## Thursday, 1 February 2024

## (9.59 am)

MR BEER: Good morning, sir. Can you see and hear us?
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can. Thank you.
MR BEER: Thank you very much. May I call Graham Ward.
GRAHAM WARD (sworn)
Questioned by MR BEER
MR BEER: Good morning, Mr Ward. My name is Jason Beer and, as you know, I ask questions on behalf of the Inquiry.
Can you tell us your full name, please?
A. Graham Ward.
Q. Thank you very much.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Before you continue, Mr Beer, I think
it's appropriate to give Mr Ward a direction about self-incrimination, so l'll do that now.

MR BEER: Yes, thank you, sir.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Mr Ward, under our law, a witness at a public inquiry has a right to decline to answer a question put to him by Counsel to the Inquiry, by any recognised legal representative or by me if there is a risk that the answer to that question will incriminate the witness. In shorthand, this legal principle is known as the privilege against self-incrimination.

I consider that fairness demands that I remind you of that principle before you give your evidence. If at 1
statement, excluding its appendices. Can we turn that up, please. It's WITN10590100. It should be at tab A1 in the bundle in front of you as well. Now, I think there's an amendment you would like to make to it, to paragraph 4(b), which is on page 2.
A. That's correct.
Q. Sorry, 4(d) on page 2, right at the bottom.
A. Yeah.
Q. When it says, "In around [1995] I joined the Post Office Investigation Team", do you wish to amend that to 1995 ?
A. Yeah, it actually says "around 1997" but it's actually 1995, yeah.
Q. Okay, so it should read "In ... 1995"?
A. Yeah.
Q. Thank you very much. If you turn to the last page, please, which is page 35 , is that your signature?
A. It is, yes.
Q. With the amendment we've just made, are the contents of the witness statement true to the best of your knowledge and belief?
A. They are.
Q. Thank you very much. You can put that to one side, please, and that can come down.

I think you joined the Post Office in 1984 as a counter clerk; is that right?
any stage you wish to rely upon the privilege, it is for you to make it clear to me that, in respect of any question put to you, it is your wish to rely upon the privilege against self-incrimination. If, therefore, any questions are put to you by any of the lawyers who ask you questions, or by me, which you do not wish to answer, you must tell me immediately after any such question is raised.

At that point, I will consider your objection to answering the question and, thereafter, rule upon whether your objection should be upheld. I understand that you're represented by a solicitor here at the Inquiry today. No doubt, if the issue relating to self-incrimination arises, that solicitor will assist you and, if at any stage during the questioning, you wish to consult your solicitor about the privilege, you must tell me so that I can consider whether that is appropriate.

Do you understand what l've just said to you, Mr Ward?
A. Yes, I do.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thank you. Then over to you, Mr Beer.
MR BEER: Thank you very much.
Now, Mr Ward, you've helpfully made a witness
statement to us in the Inquiry. It's a 35-page witness 2
A. That's correct.
Q. You left in May 2016 as Mail Conformance Manager within the National Network Conformance Team; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. If I can go at a canter, first, through your various positions and then come back and explore each of them in a little more detail.
A. Yeah.
Q. So I think 1984 to 1992 you were a counter clerk at branches in south London; is that right?
A. Yeah, that's correct.
Q. In 1992 you became an Assistant Area Manager in the London South West District?
A. That's correct.
Q. In 1993 you became an Auditor in the South East Regional Audit Team; is that right?
A. Yeah, that's correct.
Q. In 1995, as you've just told us, you joined the Post Office Investigation Team, first as an Analyst and then as an Investigation Manager --
A. That's correct.
Q. -- albeit, as I think you're going to tell us, that was just a job retitling exercise --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- and the substance of the job remained the same?
A. Essentially, yeah.
Q. Thank you. 2001, you became the Policy and Standards Manager within the Security Team; is that right?
A. Yeah, that's correct.
Q. In 2002 you became the Assistant Casework Manager in the Security Team?
A. That's correct.
Q. In 2007 you became the Casework Manager in the Security Team?
A. That's correct.
Q. In 2012 you moved to work on a project in Information Security?
A. Yes, that's correct.
Q. In 2013 you became the Mail Conformance Manager --
A. Yeah, that's correct.
Q. -- and you left in May 2016?
A. Exactly, yeah.
Q. So, overall, it's plain, would you agree, that you had a long career in the Post Office?
A. Yes, I did, yeah.
Q. That included working in the Investigation Team, the Security Team --
A. Yeah
Q. -- for a long period of time --
A. Indeed, yeah.
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Q. Did you have any professional qualifications when you became an Auditor?
A. No, I didn't, no.
Q. Did you receive any in-house training in order to perform the role of Auditor?
A. Yes, it was on-the-job training, yeah.
Q. What training did you receive when you became an Auditor?
A. So as an Auditor, it was a case of auditing accounts of whichever branches we were going into, which involved counting cash, stock and doing performance of all the various vouchers that were on hand. So, essentially, you were doing the same sort of job as you were as a counter clerk, so it was just more of the same, auditing the entire branch.
Q. To some people's mind an Auditor may, or the title "Auditor" may convey a certain image. Would a fairer description of what you were, in fact, doing be stock taking?
A. Well, we were counting all the cash, all the stock, all the vouchers that were on hand, and coordinating that into the office balance. So yeah, I guess you could say that, yes.
Q. In 1995, as you have told us, you joined the Post Office Investigation Team; is that right?
Q. -- prior to the rollout of the Horizon system, and through the rollout of the Horizon system?
A. Yes.
Q. You held, would you agree, significant roles, so far as the Inquiry's investigation is concerned, as an Investigation Manager, Assistant Casework Manager, and Casework Manager?
A. Yes.
Q. I think we're going to hear that you were the Casework Manager in relation to the investigations of Noel Hughie Thomas, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. You were a Financial Investigator in the proceedings against Julian Wilson?
A. Correct.
Q. And you were involved in a capacity in the civil claim concerning Lee Castleton?
A. Correct, yeah.
Q. Can we go back and look at some of those jobs in a little more detail, starting with when you became an Auditor in 1993 in the South East Regional Audit Team. You tell us that involved auditing branch accounts and undertaking various compliance tests; is that right?
A. That's correct, yeah.
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A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. The Investigation Team was part of the Security Team?
A. Yes, that's correct, yeah.
Q. You were initially an Investigation Analyst; is that right?
A. That's right, yeah.
Q. You were line managed by a manager; is that right?
A. That was right, yeah.
Q. You tell us that you attended two weeks of formal training provided by something you describe as the Royal Mail Training Team?
A. Yeah.
Q. Was that assessed training?
A. There was an assessment at the end of the course, yeah. It was a two-week training course and you had to pass the assessment to sort of pass out, as it were.
Q. Did that training involve any external trainers?
A. No, they were in-house trainers.
Q. So there were no, for example, police officers --
A. No.
Q. -- or other people involved in the law enforcement business there?
A. No, no.
Q. Did it involve any training delivered by external lawyers?
A. No.
Q. Did it involve any training delivered by lawyers at all?
A. I don't remember any lawyers during that two-week session coming to the course, but there may have been but I don't recall.
Q. In a subsequent part of your statement you recall there being a training session about disclosure. Was that within the two-week course or was that a separate course?
A. I believe that was probably a separate -- I don't recall it during that two weeks but it was a long time ago.
Q. Just jumping ahead a bit, you tell us there was a job re-evaluation exercise; is that right?
A. Yeah.
Q. When was that?
A. I think it would probably have been about a year or so into the role. So I joined in '95 as an Investigation Analyst and the job, essentially, was to support the Investigation Manager putting cases together. The evaluation that sort of -- basically, you became an Investigation Manager, so it was just leading investigations at that point, instead of supporting.
Q. So after that time, you were the first officer --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- as it were --
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Q. You tell us in your statement that as an Investigator, both as an Analyst and then an Investigation Manager, you were required to apply legislation including the Police and Criminal Evidence Act --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- and the Criminal Procedure and Investigations Act?
A. Yeah.
Q. Were you trained on the requirements of each of those pieces of legislation in the two weeks?
A. Yeah, it was covered in those two weeks, yeah.
Q. What about the Codes of Practice issued under each of those pieces of legislation?
A. It was such a long time ago, I can't recall, to be honest, but we had those Codes of Practice books in our tackle kits. So you'd have a kit that you would carry around with you, so the Codes of Practice were there.
Q. In hard copy, you'd carry them around?
A. Yeah, in hard copy, yeah.
Q. You tell us in your witness statement that there was an intranet site, as well?
A. Yeah, there was an intranet site, yeah.
Q. Were the Acts and Codes issued under them on the intranet site?
A. I don't recall. I can't --
Q. Did you -- whichever, in hard copy or in electronic
A. Yeah.
Q. -- in any investigation?
A. Absolutely, yeah.
Q. Did any training or anything else occur at that time, or was it just a retitling of your --
A. Just a retitling. There was no other training.
Q. Do you know what the job re-evaluation exercise consisted of?
A. No, l've got -- I've no idea. It was just retitled and, yeah, we were told that "You're going to lead investigations".
Q. Going back, then, to when you were the Investigation Analyst. In addition to the two weeks of training, was there a period of mentoring?
A. Yeah.
Q. Who was that by and how long did it last for?
A. So I was working to an Investigation Manager called Aileen Saubelle, so she would have done the mentoring. There was another Investigation Manager at the time, Ray Pratt, who was there to mentor as well, and we would essentially be mentored -- or I would essentially be mentored by either of them. It was ongoing.
Q. Okay. So that sort of on-the-job training; is that right?
A. Yeah, absolutely, yeah.
form -- often have recourse to what the relevant legislation or the Code provided?
A. Not that I can recall, no.
Q. What was the purpose of carrying them around?
A. Just in case you needed to refer to them.
Q. In your years -- and I suppose we're looking now between 1995 and 2001 --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- when you became the Policy and Standards Manager --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- in those six years, there wasn't the occasion, the occasion didn't arise, that you ever needed to consult them?
A. Not really, no.
Q. In relation to your training, either the two weeks at the beginning or the on-the-job training, did that cover disclosure duties?
A. Not that I can recall. I do remember at some point there would have been some sort of disclosure training but I can't recall the details now, I'm afraid.
Q. Asking you now, what would you say is the duty that is owed by an Investigator in relation to disclosure?
A. Anything that undermines the prosecution or supports the defence.
Q. What must happen to such material?
A. It needs to be disclosed within your case file.
Q. When you say it needs to be disclosed in the case file, is that in the file that's going to go up to the lawyer?
A. Yeah, exactly, yeah, with various appendices to each case file. So, yes, you would disclose whatever within that.
Q. When you were constructing a case file and there was material that undermined the proposed prosecution case or supported that of the suspect, how was that material provided to the lawyer?
A. I didn't have that many cases that went to prosecution, myself.
Q. In the six-year period?
A. Yeah, yeah, there weren't that many. If there was material that needed to be provided, it would have been in hard copy in the case file.
Q. I deliberately asked an open question there because one way of providing disclosure to a lawyer and then to a defendant is to list it.
A. Yeah.
Q. To say "There's document $A$, document $B$, document $C$ ".
A. It would be on a schedule within the appendices.
Q. Another way to provide disclosure is to provide the documents to the lawyer --
A. $M m-h m$.
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Q. The only material that you found proved guilt?
A. Yeah, from what I can recall, yeah. I mean, it's such a long time ago but yeah, I don't recall anything like that.
Q. What about your training on pursuing reasonable lines of inquiry; can you recall what that was?
A. No, I mean, the training was to pursue all reasonable lines of inquiry, I mean, to do a thorough investigation, and that's what we tried to do.
Q. What would you understand that to mean, a "thorough investigation"?
A. Well, yeah, it's a difficult one --
Q. Would it include actively looking for material that might help --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- the suspect?
A. Yeah, I guess it would, yes, but it's --
Q. You guess or you know?
A. Yeah, I'm not guessing. It's been such a long time since l've actually conducted an investigation. You know, if I could refer it to a specific type of enquiry it might be easier for me to tell you what I would be looking for.
Q. Do you remember the introduction of the Horizon system?
A. Yeah, vaguely. I think it was around '99/2000-ish.
Q. -- in a big pack?
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. Which of those methods was used in your branch of --
A. It would have been --
Q. -- the Post Office?
A. There would have been a schedule of the documents if there was anything but I don't recall ever having anything that would have undermined the defence -- or supported the defence, sorry.
Q. Again, this is in this six-year period --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- '95 to 2001?
A. Most of the cases I dealt with was pre-Horizon, so it was manual balancing within the branches for the most part and I don't recall having any cases at all that involved Horizon.
Q. I'm going to come on to that in a moment because your time in investigation straddled the introduction of Horizon?
A. Yeah, yeah, it did.
Q. But just looking at it generally at the moment, you're saying in this six-year period you don't recall ever coming across a document that undermined the prosecution case or helped the defendant?
A. Not that I can recall, no.
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Q. That's right. Did you receive any training when it was introduced, as to the operation of the Horizon system?
A. Not that I can recall. I think we went on a very brief kind of introduction but it wasn't thorough training on everything, no.
Q. You say you think you went on a very brief introduction. Was that sort of in a branch, in an office somewhere --
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. -- to see how the counter worked?
A. Yeah, exactly that, yeah. I mean, the operation of the cash accounts and the balancing, essentially, was the same but on a computer, so yeah. The training wasn't sort of thorough. It was a brief overview, as you say.
Q. Was that sort of a half day, a day, or longer?
A. Probably half a day, I would say, but I genuinely can't remember.
Q. Okay. Did you get any training at that time when Horizon was being introduced in the types of data that it produced, that might be relevant to your role as an Investigator?
A. Not that I can recall, no.
Q. Can you recall any discussion within the Investigation Team, "Look, we're now going over to a computer-based accounting system. This going to fundamentally alter the way that we obtain data in order to investigate and 16
perhaps prosecute subpostmasters. We need to know what this computer system, not in the branch, not what the keypad in the monitor looks like, but the back office functions; what data it produces; where they're stored; what they mean; how we interpret them". Was there anything like that?
A. I genuinely can't remember. I'm sure there must have been some kind of a guide as to the sort of data that could be obtained from Fujitsu but I really don't remember, I'm afraid, I'm sorry.
Q. Were you, as an Investigator, trained in how to analyse the data produced by Horizon?
A. Not that I can recall, no.
Q. Whose function was it, when Horizon was introduced, bearing in mind we're, in your case as an Investigator, talking about a one or two-year period, either 2000 or 2001, essentially --
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hm}$.
Q. -- whose function was it to analyse the data that Horizon produced?
A. The Investigator.
Q. Do you know when investigators were taught to look for any errors made by the system, by the Horizon system?
A. Not that I can recall, no.
Q. Was the potential for the system to make errors 17
relied on the reliability of the Horizon data too?
A. Mm-hm.
Q. Is that right?
A. Yeah, that's correct, yeah.
Q. Were you, or members of the Investigation Team around you informed of issues or problems that had arisen in the course of the testing, acceptance phase, and then the rollout of Horizon?
A. No.
Q. Were you told about any measures that had been put in place to monitor the continuation of such errors and the rectification of them?
A. Not that I can recall, no.
Q. You've told us that you don't recall dealing with a case involving Horizon; is that right?
A. Yeah, not that I can recall, no. I may well have done but I can't remember.
Q. When you say that, do you mean involving a subpostmaster?
A. Yeah, yeah, subpostmaster. I dealt with --
Q. What about the pension book fraud?
A. Yeah, yeah pension fraud --
Q. You must have been dealing with those?
A. Oh, yeah, yeah, absolutely.
Q. Again, as we've said, the investigation of that would
Q. But that species of investigation is something that 18
involve consideration of data produced by Horizon?
A. Yes, it would, yeah.
Q. Were you, at this stage, told of any bugs, errors or defects in Horizon that might affect the reliability of the data that it produced?
A. No, we weren't.
Q. For that species of investigation, was there a method by which the Investigation Team obtained assurance as to the reliability of the data that the computer was producing?
A. You know, I can't remember, I really can't. It's that far back.
Q. We're going to go on later and talk about when you became the Assistant Casework Manager --
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. -- and then the Casework Manager, about getting ARQ data and getting witness statements from Fujitsu.
A. Yeah.
Q. Back in '99, 2000 and 2001, when you were an Investigator, was there that facility available then?
A. Yeah, I cannot -- I genuinely cannot remember that far back.
Q. Were there team meetings amongst the Investigators?
A. Yeah, we -- yeah, we would have team meetings.
Q. Where were you based?
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A. I was based in Croydon. So I was part of the South East Regional Team.
Q. Were all of the Investigators within that regional team based there?
A. No, no, they were dotted around. There was -- I think our regional office at that point was down in Tunbridge Wells and there were Investigators within the South East Regional Team based in Twickenham as well. I can't remember anywhere else. There may have been other people located. I mean, Investigators were located, you know, all over.
Q. I'll look at it the other way around then. What method was adopted, if any, for the sharing of information amongst Investigators about issues that had arisen in the course of their investigations that might be relevant to other Investigators?
A. Well, team meetings would be -- they weren't scheduled all the time. I mean, we had, probably, monthly meetings, maybe; maybe bimonthly.
Q. You said they weren't scheduled?
A. No.
Q. So does that mean --
A. Not that I can --
Q. -- they were arranged ad hoc?
A. Probably, yeah.
would have happened, yeah.
Q. Who was your line manager at this time? So '99, 2000, 2001?
A. As an Investigator, my line manager was either Aileen

Saubelle until she left -- I can't remember when she left -- and then Ray Pratt took over.
Q. What form of management supervision did they take in relation to you?
A. So we would have one to ones and working in the same office, we would obviously chat regularly. But, yeah, one to ones would be the formal supervision and they would be monthly.
Q. You moved into the role of Assistant Casework Manager in 2002?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. Can you say describe what the function of the Assistant Casework Manager was?
A. From what I can recall, essentially, it was to support the Casework Manager, and the Casework Manager was responsible for movement of case files, provision of management information to senior lead team on cases. And we were -- from what I can recall at that point, we were kind of a focal point or a central point for the team, in terms of movement of case files and so on.
Q. So just tell us what the purpose of the role was, of --
A. The purpose of Casework --
Q. -- Casework Management?
A. So the purpose of Casework Management, as I recall, would be to monitor the progress of case files, from raising a case. So you would receive -- you know, we used to have a spreadsheet that we ran for Casework. We also had a spreadsheet for incidents that were reported to us across the network in the South East Region, and we would just, you know, if there were a series of losses at a particular Crown Office, we would put that together and consider raising a case.

Cash centres would be similar, if there were a pattern of losses, we would raise a case. For audit losses, pension allowance fraud, as we mentioned, was our main source of investigation at that point. I think pensions went on to card account, I think it was around 2003, so that sort of stopped at that point.
Q. First of all, was it a national function?
A. Yeah, yes it was, yeah.
Q. So did it apply to cases involving post offices in England and Wales?
A. Yes, it did, yeah.
Q. Did it involve any of the devolved administrations: Scotland or Northern Ireland?
A. They were very much independent, so, you know, I can't 24
remember whether we recorded the details of those cases or not.
Q. I got a sense, please correct me if this is wrong, that there were essentially two parts of it: one is the management of cases that were being investigated; and the second was analysis of data to see whether an incident or an issue should be investigated?
A. Yeah, exactly.
Q. Is that right?
A. Yeah, that's correct, yeah.
Q. Did your role involve both of those things?
A. From what I can recall, yes.
Q. What did the management of the existing cases consist of? What management of a case was needed?
A. So when a case was raised, it would go to the Investigator and the Investigator would carry out whatever investigations they deemed appropriate, which may involve interviewing, you know, PACE interviews, et cetera. If that happened, reports would be written, taped summaries would be produced and the case would then be sent to the Casework Manager.
Q. Sorry, at that stage, stopping you there, did the Casework Manager, whether the senior person or the assistant, you, have any role to perform before the file was received in the office?
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could monitor the number of cases that were on hand, the number of interviews that were being conducted and, you know, the progress of the case when it was passed through to the Legal Team.
Q. Why was it necessary to have that information?
A. I don't know, really. I think that was just the process that we followed.
Q. Okay. So you recorded that information. What else, if anything, did you do with the casework file?
A. So the Casework Manager would just put a short memo in the file, just summarising that "Here's a case relating to pension allowance fraud, PACE interviews have been conducted", and the case is passed through to the Criminal Law Team for their review as to whether, you know, the case should proceed to prosecution or not.
Q. So the Casework Management Team was responsible, physically, for receiving the file --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- and, physically, for passing it on to the lawyers?
A. Exactly, yeah.
Q. Was any compliance check undertaken?
A. I can't remember when compliance came in --
Q. So there was a time?
A. There was a time when compliance was performed, yeah, on cases.
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A. Not that I can recall, no.
Q. Okay. So you weren't overseeing, managing or supervising the conduct of the investigation?
A. No, no, that would be dealt with -- I mean, the Investigator was in charge of the conduct of the investigation and their team leader would supervise. So it was monitoring --
Q. So -- I'm so sorry, I spoke over you.
A. Sorry.
Q. So management and oversight of the investigation was conducted out of the Croydon office; is that right?
A. Yeah.
Q. At a local level?
A. Yes.
Q. So you were saying then the file came in, and was that essentially the trigger for involvement of the Casework Managers?
A. Exactly, yeah, and we would record all the details on the spreadsheet that we had at the time.
Q. What was the spreadsheet for and what were the details?
A. So the details would be the date the case was raising, branch involved, branch code, whether a PACE interview had happened or not.
Q. Why were you recording that data or those data?
A. For information, so that it was provided upwards so they 26
Q. What did compliance consist of?
A. So that was all about the structure of the case file and the uniformity of the case file and reference to making sure that, within the body of the report, if there was reference to a particular exhibit, it would be included in the right appendices envelope, and paginated, red label. It was about consistency and uniformity, and --
Q. Was it about quality?
A. It was to drive up the standard of the case file to ensure a consistency and an accuracy in the way they were being presented. In terms of the --
Q. Sorry to interrupt you, the things you've listed may sound like presentational issues --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- about the right stickers and the way it's set out. What about the quality of the investigation; was that addressed?
A. Yeah, it's a long time ago to remember, to be honest, but there would be -- in terms of the format of the report, the structure of the report, reference to admissions made, or not, in terms of -- I'm just trying to think -- procedural failings, that type of thing, then we would be wanting to check that that had all been covered. I can't remember whether that was actually formally part of the compliance or not, yeah, I can't 28
recall.
Q. If you had to describe the nature of the exercise you undertook as the Assistant Casework Manager and then the Casework Manager, would you say it was more to do with procedure and process than it was to do with substance and quality of investigations?
A. I think that's fair, yeah.
Q. So would you, for example, read the investigation report, the witness statements, look at any exhibits, and think "Mmm, they haven't pursued this line of inquiry" --
A. No, I think.
Q. -- "send it back"?
A. No, I don't recall going into that level of detail.

That would be more for the Team Leader to look at I would have thought.
Q. By team leader you mean back out on the areas?
A. Yeah. I mean, if there was anything glaringly obvious within the case file that had been missed, you know, if there was reference to a witness statement and there was no witness statement within the file, then that would be highlighted, but --
Q. That's again, a bit more process --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- rather than substance though, isn't it? 29

Transaction Enquiry Service, which was something you could access to obtain details of all the banking transactions that had happened and the team were responsible for DPA requests that would come in from external agencies asking for information. I mean, again, I can't remember the full details but that was another area.

Yeah, I think -- and we had a couple of managers
come in at the time as well, who were sort of supervising the different postal officers or support staff that we had.
Q. Who were they?
A. Jason Collins and I think, from memory, he dealt with the casework side of it as well, and Natasha Bernard, and she dealt with the banking side.
Q. You tell us about this in your witness statement. You say that, due to the high volume of work within the Casework Team --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- and then following another team restructure, you were promoted to the role of Casework and Banking Fraud Team Leader?
A. Yeah.
Q. Which was essentially a similar role to that of the Casework Manager but brought into the team two other 31
A. Yeah.
Q. If there's a missing document?
A. Yeah, it is, yeah.
Q. Now, I think you, when you became Casework Manager, you had line management responsibility for four or five administrative support staff within Case Management; is that right?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. What did they do?
A. So there were various areas. When I became Casework Manager, I think it was around 2004, that was when I think there was a Horizon upgrade at that point because the Post Office Card Account came in. So we had a banking side to the team as well. So with Casework, we had support staff who covered -- well, we had somebody who dealt with, you know, stationery and stores for the whole team, so that was one role, and we had a support member of staff who used to monitor losses and issues at cash centres. We had somebody who covered the directly-managed branches, that -- they had a responsibility to report all losses to us, just Crown Offices.

And we had a member of staff dealing with the banking side. I think the system that they had access to, I think, from memory, it was called TES, which was 30
managers, the two people you've just mentioned, and you managed both of them too?
A. That's correct.
Q. So this is still working as Casework Manager, essentially, in Croydon?
A. Yeah.
Q. You took over two other managers and your job was retitled again?
A. Yeah, exactly, yeah. So I line managed Jason and Natasha and they line managed the support staff, so it took away that element from me.
Q. One of the things that you tell us in your witness statement was your responsibility was the provision of performance statistics to senior management.
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. What were the statistics that you supplied to senior management?
A. So it would be the losses, the total value of losses for cases under investigation, the number of PACE interviews, the number of cases where charges had been preferred, summonses issued.
Q. Convictions?
A. Yeah. Convictions, yeah. I can't remember the rest, to be honest, but --
Q. Money recovered?
A. Yeah, I mean, POCA came -- started around 2003/4, I think.
Q. The Act was 2002 and bought into effect in 2003.
A. Yeah, the Act was 2003, yeah, but we didn't get Financial Investigators straightaway, I don't think. I think they came in around 2004-ish, I'm not 100 per cent clear but --
Q. Was there no recovery before POCA came into force?
A. Well, realistically, no. I mean, most of the -- I mean in terms of benefit fraud and the pension frauds that we've spoken about, the loss wasn't the Post Office's. That would be the DWP, as it was, or I think it was DWP then, Benefit Agency. So, you know, that wasn't our losses. I think prior to POCA, compensation, civilly, would have been pursued but that wouldn't have been our team dealing with that, that would have been the Civil Litigation Team.
Q. What was the purpose of the provision of these performance statistics to senior management?
A. I presume to justify our existence, to demonstrate that -- you know, the role that we were performing.
Q. Which senior management were provided with the statistics?
A. That would have been the Head of Security team, whoever that was at the time.
to that, I don't know, but quite -- getting on for about 2013/2012, just before I left the team, there was definitely objectives then. Whether they were there in 2004-7, I can't be 100 per cent sure but they may well have been.
Q. Were they for the Financial Investigators, those targets --
A. I think they were -- no, I think --
Q. -- or did they trickle through to people on the Casework Management Team?
A. No, it was a team objective. So, you know, if there was bonuses it would have applied to the whole team.
Q. So when you say the "whole team", do you mean the Security Team?
A. Yeah, exactly. There weren't individual targets or anything like that.
Q. Right.
A. But, as I say, I'm not 100 per cent sure when bonuses came in.
Q. Can you recall what they were tied to, what they were linked to. For the Security Team as a whole, what was the measure or the metric that meant that a bonus was achieved or not achieved or partially achieved?
A. Just in terms of loss and recovery?
Q. Yes, was that the only metric?
Q. You tell us in your witness statement that your line managers during this period, when you were the Casework Manager, under either or both of the titles, were Tony Utting and then David Pardoe?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. Were they located in the Croydon office?
A. No, Tony Utting was, Dave Pardoe, I'm not sure where he was based. It was somewhere up North. I think it -I think it might have been St Helens but I can't be 100 per cent sure now.
Q. How did they manage you?
A. So with Tony being based on Croydon, he was on hand and Dave Pardoe -- he would come down to London quite often to, you know, undertake one-to-ones but I would say I was well supported by both in my role.
Q. Going back to the provision of performance statistics, to your knowledge, were any members of your team or you paid bonuses or performance related pay in this period?
A. And this is going back to 2004-7?
Q. Yes, so when you were the Casework Manager and then the same job under the different title until 2007?
A. I think there might have been targets for recovery when Proceeds of Crime first came in but I can't remember. It would have been quite a low percentage. I was aware, when I was, you know -- later on, maybe you'll come on 34
A. There were lots of other metrics in terms of bonus. That would just be one element. But, as I say, I'm very vague on that, l've got to be honest.
Q. Were any of the metrics, to your knowledge, tied to the number of convictions obtained?
A. No, they weren't, no.
Q. Was recovering money itself tied or a condition precedent to obtaining recovery getting a conviction?
A. Well, POCA and recovery from POCA was obviously post-conviction but it didn't influence the way we dealt with financial investigations.
Q. How do you know that?
A. Well, I can only speak for myself, if you're conducting a financial investigation, you do the investigation thoroughly and, if there are no assets, there won't be a recovery. So there's nothing you can do to influence that.
Q. One of the other functions, I think, as a Casework Manager was acting a single point of contact for requesting Horizon data from Fujitsu via the ARQ Audit Record Query process; is that right?
A. Yeah, that's correct.
Q. Did you perform that function when you were the Assistant Casework Manager?
A. Again, it's such a long time ago, I can't recall but 36
quite likely, yes.
Q. Moving on, we're going to come back to what ARQ requests consisted of and how they were processed in a moment.
So, in 2007, you moved into the role of an Accredited
Financial Investigator; is that right?
A. Yeah.
Q. An AFI?
A. That's correct.
Q. Was that in the Financial Investigation Unit?
A. It was, yeah.
Q. Where was the FIU?
A. That was based at Croydon, as well, and a separate office. I can't remember if we were on the same floor or not but, yeah, we were in the Croydon office, yeah.
Q. You tell us that involved seeking recovery of money through the application of the Proceeds of Crime Act, yes?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. That's in convicted cases; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. And making applications at the Crown Court for production, restraint and confiscation orders?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. You tell us that your previous experience as an Auditor, Investigator and Casework Manager provided you with 37
Q. To limit or regulate the number of investigations being undertaken?
A. Yeah, from a financial investigation perspective, yeah.
Q. Does it follow that, as the figures progressively went up, 10 to 20 , and then 20 to another figure, which you can't now remember --
A. I'm not sure it went up above 20.
Q. -- okay -- that that signalled that there was an increase in work, an increase in -- if you hadn't changed the figures, there would have been an increase in work?
A. Yeah.
Q. An increase in the volume of convicted people?
A. I'm not sure the volume of convicted cases went up that much, to be honest, but we would --
Q. What led to the increase in volume of work, then?
A. Well, there were -- cases were raised based on loss, so they would be referred to as -- for financial investigation which might involve some intelligence work just to see what assets were there that didn't proceed to a prosecution, and obviously the case would then be closed from our perspective. So yeah, I -- I don't recall the number of convictions going up significantly.
Q. Okay.
A. We'd always had quite a reasonable --
Q. The number of cases required to be investigated went up?
A. Yeah.
Q. Did anyone ask why?
A. No, not that I can recall, no.
Q. Was there anything obvious that accounted for the number of cases that required investigating going up?
A. Not that -- no, not that I can recall, no.
Q. Was this just a sort of mystery then, why the number of cases requiring investigation, involving losses in branches, going up?
A. I didn't -- I don't know that the cases were going up, to be honest.
Q. You told us that they had to up the floor from $£ 10,000$ to $£ 20,000$ as a control measure --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- because the number of -- the workload was increasing the number of investigations were increasing.
A. Mm .
Q. So I think it must follow that the number of investigations must have been increasing, otherwise they wouldn't have had to have introduced the control measure?
A. I think the Financial Investigators were flooded with cases from the outset. I mean, we didn't have financial investigations pre-2003, whenever it was. So I don't 40
know that they'd gone up significantly. So I don't know that that's true because there were always a high volume of cases within the team.
Q. So there was a high volume from the start, which was always too much and that's why they had to increase the floor from ten to $£ 20,000$ ?
A. Yeah, I would say that's fair, yeah.
Q. Rather than an increase in the number of cases requiring to be investigated from the start of financial investigations occurring?
A. Well, as I say, there were always a high volume of cases for Financial Investigators to look at, right from the outset. Not all of them went to conviction though.
Q. When you say there were always a high volume of cases, does that mean that there was a surprisingly high number of cases that required to be investigated or there weren't enough Investigators or both?
A. I don't think it was any surprise that there were a high number of cases to be investigated because there always were high volumes of cases, and that was pre-Horizon and after Horizon. And, obviously, the number of Investigators dropped. There were numerous reviews, from my time in the team, you know, efficiencies where, you know, Investigators were lost. So yeah, from memory, no, there was always a high volume of cases to 41
A. No, it had nothing to do with Horizon at all. It was to do with the segregation of mail. There was a contract between Royal Mail and the Post Office to correctly segregate mail into First Class, Second Class packets/parcels, and the role was reduce or achieve a better compliance, because there were penalties, financial penalties for the business, if mail wasn't segregated correctly. So I was involved in driving up compliance for that.
Q. Did you remain in that role until you left in May '16?
A. Yes, I did, yeah.
Q. In that time, January '13 to May '16, did you have anything to do with the Horizon system?
A. Nothing at all, No.
Q. So, looking at the period of 1995 when you joined the Security Team, until 2012 when you left, to go over, essentially, on this project, that 17-year period, how would you describe the culture within the Security Team?
A. When I joined the Security Team it was quite a small team. We were regionalised and it was a great team to work with. It was a -- really good people working together, it was, you know, good culture. No question about that. I think we became a national team at some point, which, again, yeah, the culture was always very positive. I was well supported by line manager
be dealt with.
Q. In 2012 you moved into the Information Security Team.
A. Yeah, I was seconded onto a project.
Q. What was the project about?
A. It was PCCl .
Q. What's that about?
A. It was Payment Card Industry, not entirely clear. I can't really remember but we had a contractor come into the business and I was asked to sort of support her obtaining a certificate for PCCI .
Q. Was this a project that lasted about eight to ten months?
A. Yeah, I think so, yeah. I stayed in the team for around ten months, I think, and on the project with her -I can't remember exactly how long.
Q. Did it have anything to do with the Horizon system?
A. Not in terms of Horizon losses no, not that I can recall.
Q. Did it have any --
A. It was more to do with banking cards.
Q. Okay, I think in January '13 you left that role and became Mail Conformance Manager?
A. Yeah.
Q. Just briefly, what was the Mail Conformance Manager and did it have anything to do with Horizon? 42
management, 20 -- when was it now? I can't remember when Mr Scott came into the team as the Head of Security, I think it was around 2008, maybe. Yeah, initially it was fine.

I remember him delivering a strategy on how the team was going to be taken forward. But the team -- there seemed to be a lot of changes from that point on, a lot of Senior Managers came and left. The team was reduced again. There was a movement from -- well, a movement to a hub way of working. So people that were based out wherever they'd been, if they were based out in -- on the South Coast or wherever, the hub for the South was London and everybody had a requirement to be in London to work, which, effectively, moved a lot of people out of the role because the travel would just have been too much, so they had to find other roles within the business, which, you know, was I think difficult for a lot of people.

Yeah. The culture changed slightly but as we -when we moved into head office it became -- personally, it didn't affect me but you we knew there were rumblings of people not being very happy within the team so, yeah, I was quite happy to leave when I left.
Q. When I asked you the question about what the culture was like, you said initially it was fine.
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. Then you went on to talk about something else.
A. Mm .
Q. What was it like after it ceased to be fine?
A. Well, it just wasn't a happy team to be in, from sort of 2008/9. It wasn't particularly happy.
Q. Was that -- and I'm going to divide things into two here, which might not be the only way of doing things -was that about your own working conditions and practices, ie the things that affected you as employees of Post Office -- salary, job structure, management lines of reporting, distance of travel to work --
A. Mm .
Q. -- pay and conditions, those kind of things --
A. Mm .
Q. -- or was it, on the other hand, a substance of what you were being required to do?
A. Yeah, it was -- it was just a feeling of how the team was. When we were regionalised or when we were within the South East Region, there was -- it was more personable. It just seemed to change -- the culture of the business seemed change, in my opinion. So, you know, I was very happy to leave, personally.
Q. Do you know how the Post Office Investigation Department was viewed by other parts of the business, including by 45
members of the same team as him, the Criminal Law Team --
A. Financial Investigator?
Q. -- before you were a Financial Investigator.
A. Yeah, case files were sent to the Criminal Law Team. As I say, I didn't have any case files when Mr Singh joined the Post Office. We would submit case files through the Criminal Law Team that were based in Croydon. I think Mr Singh was part of that team.
Q. Okay. Can we move on, please. I'm going to turn to investigation policies, strategies and decisions to prosecute, to start with, your role in relation to Post Office investigations and prosecutions against subpostmasters.

You tell us in your witness statement, and this is paragraph 6 on page 5 -- no need to turn it up -- you say that your role in relation to disciplinary matters was limited to those staff you line managed directly --
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. -- and you don't recall ever having to deal with any disciplinary issues in your time in Post Office?
A. No.
Q. When you were an Investigation Manager, you interviewed suspect offenders and were responsible for disclosure in those cases?
subpostmasters?
A. Well, I'd imagine the Post Office Investigation Department wasn't very popular because of the job we did. I can go back to the days of being an Investigator, you know, pre-Horizon. We had a very good relationship with the subpostmasters' Federation at that time. They were very supportive of the work we were doing in terms of the pension allowance frauds. We were always invited to interviews, and what have you, so, you know, we got on very well but I don't know how the relation with the Federation developed after that.
Q. You tell us in your witness statement that, after the Post Office separated from Royal Mail Group in about 2011, prosecutions were dealt with by a senior lawyer, Jarnail Singh, and external solicitors?
A. Yeah.
Q. Did you submit files to Mr Singh at all?
A. No, we didn't have case files as Financial Investigators. We would have submitted, you know, our restraint orders and Section 16 statements for confiscation through Mr Singh, and we would have sought his approval. We needed authority from a Senior Authorising Officer and also, yeah, Mr Singh, before we did anything.
Q. So you did earlier on submit cases on to Mr Singh and 46
A. Yeah.
Q. Did that role involve gathering information and evidence that might be relevant to a disciplinary proceeding against a subpostmaster?
A. Yeah, that would do, yeah. The discipline side of subpostmasters, yeah, that would be -- we would produce a report for that and that would include reference to any evidence that had been identified in the investigation, so -- and that would be sent to the Contract Manager for discipline.
Q. You were involved, at that time as an Investigation Manager, in disclosure decisions?
A. Yeah.
Q. You were responsible for processing disclosure as a Casework Manager?
A. Yeah.
Q. And, as a Financial Investigator, were you responsible for disclosure?
A. Yeah.
Q. In all three functions, did you liaise with members of the Criminal Law Team in relation to your own cases?
A. Yeah.
Q. Did you liaise with the Civil Litigation lawyers within the Post Office, in each of those three functions?
A. I -- my involvement with Civil Litigation, from memory, 48
was in relation to provision of ARQ data, if I was asked in my spot(?) role as Casework Manager.
Q. So that was only when you were Assistant Casework Manager and Casework Manager?
A. Yeah, exactly, yeah.
Q. Did you have any involvement in what might be described as litigation strategy or prosecution strategy --
A. No.
Q. -- at any point in your career in the Post Office?
A. No, not at all.
Q. You tell us, in terms of policies/procedures that Post Office's policy in relation to the investigation and prosecution of offenders was the same for all Post Office employees, as well as for subpostmasters, managers and staff?
A. Yeah, that's correct.
Q. You tell us about a "Triggers \& Timescales" document which broadly outlined the types of cases that the team would investigate and the expected timescales for completion?
A. Yeah, that's correct.
Q. Can we look, please, at POL00105221, please. Can you see that this is described as a document of the Security Operations Team?
A. I don't have anything on my screen.
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Utting.
Q. What was the purpose of it?
A. To make people aware of how we dealt with cases and what the timescales or the expectations would be for processing cases.
Q. If we control on through the document, please, and scroll down, please. We can see, essentially, the steps in the first two columns and then the time by which that step must be taken in the last column; is that how it works?
A. Yeah, that's correct, yeah.
Q. Then, if we scroll on, please, that's depicted in a different way in that infographic there.
A. Yeah.
Q. Then if we can look, please, at POL00105220. If we scroll down, please, a little bit, just so we get the heading, as well. Thank you.

Do you remember this document or the type of information contained on it?
A. Yeah, I think it's sort of not that familiar now but, yeah, it looks like a document that went with the "Triggers \& Timescale".
Q. The other one was more about timeliness and the steps which must be taken within certain time frames; is that right?
Q. Well, I'm sorry about that. Somebody will come and press a button on your screen. It may have gone to sleep. (Pause)

Is that now working?
A. Yeah.
Q. Can you see the "Triggers \& Timescales" document on the screen?
A. Yes, I can, yeah.
Q. Is this the type of document you were referring to when you referred to a "Triggers \& Timescales" document --
A. Yes, it is.
Q. -- in your witness statement?
A. Yes, it is, yeah.
Q. When would this have been operative, ie in which of your many functions would this have been relevant?
A. I would say casework, probably 2002, 2004 to 2007.
Q. Who was this addressed to?
A. I think this was a document put together for the Network to make them aware of the cases we dealt with and what the timescales for dealing with them were.
Q. So this was something that came out from the centre, as it were, from the Casework Management Team to the regions?
A. It's not a document that was put together by Casework, I don't think. I think this was put together by Tony 50
A. Yeah, that's correct.
Q. Whereas this is about raising cases, ie what must be investigated, what may be investigated and what need not --
A. Yes.
Q. -- is that right?
A. That's correct yeah.
Q. So looking at the first box, "Loss of any amount", where there hasn't been a suspension, "Case Raise"; what does that mean?
A. Raise a -- well, it just means --
Q. Investigate?
A. -- raise a formal case for investigation, yeah.
Q. So if we fell in that first row there, that need not be or should not be raised for investigation; is that right?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. Then there's the second box, if the loss is less than $£ 1,000$, same answer; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Between $£ 1,000$ and $£ 5,000$, there seemed to have been discretion as to whether or not to raise a case or not, for investigation; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. It says, "to be discussed with the Contracts Team". Who 52
would decide, first of all, who would conduct that discussion with the Contracts team?
A. So if we're talking about audit losses, that would probably be the Team Leader for the area, I would think. I mean, when audits were reported to the team, the Auditors -- they may well have a phone number of an Investigator, just because they dealt with them previously. So sometimes an auditor would contact an Investigator directly but, generally speaking, I would say the Team Leader would be the one.
Q. Who would make that decision, whether or not, within that third row, to investigate or not?
A. I would say it would be a joint decision between the Contract Manager and the Investigator or the Team Leader, whoever took the call.
Q. Then scroll down, please. Loss more than $£ 5,000$, investigate; is that right?
A. That's what that's saying, yeah.
Q. Is that your memory of what the trigger for a certain investigation was, a loss of over $£ 5,000$ ?
A. I actually thought it was higher than that but, if that's what the document says. I don't know whether there would have been a document following this. Do you know what date this was from?
Q. If we go back to the first page at the top, please. 53
not there should be an investigation or not?
A. I wouldn't have said so, no. I mean, if there was clear evidence of dishonesty, then that would have been investigated regardless of the loss but, as I said, the team reduced over time. So we had to be a bit more selective about the cases we would take on. I think when I first joined the team, back in the '90s, I think we had somewhere in the region of 90 Investigators. There were at least nine or ten teams, I think, maybe eight or nine teams, maybe 70 or 80 Investigators. As I say, it's not clear to me but, by the time I left, we had considerably less so we had to be more selective on the cases we took.
Q. This does include MO, modus operandi --
A. Yes.
Q. -- as a factor to consider?
A. Yeah.
Q. I'm just asking, to your knowledge, was the decision on whether to investigate or not primarily based on the amount of alleged loss which the table tends to indicate or an understanding of what it was alleged that the postmaster had done?
A. I mean, the table indicates that, I agree. But, if there was a clear evidence of dishonesty, I'm sure that we would have raised a case on it regardless of the

I can check to which document this was an appendix and over the break I might be able to establish a date?
A. Okay, yeah, I mean, 5 K feels quite okay.
Q. It feels low to you?
A. It does, yeah, but that may well have been the case at that time or it will would have been the case at that time but yeah, I think it might have been increased.
Q. If we scroll down to the bottom, please, it says:
"This is a guide only, as each loss will ... be assessed on its own merits and will include other factors (eg admissions, resource, timescales modus operandi ...')"
Yes?
A. Yes.
Q. The document doesn't list whether there was evidence of dishonesty by the postmaster as a tracker for investigation. It's focused on the loss being the key into whether to investigate or not.
A. Mm .
Q. Is that right?
A. Yeah, I mean, obviously, the investigation would determine whether there was dishonesty or not but, yeah, I mean, that's essentially what the document says, yeah.
Q. Was that the approach that was taken over time, that the amount of loss was the determining factor on whether or 54
loss, whether it was, you know -- as long as it was over 5,000 or thereabouts, then a case would have been raised, I'm sure.
MR BEER: Thank you.
Sir it's 11.20 now. That might be an appropriate moment for a break. Can we break until 11.35, please.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, of course.
MR BEER: Thank you, sir.
(11.19 am)

## (A short break)

(11.35 am)

MR BEER: Sir, good morning. Can you continue to see and hear us?
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you, yes.
Thank you very much.
Mr Ward, can we look, please, at POL00104747. If we just look at the foot of the page, please. You'll see there's no date here. Go over the page, keep going. You will see that it's consistently not dated at the foot of the page but that this is a document that is said to be effective from March 2000; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. At this time, you would have been an Investigation Manager?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. If we go back to page 1, please, you'll see that it's described as a "Casework Management Document", part of "Investigation Policy", and it's addressed to, I think, "Link to Accountabilities", Security Managers. That would include you, yes?
A. Correct.
Q. "The aim ... is to ensure that adequate controls are in place to maintain standards throughout investigation processes."
So I suspect this is a document you can no longer remember but would have been something with which you would have been familiar at the time?
A. Exactly, yeah.
Q. If we look at reporting standards in the third box down and look at the sort of preamble to what we're going to look at in a moment, some criticism of refusing to disclose investigation reports, yes, in the first bullet point there? If we can go over the page, please, to the second page and look at the third bullet point.
"In England and Wales, Legal Services will decide what information will be disclosed to the Defence in compliance with the [CPIA] 1996."
So l've moved over all the parts that are about disciplinary and employment processes to look at crime.
Then the next bullet point down: 57
[CPIA] 1996 still apply."
Thank you. That can come down.
With that document in mind, can you tell us how you, when you were writing reports as an Investigation Manager, addressed the issue of what were described there as security procedure failures, operational procedure failures, procedural weaknesses or procedural failings?
A. So I'm going back probably 22 years, since I probably dealt with the case. So it's very difficult for me to remember any specific cases that I dealt with where there were procedural failings.
Q. Do you think from that --
A. There obviously would have been some but I really just cannot remember. There was one case I can remember, sorry, that just come back to me. It was a case involving a recruitment of a counter clerk working at a Crown Office. Cutting a long story short, the person that turned up at the branch as a new member of staff wasn't the person that went for an interview and the only way it was found out was just his misfortune that the person that interviewed him was the branch manager at the office he turned up at, and the procedure failing there was that there was no photograph attached to the documents that were sent to the branch manager. So that 59
"If, during the course of an enquiry, failures in
security or operational procedures are identified which
may or may not be directly connected with the offence/s
under investigation, a separate report should be made to
the relevant function or line manager in order that
remedial action should be taken. In the interests of
maintaining good industrial relations and to maintain
confidentiality, it is important that individuals are
not named in this report and recommendations are made in
general terms. The separate report [will] need to be
listed on [CS006D and possibly on E]. Legal Services
will then decide whether such a report should be
disclosed to the Defence under the [CPIA] 1996."
Then the next bullet point:
"The issue of dealing with information concerning
procedural failures is a difficult one. Some major
procedural weaknesses if they become public knowledge
have the potential to assist others to commit offences
against the Post Office, or to undermine the Prosecution
case, or to bring Consignia into disrepute, or to harm
relations with major customers ... Unless the Offender
states that he is aware that accounting weaknesses exist
and that he took advantage of them, it is important not
to volunteer that option to the Offender during
interview. The usual duties of disclosure under the 58
was a procedural failing, which was highlighted in the report. So any procedural failings that you would come across --
Q. When you say "it was highlighted in the report" what do you mean by "the report"?
A. So the offender report I would have prepared for that case.
Q. This tended to indicate that there needed -- that needed to be addressed separately in a different document that went to and only went to Legal Services. Can you remember that being the rule?
A. So the procedural failing would be in the report that went to Legal Services but the procedural failing in the report that went to the discipline manager wouldn't be there.
Q. Why was that? Did you understand what the rationale was for that?
A. So my understanding of the rationale for that would be that the discipline report would be available to the person being disciplined, which would then mean that you're highlighting a failing that could be communicated to everyone else.
Q. Might that not be relevant to their discipline case?
A. Well, in the case I dealt with not really, I don't think, no.
Q. Can you recall a case, other than the one you've just mentioned, in which it would be relevant or may be relevant?
A. Not off the top of my head, no, sorry.
Q. Okay, in relation to criminal cases, it seems that the documents were not to be sent to, from this policy, the Criminal Law Team, but a report, setting out what the procedural weakness or failing was, was to be sent to the Criminal Law Team. Are you saying that was essentially within the offender report?
A. Sorry, the procedural failing that was identified within the offender report?
Q. Yes.
A. It would be in the offender report, yes.
Q. Right, okay, there wasn't a yet third report --
A. No.
Q. -- a separate report?
A. No.
Q. That was in the offender report?
A. Yeah.
Q. Okay. What was your role as an Investigator in ensuring that the Post Office in such cases complied with its duty of disclosure?
A. So my role for disclosure would be -- it's the Investigator's role to disclose everything that would 61
Q. -- 2001, you told us earlier?
A. I joined in '95 as an Analyst. From '97 to 2001, I was an Investigation Manager and, in that time, I can think of three that I can remember. There may have been one or two more but certainly no more than five, I would have thought.
Q. Who acted as the Disclosure Officer, if you did not?
A. Well, I would have been the Disclosure Officer as such. You know -- so it's my responsibility but I didn't see myself as a Disclosure Officer. I know it's my responsibility to be the -- to disclose everything, but I saw myself as the Investigating Officer. I appreciate it's a kind of a dual control, but, yeah, I wouldn't have seen myself as singularly a Disclosure Officer. But yes, I knew it was my responsibility.
Q. Your responsibility to do what?
A. To disclose everything that was relevant to the case and, if it supported the defence or undermined the prosecution, then it needed to be disclosed.
Q. When you became the Assistant and then the Casework Manager, was it the Casework Manager's responsibility to ensure that all the reasonable lines of inquiry had been exhausted?
A. No, not that I can recall, no.
Q. You told us earlier that those working in Casework might 63
undermine the prosecution, support the defence.
Q. You're working, I think, here hypothetically because you never found a case in which there was anything that undermined the prosecution?
A. Not that I can recall. I mean, as I say, I'm going back -- 22 years was the last time I dealt with a case myself. So I am sure there may have been but I just can't recall.
Q. Was the limit of the responsibility to make Legal Services aware of it or did the Investigator perform a separate role of Disclosure Officer?
A. My role would have been to have made Legal Services aware of it. That's my understanding.
Q. Did you ever act as a Disclosure Officer in any prosecution case?
A. No, I didn't, no.
Q. How many cases of yours, when you were an Investigation Analyst and an Investigation Manager, went to prosecution?
A. Ooh ... I would say three or four.
Q. So that's between 1995 and 2001?
A. Yeah. Yeah, because I was First Officer from about
2004. Sorry, l've got my times mixed up, haven't I?
Q. Yes, you became Policy and Standards Manager --
A. Yeah, 2004.
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point out anything obvious, like a missing witness statement or a missing exhibit?
A. Yeah.
Q. Does that describe the extent of Casework Management's oversight of the quality or the substance of an investigation?
A. Yeah, as I say, from memory, the Team Leader would be the one who would have more oversight of the case and the conduct of the case.
Q. Did files have to go through a team leader before they were submitted to Casework?
A. I think so, yeah.
Q. Do you know what function the team leader performed, what checks the team leader performed?
A. No, I don't know.
Q. When you were an Assistant Casework Manager and a Casework Manager, who made the decision whether or not a person was to be prosecuted or not?
A. That would be the lawyer within the Criminal Law Team -sorry, no, the Criminal Law Team would advise on the charges. The decision to prosecute would be down to whoever was the prosecuting authority, which was generally the Head of the Security Team or Investigation Team, whatever it was at the time.
Q. So who would make the decision to prosecute?
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A. The decision to prosecute would -- from my recollection, would be whoever the prosecuting authority was at the time. So it could be the Head of Security had changed -- the prosecuting authority would change, in my time in the team.
Q. Did you get to see all the advices that the Criminal Law Team prepared?
A. They would -- yeah, I mean, the Criminal Law Team would put an advice in the case papers that would come back to the Casework Team.
Q. So the whole file would come back to you physically --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- with advice added?
A. Yes, that's correct, yeah.
Q. In your witness statement -- no need to look at it, it's paragraph 16 -- you say the case file would be submitted by the Casework Team to the Criminal Law Team, who would prepare an advice and detail any charges based on the evidence. Is that right, that before the file came back to you, they would outline the charges that they suggested be pursued?
A. Yeah, or they would come back with an advice for further enquiries to be made and not necessarily make a decision, so --
Q. Did that happen?

65
the Criminal Law Team.
Q. Was that a document with which you and the team were familiar, at the time the Code for Crown Prosecutors?
A. I wasn't familiar with it, no.
Q. Was any filter applied by the Casework Team by reference to evidential sufficiency, "We're not going to put a case up to the Criminal Law Team and the Head of Investigations if, on our review of the file, there's not sufficient evidence"?
A. No, there wasn't, no.
Q. So were you literally postboxing it?
A. Essentially, yes.
Q. As we said earlier, the compliance didn't address that evidential sufficiency; the compliance checks didn't address evidential sufficiency?
A. No.
Q. Thank you. You tell us in your witness statement that you're not aware of the tests applied by either the Criminal Law Team or the Head of Investigations in decided whether to prosecute or not; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. So is it right to say that the role played by Casework Team members in decisions to prosecute was essentially moving files from one place to another?
A. Yes, I would agree with that, yeah.
A. Yeah, yeah, that would happen quite frequently, yeah.
Q. So "We're not making a decision now, further investigatory work needs to be undertaken"?
A. Yes, absolutely. That would happen quite frequently, yeah.
Q. Would you then pass the file back down the chain or along the line to the Investigation Manager?
A. Yes.
Q. You carry on in your witness statement:
"The Head of Investigations or whoever was the Prosecution Authority at the time would have sight of the case file and would make the final decision on whether to prosecute or not."

Do you know what test or approach the Head of Investigations took when deciding whether to prosecute or not?
A. No, I don't, no.
Q. In Casework, did you know what standard had to be achieved before a decision positively to prosecute was made?
A. No.
Q. Were you aware of the Code for Crown Prosecutors?
A. I've heard of it but I wouldn't know the details of it. That would be -- from my perspective, that would be a decision for the Criminal Law Team or the lawyer in 66
Q. Why didn't the Investigation Team just send the file to the Criminal Law Team?
A. Well, we had to do the compliance, but -- and record the details of the case because we had a casework spreadsheet that we were running, that we were required to do, so that we could, you know, maintain details of the case, where the case is at in terms of decision making. That was essentially it, I think.
Q. So it was about numbers and -- you called them earlier, whether the stickers were in the right place or, I think, one of the casework compliance things was whether something was written in the right font and of the right size?
A. That was part of the compliance, yeah.
Q. It was that kind of thing compliance was aimed at?
A. Yeah.
Q. Do you know why the compliance didn't look at substance?
A. No, I didn't. I don't know.
Q. Thank you.

Can we turn to your role in Casework in obtaining data and witness statements from Fujitsu. You tell us over a large passage in your witness statement -- it's paragraphs 34 to 54 of your witness statement, your involvement in obtaining ARQ data and analysing it, yes?
A. Me analysing it?
Q. Yes, ie that you didn't?
A. Yeah, I didn't no.
Q. What training did you receive, if any, in the obtaining of data from a computer system for the purposes of disclosure in criminal proceedings?
A. I didn't have any training at all in that. I was trained how to obtain event and transaction logs within a branch because that was available, I believe, for about a month, and that would just be in the form of a till roll.
MR BEER: Sorry, sir, the stenographer said something that I didn't hear.
THE STENOGRAPHER: I didn't catch the end of the answer, sorry.
MR BEER: I think the stenographer didn't catch the end of the last sentence.
A. To do with the till role?
Q. Yes, I think that was the one.
A. So within the branch, you could obtain event and transaction logs, I believe it went back a month, which were quite unwieldy to look through and, you know, analyse, but I was -- I was shown how to do that. But, in terms of the data that was provided by Fujitsu, I didn't receive any formal training at all. It was in the form of an Excel spreadsheet, so -- and the columns
A. No.
Q. Was that ever the subject of discussion within the Casework Management Team when you were obtaining this data from Fujitsu?
A. Not that I can recall, no.
Q. We're getting computer data from this person over here, this organisation over there, there are some requirements, evidential requirements, that need to be satisfied if we're going to present it to the Crown Court or the Magistrates Court. That was not something that was the subject of discussion?
A. No, not that I can recall, no.
Q. Can you remember the Criminal Law Team ever advising on that issue or being asked to advise on that issue?
A. In their advices they might ask for -- you know, obtain Horizon data but there was no advice given on how it should be presented that I can recall.
Q. Can we look, please, at POL00114566 and page 14, please.

We can see a document here dated 6 January 2003.
Maybe if we just skip back to the beginning part of it, if we just go back and then go forward each page, please. Keep going, thank you.

You'll see this is a Fujitsu document, a "Description for Implementation and Maintenance of Security Policies and Procedures". Then if we go to the 71
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were explained to us what was in each column and it was all fairly common sense stuff, to be honest.
Q. Had you ever heard of Section 69 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act and what it required when you were performing the role of Casework Manager?
A. Section 69? No. It doesn't ring a bell with me, sorry.
Q. Had you ever heard, if not the section and the Act, anything about what the law required in criminal proceedings as to the nature and quality of the evidence produced from a computer?
A. Not that I can recall, no.
Q. When you were performing this role as Casework Manager from 2002 onwards, as an assistant to start with, were you aware that there had been a law change, prior to your taking up the function, that was relevant to that issue or may have been relevant to that issue; if we're getting data from a computer, there's certain things that we have to do alongside that to prove it in a court?
A. No, I wasn't aware of that.
Q. And that there was a change in the requirements?
A. No, wasn't aware of that.
Q. Were you aware of any law or evidential requirements concerning the production of computer evidence from 2002 until 2007?
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fourth page, please. If we see in the third box down there, "Sue Lowther [Post Office Limited] comments on version 0.2."

Sue Lowther was a Post Office employee; is that right?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. What function would she have been performing at this time, December 2002?
A. Looking at the box below, Post Office Information Security Manager.
Q. So what relation did she have to you?
A. I don't recall meeting Sue.
Q. Was she somebody with whom you were familiar?
A. I was aware of the name, yeah.
Q. It seems that somebody within the Post Office knew about this document, namely Ms Lowther?
A. Yeah.
Q. If we go back to page 14 , please. Can you see that ARQ is defined in the second definition down, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Then if we just scroll through, please -- keep going -you'll see there's a section on Litigation Support, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. Then if we keep going. Then stop there, thank you.

I've not taken you to individual parts of it to see 72
what it described but, in general terms, it sets out the relationship between Fujitsu, on the one hand, and Post Office, on the other, in the provision of $A R Q$, with some other data, as well, but ARQ data, and Litigation Support and, in particular, describes some contractual limits in terms of years and months. But also, the process that's to be adopted in making requests and the provision of data.
A. Yes.
Q. Was this a document with which you were familiar when you were performing the function of manager in 2003?
A. I've certainly seen a document along those lines, yeah. I mean, whether it's this one or not, but yeah. I would have had that document to help me understand the volume of requests, so yeah, I would have been aware of that, yeah.
Q. Thank you. Then FUJ00122366. we can see a document entitled "Management of the Prosecution Support Service for [ARQs]", dated 6 June 2007, so this is right at the end of your period as a Casework Manager; is that right?
A. Yeah, roughly, yeah.
Q. Just before, I think, you became an AFI?
A. Yeah, I found my -- one of the certificates for passing FI, you had to go through various stages of training, and it was dated December, so my guess is that probably 73

Then the left-hand side describes what is to be done in the audit request part of the request.
A. Yeah.
Q. Does that describe -- admittedly this isn't a document addressed to Post Office Limited -- the nature of the possible forms of information and data the Post Office could seek from Fujitsu?
A. I would say, yes, that's my understanding, yeah.
Q. Were all of them, were each of them, requested in each case?
A. Sorry, prosecution support?
Q. Yes.
A. Not that I'm aware of, no. So, in terms of the process for Casework, we would request ARQ data that was asked for.
Q. Just stopping there -- sorry to interrupt you -- would, in each proposed prosecution case, you request ARQ data in each case?
A. No.
Q. Why would you not request ARQ data?
A. Unless it was asked for.
Q. Whose decision was it to ask for it?
A. So it would be -- Legal Services would make the decision on what evidence was required for the case, so if there were admissions in a case, then you wouldn't necessarily 75
joined around six months earlier, because I worked in the team and started training. So I would guess it would be about that time, yeah.
Q. This seems to be an updated process in mid-2007 relating to the document that we've just looked at, the processes described in that. Do you know what prompted or led to this document being created, this policy being created?
A. No, I don't, no.
Q. Can we just look forward to page 21, please, and scroll down, please. I'm sorry, that's an errant reference.

If we go back to the beginning, please, and just scroll forwards, please. Keep scrolling. Yes, there, thank you.

You'll see, and this is depicted in words elsewhere in the document, a process described in a graphic in relation to making out requests --
A. Yes.
Q. -- ARQ requests. On the left-hand side, I think, non-prosecution cases and, on the right-hand, side prosecution cases. You'll see the steps on the right-hand side, "Check Horizon System Helpdesk, if required"; "Check non-polling reports, if required"; "Check appropriate PEAK logs, if required"; "Complete a witness statement of fact"; "Complete Exhibit Labels"; "Dispatch to Post Office Limited".
need to obtain a witness statement for it.
Q. You mentioned a lot of issues in that last answer there?
A. Sorry.
Q. You said, firstly, Legal Services would decide what evidence to ask for?
A. Yeah.
Q. Legal Services only got involved at the point at which a request to prosecute was being made?
A. Yeah.
Q. Yes? Does it follow that an Investigator would not seek ARQ data as part of their investigation?
A. Yeah, for an audit shortage, yeah, absolutely.
Q. They wouldn't?
A. They would, yeah.
Q. Okay. What determined whether or not an Investigator asked for ARQ data in an audit shortage case?
A. I would think that, for an audit shortage case, they would always request ARQ data.
Q. Why would they always request it?
A. Because it would be relevant to the case.
Q. Why would it be relevant to the case?
A. Because it's an audit -- or it's an audit query of all events and transactions that have happened at that office.
Q. Isn't it enough to show that, on audit, there was 76
a difference between what Horizon showed on the cash account or some other document, as being needing to be present in the branch, and what the stocktake showed was present in the branch?
A. That would clarify the audit shortage. The ARQ data would help to clarify the person in the office that prepared the balance that may have undertaken certain transactions, so it would be relevant, I think.
Q. When you say it would be relevant, are you saying it would be necessary?
A. Yes, sorry, yeah.
Q. It would be necessary in all audit shortage cases?
A. Yeah, I would think so, yeah.
Q. So you would expect to see an ARQ request in each and every audit shortage case?
A. If there had been admissions, I'm not sure that the investigator would have thought it necessary at that time to request ARQ data.
Q. Why?
A. I don't know, really.
Q. Okay, we'll move on. You said that it was for Legal Services to decide whether, I think, a witness statement was required. Did I understand you correctly there or not?
A. No, sorry, that wouldn't be correct, obviously. If -77
A. Not -- it doesn't ring a bell with me, no.
Q. Something that had more data on it than was available -than simple ARQ data; were you aware of that?
A. No.
Q. Were you aware of something called the event log?
A. Yeah, I mean, that came as part or the ARQ so the transaction log was all the transactions conducted at the counter. The event log was logging on, logging off, cash declarations and balance results, probably other things, as well, but I know there was two, two logs that came with an ARQ.
Q. Can we just look, please -- remembering this -- at POL00081910, and look at pages 4 and 5, please. If we can look at them alongside each other, please. Thank you.

If we look on the right-hand side first, you'll see an email from Mr Dilley, dated Friday, 15 December to Anne Chambers and you're copied in; can you see that?
A. Yes, I can.
Q. "... many thanks to you and Andy Dunks for attending court to give evidence this week which was helpful. The judge has reserved his judgment ... Thanks also to Brian and his team for ... providing information about the Falkirk branch on short notice."

Then if we scroll down:

## "In ... litigation the parties involved have

a continuing obligation pursuant to the court rules ..."
Then skipping over five or six lines:
"I was also recently told that there was a message store which had everything else on it and we invited Mr Castleton to look at it but he didn't take up the opportunity.
"... whilst giving evidence you [that's Ms Chambers] told the court there was a different sort of events log, not included on the message store, that we had not seen or disclosed for the Marine Drive branch. Mr Castleton telephoned me today and asked for a copy of this ..."

Scrolling down.
" ... to be supplied ... immediately."
Then you can read to the rest of the email.
Looking at it generally at the moment -- we'll come back to Castleton in a moment -- what was your involvement in the Castleton case?
A. So, yeah, I would have been Casework Manager at that time, so I would have been requesting data on behalf of the Civil Litigation Team that were dealing with it.
Q. So you would have been the go-between --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- between Civil Litigation to your right --
A. (The witness nodded)
Q. -- as it were, and then Fujitsu to your left?
A. Exactly, yeah.
Q. Okay. This speaks of, can you see, the message store which had "everything else on it". It seems to be speaking about something in addition to the ARQ data that was obtained.
A. Yes, it does, yeah.
Q. Do you know what that's referring to there?
A. No, I don't, no.
Q. Were you aware of a message store which had "everything else on it"?
A. No, I wasn't, no. All I was aware of, through ARQ data, was we could request transaction logs, event logs, that were relevant to the transactions that were conducted at a post office and the events that happened at a post office, and we could further request Horizon System Helpdesk calls.
Q. You had previously been an Investigator responsible for disclosure of material in criminal proceedings before this, this is December 2005 --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- and you're being told, albeit as a copyee on this email, that there is another species of data available in a message store which has been made available to Mr Castleton, yes?
within the Post Office was "graham.c.ward", so obviously I'm not going to remember receiving emails from 2006 anyway and, if I was cc'd in, you know, I'd like to think I would have read it and, if l'd have seen that, then that would have concerned me greatly, and yeah, I would have escalated that as an issue. But I just don't think I picked that up, and whether that was because I haven't received the email, or whether I just haven't picked it up, I don't know.
Q. Can we just go up, please, to page 3. So maybe if we can just display one page at a time now.

Thank you. Just scroll up.
You'll see here, at the foot of the page, that I think your email address is in a reply to that, displayed as "graham.c.ward"; that is the correct --
A. Yeah. That is correct, yeah.
Q. So whether this is a function of the way this has been printed, sometimes the downloading process -- I'm using very inelegant terms here -- and the printing process affects the way email addresses appear, or whether somebody made a mistake in the first email we looked at, this second email is the correct email address?
A. Yeah.
Q. So you would have got the chain?
A. Yeah.
A. Yes, that's correct, yeah.
Q. Is that knowledge that you took forwards when you were discharging your role as Casework Manager in criminal cases?
A. I hadn't picked that up.
Q. What about the different sort of events log which apparently Ms Chambers had referred to in her evidence? Was that something you didn't pick up?
A. Yeah, I didn't pick it up, no. Not at all.
Q. So does it follow that, after this time, December 2005, this wasn't something that you took back to Casework Management to say, "Hold on, we're processing all these ARQ requests, there's this other species of data that somebody at Fujitsu, Anne Chambers, has mentioned as being important or useful that we're not getting or not asking for"?
A. No, l've just not picked it up at all. You know, don't recall seeing this email. Can we just scroll to the top, where it's got my email address?
Q. Yeah, sure. So right-hand side. That's it.
A. So I mean, I know it's, some of it's --
Q. Redacted.
A. -- redacted, sorry, yeah, but it's got "grahamc.wa.r" -I don't know whether that's relevant or not but would I have actually got that email because my email address 82
Q. So I think we can probably rule out that it didn't come to you.
A. Okay.
Q. That leaves, I think, that it's not something that you picked up?
A. Yeah, exactly, yeah.
Q. I think you'd probably agree, in the light of what you just said, it's quite important, isn't it?
A. Very.
Q. Again, we don't see it reflected in that table of a couple of years later, that I showed you in Section 7 of the policy --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- as things to look for?
A. Yeah. I would have thought, given that, yes, it appears to be really important, that this would have been, you know, escalated by the Civil Litigation Team. They worked closely with the Criminal Law Team, as well. I would have thought it would have been escalated as -you know, as an issue.
Q. You're talking about Mandy Talbot there?
A. Well, Stephen Dilley was the lawyer dealing with it.
Q. Yes, he was in an outsourced firm --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- so he wasn't within Post Office.
A. Okay, yeah. Well, yeah, I agree it was significant and, yeah, it should have been escalated.
Q. We also know about a note that Anne Chambers herself wrote, which is along the same lines, up to her line management, her reflections document, which picks up this point about the categories of data obtained as a result of the initial request for data. Can you recall any fallout from that coming back to Post Office, saying, "When you ask for data you need to be asking for message store data too"?
A. No, not at all.
Q. Thank you.

That can come down. Thank you.
You tell us in your witness statement that the Casework Manager acted as the single point of contact as between the Post Office, on the one hand, and Fujitsu, on the other, in relation for requests for, and then the provision of, ARQ data.
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. Other than the two documents that l've shown you, the 2003 and the 2007 document, which are Fujitsu documents, were there any written policies or protocols which you, in the Post Office, followed within the Casework Team concerning requesting ARQ data?
A. Not that I'm aware of, no.
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managed the system but it was Post Office data. So it always struck me as odd that we had restrictions on it, but that was the contract.
Q. Did you grumble about that?
A. Yeah, I did. I did and I think there was -- I think, you know, my line manager at the time was Tony Utting and we had issues staying within the limits. We didn't refuse many at all. I mean, we always were there or thereabouts. But I did make the point to him we had a lot of requests coming from the Benefits Agency, as they were known then, because of the pension allowance cases we were dealing with, with Fujitsu. When they heard that the evidence that came from Fujitsu included times of transactions which was really, really, really helpful, they started making lots of requests for ARQ data and, at that point, I said to Mr Utting that, you know, we're going to have problems here, and I know he escalated it, and I --
Q. Who, Tony Utting did?
A. Tony Utting escalated it within the business that the limits were restrictive and I know that it was increased at some point. I can't remember the details but I know there was some clause in the contract where we could ask for further ARQ numbers and it was increased but I couldn't tell you the details of, you know, what it
Q. Did you just do, therefore, what your predecessor had done: follow the custom and practice of him or her?
A. Yeah, I say I think I inherited the process. I can't be absolutely clear because, as I say, it goes back, you know, 22 years, but, yeah, we just basically carried on requesting the data that we thought was important.
Q. You were aware, and I think you remember because it's in your witness statement, contractual limits on the number of ARQ requests you could make to Fujitsu without a separate charge?
A. Yeah.
Q. You recall maintaining a spreadsheet, the purpose of which was to ensure that the Post Office did not exceed these limits; is that right?
A. Yeah, that's correct, yeah.
Q. You tell us in your witness statement that the number of requests made by Post Office was monitored very closely?
A. Yeah.
Q. Why was it monitored very closely?
A. Well, to ensure that we, where we could, not exceed the contractual limits because there were financial penalties, unfortunately. I will say, at this point, that I never quite understood why there was such restrictions on the data coming over to us, why we had a contract with Fujitsu, and I understand Fujitsu 86
went from and to.
Q. So this was when you were Casework Manager, you recall discussing the limitations --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- placed by the contract with your line manager, Tony Utting?
A. Yes.
Q. Why was there a need to raise it with him?
A. Well, any changes to the contract, from my understanding, were going to mean money and it was raised at the level that he worked at. It wasn't at my level.
Q. It's my poor question: why was there a need to raise the issue of the availability of $A R Q$ requests with him, because you needed more than the contract permitted, presumably?
A. Well, exactly, yeah.
Q. You tell us in your witness statement -- no need to turn it up, it's paragraph 49 -- that the contractual limits on $A R Q$ requests were the main consideration that informed the Post Office's decision whether to request ARQ data or not?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hm}$.
Q. Ought the main consideration to have been whether or not the ARQ data was necessary for the purposes of 88
an investigation?
A. Sorry, can you repeat the question?
Q. Yes. You tell us in your witness statement that the contractual limits on ARQ data were the main consideration that informed the decision whether to ask for ARQ data or not.
A. Mm .
Q. Ought the main consideration, instead, have been whether or not the data was necessary for the purposes of an individual case?
A. Yeah, I would agree.
Q. So why was the contractual limit the main consideration?
A. Yeah, it's not very well worded, I would say. For me, as Casework Manager, I would want to be able to provide Horizon data whenever it was asked for, so increasing the contractual limits was, you know, necessary. That was as far as I got involved in it, really.
Q. Did the knowledge about the contractual limits and the additional financial penalties that might be placed on POL if more requests than were permitted were made trickle down to Investigators?
A. I wouldn't have thought so, no. I certainly wouldn't have communicated it.
Q. So they might know that, if the Post Office had reached its allocation for the month or the year, it was going 89

Horizon, you would have assumed that the Investigation
Manager investigating that shortfall would have requested Horizon data?
A. Yeah.
Q. In every case, essentially?
A. Yeah, I would have thought so, yeah.
Q. Why would you assume that such an Investigation Manager in every case would ask for Horizon data?
A. Well, just because it's -- it could be used evidentially.
Q. To do what, to prove or disprove what the subpostmaster was saying?
A. Yeah, I mean it's -- you know, there could be transactions or things happening on the ARQ data that could be relevant.
Q. Was there any system of prioritisation of $A R Q$ requests coming from the Security Team over other requests?
A. I would prioritise Security Team, personally, yeah, absolutely, over --
Q. Where were the other requests coming from?
A. Sorry, the other requests would come from Contract Managers, Field -- not Field Support but whoever it was that was investigating any issues at offices. There were various teams that were involved in supporting branches and I presume that everybody within the
to cost Post Office money to ask for data?
A. It may have trickled down, yeah, it may have trickled down. I mean --
Q. Was there ever any discussion between the Casework Team and Investigators about whether it was necessary, truly necessary, to seek ARQ data or not?
A. No. Not insofar as "Don't request it". We might have asked them to really consider the scope because, for me, you know, you want as much Horizon data as you could possibly have but, you know, sometimes you would just ask for, you know, a couple of months when you might want six. So it was restrictive, there's no question about that.
Q. So you wouldn't go as far as saying "Don't ask" or "Don't bother asking"?
A. No.
Q. But you might encourage them to limit the range of their request --
A. Absolutely, I mean, in the early days we were always quite close to our limits. When the contract was increased, we had a lot more scope, so I don't recall, towards the end of my time in Casework, having to worry about the contractual limits.
Q. You tell us in your witness statement that, where a postmaster was attributing an alleged shortfall to 90
business was aware of the ARQ process. So yeah, we would get not many, but you would get ad hoc requests from other areas of the business and, as I say, I don't recall having to say "No, you can't have it". It was certainly an issue in the early days but, latterly, it wasn't.
Q. What kinds of ARQ requests would postmasters and Contract Managers make?
A. Just per individual transactions, you know, where they thought they had an issue or if a transaction correction had been received at the office and the subpostmaster wanted to dispute that transaction correction, ARQ data would be requested.
Q. Why did you prioritise Security Team requests over those made by subpostmasters and Contract Managers?
A. Well, just because of the numbers.
Q. But why were they more important than the subpostmasters?
A. Um, that's good question. They're not more important. I mean --
Q. Why were they prioritised?
A. They were prioritised because we need -- we may have needed them for prosecution cases.
Q. Why was it more important to service the requirements of somebody who had, as their function, prosecution over 92
a subpostmaster that may be querying or disputing a transaction?
A. I guess it wouldn't be really but, as I say --
Q. Well, why, was it?
A. I don't recall refusing requests, at all.
Q. That's a different issue.
A. But we would have prioritised -- yeah, I hear what you're saying but I haven't got an answer for that, I'm sorry.
Q. Was it because it was thought more important to prosecute subpostmasters than anything else?
A. No, I don't think so, not from my perspective.
Q. Why were Security Team requests prioritised?
A. Well, without the Horizon data, we wouldn't have potentially been able to continue with an investigation.
Q. Can we look, please, at POL00114566, and pages 31 and 32, please. If we can display 31 and 32 at the same time, please. If we look on the right-hand side and scroll down, please, and look at your email first at the foot of the page. Scroll a bit further, on the right-hand side, your email of 22 July 2004 to Mr Utting, "Horizon data requests", yeah?
Yeah
Q. "This year we have submitted the following", and you set out the monthly figures for the, I think, eight months 93
a bit of trickle down, doesn't it?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Looking at that sentence now, do you think in fact there had been some trickle down: because people on the ground who were conducting the investigations knew about the contractual restrictions on the provision of ARQ data, they didn't bother asking for them?
A. Yeah, I would have to agree, yeah.
Q. "If we had greater access, I am sure once the 'word' got around we would use up whatever was available.
"... with a monthly limit of 46 I didn't have to turn [any] away ..."

You said that in your witness statement and you said that today.
A. Mm .
Q. "... so I would get that having 50 per month for the rest of this year would see us through until the contract is amended. Therefore my guesstimate for the remaining year ... would be 220 ..."

You explain why.
Essentially, you were saying that, because of the arrangements that had been agreed as a matter of contract between Post Office and Fujitsu, people in other teams, including Security, weren't asking for ARQ data because they knew it wouldn't be given.
that have then elapsed?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hm}$.
Q. "Total 330 (our annual limit)."

Can you see that?
A. Yes, I can, yeah.
Q. Were you saying by that that you'd reached your annual limit?
A. That would appear to be the case, yeah.
Q. By August?
A. Yeah.
Q. If we scroll on a little further on the right-hand side.

If we can scroll up on the left-hand side, please.
Let's just display this as one document, rather than try to be flash and display two at the same time. Thank you.

Then scroll down.
Yes, it does just begin "predicting". I was unsure whether we were missing some text because you didn't start the sentence with a capital P:
"[Predicting] how many we will want isn't straightforward as people in our own team/[Retail Line Managers]NBSC/Legal Services are aware of the problems/restrictions in obtaining these logs and thus don't bother asking for them."

Just on that sentence, that does tend to indicate 94
A. Yeah, that's why we raised it as a real issue and that's thankfully why we got the limits increased, as I said.
Q. So you saw the position needed to be put right?
A. Yeah, absolutely.
Q. That was not just by increasing the limit but by also encouraging people to ask for data whenever they wanted it; is that right?
A. No, I wasn't encouraging people to ask for it whenever they wanted it but I wanted to be able to provide data when people asked for it.
Q. Was anything done to correct the attitude of mind that's described in the first paragraph there: investigators and others not asking for it, don't bother asking, because of knowledge of restrictions?
A. Not that I can recall, no.
Q. Can we go on to page 37 and 38. Start on page 38, please, so from Tony Utting. Then scroll up, please, and keep going. Can we see at the top here Mr Utting forwarding this chain to you and others --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- in June 2004?
A. Yeah.
Q. "... there are reams of emails about this (as you can imagine) ..."

Let's just look at what this part of the ream said, 96
if we scroll down. Keep going.
Well, Mr Utting is forwarding you an email, in which he says:
"I have today spoken with Keith Baines the Client Manager for Fujitsu, who tells me that the proposed reduction in requests has been agreed at EC level ..."

I think that might be Executive Committee level?
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hm}$.
Q. "... and that the business is aware, that should we exceed the number of requests in the contract, further resources will have to be found by the business to pay for them.
"The rationale behind the decision was that it was felt that we should not pay for anything in the contract that we did not use and there was no certainty that we would reach the previously agreed numbers."

Do you read this as suggesting there had, in fact, been a previous reduction in numbers through a fear that capacity would not be used up?
A. Yeah, that's how it reads, but that wouldn't have been my recollection at all because we'd always, at the time I was doing it, we'd always got very, very close to the limits and, you know, that's why it was increased.
Q. So if we scroll up, please, we can see David Miller, can you remember who he was at this point?
A. Not always, no. I mean, it was increased to -- was it 720? I think it went up quite considerably.
Q. "With the introduction of banking and the proposal to remove the hard copy cash account facility ... every investigation, whether full or preliminary, may require access to data held by Fujitsu.
"I was surprised that such a change was made without any reference to the primary stakeholder. Providing I have your commitment that [the Post Office] will meet any additional costs which may be caused as a result of this decision ... I am comfortable if this has contributed to the reduction in the overall Fujitsu contract costs."

Were you included in any of this prior discussion?
A. Not that I can recall, no. I mean, it's way above my pay grade.
Q. Did you hear about the fallout from it, ie a decision seemingly having been made without your line manager or his line manager, Mr Marsh, being included in the discussion?
A. No, I don't recall.
Q. If we go up, please. Stop there. He's forwarding you, Mr Utting, this chain. What was the purpose of that, do you know? Is it simply to tell you, "Look, this has been going on at the higher levels of the organisation,
A. Yeah, he was in -- I think he was one of the senior directors, was he?
Q. An email to him from Mr Marsh:
"This refers to the reduction, without any prior reference to anyone in my team, of the number of pre-paid audit and investigation information requests agreed in the contract from 500 to 330 ."

Remember that 330 number is the number that you had said, in your email that we just looked at, was the limit for the year.
A. Mm .
Q. Were you aware of a previous reduction from 500 to 330 ?
A. No, I wasn't, no.
Q. "I had previously agreed with Mike Hannon that our original figure of 750 (itself reduced from a rather comfortable 1,000 ) could be reduced to 500 provided that our bid for funding to cover any additional requests would be met."

Were you aware of any of those steps, an original comfortable 1,000 a year, itself reduced to 750, itself reduced to 500, itself reduced to 330 ?
A. No, I wasn't aware, no.
Q. When you were the Casework Manager, the single point of contact for making these requests, did you always work on the basis that your annual limit was 330 ?
we just deal with the consequences", kind of thing?
A. Yeah, it would appear so, yeah.
Q. Thank you. Can we move on, please, to page 44 of this bundle. If we scroll down, please -- thank you -- we can see an email of 1 June 2004 from you to Keith Baines, copied to Dave Pardoe and Mr Utting.
A. Yes.
Q. At this time, mid-2004, what role was Mr Baines performing?
A. He must have been a Fujitsu relationship manager or something along those lines, I really don't remember.
Q. Was he a senior person --
A. Yeah, well, I --
Q. -- within the Post Office?
A. From my understanding, yeah, he was, yeah.
Q. You say:
"Please see the email from Bill Mitchell, Fujitsu Security Manager ... some of the transaction log requests we have submitted have been returned 'incomplete' due to human error on their part. This could invite some criticism from Defence counsel in cases where the logs have been used have been used in evidence. Fujitsu armies thing 'complete' data with a supporting statement, so hopefully the issue will not be a great problem.
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"[Forwarded for information and] action you deem appropriate from a commercial/contractual perspective."

Can you recall what the issue was with incomplete transaction and event logs that you're describing here?
A. No, without reference to the email chain I was sent --
Q. If we go down, I think we'll see it.
A. -- yeah, I wouldn't have remembered any of this at all.
Q. If we just keep going, that is the email from Bill Mitchell.
A. Yeah
Q. In summary, does this help, in evidence that had been submitted in court proceedings, had incomplete ARQ data been provided by Fujitsu?
A. Yeah.
Q. Just going back up, you were telling Keith Baines about this. Was he somebody that you liaised with often?
A. No.
Q. Why were you bringing in Mr Baines?
A. Well, I presume because he managed the relationship with Fujitsu, so he needed to be made aware of what had happened.
Q. Do you know whether anyone else within senior management, ie at his level, was informed about the failure to provide complete ARQ data?
A. Yeah, I'm not aware of what level of seniority Keith
$A R Q$ data and the increase in limits of $A R Q$ data?
A. No idea at all, no.

MR BEER: Sir, we're about to move to a new topic. It is just coming up to 12.55 now. I wonder whether you will consider adjourning until 1.55 .
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I'd even consider adjourning until 2.00, unless you tell me those five minutes are crucial.

MR BEER: Well, five minutes lost now is five minutes at the end of the day, sir.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right, 1.55.
MR BEER: Thank you, sir.
( 12.53 pm )
( 1.55 pm )
MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir. Can you see and hear us?
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you.
MR BEER: Yes, thank you. Good afternoon, Mr Ward. Can we pick up the topic of litigation support, please. In paragraph 42 of your statement you told us that your understanding was, if ARQ data was required, it would be supplied in accordance with the contract and that, if a supporting witness statement was needed, this would also be supplied in accordance with the contract, and would be dealt with on a case-by-case basis; is that right?
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## (The Short Adjournment)

Baines was at. He might have been the same level as Tony Utting, I don't know.
Q. You say that they, Fujitsu, are:
"... submitting complete data with a supporting statement, so hopefully the issue will not be it a great problem."

Can you recall whether any action was taken in relation to past cases to check whether what had occurred here, the submission of incomplete ARQ data, had afflicted them too?
A. No. I mean, I think this was raised by Fujitsu.

I think they brought it to our attention. So they had obviously made a mistake. So, no, I don't recall that there was any further action taken.
Q. Can you recall whether there was any review undertaken of cases in which a conviction had been obtained, whether by plea or after a trial, in which ARQ data had featured, to see whether, before this time, mid-2004, the ARQ data was complete?
A. I can't recall, no.
Q. This email is within a folder, a physical folder, which has got, on its front sheet information -- if we go to page 1, we'll see it -- "[ARQ requests] (Increase in Limits)". Do you know what the relationship was, the connection was, between the failure to provide complete 102
A. That's correct.
Q. If we just look at the paragraph 56 of your statement, please, which is on page 20 , if that could be brought up.

Page 20, paragraph 56, second from the top. You say in the second sentence:
"As Casework Manager, I had little involvement with prosecution witnesses, aside from liaising with Fujitsu's Prosecution Support Team."

Is that right?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. So you weren't involved in or interested in the substance of what the prosecution witnesses were saying --
A. No.
Q. -- irrespective of whether they came from Fujitsu or otherwise?
A. Correct.
Q. Can we look, please, at FUJ00122197. If we scroll down, please.

We can see, if we just scroll to the bottom, please, the start of an email chain, not involving you -- if we scroll up -- not involving you, yes? Then scroll up.

Can we go to the end of the email chain, please, and scroll up. Thank you. If we just take the top of the 104
email, which is on the next page, from you; can you see that?
A. Yeah.
Q. Subject of ARQ requests, dated March 2006, and scroll down. You say:
"All volume of requests attached." you see under the "To" section, it simply says, "Fujitsu"?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that a group email address?
A. It was, yeah.
Q. Can you now remember who was within it or not?
A. So 2006, I would guess it would be Neneh Lowther, Pete Sewell, maybe Penny Thomas, maybe Andy Dunks.
Q. Okay, thank you. Scroll back down to the substance, then:
"Both of the above requests relate to cases where [the Post Office] are being challenged about the accuracy of the Horizon system." have provided data:
Q. Can you keep your voice up a little bit please?
A. Sorry. In terms of cases in Security, there weren't any Horizon -- many Horizon cases that I was aware of.
Q. Any or many?
A. Well, going back to 2006 , I can't recall exactly now, but I don't think there were any. Obviously, I was --
Q. I'll come back to that answer in a moment but why does the fact that there weren't any or many challenges nonetheless mean that it's in your mutual interest to prove any challenges as being wrong?
A. I agree, it's a poor choice of words.
Q. Is it a poor choice of words --
A. Yeah, it absolutely --
Q. -- ie you meant something else but you've expressed yourself badly?
A. I've expressed myself badly, I --
Q. Hold on. Let me finish the question, Mr Ward. "Poor choice of words" means that you didn't intend what the words mean: you intended something else but you've expressed yourself badly by the words you've selected; is that what you mean?
A. I've expressed myself badly.
Q. What did you mean?
A. Well, I just wanted to do the right thing by ensuring that we were able to show that the system was working 107
"... sorry for the length of this email and the high

If we scroll up again to see who the "All" was. Can

You're already aware of the case at Torquay Road and
"... In the cases of Marine Drive and Torquay Road 105
for which you have previously provided ... responses, I would like to 'sound out' the possibility of someone at Fujitsu providing a formal witness statement along the lines of [the attached] provided by Bill Mitchell in one of our criminal cases (whilst Marine Drive and Torquay Road are not criminal matters, given the allegations being made by postmasters, I'm sure you'll agree that it is very much in both ourselves and Fujitsu's interests to challenge the allegations and provide evidence that the system is not to blame for the losses [provided]). Whilst it may not be a statement that you, Penny or Neneh can provide, I'm sure there must be someone who can."

Just stopping there, what were the mutual interests of the Post Office and Fujitsu that you were referring to?
A. To prove that the Horizon system was working correctly.
Q. Why was it in your interests to prove that the system was working correctly and that the subpostmasters were wrongly blaming it for losses?
A. Well, I can see now, with the benefit of hindsight, that it was a very one-sided view. At the time, certainly in the Security Team in terms of criminal cases, there weren't any cases, Horizon integrity challenges or whatever.
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correctly.
Q. Would you agree that it would have been in Fujitsu's interests to show that the system was working correctly and not producing unreliable data?
A. Yeah, I guess so, yeah.
Q. As the manufacturer and operator and system maintenance company, that would be very much in their interests?
A. Yeah.
Q. And, corporately, for the Post Office, it would be important to show that the system that was being used up and down the country had integrity and was working properly, wouldn't it?
A. I wasn't thinking like that at all.
Q. Would you agree that that would be a corporate view which Post Office senior management would doubtless hold --
A. Yeah, I would agree, yeah.
Q. -- not least because, I think you'd probably be aware, that the proper functioning and integrity of the system was viewed as essential to the continuation of a number of sub post offices around the country?
A. Yeah, I would agree, yeah.
Q. But as the person responsible within a team for bringing people to justice, is that your principal concern?
A. No, my principal concern was to ensure that we were 108
asking Fujitsu to provide us with a witness statement and provide us with the evidence that the system couldn't be responsible for losses. Again, it's a poor choice of words, I know, but that was the view I had at the time.
Q. Well, that's a different thing, whether you held a view at the time, which is different from one you hold now, in the light of what you now know. That's different from using words poorly.
A. Okay.
Q. Were you using words poorly or does this, in fact, reflect your state of mind at the time?
A. I don't believe it reflects my state of mind. I was just trying to do the right thing but, you know, l've got it wrong, haven't I?
Q. Well, the right thing, would you agree, Mr Ward, would be to say, "Although it might be in Fujitsu's interests to refute challenges and allegations about the system and it might be in Post Office's corporate favour or benefit to adopt the same approach, we're here as Investigators, or people who assist in an investigation, and we've got separate duties that we owe under the law and to the court, properly and fairly to investigate"?
A. Yeah, I can't disagree with that.
Q. What you've written is the opposite of that, isn't it? 109

## witnesses might say, aren't you?

A. I don't know why I got involved in this. I think it was because Neneh Lowther had asked me and I was trying to be helpful. It's not -- it wasn't the function of the
Casework Manager to get involved in this way.
Q. Why did you get involved?
A. Because I was asked and I tried to be helpful.
Q. Asked by who?
A. I think Neneh Lowther in the email has -- I saw somewhere in the email chain that Neneh had sent me a statement, asking me to review it. Maybe she'd phoned me previously, I don't know.
Q. You explain in the last sentence of that big paragraph there, the one that starts "Brian", "it may not be a statement that you, Penny or Neneh can provide", you're sure that there must be somebody who can. Was that because you understood that such a statement needed to be authored by a person who could consider underlying data and properly analyse it?
A. No, it was because Penny and Neneh only provided basic statements and, because this was relating to banking transactions and nil transactions, I just assumed, maybe wrongly, that it would have been outside their knowledge, and I was aware, obviously, that Mr Jenkins had provided us a more detailed statement in the
A. Yeah.
Q. You say in your witness statement, when we asked you to address this, that you suspect your concern at the words "system failure" would have been that it would have required a detailed explanation in a witness statement?
A. Yeah.
Q. Why would that have been a bad thing to have to explain what a system failure was?
A. Well, I just think, you know -- and I've reflected on this an awful lot -- I just think what I was really looking at was getting a full explanation of what Mr Jenkins was saying in his statement what a system failure was, because it didn't appear to me to be terribly clear. So I would -- you know, I would not have said anything along the lines of "You can't say this", or whatever.

I was just trying to get some clarity and I appreciate how it looks now and I'm sorry it looks that way now but, you know, it was not my intention for that to happen in terms of removing the words "system failure", or whatever. I just wanted it to be clear and make sure it was explained properly.
Q. You told us in your witness statement that you had little involvement with prosecution witnesses. Here you're making a suggestion as to what prosecution 110

Castleton case so I just assumed, maybe, that it, you know, somebody else within the team might have needed to have made that statement.
Q. Sorry, you said that you were aware that Mr Jenkins had provided a statement in the Castleton case?
A. Yeah.
Q. Were you aware that it wasn't used?
A. No, I wasn't aware, no.
Q. Okay that can come down. Thank you.

Can we look at your witness statement, please, page 34, paragraph 112:
"Paragraph 90 of the Request [that's our request to you] asks me if I had or was aware of any concerns regarding the robustness of the Horizon system during the time I worked for [the Post Office]. I will say that at no time was I ever aware that the Horizon system had bugs, errors and defects that could have affected balancing at a branch. As with any computer system, I was aware of minor issues, such as ... monitors freezing and terminals having to be rebooted."

Then you address the system failures issue, which I'm going to come back to.

So at no time, in all of your service right up until May 2016, were you aware that the system had any bugs, errors or defects that could affect balancing, correct? 112
A. Obviously, there was an article at some point, I can't remember exactly what year. I mean, I can't remember what year it was it came out --
Q. Which publication are you referring to?
A. Was it -- I don't -- I can't remember which one.
Q. Are you thinking about Computer Weekly in May 2009?
A. No, I think it was later than that. I don't know, it was in the media, and I know it's obviously been in the media a lot. So no.
Q. Other than that article, until you left in 2016, not aware of bugs, errors or defects that could have affected balancing at a branch?
A. No.
Q. Everything else was about freezing monitors or reboots of terminals, or something like that?
A. Well, just -- yeah, I mean, there isn't a computer I've used that hasn't had an issue, you know, rebooting or whatever. I just didn't consider system failures at all as being a serious issue, such as a bug, an error, a defect.
Q. Thank you. Can we look at POL00119895, please. Can you see this is a record of a meeting held at Coton House in Rugby on 6 December 2005 and you're listed amongst those being present. By this time, you were the Investigation Team Casework Manager, correct? 113
cases that I was aware of at all, at this point. I was attending the meeting, I presume, on behalf of Tony Utting.
Q. Just going up the page again to the cast list, looking back at it now, was this the kind of thing you went to regularly --
A. No, not at all.
Q. -- a meeting at Coton House in Rugby --
A. No.
Q. -- with a group of people relatively senior like that?
A. No, it wasn't, no.
Q. Looking at that cast list and the location of the meeting, about Horizon integrity and that first paragraph, doesn't it look like it's a meeting called because there were concerns about Horizon integrity?
A. Yeah, it does, yeah.
Q. Go back to paragraph 1, please. So it looks like the result of the meeting was a conclusion that there wasn't a process for identifying cases in which integrity of Horizon accounting information might an issue. Would you agree that if it was -- and we'll see in a moment at the rest of the minutes of the meeting it suggested that such a process be designed.

Given that that was the focus of the meeting and the outcome of it, does that tend to suggest to you that, by 115
A. Correct.
Q. You can see the others present, Mr Baines, Ms Cockett Mr Gallagher, Dave Hulbert, Mr Legg, Ms Robson and Alvin West.
A. Yes.
Q. If we go forwards, further down the page, please -"Flip charts from the meeting" -- "Findings":
"There is no generally understood process for identifying emerging cases in which the integrity of accounting information produced by Horizon may become an issue."

Do you remember, in December 2005, attending a meeting in which the integrity of accounting information produced by Horizon was discussed?
A. No, I don't remember the meeting at all but, obviously, I was there.
Q. This is very early on in the piece, isn't it --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- December 2005? Can you help us now as to why, if you were not aware of any bugs, errors or defects that might affect financial information, ie accounting, you were attending a meeting in December 2005 which addressed the process for identifying cases where the integrity of accounting information was in issue?
A. No, I can't explain that at all. There weren't many 114
this time, December 2005, the Post Office knew there was an issue about the integrity of Horizon information?
A. There were challenges but, you know, from my own personal point of view, I didn't see that there were any, you know, serious issues with the actual integrity of the data.
Q. Why would there need to be a process then? Surely, if your state of mind was the right one, you'd say, "Hold on, why are we bothering with all this? Why have we got to go to Rugby and discuss this? Why are we going to design a process? All we'll need to do is ask Fujitsu and they'll tell us everything is all right"?
A. Yeah. Well, I think it was just about coming up with a process --
Q. Why does there need to be a process if there's not a problem?
A. Well, because I can only assume that they were expecting other challenges to come.
Q. Okay, we'll continue:
"There are a number of channels by which such cases may enter Post Office ... and there's no process for making information about them available to all relevant functions. This increases the risk that different parts of the business may be dealing with the same issue and not coordinate responses.
"The transaction logs that can be obtained from Fujitsu via audit query requests provide the data that is required for investigation of claimed anomalies in particular cases. However, interpretation of this data is not simple. It requires a considerable level of understanding of branch transaction and accounting processes and how these are implemented, as well as the skills to analyse such data using PC-based tools.
"[The] price for providing the data and for skilled resource to analyse and report on it is high ... capacity provided in the contract is fully used [we've looked at that already].
"To date, the number of cases in which the integrity of Horizon data has been an issue is small; however, recent correspondence in The SubPostmaster may well cause an increase; also there may be an effect from the introduction of transaction corrections replacing error notices.
"The [Federation] has had no involvement to date,
and this is expected to continue unless there was 20 considerable momentum for a change ... from membership.
"Challenges ... may arise late in the process ...
following suspension or issue of a late account ..."
Further down the page:
"If all potential cases were to require Horizon data 117
may mean in some circumstances an independent expert
would need to repeat analysis for himself that Post
Office or Fujitsu had already carried out.
"The [Marine Drive] case, scheduled for 7 February
is the first of the current cases that may require expert testimony ...
"Recommendations
"A coordination role should established to maintain
a list of all current civil cases and potential civil
cases where accuracy of Horizon accounting information
may be an issue ... and ensure that all relevant business functions are made aware of these cases.
"2. Briefing is required [for contract managers and
service managers] all staff [as well] setting out
business policy, lines to take and ... identify
potential emerging cases.
"3. Data ... is adequate ... However, the capability to analyse ... such data is not available to [Post Office]. Additional cost will be required."

Over the page:
"On balance ... probably best to provide this resource in-house ...
"Appointing an external expert is likely to give the best results in court ... discussions with Fujitsu should be initiated on the role, [Terms of Reference] 119
to be analysed early in the process ... workload would be considerable -- and much would later prove unnecessary ... there are ... 12 suspensions a week ... Most of these [cases] are subsequently settled by agreement, or are not contested.
"Where a case does go to court, it is essential that Post Office is able to refute any suggestion that Horizon is unreliable (in general) or that it could have caused specific losses to the subpostmaster ... evidence needed for these 2 points will be different.
"For [general] evidence will need to be in the form of a credible expert opinion that confirms the system has been designed, built and operated in accordance with good practice and its overall performance provides confidence ...
"On the specific errors claimed to have been caused in a particular case, evidence will need to show ... that the system recorded transactions and calculated accounts accurately; and that the transaction data is an accurate record ..."

13:
"Such evidence will be given greater weight by a court if it is provided by an expert who is distanced from Post Office and Fujitsu. Evidence will need to be given by the person who carried out the analysis -- this 118
and access to Fujitsu staff ..."
We can ignore 5. Then some actions, none of which relate to you. Okay.

Just scrolling back, please, to 3 -- or to 1 , in
fact, coordination role. Was that done?
A. Not that I'm aware. I mean, as I say, I think I would have been there, just covering for Tony Utting, so I would have just updated him with what happened at the meeting and he would have presumably got a copy of this.
And I don't remember being involved in anything after that.
Q. If something was done to carry recommendation 1 into effect, that's something you would know about --
A. I would think so.
Q. -- after December 2005 as having happened?
A. Yeah, I would have thought so.
Q. It's something that would have engaged well, it would either have occurred in your branch, in your team --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- or it would have been something that required somebody within your branch, in your team to provide data to?
A. Yeah.
Q. Can we take it from the fact that you do not know about it, that it didn't happen?
A. Not that I'm aware of. I can't say it didn't happen, but I certainly don't have any knowledge of that.
Q. If there was no problem with Horizon, if it was about frozen screens and keyboards not working, why was it necessary to establish a centralised coordination role?
A. No idea.
Q. Why wouldn't you have piped up at the meeting and said, "Hold on, this is all about monitors freezing and F1 not working on the keyboard"?
A. I don't know.
Q. Is it because you, in fact, know that there was something more deep seated --
A. No.
Q. -- about Horizon integrity and the data that it produced?
A. Absolutely not, no.
Q. You agree that these minutes of this meeting tend to suggest that?
A. Well, I don't know if they suggest -- I wouldn't interpret it that they suggest that the system is inaccurate because of bugs, errors and defects, and it could affect the balancing, no. I think the meeting was about Horizon integrity.
Q. What's the difference between Horizon integrity and --
A. The challenges that were being -- that the business was
Q. -- and was treated as an expert or a person with expertise?
A. Yeah.
Q. Did you ever raise an issue "Hold on, I went to a quite high-powered meeting in Rugby, where it was agreed that we can't use somebody from Fujitsu or Post Office, they needed to be independent, there was discussion about using our external auditors and whether even that was independent enough. Why are we using somebody from Fujitsu?"
A. Yeah, I mean, in terms of Mr Jenkins, I didn't see him as an expert witness myself. I don't recall, you know, seeing him as an expert witness. I saw references to him as a distinguished engineer. And the statement that, you know, we'll come on to, it was just a case of asking somebody, or Fujitsu, to provide a more detailed statement than the basic statement. It was specific requirement and I think Fujitsu identified Mr Jenkins as somebody who could provide that statement.
Q. But, even if you didn't view him as an expert, why not pipe up and say, "Well, hold on, we've had this discussion. A meeting is being convened where various parts of the business have been pulled together and a strategy has been developed. Never mind all of the other things in the recommendations that haven't been
receiving from subpostmasters.
Q. So are you drawing a distinction there between there's going to be an increase in challenges because of this article in a magazine?
A. I say, I can't recall what I'd have been thinking back -- at this time but that's possible.
Q. To your knowledge did recommendation 2 get carried into effect: briefing, setting out lines to take?
A. I didn't have -- I don't recall receiving any feedback at all from this meeting apart from, obviously that -these minutes. So that would be the same for all the recommendations.
Q. Well, over the page, please, at 4: Appointing an expert; the expert will need to testify; such an expert may be needed in the Castleton case; advice from Corbett on the desirability of using our external auditors.

Remember the discussion earlier in the minute, reflecting the meeting that the expert needed to be somebody outside of Post Office and Fujitsu.
A. Mm .
Q. Did that recommendation get carried into effect?
A. Not that I'm aware of.
Q. You know, subsequently, that Mr Jenkins started providing witness statements --
A. Yeah.
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done, one of them, we sat down and talked and agreed we can't use somebody from Fujitsu or the Post Office; why are we doing that?"
A. Honestly, I've got no recollection of this meeting at all. I'm sorry.
Q. Go back to page 1, please. You said that you were deputising, you think, from Mr Utting?
A. I think so.
Q. You would have got a minute -- a note of this minute after the meeting?
A. Yeah.
Q. Would Mr Utting have got one directly?
A. Well, if I forwarded it on to him, yeah.
Q. Why would you forward it on to him rather than you deal with the issues that were raised in it yourself?
A. Well, I can only assume that I -- as I say, I believe I was there covering for him.
Q. So it would because you were covering for him?
A. Yeah.
Q. Do you agree that this is a record of you being aware of challenges to the Horizon system's integrity and the financial information that it produced as early as December 2005?
A. I was aware of it being a meeting involving challenges to the Horizon system, yes, but I didn't consider them 124
to be affecting the integrity of the balancing and the data on the system.
Q. Why does it matter then? Why does --
A. Because --
Q. -- Horizon integrity matter if it doesn't affect any of the financial data?
A. Because any issues on Horizon would matter.
Q. What, irrelevant issues that have no cause and effect?
A. Well, I wouldn't say they were irrelevant.
Q. So what were the relevant Horizon integrity issues if they weren't to do with accounting?
A. Well, it was just to do with the system operating correctly.
Q. What does that mean, please, Mr Ward? You know, don't you, that this was about the accounting information that the system produced?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Go to paragraph 1, please, "emerging cases in which the integrity of accounting information"?
A. For me, it was about the challenges that we were facing, not the actual system itself being incorrect.
Q. Can we move on, please, to another aspect of what I might call an attitude of mind. You tell us in your witness statement -- and this is paragraph 22 of your witness statement, no need to display it -- that in 2012 125
Q. What connection did you make between the two events?
A. Horizon cases.
Q. le they were investigating the integrity of Horizon?
A. We were never formally told that, as far as I was aware, but they were investigating Horizon cases.
Q. Why did the number of investigations slow down or cease?
A. Because we weren't doing -- I'm assuming that at the time we just stopped investigating things under PACE.
Q. But why? Presumably the shortfalls were still continuing, the postmasters were still stealing the money?
A. Well, I don't know. That didn't -- wasn't something I thought about. At the end of the day, we weren't receiving new cases.
Q. But why? If you've got faith in the system and the data that it produces, the fact that these consultants have come in to investigate the system, why does that mean there is a cessation or a slowdown in investigations?
A. Well, they must have obviously identified some issues, I guess.
Q. Were you upset at this?
A. No, not at all.
Q. What did you think of the fact that investigations had stopped or had slowed right now?
A. Well, it just meant that, as far as Proceeds of Crime 127
A. Well, I'm assuming they were connected.
cases, we wouldn't be dealing with them any more, and that would be that.
Q. Can we look, please, at POL00121975. If we can start, please, at page 5. Scroll up to page 4. Just keep going. Thank you. We can see your email of 1st November to Andy Hayward, Rob King and Dave Pardoe. At this time what function did each of them perform?
A. Well, they were all Senior Managers. I'm not sure what Andy Hayward's role was. I think Dave Pardoe might have been my line manager then. Well, no, that would have been -- no, it wouldn't have been. That's not right. I'm not sure what roles they were doing. They were all Senior Managers within the Security Team.
Q. Within the Security Team?
A. Yeah, yeah.
Q. So they were all within your team --
A. Yes, yeah.
Q. -- and at this time you were an AFI?
A. Correct.
Q. You say:

## "Andy

"As discussed
"Compensation should be sought post-conviction for all non-POCA cases, where [Post Office] has incurred a loss (At the moment the ...)"
Is that Financial Investigator's trigger?
A. Yeah.
Q. "... for involvement is [more than] $£ 15,000$ ). Once a compensation order has been made by the court then the defendant owes [the Post Office] that money and has to pay up within the timescales. However unlike the [Proceeds of Crime Act], compensation orders have 'no teeth' and enforcing these orders is time consuming and in sum cases ineffective, ending up with defendants paying minimal monthly instalments over a prolonged period of time.
"In [Post Office] cases [one of the provisions] covers the issue of compensation ... the court can confiscate the defendants assets to the value of the benefit figure and also compensate the victim, so for example, if a subpostmaster is convicted of theft of $£ 50,000$ and has sufficient assets, the court could make [an order] for $£ 50,000$ and make a further compensation order for $£ 50,000$ which is awarded to the victim, in effect a 'double-whammy'. In reality, in all the cases I have dealt with, the Post Office will only seek compensation 'out of' the confiscation order, but this is a matter decided by the Judge. It is crucial at these confiscation hearings to ensure that the Post Office are awarded compensation from the Confiscation 129
Do you remember who the JFSA were?
A. Yes, the Justice for Subpostmasters Alliance.
Q. "... and [Post Office] Criminal Enforcement Policy documents as requested I enclose [the Post Office] approach to compensation from Graham Ward ..."
A. Yes.
Q. So it looks like, if you look at the title, JFSA and Post Office Criminal Enforcement Policy, that the request was made in the context of asking -- somebody asking about what Post Office's enforcement policy was; do you agree?
A. Well, I -- my understanding, that they were just asking for clarity on how we approached confiscation and compensation orders.
Q. Okay. If we carry on up the page, please, a thank you to Mr Singh. Second line:
"This is helpful background but I am not clear whether this is an instruction provided to counsel in each and every case/whether this is strict policy at [Post Office] or this is just Graham Ward's view?"
A. I don't recall it being a policy and it wasn't just my view; it's what we did in the FIU.
Q. So practice?
A. Practice, yeah.
Q. Then further up the page, please. Jarnail Singh comes

Order."
Then there is a provision that we needn't look at. What was the context in which you were writing here?
A. What was the context?
Q. Yes.
A. I was explaining that Proceeds of Crime cases, we would seek compensation orders out of the confiscation order rather than, you know, a judge could impose a compensation order and a confiscation order, which we never went for at all. We just went for a loss.
Q. That's what you were saying. We can see that. Why were you saying it?
A. Because I was presumably asked for some clarity.
Q. If we scroll up, please. Keep going. We can see that Mr Hayward sends your email on to Jarnail Singh.
A. Yeah.
Q. Then if we carry on, we can see that Mr Singh duly sends it on to Sally Roff and Mary Lawrence. Do you know who they are?
A. No, I don't, no.
Q. I think we can certainly see who one of them is further up the page. She's an associate in DAC Beachcroft. Just reading back to what Mr Singh said:
"Thank you for your kind help and assisting with the JFSA ..."
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back to you and said can you provide him with views on Mary's email.

Further up the page, please. You forward that chain to David Posnett, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. You say "Elv"; is that Mr Posnett?
A. Yes, it is.
Q. Why was he called "Elv"?
A. It goes back to when we first worked on the counter together back in, whenever it was, 1980s, he just had an Elvis haircut.
Q. Right:
"Elv
"I am; lost for words ... whilst in the pub earlier, Jarnail rang me about this very subject and we spoke for about 15 minutes (presumably he either didn't understand what I was on about or didn't get the answer he wanted to hear!!) ... personally I think these issues are for the [senior leadership team], what are your views?
"... my answer would be as follows:
"'As things stand we are a public body with responsibility for public money. We currently have a prosecution policy and are recognised by the Home Office as a non-police prosecuting authority with PACE trained Investigators and our own legal team ...
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Following a successful conviction we robustly seek to recover monies stolen by Proceeds of Crime Act confiscation proceedings.
"I can only reiterate what I have said below and as far as I'm [concerned] it is [Post Office's] policy to recover money in all cases where we have suffered a loss, which will include seeking compensation orders where there are no POCA proceedings and seeking confiscation orders where POCA has been instigated.
"I do not believe we will easily be able to provide stats to support which cases we have been awarded compensation orders for ... as the Casework spreadsheet does not have a column to record that. A trawl of recently closed case files where we have prosecuted may provide some details. However Dave and I have been recording details of cases where we have been awarded confiscation orders.
"As you will be aware, the Late Account Team will also be involved in recovery using civil action to pursue repayment of losses'.
"I could waffle on but I think we are flogging a dead horse, I get the impression there's a strong desire from the powers that be, to water down our approach to prosecution and recovery, a sad, shortsighted and disastrous move if I'm right. 133
though we were going to stop prosecutions, even though the system was robust and reliable, which I must --
Q. You were fed up about that?
A. At the time. I just thought, you know, if the system is robust and reliable, why do we need to worry about stopping it?
Q. You were angry, weren't you?
A. I wasn't, no not really. I'm not an angry type of person. I mean, at the end of the day, if -- you know, I just get on with things.
Q. You wanted to get on with prosecuting people?
A. No, I was --
Q. Taking money back from them, didn't you?
A. No, no, I didn't. I was actually leaving the team. I probably already -- I was already aware that I was leaving the team at that time.
Q. Well, you were leaving the team because things were winding down and you weren't going to be able to carry on prosecuting people and taking money from them, weren't you?
A. No, that's not the case at all. I'd applied for jobs well, a view -- quite a few years previous. So, no.
Q. At the very least, would you agree that the chain we've looked at here shows that you were aware that the impact of Horizon challenges and the work of the JFSA was 135

## "Goodnight."

Now, you're here writing I think at 9.54 at night, if we look at the top of the page, having been in the pub.
A. Well, I don't know if I was -- well, I wouldn't have been in the pub writing that email.
Q. No, but you had been in the pub?
A. Yeah.
Q. Was this is an important topic to Mr Singh then, to engage you after hours whilst you were drinking?
A. Well, I don't know what time he rang me.
Q. You may have been in the pub in the afternoon?
A. Well, it may have been. I've got no recollection at all. It may have been just after work, four o'clock, whatever.
Q. Was it an important topic that you would interrupt some time in the pub to spend 15 minutes talking about it to Jarnail Singh?
A. Yeah, if Jarnail rang me up and asked me a question I would try and answer it.
Q. And what was your concern; why were you lost for words?
A. I think it's -- you know, at the time my feeling was because we were still being told by the business that the Horizon system was robust and, you know, we could rely on it, my view at the time was that it looked as 134
impacting on the strategy and decision making of the Post Office in late 2012.
A. Yes, I would agree with that.
Q. You and your colleagues, including Mr Posnett, would have been well aware of the significance of those challenges to the Post Office; do you agree?
A. Yeah, of course, yeah.
Q. By this time, late 2012, Jarnail Singh was the Head of the Criminal Law Team, wasn't he?
A. I think he was the Criminal Law Team. I don't think there were any other lawyers there.
Q. Was he consulting you on the Security Team's strategy, so far as enforcement was concerned?
A. Well, he asked me a question about confiscation and compensation orders but he didn't consult me about anything else that I can recall.
Q. You say that you won't be able easily to provide statistics to support those cases in which compensation orders had been made, yes?
A. Yeah.
Q. Wasn't the Post Office monitoring which of its cases resulted in a compensation order?
A. Well, that would have been recorded on the JARD system we used, the Joint Asset Recovery Database, so I would have been able to have accessed that to obtain that 136
information but it would have been there.
Q. You say, "I do not believe we'll easily be able to provide stats"?
A. Mm .
Q. Why wouldn't you easily have been able to provide stats?
A. Because we -- at that time, we had to access JARD via a police station. So, you know, it would just have been a case of having to go to a police station and find an available computer that we could log on to access JARD to recover the information. So it could have been done but ...
Q. Scrolling down to the bottom, please -- sorry, before we got to the bottom, just scroll up, please.

You say that Mr Singh either didn't understand what you were on about -- which, of course, is
a possibility -- or didn't get the answer he wanted to hear. Why did you think that he didn't get the answer that he wanted to hear?
A. Honestly, I don't -- no idea now. I can't recall.
Q. Was it because he was in favour of what you've described as watering down or winding down the investigation and prosecution function?
A. Not that I'm aware of, no. As I say, I really don't know.
Q. If we go to the bottom of the page then, please. You 137
approach to prosecution and recovery?
A. I have no idea why I would think that, I'm sorry.
Q. Why did you consider the change in approach to be sad, shortsighted and disastrous?
A. Well, I do believe that a prosecution policy is important. I think -- I do think it sends out a good message that the business is going to proactively deal with people that are committing offences. I think, you know, I've worked in security a long time, I think it's important. So I think moving away from that would have been a bad thing. That was just my personal opinion.

I do say that this email was obviously late at night and sometimes you say things emails that maybe sound a bit worse than you actually mean.
Q. Is that the case here?
A. Well, possibly, yeah.
Q. Or is it that, after you'd had a drink, your true feelings were being revealed?
A. No, not at all. I'm not a drinker at all. So I would have just been having, probably, one drink on the way home.
Q. Why would it be disastrous to either slow down prosecutions or stop them whilst experts investigated the integrity of Horizon?
A. Well, I wasn't referring to the investigation that was 139
say you think you're flogging a dead horse. You get the impression there's "a strong desire from the powers that be to water down our approach to prosecution and recovery". Why did you think there was a strong desire from the powers that be to water down the approach to prosecution and recovery?
A. I think cases had dried up by that time. So I don't recall exactly. As I say, it's quite a while ago but, towards the end of my time in the Security Team, new cases had dried up completely, more or less, so it was just the old cases we were dealing with.
Q. But dried up deliberately because there weren't steps being taken proactively to investigate them --
A. Yeah, I don't know.
Q. -- rather than subpostmasters suddenly becoming honest again?
A. Quite possibly, yeah.
Q. You say that this strong desire to water down is one of the powers that be. Who are the powers that be that you are referring to?
A. Well, I was probably just referring to our senior management within Security.
Q. Being who?
A. Well, at the time, it would have been John Scott.
Q. Why did you think that he wanted to water down the 138
going on with this --
Q. This was all in the context, wasn't it Mr Ward, of Second Sight?
A. Sorry, this is what?
Q. All in the context of Second Sight?
A. I don't think I'd have been thinking of Second Sight at all at the time.
Q. Why did you think the powers that be were watering down the approach to prosecution and recovery? Was it independent of what Second Sight were doing, then?
A. No, I don't think it would have been, but -- I don't know what to say. It was just an email.
Q. Well, it's not just an email, is it? It's you speaking to us, back in 2012, revealing what you thought.
A. Well, as I said, I still believed -- or we were told -I don't know, you know -- we were told that the system was robust and reliable. I believed that --
Q. Told by who?
A. Well, it was senior management. You know, it was communications that came out. You know, we were being told that, you know, we were robustly defending the system and, rightly or wrongly, I believed that.
Q. How were these communications distributed to you?
A. Well, normally, I think there were emails that came out.
Q. When you say "senior management" do you mean senior 140
management within the Security Team or from outside the Security Team?
A. No, it was -- it wouldn't have been the Security Team, no. This would have been the business.
Q. So do you mean the very senior leadership within the team?
A. Well, yeah, that's where it --
Q. Within the Post Office?
A. -- would come from, yeah. It was the Communications Team that would send out the messages. I can't remember, you know, who -- a name of someone but, yes, there were messages that came out regularly and I believed them.
Q. What did they say?
A. Well, just, you know, that -- reiterating that the business is challenging or defending the challenges to Horizon and has full confidence in the Horizon system.
Q. Before the break, please, can we look at POL00329521, page 2 to start with, please. If we just scroll down a little bit. Thank you. Email from Gary Thomas to Dave Posnett:
"... I ... still have [some] electronic documents [about a branch or branches]."

Then scroll up, please. Keep going. You email him:
"Why are you pleased ... you've breached [the Data 141
A. No, I wouldn't agree with anything that Gary said there at all.
Q. Scroll up, please. Presumably, that's -- just stop there. You didn't reply that at the time, "Gary, I don't agree with anything you've said there", did you?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. You said, "I will be all right if I get [voluntary redundancy]"?
A. Yeah.
Q. Just scroll back down to the text of the email. Why would he say that John Scott had to get rid of you if that's not true?
A. Well, I think -- and I don't know what Gary was thinking there, it was a rant email that was most unlike him. I mentioned earlier in my evidence that there had been a policy decision by Mr Scott to introduce a hub way of working. So that affected Gary Thomas because he was based in -- I think he was somewhere on the South Coast and travelling in to London was just totally impractical for him, so he had to find a different job.

I don't think, when he said "get rid of us", I don't know that that was applying to anybody else. I really don't know. I've no idea what Gary would have been thinking.
Q. Did you "laugh out loud" when you got this, as he 143

Protection Act] as you should have deleted them years ago ... [smiley face]."

Further up the page, please. He says in reply:
"Because I want to prove there is FFFFiiinnn no 'Case for the Justice of Thieving SubPostmasters' ..."

Would you understand that to be a play on words on JFSA?
A. I would never have even thought of that, no, but I can see it may be, yeah.
Q. "... and that we were the best Investigators they ever had and they were all crooks!! Oh and we never hit our [Post Office] profit targets anymore as we stopped getting $£ \times X$ million in recoveries from bloody good financial recoveries through my good friends Ward, Harbinson, Posnett and the like!!
"End of rant!! Hence why Scott had to get rid of us [because] we is right and spoke out!! Power To The People Wolfie Smith!!
"All right my old Gunner Mate?"
Presumably that bit is addressed to you --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- as an Arsenal fan, presumably; is that right?
A. Yeah.
Q. Did Mr Scott have to get rid of you because you were right and spoke out?
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suggests at the end?
A. No, of course not.
Q. Well, your email reply within two minutes -- his email is at 5.12 and yours is at 5.14 minutes -- hardly shows you to have objected to it, does it?
A. Well, no, I didn't --
Q. These were your sentiments, as well as his, weren't they?
A. Absolutely not.
Q. You realised at the time that the Justice for Subpostmasters Alliance, the JFSA, who had been campaigning for years, were being mocked by his capitalisation of "Case for the Justice Of Thieving SubPostmasters", it's obvious, isn't it?
A. Well, I don't remember the email. I wouldn't have seen that at all, no, and it certainly wasn't my view.
Q. Well, what was Mr Thomas referring to when he said, "Hence Scott had to get rid of us when we spoke out"? Is that just a figment of his imagination?
A. Well, I don't know what he's referring to, it's -I haven't written that, so I really don't know what he was thinking.
Q. Was there a view amongst you and him, and perhaps Mr Harbinson and Mr Posnett, that you were the best Investigators that the Post Office had ever had and that 144
subpostmasters were "all crooks"?
A. No.
Q. Is that a figment of his imagination too?
A. Well, I don't know what was going on in Gary's head but it certainly wasn't my view and I'm sure it wasn't the view of Mr Posnett and Mr Harbinson.
Q. He says sarcastically or ironically, "Oh and we never hit our Post Office profit targets". What were Post Office profit targets?
A. I've no idea.
Q. Is that a reference to needing to recover a percentage of all shortfalls; remember a 65 per cent figure?
A. There wasn't a 65 per cent figure when I was there, as far as I can recall. I think -- are you referring to the documents I was sent last Friday? Yeah. So that was 2013/14, I think, 2013 and 14.
Q. Was there any profit target or recovery target when you were a Financial Investigator?
A. I don't think there was. I'm not sure. There may well have been but it would never have affected the way I did the job at all.
Q. So what's he referring to there when he says, "We never hit our Post Office profit targets anymore"?
A. I've no idea.
Q. So this to you, from beginning to end, is all 145

MR BEER: Therefore I'm allowing sufficient time for that.
I'm going to ask questions, I think, only about
Mr Ward's involvement in the case of Noel Hughie Thomas.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Mm-hm.
MR BEER: Mr Ward, in your statement in paragraphs --
I think it's 69 onwards, which is on page 23, you set out your involvement in the prosecution of Noel Thomas.
A. Yeah.
Q. You tell us, in summary, that you were the Casework

Manager in relation to Mr Thomas' case; is that right?
A. That's correct, yeah.
Q. You therefore acted as the single point of contact between Fujitsu and the Post Office in relation to litigation support in that case --
A. That's right.
Q. -- and, in particular, in relation to the ARQ process?
A. That's correct.
Q. Now, I think contemporaneous emails that we're going to look at and draft witness statements attached to them show us that you and Diane Matthews were involved in reviewing some witness statements; is that right?
A. That's correct.
Q. Was that a normal function for you, as the Casework Manager, to perform?
A. No, it wasn't, no.

## (A short break)

(3.15 pm)

MR BEER: Good afternoon, sir. Can you see and hear us? SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes, I can, thank you.
MR BEER: Sir, just by way of explanations of timings, I'm proposing to ask questions until 4.00 pm because I know that each of the three subpostmaster groups have questions that will take about 30 minutes.

## SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Fine
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Q. They also show that you were involved in the drafting of Mr Jenkins' witness statement, ie making drafting changes and suggestions to him?
A. Yes, that's correct, I offered some comments, yeah.
Q. Was that a usual function for you to perform?
A. No, it wasn't.
Q. If it was not usual for you to review witness statements, less still to suggest the contents of them, why did you do so on this occasion?
A. I think, as I said earlier, Neneh Lowther had asked me to review or there was an email saying, "Graham for review". I'm assuming that she may have called me, you know, just to ask "Would you mind because this is a new statement". It related to nil transactions and it was banking transactions, so maybe they just felt they needed a little bit of support. I don't know why I said yes, I'd normally just pass it straight on to the Investigator to deal with but I guess I was just trying to be helpful.
Q. If the function of Casework Management, so far as compliance was concerned, was checking the layout and physical tributes of a file, stickers, font size, things like that, why were you getting involved in the substance here?
A. Just because I was asked if I would help and I tried to 148
be helpful but, on reflection, obviously, I shouldn't have got involved at all.
Q. Can we look, please -- and I'm afraid there's a long trawl of documents we're going to have to go through to address the issues fairly -- to start with, at FUJ00155181. Can we start, please, at page 17. If we just look at the top of -- just scroll up -- the bottom of 16. We can see Diane Matthews emailing you on 14 October 2005 about Mr Thomas' branch?
A. Yeah.
Q. What function did Ms Matthews perform at this time, October 2005?
A. She was an Investigator.
Q. Was she local to you or was she out in Mr Thomas' area?
A. No, she was up North.
Q. "Graham,
"Just to clarify, the subpostmaster has not made any calls to HSH or NBSC prior to yesterday's audit and is now voicing concerns over the nil transactions on card account/online banking transactions.
"I believe there are at least 2 scenarios where a nil value will be recorded", and she sets them out. Both to do with what the customer does, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. If we scroll on, please:
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to somebody else and, as the -- she was asking for Horizon data then it seemed -- it just seemed the right thing to do to ask Fujitsu.
Q. So she was asking you firstly to look for other possibilities, ie other than the two which she has mentioned, for the causes of nil transactions, or nil values on transactions, yes?
A. Yeah.
Q. She was asking you, secondly, to check that there were no problems with the Horizon kit at Mr Thomas' branch, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So she was asking in that second regard about hardware at Mr Thomas' branch, wasn't she?
A. That's correct.
Q. Can we go to page 16, please, and your email at 4.15. You email the Fujitsu general address, which you described earlier, copying Ms Matthews in and copying Charles Leighton in. Who was Charles Leighton?
A. He worked in Security at the time and I think he had quite a good knowledge of Horizon. That may be why I copied him in.
Q. What did he do in Security?
A. I can't remember his job title.
Q. Was he in your office? that in her capacity as an Investigator, may have spoken 150
A. No, I don't think he was, no.
Q. In any event, you forward Ms Matthews' email to Fujitsu copying these people in?
A. Yeah.
Q. You say that it "says it all":
"... is there a check that can be made to ensure that there are or were no serious errors in the system at this Post Office?"

By that, did you intend Fujitsu to check the position at the branch itself?
A. Yes.
Q. "We already have details of calls made to the Helpdesk (see spreadsheet), which do not highlight anything obvious. Are there any general error type reports that will tell when there is a problem with the system which the Post Office may not necessarily be aware of, particularly in relation to the highlighted paragraph ... have there been any similar problems elsewhere? (I've heard of Tivoli event logs ... could these be relevant?)
"This case is in its early stages, but if it were to proceed to a prosecution, we'd likely need a statement which outlines how you can confirm that there were no operating errors within this office's system. I haven't submitted an ARQ but I can ..."
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In the second line, you ask for a check for no serious errors on the system.
A. Yes, I do, yeah.
Q. Why were you asking for checks to be made on serious errors?
A. The word "serious" obviously shouldn't have been there; it should have been "errors".
Q. You say that you've heard of Tivoli log events. Can you recall what you had heard about Tivoli log events?
A. No, I'm sorry, I've got no recollection of that at all.
Q. You say in the last paragraph that you're likely to need a statement which outlines how you can confirm there were no operating errors within this office's system. At this point, at the time of writing, you didn't know one way or the other whether there were problems in the system, did you?
A. No, I didn't, no.
Q. Why were you presuming that there were not?
A. Again, it's just a one-sided view that we seem to -- or I seem to have had at that time.
Q. Was that a view that lasted for quite a long time, Mr Ward?
A. Well, like I say, I trusted, you know, the business's messages.
Q. At this time in October 2005, there wouldn't have been
what data they are auditing that defines a nil transaction. Is it zero transaction values in the R or A messages? Or are they auditing data in some host database or log? This matters because, for example, the counter does not send up an amount value in the $R$ message for 'Withdraw to limit', but that may be represented as a zero value in a log or database field.
The same might be true for Change PIN and Balance Enquiry.
"All banking transactions are approved online with
the acquirer ... These other reasons might also cause a nil transaction.
"Nil transactions could also be caused by errors in PIN Pad, counter, agents or host code depending on what constitutes a 'nil transaction'. This cannot be determined without access to the appropriate system logs'. How would you like to proceed?"

So she's setting out a range of possibilities for the cause of a nil transaction being recorded, but which can only be checked via the appropriate system logs, and might require sudden sources to be accessed, correct?
A. Well, she's just said, "We need to check the system logs", so I wouldn't have known what logs that would be. 155
"In other words, we need to check the system logs.
messages coming down, would there, from on high --
A. No.
Q. -- cascading a belief in the integrity of Horizon?
A. I think, at that time, you know, there weren't any major issues. So --
Q. As somebody connected to the investigation process, you needed to have an open mind, didn't you?
A. Yeah.
Q. Not a closed mind, "Please give me a witness statement that shows that the subpostmasters are wrong"?
A. No -- I mean, I agree, yeah.
Q. Did you have a closed mind?
A. Well, I didn't think so at the time.
Q. Did that closed mind operate right up until 2015: "we was right", as Mr Thomas wrote to you?
A. No, I always tried to keep an open mind with everything I did but, you know, clearly, in this case, I didn't have an open mind, no.
Q. Page 15, please. Scroll down, please. Ms Thomas replies to you:
"Graham.
"... nothing is ever straightforward! Here's some feedback --
"'The original email makes reference to an audit.
To answer your question definitively l'd need to know 154
Q. If we look at your reply at the top, "you've confused me!!" and you ask some questions:
"I think it best if the system logs are examined in the first instance (do you need an ARQ?) going back to 1 April 2005. Is it possible for you to run a report to show 'nil' values to the transaction examples described, so we can see how often it happens?"

Page 14, please. You email, on 25 October, Ms Matthews, Mr Dawkins and Penny Thomas, saying you've agreed the following course of action:
"Fujitsu will instigate a thorough analysis of the system at the office going back one month to the date of the audit (if we need to go back further we will do). I do not see a need to remove hardware at this point to conduct any specialist examination of the processors, particularly given the postmaster did not report any faults with the system to the Helpdesk. I'd suggest that a call is logged with the Helpdesk outlining the 'alleged' fault and asking them to send over an engineer to the site to conduct a test of the equipment prior to the office being reopened. I'm sure they can also perform a few test transactions.
"Penny -- please find attached the relevant ARQ."
That's an ARQ that ends with 401, yes; can you see that?
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A. Yes.
Q. Can we look at page 1, please? This is ARQ 401, we can see this from the right-hand side. Can you see the reference there?
A. Yes.
Q. Date range, 14 September to 13 October, 30 days. Scroll down, please:
"Please conduct an analysis of all Helpdesk calls for [that] period.
"... conduct a thorough examination of the system in general with a view to refusing the postmaster's allegation that there is a fault with the 'nil' transactions on card account/online banking transactions.
"Please bear in mind we are investigating a substantial shortage in accounts and should this proceed to prosecution we may be asking for a supporting witness statement."

You're asking there for a thorough examination of the system. What did you think would be done as a result of that request?
A. Well, I would have assumed that that would -- well, I think I've just tried to explain it as clearly as I can. You know, she's -- Penny would have been aware of the email chain, so I'm just trying to make sure that 157
Q. But this $A R Q$ request doesn't ask for $A R Q$ data?
A. No.
Q. The form here is -- this section that we're looking at in the middle of the page -- a free text box --
A. Yes.
Q. -- it's not a dropdown, it's not populated with preset requests; you can say what you want in here?
A. Exactly, yeah.
Q. Again, you say that you're asking for an examination with a view to refuting his allegation that there's a fault with the system. Why wouldn't you say with a view to investigating the postmaster's allegation?
A. I've already acknowledged, I think, that -- yeah, that's how it should have been worded and I apologise for that. It's --
Q. If I was to look for -- I'm so sorry, I spoke over you.
A. It's a one-sided view, I agree, and it's -- yeah, I should have been wording it better.
Q. If I was to look over ARQ requests for other communications, outside the 20 -odd case studies we're looking at in this Inquiry, of which Mr Thomas' case is one, am I likely to see that one-sided view replicated?
A. I would think so, yeah.
Q. Can we look, please, at FUJ00152587, and look at page 8, please. If we just look at the bottom of the next page,
A. Yeah, I'm -- that's obviously an oversight on my part.
page 7. Just a bit more, please.
We're now in March 2006 and you're emailing the Fujitsu email account in relation to a range of cases, "ARQs, statement request and assistance", and you speak about two attached files:
"Both of the above requests relate to cases where the Post Office are being challenged about the accuracy ..."

You deal with Marine Drive and Torquay Road next, further down, if we scroll on, please. Then at the bottom of the page, you say:
"On a separate matter, I also require a witness statement in [relation] to the following ARQs", and there's one of the ones we've seen already, 401.
A. Yes.
Q. There's also 459 and 460 , all of which relate to Mr Thomas' branch:
"we need the usual (leave out paragraphs $H(b)$ and $J$ but we do need K) covering an analysis over the period 01/11/04 to 30/11/05. Penny -- you may recall this one relates to nil transactions, my previous emails ... refer. Can you add an extra paragraph in your statement explaining how online banking transactions are processed and the data downloaded and how nil transactions can occur?"
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So five or six months has passed now and you're now asking for a witness statement to address the things that had been mentioned in the three emails that you refer to there; is that right?
A. Sounds like it, yeah.
Q. Can we go to FUJ00152582. Look at page 3, please. This is 11 days later, you emailing Penny Thomas about Mr Thomas' branch:
"These are the nil transactions you sent us and will need to be produced and explained within your (Brian's) statement."

You attach the 401 analysis and then the ARQ data under the numbers 459 and 460 , by which time you have now got these, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. If we go to page 2, please. We can see that if we scroll down a little bit, in an email that you wouldn't have known about at the time, Brian Pinder of Fujitsu is forwarding that email to Gareth Jenkins:
"... please see extract from a recent email below in italics from Graham Ward ..."

Then he extracts your email of 10 March that we looked at a moment ago:
"... regarding providing a statement about nil transactions and online banking. If you're able to put 161
"Each transaction has associated with it a Response Code Field ... In summary ..."

Then if we look, please, at Response Code, second bullet point, value between 2 and 10 means declined by bank; response code with a value greater than 10 implies some sort of system failure.

Does that provide you with enough detail?
Can we look, please, at FUJ00122203. We can see a little later on the 23rd a witness statement from Mr Jenkins, and this is his initial draft being sent to Neneh Lowther and Brian Pinder. Essentially -- I'm not going to spend time looking now -- the explanation that he provided in the email is substantially summarised or replicated in that draft.

Can we go, please, to FUJ00152587. Look at page four first, please. Scroll down, please, a little further. Neneh Lowther on 22 March:
"Please see the draft witness statement for the above transactions re nil values. Does this meet your requirements?"

So that's sent to you 22 March at 1.01. If we scroll up, please, stop there. You've read the witness statement over the next hour and a bit, and you say:
"Layout is unfinished
"As per my earlier email, the three spreadsheets 163
something together for us, I'd be grateful. If you send it back I'll arrange for Neneh or Penny to write into a statement for your signature."

Then he cuts in what you had said in your 10 March email; can you see that?
A. Yeah.
Q. The important part is in bold in italics:
"Can you add an extra paragraph in your statement explaining how online banking transactions are processed and the data downloaded and how nil transactions can occur."

So this is Mr Pinder asking Mr Jenkins to put something together for him or for us, for Fujitsu, in order to address that issue. If we go up to page 1, please, scroll down, please, we can see Mr Jenkins' reply:
"I've had a look at the ARQs and I think there is sufficient info there to explain in most cases why there are zero ... transactions. I suggest the as a brief explanation.
"Three main reasons why zero transaction maybe generated as part of the banking system.
"No financial effect;
"Declined by bank; or
"There has been some sort of system failure. 162
need to be produced as individual exhibits ..."
Then second line:
"I'm concerned at the words 'system failure', which is also in an earlier line 'There has been some sort of system failure' -- what does this mean exactly and is there any indication of a system failure at this office during the period in question?"

Then scroll up, please. 24 March, second draft statement provided. Can we see what happened in between those events by looking at FUJ00122203, and look at page 2, please. Scroll down, please.

We see Neneh Lowther forwarding the email we've just read on to Mr Jenkins:
"Please see reply from Graham. Ignore the bit about exhibits. Please, can you look at his second paragraph and advise with your comments."

That's the bit about system failures?
A. Yeah.
Q. If we scroll up a bit, please, Mr Jenkins replies:
"I'm not quite sure what his problem [that's your problem] is with what I've said.
"Basically any value of response code that is greater than 10 does imply some end-to-end system failure. The actual value makes it clearer what exactly the failure is and where it has been detected."
A. Well, I just wanted them explained. I didn't know whether they were drastic or not. It's just from -- you know, and it's going back such a long time, it's so hard to sort of recall what I was thinking, but I'm guessing that the first statement wasn't clear to me at that time so I just wanted a bit more context around what he meant by system failures.
Q. Then scroll up, please. Mr Jenkins says that he's annotated it with revisions and doesn't feel able to include the last two paragraphs which may make the statement useless.

Can we now look, please, at the draft that he had 165
point at the bottom of this page: response code with a value greater than 10 implies some sort of system failure.
A. Yeah --
Q. They're speaking about the same thing, aren't they?
A. Yeah, I can see that now, yeah.
Q. Then if we go forward to page 3, please. Those last two paragraphs, can you see the one beginning "No reason to believe that" and --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- "Any records to which I refer"?
A. Yeah.
Q. You remember he said he didn't feel that he was able to include those --
A. Yes, I do, yeah.
Q. -- and that they may make the statement useless?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you think the purpose of the inclusion of those two paragraphs was?
A. Well, these were two general paragraphs that the

Criminal Law Team had asked to be included on statements that produced computer evidence. So it was, to my mind, important to have them in there to say that the system was operating properly and didn't effect the information held on it.
Q. Doesn't this explain it? His numbered paragraph 3 , some sort of system failure is linked to the third bullet 166
Q. What did you take from the fact that he thought that these bits, which I think on the original were highlight in yellow weren't true, or he wasn't sure were true?
A. Well, that would have been a concern, obviously.
Q. Sorry?
A. That would have been a huge concern, if he --
Q. Why would it have been a huge concern?
A. Because if he can't say that the system is operating properly, then, you know, there's a problem, isn't there. Is this -- this wasn't the final statement, was it?
Q. No.
A. Oh, right.
Q. What we'll see happens is that he requests for them to be removed. They are removed and then, in the end draft, they come back in.
A. What the statement that was produced in evidence?
Q. Yes.
A. I don't know anything about that.
Q. He says:
"Can this be deleted? All I've done is interpret the data ..."
A. Yeah.
Q. "... in the spreadsheets you've emailed to me."

Would you have read this at the time, ie the 168
attachment to this email?
A. I would like to think I would, yeah.
Q. This being the attachment to the email that you got?
A. Yeah, I would have thought so, yeah.
Q. Do you understand these or did you understand these two paragraphs to be statements speaking to the accuracy and reliability of Horizon generally or about a system that had been used to extract ARQ data?
A. Horizon generally.
Q. Hence your belief that these were significant omissions --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- or they would have been significant omissions?
A. Yeah
Q. Can we look, please, at FUJ00122210. If we scroll down, on the 24th, ie the next day, you say -- sorry, scroll up, please:
"This statement needs more work ..."
You're emailing Neneh Lowther, Brian Pinder, Keith Baines, Paul Dawkins and Diane Matthews:
"This statement needs more work. I've attached a suggested draft with number of comments (as mentioned previously I think the 'system failure normal occurrence' line is potentially very damaging)."

Firstly, why did you think the "system failure 169
he meant by "system failures".
Q. That's not how this reads, is it?
A. No, it's not.
Q. You've gone straight to the effect of what he says,
A. Yeah. I can see how it locks now. 6
Q. Again, is this one of those examples of the way that you were thinking at the time: the important thing is to maintain, even in our prosecutions, the line that Horizon has integrity and produces reliable data?
A. I wasn't trying to do that, no, I just obviously had a closed mind to the way I put things across but I really wasn't trying to -- you know, at the end of the day the truth is more important, and --
Q. We don't see that kind of sentiment in any of your email exchanges, do we?
A. Well, no, maybe not, but I know the person that I am.
Q. I think we can delete "maybe" from that sentence and replace it with "definitely".
A. Okay.
Q. Can we look, please, at POL00047895. This is a copy of the marked-up witness statement, marked up by you, forwarded by Ms Lowther to Mr Jenkins. If we scroll down, please, and if we keep reading -- sorry, if we just go back to the top, please. Then scroll down wasn't trying to alter his statement or make him say anything; I was just wanting, you know, clarity on what 170
slowly, please.
Remaining in the statement, in the second paragraph, second line:
"I was asked to produce information relating to 'nil' transactions."

Then if we go to the second page, please. Then the paragraph beginning "There are three", we see your comments:
"There are three ..."
Then you've added:
"If these are the main three reasons, what are the rest?"

That's in the nature of a question both in terms of the words used and the use of the question mark. So that's clarificatory, isn't it?
A. Yeah.
Q. Yes?
A. Yes, sorry.
Q. So you're genuinely trying to find something out, by the look of it there --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- why a zero transaction may be generated as part of the banking system. Then we see Mr Jenkins' own words:
"Transaction has no financial effect. Transaction has been declined by the bank."

Then we see system failure reason missing, don't we; you've deleted it, haven't you?
A. No, I would not have deleted anything at all.
Q. Well, why doesn't it appear here?
A. I don't know.
Q. You've typed over it:
"This is a really poor choice of words which seems to accept that failures in the system are normal and therefore may well support the postmasters' claim that the system is to blame for losses!!!!"
A. No, I would not have typed over anything or deleted anything at all. I just know the person that I am and I wouldn't have done that.
Q. Well, you were concerned, we've seen, at the emails that preceded this, with what Mr Jenkins was proposing to say about system failures, weren't you?
A. Yeah, I was concerned, yeah. I just wanted clarity on it, as I said, but I would not have typed over it or deleted it.
Q. This is the attachment to an email that you sent to Neneh Lowther, who, in turn, sent it on to Mr Jenkins?
A. Right.
Q. Do you know where these words have come from, then?
A. Well, I'm sure I've -- I must have typed the words, yeah. But I wouldn't have typed over "system failure". 173

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right.
MR BEER: Can we move lastly, conscious of the time, to
FUJ00122217. Now, Mr Jenkins is liaising with you directly:
"Graham, I've added some further annotations to your annotations. Does this move us forward?"

We're now on 28 March, if we scroll down. So the email I was talking about that attached the witness statement we were just looking at is the one at the bottom of the page here, 24 March 2006, 11.37:
"This statement needs more work. I've attached a suggested draft."

That the one we're talking about.
A. Yes.
Q. Then Neneh Lowther sent it to Gareth Jenkins. Then further up, he replies:
"I've added some further annotations to your annotations. Does this move us forwards?"

Can we look at his attachment, please. FUJ00122218. This is Mr Jenkins' further draft. Scroll down, please. That big paragraph at the foot of the page, three lines in:
"There are three reasons why a zero value transaction may be generated as part of the banking system."
Q. Okay, if we move on. Next page, please. We see that the paragraphs that were previously in yellow, which Mr Jenkins said that he didn't feel that he could say, have been deleted. Did you delete those then?
A. No. I can't explain it at all. I would not have written over or deleted anything from anybody's statement. Absolutely not.
Q. Can we move to FUJ00122217.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, before we do, since I think you've just accepted that you attached this witness statement to an email you sent, can you explain where this witness statement came from, so as to enable you to attach it to an email?
A. No, I'm sorry, sir. I just cannot remember, you know, this at all.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, people's memory, of course, is for them to tell me about, but this is a pretty memorable event, is it not? This is you really becoming involved in an important statement in relation to the prosecution of someone in a way that you'd never done before, as I've understood it. So can you try and rack your memory, please, as to how this statement came to be attached to an email you sent.
A. Honestly, I just can't explain it at all, no. I really can't.
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1 and 2 as normal, then what l've suggested are your words:
"This a really poor choice of words which seems to accept that failures in the system are normal [et cetera]."

Mr Jenkins replies:
"Please can you suggest something better then? What we have here are genuine failures of the end-to-end system which are not part of operation but are anticipated and the system is designed to cope with them. Some such failures could be engineered as part of a malicious attack ... In all cases the system is designed to identify such failures and handle them in such a way that the customer, the postmaster, Post Office Limited and the FIs [I think that means Investigators] are all clear as to the status of the transaction and any necessary financial reconciliation takes place. I guess one option is to delete the paragraph since it is purely an introduction to the following more detailed description."

Then that remains.
Then if we go to the last page, if we keep scrolling, then the paragraphs remain deleted about the normal operation of the computer system.
A. Yeah.
Q. FUJ00152587. Later in the day on the 28th, you say to Mr Pinder, copying Ms Lowther and Mr Jenkins in:
"I do not understand why this statement ... is taking so long ... I appreciate it is slightly unusual, but I do not understand the confusion as I thought I'd made our requirements clear."

Was it for you, as an Investigator or Manager of Investigators, to require what was included in a witness statement?
A. No, it wasn't. Not in my role as Casework Manager, no.
Q. "Unfortunately, Gareth's annotations do not take us further forward (I'm sure this is not Gareth's fault)."

We can skip the next paragraph and then go to the next paragraph:
"As already stated, we urgently need a statement producing these spreadsheets ... under what circumstances 'nil' transactions occur and in particular how the 'nil' transactions at Gaerwen occurred ... The same statement needs to include a paragraph which states that there is no evidence of a system error at Gaerwen (assuming this is the case) in relation to the 'Nil' transactions ... We do not need to mention 'system failures being normal occurrences' if there is no evidence of such a problem at the office."

Why were you so concerned about this? 177
which seems to have occurred on 6 April 2006, in order to "record the statement". Did you have any involvement in that?
A. No, I don't -- no.
Q. Do you know what happened on that occasion?
A. No, l've got no idea.
Q. Do you know why it was thought necessary to dispatch somebody to Mr Jenkins in order to "record" a statement from him, given what we've seen has transpired already?
A. No, I don't think -- no, I don't, and I think I was the one that suggested that somebody takes a statement, just because it was -- it was getting confusing, clearly. So, yeah, I made the suggestion because I wanted to get the statement right.
Q. Can we look at FUJ00122237. This is the final witness statement, dated 6 April 2006. If we scroll down, please, we can see some mention of response codes there, yes?
A. Yes.
Q. We don't see any mention of response codes 10 and above being equated to system faults, do we?
A. No.
Q. Do you know why that's disappeared?
A. I've got no idea, no.
Q. Keep scrolling -- scroll back up. We then see:
A. Yeah, it's hard for me to sort of take myself back to 2006. I really don't know.
Q. Is it because you didn't want anyone knowing that that there might be a system fault with Horizon?
A. No.
Q. You wanted that edited out of evidence being presented to a court?
A. No, I didn't want anything edited out at all; I just wanted to make sure the statement was clear and I've just gone about it the wrong way.
Q. But you accept the effect of your interventions individually and taken together, have, as their object, the editing of a witness statement to remove mention of system failures in Horizon?
A. No, because I haven't seen the final statement.
Q. We're going to come to the final statement in a moment but, so far, do you accept what I have suggested: the effect of what you were asking for is to edit out of a statement to be presented to court any mention of a system failure in Horizon?
A. I don't accept that. I didn't intend that to be the case, no. No. I can see that's how it looks but that wouldn't have been my intention at all.
Q. It seems that Mr Pinder then spoke with Ms Matthews and arranged for her to speak with Mr Jenkins personally, 178
"... no reason to believe the statement is inaccurate because of improper computer use."

Then over the page, please. The second bit of the statement -- the standard words not appearing.
A. Yeah.
Q. Do you know how the final statement came to not include any mention of system failures?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Do you know how the final statement came not to mention any reference to the fault codes, response codes that equated to system failures?
A. No, I don't, no.
Q. Do you know how it came to pass that half of the standard wording, as you've called it, came to be included in the final version when Mr Jenkins had earlier said that he couldn't include either of those paragraphs because he wasn't sure they were true?
A. No, I don't have any idea at all.

MR BEER: Mr Ward. Thank you very much.
I'm sorry, sir, I've gone ten minutes over time.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, we'll afford to the representatives of the subpostmasters an extra ten minutes so l'll sit until somewhere between 4.40 and to 4.45 , if necessary. But they'll have to sort out between them how they share out that time.
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| R BEER: Thank you, I think Ms Page first, then I think the Hudgells group and then -- they're speaking amongst themselves, sir, which you can't see -- | 1 3 |
| :---: | :---: |
| SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, of course. Please do. | 4 |
| MR BEER: -- but they're eating into their time. | 5 |
| Questioned by MS PAGE | 6 |
| MS PAGE: I act for Mr Castleton, amongst other subpostmasters. | 7 |
| In your witness statement at paragraph 62 you said: | 9 |
| "I don't personally recall being concerned that | 10 |
| Mr Castleton's claim posed a challenge to the integrity | 11 |
| of the Horizon system, as I don't recall that it was | 12 |
| considered a significant issue at that time." | 13 |
| Is that really true, Mr Ward? | 14 |
| A. Yes, that's what I believe at the time, absolutely. | 15 |
| Q. Do you remember you were being asked questions about | 16 |
| that meeting in December 2005, that you said was | 17 |
| unusual? | 18 |
| A. Yeah. | 19 |
| Q. Do you really not recall that meeting, Mr Ward? | 20 |
| A. No, honestly I don't recall it. It was 2005. | 21 |
| Q. That meeting was all about challenges to the Horizon system? | 22 |
| A. But it does say within the notes that there weren't many | 24 |
| challenges. | 25 | 181

Then, if we go down a little, you say this:
"Given this is a 'test' case and that the integrity of the Horizon system is being challenged, my own opinion is that this exercise should be completed by an 'expert' from Fujitsu."

You go on to say that that would be time consuming and that it would need to be methodically and carefully done, and you say:
"It is important that we complete the analysis and respond formally to the points raised as soon as possible ..."

Then you go on to say:
"My first question is:
"Is this is an exercise that Fujitsu could undertake, possibly by Gareth ..."

So that suggests Mr Jenkins, doesn't it?
A. Yes, it does, yes.
Q. "... who would presumably have a thorough understanding of the figures recorded on both the transaction logs and the figures on an office cash account?
"If the answer is yes, how soon can it be performed?"

Then you ask what are the costs involved.
Thank you. That can come down.
Q. One of them was Mr Castleton. It must have been a case that was up for discussion at that meeting, Mr Ward?
A. Yeah, well, honestly, I don't have any recollection of that meeting, I'm sorry.
Q. Can I have, please, FUJ00152290 on the screen, please. If we go down to page 3, please. If we just scroll a little bit up, we can see this is an email from you to Brian Pinder, 28 July, do you see that --
A. Yes.
Q. -- copied to Peter Sewell and the subject is "Castleton: Transaction logs":

## "Brian [you say]

"Stephen Dilley (representing the Post Office) is asking if it is possible that someone undertakes an analysis of the figures recorded on the transaction logs supplied by Fujitsu against the figures on the complete cash account for CAP 42."

So that's just cash account period, yeah. Then he gives the dates '04;
"It appears that the solicitors for Castleton are saying that they've compared the transaction logs with the cash accounts for week 42 themselves (just for an initial analysis) and that they don't match. They conclude that Horizon is therefore only recording half the transaction. I've attached below the letter dated 182

It's quite clear from that, isn't it, Mr Ward, that you knew full well that this was a case that challenged the integrity of Horizon?
A. Well, that was a civil case, yeah. It was one of the first that I'd been aware of and I was just acting as the Casework Manager in charge of the ARQ process.
Q. Mr Ward, you said in your witness statement that you didn't think that the Castleton claim posed a challenge to the integrity of the Horizon system.
A. I said what, sorry?
Q. I just read it out to you a few moments ago. You said that you didn't think that it posed a challenge to the integrity of the Horizon system and you didn't think it was a significant issue.
A. Can we bring that up again, please?
Q. What the email --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- or the statement?
A. No, the actual email that you're saying l've -- where I've said that.
Q. Certainly, we can have it again. It's --

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: I think you're at cross purposes. I think Ms Page's point is that, in your witness statement, you are saying that you weren't aware that the Castleton case was particularly significant -184
that's my paraphrase -- and yet you're saying the opposite, is her contention, in that email. So which would you like to see: the witness statement or the email?
A. The email please, sir.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right.
MS PAGE: Thank you that's FUJ00152290 -- oh, yes, here we go -- and it's page 3. If we zoom in on the paragraph that says:
"Given this is a 'test' case and that the integrity of the Horizon system is being challenged, my own opinion is $[X, Y$ and $Z]$."

Does that not make it clear that you understood that this was a test case challenging the integrity of the Horizon system?
A. Yes, it does.
Q. Indeed, that's why you thought it necessary to involve Gareth Jenkins, the distinguished engineer --
A. Yeah, I'm suggesting that that might be the case, yes.
Q. -- rather than just asking for a statement from Penny Thomas or Andy Dunks, one of the usual characters. You want it to be a proper expert who responds to this, don't you?
A. Well, Penny Thomas and Andy Dunks used to provide the standard ARQ data and that -- and Mr Jenkins used to 185
A. I should certainly have highlighted it, yeah. I should have escalated it up, yeah.
Q. Did you ask any questions about known faults, either of Fujitsu or anyone else?
A. I can't recall, no. I really can't recall. It's going back so far.
Q. Mr Ward, did you know anything about the Known Error Log?
A. No, not at all.

MS PAGE: Thank you. Those are my questions.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Ms Page, just so I'm clear, part of Mr Ward's witness statement that you want me to look at in this context of the email is the last sentence of paragraph 62; is that right?
MS PAGE: That's right, sir. Thank you.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Thanks. Who is next?
MS PATRICK: Sir, it's me, Ms Patrick.

## Questioned by MS PATRICK

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Yes.
MS PATRICK: Good afternoon, Mr Ward. My name is Angela Patrick, I represent, with Mr Moloney, a number of subpostmasters who were prosecuted, convicted and have since had their convictions overturned.

I want to look at one topic and it's going back to
something that Mr Beer asked you about a lot. If you 187
provide more detailed evidence on cases. So, again, I'm just trying to be helpful in helping Mr Dilley get the information that he'd asked for.
Q. You knew this was a case about the integrity of the Horizon system that was being closely watched across the business, didn't you, Mr Ward?
A. No, I didn't know anything about the case at all, really. All I was being doing was being asked to get the ARQ data and I was just trying to help. It really wasn't a significant case, as far as I was concerned. It was one of the first cases I'd heard about and I was just trying to help, that was all.
Q. Mr Ward, the report was duly produced. I won't take you to it to save time, I'll hope that you'll take it from me that, on the first page of that report, which was sent to you in close to final form, there is a reference to a known fault in the Horizon system.

Now, you were the liaison point for hundreds of requests for Horizon data. Had you ever heard of "known faults"?
A. No, I hadn't, no.
Q. The fact that there were known faults in the system suggests that the process you were responsible for should have included searching for relevant known faults, should it not?
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remember this morning, he asked you about a document, the 2007 policy which covered prosecution support.
A. $\mathrm{Mm}-\mathrm{hm}$.
Q. We can bring it up but let's try not to, to start with. I just want to refresh your memory about that document.
I think you agreed that that document that Mr Beer showed you, the document behind prosecution support that Fujitsu has provided to the Post Office, it was an important document, wasn't it?
A. It was.
Q. It dealt with things like the obtaining of the message store by Fujitsu and the events log from the message store, and you discussed this morning two different kinds of events with Mr Beer, didn't you?
A. Yeah.
Q. I'll do this very quickly but I think you looked at knowing that an $A R Q$ request would cover the obtaining of some information from the message store, wouldn't it?
A. So my understanding of the ARQ request was that we would get transaction and event logs from Fujitsu and if we asked for a supporting statement they would provide that statement and provide the standard paragraphs at the end, attesting to the sort of system working correctly.
Q. If we can just refresh your memory, it might help to get where I'm coming from. If we can look at the 2007 188
policy very, very briefly. Can we look at FUJ00122366.
I'm looking at page 17. At the bottom of page 17,
please. We see there "Generate message store"; can you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. "A message store of selected files shall be initiated on the operator's local machine using the files extracted to the audit server."

Then here's what happens next with the message store:
"Once the message store has been successful generated, the RQuery tool shall be used to select the files as per the search criteria set out in the ARQ."

So that sounds very technical but do you accept it suggests that search criteria exist in the ARQ and what you get from the message store is what's set out in the search criteria? You're nodding, Mr Ward: do you agree?
A. Yes, I would agree, yes.
Q. So you don't get the whole of the message store, you get what you asked for in the ARQ?
A. Yeah.
Q. Thank you.

You can just scan through, since we've got this open, just so we're being absolutely clear we're all on the same page, if we can through the next page, page 18, 189
the document management team. It's FUJ00152189.
I apologise, sir, for the delay. That's my note.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Oh, no, that's all right.
MS PATRICK: Thank you. If we zoom in a little, we can see this a document headed 11 February 2002. Now, I'm just going to take this slightly quickly. It's headed, you remember that date, 11 February --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- which I mixed up, thinking it was November.
"Network Banking Management of Prosecution Support."
Now, I'm going to deal with this quite quickly, if
I can. You see on the front page there it says,
"Draft"?
A. Yeah.
Q. If we can go to page 1 , a little bit further down that we can see here, we see you under "Reviewed by, "Post Office -- Graham Ward"; is that likely to be you?
A. Yes, that's me.
Q. Can we turn to page 2, please, and we scroll a little bit, yeah, we can see just about see you there on the page, approval authority is Mr Ward, "Post Office Limited Internal Crime Policy and Standards Manager".
A. Yeah.
Q. Is it likely at this point, February 2002, you were still in that role?
we can see different kinds of prosecution support, which you went through with Mr Beer this morning, included Horizon Helpdesk logs, non-polling reports. Next page you see fault logs, and so on, witness statements of fact, and then, again, expert evidence.
A. Yes
Q. That was all dealt with this morning.
A. Yeah.
Q. Now, I want to look at the history of this document a little. So if we can go to page 2, I'd be very grateful. We can see there, if we scroll down a little, we can see reviewers' names and, if we scroll a little bit further, you don't appear there but, if we scroll a little bit further up, we can see the history in the box at the top of the page, and we can see the first draft of this document, version 0.1 dates from -I think the dating that Fujitsu use, I think it's 2 November --
A. Okay.
Q. -- 2002, but I'm sure somebody will correct me if I'm wrong.

Oh, no, I think it's 11 February at this point.
11 February. If we can bring up a document, I'd be grateful. FUJ00159189, please.

I think I've got the wrong reference, I apologise to 190
A. Yeah, if that's what it says, yeah.
Q. Right. Although this refers to Network Banking, if we can scroll down to page 7 -- and I won't read this all out but if we scroll down a little bit further on the page, l'd be grateful -- it deals with there in some detail -- so I won't read it out, somebody will correct me if I'm wrong -- there being an arrangement where, at this time, for general Litigation Support, there wasn't a contractual arrangement in place; it was being done subject to a without-prejudice agreement but there were arrangements in the contract for network banking.
A. Okay.
Q. So if we scroll a little bit further, we can go to page 13. We see you again here named as the point of contact --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- in 2002. Likely that you were expected to be the point of contact in relation to requests for data, then?
A. That would seem so, yeah.
Q. If we go to page 16 , you see, taking this very quickly, a flowchart very similar to the one that Mr Beer took you to this morning?
A. Yeah.
Q. Again, message store on the left; Helpdesk, polling logs and fault log review on the right. 192
A. Yeah.
Q. Can you see that there?
A. I can, yeah.
Q. I think we can agree this looks like an earlier iteration --
A. Yeah
Q. -- an earlier draft --
A. It does, yeah.
Q. -- of the document from today. I won't scan through the rest, we'll go through them in some detail in a minute.

I want to look at two things in detail. Can we look down at page 22. We see this is the section that deals with expert witness and you can scroll down, you can see one of the things about the middle of the box there, you can see there's a list:
"Expert witnesses could be called upon to provide for example ..."

One of the things there, if you can see the second one from the bottom, one of the things the expert witness was going to do in 2002 was the:
"Provision of specific Tivoli and other system security event files ..."

Can you see that, Mr Ward?
A. I can see that.
Q. Could this explain why you were familiar with Tivoli 193
"Any relevant PinICLs identified in PowerHelp logs will be reviewed through PinICL Client to ensure that any recorded faults would not hinder the outlets performance or otherwise affect the integrity of audit archive from which the record queries are extracted."

Then it says:
"The PinICL log will detail the error relating to the site, equipment and/or service in question."

Were you aware at that point what a PinICL was?
A. No, I'd had no idea.
Q. But being involved in this drafting exercise, do you accept you would have read the document?
A. Yeah, yes. I must have read the document but I don't think I would have understood most of it.
Q. Now:
"The PinICL log will detail the error relating to the site, equipment or the service in question."

Now, the PinICL log, does that sound important to the understanding of faults in the system?
A. It would sound so, yeah. It would sound as though it's important, yeah.
Q. Can you recall whether, when you were involved in this exercise, you asked for more information about what the PinICL log was?
A. No, I don't. I don't recall.
events later in 2005: you'd been involved in this drafting exercise?
A. It might be where I'd heard it, yeah. I really can't remember now.
Q. If we scroll -- you don't have to scroll, you can see
it. If we go to the very bottom part of that draft, I'm looking at the last paragraph, it says:
"Support in excess of 15 days shall be considered on the production of an appropriate change request."

So they're essentially saying, "We'll give you up to 15 days' expert support but only if you give us a change request"; is that fair, Mr Ward?
A. That's what it says.
Q. Again, if you scroll down to 8.2 at the bottom, you had 15 days' on a change request, again, that's for experts going to court; can you see that there, Mr Ward?
A. Yes, I can see that.
Q. Now, if we scroll back up to page 18 , I want to look at the analysis of faults, previously. If we scroll to the bottom of the page, and I can ask you to look at 7.2.3 and, if you can bear in mind we just looked at 8.1 , if you remember --
A. Yeah.
Q. -- bear in mind 8.1 and now 7.2.3, and you can see there
"Analysis of event and fault logs", and you can see: 194
Q. I'm going to move on from this draft. I want to see where we go next. Can we look at FUJ00152501. We can zoom in a little because it's very small writing and, first of all, I want to look at the box at the very top. You can see there it's a "Quality Review Comment Sheet" and it's an ICL Pathway document. I want you to ignore the date on the right-hand side for now and look at the boxes. It's referring to this document, the document we looked at, the draft, Network Banking Prosecution Support, and you can see the date, 11 February 2002 matches; can you see that there on the left, Mr Ward?
A. Yeah, I do, yeah.
Q. On the right, it gives a deadline for comments by 22 February 2002, and we can see below there the reviewer's name in section B; can you see that, Mr Ward?
A. Yes, I can.
Q. The name is Jan Holmes?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you remember Jan Holmes?
A. I remember the name, yeah. But I don't -- can't recall much else about him, I'm afraid, it's -- well, what's it 22 years ago?
Q. Well, okay. You can see on the right-hand side his review was on 12 February. I'd like to look at some of his comments, if you don't mind. If we can scroll down 196
a little, so we can see box C, l'd be very grateful. Thank you.

Now, if we can look at page 2 of this document, so going over the page. We see these are his comments. If we can see, first of all, I'd like to look at the box which is the reference to 7.2 .3. If you remember, I asked you to remember 7.2.3, that was the section of the document which dealt with fault analysis.
A. Yeah.
Q. He says:
"This is lining yourself up for a heap of work. Better I would have thought to analyse the Tivoli Events Logs only."

Now, can you see that there?
A. I can see that.
Q. Did you think "Oh, let's not bother with what you're proposing, shall we just look at Tivoli events"; is that the effect of what he's saying?
A. Yeah, I mean, this is the first time l've seen this. I mean, this document was sent to me in the bundle last Friday.
Q. We'll come to that, I want to ask you a question about whether you saw it or didn't?
A. All right.
Q. He's saying "Let's do Tivoli events when we look at 197
Q. Another Graham. There wasn't another Graham in the request was there?
A. No, it's just me.
Q. So:
"Graham, on 007007 Witness Statement, Tony Utting


Tony Utting, at this point, would he have been your boss or somebody else in the Security Team?
A. No, I think it would have been Tony Utting, yeah, or may have been Ray Pratt at that time, I can't remember.
Q. Yeah:
"... Tony Utting advised me to remove any parts of the Statement that I did not personally know. Specifically it was some historical stuff about what existed in the Post Offices ... Have you got this in your standard WS or is it removed?"

Now, this is an aside from the draft. I just want to ask you about that comment. This refers to some Post Office advice to Fujitsu to remove anything from a witness statement that they did not personally know. Did you think that was good advice?
A. Yeah
Q. Advice that you'd have adopted when you were in the Case Manager role?
A. Yeah, absolutely.
fault analysis", isn't he?
A. That's what he's saying, yeah.
Q. Let's not leave it to the special expert to look at Tivoli events, let's do it at this stage, at 7.2.3, isn't he?
A. Yes.
Q. Does it look like he's trying to save Fujitsu some work in this comment?
A. Well, that's what it looks like to me, yeah.
Q. If you'd read it, would that be a cause of concern for you, if you were the reviewer for Post Office?
A. Yeah, it should be, yeah.
Q. It's clear on this, in any event, on fault analysis, that, in 2002, Mr Holmes thinks Tivoli events are important, doesn't he?
A. Yeah, that's what he's saying, yeah.
Q. Okay, and if we scroll down a little, I want to look at his comment two down on 7.2.4.1. He says:
"Graham ..."
Now, you're the reviewer here -- I'm going to look at the comment itself in a minute. You're the reviewer for the Post Office. Is it likely these comments were being directed to you?
A. Well, I would imagine they must be, yeah. I didn't see any other -- well, there was --
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Q. If there were any later statements provided from Fujitsu under your watch, would you have expected the person giving the statement to say if it included anything of which they did not have personal knowledge?
A. No, they should -- anything in their statement should be their own personal knowledge, yeah.
Q. If they were relying on something somebody else had told them, somebody else's information, they'd said, you know, "I got Dave to tell me about this thing", would you expect that to be in the witness statement, who told them the thing they were relying on?
A. Well, they should -- yeah, they should include that, yeah.
Q. Okay, that's the side point. If we can move down a little bit, can we look down two boxes to what he says about 8.1 and the expert witness.

If you remember, they were talking about a 15-day sort of cap but only when there was a change request. He says:
"Graham, I think if I were doing this, I would separate the work into that which you could reasonably fix a duration for and that which you could not. For the fixed duration ... you're on fairly safe ground when it comes to turnaround ... and you can be more certain about what you can achieve. I wouldn't have any
inclusive time to deal with that over which you have no control, ie Expert Witness stuff. My preference would be to declare all this outside the normal process and subject to a CR [I presume change request] on a case-by-case basis."

Then below he says the same for an expert going to court.

Now, Graham, reading that, is that a comment you think is directed to you, or to somebody else?
A. Yeah, I think it must have been directed to me, yeah.
Q. Can you remember these comments being sent to you?
A. No, not at all. I mean -- no, it's 20-odd -- 20-plus years ago. I can't remember, I'm sorry.
Q. Just for a bit of background, at this point in 2002, you know you say you can vaguely remember Mr Holmes. Do you remember ever being told that he'd been involved in an EPOSS taskforce looking at large numbers of PinICLs and problems in the Horizon EPOSS system --
A. No.
Q. -- before 1999 --
A. No.
Q. -- because that would have been important information for you to have, if you were negotiating policy on how Fujitsu would look at faults in the system?
A. I don't ever recall negotiating on policy. I know I've 201
authority any more, you're "Optional Review/Issued for Information"; can you see that?
A. I can see that, yes.
Q. In the names above, we see "Jan Holmes". Can you see any other people there from the Post Office?
A. There's no names from the Post Office that I can see, no.
Q. Okay. We see an asterisk next to your name, and the asterisk designates you returned comments; can you remember if you returned comments?
A. If it says I did, then I would have done, yeah.
Q. Okay. Now, I'm trying to save time as much as we possibly can. Can we go to page 18, please -- sorry page 20, I apologise.

If we scroll to the bottom, we can see 7.2.3, the approved version. We see the reference to PinICLs but there's no reference to Tivoli events, is there?
A. No.
Q. Okay, and if we scroll to page 23 and scroll a little bit further down, we see the "Expert Witness Statement" section. You see there again, Tivoli events and other security event files stay with the expert; can you see that, Mr Ward?
A. I can see that, yeah.
Q. Again, at the bottom, the very bottom of the page, we 203
been sent as a reviewer here but I was new into the internal crime policy role.
Q. We looked at that draft: you were listed as the approval authority, weren't you?
A. I was, yeah, and I'm surprised at being the approval authority, but if that's what it says.
Q. Would you have had the authority at that point, in that role you were in in 2002, to approve policy?
A. I don't think I would have had the approval authority at the grade I was working at, no.
Q. This might help. If we move to the next draft, it's --

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Ms Patrick, where are we going? We're now in overtime, so to speak.
MS PATRICK: Sir, I'm afraid that I'd said 20 minutes.
I think I've had 10 so far.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: No, no, you've had a bit longer, but who is coming after you? I said I was finishing, that's the point.
MS PATRICK: I apologise, sir. Essentially, we can move on to the final draft.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Right.
MS PATRICK: The final draft, if we move to FUJ00152205.
I apologise, sir.
If we scroll to page 2 , we see the date at the top is November 2002. We see there you aren't an approval 202
see the 15 days goes and, instead, it's to be agreed on a case-by-case basis and dealt with in accordance with the change control procedure.
A. Yes.
Q. So it looks as though Mr Holmes' recommendation has been accepted?
A. Accepted, yeah.
Q. It will be a case-by-case basis?
A. Yeah.
Q. Now, I just want to look back at the 2007 policy, very briefly.
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: In one minute, Ms Patrick.
MS PATRICK: Sir, if we can look at page 19, please.
Can you see at the top of page 19, 7.2.3?
A. I'm not there yet. Yes.
Q. So this is still the 2002 document. I'm sorry, it's FUJ00122366. If we don't need to bring it up, Mr Ward, we can look at it. I'm looking at it now. It says:
"If requested, all PowerHelp calls will be reviewed to identify any recorded faults that might affect the integrity or admissibility of the audit archive from which ARQs are extracted."

The reference to PinICLs and the PinICL log is removed. Do you know why?
A. I've no idea at all.
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Q. Again, there's no references to Tivoli events in 2007.
A. No, l've got no idea.
Q. Okay.

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right. Thank you, Ms Patrick.
MS PATRICK: Thank you, sir. 4

SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Does anyone else think they're going to 6
ask any questions? 7
MR STEIN: Sir, I was going to ask questions. I was going 8 to take five minutes. Can I undertake to do it in 9 three? 10
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Does it actually relate to a client, 11
Mr Stein, or is it of a more general nature? 12
MR STEIN: I have to say, it relates to clients generally, 13 rather than an individual client. 14
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: Well, I think I've heard enough from this 15 witness to form a proper impression of the crucial 16 points, all right? 17
MR STEIN: Very well, sir. 18
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: We'll now adjourn until tomorrow morning. 19
Thank you, Mr Ward, for answering all those 20 questions and coming to the Inquiry. 21

So, Mr Beer, we have closing submissions tomorrow; 22 yes? 23

MR BEER: Yes, commencing at 10.00 am tomorrow. 24
SIR WYN WILLIAMS: All right. See you all then. 25

```
MR BEER: Thank you very much.
(4.48 pm)
    (The hearing adjourned until 10.00 am the following day)
```

|  | 'out [1] 129/22 | 15 [4] 132/16 154/19 | 102/18 | $32 \text { [2] 93/17 93/17 }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MR BEER: [28] 1/3 |  |  | 2004-7 [2] 34/19 35/4 | 6] |
| 1/5 1/8 1/16 2/23 56/4 | 'system [4] 164/3 | 15 days' [2] 194/11 | 2004-ish [1] 33/6 | 98/8 98/12 98/2 |
| 56/8 56/12 69/11 | 165/12 169/23 177/22 | 194/15 | 2005 [16] 81/20 | 98/25 |
| 69/15 103/3 103/8 | 'test' [2] 183/3 | 15 December [1] | 82/10 113/23 114/12 | 34 [2] 68/23 112/1 |
| 103/11 103/15 103/17 | 185/10 | 79/17 | 114/19 114/22 116/1 | 35 [1] 3/16 |
| 146/9 146/13 146/15 | 'The [1] 154/2 | 15 minutes [1] | 120/15 124/23 149 | 37 [1] 96/16 |
| 146/19 146/21 147/1 | 'There [1] 164/4 | 134/17 | 149/12 153/25 156/5 | 38 [2] 96/16 96/16 |
| 147/5 175/2 180/19 | 'Withdraw [1] 155/6 'word' [1] 95/9 | $15,000 \text { [1] 129/3 }$ <br> 16 [5] 46/20 65/16 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|} \hline 181 / 17 & 181 / 21 \\ 2006 & \text { 197 } \\ 83 / 2 & 105 / 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 4 |
| 181/1 181/5 205/24 | 'word' [1] 95/9 | 16 [5] 46/20 65/16 149/8 151/16 192/2 | $\begin{array}{\|c} 2006[9] \\ 105 / 16107 / 5163 / 2105 / 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 4.00 pm [1] 146/22 |
| 206/1 | - | 17 [3] 149/6 189/2 | 175/10 178/2 179/1 | $4.00 \mathrm{pm} \mathrm{[1]} 146 / 22$ 4.15 [1] 151/16 |
| MR STEIN: [3] 205/8 | ...' [1] 54/12 | 189/2 | 179/16 | 4.40 [1] 180/23 |
| 205/13 205/18 <br> MS PAGE: [4] | 0 | 17-year [1] 43/17 | 2007 [13] 5/8 34/21 | 4.45 [1] 180/23 |
| 185/7 187/10 187/15 | 0 | 18 [3] 189/25 194/18 | 37/4 38/4 50/16 70/25 | 4.48 [1] 206/2 |
| 185/7 187/10 187/15 | 0.1 [1] 190/16 | 203/13 | 73/19 74/4 85/21 | 401 [4] 156/24 157/2 |
| MS PATRICK: [8] | 0.2 [1] 72/3 | 19 [2] 204/13 204/14 | 188/2 188/25 204/10 | 160/14 161/12 |
| $1920$ | 007007 [1] 199/5 | 1980s [1] 132/10 | 205/1 | 42 [3] 103/19 182/17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 14 \text { 202/19 202/22 } \\ & 13 \text { 205/5 } \end{aligned}$ | 01/11/04 [1] 160/20 | 1984 [2] 3/24 4/9 | 2008 [1] 44/3 | 182/22 |
| 205/5 | 04 [1] 160/20 | 1992 [2] 4/9 4/12 | 2008/9 [1] 45/6 | 44 [1] 100/3 |
| [35] | 05 [1] 160/20 | 1993 [2] 4/15 6/21 | 2009 [1] 113/6 | 459 [2] 160/16 |
| 2/22 56/7 56/14 103/6 | 1 | 1995 [9] 3/9 3/10 | 2011 [1] 46/14 | 161/13 |
| 103/10 103/16 146/12 | 1 April [1] 156/5 |  | 2012 [9] 5/11 35/2 |  |
| 146/14 146/20 146/25 | 1 February 2024 [1] | 1996 [3] 57/22 58/13 | 126/16 136/2 136/8 | $161 / 13$ |
| 147/4 174/9 174/16 | 1/1 |  |  | 49 [1] 88/19 |
| 175/1 180/21 181/4 | 1 June [1] 100/5 |  |  |  |
| 184/22 185/6 187/11 | 1,000 [4] 52/19 52/21 | $\begin{aligned} & 1997 \text { [1] 3/11 } \\ & 1999 \text { [1] 201/20 } \end{aligned}$ | $2013 / 14[1] \quad 145 / 16$ | 5 |
| 187/16 187/19 191/3 | 98/16 98/20 | 1st November [1] | $2013 / 2012 \text { [1] 35/2 }$ | 5,000 [4] 52/21 53/16 |
| 202/12 202/16 202/21 | 1.01 [1] 163/21 | $128 / 6$ | $2015 \text { [1] } 154 / 14$ | 53/20 56/2 |
| 204/12 205/4 205/6 | 1.55 [3] 103/5 103/10 |  | 2016 [4] 4/2 5/16 | 5.12 [1] 144/4 |
| 205/11 205/15 205/19 | 103/14 | 2 | 112/24 113/10 | 5.14 [1] 144/4 |
| 205/25 | 10 [8] 38/20 39/5 | 2 Novemb | 2024 [1] 1/1 | 50 [1] 95/16 |
| THE | 163/4 163/5 164/23 | 190/18 | 21 [1] 74/9 | 50,000 [3] 129/17 |
| STENOGRAPHER: <br> [1] 69/13 | 167/2 179/20 202/15 | 2.00 [1] 1 | 22 [2] 125/24 193/12 | 129/18 129/19 |
| [1] 6 | 10 March [2] 161/22 | 20 [9] 38/20 38/20 | 22 February [1] | 500 [4] 98/7 98/12 |
| ' |  | 39/5 39/5 39/7 44/1 | 196 | 98/16 98/21 |
| '04 [1] 182/ | 10,000 [2] | 104/3 104/5 203/14 | 22 July [1] 93/21 | 54 [1] 68/2 |
| '13 [2] 42/21 4 | 40/13 | 20 minutes [1] | 22 March [2] 163/17 | 56 [2] 104/2 104/5 |
| '16 [2] 43/10 43/12 | 10.00 [1] 206/3 | 2/14 | 163/21 | 5K [1] 54/3 |
| '90s [1] 55/7 | 100 per cent [4] 33/7 | $\begin{gathered} 20,000[4] \\ 38 / 1940 / 14 \\ 38 \end{gathered}$ | 22 years [4] 59/9 62/6 86/5 196/22 | 6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { '95 [3] } 9 / 17 \text { 14/12 } \\ & 63 / 2 \end{aligned}$ | $34 / 1035 / 435 / 18$ | $20 \text {-odd [2] } 159 / 20$ | $220 \text { [1] } 95 / 19$ | 6 April [2] 179/1 |
|  | 11 days [1] 161/7 | 201/12 | 23 [2] 147/6 203/19 | 179/16 |
| \|'9 | 11 February [5] | 20-plus [1] 201/12 | 23rd [1] 163/9 | 6 December [1] |
| '97 to [1] 63/2 | 190/22 190/23 191/5 | 2000 [5] 17/16 18/9 | 24 March [1] 164/8 | 113/23 |
| '99 [3] 15/25 20/19 | 96 | 20/19 23/2 56/21 | 24 March 2006 [1] | 6 January |
| 23/2 |  | 2001 [9] 5/2 12/7 | 175/10 |  |
| '99/2000-ish [1] |  | 14/12 17/17 20/19 | 24th [1] 169/16 |  |
| 15/25 | $11.37 \text { [1] } 175 / 10$ | 23/3 62/21 63/1 63/2 | 25 July [1] 183/1 | $147 / 6$ |
| 'alleged' [1] 156/19 | $112 \text { [1] } 112 / 11$ | $33 / 350 / 1670 / 13$ | 25 October [1] 156/8 28 July [1] 182/8 |  |
| 'As [1] 132/21 | 12 [1] 118/3 | 70/24 72/8 190/20 |  | 7 |
| 'Case [1] 142/5 | 12 February [1] | 191/5 191/24 192/17 | $\text { 28th [1] } 177 / 1$ | 7 February [1] 119/4 |
| 'complete' [1] 100/23 | 196/24 | 193/20 196/10 196/14 | 28th [1] 177/1 | 7.2.3 [7] 194/20 |
| 'double [1] 129/20 | 12.53 [1] 103/12 | 198/14 201/14 202/8 | 3 | 194/24 197/6 19717 |
| 'expert' [1] 183/6 | 12.55 [1] 103/4 | 202/25 204/16 |  | 198/4 203/15 204/14 |
| 'incomplete' [1] 100/20 | 13 [2] 118/21 192/14 | 2003 [7] 24/17 33/3 | $3.15 \text { [2] 146/13 }$ | 7.2.4.1 [1] 198/18 |
|  | 13 October [1] 157/6 | 33/4 40/25 71/19 | $146 / 18$ | $70 \text { [1] 55/10 }$ |
| 'nil [1] 155/15 | 14 [5] 71/18 72/18 | 73/11 85/21 | $30 \text { [4] 146/24 157 }$ | 720 [1] 99/2 |
| 'nil' [6] 156/6 157/12 172/5 177/17 177/18 | 145/16 145/16 156/8 | 2003/4 [1] 33/1 | 158/5 158/23 | 750 [2] 98/15 98/20 |
| $177 / 21$ | 14 October [1] 149/9 | 2004 [9] 30/11 50/16 | 30-day [1] 158/13 | 8 |
| 'no [1] 129/7 | $157 / 6$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 62 / 2362 / 25 ~ 93 / 21 \\ 96 / 21 \\ 100 / 5 \\ 100 / 8 \end{array}$ | 30/11/05 [1] 160/20 31 [2] $93 / 16$ 93/17 | 8.1 [3] 194/21 194/24 |


| 8 | 179/20 203/4 | 102/7 102/14 133/19 | 44/21 112/25 114/21 | $21$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $8 .$ | absolutely [16] 10/3 |  | 121/22 125/5 195/4 | all [136] |
| $8.2 \text { [1] 194/14 }$ | 6 |  |  | $7 /$ |
| 80 [1] 55/10 |  | vely | cted |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 9.5 | 181/15 189/24 199/25 | 16 | affecting [ | 41/13 43/1 43/14 |
| 9.59 [1] 1 | ac | 18 | affects [1] | 46/17 48/20 49/10 |
| 90 [2] 55/8 112/12 | 176/4 178/11 178 | ac | afflicted [1] |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| A | acceptance [1] 19/7 | 28 | AFI [3] 3 | 70/2 75/9 |
|  | accepted [3] 174/10 | 135/14 139/14 170/17 | 128/18 | 79/7 81/12 |
| able [16] 5 | 204/6 204/7 |  | afraid [5] 12/20 17/10 | 82/17 85/11 87/8 93 |
| 93/15 96/9 107/25 | access [8] | ad [2] 21/24 92/2 | 149/3 196/21 202/14 | 97/21 101/7 103/2 |
| 118/7 126/9 133/10 | 31/2 95/9 99/6 120/1 | ad hoc [2] 21/24 92/2 | after [17] 2/7 9/23 | 103/10 105/6 105/9 |
| 135/18 136/17 136/25 | 137/6 137/9 155/16 | add [3] 160/22 162/8 | 18/5 38/11 41/21 45/4 | 108/13 112/23 113/18 |
| 137/2 137/5 161/25 | accessed [2] 136/25 | 165/2 | 46/11 46/12 82/10 | 114/15 114/25 115/1 |
| 165/22 167/13 | 155/23 | added [4] | 102/17 120/10 120/15 | 115/7 116/9 116/11 |
| about [137] 1/14 2/16 | accordance [4] | 172/10 175/5 175/17 | 124/10 134/10 134/14 | 116/12 116/22 117/25 |
| 9/7 9/16 11/11 15/5 | 103/21 103/23 118/13 | addition [2] 10/13 | 139/17 202/17 | 119/9 119/11 119/14 |
| 17/16 19/10 19/21 | 204/2 | 81/5 | afternoon [5] 103/15 | 121/8 122/10 122/11 |
| 20/13 20/16 21/14 | account [12] 24/16 | additional [4] 89/19 | 103/17 134/12 146/19 | 123/24 124/5 127/22 |
| 22/2 22/9 22/12 22/14 | 30/13 77/2 99/4 | 98/17 99/10 119/19 | 187/20 | 128/8 128/12 128/16 |
| 28/2 28/7 28/8 28/15 | 117/23 133/18 149/20 | address [13] 67/13 | again [28] 14/10 | 128/24 129/20 130/10 |
| 28/16 31/16 33/11 | 157/13 160/3 182/17 | 67/15 82/19 82/25 | 19/25 29/23 31/6 32/8 | 133/6 134/14 135/21 |
| 35/1 42/4 42/6 42/11 | 182/18 183/21 | 83/14 83/22 105/13 | 36/25 43/24 44/9 | 139/19 139/19 140/2 |
| 43/23 44/24 45/2 45/9 | account/online [2] | 110/3 112/21 149/5 | 84/10 105/9 109/3 | 140/5 140/7 142/11 |
| 46/13 49/17 50/1 | 149/20 157/13 | 151/17 161/2 162/14 | 115/4 138/16 146/8 | 142/19 143/2 143/7 |
| 51/23 52/2 53/3 55/6 | Accountabilities [1] | addressed [8] 28/17 | 153/19 159/9 171/7 | 144/16 145/1 145/12 |
| 57/23 62/22 68/9 69/9 | 57/4 | 50/17 57/3 59/5 60/9 | 184/15 184/21 186/1 | 145/21 145/25 146/3 |
| 70/8 72/15 74/3 79/23 | accounted [1] 40/5 | 75/5 114/22 142/20 | 190/5 192/14 192/24 | 149/2 152/5 153/10 |
| 81/5 82/6 84/21 85/3 | accounting [12] | addresses [1] 83/20 | 194/14 194/15 203/21 | 155/10 157/8 158/1 |
| 85/6 87/4 89/18 90/5 | 16/24 58/22 114/10 | adequate [2] 57/7 | 203/25 205/1 | 158/9 158/15 158/17 |
| 90/13 90/23 95/5 | 114/13 114/21 114/24 | 119/17 | against [7] 1/23 2/4 | 160/16 168/21 173/3 |
| 96/23 99/17 101/15 | 115/20 117/6 119/10 | adjourn [1] 205/19 | 6/14 47/13 48/4 58/19 | 173/12 174/5 174/15 |
| 101/23 103/3 105/21 | 125/11 125/15 125/19 | adjourned [1] 206/3 | 182/16 | 174/24 175/1 176/12 |
| 109/18 113/6 113/14 | accounts [6] 6/23 7/9 | adjourning [2] 103/5 | agencies [1] 31/5 | 176/16 178/8 178/23 |
| 115/13 115/15 116/2 | 16/11 118/19 157/16 | 103/6 | Agency [2] 33/13 | 180/18 181/22 186/7 |
| 116/13 116/22 120/13 | 182/22 | Adjourn | 87/10 | 186/8 186/12 187/9 |
| 120/24 121/3 121/8 | Accredited [1] 37/4 | 103/13 | agents [1] | 189/24 190/7 191/3 |
| 121/14 121/23 123/7 | accuracy [5] 28/10 | administrations [1] | ago [11] 9/11 11/13 | 192/3 196/4 197/5 |
| 125/15 125/20 127/13 | 105/22 119/10 160/7 | 24/23 | 15/3 28/18 36/25 | 197/24 201/3 201/12 |
| 131/10 132/15 132/16 | 169/6 | adminis | 138/8 142/2 161/23 | 204/19 204/25 205/4 |
| 132/17 134/17 135/3 | accurate [1] 118/20 | 30/6 | 184/11 196/22 201/13 | 205/17 205/20 205/25 |
| 135/5 136/14 136/15 | accurately [1] 118/19 | admissibility [1] | agree [30] 5/18 6/4 | 205/25 |
| 137/15 141/23 146/24 | achieve [2] 43/5 | 204/21 | 55/23 67/25 84/7 85/1 | allegation [3] 157/12 |
| 147/2 149/9 151/13 | 200/25 | admissions [4] 28/2 | 89/11 95/8 106/8 | 159/10 159/12 |
| 153/9 160/5 160/7 | achieved [4] 35/23 | 54/11 75/25 77/ | 107/11 108/2 108/14 | allegations [3] 106/7 |
| 161/7 161/18 161/24 | 35/23 35/23 66/19 | admittedly [1] 75/4 | 108/17 108/22 109/16 | 106/9 109/18 |
| 164/14 164/17 166/8 | acknowledged [1] | adopt [1] 109/20 | 115/21 121/17 124/20 | alleged [3] 55/20 |
| 167/5 168/19 169/7 | 159/13 | adopted [3] 21/13 | 131/11 135/23 136/3 | 55/21 90/25 |
| 170/5 173/16 174/17 | acquirer [1] 155/11 | 73/7 199/23 | 136/6 143/1 143/5 | Alliance [2] 131/2 |
| 175/8 175/13 176/23 | across [7] 14/23 | advantage [1] 58/23 | 154/11 159/17 166/11 | 144/11 |
| 177/25 178/10 181/16 | 18/11 22/5 24/8 60/3 | advice [9] 65/9 65/13 | 189/17 189/18 193/4 | allocation [1] 89/25 |
| 181/22 186/4 186/7 | 171/12 186/5 | 65/18 65/22 71/16 | agreed [10] 95/22 | allowance [5] 18/10 |
| 186/11 187/3 187/7 | act [12] 11/4 11/6 | 122/15 199/19 199/21 | 97/6 97/16 98/7 98/14 | 24/14 27/12 46/8 |
| 187/25 188/1 188/5 | 33/3 33/4 37/16 62/14 | 199/23 | 123/5 124/1 156/10 | 87/11 |
| 191/20 193/14 195/23 | 70/4 70/7 129/7 133/2 | advices [2] 65/6 | 188/6 204/1 | lowing [1] 147/1 |
| 196/21 197/22 199/14 | 142/1 181/7 | 71/ | agreement [2] 118/5 | along [6] 66/7 73/12 |
| 199/18 200/9 200/16 | acted [3] 63/7 85/15 | advise [4] 64/20 | 192/10 | 85/4 100/11 106/3 |
| 00/17 200/25 | 147/ | 71/14 78/7 | ahead [1] 9/12 | 110/15 |
| above [7] 39/7 99/15 | acting [2] 36 | advised [1] 199/12 | Aileen [2] 10/18 23/4 | alongside [2] 70/18 |
| 105/20 160/6 163/19 | $\begin{aligned} & 184 / 5 \\ & \text { action [6] 58/6 101/1 } \end{aligned}$ | advising [1] 71/13 affect [9] 20/4 38/5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { aim [1] 57/7 } \\ & \text { aimed [1] } 68 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | 79/14 <br> already [10] 105/23 |
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119/24 142/10 144/24 156/3 170/15
better [4] 43/6
159/18 176/7 197/12
between [22] 12/6
43/3 52/21 53/13 62/21 73/2 77/1 80/22 80/24 85/16 90/4 95/23 102/25 121/24 122/2 126/22 127/1 147/13 163/4 164/9 180/23 180/24
bid [1] 98/17
big [3] 14/1 111/13 175/21
Bill [3] 100/17 101/8 106/4
bimonthly [1] 21/19
bit [34] 9/12 22/16 22/17 29/23 51/16 55/5 93/20 95/1 107/1 139/14 141/20 142/20 148/16 160/1 161/17 163/23 164/14 164/17 164/19 165/19 170/3 170/14 180/3 182/7 190/13 190/14 191/15 191/20 192/4 192/13 200/15 201/14 202/16 203/20
bits [1] 168/2
blame [2] 106/10 173/10
blaming [2] 106/20 150/3
bloody [1] 142/13
body [2] 28/4 132/21
bold [1] 162/7
bolt [1] 78/12
bolt-on [1] 78/12
bonus [2] 35/22 36/1
bonuses [3] 34/18
35/12 35/18
book [1] 19/21
books [2] 11/14 18/11
boss [1] 199/8
both [13] 11/2 25/11
32/2 34/3 34/15 41/17 78/17 105/20 106/8 149/23 160/6 172/13 183/20
bother [5] 90/15
94/24 95/7 96/13 197/16
bothering [1] 116/9 bottom [19] 3/7 54/8
$\begin{array}{ll}104 / 21 & 137 / 12 \\ 137 / 25 & 139 / 1 \\ 159 / 25\end{array}$ 160/11 167/1 175/10 189/2 193/19 194/6 194/14 194/20 203/15 203/25 203/25
bought [1] 33/3 bound [1] 38/14 box [11] 52/8 52/18 57/14 72/1 72/9 159/4 190/15 193/14 196/4
197/1 197/5
boxes [2] 196/8 200/15
branch [32] 6/22
7/15 14/3 16/7 17/2 26/22 26/22 59/19 59/22 59/25 69/8 69/19 77/3 77/4 79/24 80/11 112/18 113/12 117/6 120/18 120/21 141/23 149/9 150/5 150/6 151/10 151/14 152/10 158/17 158/18 160/17 161/8
branches [7] 4/10 7/10 14/14 30/20 40/10 91/25 141/23
breached [1] 141/25
break [7] 54/2 56/6 56/6 56/10 141/18 146/10 146/17
Brian [7] 79/22
111/14 161/18 163/11
169/19 182/8 182/12
Brian Pinder [2]
163/11 169/19
Brian's [1] 161/10
brief [4] 16/3 16/6 16/13 162/19
briefing [2] 119/13 122/8
briefly [3] 42/24 189/1 204/11
bring [5] 58/20
184/15 188/4 190/23 204/17
bringing [2] 101/18 108/23
broadly [1] 49/18 brought [3] 31/25 102/12 104/3
bug [1] 113/19
bugs [7] 20/3 38/4
112/17 112/24 113/11
114/20 121/21
built [1] 118/13
bullet [6] 57/17 57/19
57/25 58/14 163/4 166/25
bundle [3] 3/3 100/4 197/20
business [21] 8/22
42/9 43/7 44/17 45/22

45/25 87/20 92/1 92/3 $125 / 23$ 156/18 97/9 97/11 116/24 called [10] 10/17 119/12 119/15 121/25 30/25 68/9 78/25 79/5 123/23 134/23 139/7
141/4 141/16 186/6
business's [1] 153/23
but [172] 3/11 9/4 9/5 9/11 11/14 12/20 14/7 14/21 15/3 15/17 16/4 16/12 16/15 17/3 17/9 18/25 19/17 22/25 23/10 28/19 29/22 31/6 31/25 32/24 33/4 33/7 33/15 34/9 34/14 34/23 35/1 35/4 35/18 36/2 36/10 36/25 37/14 39/15 42/8 44/6 44/19 44/21 46/10 51/20 53/9 53/21 54/5 54/7 54/22 55/4 55/11 55/23 56/20 57/11 59/14 60/13 61/7 62/7 63/5 63/9 63/11 63/13 63/15 66/23 68/3 69/22 69/22 71/16 73/1 73/4 73/6 73/13 78/3 79/10 80/6 82/23 82/24 83/6 86/5 87/1 87/3 87/9 87/22 87/24 90/10 90/17 91/22 92/2 92/5 92/17 93/3 93/7 93/8 96/5 96/9 97/20 107/6 107/7 107/14 107/19 108/23 109/4 109/14 110/19 114/15 116/3 121/2 122/6 123/20 124/25 126/5 126/18 126/21 127/5 127/9 127/15 129/22 131/17 133/21 134/7 136/15 137/1 137/11 138/8 138/12 140/11 141/11 142/8 145/4 145/20 148/18 149/1 152/21 152/25 154/17 155/6 155/21 158/9 159/1 160/19 165/17 170/6 170/9 171/12 171/17 173/18 173/25 174/17 176/9 177/5 178/11 178/17 178/22 180/24 181/5 181/24 188/4 188/16 189/14 190/13 190/20 192/4 192/10 194/11 195/11 195/13 196/20 200/18 202/1 202/6 202/16 203/16 button [1] 50/2

## C

calculated [1] 118/18
call [4] $1 / 553 / 15$

115/14 132/8 148/12 180/14 193/16
calls [11] 81/17 149/18 152/12 157/8 158/10 158/15 158/17 158/20 158/22 158/23 204/19
came [27] 26/15
27/22 30/13 33/1 33/6
33/8 34/23 35/19 44/2 44/8 50/21 65/19 79/6
79/11 87/13 104/16 113/3 126/16 140/20 140/24 141/12 174/12 174/22 180/6 180/9 180/13 180/14
campaigning [1] 144/12
can [281]
can't [58] 11/13 11/24 12/20 16/15 17/7 18/20 19/17 20/11 20/11 21/8 23/5 24/25 27/22 28/24 28/25 31/6 32/23 34/9 34/23 35/4 36/25 37/13 38/15 39/6 42/8 42/15 44/1 62/8 86/3 87/22 92/4 102/20 107/5 109/24 110/15 113/1 113/2 113/5 114/25 121/1 122/5 123/6 124/2 126/5 137/19 141/10 151/24 168/8 174/5 174/24 174/25 181/3 187/5 187/5 194/3 196/20 199/10 201/13
cannot [5] 20/21
20/21 59/15 155/15 174/14
canter [1] 4/5
cap [2] 182/17
200/18
capability [1] 119/18 capacity [4] 6/16 97/19 117/11 150/25 capital [1] 94/19 capitalisation [1] 144/13
card [5] 24/16 30/13 42/7 149/19 157/13
cards [1] 42/20
career [2] 5/19 49/9
carefully [1] 183/8
carried [5] 86/5
118/25 119/3 122/7 122/21
carry [8] 11/15 11/17 25/16 66/9 120/12 130/17 131/15 135/18
carrying [1] 12/4 cascading [1] 154/3 case [121] 7/9 12/5 13/1 13/2 13/5 13/7 13/8 13/16 14/24 17/15 19/14 23/20 23/24 24/4 24/5 24/11 24/13 25/14 25/15 25/20 26/21 27/3 27/11 27/13 27/15 28/2 28/3 28/9 29/19 30/6 39/21 46/18 47/5 47/6 47/7 52/9 52/13 52/22 54/5 54/6 55/25 56/2 58/20 59/10 59/15 59/16 60/7 60/23 60/24 61/1 62/3 62/6 62/15 63/17 64/8 64/9 65/9 65/16 66/12 67/7 68/4 68/7 68/7
75/10 75/17 75/18 75/24 75/25 76/16 76/17 76/20 76/21 77/15 80/18 89/10 91/5 91/8 94/8 103/24 103/24 105/23 112/1 112/5 118/6 118/17 119/4 122/15 123/15 131/19 133/14 135/21 137/8 139/15 144/13 147/3 147/10 147/14 152/21 154/17 159/20 159/21 177/21 178/22 182/1 183/3 184/2 184/4 184/25 185/10 185/14 185/19 186/4 186/7 186/10 199/23 201/5 201/5 204/2 204/2 204/8 204/8
case/whether [1] 131/19
cases [102] 9/19
13/11 14/13 14/15 18/8 23/21 24/20 25/1 25/5 25/13 27/1 27/25 32/19 32/20 37/19 38/18 39/14 39/17 40/1 40/6 40/9 40/11 40/24 41/3 41/8 41/11 41/14 41/16 41/19 41/20 41/25 46/25 47/25 48/21 49/18 50/19 51/3 51/5 52/2 55/6 55/13 59/11 61/5 61/22 62/17 74/19 74/20 77/12 82/4 87/12 92/23 100/22 102/8 102/16 105/20 105/25 106/5 106/23 106/24 107/2 107/3 114/9 114/23 115/1 115/19 116/20 117/4 117/13 117/25 118/4 119/5 119/9 119/10
cases... [29] 119/12 119/16 125/18 126/17 126/18 126/23 127/2 127/5 127/14 128/1 128/24 129/9 129/12 129/20 130/6 133/6 133/11 133/16 136/18 136/21 138/7 138/10 138/11 160/3 160/6 162/18 176/12 186/1 186/11
casework [84] 5/5
5/8 6/6 6/7 6/9 20/14 20/16 23/13 23/17 23/19 23/19 24/1 24/2 24/3 24/6 25/21 25/23 26/16 27/9 27/10 27/16 29/3 29/4 30/4 30/10 30/14 31/14 31/18 31/21 31/25 32/4 34/2 34/20 35/9 36/18 36/24 37/25 48/15 49/2 49/3 49/4 50/16 50/22 50/24 57/2 63/20 63/21 63/25 64/4 64/11 64/16 64/17 65/10 65/17 66/18 67/5 67/22 68/4 68/11 68/20 70/5 70/12 71/3 73/20 75/14 80/19 82/3 82/11 85/15 85/23 88/2 89/14 90/4 90/22 98/23 104/7 111/5 113/25 133/12 147/9 147/23 148/20 177/10 184/6
cash [12] 7/11 7/20 16/11 24/12 30/19 77/1 79/9 99/4 182/17 182/18 182/22 183/21 cast [2] 115/4 115/12
Castleton [15] 6/17
80/6 80/11 80/17
80/18 81/25 112/1
112/5 122/15 181/7
182/1 182/10 182/20 184/8 184/25
Castleton's [1]
181/11
catch [2] 69/13 69/15
categories [1] 85/6
cause [5] 117/16
125/8 155/11 155/21 198/10
caused [4] 99/10 118/9 118/16 155/13 causes [4] 150/11 150/18 151/6 171/5 cc'd [1] 83/3 cease [1] 127/6 ceased [3] 45/4

126/5 126/14 cent [6] 33/7 34/10 35/4 35/18 145/12 145/13
central [1] 23/23 centralised [1] 121/5 centre [1] 50/21 centres [2] 24/12 30/19
certain [6] 7/17 51/24 53/19 70/17 77/7 200/24
certainly [11] 63/5 73/12 89/22 92/5 106/22 121/2 130/21 144/16 145/5 184/21 187/1
certainty [1] 97/15 certificate [1] 42/10 certificates [1] 73/23 cessation [2] 126/24 127/18
cetera [2] 25/19 176/5
chain [12] 22/22 66/6 83/24 96/19 99/23 101/5 104/22 104/24 111/10 132/3 135/23 157/25
challenge [4] 106/9 181/11 184/8 184/12 challenged [5] 105/21 160/7 183/4 184/2 185/11 challenges [17] 106/24 107/8 107/10 109/18 116/3 116/18 117/22 121/25 122/3 124/21 124/24 125/20 135/25 136/6 141/16 181/22 181/25 challenging [2] 141/16 185/14
Chambers [5] 79/18 80/8 82/7 82/14 85/3 change [16] 18/5 45/21 45/22 65/4 70/14 70/21 99/7 117/21 139/3 155/8 194/9 194/11 194/15 200/18 201/4 204/3 changed [4] 18/7 39/10 44/19 65/4 changes [4] 18/20 44/7 88/9 148/3 channels [1] 116/20 characters [1] 185/21
charge [3] 26/5 86/10 184/6
charges [5] 32/20
64/21 65/18 65/20 78/8
Charles [2] 151/19

151/19
charts [1] 114/7
chat [1] 23/10
check [16] 27/21
28/23 54/1 74/21
74/22 74/23 102/8
150/1 150/4 150/15
151/9 152/6 152/9
153/1 155/18 155/24
checked [1] 155/22
checking [1] 148/21
checks [3] 64/14
67/14 153/4
choice [6] 107/11 107/12 107/18 109/4 173/7 176/3
circular [2] 22/6 22/10
circumstances [2]
119/1 177/17
civil [11] 6/16 33/16
48/23 48/25 80/21
80/24 84/17 119/9 119/9 133/19 184/4
civilly [1] 33/14
claim [4] 6/16 173/9
181/11 184/8
claimed [2] 117/3
118/16
clarificatory [1]
172/15
clarify [3] 77/5 77/6 149/17
clarity [5] 110/17
130/13 131/13 170/25 173/17
Class [2] 43/4 43/4
clause [1] 87/23
clear [21] $2 / 2$ 22/18 33/7 42/7 55/2 55/11 55/24 86/4 110/14 110/21 131/17 165/18 170/4 176/16 177/6 178/9 184/1 185/13 187/11 189/24 198/13 clearer [2] 164/24 165/5
clearly [4] 154/17 157/23 170/9 179/12 clerk [4] 3/25 4/9 7/14 59/17
client [4] 97/4 195/2 205/11 205/14
clients [1] 205/13
close [3] 90/20 97/22 186/16
closed [7] 39/22
133/14 150/6 154/9 154/12 154/14 171/12
closely [4] 84/18
86/17 86/19 186/5
closing [1] 205/22
Coast [2] 44/12 143/18

Cockett [1] 114/2
code [11] 12/2 26/22 66/22 67/3 155/14 163/2 163/3 163/5 164/22 166/18 167/1 codes [10] 11/11 11/14 11/16 11/22 165/4 166/9 179/17 179/20 180/10 180/10 completed [1] 183/5 colleagues [1] 136/4 completely [2] 126/6 Collins [1] 31/13 138/10
column [3] 51/9 70/1 completion [1] 49/20 133/13
columns [2] 51/8 69/25
come [34] 3/23 4/6
14/17 22/6 31/4 31/9 34/13 34/25 37/2 42/8 50/1 59/2 59/16 60/2 65/9 65/11 65/22
78/13 80/16 84/1 85/13 91/21 107/7 112/9 112/22 116/18 123/15 127/17 141/9 168/16 173/23 178/16 183/25 197/22
comes [2] 131/25 200/24
comfortable [3]
98/16 98/20 99/11
coming [13] 9/4
14/23 85/8 86/24
87/10 91/17 91/20
103/4 116/13 154/1
188/25 202/17 205/21
commencing [1]
205/24
comment [7] 170/7
196/5 198/8 198/18
198/21 199/18 201/8
comments [12] 72/2
148/4 164/16 169/22
172/8 196/13 196/25
197/4 198/22 201/11 203/9 203/10
commercial [1] 101/2
commit [1] 58/18
commitment [1] 99/9
Committee [1] 97/7
committing [1] 139/8
common [1] 70/2
communicated [2]
60/21 89/23
communications [4]
140/20 140/23 141/9 159/20
company [1] 108/7
compared [1] 182/21 compensate [1] 129/15
compensation [17]
33/14 128/23 129/4
129/7 129/13 129/18

129/22 129/25 130/7 130/9 131/5 131/14 133/7 133/12 136/15 136/18 136/22
complete [8] 74/23
74/24 101/24 102/4
102/19 102/25 182/17
183/10
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { completed [1] } & 183 / 5 \\ \text { completely [2] } & 126 / 6\end{array}$
compliance [17] 6/23
27/21 27/22 27/24
28/1 28/25 43/6 43/9
57/22 67/13 67/14
68/3 68/11 68/14
68/15 68/17 148/21
complied [1] 61/22
computer [16] 16/12
16/23 17/2 20/9 69/4
70/10 70/17 70/24
71/6 112/18 113/6
113/16 137/9 167/22
176/24 180/2
concern [8] 108/24
108/25 110/3 134/21
168/4 168/6 168/7
198/10
concerned [12] 6/5
83/5 133/5 136/13
148/21 164/3 170/18
173/14 173/17 177/25
181/10 186/10
concerning [4] 6/17 58/15 70/24 85/24
concerns [4] 22/14
112/13 115/15 149/19
conclude [1] 182/24
conclusion [1]
115/18
condition [1] 36/7
conditions [2] 45/9 45/14
conduct [10] 22/19
26/3 26/5 53/1 64/9
156/15 156/20 157/8
157/10 158/14
conducted [6] 15/20
26/11 27/2 27/13 79/7
81/14
conducting [2] 36/13 95/5
confidence [2]
118/15 141/17
confidentiality [1] 58/8
confirm [2] 152/23 153/12
confirms [1] 118/12
confiscate [1] 129/14
confiscation [12]
37/22 46/21 129/22
129/24 129/25 130/7
confiscation... [6]
130/9 131/13 133/3 133/9 133/17 136/14
Conformance [5] 4/2 4/3 5/14 42/22 42/24
confused [1] 156/1
confusing [2] 170/14 179/12
confusion [1] 177/5
connected [3] 58/3
126/25 154/6
connection [2]
102/25 127/1
conscious [1] 175/2
consequences [1]
100/1
consider [12] 1/24
2/9 2/17 24/11 55/16
90/8 103/5 103/6 111/18 113/18 124/25 139/3
considerable [3]
117/5 117/21 118/2
considerably [4]
55/12 99/2 126/4 126/14
consideration [6]
20/1 88/20 88/24 89/5 89/8 89/12
considered [2]
181/13 194/8
Consignia [1] 58/20
consist [2] 25/13 28/1
consisted [2] 10/8 37/3
consistency [2] 28/7 28/10
consistently [1]
56/19
constitutes [1]
155/15
constructing [1] 13/7
consult [3] $2 / 16$
12/12 136/15
consultants [1]
127/16
consulting [1]
136/12
consuming [2] 129/8 183/7
contact [7] 36/19
53/8 85/15 98/24
147/12 192/15 192/18
contained [1] 51/19
contemporaneous
[1] 147/18
contention [1] 185/2 contents [2] 3/18 148/8
contested [1] 118/5
context [7] 130/3

130/4 131/9 140/2 140/5 165/19 187/13 continuation [2] 19/11 108/20
continue [5] 1/13 56/12 93/15 116/19 117/20
continuing [2] 80/2 127/10
contract [24] 43/2 48/10 53/14 86/25 87/3 87/23 88/5 88/9 88/15 90/20 91/21 92/8 92/15 95/18 95/23 97/10 97/14 98/7 99/13 103/21 103/23 117/11 119/13 192/11
contractor [1] 42/8
Contracts [2] 52/25 53/2
contractual [12] 73/5 86/8 86/21 88/19 89/4 89/12 89/16 89/18 90/23 95/6 101/2 192/9
contributed [1] 99/12 control [7] 38/24 40/14 40/21 51/6 63/13 201/2 204/3 controls [1] 57/7 convened [1] 123/22 convey [1] 7/17 convicted [5] 37/19 39/13 39/14 129/16 187/22
conviction [6] 36/8 36/10 41/13 102/16 128/23 133/1
convictions [5] 32/22 32/23 36/5 39/23 187/23
coordinate [1] 116/25
coordinating [1] 7/21 coordination [3] 119/8 120/5 121/5 cope [1] 176/10 copied [4] 79/18 100/6 151/22 182/10 copy [8] 11/17 11/18 11/25 13/16 80/12 99/4 120/9 171/21
copyee [1] 81/22 copying [4] 151/18 151/18 152/3 177/2 Corbett [1] 122/15
corollary [1] 78/11 corporate [2] 108/14 109/19 corporately [1] 108/9 correct [73] 3/6 4/1 4/4 4/11 4/14 4/17 4/21 5/4 5/7 5/10 5/13

5/15 6/15 6/18 6/25 8/1 8/3 19/4 23/15 25/3 25/10 30/8 32/3 32/15 34/5 36/22 37/8 37/18 37/20 37/23 38/10 38/12 47/19 49/16 49/21 51/11 52/1 52/7 52/17 52/24 56/25 57/6 65/14 67/21 72/6 77/25 82/1 83/15 83/16 83/22 85/19 86/15 96/11 104/1 104/11 104/18 112/25 113/25 114/1 126/2 126/12 128/19 147/11 147/17 147/22 148/4 150/13 151/11 151/15 155/23 158/21 190/20 192/6
correction [2] 92/10 92/12
corrections [1] 117/17
correctly [9] 43/3
43/8 77/23 106/17
106/19 108/1 108/3
125/13 188/23
correspondence [1] 117/15
cost [2] 90/1 119/19
costs [3] 99/10 99/13 183/24
Coton [2] 113/22 115/8
could [48] 7/22 15/21 17/9 27/1 31/2 38/5 60/21 65/3 68/6 69/19 75/7 78/7 81/13 81/16 86/9 86/20 87/23 90/9 91/9 91/13 91/15 98/16 100/21 104/3 111/18 112/17 112/25 113/11 118/8 121/22 123/19 129/17 130/8 133/21 134/24 137/9 137/10 150/4 152/19 155/13 165/10 174/3 176/11 183/15 193/16 193/25 200/21 200/22 couldn't [4] 22/25 87/25 109/3 180/16 counsel [3] $1 / 19$ 100/21 131/18 counter [9] 3/25 4/9 7/14 16/9 59/17 79/8 132/9 155/5 155/14
counting [2] 7/11 7/20
country [3] 18/12 108/11 108/21
couple [3] 31/8 84/11 90/11 course [15] 8/14 8/15
9/4 9/8 9/9 19/7 21/15

56/7 58/1 136/7
137/15 144/2 156/10 174/16 181/4
court [19] 37/21 70/19 71/10 71/10 79/21 80/2 80/9 101/12 109/23 118/6 118/23 119/24 129/4 129/13 129/17 178/7 178/19 194/16 201/7
cover [4] 12/16 98/17
165/3 188/17
covered [5] 11/10
28/24 30/15 30/19 188/2
covering [4] 120/7
124/17 124/18 160/19 covers [1] 129/13
CPIA [3] 57/22 58/13
59/1
CR [1] 201/4
created [2] 74/7 74/7
credible [1] 118/12
crime [9] 34/23 37/16
57/24 127/25 129/7
130/6 133/2 191/22 202/2
criminal [36] 11/4
11/6 27/14 47/1 47/5
47/8 48/21 61/5 61/7
61/9 64/19 64/20 65/6
65/8 65/17 66/25 67/1
67/7 67/19 68/2 69/5
70/4 70/8 71/13 78/7
81/19 82/3 84/18
106/5 106/6 106/23
131/3 131/8 136/9
136/10 167/21
criteria [3] 189/13 189/15 189/17
criticism [2] 57/16
100/21
crooks [2] 142/11 145/1
cross [2] 22/4 184/22
Crown [7] 24/10
30/21 37/21 59/18
66/22 67/3 71/9
Croydon [8] 21/1
26/11 32/5 34/6 34/12
37/12 37/14 47/8
crucial [3] 103/7 129/23 205/16
CS006D [1] 58/11
culture [6] 43/18
43/22 43/24 44/19 44/24 45/21
current [2] 119/5 119/9
currently [1] 132/22
custom [1] 86/2
customer [2] 149/23
176/14
customers [1] 58/21
cuts [1] 162/4
cutting [2] 22/4 59/18

## D

DAC [1] 130/22
DAC Beachcroft [1] 130/22
damage [1] 171/5
damaging [3] 169/24
170/1 170/20
data [126] 16/18
16/25 17/4 17/8 17/12 17/19 18/14 19/1 20/1 20/5 20/9 20/16 22/19 22/23 25/6 26/24
26/24 36/20 38/6 49/1
68/21 68/24 69/4
69/23 70/17 71/4 71/6
71/16 73/4 73/4 73/8
75/6 75/14 75/17
75/20 76/11 76/16
76/18 77/5 77/18 78/5
78/5 78/11 79/2 79/3
80/20 81/5 81/12
81/23 82/13 85/6 85/7 85/9 85/10 85/18
85/24 86/6 86/24 87/1
87/16 88/22 88/25
89/4 89/6 89/9 89/15
90/1 90/6 90/9 91/3
91/8 91/14 92/12
93/14 93/22 95/6
95/25 96/6 96/9 99/6
100/23 101/12 101/24
102/4 102/9 102/17
102/19 103/1 103/1
103/20 105/24 108/4
111/19 116/6 117/2
117/4 117/8 117/9
117/14 117/25 118/19
119/17 119/18 120/22
121/14 125/2 125/6
127/15 141/25 151/2
155/1 155/3 158/5
158/11 158/11 159/1
160/24 161/12 162/10
168/22 169/8 171/10
185/25 186/9 186/19 192/18
database [3] 136/24
155/4 155/7
date [12] 26/21 53/24
54/2 56/18 117/13
117/19 156/12 157/6
191/7 196/7 196/10 202/24
dated [8] 56/19 71/19
73/19 73/25 79/17
105/4 179/16 182/25
dates [2] 182/19 190/16
dating [1] 190/17
Dave [9] 34/7 34/13
100/6 114/3 128/6

## D

Dave... [4] 128/9
133/15 141/21 200/9
Dave Hulbert [1] 114/3
David [3] 34/4 97/24 132/4
Dawkins [2] 156/9 169/20
day [12] 16/14 16/14
16/15 103/9 127/13
135/9 158/13 169/16 171/14 177/1 200/17 206/3
days [9] 46/4 90/19
92/5 157/6 158/5
158/23 161/7 194/8
204/1
days' [2] 194/11
194/15
dead [2] 133/22 138/1
deadline [1] 196/13
deal [9] 47/20 100/1
124/14 139/7 148/18 160/9 170/17 191/11 201/1
dealing [13] 19/14
19/23 30/23 33/16
50/20 58/15 80/21
84/22 87/12 116/24
128/1 138/11 170/16
deals [2] 192/5
193/12
dealt [23] 14/13 18/8 19/20 26/4 30/16 31/13 31/15 36/10 42/1 46/14 50/19 51/3 53/7 59/10 59/11 60/24 62/6 103/24
129/21 188/11 190/7 197/8 204/2
December [13] 72/8 73/25 79/17 81/20 82/10 113/23 114/12
114/19 114/22 116/1 120/15 124/23 181/17
December 2005 [1] 124/23
decide [5] 53/1 57/20
58/12 76/4 77/22
decided [2] 67/20 129/23
deciding [1] 66/15
decision [22] 53/11 53/13 55/18 64/17
64/21 64/25 65/1
65/24 66/2 66/12
66/19 66/25 68/7
75/22 75/23 88/21
89/5 97/13 99/11 99/17 136/1 143/16
decisions [3] 47/11

48/12 67/23
declarations [1] 79/9
declare [1] 201/3 decline [1] 1/18 declined [3] 162/24 163/4 172/25
deem [1] 101/1 deemed [1] 25/17 deep [1] 121/12
defect [1] 113/20
defects [7] 20/4 38/5 112/17 112/25 113/11 114/20 121/21
defence [8] 12/24 14/8 14/9 57/21 58/13 62/1 63/18 100/21 defendant [3] 13/19 14/24 129/5
defendants [2] 129/9 129/14
defending [2] 140/21 141/16
defined [1] 72/19 defines [1] 155/1 definitely [2] 35/3 171/19
definition [1] 72/19 definitively [1] 154/25
delay [1] 191/2
delete [3] 171/18 174/4 176/18 deleted [9] 142/1 168/21 173/2 173/3 173/11 173/19 174/4 174/6 176/23
deliberately [2] 13/17 138/12
delivered [2] 8/24 9/2
delivering [1] 44/5
demands [1] $1 / 24$
demonstrate [1] 33/20
Department [2]
45/24 46/3
depending [1]
155/14
depicted [2] 51/12 74/14
deputising [1] 124/7
describe [6] 8/10
23/16 29/2 43/18 64/4 75/4
described [11] 49/6 49/23 57/2 59/5 73/1 74/6 74/15 96/12 137/20 151/18 156/6 describes [2] 73/5 75/1
describing [1] 101/4 description [3] 7/18 71/24 176/20
design [1] 116/11
designates [1] 203/9

| designed [4] 115/23 | 199/21 200/4 203/11 |
| :--- | :--- | 118/13 176/10 176/13 didn't [75] 7/3 12/12 desirability [1] 122/16

desire [4] 133/23
138/2 138/4 138/18
detail [11] 4/7 6/20
29/14 65/18 158/1 163/7 192/6 193/10 193/11 195/7 195/16 detailed [5] 110/5 111/25 123/16 176/20 186/1
details [15] 12/20
25/1 26/18 26/20 26/21 31/2 31/6 66/23 68/4 68/6 87/22 87/25 133/15 133/16 152/12 detected [1] 164/25
determine [1] 54/22
determined [2] 76/15 155/16
determining [1] 54/25
developed [2] 46/11 123/24
devolved [1] 24/23
Diane [4] 147/20
149/8 150/24 169/20 did [116] $5 / 207 / 17 / 4$ 7/7 8/17 8/24 9/2 10/4 10/16 11/25 12/16 14/20 16/1 16/17 18/4 22/24 23/7 24/20 24/22 24/23 25/11 25/13 25/22 27/9 28/1 30/9 34/11 35/9 36/23 40/3 42/16 42/19 42/25 43/10 43/11 43/12 46/4 46/17 46/24 46/25 48/2 48/20 48/23 49/6 60/16 62/10 62/14 63/7 64/10 65/6 65/25 66/18 69/3 72/11 77/23 86/1 86/13 87/4 87/5 87/5 87/9 87/19 89/18 92/14 97/15 98/24 99/17 107/23 111/6 122/7 122/21 123/4 127/1 127/6 127/23 128/7 131/22 137/17 138/4 138/25 139/3 140/8 141/14 142/24 143/5 143/25 145/20 148/9 149/11 150/8 150/11 150/15 150/23 151/23 152/9 153/16 154/12 154/14 60/23
154/17 156/16 157/20 disciplined [1] 60/20 167/18 168/1 169/5 disclose [5] 13/5 169/25 170/13 174/4 179/2 187/3 187/7 197/16 199/13 199/20 disclosed [6] 13/1

13/11 33/4 36/10
39/20 40/11 40/24
44/21 46/18 47/6
62/16 63/9 67/13
67/14 68/1 68/17
68/18 69/1 69/2 69/6
69/12 69/13 69/15
69/24 80/6 82/8 82/9
84/1 87/7 94/18 95/7
95/11 107/18 110/13 113/18 116/4 120/25 121/1 122/9 123/11 123/20 124/25 127/12 132/16 132/17 135/13
135/14 136/15 137/14 137/16 137/17 143/4 143/6 144/6 153/14
153/17 154/7 154/13
154/17 165/14 167/13
167/24 174/3 178/3
178/8 178/21 184/8
184/12 184/13 186/6
186/7 188/14 197/23 198/24
difference [2] 77/1 121/24
different [15] 31/10 34/21 51/13 60/9 80/9 82/6 93/6 109/6 109/7 109/8 116/23 118/10 143/20 188/13 190/1
differently [1] 158/7
difficult [6] 15/12
22/16 44/17 58/16
59/10 78/15
Dilley [4] 79/17 84/22
182/13 186/2
directed [3] 198/23
201/9 201/10
direction [1] 1/14
directly [7] 30/20
47/18 53/9 58/3
124/12 170/11 175/4
directly-managed [1] 30/20
directors [1] 98/2
disagree [1] 109/24
disappeared [1]
179/23
disastrous [3]
133/25 139/4 139/22
discharging [1] 82/3
disciplinary [4] 47/17
47/21 48/3 57/24
discipline [5] 48/5 48/10 60/14 60/19
disciplined [1] 60
disclose [5] 13/5
57/17 61/25 63/11
63/17
disclosed [6] 13/1

13/2 57/21 58/13 63/19 80/11
disclosure [21] 9/7
12/17 12/19 12/22 13/18 13/23 47/24 48/12 48/14 48/18 58/25 61/23 61/24
62/11 62/14 63/7 63/8 63/10 63/14 69/5 81/19
discretion [1] 52/22
discuss [1] 116/10
discussed [4] 52/25
114/14 128/22 188/13
discussing [1] 88/3
discussion [11]
16/22 53/2 71/2 71/11 90/4 99/14 99/20
122/17 123/7 123/22 182/2
discussions [1] 119/24
dishonesty [4] 54/16
54/22 55/3 55/24
dispatch [2] 74/25 179/7
display [5] 83/11
93/17 94/13 94/14 125/25
displayed [1] 83/15
disprove [1] 91/11
dispute [1] 92/12
disputing [1] 93/1
disrepute [1] 58/20
distance [1] 45/12
distanced [1] 118/23
distinction [1] 122/2
distinguished [2]
123/14 185/18
distributed [1]
140/23
District [1] 4/13
divide [1] 45/7
do [121] 1/15 2/6
2/19 2/21 3/10 10/7 12/18 15/8 15/9 15/24 17/22 19/18 27/9 29/4 29/5 30/9 35/13 36/12 36/14 36/16 42/16 42/20 42/25 43/1 43/2 43/13 45/17 45/24 48/5 51/18 53/23
56/21 59/13 60/4 63/16 64/13 66/14 68/3 68/6 68/17 69/17 69/22 70/18 74/6 81/8 86/1 91/11 95/3 97/17 99/23 101/22 102/24 107/24 109/14 114/12 116/11 120/24 124/20 125/11 125/12 130/18 131/1 131/11 133/10 135/5 136/6 137/2 139/5 139/6 139/12
do... [51] 140/25
141/5 146/12 148/9 149/23 151/3 151/23 152/13 153/3 156/4 156/13 156/14 158/1 158/1 160/19 165/2 165/2 167/15 169/5 171/11 171/16 173/23 174/9 177/3 177/5 177/11 177/22 178/17 179/5 179/7 179/21 179/23 180/6 180/9 180/13 181/4 181/16 181/20 182/8 188/16 189/14 189/17 193/20 195/11 196/12 196/19 197/25 198/4 201/15 204/24 205/9
document [61] 13/21 13/21 13/21 14/23 30/2 49/17 49/23 50/6 50/9 50/10 50/18 50/24 51/6 51/18 51/21 53/22 53/23 54/1 54/15 54/23 56/20 57/2 57/10 59/3 60/9 67/2 71/19 71/23 72/16 73/10 73/12 73/14 73/17 74/5 74/7 74/15 75/4 77/2 85/5 85/21 94/13 188/1 188/5 188/6 188/7 188/9 190/9 190/16 190/23 191/1 191/5 193/9 195/12 195/13 196/6 196/8 196/8 197/3 197/8 197/20 204/16

## documents [10]

13/24 14/6 59/25 61/6 85/20 85/21 131/4 141/22 145/15 149/4
does [46] 21/22 39/4 41/15 52/9 54/5 55/14 64/4 75/4 76/10 78/18 78/22 81/7 82/10 94/17 94/25 95/2 101/11 107/7 109/11 115/16 115/25 116/15 118/6 125/3 125/3 125/14 127/17 133/13 144/5 149/23 155/5 163/7 163/19 164/5 164/23 175/6 175/18 181/24 183/18 185/13 185/16 193/8 195/18 198/7 205/6 205/11
doesn't [13] 54/15 70/6 78/18 79/1 95/1 115/14 125/5 159/1 165/22 166/24 173/4 183/17 198/15
doing [12] $7 / 117 / 13$ 7/18 45/8 46/8 97/22 124/3 127/7 128/12 140/10 186/8 200/20 don't [127] 9/3 9/5 9/10 11/24 14/7 14/15 14/22 15/3 17/9 18/7 19/14 27/6 29/14 33/5 35/1 39/22 40/11 40/25 41/1 41/18 46/10 47/20 49/25 50/25 53/22 60/24 64/15 66/17 68/18 72/12 74/8 77/20 78/15 78/24 81/9 82/17 82/24 83/7 83/9 84/10 90/7 90/14 90/15 90/21 92/3 93/5 93/12 94/24 96/13 99/21 100/11 102/2 102/13 107/6 109/13 111/2 111/12 113/5 113/7 114/15 120/10 121/2 121/10 121/19 122/9 123/12 125/14 125/17 126/17 127/12 130/20 131/21 134/5 134/11 136/10 137/19 137/23 138/7 138/14 140/6 140/11 140/11 140/16 143/5 143/13 143/21 143/21 143/23 144/15 144/20 144/21 145/4 145/19 148/16 152/1 158/8 166/20 168/19 171/15 173/1 173/5 178/2 178/21 179/4 179/10 179/10 179/20 180/8 180/12 180/18 181/10 181/12 181/21 182/3 182/23 185/23 189/19 190/13 194/5 195/13 195/25 195/25 196/20 196/25 201/25 202/9 204/17 done [18] 10/18 19/16 55/22 75/1 86/2 96/11 120/5 120/12 124/1 137/11 150/24 dropdown [1] 159/6 157/20 168/21 173/13 dropped [1] 41/22 174/20 183/9 192/9 203/11
dotted [1] 21/5
doubt [1] 2/13 doubtless [1] 108/15 down [86] 3/23 21/6 34/13 51/7 51/16 53/16 54/8 57/14 57/25 59/2 64/21 66/6 72/1 72/19 74/10 79/25 80/13 85/13 89/21 90/2 90/3 93/19 94/16 95/1 95/4 97/1 100/4 101/6 104/19

105/5 105/18 108/11 112/9 114/6 117/24 124/1 126/4 126/8 126/14 126/18 126/23 127/6 133/23 135/18 137/12 137/21 137/21 138/3 138/5 138/18 138/25 139/22 140/8 141/19 143/10 154/1 154/19 157/7 160/10 161/17 162/15 163/16 164/11 166/2 169/15 171/24 171/25 175/7 175/20 179/16 182/6 183/2 183/25 190/11 191/15 192/3 192/4 193/12 193/13 194/14 196/25 198/17 198/18 200/14 200/15 203/20
downloaded [2]
160/24 162/10
downloading [1]
83/18
DPA [1] 31/4
draft [21] 147/19
163/10 163/14 163/18 164/8 165/25 168/16 169/22 175/12 175/20 190/16 191/13 193/7 194/6 196/1 196/9 199/17 202/3 202/11 202/20 202/22
drafted [1] 22/10
drafting [4] 148/1
148/2 194/2 195/11
drastic [2] 165/12 165/15
drawing [1] 122/2
dried [3] 138/7
138/10 138/12
drink [2] 139/17
139/20
drinker [1] 139/19
drinking [1] 134/10
drive [6] 28/9 80/11
105/25 106/5 119/4
160/9
driving [1] 43/8
dropdown [1] 159/6
dropped [1] 41/22
dual [1] 63/13
due [2] 31/17 100/20
duly [2] 130/17 186/13
Dunks [4] 79/20
105/17 185/21 185/24
duration [2] 200/22 200/23
during [8] 2/15 9/3
9/11 34/2 58/1 58/24 112/14 164/7
duties [3] 12/17
58/25 109/22
duty [2] 12/21 61/23

DWP [2] 33/12 33/12

E
each [18] 4/6 11/8
11/11 13/4 48/24 54/9
70/1 71/21 75/9 75/9
75/17 75/18 77/14
79/14 128/7 131/19
146/23 163/1
earlier [16] 46/25
63/1 63/25 67/13 68/9
74/1 122/17 132/14
143/15 148/10 151/18
163/25 164/4 180/16
193/4 193/7
early [7] 18/9 90/19
92/5 114/17 118/1
124/22 152/21
easier [1] 15/22
easily [4] 133/10
136/17 137/2 137/5
East [6] 4/15 6/21
21/1 21/7 24/8 45/20
eating [1] 181/5
EC [1] 97/6
edit [1] 178/18
edited [2] 178/6
178/8
editing [1] 178/13
effect [15] 33/3
117/16 120/13 122/8
122/21 125/8 129/20
162/23 167/24 170/19
171/4 172/24 178/11
178/18 197/18
effective [1] 56/21
effectively [1] 44/14
efficiencies [1] 41/23
eg [1] 54/11
eg admissions [1]
54/11
eight [3] 42/11 55/10 93/25
either [12] 10/22
12/15 17/16 23/4 34/3
67/18 120/18 132/16
137/14 139/22 180/16 187/3
elapsed [1] 94/1
electronic [2] 11/25
141/22
element [2] 32/11 36/2
else [24] 10/4 21/9
22/22 27/8 45/2 60/22 80/5 81/4 81/11 93/11 101/22 107/14 107/19 112/2 113/14 136/16 143/22 151/1 187/4 196/21 199/8 200/7 201/9 205/6
else's [1] 200/8
elsewhere [2] 74/14 152/18

Elv [3] 132/6 132/8 132/13
Elvis [1] 132/11
email [78] 79/17
80/15 81/23 82/18 82/19 82/25 82/25 83/8 83/14 83/20
83/21 83/22 83/22 93/19 93/21 97/2 98/3 98/9 100/5 100/17 101/5 101/8 102/21 104/22 104/24 105/1 105/7 105/13 111/9 111/10 128/5 130/15 132/2 134/6 139/12 140/12 140/13 141/20 141/24 143/10 143/14 144/3 144/3 144/15 148/11 150/8 150/14 151/16 151/17 152/2 154/24 156/8 157/25 160/3 161/17 161/19 161/20 161/22 162/5 163/13 163/25 164/12 166/8 169/1 169/3 171/15 173/20 174/11 174/13 174/23 175/8 182/7 184/16 184/19 185/2 185/4 185/5 187/13
emailed [1] 168/24
emailing [4] 149/8 160/2 161/7 169/19 emails [8] 83/2 96/23 139/13 140/24 147/18 160/21 161/3 173/14
emerging [3] 114/9 119/16 125/18
employee [1] 72/4
employees [2] 45/10 49/14
employment [1] 57/24
enable [1] 174/12
enclose [1] 131/4
encourage [1] 90/17 encouraging [2] 96/6 96/8
end [20] 8/14 69/13
69/15 73/20 90/22
103/9 104/24 127/13
135/9 138/9 142/16
144/1 145/25 164/23
164/23 168/15 171/13
176/8 176/8 188/23
ending [1] 129/9
ends [1] 156/24
enforcement [5] 8/21
131/3 131/8 131/10
136/13
enforcing [1] 129/8
engage [1] 134/10
engaged [1] 120/17
engineer [3] 123/14

(62) engineer... - filter
final [11] 66/12
168/10 178/15 178/16 179/15 180/6 180/9 180/15 186/16 202/20 202/22
financial [34] 6/13 33/5 35/6 36/11 36/14 37/5 37/9 38/1 38/13 39/3 39/18 40/23 40/24 41/9 41/12 43/7 46/18 47/3 47/4 48/17 86/21 89/19 114/21 124/22 125/6 126/4 126/9 126/13 129/1 142/14 145/18 162/23 172/24 176/17
find [5] 44/16 137/8 143/20 156/23 172/19
Findings [1] 114/7
fine [4] 44/4 44/25 45/4 146/25
finish [1] 107/17
finishing [1] 202/17
firm [1] 84/23
first [33] $4 / 54 / 19$ 9/23 24/18 34/23 43/4 51/8 52/8 52/14 53/1 53/25 55/7 57/17 62/22 79/16 83/21 93/19 96/12 115/13 119/5 132/9 156/4 163/16 165/18 181/1 183/14 184/5 186/11 186/15 190/15 196/4 197/5 197/19
firstly [3] 76/4 151/4 169/25
Fls [1] 176/15
fit [1] 165/10
FIU [2] 37/11 131/22
five [8] 30/5 63/5
80/3 103/7 103/8
103/8 161/1 205/9
fix [1] 200/22
fixed [1] 200/23
flash [1] 94/14
Flip [1] 114/7
flogging [2] 133/21
138/1
flooded [1] 40/23
floor [4] 37/13 38/13 40/13 41/6
flowchart [2] 78/17 192/21
focal [1] 23/23
focus [1] 115/24
focused [1] 54/17
folder [2] 102/21 102/21
follow [5] 39/4 40/19 76/10 82/10 86/2
followed [3] 27/7

78/3 85/23
following [9] 31/20
53/23 93/24 117/23 133/1 156/10 160/13 176/20 206/3
follows [1] 132/20 font [2] 68/12 148/22 foot [5] 56/17 56/20 83/13 93/20 175/21
force [1] 33/8
form [8] 12/1 23/7
69/9 69/25 118/11 159/3 186/16 205/16
formal [5] 8/9 23/11
52/13 69/24 106/3
formally [4] 28/25
126/17 127/4 183/11
format [1] 28/19
forms [1] 75/6 forward [9] 44/6 71/21 74/9 124/14 132/3 152/2 167/7 175/6 177/12
forwarded [3] 101/1
124/13 171/23
forwarding [5] 96/19 97/2 99/22 161/19 164/12
forwards [4] 74/12 82/2 114/6 175/18
found [7] 15/1 22/14 22/18 59/21 62/3 73/23 97/11
four [4] 30/5 62/20 134/14 163/16
four o'clock [1] 134/14
fourth [1] 72/1
frames [1] 51/24
fraud [7] 18/10 19/21
19/22 24/14 27/12 31/21 33/10
frauds [2] 33/10 46/8
free [1] 159/4
freezing [3] 112/20
113/14 121/8
frequently [2] 66/1 66/4
Friday [3] 79/17
145/15 197/21
friends [1] 142/14
front [3] $3 / 3$ 102/22 191/12
frozen [1] 121/4
FUJ00122197 [1] 104/19
FUJ00122203 [2] 163/8 164/10
FUJ00122204 [1] 166/2
FUJ00122210 [1] 169/15
FUJ00122217 [2] 174/8 175/3

FUJ00122218 [1]
$175 / 19$
FUJ00122237 [1] 179/15
FUJ00122366 [3]
73/17 189/1 204/17
FUJ00152189 [1] 191/1
FUJ00152205 [1] 202/22
FUJ00152290 [2]
182/5 185/7
FUJ00152501 [1] 196/2
FUJ00152582 [1] 161/6
FUJ00152587 [3]
159/24 163/15 177/1
FUJ00155181 [1] 149/6
FUJ00159189 [1] 190/24
Fujitsu [73] 17/9
20/17 22/16 22/21
36/20 68/21 69/23
71/4 71/23 73/2 75/7
81/1 82/14 85/16
85/21 86/9 86/25
86/25 87/12 87/13
95/23 97/5 99/6 99/12 100/10 100/17 100/23 101/13 101/20 102/3 102/11 104/16 105/11 106/3 106/15 109/1 116/11 117/2 118/24 119/3 119/24 120/1 122/19 123/6 123/10 123/16 123/18 124/2 147/13 150/2 150/14 150/23 151/3 151/17 152/2 152/9 156/11 160/3 161/18 162/13 170/19 182/16 183/6 183/15 187/4 188/8 188/12 188/20 190/17 198/7 199/19 200/1 201/24
Fujitsu's [4] 104/9 106/9 108/2 109/17 full [6] $1 / 1031 / 6$ 99/5 110/11 141/17 184/2 fully [2] 117/11 150/7 function [19] 17/14 17/19 23/16 24/18 36/23 58/5 64/13 70/15 72/7 73/11 83/17 92/25 111/4 128/7 137/22 147/23 148/5 148/20 149/11

## functioning [1]

 108/19functions [7] 17/4 36/18 48/20 48/24 50/15 116/23 119/12
fundamentally [1] 16/24
funding [1] 98/17
further [31] 22/22
65/22 66/2 81/16
87/24 93/20 94/11
97/10 102/14 114/6
117/24 129/18 130/21
131/25 132/3 142/3
156/13 160/10 163/17
165/6 175/5 175/16
175/17 175/20 177/12
190/13 190/14 191/15
192/4 192/13 203/20

## G

Gaerwen [2] 177/18 177/20
Gallagher [1] 114/3
Gareth [4] 161/19
175/15 183/16 185/18
Gareth Jenkins [1]
175/15
Gareth's [2] 177/11
177/12
Gary [6] 141/20
143/1 143/4 143/13 143/17 143/23
Gary's [1] 145/4
gathering [1] 48/2
Ged [1] 38/8
general [10] 58/10
73/1 118/8 118/11 151/17 152/14 157/11 167/20 192/8 205/12
generally [8] 14/21
53/9 64/23 80/16
114/8 169/7 169/9 205/13
Generate [3] 78/21 78/23 189/3
generated [6] 162/22
166/4 166/13 172/22 175/24 189/12
generic [1] 165/4
genuine [1] 176/8
genuinely [4] 16/15 17/7 20/21 172/19 get [38] 16/17 18/16 22/15 22/17 22/21 22/23 33/4 51/16 65/6 92/2 92/2 95/16
110/17 111/5 111/6 122/7 122/21 132/17 133/22 135/10 135/11 137/16 137/17 138/1 142/16 142/24 143/7 143/11 143/21 144/18 179/13 186/2 186/8 188/20 188/24 189/16 189/19 189/19
getting [12] 20/16
20/17 35/1 36/8 70/17 71/6 82/15 110/11

142/13 148/23 170/14 179/12
give [8] 1/14 1/25
22/25 79/21 119/23
154/9 194/10 194/11
given [11] 71/16 84/15 95/25 106/6 115/24 118/22 118/25 156/16 179/9 183/3 185/10
gives [3] 165/1
182/19 196/13
giving [3] 80/8
170/19 200/3
glaringly [1] 29/18 go [60] $4 / 5$ 6/19 13/3 20/13 25/15 43/16 46/4 53/25 56/18 57/1 57/18 64/10 71/21 71/21 71/25 72/18
73/24 74/11 80/22 83/10 90/14 96/16 99/22 101/6 102/22 104/24 114/6 115/17 116/10 118/6 124/6 125/18 137/8 137/25 149/4 150/23 151/16 156/13 161/6 161/16 162/14 163/15 167/7 171/25 172/6 176/22 177/13 182/6 183/2 183/7 183/13 185/8 190/10 191/15 192/13 192/20 193/10 194/6 196/2 203/13
go-between [1] 80/22
goes [3] 86/4 132/9 204/1
going [75] 4/22 6/9 7/10 10/10 10/12 13/3 14/17 16/23 16/24 20/13 29/14 34/16 34/19 37/2 39/23 40/6 40/10 40/11 44/6 45/7 47/10 56/18 57/15 59/9 62/5 67/6 71/9 71/22 72/21 72/24 83/2 87/17 88/10 89/25 96/18 97/1 99/25 101/8 101/15 107/5 112/22 115/4 116/10 122/3 126/20 128/5 130/14 135/1 135/18 139/7 140/1 141/24 145/4 147/2 147/18 149/4 156/4 156/12 163/12 165/16 178/16 187/5 187/24 191/6 191/11 193/20 194/16 196/1 $197 / 4$ 198/20 201/6 202/12 205/6 205/8 205/8
gone [5] 41/1 50/2
gone... [3] 171/4 178/10 180/20
good [20] 1/3 1/8 38/1 43/21 43/22 46/6 56/12 58/7 92/19 103/15 103/17 118/14 139/6 142/13 142/14 146/19 151/21 170/13 H 187/20 199/21
Goodnight [1] 134/1 got [41] 10/9 25/3 36/3 46/10 62/23 76/7 78/21 82/19 82/23 82/25 83/24 89/17 93/8 95/9 96/2 97/22 102/22 109/15 109/22 111/2 116/9 120/9 124/4 124/9 124/12 127/15 134/13 137/13 143/25 146/8 149/2
153/10 161/14 169/3 179/6 179/24 189/23
190/25 199/15 200/9
205/2
grade [2] 99/16 202/10
Graham [20] 1/5 1/6
1/11 131/5 131/20 148/11 149/16 154/21
161/21 164/14 165/11
175/5 191/17 198/19
199/1 199/1 199/5
200/20 201/8 207/2
Graham Ward [7] 1/5
1/6 131/5 161/21
165/11 191/17 207/2
Graham Ward's [1] 131/20
graham.c.ward [2] 83/1 83/15
grahamc.wa.r [1] 82/23
graphic [1] 74/15 grateful [5] 162/1
190/11 190/24 192/5 197/1
great [3] 43/20 100/25 102/5
greater [5] 95/9
118/22 163/5 164/23 167/2
greatly [1] 83/5
ground [2] 95/4
200/23
group [4] 46/13 105/13 115/10 181/2
groups [1] 146/23
grumble [1] 87/4
guess [11] $7 / 22$
15/17 15/18 73/25
74/2 93/3 105/16
108/5 127/20 148/18

176/18
guessing [2] 15/19 165/17
guesstimate [1] 95/18
guide [2] 17/8 54/9 guilt [1] 15/1 Gunner [1] 142/19

## H

had [146] 5/18 8/15
11/14 19/6 19/10 21/14 21/18 24/7 26/19 26/23 28/23 29/2 29/19 30/5 30/13 30/15 30/15 30/17 30/19 30/20 30/23 30/24 31/3 31/8 31/11 32/20 39/25 40/13 40/21 41/5 42/8 43/1 44/13 44/16 46/5 48/8 55/5 55/8 55/12 55/12 55/22 63/22 65/3 66/18 68/3 68/4 70/3 70/7 70/14 73/14 73/24 77/16 78/4 78/5 78/13 79/2 80/5 80/10 81/4 81/10 81/18 82/7 86/1 86/24 87/2 87/7 87/9 89/24 90/21 92/10 92/11 92/25 95/4 95/9 95/22 97/17 98/8 98/14 101/11 101/12 101/20 102/8 102/10 102/12 102/16 102/17 104/7 108/11 109/4 110/23 111/3 111/10 111/25 112/4 112/13 112/17 112/24 113/17 117/19 119/3 123/21 126/4 126/13 126/15 127/23 127/24 132/10 134/7 136/19 137/6 138/7 138/10 139/17 142/11 142/16 143/11 143/15 143/20 144/11 144/18 144/25 144/25 148/10 150/20 150/21 151/20 153/9 153/20 158/19 161/3 162/4 162/17 165/25 167/21 169/8 171/11 180/15 186/19 187/23 194/14 195/10 200/7 202/7 202/9 202/15 202/16
had a [2] 31/8 46/5
hadn't [4] 39/9 82/5
158/19 186/21
haircut [1] 132/11 half [4] 16/14 16/15 180/13 182/24
hand [21] 7/12 7/21
27/1 34/12 45/16 73/2
$74 / 1874 / 1974 / 21$ 75/1 78/20 79/16 82/20 85/16 93/18 93/21 94/11 94/12 157/3 196/7 196/23 handle [1] 176/13 Hannon [1] 98/14 happen [7] 12/25 65/25 66/1 66/4 110/20 120/25 121/1 happened [11] 23/1 25/19 26/23 31/3 76/23 81/15 101/21 120/8 120/15 164/9 179/5
happening [2] 91/14 126/20
happens [3] 156/7 168/14 189/9 happy [6] 44/22 44/23 45/5 45/6 45/23 150/6
Harbinson [5] 38/8
38/11 142/15 144/24 145/6
hard [7] 11/17 11/18 11/25 13/16 99/4 165/16 178/1
hardly [1] 144/4 hardware [2] 151/13 156/14
harm [1] 58/20
has [34] 1/18 79/22
81/24 82/14 83/17 97/6 99/11 99/24 102/22 111/9 117/14 117/19 118/13 123/24 128/24 129/4 129/5 129/17 133/9 141/17 149/17 151/5 161/1 162/25 163/1 164/4 164/25 171/10 172/24 172/25 179/9 188/8 189/11 204/5
hasn't [2] 52/9
113/17
have [294]
haven't [11] 29/10
62/23 83/8 83/9 93/8 109/15 123/25 144/21 152/24 173/2 178/15 having [13] 14/7 14/15 47/20 78/1 90/22 92/4 95/16 99/18 112/20 120/15 134/3 137/8 139/20
Hayward [2] 128/6 130/15
Hayward's [1] 128/9
he [97] 31/13 34/7 34/12 34/13 58/22 58/23 59/23 80/6 84/23 84/25 87/17 88/11 97/3 97/25 98/1

| $98 / 1$ 98/2 100/10 | 192/24 |
| :--- | :--- |

100/12 100/15 101/16 helped [1] 14/24 101/19 101/20 102/1 helpful [11] 18/19 120/9 132/8 132/10 22/21 79/21 87/15 132/16 132/17 134/11 $111 / 4$ 111/7 131/17 136/9 136/10 136/12 $\quad 148 / 19$ 149/1 170/9 136/14 136/15 137/16 186/2
137/17 137/18 137/20 helpfully [1] 2/24
138/25 142/3 143/11 helping [1] 186/2 143/17 143/18 143/20 Hence [3] 142/16 143/21 143/25 144/17 144/18 169/10
144/21 145/7 145/22 her [9] 42/9 42/14 145/22 151/20 151/20 82/7 85/4 85/5 86/2 151/23 151/25 152/1 150/25 178/25 185/2 158/19 158/22 161/22 here [30] 2/12 45/8 162/4 163/13 165/1 $56 / 18$ 62/2 71/6 71/19 165/19 165/25 166/2 $\quad 83 / 13$ 83/19 87/17 166/7 166/8 166/15 96/18 101/4 102/9 167/13 167/13 167/13 $\quad 109 / 20$ 110/24 130/3 168/1 168/3 168/6 168/8 168/14 168/20 170/4 171/1 171/4 174/3 174/3 175/16 180/16 180/17 182/18 192/14 198/20 202/1 188/1 197/10 198/1 here's [3] 27/11 198/5 198/15 198/18 154/22 189/9 199/7 200/15 200/19 201/6
he'd [2] 186/3 201/16 he's [9] 99/22 144/20 165/21 166/18 197/18 197/25 198/2 198/7 198/16
head [12] 33/24 44/2
44/20 61/4 64/23 65/3 66/10 66/14 67/7 67/19 136/8 145/4 headed [2] 191/5 191/6
heading [1] 51/17
heap [1] 197/11
hear [11] 1/3 6/9
56/13 69/12 93/7
99/17 103/15 132/18 137/17 137/18 146/19
heard [11] 66/23 70/3
70/7 87/13 152/19
153/8 153/9 186/11
186/19 194/3 205/15
hearing [1] 206/3
hearings [1] 129/24
held [5] 6/4 99/6
109/6 113/22 167/25
Helens [1] 34/9
help [13] 15/14 22/23 73/14 77/6 101/11 114/19 130/24 148/25 165/10 186/9 186/12 188/24 202/11
Helpdesk [14] 74/21 81/17 152/12 156/17 156/18 157/8 158/10 158/15 158/17 158/20 158/22 158/23 190/3
herself [1] 85/3
high [14] 31/17 38/18 41/2 41/4 41/11 41/14
41/15 41/18 41/20
41/25 105/7 117/10 123/5 154/1
high-powered [1] 123/5
higher [2] 53/21 99/25
highlight [2] 152/13 168/2
highlighted [5] 29/22 60/1 60/4 152/17 187/1

## highlighting [1]

 60/21him [31] 1/19 44/5 47/1 59/22 86/2 87/9 88/8 88/14 98/3 120/8 123/11 123/13 123/14 123/20 124/13 124/14 124/17 124/18 132/1 141/24 143/14 143/20 144/23 148/3 151/22
162/13 170/7 170/12 170/24 179/9 196/21
himself [1] 119/2 hinder [1] 195/3 hindsight [1] 106/21 his [27] 46/22 59/21 79/22 79/23 99/19 101/23 110/12 144/3 144/7 144/12 144/19 145/3 150/4 151/24 159/10 163/10 164/15 164/20 166/24 170/8 170/14 170/24 175/19

186/17 186/19 190/3 201/18
horse [2] 133/22 138/1
host [2] 155/3 155/14 hotspot [1] 18/12 hour [1] 163/23
hours [1] 134/10 house [5] 7/4 8/18 113/22 115/8 119/22 how [49] 10/16 13/9 16/9 17/5 17/11 34/11 36/12 37/3 42/15 43/17 44/5 45/18 45/24 46/10 51/3 51/9 59/3 62/17 69/7 69/22 71/16 94/20 97/20 110/18 117/7 131/13 140/23 152/23 153/12 155/19 156/7 159/14 160/23 160/24 162/9 162/10 165/2 165/9 171/2 171/6 174/22 177/18 178/22 180/6 180/9 180/13 180/24 183/22 201/23
however [5] 117/4 117/14 119/17 129/6 133/15
HSH [1] 149/18
hub [3] 44/10 44/12 143/16
Hudgells [1] 181/2 huge [2] 168/6 168/7 Hughie [2] 6/10 147/3
Hulbert [1] 114/3 human [1] 100/20 hundreds [1] 186/18 hypothetically [1] 62/2 $74 / 21$ 77/1 81/16
$89 / 1590 / 991 / 191 / 3$ 91/8 93/14 93/22 105/22 106/17 106/24 107/3 107/3 112/14 112/16 114/10 114/14 115/13 115/15 115/20 116/2 117/14 117/25 118/8 119/10 121/3 121/14 121/23 121/24 124/21 124/25 125/5 125/7 125/10 127/2 127/3 127/5 134/24 135/25 139/24 141/17 141/17 150/3 150/5 150/7 151/2 151/10 151/21 154/3 169/7 169/9 171/10 178/4 178/14 178/20 181/12 181/22 182/24 183/4 184/3 184/9 184/13 185/11 185/15 186/5

## I

I act [1] 181/7
I actually [1] 53/21
I agree [5] 55/23 85/1 107/11 154/11 159/17 I also [1] 160/12 I always [1] 154/16 I am [7] 62/7 95/9 99/11 131/17 132/14 171/17 173/12
I apologise [6]
159/14 190/25 191/2
202/19 202/23 203/14
I appreciate [3]
63/12 110/18 177/4
I ask [1] 1/9
l asked [2] 44/24 197/7
I became [1] 30/10 I believe [7] 9/10 38/3 69/8 69/20 124/16 149/21 181/15
believed [3] 140/17 140/22 141/13 I call [1] 1/5
I can [63] 1/4 2/17 4/5 12/3 12/18 14/25 15/2 16/3 16/21 17/13 17/24 18/7 19/13 19/16 21/23 23/18 23/22 25/12 26/1 36/13 40/4 40/7 42/17 46/4 54/1 59/15 62/5 63/3 63/4 63/24 70/11 71/5 71/12 71/17 94/5 96/15 99/15 106/21 116/17 124/16 133/4 136/16 142/8 145/14 146/20 150/17 150/19 152/25 157/24 166/10 167/6 170/10 171/6 178/22 191/12 193/3 193/24 194/20 196/16 197/15 203/3 203/6 203/24
I can't [40] 11/13 11/24 12/20 18/20 19/17 20/11 21/8 23/5 24/25 27/22 28/24 28/25 31/6 32/23 34/9 34/23 35/4 36/25 37/13 38/15 42/8 42/15 44/1 86/3 87/22 102/20 107/5 109/24 113/1 113/2 114/25 121/1 122/5 137/19 141/10 151/24 174/5 187/5 199/10 201/13 I cannot [1] 20/21 I certainly [2] 89/22 121/2
I consider [1] 1/24 I copied [1] 151/22 I could [2] 15/21 133/21
I couldn't [2] 22/25 87/25
I dealt [4] 14/13
59/11 60/24 62/6 I deliberately [1] 13/17
I did [9] 5/20 43/11 87/5 87/5 87/9 145/20 154/17 199/13 203/11 I didn't [29] 7/3 13/11 40/11 47/6 62/16 63/9 I have [7] 82/25 97/4 68/18 69/2 69/6 69/12 99/9 129/21 139/2 69/13 69/24 82/9 95/11 116/4 122/9 123/11 124/25 135/14 143/6 144/6 153/17 154/13 154/17 165/14 178/8 178/21 186/7 198/24
I do [13] 2/21 12/18 133/10 137/2 139/5

139/6 139/12 153/3 156/14 167/15 177/3 177/5 196/12
I don't [98] 9/3 9/5
9/10 11/24 14/7 14/15 15/3 18/7 27/6 29/14 33/5 35/1 39/22 40/11 40/25 41/1 41/18 46/10 49/25 50/25 53/22 60/24 64/15 66/17 68/18 72/12 74/8 77/20 78/15 78/24 81/9 82/24 83/9 90/21 92/3 93/5 93/12 99/21 102/2 102/13 107/6 109/13 111/2 111/12 113/5 113/7 143/5 143/13 143/21 143/21 144/15 144/20 145/4 145/19 148/16 152/1 158/8 166/20 168/19 173/5 178/21 179/4 179/10 179/10 180/8 180/12 180/18 181/10 181/12 181/21 182/3 195/13 195/25 195/25 196/20 201/25 202/9
I enclose [1] 131/4
I ever [1] 112/16
I first [1] 55/7
I forwarded [1]
124/13
I found [1] 73/23
I genuinely [3] 16/15
17/7 20/21
I get [2] 133/22 143/7
I got [4] 25/3 89/17
111/2 200/9
I guess [7] 7/22
15/17 93/3 108/5
127/20 148/18 176/18
I had [4] 98/14 104/7
109/4 112/13
hadn't [2] 82/5
186/21

178/17 205/13
I haven't [5] 83/8
93/8 144/21 152/24 178/15
I hear [1] 93/7
I inherited [1] 86/3
I joined [4] 3/9 9/17
43/19 63/2
I just [26] 62/7 83/6

114/15 120/10 121/10 I likely [1] 159/22 121/19 122/9 123/12 I line [1] 32/9 125/17 126/17 127/12 I made [1] 179/13 130/20 131/21 134/5 I may [1] 19/16 134/11 136/10 137/19 I mean [43] 15/2 15/7 138/7 138/14 140/6 $15 / 8$ 16/10 21/10 140/11 140/11 140/16 $21 / 18$ 26/4 29/18 31/5

83/8 107/24 110/9 110/10 110/21 111/22 112/1 113/18 135/4 135/10 165/14 165/19 170/14 170/15 171/11 173/12 173/17 174/14 174/24 178/8 184/11 188/5 199/17 204/10
I knew [2] 63/15 126/20
I know [12] 38/17 63/10 79/10 82/21 87/17 87/21 87/22 109/4 113/8 146/22 171/17 201/25 I left [3] 35/2 44/23 55/11

33/1 33/9 33/9 40/24
53/5 54/3 54/21 54/23
55/2 55/23 62/5 65/8 73/13 79/6 82/21 87/8
90/3 90/19 91/13
92/20 99/1 99/15
102/11 113/2 113/16
120/6 123/11 135/9
146/4 154/11 158/7
197/19 197/20 201/12
I mentioned [1]
143/15
I might [3] 38/16 54/2
125/23
I mixed [1] 191/9
I must [3] 135/2
173/24 195/13
I never [1] 86/23
I offered [1] 148/4
I picked [1] 83/7
I presume [5] 33/20
91/25 101/19 115/2 201/4
I probably [2] 59/9 135/15
I put [1] 171/12
I really [11] 17/9
20/11 59/14 100/11
137/23 143/22 144/21
171/13 174/24 178/2 194/3
I recall [1] 24/3
I refer [1] 167/11
I remember [2] 44/5
196/20
I remind [1] 1/24
I represent [1]
187/21
I said [9] 55/4 87/16
96/2 140/15 148/10

I said... [4] 148/16
173/18 184/10 202/17
I saw [3] 63/12 111/9 123/13
I say [19] 18/20 35/18
36/2 41/11 47/6 55/11 62/5 64/7 86/3 86/4 92/3 93/3 120/6 122/5 124/16 137/23 138/8 153/23 170/10
I seem [1] 153/20
I should [3] 159/18 187/1 187/1
I shouldn't [1] 149/1
I showed [1] 84/11
I spoke [2] 26/8 159/16
I stayed [1] 42/13
I still [1] 140/15
I suggest [1] 162/19
I suppose [1] 12/6
I suspect [1] 57/10
I think [138] 1/13 3/3
3/24 4/9 4/22 6/9 9/16 15/25 16/3 21/5 22/6
24/15 24/16 27/6 29/7 29/12 30/4 30/11
30/12 30/24 30/25
31/8 31/13 33/2 33/6
33/12 33/14 34/8 34/9
34/22 35/8 35/8 36/18
38/8 38/15 38/18
40/19 40/23 42/13
42/14 42/21 43/23
44/3 44/17 47/8 50/18
50/25 51/20 55/6 55/7
55/9 57/3 62/2 64/12 68/8 68/11 69/15 69/18 73/22 74/18 77/8 77/22 83/14 84/1 84/4 84/7 86/3 86/7 87/5 87/5 93/25 97/7 98/1 99/2 101/6 102/11 102/12 108/18 111/2 111/9 113/7
116/13 120/6 121/22 123/18 124/8 126/16 128/9 130/21 132/18 133/21 134/2 134/22 136/10 138/7 139/6 139/8 139/9 139/10 140/24 143/13 143/18 145/14 145/16 147/2 147/6 147/18 148/10 151/20 154/4 156/3 157/23 158/9 158/16 159/13 162/17 168/2 169/23 170/3 171/18 174/9 179/10 181/1 181/1 184/22 184/23 188/6 188/16 190/17 190/17 190/22 190/25

193/4 199/9 200/20 201/10 202/15 205/15 I thought [3] 127/13 158/19 177/5
I tried [2] 111/7 148/25
I trusted [1] 153/23
I understand [3] 2/11 77/23 86/25
I undertake [1] 205/9 I want [10] 142/4 187/24 190/9 193/11 194/18 196/1 196/4 196/6 197/22 198/17 I wanted [2] 96/9 179/13
I was [75] 10/17 18/13 21/1 21/1 34/15 34/24 34/25 42/3 42/9 43/8 43/25 44/23 45/23 49/1 62/22 63/2 69/6 69/22 69/22 72/14 80/4 81/12 83/3 94/17 97/22 99/7 101/5 107/3 107/6 109/13 110/10 110/17 111/3 111/7 111/24 112/19 114/16 115/1 115/1 124/17 124/24 127/4 130/6 130/13 132/17 134/5 135/12 135/14 135/15 138/21 145/15 148/18 148/25 159/16 159/19 165/17 166/20 170/3 170/9 170/25 172/4 173/17 175/8 179/10 184/5 186/8 186/9 186/10 186/11 202/1 202/5 202/10 202/17 205/8 205/8
I wasn't [13] 67/4 70/20 81/12 96/8 98/13 98/22 108/13 112/8 126/21 135/8 139/25 170/9 171/11 I went [1] 123/4 I were [1] 200/20 I will [3] 2/9 86/22 112/15
I won't [4] 186/13 192/3 192/6 193/9
I wonder [1] 103/4 I worked [2] 74/1 112/15
I would [67] 10/21 15/22 16/15 29/16 34/14 50/16 53/4 53/10 53/13 60/6 62/20 63/5 63/8 67/25 73/13 73/15 74/2 75/8 76/17 77/13 80/19 80/20 83/4 83/6 84/15 84/19 89/11 89/13

| $89 / 14 ~ 91 / 6 ~ 91 / 18 ~ 95 / 8 ~$ | $22 / 18 ~ 36 / 3 ~ 57 / 23$ |
| :--- | :--- | 95/16 105/16 106/2 $\quad 62 / 23$ 66/23 72/25 108/17 108/22 110/14 73/12 82/17 85/20 110/14 120/6 120/8 120/14 120/16 134/20 136/3 136/24 139/2 139/19 142/8 148/25 150/24 157/22 159/23 169/2 169/2 169/4 173/3 173/11 173/18 174/5 189/18 195/14 197/12 198/24 200/20 202/9 203/11

I wouldn't [15] 55/2 63/13 66/23 89/22 101/7 121/19 125/9 134/5 143/1 144/15 150/13 155/25 173/13 173/25 200/25
I'd [23] 46/2 83/3
83/4 103/6 122/5 135/21 140/6 148/17 154/25 156/17 162/1 177/5 184/5 186/11 190/10 190/23 192/5 194/3 195/10 196/24 197/1 197/5 202/14 I'II [7] 1/15 21/12 107/7 162/2 180/22 186/14 188/16
I'm [99] 12/20 14/17 15/19 17/7 17/10 17/10 22/14 22/25 26/8 28/21 33/6 34/7 35/18 36/2 39/7 39/14 45/7 47/10 50/1 55/18 55/24 56/3 59/9 62/5 74/10 75/13 77/16 78/2 78/24 78/24 83/2 83/18 85/25 93/8 101/25 106/7 106/12 110/18 112/22 120/6 121/1 122/22 124/5 126/25 127/7 128/8 128/12 133/5 133/25 135/8 137/23 139/2 139/19 145/5 145/19 146/21 147/1 147/2 148/12 149/3 153/10 156/21 157/25 158/8 158/9 158/25 159/16 163/11 164/3 164/20 165/17 170/6 170/7 173/24 174/14 177/12 ignorance [2] 166/22 180/20 182/4 185/19 186/1 187/11 188/25 189/2 190/20 190/20 191/5 191/11 192/7 194/6 196/1 196/21 198/20 201/13 202/5 202/14 203/12 204/15 204/16 204/18
I've [55] 2/19 10/9
10/9 15/20 22/14

107/16 107/22 109/14 110/9 113/16 124/4 134/13 139/9 143/23 145/10 145/24 146/8 152/19 153/10 157/23 implies [2] 163/5 159/13 162/17 164/21 167/2 168/21 169/21 170/2 imply [1] 164/23 173/24 174/21 175/5 important [28] 58/8 175/11 175/17 176/1 $\quad 58 / 23$ 82/15 84/8 178/9 179/6 179/24 180/20 182/25 184/19 92/19 92/24 93/10 184/20 190/25 197/19 108/10 134/9 134/16 201/25 202/15 204/25 $139 / 6$ 139/10 162/7 205/2 205/15
ICL [1] 196/6
ID [1] 18/17
idea [16] 10/9 103/2

121/6 137/19 139/2 143/23 145/10 145/24 impractical [1] | $146 / 8$ | $170 / 13$ | $179 / 6$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $143 / 19$ |  |  | 179/24 180/18 195/10 impression [3] 204/25 205/2

identified [7] 18/1 48/8 58/2 61/11 123/18 127/19 195/1
identify [5] 18/17
119/15 166/19 176/13 204/20
identifying [3] 114/9 114/23 115/19 ie [16] 38/14 45/10 50/14 52/2 69/1 99/17 101/23 107/14 114/21 127/3 148/2 151/5 168/25 169/16 171/5 201/2
ie accounting [1] 114/21
ie at [2] 101/23 171/5
ie Expert [1] 201/2
ie in [1] 50/14
ie making [1] 148/2
ie other [1] 151/5
ie that [1] 69/1
ie the [3] $45 / 10$ 168/25 169/16
le they [1] 127/3
ie what [1] 52/2
ie you [1] 107/14
if [241]
170/5
ignore [3] 120/2
164/14 196/6
image [1] 7/17
imagination [2]
144/19 145/3
imagine [3] 46/2
96/24 198/24
immediately [2] 2/7 80/14
impact [2] 135/24 158/3
impacting [1] 136/1 Implementation [1] 71/24
implemented [1] 117/7

84/16 86/6 92/17

166/11 166/14 167/23
171/8 171/14 174/19
183/10 188/9 195/18
195/21 198/15 201/22
impose [1] 130/8
impractical [1] 133/22 138/2 205/16 improper [1] 180/2 inaccurate [2] 121/21 180/2
incident [1] 25/7
incidents [1] 24/7
include [12] 15/13
48/7 54/10 55/14 57/5
133/7 165/23 167/14
177/19 180/6 180/16
200/12
included [13] 5/21
28/5 80/10 87/13
99/14 99/19 165/9
167/21 177/8 180/15
186/24 190/2 200/3
including [5] 11/3
45/25 95/24 136/4 166/13
inclusion [1] 167/18 inclusive [1] 201/1 incomplete [3] 101/3 101/12 102/9
incorrect [1] 125/21 increase [11] 39/9
39/9 39/10 39/13 39/16 41/5 41/8
102/23 103/1 117/16 122/3
increased [7] 54/7
87/21 87/24 90/21
96/2 97/23 99/1
increases [1] 116/23
increasing [5] 40/16
40/17 40/20 89/15
96/5
incriminate [1] $1 / 21$ incrimination [4]
1/15 1/23 2/4 2/14
incurred [1] 128/24

Indeed [2] 5/25
185/17
independent [5]
24/25 119/1 123/7 123/9 140/10
indicate [3] 55/20
60/8 94/25
indicates [1] 55/23
indication [1] 164/6
individual [6] 35/15
72/25 89/10 92/9
164/1 205/14
individually [1]
178/12
individuals [1] 58/8
industrial [1] 58/7
Industry [1] 42/7
ineffective [1] 129/9
inelegant [1] 83/19
influence [2] 36/10 36/16
info [1] 162/18
infographic [1] 51/13
information [42] 5/11
18/15 21/13 22/2
23/21 26/25 27/5 27/8
31/5 42/2 48/2 51/19
57/21 58/15 72/9 75/6 79/23 98/6 101/1
102/22 114/10 114/14 114/21 114/24 115/20 116/2 116/22 119/10 124/22 125/15 125/19 137/1 137/10 166/11 167/24 172/4 186/3 188/18 195/23 200/8 201/22 203/2
informed [4] 19/6 88/21 89/5 101/23 inherited [1] 86/3 initial [3] 85/7 163/10 182/23
initially [3] 8/4 44/4 44/25
initiated [2] 119/25 189/6
inquiry [12] 1/9 1/18 1/19 2/13 2/25 15/6 15/8 18/23 29/11 63/22 159/21 205/21
Inquiry's [1] 6/5
insofar [1] 90/7
instalments [1]
129/10
instance [1] 156/4
instead [3] 9/22 89/8 204/1
instigate [1] 156/11
instigated [1] 133/9
instinct [1] 78/3
instruction [1]
131/18
integrity [34] 106/24 108/11 108/19 114/9 114/13 114/23 115/13 115/15 115/19 116/2 116/5 117/13 121/14 121/23 121/24 124/21 125/1 125/5 125/10 125/19 127/3 139/24 154/3 171/10 181/11 183/3 184/3 184/9 184/13 185/10 185/14 186/4 195/4 204/21 intelligence [1] 39/19 intend [3] 107/18 152/9 178/21
intended [1] 107/19 intention [2] 110/19 178/23
interest [1] 107/9 interested [1] 104/12 interests [7] 58/6 106/9 106/14 106/18 108/3 108/7 109/17 internal [3] 126/20 191/22 202/2
interpret [3] 17/5 121/20 168/21 interpretation [1] 117/4
interrupt [3] 28/12
75/16 134/16
interventions [1]
178/11
interview [3] 26/22 58/25 59/20
interviewed [2] 47/23 59/22
interviewing [1] 25/18
interviews [5] 25/18 27/2 27/12 32/20 46/9 into [25] 7/10 7/22 9/17 23/13 29/14 31/25 33/3 33/8 37/4 42/2 42/9 43/4 44/2 44/20 45/7 54/18 58/20 120/12 122/7 122/21 162/2 170/8 181/5 200/21 202/1 intranet [3] 11/20 11/21 11/23
introduce [1] 143/16 introduced [5] 16/2 16/18 17/14 18/1 40/21
introduction [8] 14/18 15/24 16/4 16/6 18/6 99/3 117/17 176/19
investigate [10]
16/25 49/19 52/12 53/12 53/17 54/18 55/19 109/23 127/17 138/13
investigated [10]
25/5 25/7 40/1 41/9 41/16 41/19 52/3 52/3 55/4 139/23 investigating [9] 40/6 63/12 91/2 91/23 127/3 127/5 127/8 157/15 159/12 investigation [88] 3/10 4/19 4/20 5/21 6/5 6/6 7/25 8/2 8/4 9/17 9/19 9/21 10/2 10/12 10/17 10/19 11/2 14/18 15/9 15/11 15/20 16/22 18/4 18/5 18/22 18/25 19/5 19/25 20/7 20/8 22/15 22/20 24/15 26/3 26/6 26/10 28/16 29/8 32/19 36/14 36/14 37/9 38/2 39/3 39/19 40/9 45/24 46/2 47/11 47/23 48/9 48/11 49/12 52/13 52/15 52/23 53/20 54/17 54/21 55/1 56/23 57/3 57/8 57/17 58/4 59/4 62/17 62/18 63/3 64/6 64/23 66/7 68/1 76/11 89/1 91/1 91/7 93/15 98/6 99/5 109/21
113/24 117/3 137/21 139/25 154/6 170/16 170/22
investigations [32]
6/10 9/22 10/11 11/6 21/15 22/5 25/17 29/6 36/11 38/13 39/1 40/17 40/20 40/25 41/10 47/13 66/10 66/15 67/8 67/19 95/5 126/3 126/4 126/8 126/9 126/13 126/13 126/23 126/24 127/6 127/18 127/23
investigator [36]
6/13 11/1 12/22 16/20 17/11 17/15 17/21 18/2 20/20 23/4 25/16 25/16 26/5 37/5 37/25 46/5 47/3 47/4 48/17 53/7 53/9 53/14 61/21 62/10 76/10 76/15 77/17 78/1 81/18 145/18 148/18 149/13 150/25 170/16 170/21 177/7
Investigator's [2] 61/25 129/1

## investigators [26]

17/22 20/23 21/3 21/7 21/10 21/14 21/16 33/5 35/6 40/23 41/12 41/17 41/22 41/24

46/19 55/8 55/10 89/21 90/5 96/12 109/21 132/25 142/10 144/25 176/16 177/8 investigatory [1] 66/3
invite [1] 100/21
invited [2] 46/9 80/5 involve [10] $8 / 17$
8/24 9/2 20/1 24/23 25/11 25/18 39/19 48/2 185/17
involved [31] 6/16
6/22 7/10 8/21 14/16 22/22 26/22 37/15 43/8 48/11 76/7 80/1 89/17 91/24 104/12 111/2 111/5 111/6 120/10 126/21 133/19 147/20 148/1 148/23 149/2 174/18 183/24 194/1 195/11 195/22 201/16
involvement [12] 26/16 48/25 49/6 68/24 80/18 104/7 110/24 117/19 129/3 147/3 147/7 179/2 involving [8] 19/15 19/18 24/20 40/9 59/17 104/22 104/23 124/24
Ireland [1] 24/24
ironically [1] 145/7
irrelevant [2] 125/8
125/9
irrespective [1]
104/16
is [314]
ish [2] 15/25 33/6
isn't [14] 29/25 75/4
76/25 84/8 94/20
109/25 113/16 114/17 144/14 168/9 172/15 184/1 198/1 198/5
issue [34] 2/13 25/7
58/15 59/5 70/16 70/16 71/14 71/14 83/6 84/20 88/14 92/5 92/10 93/6 96/1 100/24 101/3 102/5 112/21 113/17 113/19 114/11 114/24 115/20 116/2 116/24 117/14 117/23 119/11 123/4 129/13 162/14 181/13 184/14
issued [4] 11/11
11/22 32/21 203/1
issues [22] 19/6
21/14 22/2 22/4 22/8 22/14 28/13 30/19 47/21 76/2 87/7 91/23 112/19 116/5 124/15

125/7 125/8 125/10 127/19 132/18 149/5 154/5
it [591]
it's [100] 1/14 2/25 3/2 3/11 5/18 15/2 15/12 15/17 15/19 20/11 22/16 28/15 28/18 36/25 50/24 51/20 54/17 55/11 56/5 56/19 57/1 57/3 59/10 61/24 63/9 63/10 63/13 65/15 68/22 73/13 76/22 76/22 78/1 78/15 78/20 82/19 82/21 82/21 82/23 84/4 84/8 86/7 88/13 88/19 89/13 91/9 91/13 99/15 107/9 107/11 109/3 111/4 113/8 115/14 120/17 131/22 134/22 138/8 139/9 140/13 140/13 144/14 144/20 146/2 146/4 147/6 153/19 158/7 159/6 159/6 159/15 159/17 159/17 165/15 165/16 165/16 171/3
178/1 184/1 184/21
185/8 187/5 187/17
187/24 190/17 190/22
191/1 191/6 195/20
196/3 196/5 196/6
196/8 196/21 198/13
199/3 201/12 202/11
204/1 204/16
italics [2] 161/21 162/7
iteration [1] 193/5
its [8] 3/1 54/10
61/22 89/25 102/22
118/14 136/21 152/21
itself [8] 36/7 98/15
98/20 98/20 98/21
125/21 152/10 198/21
J
Jan [3] 196/17
196/19 203/4
January [3] 42/21
43/12 71/19
January '13 [2] 42/21
43/12
JARD [3] 136/23
137/6 137/10
Jarnail [7] 46/15
130/15 131/25 132/15
134/18 134/19 136/8
Jason [3] 1/8 31/13 32/9
Jenkins [26] 110/12
111/24 112/4 122/23
123/11 123/18 161/19
(67) Indeed - Jenkins

Jenkins... [19]
162/12 163/10 164/13 164/19 165/21 171/23 173/15 173/21 174/3 175/3 175/15 176/6 177/2 178/25 179/8 180/15 183/17 185/18 185/25
Jenkins' [5] 148/2
162/15 165/8 172/23 175/20
JFSA [6] 130/25
131/1 131/7 135/25
142/7 144/11
job [16] 4/23 4/25 7/6 7/13 9/12 9/18 10/7
10/23 12/16 32/7
34/21 45/11 46/3
143/20 145/21 151/24
jobs [2] 6/19 135/21
John [2] 138/24
143/11
joined [11] 3/9 3/24
4/18 7/24 9/17 43/15 43/19 47/6 55/7 63/2 74/1
joint [2] 53/13 136/24
judge [3] 79/22
129/23 130/8
judgment [1] 79/22
Julian [1] 6/14
July [3] 93/21 182/8 183/1
jumping [1] 9/12
June [3] 73/19 96/21 100/5
just [188] 2/19 3/18
4/18 4/23 7/14 9/12 9/21 10/5 10/6 10/9 12/5 14/21 23/25 24/9 27/6 27/10 27/11 28/21 30/21 32/1 35/2 35/24 36/2 39/20 40/8 42/24 44/15 45/5 45/18 45/21 51/16 52/11 53/7 55/18 56/17 59/14 59/16 59/21 61/1 62/7 68/1 69/9 71/20 71/21 72/21 73/22 74/5 74/9 74/11 75/16 79/12 82/17 82/18 83/6 83/8 83/10 83/11 83/12 84/8 86/1 86/5 90/10 91/9 92/9 92/16 94/13 94/17 94/25 96/5 96/25 98/9 100/1 101/8 101/15 103/4 104/2 104/21 104/25 106/14 107/24 109/14 110/9 110/10 110/17
110/21 111/22 112/1

113/16 113/18 115/4 knew [10] 44/21 116/13 120/4 120/7 $\quad$ 63/15 72/15 95/5 120/8 123/15 125/12 $\quad 95 / 25$ 116/1 126/20 127/8 127/25 128/4 158/22 184/2 186/4 130/10 130/23 131/12 know [188] 1/9 10/7 131/20 131/21 132/10 $15 / 18$ 15/21 17/1 134/14 135/4 135/10 137/7 137/13 138/11 138/21 139/11 139/20 140/12 140/13 141/15 141/19 143/3 143/10 143/19 144/19 146/2 146/4 146/21 148/13 148/15 148/17 148/18 148/25 149/7 149/7 149/17 151/2 153/19 155/24 157/23 157/25 158/10 158/18 159/25 160/1 164/12 165/14 165/15 165/19 166/21 170/2 170/3 170/3 170/5 170/7 170/14 170/15 170/25 171/11 171/25 173/12 173/17 174/10 174/14 174/24 175/9 178/8 178/10 179/11 182/6 182/18 182/22 184/5 184/11 185/20 186/2 186/9 186/12 187/11 188/5 188/24 189/23 189/24 191/5 191/20 194/21 197/17 199/3 199/17 201/14 204/10 justice [5] 108/24 131/2 142/5 144/10 144/13
Justice for [1] 131/2 justify [1] 33/20

## K

keep [16] 56/18 71/22 72/21 72/24 74/12 96/18 97/1 101/8 107/1 128/4 130/14 141/24 154/16 171/24 176/22 179/25 Keith [5] 97/4 100/5 101/15 101/25 169/19
key [1] 54/17
keyboard [1] 121/9
keyboards [1] 121/4
keypad [1] 17/3
kind [12] 16/4 17/8
22/18 22/23 23/23
45/14 63/13 68/15
100/1 115/5 130/24 171/15
kinds [3] 92/7 188/14 190/1
King [1] 128/6
kit [3] 11/15 150/5
151/10
kits [1] 11/15

17/22 18/9 18/18
18/19 18/23 20/11 21/11 22/9 22/15 24/5 24/9 24/25 25/18 27/3 27/6 27/15 29/19 30/16 33/13 33/21 34/14 34/25 35/1 35/11 36/12 38/17 40/11 41/1 41/1 41/23 41/24 43/22 44/17 45/23 45/24 46/5 46/10 46/10 46/19 53/22 53/24 56/1 63/9 63/10 64/13 64/15 66/14 66/18 66/23 68/6 68/17 68/18 69/21 71/15 74/6 77/20 78/8 78/15 78/15 78/24 79/10 81/8 82/17 82/21 82/24 83/3 83/9 84/17 84/20 85/3 86/5 87/6 87/17 87/17 87/21 87/22 87/25 89/16 89/24 90/9 90/10 90/11 91/13 92/9 97/23 99/24 101/22 102/2 102/24 109/4 109/8 109/14 110/9 110/14 110/19 111/2 111/12 112/2 113/7 113/8 113/17 116/3 116/5 120/13 120/24 121/10 121/11 121/19 122/23 123/12 123/15 125/14 126/19 127/12 130/8 130/18 134/5 134/11 134/22 134/24 135/4 135/9 137/7 137/24 138/14 139/9 140/12 140/16 140/16 140/19 140/20 140/21 141/11 141/15 143/13 143/22 143/23 144/20 144/21 145/4 146/22 148/13 148/16 150/8 150/11 150/14 153/14 153/23 154/4 154/17 154/25 157/24 158/8 158/12 165/14 165/16 166/20 168/9 168/19 170/6 170/17 170/25 171/13 171/17 173/5 173/12 173/23 174/14 178/2 179/5 179/7 179/23 180/6 180/9 180/13 186/7 187/7 199/13 199/20 200/9

201/15 201/25 204/24 least [4] 55/9 108/18 knowing [4] 166/22 135/23 149/21
170/5 178/3 188/17 leave [4] 44/23 45/23
knowledge [14] $3 / 19$ 160/18 198/3
34/17 36/4 55/18 leaves [1] 84/4 58/17 82/2 89/18 leaving [4] 126/1 96/14 111/24 121/2 122/7 151/21 200/4 200/6
known [11] 1/23
87/11 150/13 155/25
161/18 186/17 186/19
186/22 186/24 187/3 187/7
L
label [1] 28/7
Labels [1] 74/24
large [2] 68/22
201/17
last [15] 3/15 10/16 51/9 62/6 69/16 76/2 111/13 145/15 153/11 165/23 167/7 176/22 187/13 194/7 197/20
lasted [2] 42/11 153/21
lastly [1] 175/2
late [6] 117/22
117/23 133/18 136/2 136/8 139/12
later [10] 20/13 34/25
84/11 113/7 118/2
161/7 163/9 177/1
194/1 200/1
latterly [1] 92/5
laugh [1] 143/25
law [30] 1/17 8/21
22/12 27/14 47/1 47/5 47/8 48/21 61/7 61/9 64/19 64/20 65/6 65/8 65/17 66/25 67/1 67/7 67/19 68/2 70/8 70/14 70/23 71/13 78/7 84/18 109/22 136/9 136/10 167/21
Lawrence [1] 130/18
lawyer [8] 13/3 13/10
13/18 13/24 46/14
64/19 66/25 84/22
lawyers [7] 2/5 8/25
9/2 9/3 27/19 48/23
136/11
layout [2] 148/21
163/24
lead [3] 10/10 23/21
170/7
leader [11] 26/6
29/15 29/17 31/22
53/4 53/10 53/15 64/7 64/10 64/13 64/14
leadership [2]
132/19 141/5
leading [1] 9/21

135/14 135/16 135/17
led [2] 39/16 74/6
Lee [1] 6/17
left [20] $4 / 25 / 16$ 23/5
23/6 35/2 38/11 42/21
43/10 43/16 44/8
44/23 55/11 74/18
75/1 78/20 81/1 94/12
113/10 192/24 196/11
left-hand [4] 74/18
75/1 78/20 94/12
legal [15] $1 / 201 / 22$
27/4 57/20 58/11
60/10 60/13 62/9
62/12 75/23 76/4 76/7
77/21 94/22 132/25
Legg [1] 114/3
legislation [4] 11/3
11/9 11/12 12/2
Leighton [2] 151/19 151/19
length [1] 105/7
less [4] 52/18 55/12
138/10 148/8
Let [1] 107/17
let's [7] 94/13 96/25
188/4 197/16 197/25
198/3 198/4
letter [1] 182/25
level [10] 26/13
29/14 88/11 88/12
97/6 97/7 101/23
101/25 102/1 117/5
levels [1] 99/25
liaise [2] 48/20 48/23
liaised [1] 101/16
liaising [2] 104/8 175/3
liaison [1] 186/18
light [2] 84/7 109/8
like [33] $3 / 415 / 3$
17/3 17/6 28/13 35/16 44/25 45/4 51/21 64/1 83/3 106/2 108/13
113/15 115/10 115/14
115/17 131/7 142/15
148/23 153/23 155/19
161/5 169/2 170/8 170/23 185/3 188/11
193/4 196/24 197/5
198/7 198/9
likely [9] 37/1 119/23
152/22 153/11 159/22
191/17 191/24 192/17 198/22
limit [10] 39/1 62/9
89/12 90/17 94/3 94/7
95/11 96/5 98/10

L
limit... [1] 98/25
limit' [1] 155/6
limitations [1] $88 / 3$
limited [6] 47/18 72/2
74/25 75/5 176/15 191/22
limits [16] 73/6 86/8 86/14 86/21 87/7 87/21 88/19 89/4 89/16 89/18 90/20 90/23 96/2 97/23 102/24 103/1
line [28] 8/7 23/2 23/4 29/10 30/5 32/9 32/10 34/1 38/8 43/25 47/18 58/5 66/7 85/4 87/6 88/5 94/21 99/18 99/19 128/10 131/16 153/1 164/2 164/4 169/24 170/1 171/9 172/3
lines [13] 15/5 15/8 45/12 63/22 73/12 80/3 85/4 100/11 106/4 110/15 119/15 122/8 175/21
lining [1] 197/11
Link [1] 57/4
linked [2] 35/21 166/25
list [6] 13/19 54/15 115/4 115/12 119/9 193/15
listed [4] 28/12 58/11 113/23 202/3
literally [1] 67/11
litigation [13] 33/17 48/23 48/25 49/7 72/22 73/4 80/1 80/21 80/24 84/17 103/18 147/14 192/8
little [29] 4/7 6/20 51/16 94/11 104/7 107/1 110/24 141/20 148/16 161/17 163/9 163/16 170/3 182/7 183/2 190/10 190/11 190/12 190/14 191/4 191/15 191/19 192/4 192/13 196/3 197/1 198/17 200/15 203/19
local [3] 26/13
149/14 189/7
located [3] 21/10 21/10 34/6
location [1] 115/12 locks [1] 171/6 $\log$ [19] 79/5 79/7 79/8 80/9 82/6 100/18 137/9 153/8 153/9 155/4 155/7 187/8 188/12 192/25 195/7

195/16 195/18 195/24 204/23
logged [1] 156/18 logging [2] 79/8 79/8 logs [29] 18/17 69/7 69/20 74/23 79/10 81/13 81/13 94/23 100/22 101/4 117/1 152/19 155/18 155/22 155/25 155/25 156/3 158/12 182/11 182/16 182/21 183/20 188/20 190/3 190/4 192/24 194/25 195/1 197/13 logs' [1] 155/17 London [7] 4/10 4/13 18/12 34/13 44/13 44/13 143/19
long [18] 5/19 5/24 9/11 10/16 11/13 15/3 15/19 28/18 36/25 42/15 56/1 59/18 78/2 139/9 149/3 153/21 165/16 177/4
longer [3] 16/14 57/10 202/16 look [93] 6/19 16/23 17/22 21/12 29/9 29/15 41/12 49/22 51/15 56/16 56/17 57/14 57/15 57/16 57/19 57/24 65/15 68/17 69/21 71/18 74/9 78/18 79/12 79/13 79/14 79/16 80/6 84/14 93/16 93/18 93/19 96/25 99/24 104/2 104/19 112/10 113/21 115/14 128/3 130/2 131/7 134/3 141/18 147/19 149/3 149/7 151/4 156/1 157/2 159/16 159/19 159/24 159/24 159/25 161/6 162/17 163/3 163/8 163/15 164/10 164/15 165/25 169/15 171/21 172/20 175/19 179/15 187/12 187/24 188/25 189/1 190/9 193/11 193/11 194/18 194/20 196/2 196/4 196/7 196/24 197/3 197/5 197/17 197/25 198/3 198/7 198/17 198/20 200/15 201/24 204/10 204/13 204/18
looked [12] 74/5 83/21 98/9 117/12 134/25 135/24 161/23 166/8 188/16 194/21 196/9 202/3
looking [24] 12/6

| $14 / 21 ~ 15 / 1315 / 23$ | $88 / 24 ~ 89 / 4 ~ 89 / 8 ~ 89 / 12$ |
| :--- | :--- | 18/23 43/15 52/8 72/9 162/21 166/3 172/11 78/17 80/16 95/3 maintain [5] 57/8 159/3 159/21 163/12 maintaining [2] 58/7 164/10 170/3 175/9 189/2 194/7 201/17 204/18

looks [10] 17/3 51/21 110/18 110/18 115/17 131/7 178/22 193/4 198/9 204/5
loss [17] 33/11 35/24 38/16 39/17 52/8 52/18 53/16 53/20 54/9 54/17 54/25 55/4 55/20 56/1 128/25 130/10 133/7
losses [18] 24/10 24/13 24/14 30/18 30/21 32/18 32/18 33/14 40/9 42/17 53/3 106/11 106/20 109/3 118/9 126/10 150/4 173/10
losses' [1] 133/20 lost [4] 41/24 103/8 132/14 134/21
lot [10] 44/7 44/7
44/14 44/18 76/2 87/10 90/21 110/10 113/9 187/25
lots [2] 36/1 87/15
loud [1] 143/25
low [2] 34/24 54/4
lower [1] 38/14
Lowther [16] 72/2
72/4 72/16 105/16
111/3 111/9 148/10 163/11 163/17 164/12 165/7 169/19 171/23 173/21 175/15 177/2

## M

machine [1] 189/7 made [34] 2/24 3/18 17/23 28/21 58/4 58/9 62/12 64/17 65/23
66/20 76/8 78/11 81/24 83/21 86/17 89/20 92/15 99/7 99/18 101/20 102/13 106/7 112/3 119/12 129/4 131/9 136/19 149/17 152/6 152/12 153/4 158/19 177/6 179/13
magazine [1] 122/4 Magistrates [1] 71/10
mail [10] $4 / 25 / 14$ 8/11 42/22 42/24 43/2 43/3 43/4 43/7 46/13 main [9] 24/15 88/20

58/7 68/6 119/8 171/9
$72 / 1073 / 1173 / 20$ 80/19 82/3 85/15 87/6 88/2 88/5 89/14 91/2
91/7 97/5 98/23 99/18 99/19 100/10 100/18 104/7 111/5 113/25 128/10 147/10 147/24
177/7 177/10 184/6 191/22 199/24
Manager's [1] 63/21 managers [17] 22/7 26/17 31/8 32/1 32/7 34/2 44/8 49/15 57/4 91/22 92/8 92/15 94/22 119/13 119/14 128/8 128/13
86/9 87/9 92/8 110/22
127/1 129/17 129/18 managing [1] 26/2
157/25 165/23 167/16 Mandy [1] 84/21
170/24 178/9 185/13 manual [2] 14/14
makes [3] 146/3
154/24 164/24
making [13] 28/3
37/21 66/2 68/8 73/7 74/16 87/15 98/24
110/25 116/22 136/1
148/2 158/22
malicious [1] 176/12
manage [1] 34/11
managed [9] 8/7
30/20 32/2 32/9 32/10
38/8 47/18 87/1 101/19
management [33]
23/7 23/21 24/2 24/3 25/5 25/13 25/14 26/10 27/16 30/5 30/6
$32 / 1432 / 1733 / 19$
33/22 35/10 44/1
45/11 50/22 57/2 71/3
73/18 82/12 85/5 mark [1] 172/14
101/23 108/15 138/22 marked [2] 171/22 140/19 140/25 141/1 171/22
148/20 191/1 191/10 marked-up [1]
Management's [1] 64/4
manager [96] 4/2
4/12 4/20 5/3 5/5 5/8
5/14 6/6 6/6 6/7 6/10 8/7 9/19 9/21 10/17
10/19 11/2 12/9 20/14 Mate [1] 142/19
20/16 22/8 23/2 23/4 material [7] 12/25
23/13 23/17 23/19 $\quad 13 / 8$ 13/9 13/15 15/1 23/19 25/21 25/23 27/10 29/3 29/4 30/4 matter [6] 95/22 30/11 31/25 32/4 34/3 125/3 125/5 125/7 34/20 36/19 36/24 129/23 160/12 37/25 42/22 42/24 matters [3] 47/17 43/25 47/23 48/10 106/6 155/4 48/12 48/15 49/2 49/4 Matthews [7] 147/20 49/4 53/14 56/24 58/5 $149 / 8$ 149/11 151/18 59/5 59/22 59/25 156/9 169/20 178/24 60/14 62/18 62/24 Matthews' [1] 152/2 63/3 63/21 64/16
64/17 66/7 70/5 70/12

171/22
Marsh [2] 98/3 99/19
Mary [1] 130/18
Mary's [1] 132/2
match [1] 182/23
matches [1] 196/11 15/13 81/19
18/16
manufacturer [1] 108/6
many [13] 13/11
13/14 50/15 62/17 79/20 87/8 92/2 94/20
107/3 107/4 107/8 114/25 181/24
March [10] 56/21
105/4 160/2 161/22
162/4 163/17 163/21
164/8 175/7 175/10
March 2000 [1] 56/21
March 2006 [1] 105/4
Marine [5] 80/11 105/25 106/5 119/4 160/9
Marine Drive [5] 80/11 105/25 106/5 119/4 160/9 $\begin{array}{ll}149 / 8 & 149 / 11 \\ 156 / 9 & 169 / 20 \\ 178 / 24\end{array}$
Matthews' [1] $152 / 2$
may [70] $1 / 54 / 25 / 16$
7/16 7/17 9/4 19/16

25/18 28/12 35/4 43/10 43/12 50/2 52/3 53/6 54/5 58/3 58/3 61/2 62/7 63/4 70/16 77/7 90/2 90/2 92/22 93/1 99/5 99/10
106/11 111/14 112/24 113/6 114/10 116/21 116/24 117/15 117/16 117/22 119/1 119/5 119/11 122/14 126/5 133/14 134/12 134/13 134/14 142/9 145/19 148/12 150/25 151/21 152/16 155/6 157/17 160/20 165/23 166/4 166/12 166/12 166/18 167/16 170/5 170/10 172/22 173/9 175/24 199/9
May '16 [1] 43/10 May 2016 [2] $4 / 2$ 5/16
maybe [20] 21/19 21/19 34/25 44/3 55/9 55/10 71/20 83/10 105/17 105/17 111/11 111/22 112/1 139/13 148/15 162/21 166/21 170/15 171/17 171/18 me [59] 1/20 2/2 2/6 2/7 2/17 15/22 25/3 32/11 44/21 55/11 59/10 59/16 68/25 70/6 73/14 79/1 80/12 83/5 87/2 89/13 90/8 97/5 103/7 107/17 110/13 111/3 111/10 111/11 111/12 112/13 125/20 126/19 132/15 134/11 134/19 134/19 136/14 136/15 148/10 148/12 154/9 156/2 165/18 168/24 170/4 174/17 178/1 186/15 187/12 187/17 190/20 191/18 192/7 197/20 198/9 199/3 199/12 200/9 201/10
mean [66] 15/2 15/7
15/8 15/10 16/10 17/5 19/18 21/10 21/18 21/22 26/4 29/17 29/18 31/5 33/1 33/9 33/9 35/13 40/24 41/15 52/10 53/5 54/3 54/21 54/23 55/2 55/23 60/5 60/20 62/5 65/8 73/13 78/22 79/6 82/21 87/8 88/10 90/3 90/19 91/13 92/20

99/1 99/15 102/11 107/9 107/19 107/21 107/23 113/2 113/16 119/1 120/6 123/11 125/14 127/17 135/9 139/14 140/25 141/5 146/4 154/11 158/7 164/5 197/19 197/20 201/12
means [5] 52/11 78/24 107/18 163/4 176/15
meant [8] 35/22 38/24 107/14 126/9 127/25 165/19 170/4 171/1
measure [4] 35/22
38/24 40/14 40/22
measures [1] 19/10 media [2] 113/8 113/9
meet [2] 99/9 163/19 meeting [29] 72/12 113/22 114/7 114/13 114/15 114/22 115/2 115/8 115/13 115/14 115/18 115/22 115/24 120/9 121/7 121/17 121/22 122/10 122/18 123/5 123/22 124/4 124/10 124/24 181/17 181/20 181/22 182/2 182/4
meetings [5] 20/23 20/24 21/17 21/19 126/20
member [3] 30/18 30/23 59/19
members [5] 19/5
34/17 47/1 48/20 67/23
membership [1] 117/21
memo [1] 27/10 memorable [1] 174/17
memory [10] 30/25
31/13 41/25 48/25
53/19 64/7 174/16
174/22 188/5 188/24
mention [8] 78/18
177/22 178/13 178/19 179/17 179/20 180/7 180/9
mentioned [9] 24/14 32/1 61/2 76/2 82/14 143/15 151/6 161/3 169/22
mentor [1] 10/20 mentored [2] 10/21 10/22
mentoring [2] 10/14 10/18
merits [1] 54/10
message [22] 78/18 misfortune [1] 59/21 78/21 78/23 78/25 missed [1] 29/19 80/4 80/10 81/3 81/10 missing [5] 30/2 64/1 81/24 85/10 139/7 64/2 94/18 173/1 155/6 188/11 188/12 mistake [2] 83/21 188/18 189/3 189/6 102/13
189/9 189/11 189/16 Mitchell [3] 100/17 189/19 192/24 101/9 106/4
messages [5] 141/10 mixed [2] 62/23 141/12 153/24 154/1 191/9

## 155/3

met [1] 98/18
method [3] 20/7
21/12 22/1
methodically [1] 183/8
methods [1] $14 / 3$
metric [2] 35/22
35/25
metrics [2] 36/1 36/4
mid [3] 74/4 100/8 102/18
mid-2004 [2] 100/8 102/18
mid-2007 [1] 74/4 middle [2] 159/4 193/14
might [45] 15/14
15/22 16/19 20/4
21/15 22/4 22/23 34/9
34/22 38/16 39/19
45/8 48/3 49/6 54/2
54/7 56/5 60/23 63/25 71/15 89/19 89/24 90/7 90/11 90/17 97/7 102/1 109/17 109/19 111/1 112/2 114/20 115/20 125/23 128/9 146/9 155/8 155/11 155/23 178/4 185/19 188/24 194/3 202/11 204/20
Mike [1] 98/14
Miller [1] 97/24
million [1] 142/13
mind [22] 7/16 17/15
59/3 96/11 109/12 109/13 116/8 123/24 125/23 148/13 154/7 154/9 154/12 154/14 154/16 154/18 157/15 monthly [5] 21/18
167/22 171/12 194/21 $23 / 12$ 93/25 95/11 194/24 196/25
minimal [1] 129/10 minor [1] 112/19 minute [7] 122/17 124/9 124/9 146/10 193/10 198/21 204/12 minutes [15] 103/7 103/8 103/8 115/22 121/17 122/11 132/16 134/17 144/3 144/4 146/24 180/20 180/22 202/14 205/9

89/25 95/16 156/12
Mm [18] 13/25 17/18 19/2 40/18 45/3 45/13 45/15 54/19 88/23 89/7 94/2 95/15 97/8 98/11 122/20 137/4 147/4 188/3
Mm-hm [8] 13/25
17/18 19/2 88/23 94/2 97/8 147/4 188/3
Mmm [1] 29/10
MO [1] 55/14
mocked [1] 144/12
modus [2] 54/12 55/14
modus operandi [2]
54/12 55/14
Moloney [1] 187/21
moment [13] 14/17
14/21 37/3 56/6 57/16
80/16 80/17 107/7
115/21 128/25 146/10 161/23 178/16
moments [1] 184/11
momentum [1]
117/21
money [11] 32/25
36/7 37/15 88/10 90/1
127/11 129/5 132/22
133/6 135/13 135/19
monies [1] 133/2
monitor [5] 17/3
19/11 24/4 27/1 30/18
monitored [2] 86/17 86/19
monitoring [2] 26/7 136/21
monitors [3] 112/19
113/14 121/8
month [5] 69/9 69/20 129/10
months [7] 42/12
42/14 73/6 74/1 90/11
93/25 161/1
more [42] 4/7 6/20 7/14 18/15 29/4 29/15 29/23 42/20 45/20 51/23 53/16 55/5 55/12 63/5 63/5 64/8 79/2 88/15 89/20 90/21 92/17 92/19 92/24 93/10 111/25

121/12 123/16 128/1 129/3 138/10 160/1 165/19 169/18 169/21 171/14 175/11 176/20 186/1 195/23 200/24 203/1 205/12
morning [9] 1/3 1/8 56/12 188/1 188/13 190/2 190/7 192/22 205/19
most [7] 14/13 14/14 33/9 118/4 143/14 162/18 195/14
move [16] 47/10
77/21 100/3 103/3
125/22 133/25 174/1
174/8 175/2 175/6
175/18 196/1 200/14
202/11 202/19 202/22
moved [7] 5/11 23/13
37/4 42/2 44/14 44/20 57/23
movement [4] 23/20 23/24 44/9 44/9
moving [3] 37/2
67/24 139/10
MR [137] 1/7 1/8 1/13 1/14 1/17 2/20 2/22
2/24 38/11 44/2 46/17 46/21 46/23 46/25 47/6 47/9 56/16 79/17 80/6 80/11 81/25 87/16 93/22 96/18 97/2 98/3 99/19 99/23 100/6 100/8 101/18 103/17 107/17 109/16 110/12 111/24 112/4 114/2 114/3 114/3 122/23 123/11 123/18 124/7 124/12 125/14 130/15 130/17 130/23 131/16 132/6 134/9 136/4 137/14 140/2 142/24 143/16 144/17 144/24 144/24 145/6 145/6 147/3 147/5 147/10 148/2 149/9 149/14 151/10 151/14 153/22 154/15 156/9 159/21 160/17 161/8 162/12 162/12 162/15 163/10 164/13 164/19 165/8 165/21 171/23
172/23 173/15 173/21 174/3 175/3 175/20 176/6 177/2 177/2 178/24 178/25 179/8 180/15 180/19 181/7 181/11 181/14 181/20 182/1 182/2 183/17 184/1 184/7 185/25 186/2 186/6 186/13 187/7 187/12 187/20 187/21 187/25 188/6

MR... [19] 188/14 189/17 190/2 191/21 192/21 193/23 194/12 194/16 196/11 196/15 198/14 201/15 203/23 204/5 204/17 205/12 205/20 205/22 207/4
Mr Baines [3] 100/8
101/18 114/2
MR BEER [10] 1/7 1/13 2/22 187/25 188/6 188/14 190/2 192/21 205/22 207/4
Mr Castleton [5] 80/6 80/11 81/25 181/7 182/1
Mr Castleton's [1] 181/11

## Mr Dawkins [1]

 156/9Mr Dilley [2] 79/17 186/2
Mr Gallagher [1] 114/3
Mr Harbinson [3] 38/11 144/24 145/6
Mr Hayward [1] 130/15
Mr Holmes [2] 198/14 201/15
Mr Holmes' [1] 204/5
Mr Jenkins [23]
110/12 111/24 112/4 122/23 123/11 123/18 162/12 163/10 164/13 164/19 165/21 171/23 173/15 173/21 174/3 175/3 176/6 177/2
178/25 179/8 180/15 183/17 185/25
Mr Jenkins' [5] 148/2 162/15 165/8 172/23 175/20
Mr Legg [1] 114/3
Mr Marsh [2] 98/3 99/19
Mr Moloney [1] 187/21
Mr Pinder [3] 162/12 177/2 178/24
Mr Posnett [4] 132/6 136/4 144/24 145/6
Mr Scott [3] 44/2 142/24 143/16
Mr Singh [11] 46/17 46/21 46/23 46/25 47/6 47/9 130/17 130/23 131/16 134/9 137/14
Mr Stein [1] 205/12 Mr Thomas [2] 144/17 154/15

Mr Thomas' [8] 147/10 149/9 149/14 151/10 151/14 159/21 160/17 161/8
Mr Utting [8] 87/16 93/22 96/18 97/2 99/23 100/6 124/7 124/12
Mr Ward [33] 1/8 1/14 1/17 2/20 2/24 56/16 103/17 107/17 109/16 125/14 140/2 147/5 153/22 180/19 181/14 181/20 182/2 184/1 184/7 186/6 186/13 187/7 187/20 189/17 191/21 193/23 194/12 194/16 196/11 196/15 203/23 204/17 205/20
Mr Ward's [2] 147/3 187/12
Ms [24] 72/16 80/8 82/7 114/2 114/3 149/11 151/18 152/2 154/19 156/9 171/23 177/2 178/24 181/1 181/6 184/23 187/11 187/17 187/18 202/12 204/12 205/4 207/6 207/8
Ms Chambers [2] 80/8 82/7
Ms Cockett [1] 114/2 Ms Lowther [3]
72/16 171/23 177/2
Ms Matthews [4] 149/11 151/18 156/9 178/24
Ms Matthews' [1] 152/2
Ms Page [4] 181/1 181/6 187/11 207/6 Ms Page's [1] 184/23 Ms Patrick [4] 187/17 202/12 204/12 205/4
Ms Robson [1] 114/3 Ms Thomas [1] 154/19
much [18] 1/5 1/12 2/23 3/15 3/22 24/25 39/15 41/5 44/16 56/15 90/9 106/8 108/7 118/2 180/19 196/21 203/12 206/1 must [20] 2/7 2/17 12/25 17/7 19/23 40/19 40/20 51/9 51/24 52/2 100/10 106/13 111/16 127/19 135/2 173/24 182/1 195/13 198/24 201/10 mutual [2] 106/14

107/9
my [73] 1/8 22/15 22/19 23/4 34/15 41/23 45/22 48/25 49/2 49/25 60/18 61/4 61/24 62/12 62/13 62/23 63/9 63/10 63/15 65/1 65/4 66/24 73/23 73/25 75/8 78/3 82/19 82/25 87/6 88/9 88/11 88/13 90/22 93/12 95/18 97/21 98/5 99/15 100/15 108/25 109/13 110/19 116/3 128/10 131/12
131/21 132/20 134/22 134/25 138/9 139/11 142/14 142/19 143/15 144/16 145/5 158/25
160/21 163/25 166/21 167/22 170/5 177/10 178/23 183/4 183/14 185/1 185/11 187/10 187/20 188/19 191/2 201/2
myself [10] 13/12 36/13 62/7 63/10 63/12 63/14 107/16 107/22 123/12 178/1 mystery [1] 40/8

N
name [9] 1/8 1/10 72/14 141/11 187/20 196/15 196/17 196/20 203/8
named [2] 58/9
192/14
namely [1] 72/16
names [3] 190/12 203/4 203/6
Natasha [2] 31/14 32/10
national [3] 4/3 24/18 43/23
nature [5] 29/2 70/9
75/5 172/13 205/12
NBSC [2] 94/22
149/18

## NBSC/Legal [1]

94/22
necessarily [4] 65/23 75/25 78/14 152/16 necessary [16] 27/5 77/10 77/12 77/17 78/11 78/12 88/25 89/9 89/16 90/5 90/6 121/5 176/17 179/7 180/23 185/17 need [40] 17/1 47/16 52/3 52/14 58/10 65/15 71/8 76/1 85/9 88/8 88/13 88/18 92/22 116/7 116/11

116/15 118/11 118/17 non [5] 74/19 74/22 118/24 119/2 122/14 128/24 132/24 190/3 125/25 135/5 152/22 non-POCA [1]
153/11 154/25 155/18 128/24
155/24 156/4 156/13 non-polling [2] 74/22 156/14 158/1 160/18 190/3
160/19 161/10 164/1
177/15 177/22 183/8
204/17
needed [22] 12/5
12/12 13/15 22/9
25/14 46/22 60/8 60/8 63/19 88/15 92/23
96/3 101/20 103/22
111/17 112/2 118/10 122/15 122/18 123/7 148/16 154/7
needing [2] 77/2 145/11
needn't [1] 130/2
needs [7] 13/1 13/2 66/3 169/18 169/21 175/11 177/19
negotiating [2]
201/23 201/25
Neneh [16] 105/16 106/12 111/3 111/9 111/10 111/15 111/20 148/10 162/2 163/11 163/17 164/12 165/6 169/19 173/21 175/15 network [7] 4/3 24/8 50/18 191/10 192/2 192/11 196/9 never [11] 62/3 86/23 123/24 127/4 130/10 142/8 142/11 145/7 145/20 145/22 174/20 new [6] 59/19 103/3 127/14 138/9 148/13 202/1
next [17] 57/25 58/14 105/1 159/25 160/9 163/23 169/16 174/1 177/13 177/14 187/16 189/9 189/25 190/3 196/2 202/11 203/8 night [2] 134/2 139/12
nil [23] 111/22
148/14 149/19 149/22 150/1 150/9 150/12 150/16 151/6 151/6 155/1 155/12 155/13 155/21 158/2 160/21 160/24 161/9 161/24 162/10 163/19 166/22 170/6
nine [2] 55/9 55/10 no [285]
nodded [1] 80/25 nodding [1] 189/17 Noel [3] 6/10 147/3 147/7
non-prosecution [1] 74/19
none [1] 120/2
nonetheless [1] 107/9
nonsense [1] 146/1 normal [12] 147/23 158/7 166/6 166/15 169/23 170/1 173/8 176/1 176/4 176/24 177/23 201/3
normally [2] 140/24 148/17
North [2] 34/8 149/15
Northern [1] 24/24
not [233]
note [3] 85/3 124/9 191/2
notes [1] 181/24
nothing [4] 36/16
43/1 43/14 154/22
notice [1] 79/24
notices [1] 117/18
November [4] 128/6 190/18 191/9 202/25
November 2002 [1] 202/25
now [63] 1/15 2/24
3/3 12/6 12/20 12/21
16/23 30/4 34/10 39/6 44/1 50/4 51/20 56/5
66/2 83/11 95/3 103/4 103/8 105/15 106/21 107/5 109/7 109/8 110/18 110/19 114/19 115/5 127/24 134/2 137/19 147/18 149/19 160/2 161/1 161/1 161/14 163/12 165/25 167/6 171/6 175/3 175/7 186/18 190/9 191/5 191/11 194/4 194/18 194/24 195/15 195/18 196/7 197/3 197/14 198/20 199/17 201/8 202/13 203/12 204/10 204/18 205/19 number [30] 27/1 27/2 32/19 32/20 36/5 39/1 39/23 40/1 40/5 40/8 40/16 40/17 40/19 41/8 41/15 41/19 41/21 53/6 86/8 86/16 97/10 98/5 98/8 98/8 108/20 116/20 117/13 127/6 169/22 187/21
numbered [1] 166/24

N
numbers [7] 68/9
87/24 92/16 97/16 97/18 161/13 201/17
numbers 459 [1]
161/13
numerous [1] 41/22

## 0

o'clock [1] 134/14
object [1] 178/12
objected [1] 144/5
objection [2] 2/9 2/11
objective [1] 35/11
objectives [1] 35/3
obligation [1] 80/2
obtain [7] 16/25 31/2
69/7 69/19 71/15 76/1
136/25
obtained [7] 17/9
20/8 36/5 81/6 85/6 102/16 117/1
obtaining [9] 36/8
42/10 68/20 68/24
69/3 71/3 94/23
188/11 188/17
obvious [6] 29/18
40/5 64/1 126/18 144/14 152/14
obviously [22] 23/10
36/9 39/21 41/21
54/21 59/14 77/25 83/1 102/13 107/6 111/24 113/1 113/8 114/15 122/10 127/19 139/12 149/1 153/6 158/25 168/4 171/11 occasion [4] 12/11 12/12 148/9 179/5
occur [5] 10/4 22/24
160/25 162/11 177/17
occurred [4] 102/9
120/18 177/18 179/1
occurrence [1] 170/1
occurrence' [1]
169/24
occurrences [2] 166/6 166/16
occurrences' [1] 177/23
occurring [1] 41/10
October [5] 149/9
149/12 153/25 156/8 157/6
odd [3] 87/2 159/20 201/12
of' [1] 129/22
off [3] 38/16 61/4 79/8
offence [1] 58/3
offence/s [1] 58/3 offences [2] 58/18 139/8
offender [7] 58/21 58/24 60/6 61/10 61/12 61/14 61/19 offenders [2] 47/24 49/13
offered [1] 148/4 offering [1] 170/7 office [118] 3/9 3/24 4/19 5/19 7/22 7/24 14/5 16/7 17/3 21/6 22/22 23/10 24/10 25/25 26/11 30/13 34/6 37/13 37/14 43/3 44/20 45/11 45/24 on [247] 46/2 46/13 47/7 47/13 once [3] 95/9 129/3 47/21 48/24 49/9 49/14 58/19 59/18 59/23 61/22 72/2 72/4 72/9 72/15 73/3 74/25 75/5 75/6 76/24 77/6 81/15 81/16 83/1 84/25 85/8 85/16 85/23 86/13 86/17 87/1 89/24 90/1 92/11 95/23 99/9 100/14 105/21 106/15 108/9 108/15 112/15 116/1 116/21 118/7 118/24 119/3 119/19 122/19 123/6 124/2 128/24 129/5 129/12 129/21 129/25 131/3 131/4 131/8 131/20 132/24 136/2 136/6 136/21 141/8 142/12 144/25 145/8 145/9 145/23 147/13 150/16 150/20 151/25 152/8 152/16 156/12 156/21 160/7 164/6 165/4 171/5 176/15 177/24 182/13 183/21 188/8 191/17 191/21 198/11 198/22 199/19 203/5 203/6
office's [8] 33/11 49/12 88/21 109/19 131/10 133/5 152/24 153/13
officer [10] 9/23
46/23 62/11 62/14 62/22 63/7 63/8 63/10 63/12 63/14
officers [2] $8 / 19$ 31/10
offices [5] 24/20
30/22 91/23 108/21 199/15
often [4] 12/1 34/13 101/16 156/7
oh [8] 19/24 142/11 145/7 168/13 185/7 190/22 191/3 197/16 okay [38] 3/13 10/23 16/17 26/2 27/8 39/8

39/24 42/21 47/10 54/3 54/3 61/5 61/15 61/21 76/15 77/21 81/3 84/3 85/1 105/18 109/10 112/9 116/19 120/3 131/15 158/13 165/5 171/20 174/1 190/19 192/12 196/23 198/17 200/14 203/8 203/12 203/19 205/3 old [2] 138/11 142/19 omissions [2] 169/11 169/13
once [3]
189/11
one [68] 3/22 13/17
15/12 17/16 22/6 22/17 23/9 23/11 25/4 30/17 32/12 34/14 36/2 36/18 51/23 53/10 58/16 59/15 61/1 63/4 64/8 67/24 68/11 69/18 73/2 73/13 73/23 83/11 85/16 94/13 98/1 106/5 106/22 109/7 111/14 113/5 116/8 124/1 124/12 129/12 130/21 138/18 139/20 153/15 153/19 156/12 159/17 159/22 159/22 160/14 160/20 167/8 171/7 175/9 175/13 176/18 179/11 182/1 184/4 185/21 186/11 187/24 192/21 193/14 193/18 193/19 193/19 204/12
one role [1] 30/17
one-sided [2] 106/22 159/22
ones [4] 23/9 23/11 34/14 160/14
ongoing [1] 10/22 online [6] 149/20 155/10 157/13 160/23 161/25 162/9
only [20] 15/1 35/25 36/13 45/8 49/3 54/9 59/21 60/10 76/7 111/20 116/17 124/16 129/21 133/4 147/2 155/22 182/24 194/1 197/13 200/18
onto [1] 42/3
onwards [2] 70/13 147/6
Ooh [1] 62/20
open [5] 13/17 154/7 154/16 154/18 189/24
operandi [2] 54/12
55/14
operate [1] 154/14
operated [1] 118/13 operating [5] 125/12 152/24 153/13 167/24 168/8
operation [4] 16/2 16/10 176/9 176/24 operational [3] 58/2 59/6 150/7
Operations [1] 49/24
operative [1] 50/14
operator [1] 108/6
operator's [1] 189/7
opinion [5] 45/22
118/12 139/11 183/5 185/12
opportunity [1] 80/7 opposite [2] 109/25 185/2
option [2] 58/24 176/18
Optional [1] 203/1 or [247]
order [15] 7/4 16/25 58/5 129/4 129/18 129/19 129/22 130/1 130/7 130/9 130/9 136/22 162/14 179/1 179/8
orders [12] 37/22
46/20 129/7 129/8
130/7 131/14 133/7
133/9 133/12 133/17 136/15 136/19
organisation [2] 71/7 99/25
original [4] 98/15 98/19 154/24 168/2 other [46] $8 / 2110 / 6$ 18/20 21/9 21/12
21/16 31/25 32/7 36/1 36/18 44/16 45/16 45/25 51/23 54/10 61/1 73/3 73/4 77/2 79/9 79/14 82/13 85/17 85/20 91/17 91/20 91/21 92/3
95/24 113/10 116/18 123/25 136/11 150/1 150/14 151/4 151/5 153/15 155/11 155/18 159/19 181/7 193/21 198/25 203/5 203/21 others [4] 58/18 96/13 96/19 114/2 otherwise [3] 40/20 104/17 195/4
Ought [2] 88/24 89/8 our [30] 1/17 11/14 21/6 24/15 33/13 33/15 33/20 39/22 46/19 67/8 90/20 94/3 94/21 98/14 98/17 102/12 106/5 112/12 122/16 123/8 132/25

133/23 138/3 138/21 142/11 145/8 145/23 170/11 171/9 177/6 ourselves [1] 106/8 out [52] 8/16 22/10 22/16 25/16 26/11 28/15 29/17 44/10 44/11 44/14 50/21 59/21 61/7 64/1 73/1 74/16 84/1 93/25 113/3 118/25 119/3 119/14 122/8 130/7 139/6 140/20 140/24 141/10 141/12 142/17 142/25 143/25 144/18 146/5 146/6 147/7 149/14 149/22 155/20 160/18 166/7 172/19 178/6 178/8 178/18 180/24 180/25 184/11 189/13 189/16 192/4 192/6
out' [1] 106/2
outcome [1] 115/25
outlets [1] 195/3
outline [1] 65/20
outlined [1] 49/18
outlines [2] 152/23 153/12
outlining [1] 156/18 outset [2] 40/24 41/13
outside [5] 111/23
122/19 141/1 159/20 201/3
outsourced [1] 84/23 over [42] 2/22 16/23
21/11 23/6 26/8 32/7 43/16 53/20 54/2
54/24 55/5 56/1 56/18 57/18 57/23 68/22 71/6 71/7 80/3 86/24 91/17 91/19 92/14 92/25 119/20 122/13 129/10 149/19 156/19 159/16 159/19 160/19 163/23 173/6 173/11 173/18 173/25 174/6 180/3 180/20 197/4 201/1
overall [3] 5/18 99/12 118/14
overclaims [1] 18/10 overseeing [1] 26/2 oversight [4] 26/10 64/5 64/8 158/25
overtime [1] 202/13 overturned [1] 187/23
overview [1] 16/13
owe [1] 109/22
owed [1] 12/22
owes [1] 129/5
own [10] 45/9 48/21
(72) numbers - own

## 0

own... [8] 54/10
94/21 116/3 132/25 172/23 183/4 185/11 200/6

## P

PACE [6] 25/18 26/22 27/12 32/19 127/8 132/24
pack [1] 14/1
packets [1] 43/5
packets/parcels [1] 43/5
Pad [1] 155/14
page [106] 2/25 3/5 3/7 3/15 3/16 47/16 53/25 56/17 56/18 56/20 57/1 57/18 57/19 71/18 71/21 72/1 72/18 74/9 83/10 83/11 83/13 93/20 96/16 96/16 100/3 102/23 104/3 104/5 105/1 112/11 114/6 115/4 117/24 119/20 122/13 124/6 128/4 128/4 130/22 131/15 131/25 132/3 134/3 137/25 141/19 142/3 147/6 149/6 151/16 154/19 156/8 157/2 159/4 159/24 159/25 160/1 160/11 161/6 161/16 162/14 163/15 164/11 165/6 167/1 167/7 172/6 174/1 175/10 175/21 176/22 180/3 181/1 181/6 182/6 185/8 186/15 187/11 189/2 189/2 189/25 189/25 189/25 190/3 190/10 190/15 191/12 191/15 191/19 191/21 192/3 192/5 192/14 192/20 193/12 194/18 194/20 197/3 197/4 202/24 203/13 203/14 203/19 203/25 204/13 204/14 207/6 page 1 [6] 57/1
102/23 124/6 157/2 162/14 191/15
page 13 [1] 192/14 page 14 [3] 71/18 72/18 156/8
Page 15 [1] 154/19 page 16 [2] 151/16 192/20
page 17 [2] 189/2 189/2
page 18 [3] 189/25 194/18 203/13
page 19 [2] 204/13 204/14
page 2 [9] 3/5 3/7 141/19 161/16 164/11 190/10 191/19 197/3 202/24
page 20 [3] 104/3 104/5 203/14
page 21 [1] 74/9 page 22 [1] 193/12 page 23 [2] 147/6 203/19
page 3 [4] 83/10 167/7 182/6 185/8 page 34 [1] 112/11 page 35 [1] 3/16 page 37 [1] 96/16 page 38 [1] 96/16 page 4 [1] 128/4 page 44 [1] 100/3 page 5 [2] 47/16 128/4
page 7 [2] 160/1 192/3
page 8 [1] 159/24
Page's [1] 184/23 pages [2] 79/13 93/16
pages 31 [1] 93/16
pages 4 [1] 79/13 paginated [1] 28/6 paid [2] 34/18 98/6 papers [1] 65/9 paragraph [32] 3/5 47/16 65/16 88/19 96/12 103/19 104/2 104/5 111/13 112/11 112/12 115/14 115/17 125/18 125/24 152/17 153/11 160/22 162/8 164/15 166/24 172/2 172/7 175/21 176/19 177/13 177/14 177/19 181/9 185/8 187/14 194/7
paragraph 1 [2]
115/17 125/18
paragraph 112 [1] 112/11
paragraph 16 [1] 65/16
paragraph 22 [1] 125/24
paragraph 3 [1] 166/24
paragraph 4 [1] $3 / 5$
paragraph 42 [1] 103/19
paragraph 49 [1] 88/19
paragraph 56 [2] 104/2 104/5
paragraph 6 [1] 47/16
paragraph 62 [2] 181/9 187/14
Paragraph 90 [1]
112/12
paragraphs [13]
68/23 147/5 160/18
165/23 166/20 167/8
167/19 167/20 169/6
174/2 176/23 180/17 188/22
paragraphs 34 [1]
68/23
paraphrase [1] 185/1
parcels [1] 43/5
Pardoe [6] 34/4 34/7
34/13 100/6 128/6 128/9
part [23] 8/2 9/6
14/15 21/1 28/25 47/9
57/2 68/14 71/20 75/2
76/11 79/6 96/25
100/20 158/25 162/7
162/22 172/22 175/24
176/9 176/11 187/11
194/6
partially [1] 35/23
particular [9] 18/12
22/8 24/10 28/5 73/5
117/4 118/17 147/16
177/17
particularly [4] 45/6
152/17 156/16 184/25
parties [1] 80/1
parts [7] 25/4 45/25
57/23 72/25 116/23
123/23 199/12
pass [5] 8/15 8/16
66/6 148/17 180/13
passage [1] 68/22
passed [3] 27/3
27/13 161/1
passing [2] 27/19
73/23
past [1] 102/8
Pathway [1] 196/6
Patrick [7] 187/17
187/18 187/21 202/12
204/12 205/4 207/8
pattern [1] 24/13
Paul [2] 38/11 169/20
Paul Southin [1] 38/11
Pause [1] 50/3
pay [6] 34/18 45/14
97/11 97/14 99/16
129/6
paying [1] 129/10
Payment [1] 42/7
PC [1] 117/8
PC-based [1] 117/8
PCCI [2] 42/5 42/10
PEAK [1] 74/23
penalties [4] 43/6
43/7 86/22 89/19

Penny [12] 105/17 $\quad$ perspective [5] 39/3 106/12 111/15 111/20 39/22 66/24 93/12 156/9 156/23 157/24 101/2
160/20 161/7 162/2 persuade [1] 165/4
185/20 185/24
pension [9] 18/9
18/11 19/21 19/22
24/14 27/12 33/10
46/8 87/11
pensions [1] 24/16
people [26] $8 / 21$
Pete [1] 105/16
Peter [1] 182/10
phase [1] 19/7
phone [1] 53/6
phoned [1] 111/11
photograph [1] 59/24
physical [2] 102/21
21/10 32/1 35/9 39/13 148/22
43/21 44/10 44/14 physically [3] 27/17
44/18 44/22 51/3 27/19 65/11
94/21 95/4 95/23 96/6 pick [3] 82/8 82/9 96/8 96/10 108/24 103/18
109/21 115/10 135/11 picked [5] 82/5 82/17
135/19 139/8 142/18 83/7 83/9 84/5
152/3 203/5
people's [2] 7/16
174/16
per [10] 33/7 34/10
picks [1] 85/5
piece [1] 114/17
pieces [2] 11/9 11/12
PIN [2] 155/8 155/14
35/4 35/18 92/9 95/16 Pinder [7] 161/18
145/12 145/13 163/25 162/12 163/11 169/19
189/13
percentage [2] 34/24
145/11
perform [9] 7/5 25/24
36/23 62/10 128/7
147/24 148/5 149/11 156/22
performance [7] 7/11
32/14 33/19 34/16
34/18 118/14 195/4
performed [4] 27/24
64/13 64/14 183/23
performing [6] 33/21
70/5 70/12 72/7 73/11 100/9
perhaps [3] 17/1
144/23 165/5
period [18] 5/24
10/14 13/13 14/10
14/22 17/16 34/2
34/18 43/15 43/17
73/20 129/11 157/9
158/2 158/13 160/19
164/7 182/18
permitted [2] 88/15
89/20
person [19] 22/21
25/23 59/18 59/20
59/22 60/20 64/18
71/6 77/6 100/12
108/23 111/18 118/25
123/1 135/9 170/18
171/17 173/12 200/2
personable [1] 45/21
personal [4] 116/4
139/11 200/4 200/6
personally [8] 44/20
45/23 91/18 132/18
178/25 181/10 199/13
199/20

177/2 178/24 182/8
PinICL [7] 195/2
195/7 195/9 195/16
195/18 195/24 204/23
PinICLs [4] 195/1
201/17 203/16 204/23
pipe [1] 123/21
piped [1] 121/7
place [6] 19/11 57/8
67/24 68/10 176/18 192/9
placed [2] 88/5 89/19
plain [1] 5/18
play [2] 142/6 165/2
played [1] 67/22
plea [1] 102/17
please [147] 1/10 3/2
3/16 3/23 25/3 47/10
49/22 49/22 51/6 51/7
51/12 51/15 51/16
53/16 53/25 54/8 56/6
56/16 56/17 57/1
57/18 71/18 71/18
71/22 72/1 72/18
72/21 74/9 74/10
74/11 74/12 79/12
79/13 79/14 83/10
93/16 93/17 93/18
93/19 94/12 96/17
96/17 97/24 99/22
100/3 100/4 100/17
103/18 104/3 104/19
104/20 104/21 104/24
107/1 112/10 113/21
114/6 115/17 120/4
122/13 124/6 125/14 125/18 125/22 128/3 128/4 130/14 131/15 131/25 132/3 137/12
137/13 137/25 141/18
please... [73] 141/19
141/24 142/3 143/3 146/11 149/3 149/6 149/25 150/1 150/4 151/16 154/9 154/19 154/19 156/8 156/23 157/2 157/7 157/8 157/15 159/24 159/25 160/1 160/10 161/6 161/16 161/20 162/15 162/15 163/3 163/8 163/15 163/16 163/16 163/18 163/22 164/8 164/11 164/11 164/14 164/15 164/19 165/6 165/21 165/25 166/1 166/2 167/7 169/15 169/17 171/21 171/24 171/25 172/1 172/6 174/1 174/22 175/19 175/20 176/7 179/17 180/3 181/4 182/5 182/5 182/6 184/15 185/5 189/3 190/24 191/19 203/13 204/13
pleased [2] 141/25 170/20
plus [1] 201/12 pm [6] 103/12 103/14 146/16 146/18 146/22 206/2
POCA [9] 33/1 33/8 33/14 36/9 36/9 126/10 128/24 133/8 133/9
point [48] 2/9 9/22
12/18 21/6 23/22
23/23 23/23 24/15
24/17 30/12 36/19 43/24 44/7 49/9 57/18 57/19 57/25 58/14 64/1 76/7 85/6 85/15 86/22 87/9 87/16
87/22 97/25 98/23
113/1 115/1 116/4 147/12 153/14 156/14 163/4 167/1 184/23 186/18 190/22 191/24 192/14 192/18 195/9 199/7 200/14 201/14 202/7 202/18
points [3] 118/10 183/11 205/17 POL [2] 89/20 165/4 POL00047895 [1] 171/21
POL00081910 [1] 79/13
POL00104747 [1] 56/16
POL00105220 [1] 51/15

POL00105221 [1] 49/22 POL00114566 [2] 71/18 93/16 POL00119895 [1] 113/21 POL00121975 [1] 128/3 POL00329521 [1] 141/18 police [6] 8/19 11/4 70/3 132/24 137/7 137/8
policies [4] 47/11 49/11 71/25 85/22 policies/procedures [1] 49/11
policy [28] 5/2 12/9
22/7 22/12 49/12 57/3 61/6 62/24 74/7 84/12 119/15 131/3 131/8 131/10 131/19 131/21 132/23 133/5 139/5 143/16 188/2 189/1 191/22 201/23 201/25 202/2 202/8 204/10 polling [3] 74/22 190/3 192/24 poor [7] 88/13
107/11 107/12 107/17 109/3 173/7 176/3 poorly [2] 109/9 109/11
popular [1] 46/3 populated [1] 159/6 posed [3] 181/11 184/8 184/12 position [3] 96/3 152/10 170/22 positions [1] 4/6 positive [1] 43/25 positively [1] 66/19 Posnett [7] 132/4 132/6 136/4 141/21 142/15 144/24 145/6 possibilities [3] 150/1 151/5 155/20 possibility [2] 106/2 137/16
possible [6] 75/6 122/6 150/11 156/5 182/14 183/12
possibly [6] 58/11
90/10 138/17 139/16 183/16 203/13
post [105] 3/9 3/24 4/18 5/19 7/24 14/5 22/22 24/20 30/13 33/11 36/10 43/3 45/11 45/24 46/2 46/13 47/7 47/12 47/21 48/24 49/9 49/11 49/13 58/19
61/22 72/2 72/4 72/9

72/15 73/2 74/25 75/5 preamble [1] 57/15 75/6 81/15 81/15 83/1 preceded [1] 173/15 84/25 85/8 85/16 85/23 86/13 86/17 87/1 88/21 89/24 90/1 95/23 99/9 100/14 105/21 106/15 108/9 108/15 108/21 109/19 112/15 116/1 116/21 118/7 118/24 119/2 119/19 122/19 123/6 124/2 128/23 128/24 129/5 129/12 129/21 129/24 131/3 131/4 131/8 131/10 131/20 133/5 136/2 136/6 136/21 141/8 142/12 144/25 145/8 145/8 145/23 147/13 150/15 150/20 152/8 152/16 160/7 165/4 171/5 176/14 182/13 188/8 191/16 191/21 198/11 198/22 199/15 199/18 203/5 203/6
post-conviction [2] 36/10 128/23
postal [1] 31/10
postboxing [1] 67/11
postmaster [5] 54/16 55/22 90/25 156/16 176/14
postmaster's [2]
157/11 159/12
postmasters [3] 92/7 106/7 127/10
postmasters' [1]
173/9
potential [5] 17/25
58/18 117/25 119/9 119/16
potentially [3] 93/15 169/24 170/1
Power [1] 142/17 powered [1] 123/5
PowerHelp [2] 195/1 204/19
powers [7] 126/10
133/23 138/2 138/5 138/19 138/19 140/8 practice [8] 11/11 11/14 11/16 22/12 86/2 118/14 131/23 131/24
practices [2] 18/5 45/10
Pratt [3] 10/20 23/6 199/10
pre [5] 14/13 40/25 41/20 46/5 98/6 pre-2003 [1] 40/25 pre-Horizon [3] 14/13 41/20 46/5 pre-paid [1] 98/6
precedent [1] 36/8
predecessor [1] 86/1
1 predicting [2] 94/17 94/20
preference [1] 201/2
preferred [1] 32/21
prejudice [1] 192/10
preliminary [1] 99/5
prepare [1] 65/18
prepared [3] 60/6
65/7 77/7
present [5] 71/9 77/3
77/4 113/24 114/2
presentational [1]
28/13
presented [5] 28/11
71/17 78/7 178/6
178/19
preset [1] 159/6
press [1] 50/2
presumably [9]
88/16 120/9 127/9
130/13 132/16 142/20
142/22 143/3 183/19
presume [5] 33/20
91/25 101/19 115/2
201/4
presuming [1]
153/18
pretty [1] 174/17
previous [6] 37/24
97/18 98/12 135/22
150/21 160/21
previously [11] 53/8 81/18 97/16 98/14 106/1 111/12 166/1 169/23 170/2 174/2 194/19
price [1] 117/9
primarily [1] 55/19
primary [1] 99/8
principal [2] 108/24 108/25
principle [2] 1/22 1/25
printed [1] 83/18
printing [1] 83/19
prior [7] 6/1 33/14
70/14 98/4 99/14
149/18 156/20
prioritisation [1]
91/16
prioritise [2] 91/18
92/14
prioritised [4] 92/21
92/22 93/7 93/13
privilege [4] 1/23 2/1
2/4 2/16
proactively [2]
138/13 139/7
probably [19] 9/10
9/16 16/15 21/18

21/25 22/7 50/16 53/4 59/9 59/9 73/25 79/9 84/1 84/7 108/18
119/21 135/15 138/21 139/20
problem [11] 18/11 100/25 102/6 116/16 121/3 150/21 152/15 164/20 164/21 168/9 177/24
problems [8] 19/6
87/17 94/23 150/5 151/10 152/18 153/15 201/18
problems/restriction s [1] 94/23
procedural [12]
28/22 58/16 58/17 59/7 59/7 59/12 60/1 60/2 60/12 60/13 61/8 61/11
procedure [6] 11/6 29/5 59/6 59/7 59/23 204/3
procedures [3] 49/11 58/2 71/25
proceed [5] 27/15 39/20 152/22 155/19 157/17
proceeding [1] 48/3
proceedings [7] 6/13
69/5 70/9 81/19
101/12 133/3 133/8
Proceeds [6] 34/23
37/16 127/25 129/7 130/6 133/2
process [30] 22/18 27/6 29/5 29/23 36/21 73/7 74/4 74/15 75/13 78/2 83/18 83/19 86/3 92/1 114/8 114/23 115/19 115/23 116/7 116/11 116/14 116/15 116/21 117/22 118/1 147/16 154/6 184/6 186/23 201/3
processed [4] 18/18 37/3 160/23 162/9
processes [5] 18/5
57/9 57/24 74/5 117/7
processing [3] 48/14
51/5 82/12
processors [1]
156/15
produce [2] 48/6
172/4
produced [17] 16/19
17/12 17/20 20/1 20/5 25/20 70/10 114/10
114/14 121/15 124/22 125/16 161/10 164/1 167/22 168/17 186/13
produces [3] 17/4
127/16 171/10
(74) please... - produces
producing [3] 20/10 108/4 177/16
production [3] 37/22 70/24 194/9
professional [1] 7/1
profit [5] 142/12
145/8 145/9 145/17
145/23
progress [2] 24/4 27/3
progressively [1] 39/4
project [6] 5/11 42/3
42/4 42/11 42/14 43/17
prolonged [1] 129/10
promoted [1] 31/21
prompted [1] 74/6
proper [3] 108/19
185/22 205/16
properly [6] 108/12
109/23 110/22 111/19
167/24 168/9
proposal [1] 99/3
proposed [3] 13/8
75/17 97/5
proposing [3] 146/22
173/15 197/17
prosecute [12] 17/1
47/12 64/21 64/25
65/1 66/13 66/15
66/19 67/20 67/23
76/8 93/11
prosecuted [3] 64/18
133/14 187/22
prosecuting [6]
64/22 65/2 65/4
132/24 135/11 135/19
prosecution [45]
12/23 13/8 13/11
14/23 27/15 39/21
49/7 49/13 58/19 62/1
62/4 62/15 62/19
63/19 66/11 73/18
74/19 74/20 75/11
75/17 78/9 92/23
92/25 104/8 104/9
104/13 110/24 110/25
132/23 133/24 137/22
138/3 138/6 139/1 139/5 140/9 147/7
152/22 157/17 174/19
188/2 188/7 190/1
191/10 196/9
prosecutions [5] 46/14 47/13 135/1 139/23 171/9
Prosecutors [2]
66/22 67/3
Protection [1] 142/1 protocols [1] 85/22
prove [7] 70/18 91/11

106/17 106/18 107/10 queries [1] 195/5 query [5] 36/21 76/22 94/6
78/4 78/20 117/2
querying [1] 93/1
question [23] $1 / 19$ 1/21 2/3 2/8 2/10 13/17 43/22 44/24 88/13 89/2 90/12 92/19 107/17 134/19 136/14 154/25 164/7 172/13 172/14 183/14 195/8 195/17 197/22
Questioned [6] 1/7 181/6 187/18 207/4 207/6 207/8
questioning [1] 2/15
questions [13] 1/9 2/5 2/6 146/22 146/24 147/2 156/2 181/16 187/3 187/10 205/7 205/8 205/21 quickly [4] 188/16 191/6 191/11 192/20 quite [26] 34/13 34/24 35/1 37/1 39/25 43/19 44/23 54/3 66/1 66/4 69/21 78/1 84/8 86/23 90/20 99/2 123/4 135/22 138/8 138/17 151/21 153/21 158/8 164/20 184/1 191/11

## R

rack [1] 174/21
raise [8] 24/13 52/9
52/11 52/13 52/22
88/8 88/13 123/4
raised [11] 2/8 25/15 39/17 52/15 55/25 56/3 88/11 96/1 102/11 124/15 183/11
raising [4] 24/5 24/11
26/21 52/2
ran [1] 24/6
rang [3] 132/15
134/11 134/19
range [4] 90/17
155/20 157/6 160/3
rant [3] 142/16 143/14 146/4
rather [10] 29/25
41/8 94/13 98/15 124/14 130/8 138/15 158/10 185/20 205/14
rationale [3] 60/16
60/18 97/13
Ray [3] 10/19 23/6
199/10
re [3] 9/13 10/7 163/19
qualifications [1] 7/1 re-evaluation [2] quality [6] 28/8 28/16 $\quad 9 / 13$ 10/7 29/6 64/5 70/9 196/5 reach [1] 97/16
reached [2] 89/24
read [14] 3/13 29/8 80/15 83/4 97/17 163/22 164/13 168/25 184/11 192/3 192/6 195/12 195/13 198/10 received [4] 25/25 reading [3] 130/23 171/24 201/8
reads [2] 97/20 171/2 real [1] 96/1
realised [1] 144/10
realistically [1] 33/9 reality [1] 129/20 really [36] 12/14 17/9 20/11 22/21 27/6 42/8 recognised [2] 1/20 43/21 59/14 60/24 132/23
77/20 84/16 87/14 87/14 87/14 89/17 90/8 93/3 100/11
110/10 135/8 137/23
143/22 144/21 170/23
171/13 173/7 174/18
174/24 176/3 178/2
181/14 181/20 186/8
186/9 187/5 194/3
ream [1] 96/25
reams [1] 96/23
reason [6] 38/21
166/13 167/8 170/2 173/1 180/1
reasonable [4] 15/5
15/7 39/25 63/22
reasonably [1] 200/21
reasons [5] 155/11
162/21 166/3 172/11
175/23
rebooted [1] 112/20 rebooting [1] 113/17 reboots [1] 113/14 recall [88] 9/5 9/6 9/10 11/13 11/24 12/3 12/18 12/20 14/7 14/15 14/22 14/25 15/2 15/3 15/6 16/3 16/21 16/22 17/13 17/24 18/21 19/13 19/14 19/16 23/18 23/22 24/3 25/12 26/1 29/1 29/14 35/20 36/25 39/23 40/4 40/7 42/18 47/20 61/1 62/5 62/8 63/24 70/11 71/5 recruitment [1] 59/17 71/12 71/17 72/12 rectification [1] 82/18 85/8 86/12 88/2 19/12
90/21 92/4 93/5 96/15 red [1] 28/6 99/15 99/21 101/3 redacted [2] 82/22 102/7 102/13 102/15 102/20 107/5 122/5 122/9 123/12 126/3 131/21 136/16 137/19 138/8 145/14 150/17 150/19 153/9 158/8
receive [6] 7/4 7/7 16/1 24/5 69/3 69/24
160/20 165/17 181/10 181/12 181/20 181/21 187/5 187/5 195/22
195/25 196/20 201/25

83/8 92/11 150/8
receiving [5] 27/17
83/2 122/1 122/9
127/14
recent [2] 117/15 161/20
recently [2] 80/4 133/14
recollection [6] 65/1
97/21 124/4 134/13 153/10 182/3
recommendation [4] 120/12 122/7 122/21 204/5
recommendations
[4] 58/9 119/7
122/12 123/25
reconciliation [1] 176/17
record [12] 26/18
36/21 68/3 78/4 78/20
113/22 118/20 124/20
133/13 179/2 179/8
195/5
recorded [10] 25/1
27/8 118/18 136/23
149/22 155/21 182/15
183/20 195/3 204/20
recording [3] 26/24
133/16 182/24
records [1] 167/11
recourse [1] 12/1
recover [4] 133/2
133/6 137/10 145/11
recovered [1] 32/25
recoveries [2]
142/13 142/14
recovering [1] 36/7
recovery [16] 33/8
34/22 35/24 36/8 36/9
36/16 37/15 126/10
133/19 133/24 136/24
138/4 138/6 139/1
140/9 145/17 82/23
reduce [1] 43/5
reduced [7] 44/8
55/5 98/15 98/16
98/20 98/21 98/21
reduction [5] 97/6

R
reduction... [4] 97/18
98/4 98/12 99/12
redundancy [1] 143/8
refer [5] 12/5 15/21
160/22 161/4 167/11
reference [22] 28/3
28/5 28/20 29/20 48/7 67/5 74/10 98/5 99/8
101/5 119/25 145/11
154/24 157/4 158/13
180/10 186/16 190/25
197/6 203/16 203/17
204/23
references [2]
123/13 205/1
referred [3] 39/18
50/10 82/7
referring [12] 50/9
81/8 106/15 113/4
138/20 138/21 139/25
144/17 144/20 145/14
145/22 196/8
refers [3] 98/4 192/2 199/18
reflect [1] 109/12
reflected [2] 84/10 110/9
reflecting [1] 122/18
reflection [1] 149/1
reflections [1] 85/5
reflects [1] 109/13
refresh [2] 188/5 188/24
refuse [1] 87/8
refusing [3] 57/16
93/5 157/11
refute [2] 109/18 118/7
refuting [1] 159/10
regard [1] 151/13
regarding [2] 112/14 161/24
regardless [2] 55/4 55/25
region [3] 24/8 45/20 55/8
regional [6] 4/15 6/21
21/2 21/3 21/6 21/8
regionalised [2]
43/20 45/19
regions [1] 50/23
regularly [3] 23/10
115/6 141/12
regulate [1] 39/1
reiterate [1] 133/4
reiterating [1] 141/15
relate [5] 105/20
120/3 160/6 160/16 205/11
related [2] 34/18 148/14
relates [2] 160/21 205/13
relating [7] 2/13 27/11 74/4 111/21 172/4 195/7 195/16 relation [24] 6/10 12/15 12/22 23/8 46/11 47/12 47/17 48/21 49/1 49/12 61/5 72/11 74/16 85/17 102/8 147/10 147/13 147/16 152/17 160/3 160/13 174/19 177/21 192/18
relations [2] 58/7 58/21 relationship [6] 46/6 73/2 100/10 101/19 102/24 126/22
relatively [1] 115/10 relevant [28] 12/1 16/19 21/16 22/2 22/9 48/3 50/15 58/5 60/23 61/2 61/3 63/17 70/15 70/16 76/20 76/21 77/8 77/9 81/14 82/24 91/15 116/22 119/11 125/10 152/20 156/23 186/24 195/1
reliability [5] 19/1 20/4 20/9 38/6 169/7 reliable [4] 135/2
135/5 140/17 171/10
relied [1] 19/1
rely [3] $2 / 12 / 3$ 134/25
relying [2] 200/7 200/11
remain [3] 43/10 150/6 176/23
remained [1] 4/25 remaining [2] 95/19 172/2
remains [1] 176/21 remedial [1] 58/6 remember [71] 9/3 12/18 15/24 16/16 17/7 17/10 19/17 20/11 20/21 21/9 23/5 25/1 27/22 28/18 28/24 31/6 32/23 34/23 37/13 38/15 39/6 42/8 42/15 44/1 44/5 51/18 57/11 59/11 59/15 59/15 60/11 63/4 71/13 78/16 83/2 86/7 87/22 97/25 98/8 100/11 105/15 113/2 113/2 113/5 114/12 114/15 120/10 122/17 131/1 141/11 144/15 145/12 151/24 167/13 174/14 181/16 188/1 191/7

194/4 194/22 196/19 196/20 197/6 197/7 199/10 200/17 201/11 201/13 201/15 201/16 203/10
remembered [1] 101/7
remembering [1] 79/12
remind [1] 1/24
remove [5] 99/4
156/14 178/13 199/12 199/19
removed [4] 168/15
168/15 199/16 204/24
removing [1] 110/20
reopened [1] 156/21
repayment [1]
133/20
repeat [2] 89/2 119/2
replace [1] 171/19
replacing [1] 117/17
replicated [2] 159/22 163/14
replies [4] 154/20
164/19 175/16 176/6
reply [7] 83/14 142/3 143/4 144/3 156/1
162/16 164/14
report [29] 28/4
28/20 28/20 29/9
30/21 48/7 58/4 58/9 58/10 58/12 60/2 60/4 60/5 60/6 60/12 60/14 60/19 61/7 61/10 61/12 61/14 61/15 61/17 61/19 117/10 156/5 156/16 186/13 186/15
reported [2] 24/7 53/5
reporting [2] 45/12 57/14
reports [6] 25/19
57/17 59/4 74/22 152/14 190/3
represent [1] 187/21 representative [1] 1/20
representatives [1] 180/21
represented [2] 2/12 155/7
representing [1] 182/13
request [32] 75/2
75/2 75/14 75/17
75/20 76/8 76/18
76/19 77/14 77/18
78/10 78/20 81/13
81/16 85/7 88/21 90/7 90/18 112/12 112/12 131/9 157/21 159/1
160/4 188/17 188/19

194/9 194/12 194/15 199/2 200/18 201/4

193/10
restraint [2] 37/22 46/20
78/4 91/3 92/13 131/4 204/19
requesting [4] 36/20
80/20 85/24 86/6
requests [42] 31/4
37/2 73/7 73/15 74/16
74/18 82/13 85/17
86/9 86/17 87/10
87/15 88/14 88/20
89/20 91/16 91/17
91/20 91/21 92/2 92/7
92/14 93/5 93/13

| $92 / 14$ | $93 / 5$ | $93 / 13$ | retitled [2] 10/9 32/8 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $93 / 22$ 97/6 97/10 98/6 | retitling [3] $4 / 23$ 10/5 |  |  |

98/17 98/24 100/19
102/23 105/4 105/8
105/20 117/2 159/7
159/19 160/6 168/14
186/19 192/18
require [6] 99/5
117/25 119/5 155/23
160/12 177/8
required [19] 11/3
40/1 40/6 41/16 45/17
68/5 70/4 70/8 74/22
74/22 74/23 75/24
77/23 103/20 110/5
117/3 119/13 119/19
120/20
requirement [2]
44/13 123/18
equirements [8]
11/8 70/21 70/23 71/8 71/8 92/24 163/20 177/6
requires [1] 117/5
requiring [2] 40/9 41/8
reserved [1] 79/22
resource [3] 54/11
117/10 119/22
resources [1] 97/11
respect [1] $2 / 2$
respond [1] 183/11
responds [1] 185/22
response [10] 163/1
163/3 163/5 164/22
165/9 166/9 167/1
179/17 179/20 180/10
responses [2] 106/1 116/25
responsibility [10]
30/5 30/21 32/13 62/9
63/9 63/11 63/15
63/16 63/21 132/22
responsible [10]
23/20 27/16 31/4
47/24 48/14 48/17
81/18 108/23 109/3 186/23
rest [6] 32/23 80/15
95/17 115/22 172/12
restrictions [5] 86/24
87/2 94/23 95/6 96/14
restrictive [2] 87/21
90/12
restructure [1] 31/20
result [4] 85/7 99/10
115/18 157/21
resulted [1] 136/22
results [2] 79/9
119/24
Retail [1] 94/21
retitling [3] 4/23 10/5 10/6
return [1] 146/12
returned [3] 100/19
203/9 203/10
revealed [2] 139/18 170/22
revealing [1] 140/14
review [13] 27/14
67/8 102/15 111/11
126/17 126/19 148/7
148/11 148/12 192/25
196/5 196/24 203/1
Review/Issued [1]
203/1
reviewed [3] 191/16
195/2 204/19
reviewer [4] 198/11
198/20 198/21 202/1
reviewer's [1] 196/15
reviewers' [1] 190/12
reviewing [2] 126/22
147/21
reviews [1] 41/22
revisions [1] 165/22
rid [5] 142/16 142/24
143/11 143/21 144/18
right [105] 1/18 3/7
3/25 4/3 4/10 4/16 5/3 6/24 7/25 8/5 8/6 8/7 8/8 9/13 10/24 16/1
18/11 19/3 19/15 25/9
26/11 28/6 28/15 30/7
35/17 36/21 37/5
37/19 38/9 38/24
41/12 51/25 52/6
52/16 52/19 52/23
53/17 54/20 61/15
65/19 67/20 67/22
68/10 68/12 68/13
72/5 73/19 73/20
74/19 74/21 79/16
80/24 82/20 86/14
93/18 93/21 94/11
96/3 96/7 103/10
103/25 104/10 107/24
109/14 109/16 112/23
116/8 116/12 126/11
127/24 128/11 132/12

| R | S | 153/11 153/23 159/7 | 9 | 123/11 128/5 130/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| right... [33] 133/25 |  | 159/9 159/11 160/11 | 192/3 192/4 192/13 | 130/14 130/17 130/21 |
| 142/17 142/19 142/22 | safe [1] 200/23 | 163/23 167/23 168/8 | 19 | 142/9 146/19 149/8 |
| 142/25 143/7 147/10 | said [51] 2/19 19/25 | 169/16 170/10 170/24 | 194/14 194/18 194/19 | 152/13 156/7 156/14 |
| 147/15 147/21 151/2 | 21/20 44/25 55/2 55/4 | 173/15 174/3 177/1 | 196/25 198/17 202/24 | 156/24 157/3 157/3 |
| 154/14 154/15 157/3 | 56/21 67/13 69/11 | 181/24 182/12 183/2 | 203/15 203/19 203/19 | 159/22 161/16 161/20 |
| 158/6 161/4 168/13 | 76/4 77/21 84/8 87/16 | 183/7 183/9 183/13 | scrolling [6] 74/12 | 162/5 162/15 163/8 |
| 173/22 175/1 179/14 | 95/13 95/13 96/2 | 200/3 201/15 205/13 | 80/13 120/4 137/12 | 163/18 164/9 164/12 |
| 185/6 187/14 187/15 | 96/25 98/9 110/15 | saying [29] |  | 164 |
| 191/3 192/2 192/25 | 112/4 121/7 124/6 | 26/15 53/18 61/9 77/9 | search [3] 189/13 | 167/8 168/14 170/10 |
| 196/7 196/13 196/23 | 130/23 132/1 133/4 | 85/9 90/14 91/12 93/8 | 189/15 189/17 | 171/6 171/15 172/7 |
| 197/24 202/21 205/4 | 140/15 143/1 143/5 | 94 | searching [1] 186/ | 172/23 173/1 174/1 |
| 205/17 205/25 | 143/7 143/21 144/17 | 110/12 130/11 130/12 | seated [1] 121/12 | 178/22 179/17 179/20 |
| right-hand [10] 74/19 | 148/10 148/16 155/24 | 148/11 156/9 166/15 | second [27] 25/6 | 179/25 181/3 182/7 |
| 74/21 79/16 82/20 | 162/4 164/21 166/8 | 166/18 170/8 182/21 | 43/4 52/18 57/19 | 182/8 185/3 189/3 |
| 93/18 93/21 94/11 | 167/13 170/2 173/18 | 184/19 184/24 185/1 | 72/19 83/22 104/5 | 189/4 190/1 190/4 |
| 157/3 196/7 196/23 | 174/3 180/16 181/9 | 194/10 197/18 197/25 | 104/6 126/15 126/16 | 190/11 190/12 190/14 |
| rightly [1] 140/22 | 181/17 184/7 184/10 | 198/2 198/16 | 126/22 131/16 140/3 | 190 |
| ring [2] 70/6 79/1 | 184/11 184/20 200/8 | says [32] 3/9 3/11 | 140/5 140/6 140/10 | 191/16 191/16 191/20 |
| risk [2] 1/21 116/23 | 202/14 202/17 | 52/25 53/22 54/8 | 151/13 153/1 163/3 | 191/20 192/14 192/20 |
| Road [4] 105/23 |  | 54/23 97/3 105/10 | 164/2 164/8 164/15 | 193/2 193/12 193 |
| 105/25 106/6 160/9 | Sally [1] 130/18 | 142/3 145/7 145/22 | 172/2 172/3 172/6 | 193/15 193/18 193/23 |
| Rob [1] 128/6 | same [23] 4/25 7/13 | 152/5 165/7 165/21 | 180/3 193/18 | 193/24 194/5 194/ |
| Robson [1] 114/3 | 7/14 16/12 23/9 34/21 | 166/2 168/20 170/10 | seconded [1] 42/3 | 194/17 194/24 194/25 |
| robust [4] 134/24 | 37/13 47/1 49/13 | 171/4 185/9 191/12 | secondly [1] 151/9 | 196/1 196/5 196/10 |
| 135/2 135/5 140/17 | 52/19 85/4 93/17 | 192/1 194/7 194/13 | section [12] 46/20 | 196/11 196/14 196/15 |
| robustly [2] 133/1 | 94/14 102/1 109/20 | 195/6 197/10 198/18 | 70/3 70/6 70/7 72/22 | 196/23 197/1 197/4 |
| 140/21 | 116/24 122/11 155/8 | 200/15 200/19 201/6 | 84/11 105/10 159/3 | 197/5 197/14 197/15 |
| robustne | 166/8 167/5 177/19 | 202/6 203/11 204/18 | 193/12 196/15 197/7 | 198/24 202/24 202/25 |
| 112/14 | 189/25 201/6 | scan [2] 189/23 | 203/21 | 203/2 203/3 203/4 |
| R | sarcas |  | Section 16 [1] 46/20 | 203/4 203/6 203/8 |
| role [43] 7/5 9/17 |  | scenarios [1] 149/21 | Section 69 [2] 70/3 | 203/15 203/16 203/20 |
| 16/19 23/13 23/25 | sat [1] 124/1 | schedule [2] 13/22 | 70 | 03/21 203/22 203/24 |
| 25/11 25/24 30/17 | satisfied [1] 71/9 | 14/6 | Section 7 [1] 84 | 204/1 204/14 205/25 |
| 31/21 31/24 33/21 | Saubelle [2] 10/18 | scheduled [3] 21/17 | security [45] 5/3 5/6 | seeing [2] 82/18 |
| 34/15 37/4 42/21 43/5 | 23/5 | 21/20 119/4 | 5/8 5/12 5/22 8/2 | 123/13 |
| 43/10 44/15 47/12 | save [3] 186/14 |  | 33/24 35/14 35/21 | k [6] |
| 47/17 48/2 49/2 61/21 | 198/7 203/12 | Scotland [1] 24/24 | 42/2 43/16 43/18 | 90/6 129/21 130/7 |
| 61/24 61/25 62/11 | saw [5] 63/12 96/3 | Scott [7] 44/2 138/24 | 43/19 44/3 49/23 | 133/1 |
| 62/12 67/22 68/20 | 111/9 123/13 197/23 | 142/16 142/24 | 58/2 59/6 64/23 65/3 | seeking [3] 37/15 |
| 69/17 70/5 70/12 82/3 | say [98] 7/22 12/21 | 143/16 144/18 | 71/25 72/10 91/17 | 133/7 133/8 |
| 100/8 119/8 119/25 | 13/2 13/21 16/6 16/13 | screen [4] 49/25 50/2 | 91/18 92/14 93/13 | seem [3] 153/19 |
| 120/5 121/5 128/9 | 16/15 18/20 19/18 | 50/7 182/5 | 95/24 100/18 106/23 | 192 |
| 177/10 191/25 199/24 | 23/16 29/4 31/17 | screens [1] 121/4 | 107/2 126/1 128/13 | seemed [6] 44/7 |
| 202/2 202/8 | 34/14 35/13 35/18 | scroll [77] 51/7 51/12 | 128/14 136/12 138/9 | 45/21 45/22 52/21 |
| roles [3] 6/4 44/16 | 36/2 41/7 41/11 41/14 | 51/16 53/16 54/8 | 13 | 151/2 151/2 |
| 128/12 | 47/6 47/17 50/16 | 72/21 74/9 74/12 | 141/2 141/3 151/20 | seemingly [1] |
| roll [1] 69/10 | $53 / 1053 / 1355 / 1$ | 79/25 82/18 83/12 | 151/23 193/22 199/8 | seems [8] 61/5 72/15 |
| rollout [3] 6/1 6/2 | 60/4 62/5 62/20 64/7 | 93/19 93/20 94/11 | 203/22 | 74/4 81/4 173/7 176/3 |
| 19/8 | 65/16 67/22 75/8 77/9 | 94/12 94/16 96/17 | see [150] 1/3 16/9 | 178/24 179/1 |
| roughly [1] 73/21 | 82/12 86/3 86/4 86/22 | 97/1 97/24 100/4 | 25/6 39/20 49/23 50/6 | seen [11] 63/14 |
| row [2] 52/14 53/12 | 89/13 92/3 92/4 93/3 | 104/19 104/21 104/23 | 51/7 56/12 56/17 | 73/12 80/10 83/4 |
| Royal [3] 8/10 43/3 | 100/16 102/3 104/5 | 104/23 104/25 105/4 | 56/19 56/21 57/1 63/9 | 144/15 150/20 160/14 |
| 46/13 | 105/5 109/17 110/2 | 105/9 105/18 128/4 | 65/6 71/19 71/23 72/ | 173/14 178/15 179/9 |
| RQuery [1] 189/12 | 110/15 111/1 112/15 | 130/14 137/13 141/19 | 72/18 72/22 72/25 | 7/19 |
| Rugby [4] 113/23 | 116/8 120/6 121/1 | 141/24 143/3 143/10 | 73/17 74/14 74/20 | segregate [1] |
| 115/8 116/10 123/5 | 122/5 123/21 124/16 | 149/7 149/25 154/19 | 77/14 79/16 79/18 | segregated [1] 43/8 |
| rule [3] 2/10 60/11 | 125/9 128/20 132/6 | 157/6 160/10 161/17 | 81/3 83/13 84/10 94/4 | segregation [1] 43/2 |
| 84/1 | 136/17 137/2 137/14 | 162/15 163/16 163/22 | 95/17 96/18 97/24 |  |
| rules [1] 80/2 | 137/23 138/1 138/8 | 164/8 164/11 164/19 | 100/5 100/17 101/6 | selected [2] 107/20 |
| rumblings [1] | 138/18 139/12 139/13 | 165/21 166/2 169/1 | 102/18 102/23 103/1 | 189/6 |
| run [2] 22/17 156/5 | 140/12 140/25 141/14 | 169/16 171/23 171/25 | 104/21 105/1 105/9 | selective [2] 55/6 |
| running [1] 68/5 | 143/11 152/5 153/8 | $\begin{aligned} & 175 / 7 \text { 175/20 179/16 } \\ & 179 / 25 \\ & 182 / 6 \\ & 190 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105/10 106/21 113/22 } \\ & 114 / 2 \text { 115/21 116/4 } \end{aligned}$ | self [4] 1/15 1/23 2/4 |

self... [1] 2/14
self-incrimination [4] 1/15 1/23 2/4 2/14
send [6] 29/13 68/1 141/10 155/5 156/19 162/1
sends [3] 130/15 130/17 139/6
senior [22] 23/21
25/23 32/14 32/16 33/19 33/22 44/8 46/14 46/22 98/1 100/12 101/22 108/15 115/10 128/8 128/13 132/19 138/21 140/19 140/25 140/25 141/5
seniority [1] 101/25
sense [3] 25/3 70/2 146/3
sent [22] 22/10 25/21 47/5 48/9 59/25 61/6 61/8 101/5 111/10 145/15 161/9 163/10
163/21 173/20 173/21
174/11 174/23 175/15 186/16 197/20 201/11 202/1
sentence [9] 69/16 94/19 94/25 95/3
104/6 111/13 158/14 171/18 187/13
sentiment [1] 171/15 sentiments [1] 144/7 separate [11] 9/8 9/10 37/12 58/4 58/10 61/17 62/11 86/10 109/22 160/12 200/21
separated [1] 46/13
separately [1] 60/9
September [1] 157/6
series [1] 24/9
serious [6] 113/19
116/5 152/7 153/2
153/4 153/6
server [1] 189/8
service [7] 31/1
73/18 92/24 112/23
119/14 195/8 195/17
Services [11] 57/20
58/11 60/10 60/13 62/10 62/12 75/23 76/4 76/7 77/22 94/22
session [2] 9/4 9/7
set [5] 28/15 93/24
147/6 189/13 189/16
sets [3] 73/1 149/22
166/7
setting [4] 61/7
119/14 122/8 155/20
settled [1] 118/4
Sewell [2] 105/17 182/10
shall [4] 189/6 189/12 194/8 197/17 share [1] 180/24 sharing [2] 21/13 22/1
she [20] 10/18 23/5 23/5 31/15 72/7 72/11 72/13 148/12 149/13 149/14 149/14 149/15 149/22 151/1 151/4 151/5 151/9 151/13 151/14 165/6
she'd [1] 111/11
she's [7] 130/22
155/20 155/24 157/24
165/7 165/8 165/9
sheet [2] 102/22
196/5
short [6] 27/10 56/10
59/18 79/24 103/13
146/17
shortage [7] 76/12
76/16 76/17 77/5
77/12 77/15 157/16
shortfall [2] 90/25
91/2
shortfalls [2] 127/9 145/12
shorthand [1] 1/22
shortsighted [2]
133/25 139/4
should [32] 2/11 3/2 3/13 25/7 27/15 52/15 55/1 58/4 58/6 58/12 71/17 85/2 97/9 97/14 119/8 119/25 128/23 142/1 153/7 157/16 159/14 159/18 183/5 186/24 186/25 187/1 187/1 198/12 200/5 200/5 200/12 200/12 shouldn't [2] 149/1 153/6
show [8] 76/25
107/25 108/3 108/10 118/17 147/20 148/1 156/6
showed [4] 77/1 77/3 84/11 188/7 shown [3] 69/22 85/20 166/12
shows [3] 135/24
144/4 154/10
side [21] 3/22 30/14
30/24 31/14 31/15
48/5 74/18 74/19
74/21 75/1 78/20
79/16 82/20 93/18
93/21 94/11 94/12
157/3 196/7 196/23
200/14
sided [4] 106/22
153/19 159/17 159/22 slowdown [2] 126/8
sides [1] 78/17
sight [8] 66/11 126/15 126/16 126/22 140/3 140/5 140/6 140/10
signalled [1] 39/8 signature [2] 3/16 162/3
significance [1] 136/5
significant [8] 6/4 85/1 169/10 169/13 181/13 184/14 184/25 186/10
significantly [2] 39/23 41/1
similar [5] 24/12
31/24 150/21 152/18 192/21
simple [2] 79/3 117/5
simply [2] 99/24 105/10
since [6] 15/20 59/9 174/9 176/19 187/23 189/23
Singh [16] 46/15
46/17 46/21 46/23 46/25 47/6 47/9 130/15 130/17 130/23 131/16 131/25 134/9 134/18 136/8 137/14
single [4] 36/19
85/15 98/23 147/12
singularly [1] 63/14
sir [29] 1/3 1/16 56/5
56/8 56/12 69/11 103/3 103/9 103/11 103/15 146/9 146/11 146/13 146/19 146/21 174/14 180/20 181/3 185/5 187/15 187/17 191/2 202/14 202/19 202/23 204/13 205/5 205/8 205/18
sit [1] 180/22
site [6] 11/20 11/21 11/23 156/20 195/8 195/17
six [8] $12 / 1113 / 13$ 14/10 14/22 74/1 80/3 90/12 161/1
six-year [3] 13/13 14/10 14/22
size [2] 68/13 148/22
skilled [1] 117/9
skills [1] 117/8
skip [2] 71/20 177/13
skipping [1] 80/3
sleep [1] 50/3
slightly [3] 44/19
177/4 191/6
slow [4] 126/8
126/23 127/6 139/22

127/18
slowed [3] 126/4
126/14 127/24
slowing [1] 126/18
slowly [1] 172/1
small [3] 43/19
117/14 196/3
smiley [1] 142/2
Smith [1] 142/18
so [271]
solicitor [3] 2/12 2/14 2/16
solicitors [3] 46/15
182/20 183/1
some [55] 6/19 7/16
12/18 12/19 17/8
39/19 43/23 57/16
58/16 59/14 71/7 73/3
73/5 77/2 82/21 87/22 87/23 94/18 95/4
100/18 100/21 110/17 113/1 119/1 120/2 126/23 127/19 130/13 133/15 134/16 141/22 147/21 148/4 154/22 155/3 156/2 162/25 163/6 164/4 164/23 165/1 165/5 166/24 167/2 175/5 175/17 176/11 179/17 188/18 192/5 193/10 196/24 198/7 199/14 199/18
somebody [31] 22/2 30/16 30/19 50/1 72/13 72/15 82/14 83/21 92/25 101/16 111/16 112/2 120/21 122/19 123/6 123/9 123/16 123/19 124/2 131/9 151/1 154/6 170/21 179/8 179/11 190/20 192/6 199/8 200/7 200/8 201/9
someone [6] 106/2
106/13 141/11 170/11 174/20 182/14
something [34] 8/10
18/1 18/22 18/25 31/1
45/2 50/21 57/11
68/12 69/11 71/10
78/25 79/2 79/5 81/5
82/8 82/11 84/4
100/11 107/14 107/19 113/15 120/12 120/13 120/17 120/20 121/12 127/12 162/1 162/13 172/19 176/7 187/25 200/7
sometimes [4] 53/8 83/18 90/10 139/13
somewhere [6] 16/7
34/8 55/8 111/10 143/18 180/23
soon [2] 183/11
183/22
sorry [48] 3/7 14/9
17/10 25/22 26/8 26/9 28/12 50/1 59/16 61/4 61/11 62/23 64/20
69/11 69/14 70/6
74/10 75/11 75/16 76/3 77/11 77/25
78/24 82/23 89/2
91/21 93/9 105/7
107/2 110/18 112/4
124/5 137/12 139/2
140/4 153/10 159/16
168/5 169/16 171/24
172/18 174/14 180/20
182/4 184/10 201/13 203/13 204/16
sort [29] 7/13 8/16 9/20 10/23 12/19 16/7 16/13 16/14 17/8 24/17 31/9 40/8 42/9 45/5 51/20 57/15 78/3 80/9 82/6 162/25
163/6 164/4 165/17
166/25 167/2 178/1
180/24 188/23 200/18
sought [2] 46/21
128/23
sound [5] 28/13
139/13 195/18 195/20
195/20
sounds [2] 161/5 189/14
source [1] 24/15
sources [1] 155/23
south [11] $4 / 104 / 13$
4/15 6/21 21/1 21/7
24/8 44/12 44/12 45/20 143/18
Southin [1] 38/11 speak [5] 36/13 150/15 160/4 178/25 202/13
speaking [7] 53/9
81/5 140/13 150/14 167/5 169/6 181/2
speaks [1] 81/3
special [1] 198/3
specialist [1] 156/15
species [5] 18/22
18/25 20/7 81/23 82/13
specific [8] 15/21
22/25 59/11 118/9
118/16 123/17 165/3
193/21

## Specifically [1]

199/14
spend [2] 134/17 163/12
spoke [9] 26/8
132/15 142/17 142/25
144/18 146/5 146/6
159/16 178/24
spoken [3] 33/11
spoken... [2] 97/4 150/25
spot [1] 49/2
spreadsheet [9] 24/6 24/7 26/19 26/20 68/5 69/25 86/12 133/12 152/13
spreadsheets [3] 163/25 168/24 177/16
St [1] 34/9
St Helens [1] 34/9
staff [11] 30/6 30/15
30/18 30/23 31/11
32/10 47/18 49/15
59/19 119/14 120/1
stage [5] 2/1 2/15
20/3 25/22 198/4
stages [2] 73/24 152/21
stakeholder [1] 99/8 stand [1] 132/21 standard [7] 28/9 66/18 180/4 180/14 185/25 188/22 199/16 standards [7] 5/2 12/9 22/8 57/8 57/14 62/24 191/22
start [13] 41/4 41/9 47/12 70/13 94/19 96/16 104/22 128/3 141/19 149/5 149/6 166/1 188/4
started [5] 33/1 38/16 74/2 87/15 122/23
starting [1] 6/20
starts [1] 111/14 state [3] 109/12 109/13 116/8
stated [1] 177/15
statement [135] 2/25
3/1 3/19 9/6 11/1
11/19 22/16 29/20 29/21 31/16 32/13 34/1 46/12 47/15 50/12 64/2 65/15 66/9 67/17 68/22 68/23 74/24 76/1 77/22 78/6 78/12 85/14 86/8 86/16 88/18 89/3 90/24 95/13 100/24 102/5 103/19 103/22 104/2 106/3 106/11 109/1 110/2 110/5 110/12 110/23 111/11 111/15 111/17 111/25 112/3 112/5 112/10 123/14 123/17 123/17 123/19 125/24 125/25 147/5 148/2 148/14 152/22 153/12 154/9 157/18 160/4 160/13

160/22 161/2 161/11 161/24 162/3 162/8 163/9 163/18 163/23 164/9 165/3 165/5 165/8 165/8 165/18 165/24 167/16 168/10 168/17 169/18 169/21 170/8 170/11 170/15 170/24 171/22 172/2 174/7 174/10 174/12 174/19 174/22 175/9 175/11 177/3 177/9 177/15 177/19 178/9 178/13 178/15 178/16 178/19 179/2 179/8 179/11 179/14 179/16 180/1 180/4 180/6 180/9 181/9 184/7 184/18 184/24 185/3 185/20 187/12 188/21 188/22 199/5 199/13 199/20 200/3 200/5 200/10 203/20 statements [13] 20/17 29/9 46/20 68/21 111/21 122/24 147/19 147/21 148/8 167/21 169/6 190/4 200/1
states [2] 58/22 177/19
station [2] 137/7 137/8
stationery [1] 30/16 statistics [6] 32/14 32/16 33/19 33/23 34/16 136/18
stats [3] 133/11 137/3 137/5
status [1] 176/16 stay [1] 203/22 stayed [1] 42/13 staying [1] 87/7 stealing [1] 127/10 Stein [1] 205/12 stenographer [2] 69/11 69/15
step [1] 51/9
Stephen [2] 84/22 182/13
steps [5] 51/7 51/23
74/20 98/19 138/12
stickers [3] 28/15 68/10 148/22
still [10] 32/4 59/1 127/9 127/10 134/23 140/15 141/22 148/8 191/25 204/16 stock [3] 7/11 7/18 7/20
stocktake [1] 77/3
stolen [2] 18/11
133/2
stop [6] 72/24 99/22

135/1 139/23 143/3 163/22
stopped [4] 24/17 127/8 127/24 142/12 stopping [4] 25/22 75/16 106/14 135/6 store [20] 78/18 78/21 78/23 78/25 80/5 80/10 81/3 81/10 81/24 85/10 188/12 188/13 188/18 189/3 189/6 189/10 189/11 189/16 189/19 192/24
stored [1] 17/4
stores [1] 30/16 story [1] 59/18 straddled [1] 14/18 straight [2] 148/17 171/4
straightaway [1] 33/5
straightforward [2] 94/21 154/22
strategies [1] 47/11
strategy [6] 44/5 49/7 49/7 123/24 136/1 136/12
strict [1] 131/19
strong [4] 133/22
138/2 138/4 138/18
struck [1] $87 / 2$
structure [3] 28/2
28/20 45/11
struggling [1] 78/2 studies [1] 159/20 stuff [3] 70/2 199/14 201/2
sub [1] 108/21
subject [7] $71 / 2$
71/11 105/4 132/15
182/10 192/10 201/4
submission [1] 102/9
submissions [1]
205/22
submit [3] 46/17
46/25 47/7
submitted [7] 46/19 64/11 65/16 93/24 100/19 101/12 152/25 submitting [1] 102/4 subpostmaster [12] 19/19 19/20 48/4 91/11 92/11 93/1 117/15 118/9 129/16 146/23 149/17 150/3 subpostmasters [19] 17/1 46/1 47/14 48/6 49/14 92/15 92/18 93/11 106/19 122/1 131/2 138/15 144/11 144/14 145/1 154/10 180/22 181/8 187/22 subpostmasters' [2] 46/6 142/5
subsequent [1] 9/6
subsequently [2]
118/4 122/23
substance [10] 4/25 29/5 29/25 45/16 64/5 68/17 104/13 105/18 148/24 166/7
substantial [1]
157/16
substantially [1]
163/13
successful [2] 133/1
189/11
such [29] 2/7 11/13
12/25 15/2 15/19
19/11 36/25 58/12
61/22 63/8 86/23 91/7
99/7 111/17 112/19
113/19 115/23 116/20 117/8 118/22 119/18 122/14 165/16 166/6 166/15 176/11 176/13 176/14 177/24
sudden [1] 155/23
suddenly [1] 138/15
Sue [3] 72/2 72/4 72/12
suffered [1] 133/6 sufficiency [3] 67/6 67/14 67/15
sufficient [5] 22/19
67/9 129/17 147/1 162/18
suggest [8] 115/25
121/18 121/19 121/20 148/8 156/17 162/19 176/7
suggested [7] 65/21
115/22 169/22 175/12
176/1 178/17 179/11
suggesting [2] 97/17
185/19
suggestion [3]
110/25 118/7 179/13
suggestions [1]
148/3
suggests [4] 144/1
183/17 186/23 189/15 sworn [2] 1/6 207/2
sum [1] 129/9
summaries [1] 25/20
summarised [1]
163/13
summarising [1]
27/11
summary [4] 101/11
147/9 163/2 166/7
summonses [1]
32/21
supervise [1] 26/6
supervising [2] 26/3
31/10
supervision [2] 23/7 23/11
supplied [5] 32/16

80/14 103/21 103/23 182/16
support [30] 9/18
23/18 30/6 30/15
30/18 31/10 32/10
42/9 62/1 72/22 73/5
73/18 75/11 78/6
91/22 103/18 104/9
133/11 136/18 147/14
148/16 173/9 188/2
188/7 190/1 191/10
192/8 194/8 194/11 196/10
supported [5] 13/9 14/9 34/15 43/25 63/18
supporting [7] 9/22
91/24 100/24 102/4
103/22 157/17 188/21
supportive [1] 46/7
supports [1] 12/23 suppose [1] 12/6 sure [35] 17/7 22/25 28/4 34/7 34/10 35/4
35/18 39/7 39/14
55/24 56/3 62/7 77/16 82/20 95/9 106/7
106/12 110/22 111/16
126/6 128/8 128/12
145/5 145/19 156/21
157/25 158/8 164/20
165/9 168/3 173/24
177/12 178/9 180/17
190/20
Surely [1] 116/7
surprise [1] 41/18 surprised [2] 99/7 202/5
surprisingly [1]
41/15
suspect [5] 13/9
15/16 47/24 57/10 110/3
suspension [2] 52/9 117/23
suspensions [1] 118/3
sworn [2] 1/6 207/2
system [127] 6/1 6/2
15/24 16/2 16/24 17/2
17/23 17/23 17/25
30/24 38/5 42/16
43/13 69/4 74/21
81/16 87/1 91/16
105/22 106/10 106/17
106/18 107/25 108/3
108/6 108/10 108/19
109/2 109/18 110/4
110/8 110/12 110/20
112/14 112/16 112/18
112/21 112/24 113/18
118/12 118/18 121/20
124/25 125/2 125/12
125/16 125/21 127/15

S
134/24 135/2 135/4 136/23 140/16 140/22 141/17 150/4 150/7 152/7 152/15 152/24 153/2 153/13 153/16 155/16 155/18 155/22 155/24 156/3 156/12
156/17 157/10 157/20 159/11 162/22 162/25 163/6 164/5 164/6 164/17 164/23 165/20 166/5 166/13 166/18 166/21 166/25 167/2
167/23 168/8 169/7 169/25 171/1 172/23
173/1 173/8 173/10 173/16 173/25 175/25 176/4 176/9 176/10 176/12 176/24 177/20 178/4 178/14 178/20 179/21 180/7 180/11 181/12 181/23 183/4 184/9 184/13 185/11 185/15 186/5 186/17 186/22 188/23 193/21 195/19 201/18 201/24 system's [1] 124/21

## $T$

tab [1] 3/2
table [3] 55/20 55/23 84/10
tackle [1] 11/15
take [16] 23/7 55/6
80/6 104/25 119/15 120/24 122/8 146/10 146/24 168/1 177/11 178/1 186/13 186/14 191/6 205/9
taken [10] 44/6 51/9 51/24 54/24 58/6 72/25 102/7 102/14 138/13 178/12
takes [2] 176/18 179/11
taking [7] 7/19 70/15 135/13 135/19 170/11 177/4 192/20
Talbot [1] 84/21
talk [2] 20/13 45/2
talked [1] 124/1
talking [7] 17/16 53/3 84/21 134/17 175/8 175/13 200/17
taped [1] 25/20
target [2] 145/17 145/17
targets [7] 34/22 35/7 35/15 142/12 145/8 145/9 145/23
taskforce [1] 201/17
taught [1] 17/22 team [154] 3/10 4/3 4/16 4/19 5/3 5/6 5/9 5/21 5/22 6/22 7/25 8/2 8/2 8/11 16/23 19/5 20/8 20/23 20/24 ten [6] 41/6 42/11 21/2 21/3 21/8 21/17 $\quad 42 / 14$ 55/9 180/20 22/7 23/21 23/24 26/6 180/22 27/4 27/14 27/16 29/15 29/17 30/14 30/17 31/3 31/18 31/20 31/21 31/25 33/16 33/17 33/24 34/17 35/2 35/10 35/11 35/12 35/13 35/14 35/21 41/3 41/23 42/2 42/13 43/16 43/18 43/19 43/20 43/20 43/23 44/2 44/5 44/6 44/8 44/22 45/5 45/18 47/1 47/2 47/5 47/8 47/9 48/21 49/18 49/24 50/22 52/25 53/2 53/4 terribly [1] 110/14 $53 / 553 / 1053 / 1455 / 5$ TES [1] 30/25 55/7 61/7 61/9 64/7 64/10 64/13 64/14 64/19 64/20 64/23 64/24 65/5 65/7 65/8 65/10 65/17 65/17 66/25 67/1 67/2 67/5 67/7 67/19 67/23 68/1 68/2 71/3 71/13 74/2 78/7 79/23 80/21 84/17 84/18 85/23 90/4 91/17 91/18 92/14 93/13 94/21 98/5 104/9 106/23 108/23 112/2 113/25 120/18 120/21 126/1 128/13 128/14 128/16 132/19 132/25 133/18 135/14 135/16 135/17 136/9 136/10 138/9 141/1 141/2 141/3 141/6 141/10 167/21 170/11 191/1 199/8 Team's [2] 18/4 136/12
teams [4] 55/9 55/10 91/24 95/24
technical [2] 170/19 189/14
teeth' [1] 129/8
telephoned [1] 80/12 tell [37] $1 / 10$ 2/7 $2 / 17$ 4/22 6/22 8/9 9/12 11/1 11/19 15/22 23/25 31/16 32/12 34/1 37/15 37/24 46/12 47/15 49/11 49/17 59/3 67/17 68/21 85/14 86/16 87/25 88/18 89/3

90/24 99/24 103/7 116/12 125/23 147/9 152/15 174/17 200/9
telling [1] 101/15 tells [1] $97 / 5$
tend [3] 94/25 115/25 121/17
tended [1] 60/8
tends [1] 55/20
terminals [2] 112/20 113/15
terms [25] 18/20 23/24 28/11 28/19 28/21 33/10 35/24 36/1 42/17 46/8 49/11 58/10 68/7 69/23 73/1 73/6 75/13 83/19 106/23 107/2 110/20 119/25 123/11 166/7 172/13
test [4] 66/14 156/20 156/22 185/14
testify [1] 122/14 testimony [1] 119/6 testing [1] 19/7
tests [2] 6/23 67/18 text [4] 94/18 143/10 159/4 165/3
than [33] 18/15 29/5 29/25 41/8 52/18 53/16 53/21 61/1 63/5 79/2 79/3 85/20 88/15 89/20 92/17 93/11 94/13 113/7 113/10 123/17 124/14 129/3 130/8 138/15 139/14 150/14 151/5 158/10 163/5 164/23 167/2 185/20 205/14
thank [56] 1/4 1/5 1/12 1/16 2/22 2/23 3/15 3/22 5/2 51/17 56/4 56/8 56/14 56/15 59/2 67/17 68/19 71/22 72/24 73/17 74/13 79/14 83/12 85/12 85/13 94/14 100/3 100/4 103/11 103/16 103/17 104/25 105/18 112/9 113/21 128/5 130/24 131/15 141/20 146/9 146/12 146/15 146/20 180/19 181/1 183/25 185/7 187/10 187/15 189/22 191/4 197/2 205/4 205/5 205/20 206/1 thankfully [1] 96/2 thanks [3] 79/20

79/22 187/16 that [1109] that I [1] 135/15 that's [128] $3 / 64 / 1$ $4 / 44 / 114 / 144 / 17$ 4/21 5/4 5/7 5/10 5/13 5/15 6/25 8/1 8/3 8/6 13/3 15/9 16/1 19/4 23/15 25/10 29/7 29/23 30/8 32/3 32/15 34/5 36/22 37/8 37/18 37/19 37/20 37/23 38/10 38/12 41/2 41/5 41/7 47/19 49/16 49/21 51/11 51/12 52/1 52/7 52/17 52/24 53/18 53/18 53/22 54/23 56/25 62/13 62/21 65/14 67/21 72/6 73/7 74/10 75/8 80/8 81/8 82/1 82/20 82/24 85/19 86/15 92/19 93/6 96/1 96/1 96/11 97/20 97/23 104/1 104/11 109/6 109/8 112/12 120/13 122/6 126/2 126/12 128/11 130/11 135/21 141/7 143/3 143/12 147/11 147/15 147/17 147/22 148/4 150/13 151/15 156/24 158/25 159/13 163/21 164/17 164/20 165/6 166/21 171/2 172/13 172/15 178/22 179/23 181/15 182/18 185/1 185/7 185/17 187/15 191/2 191/3 191/18 192/1 194/13 194/15 198/2 198/9 198/16 200/14 202/6 202/17
theft [1] 129/16
their [17] 21/15 26/6 27/14 60/23 71/15 76/11 90/17 92/25 100/20 108/7 111/23 150/18 178/12 181/5 187/23 200/5 200/6 them [56] 4/6 10/22 11/17 11/22 12/4 12/5 12/13 17/5 19/12 22/20 32/2 41/13 50/19 50/20 53/7 58/23 68/9 75/9 75/9 79/14 90/8 90/17 92/23 94/24 95/7 97/12 102/10 116/22 124/1 124/25 128/1 128/7 130/21 135/13 135/19 138/13 139/23 141/13 142/1 147/19 148/8 149/22 156/19 165/14 166/5 166/19

167/23 168/14 174/17 176/11 176/13 180/24 182/1 193/10 200/8 200/11
themselves [3] 170/17 181/3 182/22
then [121] 2/22 4/6 4/19 10/12 11/2 13/18 19/7 20/16 20/20
21/12 22/1 23/6 25/21 26/15 28/23 29/3
29/21 31/20 33/13
34/4 34/20 35/3 38/11 38/20 39/5 39/16 39/21 40/8 45/2 51/8 51/12 51/15 52/18 53/16 55/3 56/2 57/25 58/12 58/14 60/20 63/19 63/20 66/6 71/21 71/25 72/21 72/24 72/24 73/17 75/1 75/25 79/25 80/3 80/15 81/1 83/5 85/17 87/11 94/1 94/16 96/17 104/23 105/19 112/21 116/7 120/2 125/3 128/10 129/4 130/2 130/17 131/25 134/9 137/25 140/10 141/24 151/2 160/10 161/12 161/22 162/4 163/3 164/2 164/8 165/21 166/7 167/7 168/9 168/15 171/25 172/6 172/6 172/10 172/23 173/1 173/23 174/4 175/15 175/15 176/1 176/7 176/21 176/22 176/23 177/13 178/24 179/25 180/3 181/1 181/2 182/18 183/2 183/13 183/24 189/9 190/5 192/18 195/6 201/6 203/11 205/25

## there [270]

there's [28] 3/4 13/21 22/17 30/2 36/16 52/18 56/18 67/8 70/17 72/22 78/8
82/13 90/12 116/15 116/21 122/2 133/22 138/2 149/3 159/10 160/14 160/16 166/18 168/9 193/15 203/6 203/17 205/1
thereabouts [2] 56/2 87/9
thereafter [1] 2/10
therefore [8] 2/4 86/1 95/18 147/1 147/12 150/11 173/9 182/24
these [35] 33/18
82/12 86/14 94/23

## $T$

these... [31] 98/24
117/7 118/4 118/10 119/12 121/17 122/11 127/16 129/8 129/24 132/18 140/23 144/7 150/2 152/3 152/19 155/11 161/9 161/14 165/3 167/20 168/2 169/5 169/5 169/10 172/11 173/23 177/16 197/4 198/22 201/11
they [123] $3 / 218 / 18$ 17/5 21/5 21/17 21/20 21/24 22/22 23/7 23/11 24/25 25/17 26/25 28/10 29/10 30/9 30/20 30/24 31/12 32/10 33/6 34/6 34/11 35/3 35/4 35/6 35/8 35/9 35/20 35/20 36/6 37/3 39/18 40/13 40/20 41/5 44/11 44/16 46/7 53/6 53/7 58/17 64/10 65/8 65/20 65/20 65/22 71/15 76/13 76/14 76/17 76/19 78/3 78/4 78/5 78/5 84/17 87/11 87/12 87/15 89/24 92/9 92/10 92/17 92/21 92/22 95/7 95/25 96/6 96/9 102/3 102/12 102/12 104/16 116/17 121/19 121/20 123/6 125/9 125/11 126/16 126/25 127/3 127/5 127/19 128/8 128/12 128/12 128/16 130/19 131/12 141/14 142/10 142/11 144/8 148/1 148/15 148/15 155/1 155/3 156/21 158/1 158/1 165/15 167/5 167/16 168/15
168/16 169/13 180/17 180/24 182/23 182/23 188/21 198/24 199/20 200/4 200/5 200/7
200/11 200/12 200/12 200/17
they'd [3] 41/1 44/11 200/8
they'Il [2] 116/12 180/24
they're [7] 17/4 92/19 167/5 181/2 181/5 194/10 205/6
they've [1] 182/21
Thieving [2] 142/5 144/13
thing [18] 22/23
$28 / 2268 / 15100 / 1$

100/23 107/24 109/6 109/14 109/16 110/7 115/5 139/11 151/3 166/8 167/5 171/8 200/9 200/11
things [26] 25/11 28/12 32/12 45/7 45/8 45/10 45/14 68/11 70/17 79/10 84/14 91/14 123/25 127/8 132/21 135/10 135/17 139/13 148/22 161/2 171/12 188/11 193/11 193/14 193/18 193/19 think [194] 1/13 3/3 3/24 4/9 4/22 6/9 9/16 15/25 16/3 16/6 18/7 21/5 22/6 24/15 24/16 27/6 28/22 29/7 29/10 29/12 30/4 30/11 30/12 30/24 30/25 31/8 31/13 33/2 33/5 33/6 33/12 33/14 34/8 34/9 34/22 35/8 35/8 36/18 38/8 38/15 38/18 40/19 40/23 41/18 42/13 42/14 42/21 43/23 44/3 44/17 47/8 50/18 50/25 50/25 51/20 53/4 54/7 55/6 55/7 55/9 57/3 59/13 60/25 62/2 63/3 64/12 68/8 68/11 69/15 69/18 73/22 74/18 76/17 77/8 77/13 77/22 83/4 83/7 83/14 84/1 84/4 84/7 86/3 86/7 87/5 87/5 93/12 93/25 95/3 97/7 98/1 99/2 101/6 102/11 102/12 107/6 108/18 110/9 110/10 111/2 111/9 113/7 116/13 120/6 120/14 121/22 123/18 124/7 124/8 126/16 126/17 127/23 128/9 130/21 132/18 133/21 134/2 134/22 136/10 136/10 137/17 138/1 138/4 138/7 138/25 139/2 139/6 139/6 139/8 139/9 139/10 140/6 140/8 140/11 140/24 143/13 143/18 143/21 145/14 145/16 145/19 147/2 147/6 147/18 148/10 151/20 152/1 154/4 154/13 156/3 157/20 157/23 158/9 158/16 159/13 159/23 162/17 167/18 168/2 169/2 169/23 169/25 170/3 170/13 171/18

174/9 176/15 179/10 $\quad$ through [24] 4/5 6/2 179/10 181/1 181/1 $\quad 27 / 4$ 27/13 35/9 37/16 $\quad 193 / 25$ 197/12 197/17
184/8 184/12 184/13 184/22 184/23 188/6 188/16 190/17 190/17 190/22 190/25 193/4 195/14 197/16 199/9 199/21 200/20 201/9 201/10 202/9 202/15 205/6 205/15
thinking [12] 22/14 108/13 113/6 122/5 140/6 143/13 143/24 144/22 165/11 165/17 171/8 191/9
thinks [1] 198/14 third [7] 53/12 57/14 57/19 61/15 72/1 166/5 166/25
this [278]
Thomas [13] 6/11 105/17 141/20 143/17 144/17 147/3 147/7 154/15 154/19 156/9 161/7 185/21 185/24 Thomas' [8] 147/10 149/9 149/14 151/10 151/14 159/21 160/17 161/8
thorough [8] 15/8 15/10 16/4 16/13 156/11 157/10 157/19 183/19
thoroughly [1] 36/15 those [36] 6/19 11/8 11/10 11/12 11/14 12/11 14/3 19/23 25/1 25/11 26/24 35/6 45/14 47/18 47/25 48/24 63/25 73/12 92/14 98/19 100/11 103/7 113/23 126/21 136/5 136/18 158/5 164/10 167/7 167/14 167/18 171/7 174/4 180/16 187/10 205/20
though [6] 29/25 41/13 135/1 135/1 195/20 204/5
thought [25] 29/16
53/21 63/6 77/17 84/15 84/19 86/6 89/22 91/6 92/10 93/10 120/16 127/13 135/4 140/14 142/8 158/19 168/1 169/4 170/14 170/15 177/5 179/7 185/17 197/12 three [15] 48/20 48/24 62/20 63/4 146/23 161/3 162/21 163/25 166/3 172/7 172/9 172/11 175/21 175/23 205/10

46/21 47/7 51/6 64/10 69/21 72/21 73/24 81/12 95/17 97/18 142/14 149/4 189/23 189/25 190/2 193/9 193/10 195/2
throughout [1] 57/8
Thursday [1] 1/1 thus [1] 94/23
tied [3] 35/20 36/4 36/7
till [2] 69/10 69/17 time [119] 5/24 9/11 9/23 10/4 10/19 11/13 14/18 15/3 15/19 16/17 18/9 18/18 21/18 23/2 26/19 27/23 27/24 28/18 31/9 33/25 36/25 38/4 41/23 43/12 46/7 47/21 48/11 51/8 51/24 54/6 54/7 54/24 55/5 55/11 56/23 57/12 62/6 63/3 64/24 65/3 65/5 66/11 67/3 72/8 74/3 77/18 78/2 78/6 80/20 82/10 83/11 87/6 90/22 93/18 94/14 97/21 100/8 102/18 106/22 109/5 109/7 109/12 112/15 112/16 112/23 113/24 116/1 122/6 126/3 126/15 127/8 128/7 128/18 129/8 129/11 134/11 134/17 134/22 134/25 135/4 135/16 136/8 137/6 138/7 138/9 138/24 139/9 140/7 143/4 144/10 147/1 149/11 151/20 153/14 153/20 153/21 153/25 154/4 154/13 161/13 161/18 163/12 165/16 165/18 168/25 171/8 175/2 180/20 180/25 181/5 181/13 181/15 183/7 186/14 192/8 197/19 199/10 201/1 203/12
timeliness [1] 51/23
times [2] 62/23 87/14
Timescale [1] 51/22
timescales [8] 49/17
49/19 50/6 50/10
50/20 51/4 54/11
129/6
timings [1] 146/21
title [4] 7/16 34/21
131/7 151/24
titles [1] 34/3
Tivoli [13] 152/19

197/25 198/4 198/14 203/17 203/21 205/1 today [5] 2/13 80/12 95/14 97/4 193/9 together [11] 9/19 24/11 43/22 50/18 50/24 50/25 123/23 132/10 162/1 162/13 178/12
told [24] 4/18 7/24 10/10 19/10 19/14 20/3 40/13 63/1 63/25 80/4 80/9 81/22
103/19 110/23 126/18 127/4 134/23 140/15 140/16 140/18 140/21 200/7 200/10 201/16
tomorrow [3] 205/19
205/22 205/24
Tony [16] 34/3 34/7
34/12 50/25 87/6
87/19 87/20 88/5
96/17 102/2 115/2
120/7 199/5 199/7 199/9 199/12
Tony Utting [4] 199/5 199/7 199/9 199/12
too [8] 19/1 32/2 41/5 44/15 78/13 85/10 102/10 145/3
took [10] 23/6 32/7
32/11 53/15 55/13
58/23 66/15 82/2
82/11 192/21
tool [1] 189/12
tools [1] 117/8
top [14] 53/25 61/4 82/19 96/18 104/5 104/25 134/3 149/7 156/1 171/25 190/15 196/4 202/24 204/14
topic [5] 103/3
103/18 134/9 134/16 187/24
Torquay [4] 105/23 105/25 106/6 160/9 total [2] 32/18 94/3 totally [1] 143/19 towards [2] 90/22 138/9
tracker [1] 54/16
trained [4] 11/8 17/11 69/7 132/25 trainers [2] 8/17 8/18 training [29] 7/4 7/6 7/7 8/10 8/11 8/13 8/15 8/17 8/24 9/2 9/7 10/4 10/6 10/13 10/23 12/15 12/16 12/19 15/5 15/7 16/1 16/4 16/12 16/17 69/3 69/6 69/24 73/24 74/2

| T | 186/9 186/12 198/7 | 62/13 75/8 78/10 | 149/15 154/14 155/5 | 115/3 120/7 124/7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| transaction [37] 18/17 18/18 31/1 69/7 | 203/12 | 78/22 88/10 100/15 | 162/14 163/22 164/8 | 124/12 199/5 199/7 |
|  | Tunbridge [1] 21/6 | 103/20 117/6 131/12 | 164/19 165/6 165/2 | 199/9 199/12 |
| 69/20 79/7 81/13 | turn [9] 3/1 3/15 | 183/19 188/19 195/19 | 169/17 171/22 171/22 | V |
| 92/10 92/12 93/2 | 47/10 47/16 68/20 | understood [6] 86/23 | 175/16 179/25 182/2 | V |
| 100/18 101/4 117/1 | 88/18 95/12 173/21 | 111/17 114/8 174/21 | 182/7 184/15 187/2 | gue [1] 36/3 |
| 117/6 117/17 118/19 | 191/19 | 185/13 195/14 | 188/4 190/14 190/23 | guely [2] 15/25 |
| 155/2 155/2 155/12 | turnaround [1] | undertake [3] 34/14 | 191/9 194/10 194/18 |  |
| 155/21 156/6 158/12 | 200/2 | 183/16 205/9 | 197/11 204/17 | va |
| 162/21 163/1 166/4 | turned [2] | undertaken [5] 27/21 | updated [3] 74/ |  |
| 166/12 172/22 172/24 |  |  |  | 164/24 164/22 |
| 172/24 175/24 176/17 | two [35] 8/9 8/15 9/3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { und } \\ & 182 \end{aligned}$ | upheld [1] $2 / 11$ | 166/3 166/12 167 |
| 182/11 182/15 182/21 |  |  | upon <br> [4] 2/1 2/3 2/10 | 175/23 |
| 182/25 183/20 188/20 | $11 / 10 \text { 12/15 17/16 }$ | undertaking [1] 6/23 undertook [1] 29/3 | upon [4] 2/1 $2 / 32 / 10$ 193/16 | values [5] 150/2 |
| transaction' [1] | 25/4 31/25 32/1 32/7 | unfinished [1] | upset [1] | 151/7 155/2 156/6 |
|  | 45/7 51/8 63/5 79/10 |  | upwards [1] 26/25 | 16 |
|  | 79/10 85/20 94/14 | unfortunately [2] | urgently [1] 177/15 | various [8] 4/5 6/23 |
|  | 127/1 144/3 151/5 | 86/22 177/11 | us [64] 1/3 1/10 2/25 | 7/12 13/4 30/10 73/2 |
|  | 160/5 165/4 165/23 | uniformity [2] 28/3 | 4/18 4/22 6/22 7/24 | 91/24 123/22 |
|  | 167/7 167/19 167/20 | 28/7 | 8/9 9/12 11/1 11/19 | verge [1] 126/1 |
| 149/19 149/20 150/2 | 169/5 188/13 193/11 | Unit [1] | 18/15 19/14 23/25 | version [4] 72/3 |
| 150/9 150/12 150/16 | 198/18 200/15 | unless [4] 58/21 | 24/8 30/21 31/16 | 180/15 190/16 203 |
| 151/6 151/7 155/10 | two paragraphs [1] | 75/21 103/7 117/20 | 32/12 34/1 37/15 | version 0.1 [1] |
| 155/13 156/22 157/13 | 165/23 | unlike [2] 129/6 | 37/24 40/13 46/12 | 190/16 |
| 157/14 158/2 158/11 | two-week [3] 8 |  | 47/15 49/11 49/17 | very [53] 1/5 1/12 |
| 160/21 160/23 160/24 | 9/3 9/8 | unnecessary [1] | 56/13 59/3 63/1 63/25 | 2/23 3/15 3/22 16/3 |
| 161/9 161/25 162/9 | two-year [1] | 118/3 | 67/17 68/21 70/1 | 16/6 18/14 18/19 |
| 162/10 162/19 163/19 | tying [1] 166/20 | unreliable [2] 108/4 | 85/14 86/16 86/24 | 24/25 36/2 43/24 |
| 166/22 170/6 170/6 | type [6] 15/21 28/22 | 118/8 | 88/18 89/3 90/24 | 44/22 45/23 46/3 46 |
| 172/5 177/17 177/18 | 50/9 51/18 135/8 | unsure [1] | 95/17 103/15 103/19 | 46/7 46/10 56/15 |
| 177/22 | 152/14 | until [17] 23/5 34/21 | 109/1 109/2 110/23 | 59/10 83/19 84/9 |
| transpired [1] 179/9 | typed [5] 173/6 | 43/10 43/16 56/6 | 111/25 114/19 116/12 | 86/17 86/19 89/13 |
|  | 173/11 173/18 173/24 | 70/25 95/17 103/5 | 125/23 140/14 142/16 | 97/22 97/22 106/8 |
|  | 173/25 | 103/6 112/23 113/10 | 143/21 144/18 146/19 | 106/22 108/7 114/17 |
|  | types [3] 16/18 49/18 | 146/22 150/6 154/14 | 147/9 147/20 161/9 | 132/15 135/23 141/5 |
|  | 150/2 | 180/23 205/19 206/3 | 162/1 162/13 171/5 | 158/8 169/24 170/1 |
|  | U | unusual [2] 177/4 | 175/6 175/18 177/11 | 180/19 188/16 189/1 |
| trial [1] 102/17 tributes [1] 148/22 trickle [4] 35/9 89/21 |  |  | 194/11 | 189/1 189/14 190/10 |
|  | Um [1] 92 | unwieldy [1] | use [8] 95/10 97/15 | 192/20 192/21 194/6 |
|  | under [16] 1/17 | up [104] 3/2 13/3 | 123/6 124/2 126/10 | 196/3 196/4 197/1 |
|  | 11/11 11/22 32/19 | 22/10 22/22 28/9 34/8 | 172/14 180/2 190/17 | 203/25 204/10 205/18 |
|  | 34/3 34/21 58/4 58/13 | 38/17 38/20 39/5 39/7 | used [18] 14/3 18/16 | 206/1 |
| trickled [2] 90/2 90/ | 58/25 105/10 109/22 | 39/14 39/23 40/1 40/6 | 24/6 30/18 91/9 97/19 | via [5] 36/20 117/2 |
| tried [5] 15/9 111/7 | 127/8 161/13 177/16 | 40/10 40/11 40/13 | 100/22 100/22 108/10 | 137/6 150/14 155/22 |
| 148/25 154/16 157/2 | 191/16 200/2 | 41/1 43/8 47/16 59/19 | 112/7 113/17 117/11 | victim [2] 129/15 |
| tris | underlying [1] | 59/23 62/23 67/7 | 136/24 169/8 172/14 | 129/ |
| 1 | 11 | 70/15 80/6 82/5 82/8 | 185/24 185/25 189/12 | view [21] 106/22 |
|  | undermine [2] 58/19 | 82/9 82/17 83/7 83/9 | useful [2] 18/14 | 108/14 109/4 109/6 |
| 50/6 50/10 51/22 | 62/1 | 83/10 83/12 84/5 85/4 | 82/15 | 116/4 123/20 131/20 |
| true [11] 3/19 41/2 | undermined [5] 13/8 | 85/5 88/19 94/12 | useless [2] 165/24 | 131/22 134/25 135/22 |
| 139/17 143/12 155/8 | 14/8 14/23 62/4 63/18 | 95/10 96/17 97/19 | 167/16 | 144/16 144/23 145/5 |
| 165/13 168/3 168/3 | undermines [1] | 97/24 99/2 99/22 | user [1] | 145/6 153/19 153/21 |
| 7 181/14 | 12/23 | 101/15 103/4 103/18 | using [9] 83/18 109/9 | 157/11 159/10 159/12 |
|  | underneath [1] | 104/4 104/23 104/23 | 109/11 117/8 122/16 | 159/17 159/22 |
| trusted [1] 153/23 | 158/14 | 104/25 105/9 107/1 | 123/8 123/9 133/19 | viewed [2] 45/25 |
| truth [1] | understand [14] 2/11 | 108/10 112/23 115/4 | 189/7 | 108/20 |
| $\operatorname{tr}\rangle$ | 2/19 15/10 60/16 | 116/13 121/7 123/21 | usual [5] 58/25 148/5 | views [2] 132/1 |
|  | 73/14 77/23 86/25 | 128/4 129/6 129/9 | 148/7 160/18 185/21 | 132/19 |
|  | 132/16 137/14 142/6 | 130/14 130/22 131/15 | Utting [23] 34/4 34/7 | voice [1] 107/1 |
|  | 169/5 169/5 177/3 | 131/25 132/3 134/19 | 51/1 87/6 87/16 87/19 | voice up [1] 107/1 |
| 0/9 170/24 171/11 | 177/5 | 135/3 137/13 138/7 | 87/20 88/6 93/22 | voicing [1] 149/19 |
| 171/13 172/19 186/2 | understanding [15] | 138/10 138/12 141/24 | 96/17 96/18 97/2 | volume [13] 31/17 |
|  | 38/1 55/21 60/18 | 142/3 143/3 149/7 | 99/23 100/6 102/2 | 38/18 38/21 39/13 |

(82) transaction - volume
volume... [9] 39/14
39/16 41/2 41/4 41/11 41/14 41/25 73/14 105/8
volumes [1] 41/20
voluntary [1] 143/7
volunteer [1] 58/24
vouchers [2] 7/12
7/21

## W

waffle [1] 133/21
Wales [2] 24/21 57/20
want [25] 22/20
89/14 90/9 90/12
94/20 142/4 159/7
165/2 165/2 178/3
178/8 185/22 187/12
187/24 188/5 190/9
193/11 194/18 196/1
196/4 196/6 197/22
198/17 199/17 204/10
wanted [17] 92/12
96/6 96/9 96/9 107/24
110/21 132/17 135/11 137/16 137/18 138/25 165/14 165/19 173/17 178/6 178/9 179/13
wanting [2] 28/23 170/25
Ward [42] $1 / 51 / 61 / 8$ 1/11 1/14 1/17 2/20 2/24 56/16 103/17 107/17 109/16 125/14 131/5 140/2 142/14 147/5 153/22 161/21 165/11 180/19 181/14 181/20 182/2 184/1 184/7 186/6 186/13 187/7 187/20 189/17 191/17 191/21 193/23 194/12 194/16 196/11 196/15 203/23 204/17 205/20 207/2
Ward's [3] 131/20 147/3 187/12
was [643]
wasn't [60] 12/11
16/4 16/12 18/3 33/11 33/13 43/7 45/5 45/6 46/3 59/20 61/15 67/4 67/10 70/20 70/22 81/12 82/11 84/25 88/11 92/6 96/8 98/13 98/22 108/13 111/4 112/7 112/8 115/11 115/18 126/21 127/12 131/21 135/8 136/9 136/21 139/25 140/2 144/16 145/5 145/5 145/13 147/25 148/6

151/14 158/22 165/18 $44 / 945 / 546 / 246 / 10$ 168/3 168/10 170/4 170/9 170/24 171/11 171/13 177/10 180/17 186/10 188/9 192/8 199/1
watch [1] 200/2
watched [1] 186/5 water [5] 133/23
138/3 138/5 138/18 138/25

## watering [2] 137/21

 140/8way [28] 13/18 13/23 16/25 18/4 21/12 22/6 28/10 28/15 36/10 44/10 45/8 51/13 59/21 83/17 83/20 99/15 110/19 111/5 139/20 143/16 145/20 146/21 153/15 171/7 171/12 174/20 176/14 178/10
we [439]
we'd [4] 39/25 97/21 97/22 152/22
we'll [15] 77/21 80/16 101/6 102/23 115/21 116/11 116/19 123/15 137/2 168/14 180/21 193/10 194/10 197/22 205/19
we're [29] 6/9 12/6 16/23 17/15 20/13 37/2 53/3 57/15 66/2 67/6 70/16 71/6 71/9 82/12 82/15 87/17 103/3 109/20 147/18 149/4 159/3 159/20 160/2 175/7 175/13 178/16 189/24 189/24 202/12
we've [13] 3/18 19/25 33/11 74/5 109/22 117/11 123/21 135/23 160/14 164/12 173/14 179/9 189/23
weakness [1] 61/8 weaknesses [3]
58/17 58/22 59/7
week [6] 8/15 9/3 9/8
79/21 118/3 182/22
Weekly [1] 113/6
weeks [6] 8/9 9/11 10/13 11/9 11/10 12/15
weight [1] 118/22
well [144] 3/3 7/20 10/20 11/20 15/12 19/16 21/8 21/17 30/14 30/15 31/9 31/14 33/9 34/15 35/4 36/9 36/13 37/12 39/17 41/11 43/25

49/14 50/1 51/17 52/11 53/6 54/5 60/24 63/8 68/3 73/4 79/10 84/18 84/22 85/1 86/20 88/9 88/17 89/13 91/9 92/16 93/4 93/14 97/2 100/13 101/19 103/8 106/21 107/5 107/24 109/6 109/16 110/9 113/16 116/13 116/17 117/7 117/15 119/14 120/17 121/19 122/13 123/21 124/13 124/16 125/9 125/12 126/15 126/19 126/25 127/12 127/19 127/25 128/8 128/10 131/12 134/5 134/5 134/11 134/13 135/17 135/22 136/5 136/14 136/23 138/21 138/24 139/5 139/16 139/25 140/13 140/15 140/19 140/24 141/7 141/15 143/13 144/3 144/6 144/7 144/15 144/17 144/20 145/4 145/19 146/2 146/4 150/24 153/23 154/13 155/24 157/22 157/22 158/9 165/14 167/20 168/4 170/2 170/23 171/17 173/4 173/9 173/14 173/24 174/9 174/16 180/21 181/4 182/3 184/2 184/4 185/24 196/21 196/23 198/9 198/24 198/25 200/12 205/15 205/18
Wells [1] 21/7
went [27] 13/11 16/3 16/6 24/16 38/17 38/20 39/4 39/7 39/14 40/1 41/13 45/2 51/21 59/20 60/10 60/10 60/13 60/14 62/18 69/20 88/1 99/2 115/5 123/4 130/10 130/10 190/2

## were [326]

weren't [28] 13/14
20/6 21/17 21/20 26/2 35/15 36/6 41/17 95/24 104/12 106/24 107/2 107/8 114/25 125/11 127/7 127/13 135/7 135/18 135/20 138/12 144/7 154/4 168/3 173/16 181/24 184/24 202/4
West [2] 4/13 114/4
whammy' [1] 129/20 what [226]
what's [5] 42/6 121/24 145/22 189/16 196/21
whatever [9] 13/5 25/17 64/24 95/10 106/25 110/16 110/21 113/18 134/15
when [90] $3 / 96 / 20$ 7/1 7/7 9/15 10/12 12/9 13/2 13/7 16/1 16/17 17/14 17/22 18/1 19/18 20/13 20/19 22/15 23/5 25/15 27/3 27/22 27/24 30/4 30/10 30/11 34/2 34/20 34/22 34/25 35/13 $35 / 1836 / 2338 / 20$ 41/14 43/15 43/16 43/19 44/1 44/2 44/20 44/23 44/24 45/19 45/19 47/6 47/23 49/3 50/9 50/14 53/5 55/7 59/4 60/4 62/17 63/20 64/16 66/15 70/4 70/12 71/3 73/10 77/9 82/2 85/9 87/12 88/2 90/11 90/20 96/10 98/23 110/2 132/9 140/25 143/21 143/25 144/17 144/18 145/13 145/17 145/22 146/12 152/15 170/23 180/15 195/22 197/25 199/23 200/18 200/23
when I [1] 145/13 whenever [5] 40/25 89/15 96/6 96/8 132/10
where [41] 17/4 18/12 20/25 32/20 34/7 37/11 41/23 52/8 59/11 68/7 82/19 86/20 87/23 90/24 91/20 92/9 100/22 105/20 114/23 118/6 119/10 123/5 123/22 128/24 133/6 133/8 133/9 133/14 133/16 141/7 149/21 160/6 164/25 173/23 174/1 184/19 188/25 192/7 194/3 196/2 202/12
Whereas [1] 52/2 wherever [2] 44/11 44/12
whether [61] $2 / 11$
2/17 18/10 18/10 25/1
25/6 25/23 26/22
27/14 28/24 35/3
52/22 53/11 53/22
54/15 54/18 54/22
54/25 55/19 56/1
58/12 64/17 66/13

66/15 67/20 68/10 68/12 73/13 76/15 77/22 78/8 78/15 82/24 83/7 83/8 83/17 83/20 88/21 88/24 89/5 89/8 90/5 94/18 99/5 101/22 102/7 102/8 102/15 102/17 102/18 103/4 104/16 109/6 123/8 131/18 131/19 150/20 153/15 165/15 195/22 197/23 which [115] $2 / 63 / 5$ 3/16 7/10 14/3 18/18 20/8 25/17 30/25 31/1 31/24 33/22 38/13 39/5 39/19 41/4 43/24 44/14 44/17 45/8 49/18 50/14 51/8 51/24 54/1 55/20 57/11 58/2 60/1 60/20 61/2 62/3 64/22 67/2 69/20 73/10 76/7 79/21 80/5 81/4 81/10 81/24 82/6 85/4 85/5 85/21 85/22 86/13 87/14 97/2 99/10 102/16 102/17 102/21 104/3 105/1 106/1 108/15 109/7 112/21 113/4 113/5 114/9 114/13 114/22 115/19 116/20 117/13 120/2 125/18 129/19 130/3 130/9 133/7 133/11 135/2 136/18 136/21 137/15 147/6 151/5 151/17 152/13 152/15 152/23 153/12 155/21 159/21 160/16 161/13 164/3 165/23 167/11 168/2 170/20 173/7 174/2 176/3 176/9 177/19 179/1 181/3 185/2 186/15 188/2 190/1 191/9 195/5 197/6 197/8 200/4 200/21 200/22 201/1 204/22
whichever [2] 7/10 11/25
while [1] 138/8 whilst [6] 80/8 106/5 106/11 132/14 134/10 139/23
who [53] 2/5 10/16 10/20 18/17 23/2 30/15 30/16 30/18 30/19 31/9 31/12 50/17 52/25 53/1 53/11 63/7 64/8 64/17 64/25 65/17 87/19 92/25 95/5 97/5 97/25 105/9 105/15 106/13
who... [25] 109/21
111/8 111/16 111/18 118/23 118/25 123/19 130/18 130/21 131/1 138/19 138/23 140/18 141/11 144/11 146/5 146/6 151/19 173/21 183/19 185/22 187/16 187/22 200/10 202/16
whoever [6] 33/24 53/15 64/22 65/2 66/10 91/22
whole [6] 30/17
35/12 35/13 35/21
65/11 189/19
whom [1] 72/13 whose [3] 17/14 17/19 75/22
why [96] 26/24 27/5 40/3 40/8 41/5 60/16 68/1 68/17 75/20
76/19 76/21 77/19 86/19 86/23 86/24 88/8 88/13 89/12 91/7 92/14 92/17 92/21 92/24 93/4 93/13 95/20 96/1 96/2 97/23 101/18 106/18 107/7 110/7 111/2 111/6 114/19 116/7 116/9 116/9 116/10 116/15 121/4 121/7 123/9 123/20 124/2 124/14 125/3 125/3 126/13 126/18 127/6 127/9 127/15 127/17 130/11 132/8 134/21 135/5 137/5 137/17 138/4 138/25 139/2 139/3 139/22 140/8 141/25 142/16 143/10 148/9 148/16 148/23 150/23 151/21 153/4 153/18 158/22 159/11 162/18 162/21 166/3 168/7 169/25 170/13 170/18 172/22 173/4 175/23
177/3 177/25 179/7
179/23 185/17 193/25 204/24
will [47] 1/21 2/9 2/14 50/1 54/6 54/9 54/10 56/19 57/20 57/21
58/10 58/12 86/22 94/20 97/11 99/9 100/24 102/5 103/4 112/15 118/10 118/11 118/17 118/22 118/24 119/19 122/14 129/21 133/7 133/10 133/18 133/18 143/7 146/24 149/22 150/6 152/15

156/11 156/13 161/9 190/20 192/6 195/2 195/7 195/16 204/8 204/19
Wilson [1] 6/14
winding [2] 135/18 137/21
wish [5] 2/1 2/3 2/6 2/16 3/10
within [58] $4 / 25 / 3$
9/8 13/1 13/5 13/22 14/14 16/22 21/3 21/7 wording [2] 159/18 28/4 29/19 29/21 30/6 180/14
31/17 41/3 43/18
44/16 44/22 45/19
48/23 51/24 53/11 61/10 61/11 64/19 69/7 69/19 71/2 72/15 83/1 84/25 85/23 87/7 87/20 91/25 100/14 101/22 102/21 105/15 108/23 112/2 120/21 128/13 128/14 128/16 128/13 128/14 128/16 work [22] 5/11 31/17 129/6 138/22 141/1 141/5 141/8 144/3 150/15 150/20 152/24 153/13 161/10 181/24 without [8] 86/9 93/14 98/4 99/7 99/18 101/5 155/16 192/10
without-prejudice [1] 192/10
WITN10590100 [1] 3/2
witness [85] $1 / 17$
1/22 2/24 2/25 3/19 11/19 20/17 22/16 29/9 29/20 29/21 31/16 32/12 34/1 46/12 47/15 50/12 64/1 65/15 66/9 67/17 68/21 68/22 68/23 74/24 76/1 77/22 78/6 78/12 80/25 85/14 86/8 86/16 88/18 89/3 90/24 95/13 103/22 106/3 109/1 110/2 110/5 110/23 112/10 122/24 123/12 123/13 125/24 125/25 147/19 147/21 148/2 148/7 154/9 157/18 160/12 161/2 163/9 163/18 163/22 165/3 165/7 165/8 171/22 174/10 174/11 175/8 177/8 178/13 179/15 181/9 184/7 184/23 185/3 187/12 190/4 193/13 193/20 199/5 199/20 200/10 200/16 201/2 203/20 205/16
witnesses [5] 104/8 104/13 110/24 111/1

193/16
Wolfie [1] 142/18 won't [6] 36/15
136/17 186/13 192/3 192/6 193/9
wonder [2] 103/4 146/10
word [2] 153/6 170/23
worded [3] 89/13 158/7 159/14

180/14
words [25] 74/14 107/11 107/12 107/18 109/9 109/11 110/3 110/20 132/14 134/21 142/6 155/18 164/3 165/5 172/14 172/23 173/7 173/23 173/24 176/2 176/3 180/4 38/2 38/22 39/9 39/11 39/16 39/19 43/21
44/14 45/12 46/7 66/3 98/24 134/14 135/25
169/18 169/21 175/11
197/11 198/7 200/21
worked [8] 16/9 74/1 84/18 88/11 112/15 132/9 139/9 151/20 working [23] 5/21 10/17 18/13 23/9 32/4 38/6 43/21 44/10 45/9 50/4 59/17 62/2 63/25 106/17 106/19 107/25 108/3 108/11 121/4 121/9 143/17 188/23 202/10
workload [2] 40/16 118/1
works [1] 51/10
worry [2] 90/22 135/5
worse [1] 139/14
worth [1] 170/10
would [347]
wouldn't [41] 33/15
40/21 55/2 60/14
63/13 66/23 75/25
76/13 77/25 78/14 89/22 89/22 90/14 93/3 93/14 95/25 97/20 101/7 108/12 121/7 121/19 125/9 126/9 128/1 128/11 134/5 137/5 141/3 143/1 144/15 150/13 153/25 155/25 159/11 161/17 170/20 173/13 173/25 178/23 188/18 200/25
write [1] 162/2
writing [6] 59/4 130/3

134/2 134/6 153/14 196/3
written [6] 25/19
68/12 85/22 109/25 144/21 174/6
wrong [9] 25/3 38/16 107/10 109/15 154/10 178/10 190/21 190/25 192/7
wrongly [3] 106/20
111/23 140/22
wrote [2] 85/4 154/15
WS [1] 199/16
$X$
$X X$ [1] 142/13
$Y$
yeah [465]
year [14] 9/16 13/13
14/10 14/22 17/16
43/17 89/25 93/24
95/17 95/19 98/10
98/20 113/2 113/3
years [12] 12/6 12/11
59/9 62/6 73/6 84/11
86/5 135/22 142/1
144/12 196/22 201/13
yellow [2] 168/3 174/2
yes [144] 1/4 1/16
2/21 3/17 5/13 5/20
6/3 6/8 6/11 6/12 7/6
7/23 8/3 13/5 15/17
20/2 24/19 24/22
25/12 26/14 34/20
35/25 37/1 37/17
43/11 50/8 50/11
50/13 52/5 52/20
54/13 54/14 55/15
56/7 56/14 56/14
56/22 57/5 57/17
61/13 61/14 62/24 63/15 65/14 66/4 66/8 67/12 67/25 68/24 69/1 69/18 72/19 72/20 72/22 72/23 73/9 74/12 74/17 75/8 75/12 76/10 77/11 79/19 81/7 81/25 82/1 84/15 84/23 88/7 89/3 94/5 94/17 95/2 100/7 103/6 103/16 103/17 104/23 105/12 114/5 124/25 128/17 130/5 131/2 131/6 132/4 132/5 132/7 136/3 136/19 141/11 146/14 146/20 148/4 148/17 149/23 149/24 151/7 151/12 152/11 153/3 156/24 157/1 157/5 158/5 159/5 160/15 161/14 161/15 166/10

166/14 167/15 167/17 168/18 170/23 172/17 172/18 175/14 179/18 179/19 181/15 182/9 183/18 183/18 183/22 185/7 185/16 185/19 187/19 189/5 189/18 189/18 190/6 191/18 194/17 195/13 196/16 196/18 198/6 203/3 204/4 204/15 205/23 205/24

## yesterday's [1]

 149/18 yet [3] 61/15 185/1 204/15you [965]
you'd [11] 11/15 11/17 84/7 94/6 108/18 116/8 139/17 174/20 194/1 198/10 199/23
you'll [11] 34/25
56/17 57/1 71/23
72/22 74/14 74/20 79/16 83/13 106/7 186/14
you're [37] 2/12 4/22 10/10 14/21 36/13 60/21 62/2 67/18 79/18 81/22 84/21 93/8 101/4 105/23 110/25 111/16 113/23 134/2 138/1 153/11 157/19 158/5 159/9 160/2 161/1 161/25 169/19 172/19 184/19 184/22 185/1 189/17 197/16 198/20 198/21 200/23 203/1
you've [26] 2/24 4/18 19/14 28/12 32/1 61/1 107/14 107/19 107/20 109/25 127/15 137/20 141/25 143/5 153/8 156/1 156/9 163/22 168/24 171/4 172/10 173/2 173/6 174/9 180/14 202/16
your [144] 1/10 1/25 2/3 2/9 2/11 2/16 3/16 $3 / 194 / 5$ 9/6 10/5 11/1 11/19 12/6 12/15 13/1 $14 / 314 / 1715 / 516 / 19$ 17/15 23/2 25/11
31/16 32/7 32/12
32/13 34/1 34/1 34/17 34/17 36/4 37/24 45/9 46/12 47/12 47/15 47/17 47/21 48/21 49/9 50/2 50/12 50/14 53/19 55/18 61/21 63/16 65/15 66/9
67/17 68/20 68/22


