 | Salmon [2] 57/24 |
| 121/25 | 172/20 172/20 178/22 | | 141/18 141/25 152/7 | 123/3 |
| rests [1] 63/1 | 184/11 184/15 184/21 | | 160/4 160/8 167/8 | same [38] 14/1 22/22 |
| result [4] 1/22 114/5 | 187/18 189/18 204/11 | | 167/18 170/2 170/9 | 33/12 33/15 33/22 |
| 224/22 225/4 | 204/14 209/19 209/23 | | 170/10 170/14 172/21 | 34/1 41/11 57/16 |
| results [3] 96/25 | 210/6 210/15 210/18 | 85/24 | 173/3 174/6 174/7 | 58/21 70/21 71/11 71/13 85/9 86/8 95/19 |
| 157/5 158/25 | 211/10 211/16 211/19 | | 177/19 177/19 189/7 | 100/21 102/4 113/4 |
| retained [1] 17/6 | 212/2 212/4 213/10 216/9 219/9 220/4 | 213/21 rights [1] 8/16 | 191/7 191/17 193/23 195/24 196/4 196/12 | 113/5 113/10 113/14 |
| retaining [1] 10/20 | 224/19 | rigorous [1] 56/10 | 197/18 197/25 199/15 | 113/16 123/21 136/22 |
| retention [3] 14/19 | reviewer [20] 75/3 | risk [8] 33/6 33/18 | 207/14 212/16 212/16 | 146/21 153/21 154/20 |
| 17/1 22/20 | 101/23 106/9 106/10 | 74/5 74/7 74/9 75/8 | 213/1 214/6 214/22 | 175/22 178/21 198/3 |
| retrieve [1] 219/20 | 106/14 107/3 107/9 | 112/5 118/10 | 220/15 | 198/8 205/13 209/11 |
| return [3] 93/2 | 107/14 111/6 114/6 | | D | 010/10 017/10 010/11 |
| 162/22 101/10 | 107/14 111/0 114/0 | risks [12] 74/11 | Rule 9 [69] 28/18 | 216/18 217/13 218/14 |
| 163/23 191/10 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 | | 226/7 226/9 |
| returned [3] 97/9 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 83/16 83/19 84/6 89/9 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 184/16 185/16 185/22 187/22 187/24 188/8 189/14 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 68/4 68/20 69/7 87/14 87/24 89/22 138/24 138/24 139/16 141/10 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 108/21 115/18 116/20 117/6 117/17 117/21 119/4 134/13 140/24 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 14/23 17/4 17/19 18/9 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 83/16 83/19 84/6 89/9 89/12 103/14 104/16 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 184/16 185/16 185/22 187/22 187/24 188/8 189/14 reviewing [25] 1/23 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 68/4 68/20 69/7 87/14 87/24 89/22 138/24 138/24 139/16 141/10 141/12 141/20 143/25 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 108/21 115/18 116/20 117/6 117/17 117/21 119/4 134/13 140/24 141/18 141/25 152/7 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 14/23 17/4 17/19 18/9 19/14 19/15 24/4 24/6 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 83/16 83/19 84/6 89/9 89/12 103/14 104/16 104/17 105/8 105/24 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 184/16 185/16 185/22 187/22 187/24 188/8 189/14 reviewing [25] 1/23 49/17 102/21 103/2 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 68/4 68/20 69/7 87/14 87/24 89/22 138/24 138/24 139/16 141/10 141/12 141/20 143/25 155/19 156/22 157/1 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 108/21 115/18 116/20 117/6 117/17 117/21 119/4 134/13 140/24 141/18 141/25 152/7 160/4 160/8 167/8 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 14/23 17/4 17/19 18/9 19/14 19/15 24/4 24/6 27/10 28/3 28/7 29/11 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 83/16 83/19 84/6 89/9 89/12 103/14 104/16 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 184/16 185/16 185/22 187/22 187/24 188/8 189/14 reviewing [25] 1/23 49/17 102/21 103/2 105/5 106/15 114/7 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 68/4 68/20 69/7 87/14 87/24 89/22 138/24 138/24 139/16 141/10 141/12 141/20 143/25 155/19 156/22 157/1 166/25 167/11 167/19 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 108/21 115/18 116/20 117/6 117/17 117/21 119/4 134/13 140/24 141/18 141/25 152/7 160/4 160/8 167/8 167/18 170/9 170/10 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 14/23 17/4 17/19 18/9 19/14 19/15 24/4 24/6 27/10 28/3 28/7 29/11 39/3 39/13 44/10 50/9 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 83/16 83/19 84/6 89/9 89/12 103/14 104/16 104/17 105/8 105/24 105/25 106/8 106/10 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 184/16 185/16 185/22 187/22 187/24 188/8 189/14 reviewing [25] 1/23 49/17 102/21 103/2 105/5 106/15 114/7 143/2 143/23 165/11 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 68/4 68/20 69/7 87/14 87/24 89/22 138/24 138/24 139/16 141/10 141/12 141/20 143/25 155/19 156/22 157/1 166/25 167/11 167/19 178/3 185/15 185/17 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 108/21 115/18 116/20 117/6 117/17 117/21 119/4 134/13 140/24 141/18 141/25 152/7 160/4 160/8 167/8 167/18 170/9 170/10 170/14 173/3 174/6 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 14/23 17/4 17/19 18/9 19/14 19/15 24/4 24/6 27/10 28/3 28/7 29/11 39/3 39/13 44/10 50/9 52/18 56/2 56/22 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 83/16 83/19 84/6 89/9 89/12 103/14 104/16 104/17 105/8 105/24 105/25 106/8 106/10 111/22 112/1 113/23 118/18 118/23 118/24 119/13 121/4 121/10 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 184/16 185/16 185/22 187/22 187/24 188/8 189/14 reviewing [25] 1/23 49/17 102/21 103/2 105/5 106/15 114/7 143/2 143/23 165/11 171/11 179/4 179/6 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 68/4 68/20 69/7 87/14 87/24 89/22 138/24 138/24 139/16 141/10 141/12 141/20 143/25 155/19 156/22 157/1 166/25 167/11 167/19 178/3 185/15 185/17 186/1 194/6 206/19 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 108/21 115/18 116/20 117/6 117/17 117/21 119/4 134/13 140/24 141/18 141/25 152/7 160/4 160/8 167/8 167/18 170/9 170/10 170/14 173/3 174/6 174/7 177/19 189/7 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 14/23 17/4 17/19 18/9 19/14 19/15 24/4 24/6 27/10 28/3 28/7 29/11 39/3 39/13 44/10 50/9 52/18 56/2 56/22 61/25 62/25 63/20 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 83/16 83/19 84/6 89/9 89/12 103/14 104/16 104/17 105/8 105/24 105/25 106/8 106/10 111/22 112/1 113/23 118/18 118/23 118/24 119/13 121/4 121/10 124/21 125/1 125/3 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 184/16 185/16 185/22 187/22 187/24 188/8 189/14 reviewing [25] 1/23 49/17 102/21 103/2 105/5 106/15 114/7 143/2 143/23 165/11 171/11 179/4 179/6 179/21 179/24 180/5 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 68/4 68/20 69/7 87/14 87/24 89/22 138/24 138/24 139/16 141/10 141/12 141/20 143/25 155/19 156/22 157/1 166/25 167/11 167/19 178/3 185/15 185/17 186/1 194/6 206/19 roles [3] 9/1 135/24 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 108/21 115/18 116/20 117/6 117/17 117/21 119/4 134/13 140/24 141/18 141/25 152/7 160/4 160/8 167/8 167/18 170/9 170/10 170/14 173/3 174/6 174/7 177/19 189/7 191/17 193/23 195/24 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 14/23 17/4 17/19 18/9 19/14 19/15 24/4 24/6 27/10 28/3 28/7 29/11 39/3 39/13 44/10 50/9 52/18 56/2 56/22 61/25 62/25 63/20 64/7 65/8 69/3 71/16 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 83/16 83/19 84/6 89/9 89/12 103/14 104/16 104/17 105/8 105/24 105/25 106/8 106/10 111/22 112/1 113/23 118/18 118/23 118/24 119/13 121/4 121/10 124/21 125/1 125/3 125/8 125/20 126/24 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 184/16 185/16 185/22 187/22 187/24 188/8 189/14 reviewing [25] 1/23 49/17 102/21 103/2 105/5 106/15 114/7 143/2 143/23 165/11 171/11 179/4 179/6 179/21 179/24 180/5 181/11 184/16 186/4 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 68/4 68/20 69/7 87/14 87/24 89/22 138/24 138/24 139/16 141/10 141/12 141/20 143/25 155/19 156/22 157/1 166/25 167/11 167/19 178/3 185/15 185/17 186/1 194/6 206/19 roles [3] 9/1 135/24 156/22 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 108/21 115/18 116/20 117/6 117/17 117/21 119/4 134/13 140/24 141/18 141/25 152/7 160/4 160/8 167/8 167/18 170/9 170/10 170/14 173/3 174/6 174/7 177/19 189/7 191/17 193/23 195/24 196/4 196/12 197/18 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 14/23 17/4 17/19 18/9 19/14 19/15 24/4 24/6 27/10 28/3 28/7 29/11 39/3 39/13 44/10 50/9 52/18 56/2 56/22 61/25 62/25 63/20 64/7 65/8 69/3 71/16 72/1 72/8 72/10 73/24 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 83/16 83/19 84/6 89/9 89/12 103/14 104/16 104/17 105/8 105/24 105/25 106/8 106/10 111/22 112/1 113/23 118/18 118/23 118/24 119/13 121/4 121/10 124/21 125/1 125/3 125/8 125/20 126/24 128/10 129/6 129/17 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 184/16 185/16 185/22 187/22 187/24 188/8 189/14 reviewing [25] 1/23 49/17 102/21 103/2 105/5 106/15 114/7 143/2 143/23 165/11 171/11 179/4 179/6 179/21 179/24 180/5 181/11 184/16 186/4 186/22 188/21 189/4 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 68/4 68/20 69/7 87/14 87/24 89/22 138/24 138/24 139/16 141/10 141/12 141/20 143/25 155/19 156/22 157/1 166/25 167/11 167/19 178/3 185/15 185/17 186/1 194/6 206/19 roles [3] 9/1 135/24 156/22 room [3] 88/9 90/23 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 108/21 115/18 116/20 117/6 117/17 117/21 119/4 134/13 140/24 141/18 141/25 152/7 160/4 160/8 167/8 167/18 170/9 170/10 170/14 173/3 174/6 174/7 177/19 189/7 191/17 193/23 195/24 196/4 196/12 197/18 197/25 199/15 207/14 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 14/23 17/4 17/19 18/9 19/14 19/15 24/4 24/6 27/10 28/3 28/7 29/11 39/3 39/13 44/10 50/9 52/18 56/2 56/22 61/25 62/25 63/20 64/7 65/8 69/3 71/16 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 83/16 83/19 84/6 89/9 89/12 103/14 104/16 104/17 105/8 105/24 105/25 106/8 106/10 111/22 112/1 113/23 118/18 118/23 118/24 119/13 121/4 121/10 124/21 125/1 125/3 125/8 125/20 126/24 128/10 129/6 129/17 134/4 135/8 135/10 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 184/16 185/16 185/22 187/22 187/24 188/8 189/14 reviewing [25] 1/23 49/17 102/21 103/2 105/5 106/15 114/7 143/2 143/23 165/11 171/11 179/4 179/6 179/21 179/24 180/5 181/11 184/16 186/4 186/22 188/21 189/4 189/23 217/14 225/18 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 68/4 68/20 69/7 87/14 87/24 89/22 138/24 138/24 139/16 141/10 141/12 141/20 143/25 155/19 156/22 157/1 166/25 167/11 167/19 178/3 185/15 185/17 186/1 194/6 206/19 roles [3] 9/1 135/24 156/22 room [3] 88/9 90/23 98/20 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 108/21 115/18 116/20 117/6 117/17 117/21 119/4 134/13 140/24 141/18 141/25 152/7 160/4 160/8 167/8 167/18 170/9 170/10 170/14 173/3 174/6 174/7 177/19 189/7 191/17 193/23 195/24 196/4 196/12 197/18 197/25 199/15 207/14 213/1 214/6 214/22 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 14/23 17/4 17/19 18/9 19/14 19/15 24/4 24/6 27/10 28/3 28/7 29/11 39/3 39/13 44/10 50/9 52/18 56/2 56/22 61/25 62/25 63/20 64/7 65/8 69/3 71/16 72/1 72/8 72/10 73/24 74/1 75/17 79/4 87/25 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 83/16 83/19 84/6 89/9 89/12 103/14 104/16 104/17 105/8 105/24 105/25 106/8 106/10 111/22 112/1 113/23 118/18 118/23 118/24 119/13 121/4 121/10 124/21 125/1 125/3 125/8 125/20 126/24 128/10 129/6 129/17 134/4 135/8 135/10 135/12 135/13 135/16 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 184/16 185/16 185/22 187/22 187/24 188/8 189/14 reviewing [25] 1/23 49/17 102/21 103/2 105/5 106/15 114/7 143/2 143/23 165/11 171/11 179/4 179/6 179/21 179/24 180/5 181/11 184/16 186/4 186/22 188/21 189/4 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 68/4 68/20 69/7 87/14 87/24 89/22 138/24 138/24 139/16 141/10 141/12 141/20 143/25 155/19 156/22 157/1 166/25 167/11 167/19 178/3 185/15 185/17 186/1 194/6 206/19 roles [3] 9/1 135/24 156/22 room [3] 88/9 90/23 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 108/21 115/18 116/20 117/6 117/17 117/21 119/4 134/13 140/24 141/18 141/25 152/7 160/4 160/8 167/8 167/18 170/9 170/10 170/14 173/3 174/6 174/7 177/19 189/7 191/17 193/23 195/24 196/4 196/12 197/18 197/25 199/15 207/14 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 14/23 17/4 17/19 18/9 19/14 19/15 24/4 24/6 27/10 28/3 28/7 29/11 39/3 39/13 44/10 50/9 52/18 56/2 56/22 61/25 62/25 63/20 64/7 65/8 69/3 71/16 72/1 72/8 72/10 73/24 74/1 75/17 79/4 87/25 91/24 92/20 93/12 95/4 96/4 97/6 100/12 102/23 105/21 108/8 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 83/16 83/19 84/6 89/9 89/12 103/14 104/16 104/17 105/8 105/24 105/25 106/8 106/10 111/22 112/1 113/23 118/18 118/23 118/24 119/13 121/4 121/10 124/21 125/1 125/3 125/8 125/20 126/24 128/10 129/6 129/17 134/4 135/8 135/10 135/12 135/13 135/16 137/7 143/5 143/11 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 184/16 185/16 185/22 187/22 187/24 188/8 189/14 reviewing [25] 1/23 49/17 102/21 103/2 105/5 106/15 114/7 143/2 143/23 165/11 171/11 179/2 180/5 181/11 184/16 186/4 186/22 188/21 189/4 189/23 217/14 225/18 reviews [9] 59/19 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 68/4 68/20 69/7 87/14 87/24 89/22 138/24 138/24 139/16 141/10 141/12 141/20 143/25 155/19 156/22 157/1 166/25 167/11 167/19 178/3 185/15 185/17 186/1 194/6 206/19 roles [3] 9/1 135/24 156/22 room [3] 88/9 90/23 98/20 roughly [2] 27/21 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 108/21 115/18 116/20 117/6 117/17 117/21 119/4 134/13 140/24 141/18 141/25 152/7 160/4 160/8 167/8 167/18 170/9 170/10 170/14 173/3 174/6 174/7 177/19 189/7 191/17 193/23 195/24 196/4 196/12 197/18 197/25 199/15 207/14 213/1 214/6 214/22 Rule 9s [12] 65/19 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 14/23 17/4 17/19 18/9 19/14 19/15 24/4 24/6 27/10 28/3 28/7 29/11 39/3 39/13 44/10 50/9 52/18 56/2 56/22 61/25 62/25 63/20 64/7 65/8 69/3 71/16 72/1 72/8 72/10 73/24 74/1 75/17 79/4 87/25 91/24 92/20 93/12 95/4 96/4 97/6 100/12 102/23 105/21 108/8 109/3 112/12 113/18 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 83/16 83/19 84/6 89/9 89/12 103/14 104/16 104/17 105/8 105/24 105/25 106/8 106/10 111/22 112/1 113/23 118/18 118/23 118/24 119/13 121/4 121/10 124/21 125/1 125/3 125/8 125/20 126/24 128/10 129/6 129/17 134/4 135/8 135/10 135/12 135/13 135/16 137/7 143/5 143/11 143/14 144/19 144/21 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 184/16 185/16 185/22 187/22 187/24 188/8 189/14 reviewing [25] 1/23 49/17 102/21 103/2 105/5 106/15 114/7 143/2 143/23 165/11 171/11 179/4 179/6 179/21 179/24 180/5 181/11 184/16 186/4 186/22 188/21 189/4 189/23 217/14 225/18 reviews [9] 59/19 77/19 170/22 183/2 184/2 185/18 185/19 187/4 188/18 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 68/4 68/20 69/7 87/14 87/24 89/22 138/24 138/24 139/16 141/10 141/12 141/20 143/25 155/19 156/22 157/1 166/25 167/11 167/19 178/3 185/15 185/17 186/1 194/6 206/19 roles [3] 9/1 135/24 156/22 room [3] 88/9 90/23 98/20 roughly [2] 27/21 51/6 round [1] 124/13 routinely [2] 32/4 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 108/21 115/18 116/20 117/6 117/17 117/21 119/4 134/13 140/24 141/18 141/25 152/7 160/4 160/8 167/8 167/18 170/9 170/10 170/14 173/3 174/6 174/7 177/19 189/7 191/17 193/23 195/24 196/4 196/12 197/18 197/25 199/15 207/14 213/1 214/6 214/22 Rule 9s [12] 65/19 71/6 78/2 79/25 117/11 119/6 119/6 119/24 170/2 172/21 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 14/23 17/4 17/19 18/9 19/14 19/15 24/4 24/6 27/10 28/3 28/7 29/11 39/3 39/13 44/10 50/9 52/18 56/2 56/22 61/25 62/25 63/20 64/7 65/8 69/3 71/16 72/1 72/8 72/10 73/24 74/1 75/17 79/4 87/25 91/24 92/20 93/12 95/4 96/4 97/6 100/12 102/23 105/21 108/8 109/3 112/12 113/18 116/12 117/4 117/20 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 83/16 83/19 84/6 89/9 89/12 103/14 104/16 104/17 105/8 105/24 105/25 106/8 106/10 111/22 112/1 113/23 118/18 118/23 118/24 119/13 121/4 121/10 124/21 125/1 125/3 125/8 125/20 126/24 128/10 129/6 129/17 134/4 135/8 135/10 135/12 135/13 135/16 137/7 143/5 143/11 143/14 144/19 144/21 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 184/16 185/16 185/22 187/22 187/24 188/8 189/14 reviewing [25] 1/23 49/17 102/21 103/2 105/5 106/15 114/7 143/2 143/23 165/11 171/11 179/4 179/6 179/21 179/24 180/5 181/11 184/16 186/4 186/22 188/21 189/4 189/23 217/14 225/18 reviews [9] 59/19 77/19 170/22 183/2 184/2 185/18 185/19 187/4 188/18 revise [1] 142/14 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 68/4 68/20 69/7 87/14 87/24 89/22 138/24 138/24 139/16 141/10 141/12 141/20 143/25 155/19 156/22 157/1 166/25 167/11 167/19 178/3 185/15 185/17 186/1 194/6 206/19 roles [3] 9/1 135/24 156/22 room [3] 88/9 90/23 98/20 roughly [2] 27/21 51/6 round [1] 124/13 routinely [2] 32/4 187/4 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 108/21 115/18 116/20 117/6 117/17 117/21 119/4 134/13 140/24 141/18 141/25 152/7 160/4 160/8 167/8 167/18 170/9 170/10 170/14 173/3 174/6 174/7 177/19 189/7 191/17 193/23 195/24 196/4 196/12 197/18 197/25 199/15 207/14 213/1 214/6 214/22 Rule 9s [12] 65/19 71/6 78/2 79/25 117/11 119/6 119/6 119/24 170/2 172/21 212/16 212/16 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 14/23 17/4 17/19 18/9 19/14 19/15 24/4 24/6 27/10 28/3 28/7 29/11 39/3 39/13 44/10 50/9 52/18 56/2 56/22 61/25 62/25 63/20 64/7 65/8 69/3 71/16 72/1 72/8 72/10 73/24 74/1 75/17 79/4 87/25 91/24 92/20 93/12 95/4 96/4 97/6 100/12 102/23 105/21 108/8 109/3 112/12 113/18 116/12 117/4 117/20 117/22 128/2 128/16 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 83/16 83/19 84/6 89/9 89/12 103/14 104/16 104/17 105/8 105/24 105/25 106/8 106/10 111/22 112/1 113/23 118/18 118/23 118/24 119/13 121/4 121/10 124/21 125/1 125/3 125/8 125/20 126/24 128/10 129/6 129/17 134/4 135/8 135/10 135/12 135/13 135/16 137/7 143/5 143/11 143/14 144/19 144/21 145/2 145/15 146/1 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 184/16 185/16 185/22 187/22 187/24 188/8 189/14 reviewing [25] 1/23 49/17 102/21 103/2 105/5 106/15 114/7 143/2 143/23 165/11 171/11 179/4 179/6 179/21 179/24 180/5 181/11 184/16 186/4 186/22 188/21 189/4 189/23 217/14 225/18 reviews [9] 59/19 77/19 170/22 183/2 187/4 188/18 revise [1] 142/14 revised [1] 48/23 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 68/4 68/20 69/7 87/14 87/24 89/22 138/24 138/24 139/16 141/10 141/12 141/20 143/25 155/19 156/22 157/1 166/25 167/11 167/19 178/3 185/15 185/17 186/1 194/6 206/19 roles [3] 9/1 135/24 156/22 room [3] 88/9 90/23 98/20 roughly [2] 27/21 51/6 round [1] 124/13 routinely [2] 32/4 187/4 Rowan [10] 1/19 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 108/21 115/18 116/20 117/6 117/17 117/21 119/4 134/13 140/24 141/18 141/25 152/7 160/4 160/8 167/8 167/18 170/9 170/10 170/14 173/3 174/6 174/7 177/19 189/7 191/17 193/23 195/24 196/4 196/12 197/18 197/25 199/15 207/14 213/1 214/6 214/22 Rule 9s [12] 65/19 71/6 78/2 79/25 117/11 119/6 119/6 119/24 170/2 172/21 212/16 212/16 rules [1] 201/13 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 14/23 17/4 17/19 18/9 19/14 19/15 24/4 24/6 27/10 28/3 28/7 29/11 39/3 39/13 44/10 50/9 52/18 56/2 56/22 61/25 62/25 63/20 64/7 65/8 69/3 71/16 72/1 72/8 72/10 73/24 74/1 75/17 79/4 87/25 91/24 92/20 93/12 95/4 96/4 97/6 100/12 102/23 105/21 108/8 109/3 112/12 113/18 116/12 117/4 117/20 117/22 128/2 128/16 134/6 134/12 134/20 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 83/16 83/19 84/6 89/9 89/12 103/14 104/16 104/17 105/8 105/24 105/25 106/8 106/10 111/22 112/1 113/23 118/18 118/23 118/24 119/13 121/4 121/10 124/21 125/1 125/3 125/8 125/20 126/24 128/10 129/6 129/17 134/4 135/8 135/10 135/12 135/13 135/16 137/7 143/5 143/11 143/14 144/19 144/21 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 184/16 185/16 185/22 187/22 187/24 188/8 189/14 reviewing [25] 1/23 49/17 102/21 103/2 105/5 106/15 114/7 143/2 143/23 165/11 171/11 179/4 179/6 179/21 179/24 180/5 181/11 184/16 186/4 186/22 188/21 189/4 189/23 217/14 225/18 reviews [9] 59/19 77/19 170/22 183/2 187/4 188/18 revise [1] 142/14 revised [1] 48/23 revisited [1] 191/6 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 68/4 68/20 69/7 87/14 87/24 89/22 138/24 138/24 139/16 141/10 141/12 141/20 143/25 155/19 156/22 157/1 166/25 167/11 167/19 178/3 185/15 185/17 186/1 194/6 206/19 roles [3] 9/1 135/24 156/22 room [3] 88/9 90/23 98/20 roughly [2] 27/21 51/6 round [1] 124/13 routinely [2] 32/4 187/4 Rowan [10] 1/19 164/8 164/10 164/12 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 108/21 115/18 116/20 117/6 117/17 117/21 119/4 134/13 140/24 141/18 141/25 152/7 160/4 160/8 167/8 167/18 170/9 170/10 170/14 173/3 174/6 174/7 177/19 189/7 191/17 193/23 195/24 196/4 196/12 197/18 197/25 199/15 207/14 213/1 214/6 214/22 Rule 9s [12] 65/19 71/6 78/2 79/25 117/11 119/6 119/6 119/24 170/2 172/21 212/16 212/16 rules [1] 201/13 run [9] 15/22 16/4 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 14/23 17/4 17/19 18/9 19/14 19/15 24/4 24/6 27/10 28/3 28/7 29/11 39/3 39/13 44/10 50/9 52/18 56/2 56/22 61/25 62/25 63/20 64/7 65/8 69/3 71/16 72/1 72/8 72/10 73/24 74/1 75/17 79/4 87/25 91/24 92/20 93/12 95/4 96/4 97/6 100/12 102/23 105/21 108/8 109/3 112/12 113/18 116/12 117/4 117/20 117/22 128/2 128/16 134/6 134/12 134/20 137/20 139/14 142/21 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 83/16 83/19 84/6 89/9 89/12 103/14 104/16 104/17 105/8 105/24 105/25 106/8 106/10 111/22 112/1 113/23 118/18 118/23 118/24 119/13 121/4 121/10 124/21 125/1 125/3 125/8 125/20 126/24 128/10 129/6 129/17 134/4 135/8 135/10 135/12 135/13 135/16 137/7 143/5 143/11 143/14 144/19 144/21 145/2 145/15 146/1 146/6 150/6 153/19 154/5 155/15 155/16 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 184/16 185/16 185/22 187/22 187/24 188/8 189/14 reviewing [25] 1/23 49/17 102/21 103/2 105/5 106/15 114/7 143/2 143/23 165/11 171/11 179/4 179/6 179/21 179/24 180/5 181/11 184/16 186/4 186/22 188/21 189/4 189/23 217/14 225/18 reviews [9] 59/19 77/19 170/22 183/2 187/4 188/18 revise [1] 142/14 revised [1] 48/23 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 68/4 68/20 69/7 87/14 87/24 89/22 138/24 138/24 139/16 141/10 141/12 141/20 143/25 155/19 156/22 157/1 166/25 167/11 167/19 178/3 185/15 185/17 186/1 194/6 206/19 roles [3] 9/1 135/24 156/22 room [3] 88/9 90/23 98/20 roughly [2] 27/21 51/6 round [1] 124/13 routinely [2] 32/4 187/4 Rowan [10] 1/19 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 108/21 115/18 116/20 117/6 117/17 117/21 119/4 134/13 140/24 141/18 141/25 152/7 160/4 160/8 167/8 167/18 170/9 170/10 170/14 173/3 174/6 174/7 177/19 189/7 191/17 193/23 195/24 196/4 196/12 197/18 197/25 199/15 207/14 213/1 214/6 214/22 Rule 9s [12] 65/19 71/6 78/2 79/25 117/11 119/6 119/6 119/24 170/2 172/21 212/16 212/16 rules [1] 201/13 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 14/23 17/4 17/19 18/9 19/14 19/15 24/4 24/6 27/10 28/3 28/7 29/11 39/3 39/13 44/10 50/9 52/18 56/2 56/22 61/25 62/25 63/20 64/7 65/8 69/3 71/16 72/1 72/8 72/10 73/24 74/1 75/17 79/4 87/25 91/24 92/20 93/12 95/4 96/4 97/6 100/12 102/23 105/21 108/8 109/3 112/12 113/18 116/12 117/4 117/20 117/22 128/2 128/16 134/6 134/12 134/20 137/20 139/14 142/21 |
| returned [3] 97/9 100/19 103/12 revealed [3] 79/18 79/18 98/8 revert [1] 68/14 reverting [2] 62/5 62/17 review [106] 29/23 29/24 56/8 56/19 59/5 59/8 69/24 70/24 82/19 82/20 83/12 83/16 83/19 84/6 89/9 89/12 103/14 104/16 104/17 105/8 105/24 105/25 106/8 106/10 111/22 112/1 113/23 118/18 118/23 118/24 119/13 121/4 121/10 124/21 125/1 125/3 125/8 125/20 126/24 128/10 129/6 129/17 134/4 135/8 135/10 135/12 135/13 135/16 137/7 143/5 143/11 143/14 144/19 144/21 145/2 145/15 146/1 146/6 150/6 153/19 154/5 155/15 155/16 | 114/21 115/1 179/15 184/18 184/24 186/5 186/18 212/4 212/8 212/21 reviewer's [2] 114/9 114/12 reviewers [16] 105/23 105/24 108/8 119/20 120/1 150/23 182/12 183/6 184/3 184/16 185/16 185/22 187/22 187/24 188/8 189/14 reviewing [25] 1/23 49/17 102/21 103/2 105/5 106/15 114/7 143/2 143/23 165/11 171/11 179/4 179/6 179/21 179/24 180/5 181/11 184/16 186/4 186/22 188/21 189/4 189/23 217/14 225/18 reviews [9] 59/19 77/19 170/22 183/2 187/4 188/18 revise [1] 142/14 revised [1] 48/23 revisited [1] 191/6 | 74/15 74/17 75/1 75/5 75/23 76/3 76/8 76/17 76/23 77/1 122/8 RLR [2] 139/1 143/24 role [45] 7/7 7/10 7/12 8/14 8/15 8/17 9/4 13/21 24/2 24/5 26/7 36/21 36/25 37/20 46/13 50/24 51/2 51/3 51/8 57/23 68/4 68/20 69/7 87/14 87/24 89/22 138/24 138/24 139/16 141/10 141/12 141/20 143/25 155/19 156/22 157/1 166/25 167/11 167/19 178/3 185/15 185/17 186/1 194/6 206/19 roles [3] 9/1 135/24 156/22 room [3] 88/9 90/23 98/20 roughly [2] 27/21 51/6 round [1] 124/13 routinely [2] 32/4 187/4 Rowan [10] 1/19 164/8 164/10 164/12 | 28/19 28/24 29/15 30/5 31/17 33/2 33/2 33/25 37/21 38/8 41/13 43/6 48/23 66/8 67/25 76/16 84/17 88/8 90/13 90/21 91/20 92/10 92/11 92/19 93/5 95/15 104/14 104/15 104/16 104/20 104/22 105/1 108/21 115/18 116/20 117/6 117/17 117/21 119/4 134/13 140/24 141/18 141/25 152/7 160/4 160/8 167/8 167/18 170/9 170/10 170/14 173/3 174/6 174/7 177/19 189/7 191/17 193/23 195/24 196/4 196/12 197/18 197/25 199/15 207/14 213/1 214/6 214/22 Rule 9s [12] 65/19 71/6 78/2 79/25 117/11 119/6 119/6 119/24 170/2 172/21 212/16 212/16 rules [1] 201/13 run [9] 15/22 16/4 | 226/7 226/9 sampling [1] 59/13 sat [6] 7/15 8/12 8/13 42/11 42/16 175/21 satisfied [2] 187/7 204/2 save [3] 22/16 60/3 197/2 saw [2] 100/22 140/21 say [118] 7/16 11/23 12/7 13/16 14/9 14/14 14/23 17/4 17/19 18/9 19/14 19/15 24/4 24/6 27/10 28/3 28/7 29/11 39/3 39/13 44/10 50/9 52/18 56/2 56/22 61/25 62/25 63/20 64/7 65/8 69/3 71/16 72/1 72/8 72/10 73/24 74/1 75/17 79/4 87/25 91/24 92/20 93/12 95/4 96/4 97/6 100/12 102/23 105/21 108/8 109/3 112/12 113/18 116/12 117/4 117/20 117/22 128/2 128/16 134/6 134/12 134/20 137/20 139/14 142/21 |

(83) responsive... - say

| S | 86/19 86/21 87/21 | 171/1 191/10 191/25 | 206/15 216/24 | 45/15 46/14 64/5 |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| | 88/11 89/8 89/12 90/2 | 192/5 192/13 214/13 | seems [3] 99/9 108/1 | 70/21 105/22 111/2 |
| say [50] 149/16 151/3 153/24 155/14 | 90/6 90/24 92/2 92/6 | 216/19 | 153/9 | 123/18 125/23 127/19 |
| 158/21 160/4 173/14 | 92/18 93/4 93/12 | searching [3] 82/24 | seen [21] 94/1 94/16 | 128/4 130/18 132/19 |
| 176/19 177/3 178/11 | 93/15 93/25 94/12 | 115/19 137/4 | 97/17 101/6 106/23 | 138/11 144/18 145/17 |
| 180/7 181/2 182/10 | 94/16 94/24 95/5 | second [15] 6/23 | 120/9 139/14 139/15 | 149/12 150/6 153/10 |
| 184/7 184/9 185/21 | 95/12 95/17 95/23 | 25/25 29/23 70/8 90/8 | | 153/12 154/2 159/16 |
| 187/5 188/25 191/16 | 96/1 96/6 96/9 96/14 | 91/21 113/12 153/12 | 141/24 142/3 142/5 | 161/21 185/18 190/15 |
| 193/2 193/12 194/3 | 96/18 96/24 97/2 | 159/16 187/15 187/24 | | 191/14 198/1 198/25 |
| 194/11 194/22 195/3 | 97/10 97/11 99/8 99/13 100/6 100/11 | 188/17 189/14 189/17 201/9 | 189/4 189/6 194/19 219/20 | 204/17 205/2 206/7 206/16 221/2 222/13 |
| 195/8 195/9 195/19 | 100/19 101/1 101/4 | second-level [3] | selected [5] 95/5 | 200/10/22/12/222/13 |
| 196/2 196/14 196/22 | 101/10 101/12 101/14 | | | sets [1] 185/21 |
| 197/21 198/12 198/16 | 101/14 101/17 101/20 | | 151/9 | setting [4] 45/25 |
| 201/8 203/15 204/19 | 101/22 102/1 102/8 | secondee [1] 8/15 | send [4] 27/19 30/7 | 190/12 200/2 221/11 |
| 211/8 213/11 214/18 | 102/9 102/12 102/15 | seconding [1] 44/19 | 178/25 191/17 | settled [5] 96/15 |
| 215/11 215/23 215/25 | 103/12 103/24 108/11 | | senior [27] 25/4 27/3 | 97/20 101/15 172/9 |
| 217/22 219/8 221/6 221/15 221/24 227/3 | 110/14 120/10 120/23 | | 61/9 106/24 123/2 | 172/22 |
| 227/25 | 121/7 122/1 128/14 | 84/8 112/21 159/5 | 123/15 137/6 147/9 | settling [1] 171/10 |
| saying [26] 19/8 | 128/15 138/22 138/25 | | 147/13 147/19 148/1 | seven [4] 13/2 113/9 |
| 29/12 39/11 39/14 | 139/3 139/22 140/21 | secondment [1] | 148/3 148/8 148/9 | 138/8 212/5 |
| 39/15 73/14 84/3 | 140/22 141/2 141/7 | 10/19 | | severe [3] 219/23 |
| 91/11 96/17 101/4 | 141/10 141/11 142/5 | secretariat [2] 19/4 | 155/6 176/1 176/2 | 220/1 220/3 |
| 105/1 120/4 120/4 | 142/6 142/11 142/18 | 35/23 | 176/6 183/7 190/12 | severely [1] 36/12 |
| 141/1 143/10 143/12 | 143/7 144/19 144/21 | secretaries [1] 35/23 | 211/9 212/2 212/4 | shades [1] 73/16 |
| 171/5 175/22 199/20 | 144/23 149/20 153/3 | section [2] 134/14 | 217/3 | share [4] 195/5 195/7 |
| 200/13 202/7 210/4 | 153/11 159/5 160/18 161/22 162/13 163/6 | 196/1 section 21 [1] 134/14 | sense [7] 25/4 25/23 26/11 54/12 69/5 71/6 | 195/8 195/18 |
| 213/22 217/3 218/16 | 163/8 165/11 169/21 | secure [1] 13/19 | 124/22 | 96/10 162/20 174/10 |
| 224/12 | 170/22 171/10 171/14 | | sensible [1] 192/7 | 194/23 195/4 195/10 |
| says [8] 2/19 33/5 | 171/18 172/3 179/15 | security [6] 93/8 | sent [11] 2/11 29/12 | 195/15 196/18 207/18 |
| 33/19 34/7 125/22 | 179/16 189/3 192/11 | 98/10 137/1 201/19 | 29/24 39/3 39/4 39/14 | |
| | 193/6 193/6 193/11 | 203/2 204/3 | 40/18 40/20 98/11 | 196/20 |
| scale [5] 72/18 82/11 82/12 126/23 168/5 | 194/2 194/10 194/13 | see [62] 1/3 6/12 | 110/23 193/6 | she [4] 45/5 114/11 |
| scattergun [1] 18/22 | 194/17 194/18 194/23 | 8/25 9/25 21/20 47/9 | sentence [7] 48/20 | 151/24 172/17 |
| scenario [1] 13/23 | 195/1 195/3 195/5 | 49/13 69/21 73/6 | 48/22 177/6 194/22 | sheer [1] 41/4 |
| scenarios [2] 23/10 | 195/14 195/18 195/22 | | | shook [1] 188/10 |
| 45/23 | 196/2 196/7 196/18 | 86/17 90/21 91/11 | separate [2] 25/21 | short [9] 11/13 11/18 |
| scenes [1] 167/20 | 196/21 197/6 197/17 | 96/12 97/23 101/24 | 126/20 | 16/2 24/9 45/1 47/7 |
| scheme [2] 123/15 | 204/16 204/20 204/21 | 104/19 107/23 108/4 | separately [1] 155/8 | 131/8 164/3 227/10 |
| 123/22 | 205/2 205/4 205/8 205/10 205/16 205/19 | 108/15 108/17 108/19 108/20 110/5 111/11 | 126/23 | shortcomings [1] 162/4 |
| schemes [1] 123/23 | 205/20 205/21 205/25 | 114/6 114/22 115/1 | September [13] 1/1 | shorten [1] 120/15 |
| scope [2] 11/24 44/2 | 206/2 206/8 206/9 | 121/22 125/11 131/10 | | shorter [2] 26/8 |
| scoped [1] 198/20 | 206/11 206/18 206/23 | 140/9 140/16 140/19 | 130/15 223/3 223/20 | 26/22 |
| scrabble [1] 220/23 | 208/12 208/21 209/1 | 140/23 141/19 143/1 | 224/5 224/7 227/14 | shortfalls [1] 207/6 |
| screen [5] 4/3 11/21 60/12 106/17 106/18 | 209/25 211/15 216/20 | | 227/21 228/4 228/5 | shortly [4] 23/4 45/4 |
| scroll [5] 125/21 | 218/14 220/11 | 151/13 153/15 153/17 | | 214/13 214/15 |
| 151/23 182/2 191/14 | search-term [1] | 156/13 156/15 164/5 | 66/25 98/11 110/24 | should [46] 2/22 3/14 |
| 201/8 | 209/25 | 164/21 176/4 176/5 | 115/8 154/10 | 18/8 21/6 22/16 31/25 |
| scrolling [1] 34/11 | searchable [1] | 178/12 184/7 185/25 | seriously [2] 72/7 | 40/10 47/23 81/20 |
| search [182] 28/8 | 140/12 | 186/1 199/1 214/5 | 72/11 | 84/14 89/25 91/17 |
| 28/15 29/1 29/4 29/9 | searched [6] 35/4 | 218/8 222/12 227/13 | served [1] 193/24 | 95/13 95/18 96/1 |
| 29/18 30/15 30/18 | 76/15 129/13 134/4 156/25 191/22 | 228/4 | service [2] 136/3 215/14 | 96/25 103/8 106/21 107/9 108/14 108/17 |
| 31/24 31/25 35/3 | searches [33] 14/25 | seeing [2] 58/19 89/20 | Services [5] 50/6 | 108/19 120/1 120/23 |
| 35/17 49/17 56/18 | 19/18 29/19 30/6 | seek [8] 49/15 49/21 | 182/13 182/17 183/2 | 128/2 132/3 140/4 |
| 59/18 59/19 66/6 | 31/16 31/18 43/21 | 50/14 56/7 74/15 92/6 | | 146/24 149/16 157/6 |
| 69/15 69/20 70/9 | 56/1 56/7 74/23 74/25 | 94/13 165/14 | serving [1] 119/25 | 158/16 164/19 164/21 |
| 70/13 70/20 71/3 | 83/18 87/3 87/18 | seeking [5] 13/24 | session [1] 49/13 | 176/19 178/11 184/10 |
| 77/10 82/18 82/24 | 100/16 115/4 116/19 | 25/18 201/12 207/8 | sessions [2] 127/10 | 184/21 186/21 187/9 |
| 83/11 83/15 84/5 84/13 84/16 84/24 | 117/6 122/6 129/2 | 213/16 | 127/17 | 187/12 193/1 194/19 |
| 85/20 86/1 86/3 86/6 | 138/15 146/21 152/6 | seeks [1] 208/20 | set [42] 22/2 28/16 | 195/11 196/1 197/2 |
| | 158/24 159/23 160/2 | seemed [3] 160/1 | 28/18 29/14 35/3 37/7 | 217/22 |
| | | | | |
| L | | | | |

(84) say... - should

| S | sir [21] 1/3 2/6 2/15 | 133/17 133/24 139/16 | sort [11] 7/24 36/10 | stage [14] 4/25 27/2 |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| | 3/3 3/7 46/9 46/10 | 142/13 153/15 159/1 | 87/25 89/24 95/25 | 57/25 65/17 127/7 |
| shouldn't [5] 82/2 | 47/1 47/9 130/22 | 159/1 161/8 167/14 | 97/19 106/20 141/16 | 130/4 145/21 146/1 |
| 108/9 120/3 143/11 | 131/10 131/13 163/17 | 219/4 | 142/10 173/25 178/12 | 181/22 187/15 187/20 |
| 191/8 | 163/21 163/22 164/5 | solution [10] 78/8 | sorts [2] 89/22 | 189/18 207/22 227/10 |
| showed [1] 141/14 | 226/17 227/12 227/22 | 78/11 146/3 146/10 | 192/25 | stages [5] 59/5 59/14 |
| showing [1] 154/9 | 228/6 229/6 | 147/3 147/16 147/24 | sought [9] 28/8 88/20 | |
| shown [3] 106/16 | sit [5] 88/9 119/19 | 147/24 148/12 152/20 | | standalone [1] |
| 207/6 226/19 | 121/4 200/22 226/1 | solutions [2] 77/21 | 198/18 201/20 205/4 | 200/25 |
| shows [1] 149/10 | site [2] 59/7 126/5 | 156/20 | 209/14 | standard [5] 115/7 |
| sic [3] 50/5 195/6 | sites [2] 18/19 | some [76] 5/17 5/24 | sound [1] 95/14 | 115/22 134/8 135/1 |
| 202/3 | 125/11 | 6/8 11/19 19/8 19/9 | sounds [2] 30/13 | 155/9 |
| side [20] 7/24 25/20 | sits [3] 64/12 106/5 | 19/10 19/21 20/11 | 217/17 | standards [2] 98/9 |
| 30/21 30/23 30/24 | 121/5 | 20/12 25/1 25/2 26/13 | | 124/15 |
| 31/12 36/16 38/22 | sitting [2] 143/15 | 28/19 40/2 42/5 42/6 | sources [1] 180/11 | standing [8] 65/9 |
| 39/2 39/14 135/8 | 150/11 | 45/5 56/4 57/18 59/3 | space [3] 11/13 15/3 | 75/18 79/11 79/17 |
| | situation [4] 19/25 | 59/14 60/1 76/11 77/3 | | 80/12 107/11 107/16 |
| 148/1 148/2 148/7 | 158/7 191/5 216/4 | 78/16 80/22 81/25 | spaces [1] 157/2 | 133/20 |
| 148/9 157/1 157/23 | six [5] 13/2 138/8 | 82/2 83/11 87/8 89/8 | speak [10] 10/23 | stands [1] 169/7 |
| sight [5] 66/8 66/9 | 129/9 129/0 212/5 | 91/10 91/18 92/4 96/6 | | start [12] 2/6 4/4 |
| 135/17 171/13 171/15 | size [5] 40/1 40/12 | 96/8 98/12 98/13 | 75/13 174/5 174/14 | 49/25 82/3 101/21 |
| sign [1] 162/20 | 129/17 137/23 138/14 | 103/6 109/7 110/10 | 178/2 178/24 192/19 | 102/5 104/22 105/1 |
| sign-off [1] 162/20 | sizes [1] 128/12 | 117/8 122/5 125/5 | speaking [7] 39/8 | 137/23 153/9 165/17 |
| signature [4] 3/19 48/2 132/8 164/21 | skip [1] 204/18 | 125/12 125/14 125/16 | | 222/7 |
| | slightly [8] 30/17 | 126/19 128/3 130/13 | 173/6 178/23 185/19 | started [9] 12/14 |
| significance [1] 151/13 | 95/9 106/6 125/6 | 130/15 134/17 136/11 | speaks [1] 117/16 | 16/22 25/13 25/16 |
| | 130/22 159/3 166/17 | 136/23 137/3 148/19 | specialist [8] 83/23 | 59/8 136/13 136/24 |
| significant [24] 9/17 13/20 13/21 26/9 35/6 | 205/14 | 155/10 156/20 157/11 | 89/14 89/17 94/3 94/9 | 138/13 144/18 |
| 61/3 72/23 113/21 | slowing [1] 77/17 | 158/1 158/18 158/22 | 122/12 122/23 123/9 | starting [4] 102/8 |
| 114/3 115/8 127/9 | slowly [1] 48/15 | 158/24 168/12 171/14 | specialists [2] | 106/20 129/25 134/2 |
| 138/18 139/8 143/16 | small [11] 11/14 | 188/3 194/14 195/5 | 166/14 218/1 | starts [2] 102/10 |
| 145/13 147/4 147/4 | 11/15 11/16 18/5 20/7 | 211/11 212/10 216/9 | species [2] 182/6 | 222/24 |
| 152/19 155/1 157/21 | 20/8 26/20 36/15 | 216/23 222/22 224/14 | | state [1] 18/16 |
| 174/22 220/19 225/23 | 45/12 167/25 224/15 | 227/24 | specific [33] 22/3 | statement [89] 1/24 |
| 226/15 | smaller [4] 126/23 | somebody [11] 6/10 | 28/20 35/14 35/18 | 2/3 3/15 3/18 3/22 4/1 |
| significantly [5] | 160/23 161/7 219/12 | 27/3 30/11 32/20 | 36/6 37/13 44/2 53/19 | |
| 60/21 92/11 93/13 | Smith [47] 7/14 8/24 | 35/11 38/13 41/8 | 58/13 62/6 62/18 68/5 | 19/5 21/3 23/3 24/4 |
| 190/17 207/25 | 9/2 24/3 24/20 25/6 | 44/23 107/22 133/12 | 68/14 76/17 77/10 | 28/4 30/14 31/8 47/22 |
| signing [5] 64/16 | 25/24 26/6 28/5 31/13 | | 84/16 95/1 119/23 | 47/24 49/5 49/9 49/11 |
| 64/17 64/19 64/25 | 31/15 35/3 35/12 | someone [6] 17/22 | 120/13 122/20 169/10 | 50/25 51/12 52/16 |
| 65/1 | 0 = 14 0 0 = 10 = 40104 | 1 7/02 100/2 102/1 | 1 1 / //16 10///26 106//21 | |
| | 35/16 35/25 40/24 | 17/23 108/3 123/1 | 177/15 194/25 195/21 | 55/15 61/16 63/10 |
| | 40/25 41/18 57/23 | 138/18 144/4 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 |
| silks [1] 166/21 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 |
| | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 similarly [1] 34/11 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 116/17 125/18 133/11 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 159/21 168/9 186/13 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 205/4 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 105/21 111/18 112/10 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 similarly [1] 34/11 simple [7] 15/10 28/20 78/17 113/2 155/25 175/5 191/2 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 116/17 125/18 133/11 135/17 138/17 142/15 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 159/21 168/9 186/13 187/3 226/19 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 205/4 speculating [2] 46/3 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 105/21 111/18 112/10 117/16 121/2 121/19 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 similarly [1] 34/11 simple [7] 15/10 28/20 78/17 113/2 155/25 175/5 191/2 simply [9] 13/8 16/12 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 116/17 125/18 133/11 135/17 138/17 142/15 147/17 148/2 152/2 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 159/21 168/9 186/13 187/3 226/19 sometimes [7] 29/21 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 205/4 speculating [2] 46/3 144/1 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 105/21 111/18 112/10 117/16 121/2 121/19 131/3 132/4 132/8 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 similarly [1] 34/11 simple [7] 15/10 28/20 78/17 113/2 155/25 175/5 191/2 simply [9] 13/8 16/12 21/16 38/23 44/19 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 116/17 125/18 133/11 135/17 138/17 142/15 147/17 148/2 152/2 152/13 154/12 154/22 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 159/21 168/9 186/13 187/3 226/19 sometimes [7] 29/21 40/7 57/14 84/10 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 205/4 speculating [2] 46/3 144/1 speed [1] 25/8 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 105/21 111/18 112/10 117/16 121/2 121/19 131/3 132/4 132/8 132/11 132/15 132/18 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 similarly [1] 34/11 simple [7] 15/10 28/20 78/17 113/2 155/25 175/5 191/2 simply [9] 13/8 16/12 21/16 38/23 44/19 45/21 111/6 176/13 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 116/17 125/18 133/11 135/17 138/17 142/15 147/17 148/2 152/2 152/13 154/12 154/22 155/1 160/22 161/17 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 159/21 168/9 186/13 187/3 226/19 sometimes [7] 29/21 40/7 57/14 84/10 134/21 163/10 191/6 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 205/4 speculating [2] 46/3 144/1 speed [1] 25/8 spend [3] 27/16 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 105/21 111/18 112/10 117/16 121/2 121/19 131/3 132/4 132/8 132/11 132/15 132/18 133/4 142/21 149/4 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 similarly [1] 34/11 simple [7] 15/10 28/20 78/17 113/2 155/25 175/5 191/2 simply [9] 13/8 16/12 21/16 38/23 44/19 45/21 111/6 176/13 181/9 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 116/17 125/18 133/11 135/17 138/17 142/15 147/17 148/2 152/2 152/13 154/12 154/22 155/1 160/22 161/17 Smith's [2] 24/12 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 159/21 168/9 186/13 187/3 226/19 sometimes [7] 29/21 40/7 57/14 84/10 134/21 163/10 191/6 somewhere [2] 27/12 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 205/4 speculating [2] 46/3 144/1 speed [1] 25/8 spend [3] 27/16 50/25 168/12 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 105/21 111/18 112/10 117/16 121/2 121/19 131/3 132/4 132/8 132/11 132/15 132/18 133/4 142/21 149/4 151/21 151/22 154/15 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 similarly [1] 34/11 simple [7] 15/10 28/20 78/17 113/2 155/25 175/5 191/2 simply [9] 13/8 16/12 21/16 38/23 44/19 45/21 111/6 176/13 181/9 since [18] 4/17 23/17 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 116/17 125/18 133/11 135/17 138/17 142/15 147/17 148/2 152/2 152/13 154/12 154/22 155/1 160/22 161/17 Smith's [2] 24/12 26/2 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 159/21 168/9 186/13 187/3 226/19 sometimes [7] 29/21 40/7 57/14 84/10 134/21 163/10 191/6 somewhere [2] 27/12 161/17 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 205/4 speculating [2] 46/3 144/1 speed [1] 25/8 spend [3] 27/16 50/25 168/12 spent [4] 13/21 13/22 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 105/21 111/18 112/10 117/16 121/2 121/19 131/3 132/4 132/8 132/11 132/15 132/18 133/4 142/21 149/4 151/21 151/22 154/15 161/22 163/19 164/18 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 similarly [1] 34/11 simple [7] 15/10 28/20 78/17 113/2 155/25 175/5 191/2 simply [9] 13/8 16/12 21/16 38/23 44/19 45/21 111/6 176/13 181/9 since [18] 4/17 23/17 33/13 33/23 52/24 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 116/17 125/18 133/11 135/17 138/17 142/15 147/17 148/2 152/2 152/13 154/12 154/22 155/1 160/22 161/17 Smith's [2] 24/12 26/2 Smiths [7] 26/13 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 159/21 168/9 186/13 187/3 226/19 sometimes [7] 29/21 40/7 57/14 84/10 134/21 163/10 191/6 somewhere [2] 27/12 161/17 sorry [30] 33/16 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 205/4 speculating [2] 46/3 144/1 speed [1] 25/8 spend [3] 27/16 50/25 168/12 spent [4] 13/21 13/22 14/3 88/12 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 105/21 111/18 112/10 117/16 121/2 121/19 131/3 132/4 132/8 132/11 132/15 132/18 133/4 142/21 149/4 151/21 151/22 154/15 161/22 163/19 164/18 164/20 164/23 165/4 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 similarly [1] 34/11 simple [7] 15/10 28/20 78/17 113/2 155/25 175/5 191/2 simply [9] 13/8 16/12 21/16 38/23 44/19 45/21 111/6 176/13 181/9 since [18] 4/17 23/17 33/13 33/23 52/24 52/25 53/8 74/17 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 116/17 125/18 133/11 135/17 138/17 142/15 147/17 148/2 152/2 152/13 154/12 154/22 155/1 160/22 161/17 Smith's [2] 24/12 26/2 Smiths [7] 26/13 68/12 73/19 121/8 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 159/21 168/9 186/13 187/3 226/19 sometimes [7] 29/21 40/7 57/14 84/10 134/21 163/10 191/6 somewhere [2] 27/12 161/17 sorry [30] 33/16 54/20 54/22 55/7 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 205/4 speculating [2] 46/3 144/1 speed [1] 25/8 spend [3] 27/16 50/25 168/12 spent [4] 13/21 13/22 14/3 88/12 split [1] 51/4 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 105/21 111/18 112/10 117/16 121/2 121/19 131/3 132/4 132/8 132/11 132/15 132/18 133/4 142/21 149/4 151/21 151/22 154/15 161/22 163/19 164/18 164/20 164/23 165/4 165/6 166/19 168/11 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 similarly [1] 34/11 simple [7] 15/10 28/20 78/17 113/2 155/25 175/5 191/2 simply [9] 13/8 16/12 21/16 38/23 44/19 45/21 111/6 176/13 181/9 since [18] 4/17 23/17 33/13 33/23 52/24 52/25 53/8 74/17 79/12 81/24 85/9 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 116/17 125/18 133/11 135/17 138/17 142/15 147/17 148/2 152/2 152/13 154/12 154/22 155/1 160/22 161/17 Smith's [2] 24/12 26/2 Smiths [7] 26/13 68/12 73/19 121/8 133/22 139/1 147/20 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 159/21 168/9 186/13 187/3 226/19 sometimes [7] 29/21 40/7 57/14 84/10 134/21 163/10 191/6 somewhere [2] 27/12 161/17 sorry [30] 33/16 54/20 54/22 55/7 55/19 57/21 58/12 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 205/4 speculating [2] 46/3 144/1 speed [1] 25/8 spend [3] 27/16 50/25 168/12 spent [4] 13/21 13/22 14/3 88/12 split [1] 51/4 spoke [6] 10/8 21/21 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 105/21 111/18 112/10 117/16 121/2 121/19 131/3 132/4 132/8 132/11 132/15 132/18 133/4 142/21 149/4 151/21 151/22 154/15 161/22 163/19 164/18 164/20 164/23 165/4 165/6 166/19 168/11 169/1 177/3 182/1 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 similarly [1] 34/11 simple [7] 15/10 28/20 78/17 113/2 155/25 175/5 191/2 simply [9] 13/8 16/12 21/16 38/23 44/19 45/21 111/6 176/13 181/9 since [18] 4/17 23/17 33/13 33/23 52/24 52/25 53/8 74/17 79/12 81/24 85/9 123/4 133/1 133/2 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 116/17 125/18 133/11 135/17 138/17 142/15 147/17 148/2 152/2 152/13 154/12 154/22 155/1 160/22 161/17 Smith's [2] 24/12 26/2 Smiths [7] 26/13 68/12 73/19 121/8 133/22 139/1 147/20 so [303] | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 159/21 168/9 186/13 187/3 226/19 sometimes [7] 29/21 40/7 57/14 84/10 134/21 163/10 191/6 somewhere [2] 27/12 161/17 sorry [30] 33/16 54/20 54/22 55/7 55/19 57/21 58/12 65/21 65/22 67/15 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 205/4 speculating [2] 46/3 144/1 speed [1] 25/8 spend [3] 27/16 50/25 168/12 spent [4] 13/21 13/22 14/3 88/12 split [1] 51/4 spoke [6] 10/8 21/21 46/13 114/7 201/22 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 105/21 111/18 112/10 117/16 121/2 121/19 131/3 132/4 132/8 132/11 132/15 132/18 133/4 142/21 149/4 151/21 151/22 154/15 161/22 163/19 164/18 164/20 164/23 165/4 165/6 166/19 168/11 169/1 177/3 182/1 184/9 191/13 194/21 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 similarly [1] 34/11 simple [7] 15/10 28/20 78/17 113/2 155/25 175/5 191/2 simply [9] 13/8 16/12 21/16 38/23 44/19 45/21 111/6 176/13 181/9 since [18] 4/17 23/17 33/13 33/23 52/24 52/25 53/8 74/17 79/12 81/24 85/9 123/4 133/1 133/2 138/5 166/19 198/5 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 116/17 125/18 133/11 135/17 138/17 142/15 147/17 148/2 152/2 152/13 154/12 154/22 155/1 160/22 161/17 Smith's [2] 24/12 26/2 Smiths [7] 26/13 68/12 73/19 121/8 133/22 139/1 147/20 so [303] Society [2] 4/9 4/10 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 159/21 168/9 186/13 187/3 226/19 sometimes [7] 29/21 40/7 57/14 84/10 134/21 163/10 191/6 somewhere [2] 27/12 161/17 sorry [30] 33/16 54/20 54/22 55/7 55/19 57/21 58/12 65/21 65/22 67/15 77/25 78/22 78/25 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 205/4 speculating [2] 46/3 144/1 speed [1] 25/8 spend [3] 27/16 50/25 168/12 spent [4] 13/21 13/22 14/3 88/12 split [1] 51/4 spoke [6] 10/8 21/21 46/13 114/7 201/22 203/1 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 105/21 111/18 112/10 117/16 121/2 121/19 131/3 132/4 132/8 132/11 132/15 132/18 133/4 142/21 149/4 151/21 151/22 154/15 161/22 163/19 164/18 164/20 164/23 165/4 165/6 166/19 168/11 169/1 177/3 182/1 184/9 191/13 194/21 196/1 200/11 206/25 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 similarly [1] 34/11 simple [7] 15/10 28/20 78/17 113/2 155/25 175/5 191/2 simply [9] 13/8 16/12 21/16 38/23 44/19 45/21 111/6 176/13 181/9 since [18] 4/17 23/17 33/13 33/23 52/24 52/25 53/8 74/17 79/12 81/24 85/9 123/4 133/1 133/2 138/5 166/19 198/5 198/10 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 116/17 125/18 133/11 135/17 138/17 142/15 147/17 148/2 152/2 152/13 154/12 154/22 155/1 160/22 161/17 Smith's [2] 24/12 26/2 Smiths [7] 26/13 68/12 73/19 121/8 133/22 139/1 147/20 so [303] Society [2] 4/9 4/10 soft [1] 35/17 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 159/21 168/9 186/13 187/3 226/19 sometimes [7] 29/21 40/7 57/14 84/10 134/21 163/10 191/6 somewhere [2] 27/12 161/17 sorry [30] 33/16 54/20 54/22 55/7 55/19 57/21 58/12 65/21 65/22 67/15 77/25 78/22 78/25 89/19 91/15 93/1 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 205/4 speculating [2] 46/3 144/1 speed [1] 25/8 spend [3] 27/16 50/25 168/12 spent [4] 13/21 13/22 14/3 88/12 split [1] 51/4 spoke [6] 10/8 21/21 46/13 114/7 201/22 203/1 spoken [4] 7/2 9/14 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 105/21 111/18 112/10 117/16 121/2 121/19 131/3 132/4 132/8 132/11 132/15 132/18 133/4 142/21 149/4 151/21 151/22 154/15 161/22 163/19 164/18 164/20 164/23 165/4 165/6 166/19 168/11 169/1 177/3 182/1 184/9 191/13 194/21 196/1 200/11 206/25 207/23 209/9 210/12 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 similarly [1] 34/11 simple [7] 15/10 28/20 78/17 113/2 155/25 175/5 191/2 simply [9] 13/8 16/12 21/16 38/23 44/19 45/21 111/6 176/13 181/9 since [18] 4/17 23/17 33/13 33/23 52/24 52/25 53/8 74/17 79/12 81/24 85/9 123/4 133/1 133/2 138/5 166/19 198/5 198/10 single [9] 18/21 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 116/17 125/18 133/11 135/17 138/17 142/15 147/17 148/2 152/2 152/13 154/12 154/22 155/1 160/22 161/17 Smith's [2] 24/12 26/2 Smiths [7] 26/13 68/12 73/19 121/8 133/22 139/1 147/20 so [303] Society [2] 4/9 4/10 soft [1] 35/17 softened [1] 45/19 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 159/21 168/9 186/13 187/3 226/19 sometimes [7] 29/21 40/7 57/14 84/10 134/21 163/10 191/6 somewhere [2] 27/12 161/17 sorry [30] 33/16 54/20 54/22 55/7 55/19 57/21 58/12 65/21 65/22 67/15 77/25 78/22 78/25 89/19 91/15 93/1 93/22 94/11 105/15 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 205/4 speculating [2] 46/3 144/1 speed [1] 25/8 spend [3] 27/16 50/25 168/12 spent [4] 13/21 13/22 14/3 88/12 split [1] 51/4 spoke [6] 10/8 21/21 46/13 114/7 201/22 203/1 spoken [4] 7/2 9/14 80/24 212/21 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 105/21 111/18 112/10 117/16 121/2 121/19 131/3 132/4 132/8 132/11 132/15 132/18 133/4 142/21 149/4 151/21 151/22 154/15 161/22 163/19 164/18 164/20 164/23 165/4 165/6 166/19 168/11 169/1 177/3 182/1 184/9 191/13 194/21 196/1 200/11 206/25 207/23 209/9 210/12 212/7 221/16 222/6 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 similarly [1] 34/11 simple [7] 15/10 28/20 78/17 113/2 155/25 175/5 191/2 simply [9] 13/8 16/12 21/16 38/23 44/19 45/21 111/6 176/13 181/9 since [18] 4/17 23/17 33/13 33/23 52/24 52/25 53/8 74/17 79/12 81/24 85/9 123/4 133/1 133/2 138/5 166/19 198/5 198/10 single [9] 18/21 19/13 89/4 114/10 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 116/17 125/18 133/11 135/17 138/17 142/15 147/17 148/2 152/2 152/13 154/12 154/22 155/1 160/22 161/17 Smith's [2] 24/12 26/2 Smiths [7] 26/13 68/12 73/19 121/8 133/22 139/1 147/20 so [303] Society [2] 4/9 4/10 soft [1] 35/17 softened [1] 45/19 solely [1] 40/5 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 159/21 168/9 186/13 187/3 226/19 sometimes [7] 29/21 40/7 57/14 84/10 134/21 163/10 191/6 somewhere [2] 27/12 161/17 sorry [30] 33/16 54/20 54/22 55/7 55/19 57/21 58/12 65/21 65/22 67/15 77/25 78/22 78/25 89/19 91/15 93/1 93/22 94/11 105/15 110/12 111/18 120/8 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 205/4 speculating [2] 46/3 144/1 speed [1] 25/8 spend [3] 27/16 50/25 168/12 spent [4] 13/21 13/22 14/3 88/12 split [1] 51/4 spoke [6] 10/8 21/21 46/13 114/7 201/22 203/1 spoken [4] 7/2 9/14 80/24 212/21 squabble [1] 117/25 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 105/21 111/18 112/10 117/16 121/2 121/19 131/3 132/4 132/8 132/11 132/15 132/18 133/4 142/21 149/4 151/21 151/22 154/15 161/22 163/19 164/18 164/20 164/23 165/4 165/6 166/19 168/11 169/1 177/3 182/1 184/9 191/13 194/21 196/1 200/11 206/25 207/23 209/9 210/12 212/7 221/16 222/6 222/8 227/10 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 similarly [1] 34/11 simple [7] 15/10 28/20 78/17 113/2 155/25 175/5 191/2 simply [9] 13/8 16/12 21/16 38/23 44/19 45/21 111/6 176/13 181/9 since [18] 4/17 23/17 33/13 33/23 52/24 52/25 53/8 74/17 79/12 81/24 85/9 123/4 133/1 133/2 138/5 166/19 198/5 198/10 single [9] 18/21 19/13 89/4 114/10 134/6 145/22 146/16 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 116/17 125/18 133/11 135/17 138/17 142/15 147/17 148/2 152/2 152/13 154/12 154/22 155/1 160/22 161/17 Smith's [2] 24/12 26/2 Smiths [7] 26/13 68/12 73/19 121/8 133/22 139/1 147/20 so [303] Society [2] 4/9 4/10 soft [1] 35/17 softened [1] 45/19 solely [1] 40/5 solicitor [4] 4/6 46/18 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 159/21 168/9 186/13 187/3 226/19 sometimes [7] 29/21 40/7 57/14 84/10 134/21 163/10 191/6 somewhere [2] 27/12 161/17 sorry [30] 33/16 54/20 54/22 55/7 55/19 57/21 58/12 65/21 65/22 67/15 77/25 78/22 78/25 89/19 91/15 93/1 93/22 94/11 105/15 110/12 111/18 120/8 131/13 149/16 151/1 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 205/4 speculating [2] 46/3 144/1 speed [1] 25/8 spend [3] 27/16 50/25 168/12 spent [4] 13/21 13/22 14/3 88/12 split [1] 51/4 spoke [6] 10/8 21/21 46/13 114/7 201/22 203/1 spoken [4] 7/2 9/14 80/24 212/21 squabble [1] 117/25 SRA [2] 7/9 7/11 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 105/21 111/18 112/10 117/16 121/2 121/19 131/3 132/4 132/8 132/11 132/15 132/18 133/4 142/21 149/4 151/21 151/22 154/15 161/22 163/19 164/18 164/20 164/23 165/4 165/6 166/19 168/11 169/1 177/3 182/1 184/9 191/13 194/21 196/1 200/11 206/25 207/23 209/9 210/12 212/7 221/16 222/6 222/8 227/10 statements [3] 1/13 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 similarly [1] 34/11 simple [7] 15/10 28/20 78/17 113/2 155/25 175/5 191/2 simply [9] 13/8 16/12 21/16 38/23 44/19 45/21 111/6 176/13 181/9 since [18] 4/17 23/17 33/13 33/23 52/24 52/25 53/8 74/17 79/12 81/24 85/9 123/4 133/1 133/2 138/5 166/19 198/5 198/10 single [9] 18/21 19/13 89/4 114/10 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 116/17 125/18 133/11 135/17 138/17 142/15 147/17 148/2 152/2 152/13 154/12 154/22 155/1 160/22 161/17 Smith's [2] 24/12 26/2 Smiths [7] 26/13 68/12 73/19 121/8 133/22 139/1 147/20 so [303] Society [2] 4/9 4/10 soft [1] 35/17 softened [1] 45/19 solely [1] 40/5 solicitor [4] 4/6 46/18 50/1 165/18 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 159/21 168/9 186/13 187/3 226/19 sometimes [7] 29/21 40/7 57/14 84/10 134/21 163/10 191/6 somewhere [2] 27/12 161/17 sorry [30] 33/16 54/20 54/22 55/7 55/19 57/21 58/12 65/21 65/22 67/15 77/25 78/22 78/25 89/19 91/15 93/1 93/22 94/11 105/15 110/12 111/18 120/8 131/13 149/16 151/1 160/20 183/4 214/10 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 205/4 speculating [2] 46/3 144/1 speed [1] 25/8 spend [3] 27/16 50/25 168/12 spent [4] 13/21 13/22 14/3 88/12 split [1] 51/4 spoke [6] 10/8 21/21 46/13 114/7 201/22 203/1 spoken [4] 7/2 9/14 80/24 212/21 squabble [1] 117/25 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 105/21 111/18 112/10 117/16 121/2 121/19 131/3 132/4 132/8 132/11 132/15 132/18 133/4 142/21 149/4 151/21 151/22 154/15 161/22 163/19 164/18 164/20 164/23 165/4 165/6 166/19 168/11 169/1 177/3 182/1 184/9 191/13 194/21 196/1 200/11 206/25 207/23 209/9 210/12 212/7 221/16 222/6 222/8 227/10 statements [3] 1/13 2/5 80/17 |
| silks [1] 166/21 similar [4] 118/16 122/19 167/21 226/9 similarly [1] 34/11 simple [7] 15/10 28/20 78/17 113/2 155/25 175/5 191/2 simply [9] 13/8 16/12 21/16 38/23 44/19 45/21 111/6 176/13 181/9 since [18] 4/17 23/17 33/13 33/23 52/24 52/25 53/8 74/17 79/12 81/24 85/9 123/4 133/1 133/2 138/5 166/19 198/5 198/10 single [9] 18/21 19/13 89/4 114/10 134/6 145/22 146/16 | 40/25 41/18 57/23 61/18 62/1 62/15 65/3 65/25 75/20 76/4 106/5 109/5 114/1 115/13 116/5 116/15 116/17 125/18 133/11 135/17 138/17 142/15 147/17 148/2 152/2 152/13 154/12 154/22 155/1 160/22 161/17 Smith's [2] 24/12 26/2 Smiths [7] 26/13 68/12 73/19 121/8 133/22 139/1 147/20 so [303] Society [2] 4/9 4/10 soft [1] 35/17 softened [1] 45/19 solely [1] 40/5 solicitor [4] 4/6 46/18 | 138/18 144/4 something [16] 8/21 25/11 40/12 41/19 41/25 67/3 69/2 69/6 106/15 112/6 126/23 159/21 168/9 186/13 187/3 226/19 sometimes [7] 29/21 40/7 57/14 84/10 134/21 163/10 191/6 somewhere [2] 27/12 161/17 sorry [30] 33/16 54/20 54/22 55/7 55/19 57/21 58/12 65/21 65/22 67/15 77/25 78/22 78/25 89/19 91/15 93/1 93/22 94/11 105/15 110/12 111/18 120/8 131/13 149/16 151/1 | 196/15 197/16 200/5 205/3 206/5 206/7 207/8 207/9 213/16 specifically [5] 54/11 146/15 173/22 200/22 205/4 speculating [2] 46/3 144/1 speed [1] 25/8 spend [3] 27/16 50/25 168/12 spent [4] 13/21 13/22 14/3 88/12 split [1] 51/4 spoke [6] 10/8 21/21 46/13 114/7 201/22 203/1 spoken [4] 7/2 9/14 80/24 212/21 squabble [1] 117/25 SRA [2] 7/9 7/11 staff [5] 14/18 40/3 | 64/21 65/8 66/24 71/23 72/5 73/24 79/3 80/20 83/1 85/4 87/19 89/7 91/17 100/8 102/22 104/18 105/18 105/21 111/18 112/10 117/16 121/2 121/19 131/3 132/4 132/8 132/11 132/15 132/18 133/4 142/21 149/4 151/21 151/22 154/15 161/22 163/19 164/18 164/20 164/23 165/4 165/6 166/19 168/11 169/1 177/3 182/1 184/9 191/13 194/21 196/1 200/11 206/25 207/23 209/9 210/12 212/7 221/16 222/6 222/8 227/10 statements [3] 1/13 |

(85) shouldn't - statistics

| S 224/13 224/18 | 99/17 100/3 111/1 | 14/12 24/9 28/13 | 53/2 53/4 53/16 54/1 |
|---|--|---|---|
| aub [2] 14/17 107/22 | | 32/23 47/3 63/24 | 55/1 64/23 66/5 66/19 |
| Sidustics [0] 100/0 sub area [1] 1//17 | 203/10 203/12 203/16 | | 67/4 67/20 67/23 68/4 |
| 104/9 100/10 100/20 sub questions [1] | 203/19 203/24 204/1 | 109/21 112/5 123/7 | 68/5 68/17 69/18 |
| 156/17 216/21 sub-questions [1] statutory [7] 19/20 | 204/24 | 123/20 128/7 128/8 | 69/22 71/16 73/18 |
| Subcommittee [1] | summarise [2] | 128/15 128/16 129/18 | 78/13 78/21 81/20 |
| 137/11 137/11 137/14 33/7 | 103/19 166/24 | 133/25 140/6 142/25 | 93/8 98/10 120/5 |
| SteerCo [10] 7/25 [subcontracting [1] | summarising [2] | 163/22 171/6 177/12 | 122/11 122/18 122/22 |
| 8/1/ 27/20 20/16 32/0 118/9 | 100/9 168/21 | 193/20 206/17 221/4 | 123/4 123/20 124/8 |
| subject [19] 61/3 | summary [5] 2/18 | taken [49] 6/14 12/18 | 124/10 124/11 136/16 |
| 79/22 80/8 68/10 87/15 87/22 | 121/10 125/2 128/3 | 23/19 26/14 60/7 60/8 | 1 |
| steering [11] 7/17 87/24 88/9 88/21 | 217/5 | 60/9 62/14 65/12 | 137/6 137/24 138/1 |
| 8/4 8/17 9/14 42/11 52/4 55/42 57/40 128/10 139/20 140/3 | summer [2] 5/9 138/6 | 66/11 69/1 69/23 72/21 77/16 78/8 81/1 | 138/7 141/4 141/17 141/21 142/3 142/17 |
| 02/100/12 07/10 178/4 102/14 102/20 | Sunday [2] 4/14 11/5 | | 147/14 147/19 148/6 |
| 103/18 211/16 | sundry [1] 202/21 | 103/1 103/15 103/20 | 148/10 152/23 154/5 |
| stem [2] 208/21 | supervised [1] 183/9 | | 157/15 157/19 166/10 |
| 64/18 64/19 65/1 | supervision [6] | 111/21 112/1 114/24 | 166/20 167/25 168/1 |
| step [1] 147/4 227/24 | 71/18 72/13 72/22 | 118/22 118/24 119/1 | 168/2 170/15 173/21 |
| steps [11] 12/17 23/19 108/5 122/7 subpostmasters [6] | 73/3 177/25 178/8 | 119/8 119/13 124/5 | 180/23 182/13 182/13 |
| 23/19 108/5 122/7 34/6 34/19 34/24 | supplement [1] | 124/18 127/3 129/15 | 182/17 182/20 183/2 |
| 133/25 176/22 179/1 50/15 60/18 207/5 | 78/15 | 143/13 174/21 175/19 | 1 |
| subsequent [2] | suppliers [1] 215/14 | 176/12 176/19 176/22 | 1 |
| Sticking [1] 108/6 148/9 211/22 | support [5] 50/17 | 181/24 184/11 213/15 | 1 |
| still [15] 10/9 10/13 subsequently [5] | 57/9 57/9 124/11 | 213/25 214/4 227/22 | 201/24 202/1 203/2 |
| 22/6 22/7 59/15 71/13 120/2 159/14 201/7 | 138/3 | takes [4] 72/6 72/10 | 204/3 209/24 210/7 |
| 119/1 119/16 121/23 202/1 210/24 | supported [4] 68/3 166/9 166/13 168/1 | 98/3 186/2 | 210/16 213/10 216/10 217/11 219/1 221/20 |
| 125/16 146/4 156/19 substance [2] 60/15 | supportive [2] 23/23 | taking [10] 24/11 | team's [2] 68/20 69/7 |
| 159/2 184/15 189/21 substantial [4] 10/1 | 23/25 | 137/7 139/16 179/2 | teams [10] 37/2 38/7 |
| Stop [1] 22/10 166/9 167/7 169/8 | suppose [2] 52/5 | 180/6 206/12 | 40/15 40/24 41/17 |
| stopping [5] 113/1 substantive [2] 05/1 | | talk [6] 7/15 16/7 | 42/5 46/14 154/1 |
| | supposedly [1] 73/10 | | 190/5 224/2 |
| 210/4 substantively [4] | sure [11] 2/9 10/23 | 226/5 | technical [4] 69/19 |
| 14/20 14/22 17/9 83/20 89/10 220/8 | 21/22 43/11 51/25 | talked [1] 136/4 | 78/12 100/13 157/1 |
| 17/14 18/23 20/4 | 93/11 104/19 105/10 | talking [11] 46/19 | techniques [2] |
| success [1] 45/8 | 121/12 147/15 157/3 | 57/25 58/10 75/17 | 218/23 219/6 |
| stored [6] 17/17 [successes [1] 45/5 | surely [2] 141/21 | 79/4 154/19 158/2 | technological [1] |
| Such [21] 22/23 00/0 | | 168/4 192/23 196/2 | 122/4 |
| 125/9 126/13 79/13 84/9 89/17 101/4 101/11 104/5 101/4 101/11 104/5 | surface [1] 75/7 surprise [2] 12/19 | 201/5 [tapes [10] 59/6 59/10 | technology [2] 136/17 156/20 |
| story [1] 181/17 107/16 112/4 125/15 | 13/10 | 125/15 125/21 126/4 | tell [17] 28/22 39/23 |
| straight [1] 59/7 140/15 151/13 152/10 | 9 survives [2] 112/19 | 126/7 126/13 127/23 | 44/17 50/25 51/12 |
| straigntforward [3] 17//5 183/22 18//10 | 112/23 | 127/24 130/1 | 51/17 64/24 67/19 |
| | | target [3] 130/10 | 83/3 87/7 111/20 |
| strategic [3] 38/18 223/25 213/14 210/14 | 131/23 164/10 229/8 | 130/14 224/1 | 119/20 136/12 160/11 |
| stratogios [6] 56/8 [Sufficient [12] 10/24 | 229/12 229/16 | targeted [1] 129/2 | 168/16 179/23 218/11 |
| 56/19 83/16 84/6 89/9 12/13 15/7 10/3 10/13 | 5 sympathy [1] 15/21 | targeting [2] 198/22 | telling [4] 126/6 |
| 89/13 66/18 73/21 81/11 | syntax [2] 141/12 | 205/9 | 179/11 180/1 182/4 |
| strategy [10] 74/22 118/3 141/2 208/1 | 157/2 | targets [1] 123/20 | tells [1] 181/17 |
| 74/24 75/21 77/16 | system [6] 22/7 | task [1] 175/6 | ten [1] 143/20 |
| 82/24 83/8 83/12 89/1 sufficiently [2] 21/24 | | tasked [1] 37/8 | tend [2] 143/8 183/8 |
| 102/16 149/3 102/16 149/3 suggest [4] 18/20 | 77/24 122/1 systematic [1] 88/20 | tasks [4] 42/3 78/17 136/22 188/21 | tens [1] 146/18 term [15] 31/8 44/22 |
| strong [2] 130/1 88/11 03/3 101/20 | | team [119] 4/23 5/24 | 44/24 45/1 86/6 87/12 |
| 138/2 suggested [4] 107/8 | <u>T</u> | 6/17 6/22 7/23 8/8 9/5 | 1 |
| Strongly [1] 157/17 137/13 155/23 160/1 | table [10] 3/1 149/5 | 10/23 11/14 12/2 20/7 | 108/11 110/14 141/2 |
| structural [2] 121/3 suggestion [3] 20/1 | 149/6 149/10 151/5 | 20/15 22/12 22/20 | 153/3 189/3 209/25 |
| | 151/7 151/14 152/25 | 23/4 23/11 28/14 | terminology [1] |
| structure [2] 139/22 suggestions [1] 21/5 | | 30/20 32/16 35/21 | 217/10 |
| structured [1] 17/6 suggests [1] 192/3 | tables [1] 154/10 | 36/15 36/16 36/23 | terms [202] 5/2 6/4 |
| studies [1] 130/19 Suitable [1] 100/15 | tagged [4] 188/4 | 38/10 39/20 40/1 | 18/15 19/22 25/25 |
| suite [18] 79/23 | 190/3 212/8 213/5 | 40/21 42/1 44/13 | 28/9 29/5 29/9 30/10 |
| 98/16 99/5 99/8 99/10 | take [29] 13/13 13/14 | 44/23 45/24 52/19 | 30/11 30/15 30/18 |
| | | | |

(86) statistics... - terms

| [| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Т | 10/10 25/6 36/22 | 193/13 194/3 196/24 | 37/6 37/7 38/9 38/12 | 214/12 217/23 217/25 |
| terms [190] 31/15 | 40/24 44/5 45/8 46/12 | 197/8 198/3 198/8 | 38/13 38/25 39/12 | 221/7 221/8 223/12 |
| 31/24 35/3 44/16 45/5 | 53/24 58/23 59/7 | 198/23 201/4 204/8 | 39/13 39/15 44/24 | they [222] 2/22 9/5 |
| | 66/17 69/4 69/7 70/4 | 205/13 207/8 212/17 | 45/16 46/2 48/19 | 9/7 9/8 9/10 15/15 |
| 45/24 49/17 52/7 | 71/10 76/21 102/4 | 214/10 214/10 219/23 | 49/21 52/11 56/11 | 18/3 19/1 21/7 21/8 |
| 52/12 54/14 56/18 | 104/25 116/1 120/20 | 220/15 220/22 221/17 | 57/25 58/2 58/14 | 21/17 22/4 22/4 22/5 |
| 57/12 58/7 58/18 | 124/20 127/3 132/18 | 221/23 222/21 224/5 | 59/13 62/25 64/3 | 22/7 22/16 22/16 |
| 59/18 59/19 59/23 | | | | |
| 60/7 66/7 69/15 69/20 | 135/14 136/14 139/12 | | 69/12 69/14 69/18 | 22/17 22/18 24/1 |
| 70/5 70/9 70/13 70/20 | 141/17 143/8 150/18 | their [66] 4/22 8/25 | 69/21 70/22 74/1 | 24/15 24/15 24/21 |
| 71/3 77/10 80/24 81/1 | 155/24 161/7 166/17 | 9/4 13/4 15/16 15/23 | 77/22 79/23 81/8 81/9 | 24/22 24/24 25/1 25/8 |
| 82/8 82/18 82/24 | 168/6 177/22 181/13 | 17/16 18/9 24/7 24/13 | 82/15 85/14 94/23 | 25/21 27/4 27/20 |
| | 224/20 225/2 | 29/9 37/8 37/10 38/6 | 95/9 95/23 96/1 98/3 | 28/17 28/22 28/23 |
| 84/13 84/14 84/16 | thank [52] 1/5 1/6 3/4 | | 98/4 102/20 105/15 | 28/25 28/25 29/1 29/2 |
| 84/24 86/1 86/3 86/19 | 3/6 3/7 3/11 3/25 28/7 | 68/6 77/23 80/10 | 108/3 108/6 112/21 | 29/11 29/11 29/13 |
| 86/21 87/21 88/11 | 33/4 33/17 46/8 46/24 | 81/13 81/14 88/12 | 118/14 124/12 125/9 | 29/14 29/16 29/17 |
| 90/2 90/6 90/24 92/2 | | | | |
| 92/6 92/18 93/5 93/12 | 46/24 47/1 47/5 47/11 | 92/14 93/23 94/23 | 127/21 128/14 128/20 | 29/17 29/19 30/2 30/3 |
| 93/15 93/25 94/12 | 47/16 47/21 49/3 95/4 | 117/2 117/22 124/2 | 129/1 130/16 131/18 | 30/17 30/18 30/25 |
| 94/16 94/24 94/24 | 113/18 121/15 121/16 | | 137/11 142/12 144/24 | 31/3 31/14 31/18 |
| 95/5 95/12 95/18 | 130/20 130/21 131/2 | 141/6 141/20 142/24 | 145/25 146/22 146/23 | 31/19 31/20 32/1 32/4 |
| | 131/5 131/6 131/12 | 148/12 152/16 153/6 | 147/5 151/3 153/8 | 32/13 32/13 37/7 |
| 95/23 96/1 96/6 96/9 | 131/21 131/25 132/14 | 167/11 167/19 170/22 | 153/24 154/9 154/9 | 37/10 38/3 38/7 38/8 |
| 96/14 96/19 96/23 | 151/20 151/22 151/23 | | 156/11 156/25 157/16 | 39/2 39/8 40/4 40/9 |
| 96/24 97/1 97/2 97/10 | 160/19 163/15 163/18 | | 159/3 159/14 160/16 | 40/9 43/25 44/21 49/7 |
| 97/11 99/13 100/6 | 163/19 163/21 163/22 | | 162/3 165/13 170/13 | 54/10 56/13 57/1 63/3 |
| 100/11 100/19 101/5 | | | | |
| 101/10 101/13 101/14 | 164/1 164/7 164/16 | 185/15 185/17 185/25 | 171/3 182/7 184/22 | 68/1 68/3 68/18 70/10 |
| 101/14 101/17 101/20 | 179/8 210/23 226/16 | 186/6 186/24 187/21 | 187/17 189/12 191/24 | 70/15 74/6 75/7 75/7 |
| 101/22 102/2 102/8 | 226/22 226/25 227/12 | 188/2 188/11 188/21 | 193/5 193/6 197/16 | 75/9 75/10 75/23 |
| 102/9 102/13 102/15 | 228/3 228/6 | 189/10 190/2 190/4 | 197/25 198/7 201/6 | 78/13 78/23 78/23 |
| 103/12 110/8 111/20 | Thanks [1] 55/20 | 199/18 219/1 223/2 | 204/15 206/10 207/21 | 80/3 81/15 83/24 |
| | that [1211] | 225/22 | 208/5 210/22 212/20 | 84/10 84/11 84/13 |
| 113/4 119/11 120/10 | that [[1] 10/22 | theirs [1] 170/16 | 214/9 216/22 216/24 | 84/15 84/18 86/3 |
| 120/18 120/23 121/7 | that's [125] 1/8 1/15 | them [59] 19/17 29/9 | 217/2 222/5 225/15 | 86/20 86/23 86/23 |
| 121/10 128/14 128/16 | | | | |
| | | 79/14 30/19 32/11 | <i>////</i> | 87/188/1189/17 |
| 134/18 138/24 138/25 | 4/19 4/24 12/22 15/10 | | 227/9 | 87/1 88/11 89/17 |
| 134/18 138/24 138/25 139/3 139/23 140/22 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 | there [249] | 89/25 90/5 93/18 |
| | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 67/9 70/1 71/15 74/2 74/18 74/22 74/24 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 67/9 70/1 71/15 74/2 74/18 74/22 74/24 76/18 81/1 81/22 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 67/9 70/1 71/15 74/2 74/18 74/22 74/24 76/18 81/1 81/22 86/10 86/21 87/2 87/14 87/16 88/18 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 117/4 117/20 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 67/9 70/1 71/15 74/2 74/18 74/22 74/24 76/18 81/1 81/22 86/10 86/21 87/2 87/14 87/16 88/18 90/3 97/8 98/17 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 117/4 117/20 117/22 120/1 120/2 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 67/9 70/1 71/15 74/2 74/18 74/22 74/24 76/18 81/1 81/22 86/10 86/21 87/2 87/14 87/16 88/18 90/3 97/8 98/17 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 117/4 117/20 117/22 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 67/9 70/1 71/15 74/2 74/18 74/22 74/24 76/18 81/1 81/22 86/10 86/21 87/2 87/14 87/16 88/18 90/3 97/8 98/17 101/18 107/4 108/11 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 117/4 117/20 117/22 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 67/9 70/1 71/15 74/2 74/18 74/22 74/24 76/18 81/1 81/22 86/10 86/21 87/2 87/14 87/16 88/18 90/3 97/8 98/17 101/18 107/4 108/11 109/10 109/25 111/8 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 117/4 117/20 117/22 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 171/18 172/4 174/6 174/16 177/14 192/11 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 67/9 70/1 71/15 74/2 74/18 74/22 74/24 76/18 81/1 81/22 86/10 86/21 87/2 87/14 87/16 88/18 90/3 97/8 98/17 101/18 107/4 108/11 109/10 109/25 111/8 111/10 114/14 115/6 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 171/18 172/4 174/6 174/16 177/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 67/9 70/1 71/15 74/2 74/18 74/22 74/24 76/18 81/1 81/22 86/10 86/21 87/2 87/14 87/16 88/18 90/3 97/8 98/17 101/18 107/4 108/11 109/10 109/25 111/8 111/10 114/14 115/6 117/24 119/3 119/18 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 171/18 172/4 174/6 174/16 177/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 67/9 70/1 71/15 74/2 74/18 74/22 74/24 76/18 81/1 81/22 86/10 86/21 87/2 87/14 87/16 88/18 90/3 97/8 98/17 101/18 107/4 108/11 109/10 109/25 111/8 111/10 114/14 115/6 117/24 119/3 119/18 120/24 125/11 126/1 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 171/18 172/4 174/6 174/16 177/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/23 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 67/9 70/1 71/15 74/2 74/18 74/22 74/24 76/18 81/1 81/22 86/10 86/21 87/2 87/14 87/16 88/18 90/3 97/8 98/17 101/18 107/4 108/11 109/10 109/25 111/8 111/10 114/14 115/6 117/24 119/3 119/18 120/24 125/11 126/1 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 171/18 172/4 174/6 174/16 177/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/23 195/1 195/3 195/6 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 67/9 70/1 71/15 74/2 74/18 74/22 74/24 76/18 81/1 81/22 86/10 86/21 87/2 87/14 87/16 88/18 90/3 97/8 98/17 101/18 107/4 108/11 109/10 109/25 111/8 111/10 114/14 115/6 117/24 119/3 119/18 120/24 125/11 126/1 127/19 128/22 129/14 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 117/4 117/20 117/22 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 171/18 172/4 174/6 174/16 177/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/23 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/6 195/14 195/18 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 67/9 70/1 71/15 74/2 74/18 74/22 74/24 76/18 81/1 81/22 86/10 86/21 87/2 87/14 87/16 88/18 90/3 97/8 98/17 101/18 107/4 108/11 109/10 109/25 111/8 111/10 114/14 115/6 117/24 119/3 119/18 120/24 125/11 126/1 127/19 128/22 129/14 131/20 132/6 132/23 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 117/4 117/20 117/22 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 171/18 172/4 174/6 174/16 177/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/23 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/6 195/14 195/18 195/22 196/3 196/7 | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 67/9 70/1 71/15 74/2 74/18 74/22 74/24 76/18 81/1 81/22 86/10 86/21 87/2 87/14 87/16 88/18 90/3 97/8 98/17 101/18 107/4 108/11 109/10 109/25 111/8 111/10 114/14 115/6 117/24 119/3 119/18 120/24 125/11 126/1 127/19 128/22 129/14 131/20 132/6 132/23 133/3 133/5 133/8 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 22/10 27/13 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 63/24 66/20 68/16 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 164/25 167/23 171/15 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 174/16 177/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/23 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/2 196/3 196/7 196/18 196/21 197/7 <th>19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 67/9 70/1 71/15 74/2 74/18 74/22 74/24 76/18 81/1 81/22 86/10 86/21 87/2 87/14 87/16 88/18 90/3 97/8 98/17 101/18 107/4 108/11 109/10 109/25 111/8 111/10 114/14 115/6 117/24 119/3 119/18 120/24 125/11 126/1 127/19 128/22 129/14 131/20 132/6 132/23 133/3 133/5 133/8 137/5 138/2 141/16</th> <th>43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 22/10 27/13 themselves [7] 14/4</th> <th>there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 63/24 66/20 68/16 74/25 75/22 82/3</th> <th>89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 164/25 167/23 171/15 172/7 172/20 173/23</th> | 19/16 27/10 32/23 34/1 49/10 49/18 50/3 51/6 53/10 56/21 57/17 57/17 61/8 62/11 63/7 63/9 65/24 67/9 70/1 71/15 74/2 74/18 74/22 74/24 76/18 81/1 81/22 86/10 86/21 87/2 87/14 87/16 88/18 90/3 97/8 98/17 101/18 107/4 108/11 109/10 109/25 111/8 111/10 114/14 115/6 117/24 119/3 119/18 120/24 125/11 126/1 127/19 128/22 129/14 131/20 132/6 132/23 133/3 133/5 133/8 137/5 138/2 141/16 | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 22/10 27/13 themselves [7] 14/4 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 63/24 66/20 68/16 74/25 75/22 82/3 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 164/25 167/23 171/15 172/7 172/20 173/23 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 174/16 177/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/23 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/6 195/14 195/18 195/22 196/3 196/7 | $\begin{array}{c} 19/16\ 27/10\ 32/23\\ 34/1\ 49/10\ 49/18\ 50/3\\ 51/6\ 53/10\ 56/21\\ 57/17\ 57/17\ 61/8\\ 62/11\ 63/7\ 63/9\ 65/24\\ 67/9\ 70/1\ 71/15\ 74/2\\ 74/18\ 74/22\ 74/24\\ 76/18\ 81/1\ 81/22\\ 86/10\ 86/21\ 87/2\\ 87/14\ 87/16\ 88/18\\ 90/3\ 97/8\ 98/17\\ 101/18\ 107/4\ 108/11\\ 109/10\ 109/25\ 111/8\\ 111/10\ 114/14\ 115/6\\ 117/24\ 119/3\ 119/18\\ 120/24\ 125/11\ 126/1\\ 127/19\ 128/22\ 129/14\\ 131/20\ 132/6\ 132/23\\ 133/3\ 133/5\ 133/8\\ 137/5\ 138/2\ 141/16\\ 142/10\ 149/23\ 150/13\\ \end{array}$ | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 22/10 27/13 themselves [7] 14/4 15/22 23/23 70/18 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 63/24 66/20 68/16 74/25 75/22 82/3 85/20 86/19 86/21 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 164/25 167/23 171/15 172/7 172/20 173/23 175/2 175/6 175/7 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 174/16 177/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/23 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/2 196/3 196/7 196/18 196/21 197/7 <th>$\begin{array}{c} 19/16\ 27/10\ 32/23\\ 34/1\ 49/10\ 49/18\ 50/3\\ 51/6\ 53/10\ 56/21\\ 57/17\ 57/17\ 61/8\\ 62/11\ 63/7\ 63/9\ 65/24\\ 67/9\ 70/1\ 71/15\ 74/2\\ 74/18\ 74/22\ 74/24\\ 76/18\ 81/1\ 81/22\\ 86/10\ 86/21\ 87/2\\ 87/14\ 87/16\ 88/18\\ 90/3\ 97/8\ 98/17\\ 101/18\ 107/4\ 108/11\\ 109/10\ 109/25\ 111/8\\ 111/10\ 114/14\ 115/6\\ 117/24\ 119/3\ 119/18\\ 120/24\ 125/11\ 126/1\\ 127/19\ 128/22\ 129/14\\ 131/20\ 132/6\ 132/23\\ 133/3\ 133/5\ 133/8\\ 137/5\ 138/2\ 141/16\\ 142/10\ 149/23\ 150/13\\ 151/16\ 151/19\ 151/21\\ \end{array}$</th> <th>43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 22/10 27/13 themselves [7] 14/4 15/22 23/23 70/18 141/11 195/7 204/2</th> <th>there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 63/24 66/20 68/16 74/25 75/22 82/3 85/20 86/19 86/21 87/8 89/22 91/20 93/5</th> <th>89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 164/25 167/23 171/15 172/7 172/20 173/23 175/2 175/6 175/7 175/8 176/21 177/8</th> | $\begin{array}{c} 19/16\ 27/10\ 32/23\\ 34/1\ 49/10\ 49/18\ 50/3\\ 51/6\ 53/10\ 56/21\\ 57/17\ 57/17\ 61/8\\ 62/11\ 63/7\ 63/9\ 65/24\\ 67/9\ 70/1\ 71/15\ 74/2\\ 74/18\ 74/22\ 74/24\\ 76/18\ 81/1\ 81/22\\ 86/10\ 86/21\ 87/2\\ 87/14\ 87/16\ 88/18\\ 90/3\ 97/8\ 98/17\\ 101/18\ 107/4\ 108/11\\ 109/10\ 109/25\ 111/8\\ 111/10\ 114/14\ 115/6\\ 117/24\ 119/3\ 119/18\\ 120/24\ 125/11\ 126/1\\ 127/19\ 128/22\ 129/14\\ 131/20\ 132/6\ 132/23\\ 133/3\ 133/5\ 133/8\\ 137/5\ 138/2\ 141/16\\ 142/10\ 149/23\ 150/13\\ 151/16\ 151/19\ 151/21\\ \end{array}$ | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 22/10 27/13 themselves [7] 14/4 15/22 23/23 70/18 141/11 195/7 204/2 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 63/24 66/20 68/16 74/25 75/22 82/3 85/20 86/19 86/21 87/8 89/22 91/20 93/5 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 164/25 167/23 171/15 172/7 172/20 173/23 175/2 175/6 175/7 175/8 176/21 177/8 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 169/22 170/17 193/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/23 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/6 195/14 195/18 195/22 196/3 196/7 196/18 196/21 197/7 | $\begin{array}{c} 19/16\ 27/10\ 32/23\\ 34/1\ 49/10\ 49/18\ 50/3\\ 51/6\ 53/10\ 56/21\\ 57/17\ 57/17\ 61/8\\ 62/11\ 63/7\ 63/9\ 65/24\\ 67/9\ 70/1\ 71/15\ 74/2\\ 74/18\ 74/22\ 74/24\\ 76/18\ 81/1\ 81/22\\ 86/10\ 86/21\ 87/2\\ 87/14\ 87/16\ 88/18\\ 90/3\ 97/8\ 98/17\\ 101/18\ 107/4\ 108/11\\ 109/10\ 109/25\ 111/8\\ 111/10\ 114/14\ 115/6\\ 117/24\ 119/3\ 119/18\\ 120/24\ 125/11\ 126/1\\ 127/19\ 128/22\ 129/14\\ 131/20\ 132/6\ 132/23\\ 133/3\ 133/5\ 133/8\\ 137/5\ 138/2\ 141/16\\ 142/10\ 149/23\ 150/13\\ 151/16\ 151/19\ 151/21\\ 155/5\ 155/19\ 161/10\\ \end{array}$ | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 22/10 27/13 themselves [7] 14/4 15/22 23/23 70/18 141/11 195/7 204/2 then [130] 1/18 2/6 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 63/24 66/20 68/16 74/25 75/22 82/3 85/20 86/19 86/21 87/8 89/22 91/20 93/5 93/25 95/15 96/14 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 164/25 167/23 171/15 172/7 172/20 173/23 175/2 175/6 175/7 175/8 176/21 177/8 182/17 182/19 183/5 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 171/18 172/4 174/6 174/16 177/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/23 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/6 195/14 195/18 195/22 196/3 196/7 196/18 196/21 197/7 197/17 203/4 203/6 203/25 204/16 204/20 205/2 205/4 205/8 | $\begin{array}{c} 19/16\ 27/10\ 32/23\\ 34/1\ 49/10\ 49/18\ 50/3\\ 51/6\ 53/10\ 56/21\\ 57/17\ 57/17\ 61/8\\ 62/11\ 63/7\ 63/9\ 65/24\\ 67/9\ 70/1\ 71/15\ 74/2\\ 74/18\ 74/22\ 74/24\\ 76/18\ 81/1\ 81/22\\ 86/10\ 86/21\ 87/2\\ 87/14\ 87/16\ 88/18\\ 90/3\ 97/8\ 98/17\\ 101/18\ 107/4\ 108/11\\ 109/10\ 109/25\ 111/8\\ 111/10\ 114/14\ 115/6\\ 117/24\ 119/3\ 119/18\\ 120/24\ 125/11\ 126/1\\ 127/19\ 128/22\ 129/14\\ 131/20\ 132/6\ 132/23\\ 133/3\ 133/5\ 133/8\\ 137/5\ 138/2\ 141/16\\ 142/10\ 149/23\ 150/13\\ 151/16\ 151/19\ 151/21\\ 155/5\ 155/19\ 161/10\\ 163/2\ 165/13\ 165/23\\ \end{array}$ | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 22/10 27/13 themselves [7] 14/4 15/22 23/23 70/18 141/11 195/7 204/2 then [130] 1/18 2/6 2/25 3/4 4/9 6/11 6/22 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 63/24 66/20 68/16 74/25 75/22 82/3 85/20 86/19 86/21 87/8 89/22 91/20 93/5 93/25 95/15 96/14 98/9 103/15 108/8 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 164/25 167/23 171/15 172/7 172/20 173/23 175/2 175/6 175/7 175/8 176/21 177/8 182/17 182/19 183/5 183/8 183/13 183/15 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 171/18 172/4 174/6 174/16 177/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/23 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/6 195/14 195/18 195/22 196/3 196/7 196/18 196/21 197/7 197/17 203/4 203/6 203/25 204/16 204/20 205/2 205/4 205/8 205/10 205/17 205/19 | $\begin{array}{c} 19/16\ 27/10\ 32/23\\ 34/1\ 49/10\ 49/18\ 50/3\\ 51/6\ 53/10\ 56/21\\ 57/17\ 57/17\ 61/8\\ 62/11\ 63/7\ 63/9\ 65/24\\ 67/9\ 70/1\ 71/15\ 74/2\\ 74/18\ 74/22\ 74/24\\ 76/18\ 81/1\ 81/22\\ 86/10\ 86/21\ 87/2\\ 87/14\ 87/16\ 88/18\\ 90/3\ 97/8\ 98/17\\ 101/18\ 107/4\ 108/11\\ 109/10\ 109/25\ 111/8\\ 111/10\ 114/14\ 115/6\\ 117/24\ 119/3\ 119/18\\ 120/24\ 125/11\ 126/1\\ 127/19\ 128/22\ 129/14\\ 131/20\ 132/6\ 132/23\\ 133/3\ 133/5\ 133/8\\ 137/5\ 138/2\ 141/16\\ 142/10\ 149/23\ 150/13\\ 151/16\ 151/19\ 151/21\\ 155/5\ 155/19\ 161/10\\ 163/2\ 165/13\ 165/23\\ 166/3\ 166/22\ 168/8\\ \end{array}$ | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 22/10 27/13 themselves [7] 14/4 15/22 23/23 70/18 141/11 195/7 204/2 then [130] 1/18 2/6 2/25 3/4 4/9 6/11 6/22 8/6 10/7 10/9 10/20 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 63/24 66/20 68/16 74/25 75/22 82/3 85/20 86/19 86/21 87/8 89/22 91/20 93/5 93/25 95/15 96/14 98/9 103/15 108/8 117/10 128/7 129/5 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 164/25 167/23 171/15 172/7 172/20 173/23 175/2 175/6 175/7 175/8 176/21 177/8 182/17 182/19 183/5 183/16 184/12 184/13 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 171/18 172/4 174/6 174/16 177/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/23 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/6 195/14 195/18 195/22 196/3 196/7 196/18 196/21 197/7 196/18 196/21 197/7 197/17 203/4 203/6 203/25 204/16 204/20 205/2 205/4 205/8 205/10 205/17 205/19 205/20 205/25 206/2 | $\begin{array}{c} 19/16\ 27/10\ 32/23\\ 34/1\ 49/10\ 49/18\ 50/3\\ 51/6\ 53/10\ 56/21\\ 57/17\ 57/17\ 61/8\\ 62/11\ 63/7\ 63/9\ 65/24\\ 67/9\ 70/1\ 71/15\ 74/2\\ 74/18\ 74/22\ 74/24\\ 76/18\ 81/1\ 81/22\\ 86/10\ 86/21\ 87/2\\ 87/14\ 87/16\ 88/18\\ 90/3\ 97/8\ 98/17\\ 101/18\ 107/4\ 108/11\\ 109/10\ 109/25\ 111/8\\ 111/10\ 114/14\ 115/6\\ 117/24\ 119/3\ 119/18\\ 120/24\ 125/11\ 126/1\\ 127/19\ 128/22\ 129/14\\ 131/20\ 132/6\ 132/23\\ 133/3\ 133/5\ 133/8\\ 137/5\ 138/2\ 141/16\\ 142/10\ 149/23\ 150/13\\ 151/16\ 151/19\ 151/21\\ 155/5\ 155/19\ 161/10\\ 163/2\ 165/13\ 165/23\\ \end{array}$ | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 22/10 27/13 themselves [7] 14/4 15/22 23/23 70/18 141/11 195/7 204/2 then [130] 1/18 2/6 2/25 3/4 4/9 6/11 6/22 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 63/24 66/20 68/16 74/25 75/22 82/3 85/20 86/19 86/21 87/8 89/22 91/20 93/5 93/25 95/15 96/14 98/9 103/15 108/8 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 164/25 167/23 171/15 172/7 172/20 173/23 175/2 175/6 175/7 175/8 176/21 177/8 182/17 182/19 183/5 183/8 183/13 183/15 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 171/18 172/4 174/6 174/16 177/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/23 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/6 195/14 195/18 195/22 196/3 196/7 196/18 196/21 197/7 197/17 203/4 203/6 203/25 204/16 204/20 205/2 205/17 205/19 205/20 205/25 206/2 206/8 206/9 206/11 | $\begin{array}{c} 19/16\ 27/10\ 32/23\\ 34/1\ 49/10\ 49/18\ 50/3\\ 51/6\ 53/10\ 56/21\\ 57/17\ 57/17\ 61/8\\ 62/11\ 63/7\ 63/9\ 65/24\\ 67/9\ 70/1\ 71/15\ 74/2\\ 74/18\ 74/22\ 74/24\\ 76/18\ 81/1\ 81/22\\ 86/10\ 86/21\ 87/2\\ 87/14\ 87/16\ 88/18\\ 90/3\ 97/8\ 98/17\\ 101/18\ 107/4\ 108/11\\ 109/10\ 109/25\ 111/8\\ 111/10\ 114/14\ 115/6\\ 117/24\ 119/3\ 119/18\\ 120/24\ 125/11\ 126/1\\ 127/19\ 128/22\ 129/14\\ 131/20\ 132/6\ 132/23\\ 133/3\ 133/5\ 133/8\\ 137/5\ 138/2\ 141/16\\ 142/10\ 149/23\ 150/13\\ 151/16\ 151/19\ 151/21\\ 155/5\ 155/19\ 161/10\\ 163/2\ 165/13\ 165/23\\ 166/3\ 166/22\ 168/8\\ 168/14\ 169/8\ 171/20\\ 172/12\ 173/25\ 180/14\\ \end{array}$ | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 22/10 27/13 themselves [7] 14/4 15/22 23/23 70/18 141/11 195/7 204/2 then [130] 1/18 2/6 2/25 3/4 4/9 6/11 6/22 8/6 10/7 10/9 10/20 15/24 19/3 19/21 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 63/24 66/20 68/16 74/25 75/22 82/3 85/20 86/19 86/21 87/8 89/22 91/20 93/5 93/25 95/15 96/14 98/9 103/15 108/8 117/10 128/7 129/5 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 164/25 167/23 171/15 172/7 172/20 173/23 175/2 175/6 175/7 175/8 176/21 177/8 182/17 182/19 183/5 183/16 184/12 184/13 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 174/16 177/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/23 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/2 196/3 196/7 195/1 195/14 195/18 195/2 196/3 196/7 196/18 196/21 197/7 197/17 203/25 204/16 < | $\begin{array}{c} 19/16\ 27/10\ 32/23\\ 34/1\ 49/10\ 49/18\ 50/3\\ 51/6\ 53/10\ 56/21\\ 57/17\ 57/17\ 61/8\\ 62/11\ 63/7\ 63/9\ 65/24\\ 67/9\ 70/1\ 71/15\ 74/2\\ 74/18\ 74/22\ 74/24\\ 76/18\ 81/1\ 81/22\\ 86/10\ 86/21\ 87/2\\ 87/14\ 87/16\ 88/18\\ 90/3\ 97/8\ 98/17\\ 101/18\ 107/4\ 108/11\\ 109/10\ 109/25\ 111/8\\ 111/10\ 114/14\ 115/6\\ 117/24\ 119/3\ 119/18\\ 120/24\ 125/11\ 126/1\\ 127/19\ 128/22\ 129/14\\ 131/20\ 132/6\ 132/23\\ 133/3\ 133/5\ 133/8\\ 137/5\ 138/2\ 141/16\\ 142/10\ 149/23\ 150/13\\ 151/16\ 151/19\ 151/21\\ 155/5\ 155/19\ 161/10\\ 163/2\ 165/13\ 165/23\\ 166/3\ 166/22\ 168/8\\ 168/14\ 169/8\ 171/20\\ 172/12\ 173/25\ 180/14\\ \end{array}$ | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 22/10 27/13 themselves [7] 14/4 15/22 23/23 70/18 141/11 195/7 204/2 then [130] 1/18 2/6 2/25 3/4 4/9 6/11 6/22 8/6 10/7 10/9 10/20 15/24 19/3 19/21 20/13 23/17 25/3 25/7 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 63/24 66/20 68/16 74/25 75/22 82/3 85/20 86/19 86/21 87/8 89/22 91/20 93/5 93/25 95/15 96/14 98/9 103/15 108/8 117/10 128/7 129/5 136/17 148/19 159/2 171/17 178/16 180/14 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 164/25 167/23 171/15 172/7 172/20 173/23 175/2 175/6 175/7 175/8 176/21 177/8 182/17 182/19 183/5 183/8 183/13 183/15 183/16 184/12 184/13 184/22 185/13 185/19 185/22 185/25 186/8 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 171/10 171/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/23 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/1 195/14 195/18 195/2 196/3 196/7 196/18 196/21 197/7 197/17 203/25 204/16 204/20 205/20 205/25 206/2 205/20 205/25 206/2 </th <th>$\begin{array}{c} 19/16\ 27/10\ 32/23\\ 34/1\ 49/10\ 49/18\ 50/3\\ 51/6\ 53/10\ 56/21\\ 57/17\ 57/17\ 61/8\\ 62/11\ 63/7\ 63/9\ 65/24\\ 67/9\ 70/1\ 71/15\ 74/2\\ 74/18\ 74/22\ 74/24\\ 76/18\ 81/1\ 81/22\\ 86/10\ 86/21\ 87/2\\ 87/14\ 87/16\ 88/18\\ 90/3\ 97/8\ 98/17\\ 101/18\ 107/4\ 108/11\\ 109/10\ 109/25\ 111/8\\ 111/10\ 114/14\ 115/6\\ 117/24\ 119/3\ 119/18\\ 120/24\ 125/11\ 126/1\\ 127/19\ 128/22\ 129/14\\ 131/20\ 132/6\ 132/23\\ 133/3\ 133/5\ 133/8\\ 137/5\ 138/2\ 141/16\\ 142/10\ 149/23\ 150/13\\ 151/16\ 151/19\ 151/21\\ 155/5\ 155/19\ 161/10\\ 163/2\ 165/13\ 165/23\\ 166/3\ 166/22\ 168/8\\ 168/14\ 169/8\ 171/20\\ 172/12\ 173/25\ 180/14\\ 181/6\ 181/21\ 184/24\\ \end{array}$</th> <th>43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 22/10 27/13 themselves [7] 14/4 15/22 23/23 70/18 141/11 195/7 204/2 then [130] 1/18 2/6 2/25 3/4 4/9 6/11 6/22 8/6 10/7 10/9 10/20 15/24 19/3 19/21 20/13 23/17 25/3 25/7 25/19 26/19 27/11</th> <th>there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 63/24 66/20 68/16 74/25 75/22 82/3 85/20 86/19 86/21 87/8 89/22 91/20 93/5 93/25 95/15 96/14 98/9 103/15 108/8 117/10 128/7 129/5 136/17 148/19 159/2 171/17 178/16 180/14 180/16 180/19 184/3</th> <th>89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 164/25 167/23 171/15 172/7 172/20 173/23 175/2 175/6 175/7 175/8 176/21 177/8 182/17 182/19 183/5 183/16 184/12 184/13 184/22 185/13 185/19 185/22 185/25 186/8 186/12 186/13 186/16</th> | $\begin{array}{c} 19/16\ 27/10\ 32/23\\ 34/1\ 49/10\ 49/18\ 50/3\\ 51/6\ 53/10\ 56/21\\ 57/17\ 57/17\ 61/8\\ 62/11\ 63/7\ 63/9\ 65/24\\ 67/9\ 70/1\ 71/15\ 74/2\\ 74/18\ 74/22\ 74/24\\ 76/18\ 81/1\ 81/22\\ 86/10\ 86/21\ 87/2\\ 87/14\ 87/16\ 88/18\\ 90/3\ 97/8\ 98/17\\ 101/18\ 107/4\ 108/11\\ 109/10\ 109/25\ 111/8\\ 111/10\ 114/14\ 115/6\\ 117/24\ 119/3\ 119/18\\ 120/24\ 125/11\ 126/1\\ 127/19\ 128/22\ 129/14\\ 131/20\ 132/6\ 132/23\\ 133/3\ 133/5\ 133/8\\ 137/5\ 138/2\ 141/16\\ 142/10\ 149/23\ 150/13\\ 151/16\ 151/19\ 151/21\\ 155/5\ 155/19\ 161/10\\ 163/2\ 165/13\ 165/23\\ 166/3\ 166/22\ 168/8\\ 168/14\ 169/8\ 171/20\\ 172/12\ 173/25\ 180/14\\ 181/6\ 181/21\ 184/24\\ \end{array}$ | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 22/10 27/13 themselves [7] 14/4 15/22 23/23 70/18 141/11 195/7 204/2 then [130] 1/18 2/6 2/25 3/4 4/9 6/11 6/22 8/6 10/7 10/9 10/20 15/24 19/3 19/21 20/13 23/17 25/3 25/7 25/19 26/19 27/11 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 63/24 66/20 68/16 74/25 75/22 82/3 85/20 86/19 86/21 87/8 89/22 91/20 93/5 93/25 95/15 96/14 98/9 103/15 108/8 117/10 128/7 129/5 136/17 148/19 159/2 171/17 178/16 180/14 180/16 180/19 184/3 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 164/25 167/23 171/15 172/7 172/20 173/23 175/2 175/6 175/7 175/8 176/21 177/8 182/17 182/19 183/5 183/16 184/12 184/13 184/22 185/13 185/19 185/22 185/25 186/8 186/12 186/13 186/16 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 171/18 172/4 174/6 174/16 177/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/23 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/6 195/14 195/18 195/22 196/3 196/7 196/18 196/21 197/7 197/17 203/4 203/6 203/25 204/16 204/20 205/2 205/4 205/8 205/10 205/17 205/19 205/20 205/25 206/2 206/8 206/9 206/11 206/17 206/18 206/23 208/12 208/21 209/1 214/8 215/1 216/20 | $\begin{array}{c} 19/16\ 27/10\ 32/23\\ 34/1\ 49/10\ 49/18\ 50/3\\ 51/6\ 53/10\ 56/21\\ 57/17\ 57/17\ 61/8\\ 62/11\ 63/7\ 63/9\ 65/24\\ 67/9\ 70/1\ 71/15\ 74/2\\ 74/18\ 74/22\ 74/24\\ 76/18\ 81/1\ 81/22\\ 86/10\ 86/21\ 87/2\\ 87/14\ 87/16\ 88/18\\ 90/3\ 97/8\ 98/17\\ 101/18\ 107/4\ 108/11\\ 109/10\ 109/25\ 111/8\\ 111/10\ 114/14\ 115/6\\ 117/24\ 119/3\ 119/18\\ 120/24\ 125/11\ 126/1\\ 127/19\ 128/22\ 129/14\\ 131/20\ 132/6\ 132/23\\ 133/3\ 133/5\ 133/8\\ 137/5\ 138/2\ 141/16\\ 142/10\ 149/23\ 150/13\\ 151/16\ 151/19\ 151/21\\ 155/5\ 155/19\ 161/10\\ 163/2\ 165/13\ 165/23\\ 166/3\ 166/22\ 168/8\\ 168/14\ 169/8\ 171/20\\ 172/12\ 173/25\ 180/14\\ 181/6\ 181/21\ 184/24\\ 186/6\ 187/23\ 188/11\\ \end{array}$ | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 22/10 27/13 themselves [7] 14/4 15/22 23/23 70/18 141/11 195/7 204/2 then [130] 1/18 2/6 2/25 3/4 4/9 6/11 6/22 8/6 10/7 10/9 10/20 15/24 19/3 19/21 20/13 23/17 25/3 25/7 25/19 26/19 27/11 27/22 28/25 29/23 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 63/24 66/20 68/16 74/25 75/22 82/3 85/20 86/19 86/21 87/8 89/22 91/20 93/5 93/25 95/15 96/14 98/9 103/15 108/8 117/10 128/7 129/5 136/17 148/19 159/2 171/17 178/16 180/14 180/16 180/19 184/3 185/4 186/19 197/3 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 164/25 167/23 171/15 172/7 172/20 173/23 175/2 175/6 175/7 175/8 176/21 177/8 182/17 182/19 183/5 183/16 184/12 184/13 184/22 185/13 185/19 185/22 185/25 186/8 186/12 186/13 186/16 186/21 187/1 187/3 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/19 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 171/10 171/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/23 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/14 195/18 195/22 196/18 196/21 197/7 196/18 196/21 197/7 197/17 203/25 204/16 204/20 205/20 205/25 206/2 205/20 205/25 206/2 | $\begin{array}{c} 19/16\ 27/10\ 32/23\\ 34/1\ 49/10\ 49/18\ 50/3\\ 51/6\ 53/10\ 56/21\\ 57/17\ 57/17\ 61/8\\ 62/11\ 63/7\ 63/9\ 65/24\\ 67/9\ 70/1\ 71/15\ 74/2\\ 74/18\ 74/22\ 74/24\\ 76/18\ 81/1\ 81/22\\ 86/10\ 86/21\ 87/2\\ 87/14\ 87/16\ 88/18\\ 90/3\ 97/8\ 98/17\\ 101/18\ 107/4\ 108/11\\ 109/10\ 109/25\ 111/8\\ 111/10\ 114/14\ 115/6\\ 117/24\ 119/3\ 119/18\\ 120/24\ 125/11\ 126/1\\ 127/19\ 128/22\ 129/14\\ 131/20\ 132/6\ 132/23\\ 133/3\ 133/5\ 133/8\\ 137/5\ 138/2\ 141/16\\ 142/10\ 149/23\ 150/13\\ 151/16\ 151/19\ 151/21\\ 155/5\ 155/19\ 161/10\\ 163/2\ 165/13\ 165/23\\ 166/3\ 166/22\ 168/8\\ 168/14\ 169/8\ 171/20\\ 172/12\ 173/25\ 180/14\\ 181/6\ 181/21\ 184/24\\ 186/6\ 187/23\ 188/11\\ 188/16\ 189/2\ 189/5\\ \end{array}$ | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 22/10 27/13 themselves [7] 14/4 15/22 23/23 70/18 141/11 195/7 204/2 then [130] 1/18 2/6 2/25 3/4 4/9 6/11 6/22 8/6 10/7 10/9 10/20 15/24 19/3 19/21 20/13 23/17 25/3 25/7 25/19 26/19 27/11 27/22 28/25 29/23 29/24 29/24 35/9 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 63/24 66/20 68/16 74/25 75/22 82/3 85/20 86/19 86/21 87/8 89/22 91/20 93/5 93/25 95/15 96/14 98/9 103/15 108/8 117/10 128/7 129/5 136/17 148/19 159/2 171/17 178/16 180/14 180/16 180/19 184/3 185/4 186/19 197/3 198/17 200/11 205/1 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 164/25 167/23 171/15 172/7 172/20 173/23 175/2 175/6 175/7 175/8 176/21 177/8 182/17 182/19 183/5 183/16 184/12 184/13 184/22 185/13 185/19 185/22 185/25 186/8 186/12 186/13 186/16 186/21 187/1 187/3 187/22 188/1 188/1 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 171/18 172/4 174/6 174/16 177/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/23 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/6 195/14 195/18 195/22 196/3 196/7 196/18 196/21 197/7 197/17 203/4 203/6 203/25 204/16 204/20 205/2 205/4 205/8 205/10 205/17 205/19 205/20 205/25 206/2 206/8 206/9 206/11 206/17 206/18 206/23 208/12 208/21 209/1 214/8 215/1 216/20 | $\begin{array}{c} 19/16\ 27/10\ 32/23\\ 34/1\ 49/10\ 49/18\ 50/3\\ 51/6\ 53/10\ 56/21\\ 57/17\ 57/17\ 61/8\\ 62/11\ 63/7\ 63/9\ 65/24\\ 67/9\ 70/1\ 71/15\ 74/2\\ 74/18\ 74/22\ 74/24\\ 76/18\ 81/1\ 81/22\\ 86/10\ 86/21\ 87/2\\ 87/14\ 87/16\ 88/18\\ 90/3\ 97/8\ 98/17\\ 101/18\ 107/4\ 108/11\\ 109/10\ 109/25\ 111/8\\ 111/10\ 114/14\ 115/6\\ 117/24\ 119/3\ 119/18\\ 120/24\ 125/11\ 126/1\\ 127/19\ 128/22\ 129/14\\ 131/20\ 132/6\ 132/23\\ 133/3\ 133/5\ 133/8\\ 137/5\ 138/2\ 141/16\\ 142/10\ 149/23\ 150/13\\ 151/16\ 151/19\ 151/21\\ 155/5\ 155/19\ 161/10\\ 163/2\ 165/13\ 165/23\\ 166/3\ 166/22\ 168/8\\ 168/14\ 169/8\ 171/20\\ 172/12\ 173/25\ 180/14\\ 181/6\ 181/21\ 184/24\\ 186/6\ 187/23\ 188/11\\ \end{array}$ | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 22/10 27/13 themselves [7] 14/4 15/22 23/23 70/18 141/11 195/7 204/2 then [130] 1/18 2/6 2/25 3/4 4/9 6/11 6/22 8/6 10/7 10/9 10/20 15/24 19/3 19/21 20/13 23/17 25/3 25/7 25/19 26/19 27/11 27/22 28/25 29/23 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 63/24 66/20 68/16 74/25 75/22 82/3 85/20 86/19 86/21 87/8 89/22 91/20 93/5 93/25 95/15 96/14 98/9 103/15 108/8 117/10 128/7 129/5 136/17 148/19 159/2 171/17 178/16 180/14 180/16 180/19 184/3 185/4 186/19 197/3 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 164/25 167/23 171/15 172/7 172/20 173/23 175/2 175/6 175/7 175/8 176/21 177/8 182/17 182/19 183/5 183/16 184/12 184/13 184/22 185/13 185/19 185/22 185/25 186/8 186/12 186/13 186/16 186/21 187/1 187/3 |
| 139/3 139/23 140/22 141/7 141/11 141/13 142/5 142/6 142/12 142/14 142/18 143/7 144/19 144/21 144/22 144/23 144/25 149/20 153/12 159/5 160/20 161/22 162/13 163/6 163/8 163/12 165/11 169/22 170/17 170/23 171/10 171/10 171/14 171/18 172/4 174/6 174/16 177/14 192/11 193/6 193/7 193/11 194/2 194/11 194/13 194/17 194/18 194/23 195/1 195/3 195/6 195/6 195/14 195/18 195/2 196/3 196/7 196/18 196/21 197/7 197/17 203/4 203/6 203/25 204/16 204/20 205/2 205/4 205/8 205/10 205/17 205/19 205/20 205/25 206/2 206/8 206/9 206/11 206/17 206/18 206/23 208/12 208/21 209/1 214/8 215/1 216/20 | $\begin{array}{c} 19/16\ 27/10\ 32/23\\ 34/1\ 49/10\ 49/18\ 50/3\\ 51/6\ 53/10\ 56/21\\ 57/17\ 57/17\ 61/8\\ 62/11\ 63/7\ 63/9\ 65/24\\ 67/9\ 70/1\ 71/15\ 74/2\\ 74/18\ 74/22\ 74/24\\ 76/18\ 81/1\ 81/22\\ 86/10\ 86/21\ 87/2\\ 87/14\ 87/16\ 88/18\\ 90/3\ 97/8\ 98/17\\ 101/18\ 107/4\ 108/11\\ 109/10\ 109/25\ 111/8\\ 111/10\ 114/14\ 115/6\\ 117/24\ 119/3\ 119/18\\ 120/24\ 125/11\ 126/1\\ 127/19\ 128/22\ 129/14\\ 131/20\ 132/6\ 132/23\\ 133/3\ 133/5\ 133/8\\ 137/5\ 138/2\ 141/16\\ 142/10\ 149/23\ 150/13\\ 151/16\ 151/19\ 151/21\\ 155/5\ 155/19\ 161/10\\ 163/2\ 165/13\ 165/23\\ 166/3\ 166/22\ 168/8\\ 168/14\ 169/8\ 171/20\\ 172/12\ 173/25\ 180/14\\ 181/6\ 181/21\ 184/24\\ 186/6\ 187/23\ 188/11\\ 188/16\ 189/2\ 189/5\\ \end{array}$ | 43/16 48/10 49/10 59/9 65/6 65/9 71/4 81/6 84/10 87/16 88/2 88/10 89/1 90/1 91/22 98/12 98/13 104/3 106/2 116/8 134/4 136/21 139/2 145/2 146/19 155/17 162/9 165/5 167/18 168/21 171/15 177/9 177/19 179/11 180/2 180/15 185/20 185/23 186/2 186/5 192/22 194/2 195/7 195/7 195/8 195/25 198/1 199/17 202/22 204/22 210/15 219/19 219/24 222/3 theme [4] 12/5 14/7 22/10 27/13 themselves [7] 14/4 15/22 23/23 70/18 141/11 195/7 204/2 then [130] 1/18 2/6 2/25 3/4 4/9 6/11 6/22 8/6 10/7 10/9 10/20 15/24 19/3 19/21 20/13 23/17 25/3 25/7 25/19 26/19 27/11 27/22 28/25 29/23 29/24 29/24 35/9 | there [249] there's [29] 33/17 67/3 79/23 89/21 91/3 94/5 101/7 108/2 120/17 121/25 124/4 127/21 128/3 148/25 149/5 150/11 163/2 163/11 165/2 167/9 172/9 180/7 191/7 194/5 202/21 207/19 215/3 215/6 220/21 therefore [11] 2/1 44/21 54/16 88/2 114/3 150/4 171/23 209/20 211/3 220/13 220/14 these [51] 17/2 33/20 34/25 46/16 63/23 63/24 66/20 68/16 74/25 75/22 82/3 85/20 86/19 86/21 87/8 89/22 91/20 93/5 93/25 95/15 96/14 98/9 103/15 108/8 117/10 128/7 129/5 136/17 148/19 159/2 171/17 178/16 180/14 180/16 180/19 184/3 185/4 186/19 197/3 198/17 200/11 205/1 | 89/25 90/5 93/18 93/25 94/1 94/16 96/10 98/10 100/14 101/15 102/16 103/22 103/23 106/1 107/9 107/19 107/22 107/24 109/7 109/17 110/2 114/7 116/17 116/24 117/2 120/1 120/2 120/9 122/20 127/24 130/2 130/7 134/16 137/3 140/14 142/8 142/14 148/19 148/20 150/9 152/4 152/14 152/16 154/2 154/6 154/12 155/18 157/19 161/10 163/8 163/13 164/25 167/23 171/15 172/7 172/20 173/23 175/2 175/6 175/7 175/8 176/21 177/8 182/17 182/19 183/5 183/16 184/12 184/13 184/22 185/13 185/19 185/22 185/25 186/8 186/12 186/13 186/16 186/21 187/1 187/3 187/22 188/1 188/1 |

(87) terms... - they

| 90/16 123/19 135/8 204/4 205/14 169/25 17/11 17/12 17/12 19/14 19/16 132/2 131/21 131/23 136/1 144/22 153/11 206/8 207/21 207/23 175/1 180/2 182/3 40/14 40/15 49/16 132/2 132/14 175/21 165/16 183/2 183/2 182/16 182/20 183/15 55/23 59/17 60/4 176/23 216/17 229/12 192/18 193/2 203/14 182/16 182/20 183/15 55/23 59/17 60/4 176/23 216/17 229/17 192/25 192/25 192/2 191/10 202/17 166/11 166/11 166/11 166/11 166/11 166/11 166/11 11/16 11/14 11/15 13/5 13/9 13/10 15/10 21/17 203/22 205/14 168/17 11/16 11/14 11/15 11/12 11/12 11/12 11/12< | T they [24] 188/24 189/2 189/9 189/9 189/20 193/5 193/19 193/19 195/10 195/15 199/11 203/10 204/2 204/10 204/17 207/16 210/18 210/20 217/15 219/4 221/8 221/10 223/4 226/1 they'd [6] 19/15 70/25 94/15 203/23 204/4 204/6 they're [25] 41/10 41/19 134/16 134/20 136/19 141/13 171/18 173/12 183/9 185/9 185/23 186/9 186/11 186/15 187/9 188/2 189/7 189/17 189/19 202/18 202/19 217/14 220/10 226/17 226/20 they've [6] 39/4 41/11 88/12 124/14 176/22 219/2 thing [10] 17/19 41/18 69/11 87/6 98/17 154/20 173/25 215/20 215/21 217/7 things [28] 49/23 57/15 58/8 66/6 70/5 72/12 75/6 77/18 81/10 84/3 87/8 87/9 87/10 88/25 89/25 | $\begin{array}{c} 105/2 \ 105/11 \ 106/13 \\ 107/4 \ 107/4 \ 108/10 \\ 110/5 \ 111/21 \ 112/4 \\ 116/6 \ 119/1 \ 120/15 \\ 122/22 \ 124/3 \ 125/4 \\ 126/1 \ 134/5 \ 134/25 \\ 135/14 \ 137/23 \ 138/19 \\ 139/14 \ 139/20 \ 139/25 \\ 140/4 \ 140/25 \ 141/25 \\ 140/4 \ 140/25 \ 141/25 \\ 140/4 \ 140/25 \ 141/25 \\ 140/4 \ 140/25 \ 141/25 \\ 140/4 \ 140/25 \ 141/25 \\ 152/23 \ 156/19 \ 157/6 \\ 157/12 \ 158/2 \ 158/10 \\ 158/13 \ 161/8 \ 166/1 \\ 166/9 \ 166/17 \ 166/18 \\ 168/5 \ 168/14 \ 171/18 \\ 172/8 \ 172/12 \ 172/25 \\ 173/21 \ 173/23 \ 174/5 \\ 174/13 \ 174/17 \ 175/3 \\ 176/23 \ 179/19 \ 180/3 \\ 180/4 \ 180/22 \ 181/8 \\ 181/10 \ 181/20 \ 181/20 \\ 186/14 \ 187/1 \ 192/12 \\ 192/21 \ 193/13 \ 194/5 \\ 194/15 \ 195/17 \ 196/5 \\ 196/5 \ 196/24 \ 197/11 \\ 199/25 \ 200/3 \ 200/13 \\ 200/14 \ 201/4 \ 201/6 \\ 202/10 \ 202/13 \ 202/15 \\ 202/23 \ 202/24 \ 203/24 \end{array}$ | 156/12 156/22 157/8 158/9 158/19 159/10 159/21 161/1 161/14 166/10 168/12 169/2 | 133/19 134/14 134/22 135/3 137/1 139/2 140/16 141/8 141/12 142/6 142/14 143/8 144/9 144/20 144/25 149/14 150/5 150/25 152/8 157/11 157/22 159/17 160/6 162/19 169/17 171/24 176/18 177/15 177/22 179/3 186/15 187/25 188/5 189/6 189/8 190/5 190/6 192/25 193/5 193/6 196/16 198/14 200/7 202/7 202/8 203/3 203/25 206/10 208/15 213/2 218/1 219/18 220/3 222/1 222/2 though [5] 30/10 49/25 118/5 160/20 200/23 thought [3] 74/16 112/2 138/12 thoughtful [1] 191/8 thousands [2] 16/20 29/22 threads [1] 103/19 three [29] 9/22 10/4 | 52/21 52/22 53/7 53/13 75/11 76/13 77/16 78/3 85/22 90/16 91/3 91/7 109/21 109/24 128/11 130/17 137/2 137/24 143/6 153/22 154/18 156/14 168/12 174/22 175/20 176/19 202/3 208/14 211/6 224/14 224/18 timely [2] 50/14 61/6 times [2] 39/14 201/18 timescale [1] 12/2 timescales [3] 13/3 71/8 222/22 timetable [1] 45/15 title [2] 6/21 6/24 today [14] 1/7 1/15 2/2 2/5 42/10 49/13 119/19 135/1 164/16 171/8 177/12 189/21 226/24 227/5 together [5] 85/9 102/23 103/20 198/20 203/15 told [14] 9/22 70/10 84/10 87/5 87/19 89/6 110/2 113/24 116/24 117/24 143/18 152/14 203/16 213/18 Tombleson [10] 1/17 |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| 18/4 18/6 18/7 18/23 224/23 227/13 215/17 219/2 220/14 58/19 65/7 66/1 69/12 63/22 64/10 104/24 18/25 20/2 20/11 thinking [1] 41/19 221/11 221/15 222/7 71/16 77/15 83/18 110/13 133/16 166/4 20/13 21/2 21/25 23/1 thinking [1] 41/19 223/3 225/3 227/3 88/10 95/6 113/25 top [2] 81/20 128/2 23/8 23/16 23/20 25/16 26/18 26/22 third [5] 41/9 70/9 thorough [3] 56/10 129/23 134/3 139/3 top [2] 81/20 128/2 25/16 26/18 26/22 third-level [1] 188/17 third-level [1] 188/17 third-level [1] 188/17 third-level [1] 188/17 third [1/10/17 11/1 122/20 total [3] 126/14 29/21 36/14 37/15 s8/19 43/24 44/18 12/19 13/11 14/16 throughout [5] 20/23 touch [1] 121/9 41/20 42/1 42/15 this [187] 1/7 2/10 14/17 15/21 16/10 22/10 57/12 134/1 14/9/11 225/3 41/20 42/1 42/15 11/12 11/19 12/3 12/4 20/23 21/1 24/10 Thursday [3] 127/23 touch [1] 121/9 42/19 43/24 44/18 11/12 11/19 12/3 12/4 20/23 21/1 24/10 Thursday [3] 127/23 tours [1] 22/25 42/19 43/24 44/16 19/20 26/15 26/16 34/23 38/1 38/4 38/21 time [54] 7/10 11/7 148/25 62/28 62/20 6 | 192/18 193/2 203/18 209/21 think [220] 4/6 6/7 10/8 11/6 12/21 12/23 13/5 13/9 13/10 15/10 15/17 16/2 16/14 16/16 16/18 17/8 | 210/11 210/12 210/13 212/5 212/6 213/14 214/5 214/7 214/17 215/1 215/19 215/20 215/25 216/2 216/13 217/6 217/11 217/18 218/11 218/21 218/21 219/3 219/16 224/12 | 191/25 192/17 193/24 195/25 196/25 197/25 199/2 201/10 202/17 202/21 203/22 205/14 207/21 208/9 208/19 209/20 211/6 211/13 213/6 214/15 215/15 | 77/1 82/4 82/15 84/3 124/23 129/21 146/21 166/11 166/12 168/4 168/7 171/24 198/13 218/11 222/15 through [25] 7/15 16/22 21/13 32/8 32/9 | 210/12 212/6 too [12] 11/14 11/15 11/16 11/18 20/7 20/8 30/2 142/9 153/9 159/3 193/14 216/24 took [12] 1/22 6/13 13/20 21/3 26/7 62/9 |
| 40/5 40/7 40/11 41/2 this [187] 1/7 2/10 14/17 15/21 16/10 22/10 57/12 134/1 touchpoints [1] 41/20 42/1 42/15 2/14 2/25 5/2 5/11 19/1 20/11 20/23 137/19 80/18 42/19 43/24 44/18 11/12 11/19 12/3 12/4 20/23 21/1 24/10 137/19 tours [1] 22/25 44/24 45/6 45/7 45/10 11/12 11/19 12/3 12/4 20/23 21/1 24/10 14/17 15/21 16/10 137/19 48/1 48/6 50/1 55/4 16/24 18/12 19/16 34/9 34/14 34/18 224/5 227/20 tier [2] 187/22 187/24 161/2 166/18 168/5 58/24 60/13 60/20 16/24 18/12 19/16 34/23 38/1 38/4 38/21 time [54] 7/10 11/7 161/2 166/18 168/5 62/8 62/20 63/5 63/9 27/2 27/8 27/15 27/21 39/21 41/24 49/4 11/13 11/15 13/20 148/25 66/4 66/13 70/9 70/15 27/21 33/1 33/2 33/4 59/22 61/24 62/21 13/22 14/3 14/19 15/3 train [11] 22/6 102/6 71/21 72/16 72/19 30/5 30/14 35/19 36/3 62/24 63/18 64/22 15/24 19/21 22/10 102/10 102/17 102/17 | 18/4 18/6 18/7 18/23 18/25 20/2 20/11 20/13 21/2 23/1 20/13 21/2 21/25 23/1 23/8 23/16 23/20 25/16 26/18 26/22 27/17 28/12 29/7 29/21 36/14 37/15 | thinking [1] 41/19 thinks [1] 101/12 third [5] 41/9 70/9 85/6 188/17 204/15 third-level [1] 188/17 thirdly [2] 82/20 84/18 | 221/11 221/15 222/7 223/3 225/3 227/3 thorough [3] 56/10 74/7 74/9 those [117] 1/10 1/13 1/14 9/11 10/17 11/1 12/19 13/11 14/16 | 71/16 77/15 83/18 88/10 95/6 113/25 129/23 134/3 139/3 144/21 149/7 150/16 165/7 182/3 189/16 222/20 throughout [5] 20/23 | 110/13 133/16 166/4 top [2] 81/20 128/2 topic [2] 158/2 172/14 total [3] 126/14 149/11 225/3 touch [1] 121/9 |
| 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | 40/5 40/7 40/11 41/2 41/20 42/1 42/15 42/19 43/24 44/18 44/24 45/6 45/7 45/10 48/1 48/6 50/1 55/4 58/24 60/13 60/20 62/8 62/20 63/5 63/9 66/4 66/13 70/9 70/15 | this [187] 1/7 2/10 2/14 2/25 5/2 5/11 11/12 11/19 12/3 12/4 12/11 14/2 14/15 16/24 18/12 19/16 19/20 26/15 26/16 27/2 27/8 27/15 27/21 27/21 33/1 33/2 33/4 33/5 35/14 35/19 36/3 | 14/17 15/21 16/10 19/1 20/11 20/23 20/23 21/1 24/10 24/11 28/9 31/8 31/18 34/9 34/14 34/18 34/23 38/1 38/4 38/21 39/21 41/24 49/4 59/22 61/24 62/21 62/24 63/18 64/22 | 22/10 57/12 134/1 137/19 Thursday [3] 127/23 224/5 227/20 tier [2] 187/22 187/24 time [54] 7/10 11/7 11/13 11/15 13/20 13/22 14/3 14/19 15/3 15/24 19/21 22/10 | touchpoints [1] 80/18 tours [1] 22/25 towards [4] 81/23 161/2 166/18 168/5 trail [2] 134/10 148/25 train [11] 22/6 102/6 102/10 102/17 102/17 |

(88) they... - train

| Т | 227/9 | 203/2 209/14 209/22 | 215/11 215/24 216/1 | 212/9 222/13 224/5 |
|--|-----------------------|--|---|------------------------|
| | two's [1] 43/12 | understanding [60] | unsuccessful [1] | 224/7 224/24 |
| trainees [1] 166/15 | two-way [1] 32/7 | 5/21 13/6 17/15 18/8 | 23/6 | use [24] 59/18 66/16 |
| training [4] 34/8 | tying [1] 99/12 | 25/1 25/17 35/1 35/15 | until [20] 5/12 6/3 | 70/14 82/18 82/23 |
| 34/13 34/17 34/22 | type [1] 114/20 | 36/20 41/3 41/5 41/17 | 50/5 61/20 62/12 | 87/12 87/16 87/25 |
| trajectory [1] 82/6 | types [5] 159/12 | 42/6 44/18 45/12 | 72/16 72/16 104/9 | 88/1 88/3 90/7 97/2 |
| tranche [1] 214/16 | 180/23 219/9 219/10 | 45/20 53/4 54/7 56/3 | 120/23 130/24 131/1 | 102/15 121/17 134/7 |
| transcript [5] 131/14 | 221/12 | 59/12 68/20 82/7 82/9 | | 134/8 141/15 196/2 |
| 131/16 131/18 132/16 | typically [6] 145/19 | 83/4 83/14 86/10 | 167/13 170/19 171/6 | 197/17 204/16 205/25 |
| 165/1 | 153/5 167/6 182/11 | 87/14 92/15 95/22 | 173/15 213/10 228/8 | 205/25 221/25 227/19 |
| transferred [1] 4/10 | 183/6 187/16 | 104/13 106/7 106/11 | | used [48] 17/5 48/20 |
| tree [1] 71/13 | 103/0 107/10 | 106/13 111/8 114/14 | unusual [1] 175/23 | 48/25 69/16 69/17 |
| trial [2] 12/25 12/25 | U | 114/23 116/21 117/9 | up [61] 2/9 2/14 3/2 10/25 13/20 14/12 | 69/20 75/22 84/16 |
| trials [2] 25/15 25/20 | UK [2] 136/19 136/23 | 117/19 118/3 119/14 | 23/8 25/2 25/8 26/7 | |
| tried [1] 87/23 | ultimate [2] 44/16 | | | 86/4 86/7 86/15 86/21 |
| triggers [1] 124/7 | 63/1 | 129/14 129/25 130/6 | 28/16 29/15 39/9 43/1 | 88/12 92/6 93/12 |
| true [6] 3/22 48/4 | | | | 93/16 94/13 94/23 |
| 49/5 132/11 164/23 | ultimately [6] 18/7 | 152/10 175/6 175/14 | 52/16 59/6 59/10 62/9 | 95/13 95/18 96/1 |
| 227/15 | 35/8 107/6 134/5 | 176/13 176/17 176/20 | | 101/11 101/18 113/20 |
| truncate [1] 93/20 | 161/18 161/23 | 180/20 203/22 204/8 | 82/4 82/13 84/24 | 114/4 115/8 115/10 |
| truncated [7] 86/12 | unattractive [1] | 208/4 211/17 217/22 | 91/23 101/2 101/16 | 115/22 115/23 117/6 |
| 87/12 88/3 141/15 | 117/25 | 218/22 | 104/9 107/2 108/7 | 117/21 140/14 145/12 |
| 141/16 208/24 209/4 | uncommon [3] | understandings [1] | 111/25 120/22 121/21 | 147/1 147/24 154/17 |
| truncating [1] 93/16 | 145/17 145/19 146/5 | 116/7 | 125/15 125/21 126/4 | 154/21 154/22 163/12 |
| try [15] 10/6 10/6 | uncovered [2] 197/9 | understood [22] 9/7 | 126/7 127/16 127/23 | 190/5 198/12 198/12 |
| 19/19 19/25 23/6 | 197/12 | 12/22 13/10 21/18 | 127/24 130/1 130/7 | 202/17 209/2 217/1 |
| 44/21 59/14 68/23 | under [27] 11/12 | 22/1 24/16 25/3 28/15 | 137/21 138/6 138/11 | 217/10 218/12 226/10 |
| 69/5 69/13 87/3 | 11/25 22/22 23/5 | 45/3 54/19 59/3 72/17 | | users [2] 34/6 207/5 |
| 101/18 201/10 201/16 | 23/14 29/2 42/20 | 72/20 74/16 88/19 | 183/6 185/18 188/7 | using [6] 149/8 |
| | 43/14 52/20 53/7 | 91/16 117/2 117/22 | 190/12 191/12 199/24 | 158/19 196/25 205/8 |
| 224/10 | 53/12 53/16 54/1 54/9 | 152/16 172/13 181/2 | 202/15 209/13 222/6 | 206/22 215/13 |
| trying [8] 7/19 10/13 | 54/11 54/24 55/1 85/7 | 203/23 | upcoming [2] 38/19 | usual [2] 83/13 147/6 |
| 36/8 90/4 95/20 | 103/15 104/6 125/20 | undertake [5] 68/18 | 223/11 | usually [1] 143/6 |
| 192/23 220/1 220/18 | 127/23 149/25 195/2 | 136/22 137/3 168/18 | update [2] 2/22 | utilise [1] 25/5 |
| Tuesday [3] 1/1 224/6 227/13 | 195/22 195/23 196/10 | 199/5 | 127/21 | utilised [5] 31/2 |
| turn [28] 3/18 14/5 | under-resourced [4] | undertaken [16] 56/1 | | 93/19 94/21 170/11 |
| 47/25 51/13 52/16 | 23/5 52/20 53/7 53/12 | | 89/8 | 199/11 |
| 67/3 71/22 73/23 | under-resourcing [6] | 120/25 125/1 125/8 | updates [7] 37/13 | utilising [1] 92/14 |
| 75/15 79/2 82/15 | | 169/13 191/24 199/11 | | V |
| 101/16 102/20 102/21 | 54/24 55/1 | 199/21 199/22 214/23 | | |
| 111/17 112/9 118/14 | underlying [4] | 222/14 222/17 225/14 | upfront [1] 144/24 | valid [1] 45/22 |
| 177/2 189/15 191/12 | 140/23 141/18 141/25 | undertaking [3] 51/1 | uploaded [2] 2/4 | value [1] 226/7 |
| 196/3 197/19 202/8 | 162/6 | 51/2 121/6 | 49/12 | variation [1] 172/10 |
| 209/12 210/22 214/17 | underpinned [2] 12/5 | undertook [2] 168/10 | | varied [1] 170/7 |
| 203/12/210/22/214/17 | 57/11 | 216/19 | upon [7] 50/22 | various [17] 7/17 |
| turned [4] 84/24 | understaffed [1] 42/1 | | 101/15 121/9 199/18 | 9/14 40/24 46/1 46/14 |
| 91/23 199/24 202/15 | understaffing [1] | 10/17 | 209/3 219/2 227/7 | 61/8 103/1 133/18 |
| Turning [1] 197/16 | 41/25 | undesirable [4] | urgently [1] 27/4 | 133/25 145/23 145/23 |
| | understand [53] | 113/22 114/19 115/9 | URN [1] 165/1 | 159/15 200/8 201/18 |
| twice [1] 75/18 | 12/24 25/15 40/8 | 145/14 | us [54] 7/15 18/20 | 202/4 203/1 217/20 |
| two [47] 8/23 9/1 20/20 30/20 32/7 37/4 | 44/10 46/15 49/15 | unfair [3] 81/3 81/4 | 21/19 27/18 28/22 | vary [2] 174/12 |
| | 49/21 54/13 54/21 | 107/4 | 29/12 29/20 39/23 | 190/16 |
| 37/5 48/7 49/14 50/13 | 60/2 60/14 68/7 68/21 | unique [3] 4/2 154/4 | 44/17 47/18 47/21 | vast [2] 130/12 |
| 51/17 66/13 72/12 | 78/17 84/13 89/3 | 158/7 | 50/25 51/12 51/17 | 142/22 |
| 77/20 81/10 89/20 | 89/24 91/25 92/16 | uniqueness [1] 158/9 | 63/1 63/3 64/24 67/19 | vaults [1] 76/18 |
| 94/1 108/4 123/2 | 95/2 97/7 97/14 99/19 | Unit [1] 50/7 | 68/7 70/10 81/3 83/3 | vendor [1] 145/22 |
| 124/3 128/9 128/15 | 113/1 113/19 116/9 | unknown [1] 126/4 | 87/19 88/23 89/6 | Venn [1] 40/16 |
| 128/17 129/11 150/5 | 116/13 116/16 118/7 | unless [4] 55/16 | 111/20 118/6 123/5 | verbally [1] 187/6 |
| 159/12 165/8 166/21 | 120/14 130/3 145/2 | 163/1 184/13 228/4 | 125/2 126/6 130/3 | version [12] 3/1 |
| 168/7 173/12 180/8 | 147/23 151/25 152/3 | unpredictable [4] | 134/11 136/12 136/20 | 150/22 153/16 154/4 |
| 180/9 189/23 189/25 | 155/23 156/1 156/2 | 113/21 114/15 115/9 | 137/1 146/20 149/1 | 200/25 201/4 202/9 |
| 191/11 198/14 203/15 | 156/4 165/9 165/14 | 145/13 | 149/7 150/16 154/4 | 203/11 203/12 208/24 |
| 203/15 205/3 206/13 | 175/1 183/4 184/21 | unreasonable [1] | 154/6 158/22 160/11 | 209/4 212/8 |
| 213/16 214/3 215/13 | 186/12 192/24 193/17 | 112/3 | 164/17 166/24 168/16 | versions [10] 153/21 |
| 219/9 219/10 224/7 | 194/9 199/12 201/17 | unsatisfactory [3] | 182/4 194/4 206/15 | 156/10 202/5 209/23 |
| | | ······································ | | |
| | | | | (90) trainaga varaiana |

(89) trainees - versions

| V | wanted [13] 21/19 | 111/19 118/19 134/25 | 92/20 94/1 94/12 | 160/17 170/2 170/25 |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| | 21/22 29/7 43/11 | 135/15 135/21 137/10 | | 172/17 175/6 176/4 |
| versions [6] 210/6 210/10 211/10 211/20 | 46/15 56/12 56/21 | 140/10 156/12 159/21 | 96/8 96/12 97/2 98/2 | 176/10 178/5 181/4 |
| 212/3 212/10 | 56/25 66/15 90/20 | 160/6 171/25 172/4 | 100/1 101/20 103/4 | 181/22 182/6 184/10 |
| vertical [1] 150/19 | 112/7 154/12 203/19 | 180/10 182/21 194/8 | 104/3 104/11 106/12 | 184/17 186/20 186/24 |
| very [66] 1/6 3/11 | wanting [3] 57/12 | 197/3 203/16 203/20 | 106/23 107/12 109/5 | 186/25 187/4 188/25 |
| 3/25 7/19 11/13 12/17 | 58/5 58/14 | 204/17 214/4 219/20 | 109/13 109/16 109/17 | 189/25 192/13 195/3 |
| 12/18 13/21 19/17 | was [509] | 225/21 226/3 | 110/2 110/5 110/6 | 196/3 199/15 199/18 |
| 20/25 23/23 27/8 | washing [1] 73/13 | wearing [1] 45/18 | 110/9 114/17 116/7 | 200/18 202/18 207/19 |
| 28/19 36/5 36/15 46/8 | wasn't [38] 6/3 7/9 | website [4] 2/5 4/1 | 116/8 117/24 119/3 | 209/10 218/14 |
| 46/24 47/1 47/5 47/11 | 7/9 7/11 11/2 11/9 | 49/12 165/8 | 120/11 121/1 121/10 | whenever [1] 88/23 |
| 52/19 56/20 56/22 | 11/11 16/2 17/15 | week [4] 6/18 8/1 8/3 | 121/23 123/1 123/13 | where [55] 7/15 |
| 57/12 58/23 64/22 | 18/21 19/13 20/4 | 227/17 | 124/14 124/14 124/15 | |
| 84/16 88/25 91/10 | 21/24 26/16 29/3 | weekend [1] 77/25 | 125/3 125/6 125/11 | 19/13 20/2 21/3 22/13 |
| 115/18 127/8 130/1 | 30/14 36/11 38/10 | weekends [1] 78/4 | 126/22 128/23 130/4 | 23/9 23/10 23/12 |
| 130/20 131/2 131/6 | 38/15 42/21 62/20 66/18 69/2 72/17 | weekly [2] 75/18 162/10 | 130/7 135/2 135/2 135/18 137/14 138/9 | 29/16 30/4 30/21 31/22 38/11 39/2 |
| 131/12 132/14 143/5 | 79/11 87/20 95/17 | weeks [1] 128/17 | 140/1 140/5 141/2 | 40/12 41/21 44/2 |
| 146/17 156/4 158/14 | 117/10 137/17 139/1 | well [35] 12/8 17/10 | 143/11 143/21 144/4 | 58/25 59/4 64/5 68/22 |
| 163/18 163/22 164/1 | 155/5 178/11 181/3 | 27/6 30/16 41/2 41/15 | | 69/9 77/23 78/1 81/19 |
| 167/21 170/19 175/5 | 204/10 212/14 213/18 | 42/5 44/6 46/11 46/23 | | 86/7 100/9 102/11 |
| 175/17 180/10 190/17 | 214/10 214/11 | 75/21 87/11 98/8 99/3 | | 104/24 106/1 107/20 |
| 190/20 191/5 197/15 | watching [1] 27/25 | 102/10 109/18 113/13 | | 111/11 125/8 125/15 |
| 200/5 214/13 214/15 | way [50] 12/13 16/23 | 114/16 138/11 143/6 | 159/8 159/10 161/15 | 137/23 139/21 140/11 |
| 218/5 219/14 219/20 | 17/7 23/15 32/7 33/10 | 147/7 148/18 162/8 | 163/9 165/15 169/5 | 142/3 143/13 151/8 |
| 224/3 226/9 226/15 226/16 226/25 227/12 | 34/20 45/20 52/4 | 162/16 171/25 172/8 | 171/9 171/23 171/25 | 154/1 162/19 167/11 |
| 228/6 | 57/16 58/21 58/24 | 174/18 179/18 186/8 | 172/6 174/15 174/19 | 172/20 174/9 182/17 |
| via [1] 65/6 | 62/24 73/15 76/3 | 188/3 189/14 193/2 | 174/24 176/5 176/11 | 183/20 183/22 183/22 |
| vice [1] 220/16 | 76/24 79/11 82/8 | 203/8 217/18 220/1 | 176/22 177/25 178/13 | 186/1 194/3 214/4 |
| view [28] 1/22 15/7 | 96/24 100/23 105/13 | went [4] 23/21 29/22 | 179/20 180/20 181/4 | whereas [2] 84/2 |
| 17/18 41/22 42/19 | 112/11 119/14 122/21 | 106/12 157/13 | 181/7 181/18 181/19 | 190/25 |
| 44/25 53/14 80/7 | 123/21 125/5 125/7 | were [300] | 182/7 183/7 184/7 | whether [72] 4/21 |
| 100/14 114/9 114/12 | | weren't [11] 7/6 20/8 | 186/3 186/20 188/11 | 48/4 53/23 58/19 71/9 |
| 139/19 141/22 142/6 | 140/13 142/14 149/15 150/11 153/18 178/9 | 29/11 38/23 38/24 40/4 42/3 84/18 | 190/8 190/8 190/19 191/19 193/14 195/14 | 73/4 73/13 75/4 76/14 87/3 89/4 92/22 93/8 |
| 142/15 142/17 148/23 | 178/18 181/8 181/10 | 144/23 153/5 194/16 | 196/24 200/7 200/9 | 93/10 100/3 100/14 |
| 150/9 157/12 206/11 | 181/15 185/18 197/5 | what [218] 1/9 5/21 | 200/23 203/11 203/25 | |
| 215/1 215/3 215/8 | 197/14 202/21 204/7 | 5/22 6/1 6/14 8/25 | 204/17 204/23 205/15 | |
| 215/12 219/14 219/17 | 205/15 219/19 224/9 | 11/9 13/2 18/9 19/8 | | 106/19 106/24 108/15 |
| 220/10 221/4 | 226/3 227/7 | 23/12 24/11 27/15 | 208/24 209/9 210/4 | 108/17 108/19 108/20 |
| viewing [1] 205/20 | ways [11] 13/25 14/1 | 28/15 28/18 28/25 | 213/18 214/10 214/11 | 109/12 111/12 112/8 |
| views [3] 215/18 | 23/14 57/15 139/15 | 29/1 31/16 31/17 | 226/10 227/6 227/8 | 117/7 118/5 119/18 |
| 216/3 227/7 vis [2] 43/22 43/22 | 145/19 173/3 180/8 | 31/17 31/18 31/24 | what's [13] 41/4 52/4 | 120/8 120/21 121/21 |
| vis [2] 43/22 43/22 vis à vis [1] 43/22 | 180/9 205/6 217/20 | 31/24 32/19 35/7 | 57/10 82/10 94/2 | 121/25 124/6 135/15 |
| visibility [5] 65/17 | we [339] | 38/17 38/18 38/18 | 107/1 111/13 118/4 | 139/3 141/1 141/8 |
| 65/19 162/17 171/9 | we'd [6] 77/5 81/9 | 39/8 39/9 39/13 40/8 | 121/23 122/7 132/18 | 141/22 142/6 142/8 |
| 171/21 | 96/22 144/23 189/8 | 41/5 41/13 41/16 44/4 | | 142/17 144/14 150/12 |
| visibly [1] 139/10 | 200/2 | 44/5 45/3 46/15 49/13 | | 154/6 154/12 159/4 |
| volume [1] 41/4 | we'll [8] 23/4 85/3 | 49/22 51/17 51/22 | 212/15 | 160/3 163/13 170/23 |
| volumes [1] 15/1 | 85/6 85/14 155/15 155/16 173/14 180/25 | | when [76] 5/14 6/12 8/10 9/24 10/7 10/11 | 173/21 178/21 184/3 185/6 185/8 185/11 |
| voting [1] 8/16 | we're [28] 47/1 52/14 | 57/17 58/14 59/12 | 11/12 16/19 16/22 | 186/16 187/2 187/5 |
| W | 59/17 60/4 60/14 61/1 | 59/24 60/7 60/23 | 17/20 17/25 19/24 | 188/7 188/22 189/2 |
| | 69/25 70/8 72/14 73/9 | 61/13 63/9 65/17 | 20/6 23/9 23/24 24/15 | |
| waiting [1] 227/23 Wales [1] 4/9 | 100/5 104/16 115/18 | 65/23 65/24 66/4 | 25/13 25/16 27/18 | 214/20 219/2 |
| wales [1] 4/9 want [22] 9/19 21/8 | 133/25 135/10 136/21 | 68/15 68/18 69/9 | 27/23 29/11 29/25 | which [169] 2/11 |
| 24/2 24/9 43/5 43/8 | 142/11 146/24 157/4 | 69/15 69/16 69/19 | 32/15 36/14 41/22 | 2/13 2/18 7/25 9/12 |
| 57/5 68/8 79/21 | 158/2 158/7 167/21 | 71/6 71/7 71/7 74/10 | 43/1 44/12 51/7 53/10 | |
| 138/15 142/14 142/20 | 171/8 171/17 181/11 | 74/15 75/13 76/8 | 55/1 79/9 107/12 | 17/11 17/25 25/5 |
| 145/10 155/2 160/19 | 184/1 186/24 203/25 | 77/11 78/10 78/11 | 107/23 107/24 115/25 | |
| 168/12 174/3 186/12 | we've [36] 39/11 42/9 | 78/18 81/22 84/13 | 119/13 119/20 119/21 | 37/18 39/12 42/4 46/3 |
| 196/25 217/16 221/4 | 51/971/2372/18 | 84/24 85/14 86/12 | 120/1 120/2 134/12 | 46/14 48/1 53/1 55/6 |
| 227/8 | 74/19 74/24 75/1 87/5 | 87/2 87/19 87/23 88/1 | 138/13 146/25 153/18 | |
| | 88/8 94/1 94/16 96/14 | 88/19 89/24 89/25 | 158/21 159/7 159/14 | 59/25 60/13 60/17 |
| | | | | (00) versions which |

(90) versions... - which

| W | 45/4 52/20 68/5 68/7 | 187/1 187/20 190/16 | WITN09950100 [1] | 124/2 125/16 130/4 |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| which [139] 61/4 | 68/21 78/15 88/22 | 190/17 191/1 193/19 | 165/2 | 130/13 130/17 130/19 |
| 62/12 63/14 63/15 | 100/16 113/24 115/13 | 206/8 214/7 214/9 | WITN09960100 [1] | 135/25 136/11 136/18 |
| 69/10 69/24 71/23 | 116/3 116/24 117/1 | 218/25 219/13 225/25 | 132/16 | 138/3 141/21 143/17 |
| 72/25 76/4 76/24 | 121/6 122/12 122/16 | 227/9 228/4 | WITN09970100 [2] | 147/10 147/12 157/2 |
| 78/21 79/5 79/18 | 123/3 133/10 136/18 | WILLIAMS [2] 46/10 | 4/2 11/21 | 163/11 164/17 166/1 |
| 79/20 79/24 81/7 | 141/5 141/21 144/4 | 229/6 | witness [65] 1/13 | 167/9 167/21 167/21 |
| 84/24 85/21 88/11 | | willing [2] 4/21 | 1/20 1/23 2/3 2/4 3/15 | 168/19 169/2 169/8 |
| 90/14 90/22 98/15 | 152/13 152/15 154/23 | | 3/25 11/19 13/15 19/5 28/3 31/7 47/22 47/24 | 169/25 170/11 172/2 172/6 176/10 177/6 |
| 98/23 99/1 99/10 | 175/21 176/23 177/5 185/5 187/12 189/12 | Wills [20] 1/16 23/3 45/4 45/7 47/2 47/12 | 49/5 49/9 49/11 51/12 | |
| 99/17 99/22 100/8 | 189/12 200/14 202/1 | 47/14 47/16 47/20 | 52/16 55/15 61/16 | 199/11 199/18 199/21 |
| 101/22 101/25 104/17 | 214/20 215/3 216/5 | 60/2 72/23 130/20 | 63/10 64/21 65/8 | 201/15 202/10 203/22 |
| 106/22 107/2 108/1 | 216/18 | 131/2 136/4 137/22 | 66/24 71/22 73/23 | 209/19 222/5 223/19 |
| 109/2 109/22 111/3 112/13 113/4 113/10 | who'd [1] 148/21 | 145/11 172/17 197/5 | 79/3 80/17 80/20 83/1 | 225/1 |
| 112/13 115/7 115/8 | Who's [1] 105/19 | 205/14 229/8 | 89/7 91/17 100/7 | worked [13] 6/22 |
| 115/17 116/11 117/8 | whoever [1] 8/7 | Wills' [3] 151/21 | 102/7 102/22 104/18 | 20/24 38/4 50/4 77/20 |
| 117/18 119/6 120/14 | whole [5] 103/7 | 151/23 155/22 | 105/18 105/20 111/17 | 123/3 139/19 148/21 |
| 120/25 121/18 122/4 | 104/9 109/8 111/2 | Winchester [8] 14/22 | | 153/17 170/4 170/16 |
| 123/15 123/17 123/18 | 123/18 | 16/19 17/23 19/10 | 132/3 142/21 149/4 | 172/3 177/18 |
| 124/4 124/10 125/10 | wholesale [1] 81/23 | 21/9 22/24 27/19 | 161/22 163/19 164/18 | |
| 125/13 128/11 128/12 | whom [5] 1/20 51/9 51/18 122/8 166/15 | 29/19 winding [1] 172/14 | 164/20 165/4 165/5 168/11 177/3 181/25 | 148/11 149/2 163/4 163/5 177/15 186/24 |
| 130/10 132/15 135/12 | whose [2] 89/22 | winding [1] 172/14 wish [5] 2/22 48/7 | 184/8 188/10 191/13 | working [20] 39/22 |
| 139/19 141/19 142/11 | 98/18 | 155/18 174/15 217/12 | 194/21 196/1 206/25 | 58/19 58/20 78/1 78/3 |
| 143/9 144/10 144/22 | why [44] 6/3 16/15 | withholding [1] | 209/9 221/16 222/6 | 133/25 141/4 148/6 |
| 146/9 147/24 149/10 | 21/23 25/25 39/23 | 115/20 | 222/8 | 148/10 148/19 167/23 |
| 149/19 150/11 150/21 150/25 151/2 153/22 | 44/17 45/6 54/23 | within [95] 6/18 7/16 | witnesses [9] 1/11 | 177/21 182/20 183/15 |
| 154/3 154/20 157/2 | 65/11 66/10 72/11 | 8/16 10/7 10/14 10/19 | 1/13 2/1 63/25 223/2 | 183/16 183/19 183/25 |
| 158/2 158/4 158/6 | 79/16 80/5 82/3 91/1 | 10/22 11/13 12/2 | 223/11 223/13 223/14 | |
| 161/18 161/23 170/14 | 91/7 92/25 96/9 97/4 | 12/21 13/11 14/17 | 224/6 | workplace [1] 127/3 |
| 171/6 175/2 175/7 | 112/1 114/2 114/15 | 15/12 15/21 16/3 | won't [7] 88/6 105/1 | works [4] 6/7 136/20 |
| 175/16 178/18 179/15 | 114/19 115/16 118/1 | 16/13 17/3 17/15 19/3 | | 149/16 153/18 |
| 181/15 183/20 183/23 | 119/7 135/9 151/17 155/23 156/2 161/24 | 21/1 21/20 23/25 24/19 27/3 28/14 | 187/22 190/25 | workspace [2] 126/20 138/11 |
| 184/5 184/21 188/18 | 162/23 163/2 165/10 | 31/11 31/20 32/16 | wonder [2] 130/23 197/18 | workspaces [2] |
| 189/5 190/6 191/13 | 174/21 175/12 175/12 | | word [24] 48/19 | 137/4 145/18 |
| 191/20 191/23 193/18 | 176/9 185/17 206/4 | 41/12 41/17 42/4 | 48/20 86/7 88/3 93/16 | |
| 196/2 196/8 197/19 198/21 198/22 200/20 | 213/12 213/22 216/8 | 51/14 51/19 51/21 | 93/17 93/20 93/21 | 198/19 |
| 200/22 202/17 203/17 | 225/13 | 51/23 53/17 54/8 | 94/4 94/6 94/7 94/7 | workstreams [2] |
| 204/25 205/10 209/11 | wide [5] 29/3 60/9 | 66/19 66/25 67/23 | 110/15 111/9 120/16 | 14/17 199/6 |
| 209/15 210/22 211/11 | 123/17 124/6 148/17 | 68/17 68/24 69/17 | 140/15 141/16 179/6 | world [3] 81/22 |
| 213/12 213/16 213/21 | wider [4] 26/9 28/21 | 70/11 71/17 75/19 | 197/1 208/22 208/22 | 182/19 185/5 |
| 213/23 215/7 215/15 | 44/3 44/5 widespread [1] 19/18 | 77/4 77/11 78/20 | 208/25 209/4 227/19 | would [238] |
| 216/23 218/3 219/13 | wild [1] 141/15 | 87/15 90/14 91/3 | wording [6] 140/20 140/24 141/6 156/23 | wouldn't [30] 10/9 10/18 29/11 71/4 73/2 |
| 221/9 221/13 221/15 | will [70] 1/15 1/17 | 99/16 101/8 105/5 | 156/24 157/18 | 86/19 86/23 88/1 |
| 222/24 223/16 225/20 | 1/18 1/19 2/3 2/4 4/1 | 111/1 114/13 122/16 | words [14] 48/11 | 89/25 114/8 114/18 |
| 226/8 226/14 227/4 | 14/12 27/9 27/10 | 134/9 134/22 134/24 | 48/13 86/13 94/1 | 146/2 151/5 151/6 |
| while [3] 33/3 34/25 141/14 | 27/15 28/23 45/4 | 142/16 143/5 148/16 | 94/17 96/2 97/17 | 151/10 173/20 173/20 |
| whilst [7] 27/13 | 49/12 60/9 60/20 | 149/12 159/13 160/14 | | 174/15 185/15 185/17 |
| 59/15 121/9 128/6 | 61/24 64/1 79/1 91/14 | | | 189/9 189/9 193/12 |
| 172/14 184/16 204/21 | 96/21 101/15 102/16 | 166/10 173/2 174/7 | 206/21 | 194/11 205/23 205/24 |
| Whistle [1] 86/9 | 105/7 113/6 113/12 119/1 119/5 119/12 | 184/4 184/19 184/20 184/25 185/12 186/20 | work [77] 6/8 9/17 10/2 12/6 12/11 23/8 | 211/25 214/25 220/25 223/25 |
| white [1] 105/10 | 123/7 128/7 128/10 | 186/22 188/2 188/14 | 23/17 30/22 45/19 | writing [2] 187/6 |
| who [70] 1/15 1/16 | 128/11 128/14 128/14 | | 47/21 52/8 52/14 59/4 | |
| 1/18 1/19 6/7 6/20 7/3 | 128/16 128/20 129/1 | 202/22 203/1 209/21 | 59/8 59/10 74/18 | written [4] 1/12 64/18 |
| 7/14 9/22 10/14 15/15 | 129/5 129/7 130/17 | 216/19 | 75/20 76/10 78/12 | 74/14 186/19 |
| 15/22 17/18 17/19 18/11 20/24 25/7 27/7 | 131/1 131/17 131/18 | without [8] 7/19 62/5 | 78/15 81/13 81/14 | wrong [2] 80/21 |
| 28/17 30/21 30/24 | 132/16 162/22 165/6 | 62/17 68/13 101/2 | 88/11 92/12 93/13 | 203/11 |
| 31/5 36/19 38/3 38/4 | 167/6 173/1 173/4 | 115/10 136/2 144/1 | 93/17 94/15 94/19 | wrote [2] 200/1 |
| 38/13 39/7 39/8 39/21 | 173/7 174/12 180/19 | WITN09940200 [2] | 94/23 95/22 101/13 | 200/15 |
| | 184/17 184/23 186/17 | 52/17 151/21 | 120/25 121/6 122/20 | WYN [2] 46/10 229/6 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | (91) which - WYN |

(91) which... - WYN

| Υ | 45/9 47/18 47/24 48/2 | | |
|---|---|---|-----------------|
| | 49/5 49/9 49/11 49/25 | | |
| yeah [8] 37/6 90/11 117/19 140/8 144/8 | 50/25 51/1 51/12 | | |
| 144/12 159/25 160/25 | 52/16 53/15 53/25 | | |
| year [16] 12/16 19/23 | 54/7 55/15 61/15 | | |
| 24/17 36/7 36/9 47/25 | 62/14 63/10 64/20 | | |
| 55/18 124/13 126/6 | 65/8 65/11 66/24 | | |
| 136/25 143/20 154/18 | 68/11 71/22 73/23 | | |
| 157/14 221/11 223/3 | 74/14 75/11 77/12 | | |
| 224/11 | 78/22 79/2 80/20 | | |
| years [9] 4/7 11/6 | 80/22 80/23 83/1 | | |
| 15/20 17/4 132/24 | 87/19 88/5 89/7 91/17 | | |
| 143/15 148/17 196/20 | 100/7 100/9 100/22 | | |
| 217/24 | 102/22 103/21 104/2 104/10 104/13 104/17 | | |
| years/decades [1] | 104/23 105/17 106/6 | | |
| 15/20 | 104/23 103/17 100/0 | | |
| yes [234] | 111/17 112/10 114/23 | | |
| yesterday [2] 2/17 | 117/16 121/1 127/17 | | |
| 3/2 | 131/2 131/25 132/8 | | |
| yet [6] 4/4 122/24 | 132/12 133/4 133/10 | | |
| 123/1 128/6 129/20 158/14 | 135/14 138/6 138/16 | | |
| yield [1] 191/21 | 139/19 139/24 140/25 | | |
| you [526] | 141/4 141/21 142/3 | | |
| you'd [2] 4/21 124/9 | 142/17 142/21 143/15 | | |
| you'll [4] 1/14 60/13 | 144/16 145/1 145/20 | | |
| 219/11 222/12 | 148/2 148/23 149/4 | | |
| you're [45] 4/5 4/16 | 154/11 154/24 156/19 | | |
| 14/7 41/13 50/1 53/6 | 163/19 164/14 164/21 164/24 165/4 165/5 | | |
| 55/21 55/25 56/17 | 165/17 167/12 168/10 | | |
| 62/8 63/13 64/3 75/16 | 171/8 173/15 176/3 | | |
| 79/3 81/25 84/3 91/11 | 176/25 177/2 177/21 | | |
| 91/19 96/17 100/8 | 178/7 178/15 179/12 | | |
| 100/21 102/14 105/20 | 181/25 182/7 184/8 | | |
| 108/6 108/10 108/22 | 191/13 194/21 195/5 | | |
| 133/9 143/15 144/2 144/3 144/9 153/18 | 196/1 197/8 198/12 | | |
| 157/22 163/9 165/18 | 206/25 207/13 208/8 | | |
| 165/21 166/13 181/19 | 209/9 210/15 213/10 | | |
| 182/3 201/5 210/4 | 214/18 215/5 215/13 | | |
| 211/21 218/16 220/1 | 217/2 218/17 218/18 | | |
| 227/23 | 221/16 222/6 222/8 | | |
| you've [40] 4/6 4/12 | 226/25 | | |
| 7/2 8/23 9/14 9/20 | yourself [1] 9/16 | | |
| 19/5 24/3 26/15 31/7 | Z | | |
| 42/11 87/25 89/15 | zip [6] 98/12 98/15 | | |
| 93/23 99/4 102/3 | 108/20 110/24 111/1 | | |
| 110/4 110/7 118/22 128/23 132/24 133/2 | 202/20 | | |
| 138/16 140/1 146/8 | | | |
| 147/1 151/11 153/23 | | | |
| 160/21 161/11 161/13 | | | |
| 172/15 185/4 193/8 | | | |
| 217/5 219/9 222/13 | | | |
| 224/23 227/1 227/22 | | | |
| your [158] 3/11 3/19 | | | |
| 3/22 6/24 9/20 10/21 | | | |
| 11/19 13/2 13/15 14/6 | | | |
| 15/7 17/18 19/5 23/6 | | | |
| 24/3 24/5 28/3 30/14 | | | |
| 31/7 31/10 35/9 36/1 | | | |
| 37/20 38/3 41/22 42/19 43/19 44/16 | | | |
| +2/13 43/13 44/10 | | | |
| | | | |
| L | | I | (92) yeah - zip |