1	Friday, 11 November 2022	1	you who are here, nor can you do it in relation to those
2	(11.00 am)	2	who are hearing it in real time because they are on
3	THE CHAIR: Thank you for observing the mark of respect.	3	a live link. So what you can do in relation to all of
4	This is a third preliminary hearing in the public	4	you and to them is to require you to refrain from
5	inquiry into the death of Dawn Sturgess, who died	5	publishing anything about what is said in court until
6	in July 2018.	6	the end of the hearing, and that way again there can be
7		7	time to take stock should an accident happen. It seems
8	Thank you all very much for coming. That includes	8	
	not only those of you who are here but those of you who	9	to me very unlikely that anything of that kind will
9	are listening or attending remotely. I am keen to give		occur, but you will understand the risks can't be taken.
10	the maximum possible scope for attendance remotely, if	10	So I am persuaded that that's an appropriate thing
11	that is convenient, as I know it is to Ms Sturgess's	11	to do for today and the order I propose to make is as
12	family.	12	follows:
13	This will, like its predecessors, be a preliminary		The public and media attending this hearing remotely
14	hearing. Its purpose is to manage the future conduct of	14	will do so by means of a link with a five minute delay.
15	the inquiry so that the evidence can be heard in due	15	Members of the public and the media who are in court may
16	course in an orderly fashion, with all the parties	16	not, I am afraid, communicate using electronic devices
17	having had the opportunity to prepare properly. The	17	during the hearing, for the obvious reason that I have
18	time for hearing the evidence, as I hope is apparent to	18	given. The court participants and legal representatives
19	everybody, comes later.	19	who are attending the hearing remotely will have a live
20	Housekeeping	20	link. They may, of course, communicate with other
21	There is one preliminary matter of housekeeping,	21	members of their team in real time; they will need to do
22	which I am told you have all been alerted to. And it	22	that. But what they may not do is communicate any more
23	arises in this way: as you will all know, the reason why	23	widely about the hearing while it is going on. Now,
24	this investigation into Dawn Sturgess's death was	24	I gather that although there wasn't time to, and there
25	converted from an inquest into a public inquiry is that,	25	perhaps ought to have been, there wasn't time to invite
	Page 1		Page 3
1	because of the circumstances, it is obvious and	1	written submissions about this. I gather that all of
2	inevitable that a good deal of highly sensitive material	2	you have been alerted to the problem and had time to
3	is bound to have to be considered in closed hearings.	3	think about it, and I hope and expect that that means
4	If it had remained an inquest that couldn't have been	4	that there isn't anything that anyone needs to say at
5	possible; it couldn't have been considered at all.	5	this moment. Am I right about that?
6	Now, I have received a request from those acting for	6	MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I thank you.
7	the various Government departments for arrangements to	7	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much, Mr Mansfield, I am
8	be made at this and later hearings to guard against any	8	grateful. Well then that is the order that I make in
9	risk that there might be of accidental mention in court	9	relation to today. For future hearings we will make
10	of sensitive material. The problem is, if you think	10	sure, I shall make sure, that either those or perhaps
11	about it, that if you don't make special arrangements	11	modified arrangements are properly thought about well in
12	once there has been such an accident, and something has	12	advance and you all have time to think about it if
13	been inadvertently mentioned, you can't undo it. So	13	necessary. But I hope everybody sees the sense of what
14	various other inquiries and some tribunals which handle	14	is being done.
15	sensitive material have evolved a technique for managing	15	Right, thank you for that. I shall ask Mr O'Connor
16	this risk, and what do you in essence is two things:	16	to open proceedings. Yes Mr O'Connor.
17	first of all you introduce a delay of a few minutes of	17	Submissions by MR O'CONNOR
18	the feed from here to those members of the public and	18	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, I am grateful. I will start with
19	press who are observing proceedings remotely. Then, if	19	representation.
20	there were an accidental mention of something which is	20	THE CHAIR: Please.
21	very sensitive, the feed can be cut off before it	21	MR O'CONNOR: I appear as counsel to the inquiry, with my
22	reaches anybody outside this courtroom, and then there	22	learned friends Ms Whitelaw and Ms Pottle. The family
23	is scope for argument about whether it is necessary to	23	of Dawn Sturgess and also Charlie Rowley are represented
24	do anything about it.	24	by my learned friends Mr Mansfield KC and Mr Nichols.
25	You can't obviously do that in relation to those of	25	The Secretary of State for the Home Department and also
	Page 2		Page 4

1	other Government departments are represented by my	1	are any problems with the link, then as before, we
2	learned friend Ms McGahey KC and Ms Woolf.	2	encourage anyone who is remote and suffering
3	THE CHAIR: Yes.	3	difficulties in the first instance to contact either
4	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the constituent parts of Operation	4	Mr Smith or Ms Nichols by email.
5	Verbasco are represented today. First of all the	5	THE CHAIR: Please. I am grateful to whoever it is who has
6	Metropolitan Police, by my learned friend	6	arranged the improved technology. It didn't work well
7	Ms Giovanetti KC and Mr Moss. And Thames Valley Police	7	last time.
8	by Mr Goss. The Chief Constable of Wiltshire Police is	8	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, very briefly, there is a hearing bundle
9	represented by Mr Beggs KC. Sergei and Yulia Skripal	9	that has been prepared. All core participants should
10	are represented by Mr Chapman, who is here.	10	have received a copy of it electronically. I know you
11	THE CHAIR: Good.	11	have, I think you have a hard copy
12	MR O'CONNOR: And lastly, sir, simply to mention that two	12	THE CHAIR: I have a hard copy as well, yes.
13	other core participants, that is Wiltshire Council and	13	MR O'CONNOR: as well as the electronic bundle. It is
14	the South Western Ambulance Service NHS Foundation	14	numbered tabs 1 to 25, and I will be making some
15	Trust. You are aware they have filed written	15	reference to it during my submissions.
16	submissions for this hearing but have indicated to you	16	THE CHAIR: Mm-hm.
17	that they will not be attending.	17	MR O'CONNOR: So written submissions. We, that is counsel
18	THE CHAIR: They were kind enough to ask to be excused and	18	to the inquiry, filed our written submissions on
19	it seems to me perfectly appropriate.	19	17 October, and core participants helpfully provided
20	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, yes.	20	responsive submissions on 31 October. Those are all in
21	Sir, as you have mentioned, this is the third open	21	the bundle at tabs 4 to 10.
22	directions hearing in this inquiry. Earlier open	22	THE CHAIR: Yes, I have seen them and read them. Thank you.
23	directions hearings took place in March and July this	23	MR O'CONNOR: We propose to publish those submissions, sir,
24	year, and each of those two hearings was followed	24	on the inquiry website after this hearing. That is
25	shortly afterwards by a closed hearing.	25	a course we have adopted at previous hearings. Of
	Page 5		Page 7
1	THE CHAIR: Mm-hm.	1	course if there are any objections to us doing that from
2	MR O'CONNOR: Following the July hearing, you issued	2	core participants we invite them to raise those
3	a ruling regarding the application for restriction		* *
		3	objections with you when they come to make oral
4	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed	3 4	objections with you when they come to make oral submissions in due course.
4 5	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		
	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed	4	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes.
5	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both	4 5	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1
5 6	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on	4 5 6	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal
5 6 7	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website.	4 5 6 7	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1
5 6 7 8	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website. THE CHAIR: Yes.	4 5 6 7 8	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal with the hearing. For the purposes of the oral
5 6 7 8 9	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And I will return to them both in the course	4 5 6 7 8 9	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal with the hearing. For the purposes of the oral hearings, I propose to take all of the issues arising under the first three items on the agenda together, that
5 6 7 8 9	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And I will return to them both in the course of my submissions this morning.	4 5 6 7 8 9	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal with the hearing. For the purposes of the oral hearings, I propose to take all of the issues arising
5 6 7 8 9 10	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And I will return to them both in the course of my submissions this morning. So just a few preliminary housekeeping matters, if	4 5 6 7 8 9 10	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal with the hearing. For the purposes of the oral hearings, I propose to take all of the issues arising under the first three items on the agenda together, that is the disclosure update, restriction notice, and what
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And I will return to them both in the course of my submissions this morning. So just a few preliminary housekeeping matters, if I may.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal with the hearing. For the purposes of the oral hearings, I propose to take all of the issues arising under the first three items on the agenda together, that is the disclosure update, restriction notice, and what we have described as the way ahead. I will make
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And I will return to them both in the course of my submissions this morning. So just a few preliminary housekeeping matters, if I may. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal with the hearing. For the purposes of the oral hearings, I propose to take all of the issues arising under the first three items on the agenda together, that is the disclosure update, restriction notice, and what we have described as the way ahead. I will make submissions on those matters and then, sir, you will
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And I will return to them both in the course of my submissions this morning. So just a few preliminary housekeeping matters, if I may. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MR O'CONNOR: So first of all as you have already indicated	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal with the hearing. For the purposes of the oral hearings, I propose to take all of the issues arising under the first three items on the agenda together, that is the disclosure update, restriction notice, and what we have described as the way ahead. I will make submissions on those matters and then, sir, you will invite submissions from core participants on those
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And I will return to them both in the course of my submissions this morning. So just a few preliminary housekeeping matters, if I may. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MR O'CONNOR: So first of all as you have already indicated this is a hybrid hearing. All advocates are here in the	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal with the hearing. For the purposes of the oral hearings, I propose to take all of the issues arising under the first three items on the agenda together, that is the disclosure update, restriction notice, and what we have described as the way ahead. I will make submissions on those matters and then, sir, you will invite submissions from core participants on those matters.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And I will return to them both in the course of my submissions this morning. So just a few preliminary housekeeping matters, if I may. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MR O'CONNOR: So first of all as you have already indicated this is a hybrid hearing. All advocates are here in the hearing room, but there are a number of observers, both	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal with the hearing. For the purposes of the oral hearings, I propose to take all of the issues arising under the first three items on the agenda together, that is the disclosure update, restriction notice, and what we have described as the way ahead. I will make submissions on those matters and then, sir, you will invite submissions from core participants on those matters. THE CHAIR: Yes, I think those all go together, Mr O'Connor.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And I will return to them both in the course of my submissions this morning. So just a few preliminary housekeeping matters, if I may. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MR O'CONNOR: So first of all as you have already indicated this is a hybrid hearing. All advocates are here in the hearing room, but there are a number of observers, both core participants and legal representatives, including,	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal with the hearing. For the purposes of the oral hearings, I propose to take all of the issues arising under the first three items on the agenda together, that is the disclosure update, restriction notice, and what we have described as the way ahead. I will make submissions on those matters and then, sir, you will invite submissions from core participants on those matters. THE CHAIR: Yes, I think those all go together, Mr O'Connor. MR O'CONNOR: They do, sir. The intention is that after
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And I will return to them both in the course of my submissions this morning. So just a few preliminary housekeeping matters, if I may. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MR O'CONNOR: So first of all as you have already indicated this is a hybrid hearing. All advocates are here in the hearing room, but there are a number of observers, both core participants and legal representatives, including, sir, as you have already mentioned, some of the family	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal with the hearing. For the purposes of the oral hearings, I propose to take all of the issues arising under the first three items on the agenda together, that is the disclosure update, restriction notice, and what we have described as the way ahead. I will make submissions on those matters and then, sir, you will invite submissions from core participants on those matters. THE CHAIR: Yes, I think those all go together, Mr O'Connor. MR O'CONNOR: They do, sir. The intention is that after that we will then deal separately with first of all the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And I will return to them both in the course of my submissions this morning. So just a few preliminary housekeeping matters, if I may. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MR O'CONNOR: So first of all as you have already indicated this is a hybrid hearing. All advocates are here in the hearing room, but there are a number of observers, both core participants and legal representatives, including, sir, as you have already mentioned, some of the family of Ms Sturgess, who are following on a remote link. So	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal with the hearing. For the purposes of the oral hearings, I propose to take all of the issues arising under the first three items on the agenda together, that is the disclosure update, restriction notice, and what we have described as the way ahead. I will make submissions on those matters and then, sir, you will invite submissions from core participants on those matters. THE CHAIR: Yes, I think those all go together, Mr O'Connor. MR O'CONNOR: They do, sir. The intention is that after that we will then deal separately with first of all the question of the venue of the substantive hearings and
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And I will return to them both in the course of my submissions this morning. So just a few preliminary housekeeping matters, if I may. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MR O'CONNOR: So first of all as you have already indicated this is a hybrid hearing. All advocates are here in the hearing room, but there are a number of observers, both core participants and legal representatives, including, sir, as you have already mentioned, some of the family of Ms Sturgess, who are following on a remote link. So it is right to say that at the last hearing there were	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal with the hearing. For the purposes of the oral hearings, I propose to take all of the issues arising under the first three items on the agenda together, that is the disclosure update, restriction notice, and what we have described as the way ahead. I will make submissions on those matters and then, sir, you will invite submissions from core participants on those matters. THE CHAIR: Yes, I think those all go together, Mr O'Connor. MR O'CONNOR: They do, sir. The intention is that after that we will then deal separately with first of all the question of the venue of the substantive hearings and the timing of the substantive hearings. And lastly
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And I will return to them both in the course of my submissions this morning. So just a few preliminary housekeeping matters, if I may. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MR O'CONNOR: So first of all as you have already indicated this is a hybrid hearing. All advocates are here in the hearing room, but there are a number of observers, both core participants and legal representatives, including, sir, as you have already mentioned, some of the family of Ms Sturgess, who are following on a remote link. So it is right to say that at the last hearing there were some difficulties with the remote connection.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal with the hearing. For the purposes of the oral hearings, I propose to take all of the issues arising under the first three items on the agenda together, that is the disclosure update, restriction notice, and what we have described as the way ahead. I will make submissions on those matters and then, sir, you will invite submissions from core participants on those matters. THE CHAIR: Yes, I think those all go together, Mr O'Connor. MR O'CONNOR: They do, sir. The intention is that after that we will then deal separately with first of all the question of the venue of the substantive hearings and the timing of the substantive hearings. And lastly there may be matters of any other business, including
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And I will return to them both in the course of my submissions this morning. So just a few preliminary housekeeping matters, if I may. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MR O'CONNOR: So first of all as you have already indicated this is a hybrid hearing. All advocates are here in the hearing room, but there are a number of observers, both core participants and legal representatives, including, sir, as you have already mentioned, some of the family of Ms Sturgess, who are following on a remote link. So it is right to say that at the last hearing there were some difficulties with the remote connection. THE CHAIR: Yes.	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal with the hearing. For the purposes of the oral hearings, I propose to take all of the issues arising under the first three items on the agenda together, that is the disclosure update, restriction notice, and what we have described as the way ahead. I will make submissions on those matters and then, sir, you will invite submissions from core participants on those matters. THE CHAIR: Yes, I think those all go together, Mr O'Connor. MR O'CONNOR: They do, sir. The intention is that after that we will then deal separately with first of all the question of the venue of the substantive hearings and the timing of the substantive hearings. And lastly there may be matters of any other business, including the timing of the next preliminary hearing.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And I will return to them both in the course of my submissions this morning. So just a few preliminary housekeeping matters, if I may. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MR O'CONNOR: So first of all as you have already indicated this is a hybrid hearing. All advocates are here in the hearing room, but there are a number of observers, both core participants and legal representatives, including, sir, as you have already mentioned, some of the family of Ms Sturgess, who are following on a remote link. So it is right to say that at the last hearing there were some difficulties with the remote connection. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: But we have made very different arrangements	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal with the hearing. For the purposes of the oral hearings, I propose to take all of the issues arising under the first three items on the agenda together, that is the disclosure update, restriction notice, and what we have described as the way ahead. I will make submissions on those matters and then, sir, you will invite submissions from core participants on those matters. THE CHAIR: Yes, I think those all go together, Mr O'Connor. MR O'CONNOR: They do, sir. The intention is that after that we will then deal separately with first of all the question of the venue of the substantive hearings and the timing of the substantive hearings. And lastly there may be matters of any other business, including the timing of the next preliminary hearing. THE CHAIR: Yes.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And I will return to them both in the course of my submissions this morning. So just a few preliminary housekeeping matters, if I may. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MR O'CONNOR: So first of all as you have already indicated this is a hybrid hearing. All advocates are here in the hearing room, but there are a number of observers, both core participants and legal representatives, including, sir, as you have already mentioned, some of the family of Ms Sturgess, who are following on a remote link. So it is right to say that at the last hearing there were some difficulties with the remote connection. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: But we have made very different arrangements on this hearing, and we very much hope, therefore, that there not be any recurrence of those problems. If there	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal with the hearing. For the purposes of the oral hearings, I propose to take all of the issues arising under the first three items on the agenda together, that is the disclosure update, restriction notice, and what we have described as the way ahead. I will make submissions on those matters and then, sir, you will invite submissions from core participants on those matters. THE CHAIR: Yes, I think those all go together, Mr O'Connor. MR O'CONNOR: They do, sir. The intention is that after that we will then deal separately with first of all the question of the venue of the substantive hearings and the timing of the substantive hearings. And lastly there may be matters of any other business, including the timing of the next preliminary hearing. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: So lastly in terms of housekeeping, I just mention, I have already mentioned, that there were
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	orders in relation to names that had been canvassed before you, and you also gave certain directions. Both the ruling and those directions have been published on the inquiry website. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And I will return to them both in the course of my submissions this morning. So just a few preliminary housekeeping matters, if I may. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MR O'CONNOR: So first of all as you have already indicated this is a hybrid hearing. All advocates are here in the hearing room, but there are a number of observers, both core participants and legal representatives, including, sir, as you have already mentioned, some of the family of Ms Sturgess, who are following on a remote link. So it is right to say that at the last hearing there were some difficulties with the remote connection. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: But we have made very different arrangements on this hearing, and we very much hope, therefore, that	4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	submissions in due course. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the agenda for this hearing is at tab 1 of the bundle. Just to indicate how we propose to deal with the hearing. For the purposes of the oral hearings, I propose to take all of the issues arising under the first three items on the agenda together, that is the disclosure update, restriction notice, and what we have described as the way ahead. I will make submissions on those matters and then, sir, you will invite submissions from core participants on those matters. THE CHAIR: Yes, I think those all go together, Mr O'Connor. MR O'CONNOR: They do, sir. The intention is that after that we will then deal separately with first of all the question of the venue of the substantive hearings and the timing of the substantive hearings. And lastly there may be matters of any other business, including the timing of the next preliminary hearing. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: So lastly in terms of housekeeping, I just

1	closed hearings that followed the earlier preliminary	1	material to your team for review, we have provided some
2	hearings in this inquiry. Just for the sake of	2	fairly detailed points about this in our written
3	transparency, may I make it clear that arrangements have	3	submissions. As I have said, we propose to publish
4	been made so that a closed hearing can take place	4	those, and so I am not going to go into that level of
5	following this hearing if you consider it necessary,	5	detail in my oral submissions this morning. As you will
6	having heard open submissions.	6	recall from both the previous hearing in July and the
7	Our current view, which is reflected in our	7	hearing before that, the stage 1 disclosure process was
8	submissions, is that it may well be that it is not	8	being delayed by what was described as the preliminary
9	necessary to have a closed hearing following this	9	security review. That was the requirement for the
10	hearing.	10	Government department to review for security
11	THE CHAIR: We will see.	11	sensitivities the majority of documents emanating from
12	MR O'CONNOR: But sir, clearly it is a matter for you and	12	the police before they were provided to us. As a result
13	you will make a decision whether you think a closed	13	of directions that you gave following the last hearing,
14	hearing is needed at the end of this hearing. And we	14	that process has now ended and that has had a very
15	will of course confirm in due course whether such	15	significant effect. In a word, the process has become
16	a hearing has taken place for those core participants	16	unblocked. As you will see from written submissions, in
17	who would not take part in such a hearing.	17	the months since the last hearing Operation Verbasco has
18	THE CHAIR: Yes, well, if anybody proposes to suggest it	18	provided us, the inquiry legal team, with thousands of
19	they should do so, please, while on their feet.	19	documents for review.
20	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, I will turn, then, to those three matters	20	Sir, you will have seen that there is
21	on the agenda, which I will address cumulatively.	21	an inconsistency between the numbers of Operation
22	Disclosure. Update. Future proposals.	22	Verbasco documents we have provided in our submissions,
23	Sir, as we have observed, and other core	23	and the numbers described in the Operation Verbasco
24	participants have observed at previous hearings, the	24	submissions. That inconsistency arises, it seems, from
25	difficulty and sheer length of the disclosure process is	25	how documents are counted, in other words whether
	Page 9		Page 11
1	a striking feature of this inquiry. It is important	1	a series of log entries, for example, is counted as
1 2	a striking feature of this inquiry. It is important that I do start by referring again to these very unusual	1 2	a series of log entries, for example, is counted as a single document or a series of items.
	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual		a series of log entries, for example, is counted as a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between
2	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before	2	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between
2 3	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those	2 3	a single document or a series of items.
2 3 4	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course	2 3 4	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it?
2 3 4 5	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those	2 3 4 5	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes.
2 3 4 5 6	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right.
2 3 4 5 6 7	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to	2 3 4 5 6 7	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to share more positive news than at the last. As a result,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference of approach. We took the former approach and Operation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to share more positive news than at the last. As a result, largely, of directions that you made, sir, at that last	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to share more positive news than at the last. As a result, largely, of directions that you made, sir, at that last hearing, or rather following the last hearing, the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference of approach. We took the former approach and Operation Verbasco the latter. THE CHAIR: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to share more positive news than at the last. As a result, largely, of directions that you made, sir, at that last	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference of approach. We took the former approach and Operation Verbasco the latter.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to share more positive news than at the last. As a result, largely, of directions that you made, sir, at that last hearing, or rather following the last hearing, the process of disclosure is now moving much more rapidly than it had been previously. There are various points	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference of approach. We took the former approach and Operation Verbasco the latter. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: At least for our part we don't think it is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to share more positive news than at the last. As a result, largely, of directions that you made, sir, at that last hearing, or rather following the last hearing, the process of disclosure is now moving much more rapidly	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference of approach. We took the former approach and Operation Verbasco the latter. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: At least for our part we don't think it is going to be necessary for you to engage too closely this
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to share more positive news than at the last. As a result, largely, of directions that you made, sir, at that last hearing, or rather following the last hearing, the process of disclosure is now moving much more rapidly than it had been previously. There are various points I am going to make covering both, first of all the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference of approach. We took the former approach and Operation Verbasco the latter. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: At least for our part we don't think it is going to be necessary for you to engage too closely this morning with the distinction between a document and an item. As the more important point is that there is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to share more positive news than at the last. As a result, largely, of directions that you made, sir, at that last hearing, or rather following the last hearing, the process of disclosure is now moving much more rapidly than it had been previously. There are various points I am going to make covering both, first of all the progress that has been made and developments since the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference of approach. We took the former approach and Operation Verbasco the latter. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: At least for our part we don't think it is going to be necessary for you to engage too closely this morning with the distinction between a document and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to share more positive news than at the last. As a result, largely, of directions that you made, sir, at that last hearing, or rather following the last hearing, the process of disclosure is now moving much more rapidly than it had been previously. There are various points I am going to make covering both, first of all the progress that has been made and developments since the last hearing. Those points largely cover what we have	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference of approach. We took the former approach and Operation Verbasco the latter. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: At least for our part we don't think it is going to be necessary for you to engage too closely this morning with the distinction between a document and an item. As the more important point is that there is a common understanding and agreement about the volume of documents being provided from Operation Verbasco to us,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to share more positive news than at the last. As a result, largely, of directions that you made, sir, at that last hearing, or rather following the last hearing, the process of disclosure is now moving much more rapidly than it had been previously. There are various points I am going to make covering both, first of all the progress that has been made and developments since the last hearing. Those points largely cover what we have described as stage I disclosure. Then further points	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference of approach. We took the former approach and Operation Verbasco the latter. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: At least for our part we don't think it is going to be necessary for you to engage too closely this morning with the distinction between a document and an item. As the more important point is that there is a common understanding and agreement about the volume of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to share more positive news than at the last. As a result, largely, of directions that you made, sir, at that last hearing, or rather following the last hearing, the process of disclosure is now moving much more rapidly than it had been previously. There are various points I am going to make covering both, first of all the progress that has been made and developments since the last hearing. Those points largely cover what we have described as stage 1 disclosure. Then further points about what we have described as the way forward, where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference of approach. We took the former approach and Operation Verbasco the latter. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: At least for our part we don't think it is going to be necessary for you to engage too closely this morning with the distinction between a document and an item. As the more important point is that there is a common understanding and agreement about the volume of documents being provided from Operation Verbasco to us, and in short, where, as before, we were receiving very small numbers of documents for review from Operation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to share more positive news than at the last. As a result, largely, of directions that you made, sir, at that last hearing, or rather following the last hearing, the process of disclosure is now moving much more rapidly than it had been previously. There are various points I am going to make covering both, first of all the progress that has been made and developments since the last hearing. Those points largely cover what we have described as stage 1 disclosure. Then further points about what we have described as the way forward, where the focus is on restriction order applications and stage 2 disclosure. Restriction orders in this case	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference of approach. We took the former approach and Operation Verbasco the latter. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: At least for our part we don't think it is going to be necessary for you to engage too closely this morning with the distinction between a document and an item. As the more important point is that there is a common understanding and agreement about the volume of documents being provided from Operation Verbasco to us, and in short, where, as before, we were receiving very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to share more positive news than at the last. As a result, largely, of directions that you made, sir, at that last hearing, or rather following the last hearing, the process of disclosure is now moving much more rapidly than it had been previously. There are various points I am going to make covering both, first of all the progress that has been made and developments since the last hearing. Those points largely cover what we have described as stage 1 disclosure. Then further points about what we have described as the way forward, where the focus is on restriction order applications and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference of approach. We took the former approach and Operation Verbasco the latter. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: At least for our part we don't think it is going to be necessary for you to engage too closely this morning with the distinction between a document and an item. As the more important point is that there is a common understanding and agreement about the volume of documents being provided from Operation Verbasco to us, and in short, where, as before, we were receiving very small numbers of documents for review from Operation Verbasco, now we are receiving their material in very considerable volume.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to share more positive news than at the last. As a result, largely, of directions that you made, sir, at that last hearing, or rather following the last hearing, the process of disclosure is now moving much more rapidly than it had been previously. There are various points I am going to make covering both, first of all the progress that has been made and developments since the last hearing. Those points largely cover what we have described as stage 1 disclosure. Then further points about what we have described as the way forward, where the focus is on restriction order applications and stage 2 disclosure. Restriction orders in this case will be essential to enabling stage 2 disclosure, that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference of approach. We took the former approach and Operation Verbasco the latter. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: At least for our part we don't think it is going to be necessary for you to engage too closely this morning with the distinction between a document and an item. As the more important point is that there is a common understanding and agreement about the volume of documents being provided from Operation Verbasco to us, and in short, where, as before, we were receiving very small numbers of documents for review from Operation Verbasco, now we are receiving their material in very considerable volume. THE CHAIR: Right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to share more positive news than at the last. As a result, largely, of directions that you made, sir, at that last hearing, or rather following the last hearing, the process of disclosure is now moving much more rapidly than it had been previously. There are various points I am going to make covering both, first of all the progress that has been made and developments since the last hearing. Those points largely cover what we have described as stage 1 disclosure. Then further points about what we have described as the way forward, where the focus is on restriction order applications and stage 2 disclosure. Restriction orders in this case will be essential to enabling stage 2 disclosure, that is disclosure to core participants, to take place. THE CHAIR: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference of approach. We took the former approach and Operation Verbasco the latter. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: At least for our part we don't think it is going to be necessary for you to engage too closely this morning with the distinction between a document and an item. As the more important point is that there is a common understanding and agreement about the volume of documents being provided from Operation Verbasco to us, and in short, where, as before, we were receiving very small numbers of documents for review from Operation Verbasco, now we are receiving their material in very considerable volume. THE CHAIR: Right. MR O'CONNOR: Whilst this is a welcome development it does
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to share more positive news than at the last. As a result, largely, of directions that you made, sir, at that last hearing, or rather following the last hearing, the process of disclosure is now moving much more rapidly than it had been previously. There are various points I am going to make covering both, first of all the progress that has been made and developments since the last hearing. Those points largely cover what we have described as stage 1 disclosure. Then further points about what we have described as the way forward, where the focus is on restriction order applications and stage 2 disclosure. Restriction orders in this case will be essential to enabling stage 2 disclosure, that is disclosure to core participants, to take place.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference of approach. We took the former approach and Operation Verbasco the latter. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: At least for our part we don't think it is going to be necessary for you to engage too closely this morning with the distinction between a document and an item. As the more important point is that there is a common understanding and agreement about the volume of documents being provided from Operation Verbasco to us, and in short, where, as before, we were receiving very small numbers of documents for review from Operation Verbasco, now we are receiving their material in very considerable volume. THE CHAIR: Right. MR O'CONNOR: Whilst this is a welcome development it does of course place the onus on us to review the material as
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to share more positive news than at the last. As a result, largely, of directions that you made, sir, at that last hearing, or rather following the last hearing, the process of disclosure is now moving much more rapidly than it had been previously. There are various points I am going to make covering both, first of all the progress that has been made and developments since the last hearing. Those points largely cover what we have described as stage 1 disclosure. Then further points about what we have described as the way forward, where the focus is on restriction order applications and stage 2 disclosure. Restriction orders in this case will be essential to enabling stage 2 disclosure, that is disclosure to core participants, to take place. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, first of all by way of a factual update,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference of approach. We took the former approach and Operation Verbasco the latter. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: At least for our part we don't think it is going to be necessary for you to engage too closely this morning with the distinction between a document and an item. As the more important point is that there is a common understanding and agreement about the volume of documents being provided from Operation Verbasco to us, and in short, where, as before, we were receiving very small numbers of documents for review from Operation Verbasco, now we are receiving their material in very considerable volume. THE CHAIR: Right. MR O'CONNOR: Whilst this is a welcome development it does
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that I do start by referring again to these very unusual features of this inquiry, and also as before acknowledging the impact of this delay on all of those with an interest in the inquiry, in particular of course Dawn Sturgess's family. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: That said, at this hearing we are able to share more positive news than at the last. As a result, largely, of directions that you made, sir, at that last hearing, or rather following the last hearing, the process of disclosure is now moving much more rapidly than it had been previously. There are various points I am going to make covering both, first of all the progress that has been made and developments since the last hearing. Those points largely cover what we have described as stage 1 disclosure. Then further points about what we have described as the way forward, where the focus is on restriction order applications and stage 2 disclosure. Restriction orders in this case will be essential to enabling stage 2 disclosure, that is disclosure to core participants, to take place. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, first of all by way of a factual update,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	a single document or a series of items. THE CHAIR: That accounts for the difference between something of the order of 4,000 or 5,000 and 60,000, does it? MR O'CONNOR: It does sir, yes. THE CHAIR: All right. MR O'CONNOR: Not necessarily all logs, but that difference of approach. We took the former approach and Operation Verbasco the latter. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: At least for our part we don't think it is going to be necessary for you to engage too closely this morning with the distinction between a document and an item. As the more important point is that there is a common understanding and agreement about the volume of documents being provided from Operation Verbasco to us, and in short, where, as before, we were receiving very small numbers of documents for review from Operation Verbasco, now we are receiving their material in very considerable volume. THE CHAIR: Right. MR O'CONNOR: Whilst this is a welcome development it does of course place the onus on us to review the material as

1 received from the family make a reasonable query as to 1 holding the vast majority of documents. 2 whether we have sufficient resources for that task. 2 We have endeavoured to progress disclosure workflows 3 THE CHAIR: Yes. 3 with both of those teams. HMG has now provided 4 MR O'CONNOR: Given the sensitivity of the material in 4 disclosure strategies covering 13 departments or 5 question, there are limits to how we can scale up our 5 agencies which it represents, and we have provided input 6 capacity, but we have managed to ensure that two further into those documents. We hold regular meetings with the 7 members of the solicitors' team have obtained the Operation Verbasco team to discuss progress on the 8 appropriate level of clearance and authorisations to 8 police report, and to facilitate the proportionate Q assist with the task of reviewing documents for 9 disclosure of material. Operation Verbasco also 10 relevance. 10 continues to share with us fortnightly its performance 11 THE CHAIR: Right. 11 dashboard, tracking the metrics for the number of 12 MR O'CONNOR: We are making very good progress through the 12 documents held, scheduled and provided for security 13 police documents. Of the three tranches of material 13 review. 14 delivered by Operation Verbasco before 8 November, we 14 THE CHAIR: Right. 15 have completed our review of two of those tranches, and 15 MR O'CONNOR: So I will say more about the stage 2 16 will complete the third in the next few weeks. 16 disclosure process in a moment, but we anticipate 17 To date, we have reviewed over 23,000 documents, or 17 working even more closely with the Operation Verbasco 18 items, to use Operation Verbasco's terminology. 18 and HMG teams in that context. 19 A fourth tranche was delivered just a few days ago, on 19 So turning briefly to the stage 2 disclosure 20 8 November, and that will take the total to just over 20 process 21 28,000 documents. THE CHAIR: Yes. 2.1 22 THE CHAIR: Right. 22 MR O'CONNOR: As we have noted in paragraph 10 of our 23 MR O'CONNOR: It is also worth noting that we have worked 23 written submissions, a limited amount of stage 2 24 with both Operation Verbasco and the Wiltshire Police to 24 disclosure, 40 or so documents, has been provided to 25 try to prioritise documents within the disclosure 25 core participants since the July hearing. Page 13 Page 15 1 process so that very broadly speaking documents which 1 THE CHAIR: Well, that so far is pretty limited, isn't it? 2 2 may be more likely to be relevant are reviewed earlier MR O'CONNOR: Of course it is, sir, and it will be 3 than those that are not. 3 immediately apparent that numbers of that nature, 40 or 4 4 Also, our stage 1 reviewing task is not limited to so, bear no comparison to the thousands of documents 5 5 police documents. As we note in our submissions, we that are currently being reviewed for relevance. Many 6 have also received further material for review, first of 6 of which ultimately will be disclosed to core 7 all from Her Majesty's Government -- or His Majesty's 7 participants. It is right to say there is an increasing 8 8 Government, sorry, and also from Wiltshire Council. As volume of material that has been determined to be 9 9 to that material, we have now reviewed all of the relevant but which is being held back from stage 2 10 material provided by HMG since the last hearing, some 10 disclosure pending restriction order applications. That 11 nine lever arch files. Relevant decisions have been 11 includes the police report that I have mentioned, and 12 provided in writing in respect of three files of that 12 which we have discussed at previous hearings, and the 13 13 material and we have given an indication in meetings documents exhibited to it. 14 regarding the way in which we propose to address the 14 Sir, the small, in fact very small, proportion of 15 remaining material. We have also reviewed all of the 15 relevant documents that we are able to disclose to core 16 material, that is two files, from Wiltshire Council and 16 participants in advance of the restriction order process 17 a further three files that we have received from 17 is simply, we say, another consequence of the scale and 18 Wiltshire Police. 18 nature of the sensitivities in this case. 19 Sir, it is also important to emphasise that our work 19 THE CHAIR: Yes. 20 is not limited simply to reviewing documents that have 20 MR O'CONNOR: Sir, I have mentioned the police report 21 been provided. We have engaged very extensively in 21 a couple of times now. And as all will be aware, work 22 a practice of holding regular meetings and engaging in 22 has been under way for some time in preparing 23 23 correspondence with all core participants, but in a statement, or report, describing the police 24 particular with Operation Verbasco and the HMG teams. 24 investigation and its outcome, together with key 25 Operation Verbasco and HMG, of course, between them 25 underlying documents. This work has been led by Page 16 Page 14

1 1 Operation Verbasco, but both we, and those acting for can't make submissions about it. 2 HMG, have had very considerable input into it. We have 2 MR O'CONNOR: Ouite, sir. 3 no doubt that Ms Sturgess's family and those 3 THE CHAIR: Yes. 4 4 representing the family are keen to see this report. MR O'CONNOR: And you, of course, as the head of this 5 THE CHAIR: Certainly. 5 inquisitorial process will wish all parties to have the 6 MR O'CONNOR: But it is right to say that that report is 6 material that they would need. 7 7 THE CHAIR: Oh, yes. still in draft in that content from the Operation 8 Verbasco disclosure is being constantly added, or being 8 MR O'CONNOR: In order to --9 9 prepared for addition to it, as we review the stage 1 THE CHAIR: In due course I will have to decide whether 10 10 disclosure. something is relevant or not, but all parties must have 11 It, that is the police report, is also one of those 11 the opportunity to see what they can --12 MR O'CONNOR: Yes. documents that cannot be disclosed to core participants 12 13 until you have determined, through ruling on restriction 13 THE CHAIR: -- of what might be relevant, so that they can 14 14 present their arguments. All right, thank you very or the applications, which aspects of this case must be 15 15 much. No, that is helpful, thank you. Now then, you dealt with by way of open evidence and which can 16 properly be addressed in closed. Indeed, the police 16 were going to go on to the restriction notice. 17 report is a classic example of such a document. 17 MR O'CONNOR: Yes, sir. 18 18 THE CHAIR: Right. In August of this year the Government legal MR O'CONNOR: At paragraphs 19 and 20 of our written 19 19 department served on the inquiry team a restriction 20 submissions, we drew attention to the fact that work on 20 notice signed by the then Home Secretary dated 21 21 27 July 2022. preparing the police report and, equally important, on THE CHAIR: Yes. 22 determining which parts of it are and are not sensitive, 22 23 has been conducted in parallel to the document review 23 MR O'CONNOR: A copy of the notice was sent to us on that 24 24 exercise. Indeed, you made a direction in relation to date, as I say, and will be published on the inquiry 25 25 website after the hearing. I should say all core this in April of this year. Page 17 Page 19 THE CHAIR: Yes. 1 1 participants have now seen it, because it was served 2 MR O'CONNOR: And as we note in our submissions, that work, 2 with our written submissions several weeks ago. 3 which is time consuming and which involves us, Operation 3 THE CHAIR: Yes. 4 Verbasco and HMG, has continued in recent months and we 4 MR O'CONNOR: Sir, a restriction notice is made under 5 are pleased to report that significant progress 5 Section 19 of the Inquiries Act 2005, and the relevant 6 continues to be made in this regard. 6 provisions of Section 19 are in fact set out in our 7 Sir, I am going to come on now to address what is in 7 written submissions, which, as I have said, will be 8 8 fact the second item on the agenda, which is published after the hearing. For anyone following these 9 9 a restriction notice. proceedings who is not familiar with the detailed 10 10 THE CHAIR: Well, just before you leave the very helpful provisions of the Inquiries Act, a restriction notice is 11 11 summary you have just given, may I ask a question about a determination that has precisely the same effect as 12 relevance. When your team is reviewing these many 12 a restriction order made by the chair of an inquiry. 13 They are both determinations relating to the way in 13 documents for the preliminary question of relevance, 14 what is being addressed? Is the test what you, as 14 which sensitive material falls to be treated within 15 counsel to the inquiry, may wish to adduce, or does it 15 an inquiry process. The difference between the two, and of course it is a very important difference, is that 16 16 extend to asking the question whether any other party 17 17 might reasonably think the material relevant? a restriction order is a decision that you make in 18 18 MR O'CONNOR: Well, sir, this is of course an inquisitorial a transparent way, having heard submissions from core 19 19 participants. A restriction notice, by contrast, is process, and so perhaps the shortest answer to your 20 essentially an instruction from a Government minister 20 query is that the test is the question of what you will 2.1 21 made without consultation. Having received the notice, need in order to conduct a full and fair investigation. 22 22 it was clear to us that the core participants would wish But, sir, to come back to the distinction you draw, it 23 is very much the latter. It is, we are of course 23 to know as much as possible about the material that it 24 covers. That material being referred to in the notice 24 mindful --25 as the schedule material. 25 THE CHAIR: Well, that is important because otherwise they Page 20 Page 18

		T T	
1	We therefore discussed this matter with those acting	1	THE CHAIR: Without that assurance the restriction notice
2	for HMG and consent was given to provide the following	2	would cause very serious difficulties for any tribunal
3	form of words:	3	chairman.
4	"The restriction notice only covers a small set of	4	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, that's quite right. As I said,
5	documents which represent an extremely small proportion	5	Mr Mansfield and Ms McGahey may address you further on
6	of the total number of documents that have been provided	6	that point, but that is our understanding.
7	or are being provided to the inquiry legal team by HMG."	7	THE CHAIR: That's what it comes to. All right.
8	As you know, sir, the family have recently raised	8	MR O'CONNOR: The effect of the restriction notice is to
9	further queries in correspondence which are summarised	9	impose special security requirements and arrangements on
10	in their written submissions, which is to be found at	10	how you may adduce this material into evidence.
11	tab 5 of the hearing bundle. Sir, I will let	11	THE CHAIR: Yes.
12	Mr Mansfield address those matters, if he wishes, but in	12	MR O'CONNOR: Or refer to it in your report. But it doesn't
13	summary it does appear to us that the family have been	13	prevent you from doing either of those two things.
14	given certain points of reassurance that they sought.	14	THE CHAIR: Yes. All right. Well, let's leave it there for
15	Sir, the correspondence to which I have referred is to	15	the moment.
16	be found at tabs 18 to 21 of the bundle. I don't ask	16	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, I am going to move on to the future.
17	you to call those matters up, but	17	First of all in terms of the future progress and
18	THE CHAIR: I have seen it, Mr O'Connor.	18	completion of stage 1 disclosure, as I have already
19	MR O'CONNOR: And I should add, sir, that we are proposing	19	said, the two organisations which are between them
20	to publish those pieces of correspondence along with the	20	providing by far the largest volume of material by way
21	restriction notice on the inquiry website.	21	of stage 1 disclosure are HMG and Operation Verbasco.
22	THE CHAIR: Yes.	22	THE CHAIR: Mm-hm.
23	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, finally, I would not wish to leave the	23	MR O'CONNOR: Both organisations have previously indicated
24	subject of the restriction notice without observing and	24	that the exercise of providing stage 1 disclosure to
25	emphasising that it is an exceptional measure. In most,	25	you, or in the case of Operation Verbasco the exercise
	tinpinesting unit to to an enterpression interest in meet,	20	you, or made that or operation vertables and entirelies
	Page 21		Page 23
1	some would say all, cases, it ought to be you and not	1	of scheduling that material, with disclosure to you to
2	the Secretary of State who takes the decision, we would	2	follow promptly thereafter, was likely to be complete by
3	submit a judicial decision, as to what evidence can be	3	the end of this calendar year.
4	adduced in open proceedings and what material must	4	THE CHAIR: That's about six weeks' time.
5	remain in closed. All that said, it should be	5	MR O'CONNOR: That's right. We did request in our written
6	emphasised that this particular restriction notice is	6	submissions that they provide an update in this regard,
7	a limited measure. It applies to only a very small	7	and both have now stated that their timings have
8	proportion of the HMG documentation that has been made	8	slipped. I will leave it to them to expand on the
9	available to you, and it will not prevent you, sir,	9	extent causes of that slippage. It is obviously
10	either from considering the schedule of material in	10	unfortunate.
11	evidence or from referring to it, if of course you think	11	THE CHAIR: Very.
12	that appropriate, in your report.	12	MR O'CONNOR: Particularly since we are now able to process
13	THE CHAIR: Well, that's very important, Mr O'Connor, and	13	documents much more quickly than we were earlier in the
14	that's how I read the correspondence.	14	year, and of course we all wish to move on to the
15	MR O'CONNOR: Yes.	15	stage 2 disclosure exercise.
16	THE CHAIR: You have had an assurance, have you, from His	16	Sir, as we indicated at paragraph 12 of our written
17	Majesty's Government, that notwithstanding the	17	submissions, we do invite you to direct monthly updates
18	restriction notice I can look at this material and if	18	be provided now by HMG and Operation Verbasco to the
19	necessary, in order to reach the conclusions, whatever	19	solicitor to the inquiry in a form that can be disclosed
20	they may be, that I arrive at, I can refer to it in	20	to other CPs on their progress towards completing
21	closed hearings. So at that point it becomes	21	stage 1 disclosure.
22	an equivalent to a restriction order that I might have	22	THE CHAIR: So that is not simply to let you know or to let
23	made.	23	me know, but to let the other participants know.
24	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, that is certainly the effect of the	24	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, we will come to the question of a further
25	correspondence as we read it.	25	hearing, but we have said in our written submissions
	1	1	<i>U</i> ,
	Page 22		Page 24

1 1 certainly submit that there can be a considerable degree that we anticipate a further preliminary hearing being 2 2 held in early next year. But it seemed to us that it of working in parallel. 3 3 THE CHAIR: Right. was important for core participants to have regular 4 4 MR O'CONNOR: Sir, you will have seen HMG's submission that updates on this particular issue within this period, 5 rather than wait until early next year to be told what 5 it is necessary to have a feel for the entirety of the 6 has happened; simply because it is so important that we 6 material in question before final decisions are made as 7 7 to where the boundaries between open and closed can and do finish this stage of the proceedings so that we can 8 properly advance to stage 2. should be drawn, but it absolutely does not follow, we 9 9 THE CHAIR: Right. say, and in fairness I don't think this is really 10 10 MR O'CONNOR: So it is the stage 2 disclosure, and the contentious as between us and HMG, it doesn't follow 11 restriction orders in particular, relating to the 11 that no useful work can be done on stage 2 until the 12 12 Operation Verbasco and HMG material that I now turn. final document has been reviewed for relevance at 13 And sir, I have already perhaps said this, but we 13 stage 1. Indeed, at our instigation, the inquiry has of 14 14 recall that the stage 2 disclosure is the process of course already begun to work on stage 2 issues. The 15 15 your team making available to core participants the restriction order applications in respect of names that 16 16 was dealt with at the last hearing being one example, documents that have been deemed relevant at stage 1. 17 And in many inquiries this is simply a logistical 17 and the preparatory work that was being done on the 18 18 exercise of transferring documents from one part of police report being another. 19 a database to another. But of course there is much more 19 THE CHAIR: Yes. 20 to it here, and most importantly this is the stage at 20 MR O'CONNOR: So we suggested in our written submissions 2.1 21 that work could begin immediately on identifying which the sensitive contents of relevant documents are 22 a sample set of documents for which HMG and Operation 22 removed from the open versions of the documents for 23 23 Verbasco could make applications for restriction orders. further consideration in closed session. And as 24 a starting point to some submissions on how this process 24 We suggested directions for first of all a date by which 25 25 the set of sample documents were to be agreed. should go forward, we advance three general Page 25 Page 27 propositions. First, the sensitivities surrounding this Secondly, a date by which HMG and Operation Verbasco 1 2 case are such that the scale of this task, that is going 2 were to make restriction orders, and then dates for open 3 through the restriction order process, will be very 3 and closed hearings to enable those applications to be 4 considerable indeed. In some cases the redaction 4 determined by you. 5 5 THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. process will simply involve removing a name, or 6 a reference to a particular technique. Here, the 6 MR O'CONNOR: You have, of course, subsequently seen HMG and sensitivities are complex. Each document that is to be 7 Operation Verbasco's responses to our proposal. The 8 8 disclosed in open will need to be considered with care. responses that were contained in their written 9 We anticipate many documents on a line by line or even submissions. HMG have indicated that identifying 10 word by word basis. We anticipate that there will be 10 a sample set of documents now will detract from efforts 11 11 extensive restriction order applications to permit to complete stage 1 disclosure, and ultimately slow 12 redactions to be made to documents. 12 progress overall. They also make the point, to which 13 THE CHAIR: Yes. 13 I have already referred, that it is not possible to make 14 MR O'CONNOR: Second, we must devise a means of dealing with 14 reliable applications on the basis of incomplete 15 these issues that is workable and as efficient as 15 material. Operation Verbasco are in a somewhat 16 16 different position. They have suggested making a single possible. And third, we must start to make progress 17 17 with the stage 2 exercise alongside the completion of overarching draft application in late January, before 18 stage 1 disclosure. 18 they have completed scheduling of their own material. 19 19 Sir, we have had productive discussions with both HMG THE CHAIR: Yes, there is no reason at all why they have to 20 be sequential, is there? 20 and Operation Verbasco since the filing of our 21 MR O'CONNOR: Well, sir, there --21 submissions and their submissions, and we have agreed 22 22 THE CHAIR: Some parts may. a proposal between all three of us which we believe will 23 MR O'CONNOR: Sir, one needs to clearly reach a certain 23 make real progress towards stage 2 disclosure without 24 stage with the stage 1 process in order to understand 24 creating unnecessary work. 25 the issues in the stage 2 process. But we would 25 THE CHAIR: Right. Page 26 Page 28 7 (Pages 25 to 28)

1	MR O'CONNOR: HMG will consider the first batch of police	1	of sensitivities in relation to the same documents by
2	material that has been reviewed by the inquiry legal	2	the same date; that is 28 February 2023. And sir, just
3	team, as it has been described, and which within that	3	to return to the point you have raised with me, this is
4	batch has been identified as relevant. That has been	4	a tripartite exercise. If these schedules are to be
5	referred to as batch 1. And also HMG will review the	5	drafted and to assist you in due course, it will be
6	documents which accompany the police report. They will	6	necessary for discussions to take place between each of
7	do that early next year, and produce a draft schedule of	7	the three parties; that is Operation Verbasco and HMG
8	sensitivities, the idea being that that will form the	8	and us, in order to make that process as efficient and
9	basis of restriction order applications to follow, which	9	helpful as possible.
10	will be timetabled at the next hearing.	10	THE CHAIR: Yes.
11	As I will mention in a moment, we anticipate, we	11	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, the first direction is simply a direction
12	think it appropriate, that Operation Verbasco are	12	for Operation Verbasco to ensure that it has provided
13	directed by you to conduct a similar process.	13	HMG with the documents in question by a backstop date of
14	Sir, we therefore invite you to make the following	14	30 November of this year. Without going into detail,
15	directions: first of all HMG to review what I will	15	sir, we know it will be possible for them to provide
16	describe as batch 1 of the Operation Verbasco disclosure	16	many of the documents earlier than that, but that is
17	and also those documents appended to the police report	17	a backstop date.
18	and then provide a draft schedule of sensitivities	18	And sir, the last direction relates, switches the
19	referring to those documents by 28 February 2023.	19	spot light to Wiltshire Police. Sir, I have already
20	THE CHAIR: Now, are you contemplating that that all	20	mentioned that they have been providing us with
21	happens, as it were, on 27 February, or is it	21	material. They have separate material, some of which,
22	a continuous process?	22	as I will mention in a moment, they have not yet been
23	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, we very much clearly a direction of	23	able to share with us because of computer difficulties.
24	this sort needs to have an end date.	24	But we invite you nonetheless to make a direction that
25	THE CHAIR: Oh yes.	25	they provide a draft schedule of sensitivities in
	Page 29		Page 31
1	MR O'CONNOR: It is very much our intention, and this is	1	respect of their material by the same date;
2	something that we have discussed with both teams, that	2	28 February 2023. And sir, if I may make two brief
3	that needs to be an iterative process and we hope to be	3	further points on those directions that we have
4	able to engage in this instance with the HMG team at	4	proposed. The first one does relate to Wiltshire
5	an early stage to discuss their work with them.	5	Police. As I have said, as we understand it the IT that
6	THE CHAIR: So when can this process start, in your	6	is required has still not been set up to allow them to
7	judgment?	7	transfer their batch of documents, which we believe
8	MR O'CONNOR: Well sir, we are happy to start it. I will	8	number some 6,000 documents, to us. So that's a point
9	come in a moment to the provision of the material to	9	which is made in the written submissions. You may
10	HMG, but certainly we anticipate it starting in the next	10	recall it has come up at previous hearings.
11	few weeks.	11	THE CHAIR: It has.
12	THE CHAIR: Right.	12	MR O'CONNOR: It is possible, therefore, depending on how
13	MR O'CONNOR: And then a process rolling forward going to	13	quickly the IT problems are ironed out, that we will not
14	the end of this year and early next year, so that we	14	have made sufficient stage 1 progress with their
15	hope that this will be a means of developing a much more	15	documents by early next year to enable them to comply
16	detailed understanding of what will be required in the	16	with the direction that we have invited you to make. We
17	restriction order process by, as I say, the end	17	hope to find a way around these difficulties, most
18	of February next year.	18	obviously by the IT problems being resolved speedily,
19	THE CHAIR: End of February. Mm-hm.	19	and therefore we do nonetheless invite you to make this
20	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, that is the first direction we invite you	20	direction but we do acknowledge now, and on the record,
21	to make, and of course you will hear submissions from	21	that there may be problems ahead for Wiltshire Police in
22	others in relation to that.	22	complying with it.
23	Sir, the second direction is a similar direction in	23	Sir, the second point I make returns to some of the
24	relation to Operation Verbasco. We invite you to direct	24	points I have made a few moments ago, and it is really
25	that they provide a similar schedule or draft schedule	25	one of emphasis. The purpose of these directions, as we
	Page 30		Page 32
<u> </u>	*****		8 (Pages 29 to 32)

1	see them, is to provide you with a full and secure basis	1	hadn't intended by saying what we said in our
2	on which to make directions for the restriction order	2	submissions that those points should be excluded.
3	process at the next hearing. I will come to the	3	I think we were simply using shorthand about some of the
4	question of fixing a date for the substantive hearings	4	steps that needed to take place.
5	of the inquiry in due course, but we make it clear now	5	THE CHAIR: The possible exercise of the Rule 12.3 power is
6	that it is imperative that we are able to make accurate	6	something that I would have to consider in any event,
7	predictions about the detail and length of the	7	and the core participants can make the necessary
8	restriction order process at the next hearing.	8	submission.
9	THE CHAIR: Effectively timetable it at our next meeting.	9	In relation to the other points about date for
10	MR O'CONNOR: Exactly, sir. Because unless we can produce	10	responses, does that, since you say you agree, does that
11	a reliable timetable, not just for the first restriction	11	entail the modification or addition to the draft of the
12	order applications but for the whole process, at the	12	directions that you have proposed?
13	next hearing, then amongst other things it will be	13	MR O'CONNOR: No it doesn't, sir, because that will be
14	difficult for you to fix a date for the substantive	14	a matter which you will need to think about at the next
15	hearings, which is a matter to which we will come.	15	hearing when you make directions for the determination
16	THE CHAIR: Yes.	16	of restriction orders.
17	MR O'CONNOR: But it follows, we say, that these schedules	17	THE CHAIR: Precisely.
18	of sensitivities that are to be the subject of these	18	MR O'CONNOR: Just to make it clear at this stage we
19	directions, if you make them, must be as robust and	19	entirely agree.
20	detailed as possible. Everyone involved must be clear	20	THE CHAIR: But in principle you agree?
21	that these documents will be relied on at the next	21	MR O'CONNOR: Of course. There must be an opportunity for
22	hearing for you to give final directions relating to the	22	core participants to make submissions on restriction
23	restriction order process. And once you have given	23	order applications.
24	those directions there can be no slippage, and as I have	24	THE CHAIR: Absolutely.
25	already indicated, we do suggest that there will be much	25	MR O'CONNOR: Then secondly and lastly, further down the
	, 56		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	Page 33		Page 35
1	to be gained if HMG and Op Verbasco in particular	1	page at paragraph 12 of the family submissions, first of
2	involve us at a early stage in the proposals, and	2	all they submit that restriction order applications when
_	3 & 1 1		an they sublint that restriction order applications when
3	equally if detailed discussions about the restriction	3	7
3	equally if detailed discussions about the restriction order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of		they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree.
Ī.	equally if detailed discussions about the restriction order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as	3	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's
4	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as	3 4	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree.
4 5	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible.	3 4 5	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail
4 5 6	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as	3 4 5 6	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and
4 5 6 7	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any submissions advanced by Mr Mansfield orally today	3 4 5 6 7	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail
4 5 6 7 8	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any	3 4 5 6 7 8	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and could I simply say we agree with them that paragraph
4 5 6 7 8 9	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any submissions advanced by Mr Mansfield orally today regarding the restriction order applications, once I've had an opportunity to make oral submissions. May	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and could I simply say we agree with them that paragraph 5(c) of that protocol should be read as stipulating that as much of the supporting evidence as possible should be
4 5 6 7 8 9	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any submissions advanced by Mr Mansfield orally today regarding the restriction order applications, once I've had an opportunity to make oral submissions. May I simply touch on a couple of points now that have been	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and could I simply say we agree with them that paragraph 5(c) of that protocol should be read as stipulating that
4 5 6 7 8 9 10	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any submissions advanced by Mr Mansfield orally today regarding the restriction order applications, once I've had an opportunity to make oral submissions. May I simply touch on a couple of points now that have been raised in their written submissions and it may help if	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and could I simply say we agree with them that paragraph 5(c) of that protocol should be read as stipulating that as much of the supporting evidence as possible should be provided in open. Sir
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any submissions advanced by Mr Mansfield orally today regarding the restriction order applications, once I've had an opportunity to make oral submissions. May I simply touch on a couple of points now that have been raised in their written submissions and it may help if you go to Mr Mansfield's written submissions at tab 5 of	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and could I simply say we agree with them that paragraph 5(c) of that protocol should be read as stipulating that as much of the supporting evidence as possible should be provided in open. Sir THE CHAIR: I am not sure you even need to say that, Mr O'Connor. But for the avoidance of doubt as far as
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any submissions advanced by Mr Mansfield orally today regarding the restriction order applications, once I've had an opportunity to make oral submissions. May I simply touch on a couple of points now that have been raised in their written submissions and it may help if you go to Mr Mansfield's written submissions at tab 5 of the bundle.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and could I simply say we agree with them that paragraph 5(c) of that protocol should be read as stipulating that as much of the supporting evidence as possible should be provided in open. Sir THE CHAIR: I am not sure you even need to say that, Mr O'Connor. But for the avoidance of doubt as far as I am concerned it follows as a matter of principle;
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any submissions advanced by Mr Mansfield orally today regarding the restriction order applications, once I've had an opportunity to make oral submissions. May I simply touch on a couple of points now that have been raised in their written submissions and it may help if you go to Mr Mansfield's written submissions at tab 5 of the bundle. THE CHAIR: Yes.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and could I simply say we agree with them that paragraph 5(c) of that protocol should be read as stipulating that as much of the supporting evidence as possible should be provided in open. Sir THE CHAIR: I am not sure you even need to say that, Mr O'Connor. But for the avoidance of doubt as far as
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any submissions advanced by Mr Mansfield orally today regarding the restriction order applications, once I've had an opportunity to make oral submissions. May I simply touch on a couple of points now that have been raised in their written submissions and it may help if you go to Mr Mansfield's written submissions at tab 5 of the bundle. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, at paragraph 11 of the family's	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and could I simply say we agree with them that paragraph 5(c) of that protocol should be read as stipulating that as much of the supporting evidence as possible should be provided in open. Sir THE CHAIR: I am not sure you even need to say that, Mr O'Connor. But for the avoidance of doubt as far as I am concerned it follows as a matter of principle; everything in this inquiry must be open, unless there is a reason for it not to be.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any submissions advanced by Mr Mansfield orally today regarding the restriction order applications, once I've had an opportunity to make oral submissions. May I simply touch on a couple of points now that have been raised in their written submissions and it may help if you go to Mr Mansfield's written submissions at tab 5 of the bundle. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, at paragraph 11 of the family's submissions they assert that directions regarding the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and could I simply say we agree with them that paragraph 5(c) of that protocol should be read as stipulating that as much of the supporting evidence as possible should be provided in open. Sir THE CHAIR: I am not sure you even need to say that, Mr O'Connor. But for the avoidance of doubt as far as I am concerned it follows as a matter of principle; everything in this inquiry must be open, unless there is a reason for it not to be. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, I am grateful for that. We entirely
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any submissions advanced by Mr Mansfield orally today regarding the restriction order applications, once I've had an opportunity to make oral submissions. May I simply touch on a couple of points now that have been raised in their written submissions and it may help if you go to Mr Mansfield's written submissions at tab 5 of the bundle. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, at paragraph 11 of the family's submissions they assert that directions regarding the determination of restriction order applications should	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and could I simply say we agree with them that paragraph 5(c) of that protocol should be read as stipulating that as much of the supporting evidence as possible should be provided in open. Sir THE CHAIR: I am not sure you even need to say that, Mr O'Connor. But for the avoidance of doubt as far as I am concerned it follows as a matter of principle; everything in this inquiry must be open, unless there is a reason for it not to be. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, I am grateful for that. We entirely adopt that.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any submissions advanced by Mr Mansfield orally today regarding the restriction order applications, once I've had an opportunity to make oral submissions. May I simply touch on a couple of points now that have been raised in their written submissions and it may help if you go to Mr Mansfield's written submissions at tab 5 of the bundle. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, at paragraph 11 of the family's submissions they assert that directions regarding the determination of restriction order applications should make provision for written responses from core	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and could I simply say we agree with them that paragraph 5(c) of that protocol should be read as stipulating that as much of the supporting evidence as possible should be provided in open. Sir THE CHAIR: I am not sure you even need to say that, Mr O'Connor. But for the avoidance of doubt as far as I am concerned it follows as a matter of principle; everything in this inquiry must be open, unless there is a reason for it not to be. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, I am grateful for that. We entirely adopt that. THE CHAIR: Sadly there may be quite a lot for which there
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any submissions advanced by Mr Mansfield orally today regarding the restriction order applications, once I've had an opportunity to make oral submissions. May I simply touch on a couple of points now that have been raised in their written submissions and it may help if you go to Mr Mansfield's written submissions at tab 5 of the bundle. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, at paragraph 11 of the family's submissions they assert that directions regarding the determination of restriction order applications should make provision for written responses from core participants, and that you should also consider	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and could I simply say we agree with them that paragraph 5(c) of that protocol should be read as stipulating that as much of the supporting evidence as possible should be provided in open. Sir THE CHAIR: I am not sure you even need to say that, Mr O'Connor. But for the avoidance of doubt as far as I am concerned it follows as a matter of principle; everything in this inquiry must be open, unless there is a reason for it not to be. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, I am grateful for that. We entirely adopt that. THE CHAIR: Sadly there may be quite a lot for which there is a reason. But there we are.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any submissions advanced by Mr Mansfield orally today regarding the restriction order applications, once I've had an opportunity to make oral submissions. May I simply touch on a couple of points now that have been raised in their written submissions and it may help if you go to Mr Mansfield's written submissions at tab 5 of the bundle. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, at paragraph 11 of the family's submissions they assert that directions regarding the determination of restriction order applications should make provision for written responses from core participants, and that you should also consider exercising the power under Rule 12.3 of the inquiry	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and could I simply say we agree with them that paragraph 5(c) of that protocol should be read as stipulating that as much of the supporting evidence as possible should be provided in open. Sir THE CHAIR: I am not sure you even need to say that, Mr O'Connor. But for the avoidance of doubt as far as I am concerned it follows as a matter of principle; everything in this inquiry must be open, unless there is a reason for it not to be. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, I am grateful for that. We entirely adopt that. THE CHAIR: Sadly there may be quite a lot for which there is a reason. But there we are. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, those are all of the submissions I wanted
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any submissions advanced by Mr Mansfield orally today regarding the restriction order applications, once I've had an opportunity to make oral submissions. May I simply touch on a couple of points now that have been raised in their written submissions and it may help if you go to Mr Mansfield's written submissions at tab 5 of the bundle. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, at paragraph 11 of the family's submissions they assert that directions regarding the determination of restriction order applications should make provision for written responses from core participants, and that you should also consider exercising the power under Rule 12.3 of the inquiry rules to disclose potentially restrictive material in	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and could I simply say we agree with them that paragraph 5(c) of that protocol should be read as stipulating that as much of the supporting evidence as possible should be provided in open. Sir THE CHAIR: I am not sure you even need to say that, Mr O'Connor. But for the avoidance of doubt as far as I am concerned it follows as a matter of principle; everything in this inquiry must be open, unless there is a reason for it not to be. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, I am grateful for that. We entirely adopt that. THE CHAIR: Sadly there may be quite a lot for which there is a reason. But there we are. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, those are all of the submissions I wanted to make on that first element relating to disclosure and
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any submissions advanced by Mr Mansfield orally today regarding the restriction order applications, once I've had an opportunity to make oral submissions. May I simply touch on a couple of points now that have been raised in their written submissions and it may help if you go to Mr Mansfield's written submissions at tab 5 of the bundle. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, at paragraph 11 of the family's submissions they assert that directions regarding the determination of restriction order applications should make provision for written responses from core participants, and that you should also consider exercising the power under Rule 12.3 of the inquiry rules to disclose potentially restrictive material in advance of determining restriction order applications.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and could I simply say we agree with them that paragraph 5(c) of that protocol should be read as stipulating that as much of the supporting evidence as possible should be provided in open. Sir THE CHAIR: I am not sure you even need to say that, Mr O'Connor. But for the avoidance of doubt as far as I am concerned it follows as a matter of principle; everything in this inquiry must be open, unless there is a reason for it not to be. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, I am grateful for that. We entirely adopt that. THE CHAIR: Sadly there may be quite a lot for which there is a reason. But there we are. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, those are all of the submissions I wanted to make on that first element relating to disclosure and it may be now appropriate for you to invite submissions
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any submissions advanced by Mr Mansfield orally today regarding the restriction order applications, once I've had an opportunity to make oral submissions. May I simply touch on a couple of points now that have been raised in their written submissions and it may help if you go to Mr Mansfield's written submissions at tab 5 of the bundle. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, at paragraph 11 of the family's submissions they assert that directions regarding the determination of restriction order applications should make provision for written responses from core participants, and that you should also consider exercising the power under Rule 12.3 of the inquiry rules to disclose potentially restrictive material in advance of determining restriction order applications. Sir, may we simply say that we agree. Those are clearly	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and could I simply say we agree with them that paragraph 5(c) of that protocol should be read as stipulating that as much of the supporting evidence as possible should be provided in open. Sir THE CHAIR: I am not sure you even need to say that, Mr O'Connor. But for the avoidance of doubt as far as I am concerned it follows as a matter of principle; everything in this inquiry must be open, unless there is a reason for it not to be. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, I am grateful for that. We entirely adopt that. THE CHAIR: Sadly there may be quite a lot for which there is a reason. But there we are. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, those are all of the submissions I wanted to make on that first element relating to disclosure and it may be now appropriate for you to invite submissions on that issue from the parties.
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any submissions advanced by Mr Mansfield orally today regarding the restriction order applications, once I've had an opportunity to make oral submissions. May I simply touch on a couple of points now that have been raised in their written submissions and it may help if you go to Mr Mansfield's written submissions at tab 5 of the bundle. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, at paragraph 11 of the family's submissions they assert that directions regarding the determination of restriction order applications should make provision for written responses from core participants, and that you should also consider exercising the power under Rule 12.3 of the inquiry rules to disclose potentially restrictive material in advance of determining restriction order applications.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and could I simply say we agree with them that paragraph 5(c) of that protocol should be read as stipulating that as much of the supporting evidence as possible should be provided in open. Sir THE CHAIR: I am not sure you even need to say that, Mr O'Connor. But for the avoidance of doubt as far as I am concerned it follows as a matter of principle; everything in this inquiry must be open, unless there is a reason for it not to be. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, I am grateful for that. We entirely adopt that. THE CHAIR: Sadly there may be quite a lot for which there is a reason. But there we are. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, those are all of the submissions I wanted to make on that first element relating to disclosure and it may be now appropriate for you to invite submissions
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	order process, discussions involving, as I have said, of Operation Verbasco, HMG and us, can commence as soon as possible. Sir, I will of course come back to addressing any submissions advanced by Mr Mansfield orally today regarding the restriction order applications, once I've had an opportunity to make oral submissions. May I simply touch on a couple of points now that have been raised in their written submissions and it may help if you go to Mr Mansfield's written submissions at tab 5 of the bundle. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, at paragraph 11 of the family's submissions they assert that directions regarding the determination of restriction order applications should make provision for written responses from core participants, and that you should also consider exercising the power under Rule 12.3 of the inquiry rules to disclose potentially restrictive material in advance of determining restriction order applications. Sir, may we simply say that we agree. Those are clearly	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	they are made should follow the terms of the inquiry's published restriction order protocol. We agree. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR O'CONNOR: And secondly, they have made a point of detail about paragraph 5 of the restriction order protocol, and could I simply say we agree with them that paragraph 5(c) of that protocol should be read as stipulating that as much of the supporting evidence as possible should be provided in open. Sir THE CHAIR: I am not sure you even need to say that, Mr O'Connor. But for the avoidance of doubt as far as I am concerned it follows as a matter of principle; everything in this inquiry must be open, unless there is a reason for it not to be. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, I am grateful for that. We entirely adopt that. THE CHAIR: Sadly there may be quite a lot for which there is a reason. But there we are. MR O'CONNOR: Sir, those are all of the submissions I wanted to make on that first element relating to disclosure and it may be now appropriate for you to invite submissions on that issue from the parties.

1 Submissions by MR MANSFIELD. 1 THE CHAIR: Yes. 2 MR MANSFIELD: Sir, can I say I am obliged. I can dispose 2 MR MANSFIELD: -- that it might have started at the 3 of matters that seem to be agreed rather quickly, 3 beginning of this year. But in any event, appreciating, 4 including the ones that have just been referred to, 4 as the family do, the national security issues, they also appreciate the amount of work that is being put in. 5 because they are all in the written submissions. 5 6 I don't have anything to add to that. 6 However, they would emphasise that the time lapse is 7 THE CHAIR: Thank you. 7 already considerable, and unless there is the pressure 8 MR MANSFIELD: As far as the publication on the website that 8 of a target date there is the risk, as we have heard 9 9 was mentioned by my learned friend at the beginning, only minutes ago, of slippage yet again in certain 10 10 again no objection to that. Sir, I don't have anything areas. 11 to add on any of those matters. 11 THE CHAIR: Yes. 12 12 May I pass to the substantive matters here, because MR MANSFIELD: So that would be the main point that I am 13 it is well known by you and everyone that there has been 13 making, I am sorry to take the last item on the agenda 14 substantial delay, and one needs to occasionally just 14 first, but that is the prism through which we would ask 15 stand back and consider the stages that have already 15 you to look at this matter. 16 been through. I am not going through them, other than 16 Now, as far as stage 1 and stage 2 is concerned, 17 to refer in a particular context. The situation here, 17 I think Mr O'Connor is aware that we particularly are 18 I think might be approached, and I am dealing really 18 whistling, or dancing, whichever is the most favoured 19 with the stage 1/stage 2 situation for the family, and 19 phrase, in the dark, because we really don't know what 20 I am going to start at the end if I may, because the 20 the exact problems are. However, we would remind those 21 21 concern that they have, and everybody has, and I am sure who are engaged in it that this is not something that is 22 you do as well, is when are we going to get to the 22 disclosure and the question of sensitivity and relevance 23 substantive hearings. 23 that has suddenly bounced out of the blue. This has 24 THE CHAIR: Quite. 24 been a matter on, I suspect, a large number of peoples' 25 MR MANSFIELD: And so may I say we have had extensive 25 minds ever since the incident itself, at the beginning. Page 37 Page 39 1 discussions between ourselves so that in fact my learned 1 Because of course, as you will recall, I needn't go 2 2 through it, a number of politicians were in a very friend was aware of some of the points I might want to 3 3 strong position to make a lot of public statements about make today. So he is aware of them. So starting at the 4 4 end, we would submit that if you accept the need for what can be revealed. 5 a hearing early next year to deal with the matters that 5 THE CHAIR: Well, they made public statements, Mr Mansfield. 6 have already been raised about schedules and so on, we 6 They didn't of course give chapter and verse or the 7 would ask that at that hearing, whenever it is, in the 7 documents that backed them up. 8 early months of next year parties should be in 8 MR MANSFIELD: That is true. 9 a position to say what workable, effective date can be 9 THE CHAIR: They didn't produce the evidence. They made 10 contemplated for the ultimate hearings, because if the 10 assertions 11 matter is left in abeyance one recognises there is 11 MR MANSFIELD: Yes. 12 a certain relaxation that occurs. So we would ask that 12 THE CHAIR: Part of my function is to try to find out 13 the opposite pressure is placed on everybody, and I am 13 whether they were right or not. 14 not apologising for that, because everybody is under the 14 MR MANSFIELD: Yes. It is a contextual matter. It starts 15 same kinds of stresses, strains and resources. And if 15 with that process. Somebody must have decided this can 16 there is a need for more resources, perhaps now is the 16 go into the public, even though there is a wealth of 17 time to indicate that need above all else, considering 17 documents, this can go to the public domain. That is 18 that this inquiry is dealing with the matters of the 18 the bare beginnings. It is the embryonic stage. But 19 utmost importance, dealing with national security. So 19 what comes after that is even more important. Of course 20 using that hopeful sign for next year, I say 20 there is an interlude, if I can put it that way, whilst 21 straightaway that it would be desirable if people were 21 matters are resolved by the High Court in relation to 22 able to agree upon a date next year. Maybe towards the 22 the inquest. But then we get to a stage at which your 23 end of the year. Because already there is a 12-month 23 predecessor was appointed, and so last year, and I just 24 slippage on that anticipated date. There was originally 24 say, and I reminded Mr O'Connor of it, of course, 25 a hint, I say no more --25 because he was involved in it last year, last August. Page 38 Page 40

1 THE CHAIR: Where are you in the protocol, Mr Mansfield? 1 A large quantity, we don't know how much, we don't know 2 MR MANSFIELD: Yes, I will just -- it is, if you have what it was, but a series of "sensitive reports" were 2 3 being reviewed in order to decide whether to have 3 paragraph 6. 4 THE CHAIR: Yes. 4 an inquiry. Now, I appreciate again it is only the 5 foot hills, but it is the context in which we say this 5 MR MANSFIELD: Sub-paragraph (e)? 6 exercise of working out relevance and sensitivity is not 6 THE CHAIR: (e)? 7 7 MR MANSFIELD: Yes, and it is (e)(2), that's where the brand new and there will have to have been a form of 8 exercise undertaken at that time in August last year for 8 wording comes from. 9 Q a decision to be taken to request an inquiry, which THE CHAIR: Got it, thank you. 10 10 MR MANSFIELD: I realise that is in relation to obviously came. 11 And since then of course you, well, it is now nearly 11 a restriction order process. 12 THE CHAIR: Yes, it is. 12 six months ago, asked for the report, the police report, 13 with underlying documents. So what I am trying to say 13 MR MANSFIELD: However, in order to determine, for example, 14 is please can we guard against the slippage which seems 14 at this early stage whether something might be relevant, 15 15 it might be possible for you to, as it were, have to amount to six months at a time when something is 16 asked, and then it just can't be met, either because of 16 a private hearing, so not all the public are there, but 17 resources or because there are too many documents, or 17 that the CPs are there in order to discuss the question 18 18 of relevance, because we say there must already be can I make this point: we don't want to be carping, and 19 we don't want to be saying that we don't understand the 19 a category of relevance that doesn't attract any 20 pressures, we do. The family do. That is the first 20 sensitivity. I hope I am right about that. I pause to 21 21 see whether later we will be told there isn't, or there thing. 22 22 THE CHAIR: Yes. is. For example we know from the inquest stage that 23 23 MR MANSFIELD: But an approach that is rather different to a certain amount of documentation and statements were 24 24 the one that is taken seems logical. But of course in revealed at that stage, of course for a very different 25 life nothing is entirely logical, unfortunately. But in 25 process, but we would submit that in relation to that Page 41 Page 43 1 this stage 1/stage 2 process, first of all if there is material there must be other relevant material that is 2 a large quantity, we understand whether it is itemised 2 not going to attract any sensitivity whatsoever. May we 3 or otherwise, it may be 20,000 it may be more, items or 3 ask that that material, relevant material, whether we 4 documents are already being released to your team, if 4 have a part in deciding what is relevant and what isn't, 5 I can call it that, and therefore within the quantity 5 to be appreciated alongside, could that be served now. 6 released we don't know how many of those have already Because it is not just a question of when is the hearing 6 7 been determined to be relevant. 7 going to be, but for example if the authorities have had 8 THE CHAIR: No. 8 this amount of time to decide what can be disclosed, 9 MR MANSFIELD: So it may not be all of them. It may be some 9 I think it is fair to say that on behalf of the family 10 of them. Now, I will take this slowly, in stages. You 10 we will need some time to assimilate what is being 11 raised yourself a very important question, namely in 11 given. So if we can have disclosed --12 whose eyes are they relevant. And we could ask you to 12 THE CHAIR: So the question is why is it not possible now, 13 consider what I understand is described in other 13 or is it possible now to serve relevant material where there is no possibility of a restriction order being 14 14 proceedings, but it is provided for in the protocol you 15 set out, and particularly in paragraph, the paragraph 6, 15 asked for at (e), which has now been added -- it is tab 15A -- and 16 16 MR MANSFIELD: That's right. 17 I am going to generically call it the restricted 17 THE CHAIR: Is that it? 18 hearings facility. Now, these are hearings that are 18 MR MANSFIELD: Yes, sir. 19 19 held in other inquiries that have touched on this, THE CHAIR: Right. Got that. 20 Manchester Arena being one of them, the Infected Blood 20 MR MANSFIELD: So the second stage is of course the relevant 21 being another, where in fact it has been necessary to 21 material that does attract sensitivity. Now, we don't, 22 and I obviously can't be told, know exactly how this is 22 have -- can I call them a hybrid hearing? In other 23 words it is not completely open and it is not completely 23 working but we are trying to introduce an element of 24 closed. So in other words it is, the word that is used 24 logic here. First of all in relation to relevance, 25 in the protocol, is a private hearing. 25 there will be some witnesses that are highly relevant, Page 42 Page 44

amat learned ywar ben involved in other inquiries, and one may have different types of sensitivity, one appreciates that I have already described, and therefore there are categories of relevance from tep to hottom, as it were, purified in the process of a twee, purified in the process of a twee, purified in the process of the process of relevant of the part of the process of the process of the process. The first thing is what a re the top, as it were, highest priority of relevant of the process of the process of the part of the part of the process of the process of the process of the part of the part of the process of the process of the part of the part of the process of the part of the part of the process of the part of the process of the part of the process of the part of the part of the process of the part o				
foot hills that I have already described, and therefore there are categories of relevance from top to bottom, as there are categories of relevance from top to bottom, as to ever, putting is shortly. The first thing is what are the top, as it were, highest priority of relevant witnesses or documents. That's the first condentuin. In other words people and documents that are necessarily going to have to be, as it were, introduced into the having at some point. Then you have sent of superimposed on that different framework, which is firmework of sensitivity. Because there are different sensitivities. Some things may be sensitive but really not that important. The sensitivity is three. So that having determined your top priority of relevant witnesses, you from them superimpose what is the most – you know, are there sensitivity is minor and it doeant require more than entirely in point and it doeant require more than a reduction of a word, or something of that kind. So these two schemes may be being employed, we don't here superimpose what is the most – you know, are there sensitivity in minor and it doeant require more than a reduction of a word, or something of that kind. So those two schemes may be being employed, we don't here is a superimpose what is the most – you know, are there sensitivity in minor and it doeant require more than a reduction of a word, or something of that kind. Page 45 The CHAIR: What is word suggest, and I am corning to he main point here, that we do welcome the progress that is with the sampling method, and I don't repeat the with the sampling method, and I don't repeat the with the sampling method, and I don't repeat the with the sampling method, and I don't repeat the with the sampling method, and I don't repeat the with the sampling method, and I don't repeat the with the sampling method, and I don't repeat the with the sampling method, and I don't repeat the with the sampling method, and I don't repeat the with the sampling method, and I don't repeat the with the sampling method, and	1	can I call them core witnesses, and a number of those	1	the room have been involved in other inquiries, and one
there are categories of relevance from top to bottom, as it were, purting it shortly. The first thing is what are the top, as it were, highest priority of relevant witnesses or documents. That's the first consideration. In other words people and documents that are necessarily going to have to be, as it were, introduced into the poing to have to be, as it were, introduced into the hearing at some point. The you have sort of superimposed on that a different framework, which is framework of sensitivity. Because there are different sensitivities. Some wheleome that. We would submit that that draft schedule of sensitivities must be in some form already. The process that is being suggested by my learned friend on your behalf is welcome, but it could be even quicker than it is if these sorts of matters had been addressed a little bit earlier. So we say that we don't want to instruct with the model that being any be essitivity but really not that important. The sensitivity is there. So that having determined your top priority of relevant witnesses, you the superimpose what is the most – you know, are there sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that obviously it would have to be in closed, or the some sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Page 45 The CHAIR. Wan is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has within that scheme, that seed put you you don't have a submissions we have made is to see if these is some way of speading this up even more dan has been speaded up. So for example in the written submissions we have made, flast there are risks with the model and the sampling method, and I don't repeat the written submissions we have made, flast there are risks with the model and the sampling method and the sampling method, and I don't repeat the difficulties of butting in the durk. Page 47 The CHAIR. What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has seplained, is slightly different with the model and the sampling method, and I don't repeat the discussi	2	must already have been identified in the process of	2	knows of course this one will have more sensitivities,
it were, putting it shortly. The first thing is what are the top, as it were, highest priority of relevant witnesses or documents. That's the first consideration. In other words people and documents that are necessarily going to have to be, as it were, introduced into the hearing at some point. Then you have sort of superimposed on that the process that is being suggested by my learned friend on your behalf is welcome, but it could be even quicker a different framework, which is framework of sensitivity. Because there are different sensitivities. Some things may be sensitive but really not that important. The sensitivity is there. So that having determined your top priority of relevant witnesses, you then superimpose what is the most — you know, are there sensitivities in this heacted that are so enseither that polytosaly it would have to be in closed, or the sensitivities in this heacted that are so enseither that polytosaly it would have to be in closed, or the sensitivities in this heacted that are so enseither sensitivities in this heacted that are so enseither a point here, that we do welcome the progress that is Page 45 I are trying to assist, and the conversations we have had is to see if there is some way of speeding this up even to be a write submissions we have made, that there are risks with the sample that they may not be compelensive, but within that scheme, that sumpling — THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Comor has explained, is stightly different system, but it is about they with the scheme, that sumpling — THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Comor has explained, is stightly different. May MANSFIELD. May I sak in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say, so, a done and schedule of sensitivities at the beginning of list year. THE CHAIR: Well, Idan't know about that. You may be THE CHAIR: Well, Idan't know about that. You may be	3	foot hills that I have already described, and therefore	3	this one may have different types of sensitivity, one
are the top, as it were, highest priority of relevant witnesses or documents. That's the first consideration. In other words people and documents that necessarily going to have to be, as it were, introduced into the learning at some point. The you have sent of superimposed on that different framework, which is framework of sensitivity. Because there are different sensitivities. Some things may be sensitive but really not that important. The sensitivity is there. So that having determined your top priority of relevant witnesses, you thete superimpose what is the most – you know, are there sensitivities in his bracket that are so sensitive that obviously it would have to be in closed, or the sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that obviously it would have to be in closed, or the sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than a reduction of a word, or something of that kind. So those two schemes may be being employed, we don't show. But we would suggest, and the conversations we have had in fit of earliers. So we say that we don't want to interfere with the model that has been put up, but we do sensitivities in his bracket that are so sensitive that obviously it would have to be in closed, or the point here, that we do welcome the progress that is being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say – we Page 45 THE CHAIR: Walt, and the conversations we have had is to see if there is some way of speeding this up even a retrying to assist, and the conversations we have had within that scheme, that sampling — THE CHAIR: Walt is now proposed, as Mr O'Comnor has evilin that scheme, that sampling — THE CHAIR: Walt is now proposed, as Mr O'Comnor has cytained, as illustion is all provide disclosure to the family and the public is a pressing one. But it is also have been done, if I may say so, a lead schedule of a discussions about that. My I just come to the central point here, I think it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is a daffit schedule of sensitivities must be in some form alte	4	there are categories of relevance from top to bottom, as	4	appreciates that, but that's why I started with the
witnesses or documents. That's the first consideration. In other words people and documents that are necessarily going to have to be, as it were, introduced into the hearing at some point. Then you have sort of superimposed on that different framework, which is framework of sensitivity. Because there are different sensitivities. Some things may be sensitive but realty not that important. The sensitivity is there. So that having determined your top priority of relevant witnesses, you then superimpose what is the most – you know, are there sensitivities in this brucket that are so sensitive that obviousely it would have to be in closed, or the sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than a reduction of a word, or something of that kind. Bo those two schemes may be being employed, we don't known being made. As I said, we are not menning to say – we Page 45 The CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has that have been done, if I may say so, a fire out of the written aubmissions we have made, that there are risks with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but within that that draft soe wendered that has been proposed in the representation when have had determined your top priority of relevant witnesses, you then superimpose what it he most – you know, are there the word, ourselves, be deluged with material once this process has been gone through. The chall's what is an are decision of a word, or something of that kind. The process has been gone through. The chall's what is now proposed in a slightly different with the model that has been from the understand in the word, word on the word, word on the word, word on the word, word on the word, on something to the model be influenced by the trage that the word that may be oposible to get a much carlier indication, so that we word, ourselves, be deluged with material once this process has been gone through. The chall's water and the supplies of the control of the trage of the control of the carling that the process that is a so the control	5	it were, putting it shortly. The first thing is what	5	incident itself. People must have been thinking about
8 In other words people and documents that are necessarily going to have to be, as it were, introduced into the bearing at some point. 11 Then you have sort of superimposed on that a different framework, which is framework of 12 as a different framework, which is framework of 13 sensitivity. Because there are different sensitivities. 14 Some things may be sensitive but really not that 15 important. The sensitivity is there. So that having 16 determined yout to protrioty of relevant winsesses, you 16 then superimpose what is the most – you know, are there 18 sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that 19 obviously it would have to be in closed, or the 20 sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that 22 sensitivities in the word of the sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than 22 sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than 23 know. But we would suggest, and I am coming to the main 24 point here, that we do welcome the progress that is being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say – we 12 to see if there is some way of speeding this up even 13 more than has been speeded up. So for example in the 24 present timatable scheme that has been put to you today, 25 is that on the sampling method, and I don't report the 25 with that the sheme, that they may not be comprehensive, but 26 with that the cheme, that they may not be comprehensive, but 27 the CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different 28 system, inty it? 11 MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? 11 disclosed by mistake, it can't be retired and mannesty careful thought. It is absolutely right if material is identified that is a broad that. 18 process of disclosure really does take time and immensely careful thought. It is absolutely right if material is identified that is a broadle or the central point, the new scheme, which is 17 the CHAIR: What is now proposed, and fill only a special and the profit of the minor of the central point here. I think 16 sensitivities, at the beginning of last yeur. 25 the fill of the w	6	are the top, as it were, highest priority of relevant	6	what the sensitivities are, particularly in the light of
going to have to be, as it were, introduced into the hearing at some point. The process that is being suggested by my learned friend in the process that is being suggested by my learned friend in the process that is being suggested by my learned friend in the process that is being suggested by my learned friend in the process that is being suggested by my learned friend in the process that is being suggested by my learned friend in the process that is being suggested by my learned friend in the process that is being suggested by my learned friend in the process that is the sensitivities. 13 a different framework, which is framework of 12 than it is if these sorts of matters had been addressed a little bit carlier. So we say that we don't want to 15 important. The sensitivity is there. So that having 15 say could the model be influenced by the tringe that 15 say could the model be influenced by the tringe that 15 say could the model be influenced by the tringe that 16 has sensitivity is minor and if doesn't require more than 20 possible to get a much earlier indication, so that we won't, ourselves, be deluged with material once this process has been gone through. 21 a reduction of a word, or something of that kind. 22 So those two schemes may be being employed, we don't know. But we would suggest, and I am coming to the main point here, that we do welcome the progress that is being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say — we 12 may be 12 may be 13 may be 14 may be 15 may be 15 may be 16 main point here, that we do welcome the progress that is being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say — we 16 main submissions what I make. If there is anything I can belp on further. 22 the complete that we have the sampling — 17 more than has been speeded up. So for example in the 16 main point here, that we have made, that three are risks with the sampling and the public is a pressing one. But it is also more than has been speeded up. So for example in the 16 may be 17 may as yo, a so understand, I hope, the diffi	7	witnesses or documents. That's the first consideration.	7	what is happening internationally at the moment.
hearing at some point. Then you have sort of superimposed on that a different framework, which is framework of sensitivity. Because there are different sensitivities. Some things may be sensitive but really not that determined your top priority of relevant witnesses, you then superimpose what is the most – you know, are there sensitivities in this breaket that are so sensitive that obviously it would have to be in closed, or the sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than obviously it would have to be in closed, or the sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than obviously it would have to be in closed, or the sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than point her, that we do welcome the progress that is being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say – we The process that is being suggested by my learned friend on your behalf is welcome, but it is different sensitivity is miner and the analyses of the trails it is the suppose what is the most – you know, are there with the model that has been put up, but we do interfere with the model that has been put up, but we do interfere with the model that has been put up, but we do interfere with the model that has been put up, but we do interfere with the model that has been put up, but we do interfere with the model that has been put up, but we do interfere with the model that has been put up, but we do interfere with the model that has been put up, but we do interfere with the model that has been put up, but we do interfere with the model that has been put up, but we do interfere with the model that has been put up, but we do interfere with the model that has been put up, but we do interfere with the model that has been put up to we do interfere with the model that has been put up, but we do interfere with the model that has been put up to we do interfere with the model that has been put up, but we do interfere with the model that has been put up to we do interfere with the model that has been put up, but we do interfere with the model	8	In other words people and documents that are necessarily	8	So we welcome that. We would submit that that draft
11 Then you have sort of superimposed on that 12 a different framework, which is framework of 13 sensitivity. Because there are different sensitivities. 14 Some things may be sensitive but really not that 15 important. The sensitivity is there. So that having 16 determined your top priority of relevant witnesses, you 17 then superimpose what is the most - you know, are there 18 sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that 19 obviously it would have to be in closed, or the 20 sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than 21 a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. 22 So those two schemes may be being employed, we don't 23 know. But we would suggest, and I am coming to the main 24 point here, that we do welcome the progress that is 25 being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say - we 26 Page 45 1 are trying to assist, and the conversations we have had 2 is to see if there is some way of speeding this up even 3 more than has been speededly up. So for example in the 4 present timetable scheme that has been put to you today, 25 is that on the sampling method, and I don't repeat the 4 written salmissions we have made, that there are risks 7 with the sample method, and I don't repeat the 4 written salmissions we have made, that there are risks 8 with the sample method, and I don't repeat the 6 written salmissions we have made, that there are risks 9 that the sample don't have been done, it is also sorry? 11 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has 12 explained, is slightly different. 13 a death schedule of sensitivities will be produced. 14 MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had 15 discussions about that. 16 MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could 17 have been done, if I may say so, a fartfi schedule of 18 sensitivity. Beause is a slightly different 19 discussions about that. 11 the call first black the model public is a pressing one. But it is also 11 discussion about that. 12 discussed to it is a something it is a become the subject of	9	going to have to be, as it were, introduced into the	9	schedule of sensitivities must be in some form already.
a different framework, which is framework of sensitivity. Because there are different sensitivities. Some things may be sensitive but really not that important. The sensitivity is there. So that having determined your top priority of relevant witnesses, you then superimpose what is the most – you know, are there sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that devices in this bracket that are so sensitive that sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than a sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than a being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say – we Page 45 Page 45 Page 47 I are trying to assist, and the conversations we have had is to see if there is some way of specifing this up even more than has been speeded up. So for example in the present timetable scheme that has been put to you today, is than to the sampling method, and I don't repeat the written submissions we have made, that there are risks with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but within that scheme, that sampling — I HE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has within that scheme, that sampling — I HE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has so with the model be influenced by the triage th	10	hearing at some point.	10	The process that is being suggested by my learned friend
a little bit earlier. So we say that we don't want to interfere with the model that has been put up, but we do in the sampling method, and I don't require more than point here, that we do welcome the progress that is beeing made. As I said, we are not meaning to say — we 1 are trying to assist, and the conversations we have had with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but within that scheme, that sampling — soysem, iart i? 1 THE CHAIR: Wall, I don't know about that. You may be 1 MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of lare way. As a draft schedule of lare word, ourselves, be deluged with mannesley careful thought. It is absolutely right if material ris is dearly and one competing in the mannesley careful thought. It is a been put up, but we do inclosed, or the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but word, ourselves, be deluged with manterial once this process has been gone through. 21 If the CHAIR: Wall, I don't know about that. You may be 22 If the one of the main summissions that I make. If there is anything I can help on further. 23 If the CHAIR: Wall is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has a captained, is slightly different. 24 If the CHAIR: Wall is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has a captained, is slightly different. 25 If the CHAIR: Wall is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has a captained, is slightly different. 26 MR MANSFIELD: Way I ask in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say so, a defined amount that has been one, if I may say so, a defined and if I may say so, also understand, I hope, the difficulties of batting in the dark. 27 THE CHAIR: Wall is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has a captained, is slightly different. 28 If the CHAIR: Wall, I don't know about that. You may be 29 THE CHAIR: Wall, I don't know about that. You may be	11	Then you have sort of superimposed on that	11	on your behalf is welcome, but it could be even quicker
14 Some things may be sensitive but really not that 15 important. The sensitivity is three. So that having 16 determined your top priority of relevant witnesses, you 17 then superimpose what is the most — you know, are there 18 sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that 19 obviously it would have to be in closed, or the 20 sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than 21 a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. 22 So those two schemes may be being employed, we don't 23 know. But we would suggest, and I am coming to the main 24 point here, that we do welcome the progress that is 25 being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say — we 26 profit here, that we do welcome the progress that is 27 being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say — we 28 retrying to assist, and the conversations we have had 29 is to see if there is some way of speeding this up even 30 more than has been speeded up. So for example in the 41 written submissions we have made, that there are risks 42 first that on the sampling method, and I don't repeat the 43 writh the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but 44 writin that scheme, that sampling — 45 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has 46 explained, is slightly different 47 grateful. Mr ManNSFIELD: I am so sorry? 48 MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? 49 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has 40 explained, is slightly different 41 day I just come to the central point here, I think 41 discussions about that. 42 MR MANSFIELD: Yes it, see. We accept that. We have had 43 day I just come to the central point, in the new scheme, which is 44 a drat schedule of sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than a been part on the death. 45 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 46 the main submission in the last has been part on the death of the part of the death of the part of the death of the part of	12	a different framework, which is framework of	12	than it is if these sorts of matters had been addressed
say could the model be influenced by the triage that the sugerimpose what is the most – you know, are there sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. So those two schemes may be being employed, we don't know. But we would suggest, and I am coming to the main point here, that we do welcome the progress that is being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say – we Page 45 The CHAIR: No, I am very grateful, Mr Mansfield. I quite understand and if I may say so, also understand, I hope, the difficulties of batting in the dark. Page 47 MR MANSFIELD: Yes. Thank you. THE CHAIR: Walt is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but within that scheme, that sampling — THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has explained, is slightly different system, isn't it? MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had sexplained, is slightly different, which is a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had show been done, if I may say so, and sort should have been done, if I may say so, also understand, I hope, the difficulties of batting in the dark. Page 47 MR MANSFIELD: Yes it has saily the produced. MR MANSFIELD: Servit its, yes. We accept that. We have had should be provided disclosure really does take time and immensely careful thought. It is also have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of the sum	13	sensitivity. Because there are different sensitivities.	13	a little bit earlier. So we say that we don't want to
then superimpose what is the most — you know, are there sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that 18 sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that 19 obviously it would have to be in closed, or the 20 sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than 21 a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. 22 So those two schemes may be being employed, we don't 23 know. But we would suggest, and I am coming to the main 24 point here, that we do welcome the progress that is 25 being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say — we 25 the difficulties of batting in the dark. Page 45 Page 47 1 are trying to assist, and the conversations we have had 25 is to see if there is some way of speeding this up even 26 is that on the sample method, and I don't repeat the 27 within that scheme, that sampleing method, and I don't repeat the 28 with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but 29 within that scheme, that sampling — 8 within that scheme, that sumpling — 11 discussions about that. 15 discussions about that. 16 May I just come to the central point here, I think 17 it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is 17 clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material that way well come into that category is being reviewed at the moment. 29 the central point, in the new scheme, which is 17 clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction objection whatsoev	14	Some things may be sensitive but really not that	14	interfere with the model that has been put up, but we do
then superimpose what is the most — you know, are there sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that obviously it would have to be in closed, or the sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. Zhat is a	15	important. The sensitivity is there. So that having	15	say could the model be influenced by the triage that
sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that obviously it would have to be in closed, or the obviously it would have to be in closed, or the sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. 22 So those two schemes may be being employed, we don't know. But we would suggest, and I am coming to the main point here, that we do welcome the progress that is being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say – we Page 45 1 are trying to assist, and the conversations we have had is to see if there is some way of speeding this up even a more than has been speeded up. So for example in the written submissions we have made, that there are risks is that on the sampling method, and I don't repeat the written submissions we have made, that there are risks with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but swithin that scheme, that sampling – 1 MR MANSFIELD: Yes. Is an Kyou. 2 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different system, isn't it? 3 MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? 11 MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? 12 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has explained, is slightly different. 14 MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had discussions about that. 15 discussions about that. 16 May I just come to the central point, in the new scheme, which is a draft schedule of sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. 23 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 18 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 19 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 10 A with the sample method, and I don't repeat the family and the public is a pressing one. But it is also hugely important that nothing disclosed double help a hostile state or a terrorist to prepare another attack or to make another attack more deadly. As you said at the beginning of this hearing, it is something is disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is for that reason that this process of disclosure really does take time	16	determined your top priority of relevant witnesses, you	16	I have suggested of relevant witnesses, and degrees of
obviously it would have to be in closed, or the sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than a reduction of a word, or something of that kind. So those two schemes may be being employed, we don't know. But we would suggest, and I am coming to the main point here, that we do welcome the progress that is being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say – we being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say – we Page 45 I are trying to assist, and the conversations we have had is to see if there is some way of speeding this up even more than has been speeded up. So for example in the present timetable scheme that has been put to you today, is that on the sampling method, and I don't repeat the written submissions we have made, that there are risks with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but within that scheme, that is now proposed is a slightly different system, isn't i? THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has cxplained, is slightly different. MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had discussions about that. MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had discussions about that. MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes, we accept that. We have had discussions about that. MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes, we accept that. We have had discussions about that. MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes, we accept that. We have had discussions about that. MR MANSFIELD: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say so, also understand, I hope, the difficulties of batting in the batte. MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of the difficulties of batting in the drak. Page 47 MR MCGAHEY: Sir, His Majesty and the public is a pressing one. But it is also hugely important that nothing disclosed and material the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is disclosed by mistake, it can't	17	then superimpose what is the most you know, are there	17	relevance, and degrees of sensitivity, so that it may be
20 sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than 21 a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. 22 So those two schemes may be being employed, we don't 23 know. But we would suggest, and I am coming to the main 24 point here, that we do welcome the progress that is 25 being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say we 26 Page 45 1 are trying to assist, and the conversations we have had 2 is to see if there is some way of speeding this up even 3 more than has been speeded up. So for example in the 4 present timetable scheme that has been put to you today, 5 is that on the sampling method, and I don't repeat the 6 written submissions we have made, that there are risks 7 with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but 8 within that scheme, that sampling 8 within that scheme, that sampling 9 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different 10 system, isn't it? 11 MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? 12 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has 13 explained, is slightly different. 14 MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had 15 discussions about that. 16 May I just come to the central point here, I think 16 it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is 17 it it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is 18 a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. 19 THE CHAIR: Was in a very simple way, this could 20 have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of 21 ECHAIR: Well, I don't know about that You may be 20 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that You may be 21 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that You may be 22 sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. 23 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that You may be 24 there is anything I can help on further. 24 there is anything I can help on further. 25 the chair, in an insumissions that I make. If 26 there is anything I can help on further. 27 THE CHAIR: Well, idon't know about that You may be	18	sensitivities in this bracket that are so sensitive that	18	possible to get a much earlier indication, so that we
21 a redaction of a word, or something of that kind. 22 So those two schemes may be being employed, we don't 23 know. But we would suggest, and I am coming to the main 24 point here, that we do welcome the progress that is 25 being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say — we 26 Page 45 1 are trying to assist, and the conversations we have had 2 is to see if there is some way of speeding this up even 3 more than has been speeded up. So for example in the 4 present timetable scheme that has been put to you today, 5 is that on the sampling method, and I don't repeat the 6 written submissions we have made, that there are risks 7 with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but 8 within that scheme, that sampling — 9 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different 10 system, isn't it? 11 MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? 12 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has 13 explained, is slightly different. 14 MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had 15 discussions about that. 16 May I just come to the central point here, I think 17 it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is 18 a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. 19 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 21 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that that. You may be 22 sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. 23 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 24 there is anything I can help on further. 25 the there is anything I can help on further. 26 there is anything I can help on further. 27 THE CHAIR: No, I am very grateful, I quite understand and if I may say so, also understand, I hope, the difficulties of batting in the dark. 26 Page 47 27 ITHE CHAIR: No, I am very grateful, I quite understand and if I may say so, also understand, I hope, the difficulties of batting in the dark. 28 ITHE CHAIR: What is I am ken to more than have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. 29 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 20 ITHE CHA	19	obviously it would have to be in closed, or the	19	won't, ourselves, be deluged with material once this
22 So those two schemes may be being employed, we don't 23 know. But we would suggest, and I am coming to the main 24 point here, that we do welcome the progress that is 25 being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say – we 26 Page 45 27 Page 45 28 Page 47 1 are trying to assist, and the conversations we have had 2 is to see if there is some way of speeding this up even 3 more than has been speeded up. So for example in the 4 present timetable scheme that has been put to you today, 5 is that on the sampling method, and I don't repeat the 6 written submissions we have made, that there are risks 7 with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but 8 within that scheme, that sampling – 9 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different 10 system, isn't it? 11 MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? 12 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has 13 explained, is slightly different. 14 MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had 15 discussions about that. 16 May I just come to the central point, in the new scheme, which is 16 a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. 17 THE CHAIR: No, I am very grateful, Mr Mansfield. I quite understand and if I may say so, also understand, I hope, the difficulties of batting in the dark. 24 THE CHAIR: No, I am very grateful, Mr Mansfield. I quite understand and if I may say so, also understand, I hope, the difficulties of batting in the dark. 24 THE CHAIR: No, I am very grateful, Mr Mansfield. I quite understand and if I may say so, also understand, I hope, the difficulties of batting in the dark. 25 THE CHAIR: No, I am very grateful, Mr Mansfield. I quite understand and if I may say so, also understand, I hope, the difficulties of batting in the dark. 26 Page 47 27 THE CHAIR: No, I am very say so, also understand, I hope, the difficulties of batting in the dark. 28 THE CHAIR: No, I am very grateful, Mr Mansfield. I quite understand and if I may say so, also understand, I hope, the difficulties of batting in the Ark. 28 THE CHAIR: No, I	20	sensitivity is minor and it doesn't require more than	20	process has been gone through.
know. But we would suggest, and I am coming to the main point here, that we do welcome the progress that is being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say we Page 45 Page 45 MR MANSFIELD: Yes. Thank you. THE CHAIR: No, I am very grateful, Mr Mansfield. I quite understand and if I may say so, also understand, I hope, the difficulties of batting in the dark. Page 47 MR MANSFIELD: Yes. Thank you. THE CHAIR: Yes. Ms McGahey. MR MANSFIELD: Yes. Thank you. THE CHAIR: Yes. Ms McGahey. MR MANSFIELD: Yes. Thank you. THE CHAIR: Yes. Ms McGahey. MR MANSFIELD: Yes. Thank you. THE CHAIR: Yes. Ms McGahey. MR MANSFIELD: Yes. Thank you. THE CHAIR: Yes. Ms McGahey. MR MGGAHEY: Sir, His Majesty's government recognises absolutely that the need to provide disclosure to the family and the public is a pressing one. But it is also hugely important that nothing disclosed could help a hostile state or a terrorist to prepare another attack or to make another attack more deadly. As you said at the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is for that reason that this process takes as long as it does. There has been no delay in the sense of disclosure really does take time and immensely careful thought. It is absolutely right if material is identified that is clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction order, then His Majesty's Government would have no objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material that may well come into that category is being reviewed that the moment. MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say so, a also understand, I hope, the difficulties of batting in the dark. THE CHAIR: No, I am very grateful, Mr Mansfield. I quite understand and if I may say so, also understand, I hope, the difficulties of batting in the dark. Page 47 1 MR MANSFIELD: Test is make another attack more deadly. As you said at the beginning of the sensor of the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is	21	a redaction of a word, or something of that kind.	21	Sir, those are the main submissions that I make. If
point here, that we do welcome the progress that is being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say – we Page 45 I are trying to assist, and the conversations we have had is to see if there is some way of speeding this up even more than has been speeded up. So for example in the present timetable scheme that has been put to you today, is that on the sampling method, and I don't repeat the written submissions we have made, that there are risks with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but within that scheme, that sampling — THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different system, isn't it? MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has explained, is slightly different. MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had discussions about that. May I just come to the central point, in the new scheme, which is a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. 24 understand and if I may say so, a list in difficulties of batting in the dark. Page 47 MR MANSFIELD: Yes. Thank you. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS McGaHEY MS MCGAHEY: Sir, His Majesty's government recognises absolutely that the need to provide disclosure to the family and the public is a pressing one. But it is also hugely important that nothing disclosed could help a hostile state or a terrorist to prepare another attack or to make another attack more deadly. As you said at the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is for that reason that this process takes as long as it disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is for that reason that this process of disclosure really does take time and immensely careful thought. It is absolutely right if material is identified that is objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material thave been done, if I may say so, a draft sch	22	So those two schemes may be being employed, we don't	22	there is anything I can help on further.
being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say – we Page 45 Page 47 1 are trying to assist, and the conversations we have had 2 is to see if there is some way of speeding this up even 3 more than has been speeded up. So for example in the 4 present timetable scheme that has been put to you today, 5 is that on the sampling method, and I don't repeat the 6 written submissions we have made, that there are risks 7 with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but 8 within that scheme, that sampling — 9 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different 10 system, isn't it? 11 MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? 12 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has 13 explained, is slightly different. 14 MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had 15 discussions about that. 16 May I just come to the central point, in the new scheme, which is 17 it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is 18 a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. 19 THE CHAIR: Yes. 10 MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had 21 have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of 22 sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. 23 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 25 the difficulties of batting in the dark. Page 47 MR MANSFIELD: Yes. Thank you. 1 MR MANSFIELD: Yes. Thank you. 1 MR MANSFIELD: Yes. Thank you. 2 THE CHAIR: Yes. Ms McGahey. 3 Submissions by MS MCGAHEY 4 MS MCGAHEY: Sir, His Majesty's government recognises absolutely that the need to provide disclosure rot the family and the public is a pressing one. But it is also hugely important that nothing disclosed could help a hostile state or a terrorist to prepare another attack or the family and the public is a pressing one. But it is also hugely important that nothing disclosed dould help a hostile state or a terrorist to prepare another attack or terror	23	know. But we would suggest, and I am coming to the main	23	THE CHAIR: No, I am very grateful, Mr Mansfield. I quite
Page 45 Page 47 MR MANSFIELD: Yes. Thank you. THE CHAIR: Yes. Ms McGahey. Submissions by MS MCGAHEY MS MCGAHEY: Sir, His Majesty's government recognises absolutely that the need to provide disclosure to the family and the public is a pressing one. But it is also hostile state or a terrorist to prepare another attack or to make another attack more deadly. As you said at the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is for that reason that this process takes as long as it disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is for that reason that this process disclosure to the discussions about that. Page 47 MR MANSFIELD: Yes. Thank you. THE CHAIR: Yes. Ms McGahey. MS MCGAHEY: Sir, His Majesty's government recognises absolutely that the need to provide disclosure to the family and the public is a pressing one. But it is also hostile state or a terrorist to prepare another attack or to make another attack more deadly. As you said at the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is for that reason that this process along as it disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is for that reason that this process of disclosure really does. There has been no delay in the sense of needlessly wasted time. But this process of disclosure really does take time and immensely careful thought. It is absolutely right if material is identified that is clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction order, then His Majesty's Government would have no objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material that have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of sensitivities	24	point here, that we do welcome the progress that is	24	understand and if I may say so, also understand, I hope,
are trying to assist, and the conversations we have had is to see if there is some way of speeding this up even more than has been speeded up. So for example in the present timetable scheme that has been put to you today, is that on the sampling method, and I don't repeat the written submissions we have made, that there are risks with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but within that scheme, that sampling THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different system, isn't it? THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has cyplained, is slightly different. MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has cyplained, is slightly different. MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had discussions about that. May I just come to the central point here, I think it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. MR MANSFIELD: Wes, Thank you. THE CHAIR: Yes. Ms McGahtey. Submissions by MS MCGAHEY MS MCGAHEY: Sir, His Majesty's government recognises absolutely that the need to provide disclosure to the family and the public is a pressing one. But it is also hugely important that nothing disclosed could help a hostile state or a terrorist to prepare another attack or to make another attack more deadly. As you said at the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is for that reason that this process takes as long as it does. There has been no delay in the sense of needlessly wasted time. But this process of disclosure really does take time and immensely careful thought. It is absolutely right if material is identified that is clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction order, then His Majesty's Government would have no objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and materi	25	being made. As I said, we are not meaning to say we	25	the difficulties of batting in the dark.
1 are trying to assist, and the conversations we have had 2 is to see if there is some way of speeding this up even 3 more than has been speeded up. So for example in the 4 present timetable scheme that has been put to you today, 5 is that on the sampling method, and I don't repeat the 6 written submissions we have made, that there are risks 6 family and the public is a pressing one. But it is also 7 with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but 8 within that scheme, that sampling 9 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different 10 system, isn't it? 11 MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? 12 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has 13 explained, is slightly different. 14 MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had 15 discussions about that. 16 May I just come to the central point, in the new scheme, which is 17 it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is 18 a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. 19 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 10 MR MANSFIELD: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 11 MR MANSFIELD: Yes. Thank you. 12 THE CHAIR: Yes. Ms McGahey. 3 Submissions by MS MCGAHEY 4 MS MCGAHEY: Sir, His Majesty's government recognises a absolutely that the need to provide disclosure to the family and the public is a pressing one. But it is also hugely important that nothing disclosed could help a hostile state or a terrorist to prepare another attack or to make another attack more deadly. As you said at the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is for that reason that this process takes as long as it does. There has been no delay in the sense of needlessly wasted time. But this process of disclosure really does take time and immensely careful thought. It is absolutely right if material is identified that is clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material that may well come into that category is being reviewed a				
is to see if there is some way of speeding this up even more than has been speeded up. So for example in the present timetable scheme that has been put to you today, is that on the sampling method, and I don't repeat the written submissions we have made, that there are risks with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but within that scheme, that sampling THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different system, isn't it? MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has caplained, is slightly different. MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had discussions about that. May I just come to the central point, in the new scheme, which is a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be		Page 45		Page 47
more than has been speeded up. So for example in the present timetable scheme that has been put to you today, is that on the sampling method, and I don't repeat the written submissions we have made, that there are risks with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but within that scheme, that sampling THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different system, isn't it? THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has explained, is slightly different. MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had discussions about that. May I just come to the central point, in the new scheme, which is a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. Submissions by MS MCGAHEY MS MCGAHEY: Sir, His Majesty's government recognises absolutely that the need to provide disclosure to the family and the public is a pressing one. But it is also hugely important that nothing disclosed could help a hostile state or a terrorist to prepare another attack or to make another attack more deadly. As you said at the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is for that reason that this process takes as long as it does. There has been no delay in the sense of needlessly wasted time. But this process of disclosure really does take time and immensely careful thought. It is absolutely right if material is identified that is clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction order, then His Majesty's Government would have no objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material that may well come into that category is being reviewed at the moment. THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be	1	are trying to assist, and the conversations we have had	1	MR MANSFIELD: Yes. Thank you.
more than has been speeded up. So for example in the present timetable scheme that has been put to you today, is that on the sampling method, and I don't repeat the written submissions we have made, that there are risks absolutely that the need to provide disclosure to the family and the public is a pressing one. But it is also hugely important that nothing disclosed could help a hostile state or a terrorist to prepare another attack or to make another attack more deadly. As you said at the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is explained, is slightly different. MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has explained, is slightly different. MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had discussions about that. MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had discussions about that. MR May I just come to the central point here, I think it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be Submissions by MS MCGAHEY: MS MCGAHEY: Sir, His Majesty's government recognises absoluted that the need to provide disclosure to the family and the public is a pressing one. But it is also hugely important that nothing disclosed could help a hostile state or a terrorist to prepare another attack or to make another attack more deadly. As you said at the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is or to make another attack more deadly. As you said at the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is family and the public is a pressing one. But it is also lutely might if naterial, sit is the central point here, I think is for that reason that this process takes as long as it disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is for that reason	2	is to see if there is some way of speeding this up even	2	THE CHAIR: Yes. Ms McGahey.
is that on the sampling method, and I don't repeat the written submissions we have made, that there are risks with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but within that scheme, that sampling THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different system, isn't it? MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has cxplained, is slightly different. MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had discussions about that. May I just come to the central point here, I think it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. Sampling and the public is a pressing one. But it is also hugely important that nothing disclosed could help a hostile state or a terrorist to prepare another attack or to make another attack more deadly. As you said at the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is for that reason that this process takes as long as it does. There has been no delay in the sense of needlessly wasted time. But this process of disclosure really does take time and immensely careful thought. It is absolutely right if material is identified that is clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction order, then His Majesty's Government would have no objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material that may well come into that category is being reviewed at the moment. THE CHAIR: Well, there is a very limited amount that has already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	3	more than has been speeded up. So for example in the	3	Submissions by MS MCGAHEY
written submissions we have made, that there are risks with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but within that scheme, that sampling THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different system, isn't it? MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has caplained, is slightly different. MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had discussions about that. May I just come to the central point here, I think distance of the central point, in the new scheme, which is a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. family and the public is a pressing one. But it is also hugely important that nothing disclosed could help a hostile state or a terrorist to prepare another attack or to make another attack more deadly. As you said at the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is for that reason that this process takes as long as it does. There has been no delay in the sense of needlessly wasted time. But this process of disclosure really does take time and immensely careful thought. It is absolutely right if material is identified that is clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction order, then His Majesty's Government would have no objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material that may well come into that category is being reviewed at the moment. THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be THE CHAIR: Well, there is a very limited amount that has already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	4	present timetable scheme that has been put to you today,	4	MS MCGAHEY: Sir, His Majesty's government recognises
with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but within that scheme, that sampling THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different system, isn't it? THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different system, isn't it? THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different within that scheme, that sampling system, isn't it? THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different within that scheme, that sampling system, isn't it? What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is for that reason that this process takes as long as it does. There has been no delay in the sense of needlessly wasted time. But this process of disclosure really does take time and immensely careful thought. It is absolutely right if material is identified that is really does take time and immensely careful thought. It is a basolutely right if material is identified that is clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction order, then His Majesty's Government would have no objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material that may well come into that category is being reviewed that may well come into that category is being reviewed at the moment. THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	5	is that on the sampling method, and I don't repeat the	5	absolutely that the need to provide disclosure to the
within that scheme, that sampling 9 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different 10 system, isn't it? 11 MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? 11 disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is 12 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has 13 explained, is slightly different. 14 MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had 15 discussions about that. 16 May I just come to the central point here, I think 17 it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is 18 a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. 19 THE CHAIR: Yes. 19 objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material 20 MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could 21 have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of 22 sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. 23 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 24 have been passed at the stage 2 process. That	6	written submissions we have made, that there are risks	6	family and the public is a pressing one. But it is also
THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different 10 system, isn't it? 11 MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? 11 disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is 12 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has 13 explained, is slightly different. 14 MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had 15 discussions about that. 16 May I just come to the central point here, I think 17 it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is 18 a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. 19 THE CHAIR: Yes. 20 MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could 21 have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of 22 sensitivities, at the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is 10 the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is 11 disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is 12 for that reason that this process takes as long as it 13 does. There has been no delay in the sense of 14 needlessly wasted time. But this process of disclosure 15 really does take time and immensely careful thought. It 16 is absolutely right if material is identified that is 17 clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction 18 order, then His Majesty's Government would have no 19 THE CHAIR: Yes. 19 objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material 20 that may well come into that category is being reviewed 21 at the moment. 22 sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. 23 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 24 already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	7	with the sample that they may not be comprehensive, but	7	hugely important that nothing disclosed could help
system, isn't it? 10 the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is 11 MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? 11 disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is 12 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has 13 explained, is slightly different. 14 MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had 15 discussions about that. 16 May I just come to the central point here, I think 17 it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is 18 a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. 19 THE CHAIR: Yes. 10 the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is 11 disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is 12 for that reason that this process takes as long as it 13 does. There has been no delay in the sense of 14 needlessly wasted time. But this process of disclosure 15 really does take time and immensely careful thought. It 16 is absolutely right if material is identified that is 17 clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction 18 order, then His Majesty's Government would have no 19 THE CHAIR: Yes. 19 objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material 20 MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could 21 have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of 22 sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. 23 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 24 already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	8	within that scheme, that sampling	8	a hostile state or a terrorist to prepare another attack
11 MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry? 12 THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has 13 explained, is slightly different. 14 MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had 15 discussions about that. 16 May I just come to the central point here, I think 17 it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is 18 a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. 19 THE CHAIR: Yes. 10 MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could 21 have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of 22 sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. 23 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 21 doss. There has been no delay in the sense of 24 needlessly wasted time. But this process of disclosure 25 needlessly wasted time. But this process of disclosure 26 needlessly wasted time. But this process of disclosure 27 really does take time and immensely careful thought. It 28 is absolutely right if material is identified that is 29 clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction 20 order, then His Majesty's Government would have no 20 disclosed and material 21 that may well come into that category is being reviewed 22 at the moment. 23 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 24 THE CHAIR: Well, there is a very limited amount that has 25 already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	9	THE CHAIR: What is now proposed is a slightly different	9	or to make another attack more deadly. As you said at
THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has explained, is slightly different. MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had discussions about that. May I just come to the central point here, I think it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 12 for that reason that this process takes as long as it does. There has been no delay in the sense of needlessly wasted time. But this process of disclosure really does take time and immensely careful thought. It is absolutely right if material is identified that is clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction order, then His Majesty's Government would have no objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material that may well come into that category is being reviewed at the moment. THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 23 already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	10	system, isn't it?	10	the beginning of this hearing, sir, if something is
23 Explained, is slightly different. 14 MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had 15 MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had 16 May I just come to the central point here, I think 17 it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is 18 a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. 19 THE CHAIR: Yes. 20 MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could 21 have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of 22 sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. 23 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 24 discussions about that. We have had 25 needlessly wasted time. But this process of disclosure 26 needlessly wasted time. But this process of disclosure 27 really does take time and immensely careful thought. It 28 is absolutely right if material is identified that is 29 clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction 20 order, then His Majesty's Government would have no 21 objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material 22 that may well come into that category is being reviewed 23 at the moment. 24 THE CHAIR: Well, there is a very limited amount that has 25 already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	11	MR MANSFIELD: I am so sorry?	11	disclosed by mistake, it can't be retrieved. And it is
MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had discussions about that. May I just come to the central point here, I think ti is the central point, in the new scheme, which is a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had discussions about that. 15 really does take time and immensely careful thought. It is absolutely right if material is identified that is clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction order, then His Majesty's Government would have no objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material that may well come into that category is being reviewed at the moment. 20 MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of at the moment. 21 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	12	THE CHAIR: What is now proposed, as Mr O'Connor has	12	for that reason that this process takes as long as it
MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had discussions about that. May I just come to the central point here, I think it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had discussions about that. 15 really does take time and immensely careful thought. It is absolutely right if material is identified that is clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction order, then His Majesty's Government would have no objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material that may well come into that category is being reviewed at the moment. 20 MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of 21 at the moment. 21 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 23 already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	13	explained, is slightly different.	13	does. There has been no delay in the sense of
discussions about that. 15 really does take time and immensely careful thought. It 16 May I just come to the central point here, I think 17 it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is 18 a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. 19 THE CHAIR: Yes. 19 objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material 20 MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could 21 have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of 22 sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. 23 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 25 really does take time and immensely careful thought. It 16 is absolutely right if material is identified that is 17 clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction 18 order, then His Majesty's Government would have no 19 objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material 20 that may well come into that category is being reviewed 21 at the moment. 22 THE CHAIR: Well, there is a very limited amount that has 23 already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	14	MR MANSFIELD: Yes it is, yes. We accept that. We have had	14	-
it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. THE CHAIR: Yes. MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 17 clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction order, then His Majesty's Government would have no objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material that may well come into that category is being reviewed at the moment. 20 that may well come into that category is being reviewed at the moment. 21 THE CHAIR: Well, there is a very limited amount that has already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	15	discussions about that.	15	
it is the central point, in the new scheme, which is a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. 18 order, then His Majesty's Government would have no 19 THE CHAIR: Yes. 19 objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material 20 MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could 21 have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of 22 sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. 23 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 24 clearly never going to be the subject of a restriction 26 order, then His Majesty's Government would have no 27 objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material 28 that may well come into that category is being reviewed 29 at the moment. 20 THE CHAIR: Well, there is a very limited amount that has 21 already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	16	May I just come to the central point here, I think	16	is absolutely right if material is identified that is
a draft schedule of sensitivities will be produced. 18 order, then His Majesty's Government would have no 19 THE CHAIR: Yes. 19 objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material 20 MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could 21 have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of 21 at the moment. 22 sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. 23 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 23 already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	17		17	
THE CHAIR: Yes. 19 objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material 20 MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could 21 have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of 21 at the moment. 22 sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. 23 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 23 already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	18		18	
MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be that may well come into that category is being reviewed at the moment. THE CHAIR: Well, there is a very limited amount that has already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	19	THE CHAIR: Yes.	19	objection whatsoever of it being disclosed and material
have been done, if I may say so, a draft schedule of 21 at the moment. 22 sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. 23 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 23 already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	20	MR MANSFIELD: May I ask in a very simple way, this could	20	that may well come into that category is being reviewed
22 sensitivities, at the beginning of last year. 23 THE CHAIR: Well, there is a very limited amount that has 23 already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	21		21	at the moment.
23 THE CHAIR: Well, I don't know about that. You may be 23 already been passed at the stage 2 process. That	22		22	THE CHAIR: Well, there is a very limited amount that has
	23		23	already been passed at the stage 2 process. That
	24		24	presumably must be of that kind. But what Mr Mansfield
25 MR MANSFIELD: Because, and I think a number of people in 25 is saying is that there must be quite a lot more of it.			25	is saying is that there must be quite a lot more of it.
Page 46 Page 48		Page 46		Page 48

1	Is that right?	1	possible, ultimately, to agree gists or redactions of,
2	MS MCGAHEY: As far as I am aware, sir, no. The material	2	for example, irrelevant elements
3	that is time consuming and may give rise to	3	THE CHAIR: Yes.
4	sensitivities is the greater proportion.	4	MS MCGAHEY: that may reduce the number of instances in
5	THE CHAIR: Well, I think the question that you are being	5	which restriction order applications have to be made.
6	asked is: is it practicable, and if not why not, to at	6	THE CHAIR: Yes.
7	any rate identify now relevant material where there will	7	MS MCGAHEY: The Government is optimistic that as things
8	never be any question of an application for	8	currently stand the work to draft the list of potential
9	a restriction order, because if it can be done, then	9	sensitivities identified in those documents will be
10	that can be handed over in short order.	10	completed by the end of February next year. Obviously
11	MS MCGAHEY: I can take instructions, sir, on how much	11	if further requests are made and large numbers of
12	material there is, and where it comes from.	12	documents added then that will have an impact on whether
13	THE CHAIR: Well, I think I would be grateful if, as part of	13	the timeframe can be met.
14	the process which Mr O'Connor has outlined to me, that	14	THE CHAIR: So a schedule of sensitivities by the end
15	specific question, which Mr Mansfield reasonably asks,	15	of February.
16	should be addressed.	16	MS MCGAHEY: Yes, sir.
17	MS MCGAHEY: Of course, sir.	17	THE CHAIR: Do you want to deal with Mr Mansfield's
18	THE CHAIR: All right.	18	suggestion that you might have expected, I think he says
19	MS MCGAHEY: As you have heard from Mr O'Connor, since	19	he might have expected, that such a list or schedule or
20	counsel to the inquiry and HMG put in their written	20	concept of topics which are sensitive must have been in
21	submissions there have been many useful discussions	21	mind for a considerable time by now.
22	about the way forward. They have been outlined to you.	22	MS MCGAHEY: Oh it certainly has been, sir, and it is very
23	THE CHAIR: Yes.	23	well known. What is being done now is the matching of
24	MS MCGAHEY: And we do submit it is absolutely right that	24	those sensitivities to specific documents and to
25	the focus of the disclosure exercise should be on the	25	paragraphs and words within those documents. And it is
	Page 49		Page 51
1	documents that the inquiry legal team have identified as	1	Alack Alack in Aires and resources
	1 7 6	1	that that is time consuming.
2	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the	2	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes.
2 3			THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by
	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the	2 3 4	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order
3	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start	2 3 4 5	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by
3 4	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal	2 3 4 5 6	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the
3 4 5	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for	2 3 4 5 6 7	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure
3 4 5 6	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the
3 4 5 6 7	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that tranche by the end of this month.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the strands of information in the round, and it is at that
3 4 5 6 7 8	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that tranche by the end of this month. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the strands of information in the round, and it is at that point that one can work out whether something that seems
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that tranche by the end of this month. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MS MCGAHEY: The streamlined securities checking process	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the strands of information in the round, and it is at that point that one can work out whether something that seems quite innocuous in one document is actually immensely
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that tranche by the end of this month. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MS MCGAHEY: The streamlined securities checking process outlined by Mr O'Connor were agreed with the inquiry	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the strands of information in the round, and it is at that point that one can work out whether something that seems quite innocuous in one document is actually immensely sensitive when viewed against parallel information in
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that tranche by the end of this month. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MS MCGAHEY: The streamlined securities checking process outlined by Mr O'Connor were agreed with the inquiry legal team following detailed discussions. But when	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the strands of information in the round, and it is at that point that one can work out whether something that seems quite innocuous in one document is actually immensely sensitive when viewed against parallel information in another, because that is the jigsaw effect.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that tranche by the end of this month. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MS MCGAHEY: The streamlined securities checking process outlined by Mr O'Connor were agreed with the inquiry legal team following detailed discussions. But when this process begins, the process of looking at these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the strands of information in the round, and it is at that point that one can work out whether something that seems quite innocuous in one document is actually immensely sensitive when viewed against parallel information in another, because that is the jigsaw effect. THE CHAIR: Well, I absolutely understand the jigsaw
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that tranche by the end of this month. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MS MCGAHEY: The streamlined securities checking process outlined by Mr O'Connor were agreed with the inquiry legal team following detailed discussions. But when this process begins, the process of looking at these 2000-odd documents, the first stage of the review by HMG	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the strands of information in the round, and it is at that point that one can work out whether something that seems quite innocuous in one document is actually immensely sensitive when viewed against parallel information in another, because that is the jigsaw effect. THE CHAIR: Well, I absolutely understand the jigsaw concept, Ms McGahey, I am sure everybody does. It
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that tranche by the end of this month. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MS MCGAHEY: The streamlined securities checking process outlined by Mr O'Connor were agreed with the inquiry legal team following detailed discussions. But when this process begins, the process of looking at these 2000-odd documents, the first stage of the review by HMG will be a review by national security experts who must	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the strands of information in the round, and it is at that point that one can work out whether something that seems quite innocuous in one document is actually immensely sensitive when viewed against parallel information in another, because that is the jigsaw effect. THE CHAIR: Well, I absolutely understand the jigsaw concept, Ms McGahey, I am sure everybody does. It doesn't prevent, does, it a good deal of work being done
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that tranche by the end of this month. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MS MCGAHEY: The streamlined securities checking process outlined by Mr O'Connor were agreed with the inquiry legal team following detailed discussions. But when this process begins, the process of looking at these 2000-odd documents, the first stage of the review by HMG will be a review by national security experts who must look for content that is so sensitive it should not be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the strands of information in the round, and it is at that point that one can work out whether something that seems quite innocuous in one document is actually immensely sensitive when viewed against parallel information in another, because that is the jigsaw effect. THE CHAIR: Well, I absolutely understand the jigsaw concept, Ms McGahey, I am sure everybody does. It doesn't prevent, does, it a good deal of work being done before, as it were, everybody has read everything.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that tranche by the end of this month. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MS MCGAHEY: The streamlined securities checking process outlined by Mr O'Connor were agreed with the inquiry legal team following detailed discussions. But when this process begins, the process of looking at these 2000-odd documents, the first stage of the review by HMG will be a review by national security experts who must look for content that is so sensitive it should not be shared more widely even within the HMG teams. Once that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the strands of information in the round, and it is at that point that one can work out whether something that seems quite innocuous in one document is actually immensely sensitive when viewed against parallel information in another, because that is the jigsaw effect. THE CHAIR: Well, I absolutely understand the jigsaw concept, Ms McGahey, I am sure everybody does. It doesn't prevent, does, it a good deal of work being done before, as it were, everybody has read everything. MS MCGAHEY: Oh, no, and that isn't possible because one
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that tranche by the end of this month. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MS MCGAHEY: The streamlined securities checking process outlined by Mr O'Connor were agreed with the inquiry legal team following detailed discussions. But when this process begins, the process of looking at these 2000-odd documents, the first stage of the review by HMG will be a review by national security experts who must look for content that is so sensitive it should not be shared more widely even within the HMG teams. Once that work has been done the documents will be reviewed by all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the strands of information in the round, and it is at that point that one can work out whether something that seems quite innocuous in one document is actually immensely sensitive when viewed against parallel information in another, because that is the jigsaw effect. THE CHAIR: Well, I absolutely understand the jigsaw concept, Ms McGahey, I am sure everybody does. It doesn't prevent, does, it a good deal of work being done before, as it were, everybody has read everything. MS MCGAHEY: Oh, no, and that isn't possible because one always has to start somewhere.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that tranche by the end of this month. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MS MCGAHEY: The streamlined securities checking process outlined by Mr O'Connor were agreed with the inquiry legal team following detailed discussions. But when this process begins, the process of looking at these 2000-odd documents, the first stage of the review by HMG will be a review by national security experts who must look for content that is so sensitive it should not be shared more widely even within the HMG teams. Once that work has been done the documents will be reviewed by all HMG departments and agencies so that they can identify	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the strands of information in the round, and it is at that point that one can work out whether something that seems quite innocuous in one document is actually immensely sensitive when viewed against parallel information in another, because that is the jigsaw effect. THE CHAIR: Well, I absolutely understand the jigsaw concept, Ms McGahey, I am sure everybody does. It doesn't prevent, does, it a good deal of work being done before, as it were, everybody has read everything. MS MCGAHEY: Oh, no, and that isn't possible because one always has to start somewhere. THE CHAIR: Yes.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that tranche by the end of this month. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MS MCGAHEY: The streamlined securities checking process outlined by Mr O'Connor were agreed with the inquiry legal team following detailed discussions. But when this process begins, the process of looking at these 2000-odd documents, the first stage of the review by HMG will be a review by national security experts who must look for content that is so sensitive it should not be shared more widely even within the HMG teams. Once that work has been done the documents will be reviewed by all HMG departments and agencies so that they can identify any sensitivities within their own areas of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the strands of information in the round, and it is at that point that one can work out whether something that seems quite innocuous in one document is actually immensely sensitive when viewed against parallel information in another, because that is the jigsaw effect. THE CHAIR: Well, I absolutely understand the jigsaw concept, Ms McGahey, I am sure everybody does. It doesn't prevent, does, it a good deal of work being done before, as it were, everybody has read everything. MS MCGAHEY: Oh, no, and that isn't possible because one always has to start somewhere. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS MCGAHEY: Because if one starts with the first 2,000
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that tranche by the end of this month. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MS MCGAHEY: The streamlined securities checking process outlined by Mr O'Connor were agreed with the inquiry legal team following detailed discussions. But when this process begins, the process of looking at these 2000-odd documents, the first stage of the review by HMG will be a review by national security experts who must look for content that is so sensitive it should not be shared more widely even within the HMG teams. Once that work has been done the documents will be reviewed by all HMG departments and agencies so that they can identify any sensitivities within their own areas of responsibility and the intention is that the Government	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the strands of information in the round, and it is at that point that one can work out whether something that seems quite innocuous in one document is actually immensely sensitive when viewed against parallel information in another, because that is the jigsaw effect. THE CHAIR: Well, I absolutely understand the jigsaw concept, Ms McGahey, I am sure everybody does. It doesn't prevent, does, it a good deal of work being done before, as it were, everybody has read everything. MS MCGAHEY: Oh, no, and that isn't possible because one always has to start somewhere. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS MCGAHEY: Because if one starts with the first 2,000 documents, it almost doesn't matter whether the next
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that tranche by the end of this month. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MS MCGAHEY: The streamlined securities checking process outlined by Mr O'Connor were agreed with the inquiry legal team following detailed discussions. But when this process begins, the process of looking at these 2000-odd documents, the first stage of the review by HMG will be a review by national security experts who must look for content that is so sensitive it should not be shared more widely even within the HMG teams. Once that work has been done the documents will be reviewed by all HMG departments and agencies so that they can identify any sensitivities within their own areas of responsibility and the intention is that the Government clients will create as they go along a list of potential	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the strands of information in the round, and it is at that point that one can work out whether something that seems quite innocuous in one document is actually immensely sensitive when viewed against parallel information in another, because that is the jigsaw effect. THE CHAIR: Well, I absolutely understand the jigsaw concept, Ms McGahey, I am sure everybody does. It doesn't prevent, does, it a good deal of work being done before, as it were, everybody has read everything. MS MCGAHEY: Oh, no, and that isn't possible because one always has to start somewhere. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS MCGAHEY: Because if one starts with the first 2,000 documents, it almost doesn't matter whether the next 8,000 are already ready sitting there waiting to be read
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that tranche by the end of this month. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MS MCGAHEY: The streamlined securities checking process outlined by Mr O'Connor were agreed with the inquiry legal team following detailed discussions. But when this process begins, the process of looking at these 2000-odd documents, the first stage of the review by HMG will be a review by national security experts who must look for content that is so sensitive it should not be shared more widely even within the HMG teams. Once that work has been done the documents will be reviewed by all HMG departments and agencies so that they can identify any sensitivities within their own areas of responsibility and the intention is that the Government clients will create as they go along a list of potential sensitivities to be discussed with the inquiry legal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the strands of information in the round, and it is at that point that one can work out whether something that seems quite innocuous in one document is actually immensely sensitive when viewed against parallel information in another, because that is the jigsaw effect. THE CHAIR: Well, I absolutely understand the jigsaw concept, Ms McGahey, I am sure everybody does. It doesn't prevent, does, it a good deal of work being done before, as it were, everybody has read everything. MS MCGAHEY: Oh, no, and that isn't possible because one always has to start somewhere. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS MCGAHEY: Because if one starts with the first 2,000 documents, it almost doesn't matter whether the next 8,000 are already ready sitting there waiting to be read or still to be identified, the first 2,000 still have to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that tranche by the end of this month. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MS MCGAHEY: The streamlined securities checking process outlined by Mr O'Connor were agreed with the inquiry legal team following detailed discussions. But when this process begins, the process of looking at these 2000-odd documents, the first stage of the review by HMG will be a review by national security experts who must look for content that is so sensitive it should not be shared more widely even within the HMG teams. Once that work has been done the documents will be reviewed by all HMG departments and agencies so that they can identify any sensitivities within their own areas of responsibility and the intention is that the Government clients will create as they go along a list of potential	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the strands of information in the round, and it is at that point that one can work out whether something that seems quite innocuous in one document is actually immensely sensitive when viewed against parallel information in another, because that is the jigsaw effect. THE CHAIR: Well, I absolutely understand the jigsaw concept, Ms McGahey, I am sure everybody does. It doesn't prevent, does, it a good deal of work being done before, as it were, everybody has read everything. MS MCGAHEY: Oh, no, and that isn't possible because one always has to start somewhere. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS MCGAHEY: Because if one starts with the first 2,000 documents, it almost doesn't matter whether the next 8,000 are already ready sitting there waiting to be read
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	relevant to the inquiry's work. At the moment the intention is that HMG should focus its efforts on the around 2,000 police documents that the inquiry legal team have collated and that they want us to start reviewing. And HMG is more than happy to start with a review of those documents. We are grateful for an indication that we should receive everything in that tranche by the end of this month. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MS MCGAHEY: The streamlined securities checking process outlined by Mr O'Connor were agreed with the inquiry legal team following detailed discussions. But when this process begins, the process of looking at these 2000-odd documents, the first stage of the review by HMG will be a review by national security experts who must look for content that is so sensitive it should not be shared more widely even within the HMG teams. Once that work has been done the documents will be reviewed by all HMG departments and agencies so that they can identify any sensitivities within their own areas of responsibility and the intention is that the Government clients will create as they go along a list of potential sensitivities to be discussed with the inquiry legal	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	THE CHAIR: I see. Yes. MS MCGAHEY: And as has already been outlined to you by Mr O'Connor, the making of a formal restriction order application will, the Government thinks, be possible once the inquiry legal team have identified all, or the vast majority, of relevant material for disclosure because it is only then that HMG can view all the strands of information in the round, and it is at that point that one can work out whether something that seems quite innocuous in one document is actually immensely sensitive when viewed against parallel information in another, because that is the jigsaw effect. THE CHAIR: Well, I absolutely understand the jigsaw concept, Ms McGahey, I am sure everybody does. It doesn't prevent, does, it a good deal of work being done before, as it were, everybody has read everything. MS MCGAHEY: Oh, no, and that isn't possible because one always has to start somewhere. THE CHAIR: Yes. MS MCGAHEY: Because if one starts with the first 2,000 documents, it almost doesn't matter whether the next 8,000 are already ready sitting there waiting to be read or still to be identified, the first 2,000 still have to

1 1 THE CHAIR: Yes. undertake to complete the work by the end of this year. 2 MS MCGAHEY: And in many cases it will be possible to say 2 Our hope was it would be done not before the end of this 3 this is a discreet topic and we can make a submission 3 year, and it is taking longer. 4 4 THE CHAIR: Well, we have had various dates at different about the need for redaction or gisting and it is very 5 unlikely to be affected by something from another 5 times, Ms McGahey, as you know, they have tended to move 6 organisation coming further down the line. But 6 forward. 7 7 MS MCGAHEY: Sir, it is absolutely inevitable. We have sometimes it isn't. 8 THE CHAIR: Mm-hm 8 tried using a streamlined disclosure process using the 9 9 MS MCGAHEY: And there is also a risk that if one does it disclosure strategies, as we have outlined in 10 10 too early, and says yes, fine, this document can go out paragraph 11 of our submissions. That has had the 11 with this bit unredacted, then later that decision is 11 inevitable consequence, as we knew would happen, that 12 12 actually the search has to go more widely. You start really regretted, because there is something very 13 important in another document that one would want to 13 with the streamlined process, you find something else 14 share with the families or the public and can't because 14 that is relevant and it is right that it should be 15 15 investigated, but that inevitably takes more time. the jigsaw effect means that something that has already 16 16 THE CHAIR: Right. Go on. gone out means a second piece of more important 17 information has to be kept private. 17 MS MCGAHEY: But the Government clients are working 18 18 THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. immensely hard because it is in everybody's interests to 19 19 MS MCGAHEY: But we do anticipate that the inquiry legal finish this process as soon as we can. We will work as 20 team are obviously going to continue their relevance 20 hard as we can. We will continue to liaise with the 21 review and they will identify further material as they 21 inquiry legal team to identify priorities and the 22 22 go. So this exercise of reviewing relevant material liaison with that team has been immensely helpful. 23 23 THE CHAIR: Now, you have heard the suggested directions will become a rolling process until disclosure is 24 complete, and that we do absolutely recognise that the 24 that Mr O'Connor asks me to give. 25 inquiry legal team have a huge task in going through all 25 MS MCGAHEY: Yes. Page 53 Page 55 potentially relevant material, and we don't know how THE CHAIR: Do you resist any of them? 1 1 2 2 long that process will take. MS MCGAHEY: No, sir. 3 THE CHAIR: Well, you must leave them to tell me about that, 3 THE CHAIR: Is there any reason why I shouldn't add to them 4 4 that by the same date, 28 February, you should identify Ms McGahey. At the moment I am concerned about what is 5 happening in your neck of the woods. 5 any relevant, any documents which the legal team has 6 MS MCGAHEY: Indeed. But it is really important, sir, that 6 identified as relevant, in respect of which there is 7 I don't raise false hopes or expectations, because HMG 7 simply no prospect of a restriction order application. 8 8 does believe that the most efficient way of approaching MS MCGAHEY: Within those 2,000 documents, yes, sir, 9 9 disclosure is the one that is now proposed by the I imagine that -- I will take instructions. 10 inquiry legal team; to identify relevant material first, 10 THE CHAIR: That is tranche 1, is it? 11 undertake sensitivity reviews, and make restriction 11 MS MCGAHEY: Tranche 1, yes, batch 1. 12 order applications only in respect of that relevant 12 THE CHAIR: Sorry, batch 1, yes. 13 13 material. But on any view this is a slow process and it MS MCGAHEY: Batch 1, yes. 14 14 THE CHAIR: In batch 1. takes considerable time, and expert time, to get it 15 15 MS MCGAHEY: Yes. THE CHAIR: What about any others? 16 THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, yes, I understand that Ms McGahey, 16 17 and you have made the point before that those who have 17 MS MCGAHEY: Sir, I would need to take instructions, because 18 the necessary expertise have one or two things on their 18 we have finite resources and I also have no idea what 19 plate at the moment. But it has to be done. 19 the volume of material is that could be landed upon us. 20 MS MCGAHEY: Yes. 20 THE CHAIR: All right. Well, would you take away, please, 21 THE CHAIR: Yes. 21 the principled question, that if it is possible, without 22 22 slowing everything else down, to identify documents MS MCGAHEY: It is probable that working towards the 23 restriction order application timetable for these 2,000 23 which, in respect of which the restriction order process 24 documents will affect the timetable for HMG to complete 24 will not be invoked. 25 its stage 1 disclosure. I should say that we did not 25 MS MCGAHEY: Yes. Page 56 Page 54

1 1 THE CHAIR: Whether successfully or otherwise, will not be significantly sped up stage 1 of the disclosure process. 2 invoked at all. Those ought to be identified as soon as 2 I think we are all agreed about the progress that has 3 possible. 3 been made. I don't know if you want to hear from me briefly on the distinction between items and documents. 4 4 MS MCGAHEY: Yes, sir, I understand that. 5 THE CHAIR: And in respect of batch 1, by 28 February will 5 We have addressed --6 be part of the directions, unless anybody persuades me 6 THE CHAIR: Honestly, no, Ms Giovanetti. 7 7 MS GIOVANETTI: I was hoping that you would say that. otherwise. All right, thank you. 8 8 MS MCGAHEY: Thank you, sir. So could I move on, then, I think, to restriction 9 9 THE CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. order applications. 10 10 THE CHAIR: Yes. Ms Giovanetti. 11 Submissions by MS GIOVANETTI 11 MS GIOVANETTI: We also are content with the order proposed 12 by counsel to the inquiry. 12 MS GIOVANETTI: Thank you, sir. We are very grateful to 13 counsel to the inquiry, for Mr O'Connor's careful and 13 THE CHAIR: Yes. 14 detailed submissions, which has significantly reduced 14 MS GIOVANETTI: And in fact had been discussing sotto voce 15 15 before you proposed it, sir, that if it became apparent the length of time, I think, that I will want to take. 16 But I will do my very best to address the points which 16 that from our perspective there were documents that 17 I know concern you and indeed which concern the family. 17 simply didn't have any sensitivities, that they could be 18 18 identified as part of that process, and as long as His Could I start by saying that we of course appreciate the 19 family's concern to proceed to the hearings, well first 19 Majesty's Government also don't have any identified 20 to disclosure and then to the hearings, as swiftly as 20 sensitivities, then we can't see why there needs to be 21 21 any delay in proceeding to disclose those documents. possible. And I hope they are reassured that Operation 22 22 THE CHAIR: And you can do that by 28 February? Verbasco has devoted very, very substantial resources to 23 23 MS GIOVANETTI: Yes. ensure that the disclosure exercise is conducted 24 24 THE CHAIR: Good. appropriately, rigorously, and at the same time as 25 swiftly as possible. And of course there is a tension 25 MS GIOVANETTI: We don't think it would be the most Page 57 Page 59 1 between those aspects, and both are of great importance. efficient use of resources to be trying to identify 2 2 non-sensitive documents, if I can call them that, from We have done our best throughout, as well, to be 3 3 amongst the cache that have not yet been identified as realistic about the targets that we have set, and the 4 dates we have proposed. So I am pleased to be able to 4 relevant. 5 5 THE CHAIR: No. say that for example in our written submissions we 6 anticipated that by the date of this hearing we would 6 MS GIOVANETTI: No. So it has to come from the 7 have produced 28,885 items to the inquiry by way of 7 documentation --8 stage 1 disclosure. We have actually done rather better 8 THE CHAIR: That wasn't the suggestion as I understood it. 9 than that, and we are slightly over 29,200, as 9 MS GIOVANETTI: No, I just wanted to be clear about that. 10 I understand it. 10 And by the same token whilst of course we will do 11 In respect of the slippage, I can see how it can be 11 our very best to provide documents to His Majesty's 12 put that way, but what we anticipated in March 2022 at 12 Government by 30 November, obviously we are dependent to 13 the directions hearing then, and it is paragraph 5 of 13 a degree on the inquiry legal team being able to provide 14 our written submissions, was that we would have 14 to us those documents which they have identified as 15 scheduled 55,000 items by the end of the year. That was 15 relevant. Now, we have a substantial number of those 16 realistic, and we are on track to do that. The 16 documents, but we don't yet have them all. But 17 slippage, such as it is, is simply that as you will see 17 presuming they can be provided to us, as is anticipated 18 by the next paragraph, we have identified further 18 quite speedily, then we shouldn't have any difficulty 19 potentially relevant material. So while we are on track 19 with meeting that deadline either. 20 for doing what we said we would be able to do, the task 20 THE CHAIR: Right. 21 is slightly more extensive than we anticipated. 21 MS GIOVANETTI: We agree, obviously, with the submission 22 THE CHAIR: You now have some more, yes. 22 made by Mr Mansfield on behalf of the family in respect 23 MS GIOVANETTI: We are extremely grateful to the inquiry 23 of them being able to make submissions in respect of 24 legal team for the very constructive liaison there has 24 restriction order applications. 25 been, which has, I think everybody has agreed, 25 THE CHAIR: Of course. Page 58 Page 60

1	MS GIOVANETTI: We have also taken on board their	1	I update on you that, in our note at 3(c).
2	suggestion, it is quite right as well, that as well as	2	THE CHAIR: Yes.
3	there being categories of sensitivity there are degrees	3	MR BEGGS: Which is we anticipate resolution of the
4	of sensitivity, and we will have that very well in mind	4	remaining IT issues within the next four weeks.
5	as we go through the process. So if I may, I will just	5	Obviously if we can do better so much the better, but
6	very briefly take instructions to make sure there is	6	that is the anticipated realistic resolution, thereby
7	nothing else I should address in my submissions.	7	keeping us well on track for your 28 February deadline.
8	(Pause)	8	THE CHAIR: Good, thank you very much. And again, if it
9	And obviously the number that we are going to be	9	applies are you content that the direction also requires
10	identifying as non-relevant in the first instance will	10	you to identify, or rather to, yes, to identify the
11	be from that first batch. Sorry, non-sensitive.	11	documents which are relevant but in relation to which
12	THE CHAIR: Non-sensitive. Relevant but non-sensitive.	12	there is no prospect of a restriction order application?
13	MS GIOVANETTI: Exactly, yes. I hope that was implicit.	13	MR BEGGS: Yes, sir. Thank you.
14	THE CHAIR: Yes.	14	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much. That, I think, is all.
15	MS GIOVANETTI: Was there anything else I could assist you	15	Anybody else? No. Mr O'Connor.
16	with, sir?	16	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, I am grateful. I don't think there are
17	THE CHAIR: No, I don't think so, Ms Giovanetti, except that	17	any specific points on which I wish to reply. It has
18	you haven't I should perhaps have asked Ms McGahey as	18	been a useful debate. We certainly agree that it is
19	well, you have both heard Mr O'Connor express the hope,	19	a very natural next step to emerge from the scheduling
20	indeed the determination, that by the time of the next	20	process that we have discussed to include within that
21	hearing I am in a position to fix a timetable for the	21	identification of documents that are relevant and will
22	restriction order process. If I don't do that we are	22	not be part of a restriction order process.
23	not going to get anywhere.	23	THE CHAIR: Good, thank you.
24	MS GIOVANETTI: No. I completely understand that, and we	24	MR O'CONNOR: So those can be disclosed, and sir, we of
25	are working to that end.	25	course have listened carefully to the submissions
	-		
	Page 61		Page 63
1	THE CHAIR: Yes.	1	Mr Mansfield makes, which as he said are matters that he
1 2	THE CHAIR: Yes. MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's	1 2	Mr Mansfield makes, which as he said are matters that he and I have discussed already and we will bear those very
	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's	1	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very
2	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal	2	*
2 3	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on	2 3	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions
2 3 4	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that.	2 3 4	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward.
2 3 4 5	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what	2 3 4 5	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of	2 3 4 5 6	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful. MS GIOVANETTI: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking them up, have other people got copies of your draft
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful. MS GIOVANETTI: Yes. THE CHAIR: Ms McGahey, on that last point are you content?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking them up, have other people got copies of your draft speaking note? No they haven't. Very well.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful. MS GIOVANETTI: Yes. THE CHAIR: Ms McGahey, on that last point are you content? MS MCGAHEY: Yes, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking them up, have other people got copies of your draft
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful. MS GIOVANETTI: Yes. THE CHAIR: Ms McGahey, on that last point are you content? MS MCGAHEY: Yes, sir. THE CHAIR: Good, thank you. Mr Goss, do you want to add	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking them up, have other people got copies of your draft speaking note? No they haven't. Very well. Well then, first His Majesty's Government is to review the documents marked as relevant by the inquiry
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful. MS GIOVANETTI: Yes. THE CHAIR: Ms McGahey, on that last point are you content? MS MCGAHEY: Yes, sir. THE CHAIR: Good, thank you. Mr Goss, do you want to add anything?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking them up, have other people got copies of your draft speaking note? No they haven't. Very well. Well then, first His Majesty's Government is to review the documents marked as relevant by the inquiry legal team from the tranche of material which was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful. MS GIOVANETTI: Yes. THE CHAIR: Ms McGahey, on that last point are you content? MS MCGAHEY: Yes, sir. THE CHAIR: Good, thank you. Mr Goss, do you want to add anything? MR GOSS: No, thank you, sir.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking them up, have other people got copies of your draft speaking note? No they haven't. Very well. Well then, first His Majesty's Government is to review the documents marked as relevant by the inquiry legal team from the tranche of material which was provided by Operation Verbasco on 15 August 2022. That
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful. MS GIOVANETTI: Yes. THE CHAIR: Ms McGahey, on that last point are you content? MS MCGAHEY: Yes, sir. THE CHAIR: Good, thank you. Mr Goss, do you want to add anything? MR GOSS: No, thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: What about you, Mr Beggs?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking them up, have other people got copies of your draft speaking note? No they haven't. Very well. Well then, first His Majesty's Government is to review the documents marked as relevant by the inquiry legal team from the tranche of material which was provided by Operation Verbasco on 15 August 2022. That is to say batch 1. And those documents appended to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful. MS GIOVANETTI: Yes. THE CHAIR: Ms McGahey, on that last point are you content? MS MCGAHEY: Yes, sir. THE CHAIR: Good, thank you. Mr Goss, do you want to add anything? MR GOSS: No, thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: What about you, Mr Beggs? Submissions by MR BEGGS	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking them up, have other people got copies of your draft speaking note? No they haven't. Very well. Well then, first His Majesty's Government is to review the documents marked as relevant by the inquiry legal team from the tranche of material which was provided by Operation Verbasco on 15 August 2022. That is to say batch 1. And those documents appended to the police report, version 3, and in respect of them provide
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful. MS GIOVANETTI: Yes. THE CHAIR: Ms McGahey, on that last point are you content? MS MCGAHEY: Yes, sir. THE CHAIR: Good, thank you. Mr Goss, do you want to add anything? MR GOSS: No, thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: What about you, Mr Beggs? Submissions by MR BEGGS MR BEGGS: Sir, just three points. Firstly, Mr O'Connor	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking them up, have other people got copies of your draft speaking note? No they haven't. Very well. Well then, first His Majesty's Government is to review the documents marked as relevant by the inquiry legal team from the tranche of material which was provided by Operation Verbasco on 15 August 2022. That is to say batch 1. And those documents appended to the police report, version 3, and in respect of them provide (a) a draft schedule of sensitivities and (b) a list of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful. MS GIOVANETTI: Yes. THE CHAIR: Ms McGahey, on that last point are you content? MS MCGAHEY: Yes, sir. THE CHAIR: Good, thank you. Mr Goss, do you want to add anything? MR GOSS: No, thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: What about you, Mr Beggs? Submissions by MR BEGGS MR BEGGS: Sir, just three points. Firstly, Mr O'Connor kindly indicated the proposed direction in respect of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking them up, have other people got copies of your draft speaking note? No they haven't. Very well. Well then, first His Majesty's Government is to review the documents marked as relevant by the inquiry legal team from the tranche of material which was provided by Operation Verbasco on 15 August 2022. That is to say batch 1. And those documents appended to the police report, version 3, and in respect of them provide (a) a draft schedule of sensitivities and (b) a list of any documents in respect of which there is no prospect
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful. MS GIOVANETTI: Yes. THE CHAIR: Ms McGahey, on that last point are you content? MS MCGAHEY: Yes, sir. THE CHAIR: Good, thank you. Mr Goss, do you want to add anything? MR GOSS: No, thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: What about you, Mr Beggs? Submissions by MR BEGGS MR BEGGS: Sir, just three points. Firstly, Mr O'Connor kindly indicated the proposed direction in respect of Wiltshire Police.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking them up, have other people got copies of your draft speaking note? No they haven't. Very well. Well then, first His Majesty's Government is to review the documents marked as relevant by the inquiry legal team from the tranche of material which was provided by Operation Verbasco on 15 August 2022. That is to say batch 1. And those documents appended to the police report, version 3, and in respect of them provide (a) a draft schedule of sensitivities and (b) a list of any documents in respect of which there is no prospect of a restriction order application, and to do that by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful. MS GIOVANETTI: Yes. THE CHAIR: Ms McGahey, on that last point are you content? MS MCGAHEY: Yes, sir. THE CHAIR: Good, thank you. Mr Goss, do you want to add anything? MR GOSS: No, thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: What about you, Mr Beggs? Submissions by MR BEGGS MR BEGGS: Sir, just three points. Firstly, Mr O'Connor kindly indicated the proposed direction in respect of Wiltshire Police. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking them up, have other people got copies of your draft speaking note? No they haven't. Very well. Well then, first His Majesty's Government is to review the documents marked as relevant by the inquiry legal team from the tranche of material which was provided by Operation Verbasco on 15 August 2022. That is to say batch 1. And those documents appended to the police report, version 3, and in respect of them provide (a) a draft schedule of sensitivities and (b) a list of any documents in respect of which there is no prospect of a restriction order application, and to do that by 28 February.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful. MS GIOVANETTI: Yes. THE CHAIR: Ms McGahey, on that last point are you content? MS MCGAHEY: Yes, sir. THE CHAIR: Good, thank you. Mr Goss, do you want to add anything? MR GOSS: No, thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: What about you, Mr Beggs? Submissions by MR BEGGS MR BEGGS: Sir, just three points. Firstly, Mr O'Connor kindly indicated the proposed direction in respect of Wiltshire Police. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MR BEGGS: We don't resist it, indeed we welcome it as it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking them up, have other people got copies of your draft speaking note? No they haven't. Very well. Well then, first His Majesty's Government is to review the documents marked as relevant by the inquiry legal team from the tranche of material which was provided by Operation Verbasco on 15 August 2022. That is to say batch 1. And those documents appended to the police report, version 3, and in respect of them provide (a) a draft schedule of sensitivities and (b) a list of any documents in respect of which there is no prospect of a restriction order application, and to do that by 28 February. Secondly, Operation Verbasco is to do the same in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful. MS GIOVANETTI: Yes. THE CHAIR: Ms McGahey, on that last point are you content? MS MCGAHEY: Yes, sir. THE CHAIR: Good, thank you. Mr Goss, do you want to add anything? MR GOSS: No, thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: What about you, Mr Beggs? Submissions by MR BEGGS MR BEGGS: Sir, just three points. Firstly, Mr O'Connor kindly indicated the proposed direction in respect of Wiltshire Police. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MR BEGGS: We don't resist it, indeed we welcome it as it will help to focus minds and resource allocation.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking them up, have other people got copies of your draft speaking note? No they haven't. Very well. Well then, first His Majesty's Government is to review the documents marked as relevant by the inquiry legal team from the tranche of material which was provided by Operation Verbasco on 15 August 2022. That is to say batch 1. And those documents appended to the police report, version 3, and in respect of them provide (a) a draft schedule of sensitivities and (b) a list of any documents in respect of which there is no prospect of a restriction order application, and to do that by 28 February. Secondly, Operation Verbasco is to do the same in relation to its documents by the same date.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful. MS GIOVANETTI: Yes. THE CHAIR: Ms McGahey, on that last point are you content? MS MCGAHEY: Yes, sir. THE CHAIR: Good, thank you. Mr Goss, do you want to add anything? MR GOSS: No, thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: What about you, Mr Beggs? Submissions by MR BEGGS MR BEGGS: Sir, just three points. Firstly, Mr O'Connor kindly indicated the proposed direction in respect of Wiltshire Police. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MR BEGGS: We don't resist it, indeed we welcome it as it will help to focus minds and resource allocation. THE CHAIR: You had better tell whoever is in charge of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking them up, have other people got copies of your draft speaking note? No they haven't. Very well. Well then, first His Majesty's Government is to review the documents marked as relevant by the inquiry legal team from the tranche of material which was provided by Operation Verbasco on 15 August 2022. That is to say batch 1. And those documents appended to the police report, version 3, and in respect of them provide (a) a draft schedule of sensitivities and (b) a list of any documents in respect of which there is no prospect of a restriction order application, and to do that by 28 February. Secondly, Operation Verbasco is to do the same in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful. MS GIOVANETTI: Yes. THE CHAIR: Ms McGahey, on that last point are you content? MS MCGAHEY: Yes, sir. THE CHAIR: Good, thank you. Mr Goss, do you want to add anything? MR GOSS: No, thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: What about you, Mr Beggs? Submissions by MR BEGGS MR BEGGS: Sir, just three points. Firstly, Mr O'Connor kindly indicated the proposed direction in respect of Wiltshire Police. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MR BEGGS: We don't resist it, indeed we welcome it as it will help to focus minds and resource allocation. THE CHAIR: You had better tell whoever is in charge of the IT that I am afraid we insist.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking them up, have other people got copies of your draft speaking note? No they haven't. Very well. Well then, first His Majesty's Government is to review the documents marked as relevant by the inquiry legal team from the tranche of material which was provided by Operation Verbasco on 15 August 2022. That is to say batch 1. And those documents appended to the police report, version 3, and in respect of them provide (a) a draft schedule of sensitivities and (b) a list of any documents in respect of which there is no prospect of a restriction order application, and to do that by 28 February. Secondly, Operation Verbasco is to do the same in relation to its documents by the same date. MR O'CONNOR: Just to be clear, sir, in fact that is in relation to the same set of documents.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful. MS GIOVANETTI: Yes. THE CHAIR: Ms McGahey, on that last point are you content? MS MCGAHEY: Yes, sir. THE CHAIR: Good, thank you. Mr Goss, do you want to add anything? MR GOSS: No, thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: What about you, Mr Beggs? Submissions by MR BEGGS MR BEGGS: Sir, just three points. Firstly, Mr O'Connor kindly indicated the proposed direction in respect of Wiltshire Police. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MR BEGGS: We don't resist it, indeed we welcome it as it will help to focus minds and resource allocation. THE CHAIR: You had better tell whoever is in charge of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking them up, have other people got copies of your draft speaking note? No they haven't. Very well. Well then, first His Majesty's Government is to review the documents marked as relevant by the inquiry legal team from the tranche of material which was provided by Operation Verbasco on 15 August 2022. That is to say batch 1. And those documents appended to the police report, version 3, and in respect of them provide (a) a draft schedule of sensitivities and (b) a list of any documents in respect of which there is no prospect of a restriction order application, and to do that by 28 February. Secondly, Operation Verbasco is to do the same in relation to its documents by the same date. MR O'CONNOR: Just to be clear, sir, in fact that is in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS GIOVANETTI: We also take on board Mr O'Connor's suggestion that we should be liaising with your legal team to make sure we are making constructive progress on the sensitivities, and we are happy to do that. THE CHAIR: Yes. Well, as far as I am able to detect what is happening there seems to a very good level of inter partes discussion, for which I am grateful. MS GIOVANETTI: Yes. THE CHAIR: Ms McGahey, on that last point are you content? MS MCGAHEY: Yes, sir. THE CHAIR: Good, thank you. Mr Goss, do you want to add anything? MR GOSS: No, thank you, sir. THE CHAIR: What about you, Mr Beggs? Submissions by MR BEGGS MR BEGGS: Sir, just three points. Firstly, Mr O'Connor kindly indicated the proposed direction in respect of Wiltshire Police. THE CHAIR: Mm-hm. MR BEGGS: We don't resist it, indeed we welcome it as it will help to focus minds and resource allocation. THE CHAIR: You had better tell whoever is in charge of the IT that I am afraid we insist.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and I have discussed already and we will bear those very much in mind going forward. Directions THE CHAIR: Yes, I don't doubt it. Well then, Mr O'Connor, I will deal with it now rather than come back to it at the end, while it is in everybody's mind. I make the directions that you invite me to make. I am picking them up, have other people got copies of your draft speaking note? No they haven't. Very well. Well then, first His Majesty's Government is to review the documents marked as relevant by the inquiry legal team from the tranche of material which was provided by Operation Verbasco on 15 August 2022. That is to say batch 1. And those documents appended to the police report, version 3, and in respect of them provide (a) a draft schedule of sensitivities and (b) a list of any documents in respect of which there is no prospect of a restriction order application, and to do that by 28 February. Secondly, Operation Verbasco is to do the same in relation to its documents by the same date. MR O'CONNOR: Just to be clear, sir, in fact that is in relation to the same set of documents.

1	Operation Verbasco is to do the same two things in	1	secondly.
2	relation to that same set of documents.^^	2	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, yes.
3	Thirdly, I didn't ask Ms Giovanetti about it	3	As far as place is concerned, first of all you have
4	specifically but she told me she agreed. Operation	4	previously indicated an intention to conduct open
5	Verbasco is to provide the batch 1 relevant documents to	5	hearings of the inquiry in Salisbury.
6	His Majesty's Government so that this process can	6	THE CHAIR: Mm-hm.
7	proceed and do that by 30 November next, which is about	7	MR O'CONNOR: The closed hearings, of course, are different.
8	a fortnight.	8	They will take place at a secure location that hasn't
9	MR O'CONNOR: It is, sir, and of course I can say I heard	9	been determined yet and in any event will not be
10	what Ms Giovanetti said about our part in that process.	10	disclosed.
11	THE CHAIR: Of course.	11	THE CHAIR: Quite.
12	And lastly, Wiltshire Police are to provide a draft	12	MR O'CONNOR: The inquiry secretariat has been undertaking
13	schedule of sensitivities and to identify any documents	13	scoping work relating to possible venues for open
14	which are accepted by the inquiry legal team as	14	hearings, and associated practical arrangements. There
15	relevant, and in respect of which there is no prospect	15	are inevitably a wealth of competing practical
16	of a restriction order application, and they are to do	16	logistical and financial considerations. Some of those
17	both of those things by 28 February.	17	considerations, for example, the ease of attendance for
18	MR O'CONNOR: Yes, sir, and that is about a separate cohort	18	Dawn Sturgess's family, and other members of the public,
19	of documents	19	and also security considerations, have been referred to
20	THE CHAIR: It is.	20	in the written submissions you have received for this
21	MR O'CONNOR: in respect of their documents.	21	hearing. In our written submissions we indicated that
22	THE CHAIR: It is.	22	very broadly speaking there are three possible ways in
23	MR O'CONNOR: Yes, I am grateful.	23	which the open hearings could be configured. That is
24	THE CHAIR: Right, is there anything else on disclosure,	24	first of all oral open hearings being conducted at
25	Mr O'Connor?	25	a venue in Salisbury.
			•
	Page 65		Page 67
1	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, no.	1	THE CHAIR: Mm-hm.
2	THE CHAIR: No, I think not. I absolutely, I think	2	MR O'CONNOR: Secondly, some open hearings in Salisbury, and
3	I probably ought to say, understand how potentially	3	we suggested that those hearings would be focused on the
4	frustrating this can be. But it is the key to the	4	evidence particularly related to the immediate
5	entire process of this inquiry, and it is perhaps worth	5	circumstances of Dawn Sturgess's death, with the
6	saying that it may well be that no doubt on advice,	6	remaining open evidence heard in London with
7	public statements were made by public figures a long	7	a video link to a venue in Salisbury. And the third
8	time ago about what was asserted to have happened. It	8	alternative being oral open hearings in London
9	doesn't that did not include, as I understand it,	9	THE CHAIR: Yes.
10	revealing the evidence on which the assertion was based,	10	MR O'CONNOR: with a video link to Salisbury.
11	and what we are now talking about is examining the	11	Sir, you have seen the written submissions that have
12	evidence. That's why this is a different process.	12	been filed in response to those three alternatives that
13	MR O'CONNOR: Indeed.	13	we posed in our submissions. And you will have seen
14	THE CHAIR: All right.	14	that very broadly speaking there is a consensus
15	Further submissions by MR O'CONNOR	15	developing around the second option, that is initial
16	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, we move to the question of arrangements	16	hearings in Salisbury to be followed by subsequent open
17	for the substantive hearings.	17	hearings in London.
18	THE CHAIR: Venue.	18	THE CHAIR: Mm-hm.
19	MR O'CONNOR: And again it is right that I start by	19	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, it seems to us
20	acknowledging, sir, that we are of course acutely aware	20	THE CHAIR: I think that's right in particular that is
21	of the importance to all involved, and again in	21	Wiltshire County Council's favoured solution, isn't
22	particular to Dawn Sturgess's family, of having as much	22	it
23	certainty as possible, as early as possible, about the	23	MR O'CONNOR: It is.
24	arrangements for the substantive hearings.	24	THE CHAIR: because I was exercising my mind over the
25	THE CHAIR: Yes, can we take place first and come to date	25	obvious local interest. Revisiting it and inflicting
ļ	D (/		D (0
	Page 66		Page 68

1	a large number of people on the locality may have its	1	said anything about the question of venue, I will hear
2	downside as well as its upside.	2	in a minute from those that are here, is the ambulance
3	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, perhaps, as you say, sir, that was	3	trust.
4	a matter that we were aware you had in mind. As	4	MR O'CONNOR: Yes, sir. And again perhaps
5	I mentioned at the outset of the hearing, Wiltshire	5	THE CHAIR: And their preference is for open hearings in
6	Council are not here but they have filed written	6	Salisbury, at least as far as it affects them, and
7	submissions. Perhaps it is appropriate if I simply read	7	presumably their staff.
8	what they have submitted regarding venue. Others that	8	MR O'CONNOR: Yes. So again, perhaps it is appropriate if
9	are here will have an opportunity to make their own	9	I simply read out a short paragraph in their
10	submissions but what the Council said is this:	10	submissions. This is the South Western Ambulance
11	"The Council is neutral as to whether the inquiry	11	Service NHS Foundation Trust. They say that they
12	sits in Salisbury or London. However, the Council would	12	strongly prefer a Salisbury venue to be used for all or
13	support option B in counsel to the inquiry's	13	part of the open hearings, because this inquiry is of
14	submissions; namely that the inquiry should hear some	14	key importance to the people of Salisbury. And
15	open evidence in Salisbury, focused on the evidence	15	secondly, due to their preference for their staff not to
16	particularly related to the immediate circumstances of	16	have to attend to give evidence in London, they would
17	Dawn Sturgess's death, with the remaining open evidence	17	support hybrid hearings, remote access for other
18	heard in London with a video link to a venue in	18	attendees.
19	Salisbury. The Council considers that this would best	19	THE CHAIR: Yes, well, I understand that and the sheer
20	aid public participation and confidence in the inquiry."	20	logistics of travel between Wiltshire and London in
21	And they add that Council officers would be happy to	21	either direction are obviously one factor.
22	assist the ILT in finding suitable venues.	22	MR O'CONNOR: Yes.
23	THE CHAIR: If that is adopted do I understand your	23	THE CHAIR: All right. Thank you very much.
24	submission to be that it is a necessary part of it that	24	MR O'CONNOR: That is all I wish to say. But save that it
25	a link be provided in relation to any hearings that take	25	does seem to us that you may well be in a position to
	Page 69		Page 71
1	place physically in London, a link to somewhere near	1	make a decision on this matter today, and if that is the
2	Salisbury, for particularly the family?	2	case, then it is clearly important that core
3	MR O'CONNOR: Yes. That's certainly something we have in	3	participants who are present have an opportunity to set
4	mind, and it follows were open hearings to take place	4	out their position.
5	away from Salisbury then it follows from what we know of	5	THE CHAIR: Absolutely. Absolutely.
6	their circumstances that that would make, impose	6	Mr Mansfield.
7	a difficulty in them attending, and so that is why we	7	Submissions by MR MANSFIELD
8	have suggested a remote link to	8	MR MANSFIELD: Sir, yes, I can be very quick. The favoured
9	THE CHAIR: Well, particularly for them and it may be for	9	one for the family is B, the hybrid. I needn't say
10	other people who live locally, or indeed I suppose the	10	more. It is really rather obvious.
11	local press.	11	THE CHAIR: Yes, well, you have heard that the idea is that
12	MR O'CONNOR: Well, certainly, sir, the provision of a link	12	they will have a necessary link to anything that happens
13	is something that we have suggested. So it needs to be	13	in London
14	borne in mind that you have yet to decide whether the	14	MR MANSFIELD: Yes.
15	substantive inquiry hearings will in fact be streamed on	15	THE CHAIR: and you will be able to have, if you choose,
16	the internet and if so that will be subject to a delay.	16	some part of your legal team there with them.
17	So these are all factors that have to be borne in mind	17	MR MANSFIELD: Yes.
18	as to the need for any particular link to a venue in	18	THE CHAIR: It is up to you.
19	Salisbury.	19	MR MANSFIELD: Thank you very much.
20	THE CHAIR: All right.	20	THE CHAIR: All right, thank you. Mrs McGahey, I don't
21	MR O'CONNOR: But it is certainly something we have raised	21	suppose it much affects you, does it?
22	and it is something that no doubt once you have made	22	Submissions by MS MCGAHEY
23	a decision in principle, it is something that we can	23	MS MCGAHEY: No, sir, HMG favoured option B which is the one
24	discuss further with the family and others.	24	that now seems to be the preference of the majority.
24	discuss further with the family and others.		, J
25	THE CHAIR: And the other party, which isn't here, which has	25	THE CHAIR: Yes.
	THE CHAIR: And the other party, which isn't here, which has	25	
	•	25	THE CHAIR: Yes. Page 72

1	MS MCGAHEY: Thank you.	1	satisfied that a large proportion of the rest of the
2	THE CHAIR: All right, thank you very much. Obviously	2	evidence to the extent that it is open ought to be taken
3	numbers of witnesses of those with whom you are most	3	in London. The reasons are essentially (1) security and
4	concerned are likely to be metropolitan based.	4	(2) simple logistics; large numbers of people are
5	MR GOSS: Yes, sir.	5	otherwise going to have to be billeted somewhere in
6	THE CHAIR: Yes, Ms Giovanetti.	6	Salisbury, or near Salisbury, for quite a long time.
7	Submissions by MS GIOVANETTI	7	The expense would not be inconsiderable, but the
8	MS GIOVANETTI: As you have have seen from our written	8	important thing is the security, which has to be managed
9	submissions, our preferred option would be for all of	9	properly and it is important that there shouldn't be
10	the open hearings to be in London, but equally we can	10	an inhibition on the calling of witnesses in open
11	see considerable force in having some of them in	11	hearings who will nevertheless need special security
12	Salisbury, having the hybrid model, and we take the view	12	arrangements. As far as the ambulance trust is
13	that following the course proposed by counsel to the	13	concerned, I would hope that to the extent that their
14	inquiry, which is that some open hearings take place in	14	locally based staff have to give evidence, it ought to
15	Salisbury with the focus being in particular on the	15	be possible to take those witnesses in Salisbury as
16	evidence relating to the immediate circumstances of Dawn	16	well. On the other hand I don't contemplate at the
17	Sturgess's death	17	moment switching back and forth. We will start in
18	THE CHAIR: Yes.	18	Salisbury. We will do as much as we sensibly can there
19	MS GIOVANETTI: would alleviate the need for the	19	and that may well include the ambulance staff, who will
20	extensive and complex security arrangements that we	20	presumably be dealing with an early part of the history
21	THE CHAIR: That is something that you particularly applied,	21	in any event, and thereafter the hearings we should
22	or those behind you have particularly applied their	22	look for a suitable location in London somewhere with
23	minds to. Do I summarise it correctly, there will	23	a feed to a location, not necessarily in Salisbury, but
24	obviously be some witnesses for whom special security	24	near Salisbury. It doesn't have to be a big public
25	arrangements are going to have to be made, even for open	25	building in the middle of Salisbury. Indeed it probably
	Page 73		Page 75
1	hearings?	1	shouldn't be, but with a feed to somewhere near
2	MS GIOVANETTI: Yes.	2	Salisbury which is convenient for the family and if
3	THE CHAIR: And those, as I understand it, are very much	3	necessary any of their legal advisers who need to be
4	more easily made in London than they are elsewhere.	4	with them to attend and for other local people, if
5	MS GIOVANETTI: In London, yes, that's right. And you will	5	necessary, to attend as well.
6	have seen from our submissions if you wanted more detail	6	MR O'CONNOR: Yes. I am grateful.
7	from us we could happily provide a closed note, but for	7	THE CHAIR: Right, that's that. That leads on to the
8	obvious reasons	8	question of when that's to be.
9	THE CHAIR: I don't think it takes an enormous amount of	9	Submissions by MR O'CONNOR
10	imagination, Ms Giovanetti, to work out why.	10	MR O'CONNOR: It does and clearly that is a matter that has
11	MS GIOVANETTI: No. Again, it doesn't surprise me. Thank	11	been lurking in the background of many of the
12	you.	12	submissions that you have heard this morning.
13	THE CHAIR: Thank you very much indeed. Mr Goss, do you	13	THE CHAIR: It has.
14	want to add anything?	14	MR O'CONNOR: And you will have seen that in our written
15	MR GOSS: No.	15	submissions we indicated that we have of course
16	THE CHAIR: Mr Beggs?	16	considered again very carefully whether it is possible
17	MR BEGGS: No, sir.	17	now to set a realistic date for the commencement of the
18	Directions	18	substantive hearings, and we indicated in our written
19	THE CHAIR: Right. Well, Mr O'Connor, I think I can deal	19	submissions in short that we didn't think we had reached
20	with this now, and I think the sooner we know the	20	that stage. So, as I say, the context for that has
21	better. I am quite satisfied that these hearings should	21	really been apparent for the last hour or so (inaudible)
22	start in Salisbury. The open hearings. And that the	22	until we know exactly how the restriction order process
23	evidence of the family, and of the immediate	23	is going to go, how long it is going to take, we are not
24		24	going to be able to be confident about identifying
27	circumstances of this unfortunate lady's death should be		8 8 7 8
25	dealt with there. For very good reason, I am equally	25	a date for the substantive hearings. And that is why,
	•		

1	really, we have floated this already, but our dual	1	almost inevitably going to have to be a closed hearing
2	proposal is that at the next hearing, first of all we	2	associated with that?
3	will we hope that you will be in a position to set	3	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, we will give that some thought. That's
4	a timetable for the restriction order process, and so	4	right. It may be, it may be that there will be merit in
5	much of what we have already debated this morning is	5	having, unusually within our processes, a closed hearing
6	intended to help us arrive at that position. But then	6	in advance of an open hearing so that you can be fully
7	it follows, and we hope it will follow from that, that	7	apprized of where things stand and where
8	once you have done that, then at the same time you will	8	THE CHAIR: So you can tell the other core participants what
9	also be in a position to set a time for the substantive	9	is happening.
10	hearings. So we entirely agree with Mr Mansfield's	10	MR O'CONNOR: Exactly, sir. The idea, and, sir, I am not
11	point that of course it is in the way of human nature	11	sure this is a decision which it is appropriate for you
12	that once you have set that time then that of course	12	to take now
13	will be an extra motivation to making all of the earlier	13	THE CHAIR: No.
14	processes that lead to it effective.	14	MR O'CONNOR: but the advantage of it hypothetically
15	THE CHAIR: Yes. That's a commonplace of case management,	15	would be that at the end of such a closed hearing you
16	isn't it, you start with the trial date and work	16	would be much more advanced in your understanding, and
17	backwards.	17	would therefore be able to relay that information at
18	MR O'CONNOR: Yes.	18	an open hearing that might follow.
19	THE CHAIR: It tends to concentrate minds.	19	THE CHAIR: Yes.
20	MR O'CONNOR: Yes.	20	MR O'CONNOR: But sir, as I say, we are not suggesting you
21	THE CHAIR: But it has to be realistic. It won't work	21	set particular dates now, but our suggestion is that the
22	otherwise. All right, thank you very much.	22	open hearing should be some time towards the end
23	I understand that. Is there anything else you want to	23	of March, and we will see about other matters around
24	add?	24	that.
25	MR O'CONNOR: Nothing on that point. There are two other	25	THE CHAIR: Right. Thank you very much indeed.
	Page 77		Page 79
1	very brief matters which it may make sense for me to	1	MR O'CONNOR: So the very last matter, without coming back
2	mention now.	2	to where we started, you mentioned at the outset that
3	THE CHAIR: Yes.	3	the arrangements you were directing today regarding the
4	MR O'CONNOR: It is really under a or b. Again, the first	4	delayed link and so on were really only for today and
5	of those is something that we have canvassed, but it	5	you would wish the position to be regularised for future
6	relates to the timing of the next preliminary hearing.	6	hearings, and so sir, may I suggest that you direct that
7	THE CHAIR: Yes.	7	we, that is the inquiry legal team, circulate a draft
8	MR O'CONNOR: In our written submissions we suggested aiming	8	protocol for these arrangements. That is something that
9	that for February/March. In the meetings we have had	9	other inquiries have done.
10	with both HMG and Operation Verbasco, it has become	10	THE CHAIR: For future hearings.
11	apparent that January, of course, will be a time of hard	11	MR O'CONNOR: For future hearings, covering both future
12	focus work on completing stage 1 disclosure, and	12	preliminary hearings and also the substantive hearings.
13	complying with the directions that you have set.	13	That is something, if you agree, we will draft and
14	THE CHAIR: Indeed it will.	14	circulate amongst core participants in advance of the
15	MR O'CONNOR: And in light of those directions for documents	15	next hearing. It will be, the intention will be that it
16	to be prepared by the end of February, we suggest that	16	would apply at the next hearing, and then subsequent
17	the latter part of March is going to be a realistic date	17	hearings, but there will then be an opportunity for both
18	for the next open preliminary hearing.	18	the core participants and the media, we can circulate
19	THE CHAIR: Easter is the first week of April, isn't it?	19	it to the media too to make representations about it
20	MR O'CONNOR: That's right, sir, yes. So I am not	20	at that hearing.
21	suggesting you set a precise date now, but we will go	21	THE CHAIR: Yes, you should. Right, thank you very much.
22	away and find a date that, for example, the court can	22	MR O'CONNOR: That covers everything I want to say today.
		1	
23	accommodate. But that is the zone we are suggesting.	23	THE CHAIR: Mr Mansfield, I think you may have said what you
23 24	•	23 24	THE CHAIR: Mr Mansfield, I think you may have said what you wanted to say about date. Do you want to add anything
	accommodate. But that is the zone we are suggesting.		
24	accommodate. But that is the zone we are suggesting. THE CHAIR: Yes. Since that is going to be particularly focused on the restriction order process, is there	24	wanted to say about date. Do you want to add anything now.
24	accommodate. But that is the zone we are suggesting. THE CHAIR: Yes. Since that is going to be particularly	24	wanted to say about date. Do you want to add anything

MR MANSFIELD (See very briefly, if I range) MR MANSFIELD (See very briefly, if I range) MR MANSFIELD (See very briefly, if I range) MR MANSFIELD (See can see the foats that the family lave, for the final hearing, If I haverit got that, I cart fix the necessary preparation stages which have to proceed it. It. (I response to the three matters are going to be as it were determined to that these matters are going to be as it were determined to the three matters are going to be assisted advantantive hearings are not going to be next year. And I would aik tist that by the three did not paying hearings all those whose are involved should be in a position to indicate them when it is work when the work of the paying hearings all those whose are involved should be in a position to indicate them when it is before the end of the year, next year. THE CHAIR: Well, they should say when it is possible and you would attain before the and of next year. THE CHAIR: Well, response. THE CHAIR: Understood. MR MANSFIELD Yes, please. THE CHAIR: Understood in the private private or by the private by th			1	
THE CHAIR. Of course. MR MANSFIELD. One can see the fears that the family lave, for example if it is end of Admich/seginning of April that these matters are gring to be as it were determined in relation to the exercise of restriction ruders, then going to be next year. And I would set kins: that by the time of the pring hearings all those who are involved should be in a position to indicate then when it is used to be workable to sat the abstantive bearings. It is used to be workable to sat the abstantive hearings before the end of the year, next year. THE CHAIR. Well, they should say when it is possible and you would absurb tefore the of of next year. MR MANSFIELD Yes, please. THE CHAIR. When they should say when it is possible and you would absurb tefore the of of next year. THE CHAIR. Well, they should say when it is possible to hearings in the spring, could it please be recommered to take into account the possibility of the private hybrid reseting. THE CHAIR. Well, they should say when it is possible to take into account the possibility of the private hybrid reseting. THE CHAIR. Where no account the possibility of the private hybrid MR MANSFIELD. Yes, thank you. I will have to think about that. Right, thank you. MR GOONNOR. Sir. yos. THE CHAIR. Where are we'l i am so sory. MR MANSFIELD. So, please. THE CHAIR. Where are we'l I am so sory, Mr Goss. MR GOONNOR. MR MANSFIELD. And one other matter. When considering the learnings in the spring, could it please be recommered to take into account the possibility of the private hybrid reseting. THE CHAIR. Where are we'l I am so sory, Mr Goss. MR GOONNOR Sir. yos. MR MANSFIELD And one other matter. MR MANSFIELD on the do feat year. THE CHAIR when the substantive bearings and begin the sort of the substantive hybrid reseting. THE CHAIR is substantially the private of the final hearings on begin the sort of the substantive hybrid THE CHAIR. Where are we'l I am so sory, Mr Goss. MR GOONNOR on a second the substantive sort of the substantive have a s	1	Submissions by MR MANSFIELD	1	with a firm date which they can undertake to meet for
4 MR MANSFIELD. One can see the fears that the finally have, for example if it is and of Match-Deganing of April to that the receives of restriction orders, then to in relation to the exercise of restriction orders, then to come fears that the actual substantive bearings are not possing to be not year. And I would ask this: that by possing to be not year. And I would ask this: that by the irrar of the springs hearings all those who are in invoked be worthall be in a position to inclicate them when it is would be worthall be to sare the objection of the properties	2	MR MANSFIELD: Yes, very briefly, if I may.	2	the final hearing. If I haven't got that, I can't fix
5 For example if it is end of March Deginning of April 6 that these matters are going to be as it were determined 7 in relation to the exercise for stratistion orders, then 8 or faces that the actual substantive hearings are not 9 going to be next year. And I would ask this: that by 10 the time of the spring hearings all those who are 11 involved should be in a position to indicate then when 12 it would be workable to ant the substantive hearings 13 before the end of the year, next year. 14 THE CHAIR: Well, they should say when it is possible and 15 you would admirt factor the end of mext year. 16 MR MANSFIELD - And one other mutter. When considering the 17 THE CHAIR: Understood. 18 MR MANSFIELD - And one other mutter. When considering the 19 hearings in the spring, could it please be remembered to 20 take into account the possibility of the private hybrid 21 meeting. 22 THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you. I will have to think about 23 that. Right, thank you. 24 Ms McGalbey. 25 MS MCGAHEY: No, thank you, sir. Page 81 THE CHAIR: My brown and have leapt to your 26 feet if you needed to, I have no doubt. 3 Right. Well, first of all lagues that it is not 29 possible to fax a date for the final hearing now. 3 THE CHAIR: No, thank you would have leapt to your 4 feet if you needed to, I have no doubt. 4 Right. Well, first of all lagues that it is not 4 possible to fax a date for the final hearing now. 5 Scondly, it is essential that at the next hearing, 4 which I do agree needs to be at the end of March, norking 5 backwards from whatever date we can fix for the hearing, 6 the restriction order process. It may be possible, it may 6 be necessary, or visible, to build into that the 7 possibly of what M Mansfeld conveniently calls 7 private or hybrid hearings. I would like you to think 8 though please indicate in advance the earliest date that 19 possibly of what M Mansfeld conveniently calls 10 private or hybrid hearings. I would like you to think 10 possibly of what M Mansfeld conveniently calls 11 private or hybrid hearings.	3	THE CHAIR: Of course.	3	the necessary preparation stages which have to precede
that these matters are going to be as it were determined in relation to the exercise of restriction orders, then consideration the severals of the spring hearings all those who are going to be next year. And I would ask thise that by going to be next year. And I would ask thise that by going to be next year. And I would ask thise that by it would be workable to start the substantive hearings is before the ord of the year, next year. 14 THE CHAIR: Well, they should say when it is possible and you would alward before the end of frext year. 15 You would submit before the end of frext year. 16 MR MANSFIELD And one other matter. When considering the hearings in the spring, could it please be remembered to take into account the possibility of the private hybrid merits. 17 THE CHAIR: Undestood. 18 MR MANSFIELD And one other matter. When considering the hearings in the spring, could it please be remembered to take into account the possibility of the private hybrid merits. 20 take into account the possibility of the private hybrid merits. 21 moreting. 22 THE CHAIR: When are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. 33 MR GGARIEY. No, thank you, sir. 34 MR OGONNOR: Sir, yes. 35 ITHE CHAIR: which there will need to be an associated closed bearing, between the destroy will never to do anything cles, Mr O'Connor? 36 ITHE CHAIR: When are restricted the what he work proceeds. 36 MR MANSFIELD. No, thank you. 37 THE CHAIR: No, thank you, sir. 38 MGGARIEY. No, thank you, sir. 39 Page 81 30 THE CHAIR: No, thank you. 30 THE CHAIR: No, thank you. 31 THE CHAIR: No, thank you. 32 THE CHAIR: No, thank you. 33 THE CHAIR: No, thank you. 34 MR AGASEY. 35 MR GGOVANETTI. No, thank you. 36 MR ANSFIELD. 37 MR GOVONNOR: Sir, yes. 38 MGGARIEY. 39 MR MANSFIELD No, thank you will never to disk will never be obeyended in the possible. Understood. And I am very graceful to you all for you help and what leas to the obeyended to the possible to fix a date for the final hearing so work in our disk will never be obeyend to the possible. I	4	MR MANSFIELD: One can see the fears that the family have,	4	it.
in relation to the exercise of restriction orders, then one fourth afthe actual abstrative hearings are not given by the case of the strain by the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those who are the time of the spring hearings all those the spring hearings all those the time of the spring hearings all those the time of the spring hearings all those the spring all the time of the spring all those the spring hearing. The case of the time and the spring probably the spring should and the spring hearing all the spring and the spring hearing. The spring the spring which all the spring and the spring hearing the spring hearing all the spring hearing al	5	for example if it is end of March/beginning of April	5	It goes without saying that the sooner it is, the
some fears that the actual substantive hearings are not going to be next year. And I would ask this that by the string of the spring hearing all those who are it would should be in a position to indicate then when it involved should be in a position to indicate then when it would be workable to start the substantive hearings before the end of the year, next year. 14 THE CHAIR: Well, they should say when it is possible and you would ashamit before the end of next year. 15 you would submit before the end of next year. 16 MR MANSFIELD. Yes, please. 17 THE CHAIR: Understood. 18 MR MANSFIELD. And one other matter. When considering the bearings in the spring, could it pleans be remembered to take into account the possibility of the private hybrid meeting. 22 THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you. I will have to think about that. Right, thank you. 23 that. Right, thank you. 24 MS McGaHEY: No, thank you, sir. Page 81 1 THE CHAIR: MG Giovanetti. 2 MS GIOVANETTE: No, thank you, sir. Page 81 1 THE CHAIR: Where are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. MR COSS: No. 1 THE CHAIR: Where are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. MR COSS: No. 1 THE CHAIR: Where are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. MR COSS: No. 1 THE CHAIR: Where are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. MR COSS: No. 2 My McGaHEY: No, thank you would have leapt to your feet if you needed to, I have no doubt. 3 THE CHAIR: Where are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. 4 MR COSS: No. 5 THE CHAIR: Where are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. 4 MR COSS: No. 5 THE CHAIR: MS Giovanetti. 1 possible to fix a date for the fanil hearing now. 10 Secondly, it is essential that at the next hearing, and the proper sould be the carliest date that the possible, in my not, I don't hearing, and begin upon. And it should please indicate in advance the varied date that the possible, in my not, I don't hearing and begin possible, in the possible, in my not, I don't hearing. 16 In a timetable which will have to be obeyed for the restriction order process. It may be possible, in my not, I don't hearing. 2 about that.	6	that these matters are going to be as it were determined	6	better.
going to be next year. And I would ask this that by the time of the spring hearings all those who are in roveled should be in a position to indicate them when the time of the spring hearings all those who are it would be workable to start the substantive hearings before the end of the year, next year. THE CHAIR. Well, they should say when it is possible and before the end of the year, next year. THE CHAIR. Well, they should say when it is possible and you would submit before the end of next year. MR MANSFIELD 'Xex, please. THE CHAIR. Understand. MR MANSFIELD And one other matter. When considering the hearings in the spring, could it please be remembered to take into account the possibility of the private hybrid meeting. THE CHAIR. Ves, thank you. I will have to bink about meeting. THE CHAIR. Yes, thank you. I will have to bink about meeting. MS MCGAHEY: No, thank you, sir. Page 81 THE CHAIR. MS Giovanerti. MR GOSS: No. THE CHAIR. Not you either Mr Beggs. I haven't asked Mr Gaps. No. MR GOSS: No. THE CHAIR. Not you either Mr Beggs. I haven't asked Mr Chapman, at all, but you would have leapt to your feet if you needed to, I have no doubt. Right. Well, first of all I agree that it is not possible to fix a date for the final hearing now. Secondly, it is essential that at the hearting in the spring and whether begins in the spring on heart of the provision by MR MANSFIELD. Secondly, it is essential that at the hearting in March, uvorking be a cessary, or visible, be build into hat the participants who wish to make submissions about it they would have feet on the submissions by MR OCONNOR. The CHAIR. Not you either Mr Beggs. I haven't asked build have been a good deat of realistic liaison. No doubt sometimes reasonably tense, going on hebind the scenes. Submissions by MR OCONNOR. Submissions by MR OCONNOR. MS MGOVANETTI. Submissions by MR MANSFIELD. Submissions by MR MANSFIELD. Submissions by MR MANSFIELD. Submissions by MR MANSFIELD. Submissions by MR OCONNOR. The Fert of the acting of the	7	in relation to the exercise of restriction orders, then	7	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, yes.
the time of the spring hearings all those who are involved should be in a position to indicate then when it is involved should be in a position to indicate then when it is involved should be workable to surf the auditative hearings in he spring, established by the private lybrid in the case of the pair, in the case of the private lybrid in the pairing in the spring, could it please be remembered to take into account the possibility of the private lybrid in the pairing. THE CHAIR: Most flow, the private lybrid in the pairing in the spring, could it please be remembered to take into account the possibility of the private lybrid in the pairing. THE CHAIR: Well, there we are. Everybody's satisfied, or at least as near as possible. Understood. And I am very lam so sorty, Mr Gous. THE CHAIR: Well, there we are. Everybody's satisfied, or at least as near as possible. Understood. And I am very lam so sorty, Mr Gous. Mr McGaley: Mr McGaley: Page 81 THE CHAIR: Ms Giovanetti. Page 81 THE CHAIR: Does anybody else want to ask me to do anything else now? THE CHAIR: Well, there we are. Everybody's satisfied, or at least as near as possible. Understood. And I am very lam so sorty, Mr Gous. Mr McGaley: Mr McGaley: Page 81 THE CHAIR: Ms Giovanetti. Page 81 THE CHAIR: Well, there we are. Everybody's satisfied, or at least as near as possible. Two what has obviously been a possible to fix and the freth final hearing now. Mr GioVanetti. No, thank you. THE CHAIR: Well, there we are. Everybody's satisfied, or at least as near as possible. Thank you were much. The CHAIR: Well, there we are. Everybody's satisfied, or at least as near as possible to many data that a thank private labely thank has obviously been a good deal or realists laison. No doubt sometimes reasonably tense, going on behind the satisfied of many data thank private labely thank private	8	one fears that the actual substantive hearings are not	8	THE CHAIR: All right. Next hearing, then, further
involved should be in a position to indicate then when it is would be workable to start the substantive hearings in whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether before or after will need thinking about as the whether the process. It is the eart per and the proceeds. Is there anything else, Mr O'Connor? If HE CHAIR: Understood. If HE CHAIR: Whether we are. Everybody's satisfied, or at least as near as possible. Understood. And I am very grateful to you all for you all f	9	going to be next year. And I would ask this: that by	9	preliminary hearing, latter part of March. It is
ti would be workable to start the substantive hearings before the end of the year, next year. THE CHAIR: Well, they should say when it is possible and you would submit before the end of next year. MR MANSFIELD: Yes, please. THE CHAIR: Understood. MR MANSFIELD: And one other matter. When considering the bearings in the spring, could it please be remembered to take into account the possibility of the private hybrid and the first possibility of the private hybrid than the first possibility of the private hybrid than the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid than the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid the private hybrid than the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the first possibility of the private hybrid than the matter of the first	10	the time of the spring hearings all those who are	10	likely, I would think, that there will need to be
before the end of the year, next year. 14 THE CHAIR: Well, they should say when it is possible and 15 you would submit before the end of next year. 16 MR MANSFIELD: Yes, please. 17 THE CHAIR: Well, they should say when it is possible and 15 you would submit before the end of next year. 18 MR MANSFIELD: Yes, please. 19 THE CHAIR: More and one other matter. When considering the 19 hearings in the spring, could it please be remembered to 19 take into account the possibility of the private hybrid 22 meeting. 21 meeting. 22 THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you. I will have to think about 23 that. Right, thank you. 23 MS MCGAHEY: No, thank you, sir. 24 MS McGabey. 25 MS MCGAHEY: No, thank you, sir. 26 Page 81 1 THE CHAIR: Ms Giovanetti. 2 MS GIOVANETTI: No, thank you. 3 THE CHAIR: No you either Mr Beggs. I haven't asked 6 Mr Chapman, at all, but you would have leapt to your 7 feet if you needed to, I have no doubt. 3 Right. Well, first of all I agree that it is not 9 possible to fix a date for the final hearing now. 10 Secondly, it is essential that at the next hearing, 10 which I do agree needs to be at the end of March, I am then in a position to fix that date, and to that end all participants who wish to make submissions about it should please indicate in advance the carriest date that they submit the final hearings can begin upon. And it is also essential that at that hearing in March, working backwards from whatever date we can fix for the hearing. I would like you to think about that I may be possible, it may be possible, it may be possible to fix a timetable which will have to be obeyed for the restriction order process. It may be possible, it may be possible to fix a timetable which will have to be obeyed for the prestriction order process. It may be possible, it may be possible to fix a timetable which will have to be obeyed for the prestriction order process. It may be possible, it may be possible to fix a timetable which will have to be obeyed for the prestriction order process. It may be possible, it	11	involved should be in a position to indicate then when	11	an associated closed hearing. Precisely when and
14 THE CHAIR: Well, they should sup when it is possible and you would submit before the end of next year. 15 MR MANSFIELD: Yes, please. 17 THE CHAIR: Understood. 18 MR MANSFIELD: And one other matter. When considering the learnings in the spring, could it please be remembered to the into account the possibility of the private hybrid meeting. 20 take into account the possibility of the private hybrid meeting. 21 THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you. I will have to think about than Right, thank you. 22 THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you. I will have to think about than Right, thank you. 23 thank Right, thank you. 24 Ms McGahey. 25 Ms MCGAHEY: No, thank you, sir. Page 81 1 THE CHAIR: Ms Giovanetti. 2 MS GIOVANETTI: No, thank you. 3 THE CHAIR: Where are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. 4 MR GOSS: No. 5 THE CHAIR: Not you either Mr Beggs. I havent asked Mr Chapman, at all, but you would have leapt to your feet if you needed to, I have no doubt. 8 Right. Well, first of all I agree that it is not possible to fix a date for the final hearing now. 10 Secondly, it is essential that at that the ring have how hold have learning in March, working the submit the final hearings can begin upon. And it is also essential that at the next hearing. 11 then in a position to fix that date, and to that end all participants who wish to make submissions about it should please indicate in advance the earliest date that they submit the final hearings can begin upon. And it is also essential that at the hearth, working the possibility of what Mr Mansfield conveniently calls private or hybrid hearings. I would like you to think about that. It may be possible, it may not, I don't the possibility of what Mr Mansfield conveniently calls private or hybrid hearings. I would like you to think about that. It may be possible, it may not, I don't the please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March. 24 know. But keep that option available. But I want, please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March. 25 blease nov? 26 MR CAJR: Well, there w	12	it would be workable to start the substantive hearings	12	whether before or after will need thinking about as the
15 you would submit before the end of next year. 16 MR MANSFIELD: Yes, please. 16 MR MANSFIELD: Yes, please. 17 THE CHAIR: Understood. 18 MR MANSFIELD: And one other matter. When considering the hearings in the spring, could it please be remembered to take into account the possibility of the private hybrid 19 hearings in the spring, could it please be remembered to take into account the possibility of the private hybrid 20 take into account the possibility of the private hybrid 21 meeting. 22 THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you. I will have to think about 23 that. Right, thank you. 24 Ms McGahey. 25 MS MCGAHEY: No, thank you, sir. Page 81 1 THE CHAIR: Ms Giovanetti. 26 MS GIOVANETTI: No, thank you. 3 THE CHAIR: Wher are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. 4 MR GOSS: No. 5 THE CHAIR: Wher are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. 4 MR GOSS: No. 5 THE CHAIR: Wher are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. 4 MR GOSS: No. 5 THE CHAIR: Wher are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. 4 MR GOSS: No. 5 THE CHAIR: Wher are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. 4 MR GOSS: No. 5 THE CHAIR: So anyhody else want to ask me to do anything else now? 10 Scoondly, it is essential that a south a south and all support and the second of the fine and the south and all support and the second of	13	before the end of the year, next year.	13	work proceeds.
THE CHAIR: Does anybody else want to ask me to do anything else now? THE CHAIR: Does anybody else want to ask me to do anything else now? THE CHAIR: Does anybody else want to ask me to do anything else now? THE CHAIR: Does anybody else want to ask me to do anything else now? MR MANSFIELD: No, thank you. THE CHAIR: Well, there we are. Everybody's satisfied, or at least as near as possible. Understood. And I am every extent to you all for your help and what has obviously been a good deal of realistic litation. No doubt sometimes reasonably tense, going on behind the seenes. Thank you very much. THE CHAIR: Ms Giovanetti. MR GAORY. Page 81 THE CHAIR: Ms Giovanetti. MR GOSS: No. THE CHAIR: Ms Giovanetti. MR GOSS: No. THE CHAIR: Not you either Mr Beggs. I haven't asked Mr Gohapma, at all, but you would have leapt to your feet if you needed to, I have no doubt. Right. Well, first of all I agree that it is not possible to fix a date for the final hearing now. Secondly, it is essential that at the next hearing, which I do agree needs to be at the end of March, Lam then in a position to fix that date, and to that end all participants who wish to make submissions about it should please indicate in advance the carliest date that they submit the final hearing sean begin upon. And it is should please indicate in advance the carliest date that they submit the final hearing sean begin upon. And it is should please indicate in advance the carliest date that they submit the final hearing sean begin upon. And it is should please indicate in advance the carliest date that they submit the final hearing sean begin upon. And it is should please indicate in advance the carliest date that they submit with the final hearing sean begin upon. And it is should please indicate in advance the carliest date that they submit with the final hearing sean begin upon. And it is should please indicate in advance the carliest date that they submit with the final hearing sean begin upon. And it is should please indicate in advance the	14	THE CHAIR: Well, they should say when it is possible and	14	Is there anything else, Mr O'Connor?
tise in the spring, could it please be remembered to take in a document the possibility of the private hybrid meeting. THE CHAIR: Vell, there we are. Everybody's satisfied, or at least as near as possible. Understood. And I am very grateful to you all for your help and what has obviously been a good deal of realistic liaison. No daubt sometimes reasonably tense, going on behind the seenes. Thank you very much. THE CHAIR: Vell, there we are. Everybody's satisfied, or at least as near as possible. Understood. And I am very grateful to you all for your help and what has obviously been a good deal of realistic liaison. No daubt sometimes reasonably tense, going on behind the seenes. Thank you very much. THE CHAIR: Where are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. MR MANSFIELD is no, thank you. THE CHAIR: Well, there we are. Everybody's satisfied, or at least as near as possible. Understood. And I am very grateful to you all for your help and what has obviously been a good deal of realistic liaison. No daubt sometimes reasonably tense, going on behind the seenes. Thank you very much. THE CHAIR: Well, there we are. Everybody's satisfied, or at least as near as possible. Understood. And I am very grateful to you all for your help and what has obviously been a good deal of realistic liaison. No daubt sometimes reasonably tense, going on behind the seenes. Thank you very much. THE CHAIR: Well, there we are. Everybody's satisfied, or at least as near as possible. Understood. And I am very grateful to you all fer you well sat sat near as possible. In doubt sometimes reasonably tense, going on behind the seenes. Thank you very much. THE CHAIR: Well, there we are. Everybody's satisfied, or at least as near as possible. In deal sat as near as possible. In deals at sear as possible. In doubt sometimes reasonably tense, going on behind the seenes. Thank you very much. THE CHAIR: Well, there we are. Everybody's satisfied, or at least as near as possible. In any very grateful to you alleast as near as possible. In any very grateful	15	you would submit before the end of next year.	15	MR O'CONNOR: Sir, no.
18 MR MANSFIELD: And one other matter. When considering the hearings in the spring, could it please be remembered to take into account the possibility of the private hybrid 21 meeting. 22 THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you. I will have to think about 23 that. Right, thank you. 24 Ms McGabey. 25 MS MCGAHEY: No, thank you, sir. Page 81 1 THE CHAIR: Well, there we are. Everybody's satisfied, or at least as near as possible. Understood. And I am very grateful to you all for your help and what has obviously been a good deal of realistic liaison. No doubt sometimes reasonably tense, going on behind the secnes. Thank you very much. 25 MS GIOVANETTI: No, thank you. 3 THE CHAIR: Where are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. 4 MR GOSS: No. 5 THE CHAIR: Where are we?? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. 4 MR GOSS: No. 5 THE CHAIR: Not you either Mr Beggs. I haven't asked 6 Mr Chapman, at all, but you would have leapt to your feet if you needed to, I have no doubt. 8 Right. Well, first of all I agree that it is not 9 possible to fix a date for the final hearing now. 10 Secondly, it is essential that at the next hearing. 11 which I do agree needs to be at the end of March, I am they submit the final hearings can begin upon. And it is should please indicate in advance the earliest date that they submit the final hearings can begin upon. And it is also essential that at that hearing in March, working backwards from whatever date we can fix for the hearing, 1 fix a timetable which will have to be obeyed for the restriction order process. It may be possible, it may be possible; it may be possible; it may not, I don't 24 know. But keep that option available. But I want, 25 please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March, 24 know. But keep that option available. But I want, 26 please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March, 27 submissions by MR MANSFIELD	16	MR MANSFIELD: Yes, please.	16	THE CHAIR: Does anybody else want to ask me to do anything
take into account the possibility of the private hybrid meeting. The CHAIR: Yes, thank you. I will have to think about that. Right, thank you. The CHAIR: Yes, thank you. I will have to think about that. Right, thank you. The CHAIR: Yes, thank you. I will have to think about that. Right, thank you. The CHAIR: Yes, thank you. I will have to think about that. Right, thank you. The CHAIR: Wes, thank you. I will have to think about that. Right, thank you. The CHAIR: Wes, thank you will have to think about the secens. Thank you very much. The CHAIR: Wes, thank you will thank the secens. Thank you very much. The CHAIR: Wes, thank you will for your help and what has obviously been a good lead of realistic liaison. No doubt sometimes reasonably tense, going on behind the secens. Thank you very much. The CHAIR: Well, there we are. Everybody to eal obviously been a good lead of realistic liaison. No doubt sometimes reasonably tense, going on behind the secens. Thank you very much. The CHAIR: Well, there we are. Everybody to eal obviously been a good lead of the secens. Thank you well were yet yet made to the secens. Thank you very much. The CHAIR: Well, there we are exer least to eat the secens. Thank you well were yet yet made to the secens. Thank you very much. The CHAIR: Well, there we are exer least that has obviously been a good lead of the secens. Thank you very much. The CHAIR: Well, there we are exer least the secens. Thank you very much. The CHAIR: Well, there we are very ever the secens. Thank you very much. The CHAIR: Well, there	17	THE CHAIR: Understood.	17	else now?
at least as near as possible. Understood. And I am very grateful to you all for your help and what has obviously been a good dead for ealistic liaison. No doubt sometimes reasonably tense, going on behind the scenes. Thank you very much. 21	18	MR MANSFIELD: And one other matter. When considering the	18	MR MANSFIELD: No, thank you.
21 meeting. 22 THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you. I will have to think about 23 that. Right, thank you. 24 Ms McCahey. 25 MS MCGAHEY: No, thank you, sir. Page 81 26 THE CHAIR: Where are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. 4 MR GOSS: No. 27 THE CHAIR: Not you either Mr Beggs. I haven't asked 6 Mr Chapman, at all, but you would have leapt to your 7 feet if you needed to, I have no doubt. 8 Right. Well, first of all I agree that it is not 9 possible to fix a date for the final hearing now. 10 Secondly, it is essential that at the next hearing, 11 which I do agree needs to be at the end of March, I am 12 then in a position to fix that date, and to that end all 13 participants who wish to make submissions about it 14 should please indicate in advance the earliest date that 15 they submit the final hearings can begin upon. And it 16 is also essential that at the hearing in March, working 17 backwards from whatever date we can fix for the hearing, 18 I fix a timetable which will have to be obeyed for the 19 restriction order process. It may be possible, it may 20 be necessary, or visible, to build into that the 21 possibility of what Mr Mansfield conveniently calls 22 private or hybrid hearings. I would like you to think 23 about that. It may be possible, it may 24 know. But keep that option available. But I want, 25 please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March 26 please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March 27 please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March 28 please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March 29 possibility of what Mr Mansfield conveniently calls 20 private or hybrid hearings. I would like you to think 21 please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March 28 please and the part of the	19	hearings in the spring, could it please be remembered to	19	THE CHAIR: Well, there we are. Everybody's satisfied, or
22 THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you. I will have to think about 23 that. Right, thank you. 24 Ms McGahey. 25 MS MCGAHEY: No, thank you, sir. Page 81 1 THE CHAIR: Ms Giovanetti. 2 MS GIOVANETTI: No, thank you. 3 THE CHAIR: Where are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. 4 MR GOSS: No. 5 THE CHAIR: Not you either Mr Beggs. I haven't asked 6 Mr Chapman, at all, but you would have leapt to your 7 feet if you needed to, I have no doubt. 8 Right. Well, first of all I agree that it is not 9 possible to fix a date for the final hearing now. 10 Secondly, it is essential that at the next hearing, 11 which I do agree needs to be at the end of March, I am 12 then in a position to fix that date, and to that end all 13 participants who wish to make submissions about it 14 should please indicate in advance the earliest date that 15 they submit the final hearings can begin upon. And it 16 is also essential that at that hearing in March, working 17 backwards from whatever date we can fix for the hearing, 18 I fix a timetable which will have to be obeyed for the 19 restriction order process. It may be possible, it may 20 be necessary, or visible, to build into that the 21 possibility of what Mr Mansfield conveniently calls 22 private or hybrid hearings. I would like you to think 23 about that. It may be possible, it may not, I don't 24 know. But keep that option available. But I want, 25 please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March 26 place in the properties of the pro	20	take into account the possibility of the private hybrid	20	at least as near as possible. Understood. And I am
that. Right, thank you. 24 Ms McGahey. 25 MS MCGAHEY: No, thank you, sir. Page 81 Page 83 1 THE CHAIR: Ms Giovanetti. 2 MS GIOVANETTI: No, thank you. 3 THE CHAIR: Where are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. 4 MR GOSS: No. 5 THIE CHAIR: Not you either Mr Beggs. I haven't asked 6 Mr Chapman, at all, but you would have leapt to your 7 feet if you needed to, I have no doubt. 8 Right. Well, first of all I agree that it is not 9 possible to fix a date for the final hearing now. 10 Secondly, it is essential that at the next hearing, 11 which I do agree needs to be at the end of March, I am 12 then in a position to fix that date, and to that end all 13 participants who wish to make submissions about it 14 should please indicate in advance the earliest date that 15 they submit the final hearing can begin upon. And it 16 is also essential that at that hearing in March, working 17 backwards from whatever date we can fix for the hearing, 18 I fix a timetable which will have to be obeyed for the 19 restriction order process. It may be possible, it may 20 be necessary, or visible, to build into that the 21 possibility of what Mr Mansfield conveniently calls 22 private or hybrid hearings. I would like you to think 23 about that. It may be possible, it may not, I don't 24 know. But keep that option available. But I want, 25 please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March, 26 place indicate in advance the earliest date that 27 possibility of what Mr Mansfield conveniently calls 28 private or hybrid hearings. I would like you to think 29 please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March 20 place indicate in advance the earliest date that 21 possibility of what Mr Mansfield conveniently calls 22 private or hybrid hearings. I would like you to think 23 about that. It may be possible, it may not, I don't 24 know. But keep that option available. But I want, 25 please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March 26 page 83 27 dubtiseions by MR OCONNOR 28 Submissions by MR MANSFIELD 29 doubt sometimes reasonable the scen	21	meeting.	21	very grateful to you all for your help and what has
24 Ms McGahey. 25 MS MCGAHEY: No, thank you, sir. Page 81 THE CHAIR: Ms Giovanetti. 2 MS GIOVANETTI: No, thank you. 3 THE CHAIR: Not you either Mr Beggs. I haven't asked 4 MR GOSS: No. 5 THE CHAIR: Not you either Mr Beggs. I haven't asked 6 Mr Chapman, at all, but you would have leapt to your 7 feet if you needed to, I have no doubt. 8 Right. Well, first of all I agree that it is not 9 possible to fix a date for the final hearing now. 10 Secondly, it is essential that at the next hearing, 11 which I do agree needs to be at the end of March, I am 12 then in a position to fix that date, and to that end all 13 participants who wish to make submissions about it 14 should please indicate in advance the earliest date that 15 they submit the final hearings can begin upon. And it 16 is also essential that at that hearing in March, working 17 backwards from whatever date we can fix for the hearing, 18 I fix a timetable which will have to be obeyed for the 19 restriction order process. It may be possible, it may 20 be necessary, or visible, to build into that the 21 possibility of what Mr Mansfield conveniently calls 22 private or hybrid hearings. I would like you to think 23 about that. It may be possible, it may not, I don't 24 know. But keep that option available. But I want, 25 please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March 26 place, everybody to come to the next meeting in March 27 please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March 28 page 83 1 (The hearing concluded) 1 (The hearing concluded) 1 (The hearing concluded) 2 submissions by MR OCONNOR. 4 5 Submissions by MR MCONNOR. 4 5 Submissions by MR MGGAHEY. 5 5 Submissions by MR BEGGS 6 6 Directions 64 Further submissions by MR OCONNOR. 66 5 Submissions by MR MGGAHEY. 72 5 Submissions by MS GIOVANETTI. 73 5 Submissions by MR OCONNOR. 76 5 Submissions by MR MGGAHEY. 72 5 Submissions by MR OCONNOR. 81 6 Purther submissions by MR OCONNOR. 76	22	THE CHAIR: Yes, thank you. I will have to think about	22	obviously been a good deal of realistic liaison. No
Page 81 THE CHAIR: Ms Giovanetti. MS GIOVANETTI: No, thank you. THE CHAIR: Where are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. MR GOSS: No. MR GOSS: No. Mr Chapman, at all, but you would have leapt to your feet if you needed to, I have no doubt. Right. Well, first of all I agree that it is not possible to fix a date for the final hearing now. Secondly, it is essential that at the next hearing, which I do agree needs to be at the end of March, I am then in a position to fix that date, and to that end all participants who wish to make submissions about it should please indicate in advance the earliest date that they submit the final hearings can begin upon. And it is also essential that at that hearing in March, working backwards from whatever date we can fix for the hearing, I fix a timetable which will have to be obeyed for the restriction order process. It may be possible, it may 20 be necessary, or visible, to build into that the possibility of what Mr Mansfield conveniently calls private or hybrid hearings. I would like you to think about that. It may be possible, it may not, I don't know. But keep that option available. But I want, please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March, please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March want, please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March and the please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March and the please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March and the please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March and the please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March and the please in	23	that. Right, thank you.	23	doubt sometimes reasonably tense, going on behind the
Page 81 THE CHAIR: Ms Giovanetti. MS GIOVANETTI: No, thank you. THE CHAIR: Where are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. MR GOSS: No. THE CHAIR: Not you either Mr Beggs. I haven't asked Mr Chapman, at all, but you would have leapt to your feet if you needed to, I have no doubt. Right. Well, first of all I agree that it is not possible to fix a date for the final hearing now. Secondly, it is essential that at the next hearing, which I do agree needs to be at the end of March, I am then in a position to fix that date, and to that end all aparticipants who wish to make submissions about it they submit the final hearings can begin upon. And it is also essential that at that hearing in March, working backwards from whatever date we can fix for the hearing, I fix a timetable which will have to be obeyed for the restriction order process. It may be possible, it may be necessary, or visible, to build into that the possibility of what Mr Mansfield conveniently calls private or hybrid hearings. I would like you to think about that. It may be possible, it may not, I don't year. I the CHAIR: Ms Giovanetti. Submissions by MR OCONNOR	24	Ms McGahey.	24	scenes. Thank you very much.
1 THE CHAIR: Ms Giovanetti. 2 MS GIOVANETTI: No, thank you. 3 THE CHAIR: Where are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. 4 MR GOSS: No. 5 THE CHAIR: Not you either Mr Beggs. I haven't asked 6 Mr Chapman, at all, but you would have leapt to your 7 feet if you needed to, I have no doubt. 8 Right. Well, first of all I agree that it is not 9 possible to fix a date for the final hearing now. 10 Secondly, it is essential that at the next hearing, 11 which I do agree needs to be at the end of March, I am 12 then in a position to fix that date, and to that end all 13 participants who wish to make submissions about it 14 should please indicate in advance the earliest date that 15 they submit the final hearings can begin upon. And it 16 is also essential that at that hearing in March, working 17 backwards from whatever date we can fix for the hearing, 18 I fix a timetable which will have to be obeyed for the 19 restriction order process. It may be possible, it may 20 be necessary, or visible, to build into that the 21 possibility of what Mr Mansfield conveniently calls 22 private or hybrid hearings. I would like you to think 23 about that. It may be possible, it may 24 know. But keep that option available. But I want, 25 please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March 1 THE CHAIR: Where are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. 4 Housekeeping. 1 Submissions by MR OCONNOR. 4 Submissions by MR OGAHEY. 4 Submissions by MR MANSFIELD. 5 Submissions by MR MANSFIELD. 72 Submissions by MR MANSFIELD. 73 Submissions by MR MANSFIELD. 74 Submissions by MR MANSFIELD. 75 Submissions by MR MANSFIELD. 76 Submissions by MR MANSFIELD. 77 Submissions by MR OCONNOR. 78 Submissions by MR MANSFIELD. 79 Directions. 74 Submissions by MR OCONNOR. 75 Submissions by MR OCONNOR. 76 Submissions by MR OCONNOR. 76 Submissions by MR OCONNOR. 77 Submissions by MR OCONNOR. 78 Submissions by MR OCONNOR. 79 Directions. 70 Submissions by MR OCONNOR. 70 Submis	25	MS MCGAHEY: No, thank you, sir.	25	(12.57 pm)
MS GIOVANETTI: No, thank you. THE CHAIR: Where are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. MR GOSS: No. THE CHAIR: Not you either Mr Beggs. I haven't asked Mr Chapman, at all, but you would have leapt to your feet if you needed to, I have no doubt. Right. Well, first of all I agree that it is not possible to fix a date for the final hearing now. Secondly, it is essential that at the next hearing, which I do agree needs to be at the end of March, I am then in a position to fix that date, and to that end all participants who wish to make submissions about it should please indicate in advance the earliest date that they submit the final hearings can begin upon. And it is also essential that at that hearing in March, working backwards from whatever date we can fix for the hearing, I fix a timetable which will have to be obeyed for the restriction order process. It may be possible, it may be necessary, or visible, to build into that the possibility of what Mr Mansfield conveniently calls private or hybrid hearings. I would like you to think about that. It may be possible, it may not, I don't know. But keep that option available. But I want, please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March Housekeeping. Submissions by MR OCONNOR		Page 81		Page 83
please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March 24 25	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	THE CHAIR: Where are we? I am so sorry, Mr Goss. MR GOSS: No. THE CHAIR: Not you either Mr Beggs. I haven't asked Mr Chapman, at all, but you would have leapt to your feet if you needed to, I have no doubt. Right. Well, first of all I agree that it is not possible to fix a date for the final hearing now. Secondly, it is essential that at the next hearing, which I do agree needs to be at the end of March, I am then in a position to fix that date, and to that end all participants who wish to make submissions about it should please indicate in advance the earliest date that they submit the final hearings can begin upon. And it is also essential that at that hearing in March, working backwards from whatever date we can fix for the hearing, I fix a timetable which will have to be obeyed for the restriction order process. It may be possible, it may be necessary, or visible, to build into that the possibility of what Mr Mansfield conveniently calls private or hybrid hearings. I would like you to think about that. It may be possible, it may not, I don't	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Submissions by MR O'CONNOR
Page 82 Page 84	25	please, everybody to come to the next meeting in March		

	<u> </u>	l	I	<u> </u>
	23:10	analysed 52:25	April 17:25 78:19	authorities 44:7
abeyance 38:11	adduced 22:4	answer 18:19	81:5	available 22:9
able 10:8 16:15	adopt 36:18	anticipate 15:16	arch 14:11	25:15 82:24
24:12 30:4 31:23	adopted 7:25	25:1 26:9,10	areas 39:10 50:21	avoidance 36:13
33:6 38:22 58:4	69:23	29:11 30:10	Arena 42:20	aware 5:15 16:21
58:20 60:13,23	advance 4:12	53:19 63:3	argument 2:23	38:2,3 39:17
62:6 72:15 76:24	16:16 25:8,25	anticipated 38:24	arguments 19:14	49:2 66:20 69:4
79:17	34:23 79:6 80:14	58:6,12,21 60:17	arises 1:23 11:24	
absolutely 27:8	82:14	63:6	arising 8:9	B
35:24 48:5,16	advanced 34:8	anybody 2:22 9:18	arranged 7:6	b 64:17 69:13 72:9
49:24 52:14	79:16	57:6 63:15 83:16	arrangements 2:7	72:23 78:4
53:24 55:7 66:2	advantage 79:14	apologising 38:14	2:11 4:11 6:23	back 16:9 18:22
72:5,5	advice 66:6	apparent 1:18	9:3 23:9 66:16	34:7 37:15 64:6
accept 38:4 46:14	advisers 76:3	16:3 59:15 76:21	66:24 67:14	75:17 80:1
accepted 65:14	advocates 6:15	78:11	73:20,25 75:12	backed 40:7
access 71:17	affect 54:24	appear 4:21 21:13	80:3,8	background 76:11
accident 2:12 3:7	afraid 3:16 62:24	appended 29:17	arrive 22:20 77:6	backstop 31:13,17
accidental 2:9,20	agencies 15:5	64:15	asked 41:12,16	backwards 77:17
accommodate	50:20	application 6:3	44:15 49:6 61:18	82:17
78:23	agenda 8:6,10 9:21	28:17 49:8 52:5	82:5	bare 40:18
accompany 29:6	18:8 39:13	54:23 56:7 63:12	asking 18:16	based 66:10 73:4
account 81:20	ago 13:19 20:2	64:19 65:16	asks 49:15 55:24	75:14
accounts 12:3	32:24 39:9 41:12	applications 10:19	aspects 17:14 58:1	basis 26:10 28:14
accurate 33:6	66:8	16:10 17:14	assert 34:17	29:9 33:1
acknowledge	agree 34:24 35:10	26:11 27:15,23	asserted 66:8	batch 29:1,4,5,16
32:20	35:19,20 36:4,8	28:3,14 29:9	assertion 66:10	32:7 56:11,12,13
acknowledging	38:22 51:1 60:21	33:12 34:9,18,23	assertions 40:10	56:14 57:5 61:11
10:4 66:20	63:18 77:10	35:23 36:2 51:5	assimilate 44:10	64:15 65:5
Act 20:5,10	80:13 82:8,11	54:12 59:9 60:24	assist 13:9 31:5	batting 47:25
acting 2:6 17:1	agreed 27:25	applied 73:21,22	46:1 61:15 69:22	bear 16:4 64:2
21:1	28:21 37:3 50:12	applies 22:7 63:9	associated 67:14	Beggs 5:9 62:15,16
actual 81:8	58:25 59:2 65:4	apply 80:16	79:2 83:11	62:17,21,25 63:3
acutely 66:20	agreement 12:16	appointed 40:23	assurance 22:16	63:13 74:16,17
add 21:19 37:6,11	ahead 8:12 32:21	appreciate 39:5	23:1	82:5 84:8
56:3 62:12 69:21	aid 69:20	41:4 57:18	attack 48:8,9	beginning 37:9
74:14 77:24	aiming 78:8	appreciated 44:5	attend 71:16 76:4	39:3,25 46:22
80:24	alerted 1:22 4:2	appreciates 47:4	76:5	48:10
added 17:8 42:16	alleviate 73:19	appreciating 39:3	attendance 1:10	beginnings 40:18
51:12	allocation 62:22	apprized 79:7	67:17	begins 50:14
addition 17:9	allow 32:6	approach 12:9,9	attendees 71:18	begun 27:14
35:11	alongside 26:17	41:23	attending 1:9 3:13	behalf 44:9 47:11
address 9:21 14:14	44:5	approached 37:18	3:19 5:17 70:7	60:22
18:7 21:12 23:5	alternative 68:8	approaching 54:8	attention 17:20	believe 28:22 32:7
57:16 61:7	alternatives 68:12	appropriate 3:10	attract 43:19 44:2	54:8 hast 57:16 59:2
addressed 17:16	ambulance 5:14	5:19 13:8 22:12	44:21	best 57:16 58:2
18:14 47:12	71:2,10 75:12,19	29:12 36:23 69:7	August 19:18	60:11 69:19
49:16 59:5	amount 15:23 39:5	71:8 79:11	40:25 41:8 64:14	better 58:8 62:23
addressing 34:7	41:15 43:23 44:8	appropriately	authorisations	63:5,5 74:21 83:6
adduce 18:15	48:22 74:9	57:24	13:8	
				big 75:24

1.20 4 1.77 5	1 146 16 17	(2.22.(2.2.0.14	1 465.10	1 . 22.10
billeted 75:5	central 46:16,17	62:23 63:2,8,14	cohort 65:18	conclusions 22:19
bit 47:13 53:11	certain 6:5 21:14	63:23 64:5,25	collated 50:5	conduct 1:14
Blood 42:20	26:23 38:12 39:9	65:11,20,22,24	come 8:3 18:7,22	18:21 29:13 67:4
blue 39:23	43:23	66:2,14,18,25	24:24 30:9 32:10	conducted 17:23
board 61:1 62:2	certainly 17:5	67:6,11 68:1,9,18	33:3,15 34:7	57:23 67:24
borne 70:14,17	22:24 27:1 30:10	68:20,24 69:23	46:16 48:20 60:6	confidence 69:20
bottom 45:4	34:25 51:22	70:9,20,25 71:5	64:6 66:25 82:25	confident 76:24
bounced 39:23	63:18 70:3,12,21	71:19,23 72:5,11	comes 1:19 23:7	configured 67:23
bound 2:3	certainty 66:23	72:15,18,20,25	40:19 43:8 49:12	confirm 9:15
boundaries 27:7	chair 1:3 4:7,20	73:2,6,18,21 74:3	coming 1:7 45:23	connection 6:21
bracket 45:18	5:3,11,18 6:1,8	74:9,13,16,19	53:6 80:1	consensus 68:14
brand 41:7	6:13,22 7:5,12,16	76:7,13 77:15,19	commence 34:5	consent 21:2
brief 32:2 78:1	7:22 8:5,16,23	77:21 78:3,7,14	commencement	consequence 16:17
briefly 7:8 15:19	9:11,18 10:7,23	78:19,24 79:8,13	76:17	55:11
59:4 61:6 81:2	12:3,7,11,22 13:3	79:19,25 80:10	common 12:16	consider 9:5 29:1
broadly 14:1	13:11,22 15:14	80:21,23 81:3,14	commonplace	34:20 35:6 37:15
67:22 68:14	15:21 16:1,19	81:17,22 82:1,3,5	77:15	42:13
build 82:20	17:5,18 18:1,10	83:8,16,19	communicate 3:16	considerable
building 75:25	18:25 19:3,7,9,13	chairman 23:3	3:20,22	12:21 17:2 26:4
bundle 7:8,13,21	19:22 20:3,12	Chapman 5:10	comparison 16:4	27:1 39:7 51:21
8:7 21:11,16	21:18,22 22:13	82:6	competing 67:15	54:14 73:11
34:14	22:16 23:1,7,11	chapter 40:6	complete 13:16	consideration
business 8:21	23:14,22 24:4,11	charge 62:23	24:2 28:11 53:24	25:23 45:7
	24:22 25:9 26:13	Charlie 4:23	54:24 55:1	considerations
<u>C</u>	26:19,22 27:3,19	checking 50:11	completed 13:15	67:16,17,19
cache 60:3	28:5,25 29:20,25	Chief 5:8	28:18 51:10	considered 2:3,5
calendar 24:3	30:6,12,19 31:10	choose 72:15	completely 42:23	26:8 76:16
call 21:17 42:5,17	32:11 33:9,16	circulate 80:7,14	42:23 61:24	considering 22:10
42:22 45:1 60:2	34:15 35:5,17,20	80:18	completing 24:20	38:17 81:18
calling 75:10	35:24 36:5,12,19	circumstances 2:1	78:12	considers 69:19
calls 82:21	36:25 37:7,24	68:5 69:16 70:6	completion 23:18	Constable 5:8
canvassed 6:4 78:5	39:1,11 40:5,9,12	73:16 74:24	26:17	constantly 17:8
capacity 13:6	41:22 42:8 43:1	classic 17:17	complex 26:7	constituent 5:4
care 26:8	43:4,6,9,12 44:12	clear 9:3 20:22	73:20	constructive 58:24
careful 48:15	44:17,19 46:9,12	33:5,20 35:18	comply 32:15	62:4
57:13	46:19,23 47:23	60:9 64:23	complying 32:22	consultation 20:21
carefully 63:25	48:2,22 49:5,13	clearance 13:8	78:13	consuming 18:3
76:16	49:18,23 50:10	clearly 9:12 26:23	comprehensive	49:3 52:1
carping 41:18	51:3,6,14,17 52:2	29:23 34:24	46:7	contact 7:3
case 10:20 16:18	52:14,20 53:1,8	48:17 72:2 76:10	computer 31:23	contained 28:8
17:14 23:25 26:2	53:18 54:3,16,21	clients 50:23 55:17	concentrate 77:19	contemplate 75:16
72:2 77:15	55:4,16,23 56:1,3	closed 2:3 5:25 9:1	concept 51:20	contemplated
cases 22:1 26:4	56:10,12,14,16	9:4,9,13 17:16	52:15	38:10
53:2	56:20 57:1,5,9	22:5,21 25:23	concern 37:21	contemplating
categories 45:4	58:22 59:6,10,13	27:7 28:3 42:24	57:17,17,19	29:20
61:3	59:22,24 60:5,8	45:19 67:7 74:7	concerned 36:14	content 17:7 50:17
category 43:19	60:20,25 61:12	79:1,5,15 83:11	39:16 54:4 67:3	59:11 62:10 63:9
48:20	61:14,17 62:1,6	closely 12:13	73:4 75:13	contentious 27:10
cause 23:2	62:10,12,15,20	15:17	concluded 84:1	contents 25:21
causes 24:9				
	ı	•	.	ı

				Page 8/
4415.10	20.16.22.11	(0.5 (0.17.72.16	J:	21.10.24.22.16
context 15:18	20:16 22:11	68:5 69:17 73:16	desirable 38:21	31:18,24 32:16
37:17 41:5 76:20	24:14 25:19	days 13:19	detail 11:5 31:14	32:20 62:18 63:9
contextual 40:14	27:14 28:6 30:21	deadline 60:19	33:7 36:6 74:6	71:21
continue 53:20	31:5 33:5 34:7	63:7	detailed 11:2 20:9	directions 5:22,23
55:20	35:21 40:1,6,19	deadly 48:9	30:16 33:20 34:3	6:5,6 10:10
continued 18:4	40:24 41:11,24	deal 2:2 8:7,18	50:13 57:14	11:13 27:24
continues 15:10	43:24 44:20 47:2	38:5 51:17 52:16	detect 62:6	29:15 32:3,25
18:6	49:17 57:18,25	64:6 74:19 83:22	determination	33:2,19,22,24
continuous 29:22	60:10,25 63:25	dealing 26:14	20:11 34:18	34:17 35:12,15
contrast 20:19	65:9,11 66:20	37:18 38:18,19	35:15 61:20	55:23 57:6 58:13
convenient 1:11	67:7 73:13 76:15	75:20	determinations	64:4,8 74:18
76:2	77:11,12 78:11	dealt 17:15 27:16	20:13	78:13,15 84:9,14
conveniently	81:3	74:25	determine 43:13	disclose 16:15
82:21	court 2:9 3:5,15,18	death 1:5,24 68:5	determined 16:8	34:22 59:21
conversations 46:1	40:21 78:22	69:17 73:17	17:13 28:4 42:7	disclosed 16:6
converted 1:25	courtroom 2:22	74:24	45:16 67:9 81:6	17:12 24:19 26:8
copies 64:9	cover 10:16	debate 63:18	determining 17:22	44:8,11 48:7,11
copy 7:10,11,12	covering 10:14	debated 77:5	34:23	48:19 63:24
19:23	15:4 80:11	decide 19:9 41:3	detract 28:10	67:10
core 5:13 6:17 7:9	covers 20:24 21:4	44:8 70:14	developing 30:15	disclosure 8:11
7:19 8:2,14 9:16	80:22	decided 40:15	68:15	9:22,25 10:12,17
9:23 10:22 14:23	CPs 24:20 43:17	deciding 44:4	development	10:20,21,22,25
15:25 16:6,15	create 50:23	decision 9:13	12:23	11:7 13:25 15:2
17:12 19:25	creating 28:24	20:17 22:2,3	developments	15:4,9,16,19,24
20:18,22 25:3,15	cumulatively 9:21	41:9 53:11 70:23	10:15	16:10 17:8,10
34:19 35:7,22	current 9:7	72:1 79:11	devices 3:16	23:18,21,24 24:1
45:1 72:2 79:8	currently 16:5	decisions 14:11	devise 26:14	24:15,21 25:10
80:14,18	51:8	27:6	devoted 57:22	25:14 26:18
correctly 73:23	cut 2:21	deemed 25:16	died 1:5	28:11,23 29:16
correspondence		degree 27:1 60:13	difference 12:3,8	36:22 39:22 48:5
14:23 21:9,15,20	D	degrees 47:16,17	20:15,16	48:14 49:25 52:7
22:14,25	dancing 39:18	61:3	different 6:23	53:23 54:9,25
Council 5:13 14:8	dark 39:19 47:25	delay 2:17 3:14	28:16 41:23	55:8,9 57:20,23
14:16 69:6,10,11	dashboard 15:11	10:4 37:14 48:13	43:24 45:12,13	58:8 59:1 65:24
69:12,19,21	database 25:19	59:21 70:16	46:9,13 47:3	78:12
Council's 68:21	date 13:17 19:24	delayed 11:8 80:4	55:4 66:12 67:7	discreet 53:3
counsel 4:21 7:17	27:24 28:1 29:24	delivered 13:14,19	difficult 33:14	discuss 15:7 30:5
18:15 49:20	31:2,13,17 32:1	deluged 47:19	difficulties 6:21	43:17 70:24
57:13 59:12	33:4,14 35:9	department 4:25	7:3 23:2 31:23	discussed 16:12
69:13 73:13	38:9,22,24 39:8	11:10 19:19	32:17 47:25	21:1 30:2 50:24
counted 11:25	56:4 58:6 64:22	departments 2:7	difficulty 9:25	63:20 64:2
12:1	66:25 76:17,25	5:1 15:4 50:20	60:18 70:7	discussing 59:14
County 68:21	77:16 78:17,21	dependent 60:12	direct 24:17 30:24	discussion 62:8
couple 16:21 34:11	78:22 80:24 82:9	depending 32:12	80:6	discussions 28:19
course 1:16 3:20	82:12,14,17 83:1	describe 29:16	directed 29:13	31:6 34:3,4 38:1
6:9 7:25 8:1,4	dated 19:20	described 8:12	directing 80:3	46:15 49:21
9:15,15 10:5	dates 28:2 55:4	10:17,18 11:8,23	direction 17:24	50:13
12:24 14:25 16:2	58:4 79:21	29:3 42:13 45:3	29:23 30:20,23	dispose 37:2
18:18,23 19:4,9	Dawn 1:5,24 4:23	describing 16:23	30:23 31:11,11	distinction 12:14
	10:6 66:22 67:18			
	I	I	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	•	•		1 480 00
18:22 59:4	dual 77:1	encourage 7:2	46:3 51:2 58:5	false 54:7
document 12:2,14	due 1:15 8:4 9:15	endeavoured 15:2	67:17 78:22 81:5	familiar 20:9
17:17,23 26:7	19:9 31:5 33:5	ended 11:14	exceptional 21:25	families 53:14
27:12 52:11	71:15	engage 12:13 30:4	excluded 35:2	family 1:12 4:22
53:10,13		engaged 14:21	excused 5:18	6:18 10:6 13:1
documentation	E	39:21	exercise 17:24	17:3,4 21:8,13
22:8 43:23 60:7	e 42:16 43:5,6,7	engaging 14:22	23:24,25 24:15	36:1 37:19 39:4
documents 11:11	earlier 5:22 9:1	enormous 74:9	25:18 26:17 31:4	41:20 44:9 48:6
11:19,22,25	14:2 24:13 31:16	ensure 13:6 31:12	35:5 41:6,8	57:17 60:22
12:17,19 13:9,13	47:13,18 77:13	57:23	49:25 53:22	66:22 67:18 70:2
13:17,21,25 14:1	earliest 82:14	entail 35:11	57:23 81:7	70:24 72:9 74:23
14:5,20 15:1,6,12	early 25:2,5 29:7	entire 66:5	exercising 34:21	76:2 81:4
15:24 16:4,13,15	30:5,14 32:15	entirely 35:19	68:24	family's 34:16
16:25 17:12	34:2 38:5,8	36:17 41:25	exhibited 16:13	57:19
18:13 21:5,6	43:14 53:10	77:10	expand 24:8	far 16:1 23:20
24:13 25:16,18	66:23 75:20	entirety 27:5	expect 4:3	36:13 37:8 39:16
25:21,22 26:9,12	ease 67:17	entries 12:1	expectations 54:7	49:2 62:6 67:3
27:22,25 28:10	easily 74:4	equally 17:21 34:3	expected 51:18,19	71:6 75:12
29:6,17,19 31:1	Easter 78:19	73:10 74:25	expense 75:7	fashion 1:16
31:13,16 32:7,8	effect 11:15 20:11	equivalent 22:22	expert 54:14	favoured 39:18
32:15 33:21 40:7	22:24 23:8 52:13	essence 2:16	expertise 54:18	68:21 72:8,23
40:17 41:13,17	53:15	essential 10:21	experts 50:16	fears 81:4,8
42:4 45:7,8 50:1	effective 38:9	82:10,16	explained 46:13	feature 10:1
50:4,7,15,19 51:9	77:14	essentially 20:20	express 61:19	features 10:3
51:12,24,25	Effectively 33:9	75:3	extend 18:16	February 29:19,21
52:22 54:24 56:5	efficient 26:15	event 35:6 39:3	extensive 26:11	30:18,19 31:2
56:8,22 59:4,16	31:8 54:8 60:1	67:9 75:21	37:25 58:21	32:2 51:10,15
59:21 60:2,11,14	efforts 28:10 50:3	everybody 1:19	73:20	56:4 57:5 59:22
60:16 63:11,21	either 4:10 7:3	4:13 37:21 38:13	extensively 14:21	63:7 64:20 65:17
64:12,15,18,22	22:10 23:13	38:14 52:15,17	extent 24:9 75:2	78:16
64:24 65:2,5,13	41:16 60:19	58:25 82:25	75:13	February/March
65:19,21 78:15	71:21 82:5	everybody's 55:18	extra 77:13	78:9
doing 8:1 23:13	electronic 3:16	64:7 83:19	extremely 21:5	feed 2:18,21 75:23
58:20	7:13	evidence 1:15,18	58:23	76:1
domain 40:17	electronically 7:10	17:15 22:3,11	eyes 42:12	feel 27:5
doubt 17:3 36:13	element 36:22	23:10 36:10 40:9		feet 9:19 82:7
64:5 66:6 70:22	44:23	66:10,12 68:4,6	F	figures 66:7
82:7 83:23	elements 51:2	69:15,15,17	facilitate 15:8	filed 5:15 7:18
downside 69:2	email 7:4	71:16 73:16	facility 42:18	68:12 69:6
draft 17:7 28:17	emanating 11:11	74:23 75:2,14	fact 16:14 17:20	files 14:11,12,16
29:7,18 30:25	embryonic 40:18	evolved 2:15	18:8 20:6 38:1	14:17
31:25 35:11	emerge 63:19	exact 39:20	42:21 59:14	filing 28:20
46:18,21 47:8	emphasis 32:25	exactly 33:10	64:23 70:15	final 27:6,12 33:22
51:8 64:9,17	emphasise 14:19	44:22 61:13	factor 71:21	62:25 82:9,15
65:12 80:7,13	39:6	76:22 79:10	factors 70:17	83:2
drafted 31:5	emphasised 22:6	examining 66:11	factual 10:24	finally 21:23
draw 18:22	emphasising 21:25	example 12:1	fair 18:21 44:9	financial 67:16
drawn 27:8	employed 45:22	17:17 27:16	fairly 11:2	find 32:17 40:12
drew 17:20	enable 28:3 32:15	43:13,22 44:7	fairness 27:9	55:13 78:22
	enabling 10:21		falls 20:14	
	<u>-</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	l	l	l	1
finding 69:22	former 12:9	gists 51:1	guard 2:8 41:14	8:19,20 9:1,2,24
fine 53:10	forth 75:17	give 1:9 33:22 40:6	H	16:12 22:21 28:3
finish 25:7 55:19	fortnight 65:8	49:3 55:24 71:16		32:10 33:4,15
finite 56:18	fortnightly 15:10	75:14 79:3	hand 75:16	37:23 38:10
firm 83:1	forward 10:18	given 3:18 13:4	handed 49:10	42:18,18 57:19
first 2:17 5:5 6:14	25:25 30:13	14:13 18:11 21:2	handle 2:14	57:20 66:17,24
7:3 8:10,18	49:22 55:6 64:3	21:14 33:23	happen 3:7 55:11	67:5,7,14,23,24
10:14,24 14:6	found 21:10,16	44:11	happened 25:6	68:2,3,8,16,17
23:17 26:1 27:24	Foundation 5:14	go 8:16 11:4 19:16	66:8	69:25 70:4,15
29:1,15 30:20	71:11	25:25 34:13 40:1	happening 47:7	71:5,13,17 73:10
31:11 32:4 33:11	four 63:4	40:16,17 50:23	54:5 62:7 79:9	73:14 74:1,21,22
36:1,22 39:14	fourth 13:19	53:10,22 55:12	happens 29:21	75:11,21 76:18
41:20 42:1 44:24	framework 45:12	55:16 61:5 76:23	72:12	76:25 77:10 80:6
45:5,7 50:15	45:12	78:21	happily 74:7	80:10,11,12,12
52:21,24 54:10	Friday 1:1	goes 83:5	happy 30:8 50:6	80:17 81:8,10,12
57:19 61:10,11	friend 5:2,6 37:9	going 3:23 10:14	62:5 69:21	81:19 82:15,22
64:11 66:25 67:3	38:2 47:10	11:4 12:13 18:7	hard 7:11,12 55:18	held 15:12 16:9
67:24 77:2 78:4	friends 4:22,24	19:16 23:16 26:2	55:20 78:11	25:2 42:19
78:19 82:8	frustrating 66:4	30:13 31:14	head 19:4	help 34:12 47:22
Firstly 62:17	full 18:21 33:1	37:16,20,22	hear 30:21 59:3	48:7 62:22 77:6
five 3:14	fully 79:6	42:17 44:2,7	69:14 71:1	83:21
fix 33:14 61:21	function 40:12	45:9 48:17 53:20	heard 1:15 9:6	helpful 18:10
82:9,12,17,18	further 10:17 13:6	53:25 61:9,23	20:18 39:8 49:19	19:15 31:9 55:22
83:2	14:6,17 21:9	64:3 73:25 75:5	55:23 61:19 65:9	helpfully 7:19
fixing 33:4	23:5 24:24 25:1	76:23,23,24	68:6 69:18 72:11	High 40:21
floated 77:1	25:23 32:3 35:25	78:17,24 79:1	76:12	highest 45:6
focus 10:19 49:25	47:22 51:11 53:6	81:6,9 83:23	hearing 1:4,14,18	highly 2:2 44:25
50:3 62:22 73:15	53:21 58:18	good 2:2 5:11	3:2,6,13,17,19,23	hills 41:5 45:3
78:12	66:15 70:24 83:8	13:12 52:16	5:16,22,25 6:2,15	hint 38:25
focused 68:3 69:15	84:10	59:24 62:7,12	6:16,20,24 7:8,24	history 75:20
78:25	future 1:14 4:9	63:8,23 74:25	8:6,8,22 9:4,5,9 9:10,14,14,16,17	HMG 14:10,24,25
follow 24:2 27:8	9:22 23:16,17	83:22	10:8,11,11,16	15:3,18 17:2
27:10 29:9 36:3	80:5,10,11,11	Goss 5:8 62:12,14	11:6,7,13,17	18:4 21:2,7 22:8
77:7 79:18	G	73:5 74:13,15	14:10 15:25	23:21 24:18
followed 5:24 9:1	gained 34:1	82:3,4	19:25 20:8 21:11	25:12 27:10,22
68:16	gather 3:24 4:1	government 2:7	24:25 25:1 27:16	28:1,6,9,19 29:1
following 6:2,19	general 25:25	5:1 11:10 14:7,8	29:10 33:3,8,13	29:5,15 30:4,10
9:5,9 10:11	generically 42:17	19:18 20:20	33:22 35:15 38:5	31:7,13 34:1,5
11:13 20:8 21:2 29:14 50:13	Giovanetti 5:7	22:17 48:4,18	38:7 42:22,25	49:20 50:3,6,15
	57:10,11,12	50:22 51:7 52:5 55:17 59:19	43:16 44:6 45:10	50:18,20 52:8
73:13 follows 3:12 33:17	58:23 59:6,7,11	60:12 64:11 65:6	48:10 58:6,13	54:7,24 72:23 78:10
	59:14,23,25 60:6	grateful 4:8,18 7:5	61:21 67:21 69:5	HMG's 27:4
36:14 70:4,5	60:9,21 61:1,13	36:17 47:23	77:2 78:6,18	
77:7 foot 41:5 45:3	61:15,17,24 62:2	49:13 50:7 57:12	79:1,5,6,15,18,22	hold 15:6 holding 14:22 15:1
force 73:11	62:9 65:3,10	58:23 62:8 63:16	80:15,16,20 82:9	Home 4:25 19:20
form 21:3 24:19	73:6,7,8,19 74:2	65:23 76:6 83:21	82:10,16,17 83:2	Honestly 59:6
29:8 41:7 47:9	74:5,10,11 82:1,2	great 58:1	83:8,9,11 84:1	hope 1:18 4:3,13
formal 52:4	84:7,13	greater 49:4	hearings 2:3,8 4:9	6:24 30:3,15
101 III at 32.4	gisting 53:4	gicalci 47.4	5:23,24 7:25 8:9	0.27 30.3,13
	5.50	<u> </u>	0.25,217.25 0.7	<u> </u>

				1 age 70
32:17 43:20	imperative 33:6	initial 68:15	47:7	kept 53:17
47:24 55:2 57:21	implicit 61:13	innocuous 52:11	internet 70:16	key 16:24 66:4
61:13,19 75:13	importance 38:19	input 15:5 17:2	introduce 2:17	71:14
77:3,7	58:1 66:21 71:14	inquest 1:25 2:4	44:23	kind 3:8 5:18
hoped 50:25	important 10:1	40:22 43:22	introduced 45:9	45:21 48:24
hopeful 38:20	12:15 14:19	inquiries 2:14 20:5	investigated 55:15	kindly 62:18
hopes 54:7	17:21 18:25	20:10 25:17	investigation 1:24	kinds 38:15
hoping 59:7	20:16 22:13 25:3	42:19 47:1 80:9	16:24 18:21	knew 55:11
hostile 48:8	25:6 40:19 42:11	inquiry 1:5,15,25	invite 3:25 8:2,14	know 1:11,23 7:10
hour 76:21	45:15 48:7 53:13	4:21 5:22 6:7	24:17 29:14	20:23 21:8 24:22
housekeeping 1:20	53:16 54:6 72:2	7:18,24 9:2 10:1	30:20,24 31:24	24:23,23 31:15
1:21 6:11 8:24	75:8,9	10:3,5 11:18	32:19 36:23 64:8	39:19 41:1,1
84:3	importantly 25:20	18:15 19:19,24	invited 32:16	42:6 43:22 44:22
huge 53:25	impose 23:9 70:6	20:12,15 21:7,21	invoked 56:24	45:17,23 46:23
hugely 48:7	improved 7:6	24:19 27:13 29:2	57:2	54:1 55:5 57:17
human 77:11	inadvertently 2:13	33:5 34:21 36:15	involve 26:5 34:2	59:3 70:5 74:20
hybrid 6:15 42:22	inaudible 76:21	38:18 41:4,9	involved 33:20	76:22 82:24
71:17 72:9 73:12	incident 39:25	49:20 50:1,4,12	40:25 47:1 66:21	known 37:13
81:20 82:22	47:5	50:24 52:6 53:19	81:11	51:23
hypothetically	include 63:20 66:9	53:25 54:10	involves 18:3	knows 47:2
79:14	75:19	55:21 57:13 58:7	involving 34:4	
	includes 1:7 16:11	58:23 59:12	ironed 32:13	L
I	including 6:17	60:13 64:12	irrelevant 51:2	lady's 74:24
idea 29:8 56:18	8:21 37:4	65:14 66:5 67:5	issue 25:4 36:24	landed 56:19
72:11 79:10	incomplete 28:14	67:12 69:11,14	issued 6:2	lapse 39:6
identification	inconsiderable	69:20 70:15	issues 8:9 26:15,25	large 39:24 41:1
63:21	75:7	71:13 73:14 80:7	27:14 39:4 63:4	42:2 51:11 69:1
identified 29:4	inconsistency	inquiry's 36:3	item 12:15 18:8	75:1,4
45:2 48:16 50:1	11:21,24	50:2 69:13	39:13	largely 10:10,16
51:9 52:6,24	increasing 16:7	inquisitorial 18:18	itemised 42:2	largest 23:20
56:6 57:2 58:18	indicate 8:7 38:17	19:5	items 8:10 12:2	lastly 5:12 8:20,24
59:18,19 60:3,14	81:11 82:14	insist 62:24	13:18 42:3 58:7	35:25 65:12
identify 49:7 50:20	indicated 5:16	instance 7:3 30:4	58:15 59:4	late 28:17
53:21 54:10	6:14 23:23 24:16	61:10	iterative 30:3	lead 77:14
55:21 56:4,22 60:1 63:10,10	28:9 33:25 62:18	instances 51:4	J	leads 76:7
65:13	67:4,21 76:15,18	instigation 27:13	January 28:17	leapt 82:6
identifying 27:21	indication 14:13	instruction 20:20	78:11	learned 4:22,24 5:2,6 37:9 38:1
28:9 61:10 76:24	47:18 50:8	instructions 49:11	jigsaw 52:13,14	47:10
ILT 69:22	inevitable 2:2 55:7	56:9,17 61:6	53:15	leave 18:10 21:23
imagination 74:10	55:11	intended 35:1 77:6 intention 8:17	judgment 30:7	23:14 24:8 54:3
imagine 56:9	inevitably 55:15 67:15 79:1		judicial 22:3	led 16:25
immediate 68:4	Infected 42:20	30:1 50:3,22 67:4 80:15	July 1:6 5:23 6:2	left 38:11
69:16 73:16	inflicting 68:25	inter 62:8	11:6 15:25 19:21	legal 3:18 6:17
74:23	influenced 47:15	inter 62.8 interest 10:5 68:25		11:18 19:18 21:7
immediately 16:3	information 52:9	interests 55:18	K	29:2 50:1,4,13,24
27:21	52:12 53:17	interests 33.18	KC 4:24 5:2,7,9	52:6 53:19,25
immensely 48:15	79:17	interlude 40:20	keen 1:9 17:4	54:10 55:21 56:5
52:11 55:18,22	inhibition 75:10	internationally	keep 82:24	58:24 60:13 62:3
impact 10:4 51:12			keeping 63:7	64:13 65:14
1	l	l	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

				1 age 71
72:16 76:3 80:7	long 48:12 54:2	March/beginning	meaning 45:25	73:12
length 9:25 33:7	59:18 66:7 75:6	81:5	means 3:14 4:3	modification
57:15	76:23	mark 1:3	26:14 30:15	35:11
let's 23:14	longer 55:3	marked 64:12	53:15,16	modified 4:11
level 11:4 13:8	look 22:18 39:15	matching 51:23	measure 21:25	moment 4:5 15:16
62:7	50:17 75:22	material 2:2,10,15	22:7	23:15 29:11 30:9
lever 14:11	looking 50:14	11:1 12:20,24	media 3:13,15	31:22 47:7 48:21
liaise 55:20	lot 36:19 40:3	13:4,13 14:6,9,10	80:18,19	50:2 54:4,19
liaising 62:3	48:25	14:13,15,16 15:9	meet 83:1	75:17
liaison 55:22 58:24	lurking 76:11	16:8 18:17 19:6	meeting 33:9	moments 32:24
83:22		20:14,23,24,25	60:19 81:21	month 50:9
life 41:25	M	22:4,10,18 23:10	82:25	monthly 24:17
light 31:19 47:6	main 39:12 45:23	23:20 24:1 25:12	meetings 14:13,22	months 11:17 18:4
78:15	47:21	27:6 28:15,18	15:6 78:9	38:8 41:12,15
limited 14:4,20	Majesty's 14:7,7	29:2 30:9 31:21	members 2:18	morning 6:10 11:5
15:23 16:1 22:7	22:17 48:4,18	31:21 32:1 34:22	3:15,21 13:7	12:14 76:12 77:5
48:22	59:19 60:11	44:1,1,3,3,13,21	67:18	Moss 5:7
limits 13:5	64:11 65:6	47:19 48:16,19	mention 2:9,20	motivation 77:13
line 26:9,9 53:6	majority 11:11	49:2,7,12 52:7	5:12 8:25 29:11	move 23:16 24:14
link 3:3,14,20 6:19	15:1 52:7 72:24	53:21,22 54:1,10	31:22 78:2	55:5 59:8 66:16
7:1 68:7,10	making 7:14 13:12	54:13 56:19	mentioned 2:13	moving 10:12
69:18,25 70:1,8	25:15 28:16	58:19 64:13	5:21 6:18 8:25	
70:12,18 72:12	39:13 52:4 62:4	matter 1:21 9:12	16:11,20 31:20	N
80:4	77:13	21:1 33:15 35:14	37:9 69:5 80:2	name 26:5
list 50:23 51:8,19	manage 1:14	36:14 38:11	merit 79:4	names 6:4 27:15
64:17	managed 13:6	39:15,24 40:14	met 41:16 51:13	national 38:19
listened 63:25	75:8	52:22 69:4 72:1	method 46:5	39:4 50:16
listening 1:9	management	76:10 80:1 81:18	metrics 15:11	natural 63:19
little 47:13	77:15	matters 6:11 8:13	metropolitan 5:6	nature 16:3,18
live 3:3,19 70:10	managing 2:15	8:15,21 9:20	73:4	77:11
local 68:25 70:11	Manchester 42:20	21:12,17 34:25	middle 75:25	near 70:1 75:6,24
76:4	Mansfield 4:6,7,24	37:3,11,12 38:5	mind 34:25 51:21	76:1 83:20
locality 69:1	21:12 23:5 34:8	38:18 40:21	61:4 64:3,7	nearly 41:11
locally 70:10 75:14	36:25 37:1,2,8,25	47:12 64:1 78:1	68:24 69:4 70:4	necessarily 12:8
location 67:8	39:2,12 40:5,8,11	79:23 81:6	70:14,17	45:8 75:23
75:22,23	40:14 41:23 42:9	maximum 1:10	mindful 18:24	necessary 2:23
log 12:1	43:1,2,5,7,10,13	McGahey 5:2 23:5	minds 39:25 62:22	4:13 9:5,9 12:13
logic 44:24	44:16,18,20	48:2,3,4 49:2,11	73:23 77:19	22:19 27:5 31:6
logical 41:24,25	46:11,14,20,25	49:17,19,24	minister 20:20	35:7 42:21 54:18
logistical 25:17	47:23 48:1,24	50:11 51:4,7,16	minor 45:20	69:24 72:12 76:3
67:16	49:15 60:22 64:1	51:22 52:3,15,18	minute 3:14 71:2	76:5 82:20 83:3
logistics 71:20	72:6,7,8,14,17,19	52:21 53:2,9,19	minutes 2:17 39:9	neck 54:5
75:4	80:23 81:1,2,4,16	54:4,6,16,20,22	mistake 48:11	need 3:21 18:21
logs 12:8	81:18 82:21	55:5,7,17,25 56:2	Mm-hm 6:1,13	19:6 26:8 35:14
London 68:6,8,17	83:18 84:5,11,16	56:8,11,13,15,17	7:16 23:22 28:5	36:12 38:4,16,17
69:12,18 70:1	Mansfield's 34:13	56:25 57:4,8	30:19 50:10 53:8	44:10 48:5 53:4
71:16,20 72:13	51:17 77:10	61:18 62:10,11	53:18 62:20 67:6	56:17 70:18
73:10 74:4,5	March 5:23 58:12	72:20,22,23 73:1	68:1,18	73:19 75:11 76:3
75:3,22	78:17 79:23	81:24,25 84:6,12	model 47:14,15	83:10,12
	82:11,16,25 83:9		<u> </u>	needed 9:14 35:4
	I	ı	I .	ı

	I		I	I
82:7	12:6,8,12,23 13:4	24:9 32:18 41:10	optimistic 51:7	paragraphs 17:19
needlessly 48:14	13:12,23 15:15	44:22 45:19	option 68:15 69:13	51:25
needn't 40:1 72:9	15:22 16:2,20	51:10 53:20	72:23 73:9 82:24	parallel 17:23 27:2
needs 4:4 26:23	17:6,19 18:2,18	60:12,21 61:9	oral 8:3,8 11:5	52:12
29:24 30:3 37:14	19:2,4,8,12,17,23	63:5 71:21 73:2	34:10 67:24 68:8	part 9:17 12:12
59:20 70:13	20:4 21:18,19,23	73:24 83:22	orally 34:8	25:18 40:12 44:4
82:11	22:13,15,24 23:4	occasionally 37:14	order 3:11 4:8	49:13 57:6 59:18
neutral 69:11	23:8,12,16,23	occur 3:9	10:19 12:4 16:10	63:22 65:10
never 48:17 49:8	24:5,12,24 25:10	occurs 38:12	16:16 18:21 19:8	69:24 71:13
nevertheless 75:11	26:14,21,23 27:4	October 7:19,20	20:12,17 22:19	72:16 75:20
new 41:7 46:17	27:20 28:6 29:1	officers 69:21	22:22 26:3,11,24	78:17 83:9
news 10:9	29:23 30:1,8,13	Oh 19:7 29:25	27:15 29:9 30:17	partes 62:8
NHS 5:14 71:11	30:20 31:11	51:22 52:18	31:8 33:2,8,12,23	participants 3:18
Nichols 4:24 7:4	32:12 33:10,17	once 2:12 33:23	34:4,9,18,23	5:13 6:17 7:9,19
nine 14:11	34:16 35:13,18	34:9 47:19 50:18	35:23 36:2,4,7	8:2,14 9:16,24
non-relevant	35:21,25 36:6,13	52:6 70:22 77:8	41:3 43:11,13,17	10:22 14:23
61:10	36:17,21 39:17	77:12	44:14 48:18 49:9	15:25 16:7,16
non-sensitive 60:2	40:24 46:12	ones 37:4	49:10 51:5 52:4	17:12 20:1,19,22
61:11,12,12	49:14,19 50:12	onus 12:24	54:12,23 56:7,23	24:23 25:3,15
note 14:5 18:2	52:4 55:24 61:19	Op 34:1	59:9,11 60:24	34:20 35:7,22
63:1 64:10 74:7	62:17 63:15,16	open 4:16 5:21,22	61:22 63:12,22	72:3 79:8 80:14
noted 15:22	63:24 64:5,23	9:6 17:15 22:4	64:19 65:16	80:18 82:13
notice 8:11 18:9	65:9,18,21,23,25	25:22 26:8 27:7	76:22 77:4 78:25	participation
19:16,20,23 20:4	66:1,13,15,16,19	28:2 36:11,15	82:19	69:20
20:10,19,21,24	67:2,7,12 68:2,10	42:23 67:4,13,23	orderly 1:16	particular 10:5
21:4,21,24 22:6	68:19,23 69:3	67:24 68:2,6,8,16	orders 6:4 10:20	14:24 22:6 25:4
22:18 23:1,8	70:3,12,21 71:4,8	69:15,17 70:4	25:11 27:23 28:2	25:11 26:6 34:1
noting 13:23	71:22,24 74:19	71:5,13 73:10,14	35:16 81:7	37:17 66:22
notwithstanding	76:6,9,10,14	73:25 74:22 75:2	organisation 53:6	68:20 70:18
22:17	77:18,20,25 78:4	75:10 78:18 79:6	organisations	73:15 79:21
November 1:1	78:8,15,20 79:3	79:18,22	23:19,23	particularly 24:12
13:14,20 31:14	79:10,14,20 80:1	Operation 5:4	originally 38:24	39:17 42:15 47:6
60:12 65:7	80:11,22 83:7,14	11:17,21,23 12:9	ought 3:25 22:1	68:4 69:16 70:2
number 6:16	83:15 84:4,10,15	12:17,19 13:14	57:2 66:3 75:2	70:9 73:21,22
15:11 21:6 32:8	O'Connor's 57:13	13:18,24 14:24	75:14	78:24
39:24 40:2 45:1	62:2	14:25 15:7,9,17	outcome 16:24	parties 1:16 19:5
46:25 51:4 60:15	obeyed 82:18	17:1,7 18:3	outlined 49:14,22	19:10 31:7 36:24
61:9 69:1	objection 37:10	23:21,25 24:18	50:12 52:3 55:9	38:8
numbered 7:14	48:19	25:12 27:22 28:1	outset 69:5 80:2	parts 5:4 17:22
numbers 11:21,23	objections 8:1,3	28:7,15,20 29:12	outside 2:22	26:22
12:19 16:3 51:11	obliged 37:2	29:16 30:24 31:7	overall 28:12	party 18:16 70:25
73:3 75:4	observed 9:23,24	31:12 34:5 57:21	overarching 28:17	pass 37:12
0	observers 6:16	64:14,21 65:1,4	P	passed 48:23
O'Connor 4:15,16	observing 1:3 2:19	78:10	page 36:1	pause 43:20 61:8
4:17,18,21 5:4,12	21:24	opportunity 1:17	paragraph 15:22	pending 16:10
5:20 6:2,9,14,23	obtained 13:7	19:11 34:10	24:16 34:16 36:1	people 38:21 45:8
7:8,13,17,23 8:6	obvious 2:1 3:17	35:21 69:9 72:3	36:7,8 42:15,15	46:25 47:5 64:9
8:16,17,24 9:12	68:25 72:10 74:8	80:17	43:3 55:10 58:13	69:1 70:10 71:14
9:20 10:8,24	obviously 2:25	opposite 38:13	58:18 71:9	75:4 76:4
7.20 10.0,24			30.10 /1.9	

			ı	
peoples' 39:24	politicians 40:2	preparation 83:3	11:7,14,15 14:1	59:15 62:18
perfectly 5:19	posed 68:13	preparatory 27:17	15:16,20 16:16	73:13
performance	position 28:16	prepare 1:17 48:8	18:19 19:5 20:15	proposes 9:18
15:10	38:9 40:3 61:21	prepared 7:9 17:9	24:12 25:14,24	proposing 21:19
period 25:4	71:25 72:4 77:3	78:16	26:3,5,24,25	propositions 26:1
permit 26:11	77:6,9 80:5	preparing 16:22	29:13,22 30:3,6	prospect 56:7
perspective 59:16	81:11 82:12	17:21	30:13,17 31:8	63:12 64:18
persuaded 3:10	positive 10:9	present 19:14 46:4	33:3,8,12,23 34:4	65:15
persuades 57:6	possibility 44:14	72:3	40:15 42:1 43:11	protocol 36:4,7,9
phrase 39:19	81:20 82:21	press 2:19 70:11	43:25 45:2 47:10	42:14,25 43:1
physically 70:1	possible 1:10 2:5	pressing 48:6	47:20 48:12,14	80:8
picking 64:8	12:25 20:23	pressure 38:13	48:23 49:14	provide 21:2 24:6
piece 53:16	26:16 28:13 31:9	39:7	50:11,14,14,25	29:18 30:25
pieces 21:20	31:15 32:12	pressures 41:20	53:23 54:2,13	31:15,25 33:1
place 5:23 9:4,16	33:20 34:6 35:5	presumably 48:24	55:8,13,19 56:23	48:5 60:11,13
10:22 12:24 31:6	36:10 43:15	71:7 75:20	59:1,18 61:5,22	64:16 65:5,12
35:4 66:25 67:3	44:12,13 47:18	presuming 60:17	63:20,22 65:6,10	74:7
67:8 70:1,4	51:1 52:5,18	pretty 16:1	66:5,12 76:22	provided 7:19
73:14	53:2 56:21 57:3	prevent 22:9 23:13	77:4 78:25 82:19	11:1,12,18,22
placed 38:13	57:21,25 66:23	52:16	processes 77:14	12:17 14:10,12
plate 54:19	66:23 67:13,22	previous 7:25 9:24	79:5	14:21 15:3,5,12
please 4:20 7:5	75:15 76:16	11:6 16:12 32:10	produce 29:7	15:24 21:6,7
9:19 41:14 56:20	81:14 82:9,19,23	previously 10:13	33:10 40:9	24:18 31:12
81:16,19 82:14	83:20	23:23 67:4	produced 46:18	36:11 42:14
82:25	potential 50:23	principle 35:20	58:7	60:17 64:14
pleased 18:5 58:4	51:8	36:14 70:23	productive 28:19	69:25
pm 83:25	potentially 34:22	principled 56:21	progress 10:15	providing 23:20
point 12:15 22:21	54:1 58:19 66:3	priorities 55:21	13:12 15:2,7	23:24 31:20
23:6 25:24 28:12	Pottle 4:22	prioritise 13:25	18:5 23:17 24:20	provision 10:25
31:3 32:8,23	power 34:21 35:5	priority 45:6,16	26:16 28:12,23	30:9 34:19 70:12
36:6 39:12 41:18	practicable 49:6	prism 39:14	32:14 45:24 59:2	provisions 20:6,10
45:10,24 46:16	practical 67:14,15	private 42:25	62:4	public 1:4,25 2:18
46:17 52:10	practice 14:22	43:16 53:17	promptly 24:2	3:13,15 40:3,5,16
54:17 62:10,25	precede 83:3	81:20 82:22	properly 1:17 4:11	40:17 43:16 48:6
77:11,25	precise 78:21	probable 54:22	17:16 25:8 75:9	53:14 66:7,7
points 10:13,16,17	precisely 20:11	probably 66:3	proportion 16:14	67:18 69:20
11:2 21:14 32:3	35:17 83:11	75:25	21:5 22:8 49:4	75:24
32:24 34:11 35:2 35:9 38:2 57:16	predecessor 40:23 predecessors 1:13	problem 2:10 4:2 problems 6:25 7:1	75:1	publication 37:8 publish 7:23 11:3
62:17 63:17			proportionate 15:8	21:20
police 5:6,7,8	predictions 33:7 prefer 71:12	32:13,18,21 39:20		
11:12 13:13,24	prefer 71.12 preference 71:5,15	proceed 57:19	proposal 28:7,22 77:2	published 6:6 19:24 20:8 36:4
14:5,18 15:8	72:24	65:7	proposals 9:22	publishing 3:5
16:11,20,23	preferred 73:9	proceeding 59:21	34:2	purpose 1:14
17:11,16,21	preliminary 1:4	proceedings 2:19	propose 3:11 7:23	32:25
27:18 29:1,6,17	1:13,21 6:11	4:16 20:9 22:4	8:7,9 11:3 14:14	purposes 8:8
31:19 32:5,21	8:22 9:1 11:8	25:7 42:14	proposed 32:4	put 39:5 40:20
41:12 50:4 62:19	18:13 25:1 78:6	proceeds 83:13	35:12 46:9,12	46:4 47:14 49:20
64:16 65:12	78:18 80:12 83:9	process 9:25 10:12	54:9 58:4 59:11	58:12
010 03.12	, 5.15 55.12 55.7	P1000557.25 10.12	, 50.157.11	55.12
	l	l	l	1

45.5	1 22 2 15	1	1 .46.5	
putting 45:5	reason 1:23 3:17	relating 20:13	repeat 46:5	rest 75:1
	26:19 36:16,20	25:11 33:22	reply 63:17	restricted 42:17
Q 41 1 42 2	48:12 56:3 74:25	36:22 67:13	report 15:8 16:11	restriction 6:3
quantity 41:1 42:2	reasonable 13:1	73:16	16:20,23 17:4,6	8:11 10:19,20
42:5	reasonably 18:17	relation 2:25 3:1,3	17:11,17,21 18:5	16:10,16 17:13
queries 21:9	49:15 83:23	4:9 6:4 17:24	22:12 23:12	18:9 19:16,19
query 13:1 18:20	reasons 74:8 75:3	30:22,24 31:1	27:18 29:6,17	20:4,10,12,17,19
question 8:19 13:5	reassurance 21:14	35:9 40:21 43:10	41:12,12 64:16	21:4,21,24 22:6
18:11,13,16,20	reassured 57:21	43:25 44:24	reports 41:2	22:18,22 23:1,8
24:24 27:6 31:13	recall 11:6 25:14	63:11 64:22,24	represent 21:5	25:11 26:3,11
33:4 39:22 42:11	32:10 40:1	65:2 69:25 81:7	representation	27:15,23 28:2
43:17 44:6,12	receive 50:8	relaxation 38:12	4:19	29:9 30:17 33:2
49:5,8,15 56:21	received 2:6 7:10	relay 79:17	representations	33:8,11,23 34:3,9
66:16 71:1 76:8	13:1 14:6,17	released 42:4,6	80:19	34:18,23 35:16
quick 72:8	20:21 67:20	relevance 13:10	representatives	35:22 36:2,4,7
quicker 47:11	receiving 12:18,20	16:5 18:12,13	3:18 6:17	43:11 44:14
quickly 12:25	recognise 53:24	27:12 39:22 41:6	represented 4:23	48:17 49:9 51:5
24:13 32:13 37:3	recognises 38:11	43:18,19 44:24	5:1,5,9,10	52:4 54:11,23
quite 19:2 23:4	48:4	45:4 47:17 53:20	representing 17:4	56:7,23 59:8
36:19 37:24	record 32:20	relevant 14:2,11	represents 15:5	60:24 61:22
47:23 48:25	recurrence 6:25	16:9,15 18:17	request 2:6 24:5	63:12,22 64:19
52:11 60:18 61:2	redaction 26:4	19:10,13 20:5	41:9	65:16 76:22 77:4
64:25 67:11	45:21 53:4	25:16,21 29:4	requests 51:11	78:25 81:7 82:19
74:21 75:6	redactions 26:12	42:7,12 43:14	require 3:4 45:20	restrictive 34:22
R	51:1	44:1,3,4,13,20,25	required 30:16	result 10:9 11:12
raise 8:2 54:7	reduce 51:4	45:6,16 47:16	32:6	retrieved 48:11
raise 8:2 34:7	reduced 57:14	49:7 50:2 52:7	requirement 11:9	return 6:9 31:3
34:12 38:6 42:11	refer 22:20 23:12	53:22 54:1,10,12	requirements 23:9	returns 32:23
70:21	37:17	55:14 56:5,6	requires 63:9	revealed 40:4
	reference 7:15	58:19 60:4,15	resist 56:1 62:21	43:24
rapidly 10:12 rate 49:7	26:6	61:12 63:11,21	resolution 63:3,6	revealing 66:10
reach 22:19 26:23	referred 20:24	64:12 65:5,15	resolved 32:18	review 11:1,9,10
reached 76:19	21:15 28:13 29:5	reliable 28:14	40:21	11:19 12:19,24
reaches 2:22	37:4 67:19	33:11	resource 62:22	13:15 14:6 15:13
	referring 10:2	relied 33:21	resources 13:2	17:9,23 29:5,15
read 7:22 22:14,25	22:11 29:19	remain 22:5	38:15,16 41:17	50:7,15,16 53:21
36:9 52:17,23 69:7 71:9	reflected 9:7	remained 2:4	56:18 57:22 60:1	64:12
ready 52:23	refrain 3:4	remaining 14:15	respect 1:3 14:12	reviewed 13:17
real 3:2,21 28:23	regard 18:6 24:6	63:4 68:6 69:17	27:15 32:1 54:12	14:2,9,15 16:5
realise 43:10	regarding 6:3	remembered	56:6,23 57:5	27:12 29:2 41:3
realistic 58:3,16	14:14 34:9,17	81:19	58:11 60:22,23	48:20 50:19
63:6 76:17 77:21	69:8 80:3	remind 39:20	62:18 64:16,18	reviewing 13:9
78:17 83:22	regretted 53:12	reminded 40:24	65:15,21	14:4,20 18:12
really 27:9 32:24	regular 14:22 15:6	remote 6:19,21 7:2	response 68:12	50:6 53:22
37:18 39:19	25:3	70:8 71:17	responses 28:7,8	reviews 54:11
45:14 48:15	regularised 80:5	remotely 1:9,10	34:19 35:10	Revisiting 68:25
53:12 54:6 72:10	relate 32:4	2:19 3:13,19	responsibility	right 4:5,15 6:20
76:21 77:1 78:4	related 68:4 69:16	removed 25:22	50:22	12:7,22 13:11,22
80:4	relates 31:18 78:6	removing 26:5	responsive 7:20	15:14 16:7 17:6
00.7				

				Page 95
17 10 10 14 22 4	40.05.57.10.66.6	20 ((0 11 12	71.076.10	70 12 71 4 72 0
17:18 19:14 23:4	48:25 57:18 66:6	28:6 68:11,13	71:9 76:19	70:12 71:4 72:8
23:7,14 24:5	83:5	73:8 74:6 76:14	shortest 18:19	72:23 73:5 74:17
25:9 27:3 28:25	says 51:18 53:10	sees 4:13	shorthand 35:3	78:20 79:3,10,10
30:12 40:13	scale 13:5 16:17	sense 4:13 48:13	shortly 5:25 45:5	79:20 80:6 81:25
43:20 44:16,19	26:2	78:1	sign 38:20	83:7,15
46:24 48:16 49:1	scenes 83:24	sensibly 75:18	signed 19:20	sits 69:12
49:18,24 54:15	schedule 20:25	sensitive 2:2,10,15	significant 11:15	sitting 52:23
55:14,16 56:20	22:10 29:7,18	2:21 17:22 20:14	18:5	situation 37:17,19
57:7 60:20 61:2	30:25,25 31:25	25:21 41:2 45:14	significantly 57:14	six 24:4 41:12,15
64:25 65:24	46:18,21 47:9	45:18 50:17	59:1	Skripal 5:9
66:14,19 68:20	51:14,19 64:17	51:20 52:12	similar 29:13	slightly 46:9,13
70:20 71:23	65:13	sensitivities 11:11	30:23,25	58:9,21
72:20 73:2 74:5	scheduled 15:12	16:18 26:1,7	simple 46:20 75:4	slippage 24:9
74:19 76:7 77:22	58:15	29:8,18 31:1,25	simply 5:12 14:20	33:24 38:24 39:9
78:20 79:4,25	schedules 31:4	33:18 45:13,18	16:17 24:22 25:6	41:14 58:11,17
80:21 81:23 82:8	33:17 38:6	46:18,22 47:2,6,9	25:17 26:5 31:11	slipped 24:8
83:8	scheduling 24:1	49:4 50:21,24	34:11,24 35:3	slow 28:11 54:13
rigorously 57:24	28:18 63:19	51:9,14,24 59:17	36:8 56:7 58:17	slowing 56:22
rise 49:3	scheme 46:4,8,17	59:20 62:5 64:17	59:17 69:7 71:9	slowly 42:10
risk 2:9,16 39:8	schemes 45:22	65:13	single 12:2 28:16	small 12:19 16:14
53:9	scope 1:10 2:23	sensitivity 13:4	sir 4:18 5:4,12,20	16:14 21:4,5
risks 3:9 46:6	scoping 67:13	39:22 41:6 43:20	5:21 6:18 7:8,23	22:7
robust 33:19	search 55:12	44:2,21 45:13,15	8:6,13,17 9:12,20	Smith 7:4
rolling 30:13	second 18:8 26:14	45:20 47:3,17	9:23 10:10,24	solicitor 24:19
53:23	30:23 32:23	54:11 61:3,4	11:20 12:6 14:19	solicitors' 13:7
room 6:16 47:1	44:20 53:16	sent 19:23	16:2,14,20 18:7	solution 68:21
round 52:9	68:15	separate 31:21	18:18,22 19:2,17	Somebody 40:15
Rowley 4:23	secondly 28:1	65:18	20:4 21:8,11,15	somewhat 28:15
Rule 34:21 35:5	35:25 36:6 64:21	separately 8:18	21:19,23 22:9,24	soon 34:5 55:19
rules 34:22	67:1 68:2 71:15	sequential 26:20	23:4,16 24:16,24	57:2
ruling 6:3,6 17:13	82:10	Sergei 5:9	25:13 26:21,23	sooner 74:20 83:5
	secretariat 67:12	series 12:1,2 41:2	27:4 28:19 29:14	sorry 14:8 39:13
S	Secretary 4:25	serious 23:2	29:23 30:8,20,23	46:11 56:12
Sadly 36:19	19:20 22:2	serve 44:13	31:2,11,15,18,19	61:11 64:25 82:3
sake 9:2	Section 20:5,6	served 19:19 20:1	32:2,23 33:10	sort 29:24 45:11
Salisbury 67:5,25	secure 33:1 67:8	44:5	34:7,16,24 35:13	sorts 47:12
68:2,7,10,16	securities 50:11	Service 5:14 71:11	36:11,17,21 37:2	sotto 59:14
69:12,15,19 70:2	security 11:9,10	session 25:23	37:10 44:18	sought 21:14
70:5,19 71:6,12	15:12 23:9 38:19	set 20:6 21:4 27:22	47:21 48:4,10	South 5:14 71:10
71:14 73:12,15	39:4 50:16 67:19	27:25 28:10 32:6	49:2,11,17 51:16	speaking 14:1
74:22 75:6,6,15	73:20,24 75:3,8	42:15 58:3 64:24	51:22 54:6 55:7	64:10 67:22
75:18,23,24,25	75:11	65:2 72:3 76:17	56:2,8,17 57:4,8	68:14
76:2	see 9:11 11:16 17:4	77:3,9,12 78:13	57:12 59:15	special 2:11 23:9
sample 27:22,25	19:11 33:1 43:21	78:21 79:21	61:16 62:11,14	73:24 75:11
28:10 46:7	46:2 52:2 58:11	share 10:9 15:10	62:17,25 63:13	specific 49:15
sampling 46:5,8	58:17 59:20	31:23 53:14	63:16,24 64:23	51:24 63:17
satisfied 74:21	73:11 79:23 81:4	shared 50:18	65:9,18 66:1,16	specifically 65:4
75:1 83:19	seen 7:22 11:20	sheer 9:25 71:19	66:20 67:2 68:11	sped 59:1
save 71:24	20:1 21:18 27:4	short 12:18 49:10	68:19 69:3,3	speeded 46:3
saying 35:1 41:19		2.101712.1017.10	00.17 07.0,0	- P
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	l	<u> </u>

speedily 32:18	stock 3:7	71:10 72:7,22	support 69:13	teams 14:24 15:3
60:18	straightaway	73:7,9 74:6 76:9	71:17	15:18 30:2 50:18
speeding 46:2	38:21	76:12,15,19 78:8	supporting 36:10	technique 2:15
spot 31:19	strains 38:15	81:1 82:13 84:4	suppose 70:10	26:6
spring 81:10,19	strands 52:9	84:5,6,7,8,10,11	72:21	technology 7:6
staff 71:7,15 75:14	strategies 15:4	84:12,13,15,16	sure 4:10,10 36:12	tell 54:3 62:23
75:19	55:9	submit 22:3 27:1	37:21 52:15 61:6	79:8
stage 10:17,20,21	streamed 70:15	36:2 38:4 43:25	62:4 79:11	tended 55:5
10:25 11:7 14:4	streamlined 50:11	47:8 49:24 81:15	surprise 74:11	tends 77:19
15:15,19,23 16:9	55:8,13	82:15	surrounding 26:1	tense 83:23
17:9 23:18,21,24	stresses 38:15	submitted 69:8	suspect 39:24	tension 57:25
24:15,21 25:7,8	striking 10:1	subsequent 68:16	swiftly 57:20,25	terminology 13:18
25:10,14,16,20	strong 40:3	80:16	switches 31:18	terms 8:24 23:17
26:17,18,24,24	strongly 71:12	subsequently 28:6	switching 75:17	36:3
26:25 27:11,13	Sturgess 1:5 4:23	substantial 37:14	system 46:10	terrorist 48:8
27:14 28:11,23	6:19	57:22 60:15		test 18:14,20
30:5 32:14 34:2	Sturgess's 1:11,24	substantive 8:19	T	Thames 5:7
35:18 37:19	10:6 17:3 66:22	8:20 33:4,14	tab 8:6 21:11	thank 1:3,7 4:6,7
39:16,16 40:18	67:18 68:5 69:17	37:12,23 66:17	34:13 42:16	4:15 7:22 19:14
40:22 42:1 43:14	73:17	66:24 70:15	tabs 7:14,21 21:16	19:15 36:25 37:7
43:22,24 44:20	Sub-paragraph	76:18,25 77:9	take 3:7 8:9 9:4,17	43:9 48:1 57:7,8
48:23 50:15	43:5	80:12 81:8,12	10:22 13:20 31:6	57:9,12 62:12,14
54:25 58:8 59:1	subject 21:24	successfully 57:1	35:4 39:13 42:10	63:8,13,14,23
76:20 78:12	33:18 48:17	suddenly 39:23	48:15 49:11 54:2	71:23 72:19,20
stages 37:15 42:10	70:16	suffering 7:2	56:9,17,20 57:15	73:1,2 74:11,13
83:3	submission 27:4	sufficient 13:2	61:6 62:2 66:25	77:22 79:25
stand 37:15 51:8	35:8 53:3 60:21	32:14	67:8 69:25 70:4	80:21 81:22,23
79:7	69:24	suggest 9:18 33:25	73:12,14 75:15	81:25 82:2 83:18
start 4:18 10:2	submissions 4:1	45:23 78:16 80:6	76:23 79:12	83:24
26:16 30:6,8	4:17 5:16 6:10	suggested 27:20	81:20	thing 3:10 41:21
37:20 50:5,6	7:15,17,18,20,23	27:24 28:16	taken 3:9 9:16	45:5 75:8
52:19 55:12	8:4,13,14 9:6,8	47:10,16 55:23	41:9,24 61:1	things 2:16 23:13
57:18 66:19	11:3,5,16,22,24	68:3 70:8,13	75:2	33:13 45:14 51:7
74:22 75:17	12:25 14:5 15:23	78:8	takes 22:2 48:12	54:18 65:1,17
77:16 81:12	17:20 18:2 19:1	suggesting 78:21	54:14 55:15 74:9	79:7
started 39:2 47:4	20:2,7,18 21:10	78:23 79:20	talking 66:11	think 2:10 4:3,12
80:2	24:6,17,25 25:24	suggestion 51:18	target 39:8	7:11 8:16 9:13
starting 25:24	27:20 28:9,21,21	60:8 61:2 62:3	targets 58:3	12:12 18:17
30:10 38:3	30:21 32:9 34:8	79:21	task 13:2,9 14:4	22:11 27:9 29:12
starts 40:14 52:21	34:10,12,13,17	suitable 69:22	26:2 53:25 58:20	35:3,14 37:18
state 4:25 22:2	35:2,22 36:1,21	75:22	team 3:21 11:1,18	39:17 44:9 46:16
48:8	36:23 37:1,5	summarise 73:23	13:7 15:7 18:12	46:25 49:5,13
stated 24:7	46:6 47:21 48:3	summarised 21:9	19:19 21:7 25:15	51:18 57:15
statement 16:23	49:21 55:10	summary 18:11	29:3 30:4 42:4	58:25 59:2,8,25
statements 40:3,5	57:11,14 58:5,14	21:13	50:1,5,13,25 52:6	61:17 63:14,16
43:23 66:7	60:23 61:7 62:16	superimpose	53:20,25 54:10	66:2,2 68:20
step 63:19	63:25 66:15	45:17	55:21,22 56:5	74:9,19,20 76:19
steps 35:4	67:20,21 68:11	superimposed	58:24 60:13 62:4	80:23 81:22
stipulating 36:9	68:13 69:7,10,14	45:11	64:13 65:14	82:22 83:10
			72:16 80:7	
	1	1	1	1

				1 486 77
thinking 47:5	track 58:16,19	understood 60:8	28:7	whatsoever 44:2
83:12	63:7	81:17 83:20	verse 40:6	48:19
thinks 52:5	tracking 15:11	undertake 54:11	version 64:16	whichever 39:18
third 1:4 5:21	tranche 13:19 50:9	55:1 83:1	versions 25:22	whilst 12:23 40:20
13:16 26:16	56:10,11 64:13	undertaken 41:8	video 68:7,10	60:10
62:25 68:7	tranches 13:13,15	undertaken 41.0	69:18	whistling 39:18
Thirdly 65:3	transfer 32:7	undo 2:13	view 9:7 52:8	Whitelaw 4:22
thought 4:11	transferring 25:18	unfortunate 24:10	54:13 73:12	widely 3:23 50:18
48:15 79:3	transparency 9:3	74:24	viewed 52:12	55:12
thousands 11:18	transparent 20:18	unfortunately	visible 82:20	Wiltshire 5:8,13
16:4	travel 71:20	41:25	voce 59:14	13:24 14:8,16,18
three 8:10 9:20	treated 20:14	unnecessary 28:24	volume 12:16,21	31:19 32:4,21
13:13 14:12,17	triage 47:15	unredacted 53:11	16:8 23:20 56:19	62:19 65:12
25:25 28:22 31:7	trial 77:16	unusual 10:2	10.8 23.20 30.19	68:21 69:5 71:20
			\mathbf{W}	wish 18:15 19:5
62:17 67:22	tribunal 23:2	unusually 79:5	wait 25:5	
68:12	tribunals 2:14	update 8:11 9:22	waiting 52:23	20:22 21:23
time 1:18 3:2,7,21	tried 55:8	10:24 24:6 63:1	want 38:2 41:18	24:14 63:17
3:24,25 4:2,12	tripartite 31:4	updates 24:17	41:19 47:13 50:5	71:24 80:5 82:13
7:7 16:22 18:3	true 40:8	25:4	51:17 53:13	wishes 21:12
24:4 38:17 39:6	trust 5:15 71:3,11	upside 69:2	57:15 59:3 62:12	witnesses 44:25
41:8,15 44:8,10	75:12	use 13:18 60:1	74:14 77:23	45:1,7,16 47:16
48:14,15 49:3	try 13:25 40:12	useful 27:11 49:21		73:3,24 75:10,15
51:21 52:1 54:14	trying 41:13 44:23	63:18	80:22,24 82:24 83:16	woods 54:5
54:14 55:15	46:1 60:1	utmost 38:19		Woolf 5:2
57:15,24 61:20	turn 9:20 25:12	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$	wanted 36:21 60:9	word 11:15 26:10
66:8 75:6 77:8,9	turning 15:19		74:6 80:24	26:10 42:24
77:12 78:11	two 2:16 5:12,24	Valley 5:7	wasn't 3:24,25	45:21
79:22 81:10	13:6,15 14:16	various 2:7,14	60:8	wording 43:8
timeframe 51:13	20:15 23:13,19	10:13 55:4	wasted 48:14	words 11:25 21:3
times 16:21 55:5	32:2 45:22 54:18	vast 15:1 52:7	way 1:23 3:6 8:12	42:23,24 45:8
timetable 33:9,11	65:1 77:25	venue 8:19 66:18	10:18,24 14:14	51:25
46:4 54:23,24	types 47:3	67:25 68:7 69:8	16:22 17:15	work 7:6 14:19
61:21 77:4 82:18	U	69:18 70:18 71:1	20:13,18 23:20	16:21,25 17:20
timetabled 29:10		71:12	32:17 40:20 46:2	18:2 27:11,14,17
timing 8:20,22	ultimate 38:10	venues 67:13	46:20 49:22 54:8	27:21 28:24 30:5
78:6	ultimately 16:6	69:22	58:7,12 77:11	39:5 50:2,19
timings 24:7	28:11 51:1	Verbasco 5:5	ways 67:22	51:8 52:10,16
today 3:11 4:9 5:5	unblocked 11:16	11:17,22,23	wealth 40:16	55:1,19 67:13
34:8 38:3 46:4	underlying 16:25	12:10,17,20	67:15	74:10 77:16,21
72:1 80:3,4,22	41:13	13:14,24 14:24	website 6:7 7:24	78:12 83:13
token 60:10	understand 3:9	14:25 15:7,9,17	19:25 21:21 37:8	workable 26:15
told 1:22 25:5	26:24 32:5 41:19	17:1,8 18:4	week 78:19	38:9 81:12
43:21 44:22 65:4	42:2,13 47:24,24	23:21,25 24:18	weeks 13:16 20:2	worked 13:23
top 45:4,6,16	52:14 54:16 57:4	25:12 27:23 28:1	30:11 63:4	workflows 15:2
topic 53:3	58:10 61:24 66:3	28:15,20 29:12	weeks' 24:4	working 15:17
topics 51:20	66:9 69:23 71:19	29:16 30:24 31:7	welcome 12:23	27:2 41:6 44:23
total 13:20 21:6	74:3 77:23	31:12 34:1,5	45:24 47:8,11	54:22 55:17
touch 34:11	understanding	57:22 64:14,21	62:21	61:25 82:16
touched 42:19	12:16 23:6 30:16	65:1,5 78:10	Western 5:14	worth 13:23 66:5
	79:16	Verbasco's 13:18	71:10	
	•	•	•	•