OPUS₂

Grenfell Tower Inquiry

Day 140

June 7, 2021

Opus 2 - Official Court Reporters

Phone: +44 (0)20 3008 5900

Email: transcripts@opus2.com

Website: https://www.opus2.com

1 Monday, 7 June 2021 1 Next one, {TMO00842341}, if we just have the first 2. (10.00 am) 2 page of that, please. SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to 3 Is that the first page of your second witness today's hearing. Today we're going to start hearing 4 4 5 evidence from Janice Wray, formerly of the TMO. 5 A. Yes 6 Yes. Mr Millett. 6 Q. Can we turn to page 4 in that, please. There is 7 MR MILLETT: Mr Chairman, thank you. Good morning, and good 7 a signature above the date of 24 September 2019. Is 8 morning, members of the panel. 8 that your signature? 9 I now call Ms Wray, please. 9 A. Yes 10 MS JANICE WRAY (sworn) 10 Q. There is then $\{TMO00847305\}$, which is your supplementary 11 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much. Now, sit down 11 or third witness statement dated 20 July 2020. Is that 12 and make yourself comfortable. 12 the first page of that? THE WITNESS: Thank you. 13 A. It is, yes. 13 Q. Thank you. Can we please go to page 39 in that, 14 (Pause) 14 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right. When you're ready, 15 15 signature above the date; is that your signature? 16 16 A. It is, yes. 17 Questions from COUNSEL TO THE INQUIRY 17 Q. Thank you. Next one, $\{TMO00862589\}$. This is a witness MR MILLETT: Thank you, Mr Chairman. 18 18 19 Ms Wray, good morning. 19 statement dealing with PEEPs of 24 January 2020. 2.0 20 A. Good morning. If we go to page 3 in that, can we see your 21 signature there? 21 Q. Can I start by thanking you very much for coming to 22 22 the Inquiry and assisting us with our investigations. A. Yes 2.3 We're extremely grateful to you. 23 Q. Thank you, above the date of 24 January 2020. 2.4 2.4 Next one, {TMO00873629}. Is that your statement My questions are intended to be short and simple; 25 25 there dated 19 June 2020? sometimes they don't turn out that way. I'm very happy 1 to rephrase the question or ask it in a different way. 1 A. Yes. 2 We're going to take scheduled breaks halfway through 2 Q. If we turn to page 20, we can see the date and the 3 the morning and halfway through the afternoons, but if 3 signature. Again, is that your signature? 4 you need a break at any other time, just say and we can 4 A. It is 5 5 Q. Thank you. take a break. A. Thank you. 6 6 The next one is {TMO00873934}. Is that the first 7 Q. Can I also ask you, please, to keep your voice up, as 7 page of your witness statement dealing with fire risk 8 loud as you can, so that the person who sits to your 8 assessment queries? 9 immediate right can get down everything you're saying 9 A. Yes. 10 very clearly and completely. Also, can I just ask you 10 Q. Dated 21 August 2020. Page 25, we can see the signature 11 not to nod or shake your head, but to say "yes" or "no" 11 above that date there. Is that your signature? 12 as the case may be, because nods and shakes don't go on 12 13 to the transcript 13 Q. Thank you. 14 Now, you have made, I think, ten witness statements 14 Next one, {TMO10048973}. This, I think, is the 15 15 to the Inquiry in $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +$ first witness statement you did dealing with aftermath. 16 put them formally into the record, but ask you to swear 16 A. Yes. 17 to them. 17 Q. Yes, and that's dated, if we can go to page 10, we can 18 The first was dated 7 February 2019, {TMO00000890}. 18 see your signature there, 13 March 2019. 19 Is that the first page of your first statement? 19 20 A. Yes, that seems to be the case. 20 Q. Is that your signature? Q. Can we go to page 56, please. There is a signature 2.1 21 A. It is, yes. 2.2 above the date of 7 February 2019. Is that your 2.2 Q. Thank you. 23 23 signature? Then the second aftermath witness statement at 24 A. It is, yes. 24 {TMO00869607}. Is that the first page of that 25 Q. Thank you. 25 statement?

2

- 1 A. Yes.
- Q. If you go to page 2, there is a signature above the 2
- 3 date, 17 January 2020. Is that your signature?
- 4 A. It is.
- 5 Q. Thank you.
- Next one, {TMO00887083}. Is that the first page of 6 7 your third aftermath statement?
- 8
- 9 Q. If we go to page 9, is that your signature above the
- 10 date of 7 December 2020?
- 11
- 12 Q. Have you read all of these statements before coming here 13
- 14
- 15 Q. Thank you. Can you confirm that the contents of each of 16 those statements are true?
- A. Yes, with one exception. On my first statement in. 17
- 18 I think, point 82, we left out "not", which obviously 19 changes the context quite considerably.
- 20 Q. Yes, it would. Okay, we'll come back to that if we need
- 2.1 22 Have you discussed your evidence with anybody before
- 2.3 coming here today? 2.4 A. No, I have not, but I would like to say that I wanted
- a little bit more information in terms of two things

- 1 specifically: notices of deficiencies, just numbers, and
- 2 also the review date for our estate staff handbook, and
- 3 my colleague, Adrian Bowman, still had access to that
- information and was able to get that for me. But
- 5 I didn't discuss anything beyond getting that
- 6 information. Okay.
- 7 Q. Now, I would like to ask you first about your role at
- the $\ensuremath{\mathsf{TMO}}$ and your qualifications and your training. 8
- 9 I think it's right that you have worked for the TMO 10 since 1996.
- 11 A. Yes, that's right.
- 12 Q. At the time of the Grenfell Tower fire on 14 June 2017,
- 13 you were the health, safety and facilities manager for 14 the TMO.
- 15 A. I was, ves.
- 16 Q. And you held that role since 2011.
- 17
- 18 Q. Is it right that, since 1 March 2018, your role has
- 19 changed and you're now head of facilities management at 2.0 RBKC?
- 2.1 A. Yes, although I'm actually on secondment at the moment 2.2 working on COVID-related issues.
- 23 MR MILLETT: Right.
- 2.4 Can I ask you to keep your voice up a little bit and
- 2.5 perhaps slow down a bit, because I'm not hearing your

- 2 Mr Chairman, I don't know whether the transcript is
- 3 keeping up with the answers. Mine isn't, but that may
- 4
- SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: I think it is. Has yours stalled? 5
- MR MILLETT: Mine has stalled.
- SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Well, if you refresh it -- I'm sure
- 8 you know how to --
- 9 MR MILLETT: I do, I will do that.
- 10 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: $\,--\,$ you may find you will be 11
 - all right.

13

14

- 12 MR MILLETT: It's now not stalled.
 - Could you explain for us, please, your role at the time of the fire on 14 June 2017 in very brief terms?
- 15 What did it entail?
- A. Okay. I had -- my previous job title was health and 16
- 17 safety adviser. My job title changed whenever I took
- 18 responsibility for facilities, because we were using
- 19 external offices and we needed to have somebody who
- 2.0 undertook that work for us. My health and safety
- 21 responsibilities didn't change at that point in time.
- 22 It was very much an advisory role, to provide advice and 23
- guidance to all the colleagues across the organisation 2.4 in terms of health and safety. That would include
- 25 fire safety, I had oversight of the fire risk assessment

- 1 process, we investigated accidents, we managed asbestos,
- 2 quite a range of things, really. We produced an annual
 - report --
- Q. Now, I want to ask you about your qualifications for

3

- 5
- 6 Can we go to your first statement, please, at page 2
- $\{TMO00000890/2\}$, paragraph 6. 8 You say there that when you joined RBKC in 1986, you
- 9 started working as a health and safety administrator in
- 10 the housing department, and at that time you completed
- 11 a diploma and a certificate from the National
- 12 Examination Board in occupational safety and health --
- 13 A. That's right.
- Q. -- otherwise known as NEBOSH. 14
- 15 When did you receive your diploma, do you remember?
- 16 A. I think it was possibly 1989. I can't be absolutely
- 17 sure, but it was a very long time ago.
- 18 Q. After you had received that diploma, did you obtain any
- 19 other qualifications relevant to your role in health and
- 2.0 safety?
- 21 A. No. I did a management NVQ at level 5, but not
- 2.2 specifically health and safety, no.
- 23 Since then, did you ever undertake any refresher
- 2.4 training based on new standards in order to make sure
- 2.5 that that qualification was kept up to date?

- 1 A. Yes, yes. I'm a chartered member of the Institution of 2 Occupational Safety and Health, and to sustain that I'm 3 obviously required to do a significant amount of 4 continuing professional development and to keep that updated, and it's audited regularly. So there is 5 a requirement to do that, but actually, obviously, 6 7 I would prefer to be informed of what's current. So 8 quite a lot.
- 9 Q. If you look down the page, you will see paragraph 8, and 10 it says:

11 "For most of my career, I have been a Chartered 12 Member of the Institution of Occupational Safety and 13 Health ('CMIOSH')."

- 14
- 15 Q. Can you help us, when did you become a member of that 16 organisation?
- A. Whenever I've been a member since I started undertook 17 18 my -- sorry, I beg your pardon. I've had a role --19 an affiliate role, I think, until I got my diploma, and then the post experience after my diploma, probably 2.0 21 a couple of years later I became chartered. So I've 22 been chartered for a considerable time.
- 2.3 Q. And you say that you have to do continuing professional 2.4 development in order to keep that membership up.
- 25

- 1 Q. Is that annual or more than annual?
- A. It's fluctuated. It used to be on a three—yearly cycle, 3 but they would send you reminders promptly, but basically annual, yes.
- 5 Q. Would it be desktop, done privately by you, or would you go to events, seminars --6
- 7 A. It would be arranged -- sorry to talk over you. It 8 would be a range of things. It could be seminars, it 9 could be briefing, it could be demonstrating some skill 10 that I've -- you know, if I've written a new policy or 11 procedure that we haven't done before or if we've 12 amended things. Probably the first time we drafted 13 an annual report, I would have submitted that as something that we hadn't previously done, but there's 14 15 a fair bit of engagement with other colleagues or --16 sorry, excuse me.
- 17 Q. Are you still a member?
- 18 A. Yes, I am.
- 19 Q. You are.

25

- 2.0 Did you undertake any particular training in order 21 to carry out your role?
- 2.2 A. It was ongoing. I mean, I was a general health and 23 safety practitioner, so I needed to know about quite 2.4 range of employee-related, resident-related and some
 - construction-based --

Q. Right.

1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

3

5

6

7

2 - work, really, activities, be able to assess those, to 3 carry out risk assessments, carry out inspections, 4 produce policies, procedures, reports, a variety of 5 things, really. So I needed quite a broad range of knowledge and skills and experience, and I would target 6 7 the ones which I felt were perhaps depleted or where 8 legislation was perhaps changing, and I would look for 9 the most appropriate training to suit that.

10 Q. Right, I see.

> Can we go to page 37 of this statement {TMO00000890/37}, please, and look at paragraph 166. You say there:

"Since 2005, the relevant fire safety legislation has been the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 (RRO). I recall receiving training on this legislation from one of the fire authorities and via professional journals when it was introduced."

Pausing there, what did that training involve?

20 A. It would have been briefing on the requirements of the 21 RRO; it would have gone through the different articles; 22 it would have identified the need for a responsible 23 person, what that responsible person would look like. 2.4 who relevant persons could be; what areas of what kinds 2.5 of premises would be covered by the RRO; who would be

1 the enforcement authority. It would be quite 2 comprehensive.

It's so long ago. I know I went to several, and some were hosted by the fire authority, some were probably hosted by my institution, but I certainly attended a variety of courses on that because it was very important.

- $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Q}}.$ Yes. Was that training regularly refreshed, either by 8 9 the relevant fire authority or the professional journals
- 10 that you read? 11 There were always opportunities to go on refresher 12
- courses. What I would say is I also participated in --13 there was some London and South East -- initially it was
- 14 a health and safety group for kind of public sector
- 15 health and safety housing professionals, and then it was
- 16 followed on by a specific dedicated fire safety group,
- 17 and I would -- we would perhaps meet quarterly, and it 18 was a really useful forum for similar people in similar
- 19 kinds of organisations to say what was going well or
- 2.0
- where they had issues or, you know, if there was 21 consistent enforcement from their Fire Brigade. So
- 2.2 there were different ways, really, and I would see that
- 23 as being a bit of continuing professional development as
- 2.4 well
- 25 Q. Did this specific, dedicated fire safety group have

10

- 1 a formal name?
- 2 A. I think it was called the London and South East
- 3 Fire Safety Group, but it probably morphed slightly as 4 the years went by.
- Q. Who gave training? What kinds of people gave training? 5
- A. Training. Well, for example, after Lakanal, 6
- David Crowder from BRE, he came and -- the lady who
- mostly was the chair was called Sarah Stevenson-Jones, 8
- 9 and she was health and safety manager at Westminster
- 10 City Council in their housing department, so she was
- 11 quite proactive about going out, and sometimes it would
- 12 be senior members from the Fire Brigade, from their
- 13
- policies or enforcement. Sometimes it would just be
- 14 meetings to discuss specific issues, but there was
- 15 ongoing opportunities for $\,--\,$ sometimes it would be
- 16 people who wanted you to buy their product, a variety
- 17 of ...
- 18 Q. Yes.
- You say you're a member of IOSH. Are you still? 19
- 20
- 2.1 Q. Were you required, as a member, to undertake continuing 2.2 professional development, CPD?
- 2.3 A. Yes.
- 2.4 Q. What form did that take?
- A. A variety, either formal training, it could be

- 1 briefings , it could -- to some extent it could be
- 2 attending —— there was sort of a local IOSH group for my
- 3 sector which met in London and had different themes,
- different speakers. So a variety of things, really, and
- 5 some --
- 6 Q. And -- I'm so sorry.
- 7 A. No, that's fine.
- 8 Q. Did any of it relate to fire safety specifically?
- 9 A. Yes. most likely it did.
- 10 Q. Again, did you go as a member of IOSH to seminars,
- 11 conferences, events, or was it purely or largely desktop 12 learning privately?
- 13 A. No, no, I would have gone as a member of IOSH, because
- often there were opportunities to plug into things that 14
- 15 they were running, which were the most appropriate.
- 16 Sometimes they weren't always housing-related, and
- 17 sometimes there was an alternative type of training 18
- which was more appropriate to our work environment. It 19 was a judgement call, really.
- 2.0 Q. Right.
- 2.1 You mentioned Lakanal House in your evidence
- 2.2 a moment ago.
- 23
- 24 Q. Can we look at your fourth statement, please,
- 25 $\{TMO00862606\}$, where you set out details, at page 1

- 1 there, of a presentation --
- 2 A. Yes

5

6

7

13

18

- 3 Q. -- of Lakanal House by David Crowder. You have 4 mentioned that a moment ago. I will examine that
 - a little bit more closely.

Before I do, just in general, you referred to the London and South East fire strategy working group, and

I think you have covered that at paragraph 8 of your 8 9 first statement as well. There is no need to go to it.

10 My question on that is: did you, at those meetings, 11 ever get involved in any discussion or have any training 12 on specific issues relating to fire safety strategies in

high-rise buildings?

14 I think what I recall is that David Crowder's

15 presentation was very specific around what had led to

- Lakanal and how the fire had progressed, and what were 16 17
 - the things that we needed to take away and reflect on. So I think inevitably, because of the nature of the
- 19 block and the height of the block, there will have been
- 2.0 things that related directly, but it was much more
- 21 focused on Lakanal, rather than being a general sort of
- 22 dialogue.
- 2.3 Q. But in general terms, what you learnt from the London 2.4
- and South East Fire Safety Group, did that involve
- 2.5 anything about fire safety strategies in high-rise

15

- 1 blocks?
- 2 A. Yeah, well, we would have had regular discussions about
- 3 how we were all trying to adhere to the legislation and
- how we were addressing that, so I would have known what
- 5 other people in the sector were doing. Ultimately, with
- 6 the purpose-built flat guide, when that was published,
- 7 they were pretty much all adhering to that, because the
- 8 high-rise were purpose-built. But, yeah, we would have
- 9 had regular dialogue on those issues.
- 10 What about cladding, cladding of the exterior of the
- 11 building, or building envelopes? Do you remember having
- 12 any discussion or any training in relation to that
- 13 specific topic?
- 14 A. Only in very general terms, that it was something that
- 15 needed to be looked at, and that there were a number of
- 16 fires across the world where there were problematic --
- 17 there were problems with cladding if it wasn't fire
- 18 rated.
- 19 Q. You call them fires across the world; do you remember
- 2.0 discussion at the London and South East Fire Safety
- 21 Group about those specific fires in particular?
- 2.2 Not really, sorry. Α.
- 23 Q. Right. We will come back to that in due course.
- 2.4 Sticking with the statement on the screen as we have
- 2.5 it, you say at paragraph 3 that:

1 "... a presentation was given by David Crowder on 2 the Lakanal House fire to the RBKC and TMO staff. This 3 was organised by Laura Johnson and held at the 4 Kensington Town Hall. A list of those who were invited can be found in the email ..." 5 6 And you exhibit it. 7 Was that on 10 January 2014? 8 A. Yes, I believe so. 9 Q. Yes 10 As you say in paragraph 4: 11 "My recollection is that David Crowder had already 12 given this presentation twice before, once to the 13 London and South East Fire Safety Group, which I attended, and once to London Housing Directors group 14 15 which included Laura Johnson." 16 Are those the meetings that you have just referred 17 to in your evidence this morning? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. I see 20 Do you remember whether you received a handout or 2.1 any written or photographic presentational material at 2.2 any of those meetings? 2.3 A. I don't recall, but actually, I have a feeling that 2.4 I also attended a similar briefing at Savills, and I may 25 have had a handout at that stage.

17

- 1 Q. Right.
- A. Sorry, I think I must have missed that from my 2
- 3 statement. It was the same presentation. I think there
- may have been a handout at that stage.
- 5 Q. Savills?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. As in the estate agents?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Do you remember when?
- 10 A. It will be about the same time, because he was -- it was
- 11 a December. I think it was possibly the December
- 12 before, whatever year that was. Q. 2013, that would have been.
- 14 A. Yes, yes.

13

- 15 Q. Can you remember, in a nutshell, if you can, what you 16 learnt from these presentations on Lakanal House?
- 17 A. Immediately after the fire, what we learned was that the
- 18 block had a scissor construction, and we investigated
- 19 immediately to see whether we had any blocks of
- 2.0 a similar construction and fortunately we did not.
- 21 There were issues about how the evacuation strategy
- 2.2 was communicated to residents. There were issues about
- 2.3 the fire safety guidance that was provided by the
- 2.4 Fire Brigade call handlers. There were concerns about
- 25 remedial works had been undertaken and not to

- fire resisting standard. I -- there were a range of 2 things that I do recall.
- 3 Q. Now, you referred to the Savills seminar. I think you do actually cover this, you do yourself an injustice. 4
- If you turn to page 2 {TMO00862606/2} and look at 5
- paragraph 8, there is a heading, "Savills Fire Safety 6 7 Seminar", and you have produced some documents for that,
- 8 for a seminar you attended on 5 December 2013, and you
- 9 say that it included presentations, can you see?
- 10 A. Yes
- 11 Q. "... on Lakanal House and Shirley Towers, as well as
- 12 a case study of a rest home. The presentation on
- 13 Lakanal House was again presented by David Crowder."
- 14 Did that presentation cover fire risk management of
- 15 residential premises, do you recall?
- 16 A. To some extent, inevitably, but I think it focused
- 17 largely on the technical aspects of what had happened on
- 18 the day in both -- in all of the specific fires .
- 19
- 20 Panning out, then, a little bit, did any of your
- 21 training at any time up to June 2017 concern fire risk
- 22 assessments? A. Yes.
- 2.4 Q What?

2.3

8

18

2.2

25 A. Well, quite a lot of my CPD. Obviously the Regulatory

- 1 Reform Order, when it came in, introduced the
- 2 requirement for fire risk assessments in communal areas.
- 3 which was an entirely new concept, so there would have
- been quite a lot of formal and informal briefings and --
- 5 around that. Sorry, I wasn't specific . I assumed --
- 6
- when we talked about Regulatory Reform, I wasn't 7
 - specific when I should have been.
 - Q. No, that's all right.
- 9 Let me be more specific: did any of your training 10
 - include the specific guidance prepared by the Government
- 11 on fire safety and risk assessments, such as the 2006
- 12 Sleeping Guide?
- 13 A. I believe so, but I can't remember the detail.
- Q. Let me just put it up for you to see if it jogs a 14
- 15 memory, {RBK00036722}, please,
- 16 This is the first page. It doesn't tell you much,
- 17 other than it's orange, but if we pan out, you can see
 - the whole thing.
- 19 A. Okay. I am familiar with the Sleeping Guide.
- 2.0 Q. You are familiar with the Sleeping Guide?
- 21 A. Yeah, sorry, sorry, I just can't -- I'm sure I would
 - have had a briefing on it at least on one occasion, but
- 23 I can't remember the detail. Apologies.
- 2.4 Q. Right, okay. Can we assume, then, in the course of your
- 25 evidence, that you were familiar with its terms?

18

7

8

9

10

- A. Reasonably, yes. Obviously I'm not a fire safety professional, but, yeah, reasonably.
- Q. No. Well, absolutely

The next document is, as you've referred to, the Local Government Association guidance on high-rise buildings called "Fire safety in purpose-built blocks of flats", published in, I think, July 2011.

Let's have that up, please. It's $\{HOM00045964\}$. 8 9 Again, an all too familiar front page and the colouring, 10 but you remember being familiar with that document?

- 11 A. Yes, I had a copy of it on my desk.
- 12 Q. Again, can we proceed on the basis that you were 13 familiar with it?
- 14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

- 15 Q. And having a copy on your desk would have made you 16 extremely familiar with it, yes.
- 17 The next one is something called PAS 79, or 18 Publicly Available Specification 79.
- 19

2

11

12

13

14

15

- 20 Q. Were you familiar with the versions published in 2.1 particularly 2007 and 2012?
- 2.2 A. I was, but, again, I'm not a fire safety professional, 2.3 so I wouldn't have known it nearly as well as I would 2.4 have known purpose-built flats -
- 25 Q. All right. Well, we will come back to that. Just for

- reference purposes, that's {CTA00000003}. 1
 - Did you have any specific training on the LGA guide?
- 3 A. Yes. In fact, the LGA guide was produced after quite a lot of consultation across the sector, and I was 5 consulted. I went to at least one briefing with other 6 similar health and safety housing individuals. We were 7

able to raise issues that we had, things that we felt 8 needed to be included, and in the course of preparing 9 for this, I found an email I sent with some of the

10 issues that I felt needed to be incorporated.

> So, yeah, we knew it was coming, we'd been consulted fairly widely, and then, when it was finalised, there was an introductory seminar, I believe, which might have been Colin Todd himself or some of his colleagues who presented it. So. ves.

16 Q. We may pick this up later on, but do you remember what 17 specific issues or matters you wanted to see reflected 18

in this guide as part of that consultation process? 19 A. Actually, one of my points was to do with interim

2.0 21 where we were not able to complete works within the 2.2 timeframe that -- and depending on the nature, sometimes 2.3 we would have had -- we would have advised the

2.4 Fire Brigade and they would be looking for interim

25 measures, but actually it was sometimes quite difficult

22

- to establish what they meant by that. So I think I was 2 looking for some guidance about -- just even some very
- 3 general guidance about what would be appropriate,
- 4 depending on which piece of plant or equipment would be 5 temporarily out of use. So that was certainly one of

the areas

I think I also sought information about the less able-bodied residents and what we needed to do to -you know, how far do we need to go, what can we do to assist residents in purpose-built blocks of flats.

- 11 Q. Did you get an answer to that question?
- 12 No. I think what happened was they were seeking things 13

for inclusion, so it was sort of a series of emails

- people were sending off, "It would be helpful if you 14
- 15 could include this, this and this", but we didn't really
- 16 get answers. The guide got produced.
- 17 Q. In relation to PAS 79, did you get any training at any
- stage specifically on the September or August 2012 18
- 19 edition of that?
- 20 A. I don't believe I did.
- 2.1 Q. No.
- 22 Were you also familiar with something called the
- 2.3 "Means of escape for disabled people guide", March 2007?
- 2.4 To some extent, but not hugely.
- 25 What about the LACORS, "Housing - fire safety. Guidance

- 1 on fire safety provisions for certain types of existing
- housing", which was 2008? 2.
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. You did. Did you get training on that?
- 5 A. Probably, but again, I can't remember the detail.
- 6 Q. Just for reference purposes, that's {CST00002516}.
- What about BS 9991, the 2015, "Fire safety in the 7
- design, management and use of resident buildings", do 8
- 9 vou remember that?
- 10 A. Again, I would have had an overview of it but not
- 11 detailed knowledge.
- 12 Q. Right, okay.
- 13 Now, can we go back to your first statement, please, 14 at {TMO00000890/37}, paragraph 166.
- 15 We looked at the first part of that and paused.
- 16 Let's look at the last sentence together. You say
- 17
- 18 "My understanding has always been that the
- 19 'Responsible Person' for the RBKC's tenanted stock, as 2.0
 - defined in that Order, was both RBKC and the TMO."
- 21 How did you come to that understanding?
- 22 A. I think partly it was my interpretation of the
- 23 legislation, and partly because we were the managing 2.4 agents, so in the first instance we had operational
- 25 day-to-day control, so very clearly we were a

1 responsible person; however, the tenants and the 2 leaseholders, their tenancy and their leasehold 3 agreement was with RBKC, who still were the freeholder 4 for the building. Depending on budgets and -- there 5 were some budgetary issues and policy issues that we would have had to defer to RBKC on. And, actually, it 6 was probably, specifically in relation to fire risk assessments -- no doubt you will ask me about this --8 9 but in 2009 we'd had protracted discussion with the 10 Fire Brigade and RBKC which resulted in us tendering for 11 a fire consultancy partner to undertake fire risk 12 assessments, and that was very much a joint initiative. 13 And, in fact, the progress meetings that happened after 14 the appointment of the contractor for a few years still 15 involved RBKC colleagues coming to sit in the programme, 16 and I believe they funded it, also, our initial 17 assessment. So there were various factors that 18 I thought indicated that we were both --19 Q. And the colleagues you're talking about, people like

20

2.1 A. Yes.

2.2 Q. I see. We will come to look at those documents in due 2.3 course.

2.4 You just said a moment ago it was your 25 interpretation; was that just as a result of reading the

1 text of the legislation, or was that as a result of 2 things you learnt from colleagues about how it should be 3 interpreted?

A. I can't really recall, to be honest. No one ever questioned me on it, and it was always included in my annual report, which went, I believe, to the council as well as to our board. Quite a lot of -- for a period of time, I was having to do very regular updates for board, and I would invariably say for the purposes of the RRO, and no one ever challenged me, so I therefore assumed that what I was saying was appropriate -- was right.

Q. I see

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

Do you remember ever having any specific discussion with anybody at RBKC along the lines of: RBKC is or is also the responsible person?

A. I don't, but I would have had regular -- I did have regular dialogue with the corporate health and safety manager, and obviously that person changed over the years, but certainly Gary Mann is someone who was there for several years. We would meet regularly and he would be wanting to know what we were working on, if we had any issues. I can't say I recall discussing it with him, but he was also someone who would have had copies of our annual report and would have been kept up to date with what was happening with fire risk assessments.

24

So, in answer to your question, I don't think I did, 2 but I wasn't making a secret of that being my

3 understanding.

4 Q. How did you understand that the joint responsibility of RBKC and the TMO as responsible persons worked in 5

6 practice?

7 A. I think, in practice, because the TMO had operational 8 day-to-day control, then, you know, we were doing the 9

lion's share, understandably, because we were in the --

10 we were in that position, but there were areas where we

11 deferred to RBKC sort of latterly. Whenever we were 12 looking to have an installation programme for

13 self-closers, and when we were looking to have

14 an inspection programme for the same, we had to raise

15 that with RBKC.

16 O I see

17 A. So it was sort of a bit policy, a bit budgetary.

18 Q. Right.

19 A. Yes

20 Q. I see. And in general terms, when one is looking at the 2.1 fire risk assessment programme --

2.2 A. Yes

2.3 — how was the responsibility as the responsible person Q. 2.4

to be shared as between the TMO and RBKC?

2.5 A. In truth, that mostly sat with us. I was the one who

27

1 had drafted the programme of properties that needed to 2 be inspected, identified the timeframes, allocated those 3 to the assessor, and I received the fire risk

assessments back and allocated the actions. 5

They came to progress meetings and they kept a kind of watching brief, and would want updates in terms of mid-year reviews and annual reports to scrutiny. Sometimes I would be asked to attend scrutiny about specific issues, perhaps fire safety issues, but generally the lion's share sat with TMO.

11 Q. Right.

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

Let me ask it this way: you have told us that RBKC had involvement and oversight in relation to fire safety, and specifically the fire risk assessment programme.

16 A. Yes

17 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Q}}.$ Why did you think that that gave them a legal 18 responsibility jointly with or together with the TMO as

19 the responsible person under the legislation?

2.0 A. I think because they were still the freeholder for the 2.1 building and because the tenants had a tenancy agreement

2.2 with the council and not with the TMO, and the

23 leaseholders had a leasehold agreement with the council,

so --

2.5 Q. Was this question of joint $\,--\,$ I'm so sorry, I cut across

28

7

8

23

2.4

2.5

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

1 you, it's my fault. 2

A. No, sorry.

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

1

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

2.4

25

- 3 Q. Was this question of joint or shared responsibility as 4 the responsible person ever discussed by you in any of 5 your fora or group meetings or training sessions you ever attended so that you could see that reflected in 6 7 other boroughs?
- A. I don't recall that being the case, apologies. 8
 - Q. I'm going to change topic now and ask you about an agreement in 2010, or discussion, with the LFEPA.

Can we start, please, by looking at {RBK00001176}.

This is email correspondence, and the one at the top of the page is dated 16 December 2010 between you and Laura Johnson, director of housing at RBKC, and you're talking about proposed wording from Kevin Thompson, who was environmental health at RBKC, for the joint working protocol, which was produced by the fire safety working group, which would set out the responsibilities of the TMO and RBKC for fire safety. So that's the context.

If we go to page 2 of this email run $\{RBK00001176/2\}$, and we look at the two bullet points towards the bottom of the page, "What will RBKC do?", this is Kevin Thompson's proposed wording, and it says this:

'Kensington and Chelsea TMO will undertake the

29

monitoring and inspection of premises they manage to ensure adequate fire safety in compliance with their duty under The Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order

"• 'RBKC cannot enforce in premises it owns but where deficiencies are identified it will seek to ensure that the Kensington and Chelsea TMO comply with their contractual obligations and legal responsibilities under the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 to ensure adequate fire safety ...

Then he goes on, does Kevin Thompson, to note to Laura Johnson:

"The first bullet point merely reflects the requirements of the law applicable to the TMO so brings nothing new. However, the second point puts a clear onus on the Council. This is surely something we want to do anyway but could I have your comments please. The bulk of the protocol is good news for the private sector and I am keen to have us sign up to it but am conscious of this obligation in relation to the TMO stock."

Did you share Kevin Thompson's understanding that the onus was on the council to ensure that the TMO complied with its legal obligations and responsibilities under the RRO?

A. To some extent, yes. I mean, we were very clear of our

obligations and we were endeavouring to comply with 2 them, but, as I said, I thought that RBKC were also 3 responsible persons and also had their own degree of 4 responsibility . So if that meant making sure that we were doing what we needed to be doing, then yes. 5

Q. Can we then turn to the protocol itself. This is at {LFB00032248}. I'll show you the first page of this document. There it is, protocol between LFEPA and RBKC.

9 If we go to page 8 {LFB00032248/8}, we can see the 10 signatures. You can see, at the bottom, Paul Morse's 11 signature, director of environmental health for RBKC. 12 17 November 2011. Then above that, the signature of 13 Steve Turek, AC for the LFEPA, 20 February 2012.

14 Did you receive this final signed version, do you 15 think?

16 A. I think I probably did.

17 Q. Can we go to page 4 {LFB00032248/4}, please, at the 18 bottom, and you will see what's recorded there, under 19

20 "What will The Royal Borough of Kensington and 21 Chelsea do?"

22 I'll just show this to you:

> ' RBKC will undertake, in line with their statutory requirements, the monitoring and inspection of premises identified in Section 3 of this protocol.

 $\ensuremath{\text{"}} \bullet \ensuremath{\text{RBKC}}$ will undertake the monitoring and inspection of their own premises to ensure adequate fire safety standards

" • RBKC will enforce fire safety standards in accordance with the provisions of the Housing Act 2004 and the HHSRS, having regard to relevant documents published by the Government including, 'Fire Safety Risk Assessment: Sleeping accommodation ..."

Over the page {LFB00032248/5}:

... and in accordance with any guidance jointly agreed with LFEPA.

" • RBKC will, when taking enforcement action under the Housing Act 2004, have regard to the Fire Safety Order.

"As RBKC cannot enforce in its own premises it will ensure that when deficiencies are identified it takes appropriate action in a timely manner to ensure acceptable fire safety standards are maintained and achieved in these premises."

Then:

" • Although RBKC may offer a suitable means of complying with fire safety requirements, it will also:

'- Ensure guidance accompanies all statutory notices informing owners/landlords of the need to undertake their own fire risk assessment.

30

"— Ensure that in any relevant notice, the schedule
of work is drafted in such a way as to offer the
owner/landlord the opportunity to bring forward
alternative means of complying in accordance with their
own fire risk assessment.
"— Where such alternatives are brought forward by

"— Where such alternatives are brought forward by the owner/landlord. RBKC will consult with LFEPA."

Then it continues about consultation and data, et cetera, and you can read that.

Now, just looking at that, there is no reference there, is there, to the TMO?

12 A. No.

7

8

9

Q. No. Do you know why Kevin Thompson's suggestedamendments weren't carried through into the final draft?

15 A. Sorry, I've absolutely no idea.

Q. Did this protocol reflect your understanding of RBKC's
 responsibilities to ensure monitoring and inspection of
 their own premises?

19 A. No, not really.

20 Q. It didn't?

21 A. No. I'm wondering whether I did get the final version,

because the draft that you showed me with those two bullet points, I thought they were what were included.

24 Q. Oh. right.

25 A. Perhaps I didn't even get it, sorry.

33

- $1\,$ $\,$ Q. Do I take it from that that this document, the final
- 2 version, did not reflect your understanding of the way
- 3 in which RBKC had assumed its own responsibilities, at

4 least in this protocol?

- 5 A. No, this seems to work for -- in terms of environmental
- 6 health and the normal HMOs and things that they're
- 7 enforcing against, but it's not very clear in terms of 8 housing, is it?
- 9 Q. Right. Did you not want to see the final version of this document?
- 11 A. Yes, I would have wanted to.
- 12 Q. Can you explain why you might not have done?
- 13 A. No.

18

- 14 Q. Right.
- 15 A. Sorry, no.
- $16\,$ $\,$ Q. In general terms, how did you understand that RBKC $\,$
- fulfilled their responsibilities under the protocol, so
 - far as you understood it, in respect of premises managed
- 19 by the TMO?
- 20 A. I in terms of my relationship with RBKC, I would meet 21 regularly with the corporate safety manager and we would
- 22 have a range of discussions and I would update him.
- 23 I would be asked to provide updates for their mid-year
- $24\,$ reports and year—end reports to scrutiny. I would be
- 25 asked for information.

34

- Depending on some areas RBKC got very involved in, for example we had issues with leaseholder doors and enforcement of leaseholder doors, and ensuring that whatever we did, we could address potentially non—compliant leaseholder doors, and RBKC were very involved in that, their legal team and their housing team. So some areas, lots of engagement, and other areas, they were sort of asking for updates, asking for
- 9 me to give them position statements. So a bit of both, 10 really.
- way RBKC fulfilled their responsibilities under the protocol was topic by topic; in other words, there were some areas where they were very involved and some areas

Q. Do I take it from that that your understanding of the

where they weren't?

16 A. I suppose

11

- 17 Q. That's the flavour I'm getting from your evidence; is that accurate or fair?
- A. Yeah. I would say certainly for a long time they —
 most of the time they were very eager to know how we
- most of the time they were very eager to know how we were doing with fire risk assessments and if there were
- any issues. They knew when we'd done door replacement.
- 23 There were quite a lot of areas that they were
- 24 monitoring and quite a lot of areas that they were
- 25 asking for information on, but possibly -- but

35

- definitely focusing more heavily on some areas than others.
- Q. Can we go to {TMO00830598}. I'll show you the first
 page and the last page. This is the first page. It's
 entitled "TMO Fire Safety Strategy".

If we go to page 15 {TMO00830598/15}, we can see there is a date and a name. The name is yours and the date is November 2013.

9 A. Yeah.

6

7

8

10 Q. Did vou draft this?

A. It was drafted in consultation with colleagues, but
 I had oversight of producing the final version, yes, and
 it would have gone to our health and safety committee

14 for approval.

Q. Can we go back to page 1 {TMO00830598/1}, please,
 paragraph 2.2, under "Legislation", the very foot of the
 screen:

"For the purposes of Fire Safety legislation ,
specifically the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order
(FSO), RBKC and the TMO are considered to be
'responsible persons' and as such must ensure that

22 'suitable and sufficient' fire risk assessments are 23 carried out in the communal areas of all the residential

24 blocks."

25 First, did RBKC approve that statement?

- A. No, I don't believe they did.
- 2 Q. Do you think they ever saw it?
- 3 A. I'd be surprised if they hadn't, but I don't believe 4 they did.
- 5 Q. Do you remember whether there was any discussion of that 6 statement there with RBKC?
- A. No, I don't recall there being one.
- 8 Q. We will come back to these documents in due course,
 9 Ms Wray, but I want to turn now with you to the
 10 structure within the TMO for managing health and safety
 11 generally, and fire safety in particular.

Can we start, please, at page 37 of your first witness statement, {TMO00000890/37}, paragraph 167. You say this:

"As at 14 June 2017, there was one other Assistant Safety Advisor, Adrian Bowman. who had been with the TMO for many years. Adrian also held a NEBOSH Certificate and membership to the Institution of Occupational Safety and Health. I reported to Barbara Matthews, who was the TMO Director with ultimate executive responsibility for health and safety, and Adrian Bowman reported to me. Prior to Barbara joining the TMO in 2015, I reported to Anthony Parkes, who was Barbara's predecessor. The Facilities Coordinator, Cyril Morris, also reported to

37

me and had done so since joining the TMO in 2011."

- And I think you confirmed that that's correct, what you have set out there?
 - A. Yes.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

2.4

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

Q. Now, at paragraph 168 you say this:

"I have never been a member of the TMO Executive or Senior Management Teams. The reports I prepared on safety performance described below would usually be presented at Executive and Board meetings by members of the Executive Team."

Who was it who reported on health and safety issues to the senior management team?

A. So I reported to Barbara, Barbara Matthews, and the ——
 our health and safety committee was chaired by
 Barbara Matthews, and also had Sacha Jevans on it, and
 they reported directly in to the executive team. So
 actually any discussions above my level were usually ——
 I might have prepared it, but Barbara would have
 presented it.

- 19 Q. Before Barbara arrived in, is it, July 2015 —
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. — it would have been Anthony Parkes, would it?
- 22 A. Yes, yes it would.
- 23 Q. Right.
- You were a team leader who reported to a member of the executive team. As I say, that's Anthony Parkes and

1 then Barbara Matthews?

- 2 A. Yes
- 3 Q. Did they present the reports, so far as you know, that 4 you had prepared on safety performance to members of the 5 executive team?
- 6 A. To the best of my knowledge, yes.
 - Q. Yes.

7

8

9

10

11

12

Now, if we go, please, to {TMO10031074}. This is a document called "Health and safety policy", TMO health and safety policy, and if you look at the bottom of page 1 there, it's signed by Robert Black, chief executive, April 2012.

Can we go to page 3 in that document

14 {TMO10031074/3}, please, and go to paragraph 2.7. That 15 there sets out the responsibilities of the health,

safety and facilities manager, which was you, wasn't it?

17 A. Yes

18 Q. Looking at that -- I'm not going to read it all out -- it 's a series of bullet points. Casting your eye down

 $20\,$ $\,$ the list , was that an accurate description there of your

21 responsibilities ?

- 22 A. Erm ... Yes. Yeah.
- $23\,$ $\,$ Q. So did you have responsibility for the overall
- $24\,$ definition and design of the TMO's fire risk management

25 system?

39

- $1\,$ A. Yeah, but again, that would have been in consultation
- 2 with other colleagues.
- 3 Q. Which other colleagues, please?
- $4\,$ A. Well -- so the assessment, when -- what we ended up with

5 was when the assessment came in, it came to me. The

6 actions were allocated to various teams, most of which

7 were in the operational division, so I'm not going to

8 set out something that doesn't work for them in the way

9 that it flows through, so it could have been -- it 10 probably was executive team members, but also

particularly heads of services in the operations team.

So it would have been housing management, repairs and

contract management particularly.

- 14 Q. I think we may be slightly at cross-purposes.
- 15 A. Sorry.
- $16\,$ Q. I think your answer was relating specifically to actions
- in response to a fire risk assessment, but I'm asking
- you a more general question. Obviously that includes
- that, but looking at the list of bullet points there --
- 20 A. Yes

2.2

- 21 $\,$ Q. $\,--$ can we take it that you had responsibility for the
 - overall definition and design of the TMO's fire risk
- 23 management system, which would include but wouldn't be
- 24 limited to FRAs?
- 25 A. Okay. I would be in a position to propose and that

38

1 would go to health and safety committee and to my 2 executive director with health and safety 3 responsibility, and the decision on something like that would have been made at that level. But it would have 4 5 been me who would have been drafting and making 6 suggestions and recommendations.

- 7 Q. Yes. I see.
- 8 A. Okay.
- 9 Q. So can we take it that, subject to your qualification 10 about decision-making, it was you who held the primary operational responsibility for health and safety at the 11 12 TMO?
- 13 A. Yes and no, because obviously health and safety is devolved to everybody, everybody's got responsibilities, 14 15 and our policy statement made it very clear that, in the 16 first instance, managers had responsibility, and they 17 could come and get advice from myself and my colleague. 18 Adrian, and they did, so -- and we have an executive 19 director with health and safety responsibility and we 2.0 have a chief exec who's got -- so I think I don't see it 2.1 that way, I see it as being more of a shared 22 responsibility , then yes, we were there to advise and to 2.3 guide and to be consulted.
- 2.4 Q. My question was with the emphasis on the word 25 "operational". Let me see if I can be a bit more

41

specific.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

If you look at the last two bullet points in that list, you can see that it says:

- " advising on compliance with the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005;
- "• attending relevant internal and external meetings and committees as necessary to update them on $\ensuremath{\mathsf{TMO}}$ performance in relation to specific areas of health & safety e.g. compliance with the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005."

Did you understand that you were the TMO person with primary operational responsibility for ensuring that the TMO complied with its legal obligations as the responsible person under that legislation?

A. The reason I'm hesitating is because so much of it was outside my control. I recognise these responsibilities and -- but a lot of these were met by me having to chase and cajole and harangue people who had responsibilities. Once they're allocated to other teams, I've lost control of them.

So my hesitation is that I couldn't be responsible for the overall control, but I had oversight, I had monitoring, I could escalate, and those were the things that I did, and did all the time. But I couldn't ensure, I wasn't in a position to do that.

42

Or have I misunderstood your question, sorry?

2 Q. No, we may come back to that answer and unpack it in due 3

course, but let's proceed for the time being. 4 Just looking at the question of competent persons,

under the RRO, did you know that the RRO, particularly

Article 18(1), provided that the responsible person was 6

7 to appoint one or more "competent persons" to assist in

8 the undertaking of preventative and protective measures?

9 A. Yes.

5

- 10 Q. You did. You were familiar, were you, at all times with 11 the concept of the competent person? Yes. And were you 12 the competent person at the TMO?
- 13

Q. Now, can we go to {RBK00055531}. We may not need this, 14 15 actually. I'll just show it to you, because we'll come 16 back to the report in due course.

17 This is a fire safety management review done by 18 Matt Hodgson Limited in September 2013. There is

19 an earlier draft, I think, from the July of that year. 2.0 If we go to page 23 {RBK00055531/23},

21 paragraph 3.2.4, you can see there that he says in the 22 first paragraph under "Health & Safety 'Competent 23 Person' role":

2.4 "The 'competent (H&S) person' for KCTMO is 25

Janice Wray ...'

43

- 1 A Yes
- 2. Q. That corresponded with your understanding?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. Okav.

5 Did you consider that you had sufficient training, 6 experience and knowledge to undertake your

7 responsibilities as the competent person?

8 A. Well, I had access to a fire safety specialist , and if 9 I needed access to other specialist advice, then I could 10

11 Q. And who was that fire safety specialist?

12 A. Well, initially it was Salvus and then it was

Carl Stokes 13

Q. Right. 14

15 A. But I also had regular dialogue with the Fire Brigade. 16 as you know, we had regular liaison meetings, so there

was quite a lot of dialogue across the sector. There 17

18 were various people who I could readily consult.

19 Q. Let's look at Article 18(3) and see what it provides.

Can we go, please, to $\{HOM00000040/13\}$. I'll just have it up on the screen. "Safety assistance".

Were you familiar with the text of this document?

23

2.0

21

2.2

24 Q. And were you familiar with sub-article (3) of

25 Article 18? Yes?

1 A. Yes.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

2.3

2.4

25

1

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

2 Q. If we go over the page, please $\{HOM0000040/14\},$ to sub-article (5):

> "A person is to be regarded as competent for the purposes of this article where he has sufficient training and experience or knowledge and other qualities to enable him properly to assist in undertaking the preventative and protective measures."

I take it from your earlier answer that you had or you thought you had sufficient training and experience and knowledge and other qualities; yes?

- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Yes

Now, the competent person has also got to ensure that the means at their disposal are adequate, having regard to the size of premises, the risks to which relevant persons are exposed and the distribution of those risks

Can you describe the budget that you had available for health and safety for the TMO, in general terms?

2.1 A. I didn't. I didn't really have a budget, because anything that I needed to be done, I escalated. It would go to the technical division. They had the budgets.

For example, when we instigated the programme of

door replacement, the Manse Masterdor, my role was to identify the trends and the issues being flagged up by the fire risk assessment. There was a recurring theme that we had to assure ourselves that the doors, the flat entrance doors, were adequately fire rated and self-closing. I escalated that, it went across to the technical division, we find a way of finding that information using stock condition surveyors, and then the budgetary decisions were all outside of mv -- they just weren't my responsibility.

11 Q. Right.

> Well, just focusing on the words, can we go back to page 13 {HOM00000040/13} and just look at sub-article (3) again. You can see that it's for the responsible person --

16 A. Yeah.

> Q. -- to ensure that the number of persons appointed as the competent person -- to ensure that the means at their disposal, that's your disposal, are adequate, having regard to the size of the premises, the risks to which relevant persons are exposed and the distribution of those risks throughout the premises.

Did you monitor or keep under close control or watch the means at your disposal and the adequacy of those means, having regard to the size of the TMO's stock for

1 which you were responsible as a competent person? 2 (Pause)

3 A. Yes, I think I did. As I've explained, I didn't have 4 budgetary control, and I didn't have contractors who reported to me, so I was reliant -- I mean, the 5 responsible person is obviously the whole -- is 6 7 an organisational term, so I was having to allocate, 8 chase, cajole, escalate, do everything within my power 9 to flag up issues which were being highlighted to people 10 who had got budgetary control. But I was reading every 11 assessment that came in and every action plan so I could 12 identify issues and trends that were coming our way so

13 that I could start saying, "We don't have a dedicated 14 budget for this, this is something that looks like it's

15 going to spiral". So that's my role in this.

16 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Q}}.$ Did you ever consider that, in your role as competent 17 person, you needed better funding or resourcing than you 18 were getting?

19 A. Erm ... I don't know. I mean, my issue tended to be trying to ensure that things were done on time and with 20 2.1 the right degree of quality, and that could be 22 problematic. I'm not sure that I necessarily thought 23 that was budgetary. It's difficult to say whether it 2.4 was -- there was a contractor issue or ... not

25 especially . There will always be -- health and safety

47

1 people will always be able to spend money and find things that they want to do, but no, I don't think 2. 3 that's necessarily an issue.

Q. Looking at the earlier expressions in sub-article (3), 5

"The responsible person must ensure that the number of persons appointed under paragraph (1), the time available for them to fulfil their functions [et cetera] ... are adequate ...

10 Did you feel that you had enough time to fulfil your 11 functions as a competent person?

12 If I'm honest, I was often spread very thinly, because 13 I had responsibility for the whole of the borough. 14 There's, what, at least 650 blocks. They're all 15 requiring assessments, they're all requiring safe 16 precautions, safe $\,--\,$ and there was me and my colleague, 17 in terms of health and safety. But that's the resource 18 we had available, so we were pretty adept at 19 re-prioritising on a regular basis, and fire safety was 2.0 always absolutely top of the pile.

21 Q. Did you ever go to anybody, either in the executive team 2.2 or higher, and say, "I am spread very thinly, I can't do

23 my role as a competent person properly under the 2.4 statute, I need help, either in terms of resources or

2.5 personal support"?

6

7

8

9

48

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

2.5

8

9

10

11

12

13

- 1 A. I don't recall doing that, but people knew -- my 2 line managers always knew exactly what I was doing, 3 exactly the range of activities I was involved with. 4 It $\,--\,$ you know, we had regular one-to-ones, we had 5 regular catch-ups. We just kept re-prioritising and trying to make sure that we covered all bases, and we 6 believed that we did, but we were very busy. 8
 - Q. In your own mind, though, did there come a time at any point where you thought to yourself: "Well, I really do need a bit more help here"?

9

10

14

19

2.0

21

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

2.4

25

11 A. I think I was aware and I imagine that there are things 12 that you will raise with me that I didn't document that 13 I wish I'd had time to document, but I would have always prioritised putting the procedure in place, putting the 15 system in place, making sure people were trained, 16 actually doing what needed to be done, so sometimes my 17 then recording that didn't happen as swiftly as it 18 should

> For example, the fire safety strategy. There was a working draft for a while, but it wasn't completed as soon as I would have liked it to be, because I was $re-prioritising\ things\ which\ I\ felt\ were\ more\ important.$

Q. Did you have sufficient time and resources as you believed it at the time to manage fire safety responsibilities for the whole of the TMO portfolio in

- 1 addition to the rest of your health and safety 2 responsibilities?
- 3 A. I'm quite hard working, and I always did -- I don't think there's anything that I missed, so I feel like we 5 were stretched really thinly, but we made it work. And in an ideal world and in a different sector, there would 6 7 have been more resources, undoubtedly, but we 8 prioritised it and we made sure that we did what we 9 needed to do, and we chased those who were not doing 10 what they needed to be doing as quickly as we wanted 11 them to, and we escalated to all sorts of committees and 12 heads of, and we kept everybody appraised of what we 13 were doing.
- 14 Q. Can we go back to your first witness statement, then, 15 please, to page 39 {TMO00000890/39}, and look at 16 paragraph 174 together. You say there:

"As Health and Safety Advisors, Adrian and I monitored the health and safety performance of the TMO through various means. I gathered relevant information from sources such as the LFB, reports of fires, accidents, dangerous occurrences and changes in legislation and presented this at regular meetings with the TMO Health and Safety Committee. I also attended bi-monthly meetings with the London Fire Brigade ('LFB') and quarterly meetings with the Royal Borough of

50

Kensington and Chelsea ('RBKC') where information was shared.

What particular matters did you monitor in respect of health and safety performance?

A. Well, my colleague, Adrian, was doing, in the early days, annual health and safety inspections in the communal areas of all of the estates, which was actually serving as an audit of the inspections that the caretakers were undertaking. So he was out practically ensuring that risks were identified, but also, you know, if the caretakers needed additional resource or additional training, or he would sort of be doing one-to-ones with them to upskill them as part of what he was doing. So that was ongoing.

We were reporting to the health and safety committee in terms of all of those fire aspects that you referred to. We were advising of accidents, dangerous occurrences. There was a range of factors that we were reporting to the health and safety committee which had that kind of remit really

In addition, what I think is important to say is that because the compliance, the contract management team was part of the operations division, and they appointed contractors and monitored those contractors. and a lot of the fire safety features were maintained by

1 that team, or their contractors, I would have regular 2 meetings with the head of that team where I brought my 3 agenda, he brought his, and that would be another means of me trying to identify if there are any sticking 5 points, if there are any issues I need to be aware of, 6 if they're re-procuring, what their stats are like, 7 you know, if we've got problematic contractors.

So there were — sorry, I realise I'm going on, but those sorts of things.

Q. That's helpful, thank you.

Just breaking that up, first of all, in respect of what you call caretakers, and we might call estate service --

14 A. Assistants.

15 Q. -- assistants. ESAs, what did you do with the 16 information you got from those individuals?

17 A. No, sorry, I might have misled you. I didn't get --18 well, information that Adrian was given as part of his 19 inspections on site, he would incorporate into his

2.0 reports. If it related to repairs or actions that

21 needed to be undertaken, there would be a pro forma that

2.2 he pretty much completed with a summary of any trends he 23 wanted to highlight. So those would be put through to

2.4 repairs, if they needed responsive items. If it was

25 training, Adrian and I would endeavour to ensure that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

2.5

- either the HR team or whoever we tried to proactively get everything in place we could to assist the caretakers, the ESAs, because they had quite a difficult
- job and we wanted to make sure that we helped them to do it as efficiently as they could.
- 6 Q. How did you go about ensuring that their work was being 7 completed to the requisite standard?

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

A. Again, they reported to — it may have changed over the years, but they reported to a team leader. There was one in the north, one in the south. Ultimately — initially, they were working off paper records and pro formas, which was difficult, and for a long time we recognised that a PDA would be better. Once they were able to introduce PDAs, then we could run regular reports to see what level of checking they're doing and what is being identified by their checks. Again, I wouldn't have seen those reports unless I requested them, and, just with so much going on, in the first instance that was their line manager's role.

As we ultimately looked to develop a better suite of KPIs for health and safety, that was one of the things that we plugged into our KPIs that would be managed by the health and safety committee, and that had started to happen, not as soon as we would have liked, but certainly for a year or two it had been in place.

EO

- 1 Q. You refer to reports completed by Adrian Bowman; what 2 did those look like?
- A. They were usually a cover sheet with a summary, which might have been issues that he particularly wanted to identify in relation to that estate or that block, and then there would be pretty much a table where he'd identified his concern and then who was going to action
- / identified his concern and then who was going to actio
- 9 Q. From the start, how did you manage that information? 10 Did you put it onto a system?
- 11 A. No. I think this is a kind of recurring weakness. 12 Ultimately we had a workflow on our W2 system. Prior to 13 W2. Adrian would have requested the orders that he 14 required from the repairs team or the customer service 15 centre or whatever. There were different procedures in 16 place. But ultimately it went on to W2, and again, that 17 was something that we plugged in to the KPIs, because we 18 could identify the number of issues which we identified 19 and the number that were being closed down.
- 20 Q. But the W2 wasn't always up and running during your
- 22 A. No, indeed.
- 23 Q. So before W2, how would you process or collate that 24 information?
- $25\,$ A. It was really difficult . It had to be done relatively

54

manually, and in fact, one of the audits, that was one of the things that we were criticised about, is not going back and ensuring that what we had identified was successfully completed. But that was just prior to W2, so actually we already had that on our radar.

Q. Now, the other aspect of that long answer you gave earlier relates to specialist contractors.

How did you go about ensuring that the fire safety equipment, systems, lifts for example, were being adequately maintained?

A. I did rely quite heavily on what was being identified by the fire risk assessment. Those actions were obviously being allocated to the responsible team. But, in addition to that — and then I monitored whether they were being completed and I escalated to the respective team where there were issues outstanding on a regular basis. With W2, they were able to run their own reports, but I still sent them one at least every kind of month or two months to identify what was outstanding and to chivvy them along. That would get escalated to the health and safety committee but — and for a while we had an operations health and safety group that looked specifically at that.

But, in addition, I think I possibly also mentioned that I would meet with the head of contract management

.

- on a regular basis to get to drill down into the detail of why these things weren't being progressed or other issues that I had perhaps been made aware of, sometimes anecdotal comments from caretakers, ESAs, about performance.
- Q. Looking at paragraph 174 {TMO00000890/39}, in the last
 sentence there, you refer to quarterly meetings with
 RBKC; which quarterly meetings were those?
- 9 A. I was probably referring to -- there was what was 10 historically called the main health and safety 11 co-ordinating committee, which I think at one stage met 12 every six weeks. It was a council committee and I was 13 invited to attend that. It became slightly more 14 complicated whenever the council went bi-borough, so 15 then it was a bi-borough health and safety group and it 16 had lots of representatives from Hammersmith and Fulham and from K&C, and actually it became a bit unwieldy, 17 18 I think, and a bit less helpful. But I also met with 19 Gary Mann, the corporate safety manager, on a regular
- Q. Whose role was it to ensure that fire safety work carried out by the operations department, health and safety operations, for the time that it existed, met with health and safety and fire safety standards in respect of which you were the adviser or competent

56

2.0

basis.

5

6

7

8

1 person? 2 A. So I would meet with the head of, who was latterly 3 Alex Bosman. We would look in detail at what I -- where 4 I could see there were issues, where there was lack of progress, where perhaps I was being told about 5 contractor performance. He would advise me what action 6 he was taking. He for quite a long time had been 8 developing a dashboard in terms of compliance. The 9 fire safety bit was unfortunately the last bit which he 10 hadn't quite got to, but he had lifts and gas safety and 11 electrical installation checks and I think lightning 12 protection, quite a few of those things went onstream. 13 so we had live information.

> Every time he re-procured a contract, he engaged a specialist in that specific field, who I think was probably heavily involved in specifying what was required in terms of complying with the legislation . But, in addition, my understanding is, and certainly I know in the case of gas this is the case, that they would look to appoint a specialist in terms of quality control

- 2.2 Q. What was your role in relation to Repairs Direct?
- 2.3 A. I didn't have one. They had their own health and safety 2.4 person.
- 25 Q. Right. I see.

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

21

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

57

- 1 $\mathsf{Did}\ \mathsf{you}\ --\ \mathsf{I}\ \mathsf{say}\ \mathsf{you};\ \mathsf{did}\ \mathsf{you}\ \mathsf{or}\ \mathsf{anybody}\ \mathsf{else}\ \mathsf{at}\ \mathsf{the}$ 2 TMO have audit rights over Repairs Direct's health and 3 safety systems?
- A. I don't know the answer to that, to be honest. I was 5 always entirely separate from Repairs Direct, so I'm afraid I can't help you. 6
- 7 Q. You don't know. You don't know who it was who exercised 8 any rights of looking into Repairs Direct's processes 9 and procedures and policies and seeing if they were up 10 to scratch?
- 11 A. I don't, I'm sorry.
- 12 MR MILLETT: I would like to turn to a different topic, 13 which is reporting and decision-making for health and 14 safety issues.
- 15 Mr Chairman, I probably won't get through all this 16 before the break, but I will make a start.
- SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes, all right. 17
- 18 MR MILLETT: Can I ask you to stay on that page in your 19 statement $\{TMO00000890/39\}$ and go to the next paragraph. 2.0 You say:
 - "The TMO Health and Safety Committee met every two months and was chaired by Barbara Matthews, the Executive Team Member with responsibility for health and safety. Prior to 2015 the meetings were chaired by

58

Anthony Parkes. In order to give that Committee

profile, the Director of Operations, Sacha Jevans, was 2 also a member as were several senior managers and 3 employee Safety Representatives. This Health and Safety 4 Committee reported to the Executive Team."

So is it right that, between 2013 and 2015, there were two committees dealing with health and safety matters: there was the TMO health and safety committee and the operational health and safety committee?

- 9 A. Yes, that's right.
- 10 Q. Right. What was the difference between the respective 11 remits of each of those committees?
- 12 The -- sort of in answer to that, what I would say is 13 the health and safety operations group was set up, 14 I think it's fair to say, directly as a result of us 15 getting a poor audit result, and since most of the risks 16 and all of the resident safety issues sat in operations, 17 I think Sacha's view, and I think rightly so, was that 18 she create an operations health and safety group to look
- 19 specifically at the risks that her managers were facing 2.0
- and how they were dealing with them. So that did run 21 for a couple of years until Barbara came in, and by that
- 22 point, actually, there was a lot of duplication, and
- 23 Barbara's position was that we merge those, and that was 2.4 sensible . really .
- 25 It sounds from that, is this right, that there was

59

- 1 actually no difference in remit, in scope of 2 responsibility, but simply that the operational health 3 and safety committee was looking after the operational 4 side of what the health and safety committee generally
- 5 was interested in? 6 A. Yes. I mean, I think it's fair to say that the health 7 and safety committee would always have had the 8 overarching responsibility, and occasionally that the 9 ops group tended to go off down a tangent into some 10 operational stuff that wasn't exclusively health and
- 11 safety, so yeah. 12 $\mathsf{Q}.\;\;\mathsf{I}\;\mathsf{see}.\;\;\mathsf{So},\;\mathsf{in}\;\mathsf{a}\;\mathsf{nutshell}\,,\;\mathsf{why}\;\mathsf{were}\;\mathsf{there}\;\mathsf{two}\;\mathsf{committees}$
- 13 for that two-year period? 14 A. In truth, I think it was, with good intentions, to drive 15 forward health and safety to ... I think it was -- it
- 16 had good intentions. It was to ensure that the culture 17 of health and safety was spread consistently throughout
- 18 the organisation and people were taking their
- 19 responsibilities seriously. It was just I think
- 2.0 ultimately we were discussing the same papers, and
- 21 actually there were a number of people who sat in both
- 2.2 committees, so it was probably -- it had run its course,
- 23
- 2.4 Right, I see. And it's right, I think, as a matter of 25 record, that from 31 July 2015, the only committee that

1 was dealing with health and safety within the TMO was 1 directorate." 2 the health and safety committee of which 2 Would you agree with that? 3 Barbara Matthews was the chair? 3 A. Erm ... not completely, because Barbara was actually A. That's right. 4 4 very proactive and very hands-on, I think she was .. Q. Yes 5 5 and at certain times very engaged operationally. When Now, if we look on in the paragraph we're looking at we were in dialogue with the Fire Brigade after we 6 6 7 ${TMO00000890/39}$, you say, in order to give that 7 received the Adair enforcement notice and when we asked committee -- that's the operations committee -- profile, 8 8 for an extension of time, that was written by Barbara and not by me, so --9 Sacha Jevans was also a member. 9 10 Why was it necessary to raise the profile of the 10 Q. Yes, I see. 11 health and safety committee? 11 She says in the second line that she made it clear 12 to all those in attendance that "Janice was the manager 12 A. Again, I believe that goes back to the audit where we 13 got limited assurance, and I think one of the things 13 and the expert". Would you agree with that? 14 that Anthony recognised is actually we didn't have 14 A. Yeah, perhaps. 15 sufficiently senior people on the health and safety 15 Q. Now, it's right, isn't it, that between November 2009 16 16 and February 2011, you provided a number of reports on committee. I think we had historically and then there 17 had been a bit of a -- people were sending deputies, and 17 fire risk assessment --18 so it was a bit ... it needed kick-starting, really. 18 A Yes 19 Q. In my question, I referred to operations committee. 19 ${\sf Q}.\ --$ and the programme for fire risk assessments generally 20 20 for the TMO operations committee? 21 Q. No, it's my fault. I meant the health and safety 2.1 A. Yes committee. Q. Yes, and I' II just read those into the record: they're 2.2 2.2 $\{TMO10034738/33\}$, that's 10 November 2009; there is 2.3 Specifically, was Sacha Jevans expected to 23 2.4 2.4 {TMO10037422/1}, a further update on fire risk communicate health and safety issues back down, as it were, to the operations committee or department? 2.5 assessment dated 25 May 2010; {TMO00899852/3}, an update 1 A. Oh, well, I think all executive directors are supposed 1 on fire risk assessments, 25 November 2010; $\{TMO00892994/4\},$ further update on fire risk assessments 2 to do that. I think that's what our policy statement 2 3 says and that seems a perfectly reasonable position. 3 dated 22 February 2011. Q. What involvement did Sacha Jevans, as director of Then there were similar reports I think prepared for the TMO board between July 2009 and 2010. 5 operations, have in terms of key fire safety issues and 5 6 Am I right about what I've just said to you? 6 decisions? 7 7 A. She received any stats, any information I was providing, A. I'm sure you are. It was fairly prolific because, in

A. She received any stats, any information I was providing
 feedback on liaison meetings, feedback on deficiency
 notices, so she had oversight of everything that was
 happening in that sphere.

11 Q. Right. And Barbara Matthews, same?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. But in a more senior and more decision—making capacity?

14 A. Yes.

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

2.4

25

15 Q. Right.

Let's just look and see what Barbara Matthews says in her first statement to the Inquiry, {TMO10049987/2}, please, paragraph 9. She says there:

"The TMO had a Health and Safety Committee that met regularly. While I chaired these meetings, I made it clear to all those in attendance that Janice was the manager and the expert. My attendance at these meetings was to highlight the importance that the TMO put on health and safety. Sacha Jevans also attended as many matters concerning health and safety fell into her

62

A. I'm sure you are. It was fairly prolific because, in fairness, we had nearly had an enforcement notice from the Fire Brigade, so it was really important to

scrutinise it, and there was commitment to quite a high

level that they needed to be updated with progress and

they needed to see progress happening, so I'm sure you're right.

13 you're right.

8

9

Q. I take it from your evidence that you had a formal reporting role to the TMO operations committee on health

16 and safety?

17 A. For a time I think I presented the reports, but
 ultimately, in recent years, it would have been Barbara.

19 Q. Why were you reporting on fire risk assessments to the

20 TMO operations committee?

21 A. Because I'd been asked to.

22 Q. Right. Who asked you to do that?

23 A. Robert, presumably

 $24 \quad \ \mbox{MR MILLETT: Right}.$

25 Let's just look at one of those --

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Mr Millett, I'm just wondering 1 2 whether that would be a good point, before we start 3 getting into the documents. 4 MR MILLETT: Yes, absolutely. That's as good a point as 5 any. Of course. SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Ms Wray, as Mr Millett said, we're 6 7 going to have a break during the morning and the 8 afternoon, and I think this is the time to have the 9 morning break. 10 So we'll stop now. We'll resume, please, at 11.35. 11 I' II say this every time you leave the room, but please 12 don't speak to anyone about your evidence or anything to 13 do with it while you're out of the room. THE WITNESS: Okay, thank you. 14 15 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right? Thank you. 16 Right, would you like to go with the usher, please. 17 (Pause) Right, 11.35, please. 18 19 (11.20 am) 20 (A short break) 2.1 (11.35 am) SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Right, Ms Wray, ready to carry on? 2.2 THE WITNESS: Yes. 2.3 2.4 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Good, thank you very much. 25 Yes, Mr Millett.

1 MR MILLETT: Thank you, Mr Chairman.

2 Ms Wray, I'm going to show you one or two of these 3 documents.

4 Can we look, please, at $\{TMO10037442/62\}$.

5

6

7

8

Q. On that page, we see a report entitled, "Further update on fire risk assessments", and you can see that it's dated 30 September 2010.

Is it right that you stopped producing these 9 10 specific FRA reports for the TMO board in or after 2010? 11 We haven't seen any after that.

12 A. I can't recall . I thought I had -- I didn't produce 13 them at the same frequency, because I wasn't asked to, 14 really, and there was quite a lot of intensive activity 15 in the early stages, but ...

16 Q. Right.

A. I'd be surprised if I hadn't produced more. That seems 17 18 like a very long time ago, but I'm sorry, I wouldn't 19 have the details

2.0 Q. I mentioned a further update of 2011, and there is one 21 further one in May 2013. I'll show you that, 2.2 {TMO10031056}.

This is a report dated 2 May 2013, and it's 23 2.4 entitled, "Current TMO position on fire risk

25 assessments".

66

1 Do you know who asked for that report?

2 A. Sorry, I don't.

3 Q. Do you know why it was produced after a gap of some 4 two years since the previous one?

5 A. No.

9

Q. You can see it's addressed to the TMO operations 6 7 committee; does that help you?

8 A. No. I would have produced whatever I was asked to

produce. In the early days after the appointment of 10 Salvus, that was quite frequent, and so there was update

11

reports being requested by my manager on a regular

12 basis. I'm sorry. I can't recall.

13 Q. Do you know why there were no further reports on fire 14 risk assessments to the TMO operations committee after

15 May 2013?

16 A. No, I don't. I think that would have to be a question 17 for my manager at the time.

18 Q. And your manager at the time was Anthony Parkes?

19 A. That would have been Anthony Parkes at that stage, yes.

20 Q. Right. Can we take it from that answer that he was the 2.1 person that asked you to produce these?

2.2 A. Yes, usually.

2.3 Q. And you wouldn't have produced them unless he'd done so?

2.4 No, because the agendas for all of these committees are

2.5 set by other individuals, and usually the frequency of

1 reports is all kind of pre-set and I'm not really party

to that, to be honest. 2

3 Q. Right.

A. What I probably should say is the original ones, the

ones back in 2010 and 2011, would have been requested by 5

6 my then line manager, who was Lornette Pemberton, it

7 wouldn't have been Anthony Parkes at that stage.

8 Q. Yes. We will come to Lornette Pemberton and her role

9 much later on. I think.

10 A. Okav.

11 There was also at this time and throughout, I think,

12 something called the TMO finance, audit and risk

13 committee

A. I believe so. 14

15 Q. Right. Do you know what oversight that committee

exercised over health and safety?

17 A. I don't, I'm sorry.

18 Q. You don't.

16

2.0

19 A. Sorry, I was just going to say that because

Anthony Parkes was — he was the director for finance,

21 I'm wondering if health and safety just fed into that

2.2 because of his role and because I reported to him, but

23 I couldn't sav. sorry.

2.4 Q. Can I see if I can then draw the threads together

25 a little bit in relation to the procedure of reporting

- 1 and decision-making on health and safety.
- 2 You reported to the health and safety committee --
- 3 A. Yes.
- $\mathsf{Q}.\ --$ and also to the operational health and safety 4
- committee between 2013 and 2015. 5
- 6 A. Yes
- 7 Q. In other words, during its lifetime; yes?
- 8
- 9 Q. Yes, and the health and safety committee reported to the
- 10 executive team.
- 11 A. That's right.
- 12 Q. Yes, and that in turn reported to the TMO board.
- 13 A. Yes
- Q. Yes. You didn't attend executive team meetings, did 14 you? 15
- A. Not unless requested to, and that was very unusual. 16
- Q. And did not attend board meetings. TMO board meetings. 17
- 18 A. I've got no recollection of going to board meetings, no.
- 19 Q. Barbara Matthews, for her part, would report on health 20 and safety issues both to the executive team and to the
- 2.1 TMO board: is that right?
- 2.2 A. Yes. Yes, that's right. Q. Now, if we can just look at her first statement to 2.3
- 2.4 the Inquiry, please, {TMO10049987/2}, paragraph 8, she
- 25 says there, just below halfway through the paragraph:

- 1 "We would also identify [that's you and she] what
- 2 health and safety matters we felt needed to be included
- 3 in the fortnightly Executive Team meetings and the
- annual health and safety report presented to the
- 5 Executive Team and the Board. We also caught up weekly
- on a more informal basis." 6
- 7 Now, of course, this is after July 2015.
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. But can you help us, how would you identify what needed 10 to be included in the executive team meetings and the
- 11 annual health and safety report?
- 12 A. I would be reporting to her on which issues were live,
- 13 what was ongoing, any trends, any changes in approach
- 14 from the Fire Brigade, any imminent legislation, any --
- 15 as we'd spoke about, post—Lakanal, there were sometimes
- 16 discussion that legislation or best practice would be
- 17 changing. A variety of different ways, really.
- 18 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Q}}.$ For the executive team meetings, would you provide input 19 on health and safety matters?
- 2.0 A. Yes, I recall that -- I found some -- I'd forgotten
- 21 I had done them. When we had team meetings with
- 2.2 Barbara, so she had four people who reported to her, we
- 23 would usually take along an update for what our teams
- 2.4 were busy in doing, and I suspect that she used some of
- 25 that information to put into her update to the executive

- team meetings.
- 2 Q. Did you help her draft the agenda or did you draft the
- 3
- 4 A. No, I think she drafted the agenda. She would have had
- 5 that information as a reasonably good starting point,
- and if she had queries or questions or if I thought of 6
- 7 anything subsequently that needed to be added, I would
- 8 have advised her.
- 9 Q. Did you draft any reports for the executive team?
- 10 A. If I was requested to.
- 11 Q. But there was no regular ——
- 12 A. No, there wasn't a regular, no, no.
- 13 Q. Right.

20

21

22

23

2.4

2.5

Can I then turn to RBKC's role, and particularly its 14 15 monitoring and scrutiny role.

16 Can we go back to your first statement, please, at 17 page 37 {TMO00000890/37}, and back to paragraph 164, 18 which we've I think looked at. But in the second half 19 of that paragraph, you say this:

> "It was always my understanding that the RBKC retained a monitoring obligation under the MMA, which was exercised by its Corporate Health and Safety Advisor and its main Health and Safety Coordinating Committee, which was succeeded by the Bi-Borough Health and Safety Committee."

> > 71

1 Could you just explain in general terms how that 2 monitoring obligation worked in practice?

3 A. In practice, it was guite informal. Gary Mann and

I would meet up regularly, might be quarterly but it

5 might be less often than that, it was sort of at his

6

discretion . He would let me know when he wanted to 7 meet, and I would go armed with what was happening,

8 where we were at with fire safety, where we were at with

9 health and safety, any trends, any issues, any serious

10 incidents or accidents that he needed to be aware of.

11 We also tried, where possible, where there was new 12 legislation or guidance, to ensure that there was 13 a consistent approach between the council and the TMO 14 about how we would -- where possible, where we would

15 adopt that.

16 He would sometimes tell me things that were working 17 well with them, they might have had particular training 18 packages or whatever that we would want to investigate.

19 So it was fairly informal, but it covered quite 2.0 a range of discussions.

- 21 Q. Now, you refer to Gary Mann; he. I think, was the 2.2 corporate health and safety adviser --
- 23
- 24 Q. -- at RBKC; yes?
- 2.5 A. Yes, that's right.

- 1 Q. And that was so until he left his post in 2015.
- 2 A. Yes
- 3 Q. Do you remember that?
- 4 A. I do, and then Somayya Yaqub was his successor, and 5 I had the same relationship with her.
- 6 Q. Yes, and she, I think, took over in January 2016.
- 7 A. Yeah, that might be the case.
- 8 Q. Yes, and you worked closely with those advisers, did 9 you?
- 10 A. Yes. reasonably.
- Q. And you met them, you say, I think is this right? —
 quarterly or maybe less.
- A. It might be less than quarterly, but regularly.
- 14 Q. When you say less than quarterly, do you mean more frequently than quarterly?
- 16 A. Oh, no, I mean less frequently.
- 17 Q. Right, less frequently.
- Were those individuals or the role of corporate
 health and safety adviser at RBKC, so far as you
 understood it, linked in any way to the housing
- 21 department?
- 22 A. At the time, I don't think I really questioned it.
- $23\,$ $\,$ I sort of assumed that there was a way that they fed
- $24\,$ $\,$ into the housing department, but I didn't question it .
- 25 I asked -- I answered his questions, I gave him the

- $1 \hspace{1.5cm} \mbox{information, and I didn't really know if there was}$
- 2 a more formal role in terms of obtaining the
- 3 information. I'm not sure, to be honest.
- Q. So far as you were aware, which was the RBKC body or
 person who exercised scrutiny over your work and your
- 6 functions?
- 7 A. It would largely would be the corporate health and safety adviser and not usually the rest of his team. If
- there was an incident or an accident or ... they would come to me. I would give them as much information as
- 11 I could. I would happily report back once I had further
- 12 information from the Fire Brigade or the Health and
- 13 Safety Executive or whatever. So they would tended to be the people that I dealt with in that regard.
- 14 to be the people that I dealt with in that regard.
- $\begin{array}{lll} {\rm 15} & {\rm Q.} & {\rm Right.} & {\rm But~that~function~sat,~I~think~--} \ {\rm is~this} \\ {\rm 16} & & {\rm right?~--} \ {\rm as~far~as~you~know,~in~the~corporate~health} \end{array}$
- 17 and safety team or group --
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. -- and not housing?
- $20 \quad \text{A. That's right, yes.} \\$
- 21 Q. Right.
- Now, can we look and see what Gary Mann says in his statement, {RBK00054414/8}, paragraph 36. He says:
- "There was no formal process in place which requiredthe Corporate Health and Safety team to attend at the
 - 74

TMO offices and check them for health and safety

compliance, or call for their policies and procedures to
 be checked for compliance."

4 Pausing there, do you agree with that statement?

A. I do.

5

7

8

9

13

6 Q. You do

Can we look at Somayya Yaqub's statement to the Inquiry. This is {RBK00054456/8}, paragraph 35.

She says there, towards the bottom of your screen:

10 "Corporate Health and Safety did not routinely

monitor or audit the general safety arrangements for the TMO. I understood that the TMO was audited by RBKC's

auditing department, who were on occasion assisted by

14 Deloitte. I do not recall seeing any audit reports in

relation to the TMO or hearing of any significant issues

as a result of the audits "

17 Was it your understanding that corporate health and 18 safety did not routinely monitor or audit general safety 19 arrangements for the TMO?

 $20\,$ $\,$ A. As I said, the relationship was largely -- was fairly

21 informal. They advised me what -- I would update them

on what we were doing, what were live issues for us, and they would often ask for more information, but it wasn't

24 a rigorous auditing and monitoring exercise, what

25 they're saying is true.

75

- $1\,$ $\,$ Q. Right. So you agree with what Ms Yaqub says there?
- 2 A. Yes
- Q. Did you ever discuss with Somayya Yaqub the relationship
 between RBKC and TMO respectively in respect of health
 and safety?
- A. No, but I would have assumed that they were given copies
 of the audit reports, but that's just obviously wrong on
 my part.
- 9 Q. Right.
- Did Gary Mann or Somayya Yaqub ever comment on or disagree with you on any issues that you raised with them?
- 13 A. Erm ... I'm sure they commented. I don't recall
 14 disagreeing with them, because I would have been -- I'm
 15 sure that would have stood out.
- 16 Q. Yes.

2.0

21

2.2

I now want to ask you about the health and safety reports which I think you referred to earlier in your evidence in passing.

Can we go back to your first witness statement, please, {TMO00000890/40}, paragraph 180.

You say there, in the middle of your screen:

"I also produced an Annual Health and Safety Report
 and Action Plan, which outlined the current strategy for
 the TMO, its performance over the last year and its

- 1 initiatives for managing and improving safety ... This
- 2 Plan was discussed with the Health and Safety Committee,
- 3 the Executive Team and the TMO Board before the full
- 4 report and an Executive Summary was presented to the
- 5 RBKC Corporate Health and Safety Manager. The feedback
- 6 we received from the RBKC's Advisor was then used to
- help identify any additional priorities for the upcomingyear."
- 9 What was the reporting period for the report, do you 10 remember?
- 11 A. It followed the financial year, so my report would havebeen from 1 April to the end of March.
- 13 Q. I see.
- 14 A. But it often -- it varied depending on how busy we were,
- 15~ but it would usually be -- I would try and get it ready
- by about the end of June, early July, which didn't
- 17 always sit exactly well with the council's reporting --
- annual report. So if they were trying to do theirs
- before mine was ready, then I would have to give them
- 20 a summary in advance.
- $21\,$ $\,$ Q. Right, I was going to ask you about that. But
- 22 invariably, the period -- and it would have been
- 23 invariable $\,--$ would have been 1 April to 31 March; the
- 24 report might take a little time after that?
- 25 A. Yes.

- $1\quad \ \ \, {\rm Q.\ \, Do\ you\ know\ why} \,\, --\,\, {\rm well,\ first\ of\ all,\ do\ you\ know\ what}$
- 2 the council's reporting year was? I imagine it would be
- 3 calendar year.
- $4\,$ $\,$ A. I don't honestly know. I didn't think it was calendar
- 5 year.6 Q. Or financial year?
- 7 A. I thought it was financial year.
- 8 Q. So you were only a few days out?
- 9 A. Yes.
- 10 Q. Did that cause any difficulties?
- 11 A. No. When it did -- I think I recall one instance where
- $12 \hspace{1cm} \hbox{they were under pressure to get their report produced} \\$
- and I didn't have all of my statistics, so I wasn't able
- to finalise ours, so I was able to give them a draft and highlight the key themes or the areas where additional
- information was required, and they were able to get what
- 17 they required from that.
- 18 Q. Can I assume that you would start to draft your annual
- health and safety report and action plan after 31 March
- 20 in any year?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. You wouldn't start work before that?
- 23 A. Unusual -- unlikely.
- 24 Q. No, quite.
- Would you have any help in drafting that or did you

78

- 1 do it on your own?
- 2 A. I had -- it was done in consultation with colleagues in
- 3 the operations teams particularly, because I needed to
- 4 get compliance information from them, for example the
- 5 number of smoke alarms installed, the percentage
- 6 compliance in terms of electrical installation checks,
- 7 et cetera. Sometimes -- mostly I had the information
- 8 I needed from the Fire Brigade because we'd been getting
- 9 that consistently over the year. But, yeah, it was done 10 in consultation with a number of other colleagues.
- 11 Q. Certainly in relation to information—gathering, but in
- relation to putting pen to paper, did you have any
- assistance, or was all the writing yours?
- 14 A. All the writing was mine, but I would have consulted on15 the draft.
- 16 Q. And is it right that Barbara Matthews, after July 2015,
- 17 reviewed that?
- 18 A. Yes.19 Q. And before that, Anthony Parkes?
- 20 A. Yes
- 21 Q. Right. And would either of them suggest any comments or
- 22 amendments to your draft?
- 23 A. Barbara would. She was quite actively involved in --
- 24 Q. Right.
- 25 A. She may just have reworded things or she might have

79

- $1 \hspace{1.5cm} \text{asked me to include additional things.} \hspace{0.2cm} \textbf{I} \hspace{0.2cm} \text{can't recall} \\$
- 2 the detail, but she definitely would have been quite
- 3 involved.
- 4 Q. But not Anthony Parkes?
- 5 A. Not so much.
- 6 Q. Would that document then be presented to the finance,
- 7 audit and risk committee as well as the TMO health and
- 8 safety committee?
- 9 A. I believe so.
- $10\,$ $\,$ Q. On what occasions was it normally presented to the TMO
- 11 board, do you know?
- 12 A. I don't, I'm sorry.
- 13 Q. Right.
- 14 Did you ever receive any feedback or further
- questions from either the finance, audit and risk
- committee or the TMO board about the contents of your
- reports, your health and safety reports?
- 18 A. I can't recall any. I wouldn't rule it out, but I can't
- 19 recall a specific instance, I'm afraid.
- 20 Q. Did you create an action plan every year?
- 21 A. I don't think I did every year, but I think that was
- 22 probably just lack of time, really.
- 23 Q. Right, lack of time?
- $24\,$ $\,$ A. Well, lack of -- yes, lack of time just to draw it up.
- There was always one in my head that we were kind of

1 working to, but it always made more sense if it was 2 documented, and I endeavoured to, but I don't think 3 I can say that I did one every year.

4 Q. Right.

5

6

7

8

9

10

I just want to ask you one or two questions about a specific health and safety action plan. This is for June 2016, for the year 2016 to 2017, and it is at $\{TMO10007728\}$. We have to, I think, go to the native document in that.

(Pause)

Yes, that's the one dated 14 June 2016. Can you 11 12 see?

13

Q. It's paper 11, so clearly it was presented to a meeting. 14 15 Am I right in thinking that it would have been the -well, you tell me, actually. 16

17 A. It says, "KCTMO [Health and Safety] Committee -18 14th June", paper 11.

19 Q. So that committee?

20

2.1 Q. I mean, would it go onwards, upwards, from the health 2.2 and safety committee to the main board?

A. Yes -- well, it certainly would go to executive team and 2.3 2.4 they would have made a decision about whether it goes

25

81

 $\mathsf{Q}.\;\;\mathsf{Looking}\;\mathsf{simply}\;\mathsf{at}\;\mathsf{the}\;\;\mathsf{first}\;\;\mathsf{page},\;\mathsf{item}\;\mathsf{A},\;\mathsf{``Maintain}\;\;$ fire safety across stock", "Continuing Ongoing Programme 2 3 of Fire Risk Assessments", et cetera.

How much input did Barbara Matthews have into that 5 document? She was in place by then, wasn't she?

6 A. She was, yeah. Yeah, she would have definitely made 7

comments.

Q. Right. 8

9 Do you know whether RBKC's health and safety adviser 10 would contribute?

11 A. I don't think I would have consulted him on this level 12 of detail

Q. Right, I see. So can we take it that no advice would be 13 sought from anybody at RBKC in relation to your action 14 15 plans such as this?

16 A. I don't think so, no.

17 Q. Right.

18 Did these reports and action plans inform the RBKC's 19 housing department contribution to the joint corporate 2.0 health and safety committee's annual report?

2.1 A. Erm ... sorry, would you mind running that by me again?

2.2 Q. Yes

23 Do you remember that there was such a thing called 2.4 the joint corporate health and safety committee annual 25 report?

82

1 A. That was produced by the corporate safety adviser, yes?

2 Q. Yes.

3 A. Yes

4 Q. Did these reports go to that person?

5 A. No, I don't believe so. I think the annual — my annual

report, health and safety report, went to the corporate 6 7

safety adviser, and then any subsequent information that he requested, not probably this level of detail, because 8

9 they were producing one report for the whole of the

10 council, all of the different departments, and I think

11 it was probably too much detail for them.

12 Q. Do you know if this report or reports like it were put

13 before any RBKC committee, such as the housing and

14 property scrutiny committee?

15 A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. It's also right, I think, that you wrote reports or 16

17 parts of reports for use by RBKC, didn't you?

18

Q. For example, the LGA report, "Extinguishing the risk: 19

A councillor's guide to fire safety"? 20

21 A. Erm ...

22 Q. Let me show you a document.

2.3 A. Yes, please, sorry.

2.4 Q. {RBK00030060}.

2.5 This is a document which was going to go to

1 a committee, looks like it was going to go to the

2 housing, environmental health and adult social care

scrutiny committee, 15 March 2010.

3

Q. "LGA report 'Extinguishing the risk: A councillor's 5

6 guide to fire safety'", and if you go down to the very

bottom, you can see, page 4 $\{RBK00030060/4\},$ that 7

8 although it's signed Robert Black and Laura Johnson --

9 A. Yeah, vou're right, must have been me.

10 Q. Yes, because of the contact, so it must have been you.

11 Is it right that you also drafted the health and 12 safety sections of the TMO's performance reports for

13 RBKC?

A. Yes 14

Q. You did. And you did that, I think — is this right? — 15 16

with Celia Caliskan?

A. Yes, I think they were co-ordinated by my colleague, 17

18 Janet Seward, and then Janet would have sent whatever we

19 thought was our final version to Celia, and if Celia had

2.0 concerns, she would come back to me directly.

21 Q. Yes, thank you.

2.2 I want to turn to a different topic now, which is

23 the start of the FRA programme and Salvus' FRA

2.4 management report in 2009.

25 A. Okay.

Q. Now, can we go, please, to your second witness statement, {TMO00842341/1}, paragraph 3. You say there: "Following the introduction of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005, which abandoned the need for fire certificates in favour of a risk – based approach to fire safety, the TMO was required as part of its management function to ensure that FRAs were undertaken and documented for all communal areas across its stock."

Then you go on at paragraph 4 to say:

"In late 2008/early 2009, the TMO, RBKC and London Fire Brigade ('LFB') entered into discussions about the suitability and sufficiency of the TMO's FRA programme. These discussions resulted in a joint decision to procure specialist consultants to undertake FRAs across the stock and adopt a risk-based approach to the FRA programme.'

Now, is it right that before 2009, the TMO did not engage external consultants to undertake FRAs at all?

19

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

- 20 Q. So it was all done in-house, was it?
- 2.1 A. Yes. With the introduction of the RRO, there was 2.2 a sort of belief that less complex buildings could be 2.3 assessed by internal colleagues with a degree of 2.4 training, which seems to have been fairly common across

25 similar organisations in our sector. I think we got to

1 the stage where we knew that that wasn't sustainable. 2 We were having dialogue with the Brigade, who were 3 saying these aren't suitable and sufficient, and we weren't challenging that. What we were trying to 5 clarify for a number of months was what the Fire Brigade's view of suitable and sufficient looked 6 7 like, and we had some very specific issues that we were 8 trying to get clarity on.

> I won't bore you with them -- I can if you wish -but it was to do with secondary means of escape, which no longer took you to a place of safety, and building control were saying, "You don't need to do anything with these, building regs aren't retrospective", and the Fire Brigade were saying, "Yeah, you need to sort this out, you need to look at finding an alternative means to get people" -- so, actually, it was quite a big issue for us in terms of clarifying what needed to be done and potentially finding a budget, and because I was getting a conflict, I'd arranged a couple of site meetings with parties from both organisations, and there still wasn't clarity, at which point the Fire Brigade lost patience and said, "You need to sort this out now or we're going to issue an enforcement notice".

Q. Just breaking it down a little bit, who was it in-house

86

1 at the TMO who was undertaking fire risk assessments 2 before September 2009?

3 A. It was mostly my colleague Adrian Bowman.

4 Q. What qualifications did he have to do that, so to speak? A. Well, he didn't have the degree of qualifications he 5

needed, he --6

7

A. In terms of what we now require. But, at the time, the 8 9 Fire Brigade were aware that that's what we were

10 endeavouring to do, and initially they were --

11 Q. Right.

12 A. — unfazed by that approach.

Q. What input did you have from RBKC on the FRA process or 13 14 production before September 2009?

15 A. So the conversations with the Fire Brigade started in

16 the June, and at that point RBKC were very engaged in 17

the process of agreeing what we were going to do and

18 adopting a risk-based -- how we were going to do it,

19

20 Q. No, sorry, my question was: what input did RBKC give in 2.1 the process of in-house production of fire risk

2.2 assessments?

2.3 A. They didn't.

2.4 Q. None, right.

2.5 Now, you have mentioned the threat of an enforcement

1 notice --

2. A. Yes

3 Q. -- in 2009. That was 17 June, wasn't it?

A. Yes. I believe so.

5 Yes, and they wanted a competent person to carry out 6

risk assessments, do you remember that?

7 A. Yes, they wanted them to be suitable and sufficient,

8 absolutely.

9 Q. Let's look at a document. Can we go to 10 {LFB00031977/23}.

11 This is an LFB document, and it identifies that on 12 18 June, at the very top of the box, there was a discussion between Team Leader Sangster, TL Sangster, 13 14 and Alexis Correa, who was health and safety adviser for 15 Kensington and Chelsea Council:

16 " ... stating that they will be employing a Risk 17 Assessor and putting money aside to implement all the 18

works necessary. He asked if they do this will 19 TL Sangster not issue Enforcement notice. TL Sangster 20

agreed on the provision that the council/TMO provide us with a schedule of works.

Were you aware of that discussion at the time?

23 Yes, I believe that I was. Alexis Correa was health and 2.4 safety adviser in, I think, what was then the social

2.5 services department.

2.1

2.2

Q. Right. And how come it was RBKC indicating that it 1 assessments so far had not been up to a satisfactory 2 would employ a risk assessor and paying for necessary 2 standard. He explained that through conversations with 3 works and not the TMO, do you know? 3 the officers currently carrying out the Fire Risk A. I don't know, no. 4 4 Assessments he felt they did not have the level of 5 Q. Right. 5 understanding required. Was the threat of an enforcement action or "Keith Holloway ... explained that the fire risk 6 6 7 enforcement notice the principal reason behind the 7 assessments would be carried out by the consultant and appointment of a consultant and the implementation of 8 8 that surveys had gone out to tender. 9 a risk - based FRA programme? 9 "Angus Sangster (LFB) suggested the TMO show the LFB 10 10 A. No, I don't think that's really fair comment. We a copy of the proforma before risk assessments are 11 were -- we knew there was an issue and we were working 11 carried out. 12 "Keith Holloway (TMO) suggested it might be 12 with them to clarify what standards they require so that 13 whatever action we took actually demonstrated the 13 beneficial for LFB to meet with the chosen contractor 14 approach that the Fire Brigade wanted, and that was 14 before any risk assessments were completed. 15 quite protracted and a bit frustrating, really, and 15 "Angus Sangster (LFB) confirmed he would be happy to 16 still hadn't been resolved. So we had already agreed 16 do this " 17 that things would be different, but we were just trying 17 Now, looking at the first part of that, where 18 to clarify how different, and then things took another 18 Mr Sangster is recorded as having said that the TMO risk 19 19 course, really. assessments were not up to a satisfactory standard, did 20 Q. Right. 20 you think that that was a fair observation? 2.1 Now, let's go to the minutes of a meeting about fire 2.1 A. I think we'd been quite clear from our protracted risk assessments in early 2009 at $\{RBK00018535\}.$ 22 2.2 discussions with the LFB prior to this that they were 2.3 This is the minute of a meeting on 6 August 2009, as 23 not happy with the assessments and believed them not to 2.4 you can see, between RBKC, TMO and the LFB. 2.4 be up to satisfactory standard, and therefore it was 25 Now, you're not identified as having been in 2.5 agreed that we were going to act upon that and act 89 1 attendance 1 promptly. The difficulty had been clarifying the 2 A. That's right. 2 standards that the Brigade required in relation to a few 3 Q. Keith Holloway was there for TMO properties, and also, 3 specific but really quite important areas. That's what from RBKC, you can see there was Jean Daintith and had caused the delay. So it's a little bit frustrating, 5 Laura Johnson. 5 but anyway. 6 Q. Right. 6 A. Yeah. 7 7 Q. What was Keith Holloway's role? A. Okay. A. I think he was an interim director. I can't recall what 8 8 Q. But, in fact, this problem had been ongoing, I think, 9 9 his remit —— he might have been an interim housing since 2008, and culminated in this episode. 10 management director, I'm not quite sure. 10 Yes, because we'd had on-site meetings with 11 Q. Do you know why you weren't at the meeting? 11 building control and the Fire Brigade and there still 12 A. I wasn't invited. Other than that, I don't know --12 wasn't a consensus about what standard I'm supposed to 13 Q. Do you know why you weren't invited? 13 follow and which way forward. 14 Q. If you go to the very bottom of the screen and count up 14 A. No, I don't, sorry. 15 Q. Was the detail of the discussion at this meeting 15 seven lines, you can see that Angus Sangster is recorded 16 reported to you? 16 as asking: 17 " ... whether the Council and TMO felt that 3 years A. Yes, it was.

17

18 Q. Did you see a copy of this meeting minute afterwards?

19 A. I think I did, yes.

2.0 Q. Who reported the detail of the discussion to you?

A. I'm presuming it must have been Keith Holloway. 2.1

2.2 Q. Can we go to page 2 {RBK00018535/2}, please, item 5, you

90

23 can see "Fire Risk Assessment(s)" is the title there,

2.4 and it savs:

25 "Angus Sangster ... stated that the TMO risk

18 would be acceptable to carry out risk assessments of all 19 the properties they are responsible for ... " 2.0 Do you see that? 21 A. Yes 22 Q. Then: 23 Both Jean Daintith and Keith Holloway ... agreed. 2.4 "Angus Sangster ... asked whether the Council and 25 TMO felt that 5 years would be acceptable to carry out

5

13

1 all the significant findings identified by the risk 2 assessments for all the properties they are responsible 3

"Both Jean Daintith and Keith Holloway ... agreed."

Were you aware of that discussion and agreement?

A. Yes, I was. 6

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

7 Q. You were.

> Then if we go to page 4 $\{RBK00018535/4\}$, item 10, you can see there it says, in the second full paragraph up, just above item 11:

"Angus Sangster (LFB) replied that he feels TMO need to develop the level of competence amongst their staff.

"He also suggested a member of staff from the council/TMO could be seconded into the LFB in order to gain experience of fire safety procedures."

16 Were you aware of that discussion? Presumably you 17 were if you saw this minute.

- 18 A. Yes, but it never amounted to anything.
- 19 Q. Well, I was going to ask you: was anything done ever to 20 pursue that suggestion?
- 2.1 A. The offer was never made formally, other than the 2.2 suggestion here, and --
- 2.3 Q. No, but did anybody at the TMO ever actively seek to 2.4 take the LFB up on it?
- 2.5 A. Not to my knowledge. I don't know -- I can't speak for

93

- 1 Keith Holloway, but not to my knowledge.
- 2 Q. Right. Was anything else done to develop the level of 3 competence among the TMO staff?
- A. Well, yes, but also there was quite a lot done to
- 5 develop our relationship with the Fire Brigade so that
- 6 we wouldn't have areas where the standards were unclear.
- 7 We --
- Q. That's not quite my question. 8
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. I'm just pressing you a little bit.
- 11
- 12 Q. You can see that the LFB tells TMO that it needs to
- 13 develop the level of competence among its staff.
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Was anything done to develop the level of competence 16 among TMO's staff?
- A. Adrian and I would have had additional training, 17
- 18 definitely , and I can't speak for ... I'm ... I would be
- 19 speculating. I'm sure there was, but I can't remember 2.0 the detail.
- 21 Q. What was the additional training you received in response to this --2.2
- 23 A. We would have sought out fire related, RRO, fire risk
- 2.4 assessment type courses, in terms of being the housing

94

2.5 manager, the landlord, because that's what our

- 1 responsibilities were going to be now we were going to
 - have a competent contractor to do the assessments
- 3 Q. From whom did you seek those fire related, RRO, risk
- 4 assessment courses?
- always checked with my institution, I would have 6
- 7 checked -- I may have asked for a steer from the
- Fire Brigade about what they would recommend, I may have 8

A. I can't remember as I'm sat here now, but I would have

- 9 asked Salvus, I don't know, I would -- there's a range
- 10 of responsibilities , but I can't recall the detail , I'm 11
- 12 Q. Did that training, whatever it was, educate you as to
 - how to go about instructing a fire risk assessor, and
- 14 making sure you knew what to expect from a competent
- 15 fire risk assessor?
- 16 A Yes I believe so
- 17 Q. Right.
- 18 Did that training educate you at that stage -- and
- 19 don't forget, this is early on, this is 2009 -- as to
- 20 the content of PAS 79, 2007 edition?
- 2.1 A. Yes. I would never have been an expert on PAS 79 and
- 22 I didn't think that I needed to be, but I would have had
- 23 an awareness of it. I would have known where to consult 2.4 it. I would have had an overview of it. ves.
- 2.5 Q. Can we then move on in the story, January 2010,

95

- {LFB00031977/30}, please. 1
- 2 This is a letter dated 27 January 2010, and it's
- 3 from, as you can see, Jean Daintith and Laura Johnson on page 1, and it's addressed to Mr Sangster, "Compliance
- 5 with the [RRO]".
- 6 If you go to page $32 \{LFB00031977/32\}$, you can see
- 7 that it's signed by Robert Black and Laura Johnson
- 8 respectively.
- 9 A. Yes
- 10 Q. If you go back, please, to page 1 {LFB00031977/30},
- 11 looking at the first paragraph, it says:
- 12 "Further to our recent meeting at your offices with
- 13 Pam Sedgwick, RBKC's Housing Client Side Manager and
- 14 Janice Wray, the TMO's Health & Safety Advisor, we write
- 15 to confirm our commitment to complying with this
- 16 legislation and to set out our approach to achieving
- 17 compliance."
- 18 Were you aware of this letter when it was sent, do 19 you think?
- 2.0 A. I think it quite likely I drafted it.
- 21 Q. Ah, I was going to ask you that. You think you drafted
 - it. Is that because under the date it says, "Please ask
- 23 for: Janice Wray"?
- 24 A. Yes

2.2

2.5 Q. Yes. And did this agree the action points set out in

7

9

11

- 1 the letter?
- 2 A. "Adopt a risk-based approach ..."
- 3 Q. Yes, if you look at the bottom of page 30 and over to 4 page 31.
- 5 A. Yes. I believe this was just confirming the discussions
- that had been had with the Brigade, that these were the 6 7 points that they'd set out and this is what we'd 8 progressed
- 9 Q. So this is a record of what was agreed at the meeting 10 you were at?
- 11 A. Yes, I believe so.
- 12 Q. Yes, thank you.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

Now, if we go to the very bottom of page 1 and look at the third bullet point there, it says:

"Appoint a competent Fire Safety Consultancy partner to undertake the fire risk assessments in each of the 110 potentially high—risk blocks."

Did the phrase "fire consultancy partner" mean anything specific to you in relation to the level of qualification of the fire consultant that was agreed with the LFB?

2.2 A. "Fire safety consultancy partner" wouldn't be a term 2.3 that I would have used generally, but in the procurement 2.4 process, my procurement colleagues were advising that 25 this is how we define people.

97

- 1 In terms of competency, we set that out in the 2 tender, what we would expect competency to look like.
- 3 Q. Was there any discussion at this stage about competence, about what competence was in this context?
- 5 A. In this context ... sorry, can I see down to the bottom 6
- Q. Yes, of course, if you turn to page 31 {LFB00031977/31}, 7
- which is page 2 of the letter . 8
- 9 (Pause)
- 10 A. I doubt it, because the consultant had been appointed, 11 we had -- all the things that we'd said, we'd shared the 12 pro forma, we'd done joint site visits, we'd asked 13 the Brigade to attend progress meetings, so they'd been 14 fairly heavily involved, so I don't recall there 15 being -- and they were happy. I don't recall there 16 being specific discussions about competence at that
- 17 stage
- 18 Q. No.
- 19 Just panning out from the detail of this document, 2.0 this is January 2010.
- 21 A. Yes.
- 2.2 Q. Now, you will remember that in the September of 2009,
- 23 Salvus had been appointed to do FRAs for the TMO's
- 2.4 stock. Do you know why what we see in this letter is
- 25 being discussed at this point, January 2010, when in the

- 1 summer of the previous year, the TMO had already run
- 2 a selection process for fire risk assessors and had
- 3 appointed Salvus?
- A. I don't know, actually. I'm assuming it was a bit of 4
 - a belt and braces -- perhaps it was -- the four-monthly
- 6 progress meeting, perhaps it was to coincide with that,
- just to confirm that these were the original 8 discussions, this is what we said that we would do,
 - we're just confirming that that's what we've done,
- 10 because the engagement with the Fire Brigade had been
 - ongoing constantly throughout, so they were aware of
- 12 this. I'm assuming somebody wanted a formal record.
- 13 like an audit trail of what we'd done.
- 14 Q. I see. It may be that there is a clue to this in the 15 fourth bullet point at the bottom of page 30 16 {LFB00031977/30}:

17 "Seek a commencement date of September 2009 for the 18 programme of FRAs at the high-risk blocks and completion 19

- 20 A. Yeah.
- 2.1 Q. I mean, this is now almost at the end of that six-month 22 period, so was this essentially backward-looking, at
- 2.3 least this part of the letter?
- 2.4 A. I'm assuming so. I assumed it was to sort of confirm 2.5
- that we had put in place what we had agreed with the

- 1 Fire Brigade would be put in place.
- 2 Q. Right.

3

4

5

12

If we go back to page 2 of this letter $\{LFB00031977/31\}$, the first bullet point at the top of the page, you can see it says this:

6 "Evaluate the performance of the Fire Consultant 7 and, resource-permitting, adopt the same approach to 8 completing the FRAs of the medium and also the low-risk 9 properties. Aim to undertake the programme of 10 medium-risk FRAs at the conclusion of the high-risk 11 programme. Aim to commence the low-risk programme

13 Now, at this stage, January 2010, the high-risk project wasn't quite completed and -- is this right? -14 15 the medium and low-risk hadn't even been put out to 16 tender yet.

immediately on completion of the medium-risk project."

- 17 A. That's right.
- 18 Q. So this part is forward-looking.
- 19 A. Yes
- 2.0 Q. Can you help us with what was discussed in terms of 21 evaluating the performance of the fire consultant there?
- 2.2 At this meeting? I doubt much was discussed. I think
- 23 the Fire Brigade were happy with the progress we were
- 2.4 making, they wanted to be assured that it was going to
- 2.5 be sustained and ongoing, and so that's what we said our

100

1 intention was, to meet the three-year deadline that they a lot of actions that perhaps with a bit more 2 had set out. But I doubt the detail -- as you say, we 2 preparation, and on our part as well as the consultant, 3 hadn't yet completed the high-risk. 3 that actually would have meant less actions coming out 4 Q. Were there any criteria or objective standards 4 5 formulated or identified at the meeting to allow you to 5 evaluate the performance of the fire consultants, so to 6 6 7 speak? 7 8 8 A. Not that I recall. 9 Q. Would you agree that it appears that there was 9 apologies. 10 10 an agreement for this to be done not only for the 11 high-risk properties, but also the medium and low-risk 11 12 12 properties, if resources permitted? 13 A. I ... Yeah, I think the "resource permitting" was about: 13 do we adopt the same approach? But I can't really 14 14 15 confirm. But yes, you're right. 15 Q. Right. And was the agreement that RBKC would also 16 16 17 evaluate the performance of the fire consultant or was 17 18 this just the TMO doing that? 18 19 A. No, no, it was very much a joint initiative . 19 20 Q. What system, then, was established for RBKC to evaluate 20 2.1 the performance of the fire risk assessor? 2.1 2.2 A. Well, they were attending all of the progress meetings, 2.2 2.3 2.3 so they could see where we were at in terms of progress 2.4 2.4 being made against the programme. They could see the

101

1 addressed, and they could see the interaction with the 2 Fire Brigade and the Fire Brigade's requirements. So 3 they were sort of party to the head overview of the

issues which were arising, how they were being

25

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

- ${\sf Q}.$ Who at RBKC would do that? I mentioned Ann Muchmore 5 6 earlier on.
- 7 A. I think it was still Ann Muchmore. At a later time, she 8 was replaced by Roger Keane, I believe, but at this 9 stage I think it was still Ann Muchmore.
- 10 Q. You have covered this, I think, but just answer me again, if you would: what would RBKC's evaluation 11 12 involve?
- A. Erm ... right . I think -- I mean, they've got really 13 the same to go on as I have. I can't recall exactly how 14 15 we did it. It's quite likely that we had a meeting with 16 Janet Rhymes, our professional services officer, who is 17 from the procurement team, and kind of sat down and 18 worked out if we had got what we expected delivered from 19 Salvus. You know, clearly we were getting the FRAs, we 2.0 were largely getting them on time. The plans were 21 coming a bit late, but that wasn't a deal-breaker.

We'd made quite a lot of progress in terms of -there were quite a lot of repeat issues coming up, sometimes because they hadn't asked for documentation, so there was definitely a feeling that we were getting

23 2.4 gathered on the fire safety management systems of the 25 TMO in respect of its property portfolio as per contract

of the assessment So I think we learned a great deal. I think we were perhaps slightly naive going into it about the scale of what we might be asked to provide. Sorry, I'm not sure I'm answering your question, Q. Can I then turn to the instruction of Salvus specifically. Go to your second witness statement. {TMO00842341/2}, paragraph 9. You say there that: "Salvus was instructed by the TMO to carry out FRAs at 110 properties within the RBKC's housing stock identified in this list as potentially high risk \dots " Then you exhibit at JW/3 a list. That, for note purposes only, is at {TMO00842374}. We don't need to go Am I right in saying that the high—risk list included Grenfell Tower? A. Yes, you're right. It did. And Salvus were instructed at the start of September 2009, I think, weren't they? 25 A. Yes, they were.

103

1 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Q}}.$ In fact, the contract was signed on 2 September by the 2 TMO and on 7 September by Andrew Furness for Salvus. 3 Now, in the light of that, can I then ask you about a document produced by Salvus on 22 September 2009, only 5 three weeks or so after they were appointed, and this is 6 at {SAL00000013}. 7 It's entitled "Fire Risk Assessment for Fire Safety 8 Policy and Procedures conducted on behalf of the [TMO]", 9 I summarise. "by Salvus". 10 You can see on page 5 $\{SAL00000013/5\}$, if we just go 11

to page 5, the date, top right-hand corner, 12 22 September 2009. A Yeah

13

16

17

18

 $\mathsf{Q.\ I'\,II\ }$ call this, for shorthand, the Salvus management 14 15 report, if I may. Can I go to the first two paragraphs of the

> introduction on page 2 $\{SAL00000013/2\}.$ It says there: "This Fire Risk Assessment Management report has been completed at the request of Russell Thompson Head

19 2.0 of Asset Strategy and Investment of Tenant Management 21 Organisation (TMO) of the Royal Borough of Kensington 2.2 and Chelsea. "This Management Report reflects information

1 Agreement dated 2nd September 2009." 1 A. Yes. 2 Do you see that? 2 Q. Do you see that? 3 A. Yes. 3 A. Mm-hm. Q. I've shown you, albeit a bit briefly , perhaps, the 4 Q. It looks as if it was the TMO that instructed Salvus. 4 not RBKC: is that right? 5 5 hazards and the identified existing control measures and A. Yes, that's right. those which are not adequately controlled. 6 6 Q. Do you know who within the TMO received a copy of this 7 7 Did you agree with Salvus' conclusions in the 8 8 italics? 9 A. I certainly did, and I imagine Russell did, and I would 9 A. Some I did and some I didn't. How -- we didn't have 10 10 a written fire safety policy statement at that stage. imagine everyone who Salvus regularly dealt with, so $1\ensuremath{^{\prime}} m$ imagining it would be Janet Rhymes and Ann Muchmore. 11 11 That's correct. I looked at this report recently and 12 12 Q. Was it shared in an email exchange or at a meeting, do there are a number of things on here that probably 13 vou remember? 13 shouldn't have been on here. However, some of it, yeah, 14 14 A. I think it came in by email. was absolutely valid. 15 Q. Right. 15 Q. Of the four I've shown you already, 1.1, 2, 3 and 4 --A. Yes. 16 Now, I'd like to show you some of the topics that 16 17 were highlighted by Salvus in it. 17 Q. -- did you disagree with any of those? 18 If we go to page 5 again {SAL00000013/5}, please, 18 A. I think with regard to the one about the premises log, 19 and look at paragraph 1.1, you can see the "Hazard" 19 that was just not going to work for us. It would not --2.0 column there, and under 1.1, it says: 2.0 we wouldn't have been able to ensure that contractors 21 "Lack of a TMO fire safety policy statement." 21 were going to complete that every time they attended the 22 22 Then if you look across to the fourth column, in premises, and so I think we --23 2.3 Q. That's 1.3? italics it says: 2.4 "There does not appear to be an overall TMO 2.4 A. Yes, I believe so. Sorry, it's not on my screen. fire safety policy statement, setting out the 25 Q. Foot of page 5 {SAL00000013/5}, let's just have it up, 105 107 please, 1.3. You say that was impracticable? 1 organisations strategic fire safety objectives, 1 2 including reference to achieving full compliance with 2 A. Yes. When I researched it with colleagues, 3 the requirements of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) 3 neighbourhood and housing management colleagues Order 2005 wherever it applies by premises managed particularly, it was felt that that wasn't going to and/or occupied by the TMO; and which is formally 5 5 endorsed by the Chief Executive on behalf of the TMO." 6 Some specific pieces of kit, for example lifts, are 6 7 7 Do you see that? very good at having a log sheet on site with some 8 8 information. But having one document that's A. Yes. 9 9 Q. Then look, if you can, at 1.2 and 1.3 on page 5, and 1.4 co-ordinated in one location and getting all of the 10 on page 6. Just read those briefly to yourself. At 10 planned preventative maintenance contractors to complete 11 11 it every time they come to the property, it just hasn't 12 "Lack or inadequate TMO policy and arrangements." 12 been possible for us, and then to police it, to go to 13 13 And you can see what's said in the italics under the the site to make sure that it's being completed, is "Existing control measures" there. Do you see that? 14 14 a challenge as well. 15 15 A. Yes. Q. But just to be very clear, apart from the 16 Q. Then 1.3: 16 impracticability of 1.3 --17 "Lack of/inadequate recording systems eg log book 17 A. Yes 18 and/or fire safety manual." 18 $Q. \ \ --$ you agree, I think, do you, with the conclusions in 19 And you can see what's said in italics there under 19 italics relating to 1.1, 1.2 and 1.4? 2.0 2.0 the "Existing control measures" column. A. I agree that we hadn't documented our arrangements in Then if you turn the page to page 6 $\{SAL00000013/6\},$ 21 21 terms of fire safety at that stage. 2.2 2.2 Q. Now, let's just look at that a bit more closely. top of the page, 1.4:

108

policy", "Statement of intent".

Could we please go to {TMO00869720/495}.

This is a document called "Health and safety

2.5

23

2.4

2.3

2.4

25

arrangements."

"Lack of/ineffective managerial audit of fire safety

Again, you can see what's said in italics there.

1 A. Yeah. 1 Q. That's my counting. Would that be right? It's Q. If you go to the bottom of the screen, if you scroll 2 a question just of counting, but would that surprise 2 3 down to the foot of page 495, you will see it's signed 3 you, 19? 4 by Gordon Perry, dated July 2003. 4 A. If you've counted them, then that must be the case. Q. Okay. 5 A. Yeah. 5 Q. That policy, as I say, appears to be dated July 2003. If we look at the second column, "Priority Rating", 6 6 Was that the only policy that was in force at the 7 the majority of the items which are flagged red, if you 8 time of Salvus' review in September 2009? 8 just scroll down the pages, are priority rated 3 or 4. 9 A. I'm sorry, I can't recall. 9 Take that from me that most of them are. 1.0 10 Q. It's not a fire safety policy, is it? A rating of 3 means that the action needed to be 11 A. No, no, it's a health and safety policy statement, but 11 taken within one month. That's right, isn't it? 12 12 I'd be surprised if there hadn't been one in the A. Yeah Q. If we go to page 19 {SAL00000013/19}, perhaps we will 13 intervening years, but I don't recall. 13 $\mathsf{Q}.\;\;\mathsf{I}\;\mathsf{take}\;\mathsf{that}\;\mathsf{point}\;\mathsf{and}\;\mathsf{I}\;\mathsf{was}\;\mathsf{going}\;\mathsf{to}\;\mathsf{ask}\;\mathsf{you},\;\mathsf{it}\;\;\mathsf{doesn't}\;$ 14 14 see that more clearly: 15 appear to have been updated since the introduction of 15 "Key to priority rating ... "3 Undertake action within 1 month. 16 the Fire Safety Order, or the RRO, rather, in 2005. We 16 17 haven't seen a document which did that. Do you know why 17 "4 Action within 3 months or agree plan within 18 that is? 18 6 months ' 19 A. I don't know why that is and I'm really surprised if 19 So you were aware of that, presumably, when you saw their work and you saw how it worked; yes? 20 20 that's the case 21 Q. Did you provide this document to Salvus before they 2.1 A. Yes. 2.2 completed their report, do you know? 22 Q. If we go back, then, to page 13 $\{SAL00000013/13\}$ and 2.3 23 A. Sorry, I don't know. look at a specific action, action 1.2, it says there --2.4 Q. No. Is this the first time you've seen this document, 2.4 and again, this is mostly marked red -- you see: do you think? 2.5 "It is strongly advised that adequate policy and 109 1 A. For a very, very long time, yes. 1 supporting arrangements are introduced to explain how TMO will meet the objectives set out in the strategic 2 Q. Right. 2 3 Going back, if we can, then, to the Salvus FRA 3 policy statement, so as to ensure suitable and management report, please, {SAL00000013/19}. sufficient fire safety is maintained at all times 5 This is the first page of the action plan, as you 5 throughout the managed estate (property portfolio)." 6 That, as you can see, had a priority rating of 4. 6 7 7 A. Yeah. It was a red item with a priority rating of 4. That 8 ${\sf Q}.\ \ --$ at the top. You can see the key. There is 8 means that it should have been actioned within 9 9 colour-coding on the right-hand side. Do you see that? three months or a plan agreed for it within six months; 10 10 11 Q. On the right-hand side: 11 A. Mm-hm. 12 "Key to colour coding 12 Q. Was that your understanding at the time of that specific item? Yes 13 $"{\sf Red} - {\sf Statutory} \ {\sf Breach}.$ 13 If you go to page 18 {SAL00000013/18}, item 9.3, you 14 "Amber - Best Practice/guidance. 14 15 can see there:

15 "Green - Consultant recommendation (additional life

16 risk protection)."

17 Do you see that?

18 A. Yes.

25

19 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Q}}.$ If you then go to the action plan itself on page 132.0 $\{SAL00000013/13\}$, we start with 1.1, and they go up 21

through the pages from page 13 to page 19. 2.2

I've counted 19 areas where the TMO was considered 23 to be in statutory breach, in other words had a red mark

2.4 next to the item.

A. Mm-hm.

evacuation plans in those less serious cases. 112 110

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

employees.

"It is strongly recommended that TMO consider

development of formal procedures to deal effectively

with fire safety issues associated with disabled or

"This should include a range of options from

relocation in severe cases with or without potential

to the provision of specific personal emergency

property adaptations and fixed fire suppression systems

vulnerable tenants and leaseholders, and also any

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

2.5

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

1 "See also recommendations in HM Government guidance 2 and Building Regulations Approved Document M." 3 So you can see from that that there was also a red 4 4 in relation to disabled and vulnerable tenants and 5 leaseholders, and employees; yes? 6 A. Yes 7 Q. How did you plan to address that deficiency at that 8 stage, do you remember? 9 A. At that stage, I think my housing management colleagues 10 were starting to gather more information about vulnerability . I know over the years the method by 11 12 which they did that fluctuated. My plan was to work 13 with the housing managers, who knew their residents, and 14 get them to identify anyone they had concerns would not 15 have the ability to be alerted to a fire or to respond 16 to a fire. And that wouldn't always result in a PEEP, 17 because it -- in some cases it would have been about 18 their sensory deprivation, which could have been and in 19 some cases was rectified by changing how the automatic 2.0 detection in the dwelling worked so that they could be 21

In some cases we certainly had some -- quite a lot of involvement with people who had been identified as potentially hoarding. In those cases what we did was -- some cases they needed cooker -- in extreme cases,

113

sometimes they needed cookers to be cut off. There was a range of things that we had in place.

We would ultimately, and we did in a small number of cases, produce a PEEP, but the reality is, we would -- it would have been unlikely we would have any staff who could assist, because -- so we would have been quite constrained by whatever PEEP was drafted. If the person who was vulnerable had family who could assist, that would be great. If they could, if there was a fire within the dwelling, and they had the wherewithal to leave the flat and close the door, then potentially, at least initially , they're in another compartment, call the Brigade and hopefully the Fire Brigade would be able to assist . But it was going to be a challenge.

15 Q. Let me be a little bit more general.

You were given a list of red deficiencies , some 19 $\,$ 17 $\,$ in all .

18 A. Yes.

22

2.3

2.4

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

Q. I picked on PEEPs specifically because we'll come back
 to it very specifically later on and what you've just
 told us.

22 A. Yes.

25

Q. But in general terms, how did you plan to address thedeficiencies highlighted in the report?

A. Okay. There were a number that were relatively

straightforward to deal with. There were issues which we did fairly promptly about amending the ESAs' checklist so that we ensured that they were checking all of the additional fire safety issues, the final exit door, the signage, the emergency lighting, et cetera, and we did the same for the community officers who worked in the specialised housing schemes. They were done pretty swiftly.

As you know, we'd identified a need for flat entrance doors to be investigated further. That was put in train and ultimately led to a substantial number of replacement doors.

There were issues raised about staff training, but the consultants hadn't asked for the staff training records, so we revisited that, but that was in place.

There were issues raised about workplaces —— there were quite a lot of things which, to give you an example, I believe there is one in here about leaseholders' gas appliances and that the TMO should make sure that those were serviced. Under the terms of the lease, those aren't our obligation, but for many years we had written to every leaseholder annually pointing out the value of having their own appliances inspected and serviced, and also advising them if they sublet their property and took on the responsibility of

115

a landlord, that, actually, under the terms of the Gas Safety (Installation and Use) Regulations, they were required to service these for their tenant.

So there were some things which were already here and actually aren't reflected, and there were quite a few other things that we were able to resolve quite swiftly.

I completely take on board that it took far too long for us to put in writing our policy statement, fire safety strategy, but it was a work in train for a substantial period.

12 Q. We're going to come to that.

13 A. Yeah, okav.

14 Q. We're going to come to that in due course.

Now, can we go to {RBK00053571}. This is a report for the TMO board dated 8 October 2009.

17 A. Okay

18 Q. If you go to page 3 $\{RBK00053571/3\}$, we can see that 19 your name is on it.

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Which is why I'm putting it to you that you prepared 22 that document --

23 A. That's right

Q. -- that's right, isn't it?

25 A. Yeah, that's likely .

- Q. You can see that at page $2 \{RBK00053571/2\}$, 1
- 2 paragraph 3.4, it says:
- 3 "A further meeting was held with Salvus on the 24th
- 4 September to enable them to have sight of our fire
- 5 safety policies, procedures, planned maintenance
- contract etc. The feedback from this meeting is that 6
- generally the TMO have good fire safety policies and
- 8 procedures in place, however, these have not been
- 9 consistently documented. Therefore, the TMO must review
- 10 and update our Fire Safety Policy and Procedures to more
- 11 accurately and comprehensively reflect our good
- 12 practice. The TMO Health & Safety Team has now started
- 13 work on this review."
- Was the meeting on 24 September 2009 itself minuted, 14 15 do you know?
- A. Sorry, I wouldn't know. Normally they were, so if not 16 17 I'd be surprised.
- 18 Q. What fire safety policies and procedures did you show 19 Salvus at that meeting, do you know?
- 20 A. I don't know.
- 21 Q. Did you show them the 2003 policy with Gordon Perry's
- 2.2 name at the bottom?
- 2.3 A. I'm sorry. I don't know.
- 2.4 Q. You don't know.
- Do you know why your report to the board here

117

- 1 doesn't comment on many of the urgent and critical
- 2 concerns raised by Salvus in their 22 September 2009 FRA
- 3 management report?
- A. I think because of timing, the board -- if the board was
- 5 on 8 October, the meeting agenda goes out whatever
- number of days in advance, the report has to be ready. 6
- 7 But, actually, I don't think I received the Salvus
- 8 report until November, because I re-read a progress 9 meeting in November and it said -- it seemed to confirm
- 10 that I'd only just received it. I think, although it's
- 11 dated 22 September, I don't believe I got it until
- 12 several weeks later.
- Q. Right. So you think that the 24 September meeting 13
- 14 happened before you'd seen the 22 September report; is
- 15 that right?
- 16 A. Yes 17 Q. Right.
- 18 A. I'm sure that is the case, yes.
- 19 Q. Right.
- 2.0 At the 24 September meeting, do you remember whether
- 21 Salvus went through their 22 September report, at least
- 2.2 in outline?
- 23 A. I don't believe that they did. I re-read the minutes of
- 2.4 the progress meetings and I think it wasn't until
- 25 November that there was reference to it, but I think we

118

- didn't discuss it then because it seemed to be worded
- 2 that I'd only just received it and I hadn't had the
- 3 opportunity to digest it. But we did discuss it
- 4 subsequently and the issues that I've raised with you 5 about training and leaseholder gas appliances and all of
- those things are all kind of set out in point. 6
- 7 Q. Can you explain why your report to the board contains no comments at all which are urgent or critical? 8
- 9 A. Well, as I say, I don't believe that I had received that
- 10 report, and anything I'd had from them verbally at that
 - point hadn't raised any concerns that needed to go to the board.
- 12 13 Q. Are you saying that at the 24 September meeting, Salvus
- 14 didn't let on to you that they had identified 19
- 15 statutory breaches with a risk rating of 3 and 4?
- 16 A. I'm absolutely sure that they didn't.
- 17 Q. You're sure that they didn't?
- 18 A. Well, unless you tell me otherwise, and I may stand
- 19 corrected, but I really don't think that's -
- 20 Q. What about by 8 October? Are you sure that even by that
- 21 stage you had no idea -- is this right? -- that Salvus
- 22 were going to make those criticisms?
- 2.3 A. I don't believe that I knew, but -- yeah, I honestly
- 2.4 don't believe that I knew, and if I did, it would have
- 2.5 been really remiss of me, but it doesn't sound like

119

- 1 something I would do.
- Q. Did Anthony Parkes have any input at this point? 2.
- 3 A. I think it was still Lornette Pemberton at that stage,
- 4 and --
- 5 Q. Right.

8

18

- 6 Was RBKC briefed about the nature and significance
- 7 of the failings identified by Salvus when you eventually
 - did get it?
- 9 A. I would be confident that Ann Muchmore had a copy of the 10 document and then it got discussed at various progress
- 11 meetings, and she would have been at some of those.
- 12 Q. Indeed. Let's go to one of those, January 2010,
- 13 {RBK00052572}.
- 14 This is a progress meeting of 26 January 2010. You
- 15 can see that you were there, as was Ann Muchmore from 16
 - RBKC, and Andrew Furness of Salvus.
- 17 Did she have a copy or did you have a copy of the
 - 22 September 2009 Salvus report there at the meeting, or
- 19 you'd already seen it?
- 2.0 A. Don't know. I'd definitely already seen it by then,
- 21 ves. but --
- 2.2 Q. And had Ann Muchmore seen it by then? Can we take it
- 23
- 24 A. Yes, I can only assume at this stage that yes.
- 2.5 Q. Yes.

- 1 Now, this was a progress meeting in relation to 2 high-risk blocks. Were meetings like this set up to 3 meet regularly?
- 4 A. Yes. Sorry, I was just going to say that this is 5 a progress meeting with Salvus, so we were trying to have them at least once a month for the duration of the 6 7
- Q. When was the first one? 8
- 9 A. Well, we had a pre-start meeting with them where we 10 introduced them to the Fire Brigade, it was some time in 11 September, and then there presumably would have been 12 a meeting in October. Sorry, I'm not sure, but I think 13 we largely did have one per month.
- 14 Q. Right

15 I'll come back to this in a moment. I'm just trying 16 to get to the bottom of your evidence about when you 17 first, saw the 22 September Salvus report. You say you 18 didn't have it at the meeting of 24 September and you 19 hadn't had it by the time of your 8 October report. That's what you're telling us.

- 20
- 2.1 A. Well, that's what I remember.
- Q. Right. Do you think you had it by December? 2.2
- 2.3 A. I think I had it by November, because I think there is 2.4 a November meeting that references it, but my memory's 25 not as great as it should be, sorry.

121

- 1 Q. Right.
- Let's then look at {TMO00873623}, please. This is 2 3 a report of 10 December 2009 by you, as you can see. 4
 - If you go to page 2 {TMO00873623/2}, you can see paragraph 4.5. You tell the board -- do you see?
- 6 A. Yes.

5

11

12

13

14

2.0

be referenced.

- 7 Q. "We have also received a 'Management Report' from the 8 Consultant which sets out the fire safety framework 9 within which we and our [contractors] should be 10 working.
 - There is no hint in that sentence there or anywhere else in this report we can find of the 19 statutory breaches or any statutory breaches identified by Salvus in their 22 September 2009 report; do you know why that
- 15 16 A. No, I don't, but any reports that I drafted for the 17 board would have gone through my line manager, and she 18 would have also had a copy of the report, so I can't 19 give you an explanation for that. They certainly should
- 21 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Q}}.$ Do you ever remember passing on even the gist of the 2.2 criticisms made by Salvus in their September management 23 report to the TMO board?
- 2.4 A. I can't recall doing it, but I would have -- Lornette 25 and I would have spoken about it at length, so unless

122

- 1 she perhaps took something to them that I'm unaware of, 2 I don't know.
- 3 Q. Do you ever remember a discussion about how much, if 4 any, of that report you were going to communicate to the 5 TMO board?
- A. No, I don't. 6
- 7 Q. Can you account for why, on the face of it, this paragraph says absolutely nothing about any of the 8 9 statutory breaches or any of the defects in fire safety 10 management that Salvus had identified in that September 11 management report?
- 12 A. No. I can't give you an explanation.
- 13 Q. Let's go back, then, to the progress meeting note, please. This is $\{RBK00052572/3\}$, please, at the bottom. 14

15 It says under "4. Salvus Management Report 16 (Fire Safety Policy and Procedures)". 4.1:

17 "Janice had prepared a list of queries she wanted to 18 raise with Salvus and these were circulated and 19 discussed. Responses given as follows (numbering 2.0 relates to the points on the Management Plan) ..."

21 There then follows, if you scroll down to page 4 and 22 on, a list of some 15 bullet point queries.

23 At the bottom of page 3, for example, 3.1 - I'II2.4 iust show you one or two examples —— it says:

"JW advised that training records are available from

123

- the H&S or HR Team." 1
- Then bottom of page 4 {RBK00052572/4}, item 9.1, 2 3 penultimate bullet point there:
 - "JW advised that the TMO Emergency Plan is available to all staff on the Intranet. AF confirmed that this would be sufficient providing all staff have access to the intranet. JW advised that this is the case."

Then top of page 5 {RBK00052572/5}, 9.3:

"Requirement for 'formal procedures to deal effectively with fire safety issues associated with disabled or vulnerable people.' JW outlined the TMO's current approach and asked AF to clarify this requirement. AF suggested that a formal documented system needs to be implemented."

15 A. Yes

2.5

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

- 16 Q. Now, I've shown you those really as a selection.
- 17 It doesn't appear that you raised those queries with 18 Salvus on 24 September 2009, or did you?
- 19 A. Sorry, I ... sorry, this is January, is it?
- 2.0 Q. Yes, this is 26 January --
- A. I'm sorry, I don't know. It will be whatever it says in 21 2.2 the minutes
- 23 Q. Right. Do you know or do you remember what policy 2.4 documents you did show Salvus at the 24 September 2009

2.5 meeting?

- 1 A. No.
- 2 Q. Right.
- 3 It appears from this meeting or the note of this 4 meeting that actions identified in that management report still required actioning; is that right? 5
- A. Some did, definitely, yes. 6
- 7 Q. Were you still required to put in place an adequate 8 policy and supporting arrangements to explain how the
 - TMO will meet the objectives set out in a future
- 10 strategic policy statement to ensure suitable and 11 sufficient fire safety is maintained at all times as per
- 12 action point 1.2 from the --
- 13

- 14 Q. You were?
- 15 A. We still were required to do it because we hadn't had
- the opportunity to. We were trying to go through all of 16 17 them, identify what we already had in place that Salvus
- 18 may or may not have been aware of, identify what was
- 19 left, figure out what the priorities were, get on and 20
- 2.1 Q. And you were required to do that in line with the
- 2.2 timescales in that plan, which was either three months 2.3 or agree a plan within six.
- 2.4 A. Absolutely.
- 25 Q. And what were you doing, agreeing a plan within six or

125

- 1 actually doing them within three?
- 2 A. I couldn't do them within three, I didn't have the 3 capacity to
- 4 Q. Right. Did you ask anyone within RBKC to give you the 5 capacity to do it within three?
- 6 A. No.
- 7 Q. Why is that?
- 8 A. I can't tell you, really . I don't think I thought that
- was an option. I was hoping to get through it as 9
- 10 swiftly and effectively as possible. We made quite
- 11 a lot of progress in quite a short space of time, but 12
- no, we didn't get through it all in the time I would 13 have wanted to
- 14 Q. Why not go for the three months rather than just a plan
- 15 within six? Given that RBKC were effectively at this
- 16 meeting, they were at the table, so to speak, why not
- 17 simply ask RBKC for the support so that you could
- 18 satisfy this recommendation within the three months
- 19 recommended?
- 2.0 A. I can't answer that. I must have felt it wasn't 21 an option, but I can't answer that beyond ... sorry.
- 2.2 Q. You must have felt that it wasn't an option; why did you 23

126

- feel that it wasn't an option? I would like to understand that
- 2.4
- 25 A. We worked in an environment where budgets are

1 constrained, that, you know, there isn't a large pot of

- 2 money that can be dipped into on a regular basis, so
- 3 I must have felt that that wasn't something that was
- 4 available to me. But I can't really tell you any more
- 5 than that. Q. Right.
- 7 A. Sorry

6

- $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Q}}.$ Did you tell the executive team at any point or the TMO 8
- 9 board at any point or RBKC that there was no strategy or
- 1.0 policy in place that met the TMO's obligations under the
- 11 RRO as highlighted by Salvus?
- 12 A. I would have spoken to Lornette, who was the executive
- 13 director with health and safety responsibility . She
- would have been aware of all of the shortcomings and 14
- 15 what I was -- what we were trying to put in place to
- 16 address as many as possible, and she would have -- I'm
- 17 assuming she would have fed into the executive team.
- 18 Q. When Carl Stokes became the TMO's sole fire risk
- assessor in September 2010 --19
- 20 A. Yeah.
- 2.1 Q. $\,--\,$ I'm going to come on to that in a lot of detail
- 2.2 later $\,\,--\,$ do you remember sending him at that time the
- 2.3 Salvus FRA management report of September 2009?
- 2.4 A. I believe I would have done, yes.
- 25 Q. Yes. Why did you send it to him?

127

- 1 A. Well, what I didn't do was update it, which goes back to
- my point about time and record-keeping. I wasn't clear 2
- 3 whether Salvus had shared that with him. I assumed that
- they had, but just in case, for the absence of doubt, as
- 5 our fire risk assessor, he needed to be aware of any
- 6 areas that were still areas of concern.
- 7 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Q}}.$ He told us that he didn't recall seeing it and didn't
 - recall asking you for confirmation that the items had
- 9 been remedied. Is that right, he didn't ask you those
- 10

8

- 11 I don't recall us sitting down and going through the
- 12 document in detail, but we had had discussions about how
- 13 we were addressing all sorts of things and how we'd
- extended -- you know, some specific things like the $\,$ 14
- 15 caretakers' checklists and whatever. So I'm not sure if
- 16 he's right or if he's not, sorry.
- 17 Q. Did you expect Carl Stokes to read the document you sent
- 18 him?
- 19 A. Yes, of course.
- 2.0 Q. Did you expect him to give you any advice about it or
- 21 about, if things had not been done, how they should be
- 2.2
- 23 If he wasn't clear about the progress of any of the
- 2.4 issues then I would expect him to come back and
- 2.5 challenge me and ask for why they were outstanding and

- 1 when they would be completed.
- 2 Q. But I take it you never had any specific discussion with 3 him about that document?
- 4 A. Not that I can recollect, but that doesn't definitively 5 mean it didn't happen, sorry.
- Q. Did you ever expect Carl Stokes to incorporate the 6 7 conclusions from that fire risk assessment management
- 8 report into his own fire risk assessment work for the 9 TMO?
- 10 A. I never really thought about it, to be honest. I think 11 that the deficiencies had been identified and it was for 12 us to resolve them and put effective things in place as 13
- Q. I see. So you didn't regard the outstanding items or 14 15 any of the 19 red statutory breaches identified by Salvus in that report as a matter for your FRA, your
- 16 fire risk assessor, and his FRAs? 17 18 A. To some extent I think that was a question for him.
- 19 I mean, he had the information. I'm confident I would 20 have briefed him on where we were at and how we planned 2.1 to address the ones that were outstanding. We didn't 22 have a conversation that he should or shouldn't put 2.3 things in; he's a fire risk assessor, it's his call what 2.4 goes in the assessment.
- 25 Q. Did you ever tell Carl Stokes about deficiencies in the

- 1 TMO's fire safety management system that Salvus had 2 identified in the FRA management report?
- 3 A. Sorry, I've already given him a copy of the report, so he's got it. I believe I've briefed him on the progress 5 we have made and are making in order to close it down. But beyond that, I don't $\,\ldots\,$ I can't recall any others. 6

7 MR MILLETT: I see.

10

11

12

19

2.0

- Can I then turn to fire safety strategy and policy 8 9 from 2009 to 2017.
 - Mr Chairman, I'm not going to finish this topic $self-evidently\ by\ 1\ o'clock,\ but\ I\ can\ certainly\ make$ a decent start on it in the four minutes available.
- 13 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right.
- MR MILLETT: We've looked at or discussed Salvus' 14 15 recommendations in 2009, particularly that the TMO did 16 not have a fire safety policy statement and that there 17 were inadequate TMO policies and arrangements for 18 fire safety at that time.
 - Do you know when the TMO fire safety strategy was first created in the form of a written document?
- 21 A. No. I know that we published the first version and gave 2.2 the LFB a copy in, I think, November 2013. I thought it 23 had been in existence in one form or another for over 2.4 a year beyond that, so it may have been 2012, I'm not 25 sure.

130

- 1 Q. Right.
- 2 Let's then look at an earlier document. We will 3 come to the November 2013 document now probably after 4 lunch, but let's start with one earlier.
- This is {TMO00870171}. You can see from page 1 that 5 it is a fire safety policy, "TMO Fire Safety Policy", 6 and if you look at page 4 {TMO00870171/4}, please, you 7 8 can see that it's signed by Robert Black and it's dated 9 December 2009.
- 10 Do you know the circumstances in which this document 11 came to be created?
- 12 A. No.
- 13 Q. You sound surprised.
- 14 I haven't seen this forever. Sorry, it's --
- 15 Q. You've never seen this document before?
- 16 A. I must have because it's probably me who drafted it, 17 but --
- 18 Q. Well, quite, and I was going to ask you that.
- 19 A. But I haven't seen it, sorry. Not for many years.
- 20 $\mathsf{Q}.\;\;\mathsf{Let's}$ see how we go, then, in light of that.
- 21 Did the Salvus FRA management report provide the
- 22 impetus for the creation of this document, do you know?
- 23 A. Looking at the timeframe, it looks like probably a first 2.4 attempt at putting something together that met their
- 2.5 requirements. So yes is probably the answer to your

131

- 1 auestion.
- 2. Q. Are you speculating or do you actually recall?
- 3 A. Could we scroll up so I can --
- Q. Go to page 1 {TMO00870171/1}, so sorry, of course.
- 5 A. It's all right.

(Pause)

- 7 It is trying to make a commitment about complying 8 with the RRO.
- 9 Q. It is.

6

- 10 A. I think you're probably right.
- 11 Q. Well, do you know, or are you speculating like I can?
- 12 A. I don't know for sure.
- 13 Q. Right.
- A. I'm sorry. But it's -- so what I can say and what I do 14
- 15 recall is we'd struggled for a long time with automatic
- 16 detection quite some years before this and before the
- RRO came in, and there'd always been a reluctance to 17
- 18 install battery alarms because people were concerned
- 19 about liability issues. So some of this progress made
- 2.0 at May 2006 rings a bell, because I think we changed 21 conditions of tenancy so that if at that stage all we
- 2.2 could install was a battery alarm, at least we could be
- 23 clear about responsibilities for testing it, and --
- 24 Q. But May 2006 isn't -- this is December.
- 2.5 A. Yes, no, I'm just -- sorry, at point 2.1 --

| 1 | Q. Oh, I see. Right, yes | | 1 | (2. | 00 pm) |
|----|---------------------------|--|----|-----|---|
| 2 | A. I'm just fixating on t | hat. So — | 2 | SIF | R MARTIN MOORE—BICK: All right, Ms Wray, are you ready to |
| 3 | Q. There is a lot in this | about AFD. | 3 | | carry on? |
| 4 | A. Right. | | 4 | TH | HE WITNESS: Yes. |
| 5 | Q. Slightly more broad of | uestions. Two-fold. | 5 | SIF | R MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Good, thank you very much. |
| 6 | First, did you pro | ovide a copy of the Salvus report | 6 | | Yes, Mr Millett. |
| 7 | to Robert Black? Did | anybody, to your knowledge? | 7 | MF | R MILLETT: Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. |
| 8 | A. I don't know. I don't | know whether I did or Lornette | 8 | | Ms Wray, before the lunch break, we were looking at |
| 9 | did. I would have th | ought it likely that we did, but | 9 | | $\{TMO00870171\}$. If we could just have that back up on |
| 10 | I can't confirm. | | 10 | | the screen, please. This is the document we looked at |
| 11 | Q. Did this document, th | e TMO fire safety policy dated | 11 | | dated December 2009, entitled "Fire Safety Policy". |
| 12 | December 2009, make | its way back to Salvus? | 12 | | Take it from me that there is no reference in it to |
| 13 | A. Don't know. | | 13 | | fire risk assessments, appointing a fire safety |
| 14 | Q. You don't know wheth | ner they commented on it or had any | 14 | | assistant, fire prevention, general fire precautions, |
| 15 | input into it? | | 15 | | dangerous substances, training of staff or co-operation |
| 16 | A. Truthfully, I don't, I | 'm sorry. | 16 | | or co-ordination with other responsible persons. |
| 17 | Q. And you don't know v | whose decision it was to draft this | 17 | | I am right, am I, in thinking that this document, |
| 18 | document? | | 18 | | insofar as you are familiar with it at all, doesn't and |
| 19 | A. No. I think $$ just | because of what I've just said | 19 | | doesn't purport to implement the Salvus recommendations? |
| 20 | about automatic detec | ction, I think we did have | 20 | A. | It doesn't, you're quite correct. |
| 21 | a document that had | been tweaked and amended over | 21 | Q. | Can we then look at {TMO00870933}. I just want to ask |
| 22 | a period of years, so | it's possible that we've amended | 22 | | you about what this is. |
| 23 | that to take account of | of some of the issues that are | 23 | | It's a document entitled, "Fire Protection Systems |
| 24 | being highlighted, but | : I'm speculating. | 24 | | Policy & Procedure, Latest Working Document 10th |
| 25 | MR MILLETT: Right. | | 25 | | February 2012 Version Seven". Are you familiar with |
| | | 133 | | | 135 |
| 1 | Now take it from | me that this document makes no | 1 | | this document? |
| 2 | reference —— | the that this document makes no | 2 | ٨ | Yes, it was drafted by John Borra, who is the policy and |
| 3 | | BICK: Mr Millett, I'm wondering whether we | 3 | Α. | compliance officer, who was based in assets and |
| 4 | | his after the adjournment, because | 4 | | regeneration, the technical division, and yeah, |
| 5 | | ork to go through this, isn't it? | 5 | | I think there were various versions of it. |
| 6 | · | proposing to because she hasn't seen | 6 | 0 | Right. This one was signed off by the health and safety |
| 7 | it before. | proposing to because site flash t seen | 7 | Q. | committee, as you can see from the box, in June 2012. |
| 8 | | happy to come back to this after | 8 | | Did you have any input into its production? |
| 9 | the break. | nappy to come back to this after | 9 | Δ | Very little , I should think. |
| 10 | | BICK: I think that would be best. | 10 | | Right. |
| 11 | | you had a break now. | 11 | | John was based in the technical division and he had |
| 12 | THE WITNESS: Thank y | | 12 | Α. | ready access to the contracts management team, so |
| 13 | - | BICK: Ms Wray, we're going to stop now so | 13 | | presumably he would have worked with them to put this |
| 14 | | lunch, so we will break there and | 14 | | together. |
| 15 | come back at 2 o'cloc | | 15 | 0 | I see. |
| 16 | | earlier , please don't talk to | 16 | ۷. | You can see from the box that versions 1, 2 and 3 |
| 17 | | dence or anything to do with it | 17 | | are authorised by AD AI&E and then D AI&E. Who is AD |
| 18 | over the break. All r | , , | 18 | | and D? |
| 19 | THE WITNESS: Okay. | = | 19 | Δ | I'm guessing it could be assistant director — |
| 20 | · | BICK: Thank you. Would you like to go | 20 | | Or director? |
| 21 | with the usher, please | | 21 | | Absolutely — well, yeah. Assistant director —— I'm |
| 22 | the defici, picase | (Pause) | 22 | | assuming AD is assistant director and D is director, and |
| 23 | Thank you. 2 o'c | . , | 23 | | Al&E were assets, investments and engineering, which was |
| 24 | (1.02 pm) | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 24 | | the name of the assets and regen division before it got |
| | · ' / | | | | S 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 |

25

changed.

(The short adjournment)

134

- 1 Q. Before it got changed to --
- 2 A. To assets and regeneration.
- 3 Q. I see

6

4 Do you know who finally approved it? It says

"Signed off by H&S Committee". Who was it who signed that off?

- A. Don't know, really. It would have just been wafted in 8 front of the health and safety committee at some stage, 9 but I don't really recall, to be honest.
- 10 Q. How did this document relate to the fire safety policy dated December 2009 that we've seen, or can you not help 11
- 12 us with that? 13 A. I think they're entirely separate.
- 14 Q. Right

15 Was this policy and procedure created in response to 16 Salvus' recommendations to create policies and 17 procedures to maintain fire safety systems?

- 18 A. It may be one of the ... it may be one of the documents 19 that John was putting together as part of his input into 20 that.
- 2.1 Q. Right. I see.

Now, can we look, please, at {TMO00899327}. This 22 2.3 version is dated January 2017, and this is version 8, as 2.4 you can see. This was last updated in June 2012, so it goes from 2012 to January 2017, so it's the next one on.

137

1 A. Okav.

7

15

- 2 Q. Do you know why this document wasn't updated between 3 2012 and 2017?
- A. No. sorry.
- Q. Do you know why it wasn't reviewed in June 2013 as 5
- 6 version 7 suggested it should be? A. No. I don't know that either.
- 8 Q. You don't. Do you know what prompted this document to 9 be updated, what caused it to be updated at that point,
- 10 January 2017?
- 11 A. I can only suggest that it might be because at that 12 stage we were reviewing the strategy document, the fire 13 safety strategy document, and that may have prompted
- John to resurrect anything else that he had. 14
- Q. Can you help us with why, although the date of this 16 document is 10 January 2017, it was going to be reviewed 17 by May 2017, only five months on from that?
- 18 A. Sorry, I can't.
- 19 Q. Right.
- 2.0 You can see that you were the person who authorised 21 this document.
- 2.2 A. Yes.
- Q. You sound puzzled. Why is that? 23
- 24 A. Just because it would normally be signed off by the
- 25 health and safety committee and not just by me.

- 1 Q. Well, it appears to have been signed off just by you.
- 2 We've taken it that you were responsible for this
- 3 document; is that wrong?
- 4 A. Yeah, that's wrong. I mean, it was largely drafted by
- John in consultation with his technical colleagues, and 5
- at that point it would normally have come to the health 6 7 and safety committee for approval, and I would not
- normally sign off somebody else's documentation on my 8
- 9 own, that's not my style.
- 10 Q. I see.

14

15

16

17

18

11 I just want to ask you one specific question about 12 the differences between version 7, which was June 2012. 13 and version 8, January 2017.

Can we have both up at the same time, please. So we've got this one, which is this document. Can we have version 7, {TMO00870933}. I just want to go to page 2 of each document under paragraph 1.2 $\{\mathsf{TMO00870933/2}\}$ {TMO00899327/2}.

19 Under 1.2, you can see that there is a list of 2.0 "Planned preventative maintenance/service visits ...

21 carried out as follows".

22 If you look at the 2017 version {TMO00899327/2} you 23 can see that there is a reference to the automatic 2.4 opening vents as the last item there. Do you see that?

25

139

- 1 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Q}}.$ "Frequency as agreed", and that's absent from the 2012 2
- 3 Do you know why this was added to the fire protection systems procedure in 2017 only?
- 5 A. No. Presumably because it should have been in the
- previous one and, for reasons I don't understand and 6 7 can't explain, it wasn't.
- 8 Q. Well, thank you. My next question was: was the AOV not 9 a significant omission from the previous drafts of this
- 10
- 11

16

17

21

- 12 Q. Yes
- 13 Can I then turn to the document you referred to 14 earlier on this morning, which was your November 2013 15 fire safety strategy.
 - I'd like to start the history of that document, please, with {CST00001187}.
- 18 Now, this is an email dated 18 January 2013 in which 19 you send a draft copy of something called a "Fire Safety 2.0 Policy. DRAFT. Sept 2012" to Carl Stokes.
 - You say to him:
- 2.2 "Attached is a very, very rough draft of this and 23 I would be really grateful for your comments.
- 2.4 Specifically, what else should I include, are there
- 2.5 areas where more detail is required, any other

140

appendices to be included etc. (The last page is a brain dump of other things I maybe should include — what do you think?)

"Really appreciate you help with this as I am sick of the sight of it!"

Then there is something personal in the last line. Now, you can see from the attachments that it's saved as a draft, September 2012.

The attachment is at $\{CST00002046\}$, if we look at that, please.

You've referred to the document as a fire safety policy, but in fact it's entitled "TMO Fire Safety Strategy".

14 A. Yes.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

 $\begin{array}{lll} 15 & Q. & \hbox{Do I take it that there was no substantive distinction} \\ 16 & & \hbox{between calling it a policy or a strategy?} \end{array}$

17 A. No. I probably hadn't just made my mind up at that time, sorry.

19 Q. Very well.

20 Did you draft this document to address one of the 21 failings or more than one of the failings identified by 22 Salvus in their September 2009 —

23 A. Yes, I did.

24 Q. Yes?

25 A. Yes.

141

1 Q. You did.

Was it intended, do you know, to replace or update the December 2009 fire safety policy signed by
Robert Black we saw earlier, or can you not help us, given your ignorance of that document?

A. I think — when I've been pondering the document the

A. I think — when I've been pondering the document that you showed me, I wonder if that was my embryonic start at pulling together a safety strategy document that then got parked in view of other work. I can only assume that was the case. I don't think that was ever adopted. So this would have been to replace that, obviously.

12 Q. Right.

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

Now, for the purposes of drafting this document, do you recall whether you referred to any particular policy documents, such as, for example, the LGA guide, which was by then about a year old, or the sleeping accommodation guide?

A. I thought I would have mentioned the LGA guide. I may
 or may not have mentioned the Sleeping Guide, I'm not
 sure.

Q. Did you seek advice or guidance from the RBKC health and
 safety adviser when you were drafting this document or
 anyone within their department?

142

24 A. I don't believe so.

 $25\,$ $\,$ Q. Did you seek help only, therefore, from Carl Stokes?

1 A. From my colleagues. I think the email that you showed 2 me was sent to Adrian and Cyril, my colleagues.

Q. It was

3

4

5

6

7

8

A. But I would have also consulted widely in the operations division, because I was trying to reflect the practices that they had in terms of inspections and maintenance and all of the other areas that were under their control.

9 Q. Right.

10 A. Sorry, just one last thing: I may have consulted the
11 Fire Brigade on specific aspects of it or if I was
12 looking to be clear that we were adhering to their
13 standards.

14 Q. Right.

Now, we know that Carl Stokes replied with his
comments to you, as you can see from this document, and
he did so on 1 February 2013. We don't need to go to
the email. It is, for reference purposes, at
{CST00030180}.

Do you know what happened to this draft document after Carl Stokes had returned his comments to you on

22 1 February 2013?

A. I don't, other than if it's in a more finalised version,
 I may have sought comments from my line manager or
 comments from other people — any changes he's made, if

1/12

they've impacted on other people's work. I don't know,
 sorry.

Q. Right.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

I just want to pick up one thing in this document $\label{eq:local_state} \text{for the time being, if we may.}$

Can we please go to page 13 {CST00002046/13}, paragraph 24, "Fire procedures". I' II read it to you:

"Staff who are not fully able—bodied and who may need assistance to be alerted to the fire alarm and/or require assistance to evacuate from the office are required to have a Personal Emergency Evacuation Plan (PEEP). The H&S Team will meet with the individual and together they will complete a proforma clarifying their specific evacuation procedure (in some cases this involves the use of a lightweight 'evac' chair and training of staff in it's use) and any additional assistance they will be provided etc. The PEEP will be reviewed on a regular basis and when the needs/ability of the individual change in any way. (A copy of the PEEP Proforma is at APPENDIX 9.)"

That's page 33.

Now, we will come back to that in due course, but it looks from this document as if it attracted no comments from Carl Stokes; that's right, isn't it?

25 A. Doesn't appear to have, no.

5

8

9

- Q. We will come back to that, as I say.
- 2 Can we then move on into 2013, and go, please, to 3 {TMO10002648}

4 These are the minutes of a meeting of the assets and 5 regeneration and repairs health and safety group of

- 18 April 2013, and you are there, as you can see --6

1

7

- ${\sf Q}.\ --$ from the end of the first line of those present. 8
- 9 Yes?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. This group, where did that sit within the TMO's
- 12 structure of committees, groups?
- 13 A. So I think it dates back to shortly after we
- 14 commissioned Salvus, when we were generating fire risk
- 15 actions. Initially I was meeting with managers of the
- 16 teams who were receiving the actions on a sort of
- 17 fortnightly or monthly basis to try and chivvy them
- 18 along and make sure that they were completing the
- 19 actions in the required timeframe. I think that that
- 2.0 group then became more kind of formalised, and because
- 2.1 they were operational people mostly, in relation to
- 22 repairs and contracts management, the assets and
- 2.3 regeneration and repairs health and safety group was
- 2.4 formed, and I think -- I believe John Borra chaired that
- group, as their compliance and policy manager.

145

- 1 Q. Right. What happened to that group?
- A. I don't actually know, to be honest. I'm wondering if,
- 3 once we got a workflow, which was imminently due, it
- came in on 1 August 2013, actually we were able to
- 5 provide them with much better information consistently,
- and I'm -- and then, actually, the operations health and 6
- safety group started at about the same time. So I think
- 8 it got superseded by events, really .
- 9 Q. I was going to ask you whether this mutated, in part, at 10 least, into the operations committee.
- 11

14

2.0

- 12 Q. I see
- 13 Now, can I ask you to look at page 3
 - {TMO10002648/3}, please, item 7.1, "Fire Safety Policy".
- 15 This is under the heading "Risk Assessment - Progress
- 16 Update", fire risk assessment, progress update:
- 17 "Fire Safety Policy: Being drafted, nearly
- 18 completed. Will include inspection frequency,
- 19 evacuation strategy, how we deal with lessee doors etc."
 - Do you see that?
- 21
- 2.2 Q. Now, do you recall a discussion on that subject?
- A. I don't recall it, but we very likely would have had 23 24
- 2.5 Q. Right. And the fire safety policy, is that the document

146

- 1 which had come back to you from Carl Stokes on
 - 1 February 2013 we saw earlier?
- 3 A. Yeah, sorry, I obviously keep interchanging the
- 4 language, which isn't very helpful, but yes.
 - Q. I see, right.
- Let's look, please, at later in the year, 6 7
 - {TMO10004726}.
 - This is a set of minutes of the operational health and safety committee meeting of 15 November 2013. You
- 1.0 are present, second item down, and you can see some
- 11 other names from the assets and regeneration and repairs 12
- health and safety group earlier in the year. 13 By now, can we take it that the operational health 14 and safety group was up and running?
- 15 A. Yes.
- Q. If you go, please, to page 6 $\{TMO10004726/6\},$ and look 16 17 at the last bullet point under "AOB", that reads:
- 18 "Fire safety policy - We need to provide the LFB 19 with our policy in mid-December.
- 2.0 "Janice will circulate the draft policy and would 21 welcome feedback in advance of this deadline."
- 22 Is the draft policy the document that you had sent 23 to Mr Stokes in the January of that year and had got
- 2.4 back from him on 1 February with the yellow and green
- 2.5 highlighting?

147

- 1 A It would seem so
- 2. Q. Yes. Did you in fact circulate a draft or the draft 3 policy before that time?
- A. I probably circulated it several times because it was in 5 preparation for far too long, as you can see.
- 6 Q. Right.

8

- 7 Do you remember what the document was that you were
 - looking at at this meeting, or referring to at this
- 9 meeting? Was it the one which Mr Stokes had sent back
- 10 to you in February or had there been further changes to
- 11
- 12 A. I believe there would have been further changes to it.
- 13 Q. Right. Do you know when those had been made or what 14 they said or --
- 15 A. Sorry, I don't off the top of my head.
- 16 Q. We haven't seen, I think, any of those.
- 17 Do you remember getting any feedback from this
- 18 meeting on that draft, assuming it to be the same
- 19 document, or substantially the same document?
- 2.0 A. It's likely that they would have taken it away and
- 21 I would have had any comments back by separate email.
- 2.2 Q. Right. All right.
- 23 Then let's go to the strategy itself , $\{TMO00830598\}$.
- 2.4 This is the document we looked at earlier on this
- 2.5 morning.

- 1
- 2 Q. And on page 15 it has November 2013 and your name at the 3
- 4 Is this the document that was referred to at the 5 operational health and safety committee meeting on
- 15 November, do you think? 6
- Q. Do you remember whether you received any comments on the 8
- 9 substance of this document from the members of the 10
- health and safety committee, the operational health and 11 safety committee?
- 12 A. I don't know — I don't know, is unfortunately the
 - answer, but there's clearly quite a lot in here about
- neighbourhood inspections and suchlike, so I would have 14
- 15 had to be clear that what was in here reflected their
- 16 working practices.
- 17 Q. Right.

- 18 A. So if I didn't get feedback, I would have been chasing
- 19 them just to confirm that this was an accurate
- reflection of what they were doing. 20
- 2.1 Q. Do you remember whether you based it on the rough policy
- 2.2 document you had sent to Carl Stokes in January and he
- 2.3 had come back to you on 1 February?
- 2.4 A. Probably
- 25 Q. You don't recall?

149

- 1 A. No, sorry.
- 2 Q. Do you remember starting from scratch after
- 3 February 2013?
- A. No, no, that was my working document. It may have
- 5 changed many times subsequently, but yeah, it was based 6
- 7 Q. When drafting it, what materials did you work from or
- 8 refer to, do you think? Go back to the first page, if 9 you would, please {TMO00830598}.
- 10 A. I know that there were some appendices, I think. Did we
- 11 append the ESA checklist and suchlike?
- 12 Q. Yes, well, if you go to page $16 \{TMO00830598/16\}$, you
- 13 are right that that is appendix 1. Just pop that up,
- page 16. "Estate Staff Inspection Checklist", that's 14
- 15 appendix 1, so that was appended.
- 16 A. Yes.
- Q. You drafted that, I assume, did you? 17
- 18 A. I didn't draft the original, but I added to it and
- 19 reviewed it and worked with Martin Barr, the estate
- 2.0 services team leader. 2.1 Q. Right.
- 2.2 Was it this document that you gave to Nick Comery of

150

- 23 the LFB at the bi-monthly meeting --
- 24 A. Yes.
- 2.5 Q. -- in December?

2

7

11

13

2.4

7

- Q. It was. Did the LFB comment on that?
- 3 A. No, actually.
- 4 Q. They didn't?
- A. Never came back to me. 5
- Q. Just for reference purposes, that's {LFB00000987/2}, 6
 - item 9. There is no need to turn it up, given your
- 8 crystal clear recollection of it.
- 9 Can I then ask you about the next operational health 1.0 and safety committee meeting on 17 January 2014,
 - {TMO00840384}.
- 12 First page, third bullet, minuted:
 - "Fire policy Michael and Janice will meet to
- 14 discuss any changes
- 15 "Janice informed the group that the Fire Brigade 16 have already been given the draft; however the finalised
- 17 version can be signed off at next months meeting."
- 18 Had the fire safety strategy that we saw not been
- 19 approved by this time or had it been approved?
- 20
- 2.1 Can I just clarify? So Michael was only recently
- 22 appointed. He was the Repairs Direct health and safety
- 23 manager, and --

That's Michael Lyons?

25 A. Yes, that's right. And I had already signed it off and,

151

- 1 as you say, given a copy to the Fire Brigade, but
- 2 I thought, well, there was value in him seeing what our
- 3 strategy looked like, and he might have had something
- useful to contribute. We could always have reviewed and
- 5 gone for a subsequent version. So I gave that to him,
- and -- well, probably you'll lead me on to it, but he 6
- sent back something that was entirely different and 8 based on a structure that we didn't actually have. So
- 9 in all of the documentation there is a fire safety
- 10 policy which was allegedly written by Michael and myself
- 11 that we never adopted because it didn't reflect working
- 12
- 13 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Q}}.\ \ \ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ think you have encapsulated, in summary, what $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$ am
- 14 going to come on to.
- 15 A. Sorry.
- 16 Q. No, it's all right. Just at this stage, though, on what
- 17 was happening at this time --
- 18 A. Yes
- 19 Q. $\,--\,$ you had drafted the November 2013 fire safety
- 2.0 strategy, you had given that to the LFB in December,
- 21 they'd effectively approved it --
- 2.2 A. Yeah.
- 23 -- but at this meeting, Mr Lyons is brought on board and
- 24 he's going to have another look at it?
- 2.5 A. Well, he's their health and safety manager. I wasn't

- sure whether he'd have any comments to make, but it was important that he saw it, because obviously he's responsible for the responsive repairs. So if there are things in there that he feels need to reflect their working practices differently or their timeframes or whatever, now was the time to find out, really.
- Q. What was his role in the fire safety strategy?
- 8 A. Well, Repairs Direct were always kind of entirely
 9 separate, but obviously, when there are actions that are
 10 of a responsive nature, then they need to be allocated
 11 to them. So, from my perspective, I saw him as
 12 expediting anything that needed to be done, making sure
 13 it was done to the right standard, that it was done to
 14 fire resisting (inaudible), et cetera.
- Q. Did you discuss any substantive changes withMichael Lyons?
- 17 A. No, and I was rather surprised that, when he responded 18 to my email, it was with an entirely different document, 19 not the one I sent him.
- 20 Q. Okay. Let's just take this in stages, then.

You say that the LFB were provided with a copy of the draft fire safety strategy. Did they ever get a further version beyond the one that Mr Comery got in December?

25 A. No, they didn't.

153

- Q. Moving on in time, we know that the next operational health and safety committee meeting was on21 March 2014. Let's look at the minutes of that, but really I'm asking you a series of negatives.
- 5 {TMO00844024}. There is the minute of it.
- 6 A. Okay.

1

2

3

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

Q. There it is, 21 March 2014. You are present, as isMichael Lyons.

Now, one can scroll down through this document, but take it from me that there is no reference in this minute to the fire safety strategy or policy. Do you know why that was?

- A. Possibly. When I received Michael's email appending an entirely different document, I looked through it and it set up a structure for managing fire safety which wasn't the one that we currently had, and it seemed to reflect that the oversight of the fire risk assessment process would be a contract manager role, newly created, reporting to Alex Bosman, and so I sent — which was news to me. I hadn't been made aware that there were going to be substantive changes.
- 22 So I sent the copy of the policy through to
 23 Anthony Parkes, my line manager, and said, "Actually,
 24 Michael's given me this, does this reflect a change
 25 that's going to happen?", and he came back and said no,

154

- 1 that wasn't the case, that -- I imagine that those
- 2 discussions must have been had and ultimately they must
- 3 have decided not to progress that, but I wasn't party to
- 4 any of those conversations, so I can't really tell you
- 5 anything more than --
- 6 Q. No, I'm just trying to work out what happened to the
 - November 2013 fire safety strategy. It was signed off
- 8 by the operations committee and the LFB, but then was
- 9 left open. Does this tell us that because of the 10 arrival , if you like , of Michael Lyons, the
- November 2013 fire safety strategy was never actually
- formally approved and adopted by either the operational
- 13 health and safety committee or the health and safety
- 14 committee?
- 15 A. No, it was.
- 16 Q. It was?
- $17\,$ $\,$ A. It was adopted, it was merely -- from my perspective, it
- was finalised . I wouldn't have given it to the
- 19 Fire Brigade if I didn't feel it was. It was just as
- 20 a courtesy, because Michael was new and he was integral
- 21 in getting some of the actions progressed, it felt like
- he at least ought to be aware of what we were saying,
- $23\,$ but also, if he felt strongly that something needed to
- $24\,$ be edited, I wanted to give him the opportunity to do
- 25 that.

155

- 1 Q. I follow. That's very clear.
- Now, I think we can take the rest of this a little bit more quickly.
- Can we go, please, to $\{TMO10040770\}$. This is a 2014
- 5 fire safety policy:
- 6 "Author Job Title: Health and Safety Manager.
- 7 "Date of issue: January 2014.
- 8 "Review date: January 2015."
- 9 At the very bottom of your screen, you can see
- 10 "Author: Michael Lyons".
- 11 A. Yes
- 12 Q. Is this the document that arrived in your inbox from
- 13 him --
- 14 A. I believe it is, yes.
- 15 Q. which you were not expecting?
- 16 A. No.
- 17 Q. Right.
- Now, there are various iterations of this document,
- but the most recent one we have is at {TMO00856458}, and
- 20 it's got an issue date of May 2014, as you can see
- 21 there, with joint authorship at the bottom, you and
- 22 Michael Lyons.
- 23 A. Yeah
- $24\,$ $\,$ Q. Do you recognise that document?
- 25 A. No.

- 1 Q. Can you explain how your name appears as author?
- 2 A. I can't. If -- I'm sure this is the same document which
- 3 clearly shows the fire safety function sitting within
- 4 the contracts management team, in which case I would
- 5 never have authored that document because that did not
- 6 reflect our structure.
- 7 Q. You sound as if you're familiar with this; is that 8 because you've reviewed this document closely before
- 9 giving evidence so you can say that?
- 10 A. I think I've scanned it. I'm confident that I've 11 scanned it.
- 12 Q. Fair enough, all right.
- 13 So can we take it, then, that this document, as it 14 vere, came from nowhere and went nowhere?
- 15 A. Pretty much.
- Q. Right. 16
- 17 Let's move on, then, into May 2014 proper, $\{TMO10006358\}, \ and \ I'm \ going to ask you about$ 18
- 19
- 2.0 What I'm showing you is a minute from the 21
- operational health and safety committee meeting on 22 16 May 2014, and you are present. You can see that
- 2.3 Peter Maddison and Sacha Jevans were also present.
- 2.4 If you go to page 3 {TMO10006358/3}, under the item
- 25 "Progress with review" -- it's actually part of 3,

- I think, although the 3 has gone a bit awry:
- 2 "Progress with review/adoption of Matt Hodgson's H&S policies ." 3
- Do you see that?
- 5 A. Mm-hm.

1

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- 6 Q. It says:
 - "SJ [Sacha Jevans] raised concerns over the lack of formality of signing off new processes. PM suggested that that JW should take the comments/feedback from this group to Anthony Parkes before presenting to the Board.
 - "The group discussed how best to finalise/implement Matt's policies and it was agreed that this should be tied into the session with ET on 3rd June as well as including it within the report to the Board meeting in Julv.
- A. Yes. 16
- 17 Q. Now, "Matt's policies", is that a reference to 18 Matt Hodgson?
- 19 A. It is, yes
- 2.0 Q. And his role was, what, to include providing health and 21 safety services to the TMO: ves?
- 2.2 A. He was engaged by Anthony and Robert, I believe, to have 23 a look at health and safety across the organisation.
- 2.4 This was in -- an action in the follow-up to the audit
- 25 report which got limited assurance. So he was appointed
 - 158

- to do that, he interviewed quite a few of us and he
- 2 eventually produced a report which he presented to exec
- 3 team which made quite a lot of recommendations. I think
- 4 you might have showed me some of it earlier, the one
- 5 where he said I was the competent person, that one.
- 6 Q. Yes.
- 7 A. So there were a range of things that he recommended, and
- 8 some of them were fairly specific policies around
- 9 Legionella and suchlike, and he went on $--\ {\rm I}$ presume he
- 10 was then commissioned to go on and draft some of these
- 11 policies . But --
- 12 Do you know why -- I'm so sorry.
 - A. No, no. I was going to say, at this stage I think there
- 14 was some frustration about there not being any formal
 - sign-off for the policies that he was drafting.
- 16 Q. Right. Was his role to include fire safety policy?
- 17 A. No, I don't think he really had a remit specifically in 18 regards to fire safety policy.
- 19

13

15

- 20 Why was Sacha Jevans concerned about the lack of 21 formality about signing off new processes, do you
- 22 remember?
- 2.3 It was -- I mean, I ... sorry. Anthony, from the -- to Α.
- 2.4 the best of my recollection. Anthony engaged Matt. and
- 25 I had never seen his brief, so I wasn't really clear

159

- 1 what he had been asked to do, but that was absolutely
- 2 fine. But then I think the brief also changed, and
- 3 I think Sacha's frustration was that she was perhaps not
- party to those conversations. I assumed they were had
- 5 with all of the executive team, but perhaps not.
- 6 Q. Right.
- 7 A. So there were things happening that she was unhappy with or she felt related to her areas and she perhaps didn't 8
- 9 have control over or oversight of. I'm speculating, but
- 10 that's my sort of memory of --
- 11 Q. No, that's okay.
- 12 In simple terms, what was the reason why
- 13 Matt Hodgson was retained in the first place?
- A. I think it was in relation to the limited assurance 14
- 15 audit, and there was a view; well, let's have a more
- 16 rigorous look at all of our compliancy, all of our
- 17 health and safety issues and see if there are any issues
- 18 that we need to tease out, rather than just look at the
- 19 RBKC audit, which was fairly short, fairly brief.
- 2.0 Q. Now, there is no reference here to the 2014 fire safety
- 21 policy, or indeed in any of the health and safety
- 2.2 committee meeting minutes in 2014. Is that because, as
- 23 you agreed with me earlier, the Michael Lyons draft went
- 2.4 in one ear and out the other?
- 25 A. Pretty much, yeah. I mean, it wasn't adopted because it

- 1 didn't reflect our practice.
- 2 Q. Moving then on to 2015, can I just show you something
- 3 from Alpesh Patel, this is {RBK00058245}. This is
- 4 Alpesh Patel's second witness statement to the Inquiry,
- 5 and he's explaining the March 2016 RBKC audit of TMO's
- health and safety system. That's his statement on the 6 7 screen.
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. Do you remember him being involved in the 2016 audit?
- A. Yeah, he was involved in several audits, and so 10
- 11 obviously, in doing that work, he would spend some time
- 12 with my colleague. Adrian, and with myself.
- 13 Q. If you go to page 12 {RBK0005824512}, paragraph 32, you will see that he says this at the end of the third line: 14
- 15 "The testing schedule shows that Janice Wray
- 16 provided me with examples of the latest internal
- 17 policies and procedures, which had recently been
- 18 refreshed and updated. Examples of which included the
- Water Management Policy and Water Management Procedures 19
- 2.0 ... Asbestos Policy ... Gas Access and Gas Safety Policy
- 21 ... and Fire Safety Policy and Strategy (AP2/38)."
- He exhibits AP2/38, and that is at $\{RBK00058236\}.$ 22
- 2.3 Let's just tease that out.
- 2.4 It's a document, as you will see, entitled
- "Fire safety policy & strategy", which is how he

- 1 correctly refers to it, and it's in a format we saw
- 2 earlier, the Michael Lyons format.
- 3 A. Yeah, it is.
- Q. It's dated May 2014, with a review date of 2015, and you 5 are the author at the bottom.
- Do you recognise this document? 6
- 7 A. Not at first glance. Could I look inside?
- Q. Absolutely. Let's go to page 3 $\{RBK00058236/3\}.$ 8
- 9 A. Okay. It looks, at a glance, like me reformatting what
- 10 we already had in our strategy document.
- 11 Q. Being the November 2013?
- 12 A. Yes. It may well go -- looks like it goes beyond that
- and it mentions the LGA guide, so it looks like 13
- 14 a slightly updated but sort of --
- 15 Q. Right. We've seen no record that this document was ever
- 16 presented to the operational health and safety committee
- 17 for approval; is that correct?
- 18 A. Yes, it probably is.
- 19 Q. Do you know whether it was ever approved and adopted 2.0 formally?
- 2.1 A I don't
- 2.2 Q. Given that we have no record that the health and safety
- 23 committee approved this document, do you know under
- 2.4 whose authority it was issued, if it was ever issued?
- 25 It says "Date of issue: May 2014". Do you know whether

it was actually issued?

- 2 A. I don't believe it was.
- 3 Q. Right.
- A. I wonder if it was in a draft version that I gave to 4
- 5 Alpesh. I can't --
- Q. Why would you have given it to Alpesh Patel if in fact 6
 - it was never approved?
- A. Well, if I'd explained that it was a draft version that 8
- 9 we were looking to work to -- I don't know, that's all
- 10 I can suggest.
- 11 Q. Right. On our review, the content is closely similar,
- 12 or similar at least, to the November 2013 fire safety 13
 - strategy you drafted and which was approved.
- 14

7

- 15 Q. Was this intended to be a revised version of that
- 16 document?
- 17 A. I think that the feedback I had from Anthony Parkes to
- 18 the document that Michael Lyons produced sort of said,
- "Oh, I like this aspect of it and I like that aspect of 19
- 2.0 it", and I maybe took on board some of what he said and
- 21 tried to redraft. But this didn't get adopted. We were
- 22 still $\,--\,$ we're still on 2013, apologies.
- 2.3 Q. Right, okay. Then let's move into 2016 proper.
- 2.4 Can we go to your first witness statement, please.
- 2.5 at paragraph 190, {TMO00000890/42}. You say there:

- 1 "In November 2016 it was agreed between the TMO
 - Health and Safety Committee and the RBKC that the TMO
- 3 Fire Safety Strategy would be revised ...'
- Pausing there, would you agree that the process for
- 5 reviewing the fire safety strategy started in
- April 2016? 6
- 7 A. Yes.

2

- 8 Q. And we know that because there is a health and safety
- 9 committee meeting on 12 April 2016 where that's referred
- 10
- 11 A. Yes, that's right. I think RBKC got involved by
- 12 November, because that's when we were talking to them
- 13 about budgets for self-closers and --
- 14 Q. Right. Let me just put that up on the screen so
- 15 everybody can see what you and I are talking about.
- 16 It's {TMO10012811}. Let's have page 1 to start
- 17 with, to show you the date and the attendees of the 18 meeting. We can see you're there, 12 April 2016.
- 19 At page 4 {TMO10012811/4}, please, bottom of page 4,
- 2.0 item 6, "Review of Fire Safety Policy and Strategy":
- 21 "Janice advised that it was timely to review our
- 2.2 fire strategy to ensure that it continues to be 23 compliant with legislation and best practice and that we
- 2.4 are able to effectively control the fire risks that we
- 2.5 face."

1 The result of that was, as you say in your 1 The fifth is about FRAs, and if you look at the third 2 statement, that there should be a revision. 2 bullet point or sub-bullet point there, it deals with 3 Let's go, then, to {TMO10024351}. This is the 3 material alterations, do you see that? 4 document that you presented, I think, to that meeting. 4 A Mm-hm $\mathsf{Q}.\ \ "\dots\ \mathsf{significant}\ \mathsf{changes}\ \mathsf{to}\ \mathsf{block}\ \mathsf{or}\ \mathsf{type}\ \mathsf{of}\ \mathsf{resident}\ \mathsf{or}$ Just confirm that, first of all. It's a document 5 5 entitled "Review of Fire Safety Strategy", paper 4, so major fire ... " 6 6 7 is that a document --7 Then the sixth bullet point: 8 8 A. It looks like it. "Stay put evacuation strategy - better publicity? 9 Q. Page 2 has your name at the bottom. Just go to that. 9 Now, that was in paper 4, that's what you produced 10 10 A. April, yes. for the health and safety committee; do you know whether 11 Q. And a date of April 2016. 11 this paper was presented to any other TMO committee or 12 12 If you go back to page 1 and look at the second the executive team or senior management team, SMT? 13 paragraph of that, you say: 13 It would be my assumption that because this committee "The Health & Safety Committee is encouraged to 14 14 feeds directly into the executive committee, and 15 provide their views on our current strategy and any 15 Barbara's role is executive team health and safety changes that they feel are required. To assist with 16 16 person. I would assume that she discussed this with 17 17 this process a copy of the current strategy is attached them. Also, as you know. Sacha's also on this group, so 18 and some initial points for consideration are summarised 18 we've already got two members of executive team who are 19 19 kind of engaged in this process. I can't tell you what 2.0 If you look at page 3 {TMO10024351/3}, the current 2.0 goes to senior management team, because I was never 21 strategy is there. That's the November 2013 version of 21 a member and I didn't see their agendas or I don't even 22 the fire safety strategy? 22 know how frequently they met, so I wouldn't be in 2.3 2.3 A. Yes a position to advise on that, sorry, 2.4 Q. But with a note which says "For review April 2016". 2.4 Do you know or can you remember what triggered this list 25 Again, just to be absolutely clear, page 20 2.5 or this suggestion that there should be a new review and 165 167 1 $\{\mathsf{TMO10024351}/20\}$ is where we see your name and date, 1 that it should include these points? November 2013. 2 2 A. We need to review things regularly. The most obvious 3 A. Okay. 3 reason for it being now is the Adair Tower fire, which Q. So it looks as if, certainly by April 2016, the had obviously just happened. But there's a lot of 5 November 2013 fire safety strategy was still in force; 5 things here that we've been thinking and pondering about how we could do differently or how we could do better, 6 6 7 A. Yes. so this is just me kind of doing a brain dump of things Q. And hadn't been superseded by the 2014 Michael Lyons 8 8 that I think should be considered, but obviously it's document or the 2015 document that you gave to 9 9 not necessarily comprehensive, it's just a starter for 10 Alpesh Patel in the spring of 2016. 10 ten. really. 11 11 Q. If we go back to where we were in your statement, 12 Q. Yes? 12 paragraph 190 at page 42 {TMO00000890/42}, please, you A Yes 13 13 "The main changes we intended to implement were Q. Right, that's very clear. 14 14 15 15 Now, if we go, please, to page 1 of this document a more proactive approach to the installation of 16 $\{TMO10024351/1\}$, we can see that you say in the first 16 self -closing devices flat doors ... " 17 17 paragraph: Do you see that? 18 "It is timely to review this strategy to ensure that 18 A. Yes. 19 our policies continue to comply with legislation and 19 Q. "... across the stock, an increase in the frequency of 2.0 2.0 London Fire Brigade advice/guidance and requirements." FRAs and a requirement for Fire Action Notices in the 21 21 Pausing there, you set out, after the second communal entrance lobbies of all blocks. I provide the

2.2

23

2.4

25

history ... "

is "Fire extinguishers, hose reels, dry & wet risers". $166 \label{eq:166}$

paragraph, a long list of bullet points for review. The

The third is "LFB Home Fire Safety Visits". The fourth

second one is "Management Arrangements for Fire Safety".

168

to an agreement with RBKC to cover those topics.

Now, at the beginning of that paragraph, you refer

Who was it at RBKC who was involved in the decision

2.2

23

2.4

- 1 to make those changes, do you know? 2 A. My understanding is that Barbara -- was it called joint 3 management team? I think Barbara discussed with Laura 4 and Laura's colleagues. I don't know at what stage the engagement started, but the decision about self-closers 5 6 and inspection programmes was discussed with, I believe,
- Q. We then come to 2017, and I just want to ask you about 8 9 the version of the fire safety strategy in play in that 10 year. It's the year of the fire.

Laura and possibly also Amanda, I'm not clear.

11 {TMO10017036}. This is the TMO fire safety strategy 12 dated June 2017.

13

7

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

1

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

Q. If we go to page 17 $\{TMO10017036/17\}$, we can see it 14 15 bears your name and date.

> I'll come back to -- well. I may not need to. In your statement, can we just look at your first statement, please, at page 41 {TMO00000890/41}, paragraph 186. You say:

"At the time of the fire the TMO had in place a Fire Safety Strategy, which was an overarching strategy document outlining how fire safety was to be approached by the organization ...

You refer to the document I've just shown you. "I produced the first draft which was reviewed by

169

the Health and Safety Committee before it went to the Executive Team. I am aware that there are many draft versions of this Strategy as it was often reviewed and discussed however a version was always in force at any given time."

Then if we go to paragraph 191 of your statement, page 42 {TMO00000890/42}, it says:

"At the time of the fire in June 2017, the updated TMO Fire Safety Strategy was in its final draft stage and I recall that we had a final review meeting the day before the fire ... The updated Strategy took longer to implement than expected due to lengthy discussions that took place between Barbara Mathews and the RBKC in respect of the process and programme for retrofitting self —closing devices to every flat entrance door in the stock. I was not involved in these discussions however my understanding is that the TMO recommended completing the retrofitting programme within three years whereas the RBKC required the programme to be completed over five years.'

Now, is it right, therefore, that the 2017 fire safety strategy was still under review at the time of the Grenfell Tower fire?

170

24 A. It was agreed on the 13th. It was agreed at the meeting 2.5 the day before.

1 Q. It was agreed. I see.

2 A. Yeah

3 Q. So it was in place at the time of the fire in that 4

5 A. Yeah.

Q. Right. 6

7

8

9

10

Now, given that the process of revision had started in April 2017, do you know why the updated version of the fire safety strategy only reached the TMO health and safety committee in June of that year?

11 A. I think, without going back in the minutes -- and the 12 minutes will be clear. I think it had been to the 13 committee on at least one or two occasions before, but 14 there was quite a lot that we were tweaking and we were 15 looking to review, and there were things like in terms 16 of the self-closer programme, we were asked to obtain 17 prices, and there were various things that were outside

18 of my control that I needed to get responses to. I --19 just unfortunately these things take longer than you

20 would ever wish them to.

2.1 Q. Yes.

2.2 Now, I want to go back to the FRA programme and what 23 happened with that.

2.4 Now, it's right, isn't it, that the high-risk programme of FRAs had been undertaken by Salvus?

171

1 A Yes

2.5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{Q}}.$ And that that programme came to an end in March 2010. 2.

3 A. Yes

Q. If we go to your first witness statement at page 30 5 $\{TMO00000890/30\}$, please, paragraph 135, we can see what 6 you say there. You say:

"At the commencement of the High Risk FRA programme one of the commitments we gave to the LFB was that we would evaluate the performance of our Fire Risk Consultant. This was jointly undertaken by the TMO and RBKC at the conclusion of the programme in February 2010 and it was decided that we would undertake a procurement exercise to appoint a Fire Risk Assessor for the medium and low risk phases of the programme."

Now, why was that commitment given to the LFB, do vou know?

17 A. Well, I think they wanted to be assured that even though 18 we were doing all sorts of checks and including them in 19 vetting pro formas and attending progress meetings, that 2.0 if we had any concerns or issues, we would address them, 21 we wouldn't let problems continue. I'm not suggesting 2.2 there were any, but I think it seemed reasonable to be 23 reviewing progress.

24 Q. Was the evaluation of Salvus carried out?

2.5 A. Yes, I believe it was

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

2.5

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

2.4

25

3 We were quite happy for Salvus to be one of the people 4 on the list, but I think we felt that we'd learned quite 5 a lot from the programme, and we would -- we were in a better -- we were kind of a bit better informed about 6 7 doing the procurement on this occasion. So that was the 8 decision 9 Q. Right. Do you know who carried out that evaluation? 10 A. It would probably have been the people who were involved 11 in the procurement initially, so it may have been 12 Valerie Sharples, I would imagine it was Ann Muchmore. 13 I think it was the people that were involved in the 14 original procurement of Salvus. 15 Q. Right. And what did they use as their benchmarks or 16 objective criteria against which to evaluate Salvus' 17 18 A. Well, we looked at what we'd originally asked them to 19 achieve, and, you know, had they met their programmes? 20 Were we happy with the quality of their documentation? 2.1 Was the Fire Brigade happy with the quality of their 22 documentation? Where we had specific areas where we 2.3 were seeking their advice, did we find that helpful? 2.4 Were they responsive? All the things you would expect, really .

A. I think we agreed with RBKC that we would re-procure.

1

Q. And what was the upshot?

173

1 Q. Why was it decided that the TMO and RBKC would re-tender for the $\operatorname{medium-risk}$ and $\operatorname{low-risk}$ programmes when you 2 3 weren't unhappy with Salvus? 4 A. We weren't unhappy with Salvus, we just felt that we 5 understood more clearly what we needed and $--\,$ 6 Q. Right. 7 A. I mean, as I say, they were always going to be on the 8 tender list, so we weren't not giving them 9 an opportunity to compete. 10 Q. You say you weren't unhappy with Salvus? 11 A. I mean, there were things that they were -- I was 12 frustrated with, but I wasn't unhappy with them. I mean, the quality of their work was good. 13 14 Q. Let's go to {RBK00053588/3}, please. 15 This is an email from you to Ann Muchmore of the 16 RBKC on 11 February 2010, copied to Lornette Pemberton 17 and others, including Robert Black: 18 "Ann 19 "Further to our brief conversation following the 2.0 last progress meeting with Salvus, as the high-risk 21 programme is on schedule to complete as agreed by late 2.2 March/early April it is now timely to consider how the

medium-risk and low-risk FRA programmes will be funded,

resourced and progressed. I anticipate that we have

6 month timespan. Additionally, it is fair to say that the programme has progressed relatively smoothly and generally with the approval of the LFB. However, I have some concerns that Salvus are very rule—bound and despite what they say about being prepared to challenge the LFB and acting on our behalf as we are their client, I believe they have shown some reluctance to challenge the LFB on thorny issues. For example, I haven't found them to be hugely helpful or proactive on our behalf on

the issue of whether or not we need to do as the LFB

Then under the third paragraph, you say this:

to complete the high risk programme within the agreed

"I can confirm that Salvus are currently on schedule

"Look to find an alternative method ..

insist and install dry risers at Gillray House etc."

Then you go on to say at the very end of that

"Therefore, personally, I would be keen to tender the medium—risk programme in the same way as we did with the high—rise."

Now, when you say that Salvus was very rule—bound and reluctant to challenge the LFB on thorny issues, what did you mean?

A. The example that I'm quoting there is — it relates to four identical blocks which were, I think, about seven

175

storey, just a shade over 18 metres tall, so you would therefore expect them to be built with a dry rising firefighting main. For reasons none of us understood, they weren't, and the Fire Brigade were saying that we needed to retrospectively fit dry rising mains on each of the four buildings.

This goes back to what I did say this morning. Building control's view was that that retrospective fitting wasn't required. I needed to be absolutely clear that there wasn't another option for how we could mitigate any potential risks before I went back and said to people, "I need this amount of budget to do this amount of work", and it was quite frustrating that I couldn't get anyone to give me a straight answer.

Salvus kind of slightly sat on the fence on it. I didn't feel that they -- when I needed them to give me a clear steer, I didn't feel that they did. And, you know, their work was really good, all the stuff that I've said here is absolutely true, but when we really needed to be clear about how we jumped in a different situation that was going to impact on budgets -- because, fine, we could have found the budget, but it would have meant that something else didn't happen. So I needed to be absolutely sure that when I went back to say, "We need to do this, this is what it costs and this

174

2.3

2.4

25

a few options ... '

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

is how long it would take, and we need to do it because it's an absolute requirement", that I was right. But I didn't have the confidence to do that because there was a lot of toing and froing and nobody giving me a definitive steer.

So that's the kind of -- and that's the kind of issue I had when we appointed Salvus in the beginning. I said, "These are a few issues like this that come up that we've been unable to really bottom out".

10 Q. Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

1

A. So they were aware that — and to be fair, they had consistently tried to get a meeting with I think it was Steve Turek, because Andy Furness sat on, I think, an IOSH committee with fire safety — a fire safety remit, and so he met with quite a lot of kind of high—ranking LFB people, so I think he thought that was the way that we would get the definitive answer that we needed about standards, and in the end, after much toing and froing, we were told that he declined all meetings with us.

So, on the one hand, I've got the fire risk assessor telling me that we need to do something, but not being able to really back it up, so I'm not confidently in a position to go back and tell people that we need to find budget to do this, and I'm sort of left where I was

177

at the start of the programme.

2 So that's my — sorry, you're probably getting all of my frustrations.

- 4 Q. What was it that you wanted from a new, independent fire 5 risk assessor that Salvus weren't giving you?
- 6 A. I just wanted them to be able to give me a clear view of
 7 what I needed to do and what I didn't, and if there was
 8 another way of mitigating risk, could they tell me what
 9 that was. But I wasn't getting another way of
 10 mitigating risk, I was sort of just getting a problem
 11 that I couldn't find a solution for.
- Q. It doesn't really say that, does it? What it says is
 you have some concerns that Salvus are very rule—bound.
 What was the problem with that?
- 18 Q. That's not quite the same thing, is it? What did you mean by "Salvus are very rule—bound"?
- A. I probably meant that they're inclined to say, "Well, if
 the Fire Brigade are asking for it, you probably need to
 do it", but not that you definitely need to do it.
- 23 Q. Right.

25

24 You say:

"... despite what they say about being prepared to 178

challenge the LFB ... I believe they have shown some reluctance to challenge the LFB ..."

You're not really saying that they're giving you muddy advice or they're being equivocal; what you're saying is they're taking the LFB's side as opposed to taking your side. That's how I read that. Is that an unfair reading, Ms Wray?

A. That might be what it says, but that wasn't what I meant it to say, having lived it. My view was I just needed to be absolutely sure. For example, in the case of the flat entrance doors, once we knew we needed to do it, we found the budget to do it and we did do it. It was just that this —— and this issue didn't just relate to these four blocks, we had I think a couple of other blocks, so it's quite a big commitment, so I need to be absolutely clear that we can't mitigate the risk in other ways and they weren't giving me that, they weren't ...

So they're my kind of fire safety specialist advice, and I'm still caught between the Fire Brigade and building control without a clear steer.

- 21 Q. You see, the LFB was the enforcing authority under the RRO, wasn't it?
- 23 A. Absolutely.
- Q. So why not just do as they asked or required, ratherthan setting out to test what they're saying or

179

challenge, actually, is the word you used? Why are you wanting to challenge the enforcing authority?

A. I'm only wanting —— I'm wanting to do what the enforcing authority need me to do, but what I'm saying is that in some circumstances, that isn't the only way to mitigate the risk. So I'm trying to be clear that if there is an alternative which may be less invasive for residents, you know, maybe just as effective, hopefully just as

9 effective, could we find out what that is. Because the 10 impact of everything that we agree to do means that

impact of everything that we agree to do means that somebody else won't get heating or hot water or —

that's just the world that we lived in, so you needed to be absolutely sure that what you've been asked to do is

 $14\,$ $\,$ what you need to do in that way, and if I had been

assured of that, I'd have gone back and fought with everybody to get that to happen, but I wasn't yet in

a position to confirm that that's what we absolutely had to do.

19 Q. You see, I wonder whether this evidence you're giving is 20 just a bit of a gloss now on the historical words that

you used, which I've shown you, and if you really did

want to take an approach which was co-operative with the

180

23 LFB to see if there was a more cost effective and 24 practical way of going about satisfying their

 $25\,$ requirements, you might have said so, but instead you

3 approach, isn't it? It's more hostile. Do you accept 4 that? 5 A. Well, it wasn't meant to be. I'm generally not a hostile person, so that wasn't my intention. Probably 6 7 my frustration is coming out here because this is 8 exactly the kind of issue that led to the threat of 9 enforcement action, because we got into this: does this 10 need to happen? Building control are saying, "No, no, 11 it doesn't", Fire Brigade -- and me caught going, "Well, 12 what is it you want me to do? It's really important, we 13 need to know. What is the standard here?" And in the 14 meantime you've got the Fire Brigade then saying, "Well, 15 no, at high level, we're refusing to meet with you".

want to go into a tender because Salvus are reluctant to

challenge the LFB on thorny issues. That's a different

And actually, to be fair, I think Salvus had their own frustrations, because they had started off the programme with us saving we need to be sure that we're meeting the Fire Brigade's requirements in terms of the standard setting. So they wanted this meeting as much as I did, not just in relation to this issue but other issues that they felt weren't being addressed.

2.3 Q. Can we then move further into 2010, $\{TMO10037421/8\}$.

2.4 This is part of your report to the operations 25 committee in May 2010, and at page 8, under

181

- 1 paragraph 12.2, you ask them "to note our proposed 2 approach to progressing the medium risk blocks"; do you
- 3 see that?
- 4

1

2

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

- 5 Q. Did you have to get approval or sign-off from the 6 operations committee in order to progress the tender?
- 7 A. I can't remember, actually. I would have --8 procurement's not something I know much about, so
- 9 I would have always gone to procurement colleagues to 10 ask them what I needed to do.
- 11
- 12 A. I think that the borough also funded the medium-risk 13 programme, so I would have had to get their sign-off as 14
- 15 Q. You can see at the top of that page, under "Legal 16 Issues", in the last sentence of paragraph 9.1,
- 17 "'responsible persons' are the TMO and RBKC". Do you 18 know what made you say that in this document? Or was
- 19 that just an observation --
- 2.0 A. We -- I think there was a standard -- sorry to speak 21 over you. I think there was a standard format that we
- 2.2 had to follow. We had to have "Legal Issues", we had to
- 2.3 have "Communication and Resident Engagement". I think

182

- 2.4 there was a template we were required to use for
- 25 committee reports, and so I -- that was just my

- 1 standard.
- 2 Q. Right.
- 3 We can see the meeting at $\{TMO10037437/88\}$. This is 4 the minute of the meeting of 25 May 2010.
- 5
- Q. Operations committee. Do you see that? 6
- 7
- 8 Q. You're in attendance, after the "and". Can you see 9 that?
- 10 A Yes
- 11 Q. Yes.
- 12 If we go to page 89 {TMO10037437/89}, agenda item 5 13 was "Fire risk assessments", you can see that there, and 14 the committee received a report on progress.
- 15 There is no minuted discussion in this document 16 about the fire risk assessor himself. Do you remember 17 whether any questions were asked about the fire risk 18 assessor and competence?
- 19 A. Sorry, I wouldn't remember.
- 20 Q. Right.
- 2.1 Once the high-risk programme had ended, did you 22 consider whether there would be a need for regular fire 2.3 risk assessments of the high—risk properties?
- 2.4 I think we should have. I think at that stage we were 2.5 gearing up to get the medium-risk on the ground as soon

183

- 1 as possible because, as you know, we had our three—year
- deadline of getting through the whole process. So I'm 2
- 3 not sure it was on our radar at that point in time, but
- it came quite quickly.
- Q. Do you remember discussing with RBKC the subject of 5
- 6 putting a programme and funding in place for having
- 7 $regular \ \ FRAs \ for \ your \ high-risk \ properties \ in \ your$
- 8 portfolio?
- 9 A. Not specifically, but we had made a commitment and we 10 would find the money somehow or other.
- 11 Q. Right.
- 12 Now, at this stage, May 2010, who did you envisage 13 would carry out the continuing FRAs for the high—risk blocks in the TMO stock? 14
- 15 A. I was probably quite short—sighted and didn't give it as 16 much consideration as I should have done.
- 17 Q. So is the answer that you didn't envisage anybody at 18 that stage?
- 19 A. It was just off my radar. We'd only just completed them 2.0 and the oldest one was six months old, and there were no
- 21 material alterations happening on any of the blocks, so
- 2.2 I thought I had a little bit of time, and at the moment
- 23 medium and moving on to low will get the whole stock
- 2.4 assessed, so that was probably my priority.
- 2.5 Q. Let's then talk about medium and the appointment of

1 Carl Stokes. 1 experience of the Project Leader and proposed team 2 Can we look at your second statement, please, 2 members who will carry out the assessments.' 3 {TMO00842341/3}, paragraph 11. 3 Do you remember whether that was something in 4 You set out there the documents that you sent to 4 respect of which you had input? A. I don't. The preceding thing that you just showed me 5 Carl Stokes on 6 August 2010 inviting him to tender for 5 the medium-risk FRA programme. Do you see that? setting out the possible qualifications I think came 6 6 7 7 from RBKC. I think this was left from the initial 8 Q. One of the documents you exhibit there is the 8 procurement and I believe that Alexis Correa put that 9 consultants' brief of July 2010. Can I take you to 9 bit in himself when we did the original tender for the 10 that. It's at {TMO00842371}. 10 high-risk. 11 Did you draft that document? 11 Q. I see, thank you. 12 12 A. No. I doubt it. It was probably drafted by my colleague Do you remember what Carl Stokes gave you to support 13 in the procurement, the professional services officer, 13 by way of evidence his fire risk assessment 14 14 I don't think it would be me. qualifications and experience? 15 Q. Right. Who was that, please? 15 A. I don't as we sit here now, but probably quite a lot. 16 Q. We understand that Mr Stokes gave you a loose set of 16 A. Janet Rhymes, the lady's name was. Q. Yes, I see. You referred to her earlier on. 17 documents, together with his public, liability, insurance 17 18 Did you have any input into the contents of this 18 and certificates . I can show you that. It's at 19 19 {TMO00880581}. That is his insurance certificate. 20 A. I'm sure that I did, but ... 2.0 Do you remember whether he provided you with any 2.1 Q. Do take time to have a look at it. 21 information about his experience as a fire risk If we just scroll down to page 3 $\{TMO00842371/3\}$, 22 22 assessor? 2.3 2.3 A. I can't recall. I understood what his work experience for example, which is the general information and 2.4 2.4 was, I knew that he'd been in the fire and rescue requirements, it may refresh your memory. 2.5 (Pause) 2.5 service as fire safety officer, and by then, obviously, 185 187 1 A. I'm sure that I did. but I --1 we knew that he'd undertaken quite a few of the fire 2. Q. You can't recall which parts? 2 risk assessments on our high-risk blocks, so we'd had 3 A. No, sorry. 3 first -hand experience. His work was obviously quality Q. So Janet Rhymes, possibly you. Anybody else, do you checked by Salvus, because that's how they operated. 5 5 But we'd been sharing the FRAs with the A. I'm sure we would have shared it with RBKC colleagues, 6 Fire Brigade, and I recall at the end of the high-risk 6 7 7 they may or may not have had something they wanted to programme we had a hard copy of all 110 and the Brigade add. I'm not sure if Valerie was also still involved as 8 8 asked for that, so I dropped it off at the fire station. 9 9 So we had sort of quite a lot of belief that he had good the project manager. I'm speculating, sorry. 10 Q. Whilst we're on page 3, can we look at paragraph 1.5. 10 experience directly on our blocks. 11 It says there: 11 Did you ever receive a CV from Carl Stokes? 12 "It is a requirement of the client that the 12 Can't remember. 13 consultant holds a current fire risk assessment 13 Q. Do you remember if it was received as part of the tender qualification, e.g from IOSH, NEBOSH, the Northern 14 14 submission? 15 15 Ireland Fire Safety Panel or similar to be submitted for A. It's possible, sorry, I can't remember. 16 approval by the TMO before the consultant's tender is 16 Q. Right. Did it ever come from Salvus? Did Salvus ever 17 provide you with a CV for Carl Stokes when he was part accepted. (See Part 4: Quotation Instructions)." 17 18 Just pausing there, can we go to page 25 18 of the high-risk programme? 19 $\{TMO00842371/25\}$, which sets out the information that 19 A. I do recall asking for the details of all of their 2.0 2.0 the consultant tendering for the project was required to assessors, but I can't recall what documentation I did 21 21 supply. You can see there "Quotation submissions". get, and in fact a couple of them never worked on the 2.2 In the list at the very foot of the page, 7.1(d) is 2.2 project, so some of the names didn't materialise. 23 23 "Additional Information", and under (iii) it says:

ifications, and 25 This is the tender eval

2.4

Q. Can we go to {TMO00842327}.

This is the tender evaluation report that you

188

2.4

25

"Details of professional qualifications, in

particular fire risk assessment qualifications, and

9

19

produced on 27 September 2010 at the very end of the tender process, which you refer to in paragraph 12 of your second witness statement {TMO00842341/3}. There is no need to go to that.

Do you remember who was part of the panel who

6 conducted this tender evaluation report?

- 7 A. I'm assuming that it was Ann Muchmore and Janet Rhymes8 or Valerie Sharples.
- 9 Q. I see. So a combination of RBKC and the TMO?
- 10 A. Yes.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

11 Q. If you look at paragraph 1.2, it says there in the 12 second line:

"Additionally, all Consultants attended a formal interview with a panel consisting of two TMO and one RBKC Officer so that further checks on the quality of the consultants could be undertaken and any queries on their submission could be clarified."

Do you remember who it was as part of that panel particularly? Was it the individuals you have just referred to, Ann Muchmore, Janet Rhymes and Valerie Sharples?

- 22 A. I believe so, yes.
- Q. Do you know what checks on the quality of the consultants were undertaken?
- 25 A. No, as we sit here now, I'm sorry, I --

189

- Q. Do you recall how that panel went about assessing the
 requisite experience and qualifications for those
- 3 tendering for that programme?
- 4 A. No

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

- 5 Q. In your first witness statement, page 31
- $\{TMO00000890/31\}$, paragraph 137, you say in the middle:
 - "It was agreed that Carl had the right knowledge, competence, experience and enthusiasm to be a good partner for the TMO."

That's what you say there.

If we go back to the tender evaluation report which we've just been looking at, page 2 $\{TMO00842327/2\}$, paragraph 2.4 at the top of the page, you say:

"The same Consultant, CS Stokes, was rated first for quality and also submitted the lowest price for the six—month programme."

Do you remember how you and the panel were assured of Carl Stokes' qualifications, competence and experience for the purposes of carrying out the medium—risk FRA programme?

- A. Well, we would have —— we must have had a CV, we must have had details of his work experience, we knew what
- 23 he'd been doing for Salvus on our high—risk properties,
- $24\,$ we would have known what CPD he'd been doing, and we
- $25\,$ must have used that to make a judgement. I mean, we had

190

set questions, as you would expect, and we scored them

according to sort of an agreed approach, but we did it

- 3 individually and then we compared notes, as you would4 expect again.
- Q. You referred to his CV a minute ago. Let's look at it.It's {CST00001895}.
- Just to be clear, is this the document that you received from Carl Stokes as part of his tender?
 - A. It could have been.
- 10 Q. Right. I mean --
- 11 A. I mean, I don't know whether he's changed it since.
- 12 Q. I see what you mean.

Look at his qualifications there, under the heading
"Qualifications", was there any particular qualification
that told you that Carl Stokes had the relevant

16 knowledge and competence?

17 A. So I think it says he's got the European Diploma in

fire safety, which I would have been aware of. I mean,

he -- I think he had a range of experience. He clearly

 $20 \hspace{1cm} \hbox{had done quite a lot of continuing professional} \\$

21 development. I would have questioned him on the NEBOSH

 $22\,$ because it's a little bit vague, and I know that you're

23 looking at diplomas and certificates really to use

 $24\,$ NEBOSH, unless you have just done a managing safely

25 qualification .

191

1 But he seemed to -- it seemed to be a balance of

 $2\,$ technical issues, fire safety and kind of -- I think

 $3\,$ obviously we then talked to him about fire risk

 $4 \hspace{1.5cm} \mbox{assessments specifically} \;. \;\; \mbox{So it} \;\; -- \;\; \mbox{that, plus the fact}$

5 that he had eight years as a fire safety officer,

6 I think we were ... we thought was good.

 $7\,$ Q. Right. I mean, is there any particular qualification

8 that stands out in that list that you thought

9 particularly marked him out as having first—rate 10 quality?

11 A. I think I would have asked him about the national

12 occupational standards. I mean, there are some that

I wouldn't know a lot about, so I would have asked him

14 questions and then I would have gone away and done my

15 own research.

16 Q. Okay.

Now, do you remember that Carl Stokes also sent you a sample fire risk assessment as part of his tender?

19 A. Yeah.

20 Q. Yes. {TMO00880584}. Do you remember whether you got this document before the interview or afterwards?

22 A. I've no idea, sorry.

23 Q. Did you get it before you appointed him or afterwards?

24 A. I would have assumed that I got all of the documentation

25 from all of the tenderers before

1 Q. Yes. Do you remember whether you and the panel looked 1 take it upon myself to ask you perhaps just to slow down 2 at this document? 2 a little bit 3 A. We would have done, yes. 3 THE WITNESS: Sorry 4 Q. If we go to page 5 $\{TMO00880584/5\}$, we can see what he 4 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: And I'm going to ask Mr Millett says in a paragraph under the heading "Assessment 5 5 perhaps to pause a little more between the witness's completed by", and then there is a chunk of text, answer and the next question. 6 6 7 six lines in all, in bold. Do you see that? 7 MR MILLETT: Yes, Mr Chairman. 8 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: When you're ready, thank you. A. Yes 8 9 Q. It starts, "Mr C Stokes, ACIArb", et cetera. 9 MR MILLETT: I am. 10 10 Now, you will know, I think, that this statement was Ms Wray --11 repeated almost identically across all of his fire risk 11 A. Yes. 12 assessments he ever did for the TMO, updating it only by 12 $Q. \ \ --$ you said in an answer just before the break that, 13 the number of years as an independent fire risk 13 after the interview, you went away and did your own 14 14 assessor. That's correct, isn't it? 15 A. Yeah. 15 Can you remember what research you did on Mr Stokes' 16 16 Q Yes qualifications? 17 17 Do you recall whether you and the panel considered A. It probably would have been more about researching the 18 the list of qualifications he set out here in this 18 qualifications that he'd identified that I was perhaps 19 19 not familiar with, to learn the extent of what that 20 A. Erm ... I don't think we did. 2.0 meant, so that I had a full picture of what his 21 Q. You don't think you did? 21 experience and his training was. 2.2 A. No. 2.2 Q. Now, Dr Lane and Colin Todd both agree that some of the 2.3 Q. So do we take it from that that it didn't assist you in 23 qualifications identified by Mr Stokes in the list that 2.4 making the decision that Carl Stokes had the right 2.4 was on the screen in front of us did not exist. Was 25 qualifications, competence and experience to carry out 2.5 that something you discovered from your independent 193 195 1 the FRAs as part of the medium-term(sic) programme? 1 researches, do you think? 2 A. Sorry, I really can't recall whether we looked at both 2. A. Not the ones I looked at, no. 3 or whether we looked at just one. 3 Q. Would you be surprised or are you surprised when I tell 4 Q. Right. 4 you that some of the qualifications for which Mr Stokes 5 5 made claim did not exist? MR MILLETT: Mr Chairman, it may be a convenient moment to 6 A. I'd be surprised. I know he sort of portrayed them as 6 7 7 take the break now. In the light of that, I can perhaps if they were post-nominals and I knew that they weren't 8 8 shorten the next run of questions. post-nominals, I always treated them as if they were CPD 9 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Yes. Well, if that's convenient to 9 that you couldn't necessarily use in that way, 10 you, I'm sure it would be convenient to Ms Wray as well. 10 Q. Can we go to your first witness statement, please, at page 31 {TMO00000890/31}, paragraph 139. You say there: 11 So, Ms Wray, we will take the afternoon break now. 11 12 We'll come back, please, at 3.30. And again, please 12 "Throughout the entirety of our working relationship 13 don't talk to anyone about your evidence while you're 13 I never had any concerns regarding Carl Stokes' out of the room. All right? 14 14 competence. I was aware that he elected not to be on THE WITNESS: Thank you. 15 15 many of the professional registers, however when SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much. 16 I raised this with him he assured me that he did not 16 17 17 (Pause) feel he would gain anything from these memberships." 18 Thank you, 3.30. 18 When did you become aware that he had not elected to 19 (3.13 pm) 19 be on many of the professional registers? 2.0 2.0 (A short break) A. I think that, as years went by, there was -- there were 21 21 (3.30 pm) a number of accreditations which started to come

194

22

23

2.4

2.5

onstream, meaningful accreditations for fire risk

so I $\,--\,$ as I became aware of those, I would have

assessors, whereas prior to that I'm not sure that there

was much store by some of the things that existed, and

2.2

23

2.4

THE WITNESS: Yes.

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: All right, Ms Wray, ready to carry

SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Now, before you do, I'm going to

- 1 probably -- I would have spoken to him about them, had 2 he ever considered being IFE or whatever.
- 3 Q. And what did he say?
- 4 A. As I said here, he was -- I think he was a bit cynical 5 and sometimes thought that, actually, what would he get back? You pay an amount but actually what do you get 6
- 7
- 8 Q. Right 9 A. By then we'd obviously been using him for some
- 10 considerable time and we were generally happy with his 11
- 12 Q. Now, you say here that you were aware that he elected 13 not to be on many of the professional registers . That tends to suggest that you thought he was at least on 14

some professional registers . Is that right?

- 16 A. No, I — that's probably an error on my part.
- 17 Q. Right. Did you know that he was on no professional 18 registers?
- 19 A. Yes. I must have done.
- 20 Q. You knew that?
- 21 A. Yes.

15

- 2.2 Q. Were you ever aware of a guidance document published by 2.3 the Fire Risk Assessment Competency Council called
- 2.4 "A Guide to Choosing a Competent Fire Risk Assessor"?
- 25

197

- 1 Q. Can I ask you to look at it, please. It's at {HOM00025548}. This is the first version of this 2 3 document published on 1 February 2013.
 - Were you aware that the guidance, which starts on page 3 {HOM00025548/3}, if we look at that, said in the second paragraph:
 - "No matter who carries out the fire risk assessment the duty holder retains the responsibility for ensuring the adequacy of that assessment."
- 10 Were you aware of that?
- 11 A. Yes.

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

2.4

25

- 12 Q. Yes. Just continuing with the text:
 - "If employing a specialist to undertake your fire risk assessment, whilst you are not expected to be an expert in fire safety, you should make reasonable checks to ensure that they are competent to do the job
 - "There are some simple steps and precautions you can take to help verify the competence and suitability of a prospective fire risk assessor:
 - Be satisfied that the fire risk assessor providing this service is competent to do so. We recommend you check that those providing this service have independent registration with, or certification from, a professional or certification body and that they

198

- 1 meet the competency criteria established by the Fire 2
- Risk Assessment Competency Council (see list below)." 3 Did you look at this document at the time, do you
- 4 think, early 2013?
 - A. Possibly
- Q. Right. 6

5

- 7 When you did, if you possibly did, were you 8 concerned that Carl Stokes might not hold independent 9 registration with or certification from a professional 10 or certification body?
- 11 A. I think it's too strong to say concerned. I was aware.
- 12 I discussed it with him. But. if I'm honest. I'm not 13
 - sure I encouraged -- I would have preferred him to
- register, but I felt it was his personal choice. 14
- 15 Q. Well, you say it was his personal choice; here is
- 16 a guidance recommendation for you to check that he is
- 17 independently registered with or certified by
- 18 a professional or certification body.
- 19 A. And if we'd been -- sorry. I'm not sure if I'm cutting
- 20
- 2.1 Q. Well, my having shown you that text, my question is
- 2.2 really why you say it was his personal choice. It was
- 23 your choice, wasn't it, whether or not you had a fire 2.4
- risk assessor who met those qualifications? 25 If we'd been procuring a fire risk assessor from that

199

- 1 point onwards, then I completely take on board that's
- 2 what we would have required. Because he was someone
- 3 we'd already engaged who had demonstrated his
- competence, I didn't interpret this as meaning that he
- 5 therefore had to go and get it. I interpreted this as
- 6 meaning when I'm acquiring a fire risk assessor, this is
- 7 what I need to do going forward.
- 8 Q. I see. So does it come to this: had this document been
- 9 in circulation in 2010, you would have looked a lot more
- 10 closely at the fact that Mr Stokes did not have
- 11 registration with or certification from a professional
- 12 or certification body, but given that he had already
- 13 been in harness, as it were, for two and a half years by
- 14 this time, you didn't?
- 15 A. Yeah, that's basically it.
- 16 Q. Right.
- A. As I said, the accreditations improved as the years went 17
- 18 by and were much more reputable and reliable. I think
- 19 some of the early fire risk assessment accreditations
- 2.0 weren't really -- didn't hold a lot of water.
- 21 Q. Were you aware that while he was at Salvus, his work was
- 2.2 peer reviewed?
- 23
- 24 Q. Often quite a number of times. We have a version 8,
- 2.5 I think, of one of his documents.

- 1 A. Okay.
- $2\,$ $\,$ Q. From October 2010, when you took him on as your
- medium—risk programme fire risk assessor, he had only been an independent fire risk assessor for a year, hadn't he?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And at that time, he had been under the supervision of
- 8 senior, experienced people at Salvus; yes?
- 9 A. Yes.
- Q. Yes. As a result of that, when he came to you asan independent, sole practitioner, were you concerned
- 12 that his work for the TMO would be unsupervised?
- 13 A. I wasn't. I think it's fair to say that the fact that 14 he'd been recruited, whatever his capacity was, whether
- he'd been recruited, whatever his capacity was, whether
 he was employed or sub—consulted, he had been recruited
- by Salvus, he had been one of the principal people they
- by Salvus, he had been one of the principal people they

 had used on our contract, it was high —— potentially
- 18 high—risk residential accommodation, so very important,
- the first time that Salvus had been our client, so
- I think it gave me faith that he had been used by that
- 21 company in that way and that they would have mutually
- both learned quite a lot from each other, and if Salvus
- were unhappy with him, they wouldn't have let him
- $24 \hspace{1cm} \hbox{continue to carry out the assessments on our high-risk} \\$
- 25 properties.

3

201

- 1 Q. Yes. But do you understand that there's all the
- 2 difference between letting him carry out assessments on
 - your high—risk properties under supervision and
- 4 peer review on the one hand, and him performing the same
- $\,\,$ $\,\,$ function for the TMO without anybody in a position to
- 6 supervise him or peer review his work?
- 7 A. I do understand that. I mean, Salvus were very
- 8 exacting, and I do think that if they had been unhappy
- $9\,$ with his performance, regardless of how many revisions,
- they would not have let him continue on the contract.
- So I did get faith in the fact that he had continued.
- $\begin{tabular}{lll} 12 & I thought that was an important factor. He was now \\ \end{tabular}$
- familiar with quite a lot of our buildings, and he ——

 and everything that he had done appeared to meet the
- 14 and everything that he had done appeared to meet the
- $15 \qquad \quad \text{requirements of the Fire Brigade as well} \, .$
- $16\,$ $\,$ Q. Why did you take on Carl Stokes, a fire risk assessor
- 17 who would have no peer review and no supervision by
- anybody senior to him, of all those who were applying
- for the post?
- $20\,$ $\,$ A. I think he just -- he seemed very -- he seemed to have
- good experience, he seemed to be extremely
 knowledgeable. He understood the fire and rescue
- 23 service, their procedures, what they had to do, how they
- did their auditing, all of that knowledge that we didn't
- have that would be really helpful. He had already

202

- 1 familiarity with the overwhelming majority of our
- 2 high-rise blocks. We were moving down to medium-risk,
- 3 where there would be a lot less maintenance, a lot less
 - AOVs and suchlike it, so it felt like less of a risk.
- But also, he did do the best interview. He did ——
 we were all —— the three of us unanimously felt that he
 was the best candidate on the day.
- 8 Q. Did you ask him the question: who will be peer reviewing 9 your work?
- 10 A. No, I can't have done, no.
- $11\,$ Q. Was it not a consideration when you were making the
- selection that there would be nobody there to supervise or peer review his work?
- 14 A. At that time, the Brigade were still very heavily
- 15 involved in scrutinising what we were doing, so I didn't
- feel it was a risk because I felt that any potential
- issue would be flagged up very definitely and very
- loudly, and quite quickly. And we continued to share
- 19 his assessments with the Brigade on a regular basis,
- and, you know, in truth, I didn't always agree with some
- $21\,$ of the things that he said, and I told him when I didn't
- agree, so we had a fairly robust relationship. But, no,
- 23 at the time we felt he was the right appointment.
- $24\,$ $\,$ Q. You see, there is a difference, isn't there, between
- relying on the LFB to pick you up robustly on the one

203

- $1 \hspace{1cm} \hbox{hand, and Mr Stokes carrying out his } \hbox{responsibilities} \\$
- 2 for you as FRA on the other?
- 3 A. Of course.
- Q. Yes. I mean, on the one hand Mr Stokes is ensuring that
- 5 you, the TMO, and you particularly as the competent
- 6 person within the TMO, comply with their statutory
- 7 obligations under the RRO; whereas the LFB is the
- 8 enforcing authority.
- $9\,$ $\,$ A. Indeed, I'm well aware of that. I was merely saying
- 10 that that was an additional factor that we thought was
- 11 actually a positive thing, that the level of scrutiny
- was an advantage, that any deviation from the suitable
- and sufficiency was likely to be flagged up quite loudly
- 14 and quite quickly.
- 15 Q. Yes, but that's not a very reasonable and sensible
- $16\,$ approach, is it, to rely on the enforcing authority to
- pick you up where you go wrong in breaching the statute?
- $18\,$ $\,$ A. No, and the point I'm making is I wasn't relying on it ,
- 19 I was just saying that it was an additional thing that20 we knew was in place.
- $21\,$ $\,$ Q. Now, it's right, I think, that Mr Stokes signed
- an acceptance of a fee tender on 21 October 2010.
- 23 That's the date we have in your second witness statement
- 24 at paragraph 13 {TMO00842341/3}; yes?
- 25 A. Yes. Sorry, I don't have all the dates in my head.

- 1 Q. I can show you that if you want to, but --
- A. No, it's fine
- 3 Q. That was for the medium-risk programme, wasn't it?
- 4
- 5 Q. So he started work for you on the medium-risk programme 6 at that time; yes?
- 7
- Q. Now, once he was appointed, did you again give 8 9 a commitment to the LFB that you would evaluate his 10 performance, as you had given the LFB in relation to 11 Salvus when they came on board to do the high-risk
- 12 programme in September 2009?
- 13 A. Yes. I believe that we did. MR MILLETT: You did.
- 15 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Sorry, could I just intervene,
- 16 before we move away from the point.
- 17 Did you ask Mr Stokes about other clients for whom 18 he had done fire risk assessments? We know he had 19 worked for Salvus as a subcontractor or at least --
- 20 A. Yes

- 21 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: -- as an employee or
- 22 a subcontractor. But did you ask him who else he had worked for and on what sort of buildings? 2.3
- 2.4 A. I did, and my impression was always that he had a range
- 25 of residential housing experience, which is what we were

205

- 1 always looking for. I can't recall the detail of his
- clients , and I know that at some stage, although I don't 2
- 3 know if it was that far back or subsequently, he had
- a range of insurers he was -- he worked for, so that was
- 5 all over the place in all sorts of different kinds of 6
- 7 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Were the insurers clients or were 8 they people who were insuring his --
- 9 A. No. no. no. they were clients. He was having to go off
- 10 all over the country to -- I recall him being in 11 Shetland once when I needed him, that's why it sticks in 12
- 13 But, yeah, we definitely would have asked about his 14 range of experience, because we had specialised housing, 15 we had temporary accommodation, and, you know, we had
- 16 low-risk, and we wanted to be assured that he had the 17 full range, and I certainly had the impression that he
- 18 had.
- 19 SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Right, thank you very much. 2.0 Sorry. Mr Millett.
- 21 MR MILLETT: Did vou ask for or take up a client reference 2.2 for Mr Stokes?
- 23 A. No, I don't believe I did.
- 2.4 Q. On the question of evaluation, did you evaluate his
- 25 performance after he had taken on the role of the fire

206

risk assessor for the medium-risk programme?

- 2 A. Yes, I'm sure I would have done. I mean, we had our
- 3 progress meeting, we still had RBKC involved. We had --
- 4 I believe we still had periodic meetings with the LFB
- 5 attending, and I was the one setting him the programme
- and I was the one who received all of his fire risk 6 7 assessments. So, yes. Yes, would have been --
- 8 Q. Against what criteria or objective yardsticks did you
- 9 measure his performance as a fire risk assessor from
- 10 that time?
- 11 A. Obviously we were always looking at his programme to see
- 12 whether he was doing what he said he was going to do in
- 13 the required timeframe. I -- to be honest, I'm probably
- 14 going to be really vague about it now. I was
- 15 scrutinising, I was scrutinising for consistency. If
- 16 there were differences in properties that I thought were
- 17 similar then I would challenge him or ask for
- 18 explanations. I can't really give you any more detail
- 19 at this stage, I'm sorry.
- $\mathsf{Q}.\;\;\mathsf{During}\;\mathsf{the}\;\mathsf{currency}\;\mathsf{of}\;\mathsf{the}\;\mathsf{medium}-\mathsf{risk}\;\mathsf{programme},\;\mathsf{at}\;\;$ 20
- 2.1 least in its early years, how many fire risk assessments
- 22 did Mr Stokes provide to you a week?
- 2.3 A. I don't know. I don't even know -- so there were 110 in
- 2.4 the high-rise ...
- 25 Q. High-risk?

207

- 1 A. Sorry, yes, high-risk, apologies. I don't know
- 2 whether -- I think we had in total about 650 blocks, so
- 3 that still left over 500. I don't know if they were
- split evenly, whether it was 200, 250, I'm not sure.
- 5 I could probably find out if I waded back through, but
- 6 I don't know. But often quite a volume, and then other
- 7 periods less so, depending on the programme and his
- 8 other activities and what fitted with what we needed.
- 9 Q. Did you read each and every one?
- 10 A. I read every action plan and I read -- I endeavoured to
- 11 read every fire risk assessment. Depending on the
- 12 volume I was receiving depended on how much attention
- 13 I was paying, and if I'm honest, if we had four
- identical blocks, I would read one rigorously and then 14
- 15 I would —— depending on how many I was getting through.
- 16 I would not pay the same level of detail to the others,
- 17 but I would try to get through all of them.
- 18 Q. Did you have a helper to read them?
- 19 A. No.
- 2.0 Q. It was all you?
- 2.1 A. It was me.
- Q. Yes. Okay. 2.2
- 23 Now, can we go to your second witness statement,
- 2.4 please, {TMO00842341/4}, paragraph 15. You say there:
- 25 "Following completion of the low risk programme,

1 Carl Stokes Associates was retained by the TMO as its "• when there is a significant change in the matters 2 fire safety consultant on a rolling basis until 2 that were taken into account as the risk assessment was 3 June 2017.' 3 carried out (such as a widespread change in the type of Now, the FRA programme for high-risk, medium-risk4 4 residents occupying the block), "• when there is a reason to suspect that the 5 and low-risk blocks ended in May 2012, didn't it? 5 A. Yes, I believe so. original FRA is no longer valid (eg after a fire that 6 6 7 Q. The actual programme; yes? 7 occurred within, or spread to, the common parts) AND. 8 8 "• following completion of significant works 9 Q. Can we then go to $\{TMO10031056\}$ and look at page 1 of 9 instigated to address shortcomings identified by the 10 10 that document. FRA 11 11 "4.4 Depending upon their complexity these FRA This is your report to the operations committee 12 12 dated 2 May 2013. You can see in the grey box, the Reviews are being carried by either the TMO Health & 13 purpose of the report --13 Safety Team or the Fire Consultant. 14 14 "4.5 FRAs are being progressed according to the 15 $Q.\ --$ which is to appraise the operations committee of the 15 criteria above and the programme progresses on TMO's current position in relation to fire risk 16 16 schedule " assessments, and there are a number of things under 17 17 Now, after the FRA programme was completed, it's 18 paragraph 1.2 that you're asking the operations 18 right, isn't it, that in and after 2013, you implemented 19 19 committee to note, and I'll just identify those for you a programme of FRA reviews? 2.0 20 there. In particular, the last one is: A. Yeah. 21 "The recommendations made by the Coroners following 2.1 Q. Is that right? 22 inquest on the Lakanal House fire and the Southampton 2.2 A. I can't remember when we implemented them before then, 2.3 23 fire and response from the Communities & Local but yeah, we were doing low-level reviews in-house which 2.4 2.4 Government to date.' was really just in between the adjacent comprehensive Now, if you go to page $2 \{TMO10031056/2\}$, you can 2.5 reviews. It was a sort of spot check in between where 209 211 1 see under paragraph 3.2 on that page, under the heading 1 there had been no material alterations. It was a way of "Progress with FRA Programme", you say: checking that the actions which had been identified were 2 2. 3 "All three assessment programmes were completed in 3 being progressed. May 2012 a few months in advance of the LFB's July 4 Q. Yes. 5 timescale and such comprehensive FRAs are now available 5 A. And my colleague was doing that as part of his regular 6 visits to blocks. If he identified that there were 6 for every block. 7 7 "Comprehensive ('suitable & sufficient') FRAs have works going on at the block that we hadn't been made 8 8 now been completed for each block." aware of, that changed the priority and that changed the 9 9 nature of the FRA. Then that would go up into the Then you see underneath that paragraph 4.0. 10 "Approach to reviewing FRAs", and you say this: 10 programme and be --11 "4.1 FRAs are living documents which cannot remain 11 Q. Were these reviews that you refer to in paragraph 4.4 12 valid for an unlimited length of time. Therefore, to 12 here being carried out before 2 May 2013? 13 ensure ongoing compliance with the legislation 13 A. Yeah, I believe so. 14 14 Q. You say there that they are being conducted either by assessments need to be reviewed and/or re-assessed 15 15 periodically the TMO health and safety team or the fire consultant. 16 "4.2 With regard to how frequently FRAs are reviewed 16 who was Carl Stokes 17 the TMO have adopted the criteria set out in the current 17 18 best practice guidance on fire safety in residential 18 Q. Did the TMO health and safety team carry out any reviews 19 accommodation - 'Fire safety in purpose-built blocks of 19 or was that all left to Carl Stokes in all cases? 2.0 flats' produced by the Local Government Group (published 2.0 A. No, actually, we mostly did the low-level reviews 21 21 ourselves because we could readily access the ordering in July 2011). 2.2 "4.3 Specifically, FRA reviews will be undertaken in 2.2 system to see where repairs had been ordered and it was 23 23

> A. Well, actually, Adrian, my colleague, was doing that. 212

easier for us to chase up

Q. When you say "we", who was --

24

2.5

2.4

25

the following circumstances -

"• following 'material alterations' at the block,

210

" • regularly,

- 1 Q. Adrian Bowman, was it?
- 2 A. Yes
- 3 Q. I see

4 In the case of those reviews, how did you decide

- 5 which reviews were, as you call it, low level?
- A. Erm --6
- 7 Q. What do you mean by low level? Do you mean low risk?
- A. No, I think what I mean by low-level review is you've 8
- 9 got your comprehensive assessment, usually, depending on
- 10 the risk rating of the block, either 12 months or
- 18 months later, you would want to do a low-level 11 12
- review, so you would want to go visually assess the
- 13 block, check that the items that have been identified
- have been completed, if they haven't, chase them up and 14
- 15 give somebody a load of grief for why they've not been,
- 16 and -- yeah, so that's what we mean by low level. It's
- 17 done in-house, really about checking that nothing has
- 18 changed which has changed the priority of when the next 19 assessment will be undertaken and that the things that
- 20 have been identified are being progressed.
- 2.1 Q. I see. So the review was not a review of the quality of 2.2 Mr Stokes' work --
- 2.3 A. No.
- 2.4 $Q. \ --$ it was a review of the progress in closing out FRA
- 25 actions?

213

- A. Yes. 1
- 2 Q. I see.
- 3 You mention Adrian Bowman. What training did
- Adrian Bowman have in respect of fire safety matters?
- A. He's got an, IOSH certificate. He does -- he did a fair 5 6 bit of CPD. It was the same thing, we would check what
- 7 was the most appropriate fire safety training for him to
- 8 be doing. I can't tell you off the top of my head, but
- 9 he would have brushed up on quite a lot of his skills.
- 10 He would have sometimes done some joint stuff with Carl
- 11 if he wanted to -- if they wanted to have a discussion
- 12 about specific aspects of fire safety, and sometimes it 13 was better practical.
- 14
- He also organised the fire safety training that the 15 estate staff and fire marshals, et cetera, attended. So 16 he was often in dialogue with that person about tweaking
- 17 that course and making it more appropriate.
- 18 Q. Did Mr Bowman have any familiarity with or training on 19 the LGA guide or PAS 79, which was by now in force?
- 2.0 A. Yes. Yes, almost definitely the LGA guide. I can't 21 recall whether he has PAS 79.
- 2.2 Q. Now, we know that Carl Stokes carried out his first
- 23 independent fire risk assessment on Grenfell Tower on
- 2.4 29 December 2010.
- 25 A. Yes

214

- 1 Q. We have that, just for reference purposes, at 2 {CST00003181}.
- 3 Had you begun this programme of reviews of FRAs
- 4 after the conclusion of the high-risk programme in
- 5 May 2010 or did that all wait until May 2013 or
- thereabouts? 6

9

10

- 7 A. Okay. So what I recall is we took on Carl to do the
- $medium-risk\ FRAs\ and\ then\ I,\ probably\ naively,\ realised$ 8
 - that the high-risk FRAs had all stated that they should
- be reviewed within 12 months, and at that time my 11 colleague hadn't had sufficient appropriate training
- 12 So at that time. I am confident I would have checked
- 13 with my line manager and possibly with RBKC to say: can
- we ask Carl to review the high-risk FRAs which are now 14
- coming up for review? 15
- 16 Q. I see. To review, to check whether the action items had
- 17 been carried out?
- 18 A. No, in this case it wouldn't have been as low-level
- 19 a review. Because the assessor was doing it, he
- 20 would --
- 2.1 Q. Right.
- 22 A. -- do it to a high standard.
- Q. Was it for Carl Stokes to carry out those reviews even 2.3
- 2.4 though he had not done the original FRA, because they
- 2.5 were on the high-risk programme?

215

- 1 A. Erm ... in this case, it was for him to do. We
- 2 subsequently introduced the situation that I've
- 3 explained to you about my colleague. But in this case
- we asked him to do them.
- 5 Q. Right. So Carl Stokes carried out reviews in relation
- 6 to high-risk where he hadn't done the FRAs --
- 7 A. At that point in time, yes.
- 8 Q. Yes, I see.
- 9 Was that ever explained to the operations committee?
- 10 A. I don't think the operations committee was in existence
- 11 at that time. Oh, sorry, you mean the high-level one.
- 12 Actually, I'm sorry, I can't recall.
- 13 Q. Right.
- 14 You didn't re-tender the high-risk FRA contract, did
- 15 you?
- 16 A. No, we didn't, and I wouldn't have just instructed him
- 17 to do high-risk FRAs when he'd been appointed for medium
- 18 without taking advice from procurement colleagues and my
- 19 line manager, and possibly also RBKC, but I don't seem
- 2.0 to be able to evidence that, which is a bit frustrating.
- 21 Well, it may be, but do your best with your
- 2.2 recollection. Why didn't you re-tender the high-risk 23
- 2.4 It was just time, really . So we were gearing up for the
- 25 medium-risk, the medium-risk starts and then I kind of

- 1 realised that actually, because the high-risk started
- 2 September the previous year, some of those now had
- 3 a 12-month review period, so we needed to very quickly
- 4 get on and do the high-risk, and that just --
- 5 procurement is slow and arduous, and it seemed that if
- my procurement colleagues were happy for us to proceed by instructing Carl to do them, that's what we would do.
- Q. I see. So you said before that it wasn't on your radar; 8
- 9 was it as a result of it not being on your radar that
- 10 you ran out of time and then found yourself in a pickle?
- A. Pretty much, unfortunately, yeah. 11
- 12 Q. And that explains, does it, why there was no recruitment 13 or selection process for who was going to do high-risk
- 14 reviews after the first programme?
- 15 A. It does, but again, I would reiterate, I wouldn't have
- made those decisions without getting procurement 16
- 17 colleagues to be very clear.
- 18 Q. Yes

- 19 Did you discuss the non-procurement of Carl Stokes,
- 20 as it were, for the high-risk programme with anybody at the TMO? 2.1
- 2.2 A. Again. Sorry, when I said procurement colleagues,
- 2.3 procurement colleagues internally in the TMO,
- 2.4 Lornette Pemberton, my line manager --
- 25 Q. Right, Lornette Pemberton then?

217

- 1 A Yes
- 2 Q. What about anybody at RBKC?
- 3 A. I'm sure, although I can't specifically remember,
- I would have contacted Ann Muchmore, because she was my
- link person at the time, and if necessary \boldsymbol{I} would have 5
- 6 escalated it within the housing team if that was her
- 7 advice.
- 8 Q. And who would that have been to?
- 9 A. Then I think -- I don't know if it was still
- 10 Pam Sedgwick or Amanda, or perhaps to Laura. I can't 11
- 12 Q. At that stage I think it was probably Pam Sedgwick.
- 13 A. Okay. Whatever she advised, I would have ——
- 14 Q. Right.
- 15 Is it right that Carl Stokes simply took over 16 responsibility for that contract, it renewed to him
- 17
- 18 A. Well, that wasn't the intention. Ultimately that's what
- 19 it ended up becoming, but that wasn't the original 2.0 intention.
- 21 Q. Did you get approval for that approach from either the 2.2 TMO executive board or RBKC?
- 23 A. I can't recall, I can only reiterate I discussed it with
- 2.4 Lornette and colleagues in the TMO procurement team and
- 25 colleagues at RBKC, and I would have done whatever they

218

- 1 required me to do, but I don't remember whether that was 2 requested.
- 3 Q. Do you know how the funding for Carl Stokes' work on the 4
 - high-risk properties was approved?
- 5 A. I don't.
- Q. Right. 6
- 7 Now, it's right, I think, that you didn't enter 8 a written contract with Carl Stokes for him to carry out
 - high-risk FRAs, did you?
- 10 A No

9

17

- 11 Q. Why is that?
- Again, I can only say that if I'd been instructed to do 12
- 13 it, I would have done it, because we had a history of
- 14 doing what procurement advised.
- 15 Q. Right.
- 16 It's also right, isn't it, that after the
 - medium-risk and low-risk FRA programmes came to an end.
- 18 you didn't enter into a fresh contract with him for
- 19 those programmes?
- 20 A. No, we didn't. Again, I would have taken advice, but
- 21 again, I don't know where I put it or what I've done
- 22 with it. I wouldn't make those decisions and I don't
- 23 usually have much budgetary control, so I'm always
- 2.4 really careful about making sure that I follow the
- 2.5 rules

1

219

- Q. No, but the factual position seems to be that there was
- 2 a formal contract for the high-risk programme with
- 3 Salvus, that came to an end, and a formal contract
- through a tender for the medium-risk programme with
- 5 Carl Stokes, and then it all just rolled into one
- 6 ongoing understanding after that, undocumented and
- 7
- non-contractual.
- A. Well, he was still operating to the contract, the terms 8
- 9 of the contract. The low-risk I did take advice and
- 10 there is a document which I was told Sacha needed to
- 11 sign and Carl needed to sign and that that's what I was
- 12 required to do, which is just one sheet of paper, but
- 13 that's the advice that I received and we did have that
- in place. But, yeah, he was always -- whatever he was 14
- 15 doing, he always was operating according to the original
- 16 contract, that was always his understanding.
- 17 Q. Yes. When I say non-contractual, I mean no fresh formal
 - contract signed --
- 19 A. No, you're right.
- 2.0 $Q. \ --$ to govern specifically that role. But your
- 21 understanding, and indeed his, was that you always
- 2.2 operated together on the basis of the terms and
- 23 conditions contained in the July 2010 consultants'
- 2.4 report for all properties?
- 2.5 A. Yes

18

Q. Yes.

1

2

3

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

9

Was his continued instruction on that basis ever approved by anybody at the TMO?

4 A. No. I'd have discussed it with Barbara probably within 5 maybe the first six months or a year of her joining, and I said, you know, "This is the situation, I think this 6 7 needs to be looked at, and I think perhaps we're in 8 a position where we now need to re-procure". And we 9 were both mindful of the fact that Carl just $\,--\,$ he 10 didn't just undertake risk assessments, that he was able 11 to offer us kind of advice and assistance, he'd assessed 12 leaseholder doors, so there was a range of other 13 activities that he was -- had undertaken on our 14 instruction, so we had done some work to identify, get 15 together a sort of comprehensive list of those. So, 16 you know, in some cases he would assist with training, 17 there were a variety of things.

> And I had spoken to and I did find some documentation — Ernest Raw was one of my procurement colleagues and I started to have discussions with him and set out the extent of the work, but I don't know where that had got to, to be honest, but we had certainly kicked it off and Barbara was aware that we needed to get on and do some re-procurement.

Q. Are you able to explain how it comes about that there

221

1 was no formal contract with Carl Stokes for any of these 2 programmes after 2012 in circumstances where the TMO was 3 a pretty document-heavy organisation which liked to write everything down, so it seems?

- 5 A. I can't. I can only reiterate that I would have taken 6 advice. There is no way that we would have let that 7 continue unless I'd been advised that that was okay.
- 8 Q. How was his funding arranged? Let me put it a slightly different way: did anybody approve the funding for 10 Carl Stokes' work?
- 11 A. I don't actually know. I mean, his invoices came in, 12 I was the one that checked that what he said he'd done 13 was what he'd actually done, and I signed them off and gave them to finance, and I truthfully don't know how it 14 15 was budgeted.
- 16 Q. You don't know how it was budgeted?
- 17 A. No.

19

2.0

21

2.2

2.3

2.4

25

18 Q. Okay.

> Can we go to your first witness statement, please, page 31 {TMO00000890/31}, paragraph 140. You say there in the third line, after having referred to the initial position with Mr Stoke:

"However, his role changed over time and the default position became that if we had an issue that might be classified as a fire safety risk, more often than not we

222

1 consulted CSA [Carl Stokes Associates]."

2 Now, when you say that you would consult with CSA 3 for any issue that "might be classified as a fire safety risk", what did you mean by that? 4

- 5 A. I mean that, for example, he got involved in assessing potentially non-compliant leaseholder doors. We 6 7 originally $\,--\,$ I know it's quite a big area, but we had 8 originally endeavoured to explain to leaseholders that 9 the door was demised and was their responsibility.
- 10 Q. Can I just pause there?
- 11 A. Sorry.
- 12 Q. You may have misunderstood my question.
- 13
- 14 How would you create a class which would contain things 15 like fire safety risks? What was the classification you 16 used?
- 17 A. When things were referred to me -- it was a range of 18 things. It could be people with hoarding tendencies
- 19 where there is an elevated potential degree of risk, it 20 could be things to do with mobility scooters, it could
- 21 be very vulnerable residents. There were a variety of
- 22 things. Anything that was referred to me that I felt 23 I wanted to get a second opinion on from a specialist
- 2.4 fire consultant, I would consider referring to Carl.
- 25 Q. I see.

223

1 Was this approach or process approved by the TMO 2 board at any time?

- 3 A. Certainly in relation to the leaseholder doors, that was approved by the health and safety committee, and I think 5 also the scrutiny committee.
- 6 Q. But this ad hoc approach in general of going to
- 7 Carl Stokes whenever a so-called or potential
- 8 fire safety risk arose, was that ever the subject of 9 approval by the TMO board?
- 10 No, not explicitly . I think there was always
- 11 an expectation that there would be things $--\,$ and the
- 12 same with Salvus, there would be things that came along
- 13 that we would seek his advice on, because we didn't have
- sufficient detailed in-house fire safety advice and that 14
- 15 was part of the contract, really.
- 16 Q. Given that the TMO board was the board of the
- 17 responsible person, was it not essential for the TMO
 - board to know of and approve of those ad hoc
- 19 arrangements?

18

- A. Possibly. Well, I mean, all I can say is my line 2.0
- 21 managers always knew the range of activities we -- and
- 2.2 sometimes it would be them who suggested we get him
- 23 involved in assessing or doing an activity-specific 2.4
- report, and there was nothing coming back from executive 2.5 team to say, "Actually, we should set out the terms of

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

2.5

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1 this". 2 Q. Did it ever occur to you to tell your line manager that 3 the ad hoc arrangements that you had with Carl Stokes

ought to be formally brought to the attention of the TMO 5 board as the board of the responsible person and

signed off? 6

4

9

- 7 A. I don't believe it did.
- Q. Why is that? 8
 - A. I can't give you an explanation. It should have done.

10 I think the problem is sometimes whenever you have 11 a really busy day job, you don't stand back and do the 12 kind of thinking about, well, actually that's the 13 structure that you need to have in place. I can't give 14 you an explanation

15 Q. What about RBKC? To your knowledge, did RBKC ever 16 sign off on Carl Stokes' ad hoc approach?

A. I don't believe they signed off on it, no, but I think 17 18 they certainly were aware of his involvement, 19 significant involvement in terms of leaseholder doors. 2.0 because we also had some joint meetings with quite

21 senior people at the Fire Brigade and Carl and 22 colleagues from RBKC were in attendance, so they were 2.3

2.4 Q. Now. I want to turn to the instructions given to 25 Carl Stokes for completing the FRAs.

225

1 Am I right in thinking that those were always 2 contained in or could be found in the July 2010 3 consultants' brief that you had sent him as part of the tender for the medium-risk programme?

5 A. Yes

Q. Yes. 6

9

7 A. I believe so.

8 Q. And once Mr Stokes had been taken on by the TMO for the low-risk FRA programme, were those instructions ever 10 supplemented by any other written instructions?

11 A. I don't recall them being, no.

12 Q. And what about when he was instructed on a rolling basis 13 at the end of the low-risk programme, was he ever given 14 any supplemental instructions, or he just carried on?

15 A. Not that I recall.

16 Q. Right.

17

18 Q. So what were his instructions once he was carrying all 19 three programmes on a rolling basis?

2.0 $\mathsf{A.}\ \mathsf{I}\ \mathsf{would}\ \mathsf{give}\ \mathsf{him}\ \mathsf{a}\ \mathsf{programme}\ \mathsf{with}\ \mathsf{timescales}\ \mathsf{for}\ \mathsf{when}$ 21 things were due to be reviewed. He would come back and 2.2 confirm that he could meet that. I would start --2.3 you know, he knew the properties quite well by then, he

2.4 knew the local caretakers, he could often -- he had

25 drop keys, so he could sometimes get his own access, he

226

had their contact details, so those are the kinds of additional things that we were providing with him and updating him on, on a regular basis, but I don't really think about those as formal instructions, but we would be providing regular information.

He would undertake -- I believe what -- so when he first came to work for us, I introduced him to colleagues in what was then I think building services but became contract management. He would often go straight to them to ask them for documentation and certification in relation to planned maintenance, because he knew if he came through me, that was just an added tier of people, it made sense just to go straight to them. He would often pop in and collect the documentation. Providing he had the documentation before he went to site then that would all be referred to in his assessment.

He had a set of Gerda keys, so he could get into all $\,--\,$ generally all the areas of the building . If there were areas that he couldn't access, he would initially try and contact the caretaker, the ESA, to provide access or he would make sure they were outlined in his report.

At the conclusion of that, when his report was finalised, I would receive it as a pdf document, and

227

1 then I would receive a Word document with the action 2 plan and significant findings.

Q. Right.

Now, when the LGA guidance was published in 2011 and when the PAS 79 guidance document was revised and published in August 2012, at either of those points or after either of those points, did you ever send any instructions to Carl Stokes just to bring him up to date with the new publications and ensure by way of 10 instruction that he complied with those?

11 A. We would have discussed them at length, particularly the LGA guide. 12

13 Q. Right.

14 A. Because we had both been involved in the consultation 15 that led up to it being finalised, he had his own input 16 and I think he also input some responses on our behalf, 17 so we were both mindful that it was coming and we were 18 quite looking forward to it, because we hoped it would 19 be the most appropriate documentation for the majority 2.0 of our blocks. So we would have talked at length about 2.1 the LGA guide. But whether that translated into written 2.2 instructions for him, I'm not sure.

23 Now, what about PAS 79, August 2012 edition, did you 2.4 ever have a conversation about that document?

2.5 A. Probably, but I can't specifically remember, apologies.

Q. Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

I want to ask you some questions about the process and frequency of the production of FRAs.

Can we go to the consultants' brief, please, at $\{TMO00842371/6\}$, part 2, paragraph 1.1, "Scope", and it says:

"Fire Risk Assessments will be undertaken and reviewed regularly at a frequency dictated by the degree of risk. The FRA and FRA reviews will include an individual examination of each communal fire door including whether it operates correctly and the findings will be clearly documented in each report."

Do you recall how often high—risk buildings were reviewed once the initial programme with Salvus was completed in April 2010?

- A. They would have been done by Carl. As you know,
 Grenfell Tower was done at I think December 2010, so
 the ... I think the plan was that they would be done
 comprehensively every three years unless there were
 material alterations or the other factors, and there
 would be a low—level review happening in between those
 periods.
- 23 Q. Yes.
- A. In reality, because we had Manse Masterdor replacing
 doors and we had some major works in various locations,

229

- there were other factors which meant that reviews were undertaken at shorter intervals , more frequently.
- Q. Yes.

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

2.0

21

2.2

23

2.4

25

- You mentioned Grenfell Tower, December 2010. That's quite right, 29 December 2010. Do you know why Carl Stokes produced an FRA in December 2010 for Grenfell Tower when he had produced one when at Salvus on 30 September 2009?
- A. I think that's what we referred to, that that sort of snuck up on me, really, that we'd appointed him to do medium—risk, he is getting on with the medium—risk and then I have a kind of crisis moment and go away and say to my colleagues in procurement and my line manager, "I'm in this position, I want us to do another comprehensive review by the consultant. Is this something that we can get on and do?" And then he is in a position where he has to programme that in along with all of his other work.
- 19 Q. Right.

What Mr Stokes says in his statement — and this is paragraph 52 on page 17 {CST00003063/17}, we don't need to go to it — is that if he had done an FRA in a given year for a particular high—risk building, then it was intended that the FRA would be reviewed in—house by TMO the next year and then he would undertake a fresh FRA

230

- 1 the year after that.
 - Do you agree with that?
- 3 A. It's right that we would get to the stage where we would 4 review the FRA in—house the following year, but
- 5 I believe at that stage, for high—risk, we were looking
- 6 to make sure they were done every three years, because
- 7 the proposal in the redrafted fire strategy that didn't
- 8 quite make it to be signed off was that we would review
- 9 comprehensively every two years, so that was a change.
- 10 So I think our original position was once every
- 11 three years.
- $12\,$ Q. Right. So can you account for why Grenfell Tower, which
- 13 was a high-risk building, I think, was redone with
- a fresh FRA only in December 2010?
- 15 A. Because that's what Salvus specified whenever they did
 16 their review
- 17 Q. Right, I see.
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Now, the concept of in-house reviews is repeated,
- 20 I think, in your November 2013 fire safety strategy,
- 21 isn't it
- 22 A. Yes
- 23 $\,$ Q. Let's go to that, $\{TMO00830598/10\},$ paragraph 14.3.3.
- 24 It says there, halfway through the paragraph:
- 25 "It is anticipated that the shorter, more regular

231

- 1 reviews which will tend to concentrate primarily on
- 2 progress with previous Action Plan and identification of
- 3 any changes, will be carried out in—house by the TMO
- 4 Health & Safety Team. However, where completely new
- 5 FRAs are required either because some of criteria
- 6 2.—4. apply or on a recurring basis the services of
- 7 a specialist fire risk assessor will be used."
 - So just to be clear, the regular reviews were not intended to be like fire risk assessments completed by
- 10 Carl Stokes to PAS 79 standards?
- 11 A. No

8

9

- 12 Q. No.
- 13 A. No, they weren't. They were --
- 14~ Q. They're just monitoring to see --
- 15 A. what we call the low—level review. Apologies.
- 16 Q. Yes. They're just monitoring to see that the actions 17 are closed out?
- 18 A. Yes, and there are no obvious changes to the building,
- 19 there's no evidence of arson or antisocial behaviour or
- any other areas which would lead you to think that
- there's an elevated degree of risk, or any works on site
- where there might be hot works that we're unaware of,
- 23 those kinds of issues.
- 24 Q. I see
- Now, Carl Stokes said in his evidence -- and, just

- 1 for our purposes, it's $\{Day136/148:12-16\}$, and we can 2 see it if you like -- he would receive copies of 3 something he called a health and safety tick-sheet. Can
- 4 you help me with that?
- A. No. 5

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- Q. What was that? You don't know? 6
- A. I really don't know, sorry. Because my colleague, when he was doing his reviews, would take out Carl's action 8 9 plan and we would add another column just to confirm 10 that what we thought had been completed was completed, 11 so that we had a record, and Carl wouldn't necessarily 12 have that, and after that was done and we moved on to 13 the next FRA. I'm not sure we would have necessarily 14 kept it. So I don't think we'd have shared that with
- him, and it wasn't a tick-sheet. 16 O. Well. that leads to the next question.
- 17 A. Oh. right. Sorry.
- 18 Q. Did you send him the FRA action plans with that fourth 19 column completed in them for his next FRA?
- 2.0 A. I don't recall that we did. We could have done, but 21 I don't recall that we did or that he requested them, 22 because I think he was going to refer back to his 2.3 original comprehensive assessment.
- 2.4 Q. Now, going back to the question of scope, can we go back 25 to the consultants' brief, please, {TMO00842371/6},

233

paragraph 1.1. I've read you this before, the reference to communal fire doors

Can you explain what you expected to be documented in the report? Was it detail of each communal fire door or just the fire doors that weren't operating correctly?

- A. I expected the action plan and significant findings to identify anything that we needed to action, so where he assured me that he did a visual check of all of the doors in the block, obviously in terms of flat entrance doors, generally that would be from the outside unless he managed to get access, but communal doors he would inspect from both sides, inspect the closer, any strips or seals or any door furniture, any glazing, all of that, and he would identify anything that was defective or potentially non-compliant, and that would be documented in the action plan, and that would allow us to raise the appropriate order for the works to be undertaken.
- 19 Q. Right.
- 2.0 Now, this document is July 2010. Can you just help 21 me, why were communal fire doors in particular singled 2.2 out for special treatment in paragraph 1.1 of this 23
- 2.4 A. I suppose because they protect the means of escape, 25 especially if there's a dedicated means of escape, often

234

- 1 communal fire doors are there to protect that. I can't 2
- 3 Q. You don't know?
- 4 A. No, I don't know. I mean, the difficulty with this 5 document, as I said before, is that it was put together involving other colleagues from the council, and I look 6 7 at it now and I don't know which bits were put in by 8 whom, but certainly Alexis did quite a lot of it, and it 9 may have been from him or me, I'm not sure.
- 10 Q. I mean, do you remember any particular problem or 11 concern arising at the time about communal fire doors 12 which would have meant that it should obtain such 13 a special place in this specification of services?
- 14 No, no, not especially. Obviously they were always 15 crucial to maintain the means of escape. The caretakers 16 were doing regular inspections and we thought it was 17 a very important —— and of the communal areas, so
- 18 they're an important part of the communal area so it's 19 important that they're looked at, and in some blocks
- 2.0 they were subject to quite a lot of use and so
- 21 potentially they could have failed more often, so we
- 22 wanted to be assured that they were being given the 2.3 level of scrutiny that they should have had.
- 2.4 Now, can we just go back to your first witness 2.5 statement, then, please, still on the question of scope,

235

1 and look at paragraph 140 at page 31 $\{TMO00000890/31\}$. 2

You say there three lines up from the bottom: "Carl's remit was the common areas of properties

only, however he had a helpful nature and would often make comments on matters outside of this remit."

What did you understand by the phrase "common areas"?

- A. I suppose well, I suppose; I understood it to be the communal areas, the areas which were sort of authorised access only, so the plant areas, and obviously the specification -- his documentation requires him to do a percentage of inspections of flat entrance doors. So he'll do all of the doors from the outside of the property, but he needed to try and gain access to a number of flat entrance doors so that we knew what they were like from the inside and he could make a better judgement about whether they were compliant or
- 19 Q. Right.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

- 2.0 A. Sorry, the other thing about communal areas is that 21 I knew that he would indicate if there was any issues in 2.2 terms of access to the block. I don't think that's
- 23 technically included in the fire risk assessment, but
- 2.4 I know that it's something that he would have

2.5 identified .

1 Q. Just focusing on that a little bit more, can we go back and South East Fire Safety Group, and I think they were 2 to the July 2010 consultants' brief, please, at 2 commonly doing 5% to 10%, so I think 5% to 10% was 3 ${TMO00842371/6}$. You will see at paragraph 1.3 it says: 3 pretty standard in the sector, although some people were 4 "FRAs and reviews will focus on ..." 4 perhaps doing significantly more. I think what I always wanted to be assured of is 5 Then there is a list of eight items, and I'll show 5 that, where possible, all different door types were 6 them to you in detail: 6 7 "i. The compartmentation of the building and any 7 sampled, and ideally there were several samples of each possible shortcomings with it. so we had a better indication of the condition of each. 8 8 9 "ii . The operation and adequacy of fire doors 9 Q. Did the checks include checking both the inside and the 10 10 including their fire resistance rating and smoke/fire outside of the door, in other words to include the 11 11 checking of self-closing devices, smoke seals, door 12 "iii . Adequacy of fire fighting equipment. 12 furniture, things like that? 13 "iv. Adequacy of automatic detection system, 13 That was my expectation, that where possible, access extraction systems, sprinklers, dry risers, wet risers 14 14 should be gained. 15 15 Q. Did you discuss with Carl Stokes, once he won the "v. Assessment of the means of escape (to include 16 16 medium-term programme under these terms and thereafter, 17 17 final exit doors) and assessment of secondary means of because these terms continued to govern, how Carl Stokes 18 escape where present and it's appropriateness/viability, 18 would choose which flat entrance door to assess? 19 emergency lighting, signage, etc. 19 A. I did, and it was along the lines of what I've just 2.0 "vi. Fitness for purpose of the building in relation 20 stated, actually, that would want -- where possible, 2.1 to fire safety. 21 where you can get access, I want you to get, if 22 "vii . Fire safety management systems and their 22 possible, access to each door type so that you can 2.3 23 recording procedures. review it from inside and out, look at the closer, look 2.4 "vii . Marking of fire detection and fire fighting 2.4 at the door furniture, and then you might have access to 25 equipment, fire doors (including their fire resistance 25 a symbol on the door which gives you better 237 239 1 rating and smoke/fire seals) and compartmentation on 1 clarification about what standard it met as well, and 2 floor plans provided by the client where possible and in 2. anything that was potentially non-compliant, definitely 3 all other cases to be produced by the consultant. 3 try and access that, but ideally multiple versions of Symbols and other information marked-up on the drawings each different style of door. 5 will be the same as in the HM Government Guides 'Fire 5 Q. Right 6 Safety Risk Assessment'." 6 Did you ever tell him that he needed to sample 5% to 7 7 Now, was it your understanding that each of those 10% in order for it to be a representative sample? A. I think I did. I mean, it's difficult because access, 8 8 instructions or those instructions generally included 9 9 checking a sample of flat entrance doors? as we know, is an issue, and I suppose the smaller the 10 A. Yes 10 block, the less doors you've got as your sample, and 11 Q. Do you know why the brief didn't say that specifically? 11 inevitably people are out during the day, at work, at 12 A. I don't. But it was always very clear from the outset 12 school, whatever. So, yes, I thought it was commonly 13 of both contracts that that was our expectation and 13 sort of agreed between us that that was what we were 14 14 that's what was being done. working towards. 15 Q. Right. How would he gain access to tenants' flats? 15 Q. Do you know where this list came from? A. Again, it was -- this was put together from a variety of 16 A. He had an ID, and initially in the contract we had 16 17 people, so I'm not clear, as I say, looking back which 17 written and written articles in the Link magazine to 18 bits were me, which bits were Alexis, but it was 18 advise that we were undertaking these and to encourage a combination.

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

2.4

2.5

confident that I raised it with my peers in the London 238

Q. Did you have an idea of what kind of percentage of flat

A. I actually couldn't find anywhere an indication of what

block such as Grenfell Tower?

front doors should be sampled in a high-risk high-rise

was -- what would be good practice. I think -- I'm

is normally in through the day, or they might be able to 240

around, they might be able to suggest that this person

people to provide access and to explain why the access

was required, obviously, and he would engage with people

when he was in the block, explain what he was doing, and

if they were happy to give him access, they would. He

would door knock. If the caretaker, the ESA, was

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

2.4

| 1 | attend with him so that anybody who was concerned about | 1 | again, please don't talk to anyone about your evidence |
|--|--|--|---|
| 2 | security or whatever would be assured. | 2 | or anything relating to it overnight. All right? |
| 3 | Q. Right. Did you ever consider pre—arranging access for | 3 | THE WITNESS: Okay. |
| 4 | him to particular flats? | 4 | SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you very much. |
| 5 | A. We did. Access is a perennial problem for housing | 5 | THE WITNESS: Thank you. |
| 6 | providers, and we did consider it, but to be honest, we | 6 | (Pause) |
| 7 | didn't go down that track. Obviously we've got very | 7 | SIR MARTIN MOORE-BICK: Thank you. |
| 8 | exacting requirements in terms of servicing gas | 8 | MR MILLETT: Thank you. |
| 9 | appliances and we've really struggled with that. | 9 | SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: 10 o'clock tomorrow, then, please. |
| 10 | You know, our compliance has been very good for many | 10 | Thank you. |
| 11 | years, but it is a relentless process and we've got | 11 | (4.30 pm) |
| 12 | a number of dedicated people who work exclusively on the | 12 | (The hearing adjourned until 10 am |
| 13 | access, so we didn't, is the $$ to cut a long story | 13 | on Tuesday, 8 June 2021) |
| 14 | short. I apologise. | 14 | |
| 15 | Q. Okay. | 15 | |
| 16 | Did you ever agree with him how his inspections of | 16 | |
| 17 | flat front doors would be documented in his FRAs? | 17 | |
| 18 | For example, would he document every door that he | 18 | |
| 19 | inspected, or only the ones where he found problems? | 19 | |
| 20 | A. Certainly everywhere where there's a problem would need | 20 | |
| 21 | to be documented on the significant findings and action | 21 | |
| 22 | plan. I would expect that in the body of his report, | 22 | |
| 23 | where possible, he would say $$ he would at least say, | 23 | |
| 24 | "I've been able to access eight dwellings", and ideally | 24 | |
| 25 | I would want him to put the flat numbers, but in truth | 25 | |
| | 241 | | 243 |
| | 241 | | 240 |
| | | | |
| 1 | I can't recall if he did. | 1 | |
| 1 2 | I can't recall if he did. Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. | 1 2 | INDEX |
| | | | INDEX MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. | 2 | |
| 2 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which | 2 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know | 2 3 4 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either | 2 3 4 5 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? | 2 3 4 5 6 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? A. We would know the doors which had been defective —— | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? A. We would know the doors which had been defective —— Q. Yes, but what about those where no defects had been | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? A. We would know the doors which had been defective —— Q. Yes, but what about those where no defects had been identified? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? A. We would know the doors which had been defective —— Q. Yes, but what about those where no defects had been identified? A. We wouldn't know that if he didn't record it. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? A. We would know the doors which had been defective —— Q. Yes, but what about those where no defects had been identified? A. We wouldn't know that if he didn't record it. MR MILLETT: Right. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? A. We would know the doors which had been defective —— Q. Yes, but what about those where no defects had been identified? A. We wouldn't know that if he didn't record it. MR MILLETT: Right. Mr Chairman, I'm really in the middle of the topic | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? A. We would know the doors which had been defective —— Q. Yes, but what about those where no defects had been identified? A. We wouldn't know that if he didn't record it. MR MILLETT: Right. Mr Chairman, I'm really in the middle of the topic of scope, but I'm certainly not going to finish it by | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? A. We would know the doors which had been defective —— Q. Yes, but what about those where no defects had been identified? A. We wouldn't know that if he didn't record it. MR MILLETT: Right. Mr Chairman, I'm really in the middle of the topic of scope, but I'm certainly not going to finish it by 4.30, because it is 4.30. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? A. We would know the doors which had been defective —— Q. Yes, but what about those where no defects had been identified? A. We wouldn't know that if he didn't record it. MR MILLETT: Right. Mr Chairman, I'm really in the middle of the topic of scope, but I'm certainly not going to finish it by 4.30, because it is 4.30. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Yes. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? A. We would know the doors which had been defective —— Q. Yes, but what about those where no defects had been identified? A. We wouldn't know that if he didn't record it. MR MILLETT: Right. Mr Chairman, I'm really in the middle of the topic of scope, but I'm certainly not going to finish it by 4.30, because it is 4.30. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Yes. MR MILLETT: So this is a natural moment to break, partly | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? A. We would know the doors which had been defective —— Q. Yes, but what about those where no defects had been identified? A. We wouldn't know that if he didn't record it. MR MILLETT: Right. Mr Chairman, I'm really in the middle of the topic of scope, but I'm certainly not going to finish it by 4.30, because it is 4.30. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Yes. MR MILLETT: So this is a natural moment to break, partly because of where the clock stands. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? A. We would know the doors which had been defective —— Q. Yes, but what about those where no defects had been identified? A. We wouldn't know that if he didn't record it. MR MILLETT: Right. Mr Chairman, I'm really in the middle of the topic of scope, but I'm certainly not going to finish it by 4.30, because it is 4.30. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Yes. MR MILLETT: So this is a natural moment to break, partly because of where the clock stands. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: I'm afraid it is, isn't it, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? A. We would know the doors which had been defective —— Q. Yes, but what about those where no defects had been identified? A. We wouldn't know that if he didn't record it. MR MILLETT: Right. Mr Chairman, I'm really in the middle of the topic of scope, but I'm certainly not going to finish it by 4.30, because it is 4.30. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Yes. MR MILLETT: So this is a natural moment to break, partly because of where the clock stands. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: I'm afraid it is, isn't it, Mr Millett, otherwise we shall be here for a long time. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? A. We would know the doors which had been defective —— Q. Yes, but what about those where no defects had been identified? A. We wouldn't know that if he didn't record it. MR MILLETT: Right. Mr Chairman, I'm really in the middle of the topic of scope, but I'm certainly not going to finish it by 4.30, because it is 4.30. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Yes. MR MILLETT: So this is a natural moment to break, partly because of where the clock stands. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: I'm afraid it is, isn't it, Mr Millett, otherwise we shall be here for a long time. MR MILLETT: Indeed. So I'm going to ask you to draw a line | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? A. We would know the doors which had been defective —— Q. Yes, but what about those where no defects had been identified? A. We wouldn't know that if he didn't record it. MR MILLETT: Right. Mr Chairman, I'm really in the middle of the topic of scope, but I'm certainly not going to finish it by 4.30, because it is 4.30. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Yes. MR MILLETT: So this is a natural moment to break, partly because of where the clock stands. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: I'm afraid it is, isn't it, Mr Millett, otherwise we shall be here for a long time. MR MILLETT: Indeed. So I'm going to ask you to draw a line for the day. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? A. We would know the doors which had been defective —— Q. Yes, but what about those where no defects had been identified? A. We wouldn't know that if he didn't record it. MR MILLETT: Right. Mr Chairman, I'm really in the middle of the topic of scope, but I'm certainly not going to finish it by 4.30, because it is 4.30. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Yes. MR MILLETT: So this is a natural moment to break, partly because of where the clock stands. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: I'm afraid it is, isn't it, Mr Millett, otherwise we shall be here for a long time. MR MILLETT: Indeed. So I'm going to ask you to draw a line for the day. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Yes. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? A. We would know the doors which had been defective —— Q. Yes, but what about those where no defects had been identified? A. We wouldn't know that if he didn't record it. MR MILLETT: Right. Mr Chairman, I'm really in the middle of the topic of scope, but I'm certainly not going to finish it by 4.30, because it is 4.30. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Yes. MR MILLETT: So this is a natural moment to break, partly because of where the clock stands. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: I'm afraid it is, isn't it, Mr Millett, otherwise we shall be here for a long time. MR MILLETT: Indeed. So I'm going to ask you to draw a line for the day. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Yes. Well, it is 4.30, Ms Wray, and I think it's time we | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. Well, I don't think he did, not in very many instances. My question then is: if he didn't document which doors he had inspected, how would you or your team know in the following year with your FRA review, either in—house or later, which doors had been looked at? A. We would know the doors which had been defective —— Q. Yes, but what about those where no defects had been identified? A. We wouldn't know that if he didn't record it. MR MILLETT: Right. Mr Chairman, I'm really in the middle of the topic of scope, but I'm certainly not going to finish it by 4.30, because it is 4.30. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Yes. MR MILLETT: So this is a natural moment to break, partly because of where the clock stands. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: I'm afraid it is, isn't it, Mr Millett, otherwise we shall be here for a long time. MR MILLETT: Indeed. So I'm going to ask you to draw a line for the day. SIR MARTIN MOORE—BICK: Yes. Well, it is 4.30, Ms Wray, and I think it's time we all stop for the day. So we're going to stop there. We | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | MS JANICE WRAY (sworn)1 |

abandoned (1) 85:4 ability (1) 113:15 able (23) 6:4 11:2 22:7,21 48:1 53:14 55:17 78:13,14,16 107:20 114:13 116:6 146:4 164:24 177:23 178:6 216:20 221:10.25 240:24,25 241:24 ablebodied (2) 23:8 144:8 above (11) 2:22 3:7,15,23 4:11 5:2.9 31:12 38:16 93:10 211:15 absence (1) 128:4 absent (1) 140:1 absolute (1) 177:2 absolutely (22) 8:16 21:3 33:15 48:20 65:4 88:8 107:14 119:16 123:8 125:24 136:21 160:1 162:8 165:25 176:9,19,24 179:10,15,23 180:13,17 ac (1) 31:13 accept (1) 181:3 acceptable (3) 32:18 92:18,25 acceptance (1) 204:22 accepted (1) 186:17 access (28) 6:3 44:8,9 124:6 136:12 161:20 212:21 226:25 227:20,22 234:11 236:10.14.22 239:13.21.22.24 240:3.8.15.19.19.22 241:3,5,13,24 accident (1) 74:9 accidents (4) 8:1 50:21 51:17 72:10 accommodation (5) 32:8 142:17 201:18 206:15 210:19 accompanies (1) 32:23 accordance (3) 32:5,10 33:4 according (3) 191:2 211:14 220:15 account (4) 123:7 133:23 211:2 231:12 accreditations (4) 196:21,22 200:17.19 accurate (3) 35:18 39:20 149:19 accurately (1) 117:11 achieve (1) 173:19 achieved (1) 32:19 achieving (2) 96:16 106:2 aciarb (1) 193:9 acquiring (1) 200:6 across (16) 7:23 16:16.19 22:4 28:25 44:17 46:6 82:2 85:8,14,24 105:22 158:23 168:19 193:11 199:20 acting (1) 175:10 action (35) 32:12,17 47:11 54:7 57:6 76:24 78:19 80:20 81:6 82:14 18 89:6.13 96:25 110:5.19 111:10,16,17,23,23 125:12 158:24 168:20 181:9 208:10 215:16 228:1 232:2 233:8,18 234:6,7,16 241:21 actioned (1) 112:8 actioning (1) 125:5 actions (16) 28:4 40:6,16 52:20 55:12 103:1,3 125:4 145:15.16.19 153:9 155:21 212:2 213:25 232:16 actively (2) 79:23 93:23 activities (5) 11:2 49:3 208:8 221:13 224:21 activity (1) 66:14 activityspecific (1) 224:23 actual (1) 209:7 actually (53) 6:21 9:6 17:23 19:4 22:19.25 25:6 38:16

43:15 49:16 51:7 55:5 56:17 59:22 60:1.21 61:14 63:3 81:16 86:16 89:13 99:4 103:3 116:1.5 118:7 126:1 132:2 146:2.4.6 151:3 152:8 154:23 155:11 157:25 163:1 180:1 181:16 182:7 197:5,6 204:11 212:20,25 216:12 217:1 222:11.13 224:25 225:12 238:23 239:20 ad (7) 136:17.17.22 224:6.18 225:3.16 adair (2) 63:7 168:3 adaptations (1) 112:23 add (2) 186:8 233:9 added (4) 71:7 140:3 150:18 227:13 addition (5) 50:1 51:21 55:14.24 57:18 additional (14) 51:11,12 77:7 78:15 80:1 94:17,21 110:15 115:4 144:16 186:23 204:10,19 227:2 additionally (2) 175:5 189:13 address (8) 35:4 113:7 114-23 127-16 129-21 141-20 172-20 211-9 addressed (4) 67:6 96:4 102:1 181:22 addressing (2) 16:4 128:13 adept (1) 48:18 adequacy (5) 46:24 198:9 237:9,12,13 adequate (8) 30:2,10 32:2 45:15 46:19 48:9 111:25 125:7 adequately (3) 46:5 55:10 107:6 adhere (1) 16:3 adhering (2) 16:7 143:12 adjacent (1) 211:24 adjourned (1) 243:12 adjournment (2) 134:4,25 administrator (1) 8:9 adopt (5) 72:15 85:15 97:2 100:7 101:14 adopted (8) 142:10 152:11 155:12,17 160:25 162:19 163:21 210:17 adopting (1) 87:18 adrian (19) 6:3 37:16.17.21 41:18 50:17 51:5 52:18.25 54:1,13 87:3 94:17 143:2 161:12 212:25 213:1 214:3,4 adult (1) 84:2 advance (4) 77:20 118:6 147:21 210:4 advantage (1) 204:12 advice (18) 7:22 41:17 44:9 82:13 128:20 142:21 173:23 179:4,18 216:18 218:7 219:20 220:9,13 221:11 222:6 224:13,14 adviceguidance (1) 166:20 advise (4) 41:22 57:6 167:23 240:18 advised (11) 22:23 71:8 75:21 111:25 123:25 124:4,7 164:21 218:13 219:14 222:7 adviser (11) 7:17 56:25 72:22 73:19 74:8 82:9 83:1,7 88:14,24 142:22 advisers (1) 73:8 advising (4) 42:4 51:17 97:24 115:24 advisor (4) 37:16 71:22 77:6 96:14 advisors (1) 50:17

after (41) 8:18 9:20 13:6 18:17 22:3 25:13 60:3 63:6 66:10.11 67:3.9.14 70:7 77:24 78:19 79:16 104:5 131:3 134:4.8 143:21 145:13 150:2 166:21 177:18 183:8 195:13 206:25 211:6,17,18 215:4 217:14 219:16 220:6 222:2.21 228:7 231:1 233-12 aftermath (3) 4:15.23 5:7 afternoon (2) 65:8 194:11 afternoons (1) 2:3 afterwards (3) 90:18 192:21,23 again (30) 4:3 14:10 19:13 21:9.12.22 24:5.10 40:1 46:14 53:8 16 54:16 61:12 82:21 102:11 105:18 106:25 111:24 165:25 191:4 194:12 205:8 217:15.22 219:12.20.21 238:16 243:1 against (4) 34:7 101:24 173:16 207:8 agenda (6) 52:3 71:2,3,4 118-5 183-12 agendas (2) 67:24 167:21 agents (2) 18:7 24:24 ago (7) 8:17 12:3 14:22 15:4 25:24 66:18 191:5 agree (18) 63:2,13 75:4 76:1 96:25 101:9 107:7 108:18 20 111:17 125:23 164:4 180:10 195:22 203:20,22 231:2 241:16 agreed (23) 32:11 88:20 89:16 91:25 92:23 93:4 97:9,20 99:25 112:9 140:1 158:12 160:23 164:1 170:24,24 171:1 173:2 174:21 175:4 190:7 191:2 240:13 agreeing (2) 87:17 125:25 agreement (9) 25:3 28:21,23 29:10 93:5 101:10,16 105:1 168:24 ah (1) 96:21 aie (3) 136:17,17,23 aim (2) 100:9,11 alarm (2) 132:22 144:9 alarms (2) 79:5 132:18 albeit (1) 107:4 alerted (3) 113:15,21 144:9 alex (2) 57:3 154:19 alexis (5) 88:14,23 187:8 235:8 238:18 allegedly (1) 152:10 allocate (1) 47:7 allocated (6) 28:2.4 40:6 42:19 55:13 153:10 allow (2) 101:5 234:16 almost (3) 99:21 193:11 214:20 olong (7) 26:14 55:20 70:23 145:18 224:12 230:17 239:19 alpesh (5) 161:3.4 163:5.6 166:10 already (17) 17:11 55:5 89:16 99:1 107:15 116:4 120:19,20 125:17 130:3 151:16.25 162:10 167:18 200:3,12 202:25 also (64) 2:7,10 6:2 12:12 17:24 23:7.22 25:16 26:15,23 31:2,3 32:22 37:17,24 38:14 40:10 44:15 45:14 50:23 51:10 55:24 56:18 59:2 61:9 62:24 68:11 69:4 70:1,5 72:11 76:23 83:16 84:11 90:3 93:13 94:4 100:8 101:11.16 112:19 113:1.3

155-23 157-23 160-2 167:17.17 169:7 182:12 186:8 190:15 192:17 203:5 214:14 216:19 219:16 224:5 225:20 228:16 alterations (5) 167:3 184:21 210:25 212:1 229:20 alternative (5) 14:17 33:4 86:16 175:2 180:7 alternatives (1) 33:6 although (9) 6:21 32:21 84:8 118:10 138:15 158:1 206:2 218:3 239:3 always (41) 12:11 14:16 24:18 26:5 47:25 48:1,20 49:2,13 50:3 54:20 58:5 60:7 71:20 77:17 80:25 81:1 95:6 113:16 132:17 152:4 153:8 170:4 174:7 182:9 196:8 203:20 205:24 206:1 207:11 219:23 220:14,15,16,21 224:10,21 226:1 235:14 238:12 239:5 amanda (2) 169:7 218:10 amber (1) 110:14 amended (3) 10:12 133-21-22 ending (1) 115:2 amendments (2) 33:14 79:22 among (3) 94:3,13,16 amongst (1) 93:12 ount (4) 9:3 176:12,13 197:6 amounted (1) 93:18 andor (4) 106:5,18 144:9 210:14 andrew (2) 104:2 120:16 andy (1) 177:13 anecdotal (1) 56:4 angus (6) 90:25 91:9,15 92:15,24 93:11 ann (14) 25:20 102:5,7,9 105:11 120:9,15,22 173:12 174:15.18 189:7.20 218:4 annual (18) 8:2 10:1.1.4.13 26:6,24 28:7 51:6 70:4,11 76:23 77:18 78:18 82:20,24 83:5,5 annually (1) 115:22 another (10) 52:3 89:18 114:12 130:23 152:24 176:10 178:8.9 230:14 233:9 answer (20) 23:11 27:1 40:16 43:2 45:9 55:6 58:4 59:12 67:20 102:10 126:20,21 131:25 149:13 176:14 177:17 178:16 184:17 195:6.12 answered (1) 73:25 answering (1) 103:8 wers (3) 7:1.3 23:16 anthony (18) 37:23 38:21,25 58:25 61:14 67:18,19 68:7,20 79:19 80:4 120:2 154-23 158-10 22 159:23.24 163:17 anticipate (1) 174:24 anticipated (1) 231:25 antisocial (1) 232:19 anybody (16) 5:22 26:14 48:21 58:1 82:14 93:23 133:7 184:17 186:4 202:5.18 217:20 218:2 221:3 222:9 241:1 anyone (8) 65:12 113:14 126:4 134:17 142:23 176:14 194:13 243:1 anything (23) 6:5 15:25 45:22 50:4 65:12 71:7 86:13 93:18,19 94:2,15 97:19 119:10 134:17

196:17 223:22 234:7,14

240:2 243:2

115:24 122:7,18 143:4

anyway (2) 30:17 92:5

arranged (3) 10:7 86:19

arrangements (11) 75:11,19

222:8

anywhere (2) 122:11 238:23 aob (1) 147:17 aov (1) 140:8 aovs (1) 203:4 ap238 (2) 161:21.22 apart (1) 108:15 apologies (7) 20:23 29:8 103:9 163:22 208:1 228:25 232:15 apologise (1) 241:14 appear (4) 105:24 109:15 124:17 144:25 appeared (1) 202:14 appears (5) 101:9 109:6 125:3 139:1 157:1 append (1) 150:11 appended (1) 150:15 appendices (2) 141:1 150:10 appending (1) 154:13 appendix (3) 144:20 150:13,15 appliances (4) 115:19,23 119:5 241:9 applicable (1) 30:14 applies (1) 106:4 apply (1) 232:6 applying (1) 202:18 appoint (4) 43:7 57:20 97:15 172:13 appointed (14) 46:17 48:7 51:24 98:10,23 99:3 104:5 151:22 158:25 177:7 192:23 205:8 216:17 230:10 appointing (1) 135:13 appointment (5) 25:14 67:9 89:8 184:25 203:23 appraise (1) 209:15 appraised (1) 50:12 appreciate (1) 141:4 approach (22) 70:13 72:13 85:5,15 87:12 89:14 96:16 97:2 100:7 101:14 124:12 168:15 180:22 181:3 182:2 191:2 204:16 210:10 218:21 224:1,6 225:16 approached (1) 169:22 appropriate (11) 11:9 14:15,18 23:3 26:11 32:17 214:7,17 215:11 228:19 234:17 appropriatenessviability (1) 237:18 approval (8) 36:14 139:7 162:17 175:7 182:5 186:16 218:21 224:9 approve (3) 36:25 222:9 224:18 approved (14) 113:2 137:4 151:19,19 152:21 155:12 162:19.23 163:7.13 219:4 221:3 224:1.4 april (14) 39:12 77:12,23 145:6 164:6,9,18 165:10,11,24 166:4 171:8 174-22 229-15 arduous (1) 217:5 area (2) 223:7 235:18 areas (36) 11:24 20:2 23:6 27:10 35:1.7.8.14.14.23.24 36:1,23 42:8 51:7 78:15 85:8 92:3 94:6 110:22 128:6.6 140:25 143:7 160:8 173:22 227:19.20 232:20 235:17 236:3.7.9.9.10.20 arent (4) 86:3,13 115:21 116:5 arising (2) 101:25 235:11 armed (1) 72:7 arose (1) 224:8 around (4) 15:15 20:5 159:8 138:14 153:12 155:5 240:24

106:12.24 108:20 112:1 125:8 130:17 166:23 224:19 225:3 arrival (1) 155:10 arrived (2) 38:19 156:12 arson (1) 232:19 article (4) 43:6 44:19,25 45:5 articles (2) 11:21 240:17 asbestos (2) 8:1 161:20 aside (1) 88:17 ask (47) 2:1,7,10,16 6:7,24 8:4 25:8 28:12 29:9 44:10 58:18 75:23 76:17 77:21 81:5 93:19 96:21,22 104:3 109:14 126:4,17 128:9,25 131:18 135:21 139:11 146:9,13 151:9 157:18 169:8 182:1,10 195:1,4 198-1 203-8 205-17 22 206:21 207:17 215:14 227:10 229:2 242:20 asked (32) 28:8 34:23,25 63:7 64:21,22 66:13 67:1,8,21 73:25 80:1 88:18 92:24 95:7,9 98:12 102:24 103:7 115:14 124:12 160:1 171-16 173-18 179-24 180-13 183-17 188-8 192:11,13 206:13 216:4 asking (10) 35:8,8,25 40:17 92:16 128:8 154:4 178:21 188:19 209:18 aspect (3) 55:6 163:19,19 aspects (4) 19:17 51:16 143-11 214-12 assess (3) 11:2 213:12 239:18 assessed (3) 85:23 184:24 221:11 sessing (3) 190:1 223:5 224:23 ssessment (50) 4:8 7:25 25:17 27:21 28:14 32:8,25 33:5 40:4.5.17 46:3 47:11 55:12 63:17.25 94:24 95:4 103:4 104:7,18 129:7,8,24 146:15,16 154:17 186:13,25 187:13 192:18 193:5 197:23 198:7,9,14 199:2 200:19 208:11 210:3 211:2 213:9,19 214:23 227:17 233:23 236:23 237:16.17 238:6 assessments (53) 11:3 19:22 20:2,11 25:8,12 26:25 28:4 35:21 36:22 48:15 63:19 64:1,2,19 66:7,25 67:14 82:3 87:1,22 88:6 89:22 90:23 91:1,4,7,10,14,19,23 92:18 93:2 95:2 97:16 135:13 183:13.23 187:2 188:2 192:4 193:12 201:24 202:2 203:19 205:18 207:7,21 209:17 210:14 221:10 229:7 232:9 assessor (30) 28:3 88:17 89:2 95:13,15 101:21 127:19 128:5 129:17.23 172:13 177:21 178:5 183:16.18 187:22 193:14 197:24 198:20,21 199:24,25 200:6 201:3,4 202:16 207:1,9 215:19 232:7 ssessors (3) 99:2 188:20 196:23 asset (1) 104:20 assets (7) 136:3,23,24 137:2 145:4.22 147:11 assist (10) 23:10 43:7 45:7 53:2 114:6,8,14 165:16 193:23 221:16 assistance (6) 44:21 79:13 144:9.10.17 221:11

assisted (1) 75:13 assisting (1) 1:22 167:16 189:7 160:14 241:2 241:1 162:5 236:9 225:18,23 230:12 awry (1) 158:1

associated (2) 112:18 124:10 associates (2) 209:1 223:1 association (1) 21:5 assume (6) 20:24 78:18 120:24 142:9 150:17 assumed (9) 20:5 26:10 34:3 73:23 76:6 99:24 128:3 160:4 192:24 assuming (7) 99:4,12,24 127:17 136:22 148:18 assumption (1) 167:13 assurance (3) 61:13 158:25 assure (1) 46:4 assured (10) 100:24 172:17 180:15 190:17 196:16 206:16 234:8 235:22 239:5 attached (2) 140:22 165:17 attachment (1) 141:9 attachments (1) 141:7 attempt (1) 131:24 attend (7) 28:8 56:13 69-14 17 74-25 98-13 attendance (6) 62:21,22 63:12 90:1 183:8 225:22 attended (10) 12:6 17:14.24 19:8 29:6 50:23 62:24 107:21 189:13 214:15 attendees (1) 164:17 attending (5) 14:2 42:6 101:22 172:19 207:5 attention (2) 208:12 225:4 attracted (1) 144:23 audit (18) 51:8 58:2 59:15 61:12 68:12 75:11,14,18 76:7 80:7,15 99:13 106:23 158:24 160:15,19 161:5,9 audited (2) 9:5 75:12 auditing (3) 75:13,24 202:24 audits (3) 55:1 75:16 161:10 august (7) 4:10 23:18 89:23 146:4 185:5 228:6,23 author (4) 156:6,10 157:1 authored (1) 157:5 authorised (3) 136:17 138:20 authorities (1) 11:17 authority (9) 12:1,4,9 162:24 179:21 180:2,4 204:8,16 authorship (1) 156:21 automatic (5) 113:19 132:15 133:20 139:23 237:13 available (9) 21:18 45:19 48:8.18 123:25 124:4 127:4 130:12 210:5 aware (34) 49:11 52:5 56:3 72:10 74:4 87:9 88:22 93:5,16 96:18 99:11 111-19 125-18 127-14 128:5 154:20 155:22 170:2 177:11 191:18 196:14.18.25 197:12.22 198:4,10 199:11 200:21 204:9 212:8 221:23 wareness (1) 95:23 away (6) 15:17 148:20 192:14 195:13 205:16

advisory (1) 7:22

af (3) 124:5,12,13

affiliate (1) 9:19

afraid (3) 58:6 80:19 242:18

afd (1) 133:3

back (72) 5:20 16:23 21:25

24-13 28-4 36-15 37-8

43:2.16 46:12 50:14 55:3

61:12,24 68:5 71:16,17

74:11 76:20 84:20 96:10

121:15 123:13 128:1.24

100:3 110:3 111:22 114:19

assistant (5) 37:15 135:14

assistants (2) 52:14,15

136:19.21.22

133:12 134:4,8,15 135:9 144:22 145:1.13 147:1.24 148:9.21 149:23 150:8 151:5 152:7 154:25 165:12 168:11 169:16 171:11.22 176:7,11,24 177:23,24 180:15 190:11 194:12 197:6,7 206:3 208:5 224:24 225:11 226:21 233:22,24,24 235:24 237:1 238-17 backwardlooking (1) 99:22 balance (1) 192:1 barbara (26) 37:19,22 38:12,12,14,17,19 39:1 58:22 59:21 61:3 62:11,16 63:3,8 64:18 69:19 70:22 79:16,23 82:4 169:2,3 170-13 221-4 23 barbaras (3) 37:23 59:23 167:15 barr (1) 150:19 based (6) 8:24 136:3,11 149:21 150:5 152:8 bases (1) 49:6 basically (2) 10:4 200:15 basis (18) 21:12 48:19 55:17 56:1 20 67:12 70:6 127:2 144:18 145:17 203:19 209:2 220:22 221:2 226:12.19 227:3 232:6 battery (2) 132:18,22 bears (1) 169:15 became (8) 9:21 56:13,17 127:18 145:20 196:25 222:24 227:9 become (2) 9:15 196:18 becoming (1) 218:19 before (50) 5:12,22 10:11 15:6 17:12 18:12 38:19 54:23 58:16 65:2 77:3,19 78:22 79:19 83:13 85:17 87:2,14 91:10,14 109:21 118:14 131:15 132:16.16 134:7 135:8 136:24 137:1 148:3 157:8 158:10 170:1,11,25 171:13 176:11 186:16 192:21,23,25 194:25 195:12 205:16 211:22 212:12 217:8 227:16 234:1 235:5 beg (1) 9:18 beginning (2) 168:23 177:7 begun (1) 215:3 behalf (5) 104:8 106:6 175:10,13 228:16 behaviour (1) 232:19 behind (1) 89:7 being (52) 12:23 15:21 21:10 27:2 29:8 37:7 41:21 43:3 46:2 47:9 53:6.16 54:19 55:9.11.13.15 56:2 57:5 67:11 94:24 98:15,16,25 101:24,25 108:13 133:24 144:5 146:17 159:14 161:9 162:11 168:3 175:9 177:22 178:25 179:4 181:22 197:2 206:10 211:12.14 212:3.12.14 213:20 217:9 226:11 228:15 235:22 238:14 belief (2) 85:22 188:9 believe (49) 17:8 20:13 22:13 23:20 25:16 26:6 37:1,3 61:12 68:14 80:9 83:5 88:4.23 95:16 97:5.11 102:8 107:24 115:18 118:11,23 119:9,23,24 127:24 130:4 142:24 145:24 148:12 156:14 158:22 163:2 169:6 172:25 175:11 179:1 187:8 189:22 205:13 206:23 207:4 209:6 212:13 225:7,17 226:7 227:6 231:5

box (4) 88:12 136:7,16 below (4) 38:7 69:25 165:19 209:12 braces (1) 99:5 brain (2) 141:1 168:7 benchmarks (1) 173:15 bre (1) 13:7 breach (2) 110:13,23 best (11) 39:6 70:16 110:14 breaches (5) 119:15 134:10 158:11 159:24 164:23 203:5,7 210:18 breaching (1) 204:17 break (16) 2:4,5 58:16 better (12) 47:17 53:13,20 146:5 167:8 168:6 173:6,6 214:13 236:17 239:8.25 breaking (2) 52:11 86:25 between (25) 27:24 29:13 31:8 59:5,10 63:15 64:5 breaks (1) 2:2 69:5 72:13 76:4 88:13 brief (12) 7:14 28:6 159:25 89:24 138:2 139:12 141:16 164:1 170:13 179:19 195:5 202:2 203:24 211:24.25 briefed (3) 120:6 129:20 beyond (6) 6:5 126:21 briefing (5) 10:9 11:20 17:24 130:6,24 153:23 162:12 biborough (3) 56:14,15 briefings (2) 14:1 20:4 big (3) 86:17 179:15 223:7 briefly (2) 106:10 107:4 bimonthly (2) 50:24 150:23 brigade (49) 12:21 13:12 bit (41) 5:25 6:24.25 10:15 12:23 15:5 19:20 27:17 17 35:9 41:25 49:10 56:17,18 57:9,9 61:17,18 68:25 86:25 89:15 92:4 94:10 99:4 102:21 103:1 107:4 108:22 114:15 156:3 158:1 173:6 180:20 184:22 187:9 191-22 195-2 197-4 214-6 bits (3) 235:7 238:18,18 black (7) 39:11 84:8 96:7 131:8 133:7 142:4 174:17 brigades (3) 86:6 102:2 block (17) 15:19,19 18:18 bring (2) 33:3 228:8 54:5 167:5 210:6,8,25 211:4 212:7 213:10,13 brings (1) 30:14 234:9 236:22 238:22 broad (2) 11:5 133:5 brought (5) 33:6 52:2,3 blocks (26) 16:1 18:19 21:6 23:10 36:24 48:14 97:17 brushed (1) 214:9 99:18 121:2 168:21 175:25 bs (1) 24:7 179:14,14 182:2 184:14,21 budget (8) 45:19,21 47:14 188:2,10 203:2 208:2,14 209:5 210:19 212:6 228:20 budgetary (7) 25:5 27:17 board (42) 8:12 26:7,8 38:8 budgeted (2) 222:15.16 69:12,17,17,18,21 70:5 budgets (5) 25:4 45:24 77:3 80:11,16 81:22 116:8,16 117:25 118:4,4 building (18) 16:11,11 25:4 119:7,12 122:5,17,23 158:10,14 163:20 200:1 224:2.9.16.16.18 225:5.5 buildings (8) 15:13 21:6 24:8 199:10,18 200:12 241:22 built (1) 176:2 bulk (1) 30:18 bullet (16) 29:21 30:13

122:13,13 123:9 129:15

65:7.9.20 134:9.11.14.18

135:8 194:7.11.20 195:12

160:2,19 174:19 185:9

226:3 229:4 233:25 237:2

18:24 22:24 25:10 44:15

86:2,14,22 87:9,15 89:14

92:2,11 94:5 95:8 97:6

102:2 114:13,13 121:10

98:13 99:10 100:1.23

143:11 151:15 152:1

155:19 166:20 173:21

176:4 178:21 179:19

203:14,19 225:21

181:19

152:23 225:4

179:12

86:18 176:12,22 177:25

46:9 47:4.10.23 219:23

126:25 164:13 176:21

28:21 86:12,13 92:11

113:2 176:8 179:20 181:10

85:22 176:6 202:13 205:23

33:23 39:19 40:19 42:2

124:3 147:17 151:12

busy (4) 49:7 70:24 77:14

166:22 167:2.7

225:11

97:14 99:15 100:4 123:22

227:8,19 230:23 231:13

232:18 237:7.20

229:13

181:11,14 188:6,7 202:15

50:24 63:6 64:9 70:14

74:12 79:8 85:11

242:16

238-11

130:4

20:22 22:5

bell (1) 132:20

199:2

belt (1) 99:5

216:21

beneficial (1) 91:13

229:21 240:13

216:20 237:1

240:10.21

235:19

64:5 66:10

123:5 127:9 152:23

205:11 218:22

body (6) 74:4 198:25

borough (5) 31:20 48:13

50:25 104:21 182:12

borra (2) 136:2 145:24

bosman (2) 57:3 154:19

both (19) 19:18 24:20 25:18

35:9 60:21 69:20 86:20

92:23 93:4 139:14 194:2

228:14,17 234:12 238:13

bottom (25) 29:22 31:10.18

39:10 75:9 84:7 92:14

97:3,13 98:5 99:15 109:2

117:22 121:16 123:14,23

162:5 164:19 165:9 177:9

54:1 87:3 213:1 214:3,4,18

124:2 149:3 156:9.21

bowman (9) 6:3 37:16.21

195:22 201:22 221:9

239:9

236:2

bold (1) 193:7

bore (1) 86:9

book (1) 106:17

boroughs (1) 29:7

buy (1) 13:16 c (1) 193:9 cajole (2) 42:18 47:8 calendar (2) 78:3,4 caliskan (1) 84:16 call (12) 1:9 14:19 16:19 18:24 52:12.12 75:2 104:14 114:12 129:23 213:5 232:15 called (14) 13:2,8 21:6,17

23:22 39:9 56:10 68:12

227:11

82:23 108:24 140:19 169:2 197:23 233:3 calling (1) 141:16 came (26) 13:7 20:1 28:5 40:5.5 47:11 59:21 105:14 131:11 132:17 146:4 151:5 154:25 157:14 172:2 184:4 187:6 201:10 205:11 219:17 220:3 222:11 224:12 227:7.12 238:15 candidate (1) 203:7 cannot (3) 30:5 32:15 210:11 cant (62) 8:16 20:13.21.23 24:5 26:4,22 48:22 58:6 66:12 67:12 80:1,18,18 90:8 93:25 94:18,19 95:5,10 101:14 102:14 109:9 122:18.24 123:12 126:8.20.21 127:4 130:6 133:10 138:18 140:7 155:4 157:2 163:5 167:19 179:16 182:7 186:2 187:23 188:12.15.20 194:2 203:10 206:1 207:18 211:22 214:8,20 216:12 218:3,10,23 222:5 225:9.13 228:25 235:1 242.1 capacity (4) 62:13 126:3,5 201:14 care (1) 84:2 career (1) 9:11 careful (1) 219:24 caretaker (2) 227:21 240:23 caretakers (8) 51:9,11 52:12 53:3 56:4 128:15 226:24 235:15 carl (60) 44:13 127:18 128:17 129:6,25 140:20 142:25 143:15,21 144:24 147:1 149:22 185:1,5 187:12 188:11,17 190:7,18 191:8,15 192:17 193:24 196:13 199:8 202:16 209:1 212:16.19 214:10.22 215:7,14,23 216:5 217:7,19 218:15 219:3,8 220:5,11 221:9 222:1,10 223:1,24 224:7 225:3,16,21,25 228:8 229:16 230:6 232:10.25 233:11 239:15.17 carls (2) 233:8 236:3 carried (16) 33:14 36:23 56:22 91:7,11 139:21 172:24 173:9 211:3,12 212:12 214:22 215:17 216:5 226:14 232:3 carries (1) 198:7 carry (18) 10:21 11:3,3 65:22 88:5 92:18.25 103:14 135:3 184:13 187:2 193:25 194:22 201:24 202:2 212:18 215:23 219:8 carrying (4) 91:3 190:19 204:1 226:18 cases (13) 112:22,25 113:17.19.22.24.25.25 114:4 144:14 212:19 221:16 238:3 casting (1) 39:19 catchups (1) 49:5 caught (3) 70:5 179:19 181:11 cause (1) 78:10 caused (2) 92:4 138:9 celia (3) 84:16.19.19 centre (1) 54:15 certain (2) 24:1 63:5 certificate (4) 8:11 37:17 187:19 214:5

certified (1) 199:17 cetera (8) 33:9 48:8 79:7 82:3 115:5 153:14 193:9 214:15 chair (3) 13:8 61:3 144:15 chaired (5) 38:13 58:22,24 62:20 145:24 chairman (11) 1:7,18 7:2 58:15 66:1 130:10 134:8 135:7 194:6 195:7 242:12 challenge (12) 108:14 114:14 128:25 175:9.11.22 179:1.2 180:1.2 181:2 207:17 challenged (1) 26:10 challenging (1) 86:4 change (7) 7:21 29:9 144:19 154:24 211:1.3 231:9 changed (15) 6:19 7:17 26:18 53:8 132:20 136:25 137:1 150:5 160:2 191:11 212:8,8 213:18,18 222:23 changes (15) 5:19 50:21 70:13 143:25 148:10,12 151:14 153:15 154:21 165:16 167:5 168:14 169:1 232-3 18 changing (3) 11:8 70:17 113:19 chartered (4) 9:1,11,21,22 chase (4) 42:17 47:8 212:23 213:14 chased (1) 50:9 chasing (1) 149:18 check (8) 75:1 198:23 199:16 211:25 213:13 214:6 215:16 234:8 checked (6) 75:3 95:6,7 188:4 215:12 222:12 checking (7) 53:15 115:3 212:2 213:17 238:9 239:9,11 checklist (3) 115:3 150:11,14 checklists (1) 128:15 checks (8) 53:16 57:11 79:6 172:18 189:15,23 198:16 239:9 chelsea (6) 29:25 30:7 31:21 51:1 88:15 104:22 chief (3) 39:11 41:20 106:6 chivvy (2) 55:20 145:17 choice (4) 199:14.15.22.23 choose (1) 239:18 choosing (1) 197:24 chosen (1) 91:13 chunk (1) 193:6 circulate (2) 147:20 148:2 circulated (2) 123:18 148:4 circulation (1) 200:9 circumstances (4) 131:10 180:5 210:23 222:2 city (1) 13:10 cladding (3) 16:10,10,17 clarification (1) 240:1 clarified (1) 189:17 clarify (5) 86:5 89:12,18 124:12 151:21 clarifying (3) 86:17 92:1 144:13 clarity (2) 86:8.21 class (1) 223:14 classification (1) 223:15 classified (2) 222:25 223:3 clear (32) 30:15,25 34:7 41:15 62:21 63:11 91:21 108:15 128:2.23 132:23 143:12 149:15 151:8 156:1 159:25 165:25 166:14 169:7 171:12 176:10,17,20 178:6 179:16,20 180:6 191:7 217:17 232:8 certificates (3) 85:5 187:18 238:12.17 191:23 clearly (10) 2:10 24:25 81:14 certification (8) 198:24,25 102:19 111:14 149:13 199:9.10.18 200:11.12 157:3 174:5 191:19 229:12

client (6) 96:13 175:10

164:2,9 165:14

186:12 201:19 206:21 238:2 clients (4) 205:17 206:2,7,9 clock (1) 242:17 close (3) 46:23 114:11 130:5 closed (2) 54:19 232:17 closely (6) 15:5 73:8 108:22 157:8 163:11 200:10 closer (2) 234:12 239:23 closing (1) 213:24 clue (1) 99:14 cmiosh (1) 9:13 coding (1) 110:12 coincide (1) 99:6 colin (2) 22:14 195:22 collate (1) 54:23 colleague (13) 6:3 41:17 48:16 51:5 84:17 87:3 161-12 185-12 212-5 25 215:11 216:3 233:7 colleagues (34) 7:23 10:15 22:14 25:15,19 26:2 36:11 40:2.3 79:2.10 85:23 97:24 108:2,3 113:9 139:5 143:1,2 169:4 182:9 186:6 216:18 217:6,17,22,23 218-24 25 221-20 225-22 227-8 230-13 235-6 collect (1) 227:14 colour (1) 110:12 colourcoding (1) 110:9 colouring (1) 21:9 column (6) 105:20,22 106:20 111:6 233:9,19 combination (2) 189:9 238:19 come (39) 5:20 16:23 21:25 24:21 25:22 37:8 41:17 43:2.15 49:8 68:8 74:10 84:20 89:1 108:11 114:19 116:12,14 121:15 127:21 128:24 131:3 134:4,8,15 139:6 144:22 145:1 147:1 149:23 152:14 169:8.16 177:8 188:16 194:12 196:21 200:8 226:21 comery (2) 150:22 153:23 comes (1) 221:25 comfortable (1) 1:12 coming (13) 1:21 5:12,23 22:11 25:15 47:12 102:21.23 103:3 181:7 215:15 224:24 228:17 commence (1) 100:11 commencement (2) 99:17 172:7 nent (4) 76:10 89:10 118:1 151:2 commented (2) 76:13 133:14 comments (15) 30:17 56:4 79:21 82:7 119:8 140:23 143:16.21.24.25 144:23 148:21 149:8 153:1 236:5 commentsfeedback (1) 158:9 commissioned (2) 145:14 159:10 commitment (7) 64:10 96:15 132:7 172:15 179:15 184:9 205:9 commitments (1) 172:8 committee (94) 36:13 38:13 41:1 50:23 51:15,19 53:23 55:21 56:11.12 58:21.25 59:4.7.8 60:3.4.7.25 61:2.8.8.11.16.19.22.25 62:19 63:20 64:15.20 67:7.14 68:13.15 69:2.5.9 71:23,25 77:2 80:7,8,16 81:17,19,22 82:24 83:13,14 84:1,3 136:7 137:5,8 138:25 139:7 146:10 147:9 149:5.10.11 151:10 154:2 155:8.13.14 157:21 160:22 162:16.23

167:10.11.13.14 170:1 171:10.13 177:14 181:25 182:6.25 183:6.14 209:11.15.19 216:9.10 224:4.5 committees (9) 42:7 50:11 59:6,11 60:12,22 67:24 82:20 145:12 common (4) 85:24 211:7 236:3.6 commonly (2) 239:2 240:12 communal (16) 20:2 36:23 51:7 85:8 168:21 229:10 234:2,4,11,21 235:1,11,17,18 236:9,20 communicate (2) 61:24 123:4 communicated (1) 18:22 communication (1) 182:23 communities (1) 209:23 community (1) 115:6 company (1) 201:21 compared (1) 191:3 compartment (1) 114:12 compartmentation (2) 237:7 238:1 compete (1) 174:9 competence (15) 93:12 94:3,13,15 98:3,4,16 183:18 190:8,18 191:16 193:25 196:14 198:19 200:4 competency (5) 98:1,2 197:23 199:1,2 competent (24) 43:4.7.11.12.22.24 44:7 45:4,14 46:18 47:1,16 48:11,23 56:25 88:5 95:2.14 97:15 159:5 197:24 198:16,22 204:5 complete (6) 22:21 107:21 108:10 144:13 174:21 175:4 completed (27) 8:10 49:20 52:22 53:7 54:1 55:4.15 91:14 100:14 101:3 104:19 108:13 109:22 129:1 146:18 170:19 184:19 193:6 210:3,8 211:17 213:14 229:15 232:9 233:10.10.19 completely (5) 2:10 63:3 116:8 200:1 232:4 completing (4) 100:8 145:18 170:17 225:25 completion (4) 99:18 100:12 208:25 211:8 complex (1) 85:22 complexity (1) 211:11 compliance (16) 30:2 42:4,9 51:22 57:8 75:2.3 79:4.6 96:4.17 106:2 136:3 145:25 210:13 241:10 compliancy (1) 160:16 compliant (2) 164:23 236:17 complicated (1) 56:14 complied (3) 30:23 42:13 228:10 comply (4) 30:7 31:1 166:19 204:6 complying (5) 32:22 33:4 57:17 96:15 132:7 comprehensive (9) 12:2 168:9 210:5.7 211:24 213:9 221:15 230:15 233:23 comprehensively (3) 117:11 229:19 231:9 concentrate (1) 232:1 concept (3) 20:3 43:11 231:19 concern (4) 19:21 54:7 128:6 235:11 concerned (6) 132:18 159:20

Opus 2 Official Court Reporters

believed (3) 49:7,24 91:23

concerning (1) 62:25

199:8.11 201:11 241:1

deal (5) 103:5 112:17 115:1

124:9 146:19

59:6.20 61:1

deals (1) 167:2

dealbreaker (1) 102:21

dealing (6) 3:19 4:7,15

dealt (2) 74:14 105:10

oncerns (10) 18:24 84:20 113:14 118:2 119:11 158:7 172:20 175:8 178:13 196:13 conclusion (4) 100:10 172:11 215:4 227:24 conclusions (3) 107:7 108:18 129:7 condition (2) 46:8 239:8 conditions (2) 132:21 220:23 conducted (3) 104:8 189:6 212:14 conferences (1) 14:11 confidence (1) 177:3 confident (5) 120:9 129:19 157:10 215:12 238:25 confidently (1) 177:23 confirm (13) 5:15 96:15 99:7,24 101:15 118:9 133:10 149:19 165:5 175:3 180:17 226:22 233:9 confirmation (1) 128:8 confirmed (3) 38:1 91:15 confirming (2) 97:5 99:9 conflict (1) 86:19 conscious (1) 30:19 consensus (1) 92:12 consider (8) 44:5 47:16 112:16 174:22 183:22 223:24 241:3.6 considerable (2) 9:22 197:10 considerably (1) 5:19 consideration (3) 165:18 184-16 203-11 considered (5) 36:20 110:22 168:8 193:17 197:2 consistency (1) 207:15 consistent (2) 12:21 72:13 consistently (5) 60:17 79:9 117:9 146:5 177:12 consisting (1) 189:14 constantly (1) 99:11 constrained (2) 114:7 127:1 construction (2) 18:18,20 constructionbased (1) 10:25 consult (4) 33:7 44:18 95:23 consultancy (4) 25:11 97:15,18,22 consultant (20) 89:8 91:7 97:20 98:10 100:6.21 101:17 103:2 110:15 122:8 172:10 186:13,20 190:14 209:2 211:13 212:15 223:24 230:15 238:3 consultants (14) 85:14,18 101:6 115:14 185:9 186:16 189:13,16,24 220:23 226:3 229:4 233:25 237:2 consultation (9) 22:4.18 33:8 36:11 40:1 79:2.10 139:5 228:14 consulted (8) 22:5,11 41:23 79:14 82:11 143:4,10 223:1 contact (3) 84:10 227:1,21 contacted (1) 218:4 contain (1) 223:14 contained (2) 220:23 226:2 contains (1) 119:7 content (2) 95:20 163:11 contents (3) 5:15 80:16 185:18 context (4) 5:19 29:19 98:4,5 continue (5) 166:19 172:21 201:24 202:10 222:7 continued (4) 202:11 203:18 221:2 239:17 continues (2) 33:8 164:22 continuing (8) 9:4,23 12:23 13:21 82:2 184:13 191:20 198:12 contract (26) 40:13 51:22

correct (5) 38:1 107:11

corrected (1) 119:19

234:5

135:20 162:17 193:14

correctly (3) 162:1 229:11

corresponded (1) 44:2

cost (1) 180:23

costs (1) 176:25

227:20 238:23

199:2 235:6

count (1) 92:14

council (16) 13:10 26:6

28:22,23 30:16,22

56:12,14 72:13 83:10

88:15 92:17.24 197:23

councillors (2) 83:20 84:5

counciltmo (2) 88:20 93:14

councils (2) 77:17 78:2

counsel (2) 1:17 244:4

counted (2) 110:22 111:4

couple (5) 9:21 59:21 86:19

course (18) 16:23 20:24 22:8

25:23 37:8 43:3,16 60:22

65:5 70:7 89:19 98:7

116:14 128:19 132:4

144:22 204:3 214:17

courses (4) 12:6,12 94:24

courtesy (1) 155:20

cover (4) 19:4,14 54:3

95:4

counting (2) 111:1,2

country (1) 206:10

179:14 188:21

correspondence (1) 29:12

couldnt (9) 42:21,24 68:23

126:2 176:14 178:11 196:9

117:6 121:7 154:18 201:17 168:24 202:10 216:14.23 218:16 covered (5) 11:25 15:8 49:6 219:8.18 220:2.3.8.9.16.18 72:19 102:10 222:1 224:15 227:9 240:16 covidrelated (1) 6:22 cpd (5) 13:22 19:25 190:24 contractor (5) 25:14 47:24 57:6 91:13 95:2 196:8 214:6 contractors (9) 47:4 create (4) 59:18 80:20 51:24,24 52:1,7 55:7 137:16 223:14 created (4) 130:20 131:11 107:20 108:10 122:9 contracts (4) 136:12 145:22 137:15 154:18 157:4 238:13 creation (1) 131:22 contractual (1) 30:8 crisis (1) 230:12 criteria (7) 101:4 173:16 contribute (2) 82:10 152:4 199:1 207:8 210:17 211:15 contribution (1) 82:19 control (21) 24:25 27:8 232:5 42:16,19,22 46:23 47:4,10 critical (2) 118:1 119:8 57:21 86:12 92:11 criticised (1) 55:2 106:14,20 107:5 143:8 criticisms (2) 119:22 122:22 160:9 164:24 171:18 crosspurposes (1) 40:14 179:20 181:10 219:23 crowder (5) 13:7 15:3 controlled (1) 107:6 17:1,11 19:13 controls (1) 176:8 crowders (1) 15:14 crucial (1) 235:15 convenient (3) 194:6,9,10 conversation (3) 129:22 crystal (1) 151:8 174:19 228:24 cs (1) 190:14 conversations (4) 87:15 91:2 csa (2) 223:1,2 155:4 160:4 cst00001187 (1) 140:17 cooker (1) 113:25 cst00001895 (1) 191:6 cookers (1) 114:1 cst00002046 (1) 141:9 cooperation (1) 135:15 cst0000204613 (1) 144:6 cooperative (1) 180:22 cst00002516 (1) 24:6 coordinated (2) 84:17 108:9 cst0000306317 (1) 230:21 coordinating (2) 56:11 71:23 cst00003181 (1) 215:2 coordination (1) 135:16 cst00030180 (1) 143:19 coordinator (1) 37:24 cta00000003 (1) 22:1 copied (1) 174:16 culminated (1) 92:9 copies (3) 26:23 76:6 233:2 culture (1) 60:16 copy (19) 21:11,15 90:18 currency (1) 207:20 91:10 105:7 120:9.17.17 current (10) 9:7 66:24 76:24 122:18 130:3,22 133:6 124:12 165:15,17,20 140:19 144:19 152:1 186:13 209:16 210:17 153:21 154:22 165:17 currently (3) 91:3 154:16 188:7 175:3 corner (1) 104:11 customer (1) 54:14 coroners (1) 209:21 cut (3) 28:25 114:1 241:13 corporate (16) 26:17 34:21 cutting (1) 199:19 56:19 71:22 72:22 73:18 cv (4) 188:11,17 190:21 74:7,16,25 75:10,17 77:5 82:19,24 83:1,6 cycle (1) 10:2 correa (3) 88:14,23 187:8 cynical (1) 197:4

> d (3) 136:17,18,22 daintith (4) 90:4 92:23 93:4 96:3 dangerous (3) 50:21 51:17 135:15 dashboard (1) 57:8 data (1) 33:8 date (29) 2:22 3:7,15,23 4:2.11 5:3.10 6:2 8:25 26:24 36:7,8 96:22 99:17 104:11 138:15 156:7,8,20 162:4.25 164:17 165:11 166:1 169:15 204:23 209:24 228:8 dated (26) 2:18 3:11,25 4:10,17 29:13 63:25 64:3 66:8,23 81:11 96:2 105:1 109:4,6 116:16 118:11 131:8 133:11 135:11 137:11.23 140:18 162:4 169:12 209:12 dates (2) 145:13 204:25 david (6) 13:7 15:3,14 17:1,11 19:13 day (9) 19:18 170:10,25 203:7 225:11 240:11,25 242-21 24 day1361481216 (1) 233:1 days (4) 51:6 67:9 78:8 118:6 daytoday (2) 24:25 27:8 deadline (3) 101:1 147:21

cyril (2) 37:24 143:2

december (22) 5:10 18:11,11 19:8 29:13 121:22 122:3 131:9 132:24 133:12 135:11 137:11 142:3 150:25 152:20 153:24 214:24 229:17 230:4.5.6 231:14 decent (1) 130:12 decide (1) 213:4 decided (3) 155:3 172:12 174:1 decision (8) 41:3 81:24 85:13 133:17 168:25 169:5 173:8 193:24 decisionmaking (4) 41:10 58:13 62:13 69:1 decisions (4) 46:9 62:6 217:16 219:22 declined (1) 177:19 dedicated (5) 12:16,25 47:13 234-25 241-12 default (1) 222:23 defective (2) 234:14 242:7 defects (2) 123:9 242:8 defer (1) 25:6 deferred (1) 27:11 deficiencies (7) 6:1 30:6 32:16 114:16.24 129:11.25 deficiency (2) 62:8 113:7 define (1) 97:25 defined (1) 24:20 definitely (12) 36:1 80:2 82:6 94:18 102:25 120:20 125:6 178:22 203:17 206:13 214:20 240:2 definition (2) 39:24 40:22 definitive (2) 177:5,17 definitively (1) 129:4 degree (7) 31:3 47:21 85:23 87:5 223:19 229:8 232:21 delay (1) 92:4 delivered (1) 102:18 deloitte (1) 75:14 demised (1) 223:9 demonstrated (2) 89:13 200:3 demonstrating (1) 10:9 department (10) 8:10 13:10 56:22 61:25 73:21,24 75:13 82:19 88:25 142:23 departments (1) 83:10 depended (1) 208:12 depending (10) 22:22 23:4 25:4 35:1 77:14 208:7.11.15 211:11 213:9 depleted (1) 11:7 deprivation (1) 113:18 deputies (1) 61:17 describe (1) 45:19 described (1) 38:7 description (1) 39:20 design (3) 24:8 39:24 40:22 desk (2) 21:11.15 desktop (2) 10:5 14:11 despite (2) 175:9 178:25 detail (23) 20:13,23 24:5 56:2 57:3 80:2 82:12 83:8,11 90:15,20 94:20 95:10 98:19 101:2 127:21 128:12 140:25 206:1 207:18 208:16 234:4 237:6 detailed (2) 24:11 224:14 details (6) 14:25 66:19 186:24 188:19 190:22 227:1 detection (5) 113:20 132:16 133:20 237:13.24

develop (6) 53:20 93:12

94:2,5,13,15

developing (1) 57:8 development (6) 9:4,24 12:23 13:22 112:17 191:21 deviation (1) 204:12 devices (3) 168:16 170:15 239:11 devolved (1) 41:14 dialogue (8) 15:22 16:9 26:17 44:15,17 63:6 86:2 214:16 dictated (1) 229:8 didnt (84) 6:5 7:21 23:15 33:20.25 45:21.21 47:3.4 49:12,17 52:17 57:23 61:14 66:12 69:14 73:24 74:1 77:16 78:4,13 83:17 87:5,23 95:22 107:9,9 119:1,14,16,17 121:18 126:2.12 128:1.7.7.9 129:5.14.21 149:18 150:18 151:4 152:8,11 153:25 155:19 160:8 161:1 163:21 167:21 176:16.17.23 177:3 178:7 179:13 184:15,17 188:22 193:23 200:4,14,20 202:24 203:15,20,21 209:5 216:14.16.22 219:7.18.20 221-10 224-13 231-7 238:11 241:7,13 242:3,10 difference (4) 59:10 60:1 202:2 203:24 differences (2) 139:12 207:16 different (22) 2:1 11:21 12:22 14:3.4 50:6 54:15 58:12 70:17 83:10 84:22 89:17,18 152:7 153:18 154:14 176:20 181:2 206:5 222:9 239:6 240:4 differently (2) 153:5 168:6 difficult (6) 22:25 47:23 53:3,12 54:25 240:8 difficulties (1) 78:10 difficulty (2) 92:1 235:4 digest (1) 119:3 diploma (6) 8:11,15,18 9:19,20 191:17 diplomas (1) 191:23 dipped (1) 127:2 direct (4) 57:22 58:5 151:22 153:8 directly (6) 15:20 38:15 59:14 84:20 167:14 188:10 director (16) 29:14 31:11 37:20 41:2,19 59:1 62:4 68:20 90:8,10 127:13 136:19,20,21,22,22 directorate (1) 63:1 directors (2) 17:14 62:1 directs (2) 58:2,8 disabled (4) 23:23 112:18 113:4 124:11 disagree (2) 76:11 107:17 disagreeing (1) 76:14 discovered (1) 195:25 discretion (1) 72:6 discuss (9) 6:5 13:14 76:3 119:1,3 151:14 153:15 217:19 239:15 discussed (18) 5:22 29:4 77:2 98:25 100:20,22 120:10 123:19 130:14 158:11 167:16 169:3.6 170:4 199:12 218:23 221:4 228:11 discussing (3) 26:22 60:20 184:5 discussion (20) 15:11 16:12,20 25:9 26:13 29:10 37:5 70:16 88:13,22 90:15,20 93:5,16 98:3 123:3 129:2 146:22 183:15 214:11

discussions (15) 16:2 34:22

38:16 72:20 85:11.13

91:22 97:5 98:16 99:8

128:12 155:2 170:12.16 221:20 disposal (4) 45:15 46:19.19.24 distinction (1) 141:15 distribution (2) 45:17 46:21 division (8) 40:7 45:23 46:7 51:23 136:4,11,24 143:5 document (127) 21:4,10 31:8 34:1,10 39:9,13 44:22 49:12.13 80:6 81:9 82:5 83:22.25 88:9.11 98:19 104:4 108:8.24 109:17,21,24 113:2 116:22 120:10 128:12,17 129:3 130:20 131:2,3,10,15,22 133:11,18,21 134:1 135:10,17,23,24 136:1 137-10 138:2.8.12.13.16.21 139:3,15,17 140:13,16 141:11,20 142:5,6,8,13,22 143:16.20 144:4.23 146:25 147:22 148:7,19,19,24 149:4,9,22 150:4,22 153:18 154:9,14 156:12 18 24 157:2 5 8 13 161:24 162:6 10 15 23 163:16,18 165:4,5,7 166:9,9,15 169:22,24 182:18 183:15 185:11.19 191:7 192:21 193:2.19 197:22 198:3 199:3 200:8 209:10 220:10 227:25 228:1.5.24 234:20.23 235:5 241:18 242:3 documentation (13) 102:24 139:8 152:9 173:20,22 188:20 192:24 221:19 227:10,15,15 228:19 236:11 documented (10) 81:2 85:8 108:20 117:9 124:13 229:12 234:3.16 241:17.21 documentheavy (1) 222:3 documents (14) 19:7 25:22 32:6 37:8 65:3 66:3 124:24 137:18 142:15 185:4,8 187:17 200:25 210:11 does (11) 30:11 67:7 105:24 154:24 155:9 178:12 181:9 200:8 214:5 217:12.15 doesnt (13) 20:16 40:8 109:14 118:1 119:25 124:17 129:4 135:18,19,20 144:25 178:12 181:11 doing (43) 16:5 27:8 31:5,5 35:21 49:1,2,16 50:9,10,13 51:5,12,14 53:15 70:24 75:22 101:18 122:24 125:25 126:1 149:20 161:11 168:7 172:18 173:7 190:23,24 203:15 207:12 211:23 212:5,25 214:8 215:19 219:14 220:15 224-23 233-8 235-16 239:2,4 240:21 done (61) 10:5,11,14 34:12 35:22 37:25 43:17 45:22 47:20 49:16 54:25 67:23 70:21 79:2,9 85:20 86:18 93:19 94:2,4,15 98:12 99:9,13 101:10 115:8 127:24 128:21.22 153:12,13,13 184:16 191:20.24 192:14 193:3 197:19 202:14 203:10 205:18 207:2 213:17 214:10 215:24 216:6 218:25 219:13,21 221:14 222:12,13 225:9 229:16,17,18 230:22 231:6 233:12.20 238:14 dont (142) 1:25 2:12 7:2 17:23 23:20 26:16 27:1 29:8 37:1,3,7 41:20

47:13.19 48:2 49:1 50:3 58:4.7.7.11 65:12 67:2.16 68:17.18 73:22 76:13 78:4 80:12,21 81:2 82:11,16 83:5 86:12 89:4.10 90:12,14 93:25 95:9,19 98:14,15 99:4 103:18 109:13,19,23 117:20,23,24 118:7,11,23 119:9.19.23.24 120:20 122:16 123:2.6 124:21 126:8 128:11 130:6 132:12 133:8.8.13.14.16.17 134:16 137:7,9 138:7,8 140:6 142:10,24 143:17,23 144:1 146:2,23 148:15 149:12,12,25 159:17 162:21 163:2.9 167:21 169:4 185:14 187:5.15 191:11 193:20.21 194:13 204:25 206:2,23 207:23,23 208:1,3,6 216:10,19 218:9 219:1,5,21,22 221:21 222:11,14,16 225:7,11,17 226:11 227:3 230:21 233:6,7,14,20,21 235:3,4,7 236-22 238-12 242-2 243-1 door (19) 35:22 46:1 114:11 115:5 170:15 223:9 229:10 234:4,13 239:6,10,11,18,22,24,25 240:4.23 241:18 doors (36) 35:2,3,5 46:4,5 115:10,12 146:19 168:16 179:11 221:12 223:6 224:3 225:19 229:25 234:2,5,9,10,11,21 235:1,11 236:12,13,15 237:9.17.25 238:9.21 240:10 241:17 242:4,6,7 doubt (6) 25:8 98:10 100:22 101:2 128:4 185:12 down (25) 1:11 2:9 6:25 9:9 39:19 54:19 56:1 60:9 61:24 84:6 86:25 98:5 102:17 109:3 111:8 123:21 128:11 130:5 147:10 154:9 185:22 195:1 203:2 222:4 241:7 dr (1) 195:22 draft (35) 33:14,22 36:10 43:19 49:20 71:2.2.9 78:14.18 79:15.22 133:17 140:19,20,22 141:8,20 143:20 147:20,22 148:2,2,18 150:18 151:16 153:22 159:10 160:23 163:4,8 169:25 170:2,9 185:11 drafted (18) 10:12 28:1 33:2 36:11 71:4 84:11 96:20.21 114:7 122:16 131:16 136:2 139:4 146:17 150:17 152:19 163:13 185:12 drafting (6) 41:5 78:25 142:13.22 150:7 159:15 drafts (1) 140:9 draw (3) 68:24 80:24 242:20 drawings (1) 238:4 drill (1) 56:1 drive (1) 60:14 drop (1) 226:25 dropped (1) 188:8 dry (5) 166:25 175:15 176:2,5 237:14 due (10) 16:23 25:22 37:8 43:2.16 116:14 144:22 146:3 170:12 226:21 dump (2) 141:2 168:7 duplication (1) 59:22 duration (1) 121:6 during (5) 54:20 65:7 69:7 207:20 240:11 duty (2) 30:3 198:8 dwelling (2) 113:20 114:10 dwellings (1) 241:24

55:25 57:14 104:1,25

fifth (1) 167:1

228:15

222:14

238:23

86:15,18

205:2

133:11

168:3.20

191:18 192:2,3,5,18

eager (1) 35:20 ear (1) 160:24 earlier (18) 43:19 45:9 48:4 55:7 76:18 102:6 131:2,4 134:16 140:14 142:4 147:2.12 148:24 159:4 160:23 162:2 185:17 early (9) 51:5 66:15 67:9 77:16 89:22 95:19 199:4 200:19 207:21 easier (1) 212:23 east (7) 12:13 13:2 15:7,24 16:20 17:13 239:1 edited (1) 155:24 edition (3) 23:19 95:20 228:23 educate (2) 95:12,18 effective (4) 129:12 180:8.9.23 effectively (7) 87:19 112:17 124:10 126:10,15 152:21 164:24 efficiently (1) 53:5 eg (4) 42:9 106:17 186:14 211:6 eight (3) 192:5 237:5 241:24 either (18) 12:8 13:25 48:21,24 53:1 79:21 80:15 125:22 138:7 155:12 211:12 212:14 213:10 218:21 228:6,7 232:5 242:5 elected (3) 196:14.18 197:12 electrical (2) 57:11 79:6 elevated (2) 223:19 232:21 else (9) 58:1 94:2 122:12 138:14 140:24 176:23 180:11 186:4 205:22 elses (1) 139:8 email (13) 17:5 22:9 29:12.20 105:12.14 140:18 143:1,18 148:21 153:18 154:13 174:15 emails (1) 23:13 embryonic (1) 142:7 emergency (5) 112:24 115:5 124:4 144:11 237:19 emphasis (1) 41:24 employ (1) 89:2 employed (1) 201:15 employee (2) 59:3 205:21 employeerelated (1) 10:24 employees (2) 112:20 113:5 employing (2) 88:16 198:13 enable (2) 45:7 117:4 encapsulated (1) 152:13 encourage (1) 240:18 encouraged (2) 165:14 199:13 end (13) 77:12,16 99:21 145:8 161:14 172:2 175:16 177:18 188:6 189:1 219:17 220:3 226:13 endeavour (1) 52:25 endeavoured (3) 81:2 208:10 223:8 endeavouring (2) 31:1 87:10 ended (4) 40:4 183:21 209:5 218:19 endorsed (1) 106:6 enforce (3) 30:5 32:4,15 enforcement (13) 12:1,21 13:13 32:12 35:3 63:7 64:8 86:23 87:25 88:19 89:6,7 181:9 enforcing (6) 34:7 179:21 180:2,3 204:8,16 engage (2) 85:18 240:20 engaged (7) 57:14 63:5 87:16 158:22 159:24 167:19 200:3 engagement (5) 10:15 35:7 99:10 169:5 182:23

26:4.10.13 29:4.6 37:2 47:16 48:21 76:3.10 80:14 93:19.23 122:21 123:3 129:6.25 142:10 153:22 46:17.18 47:20 48:6 52:25 162:15.19.24 171:20 188:11,16,16 193:12 197:2,22 216:9 221:2 224:8 225:2,15 226:9,13 228:7,24 240:6 241:3,16 every (23) 47:10,11 55:18 56:12 57:14 58:21 65:11 80:20.21 81:3 107:21 108:11 115:22 170:15 208:9,10,11 210:6 229:19 231:6,9,10 241:18 everybody (4) 41:14 50:12 164:15 180:16 entirely (7) 20:3 58:5 137:13 everybodys (1) 41:14 everyone (2) 1:3 105:10 everything (7) 2:9 47:8 53:2 62:9 180:10 202:14 222:4 everywhere (1) 241:20 evidence (19) 1:5 5:22 14:21 17:17 20:25 35:17 64:14 65:12 76:19 121:16 134:17 157:9 180:19 187:13 194-13 216-20 232-19 25 243-1 exacting (2) 202:8 241:8 exactly (5) 49:2,3 77:17 102:14 181:8 examination (2) 8:12 229:10 examine (1) 15:4 example (17) 13:6 35:2 45-25 49-19 55-9 79-4 83:19 108:6 115:18 123:23 142:15 175:12,24 179:10 185:23 223:5 241:18 76:13 82:21 83:21 102:13 examples (3) 123:24 161:16,18 exception (1) 5:17 exchange (1) 105:12 exclusively (2) 60:10 241:12 esa (3) 150:11 227:21 240:23 excuse (1) 10:16 exec (2) 41:20 159:2 executive (40) 37:20 38:5,8,9,15,25 39:5,12 40:10 41:2,18 48:21 58:23 59:4 62:1 69:10,14,20 70:3,5,10,18,25 71:9 74:13 77:3.4 81:23 106:6 especially (3) 47:25 234:25 127:8.12.17 160:5 167:12.14.15.18 170:2 218:22 224:24 essentially (2) 99:22 218:17 exercise (2) 75:24 172:13 exercised (4) 58:7 68:16 established (2) 101:20 199:1 71:22 74:5 exhibit (3) 17:6 103:17 185:8 exhibits (1) 161:22 exist (2) 195:24 196:5 existed (2) 56:23 196:24 et (9) 33:9 48:8 79:7 82:3 existence (2) 130:23 216:10 115:5 153:14 158:13 193:9 existing (4) 24:1 106:14,20 107:5 exit (2) 115:4 237:17 etc (8) 117:6 141:1 144:17 expect (11) 95:14 98:2 128:17,20,24 129:6 173:24 176:2 191:1,4 241:22 expectation (3) 224:11 238:13 239:13 evacuation (6) 18:21 112:25 expected (6) 61:23 102:18 170:12 198:14 234:3,6 expecting (1) 156:15 101:6.17.20 172:9 173:16 expediting (1) 153:12 experience (22) 9:20 11:6 44:6 45:6.10 93:15 evaluation (7) 102:11 172:24 187:1.14.21.23 188:3.10 173:9 188:25 189:6 190:11 190:2.8.19.22 191:19 193:25 195:21 202:21 even (9) 23:2 33:25 100:15 205:25 206:14 experienced (1) 201:8 expert (4) 62:22 63:13 95:21

enough (2) 48:10 157:12

32:2,16,17,23 33:1,17

56:21 60:16 72:12 85:7

107:20 112:3 125:10

164:22 166:18 198:16

210:13 228:9

204:4

entail (1) 7:15

enter (2) 219:7,18

entered (1) 85:11

enthusiasm (1) 190:8

entirety (1) 196:12

161:24 165:6

239-18

126:25

152:7 153:8.18 154:14

entitled (9) 36:5 66:6,24

104:7 135:11,23 141:12

entrance (10) 46:5 115:10

168:21 170:15 179:11

234:9 236:12,15 238:9

envelopes (1) 16:11

environment (2) 14:18

environmental (4) 29:16

envisage (2) 184:12,17

equipment (4) 23:4 55:9

erm (10) 39:22 47:19 63:3

193:20 213:6 216:1

esas (4) 52:15 53:3 56:4

escalate (2) 42:23 47:8

escalated (6) 45:22 46:6

50:11 55:15,20 218:6

escape (7) 23:23 86:10

234:24,25 235:15

essential (1) 224:17

establish (1) 23:1

estate (8) 6:2 18:7 52:12

54:5 112:5 150:14,19

237:16.18

235:14

214:15

214:15

estates (1) 51:7

146:19 175:15

237:11,15,19

evac (1) 144:15

european (1) 191:17

evacuate (1) 144:10

evaluate (8) 100:6

205:9 206:24

206:24

evaluating (1) 100:21

119:20 122:21 167:21

172:17 207:23 215:23

events (3) 10:6 14:11 146:8

eventually (2) 120:7 159:2

ever (43) 8:23 15:11

198:15

explain (13) 7:13 34:12 72:1

112:1 119:7 125:8 140:7

157:1 221:25 223:8 234:3

evenly (1) 208:4

144:11,14 146:19 167:8

31:11 34:5 84:2

episode (1) 92:9

237:12.25

equivocal (1) 179:4

ernest (1) 221:19

error (1) 197:16

115:2

sured (1) 115:3

ensuring (8) 35:3 42:12

51:10 53:6 55:3,8 198:8

ensure (30) 30:2,6,9,22

36:21 42:25 45:14

240:19.21 explained (6) 47:3 91:2,6 163:8 216:3.9 explaining (1) 161:5 explains (1) 217:12 explanation (4) 122:19 123:12 225:9,14 explanations (1) 207:18 explicitly (1) 224:10 exposed (2) 45:17 46:21 expressions (1) 48:4 extended (1) 128:14 extension (1) 63:8 extent (7) 14:1 19:16 23:24 30:25 129:18 195:19 exterior (1) 16:10 external (3) 7:19 42:6 85:18 extinguishers (1) 166:25 extinguishing (2) 83:19 84:5 extraction (1) 237:14 extreme (1) 113:25 extremely (3) 1:23 21:16 202:21 eye (1) 39:19 face (2) 123:7 164:25 facilities (5) 6:13,19 7:18 37:24 39:16 facing (1) 59:19 factor (2) 202:12 204:10

factors (4) 25:17 51:18 229:20 230:1 factual (1) 220:1 failed (1) 235:21 failings (3) 120:7 141:21,21 fair (12) 10:15 35:18 59:14 60:6 89:10 91:20 157:12 175:5 177:11 181:16 201:13 214:5 fairly (11) 22:12 64:7 72:19 75:20 85:24 98:14 115:2 159:8 160:19,19 203:22 fairness (1) 64:8 faith (2) 201:20 202:11 familiar (17) 20:19,20,25 21:9,10,13,16,20 23:22 43:10 44:22,24 135:18,25 157:7 195:19 202:13 familiarity (2) 203:1 214:18 family (1) 114:8 far (10) 23:9 34:18 39:3 73:19 74:4,16 91:1 116:8 148:5 206:3 fault (2) 29:1 61:21 favour (1) 85:5 features (1) 51:25 february (16) 2:18.22 31:13 63:16 64:3 135:25 143:17,22 147:2,24 148:10 149:23 150:3 172:11 174-16 198-3 fed (3) 68:21 73:23 127:17 fee (1) 204:22 feedback (9) 62:8,8 77:5 80:14 117:6 147:21 148:17 149:18 163:17 feeds (1) 167:14 feel (9) 48:10 50:4 126:23 155:19 165:16 176:16,17 196:17 203:16 feeling (2) 17:23 102:25 feels (2) 93:11 153:4 fell (1) 62:25 felt (24) 11:7 22:7,10 49:22 70:2 91:4 92:17,25 108:4 126:20,22 127:3 155:21,23 160:8 173:4 174:4 181:22 199:14 203:4,6,16,23 223.22 fence (1) 176:15 few (10) 25:14 57:12 78:8 92:2 116:6 159:1 174:25

177:8 188:1 210:4

field (1) 57:15

fighting (2) 237:12,24 figure (1) 125:19 final (11) 31:14 33:14,21 34:1.9 36:12 84:19 115:4 170:9.10 237:17 finalise (1) 78:14 finalised (6) 22:12 143:23 151:16 155:18 227:25 finaliseimplement (1) 158:11 finally (1) 137:4 finance (5) 68:12,20 80:6,15 financial (3) 77:11 78:6,7 find (14) 7:10 46:7 48:1 122:12 153:6 173:23 175:2 177-25 178-11 180-9 184-10 208-5 221-18 finding (4) 22:20 46:7 findings (5) 93:1 228:2 229:11 234:6 241:21 fine (4) 14:7 160:2 176:22 finish (2) 130:10 242:13 fire (381) 4:7 6:12 7:14,25,25 11:14,15,17 12:4,9,16,21,25 13:3,12 14:8 15:7,12,16,24,25 16:17.20 17:2.13 18:17,23,24 19:1,6,14,21 20:2,11 21:1,6,22 22:24 23-25 24-1 7 25-7 10 11 11 26:25 27:21 28:3.9.14.14 29:17,19 30:2,3,9,10 32:2,4,7,13,18,22,25 33:5 35:21 36:5.18.19.22 37:11 39:24 40:17,22 42:5,9 43:17 44:8,11,15 46:3,5 48:19 49:19,24 50:24 51:16,25 55:8,12 56:21,24 57:9 62:5 63:6.17.19.24 64:1.2.9.19 66:7.24 67:13 70:14 72:8 74:12 79:8 82:2,3 83:20 84:6 85:4,5,6,11 86:6,14,22 87:1,9,15,21 89:14,21 90:23 91:3,6 92:11 93:15 94:5.23.23 95:3.8.13.15 97:15.16.18.20.22 99:2.10 100:1.6.21.23 101:6.17.21 102:2,2 104:7,7,18,24 105:21,25 106:1,3,18,23 107:10 108:21 109:10,16 112:4,18,23 113:15,16 114:9,13 115:4 116:9 117:4,7,10,18 121:10 122:8 123:9.16 124:10 125:11 127:18 128:5 129:7.8.17.23 130:1,8,16,18,19 131:6,6 135:11,13,13,14,14,23 137:10.17 138:12 140:3,15,19 141:11,12 142:3 143:11 144:7.9 145:14 146:14.16.17.25 147:18 151:13.15.18 152:1,9,19 153:7,14,22 154:11,15,17 155:7,11,19 156:5 157:3 159:16,18 160:20 161:21.25 163:12 164:3,5,20,22,24 165:6,22 166:5,20,23,24,25 167:6 169:9.10.11.20.20.22 170:8,9,11,21,23 171:3,9 172:9,13 173:21 176:4 177:14,14,21 178:4,21 179:18,19 181:11,14,19 183:13.16.17.22 186:13.15.25 187:13.21.24.25 188:1.6.8

193:11.13 196:22 197:23.24 198:7.13.15.20.21 199:1.23.25 200:6.19 201:3.4 202:15.16.22 205:18 206:25 207:6,9,21 208:11 209:2.16.22.23 210:18,19 211:6,13 212:15 214:4,7,12,14,15,23 222:25 223:3.15.24 224:8.14 225:21 229:7.10 231:7.20 232:7.9 234:2.4.5.21 235:1.11 236:23 237:9,10,12,21,22,24,24,25,25 238:5 239:1 firefighting (1) 176:3 fires (5) 16:16,19,21 19:18 50.20 first (70) 2:18,19,19 3:1,3,12 4:6,15,24 5:6,17 6:7 8:6 10:12 15:9 20:16 24:13.15.24 30:13 31:7 36:3,4,25 37:12 41:16 43:22 50:14 52:11 53:18 62:17 69:23 71:16 76:20 78-1 82-1 91-17 96-11 100:4 104:16 109:24 110:5 121:8,17 130:20,21 131:23 133:6 145:8 150:8 151:12 160:13 162:7 163:24 165:5 166:16 169:17.25 172:4 190:5,14 196:10 198:2 201:19 214:22 217:14 221-5 222-19 227-7 235-24 firsthand (1) 188:3 firstrate (1) 192:9 fit (1) 176:5 fitness (1) 237:20 fitted (1) 208:8 fitting (1) 176:9 five (2) 138:17 170:20 fixating (1) 133:2 fixed (1) 112:23 flag (1) 47:9 flagged (4) 46:2 111:7 203:17 204:13 flat (15) 16:6 46:4 114:11 115:9 168:16 170:15 179:11 234:9 236:12,15 238:9.20 239:18 241:17.25 flats (6) 21:7.24 23:10 210:20 240:15 241:4 flavour (1) 35:17 floor (1) 238:2 flows (1) 40:9 fluctuated (2) 10:2 113:12 focus (1) 237:4 focused (2) 15:21 19:16 focusing (3) 36:1 46:12 237:1 follow (4) 92:13 156:1 182:22 219:24 followed (2) 12:16 77:11 following (9) 85:3 174:19 208:25 209:21 210:23.25 211:8 231:4 242:5 follows (3) 123:19,21 139:21 followup (1) 158:24 foot (4) 36:16 107:25 109:3 186:22 fora (1) 29:5 force (4) 109:7 166:5 170:4 214:19 forever (1) 131:14 forget (1) 95:19 forgotten (1) 70:20 form (3) 13:24 130:20.23 forma (2) 52:21 98:12 formal (17) 13:1,25 20:4 64:14 74:2,24 99:12 112:17 124:9.13 159:14 189:13 220:2,3,17 222:1 227:4 formalised (1) 145:20 formality (2) 158:8 159:21

formally (6) 2:16 93:21 106:5 155:12 162:20 225:4 formas (2) 53:12 172:19 format (3) 162:1,2 182:21 formed (1) 145:24 formerly (1) 1:5 formulated (1) 101:5 fortnightly (2) 70:3 145:17 fortunately (1) 18:20 forum (1) 12:18 forward (6) 33:3,6 60:15 92:13 200:7 228:18 forwardlooking (1) 100:18 fought (1) 180:15 found (9) 17:5 22:9 70:20 175:12 176:22 179:12 217:10 226:2 241:19 four (7) 70:22 107:15 130:12 175:25 176:6 179:14 208:13 fourmonthly (1) 99:5 fourth (5) 14:24 99:15 105:22 166:24 233:18 fra (46) 66:10 84:23,23 85:12,15 87:13 89:9 110:3 118:2 127:23 129:16 130:2 131-21 171-22 172-7 174-23 185-6 190-20 204-2 209:4 210:2,22 211:6,10,11,17,19 212:9 213:24 215:24 216:14,23 219:17 226:9 229:9.9 230:6,22,24,25 231:4,14 233:13,18,19 242:5 framework (1) 122:8 fras (36) 40:24 85:7.14.18 98:23 99:18 100:8,10 102:19 103:14 129:17 167:1 168:20 171:25 184:7,13 188:5 194:1 210:5,7,10,11,16 211:14 215:3,8,9,14 216:6,17 219:9 225:25 229:3 232:5 237:4 241:17 freeholder (2) 25:3 28:20 frequency (7) 66:13 67:25 140:1 146:18 168:19 frequent (1) 67:10 frequently (6) 73:15,16,17 167:22 210:16 230:2 fresh (4) 219:18 220:17 230:25 231:14 froing (2) 177:4,19 front (5) 21:9 137:8 195:24 238:21 241:17 frustrated (1) 174:12 frustrating (4) 89:15 92:4 176:13 216:20 frustration (3) 159:14 160:3 181:7 frustrations (2) 178:3 181:17 fso (1) 36:20 fulfil (2) 48:8,10 fulfilled (2) 34:17 35:12 fulham (1) 56:16 full (5) 77:3 93:9 106:2 195:20 206:17 fully (1) 144:8 function (4) 74:15 85:7 157:3 202:5 functions (3) 48:8,11 74:6 funded (3) 25:16 174:23 182-12 funding (5) 47:17 184:6 219:3 222:8,9 furness (3) 104:2 120:16 177:13 furniture (3) 234:13 239:12,24 further (18) 63:24 64:2 66:6,20,21 67:13 74:11 80:14 81:25 96:12 115:10 117:3 148:10.12 153:23 174:19 181:23 189:15 future (1) 125:9

Opus 2 Official Court Reporters

engineering (1) 136:23

107-13 117-8 151-16

impetus (1) 131:22

gain (4) 93:15 196:17 236:14 240:15 gained (1) 239:14 gap (1) 67:3 gary (6) 26:19 56:19 72:3,21 74:22 76:10 gas (8) 57:10,19 115:19 116:1 119:5 161:20,20 241:8 gather (1) 113:10 gathered (2) 50:19 104:24 gave (15) 13:5,5 28:17 55:6 73:25 130:21 150:22 152:5 163:4 166:9 172:8 187:12 16 201:20 222:14 gearing (2) 183:25 216:24 general (18) 10:22 15:6,21,23 16:14 23:3 27:20 34:16 40:18 45:20 72:1 75:11,18 114:15,23 135:14 185:23 224:6 generally (12) 28:10 37:11 60:4 63:19 97:23 117:7 175:7 181:5 197:10 227:19 234:10 238:8 generating (1) 145:14 gerda (1) 227:18 get (60) 2:9 6:4 15:11 23:11,16,17 24:4 33:21,25 41:17 52:17 53:2 55:20 56:1 58:15 77:15 78:12,16 79:4 86:8.16 113:14 120:8 121:16 125:19 126:9.12 149:18 153:22 163:21 171:18 176:14 177:12,17 180:11,16 182:5,13 183:25 184:23 188:21 192:23 197:5.6 200:5 202:11 208:17 217:4 218:21 221:14.24 223:23 224:22 226:25 227:18 230:16 231:3 234:11 239:21,21 getting (20) 6:5 35:17 47:18 59:15 65:3 79:8 86:19 102:19,20,25 108:9 148:17 155:21 178:2,9,10 184:2 208:15 217:16 230:11 gillray (1) 175:15 gist (1) 122:21 give (24) 35:9 58:25 61:7 74:10 77:19 78:14 87:20 115:17 122:19 123:12 126:4 128:20 155:24 176:14.16 178:6 184:15 205:8 207:18 213:15 225:9.13 226:20 240:22 given (27) 17:1.12 52:18 76:6 114:16 123:19 126:15 130:3 142:5 151:7,16 152:1,20 154:24 155:18 162:22 163:6 170:5 171:7 172:15 200:12 205:10 224:16 225:24 226:13 230:22 235:22 gives (1) 239:25 giving (8) 157:9 174:8 177:4 178:5,16 179:3,17 180:19 glance (2) 162:7,9 glazing (1) 234:13 gloss (1) 180:20 goes (10) 30:11 61:12 81:24 118:5 128:1 129:24 137:25 162:12 167:20 176:7 going (72) 1:4 2:2,15 12:19 13:11 29:9 39:18 40:7 47:15 52:8 53:18 54:7 55:3 65:7 66:2 68:19 69:18 77-21 83-25 84-1 86-23 87:17 18 91:25 93:19 95:1.1 96:21 100:24 103:6 107:19,21 108:4 109:14 110:3 114:14 116:12,14 119:22 121:4 123:4 127:21 128:11 130:10 131:18

134:13 138:16 146:9 152:14.24 154:21.25 157:18 159:13 171:11 174:7 176:21 180:24 181:11 194:25 195:4 200:7 207:12,14 212:7 217:13 224:6 233:22.24 242:13,20,24 gone (10) 11:21 14:13 36:13 91:8 122:17 152:5 158:1 180:15 182:9 192:14 good (24) 1:3.7.7.19.20 30:18 60:14.16 65:2.4.24 71:5 108:7 117:7,11 135:5 174:13 176:18 188:9 190:8 192:6 202:21 238:24 241:10 gordon (2) 109:4 117:21 govern (2) 220:20 239:17 government (7) 20:10 21:5 32:7 113:1 209:24 210:20 238:5 grateful (2) 1:23 140:23 great (3) 103:5 114:9 121:25 green (2) 110:15 147:24 grenfell (9) 6:12 103:21 170.23 214.23 229.17 230-4 7 231-12 238-22 grey (1) 209:12 grief (1) 213:15 ground (1) 183:25 group (33) 12:14,16,25 13:3 14:2 15:7,24 16:21 17:13,14 29:5,18 55:22 56-15 59-13 18 60-9 74-17 145:5.11.20.23.25 146:1.7 147:12,14 151:15 158:10,11 167:17 210:20 groups (1) 145:12 guessing (1) 136:19 guidance (18) 7:23 18:23 20:10 21:5 23:2,3,25 32:10.23 72:12 113:1 142:21 197:22 198:4 199:16 210:18 228:4,5 guide (22) 16:6 20:12,19,20 22:2,3,18 23:16,23 41:23 83:20 84:6 142:15,17,18,19 162:13 197:24 214:19,20 228:12.21 guides (1) 238:5 н hadnt (22) 10:14 37:3 57:10

216:6

231:24

hall (1) 17:4

204:1,4

98:15 100:23 134:8

240:22

harangue (1) 42:18

hard (2) 50:3 188:7

harness (1) 200:13

175:12 213:14

206:9 222:21

hazard (1) 105:19

hazards (1) 107:5

214:8

hasnt (2) 108:11 134:6

havent (8) 10:11 66:11

having (22) 16:11 21:15

109:17 131:14,19 148:16

26:8.13 32:6 42:17 45:15

46:19.25 47:7 86:2 89:25

91:18 108:7.8 115:23

head (11) 2:11 6:19 52:2

55:25 57:2 80:25 102:3

104:19 148:15 204:25

heading (5) 19:6 146:15

191:13 193:5 210:1

12:14 15 13:9 22:6 26:17

29-16 31-11 34-6 36-13

39:9,9,15 41:1,2,11,13,19

42:8 43:22 45:20 47:25

48:17 50:1.17.18.23

57-23 58-2 13 21 23

59:3.6.7.8.13.18

60:2,4,6,10,15,17

61:1,2,11,15,21,24

62:19,24,25 64:15

72:9,22 73:19

68:16,21 69:1,2,4,9,19

70:2,4,11,19 71:22,23,24

74:7,12,16,25 75:1,10,17

76:4.17.23 77:2.5 78:19

82:9,20,24 83:6 84:2,11

88:14,23 96:14 108:24

109:11 117:12 127:13

142:21 145:5,23 146:6

147:8.12.13 149:5.10.10

151:9.22 152:25 154:2

155:13.13 156:6 157:21

167:10,15 170:1 171:9

136:6 137:8 138:25 139:6

80:7.17 81:6.17.21

51:4,6,15,19 53:21,23

55:21,22 56:10,15,22,24

37:10,19,21 38:10,13

heads (2) 40:11 50:12

211:12 212:15,18 224:4 232:4 233:3 66:17 89:16 100:15 101:3 hearing (5) 1:4,4 6:25 75:15 102:24 108:20 109:12 243:12 115:14 119:2,11 121:19 125:15 141:17 154:20 heating (1) 180:11 heavily (5) 36:1 55:11 57:16 166:8 201:5 212:7 215:11 98:14 203:14 hed (13) 54:6 67:23 153:1 half (2) 71:18 200:13 187:24 188:1 190:23,24 halfway (4) 2:2,3 69:25 195-18 201-14 216-17 221:11 222:12.13 height (1) 15:19 hammersmith (1) 56:16 held (5) 6:16 17:3 37:17 hand (4) 177:21 202:4 41:10 117:3 hell (1) 236:13 handbook (1) 6:2 help (18) 9:15 48:24 49:10 handlers (1) 18:24 58:6 67:7 70:9 71:2 77:7 handout (3) 17:20,25 18:4 78:25 100:20 137:11 handson (1) 63:4 138:15 141:4 142:4,25 happen (7) 49:17 53:24 129:5 154:25 176:23 198:19 233:4 234:20 helped (1) 53:4 180:16 181:10 helper (1) 208:18 happened (9) 19:17 23:12 helpful (8) 23:14 52:10 56:18 25:13 118:14 143:20 146:1 147:4 173:23 175:13 155:6 168:4 171:23 202:25 236:4 appening (8) 26:25 62:10 here (25) 5:12,23 49:10 64:12 72:7 152:17 160:7 93:22 95:5 107:12.13 184:21 229:21 115:18 116:4 117:25 happily (1) 74:11 149:13.15 160:20 168:5 happy (12) 1:25 91:15,23 176:19 181:7,13 187:15

173:3.20.21 197:10 217:6 189:25 193:18 197:4.12 199-15 212-12 242-19 hes (12) 128:16.16 129:23 130:4 143:25 152:24.25 153:2 161:5 191:11.17 214:5 hesitating (1) 42:15 hesitation (1) 42:21 hhsrs (1) 32:6 high (7) 64:10 103:16 172:7 175:4 181:15 201:17 215:22 higher (1) 48:22 179:9 184:6 192:9 199:21 highlevel (1) 216:11 highlight (3) 52:23 62:23 highlighted (5) 47:9 105:17 114:24 127:11 133:24 highlighting (1) 147:25 highranking (1) 177:16 highrise (8) 15:13,25 16:8 21:5 175:20 203:2 207:24 238:21 highrisk (46) 97:17 99:18 health (171) 6:13 7:16,20,24 100:10,13 101:3,11 103:20 8:9,12,19,22 9:2,13 10:22 121:2 171:24 174:20 183-21 23 184-7 13 187-10 188-2 6 18 190-23 201:18,24 202:3 205:11 207:25 208:1 209:4 215:4.9.14.25 216:6.14.17.22 217:1,4,13,20 219:4,9 220:2 229:13 230:23 231-5 13 238-21 himself (3) 22:14 183:16 187:9 hint (1) 122:11 historical (1) 180:20 historically (2) 56:10 61:16 history (3) 140:16 168:22 219:13 hm (2) 113:1 238:5 hmos (1) 34:6 hoarding (2) 113:24 223:18 hoc (4) 224:6,18 225:3,16 hodgson (4) 43:18 157:19 158:18 160:13 hodgsons (1) 158:2 hold (2) 199:8 200:20 holder (1) 198:8 holds (1) 186:13 holloway (7) 90:3,21 91:6,12 92:23 93:4 94:1 158:20,23 160:17,21 161:6 162:16,22 164:2,8 165:14 holloways (1) 90:7 hom0000004013 (2) 44:20 46:13 hom0000004014 (1) 45:2 hom00025548 (1) 198:2 hom000255483 (1) 198:5 hom00045964 (1) 21:8 home (2) 19:12 166:24 honest (13) 26:4 48:12 58:4 68:2 74:3 129:10 137:9 146:2 199:12 207:13 208:13 221:22 241:6 honestly (2) 78:4 119:23 hoped (1) 228:18 hopefully (2) 114:13 180:8 hoping (1) 126:9 hose (1) 166:25 hosted (2) 12:4,5 hostile (2) 181:3,6 house (8) 14:21 15:3 17:2 18:16 19:11,13 175:15 209:22 housing (31) 8:10 12:15 13:10 17:14 22:6 23:25 24:2 29:14 32:5,13 34:8 35:6 40:12 73:20,24 74:19 82:19 83:13 84:2 90:9 94:24 96:13 103:15 108:3 113:9.13 115:7 205:25 206:14 218:6 241:5

however (12) 25:1 30:15

impacted (1) 144:1

170:4.16 175:7 196:15 222:23 232:4 236:4 hr (2) 53:1 124:1 hs (5) 43:24 124:1 137:5 144:12 158:2 hugely (2) 23:24 175:13 id (21) 37:3 49:13 64:21 66:17 70:20 86:19 105:16 109:12 117:17 118:10 119:2.10 120:20 140:16 163:8 180:15 196:6 219:12 221:4 222:7 240:16 idea (4) 33:15 119:21 192:22 238-20 ideal (1) 50:6 ideally (3) 239:7 240:3 241:24 identical (2) 175:25 208:14 identically (1) 193:11 identification (1) 232:2 identified (36) 11:22 28:2 30:6 31:25 32:16 51:10 53:16 54:7.18 55:3.11 89:25 93:1 101:5 103:16 107:5 113:23 115:9 119:14 120:7 122:13 123:10 125:4 129:11,15 130:2 141:21 195:18,23 211:9 212:2,6 213:13,20 236:25 242:9 identifies (1) 88:11 identify (16) 46:2 47:12 52:4 54:5.18 55:19 70:1.9 77:7 113:14 125:17,18 209:19 221:14 234:7,14 ife (1) 197:2 ignorance (1) 142:5 ii (1) 237:9 iii (2) 186:23 237:12 ill (15) 31:7.22 36:3 43:15 44:20 63:22 65:11 66:21 104:14 121:15 123:23 144:7 169:16 209:19 237:5 im (137) 1:25 2:15 6:21,25 7:7 9:1,2 14:6 20:21 21:1,22 28:25 29:9 33:21 35:17 39:18 40:7.17 42:15 47:22 48:12 50:3 52:8 58:6.11 64:7.12 65:1 66:2.18 67:12 68:1.17.21 74:3 76:13,14 80:12,19 90:10,21 92:12 94:10.18.19 95:5.10 99:4.12.24 103:8.8 105:10 109:9.19 116:21 117:23 118:18 119:16 121:12.15 123:1 124:21 127:16.21 128:15 129:19 130:10,24 132:14,25 133:2,16,24 134:3,8 136:19,21 142:19 146:2 6 154:4 155:6 157:2.10.18.20 159:12 160:9 169:7 172:21 175:24 177:23.25 179:19 180:3.3.4.6 181:5 184:2 185:20 186:1,6,8,9 189:7,25 194:10,25 195:4 196:23 199:12,12,19,19 200:6 204:9,18 207:2.13.19 208:4.13 216:12 218:3 219:23 228:22 230:14 233:13 235:9 238:17,24 242:12,13,18,20 imagine (6) 49:11 78:2 105:9,10 155:1 173:12 imagining (1) 105:11 immediate (1) 2:9 immediately (3) 18:17,19 100:12 imminent (1) 70:14 imminently (1) 146:3 housing related (1) 14:16 impact (2) 176:21 180:10

implement (4) 88:17 135:19 168:14 170:12 implementation (1) 89:8 implemented (3) 124:14 211:18.22 importance (1) 62:23 important (12) 12:7 49:22 51:21 64:9 92:3 153:2 181:12 201:18 202:12 235:17.18.19 impracticability (1) 108:16 impracticable (1) 108:1 impression (2) 205:24 206:17 improved (1) 200:17 improving (1) 77:1 inadequate (2) 106:12 130:17 inaudible (1) 153:14 inbox (1) 156:12 incident (1) 74:9 incidents (1) 72:10 inclined (1) 178:20 include (16) 7:24 20:10 23:15 40:23 80:1 112:21 140:24 141:2 146:18 158:20 159:16 168:1 229:9 237-16 239-9 10 included (12) 17:15 19:9 22:8 26:5 33:23 70:2,10 103:21 141:1 161:18 236:23 238:8 includes (1) 40:18 including (8) 32:7 106:2 158-14 172-18 174-17 229:11 237:10.25 inclusion (1) 23:13 incorporate (2) 52:19 129:6 incorporated (1) 22:10 increase (1) 168:19 independent (8) 178:4 193:13 195:25 198:24 199:8 201:4,11 214:23 independently (1) 199:17 index (1) 244:2 indicate (1) 236:21 indicated (1) 25:18 indicating (1) 89:1 indication (2) 238:23 239:8 individual (3) 144:12,19 229:10 individually (1) 191:3 individuals (5) 22:6 52:16 67:25 73:18 189:19 inevitably (3) 15:18 19:16 240:11 nform (1) 82:18 informal (5) 20:4 70:6 72:3.19 75:21 information (37) 5:25 6:4,6 23:7 34:25 35:25 46:8 50:19 51:1 52:16.18 54:9,24 57:13 62:7 70:25 71:5 74:1,3,10,12 75:23 78:16 79:4,7 83:7 104:23 108:8 113:10 129:19 146:5 185:23 186:19,23 187:21 227:5 238:4 informationgathering (1) 79:11 informed (3) 9:7 151:15 173:6 informing (1) 32:24 inhouse (11) 85:20 86:25 87:21 211:23 213:17 224:14 230:24 231:4.19 232:3 242:6 initial (5) 25:16 165:18 187:7 222:21 229:14 initially (9) 12:13 44:12 53:11 87:10 114:12 145:15 173:11 227:21 240:16 initiative (2) 25:12 101:19

initiatives (1) 77:1

injustice (1) 19:4

input (12) 70:18 82:4

87:13 20 120:2 133:15 136:8 137:19 185:18 187:4 228:15.16 inquest (1) 209:22 inquiry (8) 1:17.22 2:15 62:17 69:24 75:8 161:4 244:4 inside (4) 162:7 236:16 239:9,23 insist (1) 175:15 insofar (1) 135:18 inspect (2) 234:12,12 inspected (4) 28:2 115:24 241:19 242:4 inspection (8) 27:14 30:1 31:24 32:1 33:17 146:18 150:14 169:6 inspections (9) 11:3 51:6,8 52:19 143:6 149:14 235:16 236:12 241:16 install (3) 132:18,22 175:15 installation (5) 27:12 57:11 79:6 116:2 168:15 installed (1) 79:5 instance (5) 24:24 41:16 53:19 78:11 80:19 instances (1) 242:2 instead (1) 180:25 instigated (2) 45:25 211:9 institution (5) 9:1,12 12:5 37:18 95:6 instructed (6) 103:14,23 105:4 216:16 219:12 226:12 instructing (2) 95:13 217:7 instruction (4) 103:10 221:2,14 228:10 instructions (11) 186:17 225:24 226:9,10,14,18 227:4 228:8,22 238:8,8 insurance (2) 187:17,19 insurers (2) 206:4,7 insuring (1) 206:8 integral (1) 155:20 intended (6) 1:24 142:2 163:15 168:14 230:24 232:9 intensive (1) 66:14 intent (1) 108:25 intention (4) 101:1 181:6 218:18.20 intentions (2) 60:14.16 interaction (1) 102:1 interchanging (1) 147:3 interested (1) 60:5 interim (4) 22:19,24 90:8,9 internal (3) 42:6 85:23 161:16 internally (1) 217:23 interpret (1) 200:4 interpretation (2) 24:22 25:25 interpreted (2) 26:3 200:5 intervals (1) 230:2 intervene (1) 205:15 intervening (1) 109:13 interview (4) 189:14 192:21 195:13 203:5 interviewed (1) 159:1 into (40) 2:16 14:14 33:14 52:19 53:22 56:1 58:8 60:9 62:25 63:22 65:3 68:21 70:25 73:24 82:4 85:11 93:14 103:6 127:2.17 129:8 133:15 136:8 137:19 145:2 146:10 157:17 158:13 163:23 167:14 181:1.9.23 185:18 211:2 212:9 219:18 220:5 227:18 228:21 intranet (2) 124:5,7 introduce (1) 53:14 introduced (6) 11:18 20:1 112:1 121:10 216:2 227:7 introduction (4) 85:3.21 104:17 109:15

Opus 2 Official Court Reporters

introductory (1) 22:13 invariable (1) 77:23 invariably (2) 26:9 77:22 invasive (1) 180:7 investigate (1) 72:18 investigated (3) 8:1 18:18 115:10 investigations (1) 1:22 investment (1) 104:20 investments (1) 136:23 invited (4) 17:4 56:13 90:12.13 inviting (1) 185:5 invoices (1) 222:11 involve (3) 11:19 15:24 involved (23) 15:11 25:15 35:1.6.14 49:3 57:16 79:23 80:3 98:14 161:9.10 164:11 168:25 170:16 173:10,13 186:8 203:15 207:3 223:5 224:23 228:14 involvement (5) 28:13 62:4 113:23 225:18,19 involves (1) 144:15 involving (1) 235:6 iosh (7) 13:19 14:2.10.13 177:14 186:14 214:5 ireland (1) 186:15 isnt (18) 7:3 63:15 111:11 116:24 127:1 132:24 134:5 144:24 147:4 171:24 180:5 181:3 193:14 203:24 211:18 219:16 231:21 242-18 issued (3) 162:24.24 163:1 issues (63) 6:22 12:20 13:14 15:12 16:9 18:21,22 22:7.10.17 25:5.5 26:22

115:1,4,13,16 119:4 124:10 128:24 132:19 133:23 160:17,17 172:20 175:12,22 177:8 181:2,22 182:16,22 192:2 232:23 236:21 italics (6) 105:23 106:13.19.25 107:8 108:19 item (17) 31:19 82:1 90:22 93:8,10 110:24 112:7,13,14 124:2 139:24 146:14 147:10 151:7 157:24 164:20 183:12 items (7) 52:24 111:7 128:8 129:14 213:13 215:16

28:9,9 35:2,22 38:10 46:2

47:9,12 52:5 54:4,18 55:16

56:3 57:4 58:14 59:16

61:24 62:5 69:20 70:12

101:25 102:23 112:18

72:9 75:15.22 76:11 86:7

237:5 iterations (1) 156:18 its (115) 6:9 7:12 9:5 10:2 12:3 20:17,25 21:8 29:1 30:23 32:15 34:3,7 36:4 39-11 19 42-13 46-14 47:14,23 59:14 60:6,22,24 61:21 63:15 66:7.23 67:6 69:7 71:14.22.23 76:25.25 81:14 83:16 84:8 85:6.8 92:4 94:13 96:2,4,7 102:15 104:7,25 107:24 108:13 109:3.10.11 111:1 118:10 129:23 131:8.8.14.16 132:5,14 133:12,22 134:5.11 135:23 136:8 137:25 141:7.12 143:23 144:16 148:20 152:16 156:20 157:25 161:24 162:1,4 164:16 165:5 168:8,9 169:10 170:9 171:24 177:2 179:15 181:3.12 185:10 187:18 188:15 191:6.22 198:1 199:11 201:13 204:21

213:16 219:7.16 223:7 231:3 233:1 235:18 236:24 237:18 240:8 242:23 itself (4) 31:6 110:19 117:14 148:23 iv (1) 237:13 ive (31) 9:17,18,21 10:10,10 33:15 42:19 47:3 64:6 69:18 107:4,15 110:22 119:4 124:16 130:3.4 133:19 142:6 157:10.10 169:24 176:19 177:21 180:21 192:22 216:2 219:21 234:1 239:19

241:24 janet (8) 84:18,18 102:16 105:11 185:16 186:4 189:7.20 ianice (14) 1:5.10 43:25 62:21 63:12 96:14,23 123:17 147:20 151:13,15 161:15 164:21 244:3 january (25) 3:19,23 5:3 17:7 73:6 95:25 96:2 98:20.25 100:13 120:12.14 124:19.20 137:23.25 138:10.16 139:13 140:18 147:23 149:22 151:10 156:7,8 jean (4) 90:4 92:23 93:4 96:3 jevans (9) 38:14 59:1 61:9,23 62:4,24 157:23 158:7 159:20 job (6) 7:16,17 53:4 156:6 198:16 225:11 iogs (1) 20:14 john (6) 136:2,11 137:19 138:14 139:5 145:24 johnson (8) 17:3,15 29:14 30:12 84:8 90:5 96:3,7 joined (1) 8:8 joining (3) 37:22,25 221:5 ioint (14) 25:12 27:4 28:25 29:3.16 82:19.24 85:13 98:12 101:19 156:21 169:2 214:10 225:20 jointly (3) 28:18 32:10 172:10 journals (2) 11:18 12:9 judgement (3) 14:19 190:25 236:17 iuly (19) 3:11 21:7 38:19 43:19 60:25 64:5 70:7 77:16 79:16 109:4,6 158:15 185:9 210:4,21 220:23 226:2 234:20 237:2 jumped (1) 176:20 june (23) 1:1 3:25 6:12 7:14 19:21 37:15 77:16 81:7,11,18 87:16 88:3,12 136:7 137:24 138:5 139:12

158:13 169:12 170:8

171:10 209:3 243:13

jw (5) 123:25 124:4,7,11

158-9

jw3 (1) 103:17

kc (1) 56:17 kctmo (2) 43:24 81:17 lack (11) 57:4 80:22,23,24,24 105:21 keane (1) 102:8 keen (2) 30:19 175:18 106:12,17,23 158:7 159:20 keep (6) 2:7 6:24 9:4,24 lacors (1) 23:25 46:23 147:3 lady (1) 13:7 keeping (1) 7:3 ladys (1) 185:16 keith (8) 90:3,7,21 91:6,12 lakanal (10) 13:6 14:21 92-23 93-4 94-1 15:3.16.21 17:2 18:16 kensington (7) 17:4 29:25 19:11.13 209:22 landlord (2) 94:25 116:1 30:7 31:20 51:1 88:15 104:21 lane (1) 195:22 language (1) 147:4 kept (6) 8:25 26:24 28:5 49:5 50:12 233:14 large (1) 127:1

kevin (5) 29:15,23 30:11,21 largely (7) 14:11 19:17 74:7 33:13 75:20 102:20 121:13 139:4 key (5) 62:5 78:15 110:8.12 last (15) 24:16 36:4 42:2 111:15 56:6 57:9 76:25 137:24 kevs (2) 226:25 227:18 139:24 141:1.6 143:10 kicked (1) 221:23 147:17 174:20 182:16 kickstarting (1) 61:18 209:20 kind (26) 12:14 28:5 51:20 late (3) 85:10 102:21 174:21 54:11 55:18 68:1 80:25 later (10) 9:21 22:16 68:9 102:17 119:6 145:20 153:8 102:7 114:20 118:12 167:19 168:7 173:6 176:15 127:22 147:6 213:11 242:6 177:6.6.15 179:18 181:8 latest (2) 135:24 161:16 192:2 216:25 221:11 latterly (2) 27:11 57:2 225:12 230:12 238:20 laura (11) 17:3,15 29:14 kinds (6) 11:24 12:19 13:5 30:12 84:8 90:5 96:3,7 206:5 227:1 232:23 169:3,7 218:10 kit (1) 108:6 lauras (1) 169:4 knew (23) 22:11 35:22 lead (2) 152:6 232:20 49:1.2 86:1 89:11 95:14 leader (5) 38:24 53:9 88:13 113:13 119:23.24 179:11 150:20 187:1 187:24 188:1 190:22 196:7 leads (1) 233:16 197:20 204:20 224:21 learn (1) 195:19 226:23.24 227:12 learned (4) 18:17 103:5 236:15,21 173:4 201:22 knock (1) 240:23 learning (1) 14:12 know (162) 7:2,8 10:10,23 learnt (3) 15:23 18:16 26:2 12:3.20 23:9 26:21 27:8 lease (1) 115:21 33-13 35-20 39-3 43-5 leasehold (2) 25:2 28:23 44:16 47:19 49:4 51:10 leaseholder (9) 35:2,3,5 52:7 57:19 58:4,7,7 115:22 119:5 221:12 223:6 67:1,3,13 68:15 72:6 224:3 225:19 74:1.16 78:1.1.4 80:11 leaseholders (6) 25:2 28:23 112:19 113:5 115:19 223:8 82:9 83:12 89:3,4 90:11,12,13 93:25 95:9 least (18) 20:22 22:5 34:4 98-24 99-4 102-19 105-7 48-14 55-18 99-23 114-12 109:17.19.22.23 113:11 118:21 121:6 132:22 115:9 146:10 155:22 163:12 117:15,16,19,20,23,24,25 171:13 197:14 205:19 120:20 122:14 123:2 207:21 241:23 124:21,23 127:1 128:14 leave (2) 65:11 114:11 130:19,21 131:10,22 led (4) 15:15 115:11 181:8 132:11,12 228:15 133:8,8,13,14,17 137:4,7 left (8) 5:18 73:1 125:19 138:2.5.7.8 140:3 142:2 155:9 177:25 187:7 208:3 143:15.20 144:1 146:2 212:19 148:13 149:12,12 150:10 legal (7) 28:17 30:8,23 35:6 154:1,12 159:12 42:13 182:15,22 162:19,23,25 163:9 164:8 legionella (1) 159:9 legislation (19) 11:8,14,16 16:3 24:23 26:1 28:19 36:16.18 42:14 50:22

167:10,17,22,24 169:1,4 171:8 172:16 173:9,19 176:18 180:8 181:13 182:8.18 184:1 189:23 191:11.22 192:13 193:10 196:6 197:17 203:20 205:18 206:2,3,15 207:23,23 208:1,3,6 214:22 218:9 219:3,21 221:6,16,21 222:11,14,16 223:7 224:18 226:23 229:16 230:5 233:6,7 235:3.4.7 236:24 238:11.15 240:9 241:10 242:4,7,10 knowledge (14) 11:6 24:11 39:6 44:6 45:6,11 83:15 93:25 94:1 133:7 190:7 191:16 202:24 225:15 knowledgeable (1) 202:22 known (6) 8:14 16:4 21:23.24 95:23 190:24 kpis (3) 53:21,22 54:17

57:17 70:14.16 72:12 96:16 164:23 166:19 210:13 length (4) 122:25 210:12 228:11,20 lengthy (1) 170:12 less (17) 23:7 56:18 72:5 73:12,13,14,16,17 85:22 103:3 112:25 180:7 203:3.3.4 208:7 240:10 lessee (1) 146:19 let (14) 20:9,14 28:12 41:25 72:6 83:22 114:15 119:14 164:14 172:21 201:23 202:10 222:6.8 lets (31) 21:8 24:16 43:3 44:19 62:16 64:25 88:9 89:21 107:25 108:22 120:12 122:2 123:13 131:2,4,20 147:6 148:23 153:20 154:3 157:17 160:15 161:23 162:8 163:23 164:16 165:3 174:14 184:25 191:5 231:23 letter (7) 96:2,18 97:1 98:8.24 99:23 100:3 letting (1) 202:2 level (20) 8:21 38:16 41:4 53:15 64:11 82:11 83:8 91:4 93:12 94:2,13,15 97:19 181:15 204:11 208:16 213:5.7.16 235:23 Ifb (41) 50:20.24 85:11 88:11 89:24 91:9,9,13,15,22

93:11 14 24 94:12 97:21 130-22 147-18 150-23 151:2 152:20 153:21 155:8 166:24 172:8.15 175:7.10.12.14.22 177:16 179:1,2,21 180:23 181:2 203:25 204:7 205:9,10 207:4 **Іfb000009872 (1)** 151:6 **Ifb0003197723 (1)** 88:10 **Іfb0003197730 (3)** 96:1,10 99:16 Ifb0003197731 (2) 98:7 100:4 **Ifb0003197732 (1)** 96:6 Ifb00032248 (1) 31:7 Ifb000322484 (1) 31:17 Ifb000322485 (1) 32:9 Ifb000322488 (1) 31:9 Ifbs (2) 179:5 210:4 Ifepa (5) 29:10 31:8,13 32:11 33:7 lga (12) 22:2,3 83:19 84:5 142:15,18 162:13 214:19,20 228:4,12,21 liability (2) 132:19 187:17 liaison (2) 44:16 62:8 life (1) 110:15 lifetime (1) 69:7 lifts (3) 55:9 57:10 108:6 light (3) 104:3 131:20 194:7 lighting (2) 115:5 237:19 lightning (1) 57:11 lightweight (1) 144:15 like (43) 5:24 6:7 11:23 25:19 41:3 47:14 50:4 52:6 54:2 58:12 65:16 66:18 83:12 84:1 86:7 98:2 99:13 105:16 119:25 121:2 126:23 128:14 131:23 132:11 134:20 140:16 152:3 155:10,21 162:9.12.13 163:19.19 165:8 171:15 177:8 203:4 223:15 232:9 233:2 236:16 239:12 liked (3) 49:21 53:24 222:3 likely (8) 14:9 96:20 102:15 116:25 133:9 146:23 148:20 204:13 limited (5) 40:24 43:18 61:13 158:25 160:14 line (21) 31:23 49:2 53:19 63:11 68:6 122:17 125:21 141:6 143:24 145:8 154:23 161:14 189:12 215:13 216:19 217:24 222:21 224:20 225:2 230:13 242:20 lines (5) 26:14 92:15 193:7 236:2 239:19 link (2) 218:5 240:17 linked (1) 73:20 lions (2) 27:9 28:10 list (23) 17:4 39:20 40:19 42:3 103:16.17.20 114:16 123:17,22 139:19 166:22 167:24 173:4 174:8 186:22 192:8 193:18 195:23 199:2 221:15 237:5 238:15 little (17) 5:25 6:24 15:5 19:20 68:25 77:24 86:25 92:4 94:10 114:15 136:9 156:2 184:22 191:22 195:2,5 237:1 live (3) 57:13 70:12 75:22 lived (2) 179:9 180:12

living (1) 210:11

load (1) 213:15

lobbies (1) 168:21

210:20 226:24

location (1) 108:9

locations (1) 229:25

log (3) 106:17 107:18 108:7

london (12) 12:13 13:2 14:3

m (1) 113:2

maddison (1) 157:23

magazine (1) 240:17

168:14 176:3

main (5) 56:10 71:23 81:22

15:7.23 16:20 17:13.14 50:24 85:10 166:20 238:25 long (15) 8:17 12:3 35:19 53:12 55:6 57:7 66:18 110:1 116:8 132:15 148:5 166:22 177:1 241:13 242:19 longer (4) 86:11 170:11 171:19 211:6 look (71) 9:9 11:8,12,23 14:24 19:5 24:16 25:22 29:21 39:10 42:2 44:19 46:13 50:15 54:2 57:3.20 59:18 61:6 62:16 64:25 66:4 69:23 74:22 75:7 86:15 88:9 97:3,13 98:2 105:19,22 106:9 108:22 111:6.23 122:2 131:2.7 135-21 137-22 139-22 141:9 146:13 147:6.16 152:24 154:3 158:23 160:16,18 162:7 165:12,20 167:1 169:17 175:2 185:2,21 186:10 189:11 191:5,13 198:1,5 199:3 209:9 235:6 236:1 239-23 23 looked (21) 16:15 24:15 53:20 55:22 71:18 86:6 107:11 130:14 135:10 148:24 152:3 154:14 173:18 193:1 194:2.3 196:2 200:9 221:7 235:19 242:6 looking (31) 22:24 23:2 27:12.13.20 29:11 33:10 39:18 40:19 43:4 48:4 56:6 58:8 60:3 61:6 82:1 91:17 96:11 131:23 135:8 143:12 148:8 163:9 171:15 190:12 191:23 206:1 207:11 228:18 231:5 238:17 looks (10) 47:14 84:1 105:4 131:23 144:23 162:9.12.13 165:8 166:4 loose (1) 187:16 lornette (10) 68:6,8 120:3 122:24 127:12 133:8 174:16 217:24,25 218:24 lost (2) 42:19 86:22 lot (42) 9:8 19:25 20:4 22:4 26:7 35:23.24 42:17 44:17 51:25 59:22 66:14 94:4 102:22,23 103:1 113:22 115:17 126:11 127:21 133:3 134:5 149:13 159:3 168:4 171:14 173:5 177:4,15 187:15 188:9 191:20 192:13 200:9,20 201:22 202:13 203:3,3 214:9 235:8.20 lots (2) 35:7 56:16 loud (1) 2:8 loudly (2) 203:18 204:13 low (7) 172:14 184:23 208:25 213:5.7.7.16 lowest (1) 190:15 lowlevel (7) 211:23 212:20 213:8.11 215:18 229:21 232:15 lowrisk (12) 100:8,11,15 101:11 174:2,23 206:16 209:5 219:17 220:9 226:9.13 lunch (3) 131:4 134:14 135:8 lyons (11) 151:24 152:23 153:16 154:8 155:10 156:10.22 160:23 162:2 163:18 166:8 local (5) 14:2 21:5 209:23

235:15 139:20 228:19 242:2 229:20

mains (1) 176:5 maintain (3) 82:1 137:17 maintained (5) 32:18 51:25 55:10 112:4 125:11 maintenance (5) 108:10 117:5 143:6 203:3 227:11 maintenanceservice (1) major (2) 167:6 229:25 majority (3) 111:7 203:1 makes (1) 134:1 making (13) 27:2 31:4 41:5 49:15 95:14 100:24 130:5 153:12 193:24 203:11 204:18 214:17 219:24 manage (3) 30:1 49:24 54:9 managed (6) 8:1 34:18 53:22 106:4 112:5 234:11 management (48) 6:19 8:21 19:14 24:8 38:6,11 39:24 40:12.13.23 43:17 51:22 55:25 84:24 85:7 90:10 104:14,18,20,23,24 108:3 110:4 113:9 118:3 122:7 22 123:10 11 15 20 125-4 127-23 129-7 130:1,2 131:21 136:12 145:22 157:4 161:19,19 166:23 167:12.20 169:3 227:9 237:22 manager (29) 6:13 13:9 26:18 34:21 39:16 56:19 62:22 63:12 67:11 17 18 68:6 77:5 94:25 96:13 122:17 143:24 145:25 151:23 152:25 154:18,23 156:6 186:9 215:13 216:19 217:24 225:2 230:13 managerial (1) 106:23 managers (8) 41:16 49:2 53:19 59:2,19 113:13 145:15 224:21 managing (5) 24:23 37:10 77:1 154:15 191:24 mann (6) 26:19 56:19 72:3,21 74:22 76:10 manner (1) 32:17 manse (2) 46:1 229:24 manual (1) 106:18 manually (1) 55:1 many (16) 37:17 62:24 115:21 118:1 127:16 131:19 150:5 170:2 196:15,19 197:13 202:9 207:21 208:15 241:10 march (11) 4:18 6:18 23:23 77:12,23 78:19 84:3 154:3.7 161:5 172:2 marchearly (1) 174:22 mark (1) 110:23 marked (2) 111:24 192:9 markedup (1) 238:4 marking (1) 237:24 marshals (1) 214:15 martin (36) 1:3,11,15 7:5.7.10 58:17 65:1.6.15.22.24 130:13 134:3,10,13,20 135:2,5 150:19 194:9,16,22,25 195:4,8 205:15,21 206:7.19 242:15.18.22 243:4.7.9 masterdor (2) 46:1 229:24 material (6) 17:21 167:3 184:21 210:25 212:1 materialise (1) 188:22 materials (1) 150:7 mathews (1) 170:13 matt (6) 43:18 157:19 158:2.18 159:24 160:13 matter (3) 60:24 129:16

205:2 207:21 209:1 211:17

198:7

matters (9) 22:17 51:3 59:7 62:25 70:2.19 211:1 214:4 236:5 matthews (11) 37:19 38:12.14 39:1 58:22 61:3 62:11,16 69:19 79:16 82:4 matts (2) 158:12,17 maybe (5) 73:12 141:2 163:20 180:8 221:5 mean (44) 10:22 30:25 47:5.19 60:6 73:14.16 81:21 97:18 99:21 102:13 129:5.19 139:4 159:23 160:25 174:7,11,13 175:23 178:19 190:25 191:10,11,12,18 192:7,12 202:7 204:4 207:2 213:7,7,8,16 216:11 220:17 222:11 223:4.5 224:20 235:4.10 240:8 meaning (2) 200:4,6 meaningful (1) 196:22 means (19) 23:23 32:21 33:4 45:15 46:18,24,25 50:19 52:3 86:10,16 111:10 112:8 180:10 234:24,25 235-15 237-16 17 meant (11) 23:1 31:4 61:21 103:3 176:23 178:20 179:8 181:5 195:20 230:1 235:12 meantime (1) 181:14 measure (1) 207:9 measures (7) 22:20,25 43:8 45:8 106:14,20 107:5 nedium (8) 100:8.15 101:11 172:13 182:2 184:23.25 216:17 mediumrisk (24) 100:10,12 174:2.23 175:19 182:12 183:25 185:6 190:20 201:3 203:2 205:3,5 207:1,20 209:4 215:8 216:25,25 219:17 220:4 226:4 230:11.11 mediumterm (1) 239:16 mediumtermsic (1) 194:1 meet (18) 12:17 26:20 34:20 55:25 57:2 72:4,7 91:13 101:1 112:2 121:3 125:9 144:12 151:13 181:15 199:1 202:14 226:22 meeting (62) 81:14 89:21,23 90:11.15.18 96:12 97:9 99:6 100:22 101:5 102:15 105:12 117:3,6,14,19 118:5,9,13,20 119:13 120:14,18 121:1,5,9,12,18,24 123:13 124:25 125:3,4 126:16 145:4.15 147:9 148:8.9.18 149:5 150:23 151:10.17 152:23 154:2 157:21 158:14 160:22 164:9,18 165:4 170:10,24 174:20 177:12 181:19,20 183:3,4 207:3 meetings (40) 13:14 15:10 17:16,22 25:13 28:5 29:5 38:8 42:6 44:16 50:22.24.25 52:2 56:7.8 58:24 62:8,20,22 69:14,17,17,18 70:3,10,18,21 71:1 86:20 92:10 98:13 101:22 118:24 120:11 121:2 172:19 177:19 207:4 225:20 member (16) 9:1.12.15.17 10:17 13:19.21 14:10.13 38:5,24 58:23 59:2 61:9 93:13 167:21 members (8) 1:8 13:12 38:8 39:4 40:10 149:9 167:18 187-2 membership (2) 9:24 37:18 memberships (1) 196:17 memory (3) 20:15 160:10

moorebick (35) 1:3,11,15 mentioned (9) 14:21 15:4 55:24 66:20 87:25 102:5 mentions (1) 162:13 merely (3) 30:13 155:17 more (54) 5:25 10:1 14:18 56:11.18.23 58:21 62:19 73:11 127:10 131:24 167:22 173:19 177:15 method (2) 113:11 175:2 michael (14) 151:13,21,24 152:10 153:16 154:8 155:10.20 156:10.22 160:23 162:2 163:18 166:8 morning (12) 1:3,7,8,19,20 michaels (2) 154:13,24 middecember (1) 147:19 middle (3) 76:22 190:6 morphed (1) 13:3 midyear (2) 28:7 34:23 morris (1) 37:24 might (28) 22:13 34:12 morses (1) 31:10 38-17 52-12 17 54-4 most (12) 9:11 11:9 14:9.15 72:4,5,17 73:7,13 77:24 79:25 90:9 91:12 103:7 138:11 152:3 159:4 179:8 mostly (7) 13:8 27:25 79:7 180:25 199:8 222:24 223:3 232:22 239:24 240:24,25 move (6) 95:25 145:2 157:17 millett (35) 1:6,7,16,18 6:23 7.6 9 12 58:12 18 64:24 noved (1) 233:12 65:1.4.6.25 66:1 130:7.14 moving (4) 154:1 161:2 133:25 134:3,6 135:6,7 194:6 195:4,7,9 205:14 ms (18) 1:9,10,19 37:9 206:20.21 242:11.16.19.20 mind (4) 49:8 82:21 141:17 mindful (2) 221:9 228:17 much (37) 1:11,21 7:22 mine (4) 7:3,6 77:19 79:14 minute (8) 89:23 90:18 93:17 154:5,11 157:20 minuted (3) 117:14 151:12 ninutes (10) 89:21 118:23 124:22 130:12 145:4 147:8 154:3 160:22 171:11.12 muchmore (13) 25:20 misunderstood (2) 43:1 mitigate (3) 176:11 179:16 nuddy (1) 179:4 mitigating (2) 178:8,10 multiple (1) 240:3 must (18) 18:2 36:21 48:6 mmhm (5) 107:3 110:25 112:11 158:5 167:4 moment (9) 6:21 14:22 15:4 25:24 121:15 184:22 194:6 mutated (1) 146:9 mutually (1) 201:21 myself (4) 41:17 152:10

7:5.7.10 58:17

65:1,6,15,22,24 130:13

134:3.10.13.20.135:2.5

194:9.16.22.25 195:4.8

242:15,18,22 243:4,7,9

15:5,20 20:9 36:1 40:18

41:21.25 43:7 49:10.22

103:1 108:22 111:14

113:10 114:15 117:10

160:15 168:15 174:5

180:23 181:3 195:5.17

200:9.18 207:18 214:17

2:3 17:17 65:7,9 140:14

35:20 40:6 59:15 111:9

156:19 168:2 214:7 228:19

87:3 111:24 145:21 212:20

163:23 181:23 205:16

65:6,22 66:2 76:1 134:13

194:10,11,22 195:10

15:20 16:7 20:16 25:12

42:15 52:22 53:18 54:6

135:5,7 146:5 157:15

160:25 177:18 181:20

182:8 184:16 194:16

196:24 200:18 206:19

208:12 217:11 219:23

120:9,15,22 173:12 174:15

84:9.10 90:21 111:4 117:9

126:20.22 127:3 131:16

155:2,2 190:21,21,25

197:19

161:12 195:1

102:5,7,9 105:11

189:7,20 218:4

243:4

65:24 68:9 74:10 80:5 82:4

83:11 100:22 101:19 123:3

184:23 203:2

135:2,8 179:7

242:23 244:3

222:25 230:2 231:25

235:21 237:1 239:4

148:25 176:7

50:7 56:13 62:13.13 66:17

70:6 73:14 74:2 75:23 81:1

127:4 133:5 140:25 141:21

143:23 145:20 155:5 156:3

205:15,21 206:7,19

185-24 norys (1) 121:24

204:9

merge (1) 59:23

199:24 240:1

metres (1) 176:1

242:12

243:8

206:12

183:4 191:5

misled (1) 52:17

223:12

180:5

mma (1) 71:21

mobility (1) 223:20

230:12 242:16

money (4) 48:1 88:17 127:2

monitored (3) 50:18 51:24

monitoring (12) 30:1 31:24

32:1 33:17 35:24 42:23

month (6) 55:19 111:11.16

71:15,21 72:2 75:24

monitor (4) 46:23 51:3

monday (1) 1:1

184:10

75:11,18

232:14.16

221:5

121:6,13 175:5

monthly (1) 145:17

months (19) 55:19 58:22

86:5 99:19 111:17,18

138:17 151:17 184:20

210:4 213:10.11 215:10

112:9.9 125:22 126:14.18

55:14

missed (2) 18:2 50:4

183:15

met (15) 14:3 42:17

mention (1) 214:3

142:18,19 230:4

naive (1) 103:6 naively (1) 215:8 name (12) 13:1 36:7,7 116:19 117:22 136:24 149:2 157:1 165:9 166:1 169:15 185:16 names (2) 147:11 188:22 national (2) 8:11 192:11 native (1) 81:8 natural (1) 242:16 nature (6) 15:18 22:22 120:6 153:10 212:9 236:4 nearly (3) 21:23 64:8 146:17 nebosh (5) 8:14 37:17 186:14 191:21.24

numbering (1) 123:19

onsite (1) 92:10

necessarily (6) 47:22 48:3 168:9 196:9 233:11.13 necessary (5) 42:7 61:10 88:18 89:2 218:5 need (49) 2:4 5:20 11:22 15:9 23:9 32:24 43:14 48:24 49:10 52:5 85:4 86:12,15,15,22 93:11 103:18 115:9 143:17 144:9 147:18 151:7 153:4.10 160:18 168:2 169:16 175:14 176:12.25 177:1.22.24 178:21.22 179:15 180:4,14 181:10,13,18 183:22 189:4 200:7 210:14 221:8 225:13 230:21 241:20 eded (60) 7:19 10:23 11:5 15:17 16:15 22:8.10 23:8 28:1 31:5 44:9 45:22 47:17 49:16 50:9,10 51:11 52:21,24 61:18 64:11,12 70:2.9 71:7 72:10 79:3.8 86:18 87:6 95:22 111:10 113:25 114:1 119:11 128:5 153:12 155:23 171:18 174-5 176-5 9 16 20 24 177:18 178:7 179:9 11 180:12 182:10 206:11 208:8 217:3 220:10,11 221:24 234:7 236:14 240:6 needs (3) 94:12 124:14 221:7 needsability (1) 144:18 negatives (1) 154:4 neighbourhood (2) 108:3 149:14 never (16) 38:5 93:18,21 95:21 129:2,10 131:15 151:5 152:11 155:11 157:5 159:25 163:7 167:20 188:21 196:13 newly (1) 154:18 news (2) 30:18 154:20 next (22) 3:1.18.24 4:6.14 5:6 21:4.17 58:19 110:24 137:25 140:8 151:9,17 154:1 194:8 195:6 213:18 230:25 233:13,16,19 nick (1) 150:22 nobody (2) 177:4 203:12 nod (1) 2:11 nods (1) 2:12 noncompliant (4) 35:5 223:6 234:15 240:2 noncontractual (2) 220:7,17 none (2) 87:24 176:3 nonprocurement (1) 217:19 normal (1) 34:6 normally (6) 80:10 117:16 138:24 139:6,8 240:25 north (1) 53:10 northern (1) 186:14 note (7) 30:11 103:17 123:13 125:3 165:24 182:1 209:19 notes (1) 191:3 nothing (4) 30:15 123:8 213:17 224:24 notice (7) 33:1 63:7 64:8 86:24 88:1.19 89:7 notices (4) 6:1 32:23 62:9 168:20 november (27) 31:12 36:8 63:15,23 64:1 118:8,9,25

nvq (1) 8:21 0 objective (3) 101:4 173:16 207:8 objectives (3) 106:1 112:2 125:9 obligation (4) 30:20 71:21 72:2 115:21 obligations (6) 30:8,23 31:1 42:13 127:10 204:7 observation (2) 91:20 182:19 obtain (3) 8:18 171:16 235-12 obtaining (1) 74:2 obvious (2) 168:2 232:18 obviously (28) 5:18 9:3,6 19:25 21:1 26:18 40:18 41:13 47:6 55:12 76:7 142:11 147:3 153:2,9 161:11 168:4.8 187:25 188:3 192:3 197:9 207:11 234:9 235:14 236:10 240:20 241:7 occasion (3) 20:22 75:13 173:7 occasionally (1) 60:8 occasions (2) 80:10 171:13 occupational (5) 8:12 9:2,12 37:18 192:12 occupied (1) 106:5 occupying (1) 211:4 occur (1) 225:2 occurred (1) 211:7 occurrences (2) 50:21 51:18 oclock (5) 130:11 134:15,23 242:25 243:9 october (7) 116:16 118:5 119:20 121:12.19 201:2 204:22 offer (4) 32:21 33:2 93:21 221:11 office (1) 144:10 officer (6) 102:16 136:3 185:13 187:25 189:15 192:5 officers (2) 91:3 115:6 offices (3) 7:19 75:1 96:12 ofinadequate (1) 106:17 ofineffective (1) 106:23 often (17) 14:14 48:12 72:5 75:23 77:14 170:3 200:24 208:6 214:16 222:25 226:24 227:9.14 229:13 234:25 235:21 236:4 oh (7) 33:24 62:1 73:16 133:1 163:19 216:11 233:17 okay (38) 5:20 6:6 7:16 20:19.24 24:12 40:25 41:8 44:4 65:14 66:5 68:10 84:4.25 92:7 94:11 111:5 114:25 116:13.17 134:19 138:1 153:20 154:6 160:11 162:9 163:23 166:3 183:5 192:16 201:1 208:22 215:7 218:13 222:7,18 241:15 243:3 old (2) 142:16 184:20 oldest (1) 184:20 121:23.24 130:22 131:3 omission (1) 140:9 140:14 147:9 149:2,6 once (16) 17:12,14 42:19 152:19 155:7.11 162:11 53:13 74:11 121:6 146:3 163:12 164:1,12 165:21 179:11 183:21 205:8 166:2.5 231:20 206:11 226:8,18 229:14 nowhere (2) 157:14,14 231:10 239:15 number (21) 16:15 46:17 ones (6) 11:7 68:4,5 129:21 48:6 54:18,19 60:21 63:16 196:2 241:19 79:5.10 86:5 107:12 onetoones (2) 49:4 51:13 114:3.25 115:11 118:6 ongoing (10) 10:22 13:15 193:13 196:21 200:24 51:14 70:13 82:2 92:8 209:17 236:15 241:12 99:11 100:25 210:13 220:6

numbers (2) 6:1 241:25 nutshell (2) 18:15 60:12

162:16 176:10 240:7 208:16 242:19 227:22 239:10 74:5 76:25 79:9 97:3 113:11 130:23 133:21

onstream (2) 57:12 196:22 onto (1) 54:10 onus (2) 30:16,22 onwards (2) 81:21 200:1 open (1) 155:9 opening (1) 139:24 operated (2) 188:4 220:22 operates (1) 229:11 operating (3) 220:8,15 234:5 operation (1) 237:9 operational (21) 24:24 27:7 40:7 41:11.25 42:12 59:8 60:2.3.10 69:4 145:21 147:8,13 149:5,10 151:9 154:1 155:12 157:21 operationally (1) 63:5 operations (31) 40:11 51:23 55:22 56:22.23 59:1.13.16.18.61:8.19.25 62:5 63:20 64:15,20 67:6,14 79:3 143:4 146:6.10 155:8 181:24 182:6 183:6 209:11,15,18 216:9,10 opinion (1) 223:23 opportunities (3) 12:11 13:15 14:14 opportunity (5) 33:3 119:3 125:16 155:24 174:9 opposed (1) 179:5 ops (1) 60:9 option (5) 126:9,21,22,23 options (2) 112:21 174:25 orange (1) 20:17 order (22) 8:24 9:24 10:20 11:15 20:1 24:20 30:3,9 32:14 36:19 42:5.10 58:25 61:7 85:4 93:14 106:4 109:16 130:5 182:6 234:17 ordered (1) 212:22 ordering (1) 212:21 orders (1) 54:13 organisation (6) 7:23 9:16 60:18 104:21 158:23 222:3 organisational (1) 47:7 organisations (4) 12:19 85:25 86:20 106:1 organised (2) 17:3 214:14 organization (1) 169:23 original (11) 68:4 99:7 150:18 173:14 187:9 211:6 215:24 218:19 220:15 231:10 233:23 originally (3) 173:18 223:7,8 others (4) 36:2 130:6 174:17 otherwise (3) 8:14 119:18 ought (2) 155:22 225:4 ours (1) 78:14 ourselves (2) 46:4 212:21 outline (1) 118:22 outlined (3) 76:24 124:11 outlining (1) 169:22 outset (1) 238:12 outside (7) 42:16 46:9 171:17 234:10 236:5,13 outstanding (5) 55:16,19 128:25 129:14.21 over (26) 10:7 26:18 32:9 45:2 53:8 58:2 68:16 73:6

36:12 42:22 62:9 68:15 154-17 160-9 overview (3) 24:10 95:24 102:3 overwhelming (1) 203:1 own (19) 31:3 32:2,15,25 33:5,18 34:3 49:8 55:17 57:23 79:1 115:23 129:8 139:9 181:17 192:15 195:13 226:25 228:15 wnerlandlord (2) 33:3,7 ownerslandlords (1) 32:24 owns (1) 30:5

Р packages (1) 72:18 pages (2) 110:21 111:8 pam (3) 96:13 218:10,12 pan (1) 20:17 panel (9) 1:8 186:15 189:5,14,18 190:1,17 193:1,17 panning (2) 19:20 98:19 paper (8) 53:11 79:12 81:14.18 165:6 167:9.11 220:12 papers (1) 60:20 paragraph (76) 8:7 9:9 11:12 15:8 16:25 17:10 19:6 24:14 36:16 37:13 38:4 39:14 43:21,22 48:7 50:16 56:6 58:19 61:6 62:18 69:24.25 71:17.19 74:23 75:8 76:21 85:2.9 93:9 96:11 103:13 105:19 117:2 122:5 123:8 139:17 144:7 161:13 163:25 165:13 166:17,22 168:12,23 169:19 170:6 172:5 175:1,17 182:1,16 185:3 186:10 189:2.11 190:6.13 193:5 196:11 198:6 204:24 208:24 209:18 210:1,9 212:11 222:20 229:5 230:21 231:23,24 234:1,22 236:1 237:3 paragraphs (1) 104:16 pardon (1) 9:18 parked (1) 142:9 parkes (14) 37:23 38:21.25 58:25 67:18.19 68:7.20 79:19 80:4 120:2 154:23 158:10 163:17 part (30) 22:18 24:15 51:13,23 52:18 69:19 76:8 85:6 91:17 99:23 100:18 103:2 137:19 146:9 157:25 181:24 186:17 188:13.17 189:5,18 191:8 192:18 194:1 197:16 212:5 224:15 226:3 229:5 235:18 participated (1) 12:12 particular (14) 10:20 16:21 37:11 51:3 72:17 142:14 186:25 191:14 192:7 209:20 230:23 234:21 235:10 241:4 particularly (13) 21:21 40:11,13 43:5 54:4 71:14 79:3 108:4 130:15 189:19 192:9 204:5 228:11 parties (1) 86:20 partly (3) 24:22,23 242:16 partner (5) 25:11

Opus 2 Official Court Reporters 97:15,18,22 190:9

160:4

134:18 158:7 160:9 170:19

176:1 182:21 206:5,10

overall (4) 39:23 40:22 42:22

overarching (2) 60:8 169:21

overnight (1) 243:2

oversight (8) 7:25 28:13

208:3 218:15 222:23

105:24

parts (3) 83:17 186:2 211:7

party (4) 68:1 102:3 155:3

pas (9) 21:17 23:17 95:20,21

214:19.21 228:5.23 232:10

passing (2) 76:19 122:21

patels (1) 161:4

paul (1) 31:10

patience (1) 86:22

patel (3) 161:3 163:6 166:10

pause (12) 1:14 47:2 65:17 81:10 98:9 132:6 134:22 185:25 194:17 195:5 223:10 243:6 paused (1) 24:15 pausing (5) 11:19 75:4 164:4 166:21 186:18 pay (2) 197:6 208:16 paying (2) 89:2 208:13 pda (1) 53:13 pdas (1) 53:14 pdf (1) 227:25 peep (6) 113:16 114:4.7 144:12,17,19 peeps (2) 3:19 114:19 peer (6) 200:22 202:4,6,17 203:8,13 peers (1) 238:25 pemberton (6) 68:6,8 120:3 174:16 217:24.25 pen (1) 79:12 penultimate (1) 124:3 people (44) 12:18 13:5,16 16:5 23:14,23 25:19 42:18 44:18 47:9 48:1 49:1,15 60:18,21 61:15,17 70:22 74-14 86-16 97-25 113-23 124-11 132-18 143-25 145:21 173:3,10,13 176:12 177:16,24 201:8,16 206:8 223:18 225:21 227:13 238:17 239:3 240:11.19.20 241:12 peoples (1) 144:1 per (3) 104:25 121:13 125:11 percentage (3) 79:5 236:12 238:20 perennial (1) 241:5 perfectly (1) 62:3 performance (20) 38:7 39:4 42:8 50:18 51:4 56:5 57:6 76:25 84:12 100:6,21 101:6,17,21 172:9 173:17 202:9 205:10 206:25 207:9 performing (1) 202:4 perhaps (26) 6:25 11:7,8 12:17 28:9 33:25 56:3 57:5 63:14 99:5,6 103:1,6 107:4 111:13 123:1 160:3,5,8 194:7 195:1,5,18 218:10 221:7 239:4 period (8) 26:7 60:13 77:9.22 99:22 116:11 133:22 217:3 periodic (1) 207:4 periodically (1) 210:15 periods (2) 208:7 229:22 permitted (1) 101:12 permitting (1) 101:13 perry (1) 109:4 perrys (1) 117:21 person (45) 2:8 11:23.23 24:19 25:1 26:15,18 27:23 28:19 29:4 42:11,14 43:6,11,12,23,24 44:7 45:4.14 46:15.18 47:1.6.17 48:6,11,23 57:1,24 67:21 74:5 83:4 88:5 114:7 138:20 159:5 167:16 181:6 204:6 214:16 218:5 224:17 225:5 240:24 personal (7) 48:25 112:24 141:6 144:11 199:14,15,22 personally (1) 175:18 persons (12) 11:24 27:5 31:3 36:21 43:4.7 45:17 46:17.21 48:7 135:16 182:17 perspective (2) 153:11 155:17 peter (1) 157:23 phases (1) 172:14 photographic (1) 17:21 phrase (2) 97:18 236:6 nick (4) 22:16 144:4 203:25

112:5 184:8 portrayed (1) 196:6 position (19) 27:10 35:9 66:24 167:23 177:24 place (28) 49:14,15 53:2,25 54:16 74:24 82:5 86:11 231:10 99:25 100:1 114:2 115:15 positive (1) 204:11 117:8 125:7,17 127:10,15 possible (17) 72:11,14 129:12 160:13 169:20 108:12 126:10 127:16 170:13 171:3 184:6 204:20 206:5 220:14 225:13 188:15 237:8 238:2 239:6,13,20,22 241:23 plan (28) 47:11 76:24 77:2 possibly (12) 8:16 18:11 78:19 80:20 81:6 110:5,19 111:17 112:9 113:7,12 186:4 199:5,7 215:13 114:23 123:20 124:4 216:19 224:20 125:22.23.25 126:14 post (3) 9:20 73:1 202:19 144:11 208:10 228:2 postlakanal (1) 70:15 postnominals (2) 196:7,8 pot (1) 127:1 planned (5) 108:10 117:5 129:20 139:20 227:11 203:16 223:19 224:7 plans (6) 82:15,18 102:20 potentially (11) 35:4 86:18 112:25 233:18 238:2 97:17 103:16 113:24 114-11 201-17 223-6 234-15 235-21 240-2 power (1) 47:8 3:2,6,14 7:13 8:6 11:12 practical (2) 180:24 214:13 14:24 20:15 21:8 24:13 practically (1) 51:9 29:11 30:17 31:17 36:15 practice (11) 27:6,7 70:16 37:12 39:8,14 40:3 44:20 72:2,3 117:12 152:12 161:1 164:23 210:18 65:10.11.16.18 66:4 69:24 238-24 71:16 76:21 83:23 85:1 90:22 96:1,10,22 105:18 practices (3) 143:5 149:16 108:1,23 110:4 122:2 153:5 134:15,16,21,23 135:10 prearranging (1) 241:3 137:22 139:14 140:17 141:10 144:6 145:2 146:14 198:18 preceding (1) 187:5 147:6,16 150:9 156:4 163:24 164:19 166:15 predecessor (1) 37:23 168:12 169:18 172:5 prefer (1) 9:7 174:14 185:2,15 194:12,12 preferred (1) 199:13 196:10 198:1 208:24 premises (16) 11:25 19:15 222:19 229:4 233:25 235:25 237:2 242:25 33:18 34:18 45:16 plugged (2) 53:22 54:17 prepared (9) 20:10 38:6.17 pm (6) 134:24 135:1 158:8 175:9 178:25 preparing (1) 22:8 present (7) 39:3 145:8 points (15) 22:19 29:21 33:23 39:19 40:19 42:2 237:18 52:5 96:25 97:7 123:20 resentation (7) 15:1,15 165:18 166:22 168:1 17:1,12 18:3 19:12,14 presentational (1) 17:21 policies (17) 11:4 13:13 58:9 presented (15) 19:13 22:15 75:2 117:5,7,18 130:17 159:8.11.15 161:17 166:19 162:16 165:4 167:11 policy (67) 10:10 25:5 27:17 presenting (1) 158:10 39:9,10 41:15 62:2 104:8 preset (1) 68:1 105:21.25 106:12 107:10 pressing (1) 94:10 108:25 109:6.7.10.11 pressure (1) 78:12 prestart (1) 121:9 117:10,21 123:16 124:23 111:19 121:11 136:13 125:8,10 127:10 130:8,16 131:6.6 133:11 135:11.24 140:5 136:2 137:10,15 140:10,20 presume (1) 159:9 141:12,16 142:3,14 145:25 presuming (1) 90:21 147:18.19.20.22 148:3 149:21 151:13 152:10 217:11 222:3 239:3 154:11,22 156:5 159:16,18 preventative (4) 43:8 45:8

picked (1) 114:19

pickle (1) 217:10

picture (1) 195:20

piece (1) 23:4

pile (1) 48:20

235:13

229:18 232:2 233:9

234:6,16 241:22

plant (2) 23:4 236:10

please (85) 1:9 2:7,21

45:2 50:15 62:18

123:14.14 131:7

243:1,9

plug (1) 14:14

plus (1) 192:4

228:6.7

police (1) 108:12

137:16 158:3,12,17

111:25 112:3 116:9

146:14.17.25

164:20

poor (1) 59:15

160:21 161:19,20,20,21,25

pondering (2) 142:6 168:5

non (2) 150:13 227:14

portfolio (4) 49:25 104:25

108:10 139:20

140:6.9 217:2 232:2

programme (76) 25:15

previously (1) 10:14

price (1) 190:15

194:19,21 243:11

pointing (1) 115:23

play (1) 169:9

pieces (1) 108:6

prices (1) 171:17 primarily (1) 232:1 primary (2) 41:10 42:12 40:25 42:25 59:23 62:3 principal (2) 89:7 201:16 prior (6) 37:22 54:12 55:4 180:17 202:5 209:16 220:1 58:24 91:22 196:23 221:8 222:22,24 230:14,17 priorities (2) 77:7 125:19 prioritised (2) 49:14 50:8 priority (8) 111:6,8,15 112:6,7 184:24 212:8 213:18 129:13 133:22 184:1 187:6 private (1) 30:18 privately (2) 10:5 14:12 pro (4) 52:21 53:12 98:12 172:19 35:25 55:24 154:13 169:7 proactive (4) 13:11 63:4 168:15 175:13 proactively (1) 53:1 probably (46) 9:20 10:12 12:5 13:3 24:5 25:7 31:16 40:10 56:9 57:16 58:15 60:22 68:4 80:22 83:8,11 potential (5) 112:22 176:11 107:12 131:3.16.23.25 132:10 141:17 148:4 149:7,24 152:6 162:18 173:10 178:2,20,21 181:6 184-15 24 185-12 187-15 195:17 197:1 16 207:13 208:5 215:8 218:12 221:4 228:25 problem (9) 92:8 134:19 178:10.14.16 225:10 235:10 241:5,20 problematic (3) 16:16 47:22 52.7 practiceguidance (1) 110:14 problems (3) 16:17 172:21 241:19 procedure (7) 10:11 49:14 practitioner (2) 10:23 201:11 68:25 135:24 137:15 140:4 precautions (3) 48:16 135:14 procedures (19) 11:4 54:15 58:9 75:2 93:15 104:8 112:17 117:5,8,10,18 123:16 124:9 137:17 144:7 161:17.19 202:23 237:23 proceed (3) 21:12 43:3 217:6 process (22) 8:1 22:18 54:23 30:1,5 31:24 32:2,15,19 74:24 87:13,17,21 97:24 99:2 102:4 154:18 164:4 46:20,22 106:4 107:18,22 165:17 167:19 170:14 preparation (2) 103:2 148:5 171:7 184:2 189:2 217:13 224:1 229:2 241:11 39:4 64:4 116:21 123:17 processes (3) 58:8 158:8 159:21 procure (1) 85:14 procurement (20) 97:23,24 147:10 154:7 157:22,23 102:17 172:12 173:7,11,14 182:9 185:13 187:8 216:18 217:5,6,16,22,23 218:24 219:14 221:19 230:13 procurements (1) 182:8 presentations (2) 18:16 19:9 procuring (1) 199:25 produce (5) 11:4 66:12 38:8,18 50:22 64:17 70:4 67:9,21 114:4 produced (22) 8:2 19:7 22:3 77:4 80:6,10 81:14 159:2 23:16 29:17 66:17 67:3,8,23 76:23 78:12 83:1 104:4 159:2 163:18 167:9 169:25 189:1 210:20 230:6.7 238:3 producing (3) 36:12 66:9 presumably (6) 64:23 93:16 83:9 product (1) 13:16 production (4) 87:14,21 136:8 229:3 professional (21) 9:4.23 pretty (10) 16:7 48:18 52:22 11:17 12:9.23 13:22 54:6 115:8 157:15 160:25 21:2.22 102:16 185:13 186:24 191:20 196:15,19 197:13,15,17 198:25 199:9,18 200:11 prevention (1) 135:14 professionals (1) 12:15 previous (7) 7:16 67:4 99:1 profile (3) 59:1 61:8,10

27:12.14.21 28:1.15 45:25 63:19 82:2 84:23 85:12.16 89:9 99:18 100:9,11,11 101:24 170:14 18 19 171:16.22.25 172:2,7,11,14 173:5 174:21 175:4,6,19 178:1 181:18 182:13 183:21 184:6 185:6 188:7,18 190:3,16,20 194:1 201:3 208:7.25 209:4.7 210:2 211:15.17.19 212:10 215:3,4,25 217:14,20 220:2,4 226:4,9,13,20 229:14 230:17 239:16 programmes (9) 169:6 173:19 174:2.23 210:3 219:17.19 222:2 226:19 progress (36) 25:13 28:5 118:8.24 120:10.14 121:1,5 123:13 126:11 128:23 130:4 132:19 146:15,16 155:3 157:25 158-2 172-19 23 174-20 213:24 232:2 progressed (9) 15:16 56:2 211:14 212:3 213:20 progresses (1) 211:15 progressing (1) 182:2 project (6) 100:12.14 186:9.20 187:1 188:22 prolific (1) 64:7 prompted (2) 138:8,13 proper (2) 157:17 163:23 properly (3) 45:7 48:23 198:17 properties (19) 28:1 90:3 92:19 93:2 100:9 226:23 236:3 property (7) 83:14 104:25 108:11 112:5,23 115:25 236:14 proposal (1) 231:7 propose (1) 40:25 proposed (4) 29:15,23 182:1 187:1 proposing (1) 134:6 prospective (1) 198:20 protect (2) 234:24 235:1 protection (4) 57:12 110:16 135:23 140:4 protective (2) 43:8 45:8 protocol (9) 29:17 30:18 31:6,8,25 33:16 34:4,17 35:13 protracted (3) 25:9 89:15 91:21 provide (16) 7:22 34:23 165:15 168:21 188:17 207:22 227:22 240:19 provided (8) 18:23 43:6 63:16 144:17 153:21 161:16 187:20 238:2 providers (1) 241:6 provides (1) 44:19 providing (8) 62:7 124:6 158:20 198:22.23 227:2,5,15 provision (2) 88:20 112:24 provisions (2) 24:1 32:5 public (2) 12:14 187:17 publications (1) 228:9 proforma (3) 91:10 publicity (1) 167:8 144:13.20 publicly (1) 21:18

205:3.5.12 207:1.5.11.20 57:5 64:11,12 98:13 99:6 100:23 101:22,23 102:22 182-6 183-14 207-3 210-2 97:8 155:21 174:24 175:6 promptly (3) 10:3 92:1 115:2 101:11.12 103:15 183:23 184:7 190:23 201:25 202:3 206:6 207:16 219:4 220:24 70:18 88:20 103:7 109:21 131:21 133:6 146:5 147:18

published (10) 16:6 21:7,20

32:7 130:21 197:22 198:3 210:20 228:4.6 pulling (1) 142:8 purely (1) 14:11 purport (1) 135:19 purpose (2) 209:13 237:20 sebuilt (6) 16:6,8 21:6,24 23:10 210:19 purposes (12) 22:1 24:6 26:9 36:18 45:5 103:18 142:13 143:18 151:6 190:19 215:1 233:1 pursue (1) 93:20 puts (1) 30:15 putting (8) 49:14,14 79:12 88:17 116:21 131:24 137:19 184:6 puzzled (1) 138:23

q (765) 1:21 2:7,21,25 3:6,10,14,17,23 4:2,5,10,13,17,20,22 5:2.5.9.12.15.20 6:7.12.16.18 8:4.14.18.23 9:9,15,23 10:1,5,17,19 11:1,10 12:8,25 13:5.18.21.24 14:6,8,10,20,24 15:3,23 16:10,19,23 17:9,19 18:1,5,7,9,13,15 19:3,11,19,24 20:8.14.20.24 21:3.12.15.20.25 22:16 23:11,17,21,25 24:4,6,12 25:19,22 26:12 27:4,16,18,20,23 28:11,17,25 29:3,9 31:6,17 33:13,16,20,24 34:1,9,12,14,16 35:11,17 36:3.10.15 37:2.5.8 38:4.19.21.23 39:3.7.18.23 40:3,14,16,21 41:7,9,24 43:2,10,14 44:2,4,11,14,19,24 45:2,13 46:11,17 47:16 48:4,21 49:8,23 50:14 52:10,15 53:6 54:1.9.20.23 55:6 56:6.21 57:22.25 58:7 59:10.25 60:12.24 61:5.19.21 62:4.11.13.15 63:10,15,19,22 64:14,19,22 66:6,16,20 67:3,6,13,18,20,23 68:3,8,11,15,18,24 69:4,7,9,12,14,17,19,23 70:9,18 71:2,9,11,13 72:21.24 73:1,3,6,8,11,14,17 74:4,15,19,21 75:6 76:1,3,9,16 77:13,21 78:1.6.8.10.18.22.24 79:11,16,19,21,24 80:4,6,10,13,20,23 81:4.14.19.21 82:1.8.13.17.22 83:2,4,12,16,19,22,24 84:5,10,15,21 85:1,20 86:25 87:4,7,11,13,20,24 88:3,5,9 89:1,5,20 90:3,7,11,13,15,18,20,22 92:6.8.14.22 93:7.19.23 94:2.8.10.12.15.21 95:3,12,17,25 96:10,21,25 97:3,9,12 98:3,7,18,22 99:14.21 100:2.18.20 101:4,9,16,20 102:5,10 103:10,23 104:1,14 105:4,7,12,15 106:9,16 107:2.4.15.17.23.25 108:15.18.22 109:2,6,10,14,21,24 110:2,8,11,19 111:1,5,13,22 112:12

113:7 114:15.19.23

116:12.14.18.21.24 117:1.18.21.24 118:13.17.19 119:7.13.17.20 120:2.5.12.22.25 121:8,14,22 122:1,7,21 123:3,7,13 124:16,20,23 125:2,7,14,21,25 126:4,7,14,22 127:6,8,18,21,25 128:7,17,20 129:2,6,14,25 131:1.13.15.18.20 132:2.4.9.11.13.24 133:1,3,5,11,14,17 135:21 136:6,10,15,20 137:1,3,10,14,21 138:2,5,8,15,19,23 139:1,10 140:1,8,12 141:15.19.24 142:1.12.21.25 143:3.9.14 144:3 145:1,8,11 146:1,9,12,22,25 147:5,16 148:2,6,13,16,22 149:2,8,17,21,25 150:2,7,12,17,21,25 151:2,4,6,24 152:13.16.19.23 153-7 15 20 154-1 7 155:6,16 156:1,12,15,17,24 157:1,7,12,16 158:6,17,20 159:6.12.16.19 160:6,11,20 161:2,9,13 162:4,8,11,15,19,22 163:3.6.11.15.23 164:8.14 165:9.11.24 166:4.8.12.14 167:5,24 168:11,19 169:8,14 171:1,3,6,21 172:2,4,24 173:1,9,15 174:1,6,10,14 177:10 178:4,12,18,23 179:21,24 180:19 181:23 182:5,11,15 183:2,6,8,11,20 184:5.11.17.25 185:8.15.17.21 186:2.4.10 187:11,16 188:11,13,16,24 189:9,11,23 190:1,5 191:5,10,12 192:7,16,20,23 193:1,4,9,16,21,23 194:4 195:12.22 196:3.10 197:3.8.12.17.20.22 198:1.12 199:6.15.21 200:8,16,21,24 201:2,7,10 202:1,16 203:8,11,24 204:4,15,21 205:1,3,5,8 206:24 207:8,20,25 208:9,18,20,22 209:7,9,15 211:21 212:4,11,14,18,24 213:1.3.7.21.24 214:2.18.22 215:1.16.21.23 216:5,8,13,21 217:8,12,18,25 218:2,8,12,14,21 219:3.6.11.15 220:1.17.20 221:1,25 222:8,16,18 223:10,12,14,25 224:6,16 225:2.8.15.24 226:6.8.12.16.18 228:3,13,23 229:1,23 230:3,19 231:12,17,19,23 232:12,14,16,24 233:6.16.18.24 234:19 235:3,10,24 236:19 237:1 238:11,15,20 239:9,15 240:5.15 241:3.15 242:2.8 qualification (7) 8:25 41:9 97:20 186:14 191:14,25 192:7 qualifications (20) 6:8 8:4,19 87:4,5 186:24,25 187:6,14

204:17

190:2.18 191:13.14

196:4 199:24

qualities (2) 45:6,11

193:18,25 195:16,18,23

quality (11) 47:21 57:20 173:20.21 174:13 188:3 189:15,23 190:15 192:10 213:21 quarterly (9) 12:17 50:25 56:7,8 72:4 73:12,13,14,15 queries (6) 4:8 71:6 123:17,22 124:17 189:16 question (30) 2:1 15:10 23:11 27:1 28:25 29:3 40:18 41:24 43:1.4 61:19 67:16 73:24 87:20 94:8 103:8 111:2 129:18 132:1 139:11 140:8 195:6 199:21 203:8 206:24 223:12 233:16,24 235:25 242:3 questioned (3) 26:5 73:22 191:21 questions (14) 1:17,24 71:6 73:25 80:15 81:5 128:10 133:5 183:17 191:1 192:14 194:8 229:2 244:4 quickly (6) 50:10 156:3 184:4 203:18 204:14 217:3 quite (84) 5:19 8:2 9:8 10:23 11:5 12:1 13:11 19:25 20:4 22:3 25 26:7 35:23 24 44-17 50-3 53-3 55-11 57:7,10,12 64:10 66:14 67:10 72:3,19 78:24 79:23 80:2 86:17 89:15 90:10 91:21 92:3 94:4.8 96:20 100:14 102:15,22,23 113:22 114:6 115:17 116:5.6 126:10.11 131:18 132:16 134:5 135:20 149:13 159:1,3 171:14 173:3,4 176:13 177:15 178:18 179:15 184:4.15 187:15 188:1,9 191:20 200:24 201:22 202:13 203:18 204:13,14 208:6 214:9 223:7 225:20 226:23 228:18 230:5 231:8 235:8.20 quotation (2) 186:17,21 quoting (1) 175:24

radar (5) 55:5 184:3,19 217:8.9 raise (6) 22:7 27:14 49:12 61:10 123:18 234:17 raised (10) 76:11 115:13,16 118:2 119:4,11 124:17 158:7 196:16 238:25 ran (1) 217:10 range (21) 8:2 10:8,24 11:5 19:1 34:22 49:3 51:18 72:20 95:9 112:21 114:2 159:7 191:19 205:24 206:4,14,17 221:12 223:17 224-21 rated (4) 16:18 46:5 111:8 190:14 rather (6) 15:21 109:16 126:14 153:17 160:18 179:24 rating (9) 111:6,10,15 112:6,7 119:15 213:10 237:10 238:1 raw (1) 221:19 rbk00001176 (1) 29:11 rbk000011762 (1) 29:21 rbk00018535 (1) 89:22 rbk000185352 (1) 90:22 rbk000185354 (1) 93:8 rbk00030060 (1) 83:24 rbk000300604 (1) 84:7 rbk00036722 (1) 20:15 rbk00052572 (1) 120:13 rbk000525723 (1) 123:14 rbk000525724 (1) 124:2 rbk000525725 (1) 124:8 rbk00053571 (1) 116:15

rbk000535713 (1) 116:18 rbk000535883 (1) 174:14 rbk000544148 (1) 74:23 rbk000544568 (1) 75:8 rbk00055531 (1) 43:14 rbk0005553123 (1) 43:20 rbk00058236 (1) 161:22 rbk000582363 (1) 162:8 rbk00058245 (1) 161:3 rbk0005824512 (1) 161:13 rbkc (96) 6:20 8:8 17:2 24:20 25:3.6.10.15 26:14.14 27:5.11.15.24 28:12 29:14,16,19,22 30:5 31:2,8,11,23 32:1,4,12,15,21 33:7 34:3,16,20 35:1,5,12 36:20,25 37:6 51:1 56:8 71:20 72:24 73:19 74:4 76:4 77:5 82:14 83:13.17 84:13 85:10 87:13,16,20 89:1,24 90:4 101:16,20 102:5 105:5 120:6.16 126:4,15,17 127:9 142:21 160:19 161:5 164:2,11 168:24,25 170:13,19 172-11 173-2 174-1 16 182-17 184-5 186-6 187-7 189:9,15 207:3 215:13 216:19 218:2,22,25 225:15.15.22 rbkcs (10) 24:19 33:16 71:14 75:12 77:6 82:9,18 96:13 102:11 103:15 reached (1) 171:9 read (16) 5:12 12:10 33:9 39:18 63:22 106:10 128:17 144:7 179:6 208:9,10,10,11,14,18 readily (2) 44:18 212:21 reading (3) 25:25 47:10 179:7 reads (1) 147:17 ready (9) 1:15 65:22 77:15,19 118:6 135:2 136:12 194:22 195:8 realise (1) 52:8 realised (2) 215:8 217:1 reality (2) 114:4 229:24 really (78) 8:2 11:2,5 12:18.22 14:4.19 16:22 23:15 26:4 33:19 35:10 45:21 49:9 50:5 51:20 54:25 59:24 61:18 64:9 66:14 68:1 70:17 73:22 74:1 80:22 89:10,15,19 92:3 101:14 102:13 109:19 119:19,25 124:16 126:8 127:4 129:10 137:7.9 140:23 141:4 146:8 153:6 154:4 155:4 159:17.25 168:10 173:25 176:18,19 177:9,23 178:12,15 179:3 180:21 181:12 191:23 194:2 199:22 200:20 202:25 207:14,18 211:24 213:17 216:24 219:24 224:15 225:11 227:3 230:10 233:7 241:9 242:12 reason (5) 42:15 89:7 160:12 168:3 211:5 reasonable (4) 62:3 172:22 198:15 204:15 reasonably (4) 21:1,2 71:5 73:10

reasons (2) 140:6 176:3

recall (61) 11:16 15:14 17:23

19:2,15 26:4,22 29:8 37:7

reflects (2) 30:13 104:23

reform (10) 11:15 20:1,6

reformatting (1) 162:9

refresh (2) 7:7 185:24

106:3

30:3,9 36:19 42:4,9 85:3

49:1 66:12 67:12 70:20

80:1,18,19 90:8 95:10

98:14,15 101:8 102:14

128:7,8,11 130:6 132:2,15

75:14 76:13 78:11

109:9.13 122:24

reassessed (1) 210:14

137:9 142:14 146:22.23 149:25 170:10 186:2 187:23 188:6,19,20 190:1 193:17 194:2 206:1.10 214:21 215:7 216:12 218:11,23 226:11,15 229:13 233:20,21 242:1 receive (7) 8:15 31:14 80:14 188:11 227:25 228:1 233:2 received (20) 8:18 17:20 28:3 62:7 63:7 77:6 94:21 105:7 118:7.10 119:2.9 122:7 149:8 154:13 183:14 188:13 191:8 207:6 220:13 receiving (3) 11:16 145:16 208:12 recent (3) 64:18 96:12 156:19 recently (3) 107:11 151:21 161:17 recognise (3) 42:16 156:24 162:6 recognised (2) 53:13 61:14 recollect (1) 129:4 recollection (5) 17:11 69:18 151:8 159:24 216:22 ecommend (2) 95:8 198:23 recommendation (3) 110:15 126:18 199:16 recommendations (7) 41:6 113:1 130:15 135:19 137:16 159:3 209:21 recommended (4) 112:16 126:19 159:7 170:17 record (9) 2:16 60:25 63:22 97:9 99:12 162:15.22 233:11 242:10 recorded (3) 31:18 91:18 92:15 recording (3) 49:17 106:17 237:23 recordkeeping (1) 128:2 records (3) 53:11 115:15 123:25 recruited (2) 201:14,15 recruitment (1) 217:12 rectified (1) 113:19 recurring (3) 46:3 54:11 232:6 red (8) 110:13,23 111:7,24 112:7 113:3 114:16 129:15 redone (1) 231:13 redraft (1) 163:21 redrafted (1) 231:7 reels (1) 166:25 refer (9) 54:1 56:7 72:21 150:8 168:23 169:24 189:2 212:11 233:22 reference (16) 22:1 24:6 33:10 106:2 118:25 134:2 135:12 139:23 143:18 151:6 154:10 158:17 160:20 206:21 215:1 234:1 referenced (1) 122:20 references (1) 121:24 referred (20) 15:6 17:16 19:3 21:4 51:16 61:19 76:18 140:13 141:11 142:14 149:4 164:9 185:17 189:20 191:5 222:21 223:17.22 227:16 230:9 referring (3) 56:9 148:8 223:24 refers (1) 162:1 reflect (11) 15:17 33:16 34:2 117:11 143:5 152:11 153:4 154:17.24 157:6 161:1 reflected (4) 22:17 29:6 116:5 149:15 reflection (1) 149:20

refreshed (2) 12:8 161:18 refresher (2) 8:23 12:11 refusing (1) 181:15 regard (9) 32:6,13 45:16 46:20.25 74:14 107:18 129:14 210:16 regarded (1) 45:4 regarding (1) 196:13 regardless (1) 202:9 regards (1) 159:18 regen (1) 136:24 regeneration (5) 136:4 137:2 145:5.23 147:11 register (1) 199:14 registered (1) 199:17 registers (5) 196:15,19 197:13,15,18 registration (3) 198:24 199:9 200:11 regs (1) 86:13 regular (30) 16:2,9 26:8,16,17 44:15,16 48:19 49:4.5 50:22 52:1 53:14 55:16 56:1,19 67:11 71:11,12 127:2 144:18 183:22 184:7 203:19 212:5 227-3 5 231-25 232-8 235:16 regularly (12) 9:5 12:8 26:20 34:21 62:20 72:4 73:13 105:10 121:3 168:2 210:24 regulations (2) 113:2 116:2 regulatory (10) 11:15 19:25 20:6 30:3.9 36:19 42:4.9 85:3 106:3 reiterate (4) 178:15 217:15 218:23 222:5 relate (3) 14:8 137:10 179:13 related (5) 15:20 52:20 94:23 95:3 160:8 relates (3) 55:7 123:20 175:24 relating (4) 15:12 40:16 108:19 243:2 relation (26) 16:12 23:17 25:7 28:13 30:20 42:8 54:5 57:22 68:25 75:15 79:11,12 82:14 92:2 97:19 113:4 121:1 145:21 160:14 181:21 205:10 209:16 216:5 224:3 227:11 237:20 relationship (7) 34:20 73:5 75:20 76:3 94:5 196:12 203:22 relatively (3) 54:25 114:25 175:6 relentless (1) 241:11 relevant (11) 8:19 11:14,24 12:9 32:6 33:1 42:6 45:17 46:21 50:19 191:15 reliable (1) 200:18 reliant (1) 47:5 relocation (1) 112:22 reluctance (3) 132:17 175:11 179.2 reluctant (2) 175:22 181:1 rely (2) 55:11 204:16 relying (2) 203:25 204:18 remain (1) 210:11 remedial (1) 18:25 remedied (1) 128:9 remember (59) 8:15 16:11.19 17:20 18:9.15 20:13,23 21:10 22:16 24:5,9 26:13 37:5 73:3 77:10 82:23 88:6 94:19 95:5 98:22 105:13 113:8 118:20 121:21 122:21 123:3 124:23 127:22 148:7,17 149:8,21 150:2 159:22 161:9 167:24 182:7 183:16.19 184:5

187:3.12.20 188:12.13.15

189:5.18 190:17 192:17.20

193:1 195:15 211:22 218:3

219:1 228:25 235:10 reminders (1) 10:3 remiss (1) 119:25 remit (7) 51:20 60:1 90:9 159:17 177:15 236:3.5 remits (1) 59:11 renewed (1) 218:16 repairs (16) 40:12 52:20,24 54:14 57:22 58:2,5,8 145:5.22.23 147:11 151:22 153:3.8 212:22 reneat (1) 102:23 repeated (2) 193:11 231:19 rephrase (1) 2:1 replace (2) 142:2,11 replaced (1) 102:8 replacement (3) 35:22 46:1 115:12 replacing (1) 229:24 replied (2) 93:11 143:15 report (83) 8:3 10:13 26:6,24 43:16 66:6,23 67:1 69:19 70:4.11 74:11 76:23 77:4,9,11,18,24 78:12,19 82:20,25 83:6,6,9,12,19 84:5,24 104:15,18,23 105:8 107:11 109:22 110:4 114-24 116-15 117-25 118:3,6,8,14,21 119:7,10 120:18 121:17,19 122:3,7,12,14,18,23 123:4.11.15 125:5 127:23 129:8,16 130:2,3 131:21 133:6 158:14,25 159:2 181-24 183-14 188-25 189:6 190:11 209:11.13 220:24 224:24 227:23,24 229:12 234:4 241:22 reported (19) 37:19,21,22,24 38:10,12,15,24 47:5 53:8,9 59:4 68:22 69:2,9,12 70:22 90:16,20 reporting (11) 51:15,19 58:13 64:15.19 68:25 70:12 77:9.17 78:2 154:19 reports (33) 11:4 28:7 34:24,24 38:6 39:3 50:20 52:20 53:15,17 54:1 55:18 63:16 64:4,17 66:10 67:11,13 68:1 71:9 75:14 76:7.18 80:17.17 82:18 83:4.12.16.17 84:12 122:16 182:25 representative (1) 240:7 representatives (2) 56:16 reprioritising (3) 48:19 49:5,22 reprocure (2) 173:2 221:8 reprocured (1) 57:14 reprocurement (1) 221:24 reprocuring (1) 52:6 reputable (1) 200:18 request (1) 104:19 requested (9) 53:17 54:13 67:11 68:5 69:16 71:10 83:8 219:2 233:21 require (3) 87:8 89:12 144:10 required (30) 9:3 13:21 54:14 57:17 74:24 78:16,17 85:6 91:5 92:2 116:3 125:5,7,15,21 140:25 144:11 145:19 165:16 170:19 176:9 179:24 182:24 186:20 200:2 207:13 219:1 220:12 232:5 240:20 requirement (7) 9:6 20:2 124:9,13 168:20 177:2 162:4 163:11 164:20,21 165:6,24 166:18,22 167:25 requirements (13) 11:20

30:14 31:24 32:22 102:2

106:3 131:25 166:20

180:25 181:19 185:24

202:15 241:8

168:2 170:10.22 171:15

202:4.6.17 203:13

213:8.12.21.21.24

215:14,15,16,19 217:3

requires (1) 236:11 requiring (2) 48:15,15 requisite (2) 53:7 190:2 reread (2) 118:8,23 rescue (2) 187:24 202:22 research (3) 192:15 195:14,15 researched (1) 108:2 researches (1) 196:1 researching (1) 195:17 resident (4) 24:8 59:16 167:5 182:23 residential (5) 19:15 36:23 201:18 205:25 210:18 residentrelated (1) 10:24 residents (7) 18:22 23:8,10 113:13 180:7 211:4 223:21 resistance (2) 237:10,25 resisting (2) 19:1 153:14 resolve (2) 116:6 129:12 resolved (1) 89:16 resource (3) 48:17 51:11 101:13 resourced (1) 174:24 resourcepermitting (1) 100:7 resources (4) 48:24 49:23 50.7 101.12 resourcing (1) 47:17 respect (9) 34:18 51:3 52:11 56:25 76:4 104:25 170:14 187:4 214:4 respective (2) 55:15 59:10 respectively (2) 76:4 96:8 respond (1) 113:15 responded (1) 153:17 response (4) 40:17 94:22 137:15 209:23 responses (3) 123:19 171:18 228:16 responsibilities (21) 7:21 29:18 30:8,23 33:17 34:3,17 35:12 39:15,21 41:14 42:16.18 44:7 49:25 50:2 60:19 95:1.10 132:23 204:1 responsibility (25) 7:18 27:4,23 28:18 29:3 31:4 37:20 39:23 40:21 41:3,11,16,19,22 42:12 46:10 48:13 58:23 60:2,8 115:25 127:13 198:8 218:16 223:9 responsible (27) 11:22.23 24:19 25:1 26:15 27:5,23 28:19 29:4 31:3 36:21 42:14,21 43:6 46:15 47:1,6 48:6 55:13 92:19 93:2 135:16 139:2 153:3 182:17 224:17 225:5 responsive (4) 52:24 153:3.10 173:24 rest (4) 19:12 50:1 74:8 156:2 result (9) 25:25 26:1 59:14,15 75:16 113:16 165:1 201:10 217:9 resulted (2) 25:10 85:13 resume (2) 65:10 242:25 resurrect (1) 138:14 retained (3) 71:21 160:13 209:1 retains (1) 198:8 retender (3) 174:1 216:14,22 retrofitting (2) 170:14,18 retrospective (2) 86:14 176:8 retrospectively (1) 176:5 returned (1) 143:21 review (42) 6:2 43:17 109:8 117:9,13 156:8 157:25

229:21 230:15 231:4.8.16 232:15 239:23 242:5 reviewadoption (1) 158:2 reviewed (17) 79:17 138:5.16 144:18 150:19 152:4 157:8 169:25 170:3 200:22 210:14,16 215:10 226:21 229:8,14 230:24 reviewing (5) 138:12 164:5 172:23 203:8 210:10 reviews (22) 28:7 210:22 211:12.19.23.25 212:11.18.20 213:4.5 215:3,23 216:5 217:14 229:9 230:1 231:19 232:1,8 233:8 237:4 revised (3) 163:15 164:3 228:5 revision (2) 165:2 171:7 revisions (1) 202:9 revisited (1) 115:15 reworded (1) 79:25 rhymes (6) 102:16 105:11 185:16 186:4 189:7,20 righthand (3) 104:11 110:9,11 rightly (1) 59:17 rights (2) 58:2,8 rigorous (2) 75:24 160:16 rigorously (1) 208:14 rings (1) 132:20 risers (4) 166:25 175:15 237:14,14 rising (2) 176:2,5 risk (142) 4:7 7:25 11:3 19:14.21 20:2.11 25:7.11 26:25 27:21 28:3,14 32:7,25 33:5 35:21 36:22 39:24 40:17,22 46:3 55:12 63:17,19,24 64:1,2,19 66:7,24 67:14 68:12 80:7,15 82:3 83:19 84:5 87:1,21 88:6,16 89:2,22 90:23.25 91:3.6.10.14.18 92:18 93:1 94:23 95:3,13,15 97:16 99:2 101:21 103:16 104:7,18 110:16 119:15 127:18 128:5 129:7,8,17,23 135:13 145:14 146:15,16 154:17 172:7,9,13,14 175:4 177:21 178:5.8.10 179:16 180:6 182:2 183:13,16,17,23 186:13,25 187:13,21 188:2 192:3,18 193:11,13 196:22 197:23,24 198:7,14,20,21 199:2,24,25 200:6,19 201:3,4 202:16 203:4,16 205:18 207:1.6.9.21 208:11.25 209:16 211:2 213:7.10 214:23 221:10 222:25 223:4,19 224:8 229:7,9 232:7,9,21 236:23 238:6 riskbased (5) 85:5,15 87:18 89:9 97:2 risks (10) 45:16,18 46:20,22 51:10 59:15.19 164:24 176:11 223:15 robert (9) 39:11 64:23 84:8 96:7 131:8 133:7 142:4 158:22 174:17 robust (1) 203:22 robustly (1) 203:25 roger (1) 102:8 role (34) 6:7.16.18 7:13.22 8:5.19 9:18.19 10:21 43:23 46:1 47:15,16 48:23 53:19 56:21 57:22 64:15 68:8,22 71:14,15 73:18 74:2 90:7 153:7 154:18 158:20 159:16 167:15 206:25

rbk000535712 (1) 117:1

220:20 222:23

rolling (3) 209:2 226:12,19

rolled (1) 220:5

room (3) 65:11,13 194:14 rough (2) 140:22 149:21 routinely (2) 75:10,18 royal (3) 31:20 50:25 104:21 rro (17) 11:16.21.25 26:9 30:24 43:5,5 85:21 94:23 95:3 96:5 109:16 127:11 132:8,17 179:22 204:7 rulebound (4) 175:8,21 178:13.19 rules (1) 219:25 run (7) 29:20 53:14 55:17 59:20 60:22 99:1 194:8 running (4) 14:15 54:20 82:21 147:14 russell (2) 104:19 105:9

sacha (10) 38:14 59:1 61:9.23 62:4.24 157:23 158:7 159:20 220:10 sachas (3) 59:17 160:3

safe (2) 48:15.16 safely (1) 191:24 safety (352) 6:13

167:17 7:17,20,24,25 8:9,12,20,22 9:2.12 10:23 11:14.15 12:14,15,16,25 13:3,9 14:8 15:12,24,25 16:20 17:13 18:23 19:6 20:11 21:1,6,22 22:6 23:25 24:1,7 26:17 28:9.14 29:17.19 30:2.3.9.10 32:2,4,7,13,18,22 34:21 36:5,13,18,19 37:10,11,16,18,21 38:7,10,13 39:4,9,10,16 41:1,2,11,13,19 42:5,9,10 43:17,22 44:8,11,21 45:20 47:25 48:17.19 49:19.24 50:1.17.18.23 51:4,6,15,19,25 53:21,23 55:8,21,22 56:10,15,19,21,23,24,24 57:9,10,23 58:3,14,21,24 59:3,3,6,7,8,13,16,18 60:3,4,7,11,15,17 61:1.2.11.15.21.24 62:5.19.24.25 64:16 68:16.21 69:1.2.4.9.20 70:2,4,11,19 71:22,23,24 72:8,9,22 73:19 74:8.13.17.25 75:1,10,11,18,18 76:5,17,23 77:1,2,5 78:19 80:8.17 81:6.17.22 82:2.9.20.24 83:1.6.7.20 84:6,12 85:4,6 86:11 88:14,24 93:15 96:14 97:15,22 104:7,24 105:21.25 106:1.3.18.23 107:10 108:21,24 109:10,11,16 112:4,18 115:4 116:2.10 117:5.7.10.12.18 122:8 123:9,16 124:10 125:11 127:13 130:1,8,16,18,19 131:6,6 133:11 135:11,13 136:6 137:8,10,17 138:13,25 139:7 140:15,19 141:11,12 142:3,8,22 145:5.23 146:7.14.17.25 147:9,12,14,18 149:5,10,11 151:10,18,22 152:9.19.25 153:7.22 154:2,11,15 155:7,11,13,13 156:5,6 157:3,21 158:21,23 159:16.18 160:17.20.21 161:6.20.21.25 162:16.22 163:12 164:2,3,5,8,20 165:6,14,22 166:5,23,24

177:14.14 179:18 186:15 187:25 191:18 192:2.5 198:15 209:2 210:18,19 211:13 212:15.18 214:4.7.12.14 222:25 223:3,15 224:4,8,14 231:20 232:4 233:3 237:21,22 238:6 239:1 sal00000013 (1) 104:6 sal0000001313 (2) 110:20 111:22

sal0000001318 (1) 112:14 sal0000001319 (2) 110:4 111:13

sal000000132 (1) 104:17 sal000000135 (3) 104:10 105:18 107:25 sal000000136 (1) 106:21

salvus (90) 44:12 67:10 84:23 95:9 98:23 99:3 102:19 103:10,14,23 104:2,4,9,14 105:4,10,17 107:7 109:8.21 110:3 117:3,19 118:2,7,21 119:13,21 120:7,16,18 121:5,17 122:13,22 123:10.15.18 124:18.24 125-17 127-11 23 128-3 129:16 130:1,14 131:21 133:6,12 135:19 137:16 141:22 145:14 171:25 172:24 173:3.14.16 174:3,4,10,20 175:3,8,21 176:15 177:7 178:5,13,19 181:1.16 188:4.16.16 190:23 200:21 201:8,16,19,22 202:7

205:11,19 220:3 224:12 229:14 230:7 231:15 same (24) 18:3,10 27:14 60:20 62:11 66:13 73:5 100:7 101:14 102:14 115:6 139:14 146:7 148:18,19 157:2 175:19 178:18 190:14 202:4 208:16 214:6

224:12 238:5 sample (5) 192:18 238:9 240:6,7,10 sampled (2) 238:21 239:7 samples (1) 239:7

sangster (12) 88:13,13,19,19 90:25 91:9.15.18 92:15.24 93:11 96:4 sarah (1) 13:8 sat (9) 27:25 28:10 59:16 60:21 74:15 95:5 102:17

176:15 177:13 satisfactory (3) 91:1,19,24 satisfied (1) 198:21 satisfy (1) 126:18 satisfying (1) 180:24 saved (1) 141:8 savills (4) 17:24 18:5 19:3,6 saw (11) 37:2 93:17

111:19,20 121:17 142:4 147:2 151:18 153:2.11 162:1 saying (20) 2:9 26:11 47:13 75:25 86:3.12.14 103:20

119:13 155:22 176:4 179:3,5,25 180:4 181:10,14,18 204:9,19 scale (1) 103:6 scanned (2) 157:10,11 schedule (6) 33:1 88:21 161:15 174:21 175:3

211:16 scheduled (1) 2:2 schemes (1) 115:7 school (1) 240:12 scissor (1) 18:18 scooters (1) 223:20 scope (5) 60:1 229:5 233:24 235:25 242:13 scored (1) 191:1 scratch (2) 58:10 150:2

screen (13) 16:24 36:17 44:21 75:9 76:22 92:14 107:24 109:2 135:10 156:9 161:7 164:14 195:24 scroll (6) 109:2 111:8 123:21 132:3 154:9 185:22 scrutinise (1) 64:10 scrutinising (3) 203:15

207:15,15 scrutiny (10) 28:7,8 34:24 71:15 74:5 83:14 84:3 204:11 224:5 235:23 seals (4) 234:13 237:11 238:1 239:11

econd (21) 3:3 4:23 30:15 63:11 71:18 85:1 93:9 103:12 111:6 147:10 161:4 165:12 166:21.23 185:2 189:3.12 198:6 204:23 208:23 223:23

secondary (2) 86:10 237:17 seconded (1) 93:14 secondment (1) 6:21 secret (1) 27:2 section (1) 31:25 sections (1) 84:12 sector (9) 12:14 14:3 16:5 22:4 30:18 44:17 50:6

85:25 239:3 security (1) 241:2 sedgwick (3) 96:13

218:10.12 see (172) 3:20 4:2,10,18 9:9 11:10 12:22 17:19 18:19 19:9 20:14 17 22:17 25:22 26:12 27:16.20 29:6 31:9,10,18 34:9 36:6 41:7,20,21,25 42:3 43:21 44:19 46:14 53:15 57:4.25 60:12,24 62:16 63:10 64:12 66:6,7 67:6 68:24 74:22 77:13 81:12 82:13 84:7 89:24 90:4,18,23 92:15.20 93:9 94:12 96:3.6 98:5.24 99:14 100:5 101:23,24 102:1 104:10 105:2,19 106:7,13,14,19,25 107:2 109:3 110:6,8,9,17 111:14,24 112:6,15 113:1,3 116:18 117:1 120:15 122:3.4.5 129:14

130:7 131:5.8.20 133:1 136:7,15,16 137:3,21,24 138:20 139:10,19,23,24 141:7 143:16 145:6 146:12,20 147:5,10 148:5 156:9,20 157:22 158:4 160:17 161:14,24 164:15,18 166:1,16 167:3.21 168:17 169:14 171:1 172:5 179:21 180:19,23 182:3,15 183:3,6,8,13 185:6,17 186:17,21 187:11 189:9 191:12 193:4,7 199:2 200:8 203:24 207:11 209:12 210:1,9 212:22 213:3.21 214:2 215:16

216:8 217:8 223:25 231:17 232:14,16,24 233:2 237:3 seeing (4) 58:9 75:14 128:7 seek (7) 30:6 93:23 95:3 99:17 142:21,25 224:13

seeking (2) 23:12 173:23 seem (2) 148:1 216:19 seemed (10) 118:9 119:1 154:16 172:22 192:1,1 202:20,20,21 217:5 seems (7) 2:20 34:5 62:3

66:17 85:24 220:1 222:4 en (16) 53:17 66:11 109:17.24 118:14 120:19.20.22 131:14.15.19

134:6 137:11 148:16

159:25 162:15 selection (4) 99:2 124:16 203:12 217:13 selfcloser (1) 171:16

selfclosers (3) 27:13 164:13 169:5 selfclosing (4) 46:6 168:16 170:15 239:11

selfevidently (1) 130:11 seminar (4) 19:3,7,8 22:13 seminars (3) 10:6,8 14:10 send (5) 10:3 127:25 140:19 228:7 233:18

sending (3) 23:14 61:17 127:22 senior (11) 13:12 38:6,11

59:2 61:15 62:13 167:12,20 201:8 202:18 225:21 sense (3) 81:1 171:4 227:13

sensible (2) 59:24 204:15 sensory (1) 113:18 sent (16) 22:9 55:18 84:18

96:18 128:17 143:2 147:22 148:9 149:22 152:7 153:19 154:19,22 185:4 192:17 226:3

sentence (4) 24:16 56:7 122:11 182:16 separate (4) 58:5 137:13 148:21 153:9

sept (1) 140:20 september (41) 3:7 23:18 43:18 66:8 87:2,14 98:22 99:17 103:24 104:1 2 4 12 105:1 109:8 117:4.14 118:2,11,13,14,20,21

119:13 120:18 121:11.17.18 122:14.22 123:10 124:18,24 127:19,23 141:8,22 189:1

205:12 217:2 230:8 series (3) 23:13 39:19 154:4 serious (2) 72:9 112:25 seriously (1) 60:19

service (7) 52:13 54:14 116:3 187:25 198:22,23 202:23 serviced (2) 115:20,24 services (9) 40:11 88:25

102:16 150:20 158:21 185:13 227:8 232:6 235:13 servicing (1) 241:8 serving (1) 51:8

session (1) 158:13 sessions (1) 29:5 set (26) 14:25 29:18 38:2 40:8 59:13 67:25 96:16,25 97:7 98:1 101:2 112:2

119:6 121:2 125:9 147:8 154:15 166:21 185:4 187:16 191:1 193:18 210:17 221:21 224:25 227:18

sets (3) 39:15 122:8 186:19 setting (5) 105:25 179:25 181:20 187:6 207:5 seven (3) 92:15 135:25

175:25 several (7) 12:3 26:20 59:2 118:12 148:4 161:10 239:7 severe (1) 112:22

seward (1) 84:18 shade (1) 176:1 shake (1) 2:11 shakes (1) 2:12 shall (1) 242:19

share (4) 27:9 28:10 30:21 203:18 shared (9) 27:24 29:3 41:21 51:2 98:11 105:12 128:3 186:6 233:14

sharing (1) 188:5 sharples (3) 173:12 189:8,21 sheet (3) 54:3 108:7 220:12 shetland (1) 206:11 shirley (1) 19:11

short (7) 1:24 65:20 126:11 134:25 160:19 194:20 241:14

shortcomings (3) 127:14 211:9 237:8 shorten (1) 194:8 shorter (2) 230:2 231:25

shorthand (1) 104:14 shortly (1) 145:13 shortsighted (1) 184:15 should (34) 20:7 26:2 49:18 68:4 112:8.21 115:19

121:25 122:9.19 128:21 129:22 134:4 136:9 138:6 140:5,24 141:2 158:9,12 165:2 167:25 168:1,8 183:24 184:16 198:15

215:9 224:25 225:9 235:12.23 238:21 239:14 shouldnt (2) 107:13 129:22 show (18) 31:7,22 36:3

43:15 66:2,21 83:22 91:9 105:16 117:18.21 123:24 124:24 161:2 164:17 187:18 205:1 237:5 showed (5) 33:22 142:7

143:1 159:4 187:5 showing (1) 157:20 shown (8) 107:4,15 124:16 169:24 175:11 179:1

180:21 199:21

shows (2) 157:3 161:15 sick (1) 141:4 side (6) 60:4 96:13 110:9,11

179-5 6 sides (1) 234:12 sight (2) 117:4 141:5 sign (5) 30:19 139:8

220:11.11 225:16 signage (2) 115:5 237:19 signature (18) 2:21,23

3:7,8,15,15,21 4:3,3,10,11,18,20 5:2,3,9 31:11.12

signatures (1) 31:10 signed (22) 31:14 39:11 84:8 96:7 104:1 109:3 131:8 136:6 137:5,5 138:24 139:1 142:3 151:17,25 155:7 204:21 220:18 222:13 225:6.17 231:8 significance (1) 120:6

significant (11) 9:3 75:15 93:1 140:9 167:5 211:1,8 225:19 228:2 234:6 241:21 significantly (1) 239:4 signing (2) 158:8 159:21 signoff (3) 159:15 182:5,13 similar (11) 12:18,18 17:24 18:20 22:6 64:4 85:25

163:11.12 186:15 207:17 simple (3) 1:24 160:12 198:18 since (13) 6:10,16,18 8:23

9:17 11:14 37:25 59:15 67:4 92:9 109:15 148:11 191:11

singled (1) 234:21 sir (35) 1:3.11.15 7:5.7.10 58:17 65:1.6.15.22.24 130:13 134:3,10,13,20 135:2,5 194:9,16,22,25 195:4.8 205:15.21 206:7.19 242:15.18.22 243:4.7.9 sit (6) 1:11 25:15 77:17

145:11 187:15 189:25 site (7) 52:19 86:20 98:12 108:7,13 227:16 232:21 sits (1) 2:8

sitting (2) 128:11 157:3 situation (3) 176:21 216:2 221.6 situations (1) 22:20

six (8) 56:12 112:9 125:23.25 126:15 184:20 193:7 221:5

sixth (1) 167:7 size (3) 45:16 46:20,25 sj (1) 158:7 skill (1) 10:9 skills (2) 11:6 214:9 sleeping (6) 20:12,19,20 32:8 142:16,19

slightly (8) 13:3 40:14 56:13 103:6 133:5 162:14 176:15 222:8 slow (3) 6:25 195:1 217:5

sixmonth (2) 99:21 190:16

small (1) 114:3 smaller (1) 240:9 smoke (2) 79:5 239:11 smokefire (2) 237:10 238:1 smoothly (1) 175:6 smt (1) 167:12 snuck (1) 230:10 socalled (1) 224:7 social (2) 84:2 88:24 sole (2) 127:18 201:11

solution (1) 178:11 somayya (4) 73:4 75:7 76:3,10 somebody (5) 7:19 99:12 139:8 180:11 213:15 mehow (1) 184·10

someone (3) 26:19,23 200:2 something (29) 10:14 16:14 21:17 23:22 30:16 40:8 41:3 47:14 54:17 68:12 120:1 123:1 127:3 131:24 140:19 141:6 152:3,7 155-23 161-2 176-23 177:22 182:8 186:7 187:3 195:25 230:16 233:3

236:24 etimes (22) 1:25 13:11,13,15 14:16,17 22:22,25 28:8 49:16 56:4 70:15 72:16 79:7 102:24 114:1 197:5 214:10,12 224:22 225:10 226:25 soon (4) 49:21 53:24 129:13

183:25 sort (30) 14:2 15:21 23:13 27:11,17 35:8 51:12 59:12 72:5 73:23 85:22 86:15,22 99:24 102:3 145:16 160:10 162:14 163:18 177:25 178:10 188:9 191:2 196:6 205:23 211:25 221:15 230:9 236:9 240:13

sorts (5) 50:11 52:9 128:13 172:18 206:5 sought (4) 23:7 82:14 94:23 143:24

sound (4) 119:25 131:13 138:23 157:7 sounds (1) 59:25 sources (1) 50:20 south (8) 12:13 13:2 15:7,24 16:20 17:13 53:10 239:1

southampton (1) 209:22 space (1) 126:11 speak (7) 65:12 87:4 93:25 94:18 101:7 126:16 182:20 speakers (1) 14:4 special (2) 234:22 235:13 specialised (2) 115:7 206:14

specialist (11) 44:8,9,11 55:7 57:15,20 85:14 179:18 198:13 223:23 232:7 specific (38) 12:16,25 13:14 15:12.15 16:13.21 19:18 20:5.7.9.10 22:2.17 26:13 28:9 42:1.8 57:15 66:10 80:19 81:6 86:7 92:3 97:19 98:16 108:6 111:23 112:12,24 128:14 129:2

139:11 143:11 144:14 159:8 173:22 214:12 specifically (23) 6:1 8:22 14:8 23:18 25:7 28:14

36:19 40:16 55:23 59:19

61:23 103:11 114:19.20 140:24 159:17 184:9 192:4 210:22 218:3 220:20 228:25 238:11 specification (3) 21:18 235:13 236:11

specified (1) 231:15 specifying (1) 57:16 speculating (6) 94:19 132:2,11 133:24 160:9 186-9

spend (2) 48:1 161:11 sphere (1) 62:10 spiral (1) 47:15 split (1) 208:4 spoke (1) 70:15 spoken (4) 122:25 127:12

197:1 221:18 spot (1) 211:25 spread (4) 48:12,22 60:17 211:7

spring (1) 166:10 sprinklers (1) 237:14 staff (17) 6:2 17:2 93:12,13 94:3,13,16 114:5 115:13,14 124:5,6 135:15 144:8 16 150:14 214:15

stage (34) 17:25 18:4 23:18 56:11 67:19 68:7 86:1 95:18 98:3,17 100:13 102:9 107:10 108:21 113:8.9 119:21 120:3.24 132:21 137:8 138:12 152:16 159:13 169:4 170:9 183-24 184-12 18 206-2 207:19 218:12 231:3.5

stages (2) 66:15 153:20 stalled (3) 7:5,6,12 stand (2) 119:18 225:11 standard (15) 19:1 53:7 91:2,19,24 92:12 153:13 181:13,20 182:20,21 183:1

215:22 239:3 240:1 standards (13) 8:24 32:3.4.18 56:24 89:12 92:2 94:6 101:4 143:13 177:18

192:12 232:10 stands (2) 192:8 242:17 start (20) 1:4,21 29:11 37:12 47:13 54:9 58:16 65:2 78:18.22 84:23 103:23 110:20 130:12 131:4 140:16 142:7 164:16 178:1

226:22 started (14) 8:9 9:17 53:23 87:15 117:12 146:7 164:5 169:5 171:7 181:17 196:21 205:5 217:1 221:20

starter (1) 168:9 starting (3) 71:5 113:10 150:2

starts (3) 193:9 198:4 216:25 stated (3) 90:25 215:9 239:20

statement (62) 2:19 3:4.11.19.24 4:7.15.23.25 5:7,17 8:6 11:11 14:24 15:9 16:24 18:3 24:13 36:25 37:6.13 41:15 50:14 58:19 62:2.17 69:23 71:16 74:23 75:4,7 76:20 85:2 103:12 105:21,25 107:10 108:25 109:11 112:3 116:9 125:10 130:16 161:4.6 163:24 165:2 168:11 169:17.18 170:6 172:4 185:2 189:3 190:5 193:10 196:10 204:23 208:23 222:19 230:20 235:25

statements (4) 2:14 5:12,16 stating (1) 88:16 station (1) 188:8 statistics (1) 78:13 stats (2) 52:6 62:7 statute (2) 48:24 204:17

167:10,15 169:9,11,21,22

170:1.9.22 171:9.10

241:8

statutory (10) 31:23 32:23 110:13.23 119:15 122:12,13 123:9 129:15 204:6 stav (2) 58:18 167:8 steer (4) 95:7 176:17 177:5 179:20 steps (1) 198:18 steve (2) 31:13 177:13 stevensonjones (1) 13:8 sticking (2) 16:24 52:4 sticks (1) 206:11 still (30) 6:3 10:17 13:19 25:3,14 28:20 55:18 86:21 89:16 92:11 102:7,9 120:3 125:5,7,15 128:6 163:22,22 166:5 170:22 179:19 186:8 203:14 207:3.4 208:3 218:9 220:8 235:25 stock (13) 24:19 30:20 46:8,25 82:2 85:8,15 98:24 103:15 168:19 170:16 184:14,23 stoke (1) 222:22 stokes (67) 44:13 127:18 128:17 129:6 25 140:20 142:25 143:15 21 144:24 147:1,23 148:9 149:22 185:1,5 187:12,16 188:11.17 190:14.18 191:8.15 192:17 193:9.24 195:15,23 196:4,13 199:8 200:10 202:16 204:1,4,21 205:17 206:22 207:22 209:1 212:16.19 213:22 214:22 215:23 216:5 217:19 218:15 219:3,8 220:5 222:1.10 223:1 224:7 225:3,16,25 226:8 228:8 230:6,20 232:10,25 239:15,17 stood (1) 76:15 stop (4) 65:10 134:13 242:24.24 stopped (1) 66:9 store (1) 196:24 storey (1) 176:1 story (2) 95:25 241:13 straight (3) 176:14 227:10,14 straightforward (1) 115:1 strategic (3) 106:1 112:2 125:10 strategies (2) 15:12,25 strategy (53) 15:7 18:21 36:5 49:19 76:24 104:20 116:10 127:9 130:8,19 138:12,13 140:15 141:13,16 142:8 146:19 148:23 151:18 152:3.20 153:7.22 154:11 155:7.11 161:21,25 162:10 163:13 164:3,5,20,22 165:6,15,17,21,22 166:5.18 167:8 169:9,11,21,21 170:3,9,11,22 171:9 231:7.20 stretched (1) 50:5 strips (1) 234:12 strong (1) 199:11 strongly (3) 111:25 112:16 155:23 structure (6) 37:10 145:12 152:8 154:15 157:6 225:13 struggled (2) 132:15 241:9 study (1) 19:12 stuff (3) 60:10 176:18 214:10 style (2) 139:9 240:4 subarticle (4) 44:24 45:3 46:14 48:4 subbullet (1) 167:2 subconsulted (1) 201:15 subcontractor (2) 205:19.22 subject (5) 41:9 146:22

summarise (1) 104:9

77:4.20 152:13

summer (1) 99:1

202:3.17

summarised (1) 165:18

summary (5) 52:22 54:3

superseded (2) 146:8 166:8

supervise (2) 202:6 203:12

supplemental (1) 226:14

supplementary (1) 3:10

supply (1) 186:21

236:8,8 240:9

187:12

supplemented (1) 226:10

support (3) 48:25 126:17

supporting (2) 112:1 125:8

suppose (5) 35:16 234:24

supposed (2) 62:1 92:12

sure (56) 7:7 8:17.24 20:21

31:4 47:22 49:6.15 50:8

53:4 64:7,12 74:3 76:13,15

90:10 94:19 95:14 103:8

108:13 115:20 118:18

119:16.17.20 121:12

128:15 130:25 132:12

142:20 145:18 153:1,12

185:20 186:1,6,8 194:10

196:23 199:13,19 207:2

208:4 218:3 219:24 227:22

228:22 231:6 233:13 235:9

157:2 176:24 179:10

180:13 181:18 184:3

surely (1) 30:16

surprise (1) 111:2

surprised (10) 37:3 66:17

153:17 196:3,3,6

suspect (2) 70:24 211:5

surveyors (1) 46:8

surveys (1) 91:8

sustain (1) 9:2

swear (1) 2:16

sustainable (1) 86:1

sustained (1) 100:25

109:12.19 117:17 131:13

terms (47) 5:25 7:14,24

15:23 16:14 20:25 27:20

28:6 34:5.7.16.20 45:20

48:17 24 51:16 57:8 17 20

62:5 72:1 74:2 79:6 86:17

114:23 115:20 116:1 143:6

threat (3) 87:25 89:6 181:8

204:5,6 209:1 210:17

87:8 94:24 98:1 100:20

101:23 102:22 108:21

160:12 171:15 181:19

suppression (1) 112:23

supervision (3) 201:7

184:5 224:8 235:20 swiftly (4) 49:17 115:8 116:7 sublet (1) 115:25 126:10 submitted (3) 10:13 186:15 sworn (2) 1:10 244:3 190:15 symbol (1) 239:25 subsequent (2) 83:7 152:5 symbols (1) 238:4 subsequently (5) 71:7 119:4 system (11) 39:25 40:23 150:5 206:3 216:2 49:15 54:10,12 101:20 substance (1) 149:9 124:14 130:1 161:6 212:22 substances (1) 135:15 substantial (2) 115:11 systems (10) 55:9 58:3 116:11 substantially (1) 148:19 substantive (3) 141:15 237:14.22 153:15 154:21 succeeded (1) 71:24 successfully (1) 55:4 table (2) 54:6 126:16 successor (1) 73:4 taken (8) 111:11 139:2 suchlike (4) 149:14 150:11 148:20 206:25 211:2 159-9 203-4 219:20 222:5 226:8 sufficiency (2) 85:12 204:13 takes (1) 32:16 sufficient (14) 36:22 44:5 45:5,10 49:23 86:3,6 88:7 179:5,6 216:18 112:4 124:6 125:11 210:7 215:11 224:14 194:13 243:1 sufficiently (1) 61:15 suggest (5) 79:21 138:11 talking (4) 25:19 29:15 163:10 197:14 240:24 164:12,15 suggested (8) 33:13 91:9.12 tall (1) 176:1 93:13 124:13 138:6 158:8 tangent (1) 60:9 224:22 target (1) 11:6 suggesting (1) 172:21 team (64) 35:6,7 suggestion (3) 93:20,22 167:25 suggestions (1) 41:6 52:1.2 53:1.9 54:14 suit (1) 11:9 55:13.16 58:23 59:4 suitability (2) 85:12 198:19 69:10,14,20 suitable (9) 32:21 36:22 86:3,6 88:7 112:3 125:10 204:12 210:7 suite (1) 53:20

2:6,25 3:14,17,23 4:5.13.22 5:5.15 52:10 104:24 106:17 112:23 65:14.15.24 66:1 84:21 135:23 137:17 140:4 97:12 134:12.20.23 135:5.7 140:8 187:11 194:15,16,18 195:8 206:19 243:4,5,7,8,10 thanking (1) 1:21 thats (103) 4:17 6:11,17 8:13 14:7 20:8 22:1 24:6 29:19 35:17 38:1.25 46:19 47:15 48:3.17 52:10 59:9 taking (6) 32:12 57:7 60:18 61:4,8 62:2 63:23 65:4 69:11,22 70:1 72:23,25 74:20 76:7 81:11 87:9 talk (5) 10:7 134:16 184:25 89:10 90:2 92:3 94:8,25 99:9 100:17,25 105:6 talked (3) 20:6 192:3 228:20 107:11,23 108:8 109:20 111-1 11 116-23 24 25 119-19 121-20 21 139-4 9 140:1 144:21,24 150:14 151:6,24,25 154:25 156:1 160:10,11 161:6 163:9 164:9.11.12 165:21 166:14 38:9,11,15,24,25 39:5 167:9 177:6,6 178:2,18 40:10,11 48:21 51:23 179:6 180:12,17 181:2 188-4 190-10 193-14 194-9 197:16 200:1.15 204:15.23 206:11 213:16 217:7 70:3,5,10,18,21 71:1,9 218:18 220:11,13 225:12 74:8,17,25 77:3 81:23 230:4,9 231:15 236:22 88:13 102:17 117:12 124:1 238:14 127:8,17 136:12 144:12 theirs (1) 77:18 150:20 157:4 159:3 160:5 theme (1) 46:3 167:12.12.15.18.20 169:3 themes (2) 14:3 78:15 170:2 187:1 211:13 thereabouts (1) 215:6 212:15,18 218:6,24 224:25 thereafter (1) 239:16 232:4 242:4 thered (1) 132:17 teams (6) 38:6 40:6 42:19 therefore (9) 26:10 91:24 70:23 79:3 145:16 117:9 142:25 170:21 tease (2) 160:18 161:23 175:18 176:2 200:5 210:12 technical (7) 19:17 45:23 theres (11) 10:14 48:14 50:4 46:7 136:4.11 139:5 192:2 95:9 149:13 168:4 202:1 technically (1) 236:23 232:19.21 234:25 241:20 telling (2) 121:20 177:22 thevd (3) 97:7 98:13 152:21 tells (1) 94:12 theyre (20) 34:6 42:19 template (1) 182:24 48:14,15 52:6 53:15 63:22 temporarily (1) 23:5 75:25 114:12 137:13 temporary (1) 206:15 178:20 179:3,4,5,18,25 ten (2) 2:14 168:10 232:14,16 235:18,19 tenancy (3) 25:2 28:21 theyve (3) 102:13 144:1 132:21 213:15 tenant (2) 104:20 116:3 tenanted (1) 24:19 thing (10) 20:18 82:23 143:10 144:4 178:18 187:5 tenants (5) 25:1 28:21 204:11,19 214:6 236:20 112:19 113:4 240:15 thinking (5) 81:15 135:17 tend (1) 232:1 168:5 225:12 226:1 tended (3) 47:19 60:9 74:13 thinly (3) 48:12,22 50:5 tendencies (1) 223:18 third (9) 3:11 5:7 97:14 tender (20) 91:8 98:2 100:16 151:12 161:14 166:24 174:8 175:18 181:1 182:6 167:1 175:1 222:21 185:5 186:16 187:9 thompson (3) 29:15 30:11 188:13,25 189:2,6 190:11 104:19 191:8 192:18 204:22 220:4 thompsons (3) 29:23 30:21 226:4 33:13 tenderers (1) 192:25 thorny (3) 175:12,22 181:2 tendering (3) 25:10 186:20 though (4) 49:8 152:16 190:3 172:17 215:24 tends (1) 197:14 term (2) 47:7 97:22

220:8.22 224:25 225:19 three (16) 104:5 112:9 234:9 236:22 239:16.17 125:22 126:1.2.5.14.18 170:18 203:6 210:3 226:19 test (1) 179:25 229:19 231:6.11 236:2 testing (2) 132:23 161:15 threeyear (2) 101:1 184:1 text (5) 26:1 44:22 193:6 threeyearly (1) 10:2 through (30) 2:2,3,15 11:21 198:12 199:21 thank (38) 1:7,11,13,18 33:14 40:9 50:19 52:23 58:15 69:25 91:2 110:21 118:21 122:17 125:16 126:9.12 128:11 134:5 154:9.14.22 184:2 208:5.15.17 220:4 227:12 231:24 240:25 throughout (6) 46:22 60:17 68:11 99:11 112:5 196:12 ticksheet (2) 233:3,15 tied (1) 158:13 tier (1) 227:13 time (99) 2:4 6:12 7:14.21 8:10,17 9:22 10:12 18:10 19:21 26:8 35:19,20 42:24 43:3 47:20 48:7.10 49:8,13,23,24 53:12 54:21 56:23 57:7,14 63:8 64:17 65:8,11 66:18 67:17,18 68-11 73-22 77-24 80.22 23 24 87.8 88.22 102:7,20 107:21 108:11 109:8,24 110:1 112:12 121:10,19 126:11,12 127:22 128:2 130:18 132:15 134:11 139:14 141:18 144:5 146:7 148:3 151-19 152-17 153-6 154-1 161:11 169:20 170:5.8.22 171:3 184:3,22 185:21 197:10 199:3 200:14 201:7.19 203:14.23 205:6 207:10 210:12 215:10,12 216:7,11,24 217:10 218:5 222:23 224:2 235:11 242:19,23 timeframe (4) 22:22 131:23 145:19 207:13 timeframes (2) 28:2 153:5 timely (4) 32:17 164:21 166:18 174:22 times (7) 43:10 63:5 112:4 125:11 148:4 150:5 200:24 timescale (1) 210:5 timescales (2) 125:22 226:20 timespan (1) 175:5 timing (1) 118:4 title (4) 7:16,17 90:23 156:6 tl (3) 88:13,19,19 tmo (160) 1:5 6:8,9,14 17:2 24:20 27:5,7,24 28:10,18,22 29:19,25 30:7.14.20.22 33:11 34:19 36:5.20 37:10.16.20.22.25 38:5 39:9 41:12 42:7.11.13 43:12 45:20 49:25 50:18,23 58:2,21 59:7 61:1 62:19,23 63:20 64:5,15,20 66:10.24 67:6.14 68:12 69:12,17,21 72:13 75:1.12.12.15.19 76:4.25 77:3 80:7.10.16 85:6.10.17 87:1 89:3.24 90:3.25 91:9,12,18 92:17,25 93:11,23 94:3,12 99:1 101:18 103:14 104:2.8.21.25 105:4,7,21,24 106:5,6,12 110:22 112:2.16 115:19 thought (28) 25:18 31:2 116:16 117:7.9.12 122:23 33:23 45:10 47:22 49:9 123:5 124:4 125:9 127:8 66:12 71:6 78:7 84:19 129:9 130:15,17,19 131:6 126:8 129:10 130:22 133:9 133:11 141:12 158:21 142:18 152:2 177:16 164:1,2 167:11 169:11,20 184:22 192:6,8 197:5,14 170:9,17 171:9 172:10 202:12 204:10 207:16 174:1 182:17 184:14 233:10 235:16 240:12 186:16 189:9.14 190:9 threads (1) 68:24 193:12 201:12 202:5

211-12 212-15 18 217:21.23 218:22.24 221:3 222:2 224:1,9,16,17 225:4 226:8 230:24 232:3 tmo00000890 (1) 2:18 tmo000008902 (1) 8:7 tmo0000089030 (1) 172:5 tmo0000089031 (4) 190:6 196:11 222:20 236:1 tmo0000089037 (4) 11:12 24:14 37:13 71:17 tmo0000089039 (4) 50:15 56:6 58:19 61:7 tmo0000089040 (1) 76:21 tmo0000089041 (1) 169:18 tmo0000089042 (3) 163:25 168:12 170:7 tmo00830598 (3) 36:3 148:23 150:9 tmo008305981 (1) 36:15 tmo0083059810 (1) 231:23 tmo0083059815 (1) 36:6 tmo0083059816 (1) 150:12 tmo00840384 (1) 151:11 tmo00842327 (1) 188:24 tmo008423272 (1) 190:12 tmo00842341 (1) 3:1 tmo008423411 (1) 85:2 tmo008423412 (1) 103:13 tmo008423413 (3) 185:3 189:3 204:24 tmo008423414 (1) 208:24 tmo00842371 (1) 185:10 tmo0084237125 (1) 186:19 tmo008423713 (1) 185:22 tmo008423716 (3) 229:5 233:25 237:3 tmo00842374 (1) 103:18 tmo00844024 (1) 154:5 tmo00847305 (1) 3:10 tmo00856458 (1) 156:19 tmo00862589 (1) 3:18 tmo00862606 (1) 14:25 tmo008626062 (1) 19:5 tmo00869607 (1) 4:24 tmo00869720495 (1) 108:23 tmo00870171 (2) 131:5 tmo008701711 (1) 132:4 tmo008701714 (1) 131:7 tmo00870933 (2) 135:21 139:16 tmo008709332 (1) 139:17 tmo00873623 (1) 122:2 tmo008736232 (1) 122:4 tmo00873629 (1) 3:24 tmo00873934 (1) 4:6 tmo00880581 (1) 187:19 tmo00880584 (1) 192:20 tmo008805845 (1) 193:4 tmo00887083 (1) 5:6 tmo008929944 (1) 64:2 tmo00899327 (1) 137:22 tmo008993272 (2) 139:18,22 tmo008998523 (1) 63:25 tmo10002648 (1) 145:3 tmo100026483 (1) 146:14 tmo10004726 (1) 147:7 tmo100047266 (1) 147:16 tmo10006358 (1) 157:18 tmo100063583 (1) 157:24 tmo10007728 (1) 81:8 tmo10012811 (1) 164:16 tmo100128114 (1) 164:19 tmo10017036 (1) 169:11 tmo1001703617 (1) 169:14 tmo10024351 (1) 165:3 tmo100243511 (1) 166:16 tmo1002435120 (1) 166:1 tmo100243513 (1) 165:20 tmo10031056 (2) 66:22 209:9 tmo100310562 (1) 209:25 tmo10031074 (1) 39:8 tmo100310743 (1) 39:14

tmo1003473833 (1) 63:23 tmo100374218 (1) 181:23 tmo100374221 (1) 63:24 tmo1003743788 (1) 183:3 tmo1003743789 (1) 183:12 tmo1003744262 (1) 66:4 tmo10040770 (1) 156:4 tmo10048973 (1) 4:14 tmo100499872 (2) 62:17 69:24 tmos (15) 39:24 40:22 46:25 84:12 85:12 94:16 96:14 98:23 124:11 127:10.18 130:1 145:11 161:5 209:16 today (3) 1:4 5:13,23 todays (1) 1:4 todd (2) 22:14 195:22 together (14) 24:16 28:18 50:16 68:24 131:24 136:14 137:19 142:8 144:13 187:17 220:22 221:15 235:5 238:16 toing (2) 177:4,18 told (8) 28:12 57:5 114:21 128:7 177:19 191:15 203:21 220:10 tomorrow (2) 242:25 243:9 too (5) 21:9 83:11 116:8 148:5 199:11 took (14) 7:17 73:6 86:11 89:13,18 115:25 116:8 123:1 163:20 170:11.13 201:2 215:7 218:15 topic (8) 16:13 29:9 35:13,13 58:12 84:22 130:10 242:12 topics (2) 105:16 168:24 total (1) 208:2 towards (3) 29:22 75:9 240:14 tower (10) 6:12 103:21 168:3 170:23 214:23 229:17 230:4,7 231:12 238:22 towers (1) 19:11 town (1) 17:4 track (1) 241:7 trail (1) 99:13 train (2) 115:11 116:10 trained (1) 49:15 training (44) 6:8 8:24 10:20 11:9,16,19 12:8 13:5.5.6.25 14:17 15:11 16:12 19:21 20:9 22:2 23:17 24:4 29:5 44:5 45:6,10 51:12 52:25 72:17 85:24 94:17,21 95:12,18 115:13,14 119:5 123:25 135:15 144:16 195:21 214:3,7,14,18 215:11 221:16 transcript (2) 2:13 7:2 translated (1) 228:21 treated (1) 196:8 treatment (1) 234:22 trends (5) 46:2 47:12 52:22 70:13 72:9 tried (4) 53:1 72:11 163:21 177:12 triggered (1) 167:24 true (3) 5:16 75:25 176:19 truth (4) 27:25 60:14 203:20 241:25 truthfully (2) 133:16 222:14 try (6) 77:15 145:17 208:17 227:21 236:14 240:3 trying (16) 16:3 47:20 49:6 52:4 77:18 86:4.8 89:17 121:5.15 125:16 127:15 132:7 143:5 155:6 180:6 tuesday (1) 243:13 turek (2) 31:13 177:13 turn (17) 1:25 3:6 4:2 19:5 31:6 37:9 58:12 69:12 71:14 84:22 98:7 103:10 106:21 130:8 140:13 151:7 225:24 tweaked (1) 133:21

tweaking (2) 171:14 214:16 twice (1) 17:12 twofold (1) 133:5 twoyear (1) 60:13 type (5) 14:17 94:24 167:5 211:3 239:22 types (2) 24:1 239:6

ultimate (1) 37:20 ultimately (11) 16:5 53:10,20 54:12,16 60:20 64:18 114:3 115:11 155:2 unable (1) 177:9 unanimously (1) 203:6 unaware (2) 123:1 232:22 unclear (1) 94:6 underneath (1) 210:9 understand (9) 27:4 34:16 42:11 126:24 140:6 187:16 202:1,7 236:6 understandably (1) 27:9 understanding (19) 24:18,21 27:3 30:21 33:16 34:2 35:11 44:2 57:18 71:20 75:17 91:5 112:12 169:2 170:17 220:6,16,21 238:7 understood (8) 34:18 73:20 75:12 174:5 176:3 187:23 202:22 236:8 undertake (19) 8:23 10:20 13:21 25:11 29:25 31:23 32:1.24 44:6 85:14.18 97:16 100:9 111:16 172:12 198:13 221:10 227:6 230:25 undertaken (14) 18:25 52:21 85:7 171:25 172:10 188:1 189:16,24 210:22 213:19 221:13 229:7 230:2 234:18 undertaking (5) 43:8 45:7 51:9 87:1 240:18 undertook (2) 7:20 9:17

undoubtedly (1) 50:7 unfair (1) 179:7 unfazed (1) 87:12 unfortunately (4) 57:9 149:12 171:19 217:11 unhappy (7) 160:7 174:3.4.10.12 201:23 202:8 unless (9) 53:17 67:23 69:16 119:18 122:25 191:24 222:7 229:19 234:10 unlikely (2) 78:23 114:5 unlimited (1) 210:12 unpack (1) 43:2 unsupervised (1) 201:12 until (9) 9:19 59:21 73:1

undocumented (1) 220:6

unusual (2) 69:16 78:23 unwieldy (1) 56:17 upcoming (1) 77:7 undate (16) 34:22 42:7 63:24,25 64:2 66:6,20 67:10 70:23,25 75:21 117:10 128:1 142:2 146:16,16

118:8,11,24 209:2 215:5

243-12

updated (12) 9:5 64:11 109-15 137-24 138-2 9 9 161:18 162:14 170:8.11 171:8 updates (4) 26:8 28:6 34:23

35:8 updating (2) 193:12 227:3 upon (3) 91:25 195:1 211:11 upshot (1) 173:1

upskill (1) 51:13 upwards (1) 81:21 urgent (2) 118:1 119:8 used (11) 10:2 70:24 77:6 97:23 180:1,21 190:25

201:17.20 223:16 232:7

47:12 73:20,23 92:13 133:12 144:19 175:19 177-17 178-8 9 180:5.14.24 187:13 196:9 201:21 212:1 222:6,9 228:9 ways (3) 12:22 70:17 179:16 weakness (1) 54:11

useful (2) 12:18 152:4 usher (2) 65:16 134:21 using (3) 7:18 46:8 197:9 usually (10) 38:7.16 54:3 67:22.25 70:23 74:8 77:15 213:9 219:23

v (1) 237:16 vague (2) 191:22 207:14 valerie (4) 173:12 186:8 189:8,21 valid (3) 107:14 210:12 211:6 value (2) 115:23 152:2 varied (1) 77:14 variety (9) 11:4 12:6 13:16:25 14:4 70:17 221:17 223:21 238:16 various (9) 25:17 40:6 44:18 50:19 120:10 136:5 156:18 171:17 229:25 vents (1) 139:24 verbally (1) 119:10 verify (1) 198:19 version (29) 31:14 33:21 34:2,9 36:12 84:19 130:21 135:25 137:23,23 138:6 139:12,13,16,22 140:2 143:23 151:17 152:5 153:23 163:4,8,15 165:21 169:9 170:4 171:8 198:2 200:24 versions (5) 21:20 136:5,16 170:3 240:3 vetting (1) 172:19 vi (1) 237:20 via (1) 11:17 views (1) 165:15 vii (2) 237:22,24 visits (4) 98:12 139:20 166:24 212:6 visual (1) 234:8 visually (1) 213:12 voice (2) 2:7 6:24 volume (2) 208:6,12

w2 (7) 54:12,13,16,20,23 55:4,17 ded (1) 208:5 wafted (1) 137:7 wait (1) 215:5 wanting (4) 26:21 180:2,3,3 wasnt (56) 16:17 20:5.6 27:2 39:16 42:25 49:20 54:20 60:10 66:13 71:12 75:23 78:13 82:5 86:1,21 88:3 90:12 92:12 100:14 102:21 108:4 118:24 126:20,22,23 127:3 128:2.23 134:6 138:2.5 140:7 152:25 154:16 155:1.3 159:25 160:25 174:12 176:9,10 178:9 179:8,22 180:16 181:5,6 199:23 201:13 204:18 205:3 217:8 218:18.19 233:15 watch (1) 46:23 watching (1) 28:6 water (4) 161:19,19 180:11 200:20 way (29) 1:25 2:1 28:12 33:2 34:2 35:12 40:8 41:21 46:7

vulnerability (1) 113:11

114:8 124:11 223:21

vulnerable (5) 112:19 113:4

wed (28) 22:11 25:9 35:22 70:15 79:8 91:21 92:10 97:7 98:11.11.12.12 99:13 102:22 115:9 128:13 132:15 173:4.18 184:19 188:2,5 197:9 199:19,25 200:3 230:10 233:14 week (1) 207:22 weekly (1) 70:5

veeks (3) 56:12 104:5 118:12 welcome (2) 1:3 147:21 went (21) 12:3 13:4 22:5 26:6 46:6 54:16 56:14 57:12 83:6 118:21 157:14 159:9 160:23 170:1

176:11,24 190:1 195:13 196:20 200:17 227:16 verent (23) 14:16 33:14 35:15 46:10 56:2 86:4 90:11,13 103:24 174:3,4,8,10 176:4 178:5.15 179:17.17 181:22 196:7 200:20 232:13 234:5

westminster (1) 13:9 wet (2) 166:25 237:14 weve (17) 10:11 52:7 71:18 99-9 130-14 133-22 137-11 139:2,15 162:15 167:18 168:5 177:9 190:12 241:7,9,11

whatever (21) 18:12 35:4 54:15 67:8 72:18 74:13 84:18 89:13 95:12 114:7 118-5 124-21 128-15 153-6 197:2 201:14 218:13.25 220:14 240:12 241:2

whats (5) 9:7 31:18 106:13.19.25 whenever (7) 7:17 9:17 27:11 56:14 224:7 225:10 231:15

whereas (3) 170:18 196:23 204:7

wherever (1) 106:4 wherewithal (1) 114:10 whilst (2) 186:10 198:14 whoever (1) 53:1 whole (7) 20:18 47:6 48:13 49:25 83:9 184:2,23 whom (3) 95:3 205:17 235:8

whos (1) 41:20 whose (3) 56:21 133:17 162:24 widely (2) 22:12 143:4

widespread (1) 211:3 wish (3) 49:13 86:9 171:20 witness (33) 1:13 2:14 3:3,11,18 4:7,15,23 37:13

50:14 65:14.23 76:20 85:1 103:12 134:12.19 135:4 161:4 163:24 172:4 189:3 190:5 194:15,24 195:3 196:10 204:23 208:23 222:19 235:24 243:3,5

witnesss (1) 195:5 won (1) 239:15 wonder (3) 142:7 163:4 180:19

wondering (5) 33:21 65:1 68:21 134:3 146:2 wont (3) 58:15 86:9 180:11 worded (1) 119:1 wording (2) 29:15,23 work (47) 7:20 11:2 14:18 33:2 34:5 40:8 50:5 53:6 56:21 74:5 78:22 107:19 108:5 111:20 113:12 116:10 117:13 129:8 134:5 142:9 144:1 150:7 155:6 161:11 163:9 174:13

176:13,18 187:23 188:3 voud (2) 118:14 120:19 190:22 197:11 200:21 youll (1) 152:6 201:12 202:6 203:9.13 youre (28) 1:15 2:9 6:19 205:5 213:22 219:3 221:14,21 222:10 227:7

230:18 240:11 241:12 worked (15) 6:9 27:5 72:2 73:8 102:18 111:20 113:20 115:7 126:25 136:13 150:19 188:21 205:19.23 206:4

workflow (2) 54:12 146:3 working (20) 6:22 8:9 15:7 26:21 29:16,17 49:20 50:3 53:11 72:16 81:1 89:11 122-10 135-24 149-16 150:4 152:11 153:5 196:12 240:14

workplaces (1) 115:16 works (11) 18:25 22:21 88:18,21 89:3 211:8 212:7 229:25 232:21,22 234:17 world (4) 16:16,19 50:6 180-12

wouldnt (25) 21:23 40:23 53:17 66:18 67:23 68:7 78:22 80:18 94:6 97:22 107:20 113:16 117:16 155:18 167:22 172:21 183:19 192:13 201:23 215:18 216:16 217:15

219-22 233-11 242-10 wray (22) 1:5,9,10,19 37:9 43:25 65:6,22 66:2 96:14,23 134:13 135:2,8 161:15 179:7 194:10,11,22 195:10 242:23 244:3

write (2) 96:14 222:4 writing (3) 79:13,14 116:9 written (12) 10:10 17:21 63:8 107:10 115:22 130:20 152:10 219:8 226:10

228:21 240:17,17 wrong (4) 76:7 139:3,4

wrote (1) 83:16

yaqub (4) 73:4 76:1,3,10 yaqubs (1) 75:7 yardsticks (1) 207:8 yeah (57) 9:14 16:2,8 20:21 21:2 22:11 35:19 36:9 39:22 40:1 46:16 60:11 63:14 73:7 79:9 82:6.6 84:9 86:14 90:6 99:20 101:13 104:13 107:13 109:1,5 110:7 111:12 116:13,25 119:23 127:20 136:4.21 139:4 147:3 150:5 152:22 156:23

160:25 161:10 162:3 163:14 171:2.5 182:4 208:24 183:7 192:19 193:15 200:15 206:13 211:20,23 212:13 213:16 217:11

220:14 year (34) 18:12 43:19 53:25 76:25 77:8,11 78:2.3.5.6.7.20.79:9 80:20.21 81:3.7 99:1 130:24 142:16 147:6.12.23 169:10,10 171:10 201:4 217:2 221:5 230:23,25 231:1,4 242:5

yearend (1) 34:24

years (31) 9:21 13:4 25:14 26:19.20 37:17 53:9 59:21 64:18 67:4 92:17.25 109:13 113:11 115:22 131:19 132:16 133:22 170:18.20 192:5 193:13 196:20 200:13,17 207:21 229:19 231:6,9,11 241:11

ellow (1) 147:24 yet (3) 100:16 101:3 180:16

13:19 25:19 29:14 64:13 65:13 84:9 89:25 101:15

103-22 119-17 121-20 132-10 135-20 157-7 164:18 178:2 179:3.4 180:19 183:8 191:22 194:13 195:8 209:18 220:19

yours (3) 7:5 36:7 79:13 106:10 217:10 youve (11) 21:4 109:24 111:4 114:20 131:15 141:11 157:8 180:13

1 (30) 6:18 14:25 36:15 39:11 48:7 77:12.23 96:4.10 97:13 111:16 130:11 131:5 132:4 136:16 143:17,22 146:4 147:2,24 149:23 150:13,15 164:16 165:12 166:15 198:3 209:9 244:3.4

10 (12) 4:17 17:7 63:23 93:8 122:3 138:16 239:2.2 240:7 242:25 243:9.12

1000 (1) 1:2 **102 (1)** 134:24 10th (1) 135:24

11 (13) 81:14,18 93:10 105:19.20 107:15 108:19 110:20 174:16 185:3 229:5 234:1.22

110 (4) 97:17 103:15 188:7 207:23 **1120 (1)** 65:19 1135 (3) 65:10,18,21

12 (15) 106:9,11 108:19 111:23 125:12 139:17.19 161:13 164:9.18 189:2.11 209:18 213:10 215:10

122 (1) 182:1 12month (1) 217:3 13 (13) 4:18 46:13 106:9,16 107:23 108:1,16 110:19,21

111:22 144:6 204:24 237:3 135 (1) 172:5 137 (1) 190:6 139 (1) 196:11 13th (1) 170:24

14 (7) 6:12 7:14 37:15 81:11 106:9.22 108:19 140 (2) 222:20 236:1

1433 (1) 231:23 14th (1) 81:18 15 (8) 36:6 84:3 123:22 147:9 149:2.6 186:10

16 (4) 29:13 150:12,14 157:22 164 (1) 71:17

166 (2) 11:12 24:14 **167 (1)** 37:13 168 (1) 38:4

17 (6) 5:3 31:12 88:3 151:10 169:14 230:21 174 (2) 50:16 56:6

18 (7) 44:25 88:12 112:14 140:18 145:6 176:1 213:11 180 (1) 76:21 181 (1) 43:6

183 (1) 44:19 186 (1) 169:19 19 (9) 3:25 110:21.22 111:3,13 114:16 119:14 122:12 129:15

190 (2) 163:25 168:12 **191 (1)** 170:6 **1986 (1)** 8:8 1989 (1) 8:16 **1996 (1)** 6:10

2 (23) 5:2 8:6 19:5 29:20 66:23 90:22 98:8 100:3

104-1 17 107-15 117-1 122:4 134:15.23 136:16 139:16 165:9 190:12 209:12.25 212:12 229:5 20 (4) 3:11 4:2 31:13 165:25 200 (2) 135:1 208:4

yourself (5) 1:12 19:4 49:9

181:14 213:8 240:10

2006 (3) 20:11 132:20,24 2007 (3) 21:21 23:23 95:20 2008 (2) 24:2 92:9 2008early (1) 85:10 2009 (39) 25:9 63:15,23 64:5 84:24 85:10,17 87:2,14 88:3 89:22,23 95:19 98:22 99:17 103:24 104:4.12 105:1 109:8 116:16 117:14 118:2 120:18 122:3.14 124:18,24 127:23 130:9,15 131:9 133:12 135:11 137:11 141:22 142:3

205:12 230:8 2010 (42) 29:10,13 63:25 64:1,5 66:8,10 68:5 84:3 95:25 96:2 98:20 25 100-13 120-12 14 127-19 172:2,11 174:16 181:23,25 183:4 184:12 185:5,9 189:1 200:9 201:2 204:22 214:24 215:5 220:23 226:2

2003 (3) 109:4,6 117:21

2005 (9) 11:14,15 30:4,9

42:5,10 85:4 106:4 109:16

2004 (2) 32:5,13

229:15,17 230:4,5,6 231:14 234:20 237:2 2011 (10) 6:16 21:7 31:12 37:25 63:16 64:3 66:20

68:5 210:21 228:4 2012 (19) 21:21 23:18 31:13 39:12 130:24 135:25 136:7 137:24,25 138:3 139:12 140:1,20 141:8 209:5 210:4 222:2 228:6,23

2013 (39) 18:13 19:8 36:8 43:18 59:5 66:21.23 67:15 69:5 130:22 131:3 138:5 140:14,18 143:17,22 145:2,6 146:4 147:2,9 149:2 150:3 152:19 155:7,11 162:11 163:12,22 165:21 166:2,5 198:3 199:4 209:12 211:18

212:12 215:5 231:20 2014 (14) 17:7 151:10 154:3,7 156:4,7,20 157:17,22 160:20,22 162:4,25 166:8

2015 (14) 24:7 37:22 38:19 58:24 59:5 60:25 69:5 70:7 73:1 79:16 156:8 161:2 162:4 166:9

2016 (15) 73:6 81:7.7.11 161:5.9 163:23 164:1,6,9,18 165:11,24 166:4,10

2017 (21) 6:12 7:14 19:21 37:15 81:7 130:9 137:23,25 138:3,10,16,17 139:13,22 140:4 169:8,12 170:8.21 171:8 209:3

2018 (1) 6:18 2019 (4) 2:18,22 3:7 4:18 2020 (7) 3:11,19,23,25 4:10 5:3,10

2021 (2) 1:1 243:13 21 (5) 4:10 132:25 154:3,7 204:22 22 (11) 36:16 64:3 104:4.12

118:2.11.14.21 120:18 121:17 122:14 23 (1) 43:20

24 (13) 3:7,19,23 117:14 118:13.20 119:13 121:18 124:18.24 144:7 190:13 232:6

24th (1) 117:3 25 (5) 4:10 63:25 64:1 183:4

186-18 250 (1) 208:4 26 (2) 120:14 124:20 27 (3) 39:14 96:2 189:1 29 (2) 214:24 230:5 2nd (1) 105:1

3 (27) 3:20 16:25 31:25 39:13 44:24 46:14 48:4 85:2 92:17 107:15 111:8,10,16,17 116:18 119:15 123:23 136:16 146:13 157:24,25 158:1 162:8 165:20 185:22 186:10 198:5

30 (5) 66:8 97:3 99:15 172:4 230:8

31 (10) 60:25 77:23 78:19 97:4 98:7 123:23 190:5 196:11 222:20 236:1 **313 (1)** 194:19 **32 (3)** 96:6 161:13 210:1 324 (1) 43:21 33 (1) 144:21 330 (3) 194:12,18,21 34 (1) 117:2 35 (1) 75:8 **36 (1)** 74:23 **37 (3)** 11:11 37:12 71:17 39 (2) 3:14 50:15

4 (23) 3:6 17:10 31:17.19 84:7 85:9 93:8 107:15 111:8,17 112:6,7 113:3 119:15 123:15,21 124:2 131:7 164:19.19 165:6 167:9 186:17

3rd (1) 158:13

40 (1) 210:9 41 (3) 123:16 169:18 210:11 42 (3) 168:12 170:7 210:16 43 (1) 210:22

430 (4) 242:14,14,23 243:11 **44 (2)** 211:11 212:11 **45 (2)** 122:5 211:14 495 (1) 109:3

5 (16) 8:21 19:8 45:3 90:22 92:25 104:10.11 105:18 106:9 107:25 124:8 183:12 193:4 239:2.2 240:6 **500 (1)** 208:3 **52 (1)** 230:21

6 (10) 8:7 89:23 99:19 106:10.21 111:18 147:16 164:20 175:5 185:5 **650 (2)** 48:14 208:2

56 (1) 2:21

7 (8) 1:1 2:18,22 5:10 104:2 138:6 139:12,16 71 (1) 146:14 71d (1) 186:22 79 (10) 21:17,18 23:17 95:20,21 214:19,21 228-5 23 232-10

8 (14) 9:9 15:8 19:6 31:9 69:24 116:16 118:5 119:20 121:19 137:23 139:13 181:25 200:24 243:13 82 (1) 5:18 89 (1) 183:12

9 (5) 5:9 62:18 103:13 144:20 151:7 91 (2) 124:2 182:16 93 (2) 112:14 124:8 9991 (1) 24:7

Opus 2 Official Court Reporters