

OPUS2

GRENFELL TOWER INQUIRY RT

Day 278

May 16, 2022

Opus 2 - Official Court Reporters

Phone: 020 4515 2252

Email: transcripts@opus2.com

Website: <https://www.opus2.com>

1 Monday, 16 May 2022
 2 (10.00 am)
 3 SIR MARTIN MOORE–BICK: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to
 4 today’s hearing. Today we’re going to begin by hearing
 5 further evidence from Mr John Hetherington of London
 6 Resilience.
 7 So I’m going to ask Mr Hetherington to come back in,
 8 please.
 9 MR JOHN HETHERINGTON (continued)
 10 SIR MARTIN MOORE–BICK: Good morning, Mr Hetherington.
 11 THE WITNESS: Good morning.
 12 SIR MARTIN MOORE–BICK: Thank you for coming back to answer
 13 some more questions.
 14 THE WITNESS: You’re very welcome.
 15 SIR MARTIN MOORE–BICK: Yes, Mr Millett.
 16 Questions from COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY (continued)
 17 MR MILLETT: Yes, good morning, Mr Chairman. Good morning,
 18 members of the panel.
 19 Mr Hetherington, good morning to you.
 20 A. Good morning.
 21 Q. Can we now turn, please, to 15 June 2017, and I want to
 22 start with communications between London Resilience and
 23 the DCLG.
 24 Now, your colleague Hamish Cameron was, I think --
 25 is this right? -- the strategic adviser on 15 June,

1

1 until you took over at 14.30 that day.
 2 A. Yes, that’s correct.
 3 Q. Now, let’s go, please, to {CLG00003062}. We can see
 4 here an email, the second email on the page, please,
 5 from Lynne Dowdican, at 8.58 in the morning, RED control
 6 is copied, "For briefing – read out London":
 7 "Hi Jenny
 8 "Hamish rang from London – read out below – they are
 9 emailing Red control as well.
 10 "44 families have been put in accommodation
 11 overnight (commercial hotels). 25 other families with
 12 vulnerable people or children are being housed. The
 13 council have reasonable confidence that they have now
 14 accommodated those in need. The council staff have
 15 stated they can resolve any shortage in accommodation
 16 and last night all persons requiring accommodation were
 17 encouraged to attend the Westway Rest Centre.
 18 "RBKC have put plans in place overnight for recovery
 19 and the humanitarian assistance aspects."
 20 It goes on about the recovery and what is going to
 21 be needed.
 22 From whom would London Resilience have received
 23 information of this kind?
 24 A. So that would have been either a read–out from the SCG
 25 or direct communications with the borough emergency

2

1 control centre, would be my understanding of where this
 2 information came from.
 3 Q. I see.
 4 If we go to {LFB00061311}, please, second email on
 5 the page, Lynne Dowdican again, 9.24, to Hamish Cameron
 6 and Toby Gould, copied to RED, "Urgent Questions", and
 7 she says:
 8 "Dear Hamish and Toby
 9 "I tried to call. We have some further urgent
 10 queries to clear if you are able.
 11 "What were the numbers accommodated in rest centres
 12 overnight?
 13 "In the 8CG minutes it states –
 14 "25 other families with vulnerable people or
 15 children are being housed.
 16 "Have they been housed? And in what accommodation.
 17 "What support to families is available? What are
 18 the various things on the ground?
 19 "Rest centre.
 20 "Family support line.
 21 "Casualty bureau.
 22 "Friends and family centre run by Salvation Army.
 23 "What are the phone numbers for these and a one line
 24 description of what each of these do."
 25 So those are her questions.

3

1 Then if you look up the page, please, you can see
 2 Toby Gould’s response back to Lynne Dowdican and
 3 Hamish Cameron:
 4 "Lynne,
 5 "Hamish is getting the confirmed answers from RBKC
 6 and MPS.
 7 "On your other questions below the following has the
 8 answers ..."
 9 And you can see what is suggested there. There is
 10 a link to the RBKC newsroom council statements in
 11 respect of her questions on facilities and numbers.
 12 Then if you go, please, to {CLG00003099}, second
 13 email down, here is an email at 10.20 from
 14 Jenny Shellens to Philip James, copied to RED,
 15 "Hi Phil", and the subject, "SCG asks", and this is
 16 ahead of the 11 o'clock SCG meeting. Philip James is
 17 the government liaison officer, and he(sic) says in the
 18 second line:
 19 "A couple of areas that it would help us for you to
 20 probe on if it is not completely clear:
 21 "The number of residents displaced ..."
 22 Do you see that?
 23 A. Yes.
 24 Q. She goes on to say in the last paragraph, if you turn
 25 the page to the top of page 2 {CLG00003099/2}:

4

1 "We've had an update from LRP and also homelessness
 2 team are talking to the RBKC team. But it would be
 3 useful to add any intelligence you can along the lines
 4 of:
 5 "— Are we satisfied that everyone who wants
 6 accommodation has it?
 7 "— When do we think those from surrounding area (who
 8 are in the rest centre) will be able to return home?
 9 "— Are we satisfied that RBKC has a grip on this?"
 10 Now, I've shown you all this email chain now, but
 11 was it brought to your attention at the handover that
 12 DCLG were asking such specific questions on the
 13 response?
 14 A. No, not such specific questions. The — have RBKC got
 15 a grip, that's a general term that government will tend
 16 of use of local response mechanisms, and that's their
 17 litmus test, I think, coming from a COBR/central
 18 government—type environment.
 19 Q. Right. What does that mean, "grip"? I mean, "grip" is
 20 "grip", but —
 21 A. So do they have an understanding on the numbers, do they
 22 have a plan in place to respond to it, are they in
 23 control, if you like.
 24 Q. Right.
 25 Did you or do you consider that the information

1 provided by the London Resilience here to RED may have
 2 created the impression that all was in hand in relation
 3 to the response on the ground and the immediate housing
 4 needs of those affected by the fire?
 5 A. So we would have been relaying information that was
 6 provided to us. DCLG would have also been members of
 7 the SCG meetings and could have asked questions
 8 themselves, and I think it was an in—the—round
 9 discussion. But from the looks of the information that
 10 we were getting and the way in which Hamish posed his
 11 earlier response, he wouldn't have been making comment
 12 without clear indication coming from RBKC.
 13 Q. Right. Was the impression that RBKC did have a grip?
 14 What was the answer to the question, "Are we satisfied
 15 that RBKC has a grip?"
 16 A. So at that stage, on the Thursday morning, I wasn't
 17 there. Throughout the Wednesday afternoon, I think they
 18 were providing all the indications of having grip. So
 19 everything that they were saying was that they had
 20 control on the situation, they were understanding the
 21 numbers and putting their assessment in place, working
 22 out the — if you recall from the last session of
 23 evidence, we looked at the kind of — "not just bodies
 24 but the right people" was — or words to that effect,
 25 was one of the email chains. They had a logical and

1 sensible approach to defining what they needed and how
 2 they were going to go about getting it.
 3 Q. Now, moving on to the DCLG's deployment, if we go,
 4 please, to {CLG00018936/2}, this is an email at 10.09 on
 5 15 June from Toby Gould to John Bentham:
 6 "John,
 7 "We don't think it would be particularly effective
 8 to deploy to RBKC Borough Emergency Control Centre.
 9 Previously it's worked best being located at SOR and/or
 10 having a clear line of contact with the CEO/his direct
 11 office. That way you can have the overall SCG
 12 picture/access to MPS and others, but know you can
 13 discuss direct with the LA CEO or his team when
 14 required."
 15 Were you made aware yourself, Mr Hetherington, that
 16 DCLG's RED had enquired about a government liaison
 17 officer, GLO, being deployed to RBKC on that morning but
 18 were advised against it by Toby Gould?
 19 A. No, I wasn't made aware of that, and nor have I ever
 20 seen them deployed direct to the ground in other
 21 incidents either.
 22 Q. Right. Are you able to explain the rationale for the
 23 advice being given here?
 24 A. So Toby is looking at precedent there, and it is usual
 25 that a DCLG RED officer, so their resilience and

1 emergencies division, so a government liaison officer,
 2 would come and be either physically present within the
 3 special operations room or be a standing member of the
 4 SCG, so that they have the information from all of the
 5 agencies that they need to speak to there.
 6 Q. Right. But what about going into the BECC? Would there
 7 be a precedent for a GLO going into an LA's BECC?
 8 A. I've never seen that before.
 9 Q. Right.
 10 Now, SRO stands for special operations room.
 11 A. That is correct.
 12 Q. And that was at Lambeth.
 13 A. That's correct.
 14 Q. That's the MPS's facility there.
 15 A. That's correct, yes, which serves for all agencies.
 16 Q. Indeed. Yes.
 17 Then let's go, please, next to {LFB00061313}. You
 18 can see that at 10.01, second email down on the page,
 19 Philip James to Toby Gould, copied to Leanne Grimes at
 20 LFB and RED, and there are queries raised here by
 21 Nicholas Hurd, who was Minister of State for Policing
 22 and the Fire Service. The first point is that:
 23 "... [he] has raised with us the offer the
 24 Post Office have made to issue money to residents from
 25 the tower [who have no access to cash]."

1 And look at point 2 below that:
 2 "We have heard from some of the residents who spent
 3 the night in the rest centre saying how there was very
 4 little or in some cases no bedding and pillows. Can you
 5 confirm that you have organisations such as the
 6 Red Cross and the Samaritans involved and that there
 7 will be better sleeping facilities tonight?"
 8 The third {LFB00061313/2}:
 9 "... DCLG press office [offer] to support K&C comms
 10 teams ..."
 11 Now, that email, as we can see from the email above
 12 it on page 1 {LFB00061313/1}, please, is forwarded by
 13 Toby Gould to Mark Sawyer and Nicholas Holgate at 10.16,
 14 and it says:
 15 "Nicholas, Mark,
 16 "A positive response to DCLG's questions below would
 17 be appreciated.
 18 "Nicholas, if you would like to appoint someone to
 19 be their main point of contact for you rather than
 20 through us please let me know."
 21 Now, first question for you, Mr Hetherington: were
 22 you made aware on 15 June that Nicholas Hurd, the
 23 Minister of State for Policing and the Fire Service, had
 24 relayed concerns about the sleeping facilities for those
 25 at the Westway Centre?

9

1 A. No.
 2 Q. Should you have been?
 3 A. If it hadn't been a completed action by the time I came
 4 in at 2.30 or hadn't been raised directly to RBKC to
 5 provide a response, then, yes, I would expect to. But
 6 as you can see here, I think this is -- Toby's making
 7 all efforts to get in touch directly, bearing in mind at
 8 this stage we were expecting Mark Sawyer to be going
 9 into RBKC for the day to support them.
 10 Q. Yes.
 11 A. He's trying two lines of approach to both Mark and
 12 Nicholas to raise this to them.
 13 Q. Were you made aware of DCLG's press office offer to
 14 RBKC?
 15 A. No.
 16 Q. Should you have been?
 17 A. No, not necessarily. I wouldn't have expected that
 18 level of detail to be contained in a handover,
 19 especially if RBKC had either taken up the offer -- it
 20 was made at 10 o'clock in the morning, so I would have
 21 expected, within the subsequent four hours, the
 22 logistics to have been arranged as to how that offer
 23 would have been taken up.
 24 Q. Now, if we go to {LFB00061319}, again, we go to an email
 25 at 16.20, top of the chain. That's on 15 June. This is

10

1 from Toby Gould to Stuart Turner, copied to Mark Sawyer
 2 and to you, and it says:
 3 "Thanks.
 4 "Mark, from the HASG I wasn't clear about the
 5 intentions and numbers of people involved (the line was
 6 terrible), but if the cordons will remain for days to
 7 come I don't think it would be appropriate for evacuees
 8 to stay in the rest centre overnight for a number of
 9 nights. It sounded as though there may be pressure on
 10 the rooms they already have people in now if hotels
 11 already have those rooms booked for the weekend.
 12 "I appreciate they are working as hard as they can
 13 and rightly prioritising the vulnerable, and have
 14 possibly already considered this, but if there is a
 15 possible option re. the offer from the business sector
 16 panel we should explore that route.
 17 "Don Randall said he just needs numbers, duration
 18 etc. to put the request to the hotel sector."
 19 And it continues in that vein.
 20 My question for you is: was it clear to you by this
 21 point that there was a problem with emergency
 22 accommodation?
 23 A. Well, I was copied in to this email, so I would have
 24 been aware of this email at the time, but again I think
 25 there's options within it -- so there's an identified

11

1 problem with accommodation, but also a route to try and
 2 solve it at this point.
 3 Q. Yes, and what were you doing about that? What was your
 4 role in relation to dealing with this information?
 5 A. So it wasn't my role at this stage. I was -- by this
 6 time, so we were at 4 o'clock, just after 4 o'clock,
 7 I would have been in SOR, working to the MPS
 8 Gold Commander, who would have still been the SCG chair
 9 at this stage.
 10 Q. Right. But you were copied in to this; what did you
 11 think your function was in relation to the information
 12 being provided here?
 13 A. So a cc generally tends to be for information, to keep
 14 you apprised of the situation. So it was copied to
 15 Stuart Turner and Tom Brady, who were both working
 16 within the London Local Authority Co-ordination Centre
 17 at that stage, and would have been in close contact with
 18 RBKC BECC. So my understanding is that this is Toby
 19 speaking to Stuart and Tom, looking to get information
 20 either through RBKC BECC or as a result of the
 21 working -- close working with the humanitarian
 22 assistance steering group, to finalise those numbers and
 23 put an approach to the business sector to seek further
 24 hotels.
 25 Q. Let's go to {LFB00061230}, please. This is an email

12

1 from you to Nicholas Holgate at 17.44, where you say in
 2 the second line:
 3 "MPS [Commander], Neil Jerome would like to speak to
 4 you, what is the best number and most convenient time
 5 for you?"
 6 That's then followed up by an email about half
 7 an hour later at {LFB00061233}, where you send a message
 8 to Hamish Cameron and Toby Gould, copied to Steve Hamm:
 9 "Sorry to be the bearer of bad news. Just had a
 10 chat with MPS Gold following his private call with
 11 Nicholas. The Mayor was mobbed on scene earlier, there
 12 is a community meeting later today which is showing
 13 concerns of civil unrest, he is therefore not satisfied
 14 any more to be handing over to recovery tomorrow."
 15 Then let's look at the next one in the chain at
 16 {LFB00061227}. This is from you at 18.33 the previous
 17 day, which I think we looked at before, and you say
 18 there, in the second sentence in the first paragraph:
 19 "I think by Friday we will be handed over to
 20 recovery so that call should go ahead, I think it needs
 21 to with the Trooping the colour and other events over
 22 the weekend."
 23 Now, you will recall that from evidence last week.
 24 A. Yes. Just to clarify on this chain, this chain -- so
 25 every Friday, we have a partnership call at 12.30, so we

13

1 bring together all partners regardless. It will happen
 2 this week, next week, every week, and has been happening
 3 since the Olympics. That's the call that we're talking
 4 about there on Friday.
 5 So Hamish, if you see in the email below, is saying,
 6 "Shall we continue with the 1230 Friday call", and
 7 because there are other events going on in London, such
 8 as the heatwave, Trooping the Colour, we felt it prudent
 9 to carry on and speak to partners.
 10 I think the overarching email there that I'm talking
 11 about was, as you'd expect with an operation, once the
 12 operation phase has finished, so the site has stabilised
 13 somewhat and the fire is out, we would look to hand over
 14 to recovery as soon as possible.
 15 Q. Right.
 16 A. So that was all intentions working through the -- from
 17 the Wednesday night into Thursday, through the Thursday.
 18 If you recall some of the other emails we talked about
 19 was RBKC putting their structures in place ready to take
 20 over for the recovery. So that's what we were aiming
 21 towards on the Friday handover from the SCG to the
 22 recovery (inaudible) --
 23 Q. Right. So you were aiming for a transfer to recovery by
 24 the Friday?
 25 A. That's correct, yes.

14

1 Q. Right.
 2 Then if we go to {LFB00061233}, which we've just
 3 been looking at, and you refer there to your discussion
 4 with MPS Gold -- that's Neil Jerome.
 5 A. That's correct.
 6 Q. Yes -- after he'd spoken to Nicholas Holgate.
 7 Was there anything in addition to what you call
 8 concerns of civil unrest following your conversation
 9 with Commander Jerome that had led to the decision to
 10 delay the recovery phase?
 11 A. No, it was that -- there's kind of two aspects to the
 12 incident: there's the scale and then the complexity.
 13 The scale remained unchanged, we knew the numbers that
 14 we were dealing with by now, but what was becoming more
 15 and more difficult was the complexity, and this notion
 16 of civil unrest which was growing throughout the
 17 Thursday afternoon and into the Friday.
 18 Q. So that made it more complex?
 19 A. That made it more complex, yes.
 20 Q. And that led to the delay in the recovery phase
 21 starting?
 22 A. Absolutely, yes.
 23 Q. Right, I see.
 24 Then the final topic on the events of 15 June I want
 25 to explore with you are the discussions relating to the

15

1 activation of the LLAG arrangements.
 2 Now, just to recap and to clarify, the Gold
 3 resolution we looked at on Thursday. Now, we looked at
 4 appendix A -- we don't need to go back to it -- and we
 5 also looked at the mutual aid memorandum and, I think,
 6 the circular from 2011, but there are two more documents
 7 I think we need to look at to complete the story.
 8 Can I ask you, please, to go to {LFB00061167}.
 9 These are proposed clarifications to the Gold resolution
 10 and arrangements for mutual aid dated 13 July 2010 by
 11 Doug Flight.
 12 If we go to page 5 in that document {LFB00061167/5},
 13 under "Major Incidents" at paragraph 8, fourth line
 14 down, it refers to section 138, and the fourth line down
 15 it says:
 16 "The current gold resolution authorises Local
 17 Authority Gold to discharge functions under
 18 section 138(1) on behalf of the Councils following the
 19 convening of the Strategic Co-ordinating Group (Gold
 20 Command) called to respond to an incident requiring a
 21 'Level 2' response (defined as a single site or
 22 wide-area disruptive challenge which required
 23 a co-ordinated response by relevant agencies). This is
 24 the trigger mechanism for Local Authority Gold to be
 25 able to exercise their 'executive' powers."

16

1 The word "executive" there is in quotation marks.
 2 Do you know what those executive powers are or were
 3 to be?
 4 A. I think as we discussed on Thursday, it's the ability to
 5 incur expenditure.
 6 Q. Right.
 7 Then if we go, please, to paragraphs 15 and 16, on
 8 page 7 {LFB00061167/7}, "Ability to Respond to
 9 Emergencies":
 10 "There may be exceptional circumstances where it
 11 could become appropriate for Local Authority Gold to be
 12 able to respond to incidents and exercise delegated
 13 powers where Gold Command has not been convened, for
 14 example in the event of extreme and disruptive weather
 15 or other events. The point in such 'rising-tide' events
 16 at which the full Local Authority Gold arrangements may
 17 need to be implemented will not be clear at the outset.
 18 Nor would it be triggered by the convening of
 19 a police-led Gold Command. To cover this eventuality
 20 and any unforeseen events, a process has been developed
 21 which permits the full Gold powers to be triggered in
 22 the absence of a police-led Gold Command being
 23 established, but only where certain procedures are
 24 complied with to give the Councils comfort that use of
 25 the delegated powers by Local Authority Gold will only

17

1 be operated in exceptional circumstances and where
 2 absolutely necessary."
 3 And then it goes on at 16:
 4 "In these circumstances, before Local Authority Gold
 5 can exercise powers under section 138 ... a London
 6 Partnership meeting (which is normally led by the
 7 Government Office for London) will need to have been
 8 convened and, additionally, the prior agreement of
 9 London Councils, on behalf of the Boroughs, will need to
 10 have been obtained. In practice, London Councils will
 11 be consulted and its approval will need to be given
 12 before Local Authority Gold is able to exercise any
 13 delegated powers. Approval is sought for this power to
 14 be delegated to the Chief Executive of London Councils
 15 in consultation with the Leaders (or their deputies) of
 16 each of the three main political parties. The power of
 17 Local Authority Gold to incur any expenditure would be
 18 subject to further controls as set out below."
 19 And then it goes on about the discretion to incur
 20 expenditure.
 21 Now, you say that executive powers were powers to
 22 spend money; is that correct in the circumstances of 15
 23 and 16, which tend to suggest that it might be a little
 24 bit wider than that?
 25 A. So my reading of paragraphs 15 and 16 is that they speak

18

1 to -- so the Gold resolution came in in 2004, alongside
 2 the Civil Contingencies Act, for a way in which local
 3 authorities could work together, given the close
 4 proximity in London. In 2010, on the back of the
 5 experience from the snow and grit, as I mentioned
 6 before, where they had to respond when there wasn't
 7 an SCG because it wasn't deemed necessary by the police,
 8 and because we had changed from regional government
 9 offices, we had lost that level 2 descriptor to
 10 an emergency, so they were saying that they could still
 11 act in a rising tide emergency without the invocation of
 12 an SCG where there was permission from the councils to
 13 do so.
 14 Q. Now, on Thursday last week, when you and I were
 15 examining this together, we looked at the 17.30 call
 16 which took place on 14 June. Was there agreement of all
 17 local authorities for the delegation, as these
 18 paragraphs suggest here?
 19 A. So the agreement was sought in 2010/2011 that they all
 20 signed up to it. It is then for the agreement of the
 21 affected local authority to ask for that support.
 22 So my understanding, unless it is a London-wide,
 23 I don't think this is saying that all local authorities
 24 need to be asked as to whether or not they can convene
 25 the LLAG arrangements in an incident. Where it is

19

1 affecting a borough, it is for that borough to ask.
 2 Q. Well, that's not what it suggests, is it? 16 rather
 3 suggests that in each and every incident a London
 4 Partnership meeting would need to be convened, the prior
 5 agreement of London Councils would need to be obtained,
 6 and London Councils need to be consulted and approved of
 7 before Local Authority Gold is able to exercise any
 8 delegated powers.
 9 A. So a partnership meeting is a term that we use in lieu
 10 of an SCG. So if -- to give you an example, on the
 11 thunderstorms that we had last summer, where no agency
 12 was declaring it a major incident and it wasn't
 13 a police-led incident, we hold what we term
 14 a partnership meeting, which we would chair as London
 15 Resilience Group, to pull together organisations for
 16 situational awareness. That's where it says -- and
 17 bearing in mind when this was written, we still had the
 18 government offices for London and other parts of the
 19 country as well. So a London Partnership meeting, which
 20 is normally led by the government office for London, so
 21 that was their role before we took over at London
 22 Resilience team and then subsequently London Resilience
 23 Group.
 24 Q. Was discussion of the delegation and exercise of
 25 delegated powers the basis of the 17.30 call, the

20

1 5.30 pm call, on 14 June?
 2 A. On the 14th, it was what support Nicholas Holgate needed
 3 as the lead local authority to the response and the
 4 Gold Commander for RBKC.
 5 Q. Right. What happened on that call, to the best of your
 6 recollection, constitutionally within these paragraphs
 7 or other parts of appendix B, as contemplated by these
 8 arrangements? Was there any discussion of these
 9 arrangements at all?
 10 A. Not in the way that I think you're looking at, but there
 11 were questions as to what resources Nicholas Holgate
 12 needed, which is where the discussions came around the
 13 City of London providing two press officers and London
 14 Borough of Southwark providing two officers -- senior
 15 officers with experience from Lakanal and the recent
 16 London Bridge. It was more the -- what support do you
 17 need, as a single borough, from the rest of London,
 18 which is part of these arrangements.
 19 Q. These arrangements don't, I don't think -- is this
 20 right? -- contemplate that it would be simply left to
 21 a chief executive to decide for him or herself to
 22 trigger London Gold. There seems to be more to it than
 23 that. Or is that wrong?
 24 A. I think that's wrong. The decision around -- the
 25 agreement to the London Gold arrangements was made by

21

1 each of the council elected membership, so it had to go
 2 to a meeting of full council or equivalent or however it
 3 was determined, but that was in peacetime back in 2010
 4 and 2011 and took a period of a year for all of the
 5 boroughs to sign up to it. Once that agreement had been
 6 made -- and London Councils, I believe, are the
 7 organisation who hold all of those signatures in time --
 8 then the London Gold arrangements are binding, which
 9 says that boroughs will endeavour to provide mutual aid
 10 support to each other where requested, and that there is
 11 a power vested in a single local authority chief
 12 executive, London Local Authority Gold, to commit
 13 expenditure in response to an emergency.
 14 SIR MARTIN MOORE--BICK: Just help me with this, would you:
 15 you identify Mr Holgate's request for support from other
 16 boroughs by the provision of manpower, in effect.
 17 A. Yes.
 18 SIR MARTIN MOORE--BICK: That doesn't require anything to be
 19 done under section 138, does it?
 20 A. Not at that time, not unless they're invoking it.
 21 I would imagine RBKC were spending way and above outside
 22 of what they had usually budgeted. It would have
 23 been -- they were paying for hotels, et cetera,
 24 et cetera, so that is --
 25 SIR MARTIN MOORE--BICK: Well, that's a matter for RBKC,

22

1 isn't it?
 2 A. RBKC, yeah.
 3 SIR MARTIN MOORE--BICK: And they can get mutual support by
 4 asking other boroughs to provide manpower in the form of
 5 press officers or housing officers or whatever.
 6 A. Yes.
 7 SIR MARTIN MOORE--BICK: So at the moment I don't see how
 8 section 138 comes into play, which is the subject of the
 9 Gold resolution.
 10 A. But the Gold resolution also is underpinned by the
 11 mutual aid agreement as well.
 12 SIR MARTIN MOORE--BICK: Ah, that's where we look for it, is
 13 it?
 14 A. Well, it's part of the Gold resolution, is that the
 15 boroughs have agreed to a memorandum of understanding of
 16 mutual aid, and that's their agreement to endeavour to
 17 provide support through staffing or services to other
 18 local authorities as and when requested. The mutual aid
 19 agreement puts that in one of its first paragraphs,
 20 I think.
 21 SIR MARTIN MOORE--BICK: All right, thank you very much.
 22 MR MILLETT: Let's go to {LFB00061225}. This is the email
 23 that we saw on Thursday from you at 18.58, which was the
 24 short précis of your call at 15.30 with Nicholas Holgate
 25 which you send to him.

23

1 If we go, please, to the section "Immediate and
 2 longer term support", in the third chunk, about a third
 3 of the way down your screen, and the last paragraph of
 4 that says -- well, actually I can pick it up two lines
 5 down in it. It says:
 6 "If requested by the Leader of RBKC, London Councils
 7 may make an approach to political leaders across London
 8 to provide political support to RBKC but it was
 9 recognised this is a small network of people able to act
 10 in this capacity and a delicate subject."
 11 What did you mean by that?
 12 A. So if I recall, this was something that Chris Naylor had
 13 raised on the call around providing support to the way
 14 in which councillors were operating on the ground, and
 15 provide a peer network to councillors themselves.
 16 Q. Why was political support needed?
 17 A. Well, all manner of support was being provided. I think
 18 it was creating a network so that they didn't feel like
 19 they were on their own.
 20 Q. Well, you use the word "political". Political leaders
 21 to provide political support. What's political support?
 22 A. Well, support to the politicians, either a friendly face
 23 or experience of having dealt with something similar
 24 themselves, or just a peer support amongst the
 25 politicians in London.

24

1 Q. Why was it delicate? Why was it a delicate subject?
 2 A. I don't know. Well, I suspect it was a delicate subject
 3 at the time. London is a majoritively Labour
 4 constituent base and this is a Conservative council.
 5 We'd just been on the back of a general election where
 6 the MP had changed from a Conservative to Labour
 7 politician , and sometimes in these networks --- already
 8 the press had kind of looked to interview a number of
 9 the political leaders either at the scene, so it was
 10 just seen as a delicate subject for them.
 11 Q. So party political ?
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. Was there already criticism of RBKC out there?
 14 A. I think it was starting to swell by the Wednesday
 15 afternoon/Wednesday evening when we were coming to get
 16 there, yes.
 17 Q. Now, let's then go, please, to {LFB00119268}, which
 18 I think we looked at earlier . We've seen emails about
 19 the LLACC being stood up on 14 June, and we looked at
 20 those before, and it was officially opened on the
 21 morning of the 15th at 8.15 in the morning.
 22 Is it the case that there was a hybrid situation in
 23 play on the 14th, LLACC not officially open but stood
 24 up?
 25 A. Yes, that's correct .

25

1 Q. Yes. Was that because it was anticipated by London
 2 Resilience that RBKC would activate the LLAG
 3 arrangements; yes?
 4 A. Yes, or there would be requests for mutual aid, yes.
 5 Q. Let's go to {LFB00061234}. If you go to these emails,
 6 please, these are between the BECC and LLACC.
 7 If we can start, please, on page 2 {LFB00061234/2},
 8 16.34, 15 June, questions for BECC, and there they are.
 9 This was sent by LFB LAC1 to the BECC, "OFFICIAL: For
 10 Action":
 11 "Good afternoon
 12 "I am your liaison officer ... "
 13 This comes from Gillian Maxwell; do you see that?
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. The questions are four-fold, and the fourth one is:
 16 "With regard to assistance from boroughs, please can
 17 you be giving some serious thought to what you are
 18 likely to be needing over the next 24/48 hrs and over
 19 the weekend as the closer we get to the weekend the
 20 harder it will be for this to be facilitated ."
 21 Was that normal practice in an emergency, namely for
 22 the LLACC to be asking the responding authority
 23 questions like that? Was that normal?
 24 A. Well, I think we were trying to assist them in getting
 25 some foresight. We're getting towards the end of the

26

1 working day for most other local authorities in London,
 2 so to get some form of request out that they can be
 3 thinking about. This is now the Thursday, so we were
 4 trying to be pre-emptive in terms of what support they
 5 would need over a longer period of time and be on the
 6 front foot in terms of what they're requesting.
 7 Q. Yes. But at this point there had been no decision by
 8 Nicholas Holgate to invoke the London Gold, and you were
 9 still in a hybrid situation . Would it be normal, while
 10 the LLACC was stood up but not yet activated, for it to
 11 be asking questions of this nature: what are you likely
 12 to be needing over the next 24 to 48 hours?
 13 A. Yes, I think we're trying to be supportive, and that's
 14 part of our role, to try and help get the boroughs to
 15 that position .
 16 Q. Yes. What underlies my question is: was there
 17 an indication at that time that RBKC was floundering?
 18 A. Not necessarily floundering, but I think it would be ---
 19 it would be difficult for a borough to sustain that
 20 level of operations over a continued and longer period
 21 of time. So we were trying to get on the front foot so
 22 that --- push them into thinking: what are you going to
 23 need in the future so we can start to ask for it now, so
 24 that it can come in good order.
 25 Q. Now, if we then go to page 2, the top email, the

27

1 response from BECC at 17.03 to question 4:
 2 "Over the next 24/48 hours: availability of:
 3 "a) LALO.
 4 "b) Rest centre managers.
 5 "c) Rest centre teams.
 6 "d) Emergency planning staff."
 7 You see that?
 8 A. Yes.
 9 Q. It gives the official line that there are so many
 10 donations that they don't have any more capacity, that
 11 may change, and directs enquiries to the RBKC website in
 12 respect of monetary donations and other things.
 13 Now, if we go to page 1 {LFB00061234/1}, please,
 14 last email on page 1, Gillian Maxwell from the LLACC
 15 replies at 17.14, confirming that contact will be
 16 made --- do you see that? --- to boroughs for staff.
 17 Then if you go to the second email down from the
 18 BECC:
 19 "Hi Gillian ,
 20 "1. In response to your query below we would require
 21 2 shifts i.e. day and night shift (with stand by and on
 22 scene) hence we need 4 of each i.e. LALO, rest centre
 23 managers and teams and EP staff. Could you please
 24 coordinate this on our behalf?
 25 "2. For tonight have you got 2 BECC officers to work

28

1 from 9:00pm to 8:00am tonight?"
 2 You see that?
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. Now, that was then forwarded on to you by
 5 Gillian Maxwell at 17.45, which is where it comes to
 6 you, "Information just received"; right? At the top.
 7 A. Yes, that's correct.
 8 Q. Do you see that?
 9 A. Yeah.
 10 Q. My question, having shown you all of that, is: did you
 11 consider this to be the first request for mutual aid
 12 from the council?
 13 A. Yes.
 14 Q. You did.
 15 In your first statement -- we don't need to go to
 16 it -- page 23 {LFB00061158/23}, paragraph 73, you say
 17 that you sought authority from Chris Naylor, who was the
 18 duty LLAG, before a request was then made to all
 19 boroughs. Why was that procedural step necessary?
 20 A. It's to keep LLAG informed, so that they know what
 21 mutual aid is going where, and to provide us as the
 22 co-ordination centre, rather than it being -- as
 23 I mentioned, we're not a decision-maker -- to get
 24 authority so we can go out to all of the boroughs to ask
 25 for that. It was a quick process in this instance;

29

1 I think it was 10 minutes from receipt to then being
 2 made -- or 12 minutes -- to all boroughs in London.
 3 Q. Right.
 4 You say in your statement at paragraph 75 at page 23
 5 {LFB00061158/23} that it was becoming more apparent
 6 throughout the afternoon and into the evening of 15 June
 7 that LLAG activation was going to take place in order to
 8 provide greater support to RBKC.
 9 A. Yes.
 10 Q. There it is now on the screen in front of you.
 11 In what way was it becoming more apparent, at least
 12 to you?
 13 A. So as I mentioned earlier, the complexity of the
 14 incident was changing. There was -- if we consider it
 15 like a policing model, where you police by consent,
 16 local authorities responding by consent of the
 17 population wasn't necessarily happening. This was
 18 a different type of incident, where those that were
 19 trying to respond were also those that were being held
 20 to account for it, and it was making it increasingly
 21 difficult for them. And the complexity of the incident
 22 and the number of areas of response -- the donations
 23 were continuing to grow, which was an area that they had
 24 to respond to, and the kind of expansion of the walkways
 25 and not getting access back to property that you would

30

1 expect normally very quickly. A rest centre open more
 2 than a few hours or 12 hours is quite a rarity. So this
 3 kind of growing length of issue was -- or kind of
 4 problem for them was adding to the complexity.
 5 Q. Right. So it sounds from that answer that there were
 6 a number of factors which to your mind meant it -- is
 7 this right? -- was increasingly inevitable that LLAG
 8 would be triggered in some way. Those are the factors
 9 you have just set out.
 10 A. Yes, that RBKC would require greater support in
 11 responding to this, yes.
 12 Q. Was there any particular dominant factor in the list you
 13 have just given us?
 14 A. No, I think it was an amalgam of all of them.
 15 Q. Right.
 16 {LFB00061219/12} next, please, this is your logbook
 17 entry for 15 June at 18.39. You can see there at 18.39,
 18 at the foot of the screen:
 19 "Call from Mark to explain the rationale for the
 20 LLAG activation."
 21 I think that says. Am I right?
 22 A. Yes, that's correct.
 23 Q. Yes.
 24 Now, you say in your statement -- we don't need to
 25 go to it -- paragraph 76 on page 24 {LFB00061158/24},

31

1 that the rationale is documented in your email to
 2 Toby Gould and Hamish Cameron at 19.02.
 3 Let's go to that, then, linking the two documents
 4 through your statement, {LFB00061236}, and you say
 5 there:
 6 "Evening all,
 7 "In light of the increasing complexity of the
 8 incident, the recent request for mutual aid from RBKC
 9 and a number of other factors, the decision has been
 10 taken to activate LLAG to own the incident and support
 11 directly RBKC.
 12 "Current plan that as of tomorrow morning
 13 Paul Martin (Wandsworth) will go into RBKC to support
 14 LLAG and three other Chief Executives will be made
 15 available to support aspects of the response.
 16 "Hopefully the next email will contain better news!"
 17 Now, first, the number of other factors, are those
 18 the factors that you have just described to us?
 19 A. Yes.
 20 Q. Thank you.
 21 Who was it who made the decision to activate LLAG?
 22 A. It was a request from Nicholas Holgate, as I understand.
 23 Q. Yes, it was a request, but who made the decision to
 24 activate it? You say it's the same thing, do you?
 25 A. Yes. I don't know that answer.

32

1 Q. Would it be inevitable that when a chief executive asked
 2 for LLAG to be triggered, LLAG would respond?
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. Right.
 5 Let's go, then, to your second statement
 6 {LFB00119130/32}, please, paragraph 101. You say there:
 7 "Once the scope of the incident and the need for
 8 wider support to assist with the increase in community
 9 tensions and the recovery process became more apparent
 10 it became appropriate for RBKC to officially request the
 11 support of LLAG in leading the coordination of the
 12 incident and in establishing a new command structure.
 13 That process was put in motion on the evening of 15 June
 14 2017 and LLAG was formally activated in the early
 15 afternoon of 16 June 2017."
 16 Was there a particular reason why LLAG could not be
 17 activated immediately when Nicholas Holgate requested it
 18 on the evening of 15 June?
 19 A. I don't know. I think it was -- the complexity required
 20 some level of assessment to go in, so that people
 21 understood exactly what it was they were taking on in
 22 that capacity as London Local Authority Gold.
 23 Q. Why is that, given that Mark Sawyer had been at RBKC, at
 24 the Town Hall, from 8.00 am that morning?
 25 A. I don't know.

1 Q. You don't know.
 2 I mean, is that you speculating, when you say,
 3 "I think it was the complexity required"? Do you
 4 actually know why there was a delay or are you just
 5 giving your view of it now?
 6 A. I'm just giving my view as I understood, that there was
 7 that growing complexity and the need to undertake some
 8 form of assessment.
 9 Q. What form of assessment was undertaken?
 10 A. I think that the chief executives going in wanted to see
 11 for themselves what was in place and make it a managed
 12 and orderly assumption of that control, co-ordination.
 13 Q. Pushing then later into the evening of 15 June,
 14 {LFB00061238}. This is an email from you to Toby Gould,
 15 Hamish Cameron and Steve Hamm, to tell them of
 16 a conversation you'd had with Emma Strain, who was the
 17 assistant director external relations at the GLA, and
 18 your email refers to City Hall's concerns regarding
 19 grip, again, we can see that.
 20 If you go, please, to the second paragraph, you
 21 explain what happened in the call:
 22 "Given the concerns at City Hall regarding the grip
 23 on the situation at RBKC she has said that if we have
 24 further issues to raise then we can do so through her
 25 which will be passed through David Bellamy, anonymously

1 if needed.
 2 "Obviously this will be sensitive, so not a wish
 3 list of gripes but just to make you all aware we have
 4 that avenue should it be required."
 5 Had you been told what City Hall's concerns were
 6 about RBKC at that time?
 7 A. I think it was the changing media approach to the RBKC
 8 situation, and, like I say there, the grip, which is, as
 9 we discussed earlier, quite a wide-ranging term, but the
 10 control and exertion that RBKC were having on the
 11 situation.
 12 Q. Right. And what were those concerns specifically?
 13 A. I can't remember exactly.
 14 Q. Then we go to {LFB00061240}. This is an email from you
 15 at 22.04 to Toby Gould, Hamish Cameron, Matthew Hogan
 16 and Steve Hamm, "Overnight update":
 17 "No significant change to the situation."
 18 And then if you go about halfway down the email, you
 19 can see you say this:
 20 "LLAG Activation -- This will not take place before
 21 13.00 most likely. John B [John Barradell] will go to
 22 RBKC to see what he is signing up to before he
 23 officially activates LLAG. Mark is currently in RBKC
 24 trying to help they set out their stall.
 25 "My take on this, spoken briefly to Hamish, we can

1 use this to show a support to mutual aid through the
 2 LLACC and potentially reduce commitment to Recovery and
 3 HA. Mark's requests of us have diminished now that he
 4 has spent a day in RBKC and understands the frustrations
 5 and the dangers of getting embroiled in sorting out
 6 a larger numbers of problems for them."
 7 Why did John Barradell, to your understanding, need
 8 to see what he was signing up to before officially
 9 activating LLAG?
 10 A. Because he needed to understand what it was. So John
 11 wasn't the official LLAG at that time. I think there
 12 was almost a potential that this was getting beyond what
 13 the London Local Authority Gold arrangements were, where
 14 a single chief executive was representing on behalf of
 15 local government views.
 16 Q. Right. You told us earlier when I asked you that if
 17 a chief executive asked for LLAG to be activated, LLAG
 18 would inevitably respond. Was it to your understanding
 19 that John Barradell might not, he might say no?
 20 A. No, I don't think he was ever in the position or would
 21 have said no, I think he just wanted to understand what
 22 the scale and complexity was that he was going into, and
 23 what it was that would be needed to be done, how much
 24 support was required around that.
 25 Q. But in the meantime, LLAG would not be operating; it

1 would be RBKC in control; yes?
 2 A. Yes.
 3 Q. Why would it be necessary to have that limbo period
 4 pending John Barradell working out what was needed? Why
 5 not go in straight away after activation and work it out
 6 at that stage?
 7 A. Well, it doesn't make sense just to rush in and then
 8 have that paucity of working out what it is you're going
 9 to do at that point either.
 10 Q. Does it not, given that RBKC was now being criticised
 11 from all sides in its handling, which had partly
 12 necessitated the invocation of LLAG in the first place?
 13 A. I think it's probably six of one and half a dozen of the
 14 other. It was trying to get a good start to the LLAG
 15 arrangements coming in, and understanding the exact
 16 extent to which they're operating in.
 17 Q. Right.
 18 Now, you see you say:
 19 "John B will go to RBKC to see what he is signing up
 20 to before he officially activates LLAG."
 21 Is that right? Was it within his power officially
 22 to activate LLAG, or was that left simply to the request
 23 by Nicholas Holgate as the chief executive?
 24 A. Nicholas. I think this is probably my sloppy use of
 25 English at quite a late time in the evening.

1 Q. Right. Was there a sense in your mind that LLAG were
 2 nervous, reluctant perhaps, to get involved, having been
 3 asked?
 4 A. No, I don't think they were nervous or reluctant, and
 5 I think that's shown by the level of support that did go
 6 in on the Friday.
 7 MR MILLETT: Now, you say in your first statement,
 8 paragraph --
 9 SIR MARTIN MOORE--BICK: Sorry, before we leave this email,
 10 I have to say that the tenor of that paragraph beginning
 11 "LLAG Activation" leaves me with the impression that
 12 you, and perhaps John Barradell, thought that he was
 13 going to go in and take over; in other words, decide
 14 what should be done, deploy resources, take it out of
 15 the hands of Mr Holgate. Is that how you understood it?
 16 A. This is quite a unique set of circumstances. So this is
 17 where the arrangements that we have to respond to any
 18 emergency need a degree of flexibility in what we can
 19 do, and I think we probably pushed the boundaries, both
 20 of the LLAG arrangements and what we were asking
 21 individuals to do in terms of come in and support in
 22 such a large-scale incident, and almost run the show for
 23 Nicholas Holgate in response.
 24 SIR MARTIN MOORE--BICK: Well, you've used two interesting
 25 words there: one is "support" and the other is "almost"

1 run the show.
 2 A. Yeah.
 3 SIR MARTIN MOORE--BICK: I mean, there is a distinction,
 4 isn't there, between providing support and taking over,
 5 and I just wanted to understand how you and maybe others
 6 saw the position.
 7 A. So you never take over the whole council. There was --
 8 as I said previously, there's other functions that take
 9 place.
 10 SIR MARTIN MOORE--BICK: Of course.
 11 A. But that control and response to the incident was
 12 becoming more pressing that I don't think Nicholas could
 13 have managed it on his own, and needed that greater
 14 degree of experience in managing incidents that John
 15 had.
 16 SIR MARTIN MOORE--BICK: So who was nominally in charge?
 17 A. I don't know whether there's ... there is actually
 18 a nominally in charge, because you've then got the Royal
 19 Borough of Kensington and Chelsea and then what was
 20 formed in terms of the Grenfell fire response team, for
 21 which John was in charge of, that grew out of the --
 22 what was termed Gold. That emerged in the days after.
 23 SIR MARTIN MOORE--BICK: Thank you.
 24 Yes, Mr Millett.
 25 MR MILLETT: Yes.

1 Now, at paragraph 88 of your first statement,
 2 page 26 {LFB00061158/26}, you say that the LLAG
 3 arrangements were activated in the early afternoon of
 4 Friday, 16 June.
 5 Was the 19-hour delay between the decision being
 6 taken by Mr Holgate to invoke LLAG and the activation
 7 itself justified by any objective or rational criteria?
 8 A. I think it just -- it was indicative of where we were up
 9 to at that stage in the incident and working through it
 10 collectively, so that there was a full appreciation of
 11 what that LLAG role would be and what they needed to do
 12 when they took over. I can't answer that question,
 13 I'm afraid.
 14 Q. Well, you haven't, but perhaps you can answer this: from
 15 what you could see at the time, did that delay have any
 16 negative impact on the provision of emergency relief to
 17 those in need of it?
 18 A. Not that I'm aware of, but we can't repeat it and see
 19 what the impact would have been had it taken over at
 20 that time.
 21 Q. 16 June, Friday, let's move to that.
 22 {LFB00061219/16}, please. I'd like to show you this
 23 entry in your logbook on page 16 for that day. If you
 24 go, please, to 9.11 in the morning, at the top of the
 25 screen, it says:

1 "Call with Mark Sawyer regarding Chris Naylor's
 2 political concerns and potential need to ..."
 3 Is that "message" or "massage"?
 4 A. Message.
 5 Q. "... message political lead from London Councils."
 6 What does that entry mean?
 7 A. I can't remember the details of the call, but that would
 8 have been a discussion between Mark Sawyer and myself
 9 around Chris Naylor's political concerns and the need
 10 for -- I think what we were looking for is something
 11 from London Councils to send out a message to all of the
 12 political leads.
 13 Q. What were Chris Naylor's political concerns?
 14 A. I think they were still the same concerns that he had
 15 the other day around getting support to other
 16 politicians. I can't remember the exact details of what
 17 any further concerns would have been.
 18 Q. Right. What sort of message from London Councils did
 19 you have in mind, when you said "potential need to
 20 message political lead from London Councils"? What had
 21 you got in mind?
 22 A. I honestly can't remember. I don't know what that would
 23 have been.
 24 Q. Let's then turn to the HASG 16 June 2017.
 25 Well, let me just ask you, before I go there: was

1 there a sense of reluctance or trepidation, perhaps, of
 2 LLAG stepping into what might have been regarded by you
 3 at the time as a political minefield, or what had become
 4 one?
 5 A. Not that I'm aware of.
 6 Q. Did that account for the delay, nervousness of stepping
 7 into what had become politically delicate?
 8 A. I don't know, because I wasn't aware that -- it was
 9 a hugely politically charged situation, I think that's
 10 quite apparent for everybody to see, but I'm --
 11 I certainly have no indication that that was the cause
 12 of a delay at the time.
 13 Q. Yes.
 14 Let's go to the HASG, and there's a bit of
 15 background to this.
 16 There was a first meeting of the HASG by way of
 17 background on 15 June, attended by Mark Sawyer. If you
 18 go, please, to {LFB00061320}, this is an email to you on
 19 15 June, so the evening before, at 22.24. This is
 20 Toby Gould -- I'm sorry, I said Mark Sawyer; I meant
 21 Toby Gould -- email to you of that evening, and if you
 22 go to the fourth paragraph down, "HASG", he says:
 23 "I assume I'll pick up our lead on this in the
 24 morning/midday meeting. I'm turning to the composition
 25 now to try to make sure they have all the right

1 partnership people involved. Things look to be
 2 improving with H&F providing the secretariat but I'm not
 3 sure if any of the actions around establishing sub
 4 groups etc. have been progressed this afternoon. The
 5 first meeting was all over the place, short on various
 6 reps, terrible teleconference facilities, and I wasn't
 7 convinced they were given enough attention to v[ery]
 8 urgent business -- seemed to be more focussed on
 9 procedure and open questions than sorting out
 10 significant issues that are going on right now. On the
 11 plus side I think all of the voluntary and many other
 12 orgs are doing fantastic work getting on with the job on
 13 the ground."
 14 Was the activation of the HASG a fairly standard
 15 response for a local authority responding to a major
 16 incident?
 17 A. It was, but it was rare. An HASG wouldn't be stood up
 18 for a routine incident where a rest centre had been
 19 opened. It would have been to a -- probably on -- in
 20 the previous 12 months, the Croydon tram crash,
 21 Westminster terror attack and the London Bridge terror
 22 attack would have been the only occasions of an HASG.
 23 Q. Would you accept that it's a core function for a local
 24 authority?
 25 A. Yes, in their emergency response, yes.

1 Q. Yes, of course, in an emergency response.
 2 To your recollection, was the operation of the HASG
 3 ever practised during training sessions?
 4 A. Yes, so it had been practised through the Exercise
 5 Unified Responder the year before, in 2016.
 6 Q. Right. Were you concerned by what Toby Gould was
 7 telling you in this email that evening?
 8 A. Yes, it doesn't look a great start. As we've heard
 9 through the previous evidence, I don't think the
 10 humanitarian assistance lead officer was expecting to
 11 undertake that role or had the necessary support around
 12 them to be able to do that.
 13 Q. Did you do anything as a result of being told what we
 14 can see you were told by Toby Gould that evening?
 15 A. Not personally, because I knew Toby had -- the reason
 16 Toby is saying he's assuming he'll pick up the lead on
 17 this and had been involved was because he had supported
 18 the London Borough of Southwark 11/12 days previously
 19 through the London Bridge attack, so he had the
 20 experience and some of the networks into the voluntary
 21 sectors to make sure that they were engaged and
 22 supported, which is why he talked about trying to make
 23 sure that they have the right partnership people
 24 involved, because he already had those linkages or some
 25 of those linkages previously.

1 Q. I see. So is that why he offered to provide the
 2 secretariat to the HASG?
 3 A. That's correct.
 4 Q. I see.
 5 Then let's go, please, to {LFB00061327}. This is
 6 an email. If we go to the foot of page 1, please, you
 7 can see right at the very foot there's an email at 11.57
 8 from Donna Wootton at Ealing to a large number of
 9 recipients and copyees at the top of page 2
 10 {LFB00061327/2}, if we go to that, please. You are
 11 emailed, as well as Matthew Hogan and Toby Gould, as you
 12 can see, and she says:
 13 "Hi all,
 14 "Can I put in a request that either more resource or
 15 seniority is put into the LLACC Link role? I recognise
 16 priorities should be with RBKC and this is incredibly
 17 serious and dynamic incident but I personally am
 18 struggling a little bit here in getting any information
 19 or response to queries."
 20 Then she says:
 21 "The mutual aid requests are messy and complicated –
 22 and I recognise again it's a dynamic situation – but
 23 I've had to ask the LLACC 3 times to confirm a request
 24 and no one is answering emails or calls. I have
 25 multiple staff who are trained, competent and wish to

45

1 help but I'd also like assurance that briefings will be
 2 forthcoming, that a RVP isn't just 'the scene' and
 3 really just replies to emails. I've put aside today to
 4 brief and make sure all staff are ready to respond as
 5 best they can but I currently just have lots on standby
 6 unaware of their role. We're sending staff into really
 7 stressful environments and I just want to make sure they
 8 have all the information and access needed."
 9 Then the last line:
 10 "Apologies for this, in a stressful time, but as
 11 I said just a little extra resource would help us help
 12 RBKC to the best of our ability."
 13 Now, there are a couple of other confirmations along
 14 the same lines.
 15 If we go, please, to {LFB00061327/1}, this is
 16 an email from Twm Palmer, who is head of contingency at
 17 Hounslow, and Twm Palmer agrees with Donna Wootton's
 18 email. Again, you're copied in to this. It only comes
 19 about 9 minutes later:
 20 "All,
 21 "I agree.
 22 "Also, I want to mention the lack of timely
 23 information every day and lack of COP
 24 reports/Situational Awareness briefings, which would be
 25 very helpful here locally.

46

1 "I would also like to see the mutual aid be a little
 2 better and more efficiently coordinated, as it's been
 3 quite frustrating locally here too.
 4 "Echoing what Donna states below, and understand
 5 that you are doing a great job supporting this in
 6 a stressful time and a lot of us are willing to help."
 7 The response to that comes at the top of page 1, if
 8 we can just scroll up to that. You are a recipient of
 9 an email from Toby Gould:
 10 "Just checking who is responding.
 11 "They could be sent SCG minutes, STAC reports. The
 12 response on mutual aid is simply that we're having to
 13 process as and when we get them."
 14 Then if you go to {LFB00067778} — and there will be
 15 a question after all these documents — first email
 16 down, you respond at 16.04 to Twm Palmer at Hounslow and
 17 Donna Wootton at Ealing, and also Toby Gould,
 18 Matt Hogan, and copied to others:
 19 "Donna, all
 20 "Thank you for the email.
 21 "Hopefully the latest email from the Llacc provides
 22 you with an update you need. I appreciate your sense of
 23 a lack of information, rest assured had there been
 24 a risk from the plume we would have circulated that but
 25 have had to prioritise in ensuring the right information

47

1 verified and confirmed goes to those responding. We
 2 will work to make sure it is made more widely available,
 3 when there are significant changes to that released, as
 4 you can imagine there are some very difficult issues
 5 being dealt with that it would not necessarily
 6 appropriate to share on a more open basis."
 7 Then you say this:
 8 "With regards to mutual aid we are doing everything
 9 we can to clarify requests but until last night had not
 10 received any formal requests from RBKC."
 11 Just to finish this off, there's an email of 17 June
 12 at {LFB00061252}. So this is the Saturday now. This is
 13 where this ends up. Second paragraph:
 14 "Have there been any comments on our overall level
 15 of support? There was criticism of the mutual aid and
 16 llacc on Friday, I haven't got into the whole we are
 17 supporting other functions at the detriment of the llacc
 18 yet but one to be in our minds if it does come."
 19 Now, here is the question, having shown you all of
 20 that material: can you explain what you meant there by
 21 supporting other functions at the detriment of LLACC?
 22 What were the other functions you were supporting?
 23 A. So the humanitarian assistance steering group, the mass
 24 fatalities co-ordination group, providing the
 25 Secretariat to those, and some of the other wider

48

1 response, so trying to pull together information on the
 2 communications group, et cetera, and tying in those. So
 3 that's not written into either of those frameworks, that
 4 we provide that secretariat response, and so -- but
 5 because we had the experience, because it wasn't going
 6 well, that was where we felt the gap needed to be
 7 plugged more urgently. We hadn't had the mutual aid
 8 requests up until the night before, but it was becoming
 9 more apparent and more aware that there were multiple
 10 mutual aid requests going out, or not just channelled
 11 through us in the local authority co-ordination centre,
 12 but also going direct service to service. So the
 13 end-user in each of the 33 boroughs was getting multiple
 14 requests at different times of the day, which became
 15 difficult for them to organise and agree to what
 16 collective, cohesive support they could provide from
 17 their authorities as a whole.

18 Q. Right.

19 Now, we saw criticisms from the head of emergency
 20 management at Ealing and the head of contingency
 21 planning and resilience at Hounslow; was their criticism
 22 in each case fair, did you think?

23 A. It was partly fair. It wasn't a straightforward -- it
 24 wasn't a -- it wasn't as good as the response we would
 25 wish to have. We had a procedure for mutual aid whereby

1 a borough requesting mutual aid would provide a form
 2 which describes the effect they want to have achieved,
 3 as much notice as possible, and how it would best be
 4 filled, which we could go out to the boroughs with.
 5 But, as I just described, it was going across from
 6 different services, so housing were going direct amongst
 7 the directors of housing group, and so that would have
 8 gone to a borough, and for the contingency planning
 9 manager in a borough, they would have received all of
 10 these from the different forms, so they will have
 11 thought that it is becoming extremely messy.

12 So it wasn't as good as we had wanted. We were
 13 trying to get a grip on it at that stage.

14 Q. Right. So was it the case that the LLACC's resources
 15 were being stretched too thinly?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Yes.

18 Now, {LFB00061344}. Here is an email, now 17 June.
 19 If we go to the third paragraph down in this email, it's
 20 from Toby Gould to Steve Hamm and you and
 21 Hamish Cameron. Third paragraph down:
 22 "Mass Fats and Humanitarian support are a drain.
 23 I'm hoping with three other LA EP managers joining the
 24 mix [tomorrow] on HA we can position them well and limit
 25 our commitment. But the expectation from John B is we

1 will make it work. It's a little [galling] when we're
 2 doing things K and C could do themselves if they had
 3 some of the staff in over the weekend who have the
 4 weekend off and [whose] jobs we're effectively
 5 covering."

6 Was there a problem with RBKC staffing levels that
 7 you had been encountering?

8 A. Yes. I don't think they had the support staff in place
 9 to manage this, and I think that was evident through
 10 previous evidence that they've given that they didn't
 11 put the training and forethought into it.

12 If you look at the -- when I talk about scale and
 13 complexity, the previous edition of the humanitarian
 14 assistance plan, so 4.0 -- and my apologies that we
 15 provided the Inquiry with several -- various copies in
 16 the lead-up to that -- but 4.0 provides quite a clear
 17 statement in the early stages, around page 7 or 8, of
 18 the expectation of scale of response that we would
 19 expect either at a borough level or a regional level,
 20 and then also, halfway through, what we expected
 21 a borough to have trained in terms of those numbers, and
 22 I think we've seen through evidence that they just
 23 weren't there.

24 Q. You say you've seen through evidence, but was it your
 25 view at the time?

1 A. I think this was now becoming clear in the time that
 2 there was -- how could I describe it? -- that the
 3 response was almost hollow. So I recall somebody, but
 4 I can't remember who, pulling levers, and nothing was
 5 happening when they tried to pull that lever. So
 6 putting in place a humanitarian assistance group, but
 7 there just wasn't the -- it's not just a HALO, a lead
 8 officer, who's able to do it. They need a composite
 9 team behind them to understand the subject matter and
 10 are experienced in both secretariat and convening work
 11 and then the project management work behind it to pull
 12 all of the various bits together. A meeting doesn't
 13 just happen and all the actions get magically done; it
 14 takes a lot of work behind to pull all of those pieces
 15 together.

16 Q. Let's then go to {LFB00061257}. We're now at 18 June at
 17 21.26. Here is an email from Matt Hogan -- you can see
 18 that from the foot of the email -- to a large number of
 19 recipients, including you:

20 "Hi All,
 21 "You'll have seen on WhatsApp (hopefully) that the
 22 LLACC will be moving to Westminster tomorrow morning.
 23 "It has been agreed that all staff should stop all
 24 non-essential work in order to prioritise LLACC (this is
 25 subject to change as the week progresses). The only

1 exception is that the LRF will continue tomorrow
 2 supported by Hamish and Steve H."
 3 Should stopping all non—essential work in order to
 4 prioritise LLACC have happened earlier than this, which
 5 is 18 June?
 6 A. So we've never done it for another incident, where we've
 7 stopped all non—essential work. Normally we've carried
 8 on and we have the duty team, and then we manage rotas
 9 between us to enable enough or other work to carry on in
 10 conjunction.
 11 Q. Yes.
 12 A. Arguably we could have stopped it earlier, but I think
 13 by this stage we were integrated into so many of those
 14 activities that we just had to stop everything else.
 15 Q. Right.
 16 Now, going back in time, then, to the evening of
 17 17 June, the Saturday night, {LFB00061252}. This is
 18 an email from you to Hamish Cameron, Toby Gould and
 19 Steve Hamm, which we looked at before, and in the last
 20 sentence you say:
 21 "As a question just to gain an understanding of RBKC
 22 response have we been working to their local plans for
 23 HA and recovery or regional plans."
 24 You tell us in your statement, I think, that you
 25 hadn't been able to find a response to that email.

1 That's right, isn't it?
 2 A. Yes, that's correct.
 3 Q. Yes, that's your second statement at paragraph 58 at
 4 page 18. Let's actually look at that, if we can,
 5 please. That's at {LFB00119130/18}, paragraph 58. In
 6 the middle of the paragraph, you say:
 7 "I have looked over my emails and records from that
 8 time and have been unable to locate a response to that
 9 question. From memory I believe the RBKC response as to
 10 recovery was based on its local plans. I cannot recall
 11 the position regarding humanitarian assistance but
 12 I think it would likely have been based on the regional
 13 plans which is a reference to the Humanitarian
 14 Assistance framework exhibited as JH/12 to my first
 15 statement. Both the local and regional 'plans'
 16 referenced within the above email will have been
 17 framework documents setting out broad principles to be
 18 followed rather than detail[ed] situation specific
 19 plans."
 20 My question: would you expect to have been informed
 21 which plans a local authority was following if LLAG had
 22 been activated or was to be activated?
 23 A. I don't think it would have made a huge difference.
 24 I think I was just trying to understand whether or not
 25 they had contextualised the plans specifically or

1 whether it was the wider frameworks. A number of
 2 boroughs do use the regional frameworks as their
 3 overarching plan or their loose framework, it's just
 4 sometimes they add more detail and contextualisation as
 5 to how they will achieve that within their local plan.
 6 Q. Did it concern you at the time that you didn't know
 7 which plan the local authority was following in its
 8 response?
 9 A. No, it wouldn't be a huge concern. They would have been
 10 based on the same principles and to achieve the same
 11 thing. It's just a question for clarity at the time.
 12 Q. Did it surprise you at the time that RBKC did not have
 13 a humanitarian assistance plan, as David Kerry has
 14 confirmed?
 15 A. I would have expected them to have something in place
 16 that would have contextualised and put it into the
 17 reality of RBKC's response that they knew how to
 18 discharge the regional framework.
 19 MR MILLETT: Right.
 20 Mr Chairman, I have one short line of questions to
 21 cover, which won't take more than about five minutes or
 22 so. It would be more convenient to take them now and
 23 then take the break.
 24 SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: And would that get to the end of
 25 your questions?

1 MR MILLETT: Yes.
 2 SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Yes. Oh, well, I think that's much
 3 more sensible, I agree. Thank you.
 4 MR MILLETT: Thank you, Mr Chairman.
 5 Now, let me take to you, please, to {GOL00001728}.
 6 This is a paper published by London Resilience and the
 7 LAP, "MSL Peer Review Results 2016", as you can see.
 8 The introduction says that:
 9 "This paper provides the complete results of the
 10 2016 MSL peer review. The MSL assessment provides an
 11 overview of London's collective local authority
 12 capabilities and preparedness for emergencies and also
 13 provides boroughs with an assurance of their individual
 14 organisational capability. The results are intended to
 15 be used at both the London and individual borough level
 16 to inform collective and individual improvement needs
 17 respectively."
 18 If we go to page 5, please, in this document
 19 {GOL00001728/5}, and we look at the last paragraph on
 20 page 5, it says:
 21 "Overall the stabilised trends provide a positive
 22 picture. It was never intended or expected that the MSL
 23 would be 100% green in all boroughs. The implementation
 24 of a three year planning cycle demonstrates confidence
 25 of existing capability amongst boroughs and a step

1 towards unity of effort in planning. The greater detail
2 of new assessment also now provides targeted information
3 for future improvements of those capabilities. With the
4 introduction of EP2020 and the Standardisation project
5 it is expected to improve on the scorings of amber and
6 red ratings over the coming years lifting the standards
7 of London local authorities' resilience planning."

8 Now, do you agree that it follows from this that it
9 was never intended or expected that individual local
10 authorities would meet all of the minimum standards for
11 London?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Yes.

14 If we go to page 8 of the paper {GOL00001728/8}, it
15 sets out the performance of the 33 London local
16 authorities, and there they are. I think we looked at
17 them on Thursday.

18 Looking at it, do you agree that, on its face, the
19 worst performing local authority in this peer reviewed
20 self-assessment scored 16 green, 16 amber and 3 red, and
21 that is Newham in the middle of the table?

22 A. Yes. Purely on numbers, yes.

23 Q. Purely on numbers.

24 Was any action taken by London Resilience to improve
25 Newham's performance after these results were filed with

57

1 LAP?

2 A. So that's not our role, to improve their performance.
3 As I stated on Thursday, one of the primary purposes of
4 this was for the results to inform the borough's own
5 business planning, and it's their responsibilities and
6 their duties that they're trying to discharge under
7 this.

8 It's not London Resilience Group's job to improve
9 individual boroughs. We provide guidance and support to
10 them as a collective in their overall discharge of
11 duties, in ways in which they can achieve efficiencies.

12 Q. Yes, and see comparatively how they do, but does that
13 tell us that there was no effective peer review or
14 enforcement of standards?

15 A. To be enforced by who, sorry?

16 Q. Well, quite, that's the question.

17 Let's break that up.

18 First of all, it's self-assessment, not peer
19 assessment; yes?

20 A. On odd years, yes, but there was a peer review but by
21 equals, rather than independent external peer review.

22 Q. Right. So no independent peer review in any year.

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And is this right: no enforcement by an independent
25 enforcing body, such as the LAP or London Resilience?

58

1 A. The local authorities panel and London Resilience are
2 not enforcing bodies.

3 Q. Exactly so.

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And there isn't one and wasn't one?

6 A. No, there isn't one, no.

7 Q. No. I think it's also correct that there was no minimum
8 threshold, no minimum number of minimum standards for
9 London that each local authority was required to
10 achieve.

11 A. No.

12 Q. So does it come to this: these were loose benchmarking
13 measures that it would be up to each local authority to
14 score for themselves and then work out for themselves
15 what to do in response?

16 A. Yes, that's the framework that we work in, with no
17 auditing or directive powers to any agency.

18 MR MILLETT: Yes. Yes, thank you very much.

19 Mr Chairman, we have come to the end of my prepared
20 questions.

21 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, thank you.

22 MR MILLETT: And I'm going to ask for the usual break,
23 please.

24 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes.

25 Well, on this occasion, Mr Hetherington, we can

59

1 combine the usual break which we have when counsel has
2 got to the end of his questions with the break we need
3 to have in the middle of the morning anyway. So we'll
4 stop now, we'll come back at 11.35, and we'll see then
5 whether there are any more questions we have for you.

6 THE WITNESS: Yes.

7 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: As before, please don't talk to
8 anyone about your evidence while you're out of the room.

9 All right?

10 THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.

11 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much.

12 (Pause)

13 Thank you. 11.35, please. Thank you.

14 (11.22 am)

15 (A short break)

16 (11.35 am)

17 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, Mr Hetherington, we'll see if
18 there are any more questions.

19 Yes, Mr Millett.

20 MR MILLETT: Yes, Mr Chairman, thank you very much.

21 Just one question, which is a question we often ask
22 certain witnesses, and it's this: Mr Hetherington,
23 looking back on the experience, looking back on the
24 evidence that we have been through and what you now
25 know, is there anything in your role in the first

60

1 seven days after the fire that, looking back on it, you
 2 would have done differently?
 3 A. There's a lot, looking back with hindsight, that perhaps
 4 we could have probed/challenged more in terms of our
 5 role, in a supportive way, so that constructive
 6 challenge, and at the time we didn't. We maintain that
 7 we also hold together a partnership as well. It is
 8 a difficult role.

9 We've obviously focused an awful lot on areas that
 10 went wrong, and I would like to say publicly that
 11 sometimes we forget some of the staff went above and
 12 beyond, and not always looked at. So for that I'm
 13 immensely proud of the team who did step up to the
 14 plate. But where our best efforts weren't good enough,
 15 then I can only apologise to the people of Grenfell, and
 16 we strive to continue to improve the way in which we
 17 work for future incidents.

18 MR MILLETT: Thank you.

19 Well, Mr Hetherington, it remains only for me to
 20 thank you very much for coming here to the Inquiry and
 21 assisting us with our investigations. We are very
 22 grateful to you. So thank you very much.

23 THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.

24 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: And can I add my thanks too,
 25 Mr Hetherington, on behalf of all the members of the

61

1 panel. I think we all found it initially rather
 2 daunting to see the pictorial structure of London
 3 Resilience, but we have really benefitted from your
 4 explanation of how it works and your evidence about what
 5 happened on the days immediately after the fire. So
 6 thank you very much indeed. We're very grateful to you.

7 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

8 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: And now, of course, you're free to
 9 go.

10 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

11 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much.

12 (The witness withdrew)

13 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you, Mr Millett. Now, we have
 14 another witness waiting.

15 MR MILLETT: We do.

16 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: We are having a change of witness
 17 and a change of counsel, I think.

18 MR MILLETT: We are, yes, that's right. Mr Sawyer is the
 19 witness and Mr Keating is the counsel.

20 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. Well, in those
 21 circumstances, I think the best thing is if we rise for
 22 a couple of minutes to allow the usual arrangements to
 23 be made, and perhaps you'd ask the usher to come and
 24 tell us as soon as you're ready.

25 MR MILLETT: Very well, thank you.

62

1 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Or Mr Keating can ask the usher to
 2 come and get us when he is ready.

3 MR MILLETT: Yes. Thank you very much, Mr Chairman.

4 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much.

5 (11.40 am)

(A short break)

7 (11.47 am)

8 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes, Mr Keating.

9 MR KEATING: Good morning, Mr Chairman. Good morning,
 10 members of the panel.

11 Could I call Mark Sawyer, please.

12 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.

13 MR MARK SAWYER (affirmed)

14 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much. Please sit
 15 down and make yourself comfortable.

16 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

17 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, thank you.

18 Yes, Mr Keating.

19 Questions from COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY

20 MR KEATING: Well, good morning, Mr Sawyer. Thank you very
 21 much for attending today and assisting the Inquiry with
 22 its investigations.

23 Just a few introductory matters, as we say to all
 24 witnesses.

25 Firstly, if you have any difficulty in understanding

63

1 any of my questions, please do ask me just to rephrase
 2 it, I'm sure it will be my fault.

3 Secondly, if I can ask you to keep your voice up so
 4 that the transcriber, sitting to your right, can capture
 5 your evidence. Also, if I could ask you to avoid
 6 nodding or shaking your head, because that's something
 7 which isn't picked up on the transcript.

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Lastly, if you need a break at any stage, just let us
 10 know. I'm sure that's something we can accommodate.

11 Is that okay?

12 A. Very much so.

13 Q. In terms of a few formalities, I want to just deal with
 14 your statements and identify them, please.

15 You have provided three statements to the Inquiry
 16 and I'm going to ask you to look at the first one, which
 17 is {GOL00001349}, please, and that is dated 1 July 2020.

18 If we could turn to page 25, please, we see the date
 19 at the bottom, and we see your name in print.

20 Can you confirm that that's your signature?

21 A. That is my signature.

22 Q. Thank you.

23 If we could turn to your second statement, which is
 24 {GOL00001839}, please. That's your second statement.

25 In relation to that, if you could turn to page 10,

64

1 please, that's dated 27 April 2022. Again, can you
 2 confirm that's your signature?
 3 A. It is.
 4 Q. Excellent, thank you.
 5 Lastly, your third witness statement, which is very
 6 recent, and that's {GOL00001847}, please.
 7 If you could turn to page 3, please, that's dated
 8 12 May 2022, so last Thursday. Again, can you confirm
 9 that's your signature?
 10 A. It is, and thank you for accepting it so late.
 11 Q. No difficulty at all.
 12 In relation to those witness statements, can you
 13 confirm that you have had the opportunity, first of all,
 14 to read them?
 15 A. Yes.
 16 Q. And are they true to the best of your knowledge and
 17 belief?
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. Thank you.
 20 Mr Sawyer, to help you and to help the panel, in
 21 terms of questions today, they're going to fall into
 22 three broad areas.
 23 Firstly, and briefly, your role within the City of
 24 London Corporation and the work you have undertaken in
 25 the field of civil resilience prior to June 2017.

1 A. Yes.
 2 Q. Secondly, your operational involvement, if I could label
 3 it that, on 14 and 15 June, including your liaison with
 4 RBKC, the London Resilience Group and the duty London
 5 Local Authority Gold. We will touch upon your
 6 attendance on 15 June at the RBKC Town Hall, where you
 7 were supporting Nicholas Holgate and other senior RBKC
 8 staff. So that will be the second area.
 9 Finally, we will turn to an examination of some of
 10 the reviews and work you have undertaken in the months
 11 and years after the fire to review the emergency
 12 resilience structures. There's a number of reports that
 13 you have had involvement with; isn't that correct?
 14 A. Correct.
 15 Q. So they're the three broad areas, and let's turn to the
 16 first and the shortest one: your role, please.
 17 Is it correct, since April 2017, you have been the
 18 chief executive liaison officer (resilience) for the
 19 City of London Corporation?
 20 A. That is correct, for the City of London Corporation.
 21 However, in -- the best way of describing it would be
 22 that I was hosted by the City of London Corporation, but
 23 working to all 33 London local authorities, who equally
 24 funded my position.
 25 Q. Thank you.

1 A. And I believe in approximately 2018 my job title changed
 2 slightly -- however, the role didn't change
 3 significantly -- to resilience adviser, as compared to
 4 resilience liaison.
 5 Q. So the same role but re-labelled to resilience adviser?
 6 A. Yes.
 7 Q. Hosted by the City of London Corporation, but assists
 8 all 33 councils?
 9 A. Correct.
 10 Q. In relation to -- it's touched upon probably by its
 11 title, or re-labelled title, what would you say your
 12 role involved as of June 2017?
 13 A. My role involved assisting London local authorities and
 14 primarily assisting the local authorities panel to -- on
 15 resilience-related matters, supporting the setting of
 16 agendas and the level of conversation necessary on
 17 resilience at a regional level, and with the additional
 18 responsibility of monitoring preparedness across London
 19 local authorities on behalf of the local authorities
 20 panel, and assisting local authorities and the London
 21 Local Authority Gold arrangements should the unfortunate
 22 situation arise whereby we have an incident to deal
 23 with, such as was the tragedy at Grenfell.
 24 Q. So three main roles, drawing out what you said a moment
 25 ago: first of all, that sort of advice and support, as

1 you described, in relation to preparedness, which may
 2 involve policy and development work; secondly,
 3 monitoring resilience via the local authority panel;
 4 and, thirdly, in relation to the operation or activation
 5 of the LLAG; is that correct?
 6 A. Correct.
 7 Q. It may be captured by your answer already, but your role
 8 then as chief executive liaison officer, that also
 9 included supporting a chief executive when responding to
 10 a localised major incident within their borough; is that
 11 correct?
 12 A. As necessary and required.
 13 Q. Yes.
 14 Is it right also, as a result of your role, you are
 15 a standing member of the local authorities panel?
 16 A. Correct.
 17 Q. And you're also a member of its implementation group?
 18 A. Correct.
 19 Q. You have explained in your statement at paragraph 49
 20 {GOL00001349/10} that you have extensive experience in
 21 responding on behalf of local authorities to large-scale
 22 incidents in London.
 23 A. I believe so, yes.
 24 Q. And the incidents you refer to include terror attacks,
 25 severe weather events and fatal accidents; is that

1 correct?
 2 A. Correct.
 3 Q. In relation to the London Local Authority Gold, the
 4 LLAG, we've heard quite a lot of evidence in relation to
 5 that from Mr Hetherington, and I'm not going to
 6 hopefully repeat that, but just perhaps draw out a few
 7 limited points, please.
 8 It's fair to say that it's one of the special
 9 features of the London Resilience framework, isn't that
 10 correct, the LLAG?
 11 A. Of the London local authority resilience framework, yes.
 12 Q. And as we heard already, it's a pan-London mechanism
 13 which can be activated in response to an emergency,
 14 drawing upon the resources of all 33 London local
 15 authorities, led by a single chief executive. Is that
 16 a fair if not simple summary of the process?
 17 A. It's a mechanism for co-ordinating London-wide support
 18 to an incident, yes.
 19 Q. If you could just try and raise your voice a little bit
 20 more.
 21 You just said it's a mechanism for co-ordinating
 22 London-wide support to incidents.
 23 Two points just in relation to that.
 24 Firstly, in relation to the mechanism, the power, is
 25 it the case that for it to be activated, it would

1 require a request from a local authority? It would have
 2 to be invited rather than imposed?
 3 A. Correct.
 4 Q. In relation to the process or procedure for activation,
 5 is it right that at the time there was no formal
 6 recognised procedure for its activation within the Gold
 7 operating procedure document?
 8 A. The only procedure was the expectation that a local
 9 authority who wished to activate the local authority
 10 arrangements bottom-up would make a personal request.
 11 Q. Exactly. We don't need to turn to the document, but
 12 there is a guide which simply states that LLAG
 13 arrangements are activated when LLAG is contacted in
 14 relation to an emergency which has occurred.
 15 A. Correct, and if I may just add a slight additional
 16 context to that: there is no, as I'm aware, legal basis
 17 upon which Local Authority Gold can intervene in the
 18 affairs of an individual local authority. Therefore, it
 19 had to be a request rather than imposed.
 20 Q. We'll return to certain changes or modifications which
 21 have taken place in relation to guidance in our third
 22 part of the evidence, in the post-fire work.
 23 I want to move on to something which we're going to
 24 touch upon a few times, which is EP2020.
 25 EP, one assumes, stands for "emergency planning"?

1 A. It does.
 2 Q. And you have set it out in your statement, but in 2016
 3 you undertook a review of local authority emergency
 4 planning in London, and that review was called EP2020.
 5 What I'd like to do is, with your assistance,
 6 examine some of the aspects of this, really to provide
 7 an insight -- perhaps a short insight -- into the state
 8 of civil resilience in London in the period shortly
 9 before the fire in June 2017.
 10 You explain in your statement at paragraph 9
 11 {GOL00001349/2} -- I'm going to summarise -- that the
 12 report, EP2020, was commissioned as there was
 13 a recognition by the local authorities panel of
 14 heightened pressure on councils and an increase in
 15 external and internal risks; is that correct?
 16 A. Correct.
 17 Q. You touch upon some of those risks, but did those
 18 identified risks include a "loss of corporate knowledge
 19 and capacity"?
 20 A. Correct.
 21 Q. With your assistance, I would like to explore three
 22 specific points from the report, and perhaps if you
 23 could turn to the report, it's dated 3 October 2016,
 24 {GOL00001515}.
 25 We can see there it's dated 3 October. We see your

1 name, and supported by David Kerry. Is that correct?
 2 A. Correct.
 3 Q. That's somebody we've heard evidence from and who was
 4 the contingency planning manager at RBKC; is that
 5 correct?
 6 A. Correct.
 7 Q. If we could turn to page 3 {GOL00001515/3}, please.
 8 Thank you. It says in terms of the scope of your EP2020
 9 that, in relation to the Local Authority Gold
 10 resolution, that was not considered within the review.
 11 The second paragraph says this:
 12 "The two elements excluded [from the review] are;
 13 the London Local Authority Gold Resolution and the ...
 14 rota. This is due to their proven effectiveness to
 15 underpin the collective and coordinated approach of
 16 authorities to significant incidents."
 17 Is that correct?
 18 A. Correct.
 19 Q. So the position is, in this review you were doing of the
 20 London civil resilience position, the LLAG at that stage
 21 wasn't seen as an area of concern.
 22 A. Correct.
 23 Q. And that's why it wasn't within the scope of your
 24 report.
 25 A. Correct.

1 Q. If we move down to "Overall Assessment", I'm just going
 2 to read the first paragraph there:
 3 "There is a developing trend of reduced capacity and
 4 capability across London. The ability of our
 5 authorities to discharge a leadership role on resilience
 6 to the level communities would expect and deserve is
 7 under strain. To prevent further degradation of the
 8 service and potentially expose ourselves to undesirable
 9 levels of risk, this report suggests a number of actions
 10 chief executives may wish to consider to bolster the
 11 service and enhance resilience."
 12 Is that correct?
 13 A. Correct.
 14 Q. I want to deal with capacity, the second point in
 15 relation to this EP2020 report, and to do so, could we
 16 turn to page 8 {GOL00001515/8}, please, and
 17 paragraph 3.1.1. It's the bottom of the page, thank you
 18 so much.
 19 "3. Review Findings and Recommendations.
 20 "...
 21 "3.1.1. Emergency Planning Service."
 22 It says this:
 23 "Emergency Planning staffing levels are at the
 24 lowest point since 2009, with a downward trend
 25 established since the 2012 Olympics [we'll turn to the

1 figures in a moment] ... This reduction combined with
 2 continuing demand for efficiencies across authorities
 3 has the potential to significantly affect our ability to
 4 satisfy the expectations of our communities and assure
 5 them that we possess the appropriate means to prepare
 6 and respond, where necessary, to the myriad of
 7 resilience challenges that need to be addressed. This
 8 includes our ability to deliver effective authority wide
 9 support to our communities and develop a culture of
 10 community resilience across our localities ."
 11 Is that correct?
 12 A. Correct.
 13 Q. So, in effect, this report is sounding a warning that
 14 numbers were down in terms of capacity; isn't that
 15 correct?
 16 A. Very much so.
 17 Q. If we turn overleaf to page 9 {GOL00001515/9}, and we
 18 see those pictorial graphs which were referred to in the
 19 previous paragraph, figure 3.0 shows a downward graph in
 20 relation to staffing levels; isn't that correct?
 21 A. Correct.
 22 Q. We see, in terms of emergency planning staff levels per
 23 authority, Kensington and Chelsea being there
 24 centre-west, relatively high, actually, with four
 25 members, staffing levels; isn't that correct?

1 A. Correct.
 2 Q. In relation to those staffing numbers, is it the case
 3 that they do not show staffing levels in relation to
 4 what we've heard of as Council Silvers, BECC staff,
 5 LALOs?
 6 A. No, this was solely numbers of designated emergency
 7 planning personnel.
 8 Q. Whilst doing your report, and in terms of capacity, this
 9 was at very much a high specialist level, what you were
 10 dealing with, did you have any information or insight as
 11 of 2016 whether that downward trend in capacity was also
 12 reflected in those roles such as LALOs, BECC staff,
 13 Council Silvers?
 14 A. I -- there was an additional part of this process which
 15 did look at that level of detail, which was overseen by
 16 London Resilience Group on behalf of LAP, and I have no
 17 doubt that some of that data would have been taken into
 18 consideration in this report.
 19 Q. And what was your view then in relation to that
 20 additional process and additional data?
 21 A. I'd need to remind myself of what that said, but I think
 22 it would be fair to say that following the Olympics,
 23 you'll note that downward trend, combined with the
 24 financial burdens and strain that local government was
 25 experiencing at that time, did lead to a concern

1 regarding the numbers of people assigned to deal with
 2 resilience and emergency planning across local
 3 authorities.
 4 Q. Okay, thank you.
 5 If we could move on, please, the third area I want
 6 to touch upon is the minimum standards for London, which
 7 the panel have heard evidence about this morning and in
 8 the past about, and we've also heard questions being
 9 posed to David Kerry in relation to.
 10 With your assistance, could we turn to page 12,
 11 please, of this report {GOL00001515/12}, and we could
 12 look, please, at paragraph 3.2.1, which is at the
 13 bottom. This is under the heading of "Governance and
 14 Planning", and puts just puts into a little bit of
 15 context the minimum standards for London:
 16 "... introduced in 2007, comprising 16 standards
 17 designed to ensure all London local authorities had the
 18 appropriate policies and procedures in place to support
 19 the London Local Authority Gold ... arrangements."
 20 It sets out how:
 21 "In 2009, a second tranche of Standards were
 22 published detailing the specific requirements of plans
 23 and capabilities each authority should maintain. These
 24 plans and capabilities range from generic emergency
 25 response functions to humanitarian assistance and excess

1 death plans."
 2 It goes on in the second paragraph:
 3 "A review of the Minimum Standards for London
 4 assessments conducted annually reveals a minimal
 5 downward trend in immediate operational response
 6 capabilities ."
 7 Then it says this:
 8 "Of concern, however, is a significant downward
 9 trend in meeting standards relating to plans and
 10 capabilities ."
 11 So the MSLs have been in since 2007, so just
 12 nine years by this stage. They had been updated, as
 13 they describe, in 2009, and your report, your words:
 14 "Of concern, however, is the significant downward
 15 trend in meeting standards relating to plans and
 16 capabilities ."
 17 Is that the position?
 18 A. Correct.
 19 Q. Is there anything else you wanted to add in relation to
 20 that concern at this stage?
 21 A. Nothing that springs to mind immediately.
 22 Q. Well, perhaps we can just explore that a little bit
 23 more.
 24 If we see, at the bottom of page 12, figure 3.4:
 25 "Minimum Standards for London (Plans and

1 Capabilities) compliance by year."
 2 We see overleaf at page 13 {GOL00001515/13} a table,
 3 and it says "Assessment", the most recent assessment by
 4 that stage December 2015, and we see three columns,
 5 "Green", "Amber" and "Red", green being effectively
 6 there is no concern, operational; amber, is it right,
 7 indicates operational but requires development; and red
 8 indicates not operational.
 9 A. Correct.
 10 Q. Is that a fair description?
 11 A. Correct.
 12 Q. In very basic terms, there was a percentage increase in
 13 relation to amber and red rows over that year from
 14 December 2014 to December 2015, with just under
 15 a quarter of assessments having amber, which means
 16 operational but requires development; is that correct?
 17 A. Correct.
 18 Q. And there was an increase -- I'm not sure if "a slight
 19 increase" is the right terminology -- to 2.67% from
 20 0.67% in relation to red.
 21 If we could turn to the last MSL peer review
 22 results, which are 2016, and that's at {GOL00000136},
 23 please.
 24 So you did your review, you had the 2015 results of
 25 MSLs, and this is a document which we've actually seen

1 already this morning with a different reference -- I'll
 2 just give that reference for the note. The previous
 3 reference in relation to this document is {GOL00001728}.
 4 So I believe we've got the same document, two different
 5 references.
 6 To identify this document, it's "MSL Peer Review
 7 Results 2016", and it says:
 8 "This paper updates [the local authority panel] on
 9 the status of Boroughs' assessment following the MSL
 10 Peer Review 2016."
 11 If you could turn to page 2 {GOL00000136/2}, please,
 12 and look at paragraph 5, or section 5, "Trends for
 13 capabilities ". If you recall, that was one of the areas
 14 that you had expressed a concern about in your EP2020
 15 report. We're here a little bit later in time in 2016
 16 with some more information, and it says this:
 17 "Trends for capabilities
 18 "Overall, 10 capabilities have been identified as
 19 having more than a quarter (9 or more boroughs)
 20 reporting an Amber or Red rating."
 21 I'm just going to mention some of those, we can see
 22 it in that table: training provided by boroughs,
 23 humanitarian assistance, evacuation and identification
 24 of vulnerable persons.
 25 Is that correct?

1 A. Correct.
 2 Q. Applying that to RBKC for a moment, the Inquiry's heard
 3 and seen evidence that RBKC reported amber in relation
 4 to those named capabilities: training, humanitarian
 5 assistance, identification of vulnerable persons.
 6 Was it a matter of concern, from your perspective,
 7 that over a quarter of boroughs, including RBKC,
 8 reported this in their self-assessment, that they were
 9 either amber or red in ten capabilities ?
 10 A. It was a concern. It would have been a concern. What
 11 I'd just like again -- if I can add a bit more context.
 12 Q. Of course.
 13 A. The MSLs serve two purposes, and I think you may have
 14 heard this morning one of those is to inform
 15 an individual local authority, who has the statutory
 16 duty, where its weaknesses, where its strengths sit, and
 17 then inform local business planning in terms of
 18 addressing them.
 19 The second purpose of MSLs was to inform LAP, the
 20 local authorities panel, with an indication of trends,
 21 themes, things which potentially would benefit from some
 22 level of regional support. And I use the term "support"
 23 because the local authorities panel has no legal basis
 24 upon which it can assist -- insist that an individual
 25 local authority does anything with what is produced.

1 So LAP generally operates, and continues to operate,
 2 on the basis of producing guidance, producing advice,
 3 strong argument, and relying to some extent -- and my
 4 apologies for this -- on a bit of common sense, in terms
 5 of: we've provided you with the tools, it's now
 6 really -- you're encouraged to adopt what's been
 7 provided.
 8 Q. So you mentioned that it was of concern, but also within
 9 the context that this is to assist the local authority
 10 to identify where they have areas to develop, and also
 11 to identify trends. That's the context.
 12 But we're dealing with perhaps more than a quarter
 13 of local authorities having areas which required
 14 development, dealing with humanitarian assistance,
 15 identification of vulnerable persons. How much of
 16 a concern was it that this seemed to be relatively
 17 widespread?
 18 A. In 2016, I was commissioned by the local authorities
 19 panel to do the review EP2020, but the secretariat, the
 20 management of discussions at LAP, was facilitated
 21 through London Resilience Group and not directly by
 22 myself, so I wouldn't wish to comment in terms of LAP's
 23 view on that. I can give you a personal view, which is
 24 that would be of concern.
 25 Q. We have heard already this morning in your evidence as

1 well that the LAP is there to, in terms of standards,
 2 encourage compliance --
 3 A. Yes.
 4 Q. -- and meeting and improving, but in terms of
 5 enforcement, there's no power in relation to enforce
 6 those standards.
 7 A. No power whatsoever.
 8 Q. That's in relation to MSLs, which are the minimum
 9 standards for London. This is pre-fire. Later on this
 10 afternoon we'll deal with what's replaced the minimum
 11 standards for London, the RSLs; isn't that correct?
 12 A. Yeah, and I'm happy to explain some of the rationale for
 13 why that change was required.
 14 Q. Yes. We'll cover that. I just wanted to assist with
 15 having a context of the landscape in which we explore
 16 events in June 2017.
 17 The final point, and it perhaps is covered by your
 18 last answer in terms of concern, we have also heard
 19 evidence within the individual MSL report for RBKC that
 20 they had no capability, in other words it was red, for
 21 the appointments of a humanitarian assistance lead
 22 officer, a HALO. Was the absence of an operational
 23 capability for something such as that, as a HALO,
 24 a matter of concern to you back in 2016?
 25 A. It would have been of concern, but I would have expected

1 RBKC to have addressed that. It was within their gift
 2 to identify appropriate senior level officers and ensure
 3 that they were prepared to undertake that role, yes.
 4 Q. Finally in terms of your EP2020 review in 2016, you made
 5 a number of recommendations, which were made by you to
 6 the local authorities panel, for implementation
 7 commencing in early 2017. Is it correct that, following
 8 the Grenfell Tower fire, those recommendations were
 9 incorporated and updated in your EP2020 refreshed
 10 report, which was April 2018?
 11 A. That's correct.
 12 Q. So your recommendations in 2016, there was a process
 13 where they were going to be implemented. Then we have
 14 events in June 2017 and, as we'll hear this afternoon,
 15 a number of post-fire reviews, including you refreshing
 16 your report.
 17 A. Yes, correct. However, the refresh was based upon
 18 primarily a peer challenge conducted and commissioned by
 19 London Councils --
 20 Q. Yes.
 21 A. -- that considered not just Grenfell, but the other
 22 significant incidents that occurred in 2017.
 23 Q. Yes.
 24 A. So it was a consolidated review, which then led to that
 25 report being published, the assurance review being

1 published, and therefore the refreshed EP2020 -- the
 2 EP2020 consolidated all of that, those recommendations.
 3 Q. We'll deal with those three reports and that
 4 consolidation this afternoon.
 5 I'm going to move on now to your involvement on
 6 14 June.
 7 In terms of your notification, you helpfully set out
 8 in your statement -- we don't need to turn to it -- at
 9 paragraph 27 {GOL00001349/5} that you first became aware
 10 of the fire by text and email around 4.40 in the
 11 morning; is that correct?
 12 A. Correct.
 13 Q. Upon that notification, what was your role upon being
 14 notified?
 15 A. My role really was to monitor the local authority
 16 initial response, and I think that was demonstrated by
 17 identifying that the message to Local Authority Gold had
 18 been incorrectly directed, and so that was my initial
 19 role, was to monitor the level of response.
 20 Q. We could perhaps touch upon that. We know that there
 21 was an on-duty London Local Authority Gold, that being
 22 Andrew Blake-Herbert, chief executive of the London
 23 Borough of Havering. He was on duty, as it happens,
 24 until 9 o'clock. What you're referring to is that the
 25 notification had been sent to the next London Local

1 Authority Gold on the rota, who was Chris Naylor, who
 2 was due on at 9 o'clock; is that correct?
 3 A. Correct.
 4 Q. What role would the duty London Gold, using the short
 5 term, have in those circumstances? So, for instance,
 6 Andrew Blake—Herbert or Chris Naylor, whoever was on
 7 duty, what would their role be?
 8 A. Their role at that point would be to monitor the
 9 situation, assure themselves that the local authority
 10 concerned, RBKC, were fully engaged and were not
 11 expressing any immediate issues or concerns.
 12 Q. How would they assure themselves that the local
 13 authority were fully engaged?
 14 A. They would have to take it as said on the SCG, had they
 15 dialled in to the SCG.
 16 Q. So your answer was they would have to take it, ie the
 17 London Gold, on what was reported at the SCG, had they
 18 dialled in to the SCG?
 19 A. Correct.
 20 Q. Was there an expectation, in those circumstances, that
 21 the duty LLAG would dial in or attend an SCG in those
 22 circumstances?
 23 A. It was discretionary. On occasions, London Resilience
 24 Group will offer to dial in to an SCG or in to
 25 a partnership call or whatever nature of call is held,

1 and then report back. But in this situation, the —
 2 I believe Local Authority Gold was informed about the
 3 call, and then the interaction between them and London
 4 Resilience Group occurred, which then resulted in them
 5 not dialling in, I believe.
 6 Q. Okay. I don't want to conflate what the expectation
 7 would be and what happened actually in the
 8 circumstances.
 9 A. Sure.
 10 Q. So in normal circumstances, bearing in mind it's one of
 11 your areas, would your expectation be that the duty LLAG
 12 would sign in?
 13 A. For that — for this type of incident, yes.
 14 Q. Yes. But you did say it's discretionary, so there's
 15 nothing that says that they must dial in to an SCG?
 16 A. No, particularly in this situation, because it was
 17 a single-based borough incident.
 18 Q. In relation to that point about it being a single-based
 19 borough incident, what was the significance back then,
 20 if any, of that distinction?
 21 A. Could you ask the question —
 22 Q. Of course.
 23 You mentioned that this was a single incident. It
 24 was contained within a local authority. Did that have
 25 any significance in terms of what a duty LLAG would do?

1 A. Yes, I think it would, because I would expect London
 2 Local Authority Gold or Andrew Blake—Herbert at the time
 3 to dial in and just assess as to whether there are wider
 4 implications, whether it be the plume could extend into
 5 other boroughs, et cetera, as an example.
 6 Q. Yes.
 7 A. And so it's two functions, really: one is to assure that
 8 RBKC had everything it needed, and the second one was to
 9 assess as to whether there were wider implications.
 10 Q. Okay.
 11 Well, let's examine what happened, and then we can
 12 update those answers if need be.
 13 So the notification email you received at 04.41
 14 informed you that there was an SCG, a strategic
 15 co-ordination group meeting, that was to be held at
 16 5 o'clock. Is it the position that you decided to
 17 attend that meeting as you believed it would be unlikely
 18 that the on-duty London Local Authority Gold would be
 19 able to attend because of the short notification?
 20 A. Correct.
 21 Q. You mention in your statement at paragraph 30
 22 {GOL00001349/6} that, by dialling in, this allowed you
 23 to hear the briefing on the situation and ensure that
 24 you were in a good position to provide advice if
 25 required to the duty LLAG, London Resilience Group, or

1 John Barradell, chair of the local authority panel.
 2 A. Correct.
 3 Q. So that's the circumstances in which you dialled in to
 4 that first SCG.
 5 As you were listening, what view did you form about
 6 the scale of the incident?
 7 A. The view that I formed was that it was big. However,
 8 there was still a lot of information not currently
 9 available, hence I work on the basis that that's why
 10 there was a follow-up SCG pretty soon afterwards. But
 11 it was because there was a paucity of information at
 12 that point.
 13 Q. In terms of headlines, what did you consider were the
 14 areas where there was a paucity of information?
 15 A. In terms of the number — if I recollect, what I wasn't
 16 fully sighted on was as to how many — had the building
 17 been fully evacuated, you know, the numbers of people
 18 directly affected and — yeah, I think, to be honest
 19 with you, it was numbers and the data that was lacking,
 20 that would then have given me a good — a better
 21 indication of actually the scale of this, the scale of
 22 the tragedy.
 23 Q. Okay. So big absence of data in relation to numbers so
 24 that you could fully successful the true scale —
 25 A. Yes.

1 Q. -- of the incident.
 2 David Kerry for RBKC, who you have worked with in
 3 the past, closely one assumes, on EP2020, he
 4 participated on the call. What view did you form of
 5 RBKC and their input during that call?
 6 A. Their participation in the call gave me a sense that
 7 they were engaged, they had deployed LALOs to the scene,
 8 there was -- so in relation to that, the right
 9 conversations should have been taking place, the fact
 10 that David was very experienced, and there was nothing
 11 raised on the call that said RBKC when challenges or
 12 difficulties that they were unable to deal with.
 13 Q. To summarise what you say at paragraph 31
 14 {GOL00001349/6}, which chimes with what you have told us
 15 a moment ago:
 16 "Following the SCG ... I concluded that [RBKC] were
 17 actively engaged in the established multi-agency
 18 response. As a result, I reverted to monitoring emails,
 19 sharing information with John BARRADELL ... and liaising
 20 with London Resilience Group ..."
 21 Is that correct?
 22 A. Correct.
 23 Q. Is it fair to say at that stage, did you envisage London
 24 Local Authority Gold having any active role in the
 25 response?

1 A. No, not unless requested.
 2 Q. Did you anticipate at that stage that there would be
 3 an imminent request?
 4 A. No.
 5 Q. Does it follow that you formed a view as to whether RBKC
 6 had sufficient resources to deal with the humanitarian
 7 needs of those affected in the fire at that stage?
 8 A. That is something that I didn't consider and was very
 9 much reliant upon the information provided.
 10 Q. So is this a fair summary: you listened in on the call,
 11 what you heard didn't raise any concerns or flashing
 12 alarm bells, but in terms of the humanitarian needs,
 13 that's something which you didn't independently consider
 14 at that stage, whether RBKC had the capacity to deal
 15 with it?
 16 A. The consideration of the humanitarian need would have
 17 been considered, but I hadn't considered the possibility
 18 that RBKC wouldn't have the staff resource to deal with
 19 what was required.
 20 Q. We know that the next SCG was at 06.30, which you didn't
 21 attend, nor did you attend any of the subsequent SCG
 22 meetings that day on 14 June. Can you explain why that
 23 was?
 24 A. For two reasons. One was that I was receiving
 25 information around those meetings. I was aware that

1 London Resilience Group were briefing Local Authority
 2 Gold, I was aware of offers of support coming in to
 3 RBKC, so they weren't just being left stranded to deal
 4 with this. It was only towards the end of the first
 5 day, the 14th, that then the concerns started to
 6 materialise regarding their capacity and ability to deal
 7 with the challenge that they faced.
 8 And the other -- sorry, my apologies, the other, for
 9 want of a better word, failsafe was that London
 10 Resilience Group provide dedicated support to London
 11 local authorities, we have a good professional working
 12 relationship with them, and had they themselves
 13 expressed any concerns or had concerns, I would have
 14 expected them to have raised it with me, and potentially
 15 with John Barradell as well.
 16 Q. Were you aware that your colleagues from the London
 17 Resilience Group would be on those calls?
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. So from the surrounding information, you took the view
 20 that you didn't need to be on the call. You were aware
 21 LLAG colleagues were on the SCGs.
 22 In relation to the duty LLAGs, so
 23 Andrew Blake-Herbert for those first three SCGs -- we
 24 had one at 5.00, one at 6.30, one at 8.30 -- he didn't
 25 attend; Chris Naylor didn't attend the 14.00 or 19.30.

1 So none of the duty LLAGs attended either.
 2 A. That's correct, and --
 3 Q. Was that something that you were aware of, that there
 4 was a non-attendance by the duty LLAGs?
 5 A. At the point whereby it was still being considered
 6 a single-borough incident, and until such point that it
 7 became clear that RBKC weren't able to effectively deal
 8 with their responsibilities, I would suggest that there
 9 was no need for Local Authority Gold to be on those
 10 calls.
 11 Q. Although you did say earlier on that, in relation to
 12 monitoring, the role of the duty LLAG is to monitor the
 13 response of RBKC, and that there would be perhaps
 14 a benefit, even in a single local authority incident, of
 15 having a duty LLAG on the SCG call; isn't that correct?
 16 A. On the first call.
 17 Q. On the first call?
 18 A. Yes, with them then continuing to receive briefings and
 19 updates following every SCG, with the option to say,
 20 "Actually, I'm not comfortable with this, perhaps I do
 21 need to dial in". But they would be basing that upon
 22 the advice and information being provided to them also
 23 by London Resilience Group.
 24 Q. Would you accept, bearing in mind the 5 o'clock SCG,
 25 where you mention that there was data deficits, gaps, as

1 to assessing the scale of the incident, that there would
 2 have been a benefit of having an experienced chief
 3 executive calling in and monitoring to see if things
 4 were in hand?
 5 A. In hindsight, potentially, yes. However, I believe that
 6 the subsequent SCG had the RBKC chief executive. So,
 7 you know, they're peers. Local Authority Gold has
 8 a specific function, but is an equal in terms of
 9 position and role.
 10 Q. It's just really in relation to that word "monitoring",
 11 as you mentioned, that it may not have been the practice
 12 then of having a duty LLAG calling in, but whether it
 13 would have had a benefit if there was somebody who was
 14 separate from the immediate response who was able to
 15 perhaps give peer support or advise the local authority
 16 chief executive of difficulties which were apparent to
 17 that person.
 18 A. Again, in hindsight, I guess I could definitely see the
 19 value of that. However, RBKC, I believed, understood
 20 the way in which it could secure additional support, and
 21 where it could secure that additional peer support.
 22 Q. Yes.
 23 Just dealing with one discrete matter, you mentioned
 24 your belief -- and it's in your statement as well --
 25 that Nicholas Holgate was at the next SCG at 6.30.

1 I think the wider evidence is that that, although maybe
 2 noted down somewhere, is incorrect; he wasn't at the
 3 next SCG, just by way of record.
 4 A. Okay.
 5 Q. I want to move on, please, to the circumstances prior to
 6 the next SCG, which we've heard was at 08.30.
 7 Perhaps, with your assistance, we could look at
 8 an email you received just before then. There's
 9 a series of emails I'd like your assistance upon.
 10 That's {GOL00000218}, please.
 11 If we look at the body of the email there,
 12 Toby Gould to you, 8.04:
 13 "To update you on the current situation and local
 14 authority gold considerations."
 15 This is pre the next SCG, as we can see in the
 16 second paragraph. This, we see at the third paragraph,
 17 is where that misunderstanding emerged:
 18 "Nicholas Holgate was on the 06.30 SCG via
 19 teleconference (K&C's preferred method rather than
 20 attending SOR)."
 21 We have heard that already; is that the special
 22 operations room in Lambeth?
 23 A. Correct, yes.
 24 Q. Pausing there for a moment, best practice. Is there any
 25 best practice here as to whether a chief executive, in

1 those circumstances, should attend the special
 2 operations room at Lambeth or whether they could
 3 participate by teleconference?
 4 A. The original thinking was that a chief executive
 5 would -- or should I say chief executive Council Gold --
 6 Q. Yes.
 7 A. -- would make their way in to SOR.
 8 Q. So that was the original thinking.
 9 A. Yeah, subsequently -- if we're talking about this
 10 particular incident, then, yes, there was -- the
 11 thinking was that Council Gold would go in to SOR.
 12 Q. I'm going to use Council Gold rather than chief
 13 executive.
 14 What would the benefits of Council Gold in that
 15 situation be, from moving from their headquarters or
 16 town hall and coming to Lambeth for that meeting? What
 17 would the advantage be?
 18 A. One of the advantages is that, rather than dialling in
 19 via teleconference, you're establishing strong
 20 relationships, understanding across equals around the
 21 SCG table, and I think body language is an interesting
 22 benefit of sitting there face-to-face with someone, as
 23 well as by being in that environment, it fast tracks the
 24 conversations outside of the SCGs and issues and
 25 problems are more easily addressed, I believe.

1 Q. So benefits with face-to-face communication.
 2 In terms of original thinking, to use your
 3 phraseology, is there guidance or was there guidance
 4 anywhere which said that, in such an event, Council Gold
 5 should attend the SOR?
 6 A. I would need to refresh my memory, but that was, if
 7 I may add, one of the reasons why Local Authority Gold
 8 at that time was invited to visit SOR, to familiarise
 9 themselves and then understand the environment in which
 10 they may be asked to operate.
 11 But, sorry, my apologies, I just need to clarify.
 12 That was very much predicated on Local Authority Gold
 13 response going in to SOR, and very much predicated on
 14 the basis that that would often be in a situation where
 15 more than one local authority was affected. So
 16 I wouldn't like it to be seen that it was set in stone
 17 that Council Gold would go in there, but there would
 18 have been benefits in that happening.
 19 Q. Thank you.
 20 We see, in the middle of that paragraph:
 21 "Nicholas [Holgate] and Chris Naylor (oncoming
 22 [LLAG] at 09.00) are in agreement that Nicholas will
 23 lead [local authority] engagement in the SCG. From the
 24 meetings to date I would agree that seems the best
 25 approach. Nicholas thinks that aside from housing needs

1 which may spill over borough boundaries there is no need
 2 for LLAG to be stood up.”
 3 Were you content at that stage in relation to what
 4 Toby Gould said was the best approach, that the SCG
 5 would be — the lead would be taken by the local
 6 authority?
 7 A. I had no reason not to believe that was an accurate
 8 assessment. I think this is where, again, the
 9 clarification around the role of Local Authority Gold
 10 and how it interacts with Council Gold is an important
 11 one. There is a distinction. And so in terms of using
 12 terminology like “lead engagement in the SCG”, Local
 13 Authority Gold is a co-ordination, communication and
 14 representative role; the lead for the response would
 15 still have been Council Gold in terms of the local
 16 authority contribution.
 17 Q. Yes. In relation to LLAG, what did you understand by
 18 the phrase “LLAG to be stood up”, where it says that at
 19 the bottom of paragraph 3?
 20 A. It’s just — my personal impression of that would be
 21 that Local Authority Gold would become more actively
 22 involved.
 23 Q. And at that stage, when you’ve heard that there’s no
 24 need for LLAG to be stood up, we then move on to the
 25 next part, which says this:

1 “Chris [Naylor] is aware that we may need to seek
 2 his approval for mutual aid requests.”
 3 The panel have heard this very recently.
 4 “Although not requested by K&C, we will be staffing
 5 the LLACC to offer coordination support if required.”
 6 Is that correct?
 7 A. Correct.
 8 Q. So from your perspective, as chief resilience liaison
 9 officer at that stage, what was your view as to progress
 10 and the state of matters prior to the 08.30 SCG?
 11 A. My view, based upon this email, was that RBKC were
 12 dealing with the incident and, as described, didn’t
 13 require any wider London-wide support at that time.
 14 Q. We see at the top of that email, if we just scroll up
 15 a little bit, please, that you forwarded that email that
 16 you received at 08.04 to John Barradell at 08.13.
 17 A. Correct.
 18 Q. Two minutes later at 08.15, he received, John Barradell,
 19 a separate email from John Hetherington, which you were
 20 copied in to, and perhaps we can deal with that by way
 21 of completeness, {GOL00001473}. If we could scroll down
 22 to the initial email.
 23 So we see at 07.50 the source of this, “LLAG needs
 24 to gear up”. That’s Nicholas Holgate’s email to
 25 Toby Gould, copying in the duty LLAGs. We see at the

1 bottom:
 2 “... I do not (yet) think LLAG needs to gear up.”
 3 Correct?
 4 A. Correct.
 5 Q. Then the email from John Hetherington, the email in the
 6 body there, which is the 08.15 email we were referring
 7 to, and the message going to John Barradell is,
 8 paragraph 2:
 9 “All are content at the moment that RBKC retain
 10 [the] lead at [this] point.”
 11 And:
 12 “Will keep you updated through the day.”
 13 Correct?
 14 A. Correct.
 15 Q. At the top of that thread, your email back to Toby Gould
 16 that you have been copied in to at 08.18:
 17 “Looks like job done. Cheers.
 18 “Mark.”
 19 What did you mean by “Looks like job done”?
 20 A. I have no idea.
 21 Q. Well, let’s think about it. It’s a short email. We can
 22 see the context, which we spent some time running
 23 through, at 08.15, which effectively says RBKC retained
 24 the lead at this point. You mentioned earlier on that
 25 the view was that London Local Authority Gold doesn’t

1 appear to be actively involved. Is that what you meant,
 2 “Looks like job done”?
 3 A. I would suggest that is likely to be the motivation
 4 behind that message, which was that it had been
 5 clarified that RBKC were leading the incident, there was
 6 no need for Local Authority Gold to actively be
 7 involved, and therefore, other than making sure RBKC
 8 continued and had continued to be in a position to lead
 9 on the response, then there was no need for wider
 10 London-wide involvement.
 11 Q. Just to add a slight nuance to that, was it the case
 12 that, because it was a self-contained incident in
 13 a single local authority, in the circumstances you
 14 described, was that the view also, that “Job done”?
 15 A. The fact that it was a single-borough incident being led
 16 by the accountable authority — in terms of the local
 17 authority aspect of this, being led by the accountable
 18 authority; the fact that they, as I believed, understood
 19 the way in which the Gold arrangements worked and were
 20 available should the situation change; they had what
 21 I believed was experienced emergency planning personnel,
 22 who I understood to know how that system works; and
 23 therefore, until such point that the situation changed,
 24 the incident was being managed by RBKC.
 25 Q. And in relation to that view you formed, did you speak

1 to John Barradell that morning or early afternoon after
 2 these communications?
 3 A. I believe John Barradell was potentially interviewing
 4 that day, so I'm not sure -- I don't recall direct
 5 face-to-face conversation was him until later on in the
 6 day, when we started -- when some of the concerns
 7 started to materialise, and hence we had the
 8 teleconference call at 5.30 that evening.
 9 Q. Which we're going to move on to in just a moment.
 10 A. Yeah.
 11 Q. So your role going forward at this stage on the 14th,
 12 what would your role, if any, be from this email saying
 13 "Job done"?
 14 A. It was simply just to continue to monitor. I would have
 15 remained copied in to SCG minutes, had they occurred,
 16 and other information being shared by London Resilience
 17 Group, but it very much was a monitoring role.
 18 Q. You mentioned how concerns emerged in the afternoon.
 19 Can you tell us when that was and what were the nature
 20 of those concerns?
 21 A. I don't know precise timings.
 22 Q. Yes.
 23 A. But I think there were two areas of concern. One was
 24 the rising media coverage, and some of the stories that
 25 were starting to be aired didn't quite match with the

1 sort of information that we were -- had received
 2 previously in the day. And I think John Barradell may
 3 be able to add more to this, but I think he was aware of
 4 lots of offers of support and help being declined, or
 5 not being taken up. And so really it was just something
 6 that needed to happen to just sense-check the situation
 7 within the borough, and something that, you know,
 8 John Barradell, as chair of the local authorities panel,
 9 would inevitably have wanted to do.
 10 Q. Okay.
 11 Well, let's move on to that 17.30 conference which
 12 took place with Nicholas Holgate, John Barradell,
 13 Chris Naylor, the duty LLAG, John Hetherington, who we
 14 have heard already, from London Resilience Group, and
 15 John O'Brien of London Councils.
 16 You state this at paragraph 34 of your statement
 17 {GOL00001349/7}, that:
 18 "... following a conversation with John BARRADELL,
 19 I was asked to liaise with the [LRG] London Resilience
 20 Group to set up a conference call ..."
 21 Can you help with that discussion and when that
 22 discussion was?
 23 A. The discussion with John Hetherington would have been at
 24 some point late afternoon, but with sufficient time for
 25 the call to then be set up for 5.30.

1 Q. Before that call -- in fact, the person's idea to set up
 2 the call from your statement appears to be it was
 3 John Barradell.
 4 A. It was John Barradell and it would have been in
 5 discussion with me, yes.
 6 Q. What was the nature of that discussion with
 7 John Barradell which prompted setting up the conference
 8 call?
 9 A. I believe it would have been to do with the media
 10 coverage and knowledge of some of these offers --
 11 Q. Thank you.
 12 A. -- of support.
 13 Q. Perhaps we could turn to {GOL00000170}. Again, the
 14 panel may have seen this already. This is an email by
 15 you, 15.46. We can see who it's sent to, including
 16 Chris Naylor, John O'Brien, John Hetherington,
 17 John Barradell, "Categories: Red Category":
 18 "As discussed on the phone, the two main reasons for
 19 our call with Nicholas are:
 20 "1. To gain [a] better understanding of the likely
 21 support K&C will require going forward to support
 22 strategic decisions on how this is best delivered.
 23 Fundamental to this is resilience at the highest level
 24 and ensuring appropriate strategic support is available
 25 to Nicholas if required.

1 "2. To consider the wider implications for K&C and
 2 London as a whole and determine initial actions to
 3 address."
 4 That's your email setting out the purpose for the
 5 call.
 6 Were they your words? Was that your idea, or was
 7 that what was suggested to you by John Barradell as the
 8 purpose for the meeting?
 9 A. I don't recall, but the principle behind establishing
 10 the conference call had been set following previous
 11 incidents in 2017, where there had been value in Local
 12 Authority Gold, if activated, and those chief executives
 13 who were from the affected boroughs, London Councils,
 14 who obviously support the sort of political perspective
 15 and leaders' committee in London, getting together for,
 16 for want of a better word, a bit of a scrum down.
 17 Q. Yes.
 18 A. And seeking insight from Nicholas in terms of what his
 19 potential needs were going to be over the coming days,
 20 so that local authorities weren't (a) in the dark and,
 21 secondly, playing catch-up if there was to be something
 22 that materialises that needed wider support.
 23 Q. Yes.
 24 In relation to your role during this call, were you
 25 there as a watching brief or were you there to provide

1 advice, bearing in mind your expertise?
 2 A. I very much saw it as a chief exec to chief exec call,
 3 but clearly if I could add value to the call, then
 4 I would have made a comment, I would have contributed.
 5 Q. And do you recall providing any advice during this call
 6 on 14 June at 17.30?
 7 A. I don't recall, but if I may add some context.
 8 Q. Yes.
 9 A. John Barradell is vastly experienced in this and,
 10 actually, John and I had a strong working relationship.
 11 So the sorts of things that I would be thinking about,
 12 I have no doubt he would have been thinking about as
 13 well.
 14 Q. And you had that conversation, on your evidence earlier
 15 on, where there was concerns --
 16 A. Yes.
 17 Q. -- developing regarding the response --
 18 A. Correct.
 19 Q. -- by RBKC?
 20 Save for a short summary of the call in an email
 21 which the panel have seen and we may touch upon in a few
 22 moments by John Hetherington, there was no formal
 23 minutes or personal notes taken by you of this call; is
 24 that correct?
 25 A. Correct.

105

1 Q. Why was no note or minute taken of this call?
 2 A. Well, I think I had probably agreed with
 3 John Hetherington that he would produce a note
 4 afterwards, so whether it be in an email, it was still
 5 a précis of the conversation.
 6 Q. Okay.
 7 A. And it was, for want of a better word, an informal
 8 conversation between Nicholas and the other chief
 9 executives, for them to just gauge the situation and see
 10 what level of support might be required. So it wasn't
 11 a formal part of the structure. It would be classified,
 12 I guess, as an opportunity to gauge what level of peer
 13 support is required.
 14 Q. During that call, did Nicholas Holgate, from your
 15 recollection, state any concern that he had in relation
 16 to the council's capacity or ability to continue to lead
 17 the humanitarian response?
 18 A. No, and I would suggest that John Hetherington's précis
 19 is fairly accurate of the conversation.
 20 Q. Can you recall whether there was any concerns expressed
 21 by anyone on that call regarding the ability of RBKC to
 22 cope with the immediate aftermath?
 23 A. I can't recall the exact detail of the conversation, but
 24 I think, as an indication, that RBKC would have
 25 benefitted from support were the decisions to deploy

106

1 staff into the borough the next day, and included within
 2 that were communications staff, subject matter expertise
 3 in terms of recovery from London Bridge, from Southwark,
 4 et cetera, and Lakanal, of course, and then immediately
 5 after that call, I think John Barradell had a further
 6 conversation with Nicholas where it was agreed that
 7 I would also go in to provide support, in a similar way
 8 as I had provided to other local authorities in
 9 a similar situation -- well, not in a similar situation;
 10 provided to other local authorities in response to other
 11 types of incident.
 12 Q. So without having a precise recollection of the
 13 conversation, if we look at what flowed from the
 14 meeting, your view is that there must have been
 15 an identified need to support RBKC; is that correct?
 16 A. I would suggest that there was an increased nervousness
 17 in terms of what was being stated and actually what was
 18 reality.
 19 Q. Well, let's develop that a little bit more.
 20 So there was an increased nervousness by those who
 21 were listening on the call by what was being stated, ie
 22 by what was being stated by RBKC; is that correct?
 23 A. That would have been my personal take on it, yes.
 24 Q. And as a result of that increased nervousness during
 25 this call, was it the case that there were offers to

107

1 support RBKC more?
 2 A. Yes, correct.
 3 Q. And in relation to those offers to provide further
 4 support, can you recollect whether there was any
 5 resistance to any additional support?
 6 A. No, I don't believe there was.
 7 Q. In terms of your specific role, your evidence a short
 8 while ago was that you believed that there was
 9 an additional call after this teleconference between
 10 Mr Holgate and Mr Barradell, and as a result, then you
 11 were asked to deploy the next day.
 12 A. Correct, and I think that's referenced in
 13 John Hetherington's précis, where he talks about
 14 post-call note.
 15 Q. Absolutely.
 16 You said you have done it before, provided that
 17 sort of assistance; would that be unusual, in those
 18 circumstances, for you to be deployed to assist at
 19 a local authority?
 20 A. The fact that I believe I've done it twice in
 21 15/20 years suggests it is unusual, and in both
 22 situations, it was not as quickly as I was required to
 23 go in to RBKC, on the sort of 24/48 hours after.
 24 If you'd like the context, the first time I was
 25 deployed in to a borough whilst I worked for London Fire

108

1 and Emergency Planning Authority was in support of
 2 Westminster City Council's response to the
 3 Alexander Litvinenko poisoning, and the fact that there
 4 were multiple locations across London and actually
 5 across the country where there was potentially
 6 contamination, and I supported Westminster in terms of
 7 the recovery programme, but, more importantly, provided
 8 the conduit and link between the fast-paced police
 9 investigation and those boroughs that potentially had
 10 contaminated locations within their borough. So it was
 11 a facilitation role --
 12 Q. Yes.
 13 A. -- and ensured the wider sort of -- rather than it just
 14 being Westminster-focused, that there was actually
 15 a view across London.
 16 The second incident that I responded to was the
 17 potential risk of flooding in Croydon, where again it
 18 was -- there was a sense that they needed some level of
 19 support, and I provided what I could to them and helped
 20 in whatever way I could.
 21 Q. So relatively exceptional for you to be deployed --
 22 A. Yes.
 23 Q. -- and to be deployed so quickly.
 24 A. Yes.
 25 Q. We will probably turn to your deployment after the

109

1 luncheon break, but I just want to deal with a couple
 2 more emails, if we can, before then.
 3 Was it the case at that stage, by the
 4 afternoon/evening of 14 June, did you sense any
 5 reluctance of London Resilience Group or the LAP to be
 6 getting drawn in into any long-term support?
 7 A. I believe -- I don't think there was any reluctance from
 8 the local authorities panel. I believe that there was
 9 some conversations regarding -- within London Resilience
 10 Group and potentially that I had with London Resilience
 11 Group around whether RBKC were providing the right level
 12 of support to the various functions that they needed to
 13 deliver, and the need to ensure that London Resilience
 14 Group didn't get embroiled in areas of which potentially
 15 RBKC should have been taking responsibility for.
 16 Q. So you're referring to the view of the London Resilience
 17 Group and John Hetherington. There's an email which the
 18 panel saw just this morning in relation to that.
 19 What was your view as to that opinion expressed or
 20 viewpoint expressed by the London Resilience Group about
 21 not being embroiled, I think your word was?
 22 A. May I ask what the time and dates when those --
 23 Q. Of course. Let's quickly show it. It's {LFB00061229}.
 24 Thank you, Mr Sawyer. It's at 23.04. It's an email you
 25 haven't seen but the panel have seen today.

110

1 You're not on the distribution list, but there's
 2 a reference to the discussion between you and
 3 Mr Hetherington, and we see in the second paragraph:
 4 "RBKC support -- Mark is meeting with RBKC to discuss
 5 their arrangements for [humanitarian assistance] and
 6 Recovery. I have made the point this is going to be
 7 a very long process ... I have made the point to Mark
 8 [that being you, Mr Sawyer] that they should look to
 9 consume this in everyday business as far as possible so
 10 that we don't get drawn into a long term support, Mark
 11 agreed with this, I think we will need to do something
 12 but I think if possible some advice early days to bring
 13 the right people together then let them get on with it."
 14 Again, we've heard evidence in relation to that. Is
 15 that a fair summary of your discussion with
 16 John Hetherington?
 17 A. I think that would be fair to say, and I think that we
 18 need to take into account that this was still
 19 an RBKC-led local authority response. There was -- and
 20 I can't -- John Hetherington would probably be better
 21 placed to explain this, but I think that there was
 22 a concern amongst LRG at the time that they were being
 23 asked to deliver functions and, for want of a better
 24 word, bail out the local authorities, and therefore
 25 local authorities themselves needed to take more direct

111

1 responsibility, particularly for some of the
 2 administration, things that there should be no reason
 3 why they don't have the capacity within the system to do
 4 that, allowing London Resilience Group to then revert to
 5 their primary role, which is to some extent subject
 6 matter expertise as well.
 7 Q. Sure. I think the word -- you just knocked against the
 8 microphone -- was "bail out", was it?
 9 A. Yes.
 10 Q. There was a concern about bailing out the local
 11 authority?
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. Thank you.
 14 Perhaps the final email we can touch upon is one
 15 which is sent the following day, {LFB00061310}. It's
 16 an email you sent to Toby Gould. You were up early
 17 working on 15 June, and it says this:
 18 "Toby,
 19 "... We had a call with Nicholas yesterday evening
 20 prior to SCG and made the point that he needs to gap
 21 analysis his needs and then support can be more focused.
 22 Currently [City of London] are supporting Comms and
 23 Southwark are supplying SME advice."
 24 Pausing there, could you help us with SME?
 25 A. Subject matter expertise.

112

1 Q. Subject matter expertise, and that's a phrase you have
 2 used already:
 3 "David Kerry has been tasked overnight to produce
 4 the road to recovery, loosely based on an agenda for
 5 Thor SMT this morning."
 6 Perhaps you could assist us with that, what's
 7 "Thor"?
 8 A. I assume it's a typo and it should be "the SMT this
 9 morning".
 10 Q. Okay. I thought it was something special which I wasn't
 11 familiar with. Okay, so that's a typo.
 12 SMT is senior management team?
 13 A. Senior management team.
 14 Q. Okay.
 15 A. And in the context of this, SMT, I would imagine I was
 16 referring to their Council Gold meeting.
 17 Q. Their council, so RBKC Gold, we've heard that they had
 18 meetings twice a day.
 19 A. Yes.
 20 Q. That's what you're referring to, thank you.
 21 If we scroll down just to deal with this email
 22 thread, it's a response from an email sent by Toby Gould
 23 at 11.07 the night before. You are the recipient, and
 24 I'm just going to ask you to focus on the last paragraph
 25 there:

113

1 "I know you're joining ..."
 2 So this is what Toby sends you the night before:
 3 "I know you're joining RBKC colleagues in the
 4 morning and will be discussing with Hamish. It will be
 5 good to get an honest broker appraisal of what we/other
 6 Boroughs are likely to need to help them with. I think
 7 today they've been too busy to consider a lot of the
 8 offers of support. With at least five Boroughs offering
 9 support on behalf of their CEOs, I think that should be
 10 considered alongside our potential to help if gaps need
 11 to be filled."
 12 Was that how you saw your role, getting an honest
 13 broker appraisal, when you attend the Town Hall on
 14 15 June?
 15 A. Not necessarily solely an honest appraisal of what needs
 16 they wanted, but it was more of an appraisal of their
 17 ability to cope with what they were being asked to
 18 deliver.
 19 Q. So does it follow that you were down there to provide
 20 support, but also underlining that you were there to see
 21 whether they were doing what needed to be done?
 22 A. Correct, and if I may add -- we may cover this at the
 23 end of all the questioning -- I think if I had this time
 24 again, I would certainly have made an earlier assessment
 25 that they needed more direct input. But at the time

114

1 I went there and I needed to better understand what was
 2 happening, and that didn't happen immediately.
 3 Q. Well, I'm sure we will come back to that and give you
 4 the opportunity to develop that.
 5 The last question is this: bearing in mind what you
 6 mentioned earlier on about concerns discussed between
 7 you and John Barradell regarding offers of support being
 8 made, and we see here again what's been said, that five
 9 boroughs have offered support, was that a flashing
 10 warning light to you that RBKC were too busy to consider
 11 offers of support?
 12 A. It was part of building that picture. What I didn't
 13 understand was why they weren't taking up the offers of
 14 support, whether there was information not available
 15 that would have led to them making that -- forming that
 16 opinion themselves. And that wasn't something I could
 17 do at 11 o'clock at night and it wasn't something you
 18 could do remotely; you had to get in there, really
 19 understand what was happening and then make an informed
 20 decision.
 21 Q. But too busy to consider offers of support could suggest
 22 an organisation is overwhelmed; is that one potential
 23 scenario?
 24 A. Definitely.
 25 Q. And it also could suggest a lack of strategic oversight

115

1 as well.
 2 A. Definitely.
 3 MR KEATING: Okay.
 4 Well, we'll move on to 15 June just after the
 5 luncheon break, if that's acceptable, Mr Chairman.
 6 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes, that's a good point to break,
 7 I think.
 8 MR KEATING: Thank you.
 9 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, we'll stop now, Mr Sawyer, so
 10 that we can all have a chance to get some lunch. We
 11 will resume at 2 o'clock, please.
 12 I have to ask you, as all the other witnesses, while
 13 you're out of the room, please don't talk to anyone
 14 about your evidence or anything relating to it.
 15 All right?
 16 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
 17 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much.
 18 (Pause)
 19 Thank you very much. 2 o'clock, then, please.
 20 MR KEATING: Thank you.
 21 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.
 22 (1.02 pm)
 23 (The short adjournment)
 24 (2.00 pm)
 25 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, Mr Sawyer, on we go, if

116

1 you're ready.
 2 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
 3 SIR MARTIN MOORE--BICK: Thank you very much.
 4 Yes, Mr Keating.
 5 MR KEATING: Thank you, Mr Chairman.
 6 Welcome back, Mr Sawyer.
 7 We were just about to turn to 15 June, and one topic
 8 I would like your assistance with is in relation to
 9 David Kerry. Is it right that you actually had contact
 10 with him on the evening of 14 June?
 11 A. Yeah, it was a phone call.
 12 Q. Yes. You set out at paragraph 36 {GOL00001349/7} --
 13 perhaps we could open it up, so we have it all in front
 14 of us -- that you spoke to him on the phone and:
 15 "During the call David KERRY briefed me and
 16 confirmed he was just about to start a night shift .
 17 I expressed concern that he needed to be available
 18 during the day to support the Council's overall
 19 response."
 20 And he acknowledged that concern.
 21 We know that you saw him on 15 June and he was
 22 working for a short period of time, but then went on
 23 to -- he was still working a night shift , he wasn't
 24 working during the day; is that correct?
 25 A. As I understand it, yes.

117

1 Q. Was there any response or update as to why he remained
 2 on nights and not worked during the day of 15 June and
 3 16 June?
 4 A. No, no mention of that. Having raised it, also in my
 5 statement, with Tony Redpath as well, and that links
 6 back to this point about RBKC utilising the right staff
 7 in the right roles at the right time to support their
 8 decision-making.
 9 Q. So we know that he wasn't there during the day on
 10 15 June. What impact did you think that would have had
 11 or did have on the RBKC response on 15 June and then
 12 16 June?
 13 A. The impact was simply that, from what I could see, their
 14 overall response required some -- it was very
 15 fragmented, and it needed someone somewhere centrally to
 16 be advising Nicholas appropriately about the right
 17 structures that needed to be in place and the way in
 18 which that could best be delivered, the types of
 19 frameworks, planning, or sort of the response
 20 arrangements that needed to be put into place, and my
 21 view was that if David had been around there during the
 22 day, it -- in the day on day one, rather than not being
 23 there on the 14th, he might have been able to guide and
 24 steer the local authority response, and particularly
 25 Nicholas Holgate, into greater understanding about what

118

1 was required, the scale that was -- of what was required
 2 to be put into place, and that may have changed certain
 3 decisions RBKC made on the 14th.
 4 Q. So is it your view that you consider that there was
 5 a vacuum in terms of specialist advice that could have
 6 been given to the town clerk, Nicholas Holgate, on
 7 15 June, or 14 June?
 8 A. Well, I went in and probably filled that role to some
 9 extent on the 15th.
 10 Q. Yes.
 11 A. Therefore, the question is: why wasn't there someone
 12 from RBKC to do that for them?
 13 Q. Yes, and there wouldn't have been somebody doing that on
 14 14 June if David Kerry was not there?
 15 A. Yeah, and I can't obviously comment on what difference
 16 that would have made on the 14th, I can just comment on
 17 the fact that there was a vacuum on the 15th that needed
 18 to be filled .
 19 Q. So it's right, isn't it, that you had, on 15 June,
 20 a meeting early in the morning with both David Kerry and
 21 Nicholas Holgate; is that correct?
 22 A. Correct.
 23 Q. How did you find, in terms of how he appeared, Mr Kerry
 24 when you saw him on 15 June?
 25 A. I think, as described in my statement, he was

119

1 traumatised and emotional and tired.
 2 Q. Whilst he was there, did you consider he was able to
 3 actually assist Mr Holgate?
 4 A. No.
 5 Q. But --
 6 A. Sorry, I did consider that he wasn't fit to support
 7 Nicholas, yes.
 8 Q. We will see in due course, but in one of your post-fire
 9 reflections {GOL00001301} you say that:
 10 "Briefing by DK [David Kerry], [emergency planning]
 11 manager confirmed he was traumatised ... not in
 12 a position to offer strategic direction with influence."
 13 Is that a fair summary?
 14 A. Definitely .
 15 Q. And we will see that document in a moment.
 16 Did you raise with Mr Holgate on 15 June that
 17 Mr Kerry wasn't around and should be around, or there
 18 was an absence of support he required?
 19 A. I had several conversations with Nicholas Holgate,
 20 I don't recall the detail of all of them, but I do
 21 recall , as I mentioned earlier, referencing
 22 David Kerry's -- the vacuum created by him being on
 23 night shift to Tony Redpath. But I think as the day
 24 progressed, it became more and more clear that RBKC as
 25 an organisation needed additional support. So, to be

120

1 honest with you, the vacuum created by David not being
 2 there, I think we moved on, to some extent, and started
 3 talking about: so what extra help do you need?
 4 But, like I say, I did reiterate my concern about
 5 David and the need for him to still be around during the
 6 day.
 7 Q. Let's move to paragraph 69 of your statement, which is
 8 at page 14 {GOL00001349/14}. It just provides a useful
 9 summary of what you were doing soon after your arrival.
 10 You attended with some notes, which you talked through,
 11 including the type of structures and groups
 12 Nicholas Holgate would need to consider adopting as the
 13 incident moved from response to recovery, and what was
 14 required to ensure a smooth transition:
 15 "I then raised the point that the [RBKC] should
 16 consider what additional support it required and what
 17 conditions it would wish to apply in discussions with
 18 the Metropolitan Police Service considering the formal
 19 handover from response to recovery."
 20 Terms we have heard already: emergency response, and
 21 to recovery.
 22 Could you briefly explain the significance of when
 23 an emergency moves from response to recovery?
 24 A. Without quoting the guidance, my general understanding
 25 would be that response transitions to recovery at the

121

1 point whereby there's no longer a risk to life and the
 2 situation has stabilised, and that at that point, the
 3 blue light organisations start to withdraw.
 4 Q. Let me assist you in relation to the non-statutory
 5 guidance in relation to this, paragraph 5.1.5
 6 {CAB00004519/83}:
 7 "The recovery phase should begin at the earliest
 8 opportunity following the onset of an emergency, running
 9 in tandem with the response to emergency. It continues
 10 until disruption has been rectified, demands on services
 11 have returned to normal levels and the needs of those
 12 affected (directly and indirectly) have been met."
 13 Is that what you were alluding to when you were
 14 asked?
 15 A. Yeah, the final point within that, sorry?
 16 Q. "... and the needs of those affected (directly or
 17 indirectly) have been met."
 18 A. Yeah, obviously that's a moot point in terms of the
 19 Grenfell response.
 20 Q. When would you expect normally, from your experience,
 21 that transition to occur from emergency response to
 22 recovery?
 23 A. Traditionally, it is reasonably quick. It depends on
 24 the scale of the incident, you know, and every incident
 25 is obviously different, so I wouldn't like to put

122

1 a definitive timeframe on that. But it is obviously
 2 a time at which all parties concerned are satisfied that
 3 those -- if not all, some of that criteria has been met,
 4 and then it transitions to the local authority, who are
 5 responsible for supporting the community, leading the
 6 community, within that area.
 7 Q. Yes.
 8 A. So therefore it is an agreed point in time.
 9 Q. We saw from earlier emails on the day before that there
 10 was an expectation that the response would move to
 11 recovery on 15 June; is that correct?
 12 A. No, that's incorrect.
 13 Q. No?
 14 A. That wouldn't be my definitive view. I think there may
 15 have been suggestions that it was likely that that would
 16 be the point at which it would happen, but I don't
 17 recall any conversations that I was party to that
 18 suggested that that was definitely going to happen.
 19 Q. Okay.
 20 Let's perhaps look at it from a different
 21 perspective. The night before we saw an email where
 22 David Kerry had been tasked overnight to produce the
 23 road to recovery, and that was loosely based on
 24 an agenda for the senior management team this morning.
 25 You will recall --

123

1 A. Yes.
 2 Q. -- we dealt with that before lunchtime. So that was
 3 something which was referred to in correspondence the
 4 night before.
 5 When you attended and had your meeting with
 6 David Kerry, was there any document prepared in relation
 7 to setting out a route map in relation to going towards
 8 recovery?
 9 A. No, not that I saw, and just to qualify the previous
 10 question --
 11 Q. Yes.
 12 A. -- as far as I'm concerned, by defining that route
 13 towards recovery, that path, wasn't necessarily to me
 14 an indication that it was definitely going to happen on
 15 the 15th.
 16 Q. This flows from your answers so far: from what you saw
 17 and what was being discussed on that morning on 15 June,
 18 did you consider that RBKC was in a position to
 19 transition from response to recovery?
 20 A. No.
 21 Q. And why was that?
 22 A. For two reasons: firstly, I don't think that they had
 23 robust enough arrangements in place to effectively
 24 manage the recovery process; and, secondly, I think
 25 there had been a complete loss of trust and confidence

124

1 in RBKC, and, therefore, for them to lead on the
 2 recovery, strategies and action would have been required
 3 to restore some of that faith and confidence in the
 4 local authority.
 5 Q. In relation to the latter matter, that loss of trust, as
 6 you described it, when did that become apparent to you,
 7 that that was a significant factor?
 8 A. I had no idea whatsoever before the fire, even on the
 9 14th, the level of mistrust there was circulating
 10 amongst the community, so this was brand new to me.
 11 I think it started to hit home probably on the 15th,
 12 when, again, more news was being shared and the
 13 situation became clearer.
 14 Q. When we were looking at your statement at paragraph 69
 15 {GOL00001349/14}, you raised the point about RBKC should
 16 consider what additional support it required. What
 17 support did you consider that they required?
 18 A. At that point, I hadn't really got to grips with exactly
 19 what they had in place in the first place, and, to be
 20 honest with you, as always in this, I'm not sure RBKC
 21 knew what additional support they needed. There wasn't
 22 that single point of truth in terms of how they were
 23 responding. The BECC wasn't functioning effectively
 24 and, therefore, discussions were taking place without
 25 the full picture understood.

1 Q. Situational awareness is perhaps another term for it.
 2 A. Yes.
 3 Q. Is that fair?
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. I think we'll cover that in just a moment.
 6 Let's move on, then. This was your early meeting.
 7 We then know that there was an RBKC Gold Group meeting,
 8 senior management team meeting, at 10 o'clock on
 9 15 June.
 10 What was your assessment as an observer of that
 11 meeting?
 12 A. I think as detailed in the statement. I think it was
 13 very operational, and I think that was because there
 14 wasn't this, for want of a better word, consistent
 15 understanding of the situation. I think it was too big,
 16 and I think there was no -- it was too polite, and I'd
 17 need to qualify that. It was -- I think it may have
 18 been described as a board meeting by other people giving
 19 evidence, and it was, for me, very similar to
 20 a traditional style of local authority meeting, very
 21 polite, very structured. It wasn't dynamic, it wasn't
 22 forward-looking, and it -- yeah, I think I've probably
 23 said enough about that meeting.
 24 Q. Let's look at paragraph 73 {GOL00001349/14}, if you
 25 could scroll down. It chimes with what you have just

1 told us. The last sentence, you say:
 2 "After the meeting, I suggested to Nicholas HOLTGATE
 3 that the meeting had been very operational and not
 4 strategic enough."
 5 And you asked him to consider reducing the
 6 membership, if we could see overleaf {GOL00001349/15}.
 7 What was his response when you said to him that the
 8 meeting was too operational and not strategic enough?
 9 A. I'm not sure I got a response to that.
 10 Q. How receptive was Nicholas Holgate to your input on
 11 15 June?
 12 A. I believe he was receptive. I think -- I don't recall
 13 a particular comment in terms of that previous statement
 14 just made. He was receptive, but I think he was trying
 15 to oversee the council response in a traditional local
 16 authority way, which meant that if that was his senior
 17 management team, then he probably wouldn't have wished
 18 to pick and choose who he involved, whereas I would have
 19 picked and chose those heads of service, those heads
 20 of -- directors in various departments who actually had
 21 something to contribute.
 22 Q. So a more streamlined approach?
 23 A. Yeah, and I think that would be the more effective way
 24 of having a real strategic-level conversation. And the
 25 thing that was missing was not so much, "This is what we

1 need to do now"; there wasn't a clear deadline placed on
 2 anything, as far as I can remember, and there wasn't
 3 a sense of, "This is what we need to do within the next
 4 24, 48, 72 hours", and a forward look to add some sense
 5 of direction and purpose to the response.
 6 Q. Is that what you mean when you refer to it not being
 7 strategic enough?
 8 A. Yes.
 9 Q. I'm going to move on to the humanitarian assistance
 10 steering group, which, again, the panel have heard quite
 11 a lot of evidence in relation to. That was something
 12 which was being assembled that day, and the first
 13 meeting took place at 2 o'clock on 15 June.
 14 At paragraph 75 {GOL00001349/15}, which we can see
 15 just in front of us, you had contact with Sue Redmond.
 16 You say this:
 17 "I spoke to Sue Redmond, the nominated [RBKC] ...
 18 (HALO) and I noted the extreme pressure she was under
 19 due to the pace in which the response was required and
 20 the scale of the situation."
 21 Is that a fair summary?
 22 A. Yes.
 23 Q. Would you have expected a HALO to be appointed before
 24 15 June? Would you have expected one to be appointed on
 25 14 June, for instance?

1 A. I would have expected, on 14 June, someone to be
 2 designated with the responsibility to lead on the
 3 response to the community. I think within their borough
 4 emergency management plan it references a Welfare
 5 Bronze.
 6 Q. Yes.
 7 A. The question is: who does that Welfare Bronze report in
 8 to? And, yes, I would have expected someone to be
 9 tasked with leading the humanitarian assistance
 10 response.
 11 Q. The HALO is something which is a role identified in the
 12 humanitarian assistance framework, one of the London
 13 Resilience documents; is that correct?
 14 A. That's correct.
 15 Q. Were you aware that she had no training before in that
 16 role as a HALO?
 17 A. If I didn't, then I would have been informed on that
 18 morning.
 19 Q. Again, just so that the panel perhaps can assess how
 20 normal this is, would you expect in that sort of
 21 situation for the appointed HALO to be somebody with no
 22 previous experience in that role?
 23 A. No.
 24 Q. You wouldn't expect --
 25 A. Well, if you define experience as appropriately trained,

129

1 having exercised and understand the role and what's
 2 required, then I would expect that. In terms of
 3 experience, there are so few incidents that have -- of
 4 this -- of the scale that would require a full-blown
 5 humanitarian assistance response, then direct
 6 experience, no.
 7 Q. No. But you would expect, is it right, from your
 8 answer, someone who was appointed would have the
 9 requisite training --
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. -- and exercising that role?
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. Did you provide assistance to Ms Redmond in relation to
 14 her carrying out her role?
 15 A. I did in the lead-up to the meeting, but not during the
 16 meeting, because I wasn't in the room.
 17 Q. Is it the case that you invited and asked Toby Gould to
 18 assist --
 19 A. Yes, I did.
 20 Q. -- Ms Redmond?
 21 A. I did, and that included sending the meeting invites to
 22 those people that had been omitted by RBKC in the
 23 first -- I believe in the first round of invites.
 24 Q. There was probably a lot of things going on in relation
 25 to your involvement on 15 June, but were you aware that

130

1 that invitation for Toby Gould to assist Ms Redmond was
 2 around 1.30, that's when that request was made to him?
 3 Does that sound about right?
 4 A. That's correct, and after -- that was prompted by me.
 5 Q. It led to Mr Gould doing his best by sending out invites
 6 to the voluntary sector and an updated agenda about
 7 ten minutes before the meeting.
 8 A. Correct.
 9 Q. Would you agree, far from an ideal set of circumstances,
 10 sending out information such as that so close to
 11 an important meeting?
 12 A. Without doubt.
 13 Q. I'm going to move on to communications.
 14 At paragraph 72 {GOL00001349/14} you refer to
 15 speaking to Martin Fitzpatrick, and he was head of the
 16 media communications team at RBKC, and you explained
 17 that he had failed to dial in to the London Gold
 18 communications group conference call at 8.30 in the
 19 morning, and it states:
 20 "Martin FITZPATRICK indicated that the request may
 21 have been lost in the 200 emails he had not had time to
 22 open."
 23 Is that correct?
 24 A. That's what -- that event happened, yes.
 25 Q. Yes. What was the purpose -- again, to assist the

131

1 panel -- of a London Gold communications group
 2 conference? What would be that?
 3 A. That's part of the London Resilience Partnership
 4 structures and arrangements following a response
 5 strategic co-ordination arrangements. It's
 6 an opportunity for comms leads, communications leads
 7 from all of those key responding agencies to align
 8 messaging, share what -- anything relevant in terms of
 9 communications, and ensure that there is a coherent
 10 approach to messaging both the local community and the
 11 rest of London as necessary.
 12 Q. Was it a cause of concern that the head of the media
 13 communications team at RBKC had not participated in that
 14 call?
 15 A. It was concern enough for, I believe, someone from
 16 London Resilience Group to tell me that he hadn't been
 17 on that call and, therefore, it was sufficiently
 18 important for me to raise it with him.
 19 And can I just add that I'm not sure if you have the
 20 minutes from that conference call; if RBKC are on that
 21 call, then that was obviously -- I wasn't aware of that,
 22 but also I would have expected Martin Fitzpatrick to be
 23 aware if they were on the call or not.
 24 Q. Well, we've heard it's a pretty small team, the media
 25 communications team, and you've given your advice there

132

1 about the difficulties he raised in relation to the
 2 volume of material in terms of emails.
 3 What view did you form during 15 June, whilst you
 4 were at the Town Hall, of how the communications team
 5 were performing at RBKC?
 6 A. That was one of the areas I didn't really delve too
 7 deeply with.
 8 Q. Let's have a quick look at {GOL00001301}. These are
 9 your post-incident reflections, which we will touch
 10 upon. But on the fourth line we can see:
 11 "Comms team in denial and overwhelmed. Asked why
 12 missed 8.30!comms call [I'm not sure if that's
 13 deliberate or not] — missed amongst two hundred emails."
 14 So it's really the first part of the sentence I'd
 15 like your assistance with:
 16 "Comms team were in denial and overwhelmed."
 17 What did you mean by that?
 18 A. The overwhelmed aspect of that was a link to the 200
 19 emails, small team, et cetera, et cetera. The denial
 20 piece, I can't recall.
 21 Q. Okay.
 22 I wonder if we could go back to your statement. We
 23 will refer to this document again in a short while, but
 24 if we go back to your first statement, page 10
 25 {GOL00001349/10}, paragraph 50, please. Thank you. You

133

1 set out really your approach, third line:
 2 "This involvement included gaining an understanding
 3 of methods and structures being applied by the [RBKC] to
 4 manage the response across the range of
 5 responsibilities, including humanitarian assistance,
 6 housing, mass fatalities and generic command and control
 7 functions."
 8 So really this draws together what you say in your
 9 statement. So you've done a number of things, and it
 10 allowed you to gain an understanding of their
 11 structures; is that right?
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. At paragraph 54 {GOL00001349/11}, you set out your
 14 opinion, and you say this:
 15 "However, in my opinion, I did not believe that
 16 Nicholas HOLGATE had complete awareness of the scale and
 17 complexity of what [RBKC] were being asked to deal with,
 18 with a lack of full situational awareness across the
 19 senior management team."
 20 Is that correct?
 21 A. Yes, it is.
 22 Q. When did you form that view?
 23 A. Around lunchtime, I think, maybe early afternoon.
 24 I can't be specific, because, like I say, this just
 25 evolved. That understanding evolved.

134

1 Q. Yes.
 2 A. And there were a number of specific elements that led me
 3 to form my overall opinion, which then, as I've said
 4 earlier, led to a conversation with John Barradell late
 5 afternoon.
 6 Q. The conversation I think you referred to was the day
 7 before, on the 14th. So we're on the 15th —
 8 A. This is a new conversation.
 9 Q. We will move on to that conversation.
 10 But in relation to conversations, did you raise
 11 these concerns with Mr Holgate, that he had a lack of
 12 understanding of the complexity of what RBKC were to
 13 deal with and there was a lack of full situational
 14 awareness?
 15 A. I don't — no, I don't recall discussing that with him
 16 in that — in those terms, no, I don't recall that.
 17 Q. Should you have?
 18 A. I think that goes back to my comment earlier about
 19 I should have stepped in earlier and made that more
 20 clearly known. But I think, as I said, the intention
 21 was always to go in there and try and assist. I had
 22 several conversations with Tony Redpath, because
 23 Nicholas was always very — you know, appeared very
 24 busy, and I raised the issue about situational awareness
 25 definitely with him, and so I was hoping, just with the

135

1 intention of trying to help, that by flagging these
 2 things as the day progressed, the situation would
 3 improve.
 4 Q. Were you trying to encourage, nudge, point towards areas
 5 to improve? Is that how, in reality, your approach was?
 6 A. That is a really good way of describing that. And the
 7 other way, whether right or wrong, I still felt that
 8 I was a guest in RBKC, I'd been allowed in, rather than
 9 having the authority to go in and actually instruct and
 10 change. So it was working with them to ensure that
 11 I remained seen as supportive and trying to help, rather
 12 than not.
 13 Q. In retrospect, you have alluded to twice now sort of
 14 lessons learned. Is a lesson that you have learned that
 15 you should have been more challenging in highlighting
 16 the extent of how RBKC were going wrong?
 17 A. Yeah, and — exactly, and I think, again, testament to
 18 the fact that this was the first situation that I'd been
 19 involved with which required that level of assertion,
 20 you know, that level of assertiveness, and, as I said,
 21 I think there were a number of events which culminated
 22 in the earlier — sorry, mid-afternoon that then led me
 23 to say to John Barradell, "This isn't working".
 24 Q. Okay. We'll move to that in a little while.
 25 While we have paragraph 54, let's just continue

136

1 reading the last part:
 2 "It was also my opinion that [RBKC] had not been
 3 galvanised as an organisation due to witnessing members
 4 of staff seemingly continuing to deliver their day jobs
 5 whilst a small number of individuals appeared to be
 6 dealing with a significant number of issues at the same
 7 time."

8 What did you mean by that?

9 A. I think, without doubt, there were lots and lots of good
 10 people trying to do the best they possibly could. It
 11 may have been just — and, sorry, I acknowledge that
 12 there are still critical services that a local authority
 13 still needs to deliver, even in the midst of the tragedy
 14 at Grenfell, so that acknowledged, but there was just
 15 again this sense that I got that there were too few
 16 people trying to do too much, and I didn't at any stage
 17 hear the terms referenced that all non-critical services
 18 had been suspended, as an example. The fact that the
 19 humanitarian assistance group meeting had to be
 20 relocated because the IT wasn't working, et cetera.
 21 What I wasn't seeing is a team of people running around
 22 making the whole response work.

23 So it's not just those people making decisions and
 24 dealing directly with the issues; it's the
 25 infrastructure around that to enable it to function

1 effectively, and I didn't get any sense of that.

2 And I think it links back, if I may — this may seem
 3 very minor, but I was very concerned when I walked in to
 4 the council offices that morning and saw the pile of
 5 donations in the courtyard outside, and no sense of
 6 anybody being instructed or being tasked with dealing
 7 with that. There may well have been, but it was just my
 8 observations on the day.

9 Q. One interpretation or impression from your answers was
 10 that there was a lack of urgency that you observed; is
 11 that a fair impression?

12 A. I wouldn't necessarily say that that would be fair,
 13 because I'm sure, in certain areas across the
 14 organisation, there was urgency in terms of activity.
 15 What was lacking was an urgency to define the way in
 16 which the council should address these big issues that
 17 needed to be addressed, and that was, again, just my
 18 observations from the Gold meetings.

19 Q. Well, let's return back to your post-incident
 20 reflections, which is {GOL00001301}. We have touched
 21 upon some of these already, but I just want to deal with
 22 the remainder. You mentioned already this is what you
 23 noted down and emailed to yourself about a couple
 24 of weeks after the incident.

25 We see on the first example the one you just touched

1 upon, the donations which you first observed; correct?

2 A. Correct.

3 Q. The fifth line:

4 "CEO no system to address offers of support ..."

5 And you give an example where you suggest he should
 6 request acknowledgement.

7 We mentioned before lunch that there were emails
 8 internally between you and LRG regarding
 9 Nicholas Holgate being too busy to consider offers of
 10 support. Did that remain an issue?

11 A. I can't say. Others will have been more sighted than
 12 I was in terms of the actual offers coming in. I'm
 13 aware, for example, of the business sector panel making
 14 offers available.

15 Q. Sure.

16 A. So, yes, there were offers. But once the conversation
 17 was had at 5.30, then my focus moved more towards what
 18 we were going to do the next day and how we were going
 19 to ease into full sort of Local Authority Gold support.

20 Q. You make an observation here, which is implicitly
 21 a criticism, that there was no system in place to
 22 address offers of support. Perhaps if I could put it
 23 this way: what system would you expect someone in that
 24 situation to have in place to deal with offers of
 25 support?

1 A. I would have expected there to have been a dedicated
 2 officer, perhaps within the BECC, borough emergency
 3 control centre, where every offer of support would have
 4 been channelled through. That's the way I would have
 5 done it. And then allow that officer or that role to
 6 then disseminate and — but the key is not just ping
 7 it out — sorry for the technical term — of, you know,
 8 sending it on to people; it's about monitoring it, it's
 9 about making sure actually that it is actioned, which is
 10 why, again, I was particularly keen to highlight to
 11 Nicholas the offer from Borough Market, who had sadly
 12 obviously had the terrorist incident only a few days
 13 before that, but they were still willing and wanting to
 14 provide whatever support they could, which I thought was
 15 admirable, and I thought that it was worthy of
 16 a response.

17 But this then also links to this sense that Nicholas
 18 didn't have sufficiently robust support around him to
 19 take some of the, for want of a better word,
 20 administrative burden away from him and allow him to do
 21 some of that strategic thinking which was required.

22 Q. He was too operational rather than strategic?

23 A. I think he was overwhelmed.

24 Q. Okay.

25 I want to deal with one of the other observations

1 you have made and you have touched upon already,
 2 underneath that:
 3 "BECC failing with no situational awareness. No
 4 sitrep produced."
 5 Again, when did you form the view that the BECC was
 6 failing, with no situational awareness?
 7 A. I think that was after the --- we went straight from ---
 8 I went straight from observing the Council Gold meeting,
 9 I think, at 10.00 into the SCG at 11.00, and it was
 10 after the SCG that I made that point, and I think then
 11 overnight they were tasked with a situation report, so
 12 it materialised the next morning.
 13 Q. You mentioned raising this with Tony Redpath; is that
 14 correct?
 15 A. I believe so.
 16 Q. What was his response when you raised the lack of
 17 situational awareness in the BECC?
 18 A. I think he acknowledged that. I believe he acknowledged
 19 it, from my recollection.
 20 Q. Whilst we have this document open, it's slightly out of
 21 sequence in terms of the timeline, but we see down at
 22 the bottom:
 23 "Challenged director of housing over suggestion
 24 residents would be spending a further night in rest
 25 centre. See minutes to 16th pm Gold meeting.

141

1 Associated comments from Gold --- it is adequate."
 2 Can you assist with the circumstances where you
 3 challenged the director of housing over that suggestion?
 4 A. What I can recall is that there was a suggestion that
 5 there may still be people, residents, members of the
 6 community, having to spend an additional night or the
 7 next --- that night in a rest centre, and I questioned
 8 whether more could be done. I can't recall the exact
 9 words, but I questioned as to whether more should be
 10 done to ensure that didn't happen.
 11 Q. The last feature is this:
 12 "Due to continuing concerns on grip, arranged
 13 conference call on evening at approx 5.30."
 14 I'm going to ask you again --- we will read it out
 15 now:
 16 "Mid call Nick left room to speak to someone
 17 outside."
 18 In relation to that part, were you with Mr Holgate
 19 at the Town Hall during this teleconference?
 20 A. Yes, I was.
 21 Q. And this is something you noted, that during the
 22 teleconference with John Barradell and others, he left
 23 the room to speak to somebody outside?
 24 A. That's right.
 25 Q. Okay.

142

1 A. And, sorry, if I may just ---
 2 Q. Yes.
 3 A. --- contextualise that. I found it a little bit strange
 4 that he had the ear of Eleanor Kelly and John Barradell
 5 on the phone, they were talking to him about how he was
 6 coping and what additional support was required, and
 7 then Nicholas decided to leave the room and have
 8 a conversation with someone else outside, leaving us sat
 9 on the call. And I just didn't feel that that was
 10 showing (a) the right --- he wasn't necessarily
 11 prioritising in the right way, because that call was
 12 very important in my mind.
 13 Q. Did you know who the person was or what the
 14 circumstances for --- the need for Mr Holgate to absent
 15 himself?
 16 A. No, but, to be honest with you, it would have had to
 17 have been really, really important, as far as I was
 18 concerned, but there was no indication of what it
 19 related to.
 20 Q. So you have mentioned this is an important call. Was it
 21 the case that it was your suggestion that this call
 22 should take place?
 23 A. It was my suggestion to Nicholas Holgate that he needed
 24 additional support and that he should set up the call
 25 with John and Eleanor, John Barradell and Eleanor Kelly.

143

1 Q. Yes. Before this call, did you have contact with
 2 John Barradell so he was sighted as to the issues you
 3 experienced?
 4 A. Yes. Yes.
 5 Q. What information did you relay to him, in broad form?
 6 A. Just a general assessment, as described in my statement.
 7 Q. A lack of situational awareness, lack of grip?
 8 A. Common term, but yeah, a lack of grip. They just were
 9 not on top of it in a way which I would have expected
 10 and therefore needed help.
 11 Q. You used the phrase "concerned" a number of times; what
 12 sort of gradient of concern had you at this stage, prior
 13 to the call on 15 June?
 14 A. Sufficient to suggest that that call was important.
 15 Q. Did you advise Mr Barradell as to any suggested course
 16 before that call?
 17 A. I can't recall, but I think, as I mentioned earlier,
 18 John Barradell and I saw things in a similar way and,
 19 therefore, I would expect him to know what was needed.
 20 Q. This additional support, what did you envisage was going
 21 to occur or should occur at this stage?
 22 A. Well, I think, prior to the call, the main aim was to
 23 get Nicholas to realise he needed help, you know, and
 24 I don't think he didn't appreciate that, but I think he
 25 needed that extra nudge to make it happen.

144

1 As to what that additional support looked like, that
 2 was a conversation between Nicholas, John Barradell and
 3 Eleanor. And again, I saw it very much as
 4 a peer-to-peer, chief-executive-to-chief-executive
 5 conversation.
 6 Q. In terms of chief executives, the duty London Local
 7 Authority Gold, Chris Naylor, who was at the previous
 8 meeting the day before, wasn't invited to this meeting.
 9 Was there any particular reason why that was?
 10 A. I'm not sure of the exact timing, but I think there was
 11 a clear sense, particularly having just come off
 12 Westminster Bridge attack, the move to critical that the
 13 government sort of implemented, or -- and then finally,
 14 most recently, the London Bridge attack, and there was
 15 fear and concern that there would be another one
 16 imminently, so rather than tie up Chris Naylor, my
 17 understanding was that he would remain available to deal
 18 with any other unrelated incidents in London, and there
 19 are precedents for that.
 20 Q. Yes.
 21 A. And John Barradell, in his capacity as chair of LAP, but
 22 more importantly as an experienced chief executive --
 23 and I think actually that's probably the reason John was
 24 prepared to go in there and help, on the basis that he
 25 had the experience to try and make a difference.

1 Q. Okay.
 2 In relation to this meeting, which took place,
 3 I think it was 5 o'clock, actually, on 15 June, no
 4 minutes or note of the meeting; is that correct?
 5 A. Correct.
 6 Q. Again, why was that? Why was there no note of this
 7 important meeting, as you described it?
 8 A. I think, in hindsight, it should have been recorded, but
 9 at the time I treated it as a similar level of
 10 conversation to the previous day.
 11 Q. So you considered it a peer-to-peer --
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. -- informal --
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. -- conversation?
 16 A. Yes.
 17 Q. But actually, on your account, these are quite
 18 exceptional circumstances --
 19 A. Correct.
 20 Q. -- where you were sufficiently concerned to arrange
 21 a meeting, or suggest a meeting was called.
 22 A. Correct.
 23 Q. Can you recall whether Nicholas Holgate was given any
 24 advice during that meeting?
 25 A. I don't recall the details of that meeting, other than

1 the outcome.
 2 Q. Well, tell us, what can you recall of the meeting?
 3 A. Obviously I remember Nicholas leading. I remember there
 4 would have been a conversation around what support
 5 Nicholas required. But, like I say, the minutiae of the
 6 conversation, I don't recall.
 7 Q. Can you assist with the length of the meeting?
 8 A. I would suggest it was probably about 30 minutes.
 9 Q. How about the mood of the meeting?
 10 A. Supportive.
 11 Q. How would you describe the approach of Mr Holgate at
 12 that stage? You're talking about how he needed to
 13 consider what help he needed, and he perhaps hadn't
 14 arrived at that view, that he needed assistance. Did
 15 that change during the meeting?
 16 A. No, I think he was receptive. The fact that he was very
 17 happy to set up the meeting said to me that he was
 18 receptive to any support that was being made available
 19 to him.
 20 Q. Do you recall whether there was any discussion regarding
 21 the actual activation of the London Gold resolution?
 22 A. I don't -- what I can comment on that is that my
 23 understanding as a result of that meeting was that John
 24 was -- John Barradell was going to go into RBKC the next
 25 morning to provide direct support and advice to

1 Nicholas, read himself into the situation, understand
 2 the issues, the structures that were in place,
 3 understand what the resourcing needs were likely to be,
 4 and then at some point, having been read in, the Local
 5 Authority Gold arrangements would be invoked, which
 6 would then have allowed John Barradell the ability to
 7 spend RBKC's money and commit resources on behalf of
 8 RBKC into the borough for RBKC to then manage.
 9 Q. That view of the role of John Barradell, is that
 10 something which you recollect emerged after the meeting,
 11 or was this something you recollect emerged during the
 12 meeting?
 13 A. It would have ... I would suggest it must have been
 14 discussed in terms of going in there the next day during
 15 the meeting.
 16 Q. Is it fair to say that you can't be sure because of the
 17 passage of time and the absence of a note?
 18 A. Very much so.
 19 Q. John Hetherington in his statement recalls -- at
 20 paragraph 76 {LFB00061158/24}, just for the record --
 21 that on 15 June at 18.39, you discussed London Gold
 22 being activated the following day. Does that sound
 23 correct?
 24 A. I think that matches with what I've just described.
 25 Q. And he states that your discussion was subsequently

1 reflected in an email, and let's have a look at that
 2 email to aid your recollection , {LFB00061236}. Again,
 3 this may be one that the panel have seen already.
 4 19.02. You're not a recipient of this email, but
 5 Mr Hetherington believes that this reflected your
 6 discussion:
 7 "In light of the increasing complexity of the
 8 incident, the recent request for mutual aid from RBKC
 9 and a number of other factors, the decision has been
 10 taken to activate LLAG to own the incident and support
 11 directly RBKC.
 12 "Current plan that as of tomorrow morning
 13 Paul Martin (Wandsworth) will go into RBKC to support
 14 LLAG and three other Chief Executives will be made
 15 available to support aspects of the response."
 16 Was it the case that at this initial stage, at
 17 7 o'clock on 15 June, John Barradell wasn't the person
 18 who was considered to be sent down to the Town Hall, but
 19 in fact it was a different chief executive, Paul Martin?
 20 A. No, that's not correct. And if I may just add a comment
 21 about some of the language utilised within this email,
 22 where it talks about "taken to activate LLAG to own the
 23 incident", LLAG supports the incident; it's owned by
 24 the category 1 responder, the local authority, RBKC.
 25 And in terms of was it -- I think if you look at the

149

1 wording of John Hetherington's sentence starting
 2 "Current plan that as of tomorrow Paul Martin ... will
 3 go in", go in to support LLAG, not to perform the role
 4 of LLAG.
 5 Q. Okay, thank you for that clarification . Mr Hetherington
 6 has been asked already about this this morning, but
 7 I just wanted to see if you had anything to add, bearing
 8 in mind this was meant to reflect your conversation.
 9 So the evidence, drawing it together, your
 10 recollection at that meeting, or soon after, there was
 11 discussion regarding activation of London Gold. We see
 12 an email shortly after which reflects a discussion you
 13 had with John Hetherington. So on the evening of
 14 15 June, it's fair to say that activation had been
 15 discussed and agreed; correct?
 16 A. Agreed that it would happen.
 17 Q. Yes.
 18 A. I'm not party to any of the conversations around exactly
 19 when that would happen, other than I expected it the
 20 next day, hence the email as described. But I was also
 21 aware that mutual aid was already being facilitated , so
 22 that was an indication to me that support was starting
 23 to be generated for the benefit of RBKC. And I think
 24 also testament to that is the reference in that email
 25 about three other chief executives are being made

150

1 available to support. So conversations had already
 2 started as a result of that 5.30 call .
 3 Q. Yes. Your answer predicts the next question, really ,
 4 regarding whether there was a delay and if there was any
 5 impact of delay. So we know it was 2 o'clock the
 6 following day, Friday, 16 June, when it was formally
 7 activated, and do you know why that was, why there was
 8 that passage of time, if I could put it neutrally , from
 9 the evening of 15 June to 2 o'clock on the Friday,
 10 16 June, before formal activation?
 11 A. No, I don't know as to why they waited until that point.
 12 I can comment on the 2 o'clock event, if that would
 13 help. But I think I've referenced previously this
 14 belief that RBKC hadn't quite worked out what support it
 15 required and, therefore, rather than just throw
 16 everything at it and it not to be right, it was
 17 important to genuinely understand what was required.
 18 So I think the immediate need through the mutual aid
 19 request was for BECC staff, and I think additional
 20 support was then being sort of considered the next
 21 morning.
 22 Q. Yes. Would you accept there's a tension here between
 23 forming an understanding of what help they needed and
 24 the urgent need to provide humanitarian assistance to
 25 those affected?

151

1 A. Without doubt.
 2 Q. And it's right to say that by the Thursday evening,
 3 there was extensive coverage in the media about how that
 4 was apparently failing ; is that correct?
 5 A. I, to be honest with you, didn't look at the media that
 6 evening. I was busy doing this. But I would imagine
 7 that was the case.
 8 Q. In terms of forming the view of what assistance they may
 9 need, they had your expertise there for a day, actually ,
 10 to identify that there were significant failings in
 11 a number of areas; isn't that correct?
 12 A. Correct.
 13 Q. So what benefit would there have been, bearing in mind
 14 you were there to assess and identify the need, waiting
 15 until the following day to 2 o'clock to formally
 16 activate LLAG?
 17 A. As previously stated, I wasn't party to the discussions
 18 around exactly when that transfer would happen, and
 19 Nicholas Holgate and John Barradell are probably better
 20 placed to do so.
 21 Q. Do you consider that that was, as it's been termed,
 22 a limbo period from the 15th over to the 16th, where the
 23 LLAG resources weren't fully utilised ?
 24 A. There was a -- I would suggest that the time spent
 25 between 5.30 and perhaps the Gold meeting the following

152

1 morning in RBKC would have been time well spent for them
 2 to have a genuine view of what extra resources they did
 3 require. I'm not sure that that was delivered.
 4 Q. Do you consider now that the London Gold resolution
 5 should have been formally activated at a sooner stage?
 6 A. I think we would all probably have said it should have
 7 been invoked on the morning of the 14th.
 8 Q. Yes. But let's say a decision was made on the 15th, as
 9 you discussed, at this meeting. Do you think it should
 10 have waited until the following day or should it have
 11 been done sooner?
 12 A. I think it would have been very challenging for
 13 John Barradell to have taken a view in terms of what
 14 resourcing was required, how -- what level of support
 15 RBKC required, without actually going across and seeing
 16 it for himself.
 17 Q. Notwithstanding -- and forgive me for probing you on
 18 this, but you mentioned a couple of times how you and
 19 John Barradell worked closely with each other, know each
 20 other, are of similar mind; you would have known,
 21 wouldn't you, what was going through his mind and the
 22 challenges that he faced? You could assist him,
 23 couldn't you?
 24 A. I wouldn't question his decision to wait until the next
 25 morning and really read himself in.

153

1 Q. Okay.
 2 I'm going to talk about that sort of post-activation
 3 period very briefly, if I may.
 4 What did you consider to be the main challenges
 5 post-activation in meeting the needs of those affected
 6 by the fire?
 7 A. Restoring trust and confidence, and making sure that the
 8 housing needs of everyone affected was met in the most
 9 effective way possible.
 10 Q. Perhaps we could have a look at paragraph 95 of your
 11 statement {GOL00001349/18}, just to continue that
 12 answer. Thank you. Second line:
 13 "The challenge faced, however, was the scale in
 14 terms of number of residents who sadly lost their lives,
 15 the significant rehousing need, complexity such as the
 16 loss of the boilers supporting the Lancaster West estate
 17 creating a larger impact footprint, the local political
 18 dynamic and finally the community reaction which from
 19 the outset laid the blame on the [RBKC] and the [TMO].
 20 These challenges will have made the response extremely
 21 difficult to coordinate from the outset."
 22 Does that reflect your evidence as to the
 23 challenges?
 24 A. Yes, it does.
 25 Q. In relation to the larger impact footprint caused by the

154

1 difficulties in the surrounding households, what was
 2 your understanding of the role London Local Authority
 3 Gold held in relation to responsibility for, first,
 4 Grenfell Tower residents, but also those walkway
 5 residents?
 6 A. I think, before I answer that question, it is worth just
 7 clarifying, if I may --
 8 Q. Of course.
 9 A. -- London Local Authority Gold is a co-ordination role,
 10 providing resources, assets, support to the affected
 11 borough for it to then deploy and co-ordinate and
 12 manage -- sorry, manage locally, and I think that's
 13 played out in terms of how the mutual aid agreement is
 14 designed. So an offering local authority places its
 15 resources, people, at the disposal of the affected
 16 borough.
 17 The role that John Barradell moved into, in terms of
 18 being asked to lead the response, was a conversation
 19 between him and Nicholas at 2 o'clock on that -- on the
 20 16th. The technical details in terms of under what
 21 authority John Barradell undertook that lead role for
 22 the response is something that you would need to ask
 23 Nicholas and John Barradell about, because, as I say,
 24 there is no legal basis upon which Local Authority Gold
 25 leads a response within a borough.

155

1 So in terms of just clarifying that point, I think
 2 that, for me, was important to share.
 3 In terms of what John did agree, in terms of whether
 4 it was the tower, whether it was the footprint, again,
 5 I think that is a conversation that you would need to
 6 have with Nicholas and John.
 7 But as far as I'm concerned, John's role was
 8 providing an effective response to those people directly
 9 affected by the incident.
 10 Q. I'll move on, please --
 11 A. Sorry, my apologies, I've referred to "people"; to the
 12 BSRs, the bereaved, survivors, residents affected by the
 13 incident, because, you know, that's worthy of
 14 remembering.
 15 Q. Okay.
 16 I'm going to move on, if that's okay, to just
 17 briefly touch upon an assessment of the humanitarian
 18 assistance response once led by London Gold from
 19 16 June.
 20 You were closely supporting, were you not,
 21 John Barradell over these coming days?
 22 A. Yes, I was.
 23 Q. From that view close up and assisting John Barradell,
 24 how long did you think it took for London Gold to be
 25 able to effectively and adequately meet the humanitarian

156

1 needs of those affected by the fire?
 2 A. As to -- my apologies, as to meeting the needs of those
 3 people affected, I think you would need to -- as to when
 4 that occurred, I think every individual, every BSR, will
 5 have their own views in terms of when their needs were
 6 actually met. What I would suggest is that by the
 7 Sunday, there were structures in place to ensure that
 8 there was -- an effective support could be mounted. So
 9 the Saturday, the 17th, a lot of time and effort was
 10 spent on creating, for want of a better word,
 11 an organisation from scratch. So this had never been
 12 done before. We needed to bring in the right expertise,
 13 the right people, to make sure that we could make the
 14 difference that was required. So then, I would suggest,
 15 by the Sunday, we were in a much stronger position to
 16 try and go out and put into place what was required.
 17 Q. It's been described as a standing start, the sort of
 18 Grenfell fire response team had to make a standing start
 19 on the Friday and Saturday of that weekend.
 20 A. Correct, and we were very fortunate that there was
 21 appropriate accommodation in Westminster, and although,
 22 you know, ideally we would have not had to leave the
 23 RBKC offices on the Friday evening, but as a result of
 24 the demo, et cetera, it was the prudent decision to
 25 make, but it did then lead to us locating in a far more

157

1 suitable location, far more conducive to multi-agency
 2 collaboration and getting everybody in the one place to
 3 mount a concerted co-ordinated response.
 4 Q. So it took time to put in the structures, because this
 5 hadn't been done before. The structures were in place
 6 by close of play, perhaps, on Sunday.
 7 A. Yeah, I would -- I'd need to check my records, but yeah,
 8 around that time. During Sunday was when we started to
 9 break through the pressure of setting it up and actually
 10 start to really get into the meaningful work.
 11 Q. Yes. And we know that there was a press statement on
 12 the evening of the Sunday with Eleanor Kelly and the
 13 British Red Cross.
 14 A. Correct.
 15 Q. Which probably symbolised the Grenfell fire response
 16 team starting in earnest, and then --
 17 A. Well, it started -- sorry, I hope you don't mind?
 18 Q. No.
 19 A. There was -- we didn't stop and just set up, there were
 20 still actions being delivered through that -- through
 21 the Saturday and Sunday, but clearly the priority was to
 22 create the structure, because without the structure you
 23 don't have that co-ordinated, coherent approach.
 24 Q. Does it follow that, for those reasons, it took a number
 25 of days to make a material difference to the response?

158

1 A. I couldn't say as to whether it was several days,
 2 because my focus -- others may have a view. I don't
 3 have a view on that, because my focus was very much on
 4 getting the thing into a fit state to make a difference.
 5 Q. Perhaps another way to express it is this: issues did
 6 continue for a number of days, didn't they, in relation
 7 to communication with those at hotels, the Westway, and
 8 similar issues?
 9 A. Without doubt, and one of the key challenges was the
 10 lack of data, and so it was to some extent -- and not
 11 that I directly led on any of that work, but there was
 12 a significant challenge in terms of gathering the data
 13 and making sense of it.
 14 Q. Again, it's probably obvious from your answer, but data
 15 is in relation to the identification of those who were
 16 affected?
 17 A. Yes, yeah, where they'd been located, which hotels,
 18 things like that, things that were essential to mount
 19 an effective humanitarian response, and there was a lot
 20 of uncertainty in those first few days.
 21 Q. Would you expect that, from your experience, to have
 22 that lack of data so many days after an incident?
 23 A. No. I wouldn't -- I would expect to have strong data
 24 three/four days after the event.
 25 Q. I'm going to move on to the last part of our questions

159

1 to you and your evidence. You remember we had three
 2 parts, and this is the post-Grenfell Tower fire reviews
 3 which took place. With your assistance, we're going to
 4 navigate through some of those and your updated EP2020
 5 review, and perhaps cover some of the matters you have
 6 raised in your second and third statements.
 7 So you have set out in your first statement a number
 8 of the post-fire reviews which took place in the London
 9 civil resilience framework since 2017, supplemented by
 10 your second statement in April 2022, and your third most
 11 recent statement provides some final thoughts, the one
 12 that you provided on Thursday, following a period, as
 13 you describe, of reflection --
 14 A. Yes.
 15 Q. -- and preparing to give evidence.
 16 If perhaps we could open {GOL00001346}, please.
 17 This is what we mentioned already, EP2020, "Emergency
 18 Planning into the 2020s, April 2018 - Refresh". That
 19 contains -- we're not going to go through them all -- 27
 20 recommendations; is that correct?
 21 A. Correct.
 22 Q. Is it right that, in preparing this refresh report, you
 23 also reviewed your original EP2020 report, drafted in
 24 October 2016?
 25 A. Correct.

160

1 Q. And that had 14 recommendations, and you also considered
 2 two post-fire reviews which we can see touched upon
 3 under "Background", and let's look at the first one. It
 4 says this:
 5 "On the 7th February the Local Authorities'
 6 Panel ... endorsed a high-level implementation plan
 7 designed to address 11 recommendations contained in the
 8 [I want to emphasise this] Independent Peer Challenge
 9 review conducted by Tom Riordan and Mary Ney between
 10 October 2017 and February 2018."
 11 If we could turn overleaf, please, page 2
 12 {GOL00001346/2}:
 13 "Tom and Mary noted that the Recommendations for
 14 Local Government Emergency Planning and Resilience for
 15 the 2020s (EP 2020) report contained a range of
 16 recommendations that are in the process of
 17 implementation and endorsed this improvement work. It
 18 then goes on to make further recommendations to build on
 19 EP2020 ..."
 20 Let's have a look at this document briefly,
 21 {GOL00000146}. So this is the independent peer
 22 challenge review, January 2018, you see at page 1, and
 23 perhaps we could turn over to page 2 {GOL00000146/2},
 24 please, and we'll just deal with the introduction:
 25 "This independent peer challenge was commissioned in

161

1 October 2017 [as we just heard] by the London Councils
 2 Leaders' Committee who wanted an independent view about
 3 the arrangements that underpin London Local Government's
 4 collaborative resilience work. The peer challenge had
 5 an agreed scope in light of the unprecedented challenges
 6 faced between March and September 2017."
 7 Pausing there, that was your point this morning,
 8 that it wasn't just the Grenfell Tower fire --
 9 A. That's right, correct.
 10 Q. -- but there were a number of events in 2017.
 11 A. Yes.
 12 Q. I think we have heard Mr Adamson of the British
 13 Red Cross describe it as a sort of watershed year in
 14 terms of emergency planning. I'm not sure if you agree
 15 with that term.
 16 A. Unprecedented.
 17 Q. Okay. Watershed and unprecedented.
 18 If we look at the second paragraph:
 19 "The focus of the work was fitness of the collective
 20 response, not individual borough arrangements."
 21 Perhaps we could turn over, please, to page 3
 22 {GOL00000146/3}, and under "Findings", if we look at
 23 paragraph 7, we can see the Grenfell Tower fire is in
 24 there. I'm just going to deal with four lines from the
 25 bottom:

162

1 "The peer review team heard from several
 2 stakeholders that the Grenfell Tower Fire had undermined
 3 confidence in vital elements of London Local
 4 Government's collective resilience arrangements. Many
 5 of the recommendations are intended to address these
 6 issues and help restore confidence."
 7 Is that right? Is that a fair summary?
 8 A. I think it is, yes.
 9 Q. So this was the first of two reports which you
 10 considered. Let's turn to the second one, which is
 11 called "Assurance framework review", {GOL00001596}.
 12 "Providing individual and collective assurance", and
 13 that's Sean Ruth, February 2018.
 14 If we could turn to page 2 {GOL00001596/2}, please,
 15 and look at the circumstances. Again, executive
 16 summary:
 17 "This review was commissioned by the City of London
 18 Corporation on behalf of the Local Authorities' Panel in
 19 January 2018. The objective of the review is to
 20 recommend the means by which London local government ...
 21 can individually and collectively assure their
 22 organisations' preparedness, particularly their capacity
 23 and capability, through a credible, transparent,
 24 efficient and cost-effective approach."
 25 Is that right?

163

1 A. Correct.
 2 Q. If we could have a look at page 3 {GOL00001596/3},
 3 please, and the third paragraph, which may chime with
 4 something you say in one of your later statements. This
 5 was in the 2018 report:
 6 "There was a widespread view that there is limited
 7 involvement in Emergency Planning and Resilience ...
 8 across most organisations, with most of the
 9 responsibility resting with emergency planning teams and
 10 Chief Executives. This review looks at the challenge of
 11 embedding a culture of emergency planning and resilience
 12 across an organisation in a way that reflects the health
 13 and safety culture -- it becomes everyone's business ..."
 14 So in relation to that, this was mentioned in 2018,
 15 do you consider that is still a current issue?
 16 A. Yes, I do.
 17 Q. Could we also go to page 14 {GOL00001596/14}, please,
 18 and paragraph 3.12. It talks about the statutory duties
 19 in relation to planning and recovery, and I want to just
 20 read out this aspect four lines down:
 21 "On more than one occasion 'Recovery' was described
 22 as the Cinderella of emergency planning with a view this
 23 was replicated across the country. There is little
 24 evidence to suggest the same level of attention is being
 25 paid to the 'Recovery' phase of an emergency incident as

164

1 it is to preparedness and response, despite this being
 2 the lead role of local authorities, the long-term impact
 3 this will have on people and businesses in the local
 4 community and the potential risk to the credibility and
 5 reputation of a local authority.”
 6 Again, this was three years ago in 2018, and now
 7 four years ago. Do you agree with the description here
 8 that recovery is the Cinderella of emergency planning?
 9 A. Recovery is fundamental to local authorities restoring,
 10 recovering, allowing the community, the area, to recover
 11 following a large-scale emergency, and it is a local
 12 authority lead responsibility.
 13 Q. Yes. I think we understand what recovery is, but do you
 14 agree with the description which is set out in this
 15 report, that it's down as the Cinderella, that it's not
 16 given the same level of attention as paid to the other
 17 phases?
 18 A. I would suggest yes, then.
 19 Q. As we have touched upon already, from the consideration
 20 of these two reports and your previous reports, EP2020,
 21 you considered and consolidated these into your EP2020
 22 refresh; is that correct?
 23 A. Correct.
 24 Q. So with all this work that you were undertaking in your
 25 report, what did you consider the most important area,

165

1 perhaps, that needed to be changed or attention needed
 2 to be put on?
 3 A. I think the most important area was linked to the
 4 comment about it being everybody's business. It was
 5 about moving away from this reliance of the selected few
 6 to organisation ownership, and the role — sorry, and
 7 elements of resilience, emergency planning, being
 8 overseen and driven by the relevant departments, the
 9 experts within those departments, rather than it all
 10 resting with emergency planners.
 11 Q. That's one of the phrases you use in your third
 12 statement {GOL00001847/2}, which is, "Embedding the
 13 philosophy of 'resilience is everybody's business'".
 14 You consider that to be a key feature moving forward; is
 15 that correct?
 16 A. I do, and a lot of work has been done to engage with
 17 various professional networks, directors of comms,
 18 directors of housing, to really embed that philosophy
 19 that they should be taking far more ownership of areas
 20 which best sit with them.
 21 MR KEATING: I'm going to move on to a number of areas —
 22 five areas, in fact — which are recommendations and
 23 matters of discussion in EP2020: we're going to deal
 24 with standards, we have MSLs, minimum standards for
 25 London, we'll move on to resilience standards for London

166

1 in a moment; the review of the Gold resolution;
 2 community resilience; learnings from previous
 3 humanitarian responses; and training. So we're going to
 4 touch upon those and draw a few threads together.
 5 Before I do so, the first one is resilience
 6 standards for London, and perhaps, Mr Chairman, that may
 7 be a moment for a natural break.
 8 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, I assume that that's going to
 9 take you a little while to deal with those; is that
 10 right?
 11 MR KEATING: Yes.
 12 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Then I think it would be sensible to
 13 have a break now, wouldn't it?
 14 MR KEATING: Thank you.
 15 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, Mr Sawyer, I think it's time
 16 we had a short break. We'll stop now. We'll come back,
 17 please, at 3.30, and then we'll carry on then.
 18 While you're out, please don't talk to anyone about
 19 your evidence. All right?
 20 THE WITNESS: No, of course, thank you.
 21 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you.
 22 (Pause)
 23 Thank you very much.
 24 MR KEATING: Thank you.
 25 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: 3.30, please. Thank you.

167

1 (3.15 pm)
 2 (A short break)
 3 (3.30 pm)
 4 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, Mr Sawyer, ready to carry on?
 5 THE WITNESS: Very much so.
 6 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good, thank you very much.
 7 Yes, Mr Keating.
 8 MR KEATING: Thank you, Mr Chairman.
 9 Welcome back, Mr Sawyer.
 10 We're just going to deal with one of the first areas
 11 which flowed from your EP2020 refresh report, and we
 12 have that right in front of us now {GOL00001346/2}, and
 13 if we can see recommendation 2, which is this:
 14 "All London Local Authorities adopt the assurance
 15 framework recommended in the Sean Ruth Review 2018 and
 16 commit to credible selfassessment locally led by chief
 17 executives and overseen by Members which focuses on
 18 capacity and capability and organisational commitment to
 19 the resilience agenda. This local assurance is
 20 supported by sub-regional peer challenge and external
 21 independent peer review."
 22 So that was one of your core recommendations; isn't
 23 that correct?
 24 A. Correct.
 25 Q. And that's to be overseen by the local authority panel,

168

1 we see at -- we don't need to go to it --
 2 recommendation 23 {GOL00001346/6}.

3 So in relation to that core recommendation, is it
 4 right that the resilience standards for London were
 5 launched in July 2019, and they replaced the minimum
 6 standards for London?

7 A. Correct.

8 Q. Again, perhaps you could assist us, perhaps briefly --
 9 it may not be, it may be a bit difficult to do so -- but
 10 how did the resilience standards for London differ or
 11 are an improvement on the minimum standards for London?

12 A. Both in content and approach. In terms of content, it
 13 took 11 key thematic areas, and focused on core areas of
 14 resilience which local authorities, organisationally
 15 wide, should apply. So it wasn't very much -- it wasn't
 16 solely focused on potentially the role of emergency
 17 planners. The resilience standards for London now focus
 18 on the responsibilities of organisations as a whole.

19 In terms of approach, we've talked about minimum
 20 standards for London having an element of sub-regional
 21 peer challenge. That was very light touch, and it was
 22 emergency planners peer reviewing emergency planners.
 23 It didn't quite work, from my perspective. So this now
 24 applies a three-layered approach, with the LGA currently
 25 providing that external independent, impartial -- sorry,

169

1 same word -- independent peer challenge, which adds
 2 a more robust layer of sort of the process.

3 Q. So three layers. Let's remind everyone, what's layer 1
 4 and layer 2?

5 A. Layer 1 is the local self-assessment.

6 Q. Yes.

7 A. Layer 2 is sub-regional good practice workshops. So
 8 that's not necessarily a review of every standard in
 9 detail, but what it is, is an opportunity for boroughs
 10 to learn from other boroughs, again linking to some of
 11 the emphasis behind the original minimum standards for
 12 London, which was around identifying common trends,
 13 issues that need to be addressed. And, as I say, the
 14 third component is that LGA peer challenge part of the
 15 process.

16 Q. LGA being Local Government Association?

17 A. Yes, my apologies, yes.

18 Q. I would like us just to explore that theme of peer
 19 challenge as a theme.

20 Perhaps we could look at your third statement
 21 {GOL00001847/2}, please, paragraph 9. So this is what
 22 you've written down in terms of areas.

23 If you just scroll up for a moment, please, so we
 24 see paragraph 6, we touched upon that already:
 25 "Embedding the philosophy of 'resilience is

170

1 everybody's business'."

2 That was one of the key factors you mentioned, and
 3 let's move to another one of the key factors, which is
 4 in bold at paragraph 9:
 5 "Establishing an assurance process that is mandatory
 6 and enforceable."
 7 Let's read paragraph 10, please:
 8 "I believe the Resilience Standards for London ...
 9 provide the means by which all London local authorities
 10 can effectively assess preparedness across the
 11 organisation."
 12 We see there your views as to its being utilised .
 13 "If the approach is adopted by individual local
 14 authorities and applied as designed, it will allow:
 15 " ■ senior officers and local politicians to maintain
 16 effective oversight;
 17 " ...
 18 " ... appropriate levels of transparency for
 19 communities to be sighted on preparedness ..."
 20 I'm summarising because we have it in front of us.

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Perhaps more selective reading rather than summarising.
 23 But this is the part I would like your assistance upon:
 24 "To date, I believe there are varying levels of
 25 senior level commitments to RSLs [resilience standards

171

1 for London] and the Local Authority Panel ... which
 2 oversaw the development of them does not have the
 3 authority to insist that boroughs adopt the full
 4 approach. Currently signing up to the [Local Government
 5 Association] facilitated peer challenges is optional and
 6 [the local authorities panel] does not have the means of
 7 establishing a robust rolling programme to ensure all 32
 8 local authorities and the City of London ... undergo
 9 external challenge. A solution is required to ensure
 10 individual and collective strengths and weaknesses in
 11 local authority resilience arrangements are genuinely
 12 understood, shared and addressed."
 13 Big paragraph. A lot of information in there.
 14 How many local authorities to date have not signed
 15 up to the Local Government Association facilitated peer
 16 challenge?

17 A. I believe currently three have undergone the process as
 18 part of the pilot process -- the pilot review, and -- as
 19 part of the pilot process. But, to date, I'm not aware
 20 of any other local authority asking to be
 21 peer reviewed -- peer challenged, I should say.

22 Q. Three out of 33 have asked and participated in the peer
 23 challenge?

24 A. Yeah. It's worth contextually appreciating that the
 25 process was paused during COVID.

172

1 Q. Yes.
 2 A. And so it is expected that reinstating the process will
 3 start this year. My point is that whilst it remains
 4 optional, there is a risk that some local authorities
 5 won't necessarily buy into the full process and apply it
 6 as intended.
 7 Q. The first line of this paragraph is your belief, as you
 8 set out in your statement, something which you
 9 volunteered to the Inquiry late last week. You believe
 10 that there are "varying levels of senior level
 11 commitment to RSLs and the Local Authorities Panel"; is
 12 that the position?
 13 A. Some of that view is based on some anecdotal evidence.
 14 Q. Yes.
 15 A. Some evidence to suggest that the standards, the
 16 self –assessments, are being completed by emergency
 17 planning teams as compared to being overseen and worked
 18 on by senior officers. So it's flagging a risk in the
 19 process and system that through — more effective and
 20 enforceable management of the process would address.
 21 Q. How could that be achieved? You talk about a solution
 22 is required and you mention something which is more
 23 effective and enforceable management of the process. If
 24 you had a magic wand, how would you achieve that?
 25 A. If I knew how to achieve that, I would probably have

173

1 included it in the statement. Apologies to be flippant.
 2 But it would require some either government—led policy
 3 included in some level of legislation, perhaps. What
 4 I've done by recording this is just highlighting to me
 5 the risk that remains whilst this is an optional
 6 process.
 7 Q. So optional process, and the local authorities panel
 8 don't have the power to enforce this.
 9 A. Exactly.
 10 Q. So it's dependent, as we heard already, as was in
 11 relation to MSLs, on the individual local authority
 12 adherence and commitment to resilience; isn't that
 13 correct?
 14 A. Yeah, and — yeah, at the right level.
 15 Q. Let's move on to central government. You have talked
 16 about government involvement.
 17 Is it correct that central government do not have
 18 a formal role in the assessment or inspection of
 19 emergency planning and resilience at a local level?
 20 A. That is — not of local authorities, no.
 21 Q. No, so they don't participate in any local assurance
 22 framework?
 23 A. No.
 24 Q. I wonder if we could go back to the assurance framework
 25 review by Sean Ruth, please, {GOL00001596/16}, please.

174

1 This is something you considered when doing your EP2020
 2 refresh. Paragraph 4.9:
 3 "It is clear that central Government do not have
 4 plans, at this time, to put in place any process that
 5 imposes, mandates or regulates local authorities in
 6 addition to the legislation that currently exists.
 7 However, given its role in national resilience
 8 arrangements and its relationship with local resilience
 9 forums, there could be an enhanced role in supporting
 10 local authorities where it is appropriate to do so on
 11 a voluntary basis and at the request of the local
 12 organisation."
 13 It talks about peer review and training and
 14 development. You see "Peer Review" at the bottom of
 15 that page, and we don't need to turn over, "Training and
 16 development".
 17 You were asked your views regarding this in your
 18 second statement — and perhaps we could turn to your
 19 second statement, please, {GOL00001839/8} — about the
 20 options in relation to central government involvement.
 21 Paragraph 59, thank you. The question was asked
 22 overleaf really in relation to this aspect of the
 23 assurance framework review, and your answer is this:
 24 "A number of options were explored during the
 25 assurance review to determine the most appropriate

175

1 method of external and independent challenge. Options
 2 included a government inspectorate (ruled out during
 3 early discussions with CCS) ..."
 4 Civil contingencies secretariat; is that correct?
 5 A. Yes, correct.
 6 Q. Do you know why it was ruled out in those early
 7 discussions with the civil contingencies secretariat?
 8 A. No, those would have been conversations with Sean Ruth
 9 and the CCS.
 10 Q. Not something you have knowledge of in your dealings?
 11 A. No, no.
 12 Q. I'm going to continue from paragraph 59:
 13 "... a national public sector body such as the Local
 14 Government Association [which you touched upon a few
 15 moments ago] ... a private sector organisation such as
 16 one of the 'big 4' accounting firms and a subject matter
 17 expert [SME] commissioned specifically for the work."
 18 Then we've paragraph 60:
 19 "One of the options discussed was the CCS matching
 20 peers from across the [LRF] system to a London Borough
 21 for peer review purposes. This option was not explored
 22 further due to other priorities within CCS."
 23 Do you know why that was, what the other priorities
 24 were —
 25 A. No.

176

1 Q. -- as alluded to here?
 2 A. No. Again, I wasn't party to those conversations.
 3 Q. Although I'm reading from your statement.
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. You're summarising what the position is, but you're not
 6 able to assist with what underpins that information?
 7 A. No, and provided in the spirit of sharing as much as
 8 I could.
 9 Q. Yes.
 10 "It was also understood that consideration was being
 11 given to adopting this process for the national
 12 standards too."
 13 So against that background, you then say this,
 14 bottom of paragraph 62:
 15 "There is however merit in the Government further
 16 considering its role and the value of assembling an
 17 independent peer review team as this would connect the
 18 emergency planning and resilience work being undertaken
 19 at national, regional, and local level."
 20 So this is your second statement. We perhaps may
 21 have fast forwarded to your third statement already, and
 22 it's a similar topic, but in relation to that last
 23 matter, what's your view about what could be done to
 24 connect emergency planning at national, regional and
 25 local level?

177

1 A. I would suggest that further conversations on the
 2 proposal as detailed there in terms of the viability of
 3 that, et cetera, I think would be an effective way of
 4 linking national through to local.
 5 I think aligning the approach that we apply in
 6 London via the LGA, which is a national organisation, to
 7 approaches across the rest of the country, because,
 8 you know, it's fair to say that London has its unique
 9 ways of working, but actually there's lots of learning
 10 and lots of sharing to be done across the country as
 11 well, so that's another way of addressing that.
 12 But I think what we were keen to do -- sorry, what
 13 I was keen to do was get the current approach
 14 re-established, get full buy-in from all 33 to that
 15 approach, assess the value that that approach applies,
 16 the success, for want of a better word, and then
 17 determine as to whether there's any further work to be
 18 done on aligning it nationally. It's a work in
 19 progress.
 20 Q. Currently, do you think that there is this connection
 21 between local, regional and national resilience?
 22 A. In terms of assurance?
 23 Q. Yes.
 24 A. Yeah. I think there's the two layers of assurance
 25 currently applied, or several layers. One is the layer

178

1 in which LRFs and the multi-agency aspect is assessed
 2 via the national approach, and we obviously have our
 3 sector-specific local authority approach.
 4 Q. Yes.
 5 A. It's something that I'm not -- don't have sufficient
 6 detail to be able to provide any further sort of comment
 7 on that at this point.
 8 Q. Okay.
 9 Well, I'm going to move on to the second area, which
 10 is review of the Gold resolution and addendum. That's
 11 something which was identified in your EP2020 refresh
 12 report under the heading "Governance", recommendation 8.
 13 It was recommended that there should be a review and
 14 consider options to make triggers and escalation process
 15 clearer. Is that right?
 16 A. Yes.
 17 Q. If we could turn to {GOL00000146/14}, please, this is
 18 something in the independent peer challenge,
 19 paragraph 20h. Four lines down, it says this:
 20 "... there is also a need for greater clarity about
 21 the different roles of the Borough Gold, LLAG and the
 22 Chair of LAP in the context of the Gold Resolution,
 23 including extending this clarity to handling the
 24 communications and the media and to the handover from
 25 response to recovery. The peer challenge identified an

179

1 appetite to quickly strengthen the current Gold
 2 Resolution to increase the leverage of LLAG, through the
 3 LAP Chair, and to provide a more proactive and speedy
 4 response in exceptional circumstances, for example, when
 5 a borough needs help but does not request it."
 6 Is that right? That was the sort of context which
 7 was highlighted in the independent peer challenge
 8 report --
 9 A. Correct.
 10 Q. -- which flowed into the recommendation you made in your
 11 report.
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. A latter progress report -- which, again, I don't think
 14 we need to look at -- what happened was, in relation to
 15 your EP2020, there was an implementation report which
 16 was completed and a progress report which was provided
 17 to London Councils, and one of those was provided in
 18 July 2019. In that, there's reference that, after legal
 19 advice, it was not possible, in simple terms, to
 20 activate the Gold resolution without the consent of the
 21 local authority in question; is that correct?
 22 A. Yes, correct.
 23 Q. So in very simple terms, John Barradell couldn't have
 24 stepped in of his own volition and took control.
 25 A. Going back to my comment this morning, no legal basis

180

1 upon which to intervene.
 2 Q. That all concerns the interpretation of the statutory
 3 powers under section 138 of the Local Government Act
 4 1972.
 5 A. Yes.
 6 Q. So, in light of that advice received, is it the position
 7 that the local authority panel developed guidance in
 8 August 2018 for chief executives —
 9 A. Correct.
 10 Q. — in relation to the Gold resolution and its
 11 activation?
 12 A. Yes.
 13 Q. It may be obvious, what was the purpose of this
 14 guidance?
 15 A. It was to clarify how the Gold arrangements are
 16 activated and applied, and the breadth of the
 17 responsibility .
 18 Q. In your view, do you consider that that guidance
 19 addresses the concerns raised in the peer challenge
 20 review?
 21 A. I think it strengthens understanding, and if we have
 22 stronger understanding, it's more likely that the
 23 misunderstandings that potentially occurred in the early
 24 stages of the Grenfell response won't occur again.
 25 Q. Let's have a look at your second statement in relation

181

1 to this, {GOL00001839/2}, paragraph 10, please. This
 2 really just fleshes out your view that the guidance
 3 assists greater understanding. You mention at
 4 paragraph 10:
 5 "Instruction on how the guidance should be applied
 6 is delivered in three ways ... shared with all chief
 7 executives as part of their induction into local
 8 authority regional resilience arrangements ..."
 9 Correct?
 10 A. Correct.
 11 Q. "... referenced in the more detailed London Local
 12 Authority Gold (LLAG) briefing session provided by
 13 London Resilience Group ... to chief executives ..."
 14 A. Correct.
 15 Q. "... and finally, incorporated into the pre—on call
 16 briefing [s] ..."
 17 So something which is mentioned a lot for chief
 18 executives in the role as London Local Authority Gold.
 19 A. Correct.
 20 Q. It's also incorporated into London Local Authority Gold
 21 operating procedure, which is shared with all the chief
 22 executives.
 23 A. Correct.
 24 Q. Has that been improved in terms of the process as to
 25 activation, in your view?

182

1 A. The major shift is an increased emphasis on proactivity,
 2 and I think we've seen in incidents recently over the
 3 last couple of years where that proactivity has led to
 4 earlier conversations between Local Authority Gold and
 5 the affected borough's Gold, to assess whether
 6 additional support is required or not.
 7 Q. You touch upon that in relation to more recent exercises
 8 and how it provides:
 9 "... an opportunity to secure understanding about
 10 how the affected borough was addressing demands and
 11 proactively ensure the availability of wider support was
 12 understood by all and coordinated if required."
 13 A. Correct, and by including it in the exercises, we're not
 14 only making sure the Local Authority Gold performing
 15 that role in the exercise fully understands it, but that
 16 knowledge is shared across other Golds from other
 17 boroughs.
 18 Q. So more guidance, better understanding, more
 19 proactivity .
 20 A. Yes.
 21 Q. I'm going to turn on the Mayor of London, if I may,
 22 please.
 23 In relation to the role of the Mayor of London in
 24 London Resilience, we've heard that his role is not
 25 operational, but it's to act as the voice of London; is

183

1 that correct?
 2 A. Correct.
 3 Q. What is your view as to the suggestion which is made by
 4 the Mayor of London in their opening submissions to this
 5 module that there may be a need for the formal role of
 6 the Mayor of London in a civil emergency to be expanded
 7 in carefully defined circumstances to require the
 8 invocation of mutual aid and appropriate leadership
 9 arrangements? In other words, it seems to have some
 10 role in the activation of the Gold resolution .
 11 A. I would suggest that that may well be legally
 12 challenging, to find a solution to that. But that said,
 13 I believe that by better defining the role of Local
 14 Authority Gold, by establishing that proactive approach
 15 to ensuring that we don't wait to be asked, we actually
 16 ask — the Local Authority Gold asks, "Do you need help,
 17 support?", by applying that more proactive approach, we
 18 will hopefully have addressed the concerns that arose
 19 during Grenfell .
 20 Q. Let's look at your statement, please, second statement,
 21 page 6 {GOL00001839/6}, and you were asked this question
 22 at question 48. The question was:
 23 "As part of the work undertaken in your EP2020
 24 refresh report, what consideration has been given to the
 25 role of the Mayor of London?"

184

1 You say at paragraph 49:
 2 "I am not aware of any consideration being given to
 3 the role of the Mayor of London within the work
 4 undertaken to deliver the original EP2020 prospectus
 5 [that's the 2016] and the EP2020 refresh report, beyond
 6 that of delivering the 'Voice of London'."
 7 Is that correct?
 8 A. That is correct.
 9 Q. If we could turn overleaf, please, to paragraph 50
 10 {GOL00001839/7}:
 11 "During the simplification process associated to the
 12 LLAG Operating Procedure ... it was determined not to
 13 include reference to the role of the Mayor. The Mayor's
 14 role is however included in the London Strategic
 15 Coordination Framework and incorporated into LLAG
 16 arrangements briefings to chief executives and relevant
 17 exercises."
 18 Lastly to question 8 in this supplementary
 19 statement, you were asked:
 20 "Has there been any requests and/or identified need
 21 to expand the Mayor's role from beyond being the 'voice
 22 of London' to an operational role?"
 23 Requests in part of your work in the EP2020 refresh
 24 considerations of the two other reports, and your answer
 25 is at paragraph 52:

185

1 "I am not aware of any requests and/or identified
 2 need to expand the Mayor's role."
 3 Is that the position?
 4 A. Correct.
 5 Q. In relation to an expanded role for the Mayor, is there
 6 anything else that you consider is necessary to add to
 7 that?
 8 A. Not at this time.
 9 Q. Training.
 10 It was recommended in the EP2020 refresh report that
 11 all chief executives and their deputies attend
 12 periodical training events and participate in
 13 a structured exercise programme to prepare them to
 14 undertake LLAG duties. That's something which is,
 15 I believe, recommendation 20.
 16 Was that recommendation made because there was
 17 an identified gap in training provided hitherto?
 18 A. In relation to performing the role of Local Authority
 19 Gold, I think there was an identified need to ensure
 20 that training was delivered and that there was
 21 appropriate opportunities for exercising of that role,
 22 and on occasions exercising opportunities can be few and
 23 far between, so the question was: how can we improve
 24 that and ensure that all 33 local authorities undertook
 25 an appropriate level of training in that role?

186

1 Q. In your view, was there a need to improve training for
 2 chief executives for the LLAG role?
 3 A. Yes, there was.
 4 Q. In his evidence to the Inquiry, Nicholas Holgate stated
 5 this, {Day273/223:19}:
 6 "... I think that the ability to deal to the quality
 7 that we would all want, our ability to address the needs
 8 of the survivors, the bereaved and others after
 9 a tragedy of this scale, would require an intensity and
 10 an extent of preparation which to me in all probability
 11 goes well beyond what was then expected even of
 12 a compliant authority."
 13 Do you consider that the training which was
 14 available pre-June 2017 was sufficient to equip a chief
 15 executive or a Council Gold to respond to an incident
 16 such as Grenfell?
 17 A. I think we need to delineate training in terms of the
 18 Local Authority Gold role to training that should be
 19 delivered to anybody performing the role of Gold --
 20 Council Gold.
 21 Q. Yes.
 22 A. And I think, if you don't mind me saying, on the day of
 23 the fire, Nicholas Holgate was performing the role of
 24 Council Gold, not Local Authority Gold.
 25 Q. Right.

187

1 A. So the Local Authority Gold training builds on training
 2 that should be delivered locally.
 3 Q. So there's two levels. The local authority is
 4 responsible for training its own, effectively.
 5 A. Yes, very much so, and then the Gold -- the Local
 6 Authority Gold training places that knowledge,
 7 experience into a regional context, and that regional
 8 context is a co-ordination role, not a command and
 9 control role.
 10 Q. So in your wider work, were you able to identify any
 11 deficits in terms of the training which was available at
 12 the local level, local authority level, in relation to
 13 Council Gold?
 14 A. No. We never delved into that level of detail in terms
 15 of what was being delivered locally.
 16 Q. I'm going to move on to community resilience, the fourth
 17 of -- I am coming to the end of the questions now,
 18 Mr Sawyer.
 19 So in relation to community resilience and community
 20 engagement, again these were recommendations in your
 21 EP2020 report, 6 and 24, that boroughs, local
 22 authorities, recognise the importance of community
 23 resilience and have clear communication, engagement and
 24 liaison plans in place, with strong relationships across
 25 each sector that are well connected to emergency plans,

188

1 and understands the impact of incidents on their
 2 communities.
 3 So I've combined probably two recommendations
 4 together, but, in essence, in terms of community
 5 resilience, was it the case that there was an identified
 6 need for real improvements?
 7 A. Yes.
 8 Q. And that was, in part, as a result of Grenfell Tower,
 9 isn't that correct, the need to improve community
 10 resilience?
 11 A. Yes.
 12 Q. Is it the case that the London Resilience Partnership
 13 community steering group was set up as a result of the
 14 work you recommended, and that's chaired by the chief
 15 executive of London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham?
 16 A. That's correct, it was chaired by that chief executive.
 17 Q. And this London Resilience Partnership community
 18 steering group was established in 2018 to provide
 19 advice, guidance and support to other local authorities
 20 in relation to this area; is that correct?
 21 A. Correct.
 22 Q. "Developing community resilience: a review", was
 23 a document prepared by that steering group in July 2019,
 24 and that identified a number of principles, including
 25 the "need to maintain deep respect, and value the role

189

1 of communities and community organisations"; is that
 2 correct?
 3 A. Correct.
 4 Q. Something which you touch upon in your second statement,
 5 that the London Resilience Forum funded a community
 6 resilience co-ordinator, and you state at paragraph 28
 7 {GOL00001839/4} that work is also likely to begin soon
 8 to build on community resilience activities and support
 9 local authorities and other stakeholders at local level.
 10 So drawing it all together, in relation to that
 11 co-ordinator role, is that something which is still
 12 pending at this stage?
 13 A. I'm not sighted on the status of that role. That is
 14 an LRF funded role that's being hosted by the GLA,
 15 Greater London Authority.
 16 Q. At the time of your second statement, which was
 17 April 2022, it's classified as ongoing, rather than
 18 completed.
 19 A. I haven't had an update on that role.
 20 Q. So in relation to the matters you recommended in
 21 relation to community resilience and community
 22 engagement, do you consider those two features are
 23 sufficient to bring about the recommendations you
 24 identified in EP2020 refresh?
 25 A. I think that the -- to genuinely support the community

190

1 to be more resilient, takes lots of activity at a very
 2 local level to make a difference. So the work of the
 3 steering group produced guidance -- it's a bit like we
 4 talked about previously, the role of LAP in terms of
 5 producing guidance and helping to provide tools for
 6 local authorities to implement locally. That was
 7 a similar motivation behind that guidance document, to
 8 then allow the various agency and allow local
 9 authorities to consider that guidance and look at what
 10 it meant in terms of applying it locally.
 11 I think we also need to be mindful of the fact that
 12 there was the fantastic community effort both in
 13 Grenfell but also during COVID, the COVID response, and
 14 relationships between community, faith, voluntary sector
 15 and the funder sector was really reinforced during that
 16 period, and we're currently in a position whereby
 17 I believe London Funders, which is an umbrella
 18 organisation representing a significant number of
 19 community groups, et cetera, are leading on work to
 20 further strengthen those relationships, strengthen those
 21 networks, and again provide another conduit for
 22 supporting the conversation on community resilience via
 23 the GLA co-ordinator, all the way through to the local
 24 ward level activity within local authorities.
 25 So as to whether those recommendations have been

191

1 actually delivered, it's -- it has to continue to be
 2 work in progress, but it's just being discharged through
 3 a different route.
 4 Q. In some respects it's an unfair question, because it's
 5 just a start, isn't it, in relation to what you've done?
 6 A. Yes. Well, you'll never complete community resilience
 7 in its entirety. It will always be a work in progress.
 8 It's just making sure that the right level of support is
 9 available to deliver it.
 10 Q. Is it right that there is an interplay between community
 11 resilience and the resilience standards of London?
 12 That's something which there is a specific standard in
 13 relation to community engagement.
 14 A. Yeah, and that documents quite clearly what good looks
 15 like.
 16 Q. Finally in relation to this topic is whether you have
 17 any views as to the requirements under the CCA, Civil
 18 Contingencies Act, regulations, regulation 23, whether
 19 a category 1 responder -- where it says "must have
 20 regard to the activities of the voluntary organisations
 21 when carrying on their activities", whether you consider
 22 that regulation framework is sufficient or whether there
 23 needs to be more in relation to that?
 24 A. I think you can never downplay the important role of
 25 voluntary sector, faith sector, the community as

192

1 a whole, and I think there is -- anything that can be
 2 done to further reinforce the importance of that has to
 3 be considered. I don't have the answer, but I think it
 4 has to be reinforced, yes.
 5 Q. I'm going to move on to the fifth area, which is
 6 learning from previous humanitarian responses.
 7 So one of the recommendations recommended that the
 8 local authorities panel commission a review of current
 9 plans and exercising, so as to build on learnings from
 10 the experience of humanitarian welfare response provided
 11 to victims and survivors in 2017.
 12 Can you assist in relation to progress of that?
 13 What was the scope of this review of current plans and
 14 exercising as part of that recommendation?
 15 A. Is there a way you can put that up on screen, because --
 16 Q. Yes, of course I can.
 17 A. If you don't mind.
 18 Q. If you could bring up, please, {GOL00001346/24}, and
 19 just like magic, there it is. Thank you so much. So
 20 it's recommendation 18.
 21 A. Yeah, okay.
 22 Q. Okay. I'll just give you a moment. It's quite a dense
 23 paragraph:
 24 "Building on learning from the experiences of the
 25 humanitarian and welfare response in 2017 ..."

193

1 A. Okay, fine, I can update you on that.
 2 As a result of this, the local authorities panel
 3 established a humanitarian assistance programme, which
 4 had input at a strategic level from the directors of
 5 adult social services within London, led by an emergency
 6 planning manager with experience of recent incidents
 7 affecting communities, and that programme contained
 8 a number of workstreams of which over the last two or
 9 three years work has been progressed, and I believe
 10 I provided an update to the Inquiry --
 11 Q. Yes.
 12 A. -- of the status of that programme.
 13 Q. I can assist you in relation to that, and we can perhaps
 14 summarise it. So in relation to that humanitarian
 15 assistance programme you identified, that also developed
 16 policies and procedures for local authorities in
 17 providing wrap-around support to survivors. In relation
 18 to that wrap-around support, you mention that a draft
 19 version of guidance, the key worker support to people
 20 critically affected by emergencies guidance, has been
 21 approved by the local authority panel this February; is
 22 that correct?
 23 A. Correct.
 24 Q. And you state in your statement, paragraph 5 of your
 25 second statement, that it will be further developed

194

1 through a robust pilot programme.
 2 A. Correct.
 3 Q. And that it stems from lessons learned from the
 4 Grenfell Tower.
 5 A. Correct.
 6 Q. So those lessons learned from the Grenfell Tower have
 7 been reflected in this draft guidance for wrap-around
 8 support for key workers.
 9 A. Yes, and other pieces of work within that programme.
 10 Q. It's nearly five years since events, and we have talked
 11 about reviews in 2017, 2018, and this draft guidance in
 12 February 2022. Pausing there, we obviously had COVID
 13 intervening in that period of time, but are you
 14 satisfied with the pace of delivery in relation to this
 15 guidance and these improvements?
 16 A. No.
 17 Q. No?
 18 A. No.
 19 Q. Why are you not satisfied with the pace of delivery?
 20 A. I would have preferred them to be delivered much
 21 quicker.
 22 Q. What's the barrier to bringing in improvements which are
 23 identified as part of your work earlier?
 24 A. I believe local government doesn't often do things
 25 quickly, but that's not an excuse. I believe that it's

195

1 an indication that a lot of these pieces of work are
 2 being progressed by -- not by people with a dedicated
 3 responsibility to that piece of work, so they have
 4 other -- they have their day job to deliver as well. So
 5 the prioritisation of work or establishing sufficient
 6 capacity in the system to enable these pieces of work to
 7 be delivered more quickly currently doesn't exist.
 8 Q. And the solution is greater capacity and greater
 9 prioritisation?
 10 A. Investment.
 11 Q. In terms of, finally, wider observations, drawing
 12 together your work for the EP2020 refresh has resulted,
 13 as you have set upon in your statements, and we haven't
 14 gone through a lot of it, is various additional guidance
 15 documents have been produced to add to the London
 16 Resilience suite of documents. There has been a concept
 17 of operations, we have had the resilience standards for
 18 London, there's a civil resilience handbook, the
 19 a humanitarian assistance framework has been updated,
 20 the guidance we touched upon in relation to wrap-around
 21 support, the guidance we've touched upon in relation to
 22 chief executives and the activation of LLAG, and there's
 23 more guidance in relation to mutual aid and emergency
 24 planning teams which has been referred to in your
 25 statement.

196

1 Is there a danger that the field of resilience is
 2 becoming saturated with too many plans and guidance
 3 documents?
 4 A. Not necessarily saturated, because I can see a purpose
 5 for each of those documents. The challenge we have is
 6 that those documents are well known probably by --
 7 again, my favourite term today -- those selected few,
 8 and we need to find a way whereby that level of
 9 knowledge of those relevant plans, frameworks, is not
 10 just shared but actually maintained. So I think in my
 11 third statement I reference the challenge of conflicting
 12 priorities and officers dipping in and out of
 13 resilience .
 14 Q. Yes.
 15 A. So we need to find a way whereby that level of knowledge
 16 isn't continually -- it's not even refreshed, they're
 17 told multiple times, because they hear, forget, come
 18 back, hear, forget, come back, so it's a cycle of
 19 continually -- repetition, as compared to -- we need
 20 to find a way whereby that is maintained.
 21 Q. So for an individual who is not one of the select few
 22 but has some involvement or responsibility, they will be
 23 greeted, will they not be, with national guidance, in
 24 London there will be the regional guidance, and then at
 25 their local authority you're going to have the local

197

1 guidance and plans.
 2 Is there a danger that quite important messages may
 3 actually be lost due to the volume and density of the
 4 material?
 5 A. Potentially, if you're expecting somebody to know it
 6 all, but I think what we need to do -- be is much more
 7 precise in terms of what someone needs to know to enable
 8 them to perform effectively, and then maintain that
 9 level of knowledge.
 10 Q. And in terms of that maintaining the knowledge, you'd
 11 also accept that there also needs to be a sufficient
 12 number of trained staff in place to ensure that the
 13 knowledge and plans which flow from them are acted upon
 14 when the time arrives; isn't that correct?
 15 A. Very much, the right people in the right roles with the
 16 right knowledge and in the right numbers.
 17 Q. Perhaps we could bring up what you alluded to a moment
 18 ago in your last statement, please, paragraph 3,
 19 {GOL00001847/1}. Am I right that's what you were
 20 alluding to, "Professionalising the local authority
 21 approach to incident response"? You say this:
 22 "Local authorities need to take their responsibility
 23 at being Category 1 responders more seriously and accept
 24 that the right people with the appropriate skills need
 25 to be identified and installed in the right numbers into

198

1 response roles at every level. To support these
 2 officers, the problem of 'dipping in and out of
 3 interest' in resilience related matters and finding
 4 other priorities which prevent full engagement, has to
 5 be formally addressed."
 6 Is that the position?
 7 A. I believe it is. I may have used slightly different
 8 terms in reference to finding other priorities. I think
 9 other priorities find them.
 10 Q. Okay.
 11 When you say it has to be formally addressed, what
 12 do you mean by formally addressed?
 13 A. We need to -- if a solution can be found, then it should
 14 be found, and not just continue accepting: this is the
 15 way it works.
 16 Q. Is mindset a factor here? Do you think organisationally
 17 the mindset has to change towards the importance of
 18 civil resilience?
 19 A. Corporate ownership.
 20 Q. Is it your view that local authorities currently still
 21 need to take responsibility in relation to being
 22 category 1 responders more seriously?
 23 A. There are some local authorities who are better prepared
 24 than others.
 25 Q. Can you say why they're better prepared than others?

199

1 A. Probably greater corporate ownership.
 2 MR KEATING: Okay.
 3 Mr Sawyer, I'm grateful for your patience and the
 4 patience of the panel. They're all the questions I have
 5 for you this afternoon.
 6 Mr Chairman, with your leave, if we perhaps have
 7 a short pause to see if there's any questions.
 8 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes.
 9 Well, Mr Sawyer, when counsel gets to the end of his
 10 questions, we have a short break, just to let him take
 11 stock, but also to allow an opportunity for other people
 12 who are following the proceedings from elsewhere to
 13 suggest questions.
 14 So we'll break now. We'll come back at 4.25, and at
 15 that point we'll see if there are any more questions we
 16 ought to ask you. All right?
 17 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
 18 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Would you go with the usher, please.
 19 Thank you.
 20 (Pause)
 21 We'll say 4.25. If you need more time, perhaps you
 22 could just let the usher tell us.
 23 MR KEATING: Thank you.
 24 (4.17 pm)
 25 (A short break)

200

1 (4.25 pm)
 2 SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Right, Mr Sawyer, we'll see if there
 3 are any more questions for you.
 4 Yes, Mr Keating.
 5 MR KEATING: Thank you, Mr Chairman.
 6 One question which has arisen which perhaps you
 7 could assist us with, Mr Sawyer, is this: we were
 8 talking about resilience standards for London and we
 9 were talking about the pilot scheme, the voluntary pilot
 10 scheme, which is operated by the LGA, those independent
 11 peer challenges.
 12 In relation to that, you mentioned that three local
 13 authorities so far have participated or asked to
 14 participate in that. Can you assist whether RBKC was
 15 one of those three local authorities?
 16 A. No, they weren't one of those authorities.
 17 Q. Okay, thank you.
 18 Finally, Mr Sawyer, is this: in relation to your
 19 evidence, is there anything else that you wanted to add
 20 which may assist the Inquiry with its investigations?
 21 A. Nothing extra to what I included in my third statement,
 22 and other than that to say that, given this time again,
 23 which I know we can't get back, I would have made less
 24 of an assumption that Nicholas Holgate genuinely
 25 understood what invoking the Gold arrangement meant, and

201

1 that wouldn't have meant that he would have stepped
 2 aside to allow another chief executive to take over.
 3 I think, had I known that, even on the 14th, that may
 4 have been able to be addressed.
 5 Okay, so that's really in terms of what I would do
 6 differently and what I think should happen.
 7 I do have a personal statement, if I would be
 8 allowed to make that personal statement.
 9 SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Is this the statement that I read on
 10 your third statement?
 11 A. It is, and if I would be allowed to speak publicly to
 12 that and refer to my statement, I would be really
 13 grateful.
 14 SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Yes, all right. Thank you.
 15 A. Thank you.
 16 Just a little bit of context to why I wrote this
 17 statement, and I've thought very hard about it, which is
 18 why I want to refer to it, because I want to get this
 19 right.
 20 In the evening, a warm evening in late July/early
 21 August 2017, I attended a meeting with the community in
 22 the law centre underneath the finger blocks, and quite
 23 innocently, at the end of a long meeting at the — quite
 24 late in the evening, innocently said to the then chair
 25 of Grenfell United, "I hope my wife's going to be okay

202

1 because I'm going to need her to pick me up from the
 2 station because I'm going to get home really late".
 3 Without an ounce of malice, he said to me, "Well, at
 4 least you have a home to go to". So that places into
 5 context for me what Grenfell means.
 6 Now, what I have written here is that in July 2017
 7 I was asked by John Barradell to contact members of
 8 Grenfell United and see if I could help them with direct
 9 discussions with RBKC and in any way possible.
 10 I obviously agreed to this, determined to provide
 11 support in any way possible.
 12 Through this process, I met the most amazing people,
 13 who conducted themselves during a period of trauma,
 14 pain, anguish, sadness and frustration in the most
 15 dignified, compassionate and proud way possible. I was
 16 humbled by the experience and remain humbled by the
 17 experience.
 18 One of the main things from this experience I will
 19 carry with me for the rest of my life is the hope that
 20 people never again have to endure the pain that these
 21 good people had to suffer. In any situation, whether it
 22 be day-to-day life or whether it be an emergency, people
 23 always must come first.
 24 Thank you.
 25 SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Thank you.

203

1 MR KEATING: Well, Mr Sawyer, it just remains for me to say
 2 on behalf of the counsel team: thank you so much for
 3 attending today and assisting the Inquiry in its
 4 investigations and providing your evidence. Thank you.
 5 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
 6 SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: It's right that I should thank you
 7 as well, Mr Sawyer, on behalf of the panel. It's been
 8 very helpful for us to get your assistance in relation
 9 to the workings of London Resilience. We have learned
 10 a lot and we're very grateful to you. So thank you very
 11 much indeed.
 12 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
 13 SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: And you're free to go.
 14 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
 15 (The witness withdrew)
 16 SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Well, thank you very much,
 17 Mr Keating. That's it for the day.
 18 MR KEATING: Yes, it is, thank you.
 19 SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: And we shall have another witness
 20 tomorrow.
 21 MR KEATING: Yes, Mr Millett's back tomorrow with
 22 Mr Barradell.
 23 SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Right. Well, thank you very much.
 24 We break there then. 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.
 25 MR KEATING: Thank you.

204

1 SIR MARTIN MOORE–BICK: Thank you.
 2 (4.31 pm)
 3 (The hearing adjourned until 10 am
 4 on Tuesday, 17 May 2022)

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

205

1	INDEX	
2		PAGE
3	MR JOHN HETHERINGTON (continued)	1
4		
5	Questions from COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY	1
6	(continued)	
7		
8	MR MARK SAWYER (affirmed)	63
9		
10	Questions from COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY	63
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

206

207

A					
	ability (13) 17:4,8 46:12 73:4 74:3,8 91:6 106:16,21 114:17 148:6 187:6,7	add (19) 5:3 55:4 61:24 70:15 77:19 80:11 96:7 100:11 102:3 105:3,7 114:22 128:4 132:19 149:20 150:7 186:6 196:15 201:19	163:15 165:6 169:8 170:10 177:2 180:13 181:24 188:20 191:21 197:7 201:22 203:20 against (3) 7:18 112:7 177:13	133:13 analysis (1) 112:21 and/or (3) 7:9 185:20 186:1 andrew (4) 84:22 85:6 87:2 91:23	72:21 76:5 123:6 165:10,25 166:3 179:9 189:20 193:5 areas (23) 4:19 30:22 61:9 65:22 66:15 79:13 81:10,13 86:11 88:14 101:23 110:14 133:6 136:4 138:13 152:11 166:19,21,22 168:10 169:13,13 170:22
able (22) 3:10 5:8 7:22 16:25 17:12 18:12 20:7 24:9 44:12 52:8 53:25 87:19 92:7 93:14 102:3 118:23 120:2 156:25 177:6 179:6 188:10 202:4	addendum (1) 179:10 adding (1) 31:4 addition (2) 15:7 175:6 additional (21) 67:17 70:15 75:14,20,20 93:20,21 108:5,9 120:25 121:16 125:16,21 142:6 143:6,24 144:20 145:1 151:19 183:6 196:14	agencies (4) 8:5,15 16:23 132:7 agency (3) 20:11 59:17 191:8 agenda (4) 113:4 123:24 131:6 168:19 agendas (1) 67:16 ago (7) 67:25 89:15 108:8 165:6,7 176:15 198:18	another (10) 53:6 62:14 126:1 145:15 159:5 171:3 178:11 191:21 202:2 204:19 answer (17) 1:12 6:14 31:5 32:25 40:12,14 68:7 82:18 85:16 130:8 151:3 154:12 155:6 159:14 175:23 185:24 193:3	arguably (1) 53:12 argument (1) 81:3 arise (1) 67:22 arisen (1) 201:6 army (1) 3:22 arose (1) 184:18 around (28) 21:12,24 24:13 36:24 41:9,15 43:3 44:11 51:17 84:10 90:25 95:20 97:9 110:11 118:21 120:17,17 121:5 131:2 134:23 137:21,25 140:18 147:4 150:18 152:18 158:8 170:12	26:16 44:10 48:23 51:14 52:6 54:11,14 55:13 71:5,21 76:10,25 79:23 80:5 81:4 82:21 94:7,9 108:17 111:5 117:8 128:9 129:9,12 130:5,13 133:15 134:5 137:19 147:14 151:24 152:8 156:18 160:3 171:23 194:3,15 196:19 204:8
absence (5) 17:22 82:22 88:23 120:18 148:17	address (8) 104:3 138:16 139:4,22 161:7 163:5 173:20 187:7 addressed (11) 74:7 83:1 95:25 138:17 170:13 172:12 184:18 199:5,11,12 202:4	agreed (11) 46:21 49:15 56:3 57:8,18 96:24 131:9 156:3 162:14 165:7,14 agreed (10) 23:15 52:23 106:2 107:6 111:11 123:8 150:15,16 162:5 203:10 agreement (12) 18:8 19:16,19,20 20:5 21:25 22:5 23:11,16,19 96:22 155:13	answering (1) 45:24 answers (5) 4:5,8 87:12 124:16 138:9 anticipate (1) 90:2 anticipated (1) 26:1 anybody (2) 138:6 187:19 anyone (4) 60:8 106:21 116:13 167:18 anything (13) 15:7 22:18 44:13 60:25 77:19 80:25 116:14 128:2 132:8 150:7 186:6 193:1 201:19	arguing (1) 201:6 army (1) 3:22 arose (1) 184:18 around (28) 21:12,24 24:13 36:24 41:9,15 43:3 44:11 51:17 84:10 90:25 95:20 97:9 110:11 118:21 120:17,17 121:5 131:2 134:23 137:21,25 140:18 147:4 150:18 152:18 158:8 170:12	assistant (1) 34:17 assisting (7) 61:21 63:21 67:13,14,20 156:23 204:3 assistants (2) 67:7 182:3 associated (2) 142:1 185:11 association (4) 170:16 172:5,15 176:14 assume (3) 42:23 113:8 167:8 assumes (2) 70:25 89:3 assuming (1) 44:16 assumption (2) 34:12 201:24 assurance (14) 46:1 56:13 83:25 163:11,12 168:14,19 171:5 174:21,24 175:23,25 178:22,24 assure (5) 74:4 85:9,12 87:7 163:21
accidents (1) 68:25	addresses (1) 181:19 addressing (3) 80:18 178:11 183:10	agrees (1) 46:17 ah (1) 23:12 ahead (2) 4:16 13:20 aid (28) 16:5,10 22:9 23:11,16,18 26:4 29:11,21 32:8 36:1 45:21 47:1,12 48:8,15 49:7,10,25 50:1 98:2 149:2,8 150:21 151:18 155:13 184:8 196:23	anywhere (1) 96:4 apologies (9) 46:10 51:14 81:4 91:8 96:11 156:11 157:2 170:17 174:1 apologize (1) 61:15 apparent (7) 30:5,11 33:9 42:10 49:9 93:16 125:6 apparently (1) 152:4 appear (1) 100:1 appeared (3) 119:23 135:23 137:5	arrange (1) 146:20 arranged (2) 10:22 142:12 arrangement (1) 201:25 arrangements (37) 16:1,10 17:16 19:25 21:8,9,18,19,25 22:8 26:3 36:13 37:15 38:17,20 40:3 62:22 67:21 70:10,13 76:19 100:19 111:5 118:20 124:23 132:4,5 148:5 162:3,20 163:4 172:11 175:8 181:15 182:8 184:9 185:16	assured (1) 47:23 attack (5) 43:21,22 44:19 145:12,14 attacks (1) 68:24 attacked (12) 2:17 85:21 87:17,19 90:21,21 91:25,25 95:1 96:5 114:13 186:11 attendance (1) 66:6 attended (5) 42:17 92:1 121:10 124:5 202:21 attending (3) 63:21 94:20 204:3 attention (5) 5:11 43:7 164:24 165:16 166:1 auditing (1) 59:17 august (2) 181:8 202:21 authorises (1) 16:16 authorities (7) 19:3,17,23 23:18 27:1 30:16 49:17 57:7,10,16 59:1 66:23 67:13,14,19,19,20 68:15,21 69:15 71:13 72:16 73:5 74:2 76:3,17 80:20,23 81:13,18 83:6 91:11 102:8 104:20 107:8,10 110:8 111:24,25 161:5 163:18 165:2,9 168:14 169:14 171:9,14 172:6,8,14 173:4,11 174:7,20 175:5,10 186:24 188:22 189:19 190:9 191:6,9,24 193:8 194:2,16 198:22 199:20,23 201:13,15,16
accommodate (1) 64:10	adds (1) 170:1 adequate (1) 142:1 adequately (1) 156:25 adherence (1) 174:12 adjourned (1) 205:3 adjudgment (1) 116:23 administration (1) 112:2 administrative (1) 140:20 admirable (1) 140:15 adopt (3) 81:6 168:14 172:3 adopted (1) 171:13 adopting (2) 121:12 177:11 adult (1) 194:5 advantage (1) 95:17 advantages (1) 95:18 advice (16) 7:23 67:25 81:2 87:24 92:22 105:1,5 111:12 112:23 119:5 132:25 146:24 147:25 180:19 181:6 189:19	aim (1) 144:22 aiming (2) 14:20,23 aired (1) 101:25 alarm (1) 90:12 alexander (1) 109:3 align (1) 132:7 aligning (2) 178:5,18 allow (8) 62:22 140:5,20 171:14 191:8,8 200:11 202:2 allowed (6) 87:22 134:10 136:8 148:6 202:8,11 allowing (2) 112:4 165:10 alluded (3) 136:13 177:1 198:17 alluding (2) 122:13 198:20 almost (4) 36:12 38:22,25 52:3 along (2) 5:3 46:13 alongside (2) 19:1 114:10 already (27) 11:10,11,14 25:7,13 44:24 68:7 69:12 79:1 81:25 94:21 102:14 103:14 113:2 121:20 138:21,22 141:1 149:3 150:6,21 151:1 160:17 165:19 170:24 174:10 177:21	appears (1) 103:2 appendix (2) 16:4 21:7 appetite (1) 180:1 applied (5) 134:3 171:14 178:25 181:16 182:5 applies (2) 169:24 178:15 apply (4) 121:17 169:15 173:5 178:5 applying (3) 80:2 184:17 191:10 appoint (1) 9:18 appointed (4) 128:23,24 129:21 130:8 appointments (1) 82:21 appraisal (4) 114:5,13,15,16 appreciate (3) 11:12 47:22 144:24 appreciated (1) 9:17 appreciating (1) 172:24 appreciation (1) 40:10 apprised (1) 12:14 approach (29) 7:1 10:11 12:23 24:7 35:7 72:15 96:25 97:4 127:22 132:10 134:1 136:5 147:11 158:23 163:24 169:12,19,24 171:13 172:4 178:5,13,15,15 179:2,3 184:14,17 198:21 approaches (1) 178:7 appropriate (16) 11:7 17:11 33:10 48:6 74:5 76:18 83:2 103:24 157:21 171:18 175:10,25 184:8 186:21,25 198:24 appropriately (2) 118:16 129:25 approval (3) 18:11,13 98:2 approved (2) 20:6 194:21 approx (1) 142:13 approximately (1) 67:1 april (6) 65:1 66:17 83:10 160:10,18 190:17 area (12) 5:7 30:23 66:8	arrived (1) 171:14 arrives (1) 198:14 aside (3) 46:3 96:25 202:2 ask (24) 1:7 16:8 19:21 20:1 27:23 29:24 41:25 45:23 59:22 60:21 62:23 63:1 64:1,3,5,16 86:21 110:22 113:24 116:12 142:14 155:22 184:16 200:16 asked (26) 6:7 19:24 33:1 36:16,17 38:3 96:10 102:19 108:11 111:23 114:17 122:14 127:5 130:17 133:11 134:17 150:6 155:18 172:22 175:17,21 184:15,21 185:19 201:13 203:7 asking (6) 5:12 23:4 26:22 27:11 38:20 172:20 asks (2) 4:15 184:16 aspect (5) 100:17 133:18 164:20 175:22 179:1 aspects (5) 2:19 15:11 32:15 71:6 149:15 assembled (1) 128:12 assembling (1) 177:16 assertion (1) 136:19 assertiveness (1) 136:20 assess (7) 87:3,9 129:19 152:14 171:10 178:15 183:5 assessed (1) 179:1 assessing (1) 93:1 assessment (17) 6:21 33:20 34:8,9 56:10 57:2 58:19 73:1 78:3,3 79:9 97:8 114:24 126:10 144:6 156:17 174:18 assessments (2) 77:4 78:15 assets (1) 155:23 assigned (1) 76:1 assist (23) 26:24 33:8 80:24 81:9 82:14 108:18 113:6 120:3 122:4 130:18 131:1,25 135:21 142:2 137:12 139:15 145:7 148:5 149:24 155:2,9,14,21,24 165:5,12 168:25	assure (5) 74:4 85:9,12 87:7 163:21 attacked (12) 2:17 85:21 87:17,19 90:21,21 91:25,25 95:1 96:5 114:13 186:11 attendance (1) 66:6 attended (5) 42:17 92:1 121:10 124:5 202:21 attending (3) 63:21 94:20 204:3 attention (5) 5:11 43:7 164:24 165:16 166:1 auditing (1) 59:17 august (2) 181:8 202:21 authorises (1) 16:16 authorities (7) 19:3,17,23 23:18 27:1 30:16 49:17 57:7,10,16 59:1 66:23 67:13,14,19,19,20 68:15,21 69:15 71:13 72:16 73:5 74:2 76:3,17 80:20,23 81:13,18 83:6 91:11 102:8 104:20 107:8,10 110:8 111:24,25 161:5 163:18 165:2,9 168:14 169:14 171:9,14 172:6,8,14 173:4,11 174:7,20 175:5,10 186:24 188:22 189:19 190:9 191:6,9,24 193:8 194:2,16 198:22 199:20,23 201:13,15,16 authority (134) 12:16 16:17,24 17:11,16,25 18:4,12,17 19:21 20:7 21:3 22:11,12 26:22 29:17,24 33:22 36:13 43:15,24 49:11 54:21 55:7 56:11 57:19 59:9,13 66:5 67:21 68:3 69:3,11 70:1,9,9,17,18 71:3 72:9,13 74:8,23 76:19,23 79:8 80:15,25 81:9 84:15,17,21 85:1,9,13 86:2,24 87:2,18 88:1 89:24 91:1 92:9,14 93:7,15 94:14 96:7,12,15,23 97:6,9,13,16,21 99:25 100:6,13,16,17,18 104:12 108:19 109:1 111:19 112:11 118:24 123:4 125:4 126:20 127:16 136:9 137:12 139:15 145:7 148:5 149:24 155:2,9,14,21,24 165:5,12 168:25
adamson (1) 162:12	affected (21) 6:4 19:21 88:18 90:7 96:15 104:13 122:12,16 151:25 154:5,8 155:10,15 156:9,12 157:3,3 159:16 183:5,10 194:20 affecting (2) 20:1 194:7 affirmed (2) 63:13 206:8 afraid (1) 40:13 after (28) 12:6 15:6 37:5 39:22 47:15 57:25 61:1 62:5 66:11 101:1 107:5 108:9,23 109:25 116:4 121:9 127:2 131:4 138:24 141:7,10 148:10 150:10,12 159:22,24 180:18 187:8 aftermath (1) 106:22 afternoon (16) 6:17 15:17 26:11 30:6 33:15 40:3 43:4 82:10 83:14 84:4 101:1,18 102:24 134:23 135:5 200:5 afternoonevening (1) 110:4 afternoonwednesday (1) 25:15 afterwards (2) 88:10 106:4 again (44) 3:5 10:24 11:24 34:19 45:22 46:18 65:1,8 80:11 93:18 97:8 103:13 109:17 111:14 114:24 115:8 125:12 128:10 129:19 131:25 133:23 136:17 137:15 138:17 140:10 141:5 142:14 145:3 146:6 149:2 156:4 159:14	aid (28) 16:5,10 22:9 23:11,16,18 26:4 29:11,21 32:8 36:1 45:21 47:1,12 48:8,15 49:7,10,25 50:1 98:2 149:2,8 150:21 151:18 155:13 184:8 196:23 aim (1) 144:22 aiming (2) 14:20,23 aired (1) 101:25 alarm (1) 90:12 alexander (1) 109:3 align (1) 132:7 aligning (2) 178:5,18 allow (8) 62:22 140:5,20 171:14 191:8,8 200:11 202:2 allowed (6) 87:22 134:10 136:8 148:6 202:8,11 allowing (2) 112:4 165:10 alluded (3) 136:13 177:1 198:17 alluding (2) 122:13 198:20 almost (4) 36:12 38:22,25 52:3 along (2) 5:3 46:13 alongside (2) 19:1 114:10 already (27) 11:10,11,14 25:7,13 44:24 68:7 69:12 79:1 81:25 94:21 102:14 103:14 113:2 121:20 138:21,22 141:1 149:3 150:6,21 151:1 160:17 165:19 170:24 174:10 177:21 also (50) 5:1 6:6 12:1 16:5 23:10 30:19 46:1,22 47:1,17 49:12 51:20 56:12 57:2 59:7 61:7 64:5 68:8,14,17 75:11 76:8 81:8,10 82:18 92:22 100:14 107:7 114:20 115:25 118:4 132:22 137:2 140:17 150:20,24 155:4 160:23 161:1 164:17 177:10 179:20 182:20 190:7 191:11,13 194:15 198:11,11 200:11 although (5) 92:11 94:1 98:4 157:21 177:3 always (6) 61:12 125:20 135:21,23 192:7 203:23 amalgam (1) 31:14 amazing (1) 203:12 amber (9) 57:5,20 78:6,13,15 79:20 80:3,9 amongst (6) 24:24 50:6 56:25 111:22 125:10	anywhere (1) 96:4 apologies (9) 46:10 51:14 81:4 91:8 96:11 156:11 157:2 170:17 174:1 apologize (1) 61:15 apparent (7) 30:5,11 33:9 42:10 49:9 93:16 125:6 apparently (1) 152:4 appear (1) 100:1 appeared (3) 119:23 135:23 137:5 appears (1) 103:2 appendix (2) 16:4 21:7 appetite (1) 180:1 applied (5) 134:3 171:14 178:25 181:16 182:5 applies (2) 169:24 178:15 apply (4) 121:17 169:15 173:5 178:5 applying (3) 80:2 184:17 191:10 appoint (1) 9:18 appointed (4) 128:23,24 129:21 130:8 appointments (1) 82:21 appraisal (4) 114:5,13,15,16 appreciate (3) 11:12 47:22 144:24 appreciated (1) 9:17 appreciating (1) 172:24 appreciation (1) 40:10 apprised (1) 12:14 approach (29) 7:1 10:11 12:23 24:7 35:7 72:15 96:25 97:4 127:22 132:10 134:1 136:5 147:11 158:23 163:24 169:12,19,24 171:13 172:4 178:5,13,15,15 179:2,3 184:14,17 198:21 approaches (1) 178:7 appropriate (16) 11:7 17:11 33:10 48:6 74:5 76:18 83:2 103:24 157:21 171:18 175:10,25 184:8 186:21,25 198:24 appropriately (2) 118:16 129:25 approval (3) 18:11,13 98:2 approved (2) 20:6 194:21 approx (1) 142:13 approximately (1) 67:1 april (6) 65:1 66:17 83:10 160:10,18 190:17 area (12) 5:7 30:23 66:8	arrived (1) 171:14 arrives (1) 198:14 aside (3) 46:3 96:25 202:2 ask (24) 1:7 16:8 19:21 20:1 27:23 29:24 41:25 45:23 59:22 60:21 62:23 63:1 64:1,3,5,16 86:21 110:22 113:24 116:12 142:14 155:22 184:16 200:16 asked (26) 6:7 19:24 33:1 36:16,17 38:3 96:10 102:19 108:11 111:23 114:17 122:14 127:5 130:17 133:11 134:17 150:6 155:18 172:22 175:17,21 184:15,21 185:19 201:13 203:7 asking (6) 5:12 23:4 26:22 27:11 38:20 172:20 asks (2) 4:15 184:16 aspect (5) 100:17 133:18 164:20 175:22 179:1 aspects (5) 2:19 15:11 32:15 71:6 149:15 assembled (1) 128:12 assembling (1) 177:16 assertion (1) 136:19 assertiveness (1) 136:20 assess (7) 87:3,9 129:19 152:14 171:10 178:15 183:5 assessed (1) 179:1 assessing (1) 93:1 assessment (17) 6:21 33:20 34:8,9 56:10 57:2 58:19 73:1 78:3,3 79:9 97:8 114:24 126:10 144:6 156:17 174:18 assessments (2) 77:4 78:15 assets (1) 155:23 assigned (1) 76:1 assist (23) 26:24 33:8 80:24 81:9 82:14 108:18 113:6 120:3 122:4 130:18 131:1,25 135:21 142:2 137:12 139:15 145:7 148:5 149:24 155:2,9,14,21,24 165:5,12 168:25	assured (1) 47:23 attack (5) 43:21,22 44:19 145:12,14 attacks (1) 68:24 attacked (12) 2:17 85:21 87:17,19 90:21,21 91:25,25 95:1 96:5 114:13 186:11 attendance (1) 66:6 attended (5) 42:17 92:1 121:10 124:5 202:21 attending (3) 63:21 94:20 204:3 attention (5) 5:11 43:7 164:24 165:16 166:1 auditing (1) 59:17 august (2) 181:8 202:21 authorises (1) 16:16 authorities (7) 19:3,17,23 23:18 27:1 30:16 49:17 57:7,10,16 59:1 66:23 67:13,14,19,19,20 68:15,21 69:15 71:13 72:16 73:5

29:18 35:20,22 36:8 37:20
38:9 41:25 42:19 44:5 49:8
53:19 60:7 71:9 94:8 103:1
108:16 110:2 113:23 114:2
123:9,21 124:2,4 125:8
128:23 129:15 131:7 135:7
139:7 140:13 144:1,16
145:8 151:10 155:6 157:12
158:5 167:5
begin (3) 1:4 122:7 190:7
beginning (1) 38:10
behalf (13) 16:18 18:9 28:24
36:14 61:25 67:19 68:21
75:16 114:9 148:7 163:18
204:2,7
behind (7) 52:9,11,14 100:4
104:9 170:11 191:7
being (81) 2:12 3:15
7:9,17,23 12:12 17:22
24:17 25:19 29:22 30:1,19
37:10 40:5 44:13 48:5
50:15 74:23 76:8 78:5
83:25,25 84:13,21 86:18
91:3 92:5,22 95:23
100:15,17,24 101:16
102:4,5 107:17,21,22
109:14 110:21 111:8,22
114:17 115:7 118:22
120:22 121:1 124:17
125:12 128:6,12 134:3,17
138:6,6 139:9 147:18
148:22 150:21,25 151:20
155:18 158:20 164:24
165:1 166:4,7 170:16
171:12 173:16,17
177:10,18 185:2,21 188:15
190:14 192:2 196:2 198:23
199:21
belief (4) 65:17 93:24 151:14
173:7
believe (33) 22:6 54:9 67:1
68:23 79:4 86:2,5 93:5
95:25 97:7 101:3 103:9
108:6,20 110:7,8 127:12
130:23 132:15 134:15
141:15,18 171:8,24 172:17
173:9 184:13 186:15
191:17 194:9 195:24,25
199:7
believed (5) 87:17 93:19
100:18,21 108:8
believes (1) 149:5
bellamy (1) 34:25
bells (1) 90:12
below (8) 2:8 4:7 9:1,16 14:5
18:18 28:20 47:4
benchmarking (1) 59:12
benefit (7) 80:21 92:14
93:2,13 95:22 150:23
152:13
benefits (3) 95:14 96:1,18
benefitted (2) 62:3 106:25
bentham (1) 7:5
bereaved (2) 156:12 187:8
best (19) 7:9 13:4 21:5
46:5,12 50:3 61:14 62:21
65:16 66:21 94:24,25
96:24 97:4 103:22 118:18
131:5 137:10 166:20
better (20) 9:7 32:16 47:2
88:20 91:9 103:20 104:16
106:7 111:20,23 115:1
126:14 140:19 152:19
157:10 178:16 183:18
184:13 199:23,25
between (24) 1:22 26:6 39:4
40:5 41:8 53:9 86:3 106:8
108:9 109:8 111:2 115:6
139:8 145:2 151:22 152:25
155:19 161:9 162:6 178:21
183:4 186:23 191:14
192:10
beyond (5) 36:12 61:12
185:5,21 187:11
big (6) 88:7,23 126:15
138:16 172:13 176:16

binding (1) 22:8
bit (16) 18:24 42:14 45:18
69:19 76:14 77:22 79:15
80:11 81:4 98:15 104:16
107:19 143:3 169:9 191:3
202:16
bits (1) 52:12
blakeherbert (4) 84:22 85:6
87:2 91:23
blame (1) 154:19
blocks (1) 202:22
blue (1) 122:3
board (1) 126:18
bodies (2) 6:23 59:2
body (5) 58:25 94:11 95:21
99:6 176:13
boilers (1) 154:16
bold (1) 171:4
bolster (1) 73:10
booked (1) 11:11
borough (37) 2:25 7:8 20:1,1
21:14,17 27:19 39:19
44:18 50:1,8,9 51:19,21
56:15 68:10 84:23
86:17,19 97:1 102:7 107:1
108:25 109:10 129:3
140:2,11 148:8
155:11,16,25 162:20
176:20 179:21 180:5
183:10 189:15
boroughs (36) 18:9 22:5,9,16
23:4,15 26:16 27:14 28:16
29:19,24 30:2 49:13 50:4
55:2 56:13,23,25 58:4,9
79:9,19,22 80:7 87:5
104:13 109:9 114:6,8
115:9 170:9,10 172:3
183:5,17 188:21
both (11) 10:11 12:15 38:19
52:10 54:15 56:15 108:21
119:20 132:10 169:12
191:12
bottom (10) 64:19 73:17
76:13 77:24 97:19 99:1
141:22 162:25 175:14
177:14
bottomup (1) 70:10
boundaries (2) 38:19 97:1
brady (1) 12:15
brand (1) 125:10
breadth (1) 181:16
break (20) 55:23 58:17 59:22
60:1,2,15 63:6 64:9 110:1
116:5,6 158:9 167:7,13,16
168:2 200:10,14,25 204:24
bridge (6) 21:16 43:21 44:19
107:3 145:12,14
brief (2) 46:4 104:25
briefed (1) 117:15
briefing (5) 2:6 87:23 91:1
120:10 182:12
briefings (5) 46:1,24 92:18
182:16 185:16
briefly (7) 35:25 65:23
121:22 154:3 156:17
161:20 169:8
bring (6) 14:1 111:12 157:12
190:23 193:18 198:17
bringing (1) 195:22
british (2) 158:13 162:12
broad (4) 54:17 65:22 66:15
144:5
broker (2) 114:5,13
bronze (2) 129:5,7
brought (1) 5:11
bsr (1) 157:4
bsrs (1) 156:12
budgeted (1) 22:22
build (3) 161:18 190:8 193:9
building (3) 88:16 115:12
193:24
builds (1) 188:1
burden (1) 140:20
burdens (1) 75:24
bureau (1) 3:21
business (11) 11:15 12:23

38:8 58:5 80:17 111:9
139:13 164:13 166:4,13
171:1
businesses (1) 165:3
busy (6) 114:7 115:10,21
135:24 139:9 152:6
buy (1) 173:5
buyin (1) 178:14
C
c (2) 28:5 51:2
cab0000451983 (1) 122:6
call (76) 3:9 13:10,20,25
14:3,6 15:7 19:15 20:25
21:1,5 23:24 24:13 31:19
34:21 41:1,7 63:11
85:25,25 86:3 89:4,5,6,11
90:10 91:20 92:15,16,17
101:8 102:20,25
103:1,2,8,19 104:5,10,24
105:2,3,5,20,23
106:1,14,21 107:5,21,25
108:9 112:19 117:11,15
131:18 132:14,17,20,21,23
133:12 142:13,16
143:9,11,20,21,24
144:1,13,14,16,22 151:2
182:15
called (4) 16:20 71:4 146:21
163:11
calling (2) 93:3,12
calls (3) 45:24 91:17 92:10
came (4) 3:2 10:3 19:1 21:12
cameron (9) 1:24 3:5 4:3
13:8 32:2 34:15 35:15
50:21 53:18
cannot (1) 54:10
cant (17) 35:13 40:12,18
41:7,16,22 52:4 106:23
111:20 119:15 133:20
134:24 139:11 142:8
144:17 148:16 201:23
capabilities (13) 56:12 57:3
76:23,24 77:6,10,16 78:1
79:13,17,18 80:4,9
capability (7) 56:14,25 73:4
82:20,23 163:23 168:18
capacity (18) 24:10 28:10
33:22 71:19 73:3,14 74:14
75:8,11 90:14 91:6 106:16
112:3 145:21 163:22
168:18 196:6,8
capture (1) 64:4
captured (1) 68:7
carefully (1) 184:7
carried (1) 53:7
carry (5) 14:9 53:9 167:17
168:4 203:19
carrying (2) 130:14 192:21
cases (1) 9:4
cash (1) 8:25
casualty (1) 3:21
catchup (1) 104:21
categories (1) 103:17
category (5) 103:17 149:24
192:19 198:23 199:22
cause (2) 42:11 132:12
caused (1) 154:25
cc (1) 12:13
cca (1) 192:17
ccs (4) 176:3,9,19,22
central (4) 174:15,17
175:3,20
centrally (1) 118:15
centre (21) 2:17 3:1,19,22
5:8 7:8 9:3,25 11:8 12:16
28:4,5,22 29:22 31:1 43:18
49:11 140:3 141:25 142:7
202:22
centres (1) 3:11
centrewest (1) 74:24
ceo (2) 7:13 139:4
ceohis (1) 7:10
ceos (1) 114:9
certain (5) 17:23 60:22
70:20 119:2 138:13

cetera (11) 22:23,24 49:2
87:5 107:4 133:19,19
137:20 157:24 178:3
191:19
chain (5) 5:10 10:25
13:15,24,24
chains (1) 6:25
chair (8) 12:8 20:14 88:1
102:8 145:21 179:22 180:3
202:24
chaired (2) 189:14,16
chairman (13) 1:17 55:20
56:4 59:19 60:20 63:3,9
116:5 117:5 167:6 168:8
200:6 201:5
challenge (26) 16:22 61:6
83:18 91:7 154:13 159:12
161:8,22,25 162:4 164:10
168:20 169:21 170:1,14,19
172:9,16,23 176:1
179:18,25 180:7 181:19
197:5,11
challenged (3) 141:23 142:3
172:21
challenges (10) 74:7 89:11
153:22 154:4,20,23 159:9
162:5 172:5 201:11
challenging (3) 136:15
153:12 184:12
chance (1) 116:10
change (11) 28:11 35:17
52:25 62:16,17 67:2 82:13
100:20 136:10 147:15
199:17
changed (6) 19:8 25:6 67:1
100:23 119:2 166:1
changes (2) 48:3 70:20
changing (2) 30:14 35:7
channelled (2) 49:10 140:4
charge (3) 39:16,18,21
charged (1) 42:9
chat (1) 13:10
check (1) 158:7
checking (1) 47:10
cheers (1) 99:17
chelsea (2) 39:19 74:23
chief (47) 18:14 21:21 22:11
32:14 33:1 34:10 36:14,17
37:23 66:18 68:8,9 69:15
73:10 84:22 93:2,6,16
94:25 95:4,5,12 98:8
104:12 105:2,2 106:8
145:6,22 149:14,19 150:25
164:10 168:16 181:8
182:6,13,17,21 185:16
186:11 187:2,14 189:14,16
196:22 202:2
chiefexecutivetochiefexecutive
(1) 145:4
children (2) 2:12 3:15
chime (1) 164:3
chimes (2) 89:14 126:25
chose (1) 127:18
chose (1) 127:19
chris (14) 24:12 29:17
41:1,9,13 85:1,6 91:25
96:21 98:1 102:13 103:16
145:7,16
chunk (1) 24:2
cinderella (3) 164:22
165:8,15
circular (1) 16:6
circulated (1) 47:24
circulating (1) 125:9
circumstances (23) 17:10
18:1,4,22 38:16 62:21
85:5,20,22 86:8,10 88:3
94:5 95:1 100:13 108:18
131:9 142:2 143:14 146:18
163:15 180:4 184:7
city (13) 21:13 34:18,22 35:5
65:23 66:19,20,22 67:7
109:2 112:22 163:17 172:8
civil (14) 13:13 15:8,16 19:2
65:25 71:8 72:20 160:9
176:4,7 184:6 192:17

196:18 199:18
clarification (2) 97:9 150:5
clarifications (1) 16:9
clarified (1) 100:5
clarify (5) 13:24 16:2 48:9
96:11 181:15
clarifying (2) 155:7 156:1
clarity (3) 55:11 179:20,23
classified (2) 106:11 190:17
clear (15) 3:10 4:20 6:12
7:10 11:4,20 17:17 51:16
52:1 92:7 120:24 128:1
145:11 175:3 188:23
clearer (2) 125:13 179:15
clearly (4) 105:3 135:20
158:21 192:14
clerk (1) 119:6
clg00003062 (1) 2:3
clg00003099 (1) 4:12
clg000189362 (1) 7:4
close (6) 12:17,21 19:3
131:10 156:23 158:6
closely (3) 89:3 153:19
156:20
closer (1) 26:19
cobcentral (1) 5:17
coherent (2) 132:9 158:23
cohesive (1) 49:16
collaboration (1) 158:15
collaborative (1) 162:4
colleague (1) 1:24
colleagues (3) 91:16,21
114:3
collective (9) 49:16 56:11,16
58:10 125:16 162:19
163:4,12 172:10
collectively (2) 40:10 163:21
colour (2) 13:21 14:8
columns (1) 78:4
combine (1) 60:1
combined (3) 74:1 75:23
189:3
come (18) 1:7 8:2 11:7
27:24 38:21 48:18
59:12,19 60:4 62:23 63:2
115:3 145:11 167:16
197:17,18 200:14 203:23
comes (5) 23:8 26:13 29:5
46:18 47:7
comfort (1) 17:24
comfortable (2) 63:15 92:20
coming (13) 1:12 5:17 6:12
25:15 37:15 57:6 61:20
91:2 95:16 104:19 139:12
156:21 188:17
command (7) 16:20
17:13,19,22 33:12 134:6
188:8
commander (4) 12:8 13:3
15:9 21:4
commenting (1) 83:7
comment (13) 6:11 81:22
105:4 119:15,16 127:13
135:18 147:22 149:20
151:12 166:4 179:6 180:25
comments (2) 48:14 142:1
commercial (1) 2:11
commission (1) 193:8
commissioned (6) 71:12
81:18 83:18 161:25 163:17
176:17
commit (3) 22:12 148:7
168:16
commitment (5) 36:2 50:25
168:18 173:11 174:12
commitments (1) 171:25
committee (2) 104:15 162:2
common (3) 81:4 144:8
170:12
comms (6) 9:9 11:22 132:6
133:11,16 166:17
communication (4) 96:1
97:13 159:7 188:23
communications (15) 1:22
2:25 49:2 101:2 107:2

131:13,16,18
132:1,6,9,13,25 133:4
179:24
communities (7) 73:6 74:4,9
171:19 189:2 190:1 194:7
community (37) 13:12 33:8
74:10 123:5,6 125:10
129:3 132:10 142:6 154:18
165:4,10 167:2
188:16,19,19,22
189:4,9,13,17,22
190:1,5,8,21,21,25
191:12,14,19,22
192:6,10,13,25 202:21
comparatively (1) 58:12
compared (3) 67:3 173:17
197:19
compassionate (1) 203:15
competent (1) 45:25
complete (5) 16:7 56:9
124:25 134:16 192:6
completed (4) 10:3 173:16
180:16 190:18
completely (1) 4:20
completeness (1) 98:21
complex (2) 15:18,19
complexity (15) 15:12,15
30:13,21 31:4 32:7 33:19
34:3,7 36:22 51:13 134:17
135:12 149:7 154:15
compliance (2) 78:1 82:2
compliant (1) 187:12
complicated (1) 45:21
compiled (1) 17:24
component (1) 170:14
composite (1) 52:8
composition (1) 42:24
comprising (1) 76:16
concept (1) 196:16
concern (29) 55:6,9 72:21
75:25 77:8,14,20 78:6
79:14 80:6,10,10
81:8,16,24 82:18,24,25
101:23 106:15 111:22
112:10 117:17,20 121:4
132:12,15 144:12 145:15
concerned (9) 44:6 85:10
123:2 124:12 138:3 143:18
144:11 146:20 156:7
concerns (28) 9:24 13:13
15:8 34:18,20 35:5,12
41:2,9,13,14,17 85:11
90:11 91:5,13,13
101:6,18,20 105:15 106:20
115:6 135:11 142:12
181:2,19 184:18
concerted (1) 158:3
concluded (1) 89:16
conditions (1) 121:17
conductive (1) 158:1
conducted (4) 77:4 83:18
161:9 203:13
conduit (2) 109:8 191:21
conference (8) 102:11,20
103:7 104:10 131:18
132:2,20 142:13
confidence (7) 2:13 56:24
124:25 125:3 154:7
163:3,6
confirm (6) 9:5 45:23 64:20
65:2,8,13
confirmations (1) 46:13
confirmed (5) 4:5 48:1 55:14
117:16 120:11
confirming (1) 28:15
conflate (1) 86:6
conflicting (1) 197:11
conjunction (1) 53:10
connect (2) 177:17,24
connected (1) 188:25
connection (1) 178:20
consent (3) 30:15,16 180:20
conservative (2) 25:4,6
consider (35) 5:25 29:11
30:14 73:10 88:13 90:8,13
104:1 114:7 115:10,21

119:4 120:2,6 121:12,16
124:18 125:16,17 127:5
139:9 147:13 152:21 153:4
154:4 164:15 165:25
166:14 179:14 181:18
186:6 187:13 190:22 191:9
192:21
consideration (6) 75:18
90:16 165:19 177:10
184:24 185:2
considerations (2) 94:14
185:24
considered (15) 11:14 72:10
83:21 90:17,17 92:5
114:10 146:11 149:18
151:20 161:1 163:10
165:21 175:1 193:3
considering (2) 121:18
177:16
consistent (1) 126:14
consolidated (3) 83:24 84:2
165:21
consolidation (1) 84:4
constituent (1) 25:4
constitutionally (1) 21:6
constructive (1) 61:5
consultation (1) 18:15
consulted (2) 18:11 20:6
consume (1) 111:9
contact (8) 7:10 9:19 12:17
28:15 117:9 128:15 144:1
203:7
contacted (1) 70:13
contain (1) 32:16
contained (5) 10:18 86:24
161:7,15 194:7
contains (1) 160:19
contaminated (1) 109:10
contamination (1) 109:6
contemplate (1) 21:20
contemplated (1) 21:7
content (4) 97:3 99:9
169:12,12
context (16) 70:16 76:15
80:11 81:9,11 82:15 99:22
105:7 108:24 113:15
179:22 180:6 188:7,8
202:16 203:5
contextualisation (1) 55:4
contextualise (1) 143:3
contextualised (2) 54:25
55:16
contextually (1) 172:24
contingencies (4) 19:2
176:4,7 192:18
contingency (4) 46:16 49:20
50:8 72:4
continually (2) 197:16,19
continue (11) 14:6 53:1
61:16 101:14 106:16
136:25 154:11 159:6
176:12 192:1 199:14
39:11 134:6 140:3 180:24
188:9
controls (1) 18:18
convene (1) 19:24
convenced (3) 17:13 18:8
20:4
convenient (2) 13:4 55:22
convening (3) 16:19 17:18
52:10
conversation (29) 15:8 34:16
67:16 101:5 102:18 105:14
106:5,8,19,23 107:6,13
127:24 135:4,6,8,9 139:16

143:8 145:2.5 146:10.15
 147:4.6 150:8 155:18
 156:5 191:22
conversations (13) 89:9
 95:24 110:9 120:19 123:17
 135:10,22 150:18 151:1
 176:8 177:2 178:1 183:4
convinced (1) 43:7
coordinate (3) 28:24 154:21
 155:11
coordinated (6) 16:23 47:2
 72:15 158:3,23 183:12
coordinating (3) 16:19
 69:17,21
coordination (13) 12:16
 29:22 33:11 34:12 48:24
 72:15 158:3,23 183:12
 49:11 87:15 97:13 98:5
 132:5 155:9 185:15 188:8
coordinator (3) 190:6,11
 191:23
cop (1) 46:23
cope (2) 106:22 114:17
copied (14) 2:6 3:6 4:14 8:19
 11:1,23 12:10,14 13:8
 46:18 47:18 98:20 99:16
 101:15
copies (1) 51:15
copying (1) 143:6
copyees (1) 45:9
copying (1) 98:25
cordons (1) 11:6
core (4) 43:23 168:22
 169:3,13
corporate (3) 71:18 199:19
 200:1
corporation (6) 65:24
 66:19,20,22 67:7 163:18
correct (152) 2:2 8:11,13,15
 14:25 15:5 18:22 25:25
 29:7 31:22 45:3 54:2 59:7
 66:13,14,17,20 67:9
 68:5,6,11,16,18 69:1,2,10
 70:3,15 71:15,16,20
 72:1,2,5,6,17,18,22,25
 73:12,13
 74:11,12,15,20,21,25 75:1
 77:18 78:9,11,16,17 79:25
 80:1 82:11 83:7,11,17
 84:11,12 85:2,3,19 87:20
 88:2 89:21,22 92:2,15
 94:23 98:6,7,17
 99:3,4,13,14 105:18,24,25
 107:15,22 108:2,12 114:22
 117:24 119:21,22 123:11
 129:13,14 131:4,8,23
 134:20 139:1,2 141:14
 146:4,5,19,22 148:23
 149:20 150:15 152:4,11,12
 157:20 158:14
 160:20,21,25 162:9 164:1
 165:22,23 166:15
 168:23,24 169:7 174:13,17
 176:4,5 180:9,21,22 181:9
 182:9,10,14,19,23 183:13
 184:1,2 185:7,8 186:4
 189:9,16,20,21 190:2,3
 194:22,23 195:2,5 198:14
correspondence (1) 124:3
costeffective (1) 163:24
couldnt (3) 153:23 159:1
 180:23
council (28) 2:13,14 4:10
 22:1,2 25:4 29:12 39:7
 75:4,13 95:5,11,12,14
 96:4,17 97:10,15
 113:16,17 127:15 138:4,16
 141:8 187:15,20,24 188:13
councillors (2) 24:14,15
councils (24) 16:18 17:24
 18:9,10,14 19:12 20:5,6
 22:6 24:6 41:5,11,18,20
 67:8 71:14 83:19 102:15
 104:13 106:16 109:2
 117:18 162:1 180:17
counsel (9) 1:16 60:1
 62:17,19 63:19 200:9

204:2 206:5,10
country (5) 20:19 109:5
 164:23 178:7,10
couple (7) 4:19 46:13 62:22
 110:1 138:23 153:18 183:3
course (12) 39:10 44:1 62:8
 80:12 86:22 107:4 110:23
 120:8 144:15 155:8 167:20
 193:16
courtyard (1) 138:5
cover (6) 17:19 55:21 82:14
 114:22 126:5 160:5
coverage (3) 101:24 103:10
 152:3
covered (1) 82:17
covering (1) 51:5
covid (4) 172:25 191:13,13
 195:12
crash (1) 43:20
create (1) 158:22
created (3) 6:2 120:22 121:1
creating (3) 24:18 154:17
 157:10
credibility (1) 165:4
credible (2) 163:23 168:16
criteria (2) 40:7 123:3
critical (2) 137:12 145:12
critically (1) 194:20
criticised (1) 37:10
criticism (4) 25:13 48:15
 49:21 139:21
criticisms (1) 49:19
cross (3) 9:6 158:13 162:13
croynod (2) 43:20 109:17
culminated (1) 136:21
culture (3) 74:9 164:11,13
current (10) 16:16 32:12
 94:13 149:12 150:2 164:15
 178:13 180:1 193:8,13
currently (13) 35:23 46:5
 88:8 112:22 169:24
 172:4,17 175:6 178:20,25
 191:16 196:7 199:20
cycle (2) 56:24 197:18

D

d (1) 28:6
danger (2) 197:1 198:2
dangers (1) 36:5
dark (1) 104:20
data (10) 75:17,20 88:19,23
 92:25 159:10,12,14,22,23
date (5) 64:18 96:24 171:24
 172:14,19
dated (6) 16:10 64:17 65:1,7
 71:23,25
dates (1) 110:22
daunting (1) 62:2
dauid (18) 34:25 55:13 72:1
 76:9 89:2,10 113:3
 117:9,15 118:21 119:14,20
 120:10,22 121:1,5 123:22
 124:6
day (48) 2:1 10:9 13:17 27:1
 28:21 36:4 40:23 41:15
 46:23 49:14 90:22 91:5
 99:12 101:4,6 102:2 107:1
 108:11 112:15 113:18
 117:18,24
 118:2,9,22,22,22 120:23
 121:6 123:9 128:12 135:6
 136:2 137:4 138:8 139:18
 145:8 146:10 148:14,22
 150:20 151:6 152:9,15
 153:10 187:22 196:4
 204:17
day27322319 (1) 187:5
days (15) 11:6 39:22 44:18
 61:1 62:5 104:19 111:12
 140:12 156:21 158:25
 159:1,6,20,22,24
daytoday (1) 203:22
dclg (5) 1:23 5:12 6:6 7:25
 9:9
dclgs (4) 7:3,16 9:16 10:13
deadline (1) 128:1

deal (28) 64:13 67:22 73:14
 76:1 82:10 84:3 89:12
 90:6,14,18 91:3,6 92:7
 98:20 110:1 113:21 134:17
 135:13 138:21 139:24
 140:25 145:17 161:24
 162:24 166:23 167:9
 168:10 187:6
dealing (10) 12:4 15:14
 75:10 81:12,14 93:23
 98:12 137:6,24 138:6
dealings (1) 176:10
dealt (3) 24:23 48:5 124:2
dear (1) 3:8
death (1) 77:1
december (3) 78:4,14,14
decide (2) 21:21 38:13
decided (2) 87:16 143:7
decision (12) 15:9 21:24 27:7
 32:9,21,23 40:5 115:20
 149:9 153:8,24 157:24
decisionmaker (1) 29:23
decisionmaking (1) 118:8
decisions (4) 103:22 106:25
 119:3 137:23
declaring (1) 20:12
declined (1) 102:4
dedicated (3) 91:10 140:1
 196:2
deemed (1) 19:7
deep (1) 189:25
deeply (1) 133:7
deficits (2) 92:25 188:11
define (2) 129:25 138:15
defined (2) 16:21 184:7
defining (3) 7:1 124:12
 184:13
definitely (7) 93:18 115:24
 116:2 120:14 123:18
 124:14 135:25
definitive (2) 123:1,14
degradation (1) 73:7
degree (2) 38:18 39:14
delay (9) 15:10,20 34:4
 40:5,15 42:6,12 151:4,5
delegated (6) 17:12,25
 18:13,14 20:8,25
delegation (2) 19:17 20:24
deliberate (1) 133:13
delicate (6) 24:10
 25:1,1,2,10 42:7
delineate (1) 187:17
deliver (9) 74:8 110:13
 111:23 114:18 137:4,13
 185:4 192:9 196:4
delivered (12) 103:22 118:18
 153:3 158:20 182:6 186:20
 187:19 188:2,15 192:1
 195:20 196:7
delivering (1) 185:6
delivery (2) 195:14,19
delve (1) 133:6
delved (1) 188:14
demand (1) 74:2
demands (2) 122:10 183:10
demo (1) 157:24
demonstrated (1) 84:16
demonstrates (1) 56:24
denial (3) 133:11,16,19
dense (1) 193:22
density (1) 198:3
departments (3) 127:20
 166:8,9
dependent (1) 174:10
depends (1) 122:23
deploy (5) 7:8 38:14 106:25
 108:11 155:11
deployed (7) 7:17,20 89:7
 108:18,25 109:21,23
deployment (2) 7:3 109:25
deputies (2) 18:15 186:11
describe (5) 52:2 77:13
 147:11 160:13 162:13
described (14) 32:18 50:5
 68:1 98:12 100:14 119:25
 125:6 126:18 144:6 146:7

148:24 150:20 157:17
 164:21
describes (1) 50:2
describing (2) 66:21 136:6
description (4) 3:24 78:10
 165:7,14
descriptor (1) 19:9
deserve (1) 73:6
designated (2) 75:6 129:2
designed (4) 76:17 155:14
 161:7 171:14
despite (1) 165:1
detail (9) 10:18 55:4 57:1
 75:15 106:23 120:20 170:9
 179:6 188:14
detailed (4) 54:18 126:12
 178:2 182:11
detailing (1) 76:22
details (4) 41:7,16 146:25
 155:20
determine (3) 104:2 175:25
 178:17
determined (3) 22:3 185:12
 203:10
detriment (2) 48:17,21
develop (4) 74:9 81:10
 107:19 115:4
developed (4) 17:20 181:7
 194:15,25
developing (3) 73:3 105:17
 189:22
development (7) 68:2
 78:7,16 81:14 172:2
 175:14,16
dial (6) 85:21,24 86:15 87:3
 92:21 131:17
dialled (3) 85:15,18 88:3
dialling (3) 86:5 87:22 95:18
didnt (29) 24:18 51:10 55:6
 61:6 67:2 90:8,11,13,20
 91:20,24,25 98:12 101:25
 110:14 115:2,12 129:17
 133:6 137:16 138:1 140:18
 142:10 143:9 144:24 152:5
 158:19 159:6 169:23
differ (1) 169:10
difference (7) 54:23 119:15
 145:25 157:14 158:25
 159:4 191:2
different (12) 30:18 49:14
 50:6,10 79:1,4 122:25
 123:20 149:19 179:21
 192:3 199:7
differently (2) 61:2 202:6
difficult (8) 15:15 27:19
 30:21 48:4 49:15 61:8
 154:21 169:9
difficulties (4) 89:12 93:16
 133:1 155:1
difficulty (2) 63:25 65:11
dignified (1) 203:15
diminished (1) 36:3
dipping (2) 197:12 199:2
direct (12) 2:25 7:10,13,20
 49:12 50:6 101:4 111:25
 114:25 130:5 147:25 203:8
directed (1) 84:18
direction (2) 120:12 128:5
directive (1) 59:17
directly (11) 10:4,7 32:11
 81:21 88:18 122:12,16
 137:24 149:11 156:8
 159:11
director (3) 34:17 141:23
 142:3
directors (5) 50:7 127:20
 166:17,18 194:4
directs (1) 28:11
discharge (5) 16:17 55:18
 58:6,10 73:5
discharged (1) 192:2
discrete (1) 93:23
discretion (1) 18:19
discretionary (2) 85:23 86:14
discuss (2) 7:13 111:4
discussed (10) 17:4 35:9

E

103:18 115:6 124:17
 148:14,21 150:15 153:9
 176:19
discussing (2) 114:4 135:15
discussion (18) 6:9 15:3
 20:24 21:8 41:8
 102:21,22,23 103:5,6
 111:2,15 147:20 148:25
 149:6 150:11,12 166:23
discussions (9) 15:25 21:12
 81:20 121:17 125:24
 152:17 176:3,7 203:9
displaced (1) 4:21
disposal (1) 155:15
disruption (1) 122:10
disruptive (2) 16:22 17:14
disseminate (1) 140:6
distinction (3) 39:3 86:20
 97:11
distribution (1) 111:1
division (1) 8:1
dk (1) 120:10
document (15) 16:12 56:18
 70:7,11 78:25 79:3,4,6
 120:15 124:6 133:23
 141:20 161:20 189:23
 191:7
documented (1) 32:1
documents (11) 16:6 32:3
 47:15 54:17 129:13 192:14
 196:15,16 197:3,5,6
does (20) 5:19 22:19 37:10
 41:6 48:18 58:12 59:12
 71:1 80:25 90:5 114:19
 129:7 131:3 148:22
 154:22,24 158:24 172:2,6
 180:5
doesnt (7) 22:18 37:7 44:8
 52:12 99:25 195:24 196:7
doing (13) 12:3 43:12 47:5
 48:8 51:2 72:19 75:8
 114:21 119:13 121:9 131:5
 152:6 175:1
dominant (1) 31:12
don (1) 11:17
donations (5) 28:10,12 30:22
 138:5 139:1
done (28) 22:19 36:23 38:14
 52:13 53:6 61:2 99:17,19
 100:2,14 101:13 108:16,20
 114:21 134:9 140:5
 142:8,10 153:11 157:12
 158:5 166:16 174:4 177:23
 178:10,18 192:5 193:2
donna (5) 45:8 46:17
 47:4,17,19
dont (63) 7:7 11:7 16:4
 19:23 21:19,19 23:7 25:2
 28:10 29:15 31:24 32:25
 33:19,25 34:1 36:20 38:4
 39:12,17 41:22 42:8 44:9
 51:8 54:23 60:7 70:11 84:8
 86:6 101:4,21 104:9 105:7
 108:6 110:7 111:10 112:3
 116:13 120:20 123:16
 124:22 127:12
 135:15,15,16 144:24
 146:25 147:6,22 151:11
 158:17,23 159:2 167:18
 169:1 174:8,21 175:15
 179:5 180:13 184:15
 187:22 193:3,17
 192:1 174:2
eanor (5) 143:4,25,25
 145:3 158:12
elected (1) 22:1
election (1) 25:5
element (1) 169:20
elements (4) 72:12 135:2
 163:3 166:7
else (5) 53:14 77:19 143:8
 186:6 201:19
elsewhere (1) 200:12
email (82) 2:4,4 3:4 4:13,13
 5:10 6:25 7:4 8:18 9:11,11
 10:24 11:23,24 12:25 13:6
 14:5,10 23:22 27:25

ensuring (3) 47:25 103:24
184:15
entirety (1) 192:7
entry (3) 31:17 40:23 41:6
environment (3) 5:18 95:23
96:9
environments (1) 46:7
envisage (2) 89:23 144:20
ep (4) 28:23 50:23 70:25
161:15
ep2020 (32) 57:4 70:24
71:4,12 72:8 73:15 79:14
81:19 83:4,9 84:1,2 89:3
160:4,17,23 161:19
165:20,21 166:23 168:11
175:1 179:11 180:15
184:23 185:4,5,23 186:10
188:21 190:24 196:12
equal (1) 93:8
equally (1) 66:23
equals (2) 58:21 95:20
equip (1) 187:14
equivalent (1) 22:2
escalation (1) 179:14
especially (1) 10:19
essence (1) 189:4
essential (1) 159:18
established (5) 17:23 73:25
89:17 189:18 194:3
establishing (8) 33:12 43:3
95:19 104:9 171:5 172:7
184:14 196:5
estate (1) 154:16
et (11) 22:23,24 49:2 87:5
107:4 133:19,19 137:20
157:24 178:3 191:19
etc (2) 11:18 43:4
evacuated (1) 88:17
evacuation (1) 79:23
evacuees (1) 11:7
even (6) 92:14 125:8 137:13
187:11 197:16 202:3
evening (25) 25:15 30:6 32:6
33:13,18 34:13 37:25
42:19,21 44:7,14 53:16
101:8 112:19 117:10
142:13 150:13 151:9
152:2,6 157:23 158:12
202:20,20,24
event (5) 17:14 96:4 131:24
151:12 159:24
events (13) 13:21 14:7 15:24
17:15,15,20 68:25 82:16
83:14 136:21 162:10
186:12 195:10
eventuality (1) 17:19
ever (3) 7:19 36:20 44:3
every (11) 13:25 14:2 20:3
46:23 92:19 122:24 140:3
157:4,4 170:8 199:1
everybody (2) 42:10 158:2
everybodies (3) 166:4,13
171:1
everyday (1) 111:9
everyone (4) 1:3 5:5 154:8
170:3
everyones (1) 164:13
everything (5) 6:19 48:8
53:14 87:8 151:16
evidence (36) 1:5 6:23 13:23
44:9 51:10,22,24 60:8,24
62:4 64:5 69:4 70:22 72:3
76:7 80:3 81:25 82:19 94:1
105:14 108:7 111:14
116:14 126:19 128:11
150:9 154:22 160:1,15
164:24 167:19 173:13,15
187:4 201:19 204:4
evident (1) 51:9
evolved (2) 134:25,25
exact (5) 37:15 41:16 106:23
142:8 145:10
exactly (9) 33:21 35:13 59:3
70:11 125:18 136:17
150:18 152:18 174:9
examination (1) 66:9

examine (2) 71:6 87:11
examining (1) 19:15
example (8) 17:14 20:10
87:5 137:18 138:25
139:5,13 180:4
excellent (1) 65:4
exception (1) 53:1
exceptional (5) 17:10 18:1
109:21 146:18 180:4
excess (1) 76:25
excluded (1) 72:12
excuse (1) 195:25
exec (2) 105:2,2
executive (30) 16:25 17:1,2
18:14,21 21:21 22:12 33:1
36:14,17 37:23 66:18
68:8,9 69:15 84:22
93:3,6,16 94:25 95:4,5,13
145:22 149:19 163:15
187:15 189:15,16 202:2
executives (19) 32:14 34:10
73:10 104:12 106:9 145:6
149:14 150:25 164:10
168:17 181:8
182:7,13,18,22 185:16
186:11 187:2 196:22
exercise (9) 16:25 17:1,2
18:5,12 20:7,24 44:4
183:15 186:13
exercised (1) 130:1
exercises (3) 183:7,13
185:17
exercising (5) 130:11
186:21,22 193:9,14
exertion (1) 35:10
exhibited (1) 54:14
exist (1) 196:7
existing (1) 56:25
exists (1) 175:6
expand (2) 185:21 186:2
expanded (2) 184:6 186:5
expansion (1) 30:24
expect (16) 10:5 14:11 31:1
51:19 54:20 73:6 87:1
122:20 129:20,24 130:2,7
139:23 144:19 159:21,23
expectation (7) 50:25 51:18
70:8 85:20 86:6,11 123:10
expectations (1) 74:4
expected (19) 10:17,21
51:20 55:15 56:22 57:5,9
82:25 91:14 128:23,24
129:1,8 132:22 140:1
144:9 150:19 173:2 187:11
expecting (3) 10:8 44:10
198:5
expenditure (4) 17:5
18:17,20 22:13
experience (21) 19:5 21:15
24:23 39:14 44:20 49:5
60:23 68:20 122:20
129:22,25 130:3,6 145:25
159:21 188:7 193:10 194:6
203:16,17,18
experienced (7) 52:10 89:10
93:2 100:21 105:9 144:3
145:22
experiences (1) 193:24
experiencing (1) 75:25
expert (1) 176:17
expertise (7) 105:1 107:2
112:6,25 113:1 152:9
157:12
experts (1) 166:9
explain (9) 7:22 31:19 34:21
48:20 71:10 82:12 90:22
111:21 121:22
explained (2) 68:19 131:16
explanation (1) 62:4
explore (6) 11:16 15:25
71:21 77:22 82:15 170:18
explored (2) 175:24 176:21
expose (1) 73:8
express (1) 159:5
expressed (6) 79:14 91:13
106:20 110:19,20 117:17

expressing (1) 85:11
extend (1) 87:4
extending (1) 179:23
extensive (2) 68:20 152:3
extent (8) 37:16 81:3 112:5
119:9 121:2 136:16 159:10
187:10
external (7) 34:17 58:21
71:15 168:20 169:25 172:9
176:1
extra (5) 46:11 121:3 144:25
153:2 201:21
extreme (2) 17:14 128:18
extremely (2) 50:11 154:20

F

face (2) 24:22 57:18
faced (4) 91:7 153:22 154:13
162:6
factoface (3) 95:22 96:1
101:5
facilitated (5) 26:20 81:20
150:21 172:5,15
facilitation (1) 109:11
facilities (4) 4:11 9:7,24 43:6
facility (1) 8:14
factor (3) 31:12 125:7
199:16
factors (8) 31:6,8 32:9,17,18
149:9 171:2,3
failed (1) 131:17
failing (3) 141:3,6 152:4
failings (1) 152:10
failsafe (1) 91:9
fair (19) 49:22,23 69:8,16
75:22 78:10 89:23 90:10
111:15,17 120:13 126:3
128:21 138:11,12 148:16
150:14 163:7 178:8
fairly (2) 43:14 106:19
faith (3) 125:3 191:14
192:25
fall (1) 65:21
familiar (1) 113:11
familiarise (1) 96:8
families (4) 2:10,11 3:14,17
family (2) 3:20,22
fantastic (2) 43:12 191:12
far (12) 111:9 124:12,16
128:2 131:9 143:17 156:7
157:25 158:1 166:19
186:23 201:13
fast (2) 95:23 177:21
fastpaced (1) 109:8
fatal (1) 68:25
fatalities (2) 48:24 134:6
fats (1) 50:22
fault (1) 64:2
favourite (1) 197:7
fear (1) 145:15
feature (2) 142:11 166:14
features (2) 69:9 190:22
february (5) 161:5,10 163:13
194:21 195:12
feel (2) 24:18 143:9
felt (3) 14:8 49:6 136:7
few (16) 31:2 63:23 64:13
69:6 70:24 105:21 130:3
137:15 140:12 159:20
166:5 167:4 176:14 186:22
197:7,21
field (2) 65:25 197:1
fifth (2) 139:3 193:5
figure (2) 74:19 77:24
figures (1) 74:1
filed (1) 57:25
filled (4) 50:4 114:11
119:8,18
final (5) 15:24 82:17 112:14
122:15 160:11
finalise (1) 12:22
finally (8) 66:9 83:4 145:13
154:18 182:15 192:16
196:11 201:18
financial (1) 75:24

find (7) 53:25 119:23 184:12
197:8,15,20 199:9
finding (2) 199:3,8
findings (2) 73:19 162:22
fine (1) 194:1
finger (1) 202:22
finish (1) 48:11
finished (1) 14:12
fire (23) 6:4 8:22 9:23 14:13
39:20 61:1 62:5 66:11 71:9
83:8 84:10 90:7 108:25
125:8 154:6 157:1,18
158:15 160:2 162:8,23
163:2 187:23
firms (1) 176:16
first (46) 8:22 9:21 13:18
23:19 29:11,15 32:17
37:12 38:7 40:1 42:16 43:5
47:15 54:14 58:18 60:25
64:16 65:13 66:16 67:25
73:2 84:9 88:4 91:4,23
92:16,17 108:24 125:19
128:12 130:23,23
133:14,24 136:18 138:25
139:1 155:3 159:20 160:7
161:3 163:9 167:5 168:10
173:7 203:23
firstly (4) 63:25 65:23 69:24
124:22
fit (2) 120:6 159:4
fitness (1) 162:19
fitzpatrick (3) 131:15,20
132:22
five (5) 55:21 114:8 115:8
166:22 195:10
flagging (2) 136:1 173:18
flashing (2) 90:11 115:9
fleshes (1) 182:2
flexibility (1) 38:18
flight (1) 16:11
flippant (1) 174:1
flooding (1) 109:17
floundering (2) 27:17,18
flow (1) 198:13
flowed (3) 107:13 168:11
180:10
flows (1) 124:16
focus (6) 113:24 139:17
159:2,3 162:19 169:17
focused (4) 61:9 112:21
169:13,16
focuses (1) 168:17
focussed (1) 43:8
follow (3) 90:5 144:19
158:24
followed (2) 13:6 54:18
following (24) 4:7 13:10 15:8
16:18 54:21 55:7 75:22
79:9 83:7 89:16 92:19
102:18 104:10 112:15
122:8 132:4 148:22 151:6
152:15,25 153:10 160:12
165:11 200:12
follows (1) 57:8
followup (1) 88:10
foot (6) 27:6,21 31:18 45:6,7
52:18
footprint (3) 154:17,25
156:4
foresight (1) 26:25
forethought (1) 51:11
forget (3) 61:11 197:17,18
forgive (1) 153:17
form (12) 23:4 27:2 34:8,9
50:1 88:5 89:4 133:3
134:22 135:3 141:5 144:5
formal (8) 48:10 70:5 105:22
106:11 121:18 151:10
174:18 184:5
formalities (1) 64:13
formally (7) 33:14 151:6
152:15 153:5 199:5,11,12
formed (4) 39:20 88:7 90:5
100:25
forming (3) 115:15 151:23
152:8

forms (1) 50:10
forthcoming (1) 46:2
fortunate (1) 157:20
forum (1) 190:5
forums (1) 175:9
forward (4) 101:11 103:21
128:4 166:14
forwarded (4) 9:12 29:4
98:15 177:21
forwardlooking (1) 126:22
found (4) 62:1 143:3
199:13,14
four (6) 10:21 74:24 162:24
164:20 165:7 179:19
fourfold (1) 26:15
fourth (6) 16:13,14 26:15
42:22 133:10 188:16
fragmented (1) 118:15
framework (17) 54:14,17
55:3,18 59:16 69:9,11
129:12 160:9 163:11
168:15 174:22,24 175:23
185:15 192:22 196:19
frameworks (5) 49:3 55:1,2
118:19 197:9
free (2) 62:8 204:13
friday (15) 13:19,25
14:4,6,21,24 15:17 38:6
40:4,21 48:16 151:6,9
157:19,23
friendly (1) 24:22
friends (1) 3:22
front (7) 27:6,21 30:10
117:13 128:15 168:12
171:20
frustrating (1) 47:3
frustration (1) 203:14
frustrations (1) 36:4
fulham (1) 189:15
full (12) 17:16,21 22:2 40:10
125:25 134:18 135:13
139:19 172:3 173:5 178:14
199:4
fullblown (1) 130:4
fully (7) 85:10,13
88:16,17,24 152:23 183:15
function (4) 12:11 43:23
93:8 137:25
functioning (1) 125:23
functions (10) 16:17 39:8
48:17,21,22 76:25 87:7
110:12 111:23 134:7
fundamental (2) 103:23
165:9
funded (3) 66:24 190:5,14
funder (1) 191:15
funders (1) 191:17
further (19) 1:5 3:9 12:23
18:18 34:24 41:17 73:7
107:5 108:3 141:24 161:18
176:22 177:15 178:1,17
179:6 191:20 193:2 194:25
future (3) 27:23 57:3 61:17

G

gain (3) 53:21 103:20 134:10
gaining (1) 134:2
galling (1) 51:1
galvanised (1) 137:3
gap (3) 49:6 112:20 186:17
gaps (2) 92:25 114:10
gathering (1) 159:12
gauge (2) 106:9,12
gave (2) 47:24 89:6
gear (2) 98:24 99:2
general (4) 5:15 25:5 121:24
144:6
generally (2) 12:13 81:1
generated (1) 150:23
generic (2) 76:24 134:6
genuine (1) 153:2
genuinely (4) 151:17 172:11
190:25 201:24
get (3) 10:7 12:19 23:3
25:15 26:19 27:2,14,21
29:23 37:14 38:2 47:13

50:13 52:13 55:24 63:2
110:14 111:10,13 114:5
115:18 116:10 138:1
144:23 158:10 178:13,14
201:23 202:18 203:2 204:8
gets (1) 200:9
getting (17) 4:5 6:10 7:2
26:24,25 30:25 36:5,12
41:15 43:12 45:18 49:13
104:15 110:6 114:12 158:2
159:4
gift (1) 83:1
gillian (4) 26:13 28:14,19
29:5
give (9) 17:24 20:10 79:2
81:23 93:15 115:3 139:5
160:15 193:22
given (19) 7:23 18:11 19:3
31:13 33:23 34:22 37:10
43:7 51:10 88:20 119:6
132:25 146:23 165:16
175:7 177:11 184:24 185:2
201:22
gives (1) 28:9
giving (4) 26:17 34:5,6
126:18
gla (3) 34:17 190:14 191:23
glo (2) 7:17 8:7
goes (9) 2:20 4:24 18:3,19
48:1 77:2 135:18 161:18
187:11
going (77) 1:4,7 2:20 7:2
8:6,7 10:8 14:7 27:22
29:21 30:7 34:10 36:22
37:8 38:13 43:10
49:5,10,12 50:5,6 53:16
59:22 64:16 65:21 69:5
70:23 71:11 73:1 79:21
83:13 84:5 95:12 96:13
99:7 101:9,11 103:21
104:19 111:6 113:24
123:18 124:7,14 128:9
130:24 131:13 136:16
139:18,18 142:14 144:20
147:24 148:14 153:15,21
154:2 156:16 159:25
160:3,19 162:24 166:21,23
167:3,8 168:10 176:12
179:9 180:25 183:21
188:16 193:5 197:25
202:25 203:1,2
go00000136 (1) 78:22
go000001362 (1) 79:11
go00000146 (1) 161:21
go0000014614 (1) 179:17
go000001462 (1) 161:23
go000001463 (1) 162:22
go00000170 (1) 103:13
go000001218 (1) 94:10
go000001301 (3) 120:9 133:8
138:20
go000001346 (1) 160:16
go0000013462 (2) 161:12
168:12
go00000134624 (1) 193:18
go0000013466 (1) 169:2
go000001349 (1) 64:17
go00000134910 (2) 68:20
133:25
go00000134911 (1) 134:13
go00000134914 (4) 121:8
125:15 126:24 131:14
go00000134915 (2) 127:6
128:14
go00000134918 (1) 154:11
go0000013492 (1) 71:11
go0000013495 (1) 84:9
go0000013496 (2) 87:22
89:14
go0000013497 (2) 102:17
117:12
go000001473 (1) 98:21
go000001515 (1) 71:24
go00000151512 (1) 76:11
go00000151513 (1) 78:2
go0000015153 (1) 72:7

go0000015158 (1) 73:16
go0000015159 (1) 74:17
go000001596 (1) 163:11
go00000159614 (1) 164:17
go00000159616 (1) 174:25
go0000015962 (1) 163:14
go0000015963 (1) 164:2
go000001728 (2) 56:5 79:3
go0000017285 (1) 56:19
go0000017288 (1) 57:14
go000001839 (1) 64:24
go0000018392 (1) 182:1
go0000018394 (1) 190:7
go0000018396 (1) 184:21
go0000018397 (1) 185:10
go0000018398 (1) 175:19
go000001847 (1) 65:6
go0000018471 (1) 198:19
go0000018472 (2) 166:12
170:21
gold (122) 12:8 13:10 15:4
16:2,9,16,17,19,24
17:11,13,16,19,21,22,25
18:4,12,17 19:1 20:7
21:4,22,25 22:8,12
23:9,10,14 27:8 33:22
36:13 39:22 66:5 67:21
69:3 70:6,17 72:9,13 76:19
84:17,21 85:1,4,17 86:2
87:2,18 89:24 91:2 92:9
93:7 94:14 95:5,11,12,14
96:4,7,12,17
97:9,10,13,15,21 99:25
100:6,19 104:12 113:16,17
126:7 131:17 132:1 138:18
139:19 141:8,25 142:1
145:7 147:21 148:5,21
150:11 152:25 153:4
155:3,9,24 156:18,24
167:1 179:10,21,22
180:1,20 181:10,15
182:12,20 183:4,5,14
184:10,14,16 186:19
187:15,18,19,20,24,24
188:1,5,6,13 201:25
154:2 156:16 159:25
160:3,19 162:24 166:21,23
167:3,8 168:10 176:12
179:9 180:25 183:21
188:16 193:5 197:25
202:25 203:1,2
go00000136 (1) 78:22
go000001362 (1) 79:11
go00000146 (1) 161:21
go0000014614 (1) 179:17
go000001462 (1) 161:23
go000001463 (1) 162:22
go00000170 (1) 103:13
go000001218 (1) 94:10
go000001301 (3) 120:9 133:8
138:20
go000001346 (1) 160:16
go0000013462 (2) 161:12
168:12
go00000134624 (1) 193:18
go0000013466 (1) 169:2
go000001349 (1) 64:17
go00000134910 (2) 68:20
133:25
go00000134911 (1) 134:13
go00000134914 (4) 121:8
125:15 126:24 131:14
go00000134915 (2) 127:6
128:14
go00000134918 (1) 154:11
go0000013492 (1) 71:11
go0000013495 (1) 84:9
go0000013496 (2) 87:22
89:14
go0000013497 (2) 102:17
117:12
go000001473 (1) 98:21
go000001515 (1) 71:24
go00000151512 (1) 76:11
go00000151513 (1) 78:2
go0000015153 (1) 72:7

grenfell (23) 39:20 61:15
 67:23 83:8,21 122:19
 137:14 155:4 157:18
 158:15 162:8,23 163:2
 181:24 184:19 187:16
 189:8 191:13 195:4,6
 202:25 203:5,8
 grew (1) 39:21
 grimes (1) 8:19
 grip (15) 5:9,15,19,20
 6:13,15,18 34:19,22 35:8
 50:13 142:12 144:7,8
 gripes (1) 35:3
 grips (1) 125:18
 grit (1) 19:5
 ground (5) 3:18 6:3 7:20
 24:14 43:13
 group (43) 12:22 16:19
 20:15,23 48:23,24 49:2
 50:7 52:6 66:4 68:17 75:16
 81:21 85:24 86:4 87:15,25
 89:20 91:1,10,17 92:23
 101:17 102:14,20
 110:5,10,11,14,17,20
 112:4 126:7 128:10 131:18
 132:1,16 137:19 182:13
 189:13,18,23 191:3
 groups (4) 43:4 58:8 121:11
 191:19
 grow (1) 30:23
 growing (3) 15:16 31:3 34:7
 guess (2) 93:18 106:12
 guest (1) 136:8
 guidance (31) 58:9 70:21
 81:2 96:3,3 121:24 122:5
 181:7,14,18 182:2,5
 183:18 189:19 191:3,5,7,9
 194:19,20 195:7,11,15
 196:14,20,21,23
 197:2,23,24 198:1
 guide (2) 70:12 118:23

H

h (1) 53:2
 ha (3) 36:3 50:24 53:23
 hadnt (10) 10:3,4 49:7 53:25
 90:17 125:18 132:16
 147:13 151:14 158:5
 half (2) 13:6 37:13
 halfway (2) 35:18 51:20
 hall (8) 33:24 34:22 66:6
 95:16 114:13 133:4 142:19
 149:18
 halls (2) 34:18 35:5
 halo (8) 52:7 82:22,23
 128:18,23 129:11,16,21
 hamish (17) 1:24 2:8 3:5,8
 4:3,5 6:10 13:8 14:5 32:2
 34:15 35:15,25 50:21
 53:2,18 114:4
 hamm (5) 13:8 34:15 35:16
 50:20 53:19
 hammersmith (1) 189:15
 hand (3) 6:2 14:13 93:4
 handbook (1) 196:18
 handed (1) 13:19
 handing (1) 13:14
 handling (2) 37:11 179:23
 handover (5) 5:11 10:18
 14:21 121:19 179:24
 hands (1) 38:15
 happen (13) 14:1 52:13
 102:6 115:2 123:16,18
 124:14 142:10 144:25
 150:16,19 152:18 202:6
 happened (8) 21:5 34:21
 53:4 62:5 86:7 87:11
 131:24 180:14
 happening (6) 14:2 30:17
 52:5 96:18 115:2,19
 happens (1) 84:23
 happy (2) 82:12 147:17
 hard (2) 11:12 202:17
 harder (1) 26:20
 hasg (10) 11:4 41:24
 42:14,16,22 43:14,17,22

44:2 45:2
 havent (5) 40:14 48:16
 110:25 190:19 196:13
 having (1) 84:23
 having (26) 6:18 7:10 24:23
 29:10 35:10 38:2 47:12
 48:19 62:16 78:15 79:19
 81:13 82:15 89:24 92:15
 93:2,12 107:12 118:4
 127:24 130:1 136:9 142:6
 145:11 148:4 169:20
 head (6) 46:16 49:19,20 64:6
 131:15 132:12
 heading (2) 76:13 179:12
 headlines (1) 88:13
 headquarters (1) 95:15
 heads (2) 127:19,19
 health (1) 164:12
 hear (5) 83:14 87:23 137:17
 197:17,18
 heard (28) 9:2 44:8 69:4,12
 72:3 75:4 76:7,8 80:2,14
 81:25 82:18 90:11 94:6,21
 97:23 98:3 102:14 111:14
 113:17 121:20 128:10
 132:24 162:1,12 163:1
 174:10 183:24
 hearing (3) 1:4,4 205:3
 heatwave (1) 14:8
 hed (1) 15:6
 heightened (1) 71:14
 held (4) 30:19 85:25 87:15
 155:3
 hell (1) 44:16
 help (28) 4:19 22:14 27:14
 35:24 46:1,11,11 47:6
 65:20,20 102:4,21 112:24
 114:6,10 121:3 136:1,11
 144:10,23 145:24 147:13
 151:13,23 163:6 180:5
 184:16 203:8
 helped (1) 109:19
 helpful (2) 46:25 204:8
 helpfully (1) 84:7
 helping (1) 191:5
 hence (4) 28:22 88:9 101:7
 150:20
 here (24) 2:4 4:13 6:1 7:23
 8:20 10:6 12:12 19:18
 45:18 46:25 47:3 48:19
 50:18 52:17 61:20 79:15
 94:25 115:8 139:20 151:22
 165:7 177:1 199:16 203:6
 herself (1) 21:21
 hes (2) 10:11 44:16
 hesic (1) 4:17
 hetherington (29)
 1:5,7,9,10,19 7:15 9:21
 59:25 60:17,22 61:19,25
 69:5 98:19 99:5 102:13,23
 103:16 105:22 106:3
 110:17 111:3,16,20 148:19
 149:5 150:5,13 206:3
 hetheringtons (3) 106:18
 108:13 150:1
 hf (1) 43:2
 hi (5) 2:7 4:15 28:19 45:13
 52:20
 high (2) 74:24 75:9
 highest (1) 103:23
 highlevel (1) 161:6
 highlight (1) 140:10
 highlighted (1) 180:7
 highlighting (2) 136:15 174:4
 himself (4) 143:15 148:1
 153:16,25
 hindsight (4) 61:3 93:5,18
 146:8
 hit (1) 125:11
 hitherto (1) 186:17
 hogan (4) 35:15 45:11 47:18
 52:17
 hold (3) 20:13 22:7 61:7
 holgate (41) 9:13 13:1 15:6
 21:2,11 23:24 27:8 32:22
 33:17 37:23 38:15,23 40:6

66:7 93:25 94:18 96:21
 102:12 106:14 108:10
 118:25 119:6,21
 120:3,16,19 121:12
 127:2,10 134:16 135:11
 139:9 142:18 143:14,23
 146:23 147:11 152:19
 187:4,23 201:24
 holgates (2) 22:15 98:24
 hollow (1) 52:3
 home (4) 5:8 125:11 203:2,4
 homelessness (1) 5:1
 honest (8) 88:18 114:5,12,15
 121:1 125:20 143:16 152:5
 honestly (1) 41:22
 hope (3) 158:17 202:25
 203:19
 hopefully (5) 32:16 47:21
 52:21 69:6 184:18
 hoping (2) 50:23 135:25
 hosted (3) 66:22 67:7 190:14
 hotel (1) 11:18
 hotels (6) 2:11 11:10 12:24
 22:23 159:17
 hounslow (3) 46:17 47:16
 49:21
 hour (1) 13:7
 hours (7) 10:21 27:12 28:2
 31:2,2 108:23 128:4
 housed (3) 2:12 3:15,16
 households (1) 155:1
 housing (10) 6:3 23:5 50:6,7
 96:25 134:6 141:23 142:3
 154:8 166:18
 however (14) 22:2 66:21
 67:2 77:8,14 83:17 88:7
 93:5,19 134:15 154:13
 175:7 177:15 185:14
 hrs (1) 26:18
 huge (2) 54:23 55:9
 hugely (1) 42:9
 humanitarian (37) 2:19
 12:21 44:10 48:23 50:22
 51:13 52:6 54:11,13 55:13
 76:25 79:23 80:4 81:14
 82:21 90:6,12,16 106:17
 111:5 128:9 129:9,12
 130:5 134:5 137:19 151:24
 156:17,25 159:19 167:3
 193:6,10,25 194:3,14
 196:19
 humbled (2) 203:16,16
 hundred (1) 133:13
 hurd (2) 8:21 9:22
 hybrid (2) 25:22 27:9

I

id (11) 40:22 46:1 71:5
 75:21 80:11 94:9 126:16
 133:14 136:8,18 158:7
 idea (4) 99:20 103:1 104:6
 125:8
 ideal (1) 131:9
 ideally (1) 157:22
 identification (4) 79:23 80:5
 81:15 159:15
 identified (17) 11:25 71:18
 79:18 107:15 129:11
 179:11,25 185:20
 186:1,17,19 189:5,24
 190:24 194:15 195:23
 198:25
 identify (9) 22:15 64:14 79:6
 81:10,11 83:2 152:10,14
 188:10
 identifying (2) 84:17 170:12
 ie (4) 28:21,22 85:16 107:21
 ill (4) 42:23 79:1 156:10
 193:22
 im (62) 1:7 14:10 34:6
 40:13,18 42:5,10,20,24
 43:2 50:23 59:22 61:12
 64:2,10,16 69:5 70:16
 71:11 73:1 78:18 79:21
 82:12 84:5 92:20 95:12
 101:4 113:24 115:3 124:12

125:20 127:9 128:9 131:13
 132:19 133:12 138:13
 139:12 142:14 145:10
 150:18 153:3 154:2
 156:7,16 159:25 162:14,24
 166:21 171:20 172:19
 176:12 177:3 179:5,9
 183:21 188:16 190:13
 193:5 200:3 203:1,2
 imagine (4) 22:21 48:4
 113:15 152:6
 immediate (7) 6:3 24:1 77:5
 85:11 93:14 106:22 151:18
 immediately (5) 33:17 62:5
 77:21 107:4 115:2
 immensely (1) 61:13
 imminent (1) 90:3
 imminently (1) 145:16
 impact (9) 40:16,19
 118:10,13 151:5 154:17,25
 165:2 189:1
 impartial (1) 169:25
 implement (1) 191:6
 implementation (6) 56:23
 68:17 83:6 161:6,17
 180:15
 implemented (3) 17:17
 83:13 145:13
 implications (3) 87:4,9 104:1
 implicitly (1) 139:20
 importance (3) 188:22 193:2
 199:17
 important (14) 97:10 131:11
 132:18 143:12,17,20
 144:14 146:7 151:17 156:2
 165:25 166:3 192:24 198:2
 importantly (2) 109:7 145:22
 imposed (2) 70:2,19
 imposes (1) 175:5
 impression (6) 6:2,13 38:11
 97:20 138:9,11
 improve (10) 57:5,24 58:2,8
 61:16 136:3,5 186:23
 187:1 189:9
 improved (1) 182:24
 improvement (3) 56:16
 161:17 169:11
 improvements (4) 57:3
 189:6 195:15,22
 improving (2) 43:2 82:4
 inaudible (1) 14:22
 incident (55) 15:12 16:20
 19:25 20:3,12,13
 30:14,18,21 32:8,10
 33:7,12 38:22 39:11 40:9
 43:16,18 45:17 53:6 67:22
 68:10 69:18
 86:13,17,19,23 88:6 89:1
 92:6,14 93:1 95:10 98:12
 100:5,12,15,24 107:11
 109:16 121:13 122:24,24
 138:24 140:12
 149:8,10,23,23 156:9,13
 159:22 164:25 187:15
 198:21
 incidents (16) 7:21 16:13
 17:12 39:14 61:17
 68:22,24 69:22 72:16
 83:22 104:11 130:3 145:18
 183:2 189:1 194:6
 include (3) 68:24 71:18
 185:13
 included (9) 68:9 107:1
 130:21 134:2 174:1,3
 176:2 185:14 201:21
 includes (1) 74:8
 including (10) 52:19 66:3
 80:7 83:15 103:15 121:11
 134:5 179:23 183:13
 189:24
 incorporated (4) 83:9
 182:15,20 185:15
 incorrect (2) 94:2 123:12
 incorrectly (1) 84:18
 increase (6) 33:8 71:14
 78:12,18,19 180:2

increased (4) 107:16,20,24
 183:1
 increasing (2) 32:7 149:7
 increasingly (2) 30:20 31:7
 incredibly (1) 45:16
 incur (3) 17:5 18:17,19
 independent (15)
 58:21,22,24 161:8,21,25
 162:2 168:21 169:25 170:1
 176:1 177:17 179:18 180:7
 201:10
 independently (1) 90:13
 index (1) 206:1
 indicated (1) 131:20
 indicates (2) 78:7,8
 indication (10) 6:12 27:17
 41:21 80:20 88:21 106:24
 124:14 143:18 150:22
 196:1
 indications (1) 6:18
 indicative (1) 40:8
 indirectly (2) 122:12,17
 individual (16) 56:13,15,16
 57:9 58:9 70:18 80:15,24
 82:19 157:4 162:20 163:12
 171:13 172:10 174:11
 197:21
 individually (1) 163:21
 individuals (2) 38:21 137:5
 informal (1) 182:7
 inevitable (2) 31:7 33:1
 inevitably (2) 36:18 102:9
 influence (1) 120:12
 inform (5) 56:16 58:4
 80:14,17,19
 informal (2) 106:7 146:13
 information (35) 2:23 3:2
 5:25 6:5,9 8:4
 12:4,11,13,19 29:6 45:18
 46:8,23 47:23,25 49:1 57:2
 75:10 79:16 88:8,11,14
 89:19 90:9,25 91:19 92:22
 101:16 102:1 115:14
 131:10 144:5 172:13 177:6
 informed (6) 29:20 54:20
 86:2 87:14 115:19 129:17
 infrastructure (1) 137:25
 initial (5) 84:16,18 98:22
 104:2 149:16
 initially (1) 62:1
 innocently (2) 202:23,24
 input (4) 89:5 114:25 127:10
 194:4
 inquiry (13) 1:16 51:15
 61:20 63:19,21 64:15
 173:9 187:4 194:10 201:20
 204:3 206:5,10
 inquires (1) 80:2
 insight (4) 71:7,7 75:10
 104:18
 insist (2) 80:24 172:3
 inspection (1) 174:18
 inspectorate (1) 176:2
 installed (1) 198:25
 instance (3) 29:25 85:5
 128:25
 instruct (1) 136:9
 instructed (1) 138:6
 instruction (1) 182:5
 integrated (1) 53:13
 intelligence (1) 5:3
 intended (5) 56:14,22 57:9
 163:5 173:6
 intensity (1) 187:9
 intention (2) 135:20 136:1
 intentions (2) 11:5 14:16
 interaction (1) 86:3
 interacts (1) 97:10
 interest (1) 199:3
 interesting (2) 38:24 95:21
 internal (1) 71:15
 internally (1) 139:8
 interplay (1) 192:10
 interpretation (2) 138:9
 181:2
 intervene (2) 70:17 181:1

intervening (1) 195:13
 interview (1) 25:8
 interviewing (1) 101:3
 intheround (1) 6:8
 into (55) 8:6,7 10:9 14:17
 15:17 23:8 27:22 30:6
 32:13 34:13 36:22 42:2,7
 44:20 45:15 46:6 48:16
 49:3 51:11 53:13 55:16
 65:21 71:7 75:17 76:14
 87:4 107:1 110:6
 111:10,18 118:20,25 119:2
 139:19 141:9 147:24
 148:1,8 149:13 155:17
 157:16 158:10 159:4
 160:18 165:21 173:5
 180:10 182:7,15,20 185:15
 188:7,14 198:25 203:4
 introduced (1) 76:16
 introduction (3) 56:8 57:4
 161:24
 introductory (1) 63:23
 investigation (1) 109:9
 investigations (4) 61:21
 63:22 201:20 204:4
 investment (1) 196:10
 invitation (1) 131:1
 invited (4) 70:2 96:8 130:17
 145:8
 invites (3) 130:21,23 131:5
 invocation (3) 19:11 37:12
 184:8
 invoke (2) 27:8 40:6
 invoked (2) 148:5 153:7
 invoking (2) 22:20 201:25
 involve (1) 68:2
 involved (13) 9:6 11:5 38:2
 43:1 44:17,24 67:12,13
 97:22 100:1,7 127:18
 136:19
 involvement (10) 66:2,13
 84:5 100:10 130:25 134:2
 164:7 174:16 175:20
 197:22
 isnt (23) 23:1 39:4 46:2 54:1
 59:5 64:7 66:13 69:9
 74:14,20,25 82:11 92:15
 119:19 136:23 152:11
 168:22 174:12 189:9 192:5
 197:16 198:14
 issues (14) 34:24 43:10 48:4
 85:11 95:24 137:6,24
 138:16 144:2 148:2
 159:5,8 163:6 170:13
 its (110) 7:9 17:4 18:11
 23:14,19 29:20 32:24
 37:11,13 43:23 45:22 47:2
 50:19 51:1 52:7 54:10
 55:3,7,11 57:18 58:5,8,18
 59:7 60:22 63:22 67:10,10
 68:17 69:8,8,12,17,21 70:6
 71:23,25 73:17 79:6
 80:16,16 81:5 86:10,14
 87:7 93:10,24 97:20 99:21
 103:15 110:23,24,24
 112:15 113:8,22 119:19
 132:5,24 133:14 137:23,24
 140:8,8 141:20 149:23
 150:14 152:2,21 155:14
 157:17 159:14 165:15,15
 167:15 171:12 172:24
 173:18 174:10 175:7,8
 177:16,22 178:8,8,18
 179:5 181:10,22 182:20
 183:25 188:4 190:17 191:3
 192:1,2,4,4,7,8 193:20,22
 195:10,25 197:16,18
 201:20 204:3,6,7
 itself (1) 40:7
 ive (13) 5:10 8:8 45:23 46:3
 108:20 126:22 135:3
 148:24 151:13 156:11
 174:4 189:3 202:17

J

james (3) 4:14,16 8:19

january (2) 161:22 163:19
 jenny (2) 2:7 4:14
 jerome (3) 13:3 15:4,9
 jh12 (1) 54:14
 job (10) 43:12 47:5 58:8
 67:1 99:17,19 100:2,14
 101:13 196:4
 jobs (2) 51:4 137:4
 john (82) 1:5,9 7:5,6
 35:21,21 36:7,10,19
 37:4,19 38:12 39:14,21
 50:25 88:1 89:19 91:15
 98:16,18,19 99:5,7 101:1,3
 102:2,8,12,13,15,18,23
 103:3,4,7,16,16,17 104:7
 105:9,10,22 106:3,18
 107:5 108:13 110:17
 111:16,20 115:7 135:4
 136:23 142:22 143:4,25,25
 144:2,18 145:2,21,23
 147:23,24 148:6,9,19
 149:17 150:1,13 152:19
 153:13,19 155:17,21,23
 156:3,6,21,23 180:23
 203:7 206:3
 Johns (1) 156:7
 joining (3) 50:23 114:1,3
 july (6) 16:10 64:17 169:5
 180:18 189:23 203:6
 julyear (1) 202:20
 june (73) 1:21,25 7:5 9:22
 10:25 15:24 19:16 21:1
 25:19 26:8 30:6 31:17
 33:13,15,18 34:13 40:4,21
 41:24 42:17,19 48:11
 50:18 52:16 53:5,7 65:25
 66:3,6 67:12 71:9 82:16
 83:14 84:6 90:22 105:6
 110:4 112:17 114:14 116:4
 117:7,10,21
 118:2,3,10,11,12
 119:7,7,14,19,24 120:16
 123:11 124:17 126:9
 127:11 128:13,24,25 129:1
 130:25 133:3 144:13 146:3
 148:21 149:17 150:14
 151:6,9,10 156:19
 justified (1) 40:7

K

k (1) 51:2
 kc (4) 9:9 98:4 103:21 104:1
 kcs (1) 94:19

151:5,7,11 153:19 156:13
157:22 158:11 176:6,23
178:8 198:5,7 201:23
knowledge (12) 65:16 71:18
103:10 176:10 183:16
188:6 197:9,15
198:9,10,13,16
known (4) 135:20 153:20
197:6 202:3

L

la (2) 7:13 50:23
label (1) 66:2
labour (2) 25:3,6
lacr (1) 26:9
lack (14) 46:22,23 47:23
115:25 134:18 135:11,13
138:10 141:16 144:7,7,8
159:10,22
lacking (2) 88:19 138:15
laid (1) 154:19
lakanal (2) 21:15 107:4
lalo (2) 28:3,22
lalos (3) 75:5,12 89:7
lambeth (4) 8:12 94:22
95:2,16
lancaster (1) 154:16
landscape (1) 82:15
language (2) 95:21 149:21
lap (13) 56:7 58:1,25 75:16
80:19 81:1,20 82:1 110:5
145:21 179:22 180:3 191:4
laps (1) 81:22
large (2) 45:8 52:18
larger (3) 36:6 154:17,25
largescale (3) 38:22 68:21
165:11
las (1) 8:7
last (26) 2:16 4:24 6:22
13:23 19:14 20:11 24:3
28:14 46:9 48:9 53:19
56:19 65:8 78:21 82:18
113:24 115:5 127:1 137:1
142:11 159:25 173:9
177:22 183:3 194:8 198:18
lastly (3) 64:9 65:5 185:18
late (8) 37:25 65:10 102:24
135:4 173:9 202:20,24
203:2
later (9) 13:7,12 34:13 46:19
79:15 82:9 98:18 101:5
164:4
latest (1) 47:21
latter (2) 125:5 180:13
launched (1) 169:5
layer (6) 170:2,3,4,5,7
178:25
layers (3) 170:3 178:24,25
lead (24) 21:3 41:5,20 42:23
44:10,16 52:7 75:25 82:21
96:23 97:5,12,14 99:10,24
100:8 106:16 125:1 129:2
155:18,21 157:25 165:2,12
leader (1) 24:6
leaders (6) 18:15 24:7,20
25:9 104:15 162:2
leadership (2) 73:5 184:8
leading (6) 33:11 100:5
123:5 129:9 147:3 191:19
leads (4) 41:12 132:6,6
155:25
leadup (2) 51:16 130:15
leanne (1) 8:19
learn (1) 170:10
learned (5) 136:14,14
195:3,6 204:9
learning (3) 178:9 193:6,24
learnings (2) 167:2 193:9
least (3) 30:11 114:8 203:4
leave (4) 38:9 143:7 157:22
200:6
leaves (1) 38:11
leaving (1) 143:8
led (18) 15:9,20 18:6 20:20
69:15 83:24 100:15,17
115:15 131:5 135:2,4

136:22 156:18 159:11
168:16 183:3 194:5
left (5) 21:20 37:22 91:3
142:16,22
legal (5) 70:16 80:23 155:24
180:18,25
legally (1) 184:11
legislation (2) 174:3 175:6
length (2) 31:3 147:7
less (1) 201:23
lesson (1) 136:14
lessons (3) 136:14 195:3,6
let (8) 9:20 41:25 56:5 64:9
111:13 122:4 200:10,22
lets (40) 2:3 8:17 12:25
13:15 23:22 25:17 26:5
32:3 33:5 40:21 41:24
42:14 45:5 52:16 54:4
58:17 66:15 87:11 99:21
102:11 107:19 110:23
121:7 123:20 126:6,24
133:8 136:25 138:19 149:1
153:8 161:3,20 163:10
170:3 171:3,7 174:15
181:25 184:20
level (50) 10:18 16:21 19:9
27:20 33:20 38:5 48:14
51:19,19 56:15 67:16,17
73:6 75:9,15 80:22 83:2
84:19 103:23 106:10,12
109:18 110:11 125:9
136:19,20 146:9 153:14
164:24 165:16 171:25
173:10 174:3,14,19
177:19,25 186:25
188:12,12,14 190:9
191:2,24 192:8 194:4
197:8,15 198:9 199:1
levels (12) 51:6 73:9,23
74:20,22,25 75:3 122:11
171:18,24 173:10 188:3
lever (1) 52:5
leverage (1) 180:2
levers (1) 52:4
lfb (2) 8:20 26:9
lfb0006115823 (2) 29:16
30:5
lfb0006115824 (2) 31:25
148:20
lfb0006115826 (1) 40:2
lfb00061167 (1) 16:8
lfb000611675 (1) 16:12
lfb000611677 (1) 17:8
lfb0006121912 (1) 31:16
lfb0006121916 (1) 40:22
lfb00061225 (1) 23:22
lfb00061227 (1) 13:16
lfb00061229 (1) 110:23
lfb00061230 (1) 12:25
lfb00061233 (2) 13:7 15:2
lfb00061234 (1) 26:5
lfb000612341 (1) 28:13
lfb000612342 (1) 26:7
lfb00061236 (2) 32:4 149:2
lfb00061238 (1) 34:14
lfb00061240 (1) 35:14
lfb00061252 (2) 48:12 53:17
lfb00061257 (1) 52:16
lfb00061310 (1) 112:15
lfb00061311 (1) 3:4
lfb00061313 (1) 8:17
lfb000613131 (1) 9:12
lfb000613132 (1) 9:8
lfb00061319 (1) 10:24
lfb00061320 (1) 42:18
lfb00061327 (1) 45:5
lfb000613271 (1) 46:15
lfb000613272 (1) 45:10
lfb00061344 (1) 50:18
lfb00067778 (1) 47:14
lfb0011913018 (1) 54:5
lfb0011913032 (1) 33:6
lfb00119268 (1) 25:17
lga (5) 169:24 170:14,16
178:6 201:10
liaise (1) 102:19

liaising (1) 89:19
liaison (10) 4:17 7:16 8:1
26:12 66:3,18 67:4 68:8
98:8 188:24
lieu (1) 20:9
life (3) 122:1 203:19,22
lifting (1) 57:6
light (7) 32:7 115:10 122:3
149:7 162:5 169:21 181:6
like (34) 5:23 9:18 13:3
24:18 26:23 30:15 35:8
40:22 46:1 47:1 61:10
71:5,21 80:11 94:9 96:16
97:12 99:17,19 100:2
108:24 117:8 121:4 122:25
133:15 134:24 145:1 147:5
159:18 170:18 171:23
191:3 192:15 193:19
likely (11) 26:18 27:11 35:21
54:12 100:3 103:20 114:6
123:15 148:3 181:22 190:7
limbo (2) 37:3 152:22
limit (1) 50:24
limited (2) 69:7 164:6
line (16) 3:20,23 4:18 7:10
11:5 13:2 16:13,14 28:9
46:9 55:20 133:10 134:1
139:3 154:12 173:7
lines (7) 5:3 10:11 24:4
46:14 162:24 164:20
179:19
link (4) 4:10 45:15 109:8
133:18
linkages (2) 44:24,25
linked (1) 166:3
linking (3) 32:3 170:10 178:4
links (3) 118:5 138:2 140:17
list (3) 31:12 35:3 111:1
listen (12) 51:6 73:9,23
74:20,22,25 75:3 122:11
171:18,24 173:10 188:3
lever (1) 52:5
leverage (1) 180:2
levers (1) 52:4
lfb (2) 8:20 26:9
lfb0006115823 (2) 29:16
30:5
lfb0006115824 (2) 31:25
148:20
lfb0006115826 (1) 40:2
lfb00061167 (1) 16:8
lfb000611675 (1) 16:12
lfb000611677 (1) 17:8
lfb0006121912 (1) 31:16
lfb0006121916 (1) 40:22
lfb00061225 (1) 23:22
lfb00061227 (1) 13:16
lfb00061229 (1) 110:23
lfb00061230 (1) 12:25
lfb00061233 (2) 13:7 15:2
lfb00061234 (1) 26:5
lfb000612341 (1) 28:13
lfb000612342 (1) 26:7
lfb00061236 (2) 32:4 149:2
lfb00061238 (1) 34:14
lfb00061240 (1) 35:14
lfb00061252 (2) 48:12 53:17
lfb00061257 (1) 52:16
lfb00061310 (1) 112:15
lfb00061311 (1) 3:4
lfb00061313 (1) 8:17
lfb000613131 (1) 9:12
lfb000613132 (1) 9:8
lfb00061319 (1) 10:24
lfb00061320 (1) 42:18
lfb00061327 (1) 45:5
lfb000613271 (1) 46:15
lfb000613272 (1) 45:10
lfb00061344 (1) 50:18
lfb00067778 (1) 47:14
lfb0011913018 (1) 54:5
lfb0011913032 (1) 33:6
lfb00119268 (1) 25:17
lga (5) 169:24 170:14,16
178:6 201:10
liaise (1) 102:19

86:2,24 87:2,18 88:1 89:24
91:1,11 92:9,14 93:7,15
94:13 96:7,12,15,23
97:5,9,12,15,21 99:25
100:6,13,16 102:8
104:11,20 107:8,10 108:19
110:8 111:19,24,25 112:10
118:24 123:4 125:4 126:20
127:15 132:10 137:12
139:19 145:6 148:4 149:24
154:17 155:2,9,14,24
161:5,14 162:3
163:3,18,20 165:2,3,5,9,11
168:14,19,25 169:14
170:5,16 171:9,13,15
172:1,4,6,8,11,14,15,20
173:4,11
174:7,11,19,20,21
175:5,8,10,11 176:13
177:19,25 178:4,21 179:3
182:7,11,18,20 183:4,14
184:13,16 186:18,24
187:18,24
188:1,3,5,12,12,21 189:19
190:9,9 191:2,6,8,23,24
193:8 194:2,16,21 195:24
197:25,25 198:20,22
199:20,23 201:12,15
localised (1) 68:10
localities (1) 74:10
locally (8) 46:25 47:3 155:12
168:16 188:2,15 191:6,10
locate (1) 54:8
located (2) 7:9 159:17
locating (1) 157:25
location (1) 158:1
locations (2) 109:4,10
logbook (2) 31:16 40:23
logical (1) 6:25
logistics (1) 10:22
london (199) 1:5,22 2:6,8,22
6:1 12:16 14:7
18:5,7,9,10,14 19:4
20:3,5,6,14,18,19,20,21,22
21:13,13,16,17,22,25
22:6,8,12 24:6,7,25 25:3
26:1 27:1,8 30:2 33:22
36:13 41:5,11,18,20 43:21
44:18,19 56:6,15
57:7,11,15,24 58:8,25
59:1,9 62:2 65:24
66:4,4,19,20,22,23
67:7,13,18,20 68:22
69:3,9,11,14 71:4,8
72:13,20 73:4 75:16
76:6,15,17,19 77:3,25
81:21 82:9,11 83:19
84:21,22,25 85:4,17,23
86:3 87:1,18,25 89:20,23
91:1,9,10,16 92:23 99:25
101:16 102:14,15,19
101:21 92:12,15 107:3 108:25
109:4,15
110:5,9,10,13,16,20
112:4,22 129:12 131:17
132:1,3,11,16 145:6,14,18
147:21 148:21 150:11
153:4 155:2,9 156:18,24
160:8 162:1,3 163:3,17,20
166:25,25 167:6 168:14
169:4,6,10,11,17,20
170:12 171:8,9 172:1,8
176:20 178:6,8 180:17
182:11,13,18,20
183:21,23,24,25
184:4,6,25 185:3,6,14,22
189:12,15 179:15 190:5,15
191:17 192:11 194:5
196:15,18 197:24 201:8
204:9
london (1) 56:11
londonwide (5) 19:22
69:17 22:98 13 100:10
long (4) 111:7,10 156:24
202:23

longer (4) 24:2 27:5,20 122:1
longterm (2) 110:6 165:2
look (38) 4:1 9:1 13:15
14:13 16:7 23:12 43:1 44:8
51:12 54:4 56:19 64:16
75:15 76:12 79:12 94:7,11
107:13 111:8 123:20
126:24 128:4 133:8
149:1,25 152:5 154:10
161:3,20 162:18,22 163:15
164:2 170:20 180:14
181:25 184:20 191:9
looked (14) 6:23 13:17
16:3,3,5 19:15 25:8,18,19
53:19 54:7 57:16 61:12
145:1
looking (11) 7:24 12:19 15:3
21:10 41:10 57:18
60:23,23 61:1,3 125:14
looks (6) 6:9 99:17,19 100:2
164:10 192:14
loose (2) 55:3 59:12
loosely (2) 113:4 123:23
loss (4) 71:18 124:25 125:5
154:16
lost (4) 19:9 131:21 154:14
198:3
lot (17) 47:6 52:14 61:3,9
69:4 88:8 114:7 128:11
130:24 157:9 159:19
166:16 172:13 182:17
196:1,14 204:10
lots (7) 46:5 102:4 137:9,9
178:9,10 191:1
lowest (1) 73:24
lrf (3) 53:1 176:20 190:14
lrf (1) 179:1
lrg (3) 102:19 111:22 139:8
lrp (1) 5:1
lunch (2) 116:10 139:7
luncheon (2) 110:1 116:5
lunchtime (2) 124:2 134:23
lynn (4) 2:5 3:5 4:2,4

M

magic (2) 173:24 193:19
magically (1) 52:13
main (7) 9:19 18:16 67:24
103:18 144:22 154:4
203:18
maintain (5) 61:6 76:23
171:15 189:25 198:8
maintained (2) 197:10,20
maintaining (1) 198:10
major (5) 16:13 20:12 43:15
68:10 183:1
majoritively (1) 25:3
making (13) 6:11 10:6 30:20
100:7 115:15 137:22,23
139:13 140:9 154:7 159:13
183:14 192:8
malice (1) 203:3
manage (7) 51:9 53:8 124:24
134:4 148:8 155:12,12
managed (3) 34:11 39:13
100:24
management (12) 49:20
52:11 81:20 113:12,13
123:24 126:8 127:17 129:4
134:19 173:20,23
manager (4) 50:9 72:4
120:11 194:6
managers (3) 28:4,23 50:23
managing (1) 39:14
mandates (1) 175:5
mandatory (1) 171:5
manner (1) 24:17
manpower (2) 22:16 23:4
many (8) 28:9 43:11 53:13
88:16 159:22 163:4 172:14
197:2
map (1) 124:7
march (1) 162:6
mark (20) 9:13,15 10:8,11
11:1,4 31:19 33:23 35:23

41:1,8 42:17,20 63:11,13
99:18 111:4,7,10 206:8
market (1) 140:11
marks (2) 17:1 36:3
martin (68) 1:3,10,12,15
22:14,18,25 23:3,7,12,21
32:13 38:9,24
39:3,10,16,23 55:24 56:2
59:21,24 60:7,11,17 61:24
62:8,11,13,16,20
63:1,4,8,12,14,17
116:6,9,17,21,25 117:3
131:15,20 132:22
149:13,19 150:2
167:8,12,15,21,25 168:4,6
200:8,18 201:2 202:9,14
203:25 204:6,13,16,19,23
205:1
mary (2) 161:9,13
mass (3) 48:23 50:22 134:6
massage (1) 41:3
match (1) 101:25
matches (1) 148:24
matching (1) 176:19
material (4) 48:20 133:2
158:25 198:4
materialise (2) 91:6 101:7
materialised (1) 141:12
materialises (1) 104:22
matt (2) 47:18 52:17
matter (12) 22:25 52:9 80:6
82:24 93:23 107:2
112:6,25 113:1 125:5
176:16 177:23
matters (7) 63:23 67:15
98:10 160:5 166:23 190:20
199:3
matthew (2) 35:15 45:11
maxwell (3) 26:13 28:14 29:5
maybe (3) 39:5 94:1 134:23
mayor (9) 13:11 183:21,23
184:4,6,25 185:3,13 186:5
mayors (3) 185:13,21 186:2
mean (11) 5:19,19 24:11
34:2 39:3 41:6 99:19 128:6
133:17 137:8 199:12
meaningful (1) 158:10
means (6) 74:5 78:15 163:20
171:9 172:6 203:5
meant (9) 31:6 42:20 48:20
100:1 127:16 150:8 191:10
201:25 202:1
meantime (1) 36:25
measures (1) 59:13
mechanism (5) 16:24
69:12,17,21,24
mechanisms (1) 5:16
media (9) 35:7 101:24 103:9
131:16 132:12,24 152:3,5
179:24
meet (2) 57:10 156:25
meeting (68) 4:16 13:12
18:6 20:4,9,14,19 22:2
42:16,24 43:5 52:12
77:9,15 82:4 87:15,17
95:16 104:8 107:14 111:4
113:16 119:20 124:5
126:6,7,8,11,18,20,23
127:2,3,8 128:13
130:15,16,21 131:7,11
137:19 141:8,25 145:8,8
146:2,4,7,21,21,24,25
147:2,7,9,15,17,23
148:10,12,15 150:10
152:25 153:9 154:5 157:2
202:21,23
meetings (6) 6:7 90:22,25
96:24 113:18 138:18
member (3) 8:3 68:15,17
members (9) 1:18 6:6 61:25
63:10 74:25 137:3 142:5
168:17 203:7
membership (2) 22:1 127:6
memorandum (2) 16:5 23:15
memory (2) 54:9 96:6
mention (8) 46:22 79:21

87:21 92:25 118:4 173:22
182:3 194:18
mentioned (22) 19:5 29:23
30:13 81:8 86:23 93:11,23
99:24 101:18 115:6 120:21
138:22 139:7 141:13
143:20 144:17 153:18
160:17 164:14 171:2
182:17 201:12
merit (1) 177:15
message (10) 13:7
41:3,4,5,11,18,20 84:17
99:7 100:4
messages (1) 198:2
messaging (2) 132:8,10
messy (2) 45:21 50:11
met (6) 122:17,17 123:3
154:8 155:6 203:12
method (2) 94:19 176:1
methods (1) 134:3
metropolitan (1) 121:18
microphone (1) 112:8
mid (1) 142:16
midafternoon (1) 136:22
middle (4) 54:6 57:21 60:3
96:20
midist (1) 137:13
might (6) 18:23 36:19,19
42:2 106:10 118:23
millett (1) 1:15,17 23:22
38:7 39:24,25 55:19 56:1,4
59:18,22 60:19,20 61:8
62:13,15,18,25 63:18
milletts (1) 204:21
mind (19) 10:7 20:17 31:6
31:8 41:19,21 77:21 86:10
92:24 105:1 115:5 143:12
150:8 152:13 153:20,21
158:17 187:22 193:17
mindful (1) 191:11
mind (1) 48:18
minds (2) 199:16,17
minefield (1) 42:3
minimal (1) 77:4
minimum (15) 57:10
59:7,8,8 76:15 77:3,25
82:8,10 166:24
169:5,11,19 170:11
minister (2) 8:21 9:23
minor (1) 138:3
minute (1) 106:1
minutes (15) 3:13 30:1,2
46:19 47:11 55:21 62:22
98:18 101:15 105:23 131:7
132:20 141:25 146:4 147:8
minutiae (1) 147:5
missed (2) 133:12,13
missing (1) 127:25
mistrust (1) 125:9
misunderstanding (1) 94:17
misunderstandings (1)
181:23
mix (1) 50:24
mobbed (1) 13:11
model (1) 30:15
modifications (1) 70:20
module (1) 184:5
moment (15) 23:7 67:24
127:2,3,8 128:13
130:15,16,21 131:7,11
137:19 141:8,25 145:8,8
146:2,4,7,21,21,24,25
147:2,7,9,15,17,23
148:10,12,15 150:10
152:25 153:9 154:5 157:2
202:21,23
meetings (6) 6:7 90:22,25
96:24 113:18 138:18
member (3) 8:3 68:15,17
members (9) 1:18 6:6 61:25
63:10 74:25 137:3 142:5
168:17 203:7
membership (2) 22:1 127:6
memorandum (2) 16:5 23:15
memory (2) 54:9 96:6
mention (8) 46:22 79:21

55:24 56:2 59:21,24
60:7,11,17 61:24
62:8,11,13,16,20
63:1,4,8,12,14,17
116:6,9,17,21,25 117:3
167:8,12,15,21,25 168:4,6
200:8,18 201:2 202:9,14
203:25 204:6,13,16,19,23
205:1
moot (1) 122:18
more (86) 1:13 13:14
15:14,15,18,19 16:6
21:16,22 28:10 30:5,11
31:1 33:9 39:12 43:8 45:14
47:2 48:2,6 49:7,9,9
55:4,21 22 56:3 60:5,18
61:4 69:20 77:23
79:16,19,19 80:11 81:12
95:25 96:15 97:21 102:3
107:19 108:1 109:7 110:2
111:25 112:21 114:16,25
120:24,24 125:12
127:22,23 135:19 136:15
139:11,17 142:8,9 145:22
157:25 158:1 164:21
166:19 170:2 171:22
173:19,22 180:3 181:22
182:11 183:7,18,18 184:17
191:1 192:23 196:7,23
198:6,23 199:22 200:15,21
201:3
morning (48)
1:3,10,11,17,17,19,20 2:5
6:16 7:17 10:20 25:21,21
32:12 33:24 40:24 52:22
60:3 63:9,9,20 76:7 79:1
80:14 81:25 84:11 101:1
110:18 113:5,9 114:4
119:20 123:24 124:17
129:18 131:19 138:4
141:12 147:25 149:12
150:6 151:21 153:1,7,25
162:7 180:25 204:24
morningmidday (1) 42:24
most (14) 13:4 27:1 35:21
78:3 145:14 154:8 160:10
164:8,8 165:25 166:3
175:25 203:12,14
motion (1) 33:13
motivation (2) 100:3 191:7
mount (2) 158:3 159:18
mounted (1) 157:8
move (28) 40:21 70:23 73:1
76:5 84:5 94:5 97:24 101:9
102:11 116:4 121:7 123:10
126:6 128:9 131:13 135:9
136:24 145:12 156:10,16
159:25 166:21,25 171:3
174:15 179:9 188:16 193:5
moved (4) 121:2,13 139:17
155:17
moves (1) 121:23
moving (5) 7:3 52:22 95:15
166:5,14
mp (1) 25:6
mps (6) 4:6 7:12 12:7
13:3,10 15:4
mpss (1) 8:14
ms (3) 130:13,20 131:1
msl (8) 56:7,10,10,22 78:21
79:6,9 82:19
msls (7) 77:11 78:25
80:13,19 82:8 166:24
174:11
much (50) 23:21 36:23 50:3
56:2 59:18 60:10,11,20
61:20,22,23 62:6,11
63:3,4,14,21 64:12 73:18
74:16 75:9 81:15 90:9
96:12,13 101:17 105:2
116:17,19 117:3 127:25
137:16 145:3 148:18
157:15 159:3 167:23
168:5,6 169:15 177:7
188:5 193:19 195:20
198:6,15 204:2,11,16,23

multiagency (3) 89:17 158:1
179:1
multiple (5) 45:25 49:9,13
109:4 197:17
must (5) 86:15 107:14
148:13 192:19 203:23
mutual (28) 16:5,10 22:9
23:3,11,16,18 26:4
29:11,21 32:8 36:1 45:21
47:1,12 48:8,15 49:7,10,25
50:1 98:2 149:8 150:21
151:18 155:13 184:8
196:23
myriad (1) 74:6
myself (3) 41:8 75:21 81:22

N

name (2) 64:19 72:1
named (1) 80:4
namely (1) 26:21
national (10) 175:7 176:13
177:11,19,24 178:4,6,21
179:2 197:23
nationally (1) 178:18
natural (1) 167:7
nature (4) 27:11 85:25
101:19 103:6
navigate (1) 160:4
naylor (1) 24:12 29:17
85:1,6 91:25 96:21 98:1
102:13 103:16 145:7,16
nays (3) 41:1,9,13
nearly (1) 195:10
necessarily (11) 10:17 27:18
30:17 48:5 114:15 124:13
138:12 143:10 170:8 173:5
197:4
necessary (10) 18:2 19:7
29:19 37:3 44:11 67:16
68:12 74:6 132:11 186:6
necessitated (1) 37:12
need (94) 2:14 8:5 16:4,7
17:17 18:7,9,11 19:24
20:4,5,6 21:17 27:5,23
28:22 29:15 31:24 33:7
34:7 36:7 38:18 40:17
41:2,9,19 47:22 52:8 60:2
64:9 70:11 74:7 75:21 84:8
87:12 90:16 91:20 92:9,21
96:6,11 97:1,24 98:1
100:6,9 107:15 110:13
111:11,18 114:6,10
121:3,5,12 126:17 128:1,3
143:14 151:18,24 152:9,14
154:15 155:22 156:5 157:3
158:7 169:1 170:13 175:15
179:20 180:14 184:5,16
185:20 186:2,19 187:1,17
189:6,9,25 191:11
197:8,15,19 198:6,22,24
199:13,21 200:21 203:1
needed (42) 2:21 7:1 21:2,12
24:16 35:1 36:10,23 37:4
39:13 40:11 46:8 49:6 87:8
102:6 104:22 109:18
110:12 111:25 114:21,25
115:1 117:17 118:15,17,20
119:17 120:25 125:21
138:17 143:23
144:10,19,23,25
147:12,13,14 151:23
157:12 166:1,1
needing (2) 26:18 27:12
needs (27) 6:4 11:17 13:20
56:16 90:7,12 96:25 98:23
99:2 104:19 112:20,21
114:15 122:11,16 137:13
148:3 154:5,8 157:1,2,5
180:5 187:7 192:23
198:7,11
negative (1) 40:16
neil (2) 13:3 15:4
nervous (2) 38:2,4
nervousness (4) 42:6
107:16,20,24
network (3) 24:9,15,18

networks (4) 25:7 44:20
166:17 191:21
neutrally (1) 151:8
never (10) 8:8 39:7 53:6
56:22 57:9 157:11 188:14
192:6,24 203:20
newham (1) 57:21
newhams (1) 57:25
news (3) 13:9 32:16 125:12
newsroom (1) 4:10
next (27) 8:17 13:15 14:2
26:18 27:12 28:2 31:16
32:16 84:25 90:20 93:25
94:3,6,15 97:25 107:1
108:11 128:3 139:18
141:12 142:7 147:24
148:14 150:20 151:3,20
153:24
ney (1) 161:9
nicholas (63) 8:21
9:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 121:12 127:2,10
134:16 135:23 139:9
140:11,17 143:7,23 144:23
145:2 146:23 147:3,5
148:1 152:19 155:19,23
156:6 187:4,23 201:24
nick (1) 142:16
19:13,15,18,22 10:12
13:1,11 15:6 21:2,11 23:24
27:8 32:22 33:17 37:23,24
38:23 39:12 66:7 93:25
94:18 96:21,22,25 98:24
102:12 103:19,25 104:18
106:8,14 107:6 112:19
118:16,25 119:6,21
120:7,19 12

128:13 139:21,24 143:22
 146:2 148:2 157:7,16
 158:2,5 160:3,8 175:4
 188:24 198:12
placed (3) 111:21 128:1
 152:20
places (3) 155:14 188:6
 203:4
plan (11) 5:22 32:12 51:14
 55:3,5,7,13 129:4 149:12
 150:2 161:6
planners (4) 166:10
 169:17,22,22
planning (37) 28:6 49:21
 50:8 56:24 57:1,7 58:5
 70:25 71:4 72:4 73:21,23
 74:22 75:7 76:2,14 80:17
 100:21 109:1 118:19
 120:10 160:18 161:14
 162:14 164:7,9,11,19,22
 165:8 166:7 173:17 174:19
 177:18,24 194:6 196:24
plans (24) 2:18 53:22,23
 54:10,13,15,19,21,25
 76:22,24 77:1,9,15,25
 175:4 188:24,25 193:9,13
 197:2,9 198:1,13
plate (1) 61:14
play (3) 23:8 25:23 158:6
played (1) 155:13
playing (1) 104:21
please (88) 1:8,21 2:3,4 3:4
 4:1,12 7:4 8:17 9:12,20
 12:25 16:8 17:7 24:1 25:17
 26:6,7,16 28:13,23 31:16
 33:6 34:20 40:22,24 42:18
 45:5,6,10 46:15 54:5
 56:5,18 59:23 60:7,13
 63:11,14 64:1,14,17,18,24
 65:1,6,7 66:16 69:7 72:7
 73:16 76:5,11,12 78:23
 79:11 94:5,10 98:15
 116:11,13,19 133:25
 156:10 160:16 161:11,24
 162:21 163:14 164:3,17
 167:17,18,25 170:21,23
 171:7 174:25,25 175:19
 179:17 182:1 183:22
 184:20 185:9 193:18
 198:18 200:18
plugged (1) 49:7
plume (2) 47:24 87:4
plus (1) 43:11
pm (9) 21:1 116:22,24
 141:25 168:1,3 200:24
 201:1 205:2
points (3) 69:7,23 71:22
poisoning (1) 109:3
police (4) 19:7 30:15 109:8
 121:18
policed (3) 17:19,22 20:13
policies (2) 76:18 194:16
policing (3) 8:21 9:23 30:15
policy (2) 68:2 174:2
polite (2) 126:16,21
political (19) 18:16
 24:7,8,16,20,20,21,21
 25:9,11 41:2,5,9,12,13,20
 42:3 104:14 154:17
politically (2) 42:7,9
politician (1) 25:7
politicians (4) 24:22,25
 41:16 171:15
population (1) 30:17
posed (2) 6:10 76:9
position (22) 27:15 36:20
 39:6 50:24 54:11 66:24
 72:19,20 77:17 87:16,24
 93:9 100:8 120:12 124:18
 157:15 173:12 177:5 181:6
 186:3 191:16 199:6
positive (2) 9:16 56:21
possess (1) 74:5
possibility (1) 90:17
possible (10) 11:15 14:14
 50:3 111:9,12 154:9

180:19 203:9,11,15
possibly (2) 11:14 137:10
post (1) 8:24
postactivation (2) 154:2,5
postcall (1) 108:14
postfire (5) 70:22 83:15
 120:8 160:8 161:2
postgrenfell (1) 160:2
postincident (2) 133:9
 138:19
potential (9) 36:12 41:2,19
 74:3 104:19 109:17 114:10
 115:22 165:4
potentially (13) 36:2 73:8
 80:21 91:14 93:5 101:3
 109:5,9 110:10,14 169:16
 181:23 198:5
power (8) 18:13,16 22:11
 37:21 69:24 82:5,7 174:8
powers (13) 16:25
 17:2,13,21,25
 18:5,13,21,21 20:8,25
 59:17 181:3
practice (6) 18:10 26:21
 93:11 94:24,25 170:7
practised (4) 44:3,4
precis (4) 23:24 106:5,18
 108:13
pre (1) 94:15
precedent (2) 7:24 8:7
precedents (1) 145:19
precise (3) 101:21 107:12
 198:7
predicated (2) 96:12,13
predicts (1) 151:3
preemptive (1) 27:4
preferred (2) 94:19 195:20
prefire (1) 82:9
prejune (1) 187:14
preon (1) 182:15
preparation (1) 187:10
prepare (2) 74:5 186:13
prepared (7) 59:19 83:3
 124:6 145:24 189:23
 199:23,25
preparedness (7) 56:12
 67:18 68:1 163:22 165:1
 179:17 179:13
preparing (2) 160:15,22
present (1) 8:2
press (6) 9:9 10:13 21:13
 23:5 25:8 158:11
pressing (1) 39:12
pressure (4) 11:9 71:14
 128:18 158:9
pretty (2) 88:10 132:24
prevent (2) 73:7 199:4
previous (16) 13:16 43:20
 44:9 51:10,13 74:19 79:2
 104:10 124:9 127:13
 129:22 145:7 146:10
 165:20 167:2 193:6
previously (8) 7:9 39:8
 44:18,25 102:2 151:13
 152:17 191:4
primarily (2) 67:14 83:18
primary (2) 58:3 112:5
principle (1) 104:9
principles (3) 54:17 55:10
 189:24
print (1) 64:19
prior (8) 18:8 20:4 65:25
 94:5 98:10 112:20
 144:12,22
priorities (7) 45:16 176:22,23
 197:12 199:4,8,9
prioritisation (2) 196:5,9
prioritise (3) 47:25 52:24
 53:4
prioritising (2) 11:13 143:11
priority (1) 158:21
private (2) 13:10 176:15
proactive (3) 180:3
 184:14,17
proactively (1) 183:11
proactivity (3) 183:1,3,19

probability (1) 187:10
probably (23) 37:13,24 38:19
 43:19 67:10 106:2 109:25
 111:20 119:8 125:11
 126:22 127:17 130:24
 145:23 147:8 152:19 153:6
 158:15 159:14 173:25
 189:3 197:6 200:1
probe (1) 4:20
probedchallenged (1) 61:4
probing (1) 153:17
problem (5) 11:21 12:1 31:4
 51:6 199:2
problems (2) 36:6 95:25
procedural (1) 29:19
procedure (8) 43:9 49:25
 70:4,6,7,8 182:21 185:12
procedures (3) 17:23 76:18
 194:16
proceedings (1) 200:12
process (33) 17:20 29:25
 33:9,13 47:13 69:16 70:4
 75:14,20 83:12 111:7
 124:24 161:16 170:2,15
 171:5 172:17,18,19,25
 173:2,5,19,20,23 174:6,7
 175:4 177:11 179:14
 182:24 185:11 203:12
produce (3) 106:3 113:3
 123:22
produced (4) 80:25 141:4
 191:3 196:15
producing (3) 81:2,2 191:5
professional (2) 91:11 166:17
professionalising (1) 198:20
programme (9) 109:7 172:7
 186:13 194:3,7,12,15
 195:1,9
progress (7) 98:9 178:19
 180:13,16 192:2,7 193:12
progressed (5) 43:4 120:24
 136:2 194:9 196:2
progresses (1) 52:25
project (2) 52:11 57:4
prompted (2) 103:7 131:4
property (1) 30:25
proposal (1) 178:2
proposed (1) 16:9
prospectus (1) 185:4
proud (2) 61:13 203:15
proven (1) 72:14
provide (33) 10:5 22:9
 23:4,17 24:8,15,21 29:21
 30:8 45:1 49:4,16 50:1
 56:21 58:9 71:6 87:24
 91:10 104:25 107:7 108:3
 114:19 130:13 140:14
 147:25 151:24 171:9 179:6
 180:3 189:18 191:5,21
 203:10
provided (24) 6:1,6 12:12
 24:17 51:15 64:15 79:22
 81:5,7 90:9 92:22 107:8,10
 108:16 109:7,19 160:12
 177:7 180:16,17 182:12
 186:17 193:10 194:10
provides (9) 47:21 51:16
 56:9,10,13 57:2 121:8
 160:11 183:8
providing (15) 6:18 21:13,14
 24:13 39:4 43:2 48:24
 105:5 110:11 155:10 156:8
 163:12 169:25 194:17
 204:4
provision (2) 22:16 40:16
proximity (1) 19:4
prudent (2) 14:8 157:24
public (1) 176:13
publicly (2) 61:10 202:11
published (4) 56:6 76:22
 83:25 84:1
pull (5) 20:15 49:1
 52:5,11,14
pulling (1) 52:4
purity (2) 57:22,23
purpose (7) 80:19 104:4,8

128:5 131:25 181:13 197:4
purposes (3) 58:3 80:13
 176:21
push (1) 27:22
pushed (1) 38:19
pushing (1) 34:13
puts (3) 23:19 76:14,14
putting (3) 6:21 14:19 52:6

Q

q (495) 1:21 2:3 3:3 4:24
 5:19,24 6:13 7:3,22
 8:6,9,12,14,16
 10:2,10,13,16,24
 12:3,10,25 14:15,23
 15:1,6,18,20,23 17:6 19:14
 20:2,24 21:5,19 24:16,20
 25:1,11,13,17 26:1,5,15
 27:7,16,25 28:9
 29:4,8,10,14 30:3,10
 31:5,12,15,23 32:20,23
 33:1,4,23 34:1,9,13
 35:12,14 36:16,25
 37:3,10,17 38:1 40:14,21
 41:5,13,18,24 42:6,13
 43:23 44:1,6,13 45:1,4
 49:18 50:14,17 51:24
 52:16 53:11,15 54:3
 55:6,12 57:13,23
 58:12,16,22,24 59:3,5,7,12
 64:9,13,22 65:4,11,16,19
 66:2,15,25 67:5,7,10,24
 68:7,13,17,19,24
 69:3,12,19 70:4,11,20
 71:2,17,21 72:3,7,19,23
 73:1,14 74:13,17,22
 75:8,19 76:4 77:19,22
 78:10,12 18 80:2,12
 81:8,25 82:4,8,14
 83:4,12,20,23 84:3,13,20
 85:4,12,16,20
 86:6,10,14,18,22
 87:6,10,21 88:3,13,23
 89:1,13,23 90:2,5,10,20
 91:16,19 92:3,11,17,24
 93:10,22 94:5,24 95:6,8,12
 96:1,19 97:17,23
 98:8,14,18 99:5,15,21
 100:11,25 101:9,11,18,22
 102:10 103:1,6,11,13
 104:17,23
 105:5,8,14,17,19
 106:1,6,14,20
 107:12,19,24 108:3,7,15
 109:12,21,23,25 110:16,23
 112:7,10,13
 113:1,10,14,17,20 114:19
 115:3,21,25 117:12
 118:1,9 119:4,10,13,19,23
 120:2,5,8,15 121:7
 122:4,16,20 123:7,9,13,19
 124:2,11,16,21 125:5,14
 126:1,3,5,24 127:10,22
 128:6,9,23
 129:6,11,15,19,24
 130:7,11,13,17,20,24
 131:5,9,13,25 132:12,24
 133:8,21 134:13,22
 135:1,6,9,17 136:4,13,24
 138:9,19 139:3,15,20
 140:22,24 141:13,16,20
 142:11,21,25 143:2,13,20
 144:1,5,7,11,15,20
 145:6,20
 146:1,6,11,13,15,17,20,23
 147:2,7,9,11,20
 148:9,16,19,25 150:5,17
 151:3,22 152:2,8,13,21
 153:4,8,17 154:1,10,25
 155:8 156:10,15,23 157:17
 158:4,11,15,18,24
 159:5,14,21,25 160:15,22
 161:1 162:10,12,17 163:9
 164:2,17 165:13,19,24
 166:11 168:25 169:8

170:3,6,16,18 171:22
 172:22 173:1,7,14,21
 174:7,10,15,21,24
 176:6,10,12 177:1,3,5,9
 178:20,23 179:4,8,17
 180:10,13,23
 181:2,6,10,13,18,25
 182:11,15,20,24
 183:7,18,21 184:3,20
 185:9 186:5,9
 187:1,4,21,25 188:3,10,16
 189:8,12,17,22
 190:4,16,20 192:4,10,16
 193:5,16,18,22
 194:11,13,24
 195:3,6,10,17,19,22
 196:8,11 197:14,21
 198:10,17 199:10,16,20,25
 201:17
quality (2) 124:9 126:17
quality (1) 187:6
quarter (4) 78:15 79:19 80:7
 81:12
queries (3) 3:10 8:20 45:19
query (1) 28:20
query (33) 6:14 9:21
 11:20 27:16 28:1 29:10
 40:12 47:15 48:19 53:21
 54:9,20 55:11 58:16
 60:21,21 86:21 115:5
 119:11 124:10 129:7 151:3
 153:24 155:6 175:21
 180:21 184:21,22,22
 185:18 186:23 192:4 201:6
questioned (2) 142:7,9
questioning (1) 114:23
questions (36) 1:13,16
 3:6,25 4:7,11 5:12,14 6:7
 9:16 21:11 26:8,15,23
 27:11 43:9 55:20,25 59:20
 60:2,5,18 63:19 64:1 65:21
 76:8 159:25 188:17
 200:4,7,10,13,15 201:3
 206:5,10
quick (3) 29:25 122:23 133:8
quicker (1) 195:21
quickly (7) 31:1 108:22
 109:23 110:23 180:1
 195:25 196:7
quite (19) 31:2 35:9 37:25
 38:16 42:10 47:3 51:16
 58:16 69:4 101:25 128:10
 146:17 151:14 169:23
 192:14 193:22 198:2
 202:22,23
quotation (1) 17:1
quoting (1) 121:24

R

raise (7) 10:12 34:24 69:19
 90:11 120:16 132:18
 135:10
raised (14) 8:20,23 10:4
 24:13 89:11 91:14 118:4
 121:15 125:15 133:1
 135:24 141:16 160:6
 181:19
raising (1) 141:13
randall (1) 11:17
rang (1) 2:8
range (3) 76:24 134:4 161:15
rare (1) 43:17
rarity (1) 31:2
rather (21) 9:19 20:2 29:22
 54:18 58:21 62:1 70:2,19
 94:19 95:12,18 109:13
 118:22 136:8,11 140:22
 145:16 151:15 166:9
 171:22 190:17
rating (1) 79:20
ratings (1) 57:6
rational (1) 40:7
rationality (4) 7:22 31:19 32:1
 82:12
rbkc (133) 2:18 4:5,10
 5:2,9,14 6:12,13,15 7:8,17

10:4,9,14,19 12:18,20
 14:19 21:4 22:21,25 23:2
 24:6,8 25:13 26:2 27:17
 28:11 30:8 31:10
 32:8,11,13 33:10,23 34:23
 35:6,7,10,22,23 36:4
 37:1,10,19 45:16 46:12
 48:10 51:6 53:21 54:9
 55:12 66:4,6,7 72:4
 80:2,3,7 82:19 83:1 85:10
 87:8 89:2,5,11,16
 90:5,14,18 91:3 92:7,13
 93:6,19 98:11 99:9,23
 100:5,7,24 105:19
 106:21,24 107:15,22
 108:1,23 110:11,15
 111:4,4 113:17 114:3
 115:10 118:6,11 119:3,12
 120:24 121:15 124:18
 125:1,15,20 126:7 128:17
 130:22 131:16 132:13,20
 133:5 134:3,17 135:12
 136:8,16 137:2 147:24
 148:8,8 149:8,11,13,24
 150:23 151:14 153:1,15
 154:19 157:23 201:14
 203:9
rbkclcd (1) 111:19
rbkcs (2) 55:17 148:7
re (1) 11:15
reaction (1) 154:18
read (11) 2:6,8 65:14 73:2
 142:14 148:1,4 153:25
 164:20 171:7 202:9
reading (4) 18:25 137:1
 171:22 177:13
readout (1) 2:24
ready (6) 14:19 46:4 62:24
 63:2 117:1 168:4
real (2) 127:24 189:6
realise (1) 144:23
reality (3) 55:17 107:18
 136:5
really (28) 46:3,6 62:3 71:6
 81:6 84:15 87:7 93:10
 102:5 115:18 125:18
 133:6,14 134:1,8 136:6
 143:17,17 151:3 153:25
 158:10 166:18 175:22
 182:2 191:15 202:5,12
 203:2
reason (6) 33:16 44:15 97:7
 112:2 145:9,23
reasonable (1) 2:13
reasonably (1) 122:23
reasons (5) 90:24 96:7
 103:18 124:22 158:24
recall (29) 6:22 13:23 14:18
 24:12 52:3 54:10 79:13
 101:4 104:9 105:7,7
 106:20,23 120:20,21
 123:17,25 127:12 133:20
 135:15,16 142:4,8 144:17
 146:23,25 147:2,6,20
recalls (1) 148:19
recap (1) 16:2
receipt (1) 30:1
receive (1) 92:18
received (10) 2:22 29:6
 48:10 50:9 87:13 94:8
 98:16,18 102:1 181:6
receiving (1) 90:24
recent (8) 21:15 32:8 65:6
 78:3 149:8 160:11 183:7
 194:6
recently (3) 98:3 145:14
 183:2
receptive (5) 127:10,12,14
 147:16,18
recipient (3) 47:8 113:23
 149:4
recipients (2) 45:9 52:19
recognise (3) 45:15,22
 188:22
recognised (2) 24:9 70:6
recognition (1) 71:13

recollect (4) 88:15 108:4
 148:10,11
recollection (7) 21:6 44:2
 106:15 107:12 141:19
 149:2 150:10
recommend (1) 163:20
recommendation (9) 168:13
 169:2,3 179:12 180:10
 186:15,16 193:14,20
recommendations (19) 73:19
 83:5,8,12 84:2 160:20
 161:1,7,13,16,18 163:5
 166:22 168:22 188:

53:23 54:12,15 55:2,18
67:17 80:22 177:19,24
178:21 182:8 188:7,7
197:24
regulates (1) 175:5
regulation (2) 192:18,22
regulations (1) 192:18
rehousing (1) 154:15
reinforce (1) 193:2
reinforced (2) 191:15 193:4
reinstating (1) 173:2
reiterate (1) 121:4
relabelled (2) 67:5,11
related (2) 143:19 199:3
relating (4) 15:25 77:9,15
116:14
relation (96) 6:2 12:4,11
64:25 65:12 67:10 68:1,4
69:3,4,23,24 70:4,14,21
72:9 73:15 74:20 75:2,3,19
76:9 77:19 78:13,20 79:3
80:3 82:5,8 86:18 88:23
89:8 91:22 92:11 93:10
97:3,17 100:25 104:24
106:15 108:3 110:18
111:14 117:8 122:4,5
124:6,7 125:5 128:11
130:13,24 133:1 135:10
142:18 146:2 154:25 155:3
159:6,15 164:14,19 169:3
174:11 175:20,22 177:22
180:14 181:10,25 183:7,23
186:5,18 188:12,19 189:20
190:10,20,21
192:5,13,16,23 193:12
194:13,14,17 195:14
196:20,21,23 199:21
201:12,18 204:8
relations (1) 34:17
relationship (3) 91:12 105:10
175:8
relationships (4) 95:20
188:24 191:14,20
relatively (3) 74:24 81:16
109:21
relay (1) 144:5
relayed (1) 9:24
relaying (1) 6:5
released (1) 48:3
relevant (5) 16:23 132:8
166:8 185:16 197:9
reliance (1) 166:5
reliant (1) 90:9
relief (1) 40:16
relocated (1) 137:20
reluctance (3) 42:1 110:5,7
reluctant (2) 38:2,4
relying (1) 81:3
remain (4) 11:6 139:10
145:17 203:16
remainder (1) 138:22
remained (4) 15:13 101:15
118:1 136:11
remains (4) 61:19 173:3
174:5 204:1
remember (9) 35:13
41:7,16,22 52:4 128:2
147:3,3 160:1
remembering (1) 156:14
remind (2) 75:21 170:3
remotely (1) 115:18
repeat (2) 40:18 69:6
repetition (1) 197:19
rephrase (1) 64:1
replaced (2) 82:10 169:5
replicated (1) 164:23
replies (2) 28:15 46:3
report (36) 71:12,22,23
72:24 73:9,15 74:13
75:18 76:11 77:13 79:15
82:19 83:10,16,25 86:1
129:7 141:11 160:22,23
161:15 164:5 165:15,25
168:11 179:12
180:8,11,13,15,16 184:24
185:5 186:10 188:21

reported (3) 80:3,8 85:17
reporting (1) 79:20
reports (7) 47:11 66:12 84:3
163:9 165:20,20 185:24
reportsituational (1) 46:24
representative (1) 97:14
representing (2) 36:14
191:18
reps (1) 43:6
reputation (1) 165:5
request (23) 11:18 22:15
27:2 29:11,18 32:8,22,23
33:10 37:22 45:14,23
70:1,10,19 90:3 131:2,20
139:6 149:8 151:19 175:11
180:5
requested (6) 22:10 23:18
24:6 33:17 90:1 98:4
requesting (2) 27:6 50:1
requests (12) 26:4 36:3
45:21 48:9,10 49:8,10,14
98:2 185:20,23 186:1
require (11) 22:18 28:20
31:10 70:1 98:13 103:21
130:4 153:3 174:2 184:7
187:9
required (42) 7:14 16:22
33:19 34:3 35:4 36:24 59:9
68:12 81:13 82:13 87:25
90:19 98:5 103:25
106:10,13 108:22 118:14
119:1,1 120:18 121:14,16
125:2,16,17 128:19 130:2
136:19 140:21 143:6 147:5
151:15,17 153:14,15
157:14,16 172:9 173:22
183:6,12
requirements (2) 76:22
192:17
requires (2) 78:7,16
requiring (2) 2:16 16:20
requisite (1) 130:9
residents (9) 4:21 8:24 9:2
141:24 142:5 154:14
155:4,5 156:12
resilience (114) 1:6,22 2:22
6:1 7:25 20:15,22,22 26:2
49:21 56:6 57:2,4 58:8,25
59:1 62:3 65:25 66:4,12,18
67:3,4,5,17 68:3 69:9,11
71:8 72:20 73:5,11 74:7,10
75:16 76:2 81:21 85:23
86:4 87:25 89:20
91:1,10,17 92:23 98:8
101:16 102:14,19 103:23
110:5,9,10,13,16,20 112:4
129:13 132:3,16 160:9
161:14 162:4 163:4
164:7,11 166:7,13,25
167:2,5 168:19
169:4,10,14,17 170:25
171:8,25 172:11 174:12,19
175:7,8 177:18 178:21
182:8,13 183:24
188:16,19,23
189:5,10,12,17,22
190:5,6,8,21 191:22
192:6,11,11 196:16,17,18
197:1,13 199:3,18 201:8
204:9
resiliencerelated (1) 67:15
resilient (1) 191:1
resistance (1) 108:5
resolution (18) 16:3,9,16
19:1 23:9,10,14 72:10,13
147:21 153:4 167:1
179:10,22 180:2,20 181:10
184:10
resolve (1) 2:15
resource (3) 45:14 46:11
90:18
resources (10) 21:11 38:14
50:14 69:14 90:6 148:7
152:23 153:2 155:10,15
resourcing (2) 148:3 153:14
respect (3) 4:11 28:12

189:25
respectively (1) 56:17
respects (1) 192:4
respond (14) 5:22 16:20
17:8,12 19:6 30:19,24 33:2
36:18 38:17 46:4 47:16
74:6 187:15
responded (1) 109:16
responder (3) 44:5 149:24
192:19
responders (2) 198:23
199:22
responding (10) 26:22 30:16
31:11 43:15 47:10 48:1
68:9,21 125:23 132:7
response (105) 4:2 5:13,16
6:3,11 9:16 10:5 16:21,23
21:3 22:13 28:1,20 30:22
32:15 38:23 39:11,20
43:15,25 44:1 45:19
47:7,12 49:1,4,24 51:18
52:3 53:22,25 54:8,9
55:8,17 59:15 69:13 76:25
77:5 84:16,19 89:18,25
92:13 93:14 96:13 97:14
100:9 105:17 106:17
107:10 109:2 111:19
113:22 117:19
118:1,11,14,19,24
121:13,19,20,23,25
122:9,19,21 123:10 124:19
127:7,9,15 128:5,19
129:3,10 130:5 132:4
134:4 137:22 140:16
141:16 149:15 154:20
155:18,22,25 156:8,18
157:18 158:3,15,25 159:19
162:20 165:1 179:25 180:4
181:24 191:13 193:10,25
198:21 199:1
responses (2) 167:3 193:6
responsibilities (4) 58:5 92:8
134:5 169:18
responsibility (12) 67:18
110:15 112:1 129:2 155:3
164:9 165:12 181:17 196:3
197:22 198:22 199:21
responsible (2) 123:5 188:4
rest (18) 2:17 3:11,19 5:8
9:3 11:8 21:17 28:4,5,22
31:1 43:18 47:23 130:11
141:24 142:7 178:7 203:19
resting (2) 164:9 166:10
restore (2) 125:3 163:6
restoring (2) 154:7 165:9
result (12) 12:20 44:13
68:14 89:18 107:24 108:10
147:23 151:2 157:23
189:8,13 194:2
resulted (2) 86:4 196:12
results (8) 56:7,9,14 57:25
58:4 78:22,24 79:7
resume (1) 116:11
retain (1) 99:9
retained (1) 99:23
retrospect (1) 136:13
return (3) 5:8 70:20 138:19
returned (1) 122:11
reveals (1) 77:4
revert (1) 112:4
reverted (1) 89:18
review (48) 56:7,10
58:13,20,21,22 66:11
71:3,4 72:10,12,19 73:19
77:3 78:21,24 79:6,10
81:19 83:4,24,25 160:5
161:9,22 163:1,11,17,19
164:10 167:1 168:15,21
170:8 172:18 174:25
175:13,14,23,25 176:21
177:17 179:10,13 181:20
189:22 193:8,13
reviewed (3) 57:19 160:23
172:21
reviewing (1) 169:22
reviews (6) 66:10 83:15

160:2,8 161:2 195:11
rightly (1) 11:13
riordan (1) 161:9
rise (1) 62:21
rising (2) 19:11 101:24
risingtide (1) 17:15
risk (8) 47:24 73:9 109:17
122:1 165:4 173:4,18
174:5
risks (3) 71:15,17,18
road (2) 113:4 123:23
robust (5) 124:23 140:18
170:2 172:7 195:1
role (94) 12:4,5 20:21 27:14
40:11 44:11 45:15 46:6
58:2 60:25 61:5,8 65:23
66:16 67:2,5,12,13 68:7,14
73:5 83:3 84:13,15,19
85:4,7,8 89:24 92:12 93:9
97:9,14 101:11,12,17
104:24 108:7 109:11 112:5
114:12 119:8 129:11,16,22
130:1,11,14 140:5 148:9
150:3 155:2,9,17,21 156:7
165:2 166:6 169:16 174:18
175:7,9 177:16 182:18
183:15,23,24
184:5,10,13,25
185:3,13,14,21,22
186:2,5,18,21,25
187:2,18,19,23 188:8,9
189:25 190:11,13,14,19
191:4 192:24
roles (6) 67:24 75:12 118:7
179:21 198:15 199:1
rolling (1) 172:7
room (10) 8:3,10 60:8 94:22
95:2 116:13 130:16
142:16,23 143:7
rooms (2) 11:10,11
rota (2) 72:14 85:1
rotas (1) 53:8
round (1) 130:23
route (5) 11:16 12:1
124:7,12 192:3
routine (1) 43:18
rows (1) 78:13
royal (1) 39:18
rsls (3) 82:11 171:25 173:11
ruled (2) 176:2,6
run (3) 3:22 38:22 39:1
running (3) 99:22 122:8
137:21
rush (1) 37:7
ruth (4) 163:13 168:15
174:25 176:8
rvp (1) 46:2

S

188:18 200:3,9 201:2,7,18
204:1,7 206:8
saying (8) 6:19 9:3 14:5
19:10,23 44:16 101:12
187:22
scale (17) 15:12,13 36:22
51:12,18 88:6,21,21,24
93:1 119:1 122:24 128:20
130:4 134:16 154:13 187:9
scenario (1) 115:23
scene (5) 13:11 25:9 28:22
46:2 89:7
scg (43) 2:24 4:15,16 6:7
7:11 8:4 12:8 14:21
19:7,12 20:10 47:11
85:14,15,17,18,21,24
86:15 87:14 88:4,10 89:16
90:20,21 92:15,19,24
93:6,25 94:3,6,15,18 95:21
96:23 97:4,12 98:10
101:15 112:20 141:9,10
scgs (3) 91:21,23 95:24
scheme (2) 201:9,10
scope (5) 33:7 72:8,23 162:5
193:13
score (1) 59:14
scored (1) 57:20
scorings (1) 57:5
scratch (1) 157:11
screen (5) 24:3 30:10 31:18
40:25 193:15
scrolls (6) 47:8 98:14,21
113:21 126:25 170:23
scrum (1) 104:16
sean (4) 163:13 168:15
174:25 176:8
second (38) 2:4 3:4 4:12,18
8:18 13:2,18 28:17 33:5
34:20 48:13 54:3 64:23,24
66:8 72:11 73:14 76:21
77:2 80:19 87:8 94:16
109:16 111:3 154:12
160:6,10 162:18 163:10
175:18,19 177:20 179:9
181:25 184:20 190:4,16
194:25
secondly (5) 64:3 66:2 68:2
104:21 124:24
secretariat (8) 43:2 45:2
48:25 49:4 52:10 81:19
176:4,7
section (8) 16:14,18 18:5
22:19 23:8 24:1 79:12
181:3
sector (12) 11:15,18 12:23
131:6 139:13 176:13,15
185:25 191:14,15
192:25,25
sectors (1) 44:21
sectorspecific (1) 179:3
secure (3) 93:20,21 183:9
see (87) 2:3 3:3 4:1,9,22
8:18 9:11 10:6 14:5 15:23
23:7 26:13 28:7,16 29:2,8
31:17 34:10,19 35:19,22
36:8 37:18,19 40:15,18
42:10 44:14 45:1,4,7,12
47:1 52:17 56:7 58:12
60:4,17 62:2 64:18,19
71:25,25 74:18,22 77:24
78:2,4 79:21 93:3,18
94:15,16 96:20
98:14,23,25 99:22 103:15
106:9 111:3 114:20 115:8
118:13 120:8,15 127:6
128:14 133:10 138:25
141:21,25 150:7,11
161:2,22 162:23 168:13
169:1 170:24 171:12
175:14 197:4 200:7,15
201:2 203:8
seeing (2) 137:21 153:15
seek (2) 12:23 98:1
seeking (1) 104:18
seem (1) 138:2
seeded (2) 43:8 81:16

seemingly (1) 137:4
seems (3) 21:22 96:24 184:9
seen (18) 7:20 8:8 25:10,18
51:22,24 52:21 72:21
78:25 80:3 96:16 103:14
105:21 110:25,25 136:11
149:3 183:2
select (1) 197:21
selected (2) 166:5 197:7
selective (1) 171:22
selfassessment (5) 57:20
58:18 80:8 168:16 170:5
selfassessments (1) 173:16
selfcontained (1) 100:12
send (3) 13:7 23:25 41:11
sending (5) 46:6 130:21
131:5,10 140:8
sends (1) 114:2
senior (13) 21:14 66:7 83:2
113:12,13 123:24 126:8
127:16 134:19 171:15,25
173:10,18
seniority (1) 45:15
sense (16) 37:7 38:1 42:1
47:22 81:4 89:6 109:18
110:4 128:3,4 137:15
138:1,5 140:17 145:11
159:13
sensecheck (1) 102:6
sensible (3) 7:1 56:3 167:12
sensitive (1) 35:2
sent (8) 26:9 47:11 84:25
103:15 112:16 113:22
149:18
sentence (5) 13:18 53:20
127:1 133:14 150:1
separate (2) 93:14 98:19
september (1) 162:6
sequence (1) 141:21
series (1) 94:9
serious (2) 26:17 45:17
seriously (2) 198:23 199:22
serve (1) 80:13
services (1) 8:15
service (9) 8:22 9:23
49:12,12 73:8,11,21
121:18 127:19
services (6) 23:17 50:6
122:10 137:12,17 194:5
session (2) 6:22 182:12
sessions (1) 44:3
set (23) 18:18 31:9 35:24
38:16 71:2 84:7 96:16
102:20,25 103:1 104:10
117:12 131:9 134:1,13
143:24 147:17 158:19
160:7 165:14 173:8 189:13
196:13
sets (2) 57:15 76:20
setting (6) 54:17 67:15
103:7 104:4 124:7 158:9
seven (1) 61:1
several (6) 51:15 120:19
135:22 159:1 163:1 178:25
severe (1) 68:25
shaking (1) 64:6
shall (2) 14:6 204:19
share (3) 48:6 132:8 156:2
shared (7) 40:16 125:12
172:12 182:6,21 183:16
197:10
sharing (3) 89:19 177:7
178:10
shellens (1) 4:14
shift (5) 28:21 117:16,23
120:23 183:1
shifts (1) 28:21
short (19) 23:24 43:5 55:20
60:15 63:6 71:7 85:4 87:19
99:21 105:20 108:7 116:23
117:22 133:23 167:16
168:2 200:7,10,25
shortage (1) 2:15
shortest (1) 66:16
shortly (2) 71:8 150:12
should (49) 10:2,16 11:16

13:20 35:4 38:14 45:16
52:23 53:3 67:21 76:23
89:9 95:1,5 96:5 100:20
110:15 111:8 112:2 113:8
114:9 120:17 121:15 122:7
125:15 135:17,19 136:15
138:16 139:5 142:9
143:22,24 144:21 146:8
153:5,6,9,10 166:19
169:15 172:21 179:13
182:5 187:18 188:2 199:13
202:6 204:6
show (6) 36:1 38:22 39:1
40:22 75:3 110:23
showing (2) 13:12 143:10
shown (4) 5:10 29:10 38:5
48:19
shows (1) 74:19
side (1) 43:11
sides (1) 37:11
sighted (5) 88:16 139:11
144:2 171:19 190:13
sign (2) 22:5 86:12
signature (4) 64:20,21 65:2,9
signatures (1) 22:7
signed (2) 19:20 172:14
significance (3) 86:19,25
121:22
significant (13) 35:17 43:10
48:3 72:16 77:8,14 83:22
125:7 137:6 152:10 154:15
159:12 191:18
significantly (2) 67:3 74:3
signing (4) 35:22 36:8 37:19
172:4
silvers (2) 75:4,13
similar (11) 24:23 107:7,9,9
126:19 144:18 146:9
153:20 159:8 177:22 191:7
simple (3) 69:16 180:19,23
simplification (1) 185:11
since (7) 14:3 66:17 73:24,25
77:11 160:9 195:10
single (9) 16:21 21:17 22:11
36:14 69:15 86:23 92:14
100:13 125:22
singlebased (2) 86:17,18
singleborough (2) 92:6
100:15
sir (61) 1:3,10,12,15
22:14,18,25 23:3,7,12,21
38:9,24 39:3,10,16,23
55:24 56:2 59:21,24
60:7,11,17 61:4
62:8,11,13,16,20
63:1,4,8,12,14,17
116:6,9,17,21,25 117:3
167:8,12,15,21,25 168:4,6
200:8,18 201:2 202:9,14
203:25 204:6,13,16,19,23
205:1
sit (3) 63:14 80:16 166:20
site (2) 14:12 16:21
sitrep (1) 141:4
sitting (2) 64:4 95:22
situation (36) 6:20 12:14
25:22 27:9 34:23
35:8,11,17 42:9 45:22
54:18 62:22 85:9 86:1,16
87:23 94:13 95:15 96:14
100:20,23 102:6 106:9
107:9,9 122:2 125:13
126:15 128:20 129:21
136:2,18 139:24 141:11
148:1 203:21
situational (9) 20:16 126:1
134:18 135:13,24
141:3,6,17 144:7
situations (1) 108:22
six (1) 37:13
skills (1) 198:24
sleeping (2) 9:7,24
slight (3) 70:15 78:18 100:11
199:7
slippy (1) 37:24

small (4) 24:9 132:24 133:19 137:5
sme (3) 112:23,24 176:17
smooth (1) 121:14
smt (4) 113:5,8,12,15
snow (1) 19:5
social (1) 194:5
solely (3) 75:6 114:15 169:16
solution (5) 172:9 173:21 184:12 196:8 199:13
solve (1) 12:2
somebody (7) 52:3 72:3 93:13 119:13 129:21 142:23 198:5
someone (12) 9:18 95:22 118:15 119:11 129:1,8 130:8 132:15 139:23 142:16 143:8 198:7
something (39) 24:12,23 41:10 55:15 64:6,10 70:23 82:23 90:8,13 92:3 102:5,7 104:21 111:11 113:10 115:16,17 124:3 127:21 128:11 129:11 142:21 148:10,11 155:22 164:4 173:8,22 175:1 176:10 179:5,11,18 182:17 186:14 190:4,11 192:12
sometimes (3) 25:7 55:4 61:11
somewhat (1) 14:13
somewhere (2) 94:2 118:15
soon (6) 14:14 62:24 88:10 121:9 150:10 190:7
sooner (2) 153:5,11
sor (8) 7:9 12:7 94:20 95:7,11 96:5,8,13
sort (20) 41:18 67:25 102:1 104:14 108:17,23 109:13 118:19 129:20 136:13 139:19 144:12 145:13 151:20 154:2 157:17 162:13 170:2 179:6 180:6
sorting (2) 36:5 43:9
sorts (1) 105:11
sought (3) 18:13 19:19 29:17
sound (2) 131:3 148:22
sounded (1) 11:9
sounding (1) 74:13
sounds (1) 31:5
source (1) 98:23
southwark (4) 21:14 44:18 107:3 112:23
speak (8) 8:5 13:3 14:9 18:25 100:25 142:16,23 202:11
speaking (2) 12:19 131:15
special (6) 8:3,10 69:8 94:21 95:1 113:10
specialist (2) 75:9 119:5
specific (10) 5:12,14 54:18 71:22 76:22 93:8 108:7 134:24 135:2 192:12
specifically (3) 35:12 54:25 176:17
speculating (1) 34:2
speedy (1) 180:3
spend (3) 18:22 142:6 148:7
spending (2) 22:21 141:24
spent (6) 9:2 36:4 99:22 152:24 153:1 157:10
spill (1) 97:1
spirit (1) 177:7
spoke (2) 117:14 128:17
spoken (2) 15:6 35:25
springs (1) 77:21
sro (1) 8:10
stabilised (3) 14:12 56:21 122:2
stac (1) 47:11
staff (22) 2:14 28:6,16,23 45:25 46:4,6 51:3,8 52:23 61:11 66:8 74:22 75:4,12 90:18 107:1,2 118:6 137:4 151:19 198:12
staffing (8) 23:17 51:6 73:23

74:20,25 75:2,3 98:4
stage (30) 6:16 10:8 12:5,9,17 37:6 40:9 50:13 53:13 64:9 72:20 77:12,20 78:4 89:23 90:2,7,14 97:3,23 98:9 101:11 110:3 137:16 144:12,21 147:12 149:16 153:5 190:12
stages (2) 51:17 181:24
stakeholders (2) 163:2 190:9
stall (1) 35:24
stand (1) 28:21
standard (3) 43:14 170:8 192:12
standardisation (1) 57:4
standards (34) 57:6,10 58:14 59:8 76:6,15,16,21 77:3,9,15,25 82:1,6,9,11 166:24,24,25 167:6 169:4,6,10,11,17,20 170:11 171:8,25 173:15 177:12 192:11 196:17 201:8
standby (1) 46:5
standing (4) 8:3 68:15 157:17,18
stands (2) 8:10 70:25
start (12) 1:22 26:7 27:23 37:14 44:8 117:16 122:3 157:17,18 158:10 173:3 192:5
started (8) 91:5 101:6,7 121:2 125:11 151:2 158:8,17
starting (6) 15:21 25:14 101:25 150:1,22 158:16
stated (7) 2:15 58:3 107:17,21,22 152:17 187:4
statement (65) 29:15 30:4 31:24 32:4 33:5 38:7 40:1 51:17 53:24 54:3,15 64:23,24 65:5 68:19 71:2,10 84:8 87:21 93:24 102:16 103:2 118:5 119:25 121:7 125:14 126:12 127:13 133:22,24 134:9 144:6 148:19 154:11 158:11 160:7,10,11 166:12 170:20 173:8 174:1 175:18,19 177:3,20,21 181:25 184:20,20 185:19 190:4,16 194:24,25 196:25 197:11 98:18 201:21 202:7 8:9,10,12,17
statements (7) 4:10 64:14,15 65:12 160:6 164:4 196:13
states (5) 3:13 47:4 70:12 131:19 148:25
station (1) 203:2
status (3) 79:9 190:13 194:12
statutory (3) 80:15 164:18 181:2
stay (1) 11:8
steer (1) 118:24
steering (7) 12:22 48:23 128:10 189:13,18,23 191:3
stems (1) 195:3
step (3) 29:19 56:25 61:13
stepped (3) 135:19 180:24 202:1
stepping (2) 42:2,6
steve (6) 13:8 34:15 35:16 50:20 53:2,19
still (21) 12:8 19:10 20:17 27:9 41:14 88:8 92:5 97:15 106:4 111:18 117:23 121:5 136:7 137:12,13 140:13 142:5 158:20 164:15 190:11 199:20
stock (1) 200:11
stone (1) 96:16
stood (7) 25:19,23 27:10 43:17 97:2,18,24
stop (6) 52:23 53:14 60:4 116:9 158:19 167:16

stopped (2) 53:7,12
stopping (1) 53:3
stories (1) 101:24
story (1) 16:7
straight (3) 37:5 141:7,8
straightforward (1) 49:23
strain (3) 34:16 73:7 75:24
stranded (1) 91:3
strange (1) 143:3
strategic (15) 1:25 16:19 87:14 103:22,24 115:25 120:12 127:4,8 128:7 132:5 140:21,22 185:14 194:4
strategiclevel (1) 127:24
strategies (1) 125:2
streamlined (1) 127:22
strengthen (3) 180:1 191:20,20
strengthens (1) 181:21
strengths (2) 80:16 172:10
stressful (3) 46:7,10 47:6
stretched (1) 50:15
strive (1) 61:16
strong (5) 81:3 95:19 105:10 159:23 188:24
stronger (2) 157:15 181:22
structure (5) 33:12 62:2 106:11 158:22,22
structured (2) 126:21 186:13
structures (11) 14:19 66:12 118:17 121:11 132:4 134:3,11 148:2 157:7 158:4,5
struggling (1) 45:18
stuart (3) 11:1 12:15,19
style (1) 126:20
sub (1) 43:3
subject (14) 4:15 18:18 23:8 24:10 25:1,2,10 52:9,25 107:2 112:5,25 113:1 176:16
subregional (3) 168:20 169:20 170:7
subsequent (3) 10:21 90:21 93:6
subsequently (3) 20:22 95:9 148:25
success (1) 178:16
successful (1) 88:24
sue (2) 128:15,17
suffer (1) 203:21
sufficient (9) 90:6 102:24 144:14 179:5 187:14 190:23 192:22 196:5 198:11
sufficiently (3) 132:17 140:18 146:20
suggest (22) 18:23 19:18 92:8 100:3 106:18 107:16 115:21,25 139:5 144:14 146:21 147:8 148:13 152:24 157:6,14 164:24 165:18 173:15 178:1 184:11 200:13
suggested (5) 4:9 104:7 123:18 127:2 144:15
suggestion (6) 141:23 142:3,4 143:21,23 184:3
suggestions (1) 123:15
suggests (4) 20:2,3 73:9 108:21
suitable (1) 158:1
suite (1) 196:16
summarise (3) 71:11 89:13 194:14
summarising (3) 171:20,22 177:5
summary (9) 69:16 90:10 105:20 111:15 120:13 121:9 128:21 163:7,16
summer (1) 20:11
sunday (6) 157:7,15 158:6,8,12,21
supplementary (1) 185:18
supplemented (1) 160:9

supplying (1) 112:23
support (134) 3:17,20 9:9 10:9 19:21 21:2,16 22:10,15 23:3,17 24:2,8,13,16,17,21,21,22,24 27:4 30:8 31:10 32:10,13,15 33:8,11 36:1,24 38:5,21,25 39:4 41:15 44:11 48:15 49:16 50:22 51:8 58:9 67:25 69:17,22 74:9 76:18 80:22,22 91:2,10 93:15,20,21 98:5,13 102:4 103:12,21,21,24 104:14,22 106:10,13,25 107:7,15 108:1,4,5 109:1,19 110:6,12 111:4,10 112:21 114:8,9,20 115:7,9,11,14,21 117:18 118:7 120:6,18,25 121:16 125:16,17,21 139:4,10,19,22,25 140:3,14,18 143:6,24 144:20 145:1 147:4,18,25 149:10,13,15 150:3,22 151:1,14,20 153:14 155:10 157:8 183:6,11 184:17 189:19 190:8,25 192:8 194:17,18,19 195:8 196:21 199:1 203:11
supported (6) 44:17,22 53:2 72:1 109:6 168:20
supporting (13) 47:5 48:17,21,22 66:7 67:15 68:9 112:22 123:5 154:16 156:20 175:9 191:22
supportive (4) 27:13 61:5 136:11 147:10
supports (1) 149:23
sure (30) 42:25 43:3 44:21,23 46:4,7 48:2 64:2,10 78:18 86:9 100:7 101:4 112:7 115:3 125:20 127:9 132:19 133:12 138:13 139:15 140:9 145:10 148:16 153:3 154:7 157:13 162:14 183:14 192:8
surprise (1) 55:12
surrounding (3) 5:7 91:19 155:1
survivors (4) 156:12 187:8 193:11 194:17
suspect (1) 25:2
suspended (1) 137:18
sustain (1) 27:19
swell (1) 25:14
symbolised (1) 158:15
system (8) 100:22 112:3 139:4,21,23 173:19 176:20 196:6

T

tasked (5) 113:3 123:22 129:9 138:6 141:11
team (28) 5:2,2 7:13 20:22 39:20 52:9 53:8 61:13 112:13 131:24,24 132:3 127:17 131:16 132:13,24,25 133:4,11,16,19 134:19 137:21 157:18 158:16 163:1 177:17 204:2
teams (6) 9:10 28:5,23 164:9 173:17 196:24
technical (2) 140:7 155:20
teleconference (8) 43:6 94:19 95:3,19 101:8 108:9 142:19,22
telling (1) 44:7
ten (2) 80:9 131:7
tend (2) 5:15 18:23
tends (1) 12:13
tenor (1) 38:10
tension (1) 151:22
tensions (1) 33:9
term (13) 5:15 20:9,13 24:2 35:9 80:22 85:5 111:10 126:1 140:7 144:8 162:15 197:7
termed (2) 39:22 152:21
terminology (2) 78:19 97:12
terms (83) 27:4,6 38:21 39:20 51:21 61:4 64:13 65:21 72:8 74:14,22 75:8 78:12 80:17 81:4,22 82:1,4,18 83:4 84:7 86:25 88:13,15 90:12 93:8 96:2 97:11,15 100:16 104:18 107:3,17 108:7 109:6 119:5,23 121:20 122:18 125:22 127:13 130:2 132:8 133:2 135:16 137:17 138:14 139:12 141:21 145:6 148:14 149:25 152:8 153:13 154:14 155:13,17,20 156:1,3,3 157:15 159:12 162:14 169:12,19 170:22 178:2,22 180:19,23 182:24 187:17 188:11,14 189:4 191:4,20 196:11 198:7,10 199:8 202:5
terrible (2) 11:6 43:6
terror (3) 43:21,21 68:24
terrorist (1) 140:12
test (1) 5:17
testament (2) 136:17 150:24
text (1) 84:10
thank (87) 1:12 23:21 32:20 39:23 47:20 56:3,4 59:18,21 60:10,11,13,13,20 61:18,20,22,23 62:6,7,10,11,13,25 63:3,4,12,14,16,17,20 64:22 65:4,10,19 66:25 72:8 73:17 76:4 96:19 103:11 110:24 112:13 113:20 116:8,16,17,19,20,21 117:2,3,5 133:25 150:5 154:12 167:14,20,21,23,24,25 168:6,8 175:21 193:19 200:17,19,23 201:5,17 202:14,15 203:24,25 204:2,4,5,6,10,12,14,16,18,23,25 205:1
thanks (2) 11:3 61:24
thats (97) 2:2 5:15,16 8:13,14,15 10:25 13:6 14:3,20,25 15:4,5 20:2,16 21:24 22:25 23:12,16 25:25 27:13 29:7 31:22 38:5 42:9 45:3 49:3 51:1,2,3,5 56:2 58:2,16 59:16 62:18 64:6,10,20,24 65:1,2,6,7,9 72:3,23 78:22

81:11 82:8 83:11 88:3,9 90:13 92:2 94:10 98:24 104:4 108:12 113:1,11,20 116:5,6 122:18 123:12 129:14 131:2,4,24 132:3 133:12 140:4 142:24 145:23 149:20 155:12 156:13,16 162:9 163:13 166:11 167:8 168:25 170:8 178:11 179:10 185:5 186:14 189:14,16 190:14 192:12 195:25 198:19 202:5 204:17
thematic (1) 169:13
theme (2) 170:18,19
themes (1) 80:21
themselves (14) 6:8 24:15,24 34:11 51:2 59:14,14 85:9,12 91:12 96:9 111:25 115:16 203:13
therefore (14) 13:13 70:18 84:1 100:7,23 111:24 119:11 123:8 125:1,24 132:17 144:10 19:15 151:15
theres (27) 11:25,25 15:11,12 39:8,17 42:14 45:7 48:11 61:3 66:12 82:5 86:14 94:8 97:23 110:17 111:1 122:1 151:22 178:9,17,24 180:18 188:3 196:18,22 200:7
theyd (1) 159:17
theyre (10) 22:20 27:6 37:16 58:6 65:21 66:15 93:7 197:16 199:25 200:4
theyve (2) 51:10 114:7
thing (5) 32:24 55:11 62:21 127:25 159:4
thinking (9) 27:3,22 95:4,8,11 96:2 105:11,12 140:21
thinks (1) 96:25
thinly (1) 50:15
third (20) 9:8 24:2,2 50:19,21 65:5 70:21 76:5 94:16 134:1 160:6,10 164:3 166:11 170:14,20 177:21 197:11 201:21 202:10
thirly (1) 68:4
thor (2) 113:5,7
though (1) 11:9
thought (7) 26:17 38:12 50:11 113:10 140:14,15 202:17
thoughts (1) 160:11
thread (2) 99:15 113:22
threads (1) 167:4
three (23) 18:16 32:14 50:23 56:24 64:15 65:22 66:15 67:24 71:21 78:4 84:3 91:23 149:14 150:25 160:1 165:6 170:3 172:17,22 182:6 194:9 201:12,15 192:10
threefour (1) 159:24
three layered (1) 169:24
threshold (1) 59:8
through (40) 9:20 12:20 14:16,17 23:17 32:4 34:24,25 36:1 40:9 44:4,9,19 49:11 51:9,20,22,24 60:24 81:21 99:12,23 121:10 140:4 151:18 153:21 158:9,20,20 160:4,19 163:23 173:19 178:4 180:2 191:23 192:2 195:1 196:14 203:12
throughout (3) 6:17 15:16 30:6
throw (1) 151:15
thunderstorms (1) 20:11
thursday (14) 6:16 14:17,17 15:17 16:3 17:4 19:14 23:23 27:3 57:17 58:3 65:8 152:2 160:12
tide (1) 39:11

tie (1) 145:16
time (62) 10:3 11:24 12:6 13:4 22:7,20 25:3 27:5,17,21 35:6 36:11 37:25 40:15,20 42:3,12 46:10 47:6 51:25 52:1 53:16 54:8 55:6,11,12 61:6 70:5 75:25 79:15 87:2 96:8 98:13 99:22 102:24 108:24 110:22 111:22 114:23,25 117:22 118:7 123:2,8 131:21 137:7 146:9 148:17 151:8 152:24 153:1 157:9 158:4,8 167:15 175:4 186:8 190:16 195:13 198:14 200:21 201:22
timeframe (1) 123:1
timeline (1) 141:21
timely (1) 46:22
times (6) 45:23 49:14 70:24 144:11 153:18 197:17
timing (1) 145:10
timings (1) 101:21
tired (1) 120:1
title (3) 67:1,11,11
tmo (1) 154:19
toby (35) 3:6,8 4:2 7:5,18,24 8:19 9:13 11:1 12:18 13:8 32:2 34:14 35:15 42:20,21 44:6,14,15,16 45:11 47:9,17 50:20 53:18 94:12 97:4 98:25 99:15 112:16,18 113:22 114:2 130:17 131:1
tobys (1) 10:6
today (9) 1:4 13:12 46:3 63:21 65:21 110:25 114:7 197:7 204:3
todays (1) 1:4
together (16) 14:1 19:3,15 20:15 49:1 52:12,15 61:7 104:15 111:13 134:8 150:9 167:4 189:4 190:10 196:12
told (7) 35:5 36:16 44:13,14 89:14 127:1 197:17
tom (4) 12:15,19 161:9,13
tomorrow (10) 13:14 32:12 50:24 52:22 53:1 149:12 150:2 204:20,21,24
tonight (3) 9:7 28:25 29:1
tony (4) 118:5 120:23 135:22 141:13
too (16) 47:3 50:15 61:24 89:14 115:10,21 126:15,16 127:8 133:6 137:15,16 139:9 140:22 177:12 197:2
took (16) 2:1 19:16 20:21 22:4 40:12 91:19 102:12 128:13 146:2 156:24 158:4,24 160:3,8 169:13 180:24
tools (2) 81:5 191:5
topic (4) 15:24 117:7 177:22 192:16
touch (14) 10:7 66:5 70:24 71:17 76:6 84:20 105:21 112:14 133:9 156:17 167:4 169:21 183:7 190:4
touched (10) 67:10 138:20,25 141:1 161:2 165:19 170:24 176:14 196:20,21
towards (9) 14:21 26:25 57:1 91:4 124:7,13 136:4 139:17 199:17
tower (11) 8:25 83:8 155:4 156:4 160:2 162:8,23 163:2 189:8 195:4,6
town (8) 33:24 66:6 95:16 114:13 119:6 133:4 142:19 149:18
tracks (1) 95:23
traditional (2) 126:20 127:15
traditionally (1) 122:23
tragedy (4) 67:23 88:22 137:13 187:9

trained (4) 45:25 51:21
129:25 198:12
training (23) 44:3 51:11
79:22 80:4 129:15 130:9
167:3 175:13,15
186:9,12,17,20,25
187:1,13,17,18
188:1,1,4,6,11
tram (1) 43:20
tranche (1) 76:21
transcriber (1) 64:4
transcript (1) 64:7
transfer (2) 14:23 152:18
transition (3) 121:14 122:21
124:19
transitions (2) 121:25 123:4
transparency (1) 171:18
transparent (1) 163:23
trauma (1) 203:13
traumatised (2) 120:1,11
treated (1) 146:9
trend (7) 73:3,24 75:11,23
77:5,9,15
trends (6) 56:21 79:12,17
80:20 81:11 170:12
trepidation (1) 42:1
tried (2) 3:9 52:5
trigger (2) 16:24 21:22
triggered (4) 17:18,21 31:8
33:2
triggers (1) 179:14
trooping (2) 13:21 14:8
true (2) 65:16 88:24
trust (3) 124:25 125:5 154:7
truth (1) 125:22
try (7) 12:1 27:14 42:25
69:19 135:21 145:25
157:16
trying (19) 10:11 26:24
27:4,13,21 30:19 35:24
37:14 44:22 49:1 50:13
54:24 58:6 127:14
136:1,4,11 137:10,16
tuesday (1) 205:4
turn (32) 1:21 4:24 41:24
64:18,23,25 65:7 66:9,15
70:11 71:23 72:7 73:16,25
74:17 76:10 78:21 79:11
84:8 103:13 109:25 117:7
161:11,23 162:21
163:10,14 175:15,18
179:17 183:21 185:9
turner (2) 11:1 12:15
turning (1) 42:24
twice (3) 108:20 113:18
136:13
twm (3) 46:16,17 47:16
tying (1) 49:2
type (3) 30:18 86:13 121:11
types (2) 107:11 118:18
typo (2) 113:8,11

U

umbrella (1) 191:17
unable (2) 54:8 89:12
unaware (1) 46:6
uncertainty (1) 159:20
unchanged (1) 15:13
undergo (1) 172:8
undergone (1) 172:17
underlies (1) 27:16
underlining (1) 114:20
undetermined (1) 163:2
underneath (2) 141:2 202:22
underpin (2) 72:15 162:3
underpinned (1) 23:10
underpins (1) 177:6
understand (18) 32:22
36:10,21 39:5 47:4 52:9
54:24 96:9 97:17
115:1,13,19 117:25 130:1
148:1,3 151:17 165:13
understanding (29) 3:1 5:21
6:20 12:18 19:22 23:15
36:7,18 37:15 53:21 63:25
95:20 103:20 118:25

121:24 126:15 134:2,10,25
135:12 145:17 147:23
151:23 155:2 181:21,22
182:3 183:9,18
understands (3) 36:4 183:15
189:1
understood (11) 33:21 34:6
38:15 93:19 100:18,22
125:25 172:12 177:10
183:12 201:25
undertake (4) 34:7 44:11
83:3 186:14
undertaken (6) 34:9 65:24
66:10 177:18 184:23 185:4
undertaking (1) 165:24
undertook (3) 71:3 155:21
186:24
undesirable (1) 73:8
unfair (1) 192:4
unforeseen (1) 17:20
unfortunate (1) 67:21
unified (1) 44:5
unique (2) 38:16 178:8
united (2) 202:25 203:8
unity (1) 57:1
unless (3) 19:22 22:20 90:1
unlikely (1) 87:17
unprecedented (3)
162:5,16,17
unrelated (1) 145:18
unrest (3) 13:13 15:8,16
until (13) 2:1 48:9 49:8
84:24 92:6 100:23 101:5
122:10 151:11 152:15
153:10,24 205:3
unusual (2) 108:17,21
update (9) 5:1 35:16 47:22
87:12 94:13 118:1 190:19
194:1,10
updated (6) 77:12 83:9
99:12 131:6 160:4 196:19
updates (2) 79:8 92:19
upon (37) 66:5 67:10 69:14
70:17,24 71:17 76:6 80:24
83:17 84:13,13,20 90:9
92:21 94:9 98:11 105:21
112:14 133:10 138:21
139:1 141:1 155:24 156:17
161:2 165:19 167:4 170:24
171:23 176:14 181:1 183:7
190:4 196:13,20,21 198:13
urgency (3) 138:10,14,15
urgent (4) 3:6,9 43:8 151:24
urgently (1) 49:7
used (5) 38:24 56:15 113:2
144:11 199:7
useful (2) 5:3 121:8
usher (4) 62:23 63:1
200:18,22
using (2) 85:4 97:11
usual (4) 7:24 59:22 60:1
62:22
usually (1) 22:22
utilised (3) 149:21 152:23
171:12
utilising (1) 118:6

V

vacuum (4) 119:5,17 120:22
121:1
value (6) 93:19 104:11 105:3
177:16 178:15 189:25
various (9) 3:18 43:5 51:15
52:12 110:12 127:20
166:17 191:8 196:14
varying (2) 171:24 173:10
vastly (1) 105:9
vein (1) 11:19
verified (1) 48:1
version (1) 194:19
vested (1) 22:11
via (6) 68:3 94:18 95:19
178:6 179:2 191:22
viability (1) 178:2
victim (1) 193:11
viewpoint (1) 110:20

views (5) 36:15 157:5 171:12
175:17 192:17
visit (1) 96:8
vital (1) 163:3
voice (5) 64:3 69:19 183:25
185:6,21
volition (1) 180:24
volume (2) 133:2 198:3
voluntary (8) 43:11 44:20
131:6 175:11 191:14
192:20,25 201:9
volunteered (1) 173:9
vulnerable (6) 2:12 3:14
11:13 79:24 80:5 81:15

W

wait (2) 153:24 184:15
waited (2) 151:11 153:10
waiting (2) 62:14 152:14
walked (1) 138:3
walkway (1) 155:4
walkways (1) 30:24
wand (1) 173:24
wandsworth (2) 32:13
149:13
wanting (1) 140:13
wants (1) 5:5
ward (1) 191:24
warm (1) 202:20
warning (2) 74:13 115:10
wasnt (51) 6:16 7:19 11:4
12:5 19:6,7 20:12 30:17
36:11 42:8 43:6
49:5,23,24,24 50:12 52:7
59:5 72:21,23 88:15 94:2
106:10 113:10 115:16,17
117:23 118:9 119:11
120:6,17 124:13 125:21,23
126:14,21,21 128:1,2
130:16 132:21 137:20,21
143:10 145:8 149:17
152:17 162:8 169:15,15
177:2
watching (1) 104:25
watershed (2) 162:13,17
way (45) 6:10 7:11 19:2
21:10 22:21 24:3,13 30:11
31:8 42:16 61:5,16 66:21
93:20 94:3 95:7 98:20
100:19 107:7 109:20
118:17 127:16,23 136:6,7
138:15 139:23 140:4
143:11 144:9,18 154:9
159:5 164:12 178:3,11
191:23 193:15 197:8,15,20
199:15 203:9,11,15
ways (3) 58:11 178:9 182:6
weaknesses (2) 80:16 172:10
weather (2) 17:14 68:25
website (1) 28:11
wed (1) 25:5
wednesday (3) 6:17 14:17
25:14
week (7) 13:23 14:2,2,2
19:14 52:25 173:9
weekend (7) 11:11 13:22
26:19,19 51:3,4 157:19
weeks (1) 138:24
welcome (4) 1:3,14 117:6
168:9
welfare (4) 129:4,7
193:10,25
went (7) 61:10,11 115:1
117:22 119:8 141:7,8
weother (1) 114:5
werent (8) 51:23 61:14 91:3
92:7 104:20 115:13 152:23
201:16
west (1) 154:16
westminster (6) 43:21 52:22
109:2,6 145:12 157:21
westminsterfocused (1)
109:14
westway (3) 2:17 9:25 159:7
weve (25) 5:1 15:2 25:18
44:8 51:22 53:6,6,7 61:9

69:4 72:3 75:4 76:8 78:25
79:4 81:5 94:6 111:14
113:17 132:24 169:19
176:18 183:2,24 196:21
whatever (4) 23:5 85:25
109:20 140:14
whats (9) 24:21 81:6 82:10
113:6 115:8 130:1 170:3
177:23 195:22
whatsapp (1) 52:21
whatsoever (2) 82:7 125:8
whereas (1) 127:18
whereby (8) 49:25 67:22
92:5 122:1 191:16
197:8,15,20
whilst (8) 75:8 108:25 120:2
133:3 137:5 141:20 173:3
174:5
whoever (1) 85:6
whole (7) 39:7 48:16 49:17
104:2 137:22 169:18 193:1
whom (1) 2:22
whos (1) 52:8
whose (1) 51:4
wide (2) 74:8 169:15
widearea (1) 16:22
widely (1) 48:2
wider (15) 18:24 33:8 48:25
55:1 87:3,9 94:1 98:13
100:9 104:1,22 109:13
183:11 188:10 196:11
wideranging (1) 35:9
widespread (2) 81:17 164:6
wives (1) 202:25
willing (2) 47:6 140:13
wish (6) 35:2 45:25 49:25
73:10 81:22 121:17
wished (2) 70:9 127:17
withdraw (1) 122:3
withdrew (2) 62:12 204:15
witness (24) 1:11,14 60:6,10
61:23 62:7,10,12,14,16,19
63:16 65:5,12 116:16
117:2 167:20 168:5 200:17
204:5,12,14,15,19
witnesses (3) 60:22 63:24
116:12
witnessing (1) 137:3
wonder (2) 133:22 174:24
wont (3) 55:21 173:5 181:24
wootton (2) 45:8 47:17
woottons (1) 46:17
wording (1) 150:1
work (52) 19:3 28:25 37:5
43:12 48:2 51:1
52:10,11,14,24 53:3,7,9
59:14,16 61:17 65:24
66:10 68:2 70:22 88:9
137:22 158:10 159:11
161:17 162:4,19 165:24
166:16 169:23 176:17
177:18 178:17,18 184:23
185:3,23 188:10 189:14
190:7 191:2,19 192:2,7
194:9 195:9,23
196:1,3,5,6,12
182:1,4 204:24 205:3
100 (1) 56:23
1000 (2) 1:2 141:9
1001 (1) 8:18
1009 (1) 7:4
101 (1) 33:6
1016 (1) 9:13
102 (1) 116:22
1020 (1) 4:13
11 (4) 4:16 115:17 161:7
169:13
1100 (1) 141:9
1107 (1) 113:23
1112 (1) 44:18
1122 (1) 60:14
1135 (3) 60:4,13,16
1140 (1) 63:5
1147 (1) 63:7
1157 (1) 45:7
12 (6) 30:2 31:2 43:20 65:8
76:10 77:24

1230 (2) 13:25 14:6
13 (2) 16:10 78:2
130 (1) 131:2
1300 (1) 35:21
138 (5) 16:14 18:5 22:19
23:8 181:3
1381 (1) 16:18
14 (16) 19:16 21:1 25:19
66:3 84:6 90:22 105:6
110:4 117:10 119:7,14
121:8 128:25 129:1 161:1
164:17
1400 (1) 91:25
1430 (1) 2:1
14th (11) 21:2 25:23 91:5
101:11 118:23 119:3,16
125:9 135:7 153:7 202:3
15 (45) 1:21,25 7:5 9:22
10:25 15:24 17:7 18:22,25
26:8 30:6 31:17 33:13,18
34:13 42:17,19 66:3,6
112:17 114:14 116:4
117:7,21 118:2,10,11
119:7,19,24 120:16 123:11
124:17 126:9 127:11
128:13,24 130:25 133:3
144:13 146:3 148:21
149:17 150:14 151:9
1520 (1) 108:21
1530 (1) 23:24
1546 (1) 103:15
15th (8) 25:21 119:9,17
124:15 125:11 135:7
152:22 153:8
16 (19) 1:1 17:7 18:3,23,25
20:2 33:15 40:4,21,23
41:24 57:20,20 76:16
118:3,12 151:6,10 156:19
1604 (1) 47:16
1620 (1) 10:25
1634 (1) 26:8
16th (3) 141:25 152:22
155:20
17 (4) 48:11 50:18 53:17
205:4
1703 (1) 28:1
1714 (1) 28:15
1730 (4) 19:15 20:25 102:11
105:6
1744 (1) 13:1
1745 (1) 29:5
1804 (1) 98:16
0813 (1) 98:16
0815 (3) 98:18 99:6,23
0818 (1) 99:16
0830 (2) 94:6 98:10
0900 (1) 96:22

I

1 (17) 9:12 28:13,14,20 45:6
47:7 64:17 103:20 149:24
161:22 170:3,5 192:19
198:23 199:22 206:3,5
10 (11) 10:20 30:1 64:25
79:18 126:8 133:24 171:7
182:1,4 204:24 205:3
100 (1) 56:23
1000 (2) 1:2 141:9
1001 (1) 8:18
1009 (1) 7:4
101 (1) 33:6
1016 (1) 9:13
102 (1) 116:22
1020 (1) 4:13
11 (4) 4:16 115:17 161:7
169:13
1100 (1) 141:9
1107 (1) 113:23
1112 (1) 44:18
1122 (1) 60:14
1135 (3) 60:4,13,16
1140 (1) 63:5
1147 (1) 63:7
1157 (1) 45:7
12 (6) 30:2 31:2 43:20 65:8
76:10 77:24

2017 (24) 1:21 33:14,15
41:24 65:25 66:17 67:12
71:9 82:16 83:7,14,22
104:11 160:9 161:10
162:16,10 187:14
193:11,25 195:11 202:21
203:6
2018 (14) 67:1 83:10 160:18
161:10,22 163:13,19
164:5,14 165:6 168:15
181:8 189:18 195:11
2019 (3) 169:5 180:18
189:23
2020 (2) 64:17 161:15
2020s (2) 160:18 161:15
2022 (7) 1:1 65:1,8 160:10
190:17 195:12 205:4
20h (1) 179:19
2126 (1) 52:17
2204 (1) 35:15
2224 (1) 42:19
23 (4) 29:16 30:4 169:2
192:18
230 (1) 10:4
2304 (1) 110:24
24 (4) 27:12 31:25 128:4
188:21
2448 (3) 26:18 28:2 108:23
25 (3) 2:11 3:14 64:18
26 (1) 40:2
267 (1) 78:19
27 (3) 65:1 84:9 160:19
124:15
28 (1) 190:6

3

3 (11) 45:23 57:20 65:7
71:23,25 72:7 73:19 97:19
162:21 164:2 198:18
30 (3) 74:19 87:21 147:8
31 (1) 89:13
311 (2) 73:17,21
312 (1) 164:18
315 (1) 168:1
32 (1) 172:7
321 (1) 76:12
33 (8) 49:13 57:15 66:23
67:8 69:14 172:22 178:14
186:24
330 (3) 167:17,25 168:3
34 (2) 77:24 102:16
36 (1) 117:12

4

4 (5) 12:6,6 28:1,22 176:16
40 (2) 51:14,16
417 (1) 200:24
425 (3) 200:14,21 201:1
431 (1) 205:2
44 (1) 2:10
440 (1) 84:10
48 (3) 27:12 128:4 184:22
49 (3) 68:19 175:2 185:1

5

5 (9) 16:12 56:18,20
79:12,12 87:16 92:24
146:3 194:24
50 (2) 133:25 185:9
500 (1) 91:24
515 (1) 122:5
52 (1) 185:25
530 (7) 21:1 101:8 102:25
139:17 142:13 151:2
152:25
54 (2) 134:13 136:25
58 (2) 54:3,5
59 (2) 175:21 176:12

6

6 (3) 170:24 184:21 188:21
60 (1) 176:18
62 (1) 177:14
63 (2) 206:8,10
630 (2) 91:24 93:25
69 (2) 121:7 125:14

7

7 (4) 17:8 51:17 149:17
162:23
72 (2) 128:4 131:14
73 (2) 29:16 126:24
75 (2) 30:4 128:14
76 (2) 31:25 148:20
7th (1) 161:5

8

8 (6) 16:13 51:17 57:14
73:16 179:12 185:18
800 (1) 33:24
800am (1) 29:1
804 (1) 94:12
815 (1) 25:21
830 (2) 91:24 131:18
830comms (1) 133:12
858 (1) 2:5
88 (1) 40:1
8cg (1) 3:13

9

9 (8) 46:19 71:10 74:17
79:19 84:24 85:2 170:21
171:4
900pm (1) 29:1
911 (1) 40:24
924 (1) 3:5
95 (1) 154:10