2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 2

3

4 5 6

7 8 9

10 11 12

14 15 16

13

17 18 19

20 21 22

23 24

25

2 3

1

4 5 6

> 7 8

9 10

14

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

(10.00 am)

LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: Good morning. As many of you will be aware already, since we last sat in the

MS BROWN: Thursday, 26 September 2024

Council chamber we have heard a great deal of evidence from a large number of parents in person, online or read, and transcripts of live evidence and many of the detailed statements are on the website already. Those from yesterday will be available very soon.

I repeat my profound thanks on behalf of the Inquiry to all parents who have contributed either with evidence or supporting the person giving evidence and that concludes the evidence in respect of Part A of this Inquiry.

This morning we are moving to two days of evidence in respect of the broader NHS. It comes from Professor Mary Dixon-Woods, Dr Joanna Garstang and on Monday, Sir Robert Francis. None of them has been asked to comment on or consider the facts of this case because obviously the evidence has only just begun.

The reason we are hearing from these witnesses now, immediately after the evidence of the parents, is to inform the Inquiry about the systems and processes that were in place at the material time and the studies that

Health Foundation which is an independent charitable organisation and its mission is to build the evidence

base for how to improve patient safety and quality of care.

> Q. And what's the staffing, how big is it?

- We have a team of about 60 people who study how to improve quality and safety and to communicate about it.
- Q. And I think you have done work on the duty of candour in that institute?
- A. Yes. We have studied duty of candour, speaking up, openness policies and influences on what is called employee voice.
- And you have various appointments of distinction set out on page 2 and you are qualified to comment in an up-to-date sense on patient safety issues and research in this area?
- I believe I am qualified to comment in this area, yes, thank you.
- As the Chair has already said, you haven't been asked to comment on the facts or background to this Inquiry, but you have provided a lengthy report which has been available to core participants and their representatives since August and is now available on the website publicly, as I understand it. Can you confirm

have been done into how people behave. It is to examine the historical context and to provide a backdrop to the evidence in respect of Part B, which will begin with evidence from some of the doctors on Tuesday of next week. In due course I will consider it, all of that evidence, in the context of the facts of Part B and of course when considering Part C.

Ms Langdale.

MS LANGDALE: Thank you. May I call the witness. PROFESSOR MARY DIXON-WOODS (affirmed) Questioned by MS LANGDALE

MS LANGDALE: Please do sit down. Can you give us your name and qualifications?

- Hello there. I'm Mary Dixon-Woods and I'm Professor of Healthcare Improvement Studies at the University of Cambridge. My qualifications include a PhD.
- Q. I'm going to ask Professor Woods that we put on screen pages 2 and 3 of your CV -- not of your report, of your CV -- and we see you currently work at the THIS Institute. Can you tell us something about that work?
- Thank you. THIS Institute, it stands for The Healthcare Improvements Studies Institute. It's a centre at the University of Cambridge funded by The

the contents of that report are true and accurate as far as you are concerned?

- A. I can confirm the contents of that report are true and accurate as far as I know.
- I'm going to dip into parts of that report today, Professor Dixon-Woods, and ask you to comment on it, or to set out and expand on some of the things you say within it, but at the outset may I say thank you for providing this report and the detail contained within

If we go first of all to page 8 of the report.

- A. Sure, I would like to say at the outset --I would like to express my profound sympathies for The Families for the terrible suffering they have endured.
- Professor, you set out at page 8 of your report and earlier the concept of the bad apple problem and the dangers of not recognising bad apples exist. Can you expand on the concept and what you say the dangers are and also the case illustrations that you rely on there to demonstrate the issue?
- Thank you. The modern patient safety movement, which is to say the study of patient safety and the attempts to improve it systematically can probably be dated to about 25 years ago and much of the learning from that time was based on the principle that

patient safety incidents and accidents arise from error, unintended behaviours, unintended actions, and that the correct approach to addressing patient safety would be to design better systems. That's absolutely correct.

If you persist in blaming people for things that are actually defects in the systems, then you're unlikely to solve the problem and an example would be something like overdoses that are accidently given. You want to design a system that essentially prevents people from -- or inhibits people from doing that.

One of the challenges of operating what's called a no blame approach in order to improve systems is that you may inadvertently fail to identify another threat to patient safety, which is the bad apple problem. Bad apples are people who demonstrate grossly incompetent or substandard clinical practice but nonetheless persist. They demonstrate unacceptable behaviours, which might include things like abuse, bullying, racism or disrespectful or negligent care, or what I call transgressive behaviours, behaviours that are so transgressive they reach the threshold for criminality and that might include murder, assault, rape and other violations.

An analysis I did published in 2010 focused specifically on doctors and a series of cases that had

the source of problems and because there wasn't a very clear procedure for dealing with it. It wasn't until a group of doctors at the Queens Medical Centre in Nottingham who were receiving a very high number of cases from Grantham raised the alarm and spoke to their Head of Department, who then called the doctor at Grantham, that the action was finally taken.

Q. One of the recommendations you refer to in your report from the Clothier Inquiry that investigated events at Grantham was this: the main lesson that the Grantham disaster should serve is to heighten awareness in all those caring for children of the possibility of a malevolent intervention as a cause of unexplained clinical events. That was the recommendation and we will be investigating in this Inquiry whether and to what extent there was learning from that, but from your perspective how can that be achieved to heighten awareness?

A. I think the key thing is that we recognise some of the human behaviour that's involved in identifying what may be a very unusual pattern of events. I can speak about that. The second thing is that there is a procedure for dealing with it. I think our procedures for dealing with these kinds of very transgressive, unusual incidents have remained

arisen throughout the 2000s, including the Harold Shipman case, which I can speak about if of interest, and the analogy that is often used in-patient safety is the "Swiss cheese model", that an incident may occur if the kind of holes that are meant to -- a number of holes line up so the barriers that prevent an incident happening essentially align, but what was shown was that Shipman essentially like a snake managed to wriggle through the holes and was able to commit his terrible actions.

The challenge of not identifying a bad apple was also illustrated by the Beverley Allitt case and I can say more about that, if of interest.

Q. Yes, say more about the Allitt case.

A. The Allitt case involved a State Enrolled
Nurse at Grantham in Lincolnshire and she committed
a series of murders over actually about a three-month
period and it was initially the -- the series of
incidents was initially attributed to poor staffing, to
other challenges on the ward including poor estates and
so on, and the doctor who began to suspect it was in
fact Allitt who was responsible for the incidents was
initially treated as having fanciful ideas and was not
treated seriously. Partly this was because there wasn't
a recognition that bad apple behaviour can sometimes be

underdeveloped in the NHS and we know from other areas, like fraud or sexual abuse, unless you've got the procedures in place it's very difficult for organisations to deal with them. I think there is an absence of clarity about what you do in -- confronted with an unexpected series of highly transgressive events, particularly in those caring for children.

Q. What are you speaking of there when you say "procedures"? Do you mean referral procedures, employment procedures, picking things up? Which type of procedures?

A. A procedure that you would follow in this event. If somebody is suspected of fraud, there is a series of steps that the organisation knows what to take. I'm not sure that the same clarity is there in an event that somebody is suspected of murder, for example, or attempted murder, so what may happen is that patient safety incidents are handled through patient safety incident processes, they are entirely separate from issues -- or not entirely separate, but effectively are sequestered from issues to do with discipline and HR issues, so may enter a different process which remains confidential and those two systems don't necessarily handle very well issues of highly transgressive behaviour.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You articulated in that answer when people are suspected of murder or attempted murder. How easy is it to voice those concerns in the way that you have just expressed them?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It is extremely difficult. We have done a large number of studies about the influences on speaking up and speaking out. There is a very large academic literature on employee voice and it is typically difficult to articulate concerns about individuals, as compared with articulating concerns with systems. When a concern about somebody behaving in a particularly transgressive way is identified by somebody, they may be met with what's called the "credibility gap" which was identified in the Shipman Inquiry and they may struggle to be heard or to progress the concern.

What's a credibility gap?

The credibility gap is -- typically appears Α. when the issue at hand is so extraordinarily egregious that it is difficult to believe that somebody could have committed it and in the Shipman Inquiry the -- this arose when Dr Linda Reynolds, who was a GP in a surgery neighbouring Shipman's, became concerned at what she saw as an excess of deaths in his practice. She was sufficiently concerned that she went to the Coroner

relate to an emerging or established pattern rather than to a specific, easily defined incident. Such patterns may lead to a generalised sense that things are 'not right', even though each individual incident or signal may be minor."

I just want to ask you about that, the sense that things are not right. We have already heard evidence from parents where their babies died or collapsed, it just didn't feel right, their babies were well, stable, they didn't understand what happened. They didn't know what happened then but it didn't feel right. How does that issue impact on this? What should somebody do when something doesn't feel right?

This is a very challenging problem to deal with. Organisational systems are set up so they tend to deal with things incident by incident. It may be difficult to convert something that is an intuitive sense or an unease into something that an organisation can actually handle. There may not be the -- what we sometimes call the sensors available to listen to that and --

Q. What does that mean, sorry, the sensors available --

Sensors, so we often talk about problem-sensing behaviours, which you see in highly 11

to -- she went -- she reported it and the police investigation that followed was essentially incompetent because it did not consider the possibility that Shipman might be murdering his patients and we see similar challenges in other Inquiries which include the inquiries, for example, into Jimmy Savile and other cases where there is something so extraordinarily egregious that it is at first met with essentially a lack of credulity.

So the credibility gap in your view impacts both on the people who might be witnessing something that doesn't feel right, and also the people responding to that?

Yes, the credibility gap has generally been used to describe the response when somebody first raises the issue.

On page 9 of your report, paragraph 2.2.1, you deal with the certainty that something is wrong and is an occasion for voice and you say:

"Some situations are easily and straightforwardly recognised as sources of concern, for example where there is unequivocal risk or harm or when an egregious injury or violation has already taken place. But many others are fraught with ambiguity. Possible opportunities to speak are more complicated when they

functioning organisations. They are alert to possible signs that something might be going wrong, they are actively seeking information and the metaphor is that they have their sensors turned on, they may have multiple different sensors, they may be listening to signals of soft intelligence, which may come in the form of conversations, it might come in the form of talking to patients, talking to staff on the wards, as well as taking in data streams from hard data which may come from clinical audits and other sources.

So it is very, very difficult to deal with those more inchoate less well formed senses that something is not right and I'm not sure I have a quick solution for it, but one of the things you would see in a high performing organisation is they have that sensor turned on and they begin to look at other sources of data, they will triangulate it, they will look at are there other things happening in this situation, do we have a -- are we having under-reporting of incidents, are we having misclassification of incidents, are we having data from external sources that is giving us some sense of there's something else going on here.

Over the page at page 10, at the end of the top paragraph, you say:

"Concerns related to behaviour or conduct are often

seen as potentially harder to judge and more discomfiting to evidence and to articulate."

In a healthcare setting, again probably not a straightforward answer, but how can that be achieved if there is an uncomfortable situation or a sense of unease in any department, ward, risk assessment? How can that be tackled?

A. Those issues where you've got some amalgam of poor systems and poor behaviour are typically extremely difficult to handle at the moment because they get channeled through different processes, different departments, different procedures of -- for example, a complaints handling process from patients may not have very much to do with an HR process that applies to a staff member. There may be other data coming in from clinical audits and so on. They don't necessarily get synthesised very easily into a single picture and I think that's probably what needs to happen.

If we return to the issue of bad apples I think that's particularly poorly developed, what happens when there's a concern that there may be some transgressive behaviour at hand here. It can be very, very difficult for somebody to raise that issue because they will be readily identifiable very often as the source of the concern. It may be difficult to investigate. People

coming in even when they were on call, leaving doctors who were inexperienced on their own on the ward to handle complex situations, racism, other forms of discriminatory behaviour and when a Head of Midwifery attempted to deal with the situation, a collective grievance was taken out by the staff on the ward and the Head of Midwifery ended up leaving because she was advised it would be -- that essentially her position was untenable, so that situation ended up being unaddressed for several more years.

If we come back to HR issues, again I can talk about it, but issues that are cultural in character are very, very difficult to deal with because HR processes are set up to deal with one individual at a time.

If you have bad apple behaviour it may be difficult to parse out which particular individual is responsible and you may have a cluster of bad apples in a particular situation. One bad apple we know from the research literature tends to have a very bad effect on the whole group, when they -- when you get a kind of cluster together, it's really very adverse.

- **Q.** Tell us more about that, the bad apple effect on those in the barrel, when it is transgressive behaviour?
 - A. The bad apple effect has been studied

may be reluctant to come forward. There may be all kinds of challenges with taking this forward.

Q. You deal with it later -- and we will come to it later -- when you address HR issues, but you raise the issue of confidentiality complicating this, so if there were concerns about transgressive behaviour that need investigating how can that be adequately addressed if there's such a tight confidentiality ring?

A. I think it's very, very difficult to address in the present legal environment that applies to HR issues because they are governed by processes that are designed for employment in general and not for dealing with patient safety issues, so Trusts are beholden to that set of laws and requirements when something has entered into an HR process and, as we saw from, say, East Kent, the investigation there was very clear that the HR processes essentially deferred dealing effectively with what was a very poor culture and a poor environment on the maternity units there.

Q. Can you just succinctly summarise for us what that issue was?

A. The issues there were egregious bullying, poor behaviour towards colleagues, poor behaviour towards patients, poor behaviour in relation to professional responsibilities, so, for example, Consultants not

extensively by psychologists who have done experiments where they have done things like put somebody into a group situation and they have been briefed to behave badly in particular ways. An example might be that they basically withhold their labour, so they let others do all the work and they sit back, but another example might be being very hostile or aggressive towards others, and when you do those experiments you see that the teams that have a bad apple in them perform much less well, they express much more anxiety, they demonstrate huge effects in terms of group cohesion and so on. So it's really important to deal with the bad apple problem, but I'm not sure the way the NHS is set up at the moment is able to do that as effectively as it needs to.

Q. And is your concern in that employment context that there's no patient at the centre, or child safeguarding at the centre?

A. Once it enters into an employment process there may be concerns to address the issue because it's got a patient safety component, or it's got a child at the centre of it, but it's governed by a whole lot of different processes. The people involved may be supported by their unions and the focus switches to essentially protecting the Trust from legal risk

associated with Employment Tribunals or other outcomes of an HR process.

- **Q.** Further down on the same page, at 2.3, you refer to patient safety and the problem of many hands. What do you mean "The problem of many hands"?
- A. The problem of many hands describes a situation where there is no shortage of actors or agencies or bodies in a situation, but where there's no -- it's very difficult to identify who was responsible and this can happen at a system level, so you have multiple bodies that are intended to supervise or set standards for a particular area, but it's hard to compile all of that information into a single synthetic overview of the area.

This was called out -- I'm not sure if that exact term was used, but Sir Robert Francis identified it in his report into the Mid Staffordshire disaster and what was happening there was lots of information about things going very badly wrong, but not compiled into a single picture and not clear whose job it was to take action. You do get something of the same kind of thing happening within organisations itself. As we said earlier, there may be some unease, there may be some concern, but who it is that is responsible for taking action may be less clear.

A. That's not a straightforward question to answer because healthcare isn't responsible, for example, for much of the legislation governing employment, so of itself it can't resolve that. I do believe that we need a review and consultation on how employment law works in healthcare situations and other situations where there is a lot of exposure to risk of public harm.

When attempts have been made to reduce what were called arm's length bodies they have sometimes stripped out functions that were actually extremely useful at the time and it got lost as they have been absorbed into other bodies, so I would be reluctant to comment specifically on what we could do to rationalise the situation. It clearly does need to be rationalised. Whether that involves reducing the number of bodies or whether it requires some kind of overview to address that issue I'm less clear about, but it would require a programme of review and consultation to come up with the right answer.

- **Q.** And who would be best placed to do that, to do that rationalisation and overview?
- **A.** Structurally it's probably the Department of Health but I think it would need a lot of co-design, consultation and review in order to take it forward.

Q. And you say, just as you have now:

"Healthcare in England is characterised by an exceptional level of institutional complexity. There is no single statute governing healthcare, so services are subject to multiple statutory requirements and sanctions of both a civil and criminal nature."

Standing back from it, is there need for that institutional complexity in your view?

A. The institutional complexity is pretty extreme. Some of it arises from requirements outside of healthcare entirely, for example health and safety legislation, data protection, that's not specific to healthcare. Within healthcare there is institutional complexity because of different legal regimes and different regulatory structures that have set up different bodies.

It's hard to say whether we need that level of complexity but what we do need is coordination and coherence and synthetic overviews so that we don't end up losing information and that there's clarity about whose job it is to take action, whose role it is to take action in a particular circumstance.

Q. How far can the system harmonise regulatory standards or the number and nature of regulators in your view?

Q. Do you think the level and the number of organisations and the attendant bureaucracy that comes with that is suffocating for those working in healthcare settings?

A. What we have in healthcare organisations is a problem we call "priority thickets" which is to say there are so many recommendations, standards, targets, and incentives that they're expected to meet that it becomes very rapidly overwhelming and it crowds out attention to things that may be arising internally or being able to craft their own vision of how the organisation might progress.

Those targets, expectations, priorities, come from multiple sources. They are not prioritised. They often aren't even costed. They require a huge amount of work internal to organisations to turn them into operational reality and I think we are -- it is -- we end up essentially creating -- I'm reluctant to use the term "bureaucratic" because actually an awful lot of what's called bureaucracy is essential, it's essential for accountability, it's essential to produce data, so you do need a functioning bureaucracy in order for health systems to operate, but I don't think we are currently running the health system in a way that makes it easy for those running organisations to be absolutely clear

about what are the priorities and what they should do first, second and third.

Q. In your last paragraph on page 11 you say:

"Too many organisations with a say in providers' activities may also impose significant costs and inefficiencies."

What organisations are you thinking of there?

There are multiple organisations that can issue recommendations, offer suggestions, make requirements to NHS bodies. Sometimes those expectations compete, they conflict, they fail to cohere and they may -- they may make recommendations that require an awful lot of large-scale design that organisations are often ill-equipped to do. So you can get -- without getting into too many names, you can get Care Quality Commission, NHS England, what used to be called Health Education England, which is responsible for training, you can get NHS Resolution. There are multiple bodies operating in the system, probably of the order of about 100, and you have also got bodies like the Health Service Investigation Branch, which has now been renamed, but there are recommendations coming out all the time.

I spoke to one person who runs a maternity unit recently and she has 903 actions that she is supposed to

very serious about patient safety, understands how you do improvement, is very committed, very patient focused and you may have, in fact, a unit right next door that is doing much less well.

Some of that comes down to leadership, some of it comes down to the level of support available, some of it comes down to the ability to have difficult conversations, to offer challenge, and a lot of it comes down to basic workplace conditions which are often quite adverse in the NHS.

Q. You say at the bottom of page 13:

"Cultures are powerfully influenced by structural issues, by features of organisational and institutional systems, and by their broader environments (including the budgetary and policy environment, broadly conceived)."

Can you expand upon that: so what are the impacts of these various features?

A. Some of what we're talking about when we're talking about culture is norms, which is to say the normal way of doing things and you can have a norm which is entirely untethered to structural issues, by which I mean things like IT systems, operational systems, the state of the estate, the facilities, the ability to -- essentially the work system, design how things get moved

be taking forward in her unit. That's not feasible and it's a classic example of priority thickets.

Q. Culture. We asked you about culture in the NHS and what impacted on it and how you would define it at page 13 of your report. You say at paragraph 3:

"A further complexity is that culture is very rarely, if ever, uniform across organisations."

Can you help us with that? How is it that you can end up with pockets of a healthcare setting that perform well and have patients at the centre, and other pockets might not?

A. That's a very, very common finding and it's to do with the way humans behave. Culture is essentially shared ways of doing, thinking, talking, behaving. It's patterned and it is passed essentially down through generations as people are socialised into the way things happen on a particular unit or ward or service line. Culture can also cut across professions. So people may be socialised into a nursing culture, a surgeon culture, an occupational therapist culture, and they have very different ways of doing and saying and thinking about things.

Within a single NHS Trust it is extremely common to get what are called cultural mosaics and you may have one part of the hospital that is doing very well, is

from one section to the next. Some of that doesn't work well in the NHS. Many people have to work in circumstances that are not conducive to good behaviour because they have extremely heavy workloads and the work systems — the structural aspects of their work are hostile essentially to behaving well, so the norms get influenced by that. If there's an expectation you're going to be highly civil to colleagues but you're dealing with a very frustrating environment, you feel that you're not valued, you feel that every step you take involves three steps back in order to get the thing you want done, that norm becomes strongly influenced by the structural environment.

What I think is also important here is that the NHS is a multi-layered institution, it's not a single organisation. Some of the behaviours that you see playing out in organisations essentially are modelled on behaviours that are external to NHS organisations, they're coming from the centre, they're coming from the Government, they're coming from the national bodies who don't -- at least historically have not always behaved particularly well towards their colleagues in the provider organisations. It can be very aggressive and that can then be seen as a norm that gets passed down again.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- You say at page 14 at the end of the second paragraph where you refer to staffing shortages, that they can reduce.
- "... teams' ability to notice and react to small signs of safety deterioration and affect their capacity for debriefing, mentoring and informal knowledge-sharing which are all important to maintaining a culture of learning, teamwork and cooperation."

That largely speaks for itself, but teamwork, identifying that, how important is teamwork in a healthcare setting, or on any unit or ward?

Teamwork is absolutely indispensable and it is one of those words that sounds a bit fluffy but in fact we can show experimentally the impact it has on outcomes and it requires that the team has very clear understanding of each other's roles, the tasks they need to do, the ways they need to communicate with each other and the -- essentially standards of behaviours. They need to be really clear about the goals they're trying to achieve and they need to be learning all the time, so every time something goes wrong they need to be figuring out how to do it well.

When we have looked at very high performing teams there are a very characteristic set of things that they are doing and that will include preparation in advance

If you have a situation where there are huge production pressures, so people are under enormous demand from patient acuity, from workload pressures, it is tragically sometimes the case that training and that kind of teamwork work is the first thing to go and people aren't making time for it.

- And in those best examples that you refer to was there a consistency of team members or was that not a variable or did you not examine that?
- Multi-disciplinary training for emergencies typically will involve a situation where the team don't know each other. They have essentially been improvised for the situation so you have to know how to behave, you have to know what the tasks are, you have to know how to communicate when you come together in an emergency.

Our colleagues who have done this kind of training, say in maternity, have shown huge improvements in outcomes of problems like shoulder dystocia where people are trained in this way and using simulation, using high quality debriefing, it's absolutely clear what they're going to do and that problem has largely -- I wouldn't say disappeared, but it is massively improved from where it was 15 years ago because of that kind of intervention.

We don't see unfortunately that kind of teamwork at

27

of a shift, it will include debriefing afterwards, there will be a very clear way of handling something that didn't go as well as it should. Very importantly there will be multi-disciplinary training so it's always clear what is happening and why and you will see that they are using very powerful techniques like simulation, so they will be given a scenario and taken through that in the equivalent of real-time --

Q. Is that in the NHS you have seen that demonstrated?

This would be in the NHS. This is uneven but in the highest performing units this is what they're doing and it will be exactly like the way you train emergency responders. They -- you can't make up what you need to do in an emergency situation, you have to be absolutely prepared for it, so you prepare for that by doing simulations, so people are clear about the tasks that they need to do, they're clear about who is going to do them, they're clear about how they are going to communicate with each other while they're doing them and then they debrief afterwards because the simulation will never go perfectly but much better it goes imperfectly in a simulation situation rather than in a real one and they will learn from that, so the debriefing is very important.

26

board level, which we might come back to a bit later.

We will. You say at paragraph 3.1.3:

"As a general principle, 'the broader environment within which organisations operate emits powerful injunctions about what they should look like and what they should be doing'. This is especially true in the NHS, where the wider institutional contexts have major influence on culture in provider organisations through budget setting, directions and guidance, priority setting and regulation ..."

I want to link this to safeguarding, if I may. When we were first looking for experts to help us in this area of patient safety and particularly safeguarding of children, or child protection, we were met with a number of people saying that safeguarding wasn't their area of expertise, patient safety was. First of all does that resonate with you and is it seen as somebody else's problem and all to do with parents harming children rather than potentially staff?

Thank you and I would say I know a lot about patient safety and quality of care and much less about safeguarding. That may just reflect my particular field of work, but I think it's probably fair to say safeguarding and patient safety are not -- patient safety management are not as well integrated as they

could and should be.

Q. And one question arising from what you say at 3.1.3 is how might the importance of safeguarding children be reflected in governance models, assurance models and budgets? Would it help if it was reflected that children deserve a particular attention or protection under safeguarding rules and guidance?

A. I think that's fair and one of the -- going back to our discussion about priority setting earlier -- sorry, priority thickets, unless something is signalled to organisations as something they need to be paying attention to, unless it's very, very clear that this is an injunction about how they need to give priority to it, it is likely to fall down the priority list and there have been complaints over many years that maternity and neonatology were Cinderella areas, they weren't necessarily on the top of the board's agendas because of the kinds of things that were prioritised in the NHS. I think things have improved particularly in neonatology quite significantly in the last few years.

Q. In what way?

A. Many of the things that we have seen in terms of the introduction of the Perinatal Mortality tool, the Child Death Review process, the national audit, the databases and so on, I think we have actually seen quite

aspect of how humans process information and culture and I will be very happy to talk through how that may influence the recognition of a patient safety risk.

Q. Can I ask you this first of all: how would good -- how does good communication between colleagues assist with this? If people at the top don't know what's going on, there's a number of ways that can be approached, isn't it, what people are saying to them and also how they're listening, what they're asking about, their curiosity. So what do you say about the need for communication to prevent institutional secrecy?

A. Institutional secrecy is endemic to organisations. There isn't going to be -- this is a feature of the way organisations operate because not all information can go to the top of the organisation, it's got to be organised so that you're dealing with things at different levels, so it's an inevitable feature of how organisations are organised.

What you do need is systems that are able to pick out issues of concern. We actually don't have a shortage of signals being sent through organisations. There are thousands and thousands of patient safety incidents reported to the NHS every day. There are thousands and thousands, about a quarter of a million, of patient complaints per year. What is very difficult

significant improvements number of those areas in recent years, last seven to eight years.

Q. Can I ask you now about institutional secrecy, at page 17 of your report. First of all, perhaps if you could just give us a definition of institutional secrecy?

A. The term is my own and I have adapted it from a phenomenon called structural secrecy which was described in the analysis of the Challenger disaster and structural secrecy, which arose in the context of NASA, was used by the sociologist Diane Vaughan to explain how information can become hidden through the way systems are organised and that's a very useful idea. What happened in the Challenger disaster was that information that was important to understanding that this -- that there were risks in the design of the space shuttle did not essentially bubble up or surface in the approach taken.

I prefer to use the term "institutional secrecy" in the context of the NHS and it has two components. One of them is the way structures and systems function and that will tend to suppress some information because of the way they're handled, but the second is -- the second very important component here is human sense-making and culture, so there's a systems component and there's an

is to work out which of those is one that you need to be concerned about in the sense of taking immediate action to safeguard people and the volume is not the issue, but there are aspects of culture that may -- and organisational sense-making that may obstruct recognition of an unusual transgressive problem in particular.

Q. What aspects obstruct?

A. Doctors will say with diseases there's a kind of natural history to them, so something like a mole, you know how that's going to evolve if you don't intervene to deal with it.

So the first thing is that there is a way of making the concern known that people can speak about it, they can be heard about it. The second is the way that's processed, whether that's heard, whether it's classified as being a signal.

The third will be the priority given to it and then the fourth is the action taken in response and none of this is very easy actually, so a characteristic thing that might happen is that somebody raised a concern about a systems issue which might be understaffing, it might be corridor care and the organisation is unable or essentially it isn't able to make the improvement that's sought. Some of the issues that are raised may be not

appropriate for a huge organisational response, but may be very important to the person, they may have interpersonal difficulties and so on.

With a highly unusual -- going back to our conversation at the beginning, highly unusual situation involving transgressive behaviour by an individual, there is a pattern -- a fairly well understood pattern -- of how that's going to develop, which we know from studies of disasters in other areas. So what will happen is there is an accumulating set of warning signs and soft signals. There may be information coming in from other sources. There may be all kinds of -- to go back to our -- the sensors may be picking up different kinds of things and it may be some time before people begin to recognise that there is something amiss here.

What can happen is that the people who are responsible for taking action judge them inappropriately and that may happen for a reason, so for normal human sense-making. They may not recognise the pattern, they may classify it as something else and when they classify it as something else, for example as some sort of interpersonal dispute or an HR issue, they enter into something called cultural entrapment which is very difficult to escape from. They keep understanding the issue in the same way, they keep applying the same

--

In teamwork, when we study this in healthcare, when you're training a team in how to handle an emergency, we know that there's a problem called loss of situation awareness which has been found in every high stress human endeavour, including the aviation industry. So loss of situation awareness means you forget how to --you get trapped in your first understanding of the situation and when healthcare teams are being trained this is a known risk, so you train them what to do, which will include, for example, having somebody else on the team to offer a challenge. You train them that this is a problem they're going to fall into and you have various processes so you can essentially release them from getting stuck with that.

We do not have an equivalent for something that's unfolding over a longer time at board level or senior executive level or managerial level. They may not realise that they're stuck in this loop of the first understanding unless something disrupts it.

Q. Can we go to page 19 of your report, "normalisation of deviance". You say in the penultimate paragraph:

"Over time, these challenges can mean that a phenomenon known as 'normalisation of deviance', described by ... Vaughan ... emerges. Normalisation of

actions and it's not disrupted unless something else happens.

Now, in --

Q. Pausing there, what's the important of reflection then for most people assessing any information, particularly information of concern, to be reflective and thoughtful about what you're doing with that?

A. Yes, that will be very important but I also think -- so what I'm describing, cultural entrapment, these normal heuristics and biases is what explains why this happens and this can happen anywhere, any time. This is normal behaviour and I think understanding this will be helpful for preventing the next disaster of this nature in the sense that this isn't necessarily bad people, this is people getting trapped in a normal process of sense-making.

Where it becomes pathological is when people are also -- when that is overlayered with denial, defensiveness, inability to accept challenge and that's what we saw, for example, with East Kent. There were multiple signs that things were going very badly wrong there, but people kept -- the senior level of the organisation kept interpreting it as unhelpful criticism, hostility, et cetera, et cetera.

.3

deviance occurs when people within an organisation become desensitised to a deviant practice or behaviour that it is no longer recognised as deviant. It can ... 'neutralise signals of danger, enabling people to conform to institutional and organisational mandates even when personally objecting to a line of action'."

Do you want to expand before I ask you a question about that?

A. Sure. I think this is a very useful phrase and again was -- emerged in the context of the analysis of the NASA disasters and again it's a common finding in healthcare settings that you get normalisation of deviance. You may have some very poor conduct, very poor behaviour, and over time it becomes accepted as "just the way things happen around here", "just the way he behaves or she behaves", and people end up -- it becomes extremely difficult to raise challenge in a situation where everybody else seems to think this is the normal way of carrying on.

Q. And is that linked to futility of voice: there's no point saying anything because it will carry on?

A. Voice futility is another problem. The normalisation of deviance means that people actually become desensitised to the fact that this is actually

terrible behaviour, they just accept the way it is. If they -- and that may prevent them ever speaking up about it because it is just accepted as normal. If they do speak up, the voice futility issue kicks in, sometimes because the way it is handled through an HR process means they're never told what the outcome is, sometimes because the Trust doesn't appear to fix the problem, which might be a systems issue, and it may also kick in when the issue that they're raising in fact isn't the issue that they think it is, it's when you --

Q. Can understaffing -- sorry, have you finished there? Can understaffing and care backlogs in paediatric services attribute to normalisation of deviance?

A. Yes, we know this. Production pressures is what Diane Vaughan calls them in the context of normalisation of deviance, people start cutting corners, they start to do things in a perhaps sloppier way than -- essentially to get through them quickly, and the same thing happens in NHS contexts where there isn't enough resource, where the systems are poorly designed, where the staffing isn't equal to the demands of the clinical workload. Again, you get tolerance of standards that really aren't appropriate.

LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: I seem to have a memory

up and be confident that they will be heard and not be gaslighted or not be criticised or not be treated as ridiculous if they do say something. I'm not sure that is fully understood or fully operationalised throughout the NHS, either at board level or in the bodies that interact with boards.

Q. So what -- let's start with boards. What helps a board to support that concept, that people can speak up? What should they be doing to enable that?

A. That's described in the psychological safety as leadership inclusiveness and it's demonstrating a willingness to hear, so offering the floor, being open to challenge, when somebody says something, respecting it, thanking them for it, being open to criticism and really quite specific behaviours that leaders need to demonstrate when somebody is offering discomfiting information.

Q. And what about thinking about how the information is received by a board, because there might be formal processes, but being open to different routes of receiving information, speaking to different people, are they examples?

A. They are examples. We do have a problem that there is only so much bandwidth that boards have and they may be receiving packs of 600 pages of papers for

of -- was there a CQC report quite recently which talked about normalisation?

A. Yes, yes.

LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: That was in the context of maternity services, I think.

A. Yes.

MS LANGDALE: Psychological safety, page 20 of your report. You say in the last paragraph:

"When staff feel able to speak up without fear of retaliation or embarrassment, share ideas and ask questions, it can help to foster a culture of openness, improve team performance, and, in turn, help to improve performance and the safety of the service.

Psychological safety can enable people to raise concerns about their patients, report adverse events, and to communicate across professional boundaries."

How can senior managers and boards contribute to this issue?

A. Psychological safety is a very important concept and actually was originally developed in the context of neonatal units in the US and it is exactly as you describe it, so people feel safe in speaking up. It doesn't mean that there is a niceness going on and it doesn't mean that everything people say has got to be treated as gold, but it does mean that people can speak

each board meeting. They may be confronted with multiple priorities coming in from multiple sources and the capacity to listen to things that may be poorly formulated, poorly formed, still inchoate senses may be correspondingly reduced. I think we have to again accept that there's a reality here about how much boards can deal with, so the act of speaking up is very important and it's very important that that's happening at all levels. What I would expect to see in a well run organisation is that there's an openness to what we call soft intelligence and that once there is a concern about something that that is being escalated through the right kinds of routes, so it is made known to the board rather than being suppressed lower down because those lower down in the organisation will be aware that if they have escalated something, they should be treated seriously.

Q. And in the end is this all about people, whether they're senior managers or board members? You and I might receive the same information, we might have different questions arising from this that information or responses, that that does happen? Do you see that in any of your reviews of what has happened in some of the high functioning units, for example, and some less functioning units?

A. Some of it is very much about people and we 40

have characterised that board behaviours in it particular tend to be on a spectrum from what we call comfort-seeking, and these will be behaviours that are orientated towards finding the best possible version of any story, through to problem sensing where the board is actively looking for discomfiting information, it welcomes being told about problems, it wants to know where the issues are and it's seeking to support improvement.

It is very much about people but it is also about systems and capacities. When you see an organisation that's struggling, they very often are struggling because they have very limited capacity for improvement, so when yet another issue lands on their -- in their 600 pages of board papers, it's -- they're exhausted, they have no way of actually making the problem better and so they might just try to make it go away and I think again that's something we haven't necessarily got right yet with how organisations that are struggling are supported to improve.

- **Q.** How can the RCPCH, the Royal College of Nursing and other membership organisations help to build a culture of psychological safety?
- **A.** They can do that in several ways, but I think it's also probably worth recognising that the two bodies

producing clinical guidance in particular areas and they will typically be synthesising evidence from particular evidence and saying this is what the service should look like and this is the standards of care that might apply.

They also have a very important role in developing people as leaders and showing what professional duties look like, what professional responsibilities might entail, role modelling those qualities and many of the Royal Colleges, including the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health, run quality improvement programmes that seek to support people in making improvements in specific clinical areas, so the Royal Colleges have a very important role because they are the sort of professional voice and also set the kind of professional expectations for a particular area.

- **Q.** Do you think there should be a separate framework for patient safety covering neonatal units or one framework covering all paediatric neonates?
- A. I'm not a neonatal specialist. You need a patient safety framework that covers everything, that is generic. The standards that apply in a neonatal unit and in a paediatric ward are likely to be different in the sense that you're doing different things, the care of people -- the care of people and families is going to be different and so we have traditionally had different

you have listed are of different types. So the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health is a medical Royal College and it's not allowed to be a trade union. It's purely a professional body that there's to promote professional standards and has a role in assuring registration of doctors as paediatricians, that -- essentially in setting examples and admitting them to the profession.

The Royal College of Nursing has a dual status. It is both a trade union and a professional body and there may be a question about whether those two roles are necessarily in comfortable -- a comfortable duality. I think they can -- those kinds of bodies have a very important role in promoting psychological safety. They may be able to help their members and fellows with understanding their responsibilities as leaders and they may be able potentially to help with sense-checking whether a concern is a concern.

- **Q.** Focusing on the Royal College, what more could the Royal College do to support safety in paediatrics or neonatal care?
 - A. Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health?
 - Q. Yes.
- **A.** The Royal Colleges have a very important set of responsibilities. Some of those are to do with

audits and traditional standards that apply, so I think you probably do need a framework that applies -- that has generic components and is bespoke to the specifics of clinical settings.

Q. You start at page 24, but perhaps we can put up page 25, "What good looks like for culture in healthcare organisations" and particularly you move on to neonatal units.

First of all, what would you define as a healthy culture? You have said what impacts on culture, but what's a healthy culture, or in some of the high functioning units that have done the teamwork, synthesisations that you refer to, what is the culture, how would you describe it?

A. We think there are probably eight features of a very healthy culture. One of those is being very clear about what you're there for, what the goals are, what are the values driving you, what constitutes inclusive, respectful and safe care. In a neonatal unit that's going to include respect for patients and their families and respect for colleagues.

A second feature is going to be clarity about the standards of service and of practice, so everybody is clear about what it is that the standards are that they are expected to deliver on. Those standards come in 44

from multiple sources but people in the unit will know this is the standard of care we provide, here is what that looks like.

A third feature is going to be very consistently reinforced standards of behaviour and conduct and that's very important in terms of culture, that there isn't tolerance of bad behaviour, there isn't tolerance of rudeness towards patients, towards families, isn't rudeness towards colleagues, there is an absence of racist and discriminatory behaviour.

Fourth feature would be optimised teamwork, team communication and coordination and that's going to look like teams that function very well in terms of having shared goals, clarity about the tasks that they're going to deliver and coordination and ability to deal with the inevitable conflict that occurs in teams.

A fifth feature will be the orientation towards problem sensing and voice and nurturing of conditions for psychological safety which we have been discussing.

A sixth is having effective systems of clinical governance, the ability to monitor quality and safety of care and good systems for risk management.

A seventh is highly effective operational and clinical systems, so people are working in conditions that enable them to do their best work, and the final

about the -- what the teams are there for. You need to be working on the -- making sure that the conditions people are working in, the management systems and so on, are good. You need to have an absolute clarity about how you're handling poor behaviours. You need to be very clear about the clinical standards and making sure that all of those are engineered essentially so people can achieve them.

You need to have the capacity to have many, many many, many conversations, many of them difficult in nature, so the ability to offer challenge but also very importantly to reward and respect differences of opinion.

You need to be role-modelling how to accept challenge and you need to have very strong training in place and a capacity built in for reflection, debriefing and figuring out how to do better. I could probably talk all afternoon, so I will stop there.

Q. You have referred to debriefing, as you did earlier, with staff shortages and the difficulties around mentoring. What is the importance of debriefing, reflection, discussion, learning?

A. That's really essential. So if an incident has occurred it is often quite impactful for the staff and for -- as well as for obviously the families and the

one is leadership and management.

Q. You set out at page 26 at the end about how you might change safety culture. What's required to change the safety culture in neonatal care and how can it be done?

A. On page 26?

Q. Yes.

A. Are we looking at the same page?

Q. Yes, you begin:

"Research specifically on healthy cultures in neonatal care has been relatively limited ... a US study identified ..."

Et cetera and you continue there. I'm not inviting you particularly to read parts of that section, but just in considering, as you have there, how change to some of the things that you have pointed out, the teamwork, the goals, clarity of standards, practice -- you have set it out clearly. How can that be achieved where it is not taking place?

A. Thank you. That is a very long-term project and it requires multiple interventions and multiple things to be done, so if you're going to tackle something like an adverse culture you need to start with a diagnosis of what the challenges are. You're going to need very strong leadership that is absolutely clear

patient who is affected. If you're doing debriefing it means you have a structured way of doing that that's safe so people can learn from it and then you're producing the improvement that's needed for fixing it for the next time, so the debriefing is really essential as part of a learning culture.

Q. Of course it requires time, doesn't it?

A. It does, yes.

Q. Time and energy from staff, leaders and generally?

A. Yes.

Q. Page 45 you start and address the topic "Problems in HR systems in the NHS and the influence of the wider institutional and legal environment". You touched on it earlier, particularly page 47, paragraph 4 beginning "NHS organisations often experience a high level of HR issues ..."

So page 47, paragraph -- it will come up for everyone else in a moment, Professor, but would you like to set out and provide examples -- you clearly referred to one earlier with East Kent, there may be others -- of why you say this has become burdensome and the difficulties from a patient perspective with the HR processes and procedures?

A. Sure. So HR processes are handled in the NHS 48

through HR departments who are variably well resourced and variably well staffed and they have to operate complex procedures which will typically involve coordination with other parts of the hospital.

Typically an issue will appear on the ward or in the office and eventually be escalated to an HR department. By that time it may already have become quite difficult. Many people who are line managers in the NHS are not necessarily trained for the task and they are what are called "accidental managers", so they may have already mishandled it by the time it gets through to the HR Department. Once the HR Department gets involved they have to operate according to the expectations of ACAS and they are typically very much focused on ensuring procedural propriety in the handling of the complaint.

These complaints -- or the issue -- so there's basically two types of things that they might end up handling: one is a disciplinary issue where somebody is thought to be engaged in poor conduct or behaviour, and the second is a grievance where somebody has raised a complaint against the employer. There are different procedures that may be activated depending on which of those it is and those procedures are variable and variably well designed and can consume enormous amounts

A. Well, yes, they are handled through HR departments and they are focused on essentially ensuring employment -- compliance with the expectations governing that process.

The Trust may have very legitimate patient safety concerns or concerns about bullying, harassment, et cetera, et cetera, but they may become subordinated to the handling of this process and I give the example of an individual at a hospital that over 15 years was subject to nine separate investigations relating to their conduct. They were eventually dismissed. They appealed but they still work -- but the unit where they were working declined to have them returned, so the Trust eventually dismissed the person and they went to an Employment Tribunal which did find in favour of the Trust but that went on over many, many years, consumed a huge amount of executive level time and the process was very legitimate in the sense that it followed all of the correct procedures but it was extremely difficult to deal with the behaviour and the conduct. The representation for the doctor meant that there were -it took a very long time and what we saw at East Kent, as reported by Bill Kirkup, was that the Trust felt completely powerless to act against the Consultants because they felt that if they did take them to

of people's time to operate them and if it concludes with disciplinary action against an employee, it can involve all kinds of other challenges. The unions may get involved or other representatives and the Trust may become extremely focused on avoiding progression to an Employment Tribunal.

The reasons they are keen not to go to Employment Tribunals is because of the costs involved which often can run into hundreds of thousands of pounds of legal costs for them, tying up of executive time and very uncertain outcomes of Employment Tribunals themselves, so what they may do is move towards a settlement agreement, so essentially they settle with the employee, which means that it doesn't go to an Employment Tribunal but the Trust reaches a deal essentially with the employee. So they exit the organisation, sometimes with a payment, sometimes with an agreed reference, and the problem from the perspective of the original employer has been handled, but that person may then be picked up elsewhere in the NHS without the record following them.

Q. You said at the beginning you are not obviously an expert in employment law but where is the gap? What's not being considered in those situations if it is taking a great deal of time and there's investigations and taking people off other tasks?

a tribunal they would probably lose.

Q. Can you look please at page 48 at the top, paragraph 4.5.1.

A. Yes.

Q. You refer to the ACAS guidance and you say:

"Some NHS organisations interpret this as meaning that those raising concerns must speak to the person they are complaining about in the first instance, before any further action is taken."

Then you say:

"A different challenge is that those who are the subject of concerns may take advantage of organisational processes, perhaps using HR procedures strategically, for example by introducing delays and deflections, making counter grievances or claims of discrimination, perhaps supported by their trade union ..."

Do you want to expand on that?

A. Yes. So first, employment law and protecting employees is important and it's important nothing I say is interpreted as meaning that we shouldn't protect employees, but it is like drugs, everything that is overall good can also have side-effects or a dark side and that's some of what we're seeing here, so one of the ways -- and this showed up in the East Kent report. If you're obliged in the first instance, if you have got

a concern about somebody, to discuss it with them first that may be a very powerful disincentive to raising it because you're then revealed as the person who has the concern and you may just then create a very difficult working environment.

A different challenge is that people who are actually behaving badly may be able to engage in all kinds of counterclaims, grievances, they may be strategically advised by their union representatives on what to do in order that they essentially don't end up with a disciplinary outcome. So these are very complex problems that NHS organisations are having to deal with.

- **Q.** So you think the grievance can be used to prevent a disciplinary outcome, getting a grievance in first?
 - A. Definitely.

- **Q.** And do you have experience or examination of cases dealing with that?
- A. This is exactly what happened in the East Kent situation. The people involved took out a collective grievance against the Trust and the Trust then essentially dropped their action and failed to deal with the bullying and other transgressive behaviours on that unit
 - **Q.** On the question of bullying you use the phrase 53

LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: Thank you, Ms Langdale.

Professor Dixon-Woods, we're going to take a break of 15 minutes, so we will start at 25 to 12. Thank you very much.

(11.18 am)

(Short Break)

(11.34 am)

MS LANGDALE: Professor Dixon-Woods, if we can go to page 92, please, of your report and at paragraph 8.2 you refer to improvement programmes in neonatology and you refer to The Vermont Oxford Network in the US and the Getting It Right First Time, an NHS national programme. Can you tell us about those two different models, compare and contrast, and tell us what we can learn from them?

A. Thank you. The Vermont Oxford Network I have given as an example of a collaborative approach to quality improvement that's been used in the US and this has been very successful in securing improvement in a number of outcomes over the last 30 years or so, including, for example, reduced mortality. It's doing that through a combination of things, one is very high quality data that it is using to monitor quality of care, the second is having high quality solutions that it is proposing to its members and providing support for

at page 49, the top paragraph, of "bullying up". Can you expand on that and what you mean by that?

- A. Bullying up -- we often think of bullying as being bullying of more junior people or people lower down in the organisational hierarchy. What you can also get is bullying up, where essentially people are bullying their bosses or others and they may do that by making allegations against them, claiming that they are racist, claiming that they are harassing, or claiming that they're not listening and that's a very, very difficult problem to deal with, which again we don't have a very good process for doing.
- **Q.** What do you mean "we don't have a good process" for dealing with that?
- A. There's a kind of impatience with the boss claiming that they are being bullied from below and it's not -- you know, HR issues are not easy to deal with anyway, but this one is adding complexity to it.
- **Q.** Because we're ready to see the doctors are the ones who are arrogant, perhaps, from previous inquiries or understanding of events and not ready to think that other groups could be combative or difficult from --
 - A. I think that's fair, yes.

MS LANGDALE: My Lady, I see the time. I think this might be a good time to stop for the morning break?

implementation, and the third thing is nurturing of highly collaborative approach to doing that improvement, so there's an ethos of learning together, sharing together and working together to achieve shared goals.

I gave that example because all of the evidence from the research we do on quality improvement and improving quality and safety generally suggests that those three components are the key elements of a successful improvement system. You need to have the excellence of data, you need to have -- data and analytics, I should say.

- Q. Why do you say data and analytics?
- A. Because you can collect as much data as you want but if you haven't got the analytic expertise to interpret it correctly, you don't get anywhere and the NHS tends to be low on analytic capability.
 - Q. Is that people, analytics by people?
- A. Yes, yes
 - **Q.** So data sends a signal, gives you an alert and then you need people to interrogate it and see what it means?
 - **A.** What you would be typically doing is collecting a lot of data, say, on -- an example would be something like infection rates and you might want to check are your infection rates going up or down over

time. You can't tell that necessarily just by eyeballing a graph, you need to use specific statistical techniques to detect whether you are getting something that's unusual or not, and that's not necessarily a skill clinicians are going to have, they will need people with data analytics expertise to make sure the data is clean and to apply the correct statistical techniques so you don't draw the wrong conclusion.

In the UK we have a very large infrastructure of clinical audits, about 30 of them run by the Healthcare Quality Improvement Partnership which is funded by NHS England and they run things like MBRRACE, which I referred to extensively in my report, and the National Neonatal Audit Programme.

They typically collect the data from the Trusts and then feed it back again. What they don't have typically is an improvement architecture that goes around that, so it's left up to the units to make that improvement themselves and they are variably capable of doing so.

So the Vermont Oxford Network I think does combine the three elements I think you need and that's data and analytics, the ability to come up with what look like good solutions and a collaborative approach to doing it.

So the national audits are a very underappreciated element of the NHS, they are a very important resource,

improvement.

Again, GIRFT as it is called, Getting It Right First Time, it doesn't necessarily have a huge improvement architecture around it, it's meant to be --

- Q. Sorry, a huge ... I didn't hear that?
- **A.** Getting It Right First Time is the name of the programme.
 - Q. You said it didn't have a huge ...
- **A.** It doesn't have a big improvement architecture associated with it; again, it is assumed that the Trust will largely make that improvement themselves. They do make recommendations to national bodies but the improvement work is expected to be done by the units.

There has been one cycle that I know of in neonatology which was in 2020 and that, for example, identified a lot of issues to do with the then use of the Perinatal Mortality Reporting Tool.

- **Q.** Is this a voluntary take-up for Trusts or a requirement, or don't you know?
- **A.** I don't think it's voluntary but it's not a programme on which I'm fully an expert so that would need to be checked.
- **Q.** But do you think improvement programmes designed specifically for neonatology is a very positive way forward to improve neonatology?

but we don't necessarily have the improvement support around it to make the most of the data that we have and while we used to have a lot of collaboration based programmes, they disappeared largely over the last ten years or so.

Q. Can you give me examples of the ones that have disappeared that you thought were effective, or it's unfortunate that they have disappeared, to say the least?

A. Yes, so examples were the cancer collaboratives did very good work and they were defunded effectively and have largely disappeared. I'm not an expert on those so we would need to check what I have said is correct, but my understanding is that they do not exist in the form that they used to.

Getting It Right First Time is a national programme that is -- uses many of the techniques that we -- that are likely to be effective. What they do is they compile a package of data about an individual service and a specialist team goes in and presents that data to the service and explains how they sit within comparator Trusts and so on, and the idea is that that's meant to give insight into where the Trust might be particularly an outlier, where it might be doing well and that they are stimulated to come up with a programme of

What we see in any area where you have secured improvement is that you need something that's very specific to that specialty and that service line and there are very specific features you then have to have built into an improvement programme and one of the things that's very important is that there is some sense of what needs to be standardised nationally and what you can safely leave up to the units to do for themselves and one of the things we see with improvement programmes that don't work is that they leave too much up to the units to do themselves, so an example is in maternity there is a very sensible principle that you should be monitoring the mother to detect whether there are any signs of deterioration and you can do this using structured tools which are called early warning scores. When these were first introduced in the NHS it was left up to every maternity unit to do it for themselves, so we now have 147 different Maternity Early Warning Scores and they vary in terms of the thresholds, the scoring, the actions that are going to be triggered, they vary in terms of things that are going to be counted as even things as basic as a fever, and this is not a very sensible way of doing things because you have different standards in different units and basically people are not getting the same care.

So NHS England has now taken that programme over and is now introducing a national Obstetric Early Warning Score but really you might think an improvement programme could have done that from the beginning and what we know from the work we do is that if you co-design that with the staff and very importantly with the families, with the patients, you can get to something that is a good solution and that is nationally agreed and then the job is implementation rather than having to design the whole thing from scratch individually every single time.

So there are very specific things that you can do if you do improvement work on a large scale, if you do the co-design work really carefully right at the beginning.

Q. Moving on to "Defining an effective senior manager, including leadership qualities and behaviours". At page 95 of your report, you set out at 9.2 qualities. Can I ask you first of all what you mean by a senior manager here?

A. The term "senior manager" is widely used but it's not always clear what it means. An NHS Trust will typically have a board which comprises Non-Executive Directors and these are people who are not employed by the Trust, they are external parties who come in to help

behaviours and the commitment to dealing with transgressive behaviours are all-important. The demonstration of leadership inclusiveness, so you are nurturing psychological safety. The skills to interpret soft intelligence in an intelligent way and use it alongside the other datastreams that you're going to have coming in and I think the commitment to improving workplace conditions in so far as you possibly can is vital.

I think the other thing I would say is the commitment to good management cannot be underestimated. We have had more than a decade of denigrating NHS managers as being essentially non-productive and pushing things to the frontline, about you an awful lot of what we're describing requires a huge amount of management resource to handle HR issues, to work with data, to understand how to interpret it, to set up audits, all of that is very demanding of managerial time and if the managers -- we don't know, but if the managers aren't there to do it, the clinical staff are too busy clinically to do it and that's where you start getting degradation.

Q. And of course some of these roles that you have identified, medical directors, clinical directors, are doctors, practising doctors?

with the running of the Trust and they might be from multiple different backgrounds, and then they will have Executive Directors and that will typically include the Director of Nursing, the Director of the -- the Medical Director, the Chief Executive Officer, the Chief Financial Officer and so on. So they comprise the board and they are sometimes referred to as the "Senior Management Team".

In reality you are going to have lots of other people who function as senior managers in the NHS and they will include clinical directors, these are people who lead large clinical departments, and so on down through the structure of directorates.

I don't personally find the term "senior manager" very helpful if we're not clear about exactly who we are talking about.

Q. I suppose the leadership and management at any level there should be some fundamental core skills or attributes that do well across the board?

A. That's right. Exactly.

Q. So what would you choose to highlight from page 95 or perhaps expand upon why you say some of these goals, clarities are important?

A. I think probably all of these are important. I think the behaviours and the role modelling of

A. Yes.

Q. How does that -- would you adapt the skills required, are they the same? How does that work in practice for people who have their own clinical practice?

A. The qualities I have identified here I think apply to anybody in a senior role, whether they are at board level or below. I think they are all important.

A clinical director will typically be running a large clinical directorate. Those jobs tend to be quite under-resourced. They might be running it on 12 hours a week and they're expected to deal with every issue that comes at them as well as running their clinical practice as well.

Q. One of the items you have here is "exercises good judgment in selecting priorities for attention and action." Exercise good judgment, is there work that you have done or been involved in in how you learn that exercising good judgment?

A. Not directly. What we do know is that if you look at, say, issues that come to the attention of Freedom to Speak Up guardians, they actually deal with a large number of concerns and many of those are not patient safety concerns in the sense that we would understand them, strictly speaking. A lot of them --

a large volume of them are essentially interpersonal conflicts, not getting on with people, not liking the way they do things, issues to do with essentially misalignment over clinical priorities or how to do things.

There is a skill which I don't think we have ever codified about how you essentially figure out this is an unusual incident, or an unusual pattern that I'm hearing about that I need to do something about. I think there are some hints in some of the inquiries we were talking about earlier. In the case of Shipman, for example, Dr Reynolds identified that there was a very unusual pattern to the deaths that she was observing, for example they were mostly women, the deaths were mostly occurring at home, mostly in the afternoon and the patients were found sitting up in their clothes. That's a very, very unusual set of features and the subsequent epidemiological analysis essentially confirmed that, that this was a very unusual pattern.

So that is where you would hope that when something as unusual as that, with such distinctive features is presented to a senior manager, they would recognise that this is kind of out of the ordinary.

We were talking about the example of natural history and a GP would be skilled in telling a mole from

Bill Kirkup's report into East Kent brought it I think very vividly into light, but the whole area of HR practice has received limited attention, either in policy or in practice.

There's a body of literature that demonstrates that if you improve HR and operational management generally you can hugely improve productivity and general performance in organisations.

I think there is some information out there, but I would actually quite like to see a really good study of this area, a proper review and that would incorporate what we already know but I think get the data on this and engage with the people and co-design how the risks could be managed. I think it's a terrifying task for a lot of Trusts at the moment how to handle something like this, because the clarity isn't there about the processes, the procedures and they're dealing with several different imperatives.

- **Q.** And the priorities? Is the process there for dealing with what the priorities are?
 - A. The priorities for?
- **Q**. The priorities of patient safety and providing good care --
 - A. Yes, yes.
 - Q. -- for everyone?

a freckle, or a mole to be worried about from something that is not going to turn into something more malignant and it's a similar skill here which I don't think we yet know how to characterise appropriately.

Q. Moving now to recommendations, page 101, we asked you what recommendations do you think this Inquiry should make in the light of its Terms of Reference under C, a question we have asked across the board for witnesses

10.1.1, you refer to the HR issues that you mentioned earlier and you say:

"A review and consultation on the wider institutional environment relating to employment law and practices and professional regulation should be undertaken to inform an NHS-wide framework for managing this risk."

You said earlier you thought the Department of Health and Social Care were probably the best equipped to do that. Is there already the body of material collected to identify the issues you say are raised in respect of managing disciplinary processes, counter grievances, staffing issues when processes take a long time?

A. Thank you. I feel this is an area that's been significantly understudied and under-recognised.

- **A.** Absolutely. They're dealing with multiple conflicting priorities, imperatives and once it enters into one process it's governed by the expectations, the norms, the laws governing that process so it's possible we need a completely different way of handling the issue of transgressive behaviour.
- **Q.** "Recognise the risks of institutional secrecy".

You say at the end of that paragraph:

"The risks of institutional secrecy are significantly increased when there are comfort-seeking behaviours or instincts towards denial and concealment, so those bodies involved in direction and oversight of NHS provider organisations should be accountable for the possible impacts of their own behaviours, policies and practices and their role in blame games."

Two questions, if I may. Please can you identify which or who those bodies are and how you suggest they should be made more accountable?

A. Thank you. I mean, this goes back to our conversation of earlier when we were talking about comfort-seeking versus problem-sensing behaviours. I think, as I was saying then, institutional secrecy is just a feature of organisations, so I think recognising that it's a challenge and that it needs to be very

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

actively managed would be a very important step forward.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

When you get bodies -- as it would have been at the time -- like Monitor or NHS Improvement that are engaged in behaviours that make it very difficult for leaders to raise concerns or to say that there's something going wrong in their organisation, who are incentivising what might be regarded as gaming, whose own behaviours are bullying, then that leads to a sense that it's not safe for leaders to speak up or to raise a concern. I still think there is an issue that isn't not -- there isn't a safe space for something very unusual happening in the organisation to be discussed, to get feedback on it, to promote reflection and blame games is a very important concept from the political science literature, but essentially it says that very often organisations are engaged in games of trying to pass the blame, who is going to end up with the blame for something going wrong and it very often lands back in the Trust but actually there's a whole architecture of other organisations who may have contributed.

So how should those -- I, mean you have mentioned predecessor organisations, Monitor, NHS Improvement. How should they have been more accountable for their involvement in that process, the second part of that?

69

a huge amount of interpersonal conflict in large complex organisations and I guess the worry would be that you get a large number of essentially low-level complaints coming through to that and it's still very difficult to pick out which is the really malignant behaviour. That's not to say it wouldn't work, I just would like to see quite a lot of testing of it. I would like to see a lot of attention given to board development so they are aware of the problems of institutional secrecy, they are aware that when a problem appears that has a very unusual character that's one to be especially attentive towards and that they are directly handling the issue of transgressive behaviour as a specific type of risk.

10.1.4:

"Address the need for evidence-based improvement efforts."

You say:

"This is likely to be best achieved through an infrastructure that operates collaboratively and at scale to understand problems, co-design and test solutions with patients and staff, and evaluate them, and through supporting implementation."

What infrastructure changes are proposed to achieve those aims?

Α. We have a history of improvement programmes in

It's to do with the standards we discussed a moment ago, that you would expect the same standards from those bodies, that they encourage psychological safety, that they are open to challenge about their own behaviour, that they are demonstrating listening, that they are focused on how they can support and help rather than blaming others and it goes back to some of our earlier conversation about the multiplicity of bodies who are able to make recommendations that are uncosted, haven't been fully operationalised and then expect NHS organisations to get on with them and blame them when they don't.

None of this is to say that NHS organisations themselves don't sometimes behave very badly, they sometimes do, and that is particularly the case when there is denial and concealment and they are not escalating issues either.

Would a system of low-level reporting of problematic behaviours, transgressive behaviours, by staff on a confidential basis be something which could identify transgressive behaviours and is that feasible, is that practical to have confidential reporting?

This is the kind of thing I think is a very interesting idea that would need a lot of piloting and testing to establish whether it actually works. There's

the NHS that are not necessarily very well designed and that aren't implemented effectively or consistently. One of my colleagues recently did a review of maternity programmes, for example, and there have been over 50 large-scale improvement programmes in maternity since 2010. Only 15 of those have been evaluated and many of those demonstrate weaknesses in terms of tackling -- the extent of which even their own recommendations are based on evidence, whether they have involved patients in the design and the priority given to things like inequality.

So there is an awful lot of effort that goes into improvement programmes but it's not necessarily clear that they always work. The things that you need to make improvement are the things we discussed earlier. You need really good quality data, you need a collaborative infrastructure so people can work together and co-design problems and test them before they are put in at scale and you need a capacity for evaluation and I don't think we have that currently in the NHS. In my institute we have been working on some examples of this and it's really extraordinary what you can achieve when you work directly with the staff and with patients.

So you have been working on the evaluation?

No, we have been working on how you co-design -- sorry, we have been working on evaluation, 72

but we have been working on how you co-design programmes with staff and families so you turn the best available clinical evidence into something that is workable on the ward, that respects the interests of patients and takes their views in how it's going to work into advance, it has training programmes so that you can implement it that involves patients themselves in the design of those training programmes, so you've got communication that is respectful and inclusive and that is linked to data sources so you can assess whether the improvement is occurring.

Organisations are currently extremely variable in their element to do improvement work and I don't think we have yet worked out how to support those but it's not helpful to keep pushing recommendations and expecting that they're going to turn them into something that always works and we saw that, for example, in relation to the implementation of the duty of candour and Freedom to Speak Up guardians.

Q. 10.1.5, "Improve workplace conditions and behaviours".

You say:

"Improving workplace conditions and behaviours is a priority for improving culture, and will require ..."

A number of things, one of them "making workforce

monitored?

A. Yes.

Q. At 10.1.6 you refer to "Improve and value management at all levels", not just senior leadership and you say it:

"... needs to be strengthened at all levels of the NHS. This will require, at a minimum, fuller implementation of the findings of the Messenger review, but will also require that management is recognised as a key priority for the NHS, is resourced and trained for appropriately, and is valued by political leadership."

Can you explain first of all how you propose to strengthen management at all levels?

A. Thank you --

Q. How could that be done?

A. I think the first thing is to stop the discourse about managers being dead wood in the NHS. It's absolutely clear we need to strengthen this and that's what the Messenger review said. The Darzi review which published very recently confirmed the same thing: we're undermanaged in the NHS and with better management we could enable clinical staff to do their roles more effectively. So strengthening means (a) recognising it as something that's actually very important to the NHS; a second thing is resourcing it properly, being really

stewardship a key priority". Who would you identify to take on the role of workforce steward and responsibility for workforce stewardship?

A. Thank you. I think that needs to be signalled at policy level and then made a priority for NHS organisations but with the right support. Currently the conditions people have to work in are often extremely adverse. They impact on their wellbeing. We don't have a framework of workforce standards and I believe that should be in place and should be monitored.

I think we need much more than we have in terms of work system design by which I mean roles, tasks, technologies, all of the things that we know are important to making improvement. They should be based on a discipline known as human factors and again that is highly successful when implemented well. We need better workforce planning and we need training and education that develops people rather than the current often quite dispiriting approaches we have to training in the NHS which is often online training that doesn't build collaborative ethos, that doesn't improve teamwork and that isn't necessarily a very useful experience for people.

Q. Again, are you suggesting that should be at a policy level, workforce standards that can be

clear about what managers need to be doing. It needs to be trained for appropriately and that again requires quite specific kinds of training and at the senior leadership level an example of the kinds of things we might do is much more board development work and clinical director level work that could include, for example, coaches attending meetings and then debriefing afterwards, it could include simulations where those teams are asked to handle a tricky issue and then are debriefed afterwards and at the -- at other levels it's going to mean building in the capacity for doing things like operational management and ensuring that HR and so on are all sufficiently resourced for the tasks that they need to do.

Q. Nurses and doctors of course have professional obligations to patients?

A. Yes.

Q. So those they care for in the hospital. Do you think managers should have the same obligation, same professional obligation?

A. I think there is a case to be made for having a set of NHS management standards. I think that would help to professionalise NHS managers. I don't think that should apply just to the senior management level. I think there's a very strong case to be made that

everybody who works in the NHS should be professionally registered and part of a profession that nurtures the growth of that profession, that is clear about the standards and so on.

If we were to move down that route there would need to be clarity about what the liabilities are because managers are often having to deal with things that are out of their control in some sense. They deal with an enormous amount of political pressure. They are often having to balance competing priorities, so that would require a lot of very careful design and testing before implementation, but in principle I think it's a good idea.

Q. You also, at 10.1.6, say:

"This will require ... fuller implementation of the findings of the Messenger review ..."

Which particular findings are you referring to there?

A. The findings relating to the valuing of management I think were a very important conclusion of the Messenger review. Messenger also commented that the "fit and proper person" test had not been fully operationalised and I think that could be something to be reviewed, but the general emphasis on recognising the role of the management in the NHS and the need to

co-design. No recommendation is free of its side-effects. Everything that has a bright side tends to have a dark side as well.

What I can say is we now I think know quite a lot about how to do this sort of stuff well, so drawing on the evidence base about doing this well will be key. We have a long history of recognising that clinical practice needs improvement. We do not have the same history of targeting management, of targeting how you turn a recommendation that's in the form of a legal requirement or an examination for a new role into practice and it seems to me that's some of where we need to be building the evidence base for the future.

Q. How much in practice do you think managers who, if they are not medically trained themselves, need to understand the work of those who are clinically trained and the decisions they make and the choices they make?

A. They absolutely need to understand that and that's got to be a respect on both sides. I'm not a clinician myself, but I spend a lot of time trying to understand what the clinicians are doing and why they are doing it that way and I think the same duty applies to managers. If you don't understand the work being done there's every possibility that you will not do

resource it properly and to train and set standards for it are the major parts of that.

Q. When you say -- and you have explained again in oral evidence -- management should be recognised as a key priority for the NHS, how do you suggest that might be recognised, the success or otherwise of that in practice?

A. The first thing I think would probably be to give it political priority. The second would be to design a framework for it and do that consultative --collaboratively with staff and with patients so it's clear what the expectations are, making sure that that's consistent with good practice in other areas and possibly a programme of registration so the -- there would be some professional regulation of that function in the NHS.

Q. Finally from me, Professor Dixon-Woods, in terms of the recommendations or areas for thought you have suggested, what do you think are perceived potential problems in implementing any of those recommendations?

A. All of them are going to be problems. They all require resourcing. They all require the use of attention which is a very scarce resource in the NHS. They're all going to require really high quality

things in a helpful way. You may misrecognise things.
You may design systems that don't meet clinical needs.
You may for one reason or another exclude the patient

You may for one reason or another exclude the patient concerns from what you're doing. So I think it's

absolutely essential that the clinical managers
 understand -- sorry, non-clinical managers understand

7 the nature of the work being done.

MS LANGDALE: Thank you, Professor Dixon-Woods. Those are my questions.

My Lady, slightly earlier than anticipated, Mr Skelton KC, followed by Mr Baker KC, both have permission from you to ask some questions.

LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: Very well. Thank you very much indeed, Ms Langdale. Mr Skelton.

Questioned by MR SKELTON

MR SKELTON: Thank you, my Lady.

Professor Dixon-Woods, my name is Peter Skelton. I'm one of the barristers representing one of the Family Groups, just so you're fully aware.

I'm going to ask you about speaking up and whistleblowing broadly as a topic. I appreciate Ms Langdale has asked you about it to some extent already but I would like to get into more detail about what happens on the ground for those complaining and responding.

Three broad issues, just so you can start thinking. I would like to explore what's going on in the mind of the person who is thinking about making a complaint, particularly when they're dealing with transgressive behaviour, which is a particularly difficult form of behaviour to respond to. Then what's going on in the mind of the person receiving the complaint and how they're dealing with it and the biases and systems that may be brought into play. Then if I may, may I turn to identifying the key changes that you think could be made that would improve the responses of both those hypothetical individuals faced with that difficult scenario.

As I say, I would like to address those issues in the specific context of transgressive behaviour?

A. Yes.

Q. And particularly extreme transgressive behaviour of the type that you know underpins this Public Inquiry which is criminal behaviour because it is particularly unusual, but it is also particularly difficult to handle and it is quite different, it may be said, from routine neglect or negligence or medical mishaps or system failures that other Inquiries have looked at. Is that clear enough for you?

A. Yes, thank you.

may together come to a view that there is something wrong. They may be pulling in information or intelligence from different sources, they may have seen different things, so that first conversation is very high consequence and then there's a typical set of behaviours that may ensue after that.

The issue of a system issue versus a person issue is a very important one here. People are generally much, much more uncomfortable about raising issues about a person and particularly anxious about raising an issue about a person that's involving a transgressive behaviour, in part because of the credibility gap I was discussing earlier, that the fact that they may be just met with incredulity when they try to raise it.

Q. Presumably they themselves may be second-guessing their own judgment?

A. Exactly.

Q. If the transgression isn't quite as obvious as it could be?

A. Yes.

Q. So there's a sense of personal isolation to begin with?

A. Yes.

Q. "Am I right in my own judgment?"

A. Yes.

Q. I've got 15 minutes so I'm going to need your help to keep it very focused.

A. Sure.

Q. Thank you. First of all, the identification of transgressive behaviour. One of the themes that the Inquiry may hear from in due course is how difficult it was for those who were working in a hospital environment -- how difficult it is for those in a hospital environment to sort of identify things that are outside of normal human and professional experience. Does that accord with your understanding and research?

A. Absolutely, yes.

Q. What can assist that person in trying to understand what they might first sense before they rationalise?

A. The kinds of things that they would do is often talk to somebody else, a trusted colleague, to sense check essentially what's going on. That first discussion might be quite consequential. If the other person is dismissive or acts as if the speaker is being melodramatic or fanciful, that may suppress their willingness to bring it up again for some time.

What you will sometimes find is that people begin to find a number of allies. They sense out how might be sympathetic to hearing about this issue and that group

Q. Then what you're saying is there's a process by which you start to find allies and discuss things and your concerns coalesce into something more significant?

A. That can happen, yes.

Q. Cutting straight to it: what can help that person who initially has that unease about the transgression to speed up the process by which they can bring it to the fore and have it acted on?

A. I think there are probably a number of things you could have. Some Trusts have anonymous reporting lines so people can ring and speak to somebody. That person then needs to be very well trained and needs to be able to recognise a transgressive incident when it first occurs. They also need to have a process to follow. Organisations can't function without processes and, as I was saying earlier, I think those processes are ill-defined and end up channelling things down routes that aren't necessarily terribly helpful.

Q. Just pausing there, it may be seen during the course of this Inquiry that the whistleblowing or speaking up policies weren't in fact used by those that could have used them.

A. Yes.

Q. We can't pre-empt exactly what people willsay --

1 A. Yes, yes.

Q. -- but is that your experience and if so, bearing in mind that this received a huge amount of fanfare in 2015 after Robert Francis' report and it has been rolled out nationally, there has been training given, the policies are writ large in every hospital round the country, what is stopping people from using that policy and using that anonymous route you identified?

A. Do you mean the -- there's two policies. There's the duty of candour requirement and there's Freedom to Speak Up guardians?

Q. Freedom to Speak Up specifically for the present purposes?

A. Yes. Freedom to Speak Up guardians are a role that has been extremely variably implemented and we report a lot of the research we did on this. Some organisations were very wholehearted in how they implemented the Freedom to Speak Up guardian role, they took it very seriously, they had job descriptions for that person, they advertised for them, they set up all kinds of systems to raise staff awareness, screensavers, email campaigns, posters. They made sure that person had enough time available. They provided admin support and they made sure that the person was primed to listen.

that it could be that there still isn't a clear route by which you could be absolutely confident that was going to be resolved. The Freedom to Speak Up guardian can't resolve it by themselves.

Q. One of the major themes that came out from Robert Francis' review and indeed I think from your own report, is the repercussions problem, so the person who is thinking about raising the concern is immediately thinking about themselves and what might happen and that could be a variety of things, it could be professional ostracisation, breakdown of personal relations, disciplinary proceedings, all sorts of things as well as the basic moral injury of raising something which could be wrong.

Again, how does one address that concern which is a huge weight on the decision-maker?

A. Yes, I think that's very fair. There are multiple influences on why people don't speak up and creating the psychological safety so people feel they can has got to be a key responsibility of the hearer and that's often going to take hearer courage. It's very discomfiting for somebody to raise an issue about another person, particularly relating to their practice. If we just think about how uncomfortable it is to tell somebody they smell, multiply that by thousands of folds

Other Trusts took that role much less seriously. They sometimes assigned it to somebody who was already in a senior position, so appeared remote and distant from staff so they were too scared to go to that person anyway. There was very little awareness raising. Staff were unaware of the availability of the person or they felt that they wouldn't be welcomed if they did bring something up and the person had too little time and no admin support to help with following up, so some of it was to do with how the role was implemented and not everybody who was in those roles was necessarily receptive to the kind of issues that people might bring up.

Q. So a huge variety of reasons why it may not have worked?

A. Yes.

Q. Is it your general experience that it can work as presently set up if implemented?

A. Yes. The Freedom to Speak Up guardian is a complex role in the sense that they are mainly a signposter. They don't actually have a role in sorting things out by themselves. They can advise the person on which route something needs to go down. So if somebody comes to a Freedom to Speak Up guardian with a transgressive behaviour I believe it's still the case

if you think they're engaged in some extremely transgressive behaviour and if you've got it wrong it may be that that does have repercussions, so the creating of psychological safety is going to be key here.

I think the other problem with the Freedom to Speak Up guardian role that didn't quite work is that they ended up attracting a large volume of concerns that were actually not really patient safety concerns and it goes back to the dysfunctional nature of many HR functions in NHS organisations.

Q. Creating that safety I recognise as being important, but how is that going to present to the person who doesn't know the guardian, who hasn't used the system, who isn't familiar with the person they are about to speak to, doesn't know that it's going to be safe? How can the system improve the complainant's thinking about the safety they're going to find?

A. I think one of the things you could do is take the Freedom to Speak Up guardian out of the Trust. The person is -- the Freedom to Speak Up guardian is employed by the Trust, has to be paid for by the Trust. It was one of those unfunded recommendations, so the Trust has to -- had to find the money for that person out of their own resource.

You could have a -- use the same resource and create independent essentially people -- an independent panel of people you could go to with those kinds of concerns who have no allegiance, if you like, with the Trust where they are from. I think you would probably find you have still got a lot of concerns being taken to that panel, but it is one possible route. Again it would require a lot of design and testing to see if it would work.

Q. Just going back to the disincentives that are in the mind of the person who is thinking about the complaint, obviously the whistleblowing legislation is designed to stop them being disciplined, but there are other aspects which it doesn't help with and that is the -- what's going on in the unit. If you're working in a very small professional team with people you are very close to professionally, possibly personally as well, if you were the person who is breaking the omerta and raising a very serious concern about a member of staff who may well be loved and liked by a number of colleagues, you can't -- it's very difficult to protect you from that. Again, what thinking has been done about that aspect?

A. You're absolutely right, the whistleblowing legislation really only protects you from detriment.

who witnessed the incident. In order to get them to give evidence to an investigation, which might be the one conducted by the HR team, they would still need to -- they might be identified through that process. It's remarkably difficult I think the way things are framed at the moment to preserve anonymity in the way that might be ideal for these situations. This is why I think having some kind of independent broker in this situation might be helpful.

Q. Is another aspect related to the answer you have just given to take the problem away from the complainant and the person who is receiving it or has to manage it and resolve it takes ownership of the problem, so in other words you are raising an issue but you are not part of its resolution necessarily?

A. In principle that's how the systems are supposed to work at the moment. In practice, the person who raises the concerns does typically remain involved through a series of things, but I agree, I would like to sit down with staff and patients and co-design a better way of doing this and test it possibly through simulations. I don't want to be very specific about what that might look like without doing that.

Q. One of the factors I think building on what you have said that may have occurred in the present

It's very difficult to establish detriment and a lot of the detriment people experience in reality is not of a legal standard of detriment, it's things like being excluded from tea breaks, people not liking you any more, feeling that you're a difficult person, you may end up being -- in order to move forward with the issue having to accept some blame yourself.

I don't know that we have a solution to a lot of this other than -- I mean, what we do know from the examples that we have looked at is that you usually need some kind of external action to take place. It will never be resolvable at unit level.

Q. Can I suggest to you a couple of things that could be thought about. One is the anonymity or confidentiality which you were talking about when you speak to the guardian, is maintaining that through the process so in fact you as whistleblower are not overtly identified and become, as it were, almost like an accuser in court; that doesn't happen.

A. Yes

Q. Is that a realistic possibility?

A. It's -- I would like that. In reality it may be very difficult to preserve the anonymity because the person who knows about it may be very -- may be the only person who knows about it, they may be the only person

situation is that things became adversarial?

A. Yes.

Q. So there were attempts to make things inquisitorial, in other words to have neutral independent oversight and investigation, but they kept devolving into an adversarial position. Now, again without commenting of course on the events in question, how can you maintain that independence in a process where it leaks out that someone has made an accusation and the accuser denies it and it immediately becomes problematic?

A. Yes, that's very, very challenging. The issues about descent into kind of an adversarial process I think are part of the natural history of these things. If you have got one team who have constructed the problem as being, for example, a bullying one and that might appear much more credible on first glance, then the organisational sense-making that takes place after that would essentially trap them in that explanation and it goes back to our discussion of organisational sense-making from earlier.

If you have another group who become trapped in another explanation they equally become trapped and then it becomes very difficult to break the deadlock.

I think this is why some sort of honest broker in these 92

situations, the inability of senior management handling this to accept challenge, to be debriefed on what they're doing, possibly through an independent person that could be a coach who comes in to help them with this, so you're moving towards a kind of challenge to the understanding and breaking of the entrapment, but the cultural entrapment is a consistent feature of what we see in essentially organisational degradations.

Q. So there might be scope for from early on providing more independence --

A. Yes.

Q. -- for the person who is independent having more ownership of the problem and keeping it as inquisitorial as possible, rather than it becoming adversarial?

A. Yes.

Q. And preserving anonymity and confidentiality in so far as possible throughout the process until it becomes impossible?

A. Yes.

Q. Just going back to the original premise which was the recipient -- I have asked you about the person complaining but briefly the recipient of the complaint, you have talked in your report about a number of sort of human sense-making processes that go on and Ms Langdale

likely, as you say, to be independent challenge, putting to people the stories, the narrative arc that typically develops in the absence of some kind of challenge so people are constantly revisiting their assumptions and they are open to other ways of considering what the problem might be.

Q. There is an analogy I suppose with the murder detective who -- the sort of A, B, C of murder, assume nothing, believe no one, challenge everything. So when faced with a concern you bring that openness of mind to its resolution, absolute openness of mind?

A. Yes, some of it is definitely dispositional.

Q. But do you think in other industries, for example in the airline industry, there is a laminated chart that the captain has to go through before they can take off and with a concern that's brought, a whistleblowing concern, do you think it would be helpful to have literally a forced process which you must do to resolve that concern, typically if it is about transgressive behaviour which may raise safeguarding or patient safety issues which may otherwise not be dealt with unless the person who is responding is forced to deal with them?

A. Thank you. The airline industry has a lot of learning to offer us. They have checklists which are has asked you about that in detail. To some extent, though, sense-making processes are inherent to human beings?

A. Yes.

Q. And you're not going to be able to change them but you are going to be able to make forcing mechanisms to make people challenge their own ways of thinking?

A. Yes

Q. So the credibility gap, the inability to see transgressive behaviour because you simply don't want to see it. What forcing mechanisms can you put on a manager to ensure that occurs?

A. Thank you. I think that goes back to the discussion we were having earlier that we know a lot about how to handle this in emergency situations. There are people who study things like which behaviour -- when there is smoke, which door people go out of and so on, this relates to situation awareness, and when teams are trained in how to handle emergencies there are specific ways you have to train them, there are specific roles people have to take on. I think something like this for handling non-clinical situations that -- and something that's evolving over a longer period of time so we understand the natural history and the points at which to intervene and the specific interventions which is

actually largely mechanical on take-off and landing and so on which have been generally successful in preserving safety. They have also dealt with things like the terrorist threat which is clearly a form of transgressive behaviour. That requires a lot of careful handling so you don't end up with essentially security theatre, so a lot of performative screening of things and procedures and so on, so there are dangers with the checklist approach as well.

I think what I would really like to see is a framework for handling transgressive behaviour that allows clarity about what needs to happen, what are the things you need to think about and that isn't a yes/no checkbox thing, but directs attention in the ways that need to be directed, that offers clarity in terms of procedures and processes to be followed and I keep emphasising that these are not there in the way that we would hope for. If you look at the Savile Inquiry one of the reasons why sexual abuse wasn't being escalated was because the processes and procedures were inadequate at the time that these abuses were happening.

So organisations need clarity about the steps they need to follow and that's what I would like to see, a framework, but it would incorporate the kind of challenge that you're asking about.

(24) Pages 93 - 96

- **Q.** So not necessarily as simplistic as the chart I'm mentioning but something --
 - A. Yes.

Α.

Yes.

- **Q.** -- similar as an established process of relative simplicity that could be used in each case?
- A. Yes and I would strongly emphasise the need for the families to be involved in the design of that and their say to be part of the challenge that's offered to the board.
- **Q.** Yes. I think Mr Baker is going to be asking about precisely that in a few moments.

Just lastly -- I think I have used up all my time, but are there any other suggestions when it comes to speaking up, both from the perspective of the complainant and the recipient, which you would urge this Inquiry to recommend?

A. Thank you. I would recommend attention to all of the voice pathway, so the speaking up I think we know a fair bit about, the hearer courage, and the hearer behaviours we know less about, what happens next, how the concern is to be judged. The priority to be given to it relative to all of the other priorities facing an organisation and the actions to be taken and the actions to be taken are not necessarily always very straightforward, so we call this a "warrant for action",

Q. It's correct to say, isn't it, that before the implementation of Regulation 20 of the Health and Social Care Act Regulations of 2014 there was no legally enforceable duty of candour, which is what you say here, which meant, in terms, prior to April 2015 there was no legally enforceable requirement for NHS Trusts to be honest with those who had been injured by their errors.

There is though a difference, isn't there, between a legally enforceable right or obligation and a moral obligation, or indeed good practice?

- A. That's true.
- **Q**. So prior to 2015 would a well-run hospital with a healthy safety culture have been open and candid with those who were injured by its errors?
- **A.** They absolutely would and although there wasn't a legally enforceable duty, the National Patient Safety Agency, in 2005, published guidance on exactly this topic. It set out ten principles of openness and it explained what needed to happen if there was an incident, which aimed to ensure that all involved, patients, families and healthcare professionals would feel supported.

That guidance was not as well implemented as you would hope, so they updated it in 2009 with further

what counts as a warrant for action, and then what is the response that should be made. I think there needs to be clarity on that entire end-to-end process and we have possibly focused excessively on the speaking up end of things -- I don't mean excessively in the sense that it didn't deserve it, it absolutely did, but we haven't got enough attention to the other things that are really important in actually taking things through to action.

- Q. Thank you very much.
 - A. Thank you.

LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: Thank you, Mr Skelton.

Mr Baker.

Questioned by MR BAKER

MR BAKER: Professor, my name is Richard Baker, I ask questions on behalf of the other group of Families. Can I begin by thanking you for a very compelling and erudite report.

- A. Thank you.
- **Q.** I'm going to ask you some questions about the duty of candour and if we could begin please by going to page 75 of your report and to paragraph 7.1.1.
- A. Yes, thank you.
 - **Q.** So you set out here the events that led to the creation of the duty of candour, referring of course to the very well-known case of Robbie Powell.

documentation, but that was to do with lack of concerns of impact, so there definitely was an expectation from a national body about openness, but it wasn't made legally enforceable until, as you say, April 2015.

- **Q.** Yes. In fact there was also -- I appreciate the duty of candour is an institutional obligation, but there would also have been professional obligations upon those, for example registered with the GMC, to be open and candid about errors when they occurred.
- **A.** That's right, so we can distinguish between the organisational duty of candour and what's now the statutory duty of candour and the professional duty of candour, which did exist and was updated in 2015 around the same time as the organisational duty of candour.
- **Q.** So if we have a moral obligation upon individuals, professional obligation upon individuals and also a good safety culture obligation upon institutions, what goes wrong that we need to have a duty of candour that's legally enforceable?
- A. One of the things that goes wrong is that once an incident becomes something that's going to be handled through a legal process, the Trust lawyers get involved and they may give advice that is contrary to what you would expect if the duty of candour is operating. They may basically seek to reduce the amount of information

25 ma

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that's released, they may mitigate it in some way.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A second thing that can happen is that all kinds of things can happen at Trust level that may be largely invisible, but are very highly consequential in terms of disclosures. An example would be incidents had to be reported through an incident reporting system that required grading as to whether they were a serious incident or something below. A serious incident triggered a certain series of actions which included reporting to the families and conduct of a specific type of investigation.

If the incident never got graded as a serious incident that just didn't happen and there is evidence that some incidents that should have been classified as serious incidents weren't. We saw that at East Kent, for example.

Yes. Another feature -- and again it's not unique to this set of circumstances and of course without pre-judging the evidence that may be heard in this case -- is a desire by the Trust to protect its reputation or perhaps not be willing to face up to institutional problems within itself?

Yes, that's the problem -- that's the behaviour we were describing as comfort seeking and it's essentially a behaviour that is focused on the good news

a very important intervention, but has been variably well implemented by Trusts and I described that in our report. Some Trusts took it very seriously and went to a lot of trouble to make sure staff were trained and were motivated to comply.

The duty is not easy to implement because it requires a set of procedures and not all Trusts are operationally excellent at creating operational change. It also requires a lot of behavioural change on the behalf of the professionals and implementing the disclosures was not easy for professionals. It was emotionally difficult for some of them. They had some anxieties, for example making disclosures when they thought that the abuser might be the person they were having to make the disclosure to.

So it's another example of where something that looked like a good idea could have done with a lot more co-design with the families and with the staff before it was implemented. It was one of those things that was left up to NHS Trust to figure out how to do it.

The big kind of feature of the duty of candour is it gave legal force to that duty, so CQC can and now is taking action in the event of breaches, so families do have a remedy, potentially, and Trusts are now I think much more aware of their need to comply with this or be 103

and that is uncomfortable with being uncomfortable and that may be orientated towards essentially preserving a veneer of all being well when in fact it isn't.

That may be motivated by all kinds of things. Reputation would be one of them. A second would be avoiding heavy-handed interventions from external organisations. A third one is essentially the -- the emotional labour involved in dealing with a big issue of this kind

I think a fourth thing is that many organisations are not well prepared for a situation of crisis. They haven't got a way of dealing with something like this where they are confident they're taking the right steps and there is a -- in some places, sadly, an institutional instinct towards denial and concealment.

But all of those things had carried on existing --

> A. Yes.

-- since the duty of candour was introduced, or the legal obligation was introduced. How does having a legally enforceable duty of candour stop those factors, in circumstances where having an obvious moral obligation, or even an individual professional duty wouldn't have stopped them?

I think the legal duty of candour has been

liable for prosecution or fines.

So if I summarise that in -- probably oversimplify it in two ways, one is that if you were a high functioning Trust with regards to patient safety, then you probably would implement the duty of candour quite effectively, but there again you were probably already one of those Trusts who would have been fulfilling those sorts of duties.

If you were a dysfunctional Trust, the likelihood is that you would fail to implement the duty of candour effectively within your own organisation and that is why in a number of healthcare scandals, even since 2015, we see recurrent episodes of failure to meet the duty of candour

I think if your Trust is having difficulty anyway, your ability to implement something like the duty of candour is going to be challenged and if that's compounded by comfort seeking behaviours then you're really looking at difficulties.

The challenge of implementing something like the duty of candour was significant because it required so much organisational engineering, culture and behaviour change and so on, and again it goes back to what I was saying earlier, I think a lot of that could have been much better supported.

The practice of saying "Hey, we've got a new duty, you've got to implement it", and leaving it up to the Trust to figure out how to do it themselves I think is one that we have shown many, many times means that you get extreme variation in how well it is done and it's -- the costs involved are often underestimated, so this was something the Trust had to find from existing resources and if they were already struggling this was going to be -- this was going to be really very hard for them, so it's also a cultural disposition and if you are a Trust who basically just doesn't do this kind of thing, doesn't have the right disposition, if we like, then it was particularly prone to problems.

- **Q.** Yes, and I think the cultural issue is important because we can see very clear intersections, can't we, between issues such as Freedom to Speak Up --
 - A. Very much so.

- **Q.** -- duty of candour, indeed patient safety as an overarching issue, because they are all intertwined, they are all often symptoms of a bad culture, that there's no candour or no Freedom to Speak Up and that patient safety suffers.
- **A.** I think that's absolutely true and, you know, what you might see in an organisation that isn't -- hasn't got the right culture at the top is something

A. I think the first action by the CQC in relation to duty of candour was 2019, so that was four years after the introduction, and the first prosecution I think was 2020, so that's five years afterwards. You probably do need to leave some time for the Trust to implement it, but I think that could have been greatly speeded up with the right kind of support, but once there was a kind of clarity that there was a period of embedding, then I think there is scope for greater enforcement action.

- Q. Thank you.
- **A.** It again signals the seriousness of the requirement.
- **Q.** Yes, and penalties can sometimes be a driving force behind why people make changes. It might not be why we would want them to do it, but it might be the thing that forces them to do it.
 - A. Sorry, I didn't hear that again.
- **Q.** Penalties might often be the driving force as to why people change practices, for fear of a penalty, and it may not be the reason we want them to do it, we would rather they did it on their own volition, but it can be effective.
- **A.** They can be. I mean it's -- we haven't really evaluated the effect of regulatory fines on healthcare

comes in like introduce a Freedom to Speak Up guardian and this is treated as a kind of tick boxing exercise, "We need to ensure we've got one, we need to send in a report every year", and it is done in a fairly lacklustre kind of way, possibly just find muggin's turn and give the job to them, whereas in organisations that have got a highly open, learning committed culture, they would have put a lot of effort into finding the right person, briefing them and, as I said earlier, providing them with the resources that they need and encouraging staff to come forward rather than treating it as literally yet another duty.

- **Q.** It has been variably enforced over the years in terms of the CQC taking action --
 - **A.** Sorry, I didn't hear the beginning.
- Q. The duty of candour has been variably enforced over the years in terms of the CQC prosecuting for breaches of it. I mean in other industries, for example the construction industry, quite punitive health and safety laws and penalties have been seen to bring around a change in culture and practice on construction sites, for example, for fear of a penalty more than anything else. Is there scope here for greater enforcement and greater penalties against Trusts who breach the duty of candour?

organisations because it takes more resource out of organisations that are already struggling.

I think there are many things we could do to support improvement that are not regulatory action a

support improvement that are not regulatory action and, for example, with the openness policies that was never treated as a quality improvement programme, so the resource that needed to be put into the design wasn't there and then the kinds of things that we know work, data, collaborative improvement, feedback and so on, they weren't in place either, so I think you probably need a range of things if you're going to implement something like this effectively in ways that essentially encourages authentic and genuine commitment to the interests of patients that isn't necessarily because it was a big stick going to be waved, but the big stick should be there if there's still non-compliance, absolutely.

MR BAKER: Thank you, Professor. Thank you, my Lady. I have no more questions.

LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: Thank you very much indeed, Mr Baker.

Ms Langdale, have you any other questions?

MS LANGDALE: No more questions, my Lady.

LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: Thank you very much indeed.

Professor Dixon-Woods, thank you very much indeed	1	CV, can I just check that you've got a copy of your
for coming this morning, firstly for providing the	2	witness statements with you in the witness box?
report and then answering so helpfully so many	3	A. I have, yes.
questions. You are free to go, as they say.	4	Q. So if you would like to turn to the first of
THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.	5	those witness statements that you gave, which is dated
LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: We will start again with	6	20 March 2024 do you have that?
the evidence of Dr Garstang at 2 o'clock. We will rise	7	A. I do, yes.
now.	8	Q. Can you confirm for us please that the content
(12.47 pm)	9	of that is true to the best of your knowledge and
(The luncheon adjournment)	10	belief?
(2.00 pm)	11	A. It is, yes.
LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: Mr De la Poer.	12	Q. Before we turn to that introduction, you gave
MR DE LA POER: My Lady, our witness for this	13	a second witness statement to the Inquiry, is that
afternoon is Dr Joanna Garstang. I wonder if I could	14	right?
ask Dr Garstang to come forward to the witness box,	15	A. That's correct, yes.
please.	16	Q. Dated 13 July 2024?
DR JOANNA GARSTANG (affirmed)	17	A. That's correct.
Questioned by MR DE LA POER	18	Q. And is that also true to the best of your
LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: Do sit down, Dr Garstang.	19	knowledge and belief?
MR DE LA POER: Can we begin, please, with your	20	A. Yes, it is, yes.
full name.	21	Q. Dr Garstang, turning back to your first
A. I'm Joanna Jane Garstang.	22	witness statement we're going to begin by just
Q. And you are a medical doctor, is that right?	23	introducing you, then we're going to define some key
A. That's correct.	24	terms. Our third topic this afternoon will be looking
Q. Before we come to just briefly covering your	25	at the standards in 2015/2016. Our fourth topic will be
109		110
to look at the standards now and we will have a fifth	1	A. That's correct, yes.
topic which will just cover a number of general matters,	2	LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: And the School of Nursing
including your reflections and recommendations.	3	is the University of Birmingham?
A. Thank you.	4	A. It is, yes.
Q. So we will start with the introduction,	5	LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: Thank you.
please, which you do comprehensively in the first	6	MR DE LA POER: Were you employed as a Consultant
paragraph of your first witness statement. I will just	7	Community Paediatrician at the Birmingham Community
run you through it. Please could you confirm that you	8	Healthcare NHS Trust and as that Designated Doctor
are employed as a Clinical Associate Professor of Child	9	between June 2017 and May 2023?
Protection at the School of Nursing?	10	A. That's correct, yes.
A. That's correct.	11	Q. Moving on to your paragraph 1.3, were you
Q. And that you are so employed having qualified	12	a Visiting Senior Clinical Lecturer in Child Protection
much earlier in your career as a medical doctor?	13	at the School of Nursing between September 2021 and
	14	
A. Correct, yes.Q. Were you appointed to that role in June 2023?	15	May 2023? A. That's correct, yes.
	16	•
A. That's correct, yes.		•
Q. Is that described as a clinical academic post,	17	Institute of Applied Health Research at the University
the clinical duties of which are as a Consultant	18	of Birmingham between 2019 and 2021?
Community Paediatrician?	19	A. That's correct, yes.
A. That's correct, yes.	20	Q. And although I promise you we won't go through
Q. Based in Birmingham Community Healthcare NHS	21	every single one of your very many qualifications, just
Trust?	22	the final one there you can perhaps help us with. You
5 17		say in your witness statement that you were an NIHR
,		Doctoral Research Fellow at Warwick Medical School from
Death at Birmingham and Solihull Integrated Care Board?	25	2010 to 2015 when you completed your PhD. 112
Q. And are	you the Designated Doctor for Child	you the Designated Doctor for Child 24 am and Solihull Integrated Care Board? 25

1

Firstly, is that right?

expertise. Your PhD, which we have established was

2	A. That's correct, yes.	2	between 2010 I think and 2015, was that an evaluation of
3	Q. Secondly, can you just help us with NIHR?	3	the joint agency investigation of Unexpected Infant
4	 That's the National Institute of Health 	4	Deaths?
5	Research, so they are a major funder for medical	5	A. It was, yes.
6	research.	6	Q. So in simple terms were you looking at how
7	Q. And looking at what you do in practice now, is	7	effective joint investigations or multi-agency
8	it right to say that much of your clinical work involves	8	investigations were?
9	the investigation of unexpected child death?	9	A. It was, but it was also looking from the
10	A. Yes, that's about sort of half half my work	10	parents' perspective as well and making sure that we got
11	is leading the practical investigation side, assuring	11	our investigations compassionate and supportive, as well
12	the quality of Child Death Review across the whole of	12	as effective.
13	Birmingham and Solihull and the other half of the work	13	Q. And the last one that I will draw attention to
14	is actually then researching into child death from the	14	in terms of what you list there: are you a member of the
15	University of Birmingham. That makes two halves but	15	scientific committee of the Lullaby Trust, which is a UK
16	there's another part as well which is actually providing	16	support organisation for Sudden Infant Death?
17	some national support for Child Death Review through the	17	A. That's correct, yes.
18	Association of Child Death Professionals.	18	Q. Now, that concludes what I wanted to take from
19	Q. As part of that role, are we right to	19	your witness statement. I have just been asked to
20	understand that you are also part of the Child Death	20	confirm a couple of other things, please. Are you the
21	Overview Panel?	21	Chair of the Association of Child Death Review
22	A. That's correct, as Designate Doctor I sit on	22	Professionals?
23	that panel.	23	A. That's correct, yes.
24	Q. We will come in a moment to what exactly that	24	Q. And again we will come to who they are. Are
25	is, but let's just conclude our review of your 113	25	you a specialist medical advisor to the National Child 114
1	Mortality Database?	1	England in April of this year in relation to the Draft
2	A. That's correct. That's a funded post.	2	Safeguarding, Accountability and Assurance Framework
3	Q. And through that funded post have you been	3	questions for Child Death Review?
4	working with NHS England since 2019 with a hiatus during	4	A. I don't think it was in April unless I have
5	the pandemic?	5	written it in here. I know I'm certainly having
6	 A. I was appointed by to work for NCMD just 	6	conversations with them at the moment as they draft new
7	over a year ago, so that was how the funding from NHS	7	guidance.
8	England sort of (unclear) from my work in NCMD only	8	Q. Have you advised on the statutory safeguarding
9	started a year before.	9	Child Death Review dataset during the spring of this
10	Q. In terms of your work in the last 12 months	10	year?
11	have you been involved in the following: firstly, in	11	A. I have regular conversations with NCMD about
12	October 2023 did you produce a Child Death Review	12	how we update datasets, almost on a weekly basis we're
13	Safeguarding, Accountability and Assurance Framework	13	as a team discussing how we improve things.
14	presentation?	14	Q. Has that led to a data-sharing agreement with
15	A. I reviewed that, yes.	15	the National Child Mortality Database?
16	Q. You reviewed it?	16	A. Sorry, data-sharing agreement between who?
17	A. Yes, I certainly didn't write it.	17	Q. I believe it's being suggested it's with NHS
18	Q. Did you produce videos in November on	18	England?
19	a similar topic?	19	A. I mean, I think there is lots of existing
20	A. Oh, yes, I produced videos, yes, along with	20	data-sharing agreements for NHS data to go to the
21	a colleague.	21	National Child Mortality Database. I think we're
22	Q. I think they were made available on FutureNHS	22	looking at establishing another data-sharing agreement
23	platform, is that right?	23	about a different sort of safeguarding dashboard but
24	A. Yes.	24	that's still a work in progress.
25	Q. And have you been in discussions with NHS	25	Q. I think it's described as a draft in the notes
	115		116

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that I have been given, is that fair?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Yes, I think it's fair, yes. It's certainly not -- not up there yet. It's a work in progress.

That concludes my first topic, Dr Garstang. We're going to just define three important terms or concepts which hopefully will help people navigate your evidence

The first we're just going to talk briefly about is the idea of safeguarding and I think this is something that you are keen for people to understand is that you do not hold yourself out as a safeguarding expert in the broadest sense of safeguarding, is that right?

- Yes, I mean that's right. My -- I have done some research in safeguarding and I have sort of -- but my particular expertise is in Child Death Review but there is a big overlap because our most challenging child deaths are those that have a safeguarding element to them.
- Of course there are, I'm sure, very many definitions of exactly what safeguarding is, but it's the overarching concept of keeping people who may be vulnerable safe from harm?
- Α. Absolutely. It's more than just child abuse and neglect.
 - Q. And in its broadest sense it will include 117

which is very much about parenting ability and parenting decisions and service delivery, which is sort of did we get our services right, not just healthcare but other services as well, education, police, fire.

So you have those four domains and you consider the whole of the child's life and it's very different to the adult way of looking at deaths, so the adult Learning from Deaths framework, hospitals will review their treatment of the patient for their final admission, so it's much, much broader what we look at.

- Does it apply to all children regardless of the circumstances of their death?
- Absolutely, it -- from a child who dies shortly after birth who may actually be born so prematurely that they couldn't survive, up until a young person the day before their 18th birthday; the only exclusion being a baby who is stillborn because by law they're not a child.
- Does the Child Death Review process in the case of every child death have as its final stage the Child Death Overview Panel?
 - Α. That's correct, yes.
- You have already referred, that's a panel that Q. you sit on and again just in headline terms for us, please, what is the function of the Child Death Overview

adults although that's not your focus and that's not this Inquiry's focus?

- Absolutely it does include vulnerable adults. A.
- And of course it includes non-fatal O. circumstances as well?
 - Yes, definitely, yes.
- But here we're going to focus on fatal circumstances because we're going to come to our second term for definition which is the notion of Child Death Review and could you just please tell us briefly what the Child Death Review process is in terms of its headline points?

Okay, so in England the Child Death Review Α. process is defined by the 2018 Statutory Guidance and what it consists of is the holistic review of a child's death, meaning that we look at sort of all the factors relating to why that child may have died, so looking at their sort of underlying vulnerabilities, whether they were premature, had an illness, were born with a malformation, or in fact they were sort of perfectly healthy.

We look at the domain of what we call the physical environment, so physical safety, that might be say for some babies about safe sleeping or with a road traffic accident about road safety. The social environment 118

Panel?

So there's lots of review processes up until the Child Death Overview Panel, or CDOP as it is referred to, and CDOP is very much assuring that the reviews up to that point have been done well, that we have got all the information we need, standardised coding of deaths because then all the information goes to the National Child Mortality Database and it is really important that we code things uniformly so that you can have learning at a national level.

And also because we have an organisational memory and a local footprint, we look at -- I mean, in our meetings in Birmingham we're a big CDOP so we will have 20 deaths to review in a morning and see 150, 160 in a year. We kind of know what's normal for us and so we can see if there's a particular issue and so therefore we can sort of take action, if it's something to do with a healthcare provider we might make requests that they take issue, or if it's a public health issue we can make recommendations that way for public health as well.

- my paraphrase of your answer so correct me if I am wrong -- this idea that in the CDOP you sit on, you do have the capability of spotting patterns, is that fair?
 - That's right because we're a team who have 120

One of the things you alluded to is -- this is

been together for quite a while.

Q. Now, we will come to some of the limitations in the CDOP process a little later, but just in general terms, does that mean that the CDOP, so the Panel that sits at the end of this process, is very well-equipped to detect potential cases of deliberate harm, or not very well-equipped, or does it rather depend upon the circumstances?

A. It -- CDOP is completely reliant on the information given -- passed to it from the hospitals or other agencies sort of further upstream because the people sitting round the table at CDOP are independent from the care of that child, so if, for instance, it happened to be one of my patients that we were discussing I would not be in the room. So it's to give that sort of degree of anonymity and independent oversight.

Now, certainly prior to the statutory guidance in 2018, often the quality of information that CDOPs got from hospitals was very limited, so it really tied their hands and it was an uphill struggle for a CDOP to get relevant information for children who died in hospitals because hospitals kept their Mortality Review information themselves and saw it as theirs and not appropriate to share with CDOP.

is reviewed at CDOP, particularly at the moment with the shortage of paediatric pathologists, it's typically for our -- our children who need a Joint Agency Response and postmortem it's a year plus before we get through to CDOP.

- **Q.** Is that length of time capable of affecting how well CDOP is able to potentially detect patterns of behaviour and that sort of thing?
- A. I think it is, providing -- because we have -- you can't do your job with half information so therefore you've got to have all the information there. I think what it takes for people at CDOP to be very inquiring and challenging and sometimes to demand that we don't sign a case off and we get further information. I mean, admittedly it's very rare we're thinking about deliberate harm, particularly from a professional, but much more it's about if we think that there have been issues to do with healthcare, healthcare provision, and then we're often going back to Trusts and asking for them to review again or start a new investigation.
- **Q.** So CDOP is going to recur through the topics we're covering but I just want to move on to one final concept. The SUDI, sometimes SUDIC, can you just tell us, please, what that acronym stands for and what it means in practical terms.

Thankfully that has changed and the quality of information now available for Child Death Review in England is world leading, that we're much better than pretty much any other country.

Q. Finally on CDOP, because, as you have alluded to, it sits at the end of a process and that there are, depending on the given circumstances, a number of investigative steps that might occur before the process reaches its final stage, what does that mean for the potential length of time between the death of the child and the CDOP convening to consider that?

A. I mean, there's certainly a few months, so it varies. If, for instance, it is a death of a child say with cancer who has been under palliative care, there's no postmortem and there's no concerns about care, that child may come through to CDOP relatively quickly, depending -- say within sort of three or four months. There has to be a Child Death Review meeting held by the professionals who cared for that child before the case comes to CDOP, so providing that step is taking place in a timely manner, a straightforward case will come quickly.

But if there has got to be particularly a postmortem, or other multi-agency investigations, it may well be a year or sometimes more before that child

A. So SUDI or SUDIC, it's the Sudden Unexpected Death of an Infant or Child. SUDI for an infant, more broadly we talk about SUDIC now, infant or child. It is just a descriptive term at the point of presentation for a child who has died suddenly and unexpectedly. Most deaths will go on to have an explanation and then be given a cause of death, so it's just a marker for a sudden death that needs detailed investigation.

- **Q.** We're going to look at the evolution of the circumstances in which that investigation occurs and the nature of it in just a moment, but firstly does it follow from what you have said that effectively SUDIC, so those sudden unexpected deaths, are effectively a subset of the overarching Child Death Review process?
- **A.** Yes, I mean probably -- I'm thinking in Birmingham for comparison we have about 160 deaths a year and we start a SUDIC or a Joint Agency Response investigation for between 30 and 40 deaths a year.
- **Q.** To the extent that from your national roles and your wider learning you are able to help us, is that, do you understand, broadly representative?
- **A.** It's probably broadly representative but there are sort of variations in how often -- it's not entirely clear cut and often there is some discussion between professionals as to whether a death is really sudden and

unexpected. I mean, for instance, if a child or baby is found suddenly dead in bed, well absolutely, but for instance children with life-limiting conditions may die more quickly than expected and often there may be discussions as to whether it's appropriate to start, or you start a Joint Agency Response investigation and rapidly decide actually no, the death was expected, so it varies a bit. I think maybe Birmingham probably does slightly more than most because we have a very supportive Coroner and police who are very supportive and it's very much in the forefront of everyone's minds.

- **Q.** Is the national data for the number of these SUDIC cases or Joint Agency Responses -- is that captured anywhere that you're aware of?
- **A.** It's captured by National Child Mortality Database, yes.
- **Q.** And for how long has that been the position, do you know?
- **A.** National Child Mortality Database started collecting data on child deaths in 2019.
- **Q.** I'm generalising here because we're going to look at the detail of it, but are the fundamental constituents of a SUDIC process or a Joint Agency Response that firstly it starts very, very early?
 - A. Yes, within -- pretty much it should start as 125

a footprint with healthcare services.

In the rare cases where we have to run a Joint Agency Response for a child who has died very suddenly as an in-patient, then we would fully expect the paediatrician who was caring for that child to be part of that Joint Agency Response. Whether they have the skills to actually sort of chair it, so to speak, may depend and the -- and either a Designate Doctor or the specialist nurse may be there to support them, but they are definitely needed to be part of that team investigating that death because they've got that knowledge of the child.

Q. So we will come back to the detail as it was and as it is and we will start with as it was, so this is my next topic, please, the standards at the time, and we're going to look at four domains here. The first is we're going to look at the statutory guidance; then we're going to look at the guidance issued by the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health; then we will look at some overarching NHS guidance and finally in this topic we will look at the position in Wales.

So we will begin please with the statutory guidance. My Lady, you have this behind tab 6.

LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: Thank you.

MR DE LA POER: This is the document referred to as 127

soon as it is recognised that it's an unexpected death.

- **Q.** Secondly, that it is a multi-agency response, that is to say it is not just the doctors who are there at the point of death, or who have come to certify the death, it goes far beyond them?
- **A.** Yes. Police are always involved and social care as well.
- **Q.** And does it involve a person who holds the role of Designated Paediatrician?
- A. The Designate Doctor sort of overall is there to advise, but you have a lead health professional because it wouldn't be possible for me in my role to manage all 40 cases in Birmingham, particularly as you have to have an immediate response out of hours. So you have a senior healthcare professional who is a Consultant Paediatrician or sometimes a specialist nurse who pulls the team together and leads the health response -- health part of the investigation.
- **Q.** Would you expect that person to potentially have been involved in the care of the child before death or are they independent from the care of the child that they may have received?
- **A.** I mean, the vast majority of Joint Agency Responses are for children who die suddenly and unexpectedly, so therefore they haven't got much of

"Working Together" as a shorthand but what I will ask, please, is for the INQ0013235 to be brought up on our screen. We will start at page 1 and we can see the full title is rather more comprehensive.

Thank you very much indeed.

We can see there, Dr Garstang, the rather fuller title that is emphasising what will become a theme in your evidence that this is about inter-agency working.

- A. Yes, correct, yes.
- **Q.** Now, we have brought up the March 2015 version. In fact there were predecessors to this, weren't there?
 - A. Yes, every few years, yes.
 - **Q.** Was one of the predecessors the 2013 edition?
- **A.** It was, but certainly the Child Death Review16 element of 2013 was virtually identical to 2015.
 - **Q.** So although this is the version that is, if you like, in force for the period that the Inquiry is focused upon, in fact it doesn't contain things which were new or unique as compared to the earlier guidance when it comes to the process we're going to be looking at?
 - A. That's correct, yes.
 - **Q.** So could we move forward, please, to paragraph 7. We're just going to go through this and, 128

(32) Pages 125 - 128

Dr Garstang, I hope you will forgive me but I'm just going to, through you, introduce some of these key concepts. So page 7 of this document, please. We can see -- can I just check that that is page 7?

LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: It is paragraph 7 you're asking for, is it?

MR DE LA POER: Thank you, yes. We're going to have a look first at paragraph 6 here which is in the centre of our screen. Thank you very much indeed. The sentence begins:

"This statutory guidance should be read and followed by ..."

Then it gives a list and can we see that within that list, Dr Garstang, is included social workers and professionals from the health services?

A. Correct, yes.

- Q. And we can see at paragraph 7 that:
- "All relevant professionals ..."

So in other words those who have just been identified:

"... should read and follow this guidance so that they can respond to individual children's needs appropriately."

- A. Correct, yes.
- Q. If we move forward, please, to the next page, 129

or potential abusers, may pose to children."

- A. Yes.
- **Q.** Then if we move down, please, to the bottom of page 8 we can see that paragraph 14, which is a little further down, identifies key principles and again can you confirm that this is the position, that safeguarding is everyone's responsibility: for services to be effective each professional and organisation should play their [part to the full] ..."
 - A. Absolutely, yes.
- **Q.** And again a child-centred approach, that they need to be based on a clear understanding of the needs and views of children?
- A. Yes. I just say for child death you still take it that even though a child has died they have the right to have their death investigated fully, the right that we learn from their death and also you're thinking of future children's rights to not die from the same thing. So that's how it sort of relates to child death.
- **Q.** Thank you. If we keep scrolling down and I promise you we won't look at every single line within this, but these are important principles. The heading "Safeguarding is everyone's responsibility" is obviously one of those key principles just identified and we can see that a non-exhaustive list is given, which includes,

and we can just pause at the top there. We see at paragraph 12 the guidance is aimed to:

"... help professionals understand what they need to do, and what they can expect of one another, to safeguard children."

And if we look to the last sentence in that paragraph:

"In doing so, it seeks to emphasise that effective safeguarding systems are those where ..."

And it then gives a list of effective safeguarding systems. Included in that is the first bullet point which is absolutely central, would you agree, to the whole idea about child safeguarding, which is:

"The child's needs are paramount, and the needs and wishes of each child, be they a baby or infant, or an older child, should be put first, so that every child receives the support they need before a problem escalates."

- A. Yes, absolutely.
- Q. And the second bullet point:

21 "All professionals who come into contact with 22 children and families are alert to their needs ..."

- A. Yes.
- Q. And:
- "... and any risks of harm that individual abusers, 130

for example, paediatricians, but presumably you would say includes managers and nurses as well in an NHS setting?

- A. Absolutely, yes.
- Q. At paragraph 20 "A child-centred approach":

"Effective safeguarding systems are child centred. Failings in safeguarding systems are too often the result of losing sight of the needs and views of the children within them, or placing the interests of adults ahead of the needs of children."

- A. That's correct.
- **Q.** Another important principle, would you agree?
 - A. Very much.

Q. So can we move forward please to page 17 and here we have paragraph 24 and I will just read it out again and perhaps you can help us with what it might mean in practice:

"Fears about sharing information cannot be allowed to stand in the way of the need to promote the welfare and protect the safety of children."

It goes on to say:

"To ensure effective safeguarding arrangements:

"All organisations should have arrangements in place which set out clearly the processes and the principles for sharing information between each other,

support

1	with other professionals and with the LSCB"
2	That's the Local Safeguarding Children Board?
3	A. That's correct, so yes, all health
4	organisations sort of within a local area would have
5	proper data-sharing arrangements, absolutely, to sup
6	safeguarding.

Q. And the second bullet point:

"No professional should assume that someone else will pass on information which they think may be critical to keeping a child safe. If a professional has concerns about a child's welfare and believes they are suffering or likely to suffer harm, then they should share the information with local authority children's social care."

A. That's correct, yes.

Q. And again this is a recurring theme which is perhaps moving slightly away from child death but nonetheless you will be I'm sure very familiar with it. The idea of involving the local authority and in particular the local authority's designated officer is absolutely central, isn't it, to working together with children?

A. Well, absolutely, yes, but I mean one of the sort of key mantras of safeguarding is that no child has ever died because people shared too much information,

safeguard and promote the welfare of children."

We will leave commissioning to one side, but where one is providing services designed to safeguard that needs to have a clear line of accountability, is that correct?

- A. Yes, yes.
- Q. Second bullet:

"A senior board level lead to take leadership responsibility for the organisation's safeguarding arrangements."

- A. Yes -- I mean yes.
- **Q.** We then at the fourth bullet point have:

"Clear whistleblowing procedures, which reflect the principles in Sir Robert Francis' Freedom to Speak Up review ..."

We heard something about that this morning from the witness, Professor Dixon-Woods, but is that something that was so far as 2015 was concerned something that was expected?

- **A.** If it was in Working Together, it would have been expected.
- **Q.** Then we have at the sixth bullet point a reference to a designated professional lead:
- "... (or, for health provider organisations, named professional) for safeguarding."

that the onus is always it is better to share information, and that, yes, the protecting children is your fundamental responsibility and not the adults or organisations or anything else around them and to always keep the children at the forefront.

Q. We're going to move forward, please, to page 52. Here we have the section 11 duty under the Children Act of 2004 and at paragraph 3 in this section we can see the organisations and people that section 11 applies to and at the second bullet point we can see that "NHS organisations, including the NHS England and Clinical Commissioning Groups, NHS Trusts and NHS Foundation Trusts" are all within the scope of the duty, is that right?

A. That's correct, yes.

Q. Over the page, please, we can see what is expected of those organisations in terms of the arrangements they should have in place, namely that they should:

"... reflect the importance of safeguarding and promoting the welfare of children, including ..."

And there are a number of these bullet points which are relevant, the first:

"A clear line of accountability for the commissioning and/or provision of services designed to 134

Again is that where the role you have might fall into?

A. Yes, you had designates at ICB level or CCG level, as it was then, and named within healthcare organisations.

Q. We can see the seventh point is about the safe recruitment practices for individuals who are permitted to work regularly with children and then we can see at the next one, and this is a topic that the Inquiry will be returning to:

"Appropriate supervision and support for staff, including undertaking safeguarding training ..."

And the sub-bullet effectively amounts to this, doesn't it, Dr Garstang: that the employers need to ensure that their staff are competent to carry out their duties with the appropriate level of safeguarding knowledge?

A. That's correct, yes.

Q. And if we turn over the page, please, we can see two further sub-points which are the mandatory induction and then this:

"All professionals should have regular reviews of their own practice to ensure they improve over time."

24 So safeguarding is not a static thing?

A. Yes, correct, yes, you do annual safeguarding 136

(34) Pages 133 - 136

(24) Parray 422

updates. It's expected.

Q. Then the last one to look at here is:

"Clear policies in line with those from the LSCB for dealing with allegations against people who work with children. Such policies should make a clear distinction between an allegation, a concern about the quality of care or practice or a complaint."

Then it goes on to define in three ways how an allegation may relate to a person who works with children and I would just like to just focus on the wording here, Dr Garstang, and see if you can help us a little with it. The first bullet is:

"Behaved in a way that has harmed a child, or may a have harmed a child."

The second is:

"Possibly committed a criminal offence against or related to a child; or

"Behaved towards a child or children in a way that indicates they may pose a risk of harm to children."

So we see that word "may" used in the first and third and "possibly", so in terms of your understanding what is the threshold for concern before you do something?

A. I mean, what it means here is that you only have to have concerns that it might have happened. You

necessarily about this, but whether it is appropriate to make a referral to social care for a child who is at harm from their family and discussing what to do next, so they are there to advise and support healthcare -- well, professionals within their organisation.

Q. Thank you. We're going to move forward, please, just to note at page 56, halfway down the page -- we don't need to look at the detail of all of this but we can see from the heading that it expressly deals with health services as part of its guidance, is that right?

A. That's correct, yes.

Q. If we just have a look at paragraph 16, for example:

"All staff working in healthcare settings - including those who predominantly treat adults - should receive training to ensure they attain the competences appropriate to their role and follow the relevant professional guidance."

If we go over the page we can see "Within the NHS", again this idea of a named or designated doctor and a named or designated nurse, third bullet:

"All providers of NHS funded health services, including NHS Trusts, NHS Foundation Trusts and public, voluntary sector, independent sector and social

don't need to prove -- it's not up to you to prove it before making a referral. Certainly -- I mean I have -- these cases -- it's obviously very difficult when there's concerns that it might be a staff member who has harmed or might have harmed a child, so you would expect that there would be discussions within that healthcare organisation with the Trust's safeguarding team and getting advice from them, but if there was any doubt they would make that referral to allow a proper investigation. It's not up to an individual organisation to do the investigation themselves because you have only got that one element of the picture. The other agencies may have much more information.

Q. In terms of an individual who isn't part of the formal safeguarding structure, so they're not the Designated Doctor or they're not formally badged as somebody in the safeguarding hierarchy, what is the level of concern that they need to have in order to raise it with someone internally who is a part of that safeguarding structure?

A. Well, if they've got any concern they should be going to their Trust safeguarding team for advice. That is what the -- all Trusts have safeguarding teams, that's what they're there for. Often clinicians are going to the safeguarding teams -- I mean not 138

enterprises should identify a named doctor and a named nurse (and a named midwife if the organisation provides maternity services) for safeguarding."

A. That's correct, yes.

Q. So that is, in a sense, generality of the guidance?

A. Yes.

Q. But we're going to now move to what it says about the specific circumstances of a child death and we will find that, please, on page 81. This is under the heading of "Child Death Reviews" so this is, as we described it before, not immediately focusing in on the sudden unexpected death element, but this is the process that covers all children.

A. Correct, yes.

Q. And we can see reference there to the Local Safeguarding Children Board and in particular the responsibilities in that blue box. This may be outside of your expertise, Dr Garstang, but I wonder if you can just help us. In terms of the LSCB, it is required by the regulations to have responsibility for:

"Collecting and analysing information about each death with a view to identifying ..."

And then the second (ii):

"Any matters of concern affecting the safety and 140

welfare of children in the area of the authority."

Now, in practice is that something that they need help with, or are they just expected to do that whether or not any matter of concern is drawn to their attention?

A. I mean, my take on that is that's the process of Child Death Review. You're looking to identify anything that can be done to stop children dying in future and to improve the sort of lives of children, rather than just being purely looking at it from a safeguarding perspective. That is part of it but not all of it.

Q. So a safeguarding concern may be a matter of concern but --

A. Yes.

Q. -- so might hygiene or countless other factors?

A. Road safety -- yes.

Q. In terms of identifying any wider public health or safety concern arising from a particular death or from a pattern of deaths in that area, presumably that is predicated upon the Local Safeguarding Children Board being made aware of all of the deaths that might form a pattern?

A. Yes. I mean, generally local -- it was 141

addressed that and said that CDOPs need to have oversight of all the deaths in their area, regardless of where children live and to think about which CDOP should actually do the review, so, for instance, again using Birmingham as an example, if a child dies in Birmingham Children's Hospital having been an in-patient there for most of their life, as sometimes happens, then it kind of makes sense that their death is reviewed by Birmingham CDOP.

If on the other hand a child dies following a road traffic accident in Wolverhampton and is airlifted to Birmingham Children's Hospital and dies shortly afterwards, it makes much more sense that probably the learning comes from Wolverhampton, but it needs a discussion probably on a case-by-case basis.

The electronic platform we use for CDOP reviews at the moment doesn't allow for transfer of cases although they are working on it to change it, but also it takes a lot more time to do it and Child Death Review is a bit of a poor relation to safeguarding and NHS funds are tight, that to do Child Death Review well takes a lot of resource and thankfully in Birmingham we have invested well in it but I'm aware that my CDOP probably has much greater resources than many others in terms of the amount of doctor time and admin time to make sure that

usually quite straightforward back in sort of -- going back to sort of 2015 for this guidance getting -- knowing that a child had died, but getting hold of all the relevant information and relating to that death in 2015 may have been more difficult.

The one issue that was relevant here and also still is an issue is that the CDOP footprint is based on where the child's home address is and not where they died and so therefore, for example I use Birmingham because I'm familiar, we have a national level Children's Hospital there, so probably only around a third of children who die in Birmingham Children's Hospital get reviewed by my CDOP, the other two-thirds are split over the rest of the country because they provide a national level paediatric intensive care, so that does make it much more difficult for CDOPs to have that oversight because some of your children are dying elsewhere.

Q. You have made that point very clearly, if I may say so, and rather than leave it to the end, let's just deal with it now.

A. Okay.

Q. What, in your view, is the solution to that particular problem?

A. I mean, it's already been looked at with the -- this year's Working Together has in part

we have a high-quality review.

Q. Well, we will come back to the issue of resources in our final section.

Can we move forward, please, to page 83 which is going to give us a flowchart which is to be followed for all child deaths and here we're looking at, if you like, the generic process before we look at what additional steps may be taken if the death is sudden and unexpected and we can see there as it moves down the flow diagram that that large box towards the bottom left-hand corner is the CDOP meeting.

A. Mm-hm

Q. Which follows, as you have already described, a number of earlier steps.

A. Yes

Q. And we can see that that may not be the end of it, that first meeting, because there may be further enquiries that are required?

A. Yes, sometimes yes, in which case you pause the CDOP and you come back to CDOP when you've got all the right information to complete your review.

Q. If we go over the page, please, to page 84, we will see -- and I'm not going to read all of these out but they are now -- they form part of the Inquiry record. We can see the responsibilities of the Child

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Death Overview Panel are all set out there. As I say, at this stage we need do no more between us than acknowledge that there is a comprehensive list which I'm sure you will agree captures what they were expected to do in 2015?

> Α. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. We're now going to move forward, please, to page 85 where we're going to come to that subset of the Child Death Review process which is unexpected, sudden and unexpected death and there is, as we're about to see, can you confirm, a whole section of Working Together in 2015 devoted to this?

Α. That's correct, yes.

It begins with a definition that we will see in more than one place, that:

"... an unexpected death is defined as the death of an infant or child which was not anticipated as a significant possibility for example, 24 hours before the death; or where there was an unexpected collapse or incident leading to or precipitating the events which lead to death."

You have already told us something about the fact that reasonable people can reasonably disagree about whether a death was unexpected, depending upon the presentation of the child in the preceding period, but 145

is not taken immediately to an Accident and Emergency Department) should inform the local Designated Paediatrician with responsibility for unexpected child deaths at the same time as informing the Coroner and the police."

Α. Yes, that's right, though in reality the local Designated Paediatrician is not going to be notified in the middle of the night for every case. Often that responsibility is devolved to the Consultant Paediatrician on call to hold the case until working hours

Now, one of the things the Inquiry will be investigating -- and I'm not here descending into the facts, but just describing an area of investigation -is the fact that whether different Consultants and doctors being involved in different deaths meant that relevant information didn't come together in one place as quickly as it might otherwise. That's a matter for us to investigate.

If the Designated Paediatrician is informed in every case, whether or not it's in the middle of the night or the next morning, does that potentially address that issue?

It does. So, for instance, in Birmingham I'm aware of all the cases that my colleagues are managing 147

this is the definition that they should be centering their discussion around, is that right?

Yes, and that's still the definition we use and I think it's important to note it makes no reference to where that collapse takes place. Whilst most unexpected deaths happen outside of hospital, they can and do sometimes happen in hospital and that -- there is no mention that you exclude an unexpected death just because it has happened in an in-patient area.

13, back again to that important role:

"The designated paediatrician responsible for unexpected deaths in childhood should be consulted where professionals are uncertain about whether the death is unexpected. If in doubt, the processes for unexpected child deaths should be followed until the available evidence enables a different decision to be made."

So the grey areas are accommodated: if in doubt, start the process?

A. Absolutely: if in doubt, start; you can always stop

Q. Then we have 15, which may shed some further light on the circumstances this applies in:

"When a child dies suddenly and unexpectedly, the Consultant clinician (in a hospital setting) or the professional confirming the fact of death (if the child 146

and in our -- and I have a team of nurses as well who are aware of them, so if we have any -- if there are any particular challenges and often there are because no case is ever straightforward, we can sit down and talk

Moving forward, please, to page 86 and it is just a matter that you draw attention to in your witness statement. If we have a look at paragraph 17 we can see

"In all cases when a child dies in hospital, or is taken to hospital after dying, the hospital should allocate a member of staff to remain with the parents and support them through the process."

I think you are aware of some debate as to whether or not this applied to hospital settings. Does that sentence which you have drawn attention to help you with your understanding of where it applied?

Yes. I mean, to me it makes clear that it should happen, irrespective of where the child has died and I think it sort of confirms certainly relating back to the RCPCH Child Protection Companion, again that supports that principle.

We will certainly come and have a look at that, although I promise you not in this much detail, shortly.

148

and work out what to do. that -- the final sentence in that paragraph:

If we move forward, please, to page 87 and just look briefly at paragraph 19, we have another responsibility in terms of notification:

"Where a child dies unexpectedly, all registered providers of healthcare services must notify the Care Quality Commission of the death of a service user - but NHS providers may discharge this duty by notifying NHS England."

Now, in practical terms what does that mean and how much in your experience is it observed?

- A. To be honest, I really -- I'm not sure how that works or what it means for NHS England or what they do with the data. I certainly wasn't aware of it -- I mean, I was aware of the requirement in 2015, but I think it was very much probably an administrative task. I suspect now it's covered by the notification to the National Child Mortality Database.
- **Q.** Which as you have told us didn't come into being until 2019?
 - A. Yes.

Q. Again we will just bookmark this for later evidence sessions, but we can see that the Designated Paediatrician for Unexpected Deaths in Childhood is given a specific section there inside that box at the bottom, is that correct?

you that it seems to be based upon a community death, rather than a hospital death?

- A. I mean it certainly looks much more like a hospital -- sorry, like a community death, but I mean of our 40 Joint Agency Responses a year in Birmingham we might have one that relates to an in-patient death, so therefore any flowchart which is summarising a process is going to point much more towards the majority process.
- **Q.** Regardless of that, is this clear from it, that we talked about timescales, we've got a period of the first two to four hours, so in other words working at speed?
- A. Absolutely. Pretty much -- if you're in the Emergency Department and you are initiating a Joint Agency Response, if the police aren't there already, whereas very often they automatically are notified by ambulances with an out-of-hospital child cardiac arrest, you're picking up the phone and asking the police to come in and if it's a sudden collapse in hospital, when the hospitals are sort of phoning up a SUDI or a Joint Agency Response doctor for advice, our first line is "Have you called the police?" because they need to be there.
 - Q. Thank you very much indeed. We can take that 151

A. Yes, yes.

Q. And it is they who are ensuring that all people who need to know are notified and the list includes Coroner, police, local authority.

- A. That's correct, yes.
- **Q.** Of course that is necessary, isn't it, for there to be a multi-agency response?
- **A.** Yes, you can't do a multi-agency response without notifying the other agencies.
 - Q. Over the page, page 88, paragraph 22:

"If a doctor is not able to issue a medical certificate of the cause of death, the lead professional or investigator must report the child's death to the Coroner in accordance with a protocol agreed with the local Coronial service."

- A. That's a fundamental medical practice.
- **Q.** Over to page 91 we're going to get a flowchart and here we have already touched upon this, the idea that there may be some uncertainty about whether this applies only to community settings and we're going to have a look at the historical background to this and why people may have thought that, or whether it applies more generally. You have given the firm view that this applies more generally to all child deaths, but when one has a look at this particular flowchart does it look to

document down. So that's the review of Working Together in 2015 and you have already told us that what we have just looked at is materially the same as what was the position in 2013, so I would just like to go back in time even further, just to try and understand the evolution of this process because this may be relevant.

The language that we saw there in terms of the definition of an unexpected death, was that language that was first devised by the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health?

- A. Actually the first definition of term of SUDI,
 Sudden Unexpected Death in Infancy was from the
 CESDI-SUDI studies from Peter Fleming and team which was
 I think in the early 1990s or possibly the 1980s. That
 was where the first use of the term "SUDI" came from.
- **Q.** So the term is coined there but in terms of when it first came into guidance, did we see the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health use it?
- **A.** Yes, with the 2004 RCPCH and RCPath guidance. That's when it sort of hit the mainstream if that's ...
- **Q.** Now, in terms of the circumstances which were envisaged that would be subject to that process, what was the focus of that document?
- **A.** The 2004 focus was absolutely around your classic sudden infant death, baby found unexpectedly

dead at home, and it didn't mention sort of really			
anywhere about hospitals or older children or any sort			
of unusual circumstances. It was very much focused or			
a classic case at home.			

- **Q.** So giving clear guidance for those circumstances, not referring to wider circumstances in a particular hospital setting but not saying "You mustn't follow this guidance" either?
- **A.** Yes, it didn't say "Don't", but it didn't mention that you might do it for a hospital death.
- Q. So that's the first RCPCH publication. If we then move forward to May 2013 which is obviously the year that that version of Working Together that we have spoken about, 2013, had materially the same information in, and in that year did the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health publish a Child Protection Companion?
 - A. Yes, it did, yes.
- **Q.** This isn't dealt with in your witness statement, but I understand it is a document that you have some familiarity with?
 - A. Yes.

Q. And, my Lady, it's at tab 10 of your bundle.
I wonder for this, please, if we can bring it up on screen INQ0108020. We can move forward, please, through 153

the Child Death Overview process. It is specifically focused [as you just told us] on learning lessons to improve the way agencies and individuals work, both individually and collectively, to safeguard and promote the welfare of children."

- **A.** Yes, so it's a much more -- serious case reviews are much more in-depth, looking at the multi-agency safeguarding, yes.
- **Q.** If we then move forward to the next page please, we can see the heading "Child Deaths", so that's the start of the section dealing with child deaths and if we go over the page, please, and we have some definitions and do we see there a familiar definition at 15.4.1, defining what an unexpected child death is?
 - A. Absolutely, yes.
- **Q.** Express reference there to the SUDI or SUDIC process
 - A. Yes.
- **Q**. And on the face of it no distinction in that definition as to location?
 - A. Absolutely, yes.
- Q. We can see at the bottom of our screen there, 15.5.1:

"When a child dies suddenly or unexpectedly, a coordinated and timely multi-agency response provides this document to page 151. Thank you very much indeed.

We will begin here. This is under the heading "Infant and Child Deaths". If we move towards the bottom of the page we can see there's a reference to a Serious Case Review.

- A. Yes.
- **Q.** According to this guidance a Serious Case Review, which is not a term that we have been looking at previously, must always be held where abuse or neglect of a child is known or suspected.
- A. Yes. I mean, a Serious Case Review is different to a Child Death Review. It's a safeguarding review and it's looking at -- it's not an investigation into what happened and the cause of death, it's about sort of learning for improving safeguarding systems, so it's a separate process and a child would have both a Serious Case Review and a Child Death Review if they died from abuse or neglect.
- Q. I think in fact if we look at the second (ii), it also applies if the child has been seriously harmed?
- A. Yes.
 - **Q.** So if we go over the page, please, to 152 and again just looking for more information about what this process requires, at 15.2.10 it is described as "... more in-depth and focused review than that involved in 154

the opportunity to support the family through their bereavement, and to investigate that child's death thoroughly and sensitively."

And so this is absolutely, would you agree, aligned with the statutory guidance?

- **A.** Yes, I mean this was a sort of distillation of the statutory guidance, of the Kennedy Guidance and Working Together is a I suppose easy distillation for a working paediatrician, that's what this was aimed for and in fact the authors of this chapter were people who had contributed to Kennedy and were experts in SUDI.
- **Q.** We're just going to look at a couple more passages in terms of just looking at this point as to what the expectation was in these guidance documents.

If we look at page 155, and we look at 15.6.3:

"These processes would not normally apply to children dying in hospital from known causes, or those with known life-limiting or life-threatening conditions"

So a natural inference from that is that it would otherwise apply to children dying in hospitals?

A. Yes, absolutely, yes. The inference is that if you don't know why the child has died and they're an in-patient in hospital, you should be doing the unexpected death process.

Q. Just one last page to look at in here because, as you have told us, it's a working guide for -- or a guide for working paediatricians which aligns with guidance that we have already looked at in considerable detail

Can we go to page 160 because there flagged for the reader is a -- this is under the heading "Records and Reports" and could we scroll down, please, because there's a cut out box which is a reference to recommendation 68 from the Victoria Climbié Inquiry in 2003:

"When concerns about the deliberate harm of a child have been raised, doctors must ensure that comprehensive and contemporaneous notes are made of these concerns. If doctors are unable to make their own notes, they must be clear about what it is they wish to have recorded on their behalf."

Just help us, Dr Garstang, in practice how important is it that when people have concerns that they write them down?

A. Well, it is sort of drummed into you through medical training that if you don't write something down, it didn't happen, so it's very important to document as well but also when you're handing over cases -- yes, I mean you're -- writing notes is a principle of medical

deaths, but it's only very occasionally we need to do a Sudden Unexpected Death in Infancy investigation.

Q. Is that because sudden and unexpected deaths on a neonatal unit are themselves rare events?

A. Yes. I mean again going back to Birmingham, with our 160 deaths a year, 80 of those are babies in their first month of life, the majority of whom die on neonatal units and it's about once a year that -- so one of those 80 we might need to do a SUDI investigation for, so it is a rare event.

Q. We will move on to the broader framework guidance and you have looked at this in considerable detail in your second witness statement. Again, we don't need to bring up the detail of it, partly because we're not going to see what we might have been looking for in it and I will ask you just to explain that in a moment, but were you asked by the Inquiry to have a look at the Safeguarding Assurance Framework from 2013?

A. Yes, I was, yes.

Q. And was that a document that before now, in all of your experience in this area, that you had ever come across before you were asked to look at it?

A. No, I hadn't seen it before this Inquiry, no.

Q. Did you review it as we requested you to?

159

practice.

Q. So we're going to move away from this document and just complete our review of the Royal College documentation. We don't need to bring it up, so we can take that down from the screen. Thank you very much indeed.

Can you confirm that in November 2016 the Royal College updated that 2004 guidance which had been written from that community point of view?

A. Yes, that's right, yes.

Q. We're not going to go to any of the detail of that, Core Participants have access to that, but firstly, is it still the guidance that the RCPCH has issued for SUDIC?

A. It still is. It's woefully out of date but we're not able to update it at present.

Q. I can assure you there is going to be an opportunity in our second session just to deal with that, but in terms of clearing up where it applied is there, for example, express references to deaths on neonatal units?

A. I can't remember the exact wording. It says it wouldn't normally apply in a neonatal unit but that doesn't mean it shouldn't apply because absolutely we -- sadly on a neonatal unit each year there are many

A. Yes, I did.

Q. And in terms of the 2013 guidance, in summary, what was your conclusion about the adequacy of that document as far as Child Death Review was concerned?

A. It was inadequate. It barely mentioned it, which probably explains why I wasn't familiar with it.

Q. Were you also asked to look at the 2015 version of the same framework?

A. Yes. I was, yes.

Q. And did you reach the same conclusion?

A. I did, yes.

Q. Well, in the second session we will look at the latest version of the framework. We will just conclude this session, please, as I said I would, by having a look at the position in Wales.

Now, up until now, certainly as far as the statutory guidance was concerned, was that for England?

A. Yes, the -- well, certainly the 2018 Child Death Review guidance applies only to England and Working Together -- forgive me, I am not quite sure whether that applies to Wales as well, or whether they have their own version of it, but I'm sure it would be very, very similar.

Q. I'm sure that we can check that very easily, but in terms of guidance that's been issued specific to 160

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the child death process was there guidance in force in
2014?

- A. So the PRUDiC guidance, yes, but it had much less of a statutory basis.
- Now, the PRUDIC guidance -- my Lady, you have this behind tab 5, if we can just bring that up on screen. We're just going to have a look at the couple of pages within it. That is INQ0106967.

If we turn, please, to page 3 of that guidance, we can see at paragraph 1.1:

"This procedure sets a minimum standard for a response to unexpected deaths in infancy and childhood. It describes the process of communication, collaborative action and information-sharing following the unexpected death of a child."

At 1.2 it makes clear that it begins at the point of death and ends with the completed record of child death being sent to the Child Death Review programme.

At 1.3:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"This procedural response will be followed when:

"A decision has been made that the death of a child is unexpected or

"There is a lack of clarity about whether the death of a child is unexpected or

"The cause of a child's death is not apparent and

At 3.2 an express statement that it applies in all circumstances, including deaths in hospital settings?

A. Yes.

Q. If we then move forward to page 8 we are going to have a look at the position in terms of where a child dies unexpectedly in another area because of course this is guidance for Wales --

A. Yes.

-- and all of the deaths that the Inquiry is considering in detail occurred in England.

Α.

Q. We can see that at 6.3, according to the guidance:

"When a child dies in England, but is normally resident in Wales, the PRUDiC or the English Child Death Overview Panel process may occur wherever and however the family and the principles of the PRUDiC process will be best served."

Α. Yes.

Does that envisage some consultation with the family about the process?

I mean, it would do, but I must say, having never worked on the Welsh borders or in Wales, I'm not an expert on how this actually happened in practice.

163

it is not possible to issue a death certificate."

So again, aligning with the expectations of Working Together: if in doubt, follow the procedure?

Correct, yes.

At 1.5, again aligning with this common theme we have seen:

"This is a multi-agency procedural response intended to ensure consistency across Wales, and is not agency or discipline specific. It outlines what needs to be achieved and gives broad suggestions about the roles of agencies. It does not replace existing internal agency or professional procedures."

Critically there, the first words of it, it's multi-agency?

> A. Yes.

Q. Now, if we go to page 6 -- we don't need to work our way through it for reasons that we will get to immediately after this page, but we can see that it provides guidance for specifically unexpected death as a hospital in-patient?

A. Yes, that's right, yes.

There's a flow diagram that follows.

If we go to page 7, we will see at 3.1 a familiar definition, would you agree, Dr Garstang?

A. Yes, yes.

162

Nor will I ask you to do more than confirm your expectation that there would be some kind of cross-border agreement?

Absolutely, yes.

Why in your view is it important that there is Q. such an agreement?

Well, because otherwise children will fall through the net. I mean, we have sort of cross area arrangements throughout England because it's very common with a major hospital that a child in cardiac arrest may be taken out of their local area to a Children's Hospital and you have then got to initiate a SUDIC process and hand it back to the local area where the child lives.

Two final matters before I'm going to ask the Chair to take a break -- and we can take that document down -- and they relate to your personal experience.

Firstly, in terms of your experience in Birmingham, you talk in your witness statement about the position in November 2017 and I think that was when you returned to frontline clinical practice, is that right?

A. I mean, I returned to clinical practice from my PhD in the summer of 2015, but the role I was in in Coventry didn't involve anything to do with child deaths.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3	A. Yes, yes, was the summer of 2017 when			
4	I swapped to work in Birmingham.			
5	Q. And at that stage what was your experience			
6	about the approach to SUDIC and in particular the			
7	approach to SUDIC and hospital deaths?			
8	A. It was a bit of a culture shock actually			
9	coming back to frontline SUDIC having been I suppose			
10	from an academic SUDIC background because in those			
11	intervening years the definition of what was included in			
12	the SUDIC had vastly expanded, so, for instance, when we			
13	started out in 2008 when I was doing I was helping			
14	run the training courses with the people who had written			
15	the original 2004 guidance, we never thought of			
16	including hospital deaths, we never thought of any child			
17	with a life-limiting condition would ever have a SUDIC			
18	response, and then in sort of 2017 when I'm back on the			
19	frontline it many more children being included in			
20	SUDI, so children who died in hospitals, children who			
21	•			
22	have life-limiting conditions but died unexpectedly, so			
23	yes, it was a big change. My thought is I suspect it			
24	5 5			
25	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
23	165			
1	individual you're looking at the Designated Doctor for,			
2	as it was called, Unexpected Death?			
3	A. Yes, at that point it would have been the			
4	Designated Doctor for Unexpected Death's responsibility			
5	to make sure that everyone knew what to do.			
6	MR DE LA POER: Dr Garstang, thank you.			
7	My Lady, I wonder if that would be a convenient			
8	moment for a break?			
9	LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: Yes, thank you very much			
10	indeed. We will have a break until 25 to 4.			
11	(3.18 pm)			
12	(Short Break)			
13	(3.35 pm)			
14	LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: Mr De la Poer.			
15	MR DE LA POER: My Lady, thank you.			
16	Dr Garstang, we're going to move from the standards			
17	of 2015/2016 to my fourth and penultimate topic, the			
18	standards now, and we start as we did before with the			
19	statutory guidance. Is there a 2023 version of Working			
20	Together?			
21	A. Yes, there is.			
22	Q. Does that set out for Sudden Unexpected Deaths			
	•			

So that was your first exposure to how it was

.

working in practice on the ground?

1

2

23

24

25

version?

frontline at the time those changes came in.

But it was well-established upon your return?

It was. There was no doubt about it because we had -- as I said, these are rare events and when they happen, whichever of my Consultant colleagues is on call is usually contacting me or other colleagues just checking they are doing the right thing because they are not straightforward, so you tend to remember them.

The final topic is this and it's a short one: in your view, back in 2015/2016, who, if anyone, had responsibility to ensure that the frontline doctors and nurses knew about the system that needs to have come in around 2013?

So that would have come to the Local Safeguarding Children Board because at that point they were responsible for Child Death Overview Panels and for what was called the rapid response, or the SUDI response, so they had sort of ultimate responsibility but through the Designate Doctor for, as it was then called, Unexpected Death to make sure that everyone knew and everyone trained and there were good local protocols because you have to have protocols and policies between Coroners, police and healthcare for it to run smoothly.

So in terms of filtering that information through to the frontline, when you get to any given 166

Yes, but it's the summary. It refers back to the 2018 Child Death Review statutory and operational guidance, which is much more detailed.

So it effectively incorporates a separate piece of guidance which is exclusively devoted to that topic?

Yes.

Q. And that came in in 2018?

It was published in 2018. It was sort of required to be enacted from October 2019.

As you say, that's a much more detailed document than we saw in the 2015, but does it in summary envisage a JAR, a Joint Agency Response?

Yes, it does, yes, it talks of the Joint Agency Response, yes.

Q. No difference between that and a multi-agency response?

No, it's exactly the same but they decided to change the terminology.

Again, is that envisaged that in the case of a child who falls within the definition of a Sudden Unexpected Death, for that to be geared up very quickly?

Yes, that you're starting it sort of within a couple of hours of the death, yes.

> Are similar or the same agencies involved as 168

167

in Childhood and Infancy, does that set out a process

much like the one we have looked at for the 2015

was envisaged in 2015?

A. Yes, it's police, healthcare, social care, with the Coroner's investigation running sort of in parallel but working very closely with them.

Q. In terms of the Police, and this will be as true now as it was in 2015 subject to training, what value does the police bring to that situation?

- Well, the police are there on behalf of the Coroner and they give a lot of background information, so they will know about a family's criminal records or other concerns and they will sort of -- the police you work with are -- there are specialist child abuse police officers, so they've got a very good handling of child abuse and neglect and they will -- I mean, we all offer each other challenge. They will sort of challenge paediatricians sometimes, have we thought appropriately of safeguarding, or we may challenge them. But I think also it means that if there's then -- if you do have soft concerns about something, you're not having to pick up the phone to somebody you have no relationship with or you don't know that actually they're already a part of your core team so it's very easy to have those discussions.
- Q. I'm sure I know what you mean, but can you just define for us what you mean by "soft concerns"?

child who is in a position of trust when a child has died unexpectedly, that perhaps you might be thinking do you need to go down a LADO route. It's incredibly unusual that it is a healthcare professional that you are worried has been involved in the child death -- or causing the child death, but absolutely we would be discussing that with them and very much with social care because they are the people with the responsibility for managing LADO.

- **Q.** You have described it on a number of occasions being incredibly rare or very rare. Does the existing system accommodate it though?
- A. It does, completely. I mean, for example, there is one case in Birmingham that has been reported in the press where there were concerns that a healthcare professional may have harmed a child in intensive care and my team were notified within hours of the event. The hospital contacted us for advice of what to do and our advice was "We have to call the police now", so the police were called in the middle of the night and by the following morning we had got a strategy meeting deciding what to do and later that day we were having positions of trust meeting.
- **Q.** And when you say you've got to call the police now, is that call the police as a member of the public

A. Well, I suppose if you were worried that abuse or -- much more soft, something like neglect had contributed to a child's death, you might want to talk it through with the police and think "Well, actually are we right to be concerned about" -- in most cases it is to do with parents' actions, that is this right "Are we right to be concerned about this or actually we're overthinking it?" So it's actually just having somebody from another agency to talk through your concerns and come up with usually an action plan of what further information do we need to do together to reassure ourselves or to escalate things further.

Q. Would you expect if there were concerns about a member of staff, for example, in the context of the death, would you expect that to be discussed with the police with a view to taking soundings from them about what they thought might be the next steps?

A. Absolutely. If there are concerns about a member of staff, yes, we would expect to go down the sort of local -- the LADO, the Local Authority

Designated Officer route. I mean, much more commonly that might be an issue of actually it's not that that person -- that person may be in a position of -- a position of trust but it's not actually -- and what I'm thinking about that it might be the parent of the

might call the police, or is that call the police in the context of their responsibility within the Joint Agency Response?

A. It was call the police as in the on call police officer for a Joint Agency Response who is a trained child abuse -- and have a conversation about what actions we need to take.

Q. So I'm going to move on from the statutory guidance as it is now, other than to ask you, in your view, is that statutory guidance adequate?

A. Yes, the 2018 Statutory Guidance I think is adequate but like all guidance it does need updating in some extents, for instance the Medical Examiner system has come into play since the guidance was written, but largely it stands.

Q. Whose responsibility is it to update that particular piece of guidance?

A. It would be the Department for Health.

Q. Moving to the Royal College, you have already alluded to the fact that the 2016 guidance is the extant guidance and I may be wrong in this recollection, but you may have used the word "woeful" to describe how out of date it is, but whatever term might be used, is it very out of date?

A. It is. The problem is that the 2018 guidance 172

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

16

20

21

22

23

24

25

refers to a Joint Agency Response and gives several different categories of death that need this multi-agency approach, such as deaths from trauma, suicide, unattended stillbirth, as well as your classic Sudden Unexpected Death in Infancy or Childhood.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The 2016 guidance is written from the point of view of a Sudden Unexpected Death in Infancy, full stop, and mentions you could possibly use some elements for an older child, so you've got guidance written for a sudden baby death being used to investigate a 17-year old who has died by suicide. It just doesn't work and also there is no guidance on how you manage a death of a child with a life-limiting condition, or the death of a child on an in-patient unit and so I think that's what causes confusion, that Police want to follow everything to the letter because that's the police mentality. Doctors like grey areas and nobody feels supported in making the right decision.

We're going to come to the hurdles and obstacles to updating that guidance, but just taking a step back, you will I'm sure be familiar with concerns that are expressed generally about there being too much guidance, that we have to look in a number of different places. If there is already this statutory guidance, what need, in your view, is there for the RCPCH guidance

A. That's NHS England.

Is there a target completion date for that that you're aware of, or is it simply on the to-do list to be done at some point when the money is available?

Yes, once we've got the -- there is a team of us from the National Child Mortality Database who have been working sort of jointly leading the work with the Royal College and it's probably the best part of a year's work because it will cover many different circumstances of death in the existing guidance, so it's the best part of a year's work but until we have funding agreed we can't even start so it's just on hold waiting.

We will come back to the RCPCH when it comes to training and general awareness, but staying with the guidance framework, we have the Safeguarding Assurance and Accountability Framework which there is a 2024 edition of, is that correct?

Α. That's correct, yes.

Now, you were in the earlier session not, if I may paraphrase it, terribly impressed with the previous versions in terms of Child Death Review. What is your view about the current version?

It's even less adequate given that responsibility for Child Death Review is now Department of Health rather than Department of Education, so it

to be updated as opposed to simply withdrawing it, clinicians told "look at the statutory guidance"?

The statutory guidance just covers the high level principle. It doesn't actually tell you what you're actually doing in your investigation, so for instance your multi-agency information sharing meetings, who needs to be there, what the purpose is for a child who has died suddenly at home by doing a joint home visit, what you might -- how you might manage a death of a child in hospital where you need to follow those processes, so, yes, it is very much needed because otherwise -- and I think you do need detailed guidance when you're in a multi-agency environment because all the different professions have got different perspectives and it makes it much easier, particularly when you're often dealing with rare events to actually have some detailed guidance that is based on good scientific evidence of what you should do and also informed on what's right for families too.

So the update is 100% necessary. Is it right that the RCPCH have agreed to lead in the creation of that update?

A. They have, but it's the funding that's the issue.

Who is responsible for the funding? 174

should be assured through NHS processes and it fundamentally forgets to assure it.

Q. And how is that to be remedied?

A. Well, either it needs to be included in the Safeguarding Assurance Framework sort of assuring the whole of the Child Death Review process as set out in the 2018 guidance, or there needs to be a separate Child Death Review Assurance Framework but at the moment it is just missed.

Q. Whose responsibility is that?

A. That would be I expect NHS England.

12 PRUDiC, the guidance in Wales, there is a 2023 13 version of that. Is it right that that includes 14 passages referring to neonatal deaths and unexpected 15 deaths on paediatric and critical care units?

> Α. It does, yes.

17 So very much cited on that area that has only 18 just seemed to be percolating into people's 19 consciousness?

Α.

Do you know whether there is guidance at an overarching level about how cross-border relations should be arranged?

I know there are regular cross-border meetings between the sort of Welsh Healthcare Trusts and the 176

English Healthcare Trusts that are on that border. I'm not part of those meetings because Birmingham isn't on the border, but there's also a separate Four Nations group where leaders from each -- from England and the devolved nations meet to discuss high level principles of Child Death Review.

- **Q.** So there is communication but no particular document or protocol, memorandum of understanding that you're aware of?
- **A.** No, you would have to ask the people from that sort of Welsh/English cross-border group.
 - Q. Thank you. So that deals with the document.

My fifth and final topic is a number of general questions arising out of these processes and in particular we will start with the Child Death Review process. In your first witness statement you express concern, as you frame it, about the accountability for CDR. Can you just explain to us what your concern is and what the solution might be?

A. I mean, my concern is that Child Death Review is the poor relation of safeguarding and that most hospital managers and even sort of high up within NHS England, the managers do not understand the Child Death Review process, so they don't hold Trusts to account when they don't follow it. So there are a lot

understanding at senior level, who are you talking about as the senior level? I don't mean names, but just what level are we talking about?

A. I mean, I think actually within a quite high -- at regional and at national level in NHS England as well there's a really good understanding of safeguarding because I think safeguarding has been part of our bread and butter for generations. The Child Death Review, if there's a question, they come to me. I'm happy to help but it's not my job and that's the same with other of my senior colleagues within the sort of national network of designated healthcare professionals. We haven't built up that expertise yet.

LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: Thank you.

MR DE LA POER: Now, you also express a concern about the lack of visibility of the Child Death Review process within the Royal College. Can you just explain to us what your concern is?

A. So, I mean, I'm -- I'm pleased to report that things have improved since then. Basically everyone -- as a paediatrician, pretty much every paediatrician is going to have patients who die, so you have all got to be able to -- even if you're not leading the Child Death Review process, you have to be able to contribute to it meaningfully and it's not just about safeguarding. Most

of Healthcare Trusts that still haven't implemented the 2018 Child Death Review guidance, particularly holding Child Death Review meetings, informing parents of Child Death Review processes. There's ICBs that have not commissioned an appropriate Joint Agency Response to make sure that there is a healthcare professional available to lead it, so -- but there's no one holding these Trusts or people to account when they don't comply with the statutory guidance, in part because there isn't that understanding at a very senior level and I guess from the Trust point of view if there's nobody holding you to account and you've got numerous different pressures, why are you going to do something?

Q. So in practical terms what is required to achieve that? Do we need metrics, so measurements of who does it and some sort of audit of those measurements? Is it as basic as that?

A. I would have thought, yes, that actually just making sure -- checking ICBs and Trusts' compliance with guidance would be a start because at the moment we have an idea through the information that we get at the National Child Mortality Database but you're looking at the sort of outcomes of those processes rather than actually the processes themselves.

LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: When you said there was no 178

of Child Death Review is actually about quality of healthcare and public health, so it should be a core part of paediatrics, yet for many years we were trying very hard and saying to the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health "We're a big group of paediatricians, we need to be represented in the College, we need to be able to train people in Child Death Review" -- because certainly when I was an undergraduate or even a junior paediatrician, Child Death Review didn't exist so there is a generation of Consultants who really don't understand the processes because they are new processes and until very recently it was a bit of a -- it was a bit of a brick wall, that Child Death Review was "Well, you can go to the Child Protection Standing Committee", which is all about child protection, which is the minority of child deaths.

I mean, I'm pleased to say that we have since had conversations with Steve Turner who is the new President and Child Death Review is now a Special Interest Group, so it's beginning to get sort of representation in the Royal College and filter through a bit more.

Q. Can you just timestamp that for us. How recently are we talking about?

A. I think we met in August. I would have to check my diary for the exact date but in that timescale.

Q. The summer of this year?

perspectives.

- A. The summer of this year, yes.
- **Q.** So in terms of the visibility to start with, is that a complete answer or is that just a step in the right direction?
 - A. It's a step in the right direction.
 - Q. What else needs to occur?
- A. We need national training on Child Death Review for all paediatricians so they know their responsibilities and how to contribute to it. We need proper national training, multi-agency training for Joint Agency Response, so there -- years back we ran a national course, then for various reasons people retired, it needed updating, so it stopped and whilst there's a lot of training in local areas, in terms of the quality, some qualities are really good but if you have a local area who is doing the Joint Agency Response very badly, the chances are the training isn't very good either, so we actually need to have some national joint
- **Q.** Is that training under the banner of the RCPCH?

with your colleagues so you understand their

training because it's really important if you're going

to work on a multi-agency basis that actually you train

you just help us with what your understanding of that is and what your concern is?

A. Well, so back when CDOPs were set up in 2008 there was ringfenced funding given for three years to local authorities through safeguarding budgets to set up CDOP and for Joint Agency Response.

At the end of those three years the money stopped being ringfenced and it had to come out of existing budgets, so what has happened is that particularly with the 2018 Child Death Review guidance there is an expectation that hospital -- well, the healthcare organisation caring for a child at the time of death, if it's a death that doesn't need a Joint Agency Response, holds an holistic Child Death Review meeting, so that's considering all the sort of domains relating to that child, inviting in GPs, school representatives, social workers, anyone who has had that footprint with that child, and that's much more complicated than the old style what used to be called "M and M", or Mortality and Morbidity meetings, so hospitals -- somewhere like a big teaching hospital that's got a paediatric intensive care, it is going to take a lot of resource to do it properly and budgets are pressed, so some -- well, some hospitals have done fantastic jobs in setting up proper Child Death Review meetings and along with that is also

- A. It never was under the banner of the RCPCH. Somebody needs to take it forward, but at the moment the only mechanism we have is this group which is the Association of Child Death Review Professionals, which is a sort of "Okay, we're an official organisation, we're all set up as a community interest" -- I will try and get the phrase right, but we're a properly established group, but it's all busy working professionals who are doing it as part of their day job and actually the time it takes to set up proper training and things like that is actually a bit out with our resource at the moment.
 - **Q.** So which organisation or organisations do you think is best placed, subject to their own funding concerns, to provide that sort of level of training?
 - A. I mean, I think it would be helpful to actually really have the leadership from the Royal College to support us with this because also it sort of brands us as this is actually mainstream paediatrics rather than a little fringe group.
 - Q. Now, on the subject of funding you express concerns within your witness statement about the implementation of Child Death Review and the funding challenge there is for that. Here I think we're concerned with sums which are or aren't ringfenced. Can

the funding for what's called the key worker, which is dedicated bereavement support for the parents. Other Trusts have pretty much done nothing, partly because they haven't got the funds to do it and I mention the reason why the key worker is so important, it's not just about bereavement support. Part of the key worker's role is to tell parents about Child Death Review, to ask them if they've got any questions they want answering, or if they've got any concerns or feedback they want to be considered at that Child Death Review meeting and most children who die are very complicated and have had lots of healthcare teams involved with them. The parents have been with them throughout that journey and the parents know where things slip through the net and if we don't ask the parents, we won't know and it will limit what we can learn from deaths. We may not pick up -- well, we probably would pick up many less healthcare performance issues because we're not actually asking the people who know and also it's important the parents then get the feedback afterwards and that just isn't happening.

Q. So if I can just reflect back what you have said, parents are an essential part of this process, but sometimes for funding or structural reasons they are just not being included?

A. Yes, they're not being included, or they're being sent a sort of -- a sort of very formulaic legalistic letter saying "There is a review into your child, would you like to say anything?", which for most bereaved families is sort of completely inappropriate and off-putting.

The other part of this is also the Joint Agency Response that needs fully funding because you have to have either specialist nurses or paediatricians on call to provide the service and there are some parts of the country where they have never funded a healthcare professional to go out and do the -- do a Joint Agency Response.

- **Q.** I'm going to move on from the Child Death Review process and move into safeguarding, a topic which is related at the very least, because you were asked by the Inquiry as to what you thought was the best practice for a clinician in a safeguarding situation in a hospital and can you just tell us please what you would do if you had a concern?
- **A.** A concern in general about safeguarding or a concern about a staff member?
 - Q. About a staff member.
- **A.** I mean, these are really difficult situations, but you have to bear in mind that your duty is always to 185

will be a head of safeguarding in a Trust. It's usually a senior nurse supported by named nurse, named doctor and other safeguarding professionals, but if you're making a positions of trust referral the chances are you are -- it's something you're going to be making fairly rapidly, but if you are working in safeguarding it is imprinted on your mind that you are -- your primary responsibility is to safeguard children or vulnerable adults, that is why you are in safeguarding. So yes, you may sit on the board because you are there to represent safeguarding, but you should fundamentally understand that your responsibility is absolutely towards children and vulnerable adults.

- **Q.** So to use some less formal language, if that board member is wearing a number of hats you would expect that if a safeguarding issue was raised with them they would put on their safeguarding hat and leave the other ones to one side?
- **A.** Well, yes, because they're on -- because safeguarding is always your first principle anyway, but they are sitting on the board as they are there wearing a safeguarding hat on the board. I mean, I suppose sometimes people may have two roles but fundamentally safeguarding comes first.
 - **Q.** Is child safeguarding sufficiently prioritised 187

your patient, even if that -- or to safeguard children and even if that child has died, it's still a safeguarding matter because other children are potentially at risk. So, I mean, the process would be that you would go to the safeguarding team in your healthcare organisation for support. I wouldn't be expecting a paediatrician on a ward to be picking up the phone to the local authority. I would be expecting them to be talking to their safeguarding team and then the safeguarding team either encouraging that doctor or -- well, supporting that doctor to make that referral through positions of trust to the local authority.

What I would not expect is any management involvement in that, that you absolutely do not need management permission to make a referral through LADO. Out of courtesy of course you would let management know, but it's not their decision whether that -- a safeguarding referral is made or not.

- **Q.** We saw from Working Together that there is an expectation that there will be a safeguarding role at board level. Just help us to understand how on the one hand you wouldn't speak to management, but the safeguarding lead might be a member of management? How does that work?
 - A. Well, the safeguarding lead -- I mean, there 186

in hospitals, do you think?

- A. I mean, I think that's difficult for me to answer because I work in a community -- as a Community Paediatrician for a Community Trust rather than a Hospital Trust and certainly hospitals do have -- most have safeguarding teams, there's lots of safeguarding training, but like everything else sometimes there's competing priorities.
- **Q.** Are you able to give us any indication of the degree to which nationally there is compliance with the expected requirements for -- with Working Together, for example? You have already indicated that it's a mixed picture, but is it mainly good, is it mainly bad, or is it just not possible from your position to make that assessment?
 - A. I couldn't make that assessment.
- Q. Now, we heard this morning from

 Professor Dixon-Woods something about the duty of
 candour and we're going to hear much more about that
 from Sir Robert Francis KC on Monday, but do you see the
 duty of candour having any significance in the context
 of safeguarding, or are they two separate and distinct
 ideas?
 - **A.** I would say they go hand in hand because your primary -- if you're working in -- well, safeguarding is 188

everyone's responsibility. I mean that's the mantra that goes whether you are in healthcare or whatever, but certainly if you are a child health professional, safeguarding is absolutely paramount and with that goes the sort of duty of -- I mean, duty of candour is part of that so I don't see them as separate at all.

Q. I think what we saw in Working Together back in 2015 was the idea that concern about anything else should play no part in terms of speaking up about the concern that you have about the child.

A. Yes, absolutely, yes.

Q. As far as staffing levels are concerned, is that something you can help us with as far as its potential impact on safeguarding or is that because you don't work in a hospital and that's principally what we're concerned with, something outside of your expertise?

A. All I can say is we take note of it at Child
Death Review and sometimes we have commented if we
thought that unsafe staffing has contributed to
a child's vulnerability, but no, it's not something
I'm -- as I don't work in a hospital, I don't have
a sense of staffing levels.

Q. So it can give rise to a risk, that's what you would identify at CDOP level?

I don't see it being any different. I can't see though -- having a logging system about concerns about staff and safeguarding, I think that would be something slightly different.

Q. It wouldn't perhaps fall into the definition of low-level?

A. Yes, yes.

Q. The police. You have told us about the role they play and the fact that they should receive training if they're on CDOP. Do you think there should be some form of national level agreement between the police and the NHS in terms of their involvement with concerns that the NHS may bring to them, or do you think as far as the Child Death Review process is concerned that's all adequately dealt with within the existing framework?

A. I think it's reasonably sort of well-managed that, yes, there are some -- there's a National Police Child Death Working Group which I sit on as the sort of health representative and I think we work quite well together, but you also need your local agreements and your local protocols of how you will respond to child deaths.

Q. So that's the framework. What about training, joint training about the police. Is that an area that could do with improvement as far as you are concerned?

A. Yes, yes.

Q. But whether or not it impacts upon how successfully situations are managed through the safeguarding framework, that's outside of your understanding?

A. Yes.

Q. Thank you.

The final topic is your views on potential improvements and you have touched on a number. I would like just for you to consider one that isn't within your statement. It may be the case in some schools and social care settings that there is a logging of low level concerns on a confidential basis, which can then be looked at in the round. I don't know whether you're familiar with that occurring in any particular situation, but in principle is that something that you think might have a value here, or is that really that overview provided by other organisations and individuals?

A. I mean, my understanding of the logging of sort of low-level safeguarding concerns in schools -- I mean that's part of a child safeguarding record and it's the equivalent to us writing in the medical notes that, for instance, a -- about children missing appointments, or turning up looking hungry and dirty, so

A. I think that's really important because whilst the police have got very good training for child deaths, it largely doesn't include a child health perspective and when you train together you actually understand each other's perspective much better and it makes it much more effective than, for instance, a lecture delivered by a paediatrician or a pathologist to the police on a single agency course.

I think one of the challenges though is always about budgets because any independent course such as we had at Warwick, you have to pay for it. Police have got limited training budget, so they're going to prioritise their own internal courses first because that meets the police internal requirements, so it is a real challenge.

Q. The police are one element of the Joint Agency Response. You have told us about the training and the need for joint training. How about the Coronial process, which is obviously strongly connected to the Joint Agency Response? Are there improvements to be made there?

A. Yes, I think there are, because there are some areas where actually the -- where the 2016 guidance that we want to update is at odds with Coronial law and so that causes friction and is interpreted differently in

different areas and can have sort of a significant impact on families' experiences.

I think it's also really important Coroners are trained and I'm well aware that some Coroners really don't have much understanding of Joint Agency Response and child death processes, whereas others have got a very good understanding, but again funding for multi-agency training is a problem because again budget for Coroners' training doesn't extend really for very much outside the Coronial system and it's not the same as me going along and giving a talk to Coroners, that you have to work together on your training to get the most out of it.

Q. Now, moving to an adjacent process to the Coronial one and bringing us right up-to-date, 9 September I think it was that Medical Examiners arrived on a national statutory footing. We just need to deal with their role in all of this, but firstly can you just explain to those who are unfamiliar what is a Medical Examiner and how does their role relate to the Coroner's?

A. Okay, I'm not an expert in this, but I've got hopefully a reasonable understanding, but you might want to double check I get everything right. So Medical Examiners are all doctors and their job when -- so when 193

their training may not have included very much on Child Death Review and how they link in with processes. There's also the potential overlap that you've got the key worker asking families for any concerns or comments and you've got somebody phoning up from the Medical Examiner's office, so there's also a potential duplication there.

- **Q.** And a potentially unnecessary additional intrusion?
 - A. Absolutely, yes.
- **Q.** So in principle a good idea, but dependent upon the training and qualifications and experience and resources of the Medical Examiner who the case comes to?
- **A.** Yes. I think it's -- we need to wait and see and I'm sure there will be teething issues before we get it right.

MR DE LA POER: Dr Garstang, those are all the questions that I have for you.

There are no Core Participant questions so, my Lady, can I turn to you to see if you have any questions for the Doctor.

Questioned by THE CHAIR

LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: Yes, thank you, Mr De la Poer.

Dr Garstang, thank you very much. I just have two 195

a patient dies, a medical certificate for a cause of death has to be written if you know why that patient has died. If you don't know, or for instance they have died following an operation or it's potentially unnaturally, it's automatically referred to the Coroner. But for the patients who die and the doctors think they know why they have died, they used to just write the medical certificate for cause of death. Now it has to be referred to the Medical Examiner to agree the cause of death, partly to make sure that death certificates are more accurate, but also what the Medical Examiner will do is review the case records to make sure that cause of death fits, but also checking that there aren't any major care concerns and they will put a call-in to the family asking if they've got any care concerns, and this has been happening in hospitals on a sort of pilot process, gradual roll-out for a couple of years, but it has now just become law for everything and sometimes the Medical Examiner will say, "Actually the case needs to go back to the Coroner, it's not appropriate to issue a death certificate."

Q. Is that an important safety net, do you think, in the context of Child Death Review?

A. It should be, bearing in mind though most Medical Examiners are going to be adult doctors and

questions, if I may, arising out of two things that you mentioned earlier and the first was you made the very powerful point that if you don't ask the parents who have had the closest connection with the child and their care, you won't know what you need to know in order to carry out an effective review and you pointed out the inappropriate nature of some of the letters that get sent out and I have some idea of that from the evidence I heard last week and the beginning of this week.

Sorry, that's a long preamble but what I would like to know from you is whether or not receiving a letter a year or even longer after a death may be very difficult for parents, to which the answer obviously is going to be "yes", isn't it, so what can be done -- insofar as there is an ongoing process, can parents be kept up-to-date, if they want to be obviously?

A. Absolutely. So we have recently -- I have recently been running a research project. This was around parents whose children have had -- have died in hospices or in hospital with a palliative care, so where it's been fully expected that the child is going to die. And coming up with a system for key workers to talk to them about Child Death Review and actually the first thought should be that within a few days of death you're mentioning the process, giving parents sort of written

information about it but not forcing it on them because some parents will be ready for it, others won't, but then over the next few weeks giving them a chance to contribute either by filling out a structured feedback form, or for some families it will be in conversation with their key worker.

Very important to keep parents updated throughout the months it may take to pull together a Child Death Review meeting because for a very complicated child who dies in intensive care you've got multiple specialties you've got to pull together and that is going to take probably six months to get everyone round the table, even if you don't need a postmortem, and then again finding time — making sure that key worker then goes and either has a phone call or sees the parents afterwards to feedback, or arranges — if it's a complex medical situation, arranges an appointment for them to go back and talk to the Consultants to actually hear the answers from the paediatrician or the surgeon.

So yes, so we have designed a process that is along -- we have designed it with bereaved parents and also professionals working in Child Death Review hopefully to get something that is -- that's right for families, but we also recognise that some bereaved families will want nothing to do with us, that for them

a cot". Well, I can't interpret a photo of a cot without a parent telling me where the baby was, where the bedding was, how the baby was that day. So it's really inadequate in many parts, but I think Trusts or ICBs take comfort that if their neighbours aren't doing it either, it's very easy to think actually that's acceptable, whereas if we didn't do joint visits in the West Midlands our Coroners would be furious with us.

LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: With that vivid image in mind, thank you very much indeed.

Mr De la Poer, there's nothing else you want to raise?

MR DE LA POER: Nothing arising from that, my Lady.

Can I just ask Dr Garstang to remain there as I thank her very much and I'm sure my Lady will thank her as well, but Ms Brown has just got a short matter to read into the Inquiry record now and then I think that will conclude us for today.

LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: Thank you. Dr Garstang, you don't need to sit and listen and certainly not sitting there, so thank you very much indeed for your significant contribution today.

Ms Brown.

Child Death Reviews -- their child has died, they don't want to -- it's too awful, they don't want to know, and that is perfectly fine too.

LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: Yes, thank you very much.

Then you mentioned in relation to funding the fact that in some parts of the country there's never been any funding for Joint Agency Response. Are you able to say whereabouts in the country?

A. Well, everyone got the funding in 2008. I hate to say it's largely in London. So a key part of the Joint Agency Response is that a paediatrician or specialist nurse goes out with the police within 24 hours of the child dying to visit the family at home. For babies it's absolutely vital that we see where that baby was when they died, this is in terms of particularly things like Sudden Infant Death Syndrome, to sort of look at what were the risks in the sleeping environment. But also to get that really detailed medical history for a lot of our older children who die suddenly and unexpectedly, you need a really detailed medical history which a hard-pushed Registrar in an Emergency Department is not going to get when a child has just suddenly died, and yes, there's a large part of London where that just doesn't happen. The police go and take photos and then show them "Here is a photo of

Statement read by MS BROWN

MS BROWN: Yes, my Lady, it's just to note that the Inquiry have obtained a statement from Dr Claire Thomas of Public Health Wales and in that statement it addresses the current processes in Wales regarding unexpected baby deaths, as detailed in the Procedural Response to Unexpected Deaths in Childhood 2023, known as PRUDiC, and the Wales safeguarding procedures.

The statement also addresses the situation that was addressed in 2015 to 2016 in Wales and also considers the issue of information-sharing in 2015 and 2016 and areas of suggested improvement for cross-border information-sharing and that statement will be uploaded shortly to the Inquiry website.

LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: Thank you very much indeed. Ms Brown.

I think that concludes our proceedings for today. We will start again next Monday at 10 o'clock for Sir Robert Francis. Thank you all very much.

(4.21 pm)

(The Inquiry adjourned until 10.00 am on Monday, 30 September 2024)

1	INDEX	
2	PROFESSOR MARY DIXON-WOODS	2
3	(affirmed)	
4	Questioned by MS LANGDALE	2
5	Questioned by MR SKELTON	80
6	Questioned by MR BAKER	98
7		
8	DR JOANNA GARSTANG (affirmed)	109
9	Questioned by MR DE LA POER	109
10	Questioned by THE CHAIR	195
11		
12	Statement read by MS BROWN	200
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	12 months [1]	160/7 164/23 167/24	6	196/17 198/14
LADY JUSTICE	115/10	168/12 169/1 169/6	6.3 [1] 163/13	absorbed [1] 19/12
THIRLWALL: [24]	12.47 pm [1] 109/9	189/8 200/10 200/11	60 [1] 3/6	abuse [10] 5/18 8/2
1/4 37/25 38/4 55/1	13 [3] 22/5 23/11	2015/2016 [3] 110/25	600 pages [2] 39/25	96/19 117/23 154/9
80/13 98/11 108/20	146/10	166/10 167/17	41/15	154/18 169/12 169/14
108/24 109/6 109/12	13 July 2024 [1]	2016 [9] 110/25	68 [1] 157/10	170/1 172/6
109/19 112/2 112/5	110/16	158/7 166/10 167/17		abuser [1] 103/14
127/24 129/5 167/9	14 [2] 25/1 131/4	172/20 173/6 192/23	7	abusers [2] 130/25
167/14 178/25 179/14	147 [1] 60/18	200/10 200/11	7.1.1 [1] 98/21	131/1
195/23 198/4 199/9	15 [2] 72/6 146/21	2017 [4] 112/9	75 [1] 98/21	abuses [1] 96/21
199/19 200/15	15 minutes [2] 55/3 82/1	164/20 165/3 165/18 2018 [11] 118/14	8	academic [3] 9/8
MR BAKER: [2]	15 years [2] 27/23	121/19 160/18 168/2		111/17 165/10 ACAS [2] 49/14 52/5
98/14 108/18	51/9	168/8 168/9 172/11	8.2 [1] 55/9	accept [6] 34/20 37/1
MR DE LA POER:	15.2.10 [1] 154/24	172/25 176/7 178/2	80 [2] 159/6 159/9	40/6 47/14 90/7 93/2
[10] 109/13 109/20	15.4.1 [1] 155/14	183/10	81 [1] 140/10	acceptable [1] 199/7
112/6 127/25 129/7	15.5.1 [1] 155/23	2019 [6] 107/2	83 [1] 144/4 84 [1] 144/22	accepted [2] 36/14
167/6 167/15 179/15	15.6.3 [1] 156/15	112/18 115/4 125/20	85 [1] 145/8	37/3
195/17 199/13	150 [1] 120/14	149/19 168/10	86 [1] 148/6	access [1] 158/12
MR SKELTON: [1]	151 [1] 154/1	2020 [2] 59/15 107/4	87 [1] 149/1	accident [3] 118/25
80/16	152 [1] 154/22	2021 [2] 112/13	88 [1] 150/10	143/11 147/1
MS BROWN: [2] 1/2 200/2	155 [1] 156/15	112/18		accidental [1] 49/10
MS LANGDALE: [7]	16 [1] 139/13	2023 [7] 111/15	9	accidently [1] 5/8
2/9 2/12 38/7 54/24	160 [4] 120/14	112/9 112/14 115/12	9 September [1]	accidents [1] 5/1
55/8 80/8 108/23	124/16 157/6 159/6	167/19 176/12 200/7	193/16	accommodate [1]
THE WITNESS: [1]	17 [3] 30/4 132/14	2024 [5] 1/2 110/6	9.2 [1] 61/18	171/12
109/5	148/8	110/16 175/16 200/22	903 [1] 21/25	accommodated [1]
-	18th [1] 119/16	22 [1] 150/10	91 [1] 150/17	146/17
	19 [2] 35/20 149/2	24 [2] 44/5 132/15	92 [1] 55/9	accord [1] 82/11
'neutralise [1] 36/4	1980s [1] 152/14	24 hours [2] 145/18	95 [2] 61/18 62/22	accordance [1]
'normalisation [1]	1990s [1] 152/14	198/13	A	150/14
35/24	2	25 [3] 44/6 55/3 167/10	l 	according [3] 49/13 154/7 163/13
'not [1] 11/3	2 o'clock [1] 109/7	25 years [1] 4/24	ability [9] 23/7 23/24 25/4 45/15 45/21	account [3] 177/25
'the [1] 28/3	2.00 pm [1] 109/11	26 [2] 46/2 46/6	47/11 57/22 104/16	178/8 178/12
	2.2.1 [1] 10/17	26 September 2024	119/1	accountability [7]
[4] 75/6 129/21	2.3 [1] 17/3	[1] 1/2	able [22] 6/9 16/14	20/21 115/13 116/2
130/3 145/16	20 [4] 38/7 99/3		20/11 31/19 32/24	134/24 135/4 175/16
an [1] 145/16	120/14 132/5	3	38/9 42/15 42/17 53/7	
help [1] 130/3	20 March 2024 [1]	3.1 [1] 162/23	70/9 84/13 94/5 94/6	accountable [3]
needs [1] 75/6	110/6	3.1.3 [2] 28/2 29/3	123/7 124/20 150/11	68/14 68/19 69/24
should [1] 129/21	2000s [1] 6/1	3.18 pm [1] 167/11	158/16 179/23 179/24	accumulating [1]
	2003 [1] 157/11	3.2 [1] 163/1	180/7 188/9 198/7	33/10
1	2004 [5] 134/8	3.35 pm [1] 167/13	about [220]	accurate [3] 4/1 4/4
1.1 [1] 161/10	152/19 152/24 158/8	30 [2] 57/10 124/18	absence [3] 8/5 45/9	194/11
1.2 [1] 161/16	165/15	30 September 2024	95/3	accusation [1] 92/9
1.3 [2] 112/11 161/19	2005 [1] 99/18	[1] 200/22	absolute [2] 47/4	accuser [2] 90/19
1.5 [1] 162/5	2008 [3] 165/13 183/3 198/9	30 years [1] 55/20	95/11	92/10
10 [2] 12/23 153/23	0000 545 00/05	4	absolutely [46] 5/4	achieve [6] 25/20
10 o'clock [1] 200/18	2010 [4] 5/24 72/6	4.21 pm [1] 200/20	20/25 25/12 26/16	47/8 56/4 71/23 72/21 178/15
10.00 [2] 1/3 200/21	112/25 114/2	4.5.1 [1] 52/3	27/20 46/25 68/1 75/18 79/19 80/5	achieved [5] 7/17
10.1.1 [1] 66/10	2013 [9] 128/14	40 [3] 124/18 126/13	82/12 87/2 89/24 98/6	
10.1.4 [1] 71/14 10.1.5 [1] 73/20	128/16 152/4 153/12	151/5	99/16 105/23 108/17	162/10
10.1.6 [2] 75/3 77/14	153/14 159/19 160/2	45 [1] 48/12	117/23 118/3 119/13	acknowledge [1]
100 [2] 21/20 174/20	165/23 166/13	47 [2] 48/15 48/18	125/2 130/12 130/19	145/3
101 [1] 66/5	2014 [3] 99/4 161/2	48 [1] 52/2	131/10 132/4 133/5	acronym [1] 123/24
11 [3] 21/3 134/7	165/24	49 [1] 54/1		across [8] 22/7 22/18
134/9	2015 [26] 85/4 99/6	5	151/14 152/24 155/15	
11.18 [1] 55/5	99/13 100/4 100/13		155/21 156/4 156/22	113/12 159/23 162/8
11.34 [1] 55/7	104/12 112/25 114/2	50 [1] 72/4	158/24 164/4 170/18	act [4] 40/7 51/24
12 [2] 55/3 130/2	128/10 128/16 135/18	56 [1] 139/7	171/6 186/14 187/12	99/4 134/8
12 hours [1] 64/12	142/2 142/5 145/5	00[1] 100//	189/4 189/11 195/10	acted [1] 84/8
	145/12 149/14 152/2			action [24] 7/7 17/20
	1	1	1	İ

(52) LADY JUSTICE THIRLWALL: - action

109/10 197/13 200/18 75/4 75/6 75/12 75/13 105/10 110/18 113/20 admin [3] 85/24 86/9 against [8] 49/22 76/13 78/22 78/23 114/9 120/11 131/17 action... [22] 17/24 143/25 50/2 51/24 53/21 54/8 78/23 78/25 82/4 142/6 143/18 154/20 18/21 18/22 32/2 administrative [1] 106/24 137/4 137/16 85/21 87/12 97/12 157/24 160/7 169/18 32/19 33/17 50/2 52/9 149/15 agencies [7] 17/8 97/17 97/22 99/21 173/11 174/18 177/3 53/22 64/17 90/11 admission [1] 119/9 121/11 138/13 150/9 101/2 102/3 102/4 179/15 182/18 183/25 97/25 98/1 98/8 admittedly [1] 123/15 155/3 162/11 168/25 102/16 103/7 105/19 184/19 185/7 191/20 103/23 106/14 107/1 105/20 118/16 119/11 193/3 194/11 194/13 admitting [1] 42/7 agency [51] 99/18 107/10 108/4 120/17 adult [3] 119/7 119/7 114/3 114/7 122/24 120/6 120/7 123/11 195/3 195/6 197/22 161/14 170/10 123/3 124/17 125/6 126/13 129/18 130/21 197/24 198/18 200/9 194/25 action' [1] 36/6 adults [7] 118/1 125/13 125/23 126/2 132/23 133/3 134/13 200/10 actions [10] 5/2 6/10 118/3 132/9 134/3 126/23 127/3 127/6 136/22 138/23 139/8 although [6] 99/16 21/25 34/1 60/20 139/17 187/9 187/13 128/8 150/7 150/8 139/15 139/23 140/14 112/20 118/1 128/17 97/23 97/23 101/9 adults - should [1] 151/5 151/16 151/22 141/12 141/23 142/3 143/17 148/24 170/6 172/7 139/17 155/8 155/25 162/7 143/2 144/6 144/20 always [14] 24/21 activated [1] 49/23 advance [2] 25/25 162/9 162/12 162/14 144/23 145/1 147/25 26/4 61/22 72/13 actively [3] 12/3 41/6 168/13 168/15 168/16 148/10 149/4 150/2 73/17 97/24 126/6 73/5 69/1 advantage [1] 52/12 170/9 172/2 172/5 150/24 159/22 163/2 134/1 134/4 146/19 activities [1] 21/5 adversarial [4] 92/1 173/1 173/3 174/6 163/10 169/14 172/12 154/9 185/25 187/20 actors [1] 17/7 174/13 178/5 181/11 174/13 179/22 180/15 192/9 92/6 92/13 93/15 acts [1] 82/20 181/12 181/17 181/21 181/9 182/6 182/8 adverse [5] 15/21 am [8] 1/3 3/18 55/5 actually [58] 5/6 6/17 23/10 38/15 46/23 183/6 183/13 185/7 183/15 189/6 189/18 55/7 83/24 120/22 11/19 19/11 20/19 74/8 185/12 192/8 192/16 191/14 193/18 193/25 160/20 200/21 29/25 31/20 32/20 advertised [1] 85/21 192/20 193/5 193/8 195/17 200/19 amalgam [1] 13/8 36/24 36/25 38/20 198/7 198/11 advice [6] 100/23 all-important [1] 63/2 ambiguity [1] 10/24 41/16 53/7 64/22 138/8 138/22 151/22 agendas [1] 29/17 allegation [2] 137/6 ambulances [1] 67/10 69/18 70/25 171/18 171/19 aggressive [2] 16/7 137/9 151/18 75/24 86/21 88/9 96/1 advise [3] 86/22 24/23 allegations [2] 54/8 amiss [1] 33/15 98/8 113/14 113/16 126/11 139/4 ago [4] 4/24 27/23 137/4 **amount [8]** 20/15 119/14 125/7 127/7 advised [3] 15/8 53/9 70/2 115/7 51/17 63/15 71/1 77/9 allegiance [1] 89/4 143/4 152/11 163/25 116/8 agree [7] 91/19 allies [2] 82/24 84/2 85/3 100/25 143/25 165/8 165/25 169/21 advisor [1] 114/25 130/12 132/12 145/4 **Allitt [4]** 6/12 6/14 amounts [2] 49/25 170/4 170/7 170/8 156/4 162/24 194/9 6/15 6/22 136/13 affect [1] 25/5 170/22 170/24 174/4 analogy [2] 6/3 95/7 affected [1] 48/1 agreed [5] 50/17 61/9 allocate [1] 148/12 174/5 174/16 178/18 affecting [2] 123/6 150/14 174/21 175/12 allow [2] 138/9 analysing [1] 140/22 178/24 179/4 180/1 agreement [7] 50/13 143/17 140/25 analysis [4] 5/24 181/19 181/21 182/10 affirmed [4] 2/10 116/14 116/16 116/22 allowed [2] 42/3 30/9 36/10 65/18 182/11 182/17 182/19 109/17 201/3 201/8 164/3 164/6 191/11 132/18 analytic [2] 56/14 184/18 192/4 192/23 after [9] 1/23 83/6 agreements [2] **allows [1]** 96/12 56/16 194/19 196/23 197/18 85/4 92/18 107/3 116/20 191/20 alluded [3] 120/21 analytics [5] 56/11 199/6 119/14 148/11 162/18 ahead [1] 132/10 122/5 172/20 56/12 56/17 57/6 acuity [1] 27/3 196/12 aimed [3] 99/21 almost [2] 90/18 57/22 adapt [1] 64/2 afternoon [4] 47/18 130/2 156/9 116/12 annual [1] 136/25 adapted [1] 30/7 65/15 109/14 110/24 aims [1] 71/24 along [4] 115/20 **anonymity [5]** 90/14 adding [1] 54/18 afterwards [8] 26/1 airlifted [1] 143/11 183/25 193/11 197/21 90/23 91/6 93/17 additional [2] 144/7 alongside [1] 63/6 26/21 76/8 76/10 airline [2] 95/14 121/16 195/8 107/4 143/13 184/20 anonymous [2] 95/24 already [26] 1/5 1/9 address [10] 14/4 197/16 **alarm [1]** 7/5 3/20 10/23 11/7 49/7 84/10 85/8 14/9 16/20 19/17 alert [3] 12/1 56/19 another [19] 5/13 again [50] 13/3 15/11 49/11 66/19 67/12 48/12 71/15 81/14 16/6 36/23 41/14 80/3 24/25 36/10 36/11 130/22 80/23 86/2 104/7 87/15 142/8 147/22 37/23 40/5 41/18 align [1] 6/7 105/8 108/2 119/23 87/23 91/10 92/22 addressed [3] 14/7 54/11 57/16 59/2 aligned [1] 156/4 142/24 144/13 145/22 92/23 101/17 103/16 143/1 200/10 59/10 74/15 74/24 150/18 151/16 152/2 106/12 113/16 116/22 aligning [2] 162/2 addresses [2] 200/5 76/2 78/3 82/22 87/15 157/4 169/21 172/19 130/4 132/12 149/2 162/5 200/9 89/7 89/22 92/6 aligns [1] 157/3 173/24 188/12 163/7 170/9 addressing [1] 5/3 all [104] 1/12 2/5 101/17 104/6 104/23 **also [59]** 4/19 6/12 answer [9] 9/1 13/4 adequacy [1] 160/3 107/12 107/18 109/6 4/11 7/12 14/1 16/6 10/12 21/5 21/20 19/2 19/20 91/10 adequate [3] 172/10 114/24 119/24 123/20 17/13 21/23 25/7 22/18 24/14 31/9 34/9 120/22 181/4 188/3 172/12 175/23 131/5 131/11 132/16 25/20 28/17 28/18 34/19 37/8 41/10 196/13 adequately [2] 14/7 133/16 136/1 139/21 30/4 31/4 31/15 33/12 41/25 43/5 43/14 answering [2] 109/3 191/15 40/9 40/17 43/18 44/9 47/11 52/22 54/5 75/9 143/4 146/10 148/21 184/8 adjacent [1] 193/14 answers [1] 197/19 149/21 154/23 159/5 47/7 47/18 50/3 51/18 77/14 77/21 81/20 adjourned [1] 200/21 159/13 162/2 162/5 53/7 56/5 61/19 62/24 84/14 96/3 100/5 anticipated [2] 80/10 adjournment [1] 168/20 193/7 193/8 63/2 63/17 64/8 74/13 100/7 100/17 103/9 145/17

57/23 96/9 131/11 articulating [1] 9/10 attentive [1] 71/11 132/5 165/6 165/7 as [240] attracting [1] 88/8 **anxieties [1]** 103/13 ask [23] 2/18 4/6 173/3 attribute [1] 37/13 anxiety [1] 16/10 11/6 30/3 31/4 36/7 approached [1] 31/8 attributed [1] 6/19 anxious [1] 83/10 approaches [1] 38/10 61/19 80/12 attributes [1] 62/19 any [41] 13/6 25/11 74/19 80/20 98/15 98/19 audit [3] 29/24 57/14 | backgrounds [1] 34/5 34/12 40/22 41/5 109/15 128/1 159/16 appropriate [10] 33/1 178/16 52/9 60/1 60/13 62/17 164/1 164/15 172/9 37/24 121/25 125/5 audits [6] 12/10 78/20 90/4 97/13 136/11 136/16 139/1 177/10 184/7 184/15 13/16 44/1 57/10 108/22 122/4 130/25 139/18 178/5 194/20 196/3 199/14 57/24 63/17 138/8 138/21 140/25 appropriately [5] asked [14] 1/19 3/21 August [2] 3/24 141/4 141/19 148/2 66/4 75/11 76/2 22/3 66/6 66/8 76/9 180/24 148/2 151/7 153/2 129/23 169/16 80/22 93/22 94/1 **authentic [1]** 108/13 158/11 165/16 166/25 114/19 159/17 159/23 authorities [1] 183/5 April [4] 99/6 100/4 184/8 184/9 186/13 116/1 116/4 160/7 185/16 **authority [7]** 133/13 188/9 188/21 190/15 April 2015 [1] 100/4 asking [9] 31/9 96/25 133/19 141/1 150/4 191/1 192/10 194/13 97/10 123/19 129/6 170/20 186/8 186/12 arc [1] 95/2 194/15 195/4 195/20 151/19 184/19 194/15 authority's [1] architecture [4] 198/6 57/17 59/4 59/9 69/19 195/4 133/20 anybody [1] 64/7 aspect [3] 31/1 89/23 authors [1] 156/10 are [387] **anyone [2]** 166/10 area [25] 3/17 3/19 91/10 automatically [2] 183/17 17/12 17/14 28/13 aspects [4] 24/5 32/4 151/17 194/5 anything [7] 36/21 28/16 43/15 60/1 32/8 89/14 availability [1] 86/6 106/22 134/4 141/8 66/24 67/2 67/11 assault [1] 5/22 available [13] 1/10 164/24 185/4 189/8 133/4 141/1 141/21 3/23 3/24 11/20 11/23 banner [2] 181/24 assess [1] 73/10 anyway [4] 54/18 143/2 146/9 147/14 23/6 73/2 85/24 assessing [1] 34/5 86/5 104/16 187/20 159/22 163/7 164/8 115/22 122/2 146/15 assessment [3] 13/6 anywhere [4] 34/12 164/11 164/13 176/17 188/15 188/16 175/4 178/7 56/15 125/14 153/2 assigned [1] 86/2 181/17 191/24 aviation [1] 35/5 apparent [1] 161/25 areas [14] 8/1 29/16 assist [2] 31/6 82/13 **avoiding [2]** 50/5 **appealed [1]** 51/12 30/1 33/9 43/1 43/12 **Associate** [1] 111/9 102/6 appear [3] 37/7 49/5 associated [2] 17/1 78/13 78/18 146/17 aware [17] 1/5 40/15 92/17 173/17 181/15 192/23 59/10 71/9 71/10 80/19 appeared [1] 86/3 193/1 200/12 Association [3] 103/25 125/14 141/23 71/15 72/8 74/14 **appears [2]** 9/18 aren't [10] 20/15 27/6 113/18 114/21 182/4 143/23 147/25 148/2 71/10 37/24 63/19 72/2 148/14 149/13 149/14 assume [2] 95/8 **apple [10]** 4/16 5/14 84/18 151/16 182/25 133/8 175/3 177/9 193/4 6/11 6/25 15/15 15/18 194/13 199/5 awareness [8] 7/11 assumed [1] 59/10 15/22 15/25 16/9 7/18 35/4 35/6 85/22 arise [1] 5/1 assumptions [1] 16/13 arisen [1] 6/1 95/4 86/5 94/18 175/14 **apples [4]** 4/17 5/15 away [4] 41/17 91/11 arises [1] 18/10 assurance [7] 29/4 13/19 15/17 arising [7] 20/10 29/2 115/13 116/2 159/18 133/17 158/2 applied [4] 112/17 40/20 141/20 177/14 175/15 176/5 176/8 awful [5] 20/19 21/13 148/15 148/17 158/19 63/14 72/11 198/2 196/1 199/13 assure [2] 158/17 applies [13] 13/14 arm's [1] 19/10 176/2 14/10 44/2 79/23 arose [2] 9/22 30/10 assured [1] 176/1 134/10 146/22 150/20 babies [5] 11/8 11/9 assuring [4] 42/5 around [13] 36/15 150/22 150/24 154/20 118/24 159/6 198/14 47/21 57/17 58/2 59/4 113/11 120/4 176/5 160/19 160/21 163/1 baby [9] 119/17 100/13 106/20 134/4 at [234] apply [11] 43/4 43/21 125/1 130/15 152/25 142/11 146/2 152/24 at risk [1] 186/4 44/1 57/7 64/7 76/24 173/10 198/15 199/2 166/13 196/19 at this [1] 150/25 119/11 156/16 156/21 199/3 200/6 arranged [1] 176/23 attain [1] 139/17 158/23 158/24 back [42] 15/11 16/6 arrangements [6] attempted [3] 8/17 applying [1] 33/25 18/7 24/11 28/1 29/9 132/22 132/23 133/5 9/2 15/5 appointed [2] 111/15 33/4 33/13 57/16 134/18 135/10 164/9 attempts [3] 4/23 115/6 68/20 69/18 70/7 arranges [2] 197/16 19/9 92/3 appointment [1] 88/10 89/10 92/20 197/17 attendant [1] 20/2 197/17 93/21 94/13 104/23 arrest [2] 151/18 attending [1] 76/7 appointments [2] attention [15] 20/10 164/10 3/14 190/25 142/1 142/2 144/2 arrived [1] 193/17 29/6 29/12 64/16 appreciate [2] 80/21 144/20 146/10 148/20 64/21 67/3 71/8 78/24 arrogant [1] 54/20 100/5 152/4 159/5 164/13 96/14 97/17 98/7 articulate [2] 9/9 approach [12] 5/3 165/9 165/18 166/10 114/13 141/5 148/7 13/2 5/12 30/17 55/17 56/2 168/1 173/21 175/13 articulated [1] 9/1 148/16

backdrop [1] 2/2 background [4] 3/21 150/21 165/10 169/9 62/2 backlogs [1] 37/12 bad [19] 4/16 4/17 5/14 5/14 6/11 6/25 13/19 15/15 15/17 15/18 15/19 15/22 15/25 16/9 16/12 34/15 45/7 105/20 188/13 badged [1] 138/16 badly [6] 16/4 17/19 34/22 53/7 70/14 181/18 Baker [7] 80/11 97/10 98/12 98/13 98/14 108/21 201/6 **balance** [1] 77/10 bandwidth [1] 39/24 182/1 barely [1] 160/5 barrel [1] 15/23 **barriers** [1] 6/6 **barristers** [1] 80/18 base [3] 3/3 79/6 79/13 based [10] 4/25 58/3 111/21 131/12 142/7 151/1 174/17 basic [4] 23/9 60/22 87/13 178/17 **basically [6]** 16/5 49/18 60/24 100/25 105/11 179/20 basis [6] 70/20 116/12 143/15 161/4 181/21 190/13 be [394] bear [1] 185/25 bearing [2] 85/3 194/24 became [2] 9/23 92/1 because [116] 1/20 6/24 7/1 10/3 13/10 13/23 14/11 15/7 15/13 16/20 18/14 19/2 20/19 24/4 26/21 27/23 29/18 30/22 31/14 36/21 37/3 37/5 37/7 39/19 40/14 41/13 43/13 50/8 110/21 123/19 127/13 51/25 53/3 54/19 56/5 56/13 60/23 67/16 77/6 81/19 83/12 90/23 94/10 96/20 103/6 104/21 105/15 105/19 108/1 108/14 (54) anxieties - because

181/12 183/3 184/22

189/7 194/20 197/18

20/11 31/21 32/17 167/8 167/10 167/12 В **before [30]** 33/14 164/18 165/4 171/14 36/7 52/8 72/17 77/11 35/8 39/12 39/14 177/2 breakdown [1] 87/11 because... [69] 82/14 95/15 99/2 39/20 40/12 40/14 **birth [1]** 119/14 breaking [2] 89/18 117/16 118/8 119/17 41/7 44/16 50/23 54/4 birthday [1] 119/16 103/18 109/25 110/12 93/6 120/7 120/11 120/25 115/9 119/16 122/8 54/16 63/13 75/17 bit [10] 25/13 28/1 breaks [1] 90/4 121/11 121/23 122/5 122/19 122/25 123/4 75/25 79/24 80/7 97/19 125/8 143/19 brick [1] 180/13 123/9 125/9 125/21 126/20 130/17 137/22 82/20 88/12 89/6 165/8 180/12 180/13 **briefed [1]** 16/3 126/12 127/11 133/25 138/2 140/12 144/7 89/13 90/3 90/6 92/16 180/21 182/11 **briefing [1]** 106/9 138/11 142/9 142/14 145/18 159/21 159/23 96/19 102/1 102/3 blame [7] 5/12 68/16 **briefly [5]** 93/23 142/16 144/17 146/9 159/24 164/15 167/18 116/17 119/17 141/10 69/13 69/16 69/17 109/25 117/8 118/10 148/3 151/23 152/6 195/15 141/23 147/16 149/19 70/11 90/7 149/2 157/1 157/6 157/8 161/18 165/19 171/11 blaming [2] 5/5 70/7 began [1] 6/21 bright [1] 79/2 158/24 159/3 159/14 blue [1] 140/18 bring [12] 82/22 84/8 begin [12] 2/3 12/16 173/10 173/22 183/8 163/7 164/7 164/9 184/25 185/1 185/2 33/15 46/9 82/23 **board [30]** 28/1 86/7 86/12 95/10 165/10 166/3 166/7 83/22 98/16 98/20 191/1 35/16 39/5 39/8 39/19 106/20 153/24 158/4 166/15 166/22 171/8 **beings [1]** 94/3 109/20 110/22 127/22 40/1 40/13 40/18 41/1 159/14 161/6 169/7 173/16 174/11 174/13 41/5 41/15 61/23 62/6 191/13 154/2 **belief [2]** 110/10 175/9 177/2 178/9 **beginning [8]** 33/5 110/19 62/19 64/8 66/8 71/8 **bringing [1]** 193/15 178/20 179/7 180/7 48/16 50/21 61/4 believe [7] 3/18 9/20 76/5 97/9 111/25 broad [2] 81/1 180/11 181/20 182/18 61/15 106/15 180/20 19/5 74/9 86/25 95/9 133/2 135/8 140/17 162/10 184/3 184/18 185/8 141/23 166/15 186/21 broader [5] 1/17 196/9 116/17 185/16 186/3 187/10 begins [3] 129/10 believes [1] 133/11 187/10 187/15 187/21 23/14 28/3 119/10 187/19 187/19 188/3 145/14 161/16 below [3] 54/16 64/8 187/22 159/11 188/24 189/14 192/1 begun [1] 1/21 101/8 board's [1] 29/17 broadest [2] 117/12 192/10 192/13 192/22 behalf [5] 1/11 98/15 bereaved [3] 185/5 boards [5] 38/17 117/25 193/8 197/1 197/9 103/10 157/17 169/8 197/21 197/24 39/6 39/7 39/24 40/6 **broadly [5]** 23/15 become [12] 30/12 **behave [5]** 2/1 16/3 80/21 124/3 124/21 bereavement [3] **bodies [19]** 17/8 36/2 36/25 48/22 49/7 22/13 27/13 70/14 156/2 184/2 184/6 17/11 18/16 19/10 124/22 50/5 51/7 90/18 92/22 behaved [3] 24/21 bespoke [1] 44/3 19/13 19/16 21/10 broker [2] 91/8 92/25 92/23 128/7 194/18 best [14] 19/21 27/7 137/13 137/18 21/19 21/20 24/20 brought [5] 67/1 81/9 becomes [9] 20/9 41/4 45/25 66/18 behaves [2] 36/16 39/5 41/25 42/13 95/16 128/2 128/10 24/12 34/18 36/14 36/16 71/18 73/2 110/9 59/12 68/13 68/18 **Brown [5]** 199/16 36/17 92/10 92/24 behaving [4] 9/11 110/18 163/19 175/8 69/2 70/3 70/8 199/23 200/1 200/16 93/19 100/21 22/14 24/6 53/7 175/11 182/14 185/17 **body [5]** 42/4 42/10 201/12 becoming [1] 93/14 behaviour [46] 6/25 better [11] 5/4 26/22 66/19 67/5 100/3 bubble [1] 30/17 bed [1] 125/2 7/20 8/25 12/25 13/9 41/16 47/17 74/16 bookmark [1] 149/21 budget [3] 28/9 bedding [1] 199/3 75/21 91/20 104/25 13/22 14/6 14/23 border [7] 164/3 192/12 193/8 been [83] 1/19 2/1 14/23 14/24 15/4 122/3 134/1 192/5 176/22 176/24 177/1 **budgetary [1]** 23/15 3/21 3/23 10/14 15/25 15/15 15/24 24/3 33/6 between [19] 31/5 177/3 177/11 200/12 **budgets [5]** 29/5 16/3 19/9 19/12 21/22 34/13 36/2 36/14 37/1 99/9 100/10 105/16 183/5 183/9 183/23 borders [1] 163/24 27/12 29/15 35/4 45/5 45/7 45/10 49/20 112/9 112/13 112/18 **born [2]** 118/19 192/10 45/19 46/11 50/19 51/20 68/6 70/5 71/5 114/2 116/16 122/10 119/14 build [3] 3/2 41/22 55/18 55/19 59/14 71/13 81/5 81/6 81/15 124/18 124/24 132/25|boss [1] 54/15 74/20 64/18 66/24 69/2 137/6 145/2 166/22 **bosses [1]** 54/7 81/18 81/19 82/5 **building [3]** 76/11 69/23 70/10 72/4 72/6 83/12 86/25 88/2 168/16 176/25 191/11 **both [9]** 10/11 18/6 79/13 91/24 72/20 72/23 72/24 42/10 79/20 80/11 94/10 94/16 95/20 **built [3]** 47/16 60/5 between September 72/25 73/1 77/22 85/5 96/5 96/11 101/24 **2021 [1]** 112/13 81/11 97/14 154/16 179/13 85/5 85/16 89/22 96/2 101/25 104/22 123/8 **Beverley [1]** 6/12 155/3 bullet [11] 130/11 99/8 99/14 100/7 behavioural [1] beyond [1] 126/5 **bottom [6]** 23/11 130/20 133/7 134/10 101/14 102/25 103/1 131/3 144/10 149/25 103/9 biases [2] 34/11 81/8 134/22 135/7 135/12 104/7 104/24 106/13 behaviours [30] 5/2 big [11] 3/5 59/9 154/4 155/22 135/22 136/13 137/12 106/16 106/20 107/6 5/17 5/20 5/20 11/25 102/8 103/21 108/15 **boundaries** [1] 38/16 139/22 114/19 115/3 115/11 24/16 24/18 25/18 108/15 117/16 120/13 box [6] 109/15 110/2 bullied [1] 54/16 115/25 117/1 120/5 140/18 144/10 149/24 bullying [13] 5/18 39/15 41/1 41/3 47/5 165/22 180/5 183/20 121/1 122/14 123/17 53/23 61/17 62/25 Bill [2] 51/23 67/1 157/9 14/22 51/6 53/23 125/17 126/20 129/19 63/1 63/2 68/12 68/15 Bill Kirkup's [1] 67/1 boxing [1] 106/2 53/25 54/1 54/3 54/3 135/21 142/5 142/24 68/22 69/4 69/7 70/19 Birmingham [25] 54/4 54/6 54/7 69/8 **Branch [1]** 21/21 143/6 154/8 154/20 111/21 111/25 112/3 70/19 70/21 73/21 brands [1] 182/19 92/16 157/13 158/8 159/15 112/7 112/18 113/13 breach [1] 106/24 bundle [1] 153/23 73/23 83/6 97/20 160/25 161/21 165/9 104/18 113/15 120/13 124/16 breaches [2] 103/23 burdensome [1] 167/3 171/5 171/14 behind [3] 107/15 125/8 126/13 142/9 106/18 48/22 175/7 179/7 184/13 127/23 161/6 142/12 143/5 143/5 bread [1] 179/8 bureaucracy [3] 20/2 194/16 196/18 196/21 **beholden [1]** 14/13 143/9 143/12 143/22 break [8] 54/25 55/2 20/20 20/22 198/6 being [47] 15/9 16/7 147/24 151/5 159/5 55/6 92/24 164/16 bureaucratic [1]

112/22 113/3 120/10 142/16 143/1 183/3 В care [44] 3/4 5/19 **channeled** [1] 13/11 120/16 120/17 120/19 21/16 28/21 32/23 **CDR [1]** 177/18 channelling [1] 84/17 bureaucratic... [1] 123/23 128/3 128/6 37/12 42/21 43/4 centering [1] 146/1 **chapter [1]** 156/10 20/19 129/3 129/4 129/13 43/23 43/24 44/19 central [2] 130/12 **character [2]** 15/12 busy [2] 63/20 182/8 129/17 129/22 130/1 45/2 45/22 46/4 46/11 133/21 71/11 but [240] 130/4 131/4 131/5 55/24 60/25 66/18 centre [8] 2/25 7/3 characterise [1] 66/4 **But for [1]** 194/5 131/24 132/14 132/16 16/17 16/18 16/22 67/23 76/18 99/4 characterised [2] **butter [1]** 179/8 111/25 121/13 122/14 22/10 24/19 129/9 134/9 134/10 134/16 18/2 41/1 136/6 136/8 136/19 122/15 126/7 126/20 centred [3] 131/11 characteristic [2] 137/11 139/9 139/20 132/5 132/6 25/24 32/20 126/21 133/14 137/7 call [21] 2/9 5/19 140/16 140/19 141/8 139/2 142/15 149/5 certain [1] 101/9 charitable [1] 3/1 11/20 15/1 20/6 40/10 144/4 144/9 144/16 169/2 171/7 171/16 certainly [17] 115/17 **chart [2]** 95/15 97/1 41/2 97/25 118/22 144/25 145/11 145/23 176/15 183/22 190/12 116/5 117/2 121/18 **check [8]** 56/25 147/10 166/5 171/19 146/6 146/19 148/4 194/14 194/15 196/5 122/12 128/15 138/2 58/13 82/18 110/1 171/24 171/25 172/1 148/8 149/22 151/25 196/20 197/10 148/20 148/23 149/13 129/4 160/24 180/25 172/1 172/4 172/4 153/24 153/25 154/4 cared [1] 122/19 151/3 160/16 160/18 193/24 185/9 194/14 197/15 155/10 155/22 157/6 180/8 188/5 189/3 career [1] 111/13 checkbox [1] 96/14 called [22] 3/13 5/11 careful [2] 77/11 96/5 199/20 158/4 158/7 158/17 checked [1] 59/22 7/6 9/13 17/15 19/10 carefully [1] 61/14 checking [4] 42/17 160/24 161/6 161/10 certainty [1] 10/18 20/20 21/17 22/24 162/18 163/13 164/16 caring [4] 7/12 8/7 166/7 178/19 194/13 **certificate [5]** 150/12 30/8 33/23 35/3 49/10 169/24 177/18 179/17 127/5 183/12 162/1 194/1 194/8 **checklist** [1] 96/9 59/2 60/15 151/23 180/14 180/22 182/25 carried [1] 102/16 194/21 **checklists** [1] 95/25 166/17 166/20 167/2 184/16 184/22 185/19 carry [3] 36/21 certificates [1] **cheese [1]** 6/4 171/20 183/19 184/1 189/13 189/18 189/24 136/15 196/6 194/10 Chief [2] 62/5 62/5 calls [1] 37/16 190/13 193/1 193/18 carrying [1] 36/19 **certify [1]** 126/4 **Chief Executive [1]** Cambridge [2] 2/16 195/20 196/14 196/15 case [38] 1/20 4/19 **CESDI [1]** 152/13 62/5 2/25 199/14 6/2 6/12 6/14 6/15 CESDI-SUDI [1] child [214] came [5] 87/5 152/15 can reduce [1] 25/3 27/4 65/11 70/15 152/13 **child's [10]** 118/15 152/17 166/1 168/8 can't [14] 19/4 26/14 76/21 76/25 86/25 cetera [5] 34/25 119/6 130/14 133/11 campaigns [1] 85/23 57/1 84/15 84/24 87/3 97/5 98/25 101/20 34/25 46/13 51/7 51/7 142/8 150/13 156/2 can [196] 2/12 2/21 89/21 105/16 123/10 119/20 122/19 122/21 chair [6] 3/20 114/21 161/25 170/3 189/21 3/25 4/3 4/18 4/23 6/2 150/8 158/22 175/12 123/14 143/15 143/15 127/7 164/16 195/22 childhood [6] 146/12 6/12 6/25 7/17 7/22 191/1 199/1 144/19 147/8 147/10 201/10 149/23 161/13 167/23 11/19 13/4 13/7 13/22 cancer [2] 58/10 147/21 148/4 153/4 **challenge [26]** 6/11 173/5 200/7 14/7 14/20 15/11 122/14 154/5 154/7 154/11 23/8 34/20 35/11 children [56] 7/12 8/7 17/10 18/23 21/8 154/17 155/6 168/20 36/17 39/13 47/11 28/14 28/19 29/4 29/6 candid [2] 99/14 21/14 21/15 21/18 171/14 190/11 194/12 100/9 47/15 52/11 53/6 119/11 121/22 123/3 22/8 22/8 22/18 23/17 194/19 195/13 68/25 70/4 93/2 93/5 125/3 126/24 130/5 **candour [31]** 3/10 23/21 24/23 24/24 130/22 131/1 131/13 3/11 73/18 85/11 cases [14] 5/25 7/5 94/7 95/1 95/3 95/9 25/3 25/14 30/3 30/12 10/7 53/18 121/6 98/20 98/24 99/5 96/25 97/8 104/20 132/9 132/10 132/20 31/4 31/7 31/15 32/14 169/15 169/15 169/17 100/6 100/11 100/12 125/13 126/13 127/2 133/2 133/22 134/2 32/15 33/16 34/12 100/13 100/14 100/19 138/3 143/17 147/25 182/24 192/15 134/5 134/8 134/21 35/13 35/20 35/23 100/24 102/19 102/21 148/10 157/24 170/5 135/1 136/8 137/5 challenged [1] 36/3 37/11 37/12 102/25 103/21 104/5 categories [1] 173/2 104/17 137/10 137/18 137/19 38/11 38/14 38/17 104/10 104/14 104/17 cause [9] 7/13 124/7 Challenger [2] 30/9 140/14 140/17 141/1 38/25 39/8 40/7 41/21 141/8 141/9 141/22 104/21 105/18 105/21 150/12 154/14 161/25 30/14 41/24 42/13 44/5 46/4 106/16 106/25 107/2 194/1 194/8 194/9 142/11 142/17 143/3 challenges [9] 5/11 46/18 47/8 48/3 49/25 188/19 188/21 189/5 194/12 6/20 10/5 14/2 35/23 153/2 155/5 156/17 50/2 50/9 52/2 52/22 cannot [2] 63/11 causes [3] 156/17 46/24 50/3 148/3 156/21 164/7 165/19 53/13 54/1 54/5 55/8 132/18 173/15 192/25 192/9 165/20 165/20 166/15 55/13 55/14 56/13 **capability [2]** 56/16 causing [1] 171/6 challenging [4] 11/14 184/11 186/1 186/3 58/6 60/8 60/14 61/7 92/12 117/16 123/13 187/8 187/13 190/24 120/24 **CCG [1]** 136/3 61/12 61/19 63/8 67/7 196/19 198/19 capable [2] 57/19 **CDOP [31]** 120/3 **chamber [1]** 1/6 68/17 70/6 72/16 120/4 120/13 120/23 123/6 **chance [1]** 197/3 Children Act [1] 72/21 73/6 73/10 capacities [1] 41/11 121/3 121/4 121/9 **chances [2]** 181/18 134/8 74/25 75/12 79/4 81/1 121/12 121/21 121/25 187/4 children's [8] 129/22 capacity [7] 25/5 82/13 84/4 84/5 84/7 40/3 41/13 47/9 47/16 122/5 122/11 122/16 131/18 133/13 142/10 change [12] 46/3 84/11 86/17 86/22 72/18 76/11 122/20 123/1 123/5 46/4 46/15 94/5 103/8 142/12 143/6 143/12 87/20 88/17 90/13 123/7 123/12 123/21 103/9 104/23 106/21 **captain [1]** 95/15 164/11 92/8 94/11 95/15 107/20 143/18 165/22 choices [1] 79/17 captured [2] 125/14 142/7 142/13 143/3 98/16 100/10 101/2 125/15 143/9 143/16 143/23 168/19 choose [1] 62/21 101/3 103/22 105/15 144/11 144/20 144/20 changed [1] 122/1 Cinderella [1] 29/16 captures [1] 145/4 107/14 107/23 107/24 cardiac [2] 151/18 183/6 189/25 191/10 **changes [4]** 71/23 circumstance [1] 109/20 110/1 110/8 164/10 **CDOPs [4]** 121/19 81/10 107/15 166/1 18/22

C 79/22 138/24 174/2 Colleges [3] 42/24 commonly [1] 170/21 complicating [1] **close [1]** 89/17 43/9 43/13 communicate [5] 3/7 14/5 circumstances [17] closely [1] 169/4 combative [1] 54/22 25/17 26/20 27/15 comply [3] 103/5 24/3 101/18 102/22 closest [1] 196/4 combination [1] 38/16 103/25 178/8 118/5 118/8 119/12 clothes [1] 65/16 55/22 communication [6] component [3] 16/21 121/8 122/7 124/10 **Clothier [1]** 7/9 combine [1] 57/20 31/5 31/11 45/12 73/8 30/24 30/25 140/9 146/22 152/21 161/13 177/7 **cluster [2]** 15/17 come [46] 12/6 12/7 components [3] 153/3 153/6 153/6 12/9 14/1 14/3 15/11 15/20 community [12] 30/20 44/3 56/8 163/2 175/10 co [11] 19/24 61/6 19/19 20/13 27/15 111/19 111/21 112/7 compounded [1] cited [1] 176/17 61/14 67/13 71/20 28/1 44/25 48/18 112/7 150/20 151/1 104/18 civil [2] 18/6 24/8 72/16 72/25 73/1 79/1 57/22 58/25 61/25 151/4 158/9 182/6 comprehensive [3] claiming [4] 54/8 128/4 145/3 157/13 91/20 103/18 64/21 83/1 106/11 188/3 188/3 188/4 54/9 54/9 54/16 109/15 109/25 113/24 Companion [2] co-design [11] 19/24 comprehensively [1] claims [1] 52/15 61/6 61/14 67/13 114/24 118/8 121/2 148/21 153/17 111/6 Claire [1] 200/3 71/20 72/16 72/25 122/16 122/21 126/4 **comparator** [1] 58/21 comprise [1] 62/6 **clarities** [1] 62/23 compare [1] 55/14 73/1 79/1 91/20 127/13 130/21 144/2 **comprises [1]** 61/23 clarity [15] 8/5 8/15 144/20 145/8 147/17 103/18 compared [2] 9/10 concealment [3] 18/20 44/22 45/14 coach [1] 93/4 148/23 149/18 151/20 128/20 68/12 70/16 102/15 46/17 47/4 67/16 77/6 159/23 165/23 166/12 comparison [1] coaches [1] 76/7 **conceived [1]** 23/16 96/12 96/15 96/22 166/14 170/10 172/14 124/16 coalesce [1] 84/3 concept [7] 4/16 4/18 98/3 107/8 161/23 code [1] 120/9 173/19 175/13 179/9 38/20 39/8 69/14 compassionate [1] classic [4] 22/2 codified [1] 65/7 183/8 114/11 117/21 123/23 152/25 153/4 173/4 coding [1] 120/7 comes [17] 1/17 20/2 compelling [1] 98/17 concepts [2] 117/6 **classified [2]** 32/16 cohere [1] 21/11 23/5 23/6 23/7 23/8 compete [1] 21/11 129/3 101/14 64/13 86/24 93/4 **coherence** [1] 18/19 concern [45] 9/11 competences [1] classify [2] 33/20 97/13 106/1 122/20 139/18 9/16 10/21 13/21 **cohesion [1]** 16/11 33/20 128/21 143/14 175/13 competent [1] coined [1] 152/16 13/25 16/16 17/23 clean [1] 57/7 collaboration [1] 187/24 195/13 136/15 31/20 32/14 32/21 clear [41] 7/2 14/16 58/3 comfort [6] 41/3 34/6 40/11 42/18 **competing [2]** 77/10 17/20 17/25 19/18 68/11 68/22 101/24 188/8 42/18 53/1 53/4 69/9 collaborative [7] 20/25 25/15 25/19 compile [2] 17/13 55/17 56/2 57/23 104/18 199/5 87/8 87/15 89/19 26/2 26/4 26/17 26/18 72/15 74/21 108/9 comfort-seeking [3] 58/19 95/10 95/16 95/17 26/19 27/20 29/12 161/14 41/3 68/11 68/22 **compiled** [1] 17/19 95/19 97/21 137/6 44/17 44/24 46/25 collaboratively [2] comfortable [2] complainant [2] 137/22 138/18 138/21 47/6 61/22 62/15 71/19 78/11 42/12 42/12 91/12 97/15 140/25 141/4 141/13 72/12 75/18 76/1 77/3 coming [13] 13/15 141/14 141/20 177/17 collaboratives [1] complainant's [1] 78/12 81/24 87/1 58/11 15/1 21/22 24/19 88/17 177/18 177/20 179/15 105/15 124/24 131/12 collapse [3] 145/19 24/19 24/20 33/11 179/18 183/2 185/20 complaining [3] 52/8 134/24 135/4 135/13 40/2 63/7 71/4 109/2 80/24 93/23 185/21 185/22 189/8 146/5 151/20 137/3 137/5 148/18 189/10 **collapsed** [1] 11/8 165/9 196/22 **complaint [7]** 49/16 151/10 153/5 157/16 colleague [2] 82/17 comment [6] 1/20 49/22 81/3 81/7 89/12 concerned [14] 4/2 161/16 115/21 3/16 3/18 3/21 4/6 93/23 137/7 9/23 9/25 32/2 135/18 clearing [1] 158/19 19/13 160/4 160/17 170/5 colleagues [14] **complaints [5]** 13/13 clearly [6] 19/15 29/15 31/25 49/17 170/7 182/25 189/12 14/23 24/8 24/22 commented [2] 46/18 48/20 96/4 27/16 31/5 44/21 45/9 77/21 189/19 71/3 189/16 191/14 191/25 132/24 142/18 72/3 89/21 147/25 commenting [1] 92/7 complete [3] 144/21 concerns [47] 9/3 Climbié [1] 157/10 9/9 9/10 12/25 14/6 166/5 166/6 179/11 comments [1] 195/4 158/3 181/4 clinical [38] 5/16 181/22 Commission [2] completed [2] 16/20 38/14 51/6 51/6 7/14 12/10 13/16 collect [2] 56/13 21/16 149/6 112/25 161/17 52/7 52/12 64/23 37/23 43/1 43/12 44/4 64/24 69/5 80/4 84/3 57/15 commissioned [1] completely [5] 51/24 45/20 45/24 47/6 collected [1] 66/20 178/5 68/5 121/9 171/13 88/8 88/9 89/4 89/6 57/10 62/11 62/12 **collecting [3]** 56/23 commissioning [3] 185/5 91/18 100/1 122/15 63/20 63/24 64/4 64/9 134/12 134/25 135/2 133/11 137/25 138/4 125/20 140/22 **completion [1]** 175/2 64/10 64/14 65/4 73/3 157/12 157/14 157/19 collective [2] 15/5 commit [1] 6/9 complex [6] 15/3 75/22 76/6 79/7 80/2 53/20 commitment [4] 63/1 49/3 53/11 71/1 86/20 169/11 169/19 169/25 80/5 80/6 94/22 111/9 collectively [1] 155/4 63/7 63/11 108/13 197/16 170/9 170/13 170/18 111/17 111/18 112/12 171/15 173/21 182/15 College [21] 41/21 **committed** [5] 6/16 complexity [7] 18/3 112/16 113/8 134/12 42/2 42/3 42/9 42/19 9/21 23/2 106/7 18/8 18/9 18/14 18/18 182/22 184/9 190/13 164/21 164/22 42/20 42/22 43/9 137/16 22/6 54/18 190/21 191/2 191/12 clinically [2] 63/21 127/19 152/9 152/18 committee [2] compliance [4] 51/3 194/14 194/15 195/4 79/16 153/15 158/3 158/8 114/15 180/15 108/16 178/19 188/10 conclude [3] 113/25 clinician [3] 79/21 172/19 175/8 179/17 common [5] 22/12 160/14 199/18 complicated [4] 146/24 185/18 180/4 180/6 180/21 10/25 183/18 184/11 22/23 36/11 162/5 concludes [5] 1/14 clinicians [4] 57/5 182/18 164/9 197/9 50/1 114/18 117/4

22/3 22/3 22/6 22/13 C consistently [2] 45/4 coordination [4] counterclaims [1] 18/18 45/12 45/15 53/8 22/18 22/19 22/19 concludes... [1] consists [1] 118/15 49/4 **countless** [1] 141/16 22/20 23/20 25/7 28/8 200/17 constantly [1] 95/4 copy [1] 110/1 country [6] 85/7 30/25 31/1 32/4 38/11 conclusion [4] 57/8 core [6] 3/23 62/18 122/4 142/14 185/11 41/23 44/6 44/10 constituents [1] 77/20 160/3 160/10 158/12 169/22 180/2 198/6 198/8 44/10 44/11 44/13 125/23 **condition [2]** 165/17 constitutes [1] 44/18 195/19 44/16 45/6 46/3 46/4 **counts [1]** 98/1 173/13 46/23 48/6 73/24 constructed [1] corner [1] 144/10 couple [6] 90/13 **conditions** [11] 23/9 corners [1] 37/17 114/20 156/12 161/7 99/14 100/17 104/22 92/15 45/18 45/24 47/2 63/8 168/24 194/17 105/20 105/25 106/7 construction [2] Coroner [8] 9/25 73/20 73/23 74/7 106/19 106/21 125/10 147/4 150/4 courage [2] 87/21 106/21 165/8 125/3 156/19 165/21 97/19 150/14 169/9 194/5 cultures [2] 23/12 Consultant [6] conducive [1] 24/3 course [18] 2/5 2/7 111/18 112/6 126/16 194/20 46/10 conduct [7] 12/25 146/24 147/9 166/5 Coroner's [2] 169/3 48/7 63/23 76/15 82/6 curiosity [1] 31/10 36/13 45/5 49/20 Consultants [5] 193/21 84/20 92/7 98/24 **current [3]** 74/18 51/11 51/20 101/10 14/25 51/24 147/15 Coroners [5] 166/23 101/18 117/19 118/4 175/22 200/5 **conducted** [1] 91/3 193/3 193/4 193/11 150/6 163/7 181/13 180/10 197/18 **currently [5]** 2/20 confident [3] 39/1 consultation [5] 19/5 199/8 186/16 192/8 192/10 20/23 72/19 73/12 87/2 102/13 19/19 19/25 66/12 Coroners' [1] 193/9 courses [2] 165/14 74/6 confidential [4] 8/23 cut [3] 22/18 124/24 163/21 **Coronial [5]** 150/15 192/13 70/20 70/22 190/13 consultative [1] 192/18 192/24 193/10 court [1] 90/19 157/9 confidentiality [4] 78/10 193/15 courtesy [1] 186/16 cutting [2] 37/17 84/5 14/5 14/8 90/15 93/17 consulted [1] 146/12 correct [44] 5/3 5/4 Coventry [1] 164/24 CV [3] 2/19 2/20 **confirm [9]** 3/25 4/3 consume [1] 49/25 51/19 57/7 58/14 99/2 cover [2] 111/2 175/9 110/1 110/8 111/8 114/20 109/24 110/15 110/17 **covered [1]** 149/16 **consumed [1]** 51/16 cycle [1] 59/14 131/6 145/11 158/7 111/11 111/14 111/16 covering [4] 43/17 contact [1] 130/21 164/1 111/20 112/1 112/10 43/18 109/25 123/22 **contacted [1]** 171/18 confirmed [2] 65/18 danger [1] 36/4 112/15 112/19 113/2 contacting [1] 166/6 covers [3] 43/20 75/20 contain [1] 128/19 113/22 114/17 114/23 140/14 174/3 dangers [3] 4/17 confirming [1] 115/2 119/22 120/22 CQC [5] 38/1 103/22 4/19 96/8 contained [1] 4/9 146/25 128/9 128/23 129/16 106/14 106/17 107/1 dark [2] 52/22 79/3 contemporaneous confirms [1] 148/20 **Darzi [1]** 75/19 **[1]** 157/14 129/24 132/11 133/3 craft [1] 20/11 conflict [3] 21/11 content [1] 110/8 133/15 134/15 135/5 **create [2]** 53/4 89/2 dashboard [1] 45/16 71/1 116/23 **contents** [2] 4/1 4/3 136/18 136/25 139/12 creating [5] 20/18 conflicting [1] 68/2 data [35] 12/9 12/9 context [14] 2/2 2/6 140/4 140/15 145/13 87/19 88/4 88/12 **conflicts** [1] 65/2 12/16 12/20 13/15 16/16 30/10 30/20 149/25 150/5 162/4 conform [1] 36/5 18/12 20/21 55/23 36/10 37/16 38/4 175/17 175/18 creation [2] 98/24 confronted [2] 8/5 56/10 56/10 56/12 38/21 81/15 170/14 correctly [1] 56/15 174/21 40/1 56/13 56/19 56/23 172/2 188/21 194/23 credibility [7] 9/14 correspondingly [1] **confusion [1]** 173/15 9/17 9/18 10/10 10/14 57/6 57/7 57/15 57/21 contexts [2] 28/7 40/5 connected [1] 58/2 58/19 58/20 37/20 **corridor** [1] 32/23 83/12 94/9 192/19 63/16 67/12 72/15 **continue** [1] 46/13 costed [1] 20/15 credible [1] 92/17 connection [1] 196/4 contrary [1] 100/23 costs [4] 21/5 50/8 73/9 108/9 116/14 **credulity [1]** 10/9 consciousness [1] 116/16 116/20 116/20 **contrast [1]** 55/14 50/10 105/6 **criminal [4]** 18/6 176/19 cot [2] 199/1 199/1 116/22 125/12 125/20 **contribute [4]** 38/17 81/19 137/16 169/10 consequence [1] 133/5 149/13 179/24 181/10 197/4 could [42] 9/20 19/14 criminality [1] 5/21 83/5 data-sharing [4] contributed [5] 1/12 29/1 30/5 42/19 47/17 crisis [1] 102/11 consequential [2] 116/16 116/20 116/22 69/20 156/11 170/3 54/22 61/4 67/14 critical [2] 133/10 82/19 101/4 133/5 70/20 75/15 75/22 189/20 176/15 consider [6] 1/20 2/5 76/6 76/8 77/23 81/10 **Critically [1]** 162/13 **Database [9]** 115/1 contribution [1] 10/3 119/5 122/11 116/15 116/21 120/8 199/22 83/19 84/10 84/22 criticised [1] 39/2 190/10 87/1 87/2 87/10 87/10 criticism [2] 34/25 125/16 125/19 149/17 control [1] 77/8 considerable [2] 175/6 178/22 87/13 88/19 89/1 89/3 39/14 **convenient** [1] 167/7 157/4 159/12 90/14 93/4 97/5 98/20 cross [6] 164/3 164/8 databases [1] 29/25 convening [1] 122/11 **considered** [2] 50/23 176/22 176/24 177/11 dataset [1] 116/9 conversation [6] 103/17 104/24 107/6 184/10 datasets [1] 116/12 33/5 68/21 70/8 83/4 108/3 109/14 111/8 200/12 considering [5] 2/7 118/10 128/24 157/8 datastreams [1] 63/6 172/6 197/5 cross-border [5] 46/15 95/5 163/11 date [8] 3/16 158/15 173/8 191/25 164/3 176/22 176/24 conversations [6] 183/15 12/7 23/8 47/10 116/6 couldn't [2] 119/15 172/23 172/24 175/2 177/11 200/12 considers [1] 200/10 180/25 193/15 196/16 116/11 180/18 188/16 crowds [1] 20/9 consistency [2] 27/8 dated [3] 4/24 110/5 convert [1] 11/17 Council [1] 1/6 cultural [7] 15/12 162/8 110/16 cooperation [1] 25/8 counted [1] 60/21 22/24 33/23 34/10 consistent [2] 78/13 day [5] 31/23 119/16 93/7 105/10 105/14 coordinated [1] **counter [2]** 52/15 93/7 171/22 182/9 199/3 155/25 66/21 **culture [37]** 14/18

166/20 167/2 168/2 122/7 122/17 145/24 38/20 D deferred [1] 14/17 depth [2] 154/25 168/22 168/24 170/3 define [6] 22/4 44/9 developing [1] 43/5 days [2] 1/16 196/24 170/15 171/5 171/6 110/23 117/5 137/8 155/7 development [2] **De [6]** 109/12 109/18 descending [1] 173/2 173/5 173/7 169/25 71/8 76/5 167/14 195/24 199/11 173/10 173/12 173/13 defined [4] 11/2 147/13 develops [2] 74/18 201/9 174/10 175/10 175/21 84/17 118/14 145/16 descent [1] 92/13 95/3 dead [3] 75/17 125/2 175/24 176/6 176/8 describe [4] 10/15 deviance [6] 35/21 defining [2] 61/16 153/1 177/6 177/15 177/20 155/14 38/22 44/14 172/22 36/1 36/13 36/24 deadlock [1] 92/24 177/24 178/2 178/3 definitely [5] 53/16 described [10] 30/9 37/14 37/17 deal [29] 1/6 8/4 178/4 179/9 179/16 95/12 100/2 118/6 35/25 39/10 103/2 deviance' [1] 35/24 10/18 11/14 11/16 179/23 180/1 180/7 127/10 111/17 116/25 140/12 deviant [2] 36/2 36/3 12/11 14/3 15/5 15/13 144/13 154/24 171/10 devised [1] 152/9 180/9 180/13 180/19 definition [13] 30/5 15/14 16/12 32/12 181/8 182/4 182/23 118/9 145/14 146/1 describes [2] 17/6 devolved [2] 147/9 40/7 45/15 50/15 183/10 183/12 183/13 146/3 152/8 152/11 161/13 177/5 50/24 51/20 53/12 183/14 183/25 184/7 155/13 155/20 162/24 describing [4] 34/10 devolving [1] 92/6 53/22 54/11 54/17 184/10 185/14 189/19 165/11 168/21 191/5 63/15 101/24 147/14 devoted [2] 145/12 64/12 64/22 77/7 77/8 definitions [2] 191/14 191/18 193/6 descriptions [1] 168/5 95/23 142/20 158/18 194/2 194/8 194/10 117/20 155/13 85/20 diagnosis [1] 46/24 193/18 194/10 194/13 194/21 deflections [1] 52/14 descriptive [1] 124/4 | diagram [2] 144/9 dealing [20] 7/2 7/23 194/23 195/2 196/12 defunded [1] 58/11 desensitised [2] 36/2 162/22 7/24 14/12 14/17 24/9 196/23 196/24 197/8 degradation [1] 36/25 Diane [2] 30/11 37/16 31/16 53/18 54/14 197/22 198/1 198/16 63/22 deserve [2] 29/6 98/6 diary [1] 180/25 63/1 67/17 67/20 68/1 **Death's [1]** 167/4 degradations [1] design [26] 5/4 5/9 did [25] 5/24 10/3 81/4 81/8 102/8 deaths [48] 9/24 19/24 21/13 23/25 27/9 30/16 47/19 93/8 102/12 137/4 155/11 65/13 65/14 114/4 30/16 61/6 61/10 51/15 51/25 58/11 degree [2] 121/16 174/16 72/3 85/17 86/7 98/6 117/17 119/7 119/8 61/14 67/13 71/20 188/10 deals [2] 139/10 120/7 120/14 124/6 72/10 72/16 72/25 100/13 107/22 115/12 delays [1] 52/14 177/12 124/13 124/16 124/18 deliberate [3] 121/6 73/1 73/7 74/12 77/11 115/18 119/2 152/17 dealt [4] 95/22 96/3 125/20 141/21 141/23 123/16 157/12 78/10 79/1 80/2 89/8 153/15 153/18 159/25 153/19 191/15 143/2 144/6 146/6 91/20 97/7 103/18 160/1 160/10 160/11 deliver [2] 44/25 death [166] 29/24 146/12 146/15 147/4 45/15 108/7 167/18 111/25 113/9 113/12 147/16 149/23 150/24 delivered [1] 192/6 **Designate [4]** 113/22 didn't [22] 11/9 11/10 113/14 113/17 113/18 154/3 155/10 155/11 126/10 127/8 166/19 11/10 11/11 26/3 59/5 delivery [1] 119/2 113/20 114/16 114/21 demand [2] 27/3 158/20 159/1 159/3 designated [17] 59/8 88/7 98/6 101/13 115/12 116/3 116/9 159/6 161/12 163/2 123/13 111/24 112/8 126/9 106/15 107/18 115/17 117/15 118/9 118/11 163/10 164/25 165/7 133/20 135/23 138/16 147/17 149/18 153/1 demanding [1] 63/18 118/13 118/16 119/12 153/9 153/9 157/23 165/16 167/22 173/3 demands [1] 37/22 139/21 139/22 146/11 119/19 119/20 119/21 176/14 176/15 180/16 demonstrate [6] 4/20 147/2 147/7 147/20 164/24 180/9 199/7 119/25 120/3 122/2 5/15 5/17 16/11 39/16 die [10] 125/4 126/24 184/16 191/22 192/2 149/22 167/1 167/4 122/10 122/13 122/18 200/6 200/7 72/7 131/18 142/12 159/7 170/21 179/12 124/2 124/7 124/8 debate [1] 148/14 demonstrated [1] designates [1] 136/3 179/22 184/11 194/6 124/14 124/25 125/7 debrief [1] 26/21 26/10 designed [10] 14/12 196/21 198/19 126/1 126/4 126/5 **debriefed [2]** 76/10 37/21 49/25 59/24 died [25] 11/8 118/17 demonstrates [1] 126/20 127/11 128/15 93/2 67/5 72/1 89/13 134/25 121/22 124/5 127/3 131/14 131/16 131/17 debriefing [10] 25/6 demonstrating [2] 135/3 197/20 197/21 131/15 133/25 142/3 131/19 133/17 140/9 26/1 26/24 27/20 142/8 148/19 154/18 desire [1] 101/20 39/11 70/5 140/11 140/13 140/23 47/16 47/19 47/21 detail [12] 4/9 80/23 156/23 165/20 165/21 demonstration [1] 141/7 141/20 142/4 48/1 48/5 76/7 63/3 94/1 125/22 127/13 171/2 173/11 174/8 143/8 143/19 143/21 decade [1] 63/12 denial [4] 34/19 139/8 148/24 157/5 186/2 194/3 194/3 144/8 145/1 145/9 158/11 159/13 159/14 194/7 196/19 198/1 decide [1] 125/7 68/12 70/16 102/15 145/10 145/16 145/16 decided [1] 168/18 denies [1] 92/10 163/11 198/15 198/23 145/19 145/21 145/24 deciding [1] 171/21 denigrating [1] 63/12 detailed [9] 1/9 124/8 dies [12] 119/13 146/8 146/13 146/25 decision [5] 87/16 department [13] 7/6 168/3 168/11 174/12 143/5 143/10 143/12 149/6 150/12 150/13 146/16 161/21 173/18 13/6 19/23 49/7 49/12 174/17 198/18 198/20 146/23 148/10 149/4 151/1 151/2 151/4 186/17 49/12 66/17 147/2 200/6 155/24 163/7 163/15 151/6 152/8 152/12 151/15 172/18 175/24 detect [4] 57/3 60/13 194/1 197/10 decision-maker [1] 152/25 153/10 154/12 175/25 198/22 121/6 123/7 87/16 difference [2] 99/9 154/14 154/17 155/1 detective [1] 95/8 168/16 decisions [2] 79/17 departments [4] 155/14 156/2 156/25 13/12 49/1 51/2 62/12 deterioration [2] 25/5 differences [1] 47/12 119/2 159/2 160/4 160/19 declined [1] 51/13 depend [2] 121/7 60/14 different [48] 8/22 161/1 161/15 161/17 **dedicated** [1] 184/2 127/8 detriment [4] 89/25 12/5 13/11 13/11 161/18 161/18 161/21 90/1 90/2 90/3 13/12 16/23 18/14 defects [1] 5/6 dependent [1] 161/23 161/25 162/1 18/15 18/16 22/21 defensiveness [1] 195/11 develop [1] 33/8 162/19 163/16 166/16 34/20 **depending [4]** 49/23 **developed [2]** 13/20 31/17 33/13 39/20

20/1 20/22 21/1 21/14 76/15 126/3 147/16 D disciplined [1] 89/13 disclosure [1] 22/13 23/2 25/17 157/13 157/15 166/11 different... [35] 39/21 103/15 25/22 26/15 26/18 173/17 193/25 194/6 40/20 42/1 43/22 disclosures [3] 26/19 27/21 28/18 194/25 43/23 43/25 43/25 101/5 103/11 103/13 31/10 31/19 35/9 document [14] 49/22 52/11 53/6 discomfiting [4] 13/2 35/15 36/7 37/3 37/18 127/25 129/3 152/1 55/13 60/18 60/23 39/3 39/23 40/21 152/23 153/20 154/1 39/16 41/6 87/22 60/24 62/2 67/18 68/5 41/24 42/20 42/25 157/23 158/2 159/21 discourse [1] 75/17 81/21 83/3 83/4 discrimination [1] 43/16 44/2 45/25 160/4 164/16 168/12 116/23 119/6 146/16 47/17 50/12 52/17 52/15 177/8 177/12 147/15 147/16 154/12 documentation [2] discriminatory [2] 53/10 53/17 54/7 173/2 173/23 174/14 15/4 45/10 54/13 56/6 56/12 100/1 158/4 174/14 175/9 178/12 discuss [3] 53/1 84/2 58/14 58/18 59/11 documents [1] 191/1 191/4 193/1 59/16 59/23 60/8 156/14 177/5 differently [1] 192/25 discussed [4] 69/12 60/11 60/14 60/17 does [45] 11/11 difficult [43] 8/3 9/5 70/1 72/14 170/15 61/5 61/12 61/13 11/22 19/15 28/17 9/9 9/20 11/17 12/11 61/13 62/19 63/20 31/5 38/25 40/21 48/8 discussing [6] 45/19 13/10 13/22 13/25 83/13 116/13 121/15 63/21 64/20 65/3 65/3 57/20 64/2 64/3 82/11 14/9 15/13 15/15 17/9 139/3 171/7 65/4 65/9 66/6 66/19 87/15 88/3 91/18 23/7 31/25 33/24 70/1 70/15 73/13 102/20 118/3 119/11 discussion [8] 29/9 36/17 47/10 49/8 75/22 76/5 76/14 119/19 121/4 121/7 47/22 82/19 92/20 51/19 53/4 54/11 94/14 124/24 143/15 76/18 78/5 78/10 122/9 124/11 125/8 54/22 69/4 71/4 81/5 146/2 78/19 79/5 79/8 79/14 126/8 142/15 147/22 81/12 81/21 82/6 82/8 discussions [4] 79/25 82/16 85/10 147/24 148/15 149/9 89/21 90/1 90/5 90/23 115/25 125/5 138/6 86/10 88/19 90/9 150/25 162/11 163/21 double [1] 193/24 91/5 92/24 103/12 95/13 95/17 95/19 167/22 167/23 168/12 doubt [6] 138/8 169/23 138/3 142/5 142/16 100/1 103/20 103/23 168/14 169/7 171/11 diseases [1] 32/9 185/24 188/2 196/13 171/13 172/12 176/16 162/3 166/3 disincentive [1] 53/2 105/3 105/11 107/5 difficulties [4] 33/3 disincentives [1] 107/16 107/17 107/21 178/16 186/24 193/20 down [33] 2/12 17/3 47/20 48/23 104/19 108/3 109/19 110/6 doesn't [28] 10/12 89/10 difficulty [1] 104/15 11/13 24/1 37/7 38/23 dismissed [2] 51/11 110/7 111/6 113/7 dip [1] 4/5 51/14 117/11 120/17 120/23 38/24 48/7 50/14 59/3 directed [1] 96/15 123/10 123/18 124/21 **dismissive** [1] 82/20 59/9 74/20 74/21 direction [3] 68/13 dispiriting [1] 74/19 125/18 130/4 136/25 88/14 88/16 89/14 181/5 181/6 disposition [2] 137/22 138/11 139/3 90/19 105/11 105/12 directions [1] 28/9 128/19 136/14 143/17 105/10 105/12 141/3 143/4 143/19 directly [3] 64/20 143/21 145/2 145/5 dispositional [1] 158/24 173/11 174/4 71/12 72/22 95/12 146/7 148/5 149/13 183/13 192/3 193/9 director [5] 62/4 62/4 150/8 153/10 155/13 198/24 dispute [1] 33/22 62/5 64/9 76/6 159/1 159/9 163/23 disrespectful [1] doing [41] 5/10 22/14 Dr [26] 1/18 9/22 directorate [1] 64/10 5/19 164/1 164/24 167/5 22/21 22/25 23/4 directorates [1] disrupted [1] 34/1 169/18 170/6 170/11 23/21 25/25 26/13 62/13 170/11 171/2 171/18 26/17 26/20 34/7 39/9 disrupts [1] 35/19 directors [5] 61/24 171/22 174/12 174/18 43/23 48/1 48/2 54/12 distant [1] 86/3 62/3 62/11 63/24 175/3 176/21 177/23 55/21 56/2 56/22 distillation [2] 156/6 63/24 178/13 178/15 182/13 57/19 57/23 58/24 156/8 directs [1] 96/14 distinct [1] 188/22 183/22 184/4 185/12 60/23 76/1 76/11 79/6 dirty [1] 190/25 185/12 185/20 186/14 distinction [3] 3/15 79/22 79/23 80/4 disagree [1] 145/23 137/6 155/19 188/1 188/5 188/20 91/21 91/23 93/3 disappeared [5] 191/10 191/13 191/25 130/8 156/24 165/13 distinctive [1] 65/21 27/22 58/4 58/7 58/8 distinguish [1] 194/12 194/22 197/25 166/7 174/5 174/8 58/12 100/10 199/7 181/17 182/9 199/5 disaster [5] 7/11 **Dixon [13]** 1/18 2/10 doctor [23] 6/21 7/6 doing' [1] 28/6 17/17 30/9 30/14 2/14 4/6 55/2 55/8 51/21 109/23 111/13 domain [1] 118/22 34/14 78/17 80/8 80/17 111/24 112/8 113/22 domains [3] 119/5 disasters [2] 33/9 109/1 135/17 188/18 126/10 127/8 138/16 127/16 183/15 36/11 139/21 140/1 143/25 201/2 don't [69] 8/23 13/16 discharge [1] 149/7 150/11 151/22 166/19 18/19 20/23 24/21 Dixon-Woods [4] disciplinary [8] 26/4 1/18 2/10 2/14 201/2 167/1 167/4 186/10 27/11 27/25 31/6 27/10 49/19 50/2 **do [176]** 2/12 8/5 8/9 186/11 187/2 195/21 31/20 32/11 53/10 53/11 53/14 66/21 8/21 11/12 12/18 **Doctoral [1]** 112/24 54/11 54/13 56/15 87/12 doctors [19] 2/4 5/25 13/14 16/5 16/8 16/14 57/8 57/16 58/1 59/19 65/12 discipline [3] 8/21 17/5 17/21 18/18 19/4 59/20 60/10 62/14 7/3 15/1 32/9 42/6 74/15 162/9 19/14 19/21 19/21 54/19 63/25 63/25 63/19 65/6 66/3 70/12 116/25

70/14 72/18 73/13 74/8 76/23 79/24 80/2 86/21 87/18 90/8 91/22 94/10 96/6 98/5 116/4 123/13 138/1 139/8 153/9 156/23 157/22 158/4 159/14 162/16 169/21 177/24 177/25 178/8 179/2 180/10 184/15 189/6 189/15 189/22 189/22 190/14 191/1 193/5 194/3 196/3 197/13 198/1 198/2 199/20 done [27] 2/1 3/9 9/5 16/1 16/2 24/12 27/16 44/12 46/5 46/22 59/13 61/4 64/18 75/15 79/25 80/7 89/22 103/17 105/5 106/4 117/13 120/5 141/8 175/4 183/24 184/3 196/14 door [2] 23/3 94/17 146/14 146/17 146/19 22/15 23/5 23/6 23/7 23/9 24/24 29/14 40/14 40/15 54/5 56/25 62/12 77/5 84/17 86/23 91/20 109/19 131/3 131/5 131/20 139/7 144/9 148/4 152/1 157/8 157/20 157/22 158/5 164/17 170/19 171/3 65/12 109/7 109/14 109/15 109/17 109/19 110/21 117/4 128/6 129/1 129/14 136/14 137/11 140/19 157/18 162/24 167/6 167/16 195/17 195/25 199/14 199/19 200/3 201/8 Dr Claire Thomas [1] 200/3 Dr Garstang [18] 109/7 109/15 109/19 110/21 117/4 128/6 129/1 129/14 136/14 137/11 140/19 157/18 162/24 167/6 167/16 195/17 195/25 199/19 **Dr Joanna [4]** 1/18 109/14 109/17 201/8 **Dr Linda [1]** 9/22 Dr Reynolds [1] draft [3] 116/1 116/6

D emerges [1] 35/25 48/21 51/22 52/24 engineering [1] **escalates** [1] 130/18 draw [3] 57/8 114/13 **escalating** [1] 70/17 53/19 67/1 101/15 emerging [1] 11/1 104/22 148/7 East Kent [7] 14/16 emits [1] 28/4 **England [24]** 18/2 escape [1] 33/24 drawing [1] 79/5 34/21 48/21 51/22 **emotional** [1] 102/8 21/16 21/17 57/12 **especially [2]** 28/6 drawn [2] 141/4 52/24 53/19 101/15 emotionally [1] 61/1 115/4 115/8 71/11 148/16 easy [9] 9/2 20/24 116/1 116/18 118/13 essential [7] 20/20 103/12 driving [3] 44/18 32/20 54/17 103/6 emphasis [1] 77/24 122/3 134/11 149/8 20/20 20/21 47/23 107/14 107/19 149/12 160/17 160/19 103/11 156/8 169/22 emphasise [2] 97/6 48/5 80/5 184/23 dropped [1] 53/22 163/11 163/15 164/9 essentially [44] 5/9 199/6 130/8 drugs [1] 52/21 edition [2] 128/14 emphasising [2] 175/1 176/11 177/4 6/7 6/8 10/2 10/8 drummed [1] 157/21 96/17 128/7 177/23 179/5 14/17 15/8 16/25 175/17 dual [1] 42/9 **education [4]** 21/17 employed [5] 61/24 **English [3]** 163/16 20/18 22/13 22/15 duality [1] 42/12 74/17 119/4 175/25 88/22 111/9 111/12 177/1 177/11 23/25 24/6 24/17 due [2] 2/5 82/6 effect [4] 15/19 15/22 112/6 enormous [3] 27/2 25/18 27/12 30/17 duplication [1] 195/7 15/25 107/25 **employee [5]** 3/13 49/25 77/9 32/24 35/13 37/19 during [3] 84/19 effective [15] 45/20 42/7 47/7 50/13 50/15 9/8 50/2 50/13 50/16 enough [4] 37/21 115/4 116/9 45/23 58/7 58/18 **employees [2]** 52/19 81/24 85/24 98/7 51/2 53/10 53/22 54/6 duties [4] 43/6 104/8 61/16 107/23 114/7 52/21 **enquiries [1]** 144/18 63/13 65/1 65/3 65/7 111/18 136/16 114/12 130/8 130/10 65/18 69/15 71/3 **employer [2]** 49/22 **Enrolled [1]** 6/15 duty [42] 3/9 3/11 131/8 132/6 132/22 82/18 89/2 92/19 93/8 50/18 ensue [1] 83/6 73/18 79/23 85/11 192/6 196/6 employers [1] 136/14 ensure [10] 94/12 96/6 101/25 102/2 98/20 98/24 99/5 effectively [13] 8/20 employment [16] 99/21 106/3 132/22 102/7 108/12 99/17 100/6 100/11 14/18 16/14 58/12 8/10 14/12 16/16 136/15 136/23 139/17 establish [2] 70/25 100/12 100/12 100/14 72/2 75/23 104/6 16/19 17/1 19/4 19/6 157/13 162/8 166/11 90/1 100/19 100/24 102/19 104/11 108/12 124/12 50/6 50/7 50/11 50/14 ensuring [4] 49/15 established [5] 11/1 102/21 102/23 102/25 124/13 136/13 168/4 50/22 51/3 51/15 97/4 114/1 166/2 51/2 76/12 150/2 103/6 103/21 103/22 effects [3] 16/11 52/18 66/13 entail [1] 43/8 182/8 104/5 104/10 104/13 52/22 79/2 empt [1] 84/24 enter [2] 8/22 33/22 establishing [1] 104/17 104/21 105/1 effort [2] 72/11 106/8 enable [4] 38/14 39/9 **entered [1]** 14/15 116/22 105/18 106/12 106/16 45/25 75/22 **efforts [1]** 71/16 enterprises [1] 140/1 estate [1] 23/24 106/24 107/2 134/7 enables [1] 146/16 **egregious** [4] 9/19 enters [2] 16/19 68/2 estates [1] 6/20 134/13 149/7 185/25 10/8 10/22 14/22 enabling [1] 36/4 entire [1] 98/3 et [5] 34/25 34/25 188/18 188/21 189/5 eight [2] 30/2 44/15 enacted [1] 168/10 **entirely [5]** 8/19 8/20 46/13 51/7 51/7 189/5 either [14] 1/12 39/5 **encourage** [1] 70/3 18/11 23/22 124/23 et cetera [5] 34/25 dying [6] 141/8 67/3 70/17 108/10 entrapment [4] 33/23 34/25 46/13 51/7 51/7 encourages [1] 142/17 148/11 156/17 127/8 153/8 176/4 108/13 34/10 93/6 93/7 ethos [2] 56/3 74/21 156/21 198/13 181/19 185/9 186/10 encouraging [2] environment [15] evaluate [1] 71/21 dysfunctional [2] 197/4 197/15 199/6 106/10 186/10 14/10 14/19 23/15 **evaluated** [2] 72/6 88/10 104/9 **electronic [1]** 143/16 end [23] 12/23 18/19 24/9 24/13 28/3 48/14 107/25 dystocia [1] 27/18 element [7] 57/25 20/17 22/9 25/1 36/16 53/5 66/13 82/8 82/9 **evaluation [4]** 72/18 73/13 117/17 128/16 40/17 46/2 49/18 118/23 118/25 174/13 72/23 72/25 114/2 138/12 140/13 192/16 53/10 68/9 69/17 198/18 even [19] 11/4 15/1 each [15] 11/4 25/16 84/17 90/6 96/6 98/3 20/15 36/6 60/21 72/8 elements [3] 56/8 environments [1] 25/17 26/20 27/12 57/21 173/8 98/3 98/4 121/5 122/6 23/14 102/23 104/12 131/15 40/1 97/5 130/15 142/19 144/16 183/7 152/5 175/12 175/23 else [15] 12/22 33/20 **envisage [2]** 163/21 131/8 132/25 140/22 endeavour [1] 35/5 33/21 34/1 35/10 177/22 179/23 180/8 168/13 158/25 169/15 177/4 186/1 186/2 196/12 36/18 48/19 82/17 ended [3] 15/7 15/9 **envisaged [3]** 152/22 192/4 106/23 133/8 134/4 88/8 168/20 169/1 197/13 earlier [24] 4/16 event [5] 8/13 8/16 181/7 188/7 189/8 endemic [1] 31/12 epidemiological [1] 17/22 29/9 47/20 199/11 ends [1] 161/17 65/18 103/23 159/10 171/17 48/15 48/21 65/11 else's [1] 28/18 endured [1] 4/14 **episodes [1]** 104/13 events [12] 7/10 7/14 66/11 66/17 68/21 7/22 8/7 38/15 54/21 **elsewhere [2]** 50/20 energy [1] 48/9 equal [1] 37/22 70/8 72/14 80/10 enforceable [7] 99/5 92/7 98/23 145/20 142/17 equally [1] 92/23 83/13 84/16 92/21 email [1] 85/23 99/7 99/10 99/17 equipped [4] 21/14 159/4 166/4 174/16 94/14 104/24 106/9 111/13 128/20 144/14 embarrassment [1] 100/4 100/19 102/21 66/18 121/5 121/7 eventually [3] 49/6 equivalent [3] 26/8 38/10 enforced [2] 106/13 51/11 51/14 175/19 196/2 embedding [1] 107/9 106/16 35/15 190/23 ever [7] 22/7 37/2 early [6] 60/15 60/18 emerged [1] 36/10 65/6 133/25 148/4 enforcement [2] **error** [1] 5/1 61/2 93/9 125/24 errors [3] 99/8 99/15 159/22 165/17 emergencies [2] 106/23 107/10 152/14 27/10 94/19 engage [2] 53/7 100/9 every [18] 24/10 easier [1] 174/15 emergency [8] 26/14 erudite [1] 98/17 25/21 31/23 35/4 67/13 easily [4] 10/20 11/2 26/15 27/15 35/2 60/17 61/11 64/12 engaged [4] 49/20 **escalate** [1] 170/12 13/17 160/24 94/15 147/1 151/15 69/3 69/16 88/1 **escalated [4]** 40/12 79/25 85/6 106/4

East [8] 14/16 34/21

198/22

40/16 49/6 96/19

engineered [1] 47/7

E	139/14 142/9 143/5	experiences [1]	83/13 84/21 90/17	65/17 65/21
every [8] 112/21	145/18 158/20 170/14 171/13 188/12		100/5 102/3 118/20 128/11 128/19 145/22	feed [1] 57/16
119/20 128/13 130/16	examples [9] 27/7	experimentally [1] 25/14	146/25 147/15 154/19	
131/21 147/8 147/21	39/22 39/23 42/7	experiments [2] 16/1	156/10 172/20 191/9	197/4 197/16
179/21	48/20 58/6 58/10	16/8	198/5	feel [11] 10/12 11/9
everybody [4] 36/18	72/20 90/10	expert [6] 50/22	factors [5] 74/15	11/11 11/13 24/9
44/23 77/1 86/11 everyone [8] 48/19	excellence [1] 56/10	58/13 59/21 117/11	91/24 102/22 118/16	24/10 38/9 38/22
67/25 166/20 166/21	excellent [1] 103/8	163/25 193/22	141/17	66/24 87/19 99/23
167/5 179/20 197/12	exceptional [1] 18/3		facts [4] 1/20 2/6	feeling [1] 90/5
198/9	excess [1] 9/24	56/14 57/6 114/1	3/21 147/14	feels [1] 173/17
everyone's [4]	excessively [2] 98/4 98/5	117/15 140/19 179/13 189/17	104/10	Fellow [2] 112/16 112/24
125/11 131/7 131/23	exclude [2] 80/3	experts [2] 28/12	failed [1] 53/22	fellows [1] 42/15
189/1	146/8	156/11	Failings [1] 132/7	felt [3] 51/23 51/25
everything [9] 38/24 43/20 52/21 79/2 95/9	excluded [1] 90/4	explain [6] 30/11	failure [1] 104/13	86/7
173/15 188/7 193/24	exclusion [1] 119/17	75/12 159/16 177/18	failures [1] 81/23	fever [1] 60/22
194/18	exclusively [1] 168/5	179/17 193/19	fair [8] 28/23 29/8	few [6] 29/20 97/11
evidence [33] 1/6 1/8	executive [6] 35/17 50/10 51/17 61/23	explained [2] 78/3 99/20	54/23 87/17 97/19 117/1 117/2 120/24	122/12 128/13 196/24 197/3
1/13 1/13 1/14 1/16	62/3 62/5	explains [3] 34/11	fairly [3] 33/7 106/4	field [1] 28/22
1/21 1/23 2/3 2/4 2/6	exercise [2] 64/17	58/21 160/6	187/5	fifth [3] 45/17 111/1
3/2 11/7 13/2 43/2	106/2	explanation [3] 92/19		177/13
43/3 56/5 71/15 72/9 73/3 78/4 79/6 79/13	exercises [1] 64/15	92/23 124/6	136/1 164/7 191/5	figure [3] 65/7
91/2 101/13 101/19	exercising [1] 64/19		falls [1] 168/21	103/20 105/3
109/7 117/7 128/8	exhausted [1] 41/15	exposure [2] 19/7	familiar [8] 88/15	figuring [2] 25/21
146/16 149/22 174/18	exhaustive [1] 131/25	165/1	133/18 142/10 155/13 160/6 162/23 173/21	
196/8	exist [4] 4/17 58/15	express [8] 4/13 16/10 155/16 158/20	190/15	filling [1] 197/4 filter [1] 180/21
evidence-based [1]	100/13 180/9	163/1 177/16 179/15	familiarity [1] 153/21	filtering [1] 166/24
71/15	existing [8] 102/17	182/21	families [20] 4/14	final [12] 45/25
evolution [2] 124/9 152/6	105/7 116/19 162/11	expressed [2] 9/4	43/24 44/21 45/8	112/22 119/9 119/20
evolve [1] 32/11	171/11 175/10 183/8	173/22	47/25 61/7 73/2 97/7	122/9 123/22 144/3
evolving [1] 94/23	191/15 exit [1] 50/16	expressly [1] 139/9 extant [1] 172/20	98/16 99/22 101/10 103/18 103/23 130/22	148/9 164/15 166/9 177/13 190/8
exact [3] 17/15	expand [7] 4/7 4/18	extend [1] 193/9	174/19 185/5 195/4	finally [4] 7/7 78/17
158/22 180/25	23/17 36/7 52/17 54/2		197/5 197/24 197/25	122/5 127/20
exactly [11] 26/13 38/21 53/19 62/15	62/22	57/13	families' [1] 193/2	Financial [1] 62/6
62/20 83/17 84/24	expanded [1] 165/12	extent [5] 7/16 72/8	family [7] 80/18	find [11] 51/15 62/14
99/18 113/24 117/20	expect [14] 40/9 70/2		139/3 156/1 163/18	82/23 82/24 84/2
168/18	70/10 100/24 126/19 127/4 130/4 138/5	extents [1] 172/13 external [5] 12/21	163/22 194/15 198/13 family's [1] 169/10	88/18 88/24 89/6 105/7 106/5 140/10
examination [2]	170/13 170/15 170/19		fanciful [2] 6/23	finding [5] 22/12
53/17 79/11	176/11 186/13 187/16		82/21	36/11 41/4 106/8
examine [2] 2/1 27/9 Examiner [6] 172/13	expectation [6] 24/7	extraordinarily [2]	fanfare [1] 85/4	197/14
193/20 194/9 194/11	100/2 156/14 164/2	9/19 10/7	fantastic [1] 183/24	findings [4] 75/8
194/19 195/13	183/11 186/20	extraordinary [1]	far [13] 4/1 4/4 18/23	77/16 77/17 77/19
Examiner's [1] 195/6	expectations [8] 20/13 21/11 43/15	72/21 extreme [3] 18/10	63/8 93/18 126/5 135/18 160/4 160/16	fine [1] 198/3 fines [2] 104/1
Examiners [3]	10/11 51/2 69/2 79/12	81/17 105/5	189/12 189/13 191/13	
193/16 193/25 194/25	162/2	extremely [12] 9/5	191/25	finished [1] 37/11
example [49] 5/7 8/16 10/6 10/21 13/12	ovposted [4.41, 20/9	13/9 19/11 22/23 24/4		fire [1] 119/4
14/25 16/4 16/6 18/11	44/25 59/13 64/12	36/17 50/5 51/19	favour [1] 51/15	firm [1] 150/23
19/3 22/2 33/21 34/21	125/4 125/7 134/17	73/12 74/7 85/16 88/1		first [65] 4/11 10/8
35/10 40/23 51/8	135/19 135/21 137/1 141/3 145/4 188/11	eyeballing [1] 57/2	107/20	10/15 21/2 27/5 28/12 28/17 30/4 31/4 32/13
52/14 55/17 55/21	196/21	F	Fears [1] 132/18 feasible [2] 22/1	35/7 35/18 44/9 52/8
56/5 56/23 59/15	expecting [3] 73/15	face [2] 101/21	70/21	52/18 52/25 53/1
60/11 65/11 65/14 65/24 72/4 73/17 76/4	186/7 186/8	155/19	feature [10] 31/14	53/15 55/12 58/16
76/7 92/16 95/14	experience [13]	faced [2] 81/12 95/10	31/18 44/22 45/4	59/3 59/6 60/16 61/19
100/8 101/5 101/16	48/16 53/17 74/22	facilities [1] 23/24	45/11 45/17 68/24	75/12 75/16 78/8 82/4
103/13 103/16 106/18	82/10 85/2 86/17 90/2		93/7 101/17 103/21	82/14 82/18 83/4
106/22 108/5 132/1	149/10 159/22 164/17 164/18 165/5 195/12	25/13 36/25 37/9	features [6] 23/13 23/18 44/15 60/4	84/14 92/17 107/1 107/3 110/4 110/21
	10-7/10 100/0 100/12	_3, .0 00,20 0110	20, 10 77, 10 00/7	101/0 110/7 110/21

	 F	fore [1] 84/8	friction [1] 192/25	129/1 129/14 136/14	gives [5] 56/19
:	first [28] 111/6		fringe [1] 182/20		129/13 130/10 162/10
	111/7 117/4 117/8		frontline [7] 63/14	162/24 167/6 167/16	173/1
	127/16 129/8 130/11	134/5	164/21 165/9 165/19		giving [6] 1/13 12/21
	130/16 134/23 137/12	forget [1] 35/6	166/1 166/11 166/25	199/19 201/8	153/5 193/11 196/25
	137/20 144/17 151/12	torgets [1] 176/2	frustrating [1] 24/9	gaslighted [1] 39/2	197/3
	151/22 152/9 152/11	torgive [2] 129/1	fulfilling [1] 104/8	gave [4] 56/5 103/22	glance [1] 92/17
	152/15 152/17 153/11	160/20	full [4] 109/21 128/3	110/5 110/12	GMC [1] 100/8
	159/7 162/13 165/1	torm [10] 12/6 12/7	131/9 173/7	geared [1] 168/22	go [40] 4/11 26/3
	177/16 187/20 187/24	58/15 79/10 81/5 96/4		general [10] 14/12	26/22 27/5 31/15
	192/13 196/2 196/23	141/24 144/24 191/11	128/6	28/3 67/7 77/24 86/17	33/12 35/20 41/17
-	firstly [8] 109/2 113/1	197/5	fully [10] 39/4 39/4	111/2 121/3 175/14	50/7 50/14 55/8 86/4
	115/11 124/11 125/24	Tormai [3] 39/20	59/21 70/10 77/22	177/13 185/21	86/23 89/3 93/25
	158/13 164/18 193/18	138/15 187/14	80/19 127/4 131/16	generalised [1] 11/3	94/17 95/15 109/4
ŀ	fit [2] 77/22 165/24	formally [1] 138/16	185/8 196/21	generalising [1]	112/20 116/20 124/6
ŀ	fits [1] 194/13	formed [2] 12/12 40/4	function [6] 30/21 45/13 62/10 78/15	125/21	128/25 139/20 144/22 152/4 154/22 155/12
ŀ	five [1] 107/4	forms [1] 15/3	84/15 119/25	generality [1] 140/5 generally [10] 10/14	157/6 158/11 162/16
	five years [1] 107/4	formulaic [1] 185/2	functioning [6] 12/1	48/10 56/7 67/6 83/8	162/23 170/19 171/3
	fix [1] 37/7	formulated [1] 40/4	20/22 40/23 40/24	96/2 141/25 150/23	180/14 185/12 186/5
	fixing [1] 48/4	forward [23] 14/1	44/12 104/4	150/24 173/22	188/24 194/20 197/18
	flagged [1] 157/6	14/2 19/25 22/1 59/25		generation [1]	198/24
- 1	Fleming [1] 152/13	69/1 90/6 106/11	88/10	180/10	goals [6] 25/19 44/17
	floor [1] 39/12	109/15 128/24 129/25		generations [2]	45/14 46/17 56/4
	flow [2] 144/9 162/22	132/14 134/6 139/6	62/18 125/22 134/3	22/16 179/8	62/23
	flowchart [4] 144/5	144/4 145/7 148/6	150/16	generic [3] 43/21	goes [21] 25/21
	150/17 150/25 151/7		fundamentally [3]	44/3 144/7	26/22 57/17 58/20
	fluffy [1] 25/13	155/0 163/5 182/2	176/2 187/11 187/23	genuine [1] 108/13	68/20 70/7 72/11 88/9
- [focus [7] 16/24 118/1	foster [1] 38/11	funded [6] 2/25 57/11		92/20 94/13 100/18
	118/2 118/7 137/10	found [4] 35/4 65/16	115/2 115/3 139/23	15/20 17/21 21/15	100/20 104/23 120/7
	152/23 152/24	125/2 152/25	185/11	21/15 21/18 22/24	126/5 132/21 137/8
	focused [13] 5/24 23/2 49/15 50/5 51/2	Foundation [3] 3/1	funder [1] 113/5	23/25 24/6 24/11 35/7	189/2 189/4 197/14
	70/6 82/2 98/4 101/25		funding [15] 115/7	36/12 37/19 37/23	198/12
	128/19 153/3 154/25	tour [6] 107/2 119/5	174/23 174/25 175/11		going [124] 2/18 4/5
	155/2		182/14 182/21 182/23		12/2 12/22 17/19 24/8
	focusing [2] 42/19	177/3	183/4 184/1 184/24	70/11 71/3 80/23 91/1	26/18 26/19 27/21
	140/12	fourth [6] 32/19	185/8 193/7 198/5	100/22 105/5 119/3	29/8 31/7 31/13 32/11
-	folds [1] 87/25	45/11 102/10 110/25		121/21 123/4 123/14	
	follow [11] 8/12		funds [2] 143/20 184/4	142/12 150/17 162/17	
	84/15 96/23 124/12	frame [1] 177/17 framed [1] 91/6	furious [1] 199/8	166/25 178/21 180/20 182/7 184/20 193/12	44/22 45/4 45/12 45/14 46/22 46/24
	129/21 139/18 153/8	framework [23]	further [13] 17/3 22/6		55/2 56/25 57/5 60/20
	162/3 173/15 174/10	43/17 43/18 43/20	52/9 99/25 121/11	197/12 197/23 198/18	
	177/25	44/2 66/15 74/9 78/10		198/22	69/5 69/17 69/17 73/5
-	followed [8] 10/2	96/11 96/24 115/13	144/17 146/21 152/5	gets [3] 24/24 49/11	73/16 76/11 78/22
	51/18 80/11 96/16	116/2 119/8 159/11	170/10 170/12	49/13	78/25 80/20 81/2 81/6
	129/12 144/5 146/15	159/18 160/8 160/13	futility [3] 36/20	getting [15] 21/15	82/1 82/18 87/2 87/21
	161/20	175/15 175/16 176/5	36/23 37/4	34/16 35/14 53/14	88/4 88/13 88/16
- [following [7] 50/20	176/8 190/4 191/15	future [3] 79/13	55/12 57/3 58/16 59/2	88/18 89/10 89/15
	86/9 115/11 143/10	191/23	131/18 141/9	59/6 60/25 63/21 65/2	
	161/14 171/21 194/4	Francis [4] 1/19	FutureNHS [1]	138/8 142/2 142/3	98/19 98/20 100/21
	follows [2] 144/13 162/22	17/16 188/20 200/19	115/22	GIRFT [1] 59/2	104/17 105/8 105/9
.	footing [1] 193/17	Francis' [3] 85/4 87/6	G	give [15] 2/12 29/13	108/11 108/15 110/22
- 1	footprint [4] 120/12	135/14	<u>G</u>	30/5 51/8 58/6 58/23	110/23 117/5 117/8
	127/1 142/7 183/17	fraud [2] 8/2 8/13	games [3] 68/16	78/9 91/2 100/23	118/7 118/8 123/19
.	force [5] 103/22	fraught [1] 10/24	69/13 69/16	106/6 121/15 144/5	123/21 124/9 125/21
	107/15 107/19 128/18	freckle [1] 66/1	gaming [1] 69/7	169/9 188/9 189/24	127/16 127/17 127/18
	161/1	tree [2] 79/1 109/4	gap [8] 9/14 9/17	given [19] 5/8 26/7	128/21 128/25 129/2
-	forced [2] 95/18	Freedom [16] 64/22	9/18 10/10 10/14	32/18 55/17 71/8	129/7 134/6 138/22
	95/23	73/18 85/12 85/13	50/23 83/12 94/9 Garetang [24] 1/18	72/10 85/6 91/11	138/25 139/6 140/8
-	forces [1] 107/17	85/15 85/19 86/19	Garstang [24] 1/18 109/7 109/14 109/15	97/21 117/1 121/10	142/1 144/5 144/23
	forcing [3] 94/6	86/24 87/3 88/6 88/20 88/21 105/16 105/21	109/17 109/14 109/13	122/7 124/7 131/25 149/24 150/23 166/25	145/7 145/8 147/7 150/17 150/20 151/8
	94/11 197/1	106/1 135/14	110/21 117/4 128/6	175/23 183/4	156/12 158/2 158/11
		100/1 100/14	110,21 111,7 120,0	110/20 100/4	100/12 100/2 100/11
- 1		İ		İ	

155/10 157/7 106/24 107/9 143/24 139/3 157/12 G 105/7 118/19 136/3 greatly [1] 107/6 142/3 153/14 156/11 harmed [6] 137/13 headline [2] 118/12 going... [23] 158/17 grey [2] 146/17 158/8 159/22 161/3 137/14 138/5 138/5 119/24 159/5 159/15 161/7 173/17 165/12 165/14 166/4 154/20 171/16 health [38] 3/1 18/11 163/5 164/15 167/16 grievance [5] 15/6 166/10 166/18 170/2 harming [1] 28/19 19/24 20/22 20/24 172/8 173/19 178/13 49/21 53/13 53/14 171/21 180/17 183/8 **harmonise** [1] 18/23 21/17 21/21 42/2 179/22 181/20 183/22 53/21 183/17 184/11 185/20 42/22 43/10 66/18 Harold [1] 6/1 185/14 187/5 188/19 grievances [3] 52/15 99/3 106/19 112/17 192/11 196/4 196/19 has [94] 1/19 1/21 192/12 193/11 194/25 53/8 66/22 hadn't [1] 159/24 3/20 3/23 10/14 10/23 113/4 120/19 120/20 196/14 196/21 197/11 14/14 15/25 21/21 126/11 126/17 126/18 grossly [1] 5/15 half [4] 113/10 198/22 ground [2] 80/24 113/10 113/13 123/10 21/25 25/14 25/15 127/19 129/15 133/3 gold [1] 38/25 27/21 30/20 35/4 135/24 139/10 139/23 165/2 halfway [1] 139/7 good [37] 1/4 24/3 **group [15]** 7/3 15/20 halves [1] 113/15 38/24 40/22 42/5 42/9 141/20 152/10 152/18 31/5 31/5 44/6 45/22 16/3 16/11 82/25 hand [8] 9/19 13/22 44/3 46/11 47/24 153/16 172/18 175/25 47/4 52/22 54/12 92/22 98/15 177/4 143/10 144/10 164/13 48/22 49/21 50/19 180/2 180/5 189/3 54/13 54/25 57/23 177/11 180/5 180/19 186/22 188/24 188/24 53/3 55/19 59/14 61/1 191/19 192/3 200/4 58/11 61/8 63/11 182/3 182/8 182/20 67/3 71/10 73/6 79/2 handed [1] 102/6 healthcare [51] 2/15 64/16 64/17 64/19 191/18 handing [1] 157/24 80/22 84/6 85/4 85/5 2/24 13/3 18/2 18/4 67/10 67/23 72/15 groups [3] 54/22 handle [11] 8/24 85/16 87/20 88/22 18/11 18/13 18/13 77/12 78/13 99/11 80/19 134/12 11/19 13/10 15/3 35/2 88/24 89/22 91/12 19/2 19/6 20/3 20/5 100/17 101/25 103/17 growth [1] 77/3 63/16 67/15 76/9 22/9 25/11 35/1 35/8 92/9 94/1 95/15 95/24 166/21 169/13 174/17 guardian [10] 85/19 81/21 94/15 94/19 102/25 103/1 106/13 36/12 44/7 57/10 179/6 181/16 181/18 86/19 86/24 87/3 88/7 handled [7] 8/18 106/16 116/14 122/1 99/22 104/12 107/25 188/13 192/2 193/7 88/14 88/20 88/21 30/23 37/5 48/25 122/14 122/18 122/23 111/21 112/8 119/3 195/11 90/16 106/1 50/19 51/1 100/21 124/5 125/17 127/3 120/18 123/18 123/18 got [62] 8/2 13/8 131/15 133/10 133/24 126/15 127/1 136/4 guardians [4] 64/22 **handling [13]** 13/13 16/21 16/21 19/12 73/19 85/12 85/15 26/2 47/5 49/15 49/19 137/13 138/4 142/25 138/6 139/4 139/15 21/20 31/16 38/24 51/8 68/5 71/12 93/1 143/23 146/9 148/19 149/5 166/23 169/2 guess [2] 71/2 41/19 52/25 56/14 178/10 94/22 96/6 96/11 150/25 154/20 156/23 171/4 171/15 176/25 73/8 79/20 82/1 87/20 169/13 158/13 161/21 171/1 177/1 178/1 178/6 guessing [1] 83/16 88/2 89/6 92/15 98/7 171/5 171/14 172/14 179/12 180/2 183/11 guidance [80] 28/9 hands [4] 17/4 17/5 101/12 102/12 105/1 29/7 43/1 52/5 99/18 17/6 121/21 173/11 174/8 176/17 184/12 184/18 185/11 105/2 105/25 106/3 99/24 116/7 118/14 179/7 183/9 183/17 186/6 189/2 happen [25] 8/17 106/7 110/1 114/10 121/18 127/17 127/18 13/18 17/10 22/17 186/2 189/20 194/2 healthy [6] 44/9 120/6 121/19 122/23 127/20 127/23 128/20 32/21 33/10 33/16 194/2 194/8 194/16 44/11 44/16 46/10 123/11 126/25 127/11 129/11 129/21 130/2 33/18 34/12 36/15 194/18 197/15 198/1 99/14 118/21 138/12 138/21 144/20 40/21 84/4 87/9 90/19 139/10 139/19 140/6 198/23 199/16 hear [7] 39/12 59/5 151/11 164/12 169/13 142/2 152/17 152/19 96/12 99/20 101/2 hasn't [2] 88/14 82/6 106/15 107/18 171/21 171/24 173/9 101/3 101/13 146/6 153/5 153/8 154/7 105/25 188/19 197/18 174/14 175/5 178/12 156/5 156/7 156/7 146/7 148/19 157/23 hat [2] 187/17 187/22 heard [10] 1/6 9/15 179/22 183/21 184/4 156/14 157/4 158/8 166/5 198/24 hate [1] 198/10 11/7 32/15 32/16 39/1 184/8 184/9 192/2 158/13 159/12 160/2 happened [11] 11/10 hats [1] 187/15 101/19 135/16 188/17 192/11 193/6 193/22 160/17 160/19 160/25 11/11 30/14 40/22 196/9 have [418] 194/15 195/3 195/5 161/1 161/3 161/5 53/19 121/14 137/25 haven't [11] 3/20 hearer [4] 87/20 197/10 197/11 198/9 146/9 154/14 163/25 161/9 162/19 163/8 41/18 56/14 70/10 87/21 97/19 97/19 199/16 hearing [3] 1/22 65/8 98/6 102/12 107/24 163/14 165/15 165/24 183/9 governance [2] 29/4 167/19 168/3 168/5 happening [10] 6/7 126/25 178/1 179/13 82/25 45/21 172/9 172/10 172/11 12/18 17/18 17/21 184/4 heavy [2] 24/4 102/6 governed [3] 14/11 having [32] 6/23 172/12 172/14 172/17 26/5 40/8 69/11 96/21 heavy-handed [1] 16/22 68/3 172/20 172/21 172/25 184/21 194/16 12/19 12/19 12/20 102/6 governing [4] 18/4 173/6 173/9 173/12 happens [7] 13/20 35/10 45/13 45/20 heighten [2] 7/11 19/3 51/3 68/4 173/20 173/23 173/24 34/2 34/12 37/20 53/12 55/24 61/10 7/17 Government [1] 173/25 174/2 174/3 80/24 97/20 143/7 76/21 77/7 77/10 90/7 held [2] 122/18 154/9 24/20 174/12 174/17 175/10 happy [2] 31/2 91/8 93/12 94/14 Hello [1] 2/14 **GP [2]** 9/22 65/25 175/15 176/7 176/12 179/10 102/20 102/22 103/15 help [31] 22/8 28/12 **GPs [1]** 183/16 176/21 178/2 178/9 harassing [1] 54/9 104/15 111/12 116/5 29/5 38/11 38/12 graded [1] 101/12 178/20 183/10 192/23 harassment [1] 51/6 143/6 160/15 163/23 41/22 42/15 42/17 grading [1] 101/7 guide [2] 157/2 157/3 hard [6] 12/9 17/12 165/9 169/19 170/8 61/25 70/6 76/23 82/2 gradual [1] 194/17 18/17 105/9 180/4 171/22 188/21 191/2 84/5 86/9 89/14 93/4 **Grantham [5]** 6/16 Н 198/21 he [1] 36/16 112/22 113/3 117/6 7/5 7/7 7/10 7/11 had [36] 5/25 43/25 harder [1] 13/1 head [4] 7/6 15/4 124/20 130/3 132/16 graph [1] 57/2 63/12 77/22 85/20 harm [10] 10/22 19/8 15/7 187/1 137/11 140/20 141/3 great [2] 1/6 50/24 85/24 86/8 88/24 99/8 117/22 121/6 123/16 148/16 157/18 179/10 heading [6] 131/22 greater [4] 106/23 101/5 102/16 103/12 130/25 133/12 137/19 139/9 140/11 154/2 183/1 186/21 189/13

Н 153/1 153/4 174/8 174/9 198/13 helpful [8] 34/14 honest [3] 92/25 99/8 62/15 73/15 80/1 149/11 84/18 91/9 95/18 **Honorary [1]** 112/16 182/16 hope [4] 65/20 96/18 helpfully [1] 109/3 99/25 129/1 helping [1] 165/13 hopefully [3] 117/6 helps [1] 39/8 193/23 197/23 her [4] 15/8 22/1 hospices [1] 196/20 199/15 199/16 hospital [43] 22/25 here [37] 12/22 13/22 49/4 51/9 76/18 82/7 24/14 30/24 33/15 82/9 85/6 99/13 36/15 40/6 45/2 52/23 142/10 142/12 143/6 61/20 64/6 64/15 66/3 143/12 146/6 146/7 83/8 88/5 98/23 99/5 146/24 148/10 148/11 106/23 116/5 118/7 148/11 148/15 151/2 125/21 127/16 129/8 151/4 151/18 151/20 132/15 134/7 137/2 153/7 153/10 156/17 137/11 137/24 142/6 156/24 162/20 163/2 144/6 147/13 150/18 164/10 164/12 165/7 154/2 157/1 182/24 165/16 171/18 174/10 190/17 198/25 177/22 183/11 183/21 heuristics [1] 34/11 185/19 188/5 189/15 **Hey [1]** 105/1 189/22 196/20 **hiatus** [1] 115/4 hospitals [14] 119/8 hidden [1] 30/12 121/10 121/20 121/22 hierarchy [2] 54/5 121/23 151/21 153/2 138/17 156/21 165/20 183/20 humans [2] 22/13 high [18] 7/4 12/14 183/24 188/1 188/5 25/23 27/19 35/4 194/16 40/23 44/11 48/16 hostile [2] 16/7 24/6 55/22 55/24 78/25 hostility [1] 34/25 83/5 104/4 144/1 hours [8] 64/12 174/3 177/5 177/22 126/14 145/18 147/11 179/5 151/12 168/24 171/17 highest [1] 26/12 198/13 highlight [1] 62/21 how [120] 2/1 3/3 3/5 highly [11] 8/6 8/24 3/7 7/17 9/2 11/11 11/25 24/8 33/4 33/5 13/4 13/6 14/7 18/23 45/23 56/2 74/16 19/5 20/11 22/4 22/8 101/4 106/7 23/1 23/25 25/10 hints [1] 65/10 25/22 26/19 27/13 his [4] 6/9 9/24 10/4 27/14 29/3 29/13 17/17 30/11 31/1 31/2 31/4 historical [2] 2/2 31/5 31/9 31/18 32/11 150/21 33/8 35/2 35/6 38/17 historically [1] 24/21 39/18 40/6 41/19 history [9] 32/10 41/21 44/14 46/2 46/4 65/25 71/25 79/7 79/9 46/15 46/18 47/5 92/14 94/24 198/19 47/14 47/17 58/21 198/21 hit [1] 152/20 65/4 65/7 66/4 67/13 **hm [1]** 144/12 67/15 68/18 69/21 hold [5] 117/11 142/3 69/23 70/6 72/24 73/1 | I can't [3] 158/22 147/10 175/12 177/24 73/5 73/14 75/12 holding [3] 178/2 75/15 78/5 79/5 79/9 178/7 178/11 79/14 81/7 82/6 82/8 **holds [2]** 126/8 82/24 85/18 86/10 183/14 87/15 87/24 88/13 holes [3] 6/5 6/5 6/9 88/17 91/16 92/8 holistic [2] 118/15 94/15 94/19 97/20 183/14 102/20 103/20 105/3 home [7] 65/15 142/8

105/5 114/6 115/7

116/12 116/13 123/7 124/23 125/17 131/19 106/15 107/18 137/8 149/9 149/11 157/18 163/25 165/1 172/22 173/12 174/9 176/3 176/22 180/22 181/10 186/21 186/23 190/2 191/21 192/18 193/20 195/2 199/3 however [1] 163/17 **HR [29]** 8/21 13/14 14/4 14/10 14/15 14/17 15/11 15/13 17/2 33/22 37/5 48/13 I give [1] 51/8 48/17 48/23 48/25 49/1 49/6 49/12 49/12 178/10 51/1 52/13 54/17 63/16 66/10 67/2 67/6 | I hate [1] 198/10 76/12 88/10 91/3 huge [14] 16/11 20/15 27/1 27/17 33/1 51/17 59/3 59/5 59/8 63/15 71/1 85/3 86/14 87/16 hugely [1] 67/7 human [8] 7/20 30/24 I heard [1] 196/9 33/18 35/5 74/15 82/10 93/25 94/2 31/1 hundreds [1] 50/9 **hungry [1]** 190/25 hurdles [1] 173/19 hygiene [1] 141/16 hypothetical [1] 81/12

I agree [1] 91/19 I also [1] 34/9 I am [3] 3/18 120/22 160/20 I appreciate [2] 80/21 100/5 lask [6] 30/3 31/4 36/7 61/19 98/15 164/1 I begin [1] 98/16 I believe [4] 3/18 74/9 86/25 116/17 I call [2] 2/9 5/19 63/17 64/2 64/3 64/18 | I can [9] 4/3 6/2 6/12 7/22 15/11 79/4 158/17 184/22 189/18 191/1 199/1 I certainly [2] 115/17 149/13 I could [2] 47/17 109/14 I couldn't [1] 188/16 I described [1] 103/2 I did [3] 5/24 160/1 160/11

I didn't [3] 59/5 I do [2] 19/4 110/7 I don't [18] 20/23 72/18 73/13 76/23 90/8 91/22 98/5 116/4 | I right [1] 83/24 179/2 189/6 189/22 189/22 190/14 191/1 I expect [1] 176/11 I feel [1] 66/24 I gave [1] 56/5 I get [1] 193/24 I guess [2] 71/2 I hadn't [1] 159/24 I have [20] 12/13 30/7 55/16 58/13 64/6 I suggest [1] 90/13 93/22 97/12 108/19 110/3 114/19 116/4 116/11 117/1 117/13 117/14 138/2 148/1 195/18 196/8 196/17 I hope [1] 129/1 I just [7] 11/6 71/6 110/1 123/22 129/4 131/14 195/25 I keep [1] 96/16 I know [6] 4/4 28/20 59/14 116/5 169/24 176/24 I may [7] 28/11 68/17 81/9 142/19 172/21 175/20 196/1 I mean [51] 23/23 68/20 74/12 90/9 106/18 107/24 116/19 117/13 120/12 122/12 123/14 124/15 125/1 126/23 133/23 135/11 137/24 138/2 138/25 141/6 141/25 142/24 148/18 149/14 151/3 151/4 154/11 156/6 157/25 159/5 163/23 164/8 164/22 165/24 169/14 170/21 171/13 177/20 179/4 179/19 180/17 182/16 185/24 186/4 186/25 187/22 188/2 189/1 189/5 190/20 190/22 I mention [1] 184/4 I might [1] 40/19 I must [1] 163/23 I need [1] 65/9 I prefer [1] 30/19 I produced [1] 115/20 I promise [3] 112/20

131/21 148/24

I referred [1] 57/13 I repeat [1] 1/11 59/20 62/14 65/6 66/3 | I returned [1] 164/22 I reviewed [1] 115/15 I said [3] 106/9 160/14 166/4 I say [4] 4/8 52/19 81/14 145/1 I see [1] 54/24 I seem [1] 37/25 **I should [1]** 56/11 I sit [2] 113/22 191/18 I spend [1] 79/21 I spoke [1] 21/24 I still [1] 69/9 I summarise [1] 104/2 I suppose [5] 62/17 95/7 165/9 170/1 187/22 I suspect [2] 149/16 165/22 I swapped [1] 165/4 I thank [1] 199/15 I think [124] 3/9 7/19 7/23 8/4 13/18 13/19 14/9 19/24 20/17 24/14 28/23 29/8 29/19 29/25 34/13 36/9 38/5 40/5 41/18 41/24 42/13 44/1 54/23 54/24 57/20 57/21 62/24 62/25 63/7 63/10 64/6 64/8 65/9 67/1 67/9 67/12 67/14 68/23 68/24 70/23 74/4 74/11 75/16 76/21 76/22 76/25 77/12 77/20 77/23 78/8 79/4 79/23 80/4 84/9 84/16 87/6 87/17 88/6 88/19 89/5 91/5 91/8 91/24 92/25 94/13 94/21 96/10 97/10 97/12 98/2 102/10 102/25 103/24 104/15 104/24 105/3 105/14 105/23 107/1 107/4 107/6 107/9 108/3 108/10 114/2 115/22 116/19 116/21 116/25 117/2 117/9 123/9 123/11 125/8 146/4 148/14 148/20 149/15 152/14 154/19 164/20 169/17 172/11 173/14 174/12 179/4 179/7 180/24 182/16 182/24 188/2 189/7

I really [1] 149/11

I recognise [1] 88/12

117/9 120/23 130/13 154/3 154/17 154/19 24/14 25/7 25/10 inchoate [2] 12/12 133/19 139/21 150/18 154/20 154/22 155/9 26/25 30/15 30/24 40/4 I think... [12] 191/3 178/21 189/8 195/11 155/12 156/15 156/23 33/2 34/4 34/9 38/19 incident [19] 6/4 6/6 191/16 191/19 192/1 40/8 40/8 42/14 42/24 8/19 11/2 11/4 11/16 196/8 157/15 157/22 161/6 192/9 192/22 193/3 ideal [1] 91/7 161/9 162/3 162/16 43/5 43/13 45/6 52/19 11/16 47/23 65/8 193/16 195/14 199/4 ideas [3] 6/23 38/10 162/23 163/5 166/10 52/19 57/25 60/6 84/13 91/1 99/21 199/17 200/17 167/7 169/18 169/18 62/23 62/24 63/2 64/8 100/21 101/6 101/8 188/23 I turn [2] 81/9 195/20 170/1 170/13 170/18 101/8 101/12 101/13 identical [1] 128/16 69/1 69/13 74/14 I understand [2] 3/25 identifiable [1] 13/24 173/24 175/19 178/11 75/24 77/20 83/8 145/20 153/20 179/9 179/23 181/16 88/13 98/8 103/1 identification [1] incidents [11] 5/1 I use [1] 142/9 82/4 181/20 183/12 184/8 105/15 117/5 120/9 6/19 6/22 7/25 8/18 I want [1] 28/11 184/9 184/15 184/22 131/22 132/12 146/4 12/19 12/20 31/23 identified [13] 9/12 I wanted [1] 114/18 9/14 17/16 46/12 185/20 186/1 186/2 146/10 157/19 157/23 101/5 101/14 101/15 I was [12] 68/23 187/3 187/6 187/14 164/5 181/20 184/5 include [15] 2/16 59/16 63/24 64/6 83/12 84/16 104/23 65/12 85/9 90/18 91/4 187/16 188/25 189/3 184/19 192/1 193/3 5/18 5/22 10/5 25/25 115/6 149/14 159/20 129/20 131/24 189/19 191/10 194/2 194/22 197/7 26/1 35/10 44/20 62/3 160/9 164/23 165/13 194/3 194/15 195/20 62/11 76/6 76/8 **identifies** [1] 131/5 importantly [3] 26/3 165/13 180/8 identify [10] 5/13 196/1 196/3 196/16 47/12 61/6 117/25 118/3 192/3 I wasn't [2] 160/6 17/9 66/20 68/17 197/13 197/16 199/5 included [9] 101/9 impose [1] 21/5 165/25 70/21 74/1 82/9 140/1 129/14 130/11 165/11 199/7 **impossible [1]** 93/19 I will [9] 2/5 31/2 141/7 189/25 ii [2] 140/24 154/19 impressed [1] 165/19 176/4 184/25 47/18 111/7 114/13 identifying [6] 6/11 ill [2] 21/14 84/17 175/20 185/1 195/1 128/1 132/15 159/16 7/21 25/10 81/10 ill-defined [1] 84/17 **imprinted** [1] 187/7 includes [5] 118/4 182/6 140/23 141/19 improve [19] 3/3 3/7 131/25 132/2 150/4 ill-equipped [1] I wonder [4] 109/14 if [187] 4/11 5/5 6/2 21/14 4/23 5/12 38/12 38/12 176/13 140/19 153/24 167/7 6/4 6/13 8/13 13/5 41/20 59/25 67/6 67/7 including [15] 6/1 illness [1] 118/19 I work [1] 188/3 73/20 74/21 75/3 13/19 14/5 14/8 15/11 6/20 23/14 35/5 43/9 illustrated [1] 6/12 I would [27] 4/12 15/15 17/15 22/7 24/7 illustrations [1] 4/19 81/11 88/17 116/13 55/21 61/17 111/3 4/13 19/13 28/20 40/9 image [1] 199/9 27/1 28/11 29/5 30/4 136/23 141/9 155/3 134/11 134/21 136/12 63/10 67/10 71/7 81/2 31/6 32/11 37/1 37/3 139/16 139/24 163/2 **immediate** [2] 32/2 improved [3] 27/22 81/14 90/22 91/19 39/3 40/15 46/22 126/14 29/19 179/20 165/16 96/10 96/23 97/6 47/23 48/1 50/1 50/23 immediately [6] 1/23 improvement [44] inclusive [2] 44/19 97/17 121/15 137/10 51/25 52/24 52/25 87/8 92/10 140/12 2/15 23/2 32/24 41/9 73/9 152/4 160/14 178/18 55/8 56/14 61/5 61/13 147/1 162/18 41/13 43/10 48/4 inclusiveness [2] 180/24 186/8 186/13 61/13 62/15 63/18 impact [6] 11/12 55/10 55/18 55/19 39/11 63/3 188/24 190/9 196/10 63/19 64/20 67/6 25/14 74/8 100/2 56/2 56/6 56/9 57/11 incompetent [2] 5/15 I wouldn't [2] 27/21 68/17 77/5 79/15 189/14 193/2 57/17 57/18 58/1 59/1 10/2 186/6 59/4 59/9 59/11 59/13 incorporate [2] 67/11 79/24 81/9 82/19 impacted [1] 22/4 I'm [58] 2/14 2/14 82/20 83/18 85/2 86/7 59/23 60/2 60/5 60/9 impactful [1] 47/24 96/24 2/18 4/5 8/15 12/13 61/3 61/13 69/3 69/23 incorporates [1] 86/18 86/23 87/24 impacts [5] 10/10 16/13 17/15 19/18 88/1 88/2 89/4 89/8 23/17 44/10 68/15 71/15 71/25 72/5 168/4 20/18 34/10 39/3 89/15 89/18 92/15 190/2 72/12 72/14 73/10 increased [1] 68/11 43/19 46/13 58/12 92/22 95/19 96/18 73/13 74/14 79/8 **impatience** [1] 54/15 **incredibly [2]** 171/3 59/21 65/8 79/20 108/4 108/6 108/9 98/20 99/20 100/15 imperatives [2] 171/11 80/17 80/20 82/1 97/2 100/24 101/12 104/2 67/18 68/2 191/25 200/12 incredulity [1] 83/14 98/19 109/22 116/5 104/3 104/9 104/15 imperfectly [1] 26/22 indeed [16] 80/14 improvements [6] 117/19 124/15 125/21 104/17 105/8 105/10 2/24 27/17 30/1 43/12 87/6 99/11 105/18 **implement [8]** 73/6 129/1 133/18 142/9 105/12 108/11 108/16 103/6 104/5 104/10 190/9 192/20 108/21 108/25 109/1 143/23 144/23 145/3 **improving [5]** 56/7 109/14 110/4 120/16 104/16 105/2 107/6 128/5 129/9 151/25 147/13 147/24 149/11 120/17 120/19 120/22 63/7 73/23 73/24 154/1 158/6 167/10 108/11 160/22 160/24 163/24 121/13 122/13 122/23 implementation [9] 154/15 199/10 199/21 200/16 164/15 165/18 165/25 123/17 125/1 128/17 56/1 61/9 71/22 73/18 improvised [1] 27/12 independence [2] 169/24 170/25 172/8 129/25 130/6 131/3 75/8 77/12 77/15 99/3 inability [3] 34/20 92/8 93/10 173/21 177/1 179/10 131/20 133/10 135/20 182/23 93/1 94/9 independent [13] 3/1 179/19 179/19 180/17 136/19 137/11 138/8 implemented [10] inadequate [3] 96/20 89/2 89/2 91/8 92/5 185/14 189/22 193/4 138/21 139/13 139/20 72/2 74/16 85/16 160/5 199/4 93/3 93/12 95/1 193/22 195/15 199/15 140/2 140/19 142/18 121/12 121/16 126/21 85/19 86/10 86/18 inadvertently [1] I'm Mary [1] 2/14 99/24 103/2 103/19 143/5 143/10 144/6 5/13 139/25 192/10 I've [2] 82/1 193/22 144/8 144/22 146/14 INDEX [1] 200/23 178/1 inappropriate [2] **ICB [1]** 136/3 146/17 146/19 146/25 implementing [3] 185/5 196/7 indicated [1] 188/12 ICBs [3] 178/4 78/20 103/10 104/20 indicates [1] 137/19 147/20 148/2 148/2 inappropriately [1] 178/19 199/5 **indication [1]** 188/9 148/8 149/1 150/11 33/17 importance [3] 29/3 idea [15] 30/13 58/22 151/14 151/16 151/20 47/21 134/20 incentives [1] 20/8 indispensable [1] 70/24 77/13 103/17 152/20 153/11 153/24 important [52] 16/12 incentivising [1] 69/6 25/12

200/13 100/18 introducing [3] 52/14 190/10 196/14 informed [2] 147/20 integrated [2] 28/25 61/2 110/23 isn't it [4] 31/8 99/2 individual [12] 11/4 174/19 111/25 introduction [4] 150/6 196/14 15/14 15/16 33/6 51/9 informing [2] 147/4 intelligence [4] 12/6 29/23 107/3 110/12 isolation [1] 83/21 58/19 102/23 129/22 178/3 40/11 63/5 83/3 111/5 issue [54] 4/20 9/19 130/25 138/10 138/14 intelligent [1] 63/5 intrusion [1] 195/9 10/16 11/12 13/19 infrastructure [4] 167/1 13/23 14/5 14/21 57/9 71/19 71/23 intended [2] 17/11 intuitive [1] 11/17 individually [2] 61/11 invested [1] 143/22 16/20 19/18 21/9 32/3 72/16 162/8 155/4 inherent [1] 94/2 intensive [4] 142/15 investigate [4] 13/25 32/22 33/22 33/25 individuals [7] 9/10 171/16 183/21 197/10 147/19 156/2 173/10 37/4 37/8 37/9 37/10 **inhibits** [1] 5/10 81/12 100/16 100/16 initially [4] 6/18 6/19 38/18 41/14 49/5 inter [1] 128/8 investigated [2] 7/9 136/7 155/3 190/19 6/23 84/6 49/17 49/19 64/13 inter-agency [1] 131/16 induction [1] 136/21 initiate [1] 164/12 128/8 investigating [4] 68/5 69/10 71/12 76/9 **industries** [2] 95/13 82/25 83/7 83/7 83/7 initiating [1] 151/15 interact [1] 39/6 7/15 14/7 127/11 106/18 injunction [1] 29/13 interest [4] 6/2 6/13 147/13 83/10 87/22 90/6 industry [4] 35/5 investigation [23] injunctions [1] 28/5 180/19 182/6 91/14 102/8 105/14 95/14 95/24 106/19 injured [2] 99/8 99/15 interesting [1] 70/24 105/19 120/16 120/19 10/2 14/16 21/21 91/2 inefficiencies [1] injury [2] 10/23 87/13 interests [3] 73/4 92/5 101/11 113/9 120/19 142/6 142/7 21/6 INQ0013235 [1] 108/14 132/9 113/11 114/3 123/20 144/2 147/23 150/11 inequality [1] 72/10 124/8 124/10 124/18 162/1 170/22 174/24 128/2 internal [4] 20/16 inevitable [2] 31/17 162/12 192/13 192/14 125/6 126/18 138/10 187/16 194/20 200/11 INQ0106967 [1] 45/16 161/8 internally [2] 20/10 138/11 147/14 154/13 issued [3] 127/18 inexperienced [1] INQ0108020 [1] 138/19 159/2 159/9 169/3 158/14 160/25 15/2 174/5 issues [37] 3/16 8/20 153/25 interpersonal [4] infancy [6] 152/12 inquiries [5] 10/5 33/3 33/22 65/1 71/1 8/21 8/22 8/24 13/8 investigations [6] 159/2 161/12 167/23 10/6 54/20 65/10 50/25 51/10 114/7 14/4 14/11 14/13 **interpret** [5] 52/6 173/5 173/7 14/22 15/11 15/12 81/23 56/15 63/4 63/17 114/8 114/11 122/24 infant [10] 114/3 23/13 23/22 31/20 inquiring [1] 123/12 199/1 investigative [1] 114/16 124/2 124/2 Inquiry [28] 1/12 1/15 interpreted [2] 52/20 122/8 32/25 41/8 48/17 124/3 130/15 145/17 1/24 3/22 7/9 7/15 192/25 54/17 59/16 63/16 investigator [1] 152/25 154/3 198/16 9/15 9/21 66/6 81/19 interpreting [1] 34/24 150/13 64/21 65/3 66/10 infection [2] 56/24 interrogate [1] 56/20 82/6 84/20 96/18 invisible [1] 101/4 66/20 66/22 70/17 56/25 97/16 110/13 128/18 81/1 81/14 83/9 86/12 intersections [1] **inviting [2]** 46/13 inference [2] 156/20 136/9 144/24 147/12 105/15 183/16 92/13 95/21 105/16 156/22 157/10 159/17 159/24 intertwined [1] involve [5] 27/11 123/18 184/18 195/15 **influence [3]** 28/8 163/10 185/17 199/17 105/19 49/3 50/3 126/8 it [602] 31/3 48/13 200/3 200/14 200/21 intervene [2] 32/12 164/24 it's [169] 2/24 8/3 **influenced [3]** 23/12 94/25 involved [24] 6/15 14/9 15/21 16/12 Inquiry's [1] 118/2 24/7 24/12 7/20 16/23 49/13 50/4 inquisitorial [2] 92/4 16/20 16/21 16/22 intervening [1] influences [3] 3/12 17/9 17/12 18/17 93/14 165/11 50/8 53/20 64/18 9/6 87/18 inside [1] 149/24 intervention [3] 7/13 68/13 72/9 91/18 97/7 19/23 20/20 20/21 inform [3] 1/24 66/15 insight [1] 58/23 27/24 103/1 99/21 100/22 102/8 22/2 22/12 22/14 147/2 insofar [1] 196/15 105/6 115/11 126/6 24/15 26/4 27/20 interventions [3] informal [1] 25/6 126/20 147/16 154/25 28/23 29/12 31/16 insofar as [1] 196/15 46/21 94/25 102/6 information [53] 12/3 instance [14] 52/8 into [51] 2/1 4/5 10/6 168/25 171/5 184/12 31/17 32/16 34/1 17/13 17/18 18/20 52/25 121/13 122/13 11/18 13/17 14/15 36/11 37/10 39/11 involvement [3] 30/12 30/14 30/22 69/24 186/14 191/12 125/1 125/3 143/4 16/2 16/19 17/13 40/8 41/8 41/15 41/25 31/1 31/15 33/11 34/6 147/24 165/12 172/13 17/17 17/19 19/12 involves [4] 19/16 42/3 42/4 52/19 54/16 34/6 39/17 39/19 174/6 190/24 192/6 20/16 21/15 22/16 24/11 73/7 113/8 55/21 57/18 58/7 59/4 39/21 40/19 40/20 59/20 59/20 61/22 194/3 22/19 33/22 35/12 **involving [3]** 33/6 41/6 67/9 83/2 100/25 instinct [1] 102/15 50/9 58/23 60/5 66/2 83/11 133/19 66/3 67/14 68/3 68/4 120/6 120/7 121/10 instincts [1] 68/12 67/1 67/2 68/3 72/11 68/25 69/8 70/1 71/4 irrespective [1] 121/19 121/22 121/24 institute [7] 2/21 2/23 73/3 73/5 73/16 79/11 72/12 72/20 73/5 148/19 122/2 123/10 123/11 80/23 81/9 84/3 92/6 73/14 75/18 76/10 2/24 3/10 72/19 is [729] 123/14 132/18 132/25 112/17 113/4 92/13 106/8 108/7 isn't [34] 19/2 31/8 77/12 78/11 80/4 133/9 133/13 133/25 **institution** [1] 24/15 113/14 130/21 136/2 31/13 32/24 34/15 86/25 87/21 88/16 134/2 138/13 140/22 147/13 149/18 152/17 37/9 37/20 37/22 45/6 89/21 90/1 90/3 90/22 institutional [21] 142/4 144/21 147/17 18/3 18/8 18/9 18/13 154/14 157/21 172/14 45/7 45/8 67/16 69/10 91/5 99/2 101/17 153/14 154/23 161/14 23/13 28/7 30/3 30/5 176/18 185/3 185/15 69/10 74/22 83/18 101/24 103/16 105/5 166/24 169/9 170/11 30/19 31/11 31/12 191/5 199/17 87/1 88/15 96/13 99/2 105/10 107/24 116/17 174/6 178/21 197/1 36/5 48/14 66/13 68/7 99/9 102/3 105/24 116/17 116/25 117/2 introduce [2] 106/1 200/11 200/13 68/10 68/23 71/9 129/2 108/14 133/21 138/14 117/2 117/3 117/20 information-sharing 150/6 153/19 177/2 117/23 119/6 119/10 100/6 101/22 102/15 introduced [3] 60/16 **[3]** 161/14 200/11 institutions [1] 102/19 102/20 178/9 181/18 184/21 120/17 120/19 121/15

198/7 198/11 199/7 jointly [1] 175/7 it's... [80] 123/2 journey [1] 184/13 123/4 123/15 123/17 judge [2] 13/1 33/17 124/1 124/7 124/22 judged [1] 97/21 124/23 125/5 125/11 125/15 126/1 137/1 138/1 138/3 138/10 142/24 146/4 147/21 149/16 151/20 153/23 154/12 154/13 154/13 154/14 154/16 155/6 157/2 157/23 158/15 159/1 159/8 162/13 164/9 166/9 168/1 168/18 169/2 169/22 170/8 170/22 170/24 171/3 174/23 175/8 175/10 175/12 175/23 179/10 179/25 180/20 181/6 181/20 182/8 183/13 184/5 184/19 186/2 186/17 187/1 187/5 188/12 189/21 190/23 191/16 193/3 193/10 194/4 194/5 194/20 195/14 196/21 197/16 198/2 198/10 198/14 199/3 199/6 200/2 items [1] 64/15 its [14] 3/2 55/25 66/7 79/1 91/15 95/11 99/15 101/20 117/25 118/11 119/20 122/9 139/10 189/13 itself [4] 17/22 19/4 25/9 101/22

Jane [1] 109/22 **JAR [1]** 168/13 **Jimmy [1]** 10/6 Jimmy Savile [1] 10/6 Joanna [5] 1/18 109/14 109/17 109/22 201/8 job [9] 17/20 18/21 61/9 85/20 106/6 123/10 179/10 182/9 193/25 iobs [2] 64/10 183/24 joint [35] 114/3 114/7 123/3 124/17 125/6 125/13 125/23 126/23 127/2 127/6 151/5 151/15 151/21 168/13 168/14 172/2 172/5 173/1 174/8 178/5 181/12 181/17 181/19 183/6 183/13 185/7 185/12 191/24 192/16 192/18 192/20 193/5

judging [1] 101/19 judgment [5] 64/16 64/17 64/19 83/16 83/24 **July [1]** 110/16 June [2] 111/15 112/9 June 2017 [1] 112/9 junior [2] 54/4 180/8 just [126] 1/21 9/3 11/6 11/9 14/20 18/1 28/22 30/5 36/15 36/15 37/1 37/3 41/17 46/14 53/4 57/1 68/24 71/6 75/4 76/24 80/19 key worker's [1] 81/1 83/13 84/19 87/24 89/10 91/11 93/21 97/12 101/13 105/11 106/5 109/25 110/1 110/22 111/2 111/7 112/21 113/3 113/25 114/19 115/6 117/5 117/8 117/23 118/10 119/3 119/24 121/3 123/22 123/23 124/4 124/7 124/11 126/3 128/25 129/1 129/4 129/19 130/1 131/14 131/24 132/15 137/10 137/10 139/7 139/13 140/20 141/3 141/10 142/20 146/8 147/14 148/7 149/1 149/21 152/3 152/4 152/5 154/23 155/2 156/12 156/13 157/1 157/18 158/3 158/18 159/16 160/13 161/6 161/7 166/6 169/25 170/8 173/11 173/20 174/3 175/12 176/9 176/18 177/18 178/18 179/2 179/17 179/25 180/22 181/4 183/1 184/5 184/20 184/22 184/25 185/19 186/21 188/14 190/10 193/17 193/19 194/7 194/18 195/25 198/23 198/24 199/14 199/16 200/2 Κ

KC [3] 80/11 80/11 188/20 keen [2] 50/7 117/10 keep [8] 33/24 33/25 73/15 82/2 96/16 131/20 134/5 197/7 keeping [3] 93/13

117/21 133/10 Kennedy [2] 156/7 156/11 Kent [8] 14/16 34/21 48/21 51/22 52/24 53/19 67/1 101/15 kept [5] 34/23 34/24 92/5 121/23 196/16 key [22] 7/19 56/8 74/1 75/10 78/5 79/6 81/10 87/20 88/4 110/23 129/2 131/5 131/24 133/24 184/1 184/5 184/6 195/4 196/22 197/6 197/14 198/10 key worker [5] 184/1 184/5 195/4 197/6 197/14 184/6 key workers [1] 196/22 kick [1] 37/8 kicks [1] 37/4 kind [30] 6/5 15/20 17/21 19/17 27/5 27/16 27/23 27/25 32/9 43/14 54/15 65/23 70/23 86/12 90/11 91/8 92/13 93/5 95/3 96/24 102/9 103/21 105/11 106/2 106/5 107/7 107/8 120/15 143/7 164/2 kinds [17] 7/24 14/2 29/18 33/12 33/14 40/13 42/13 50/3 53/8 large [17] 1/7 9/6 9/7 76/3 76/4 82/16 85/22 89/3 101/2 102/4 108/8 Kirkup [1] 51/23 Kirkup's [1] 67/1 knew [3] 166/12 166/20 167/5 know [59] 4/4 8/1 11/10 15/18 27/12 27/13 27/14 27/14 28/20 31/6 32/11 33/8 35/3 37/15 41/7 45/1 54/17 59/14 59/19 61/5 63/19 64/20 66/4 67/12 74/13 79/4 81/18 88/14 88/16 90/8 90/9 94/14 97/18 lastly [1] 97/12 97/20 105/23 108/8 116/5 120/15 125/18 150/3 156/23 169/10 169/21 169/24 176/21 latest [1] 160/13 176/24 181/9 184/14 184/15 184/19 186/16 190/14 194/2 194/3

194/6 196/5 196/5

196/11 198/2

knowing [1] 142/3 knowledge [5] 25/6 110/9 110/19 127/12 136/17 knowledge-sharing [1] 25/6 known [10] 32/14 35/9 35/24 40/13 74/15 98/25 154/10 156/17 156/18 200/7 knows [3] 8/14 90/24 90/25

la [6] 109/12 109/18 167/14 195/24 199/11 201/9 **labour [2]** 16/5 102/8 lack [4] 10/9 100/1 161/23 179/16 lacklustre [1] 106/5 **LADO [4]** 170/20 171/3 171/9 186/15 Lady [15] 54/24 80/10 80/16 108/19 108/23 109/13 127/23 153/23 161/5 167/7 167/15 195/20 199/13 least [3] 24/21 58/9 199/15 200/2 laminated [1] 95/14 landing [1] 96/1 lands [2] 41/14 69/18 Langdale [8] 2/8 2/11 leaving [3] 15/1 15/7 55/1 80/14 80/22 93/25 108/22 201/4 language [3] 152/7 152/8 187/14 21/13 57/9 61/13 62/12 64/10 64/23 65/1 71/1 71/3 72/5 85/6 88/8 144/10 198/23 large-scale [2] 21/13 72/5 largely [10] 25/9 27/21 58/4 58/12 59/11 96/1 101/3 172/15 192/3 198/10 last [13] 1/5 21/3 29/20 30/2 38/8 55/20 58/4 114/13 115/10 130/6 137/2 157/1 196/9 later [6] 14/3 14/4 28/1 121/3 149/21 171/22 law [7] 19/6 50/22 52/18 66/13 119/17

192/24 194/18

106/20

laws [3] 14/14 68/4

lawyers [1] 100/22 layered [1] 24/15 lead [11] 11/3 62/12 126/11 135/8 135/23 145/21 150/12 174/21 178/7 186/23 186/25 leaders [7] 39/15 42/16 43/6 48/9 69/4 69/9 177/4 leadership [12] 23/5 39/11 46/1 46/25 61/17 62/17 63/3 75/4 75/11 76/4 135/8 182/17 leading [5] 113/11 122/3 145/20 175/7 179/23 leads [2] 69/8 126/17 leaks [1] 92/9 learn [6] 26/24 48/3 55/15 64/18 131/17 184/16 learning [15] 4/25 7/16 25/8 25/20 47/22 48/6 56/3 95/25 106/7 119/7 120/10 124/20 143/14 154/15 155/2 185/16 leave [6] 60/8 60/10 107/5 135/2 142/19 187/17 105/2 lecture [1] 192/6 Lecturer [1] 112/12 led [2] 98/23 116/14 left [4] 57/18 60/16 103/20 144/10 left-hand [1] 144/10 legal [11] 14/10 16/25 18/14 48/14 50/9 79/10 90/3 100/22 102/20 102/25 103/22 legalistic [1] 185/3 legally [7] 99/4 99/7 99/10 99/17 100/4 100/19 102/21 legislation [4] 18/12 19/3 89/12 89/25 **legitimate** [2] 51/5 51/18 length [3] 19/10 122/10 123/6 lengthy [1] 3/22 less [13] 12/12 16/10 17/24 19/18 23/4 28/21 40/23 86/1 97/20 161/4 175/23 184/17 187/14

lesson [1] 7/10

lessons [1] 155/2

let [2] 16/5 186/16

133/12 120/12 124/9 125/22 68/19 74/5 76/21 186/13 186/15 186/16 liking [2] 65/2 90/4 127/16 127/17 127/18 76/25 81/10 85/23 186/22 186/23 let's [3] 39/7 113/25 85/25 92/9 98/2 100/3 manager [6] 61/17 limit [1] 184/16 127/20 127/21 129/8 142/19 **limitations [1]** 121/2 130/6 131/21 137/2 115/22 141/23 142/18 61/20 61/21 62/14 **letter [3]** 173/16 limited [5] 41/13 139/8 139/13 144/7 146/16 157/14 161/21 65/22 94/12 185/3 196/11 46/11 67/3 121/20 148/8 148/23 149/2 186/18 192/21 196/2 managerial [2] 35/17 **letters [1]** 196/7 150/21 150/25 150/25 main [1] 7/10 192/12 63/18 level [47] 17/10 18/3 154/19 156/12 156/15 mainly [3] 86/20 limiting [5] 125/3 managers [20] 38/17 18/17 20/1 23/6 28/1 156/18 165/17 165/21 156/15 157/1 159/18 188/13 188/13 40/18 49/8 49/10 34/23 35/16 35/17 159/23 160/7 160/12 62/10 63/13 63/19 173/13 mainstream [2] 35/17 39/5 48/17 Lincolnshire [1] 6/16 160/15 161/7 163/6 152/20 182/19 63/19 75/17 76/1 51/17 62/18 64/8 173/23 174/2 198/17 76/19 76/23 77/7 Linda [1] 9/22 maintain [1] 92/8 70/18 71/3 74/5 74/25 line [10] 6/6 22/17 looked [10] 25/23 maintaining [2] 25/7 79/14 79/24 80/5 80/6 76/4 76/6 76/24 90/12 36/6 49/8 60/3 131/21 81/24 90/10 103/17 90/16 132/2 177/22 177/23 101/3 120/10 135/8 134/24 135/4 137/3 142/24 152/3 157/4 major [6] 28/7 78/2 managing [4] 66/15 136/3 136/4 136/16 151/22 159/12 167/24 190/14 87/5 113/5 164/10 66/21 147/25 171/9 138/18 142/10 142/14 lines [1] 84/11 looking [24] 28/12 194/14 **mandates** [1] 36/5 174/4 176/22 177/5 link [2] 28/11 195/2 41/6 46/8 104/19 majority [3] 126/23 mandatory [1] 178/10 179/1 179/2 linked [2] 36/20 73/9 110/24 113/7 114/6 151/8 159/7 136/20 179/3 179/5 182/15 114/9 116/22 118/17 list [9] 29/14 114/14 make [39] 21/9 21/12 manner [1] 122/21 186/21 189/25 190/13 119/7 128/21 141/7 129/13 129/14 130/10 26/14 32/24 41/17 mantra [1] 189/1 190/21 191/6 191/11 131/25 145/3 150/3 141/10 144/6 154/8 57/6 57/18 58/2 59/11 mantras [1] 133/24 levels [8] 31/17 40/9 175/3 154/13 154/23 155/7 59/12 66/7 69/4 70/9 many [39] 1/4 1/8 75/4 75/6 75/13 76/10 listed [1] 42/1 156/13 159/15 167/1 72/13 79/17 79/18 10/23 17/4 17/5 17/6 189/12 189/23 listen [4] 11/20 40/3 178/22 190/25 92/3 94/6 94/7 103/4 20/7 21/4 21/15 24/2 liabilities [1] 77/6 looks [3] 44/6 45/3 103/15 107/15 120/18 29/15 29/22 43/8 47/9 85/25 199/20 liable [1] 104/1 120/19 137/5 138/9 47/9 47/10 47/10 151/3 **listening [4]** 12/5 life [9] 119/6 125/3 139/2 142/15 143/25 47/10 49/8 51/16 31/9 54/10 70/5 loop [1] 35/18 143/7 156/18 156/18 literally [2] 95/18 lose [1] 52/1 157/15 166/20 167/5 51/16 58/17 64/23 159/7 165/17 165/21 106/12 178/6 186/11 186/15 72/6 88/10 102/10 losing [2] 18/20 173/13 188/14 188/16 194/10 literature [4] 9/8 132/8 105/4 105/4 108/3 life-limiting [3] 125/3 15/19 67/5 69/14 loss [2] 35/3 35/6 194/12 109/3 112/21 117/19 156/18 165/21 lost [1] 19/12 143/24 158/25 165/19 little [6] 86/5 86/8 maker [1] 87/16 life-threatening [1] lot [41] 16/22 19/7 121/3 131/4 137/12 makes [9] 20/24 175/9 180/3 184/17 156/18 182/20 19/24 20/19 21/13 113/15 143/8 143/13 199/4 light [3] 66/7 67/2 live [2] 1/8 143/3 23/8 28/20 56/23 58/3 146/4 148/18 161/16 March [2] 110/6 146/22 lives [2] 141/9 59/16 63/14 64/25 174/15 192/5 128/10 like [71] 4/12 4/13 164/14 67/15 70/24 71/7 71/8 making [28] 27/6 marker [1] 124/7 5/8 5/18 6/8 8/2 16/2 72/11 77/11 79/4 local [26] 120/12 30/24 32/5 32/13 Mary [4] 1/18 2/10 21/20 23/23 26/6 79/21 85/17 89/6 89/8 133/2 133/4 133/13 33/19 34/17 41/16 2/14 201/2 26/13 27/18 28/5 90/1 90/8 94/14 95/24 43/11 47/2 47/6 52/15 massively [1] 27/22 133/19 133/20 140/16 32/10 43/4 43/7 44/6 141/22 141/25 147/2 96/5 96/7 103/4 103/9 54/8 73/25 74/14 material [2] 1/25 45/3 45/13 46/23 147/6 150/4 150/15 103/17 104/24 106/8 78/12 81/3 92/18 66/19 48/19 52/21 56/24 164/11 164/13 166/14 143/19 143/21 169/9 92/21 93/25 94/2 materially [2] 152/3 57/12 57/22 67/10 166/21 170/20 170/20 177/25 181/15 183/22 103/13 114/10 138/2 153/14 67/16 69/3 71/6 71/7 181/15 181/17 183/5 173/18 178/19 187/4 198/19 maternity [11] 14/19 72/10 76/12 80/23 186/8 186/12 191/20 187/5 197/14 21/24 27/17 29/16 lots [6] 17/18 62/9 81/2 81/14 89/4 90/3 191/21 116/19 120/2 184/12 malevolent [1] 7/13 38/5 60/11 60/17 90/18 90/22 91/19 location [1] 155/20 188/6 malformation [1] 60/18 72/3 72/5 140/3 91/23 94/16 94/21 logging [3] 190/12 loved [1] 89/20 118/20 matter [6] 141/4 96/3 96/10 96/23 190/20 191/2 low [6] 56/16 70/18 **malignant** [2] 66/2 141/13 147/18 148/7 102/12 103/17 104/16 71/3 190/12 190/21 71/5 186/3 199/16 **London [2]** 198/10 104/20 105/12 106/1 198/24 191/6 manage [4] 91/13 matters [3] 111/2 108/12 110/4 128/18 long [6] 46/20 51/22 126/13 173/12 174/9 140/25 164/15 low-level [4] 70/18 137/10 144/6 151/3 66/22 79/7 125/17 71/3 190/21 191/6 managed [5] 6/8 may [165] 2/9 4/8 151/4 152/4 167/24 196/10 lower [3] 40/14 40/14 67/14 69/1 190/3 5/13 6/4 7/21 8/17 170/2 172/12 173/17 8/22 9/13 9/15 11/3 long-term [1] 46/20 54/4 191/16 182/11 183/20 185/4 longer [4] 35/16 36/3 LSCB [3] 133/1 137/3 management [26] 11/5 11/16 11/19 12/4 188/7 190/10 196/10 94/23 196/12 28/25 45/22 46/1 47/3 12/5 12/6 12/9 13/13 140/20 198/16 look [51] 12/16 12/17 **Lullaby [1]** 114/15 62/8 62/17 63/11 13/15 13/21 13/25 liked [1] 89/20 28/5 43/3 43/7 45/12 **luncheon [1]** 109/10 63/15 67/6 75/4 75/9 14/1 14/1 15/15 15/17 likelihood [1] 104/9 52/2 57/22 64/21 75/13 75/21 76/12 16/20 16/23 17/23 likely [6] 29/14 43/22 М 91/23 96/18 111/1 76/22 76/24 77/20 17/23 17/24 20/10 58/18 71/18 95/1 118/16 118/22 119/10 made [21] 19/9 40/13 77/25 78/4 79/9 93/1 21/5 21/12 21/12

148/18 149/9 149/14 М memorandum [1] **minor** [1] 11/5 143/19 145/2 145/15 151/3 151/4 154/11 177/8 minority [1] 180/16 150/22 150/24 151/3 may... [131] 22/18 156/6 157/25 158/24 memory [2] 37/25 minutes [2] 55/3 82/1 151/8 154/23 154/25 22/24 23/3 28/11 159/5 163/23 164/8 120/11 misalignment [1] 155/6 155/7 156/12 28/22 31/2 32/4 32/5 164/22 165/24 169/14 mentality [1] 173/16 65/4 164/1 165/19 168/3 32/25 33/1 33/2 33/11 169/24 169/25 170/21 mention [4] 146/8 168/11 170/2 170/21 misclassification [1] 33/12 33/13 33/14 171/13 177/20 179/2 153/1 153/10 184/4 180/21 183/18 188/19 12/20 33/18 33/19 33/20 192/6 194/11 179/4 179/19 180/17 mentioned [5] 66/11 mishandled [1] 49/11 35/17 36/13 37/2 37/8 182/16 185/24 186/4 69/22 160/5 196/2 mishaps [1] 81/23 morning [9] 1/4 1/16 39/25 40/1 40/3 40/4 54/25 109/2 120/14 186/25 187/22 188/2 198/5 misrecognise [1] 42/11 42/15 42/17 **mentioning [2]** 97/2 189/1 189/5 190/20 80/1 135/16 147/22 171/21 48/21 49/7 49/11 190/22 188/17 196/25 **missed [1]** 176/9 49/23 50/3 50/4 50/12 meaning [3] 52/6 mentions [1] 173/8 missing [1] 190/24 mortality [14] 29/23 50/19 51/5 51/7 52/12 55/21 59/17 115/1 52/20 118/16 mentoring [2] 25/6 mission [1] 3/2 53/2 53/4 53/7 53/8 meaningfully [1] 47/21 mitigate [1] 101/1 116/15 116/21 120/8 54/7 68/17 69/20 80/1 179/25 **Messenger [5]** 75/8 mixed [1] 188/12 121/23 125/15 125/19 80/2 80/3 81/9 81/9 149/17 175/6 178/22 means [13] 35/6 75/19 77/16 77/21 **Mm [1]** 144/12 81/9 81/21 82/6 82/21 36/24 37/6 48/2 50/14 77/21 **Mm-hm [1]** 144/12 183/19 83/1 83/2 83/3 83/6 56/21 61/22 75/23 met [5] 9/13 10/8 model [1] 6/4 mosaics [1] 22/24 83/13 83/15 84/19 105/4 123/25 137/24 28/15 83/14 180/24 modelled [1] 24/17 most [15] 34/5 58/2 86/14 88/3 89/20 90/5 149/12 169/18 metaphor [1] 12/3 **modelling [3]** 43/8 117/16 124/5 125/9 90/22 90/24 90/24 meant [6] 6/5 51/21 metrics [1] 178/15 47/14 62/25 143/7 146/5 170/5 90/25 91/25 95/20 58/22 59/4 99/6 Mid [1] 17/17 models [3] 29/4 29/5 177/21 179/25 184/11 95/21 100/23 100/25 147/16 Mid Staffordshire [1] 185/4 188/5 193/13 55/14 101/1 101/3 101/19 194/24 measurements [2] 17/17 modern [1] 4/21 102/2 102/4 107/21 middle [3] 147/8 mole [3] 32/10 65/25 178/15 178/17 mostly [3] 65/14 112/9 112/14 117/21 mechanical [1] 96/1 147/21 171/20 66/1 65/14 65/15 118/17 119/14 122/16 mechanism [1] 182/3 Midlands [1] 199/8 moment [18] 13/10 mother [1] 60/13 122/25 125/3 125/4 mechanisms [2] 94/6 midwife [1] 140/2 16/14 48/19 67/15 motivated [2] 102/4 126/22 127/7 127/9 70/2 91/6 91/17 94/11 **Midwifery [2]** 15/4 103/5 131/1 133/9 137/9 medical [30] 7/3 42/2 15/7 113/24 116/6 123/1 move [26] 44/7 50/12 137/13 137/19 137/20 62/4 63/24 81/22 might [80] 5/17 5/22 124/11 143/17 159/17 77/5 90/6 123/22 138/13 140/18 141/13 109/23 111/13 112/24 10/4 10/11 12/2 12/7 167/8 176/8 178/20 128/24 129/25 131/3 142/5 142/19 144/8 113/5 114/25 150/11 16/4 16/7 20/12 22/11 182/2 182/12 132/14 134/6 139/6 144/16 144/17 146/21 150/16 157/22 157/25 28/1 29/3 32/21 32/22 moments [1] 97/11 140/8 144/4 145/7 149/7 150/19 150/22 172/13 190/23 193/16 32/23 37/8 39/19 149/1 153/12 153/25 Monday [4] 1/19 152/6 153/12 163/17 193/20 193/24 194/1 40/19 40/19 41/17 188/20 200/18 200/22 154/3 155/9 158/2 164/10 169/17 170/23 194/7 194/9 194/11 43/4 43/7 46/3 49/18 159/11 163/5 167/16 money [3] 88/24 171/16 172/21 172/22 194/19 194/25 195/5 54/25 56/24 58/23 175/4 183/7 172/8 185/14 185/15 175/20 184/16 187/10 195/13 197/17 198/19 58/24 61/3 62/1 64/11 monitor [4] 45/21 moved [1] 23/25 187/23 190/11 191/13 198/21 69/7 76/5 78/6 82/14 55/23 69/3 69/22 movement [1] 4/22 195/1 196/1 196/12 medically [1] 79/15 82/19 82/24 86/12 monitored [2] 74/10 moves [1] 144/9 197/8 meet [4] 20/8 80/2 87/9 91/2 91/4 91/7 75/1 moving [9] 1/16 May 2023 [1] 112/14 91/9 91/23 92/17 93/9 104/13 177/5 **monitoring [1]** 60/13 61/16 66/5 93/5 maybe [1] 125/8 month [2] 6/17 159/7 95/6 103/14 105/24 112/11 133/17 148/6 meeting [9] 40/1 **MBRRACE [1]** 57/12 107/15 107/16 107/19 months [5] 115/10 122/18 144/11 144/17 172/19 193/14 me [13] 58/6 78/17 122/12 122/17 197/8 Mr [17] 80/11 80/11 171/21 171/23 183/14 118/23 120/18 122/8 79/12 120/22 126/12 184/10 197/9 132/16 136/1 137/25 197/12 80/14 80/15 97/10 129/1 148/18 160/20 meetings [8] 76/7 138/4 138/5 141/16 moral [4] 87/13 99/10 98/11 98/12 98/13 166/6 179/9 188/2 141/23 147/18 151/6 100/15 102/22 120/13 174/7 176/24 108/21 109/12 109/18 193/11 199/2 177/2 178/3 183/20 153/10 159/9 159/15 Morbidity [1] 183/20 167/14 195/24 199/11 mean [73] 8/9 11/22 183/25 170/3 170/17 170/22 more [64] 6/13 6/14 201/5 201/6 201/9 17/5 23/23 35/23 meets [1] 192/13 170/25 171/2 172/1 10/25 12/12 13/1 Mr Baker [4] 80/11 38/23 38/24 38/25 172/23 174/9 174/9 melodramatic [1] 15/10 15/22 16/10 97/10 98/12 108/21 54/2 54/13 61/19 82/21 177/19 186/23 190/17 42/19 54/4 63/12 66/2 Mr De la Poer [4] 68/20 69/21 74/12 member [12] 13/15 193/23 68/19 69/23 74/11 109/12 167/14 195/24 76/11 85/10 90/9 98/5 89/19 114/14 138/4 75/22 76/5 80/23 83/9 199/11 million [1] 31/24 106/18 107/24 116/19 84/3 90/5 92/17 93/10 Mr Skelton [3] 80/11 148/12 170/14 170/19 mind [10] 81/2 81/7 117/13 120/12 121/4 80/14 98/11 171/25 185/22 185/23 85/3 89/11 95/10 93/13 103/17 103/25 122/9 122/12 123/14 186/23 187/15 95/11 185/25 187/7 106/22 108/1 108/19 Ms [13] 2/8 2/11 55/1 124/15 125/1 126/23 members [4] 27/8 194/24 199/10 108/23 117/23 122/25 80/14 80/22 93/25 132/17 133/23 135/11 40/18 42/15 55/25 123/17 124/2 125/4 108/22 199/16 199/23 minds [1] 125/11 137/24 138/2 138/25 membership [1] 125/9 128/4 138/13 200/1 200/16 201/4 **minimum [2]** 75/7 141/6 141/25 142/24 41/22 161/11 142/5 142/16 143/13 201/12

34/15 47/11 80/7 139/24 143/20 149/7 M 149/5 150/13 154/9 162/9 166/12 174/7 157/13 157/15 163/23 88/10 124/11 196/7 176/4 176/7 181/7 149/7 149/12 175/1 **Ms Brown [3]** 199/16 navigate [1] 117/6 165/23 182/2 185/8 194/19 176/1 176/11 177/23 199/23 200/16 mustn't [1] 153/8 **NCMD [3]** 115/6 neglect [6] 81/22 179/5 191/12 191/13 **Ms Langdale [6]** 2/8 my [53] 1/11 2/16 115/8 116/11 117/24 154/9 154/18 NHS England [1] 55/1 80/14 80/22 4/13 28/22 30/7 54/24 necessarily [21] 8/23 | 169/14 170/2 177/23 93/25 108/22 57/13 58/14 72/3 negligence [1] 81/22 NHS Improvement 13/16 29/17 34/15 much [93] 4/24 13/14 72/19 80/9 80/10 41/18 42/12 49/9 57/1 **negligent** [1] 5/19 **[1]** 69/23 16/9 16/10 19/3 23/4 80/16 80/17 83/24 57/4 58/1 59/3 72/1 niceness [1] 38/23 neighbouring [1] 26/22 28/21 39/24 97/12 98/14 108/19 72/12 74/22 84/18 9/23 night [3] 147/8 40/6 40/25 41/10 108/23 109/13 113/10 86/11 91/15 97/1 neighbours [1] 199/5 147/22 171/20 49/14 55/4 56/13 115/8 117/4 117/13 97/24 108/14 139/1 neonatal [16] 38/21 **NIHR [2]** 112/23 60/10 74/11 76/5 117/15 120/22 121/14 necessary [2] 150/6 42/21 43/17 43/19 113/3 79/14 80/14 83/9 83/9 126/12 127/15 127/23 43/21 44/8 44/19 46/4 nine [1] 51/10 174/20 86/1 92/17 98/9 141/6 142/12 143/23 need [119] 14/7 18/7 46/11 57/14 158/21 **no [44]** 5/12 16/17 103/25 104/22 104/25 147/25 153/23 161/5 18/17 18/18 19/5 158/23 158/25 159/4 17/7 17/9 18/4 36/3 105/17 108/20 108/24 164/23 165/22 166/5 19/15 19/24 20/22 36/21 41/16 72/24 159/8 176/14 109/1 109/5 111/13 neonates [1] 43/18 167/7 167/15 167/17 25/16 25/17 25/19 79/1 86/8 89/4 95/9 113/8 119/1 119/10 171/17 177/13 177/20 25/20 25/21 26/15 96/13 99/4 99/6 neonatology [6] 119/10 120/4 122/3 179/10 179/11 180/25 26/18 29/11 29/13 29/16 29/20 55/10 105/21 105/21 108/19 122/4 123/17 125/11 190/20 195/20 199/13 108/23 122/15 122/15 31/10 31/19 32/1 59/15 59/24 59/25 125/25 126/25 128/5 199/15 200/2 39/15 43/19 44/2 net [3] 164/8 184/14 125/7 133/8 133/24 129/9 132/13 133/25 my Lady [14] 54/24 46/23 46/25 47/1 47/4 194/22 145/2 146/4 146/8 138/13 142/15 143/13 80/10 80/16 108/19 47/5 47/9 47/14 47/15 network [4] 55/11 148/3 155/19 159/24 143/23 148/24 149/10 108/23 109/13 127/23 56/9 56/10 56/20 57/2 55/16 57/20 179/12 159/24 166/3 168/16 149/15 151/3 151/8 153/23 161/5 167/7 57/5 57/21 58/13 168/18 169/20 173/12 neutral [1] 92/4 151/14 151/25 153/3 167/15 195/20 199/15 59/22 60/2 65/9 68/5 never [11] 26/22 37/6 177/7 177/10 178/7 154/1 155/6 155/7 200/2 70/24 71/15 72/13 90/12 101/12 108/5 178/25 189/9 189/21 158/5 161/3 167/9 myself [1] 79/21 72/15 72/15 72/18 163/24 165/15 165/16 195/19 167/24 168/3 168/11 no one [2] 95/9 178/7 74/11 74/16 74/17 182/1 185/11 198/6 170/2 170/21 171/7 N 75/18 76/1 76/14 77/5 **new [7]** 79/11 105/1 **nobody [2]** 173/17 173/22 174/11 174/15 name [5] 2/13 59/6 77/25 79/12 79/15 116/6 123/20 128/20 178/11 176/17 179/21 183/18 80/17 98/14 109/21 79/19 82/1 84/14 180/11 180/18 non [7] 61/23 63/13 184/3 188/19 192/5 named [9] 135/24 90/10 91/3 96/13 news [1] 101/25 80/6 94/22 108/16 192/5 193/5 193/10 136/4 139/21 139/22 next [15] 2/4 23/3 96/15 96/22 96/23 118/4 131/25 195/1 195/25 198/4 140/1 140/1 140/2 97/6 100/18 103/25 24/1 34/14 48/5 97/20 non-clinical [2] 80/6 199/10 199/15 199/21 187/2 187/2 106/3 106/3 106/10 127/15 129/25 136/9 94/22 200/15 200/19 namely [1] 134/18 107/5 108/11 120/6 139/3 147/22 155/9 non-compliance [1] muggin's [1] 106/5 names [2] 21/15 123/3 130/3 130/17 170/17 197/3 200/18 108/16 multi [19] 24/15 26/4 179/2 131/12 132/19 136/14 **NHS [89]** 1/17 8/1 Non-Executive [1] 27/10 114/7 122/24 narrative [1] 95/2 138/1 138/18 139/8 16/13 21/10 21/16 61/23 126/2 150/7 150/8 **NASA [2]** 30/10 141/2 143/1 145/2 21/18 22/4 22/23 non-fatal [1] 118/4 155/8 155/25 162/7 36/11 150/3 151/23 158/4 23/10 24/2 24/14 non-productive [1] 162/14 168/16 173/3 national [35] 24/20 159/1 159/9 159/14 24/18 26/9 26/11 28/7 63/13 174/6 174/13 181/11 29/24 55/12 57/13 none [3] 1/19 32/19 162/16 170/11 171/3 29/19 30/20 31/23 181/21 193/8 57/24 58/16 59/12 172/7 172/12 173/2 37/20 39/5 48/13 70/13 multi-agency [9] 61/2 99/17 100/3 173/25 174/10 174/12 48/16 48/25 49/9 nonetheless [2] 5/16 114/7 122/24 155/8 113/4 113/17 114/25 178/15 180/6 180/6 50/20 52/6 53/12 133/18 155/25 162/14 173/3 116/15 116/21 120/8 181/8 181/10 181/19 55/12 56/16 57/11 Nor [1] 164/1 174/6 181/11 193/8 120/10 124/19 125/12 183/13 186/14 191/20 57/25 60/16 61/1 norm [3] 23/21 24/12 multi-disciplinary [2] 125/15 125/19 142/10 192/18 193/17 195/14 61/22 62/10 63/12 24/24 26/4 27/10 142/14 149/17 175/6 196/5 197/13 198/20 66/15 68/14 69/3 normal [9] 23/21 multiple [16] 12/5 178/22 179/5 179/12 199/20 69/23 70/10 70/13 33/18 34/11 34/13 17/11 18/5 20/14 21/8 181/8 181/11 181/13 needed [6] 48/4 72/1 72/19 74/5 74/19 34/16 36/19 37/3 21/19 34/22 40/2 40/2 181/19 191/11 191/17 99/20 108/7 127/10 75/7 75/10 75/17 82/10 120/15 45/1 46/21 46/21 62/2 193/17 174/11 181/14 75/21 75/24 76/22 normalisation [7] 68/1 87/18 197/10 nationally [4] 60/7 76/23 77/1 77/25 78/5 35/21 35/25 36/12 needs [33] 13/18 multiplicity [1] 70/8 16/15 60/7 68/25 74/4 61/8 85/5 188/10 78/16 78/24 88/11 36/24 37/13 37/17 multiply [1] 87/25 nations [2] 177/3 75/6 76/1 79/8 80/2 99/7 103/20 111/21 38/2 murder [7] 5/22 8/16 177/5 84/12 84/12 86/23 112/8 115/4 115/7 normally [3] 156/16 8/17 9/2 9/2 95/7 95/8 natural [5] 32/10 115/25 116/17 116/20 96/12 98/2 124/8 158/23 163/15 murdering [1] 10/4 65/24 92/14 94/24 129/22 130/14 130/14 127/20 132/2 134/11 norms [3] 23/20 24/6 murders [1] 6/17 156/20 130/22 131/12 132/8 134/11 134/12 134/12 68/4 must [9] 52/7 95/19 nature [8] 18/6 18/24 139/20 139/23 139/24|not [186] 2/19 4/17 132/10 135/4 143/14

obligation [10] 76/19 | 125/4 132/7 138/24 190/23 28/4 31/14 49/2 49/13 Ν nothing [6] 52/19 76/20 99/10 99/11 147/8 148/3 151/17 50/1 not... [184] 6/11 6/23 95/9 184/3 197/25 100/6 100/15 100/16 174/16 operates [1] 71/19 8/15 8/20 10/3 11/7 100/17 102/20 102/23 Oh [1] 115/20 199/11 199/13 **operating [3]** 5/11 11/19 12/13 12/13 notice [1] 25/4 obligations [2] 76/16 Okay [4] 118/13 21/19 100/24 13/3 13/13 14/12 notification [2] 149/3 100/7 142/21 182/5 193/22 operation [1] 194/4 14/25 16/13 17/15 old [2] 173/10 183/18 operational [7] 20/16 149/16 obliged [1] 52/25 17/19 17/20 18/12 notified [4] 147/7 **observed [1]** 149/10 older [4] 130/16 23/23 45/23 67/6 19/1 20/14 22/1 22/11 150/3 151/17 171/17 observing [1] 65/13 153/2 173/9 198/19 76/12 103/8 168/2 24/3 24/10 24/15 notify [1] 149/5 **obstacles** [1] 173/20 omerta [1] 89/18 operationalised [3] 24/21 27/8 27/9 28/24 **notifying [2]** 149/7 39/4 70/10 77/23 **Obstetric** [1] 61/2 on [234] 28/25 30/17 31/14 150/9 **obstruct** [2] 32/5 on call [5] 15/1 operationally [1] 32/3 32/25 33/19 34/1 **notion [1]** 118/9 32/8 147/10 166/5 172/4 103/8 35/15 35/17 39/1 39/2 Nottingham [1] 7/4 obtained [1] 200/3 185/9 opinion [1] 47/13 39/2 39/3 42/3 43/19 opportunities [1] **November [3]** 115/18 **obvious [2]** 83/18 once [8] 16/19 40/11 46/13 46/18 49/9 50/7 158/7 164/20 102/22 49/12 68/2 100/20 10/25 50/21 50/23 54/10 107/7 159/8 175/5 November 2017 [1] obviously [10] 1/21 opportunity [2] 156/1 54/17 54/17 54/21 47/25 50/22 89/12 one [88] 5/11 7/8 164/20 158/18 57/4 57/4 58/12 58/15 now [53] 1/22 3/24 131/23 138/3 153/12 12/14 15/14 15/18 opposed [1] 174/1 59/20 60/22 60/25 18/1 21/21 30/3 34/3 192/19 196/13 196/16 21/24 22/25 24/1 optimised [1] 45/11 61/22 61/24 62/15 60/18 61/1 61/2 66/5 occasion [1] 10/19 25/13 26/23 29/2 29/8 or [254] 64/20 64/23 65/2 65/2 79/4 92/6 100/11 occasionally [1] 30/20 32/1 43/18 oral [1] 78/4 66/2 69/8 69/10 70/16 103/22 103/24 109/8 159/1 44/16 46/1 48/21 order [10] 5/12 19/25 71/6 72/1 72/12 73/14 111/1 113/7 114/18 occasions [1] 171/10 49/19 52/23 54/18 20/22 21/20 24/11 75/4 77/22 79/8 79/15 121/2 121/18 122/2 55/22 59/14 60/5 60/9 53/10 90/6 91/1 occupational [1] 79/20 79/25 86/10 124/3 128/10 140/8 64/15 68/3 71/11 72/3 138/18 196/5 22/20 86/14 88/9 90/2 90/4 141/2 142/20 144/24 73/25 80/3 80/18 occur [4] 6/4 122/8 ordinary [1] 65/23 90/17 91/15 94/5 145/7 147/12 149/9 163/17 181/7 80/18 82/5 83/8 87/5 organisation [29] 3/2 95/22 96/17 97/1 149/16 152/21 159/21 occurred [4] 47/24 87/15 88/19 88/23 8/14 11/18 12/15 97/24 99/24 101/17 160/16 160/16 161/5 91/25 100/9 163/11 89/7 90/14 91/3 91/24 20/12 24/16 31/15 101/21 102/11 103/6 occurring [3] 65/15 162/16 167/18 169/6 92/15 92/16 95/9 32/23 34/24 36/1 103/7 103/11 107/15 171/19 171/25 172/9 73/11 190/15 96/18 100/20 102/5 40/10 40/15 41/11 107/21 108/4 117/3 175/19 175/24 179/15 occurs [5] 36/1 45/16 102/7 103/19 104/3 50/16 69/6 69/12 117/3 117/11 118/1 180/19 182/21 188/17 84/14 94/12 124/10 104/7 105/4 106/3 97/23 104/11 105/24 118/1 119/3 119/18 193/14 194/8 194/18 October [2] 115/12 112/21 112/22 114/13 114/16 131/8 138/7 121/6 121/15 121/24 199/17 120/21 121/14 123/22 138/11 139/5 140/2 168/10 124/23 126/3 131/18 number [29] 1/7 6/5 October 2023 [1] 128/14 130/4 131/24 182/5 182/13 183/12 134/3 136/24 138/1 7/4 9/6 18/24 19/16 115/12 133/23 135/2 135/3 186/6 138/10 138/15 138/16 20/1 28/15 30/1 31/7 136/9 137/2 138/12 odds [1] 192/24 organisation's [1] 138/25 140/12 141/4 55/20 64/23 71/3 off [5] 50/25 95/16 142/6 145/15 147/12 135/9 141/11 142/8 144/16 73/25 82/24 84/9 96/1 123/14 185/6 147/17 150/24 151/6 organisational [14] 144/23 145/17 147/1 89/20 93/24 104/12 off-putting [1] 185/6 157/1 159/8 166/9 11/15 23/13 32/5 33/1 147/7 147/13 147/21 111/2 122/7 125/12 offence [1] 137/16 167/24 171/14 178/7 36/5 52/12 54/5 92/18 148/15 148/24 149/11 134/22 144/14 171/10 offer [6] 21/9 23/8 186/21 187/18 190/10 92/20 93/8 100/11 150/11 153/6 153/7 173/23 177/13 187/15 35/11 47/11 95/25 192/9 192/16 193/15 100/14 104/22 120/11 154/8 154/13 156/16 ones [3] 54/20 58/6 190/9 169/15 organisations [58] 158/11 158/16 159/15 numerous [1] 178/12 offered [1] 97/8 187/18 8/4 12/1 17/22 20/2 160/20 161/25 162/1 nurse [8] 6/16 126/17 offering [2] 39/12 **ongoing [1]** 196/15 20/5 20/16 20/25 21/4 162/8 162/11 163/24 online [2] 1/7 74/20 127/9 139/22 140/2 39/16 21/7 21/8 21/14 22/7 166/8 169/19 170/22 187/2 187/2 198/12 offers [1] 96/15 only [16] 1/21 39/24 24/17 24/18 24/23 170/24 175/19 177/2 nurses [5] 76/15 office [2] 49/6 195/6 72/6 89/25 90/24 28/4 28/8 29/11 31/13 177/23 178/4 179/10 132/2 148/1 166/12 officer [5] 62/5 62/6 90/25 115/8 119/16 31/14 31/18 31/21 179/23 179/25 184/5 137/24 138/12 142/11 41/19 41/22 44/7 185/9 133/20 170/21 172/5 184/16 184/18 184/25 nursing [7] 22/19 150/20 159/1 160/19 48/16 52/6 53/12 67/8 officers [1] 169/13 185/1 186/13 186/14 41/22 42/9 62/4 official [1] 182/5 176/17 182/3 68/14 68/24 69/15 186/17 186/18 188/14 111/10 112/2 112/13 often [35] 6/3 11/24 onus [1] 134/1 69/19 69/22 70/11 189/21 190/2 193/10 open [8] 39/12 39/14 70/13 71/2 73/12 74/6 nurtures [1] 77/2 12/25 13/24 20/14 193/22 194/20 195/1 nurturing [3] 45/18 21/14 23/9 41/12 39/20 70/4 95/5 99/14 84/15 85/18 88/11 196/11 197/1 198/22 47/24 48/16 50/8 54/3 100/8 106/7 96/22 102/7 102/10 56/1 63/4 199/20 69/15 69/18 74/7 openness [8] 3/12 106/6 108/1 108/2 note [4] 139/7 146/4 74/18 74/20 77/7 77/9 38/11 40/10 95/10 132/23 133/4 134/4 189/18 200/2 o'clock [2] 109/7 82/17 87/21 105/6 95/11 99/19 100/3 134/9 134/11 134/17 notes [5] 116/25 200/18 105/20 107/19 121/19 108/5 135/24 136/5 182/13 157/14 157/15 157/25 123/19 124/23 124/24 operate [6] 20/23 **objecting** [1] 36/6 190/18

71/5 73/14 77/8 82/24 70/4 72/8 83/16 83/24 page 19 [1] 35/20 131/4 Ο 85/5 86/22 87/5 88/20 87/6 88/25 94/7 page 2 [1] 3/15 paragraph 16 [1] organised [3] 30/13 104/11 107/22 136/23 page 20 [1] 38/7 88/25 92/9 94/17 139/13 31/16 31/18 157/15 160/22 182/14 page 24 [1] 44/5 98/23 99/19 103/20 paragraph 17 [1] orientated [2] 41/4 105/3 108/1 117/11 192/13 page 25 [1] 44/6 148/8 102/2 126/14 132/15 132/24 ownership [2] 91/13 page 26 [2] 46/2 46/6 paragraph 19 [1] orientation [1] 45/17 136/15 144/23 145/1 93/13 page 3 [1] 161/9 149/2 original [3] 50/18 148/5 151/18 157/9 Oxford [3] 55/11 Page 45 [1] 48/12 paragraph 2.2.1 [1] 93/21 165/15 158/15 164/11 165/13 55/16 57/20 page 47 [2] 48/15 10/17 originally [1] 38/20 167/22 167/23 172/22 48/18 paragraph 20 [1] ostracisation [1] 172/24 176/6 177/14 page 48 [1] 52/2 132/5 87/11 package [1] 58/19 182/11 183/8 185/12 page 49 [1] 54/1 paragraph 22 [1] other [74] 5/22 6/20 packs [1] 39/25 186/16 193/13 194/17 page 52 [1] 134/7 150/10 8/1 10/5 10/6 12/10 paediatric [7] 37/13 196/1 196/6 196/6 page **56** [1] 139/7 paragraph 24 [1] 12/16 12/17 13/15 43/18 43/22 123/2 196/8 197/4 198/12 page 6 [1] 162/16 132/15 15/3 17/1 19/6 19/13 142/15 176/15 183/21 outcome [3] 37/6 page 7 [3] 129/3 paragraph 3 [2] 22/5 22/10 25/17 26/20 paediatrician [20] 129/4 162/23 53/11 53/14 134/8 27/12 33/9 33/12 111/19 112/7 126/9 outcomes [6] 17/1 page 75 [1] 98/21 paragraph 3.1.3 [1] 41/22 49/4 50/3 50/4 126/16 127/5 146/11 25/14 27/18 50/11 page 8 [4] 4/11 4/15 28/2 50/25 53/23 54/22 147/3 147/7 147/10 131/4 163/5 55/20 178/23 paragraph 4 [1] 62/9 63/6 63/10 69/19 147/20 149/23 156/9 outlier [1] 58/24 page 81 [1] 140/10 48/15 76/10 78/13 81/23 179/21 179/21 180/9 outlines [1] 162/9 page 83 [1] 144/4 paragraph 4.5.1 [1] 82/19 86/1 88/6 89/14 186/7 188/4 192/7 outset [2] 4/8 4/12 page 84 [1] 144/22 52/3 90/9 91/14 92/4 95/5 197/19 198/11 outside [7] 18/10 page 85 [1] 145/8 paragraph 6 [1] 95/13 97/13 97/22 82/10 140/18 146/6 paediatricians [7] page 86 [1] 148/6 129/8 98/7 98/15 106/18 189/16 190/4 193/10 42/6 132/1 157/3 page 87 [1] 149/1 paragraph 7 [3] 108/22 113/13 114/20 169/16 180/5 181/9 over [30] 6/17 12/23 page 88 [1] 150/10 128/25 129/5 129/17 119/3 121/11 122/4 185/9 29/15 35/16 35/23 page 9 [1] 10/17 paragraph 7.1.1 [1] 122/24 129/19 132/25 paediatrics [11] 42/2 page 91 [1] 150/17 36/14 51/9 51/16 98/21 133/1 138/13 141/16 42/20 42/22 43/10 55/20 56/25 58/4 61/1 page 92 [1] 55/9 paragraph 8.2 [1] 142/13 143/10 150/9 127/19 152/10 152/18 65/4 72/4 94/23 page 95 [2] 61/18 55/9 151/12 166/6 169/11 153/16 180/3 180/4 106/13 106/17 115/7 62/22 parallel [1] 169/4 169/15 172/9 179/11 134/16 136/19 136/23 182/19 pages [4] 2/19 39/25 paramount [2] 184/2 185/7 186/3 139/20 142/13 144/22 page [64] 3/15 4/11 41/15 161/8 130/14 189/4 187/3 187/18 190/18 150/10 150/17 154/22 4/15 10/17 12/23 pages 2 [1] 2/19 paraphrase [2] other's [2] 25/16 12/23 17/3 21/3 22/5 120/22 175/20 155/12 157/24 197/3 paid [1] 88/22 192/5 23/11 25/1 30/4 35/20 overall [2] 52/22 palliative [2] 122/14 parent [2] 170/25 others [9] 10/24 16/5 38/7 44/5 44/6 46/2 126/10 199/2 196/20 16/8 48/21 54/7 70/7 46/6 46/8 48/12 48/15 pandemic [1] 115/5 overarching [5] parenting [2] 119/1 143/24 193/6 197/2 48/18 52/2 54/1 55/9 105/19 117/21 124/14 panel [11] 89/3 89/7 119/1 otherwise [6] 78/6 61/18 62/22 66/5 127/20 176/22 113/21 113/23 119/21 parents [23] 1/7 1/12 95/22 147/18 156/21 98/21 128/3 129/3 overdoses [1] 5/8 119/23 120/1 120/3 1/23 11/8 28/18 164/7 174/12 129/4 129/25 131/4 121/4 145/1 163/17 148/12 178/3 184/2 overlap [2] 117/16 our [37] 7/24 27/16 195/3 132/14 134/7 134/16 184/7 184/13 184/14 **Panels [1]** 166/16 29/9 33/4 33/13 68/20 136/19 139/7 139/8 papers [2] 39/25 184/15 184/20 184/23 overlayered [1] 70/7 92/20 103/2 139/20 140/10 144/4 196/3 196/13 196/15 41/15 34/19 109/13 110/24 110/25 144/22 144/22 145/8 oversight [5] 68/13 paragraph [33] 10/17 196/19 196/25 197/2 113/25 114/11 117/16 148/6 149/1 150/10 92/5 121/17 142/16 12/24 21/3 22/5 25/2 197/7 197/15 197/21 118/8 119/3 120/12 150/10 150/17 154/1 143/2 28/2 35/22 38/8 48/15 parents' [2] 114/10 123/3 123/3 128/2 154/4 154/22 155/9 48/18 52/3 54/1 55/9 oversimplify [1] 170/6 129/9 144/3 148/1 155/12 156/15 157/1 104/3 68/9 98/21 111/7 parse [1] 15/16 151/5 151/22 155/22 157/6 161/9 162/16 overthinking [1] 112/11 128/25 129/5 part [41] 1/14 2/3 2/6 158/3 158/18 159/6 162/18 162/23 163/5 129/8 129/17 130/2 2/7 22/25 48/6 69/25 170/8 162/17 171/19 179/8 page 1 [1] 128/3 overtly [1] 90/17 130/7 131/4 132/5 77/2 83/12 91/15 182/11 198/19 199/8 page 10 [1] 12/23 overview [12] 17/14 132/15 134/8 139/13 92/14 97/8 113/16 200/17 page 101 [1] 66/5 19/17 19/22 113/21 148/8 148/9 149/2 113/19 113/20 126/18 ourselves [1] 170/12 119/21 119/25 120/3 page 11 [1] 21/3 150/10 161/10 127/5 127/10 131/9 out [71] 3/15 4/7 4/15 page 13 [2] 22/5 145/1 155/1 163/17 138/14 138/19 139/10 paragraph 1.1 [1] 9/7 15/6 15/16 17/15 23/11 166/16 190/18 161/10 141/11 142/25 144/24 19/11 20/9 21/22 page 151 [1] 154/1 169/21 175/8 175/11 overviews [1] 18/19 paragraph 1.3 [1] 24/17 25/22 31/20 page 155 [1] 156/15 177/2 178/9 179/7 overwhelming [1] 112/11 32/1 46/2 46/16 46/18 page 160 [1] 157/6 20/9 180/3 182/9 184/6 paragraph 12 [1] 47/17 48/20 53/20 page 17 [2] 30/4 184/23 185/7 189/5 own [20] 15/2 20/11 130/2 61/18 65/7 65/23 67/9 132/14 30/7 64/4 68/15 69/7 189/9 190/22 198/10 paragraph 14 [1]

134/10 135/12 135/22 P patients [23] 10/4 people's [2] 50/1 195/5 12/8 13/13 14/24 176/18 **photo [2]** 198/25 136/6 142/18 151/8 part... [1] 198/23 22/10 38/15 44/20 per [1] 31/25 199/1 156/13 158/9 161/16 Part A [1] 1/14 45/8 61/7 65/16 71/21 perceived [1] 78/19 **photos** [1] 198/25 166/15 167/3 173/6 Part B [2] 2/3 2/6 72/9 72/22 73/4 73/7 percolating [1] **phrase [3]** 36/9 53/25 175/4 178/11 196/3 Part C [1] 2/7 76/16 78/11 91/20 182/7 pointed [2] 46/16 176/18 Participant [1] 99/22 108/14 121/14 perfectly [3] 26/22 physical [2] 118/22 196/6 195/19 179/22 194/6 118/20 198/3 118/23 points [4] 94/24 participants [2] 3/23 pattern [10] 7/21 perform [2] 16/9 22/9 pick [5] 31/19 71/5 118/12 134/22 136/20 158/12 169/19 184/16 184/17 11/1 33/7 33/8 33/19 performance [4] police [39] 10/1 particular [28] 15/16 65/8 65/13 65/19 38/12 38/13 67/8 119/4 125/10 126/6 picked [1] 50/19 15/17 16/4 17/12 141/21 141/24 147/5 150/4 151/16 184/18 picking [4] 8/10 18/22 22/17 28/22 patterned [1] 22/15 performative [1] 96/7 33/13 151/19 186/7 151/19 151/23 166/23 29/6 32/7 41/2 43/1 performing [3] 12/15 169/2 169/5 169/7 patterns [3] 11/2 picture [4] 13/17 43/2 43/15 77/17 120/24 123/7 25/23 26/12 17/20 138/12 188/13 169/8 169/11 169/13 117/15 120/16 133/20 pause [2] 130/1 perhaps [13] 30/4 piece [2] 168/5 170/4 170/16 171/19 140/17 141/20 142/23 37/18 44/5 52/13 171/20 171/24 171/25 144/19 172/17 148/3 150/25 153/7 52/16 54/20 62/22 pilot [1] 194/16 172/1 172/1 172/4 pausing [2] 34/4 165/6 172/17 177/7 84/19 101/21 112/22 132/16 piloting [1] 70/24 172/5 173/15 173/16 177/15 190/15 133/17 171/2 191/5 191/8 191/11 191/17 pay [1] 192/11 place [15] 1/25 8/3 particularly [28] 8/7 191/24 192/2 192/7 paying [1] 29/11 Perinatal [2] 29/23 10/23 46/19 47/16 9/12 13/20 24/22 payment [1] 50/17 59/17 74/10 90/11 92/18 192/11 192/14 192/16 28/13 29/19 34/6 44/7 penalties [4] 106/20 period [6] 6/18 94/23 108/10 122/20 132/24 198/12 198/24 46/14 48/15 58/23 106/24 107/14 107/19 107/8 128/18 145/25 134/18 145/15 146/5 police officer [1] 70/15 81/4 81/5 81/17 penalty [2] 106/22 147/17 151/11 172/5 81/20 81/20 83/10 107/20 permission [2] 80/12 placed [2] 19/21 police officers [1] 87/23 105/13 122/23 186/15 182/14 penultimate [2] 169/13 123/1 123/16 126/13 35/21 167/17 **permitted** [1] 136/7 places [2] 102/14 policies [9] 3/12 174/15 178/2 183/9 **people [117]** 2/1 3/6 persist [2] 5/5 5/16 173/24 68/15 84/21 85/6 198/16 person [51] 1/7 1/13 5/5 5/9 5/10 5/15 9/1 85/10 108/5 137/3 placing [1] 132/9 parties [1] 61/25 10/11 10/12 13/25 21/24 33/2 50/19 **plan [1]** 170/10 137/5 166/22 partly [4] 6/24 159/14 16/23 22/16 22/18 51/14 52/7 53/3 77/22 planning [1] 74/17 policy [5] 23/15 67/4 184/3 194/10 81/3 81/7 82/13 82/20 platform [2] 115/23 24/2 26/17 27/2 27/6 74/5 74/25 85/8 Partnership [1] 27/18 28/15 31/6 31/8 83/7 83/10 83/11 84/6 143/16 political [4] 69/14 57/11 32/3 32/14 33/14 84/12 85/21 85/23 play [5] 81/9 131/8 75/11 77/9 78/9 parts [7] 4/5 46/14 poor [15] 6/19 6/20 33/16 34/5 34/16 85/25 86/4 86/6 86/8 172/14 189/9 191/9 49/4 78/2 185/10 34/16 34/18 34/23 86/23 87/7 87/23 playing [1] 24/17 13/9 13/9 14/18 14/18 198/6 199/4 please [41] 2/12 52/2 36/1 36/4 36/16 36/24 88/14 88/15 88/21 14/22 14/23 14/24 pass [2] 69/16 133/9 37/17 38/14 38/22 88/24 89/11 89/18 55/9 68/17 98/20 36/13 36/14 47/5 passages [2] 156/13 38/24 38/25 39/8 90/5 90/24 90/25 109/16 109/20 110/8 49/20 143/20 177/21 176/14 39/21 40/17 40/25 90/25 91/12 91/17 111/6 111/8 114/20 poorly [4] 13/20 passed [3] 22/15 41/10 43/6 43/11 93/3 93/12 93/22 118/10 119/25 123/24 37/21 40/3 40/4 24/24 121/10 43/24 43/24 45/1 95/22 103/14 106/9 127/15 127/22 128/2 pose [2] 131/1 pathological [1] 45/24 47/3 47/7 48/3 119/16 126/8 126/19 128/24 129/3 129/25 137/19 34/18 49/8 50/25 53/6 53/20 137/9 170/23 170/23 131/3 132/14 134/6 position [14] 15/8 pathologist [1] 192/7 54/4 54/4 54/6 56/17 134/16 136/19 139/7 personal [3] 83/21 86/3 92/6 125/17 pathologists [1] 56/17 56/20 57/6 87/11 164/17 140/10 144/4 144/22 127/21 131/6 152/4 123/2 60/24 61/24 62/10 personally [3] 36/6 145/7 148/6 149/1 160/15 163/6 164/19 pathway [1] 97/18 62/11 64/4 65/2 67/13 62/14 89/17 153/24 153/25 154/22 170/23 170/24 171/1 patient [50] 3/3 3/16 72/16 74/7 74/18 155/10 155/12 157/8 perspective [8] 7/17 188/14 4/21 4/22 5/1 5/3 5/14 74/23 82/23 83/8 48/23 50/18 97/14 160/14 161/9 185/19 positions [3] 171/22 6/3 8/17 8/18 14/13 84/11 84/24 85/7 114/10 141/11 192/3 pleased [2] 179/19 186/12 187/4 16/17 16/21 17/4 23/1 86/12 87/18 87/19 192/5 180/17 positive [1] 59/24 23/2 27/3 28/13 28/16 89/2 89/3 89/16 90/2 perspectives [2] **plus [1]** 123/4 possibility [5] 7/12 28/21 28/24 28/24 90/4 94/7 94/16 94/17 174/15 181/23 **pm [5]** 109/9 109/11 10/3 79/25 90/21 31/3 31/22 31/25 94/21 95/2 95/4 Peter [2] 80/17 167/11 167/13 200/20 145/18 43/17 43/20 48/1 107/15 107/20 117/6 152/13 pockets [2] 22/9 possible [11] 10/24 48/23 51/5 64/24 117/10 117/21 121/12 **PhD [4]** 2/17 112/25 22/10 12/1 41/4 68/4 68/15 67/22 80/3 88/9 95/21 123/12 133/25 134/9 114/1 164/23 89/7 93/14 93/18 **Poer [6]** 109/12 99/17 104/4 105/18 137/4 145/23 150/3 109/18 167/14 195/24 126/12 162/1 188/14 phenomenon [2] 105/22 119/9 127/4 150/22 156/10 157/19 199/11 201/9 30/8 35/24 possibly [11] 63/8 143/6 146/9 151/6 phone [4] 151/19 165/14 171/8 177/10 point [22] 36/21 78/14 89/17 91/21 156/24 162/20 173/14 178/8 180/7 181/13 120/5 124/4 126/4 93/3 98/4 106/5 169/20 186/8 197/15 186/1 194/1 194/2 184/19 187/23 phoning [2] 151/21 130/11 130/20 133/7 137/16 137/21 152/14

62/24 66/18 78/8 84/9 185/15 186/4 191/14 4/6 55/2 55/8 78/17 P prepared [2] 26/16 102/11 89/5 104/2 104/5 192/19 193/14 194/17 80/8 80/17 109/1 possibly... [1] 173/8 present [5] 14/10 104/6 107/5 108/10 196/15 196/25 197/20 135/17 188/18 post [3] 111/17 115/2 85/14 88/13 91/25 124/15 124/22 125/8 **processed [1]** 32/16 **Professor Mary [3]** 115/3 158/16 142/11 143/13 143/15 processes [36] 1/24 1/18 2/10 201/2 posters [1] 85/23 143/23 149/15 160/6 8/19 13/11 14/11 Professor of [2] 2/15 presentation [3] postmortem [4] 115/14 124/4 145/25 175/8 184/17 197/12 14/17 15/13 16/23 111/9 122/15 122/24 123/4 35/13 39/20 48/24 presented [1] 65/22 problem [37] 4/16 **Professor Woods [1]** 197/13 presently [1] 86/18 5/7 5/14 11/14 11/25 48/25 52/13 66/21 2/18 potential [8] 78/20 16/13 17/4 17/5 17/6 66/22 67/17 84/15 presents [1] 58/20 **profound [2]** 1/11 121/6 122/10 131/1 preserve [2] 90/23 20/6 27/21 28/18 32/6 84/16 93/25 94/2 4/13 189/14 190/8 195/3 35/3 35/12 36/23 37/7 96/16 96/20 120/2 91/6 programme [13] 195/6 132/24 146/14 156/16 19/19 55/13 57/14 **preserving [3]** 93/17 39/23 41/5 41/16 potentially [10] 13/1 96/2 102/2 45/18 50/18 54/11 174/11 176/1 177/14 58/16 58/25 59/7 28/19 42/17 103/24 68/22 71/10 87/7 88/6 178/4 178/23 178/24 59/21 60/5 61/1 61/4 **President [1]** 180/18 123/7 126/19 147/22 press [1] 171/15 91/11 91/13 92/16 180/11 180/11 193/6 78/14 108/6 161/18 186/4 194/4 195/8 pressed [1] 183/23 93/13 95/6 101/23 195/2 200/5 programmes [12] pounds [1] 50/9 **pressure** [1] 77/9 130/17 142/23 172/25 produce [3] 20/21 43/11 55/10 58/4 Powell [1] 98/25 pressures [4] 27/2 193/8 115/12 115/18 59/23 60/9 71/25 72/4 powerful [4] 26/6 27/3 37/15 178/13 72/5 72/12 73/1 73/6 produced [1] 115/20 problem-sensing [2] 28/4 53/2 196/3 presumably [3] 11/25 68/22 **producing [2]** 43/1 73/8 powerfully [1] 23/12 83/15 132/1 141/21 problematic [2] 48/4 progress [4] 9/15 powerless [1] 51/24 pretty [6] 18/9 122/4 70/19 92/11 production [2] 27/2 20/12 116/24 117/3 practical [5] 70/22 125/25 151/14 179/21 problems [12] 7/1 progression [1] 50/5 37/15 113/11 123/25 149/9 184/3 27/18 41/7 48/13 project [2] 46/20 **productive** [1] 63/13 178/14 prevent [4] 6/6 31/11 53/12 71/9 71/20 196/18 productivity [1] 67/7 practice [33] 5/16 72/17 78/20 78/22 37/2 53/14 promise [3] 112/20 profession [3] 42/8 9/24 36/2 44/23 46/17 **preventing** [1] 34/14 101/22 105/13 77/2 77/3 131/21 148/24 64/4 64/5 64/14 67/3 **prevents** [1] 5/9 procedural [4] 49/15 professional [37] promote [5] 42/4 67/4 78/7 78/13 79/8 previous [2] 54/20 161/20 162/7 200/6 14/24 38/16 42/4 42/5 69/13 132/19 135/1 79/12 79/14 87/23 175/21 procedure [5] 7/2 42/10 43/6 43/7 43/14 155/4 91/17 99/11 105/1 **previously [1]** 154/9 7/23 8/12 161/11 43/15 66/14 76/15 promoting [2] 42/14 106/21 113/7 132/17 162/3 76/20 78/15 82/10 134/21 primary [2] 187/7 136/23 137/7 141/2 87/10 89/16 100/7 188/25 procedures [21] 7/24 **prone** [1] 105/13 150/16 157/18 158/1 primed [1] 85/25 8/3 8/9 8/9 8/10 8/11 100/12 100/16 102/23 proper [7] 67/11 163/25 164/21 164/22 principally [1] 189/15 13/12 48/24 49/3 123/16 126/11 126/15 77/22 133/5 138/9 165/2 185/17 49/23 49/24 51/19 principle [12] 4/25 131/8 133/8 133/10 181/11 182/10 183/24 practices [4] 66/14 28/3 60/12 77/12 52/13 67/17 96/8 135/23 135/25 139/19 properly [4] 75/25 68/16 107/20 136/7 91/16 132/12 148/22 96/16 96/20 103/7 146/25 150/12 162/12 78/1 182/7 183/23 practising [1] 63/25 157/25 174/4 187/20 135/13 162/12 200/8 171/4 171/16 178/6 **propose [1]** 75/12 **pre [2]** 84/24 101/19 190/16 195/11 proceedings [2] 185/12 189/3 proposed [1] 71/23 pre-empt [1] 84/24 principles [8] 99/19 87/12 200/17 professionalise [1] proposing [1] 55/25 pre-judging [1] 131/5 131/22 131/24 process [78] 8/22 76/23 **propriety [1]** 49/15 101/19 132/25 135/14 163/18 prosecuting [1] 13/13 13/14 14/15 professionally [2] preamble [1] 196/10 177/5 16/19 17/2 29/24 31/1 77/1 89/17 106/17 preceding [1] 145/25 prior [3] 99/6 99/13 34/17 37/5 51/4 51/8 professionals [20] prosecution [2] precipitating [1] 51/17 54/12 54/14 99/22 103/10 103/11 121/18 104/1 107/3 145/20 priorities [13] 20/13 67/19 68/3 68/4 69/24 113/18 114/22 122/19 protect [4] 52/20 precisely [1] 97/11 21/1 40/2 64/16 65/4 84/1 84/7 84/14 90/17 124/25 129/15 129/18 89/21 101/20 132/20 predecessor [1] 91/4 92/8 92/13 93/18 130/3 130/21 133/1 67/19 67/20 67/21 protecting [3] 16/25 69/22 95/18 97/4 98/3 67/22 68/2 77/10 136/22 139/5 146/13 52/18 134/2 predecessors [2] 97/22 188/8 100/22 118/11 118/14 179/13 182/4 182/9 **protection [9]** 18/12 128/11 128/14 119/19 121/3 121/5 187/3 197/22 28/14 29/7 111/10 prioritise [1] 192/12 predicated [1] prioritised [3] 20/14 122/6 122/8 124/14 professions [2] 112/12 148/21 153/16 141/22 125/23 128/21 140/13 22/18 174/14 29/18 187/25 180/14 180/16 predominantly [1] priority [16] 20/6 141/6 144/7 145/9 **Professor [19]** 1/18 protects [1] 89/25 139/16 22/2 28/9 29/9 29/10 146/18 148/13 151/7 2/10 2/15 2/18 4/6 **protocol** [2] 150/14 **prefer [1]** 30/19 29/13 29/14 32/18 151/9 152/6 152/22 4/15 48/19 55/2 55/8 177/8 premature [1] 118/19 72/10 73/24 74/1 74/5 154/16 154/24 155/1 78/17 80/8 80/17 protocols [3] 166/21 prematurely [1] 155/17 156/25 161/1 75/10 78/5 78/9 97/21 98/14 108/18 109/1 166/22 191/21 119/15 161/13 163/17 163/18 111/9 135/17 188/18 probably [33] 4/24 prove [2] 138/1 138/1 premise [1] 93/21 13/3 13/18 19/23 163/22 164/13 167/23 201/2 provide [6] 2/2 45/2 preparation [1] 25/25 21/19 28/23 41/25 176/6 177/16 177/24 48/20 142/14 182/15 **Professor** prepare [1] 26/16 44/2 44/15 47/17 52/1 179/17 179/24 184/23 Dixon-Woods [9] 185/10

P
provided [3] 3/22 85/24 190/18
provider [5] 24/23
28/8 68/14 120/18 135/24
providers [3] 139/23
149/5 149/7 providers' [1] 21/4
provides [3] 140/2 155/25 162/19
providing [10] 4/9
55/25 67/22 93/10 106/9 109/2 113/16
122/20 123/9 135/3 provision [2] 123/18
134/25
PRUDIC [7] 161/3 161/5 163/16 163/18
165/24 176/12 200/8
psychological [11] 38/7 38/14 38/19
39/10 41/23 42/14 45/19 63/4 70/3 87/19
88/4
psychologists [1]
public [9] 19/8 81/19
120/19 120/20 139/24 141/19 171/25 180/2
200/4 Public Inquiry [1]
81/19
publication [1]
publicly [1] 3/25 publish [1] 153/16
published [4] 5/24
75/20 99/18 168/9 pull [2] 197/8 197/11
pulling [1] 83/2
pulls [1] 126/17 punitive [1] 106/19
purely [2] 42/4
purpose [1] 174/7
purposes [1] 85/14 pushed [1] 198/21
pushing [2] 63/13 73/15
put [10] 2/18 16/2
44/5 72/17 94/11 106/8 108/7 130/16
187/17 194/14
putting [2] 95/1 185/6
Q

qualifications [4] 2/13 2/16 112/21 195/12 qualified [3] 3/15 3/18 111/12

qualities [5] 43/8 61/17 61/18 64/6 181/16 quality [25] 3/3 3/7 21/16 27/20 28/21 43/10 45/21 55/18 55/23 55/23 55/24 56/6 56/7 57/11 72/15 78/25 108/6 113/12 121/19 122/1 137/7 144/1 149/6 180/1 181/16 quarter [1] 31/24 **Queens** [1] 7/3 question [8] 19/1 29/2 36/7 42/11 53/25 rationalised [1] 66/8 92/7 179/9 Questioned [10] 2/11 RCPath [1] 152/19 80/15 98/13 109/18 195/22 201/4 201/5 201/6 201/9 201/10 questions [18] 38/11 40/20 68/17 80/9 80/12 98/15 98/19 108/19 108/22 108/23 109/4 116/3 177/14 184/8 195/18 195/19 195/21 196/1 quick [1] 12/13 quickly [6] 37/19 122/16 122/22 125/4 147/18 168/22 quite [24] 23/9 29/20 29/25 38/1 39/15 47/24 49/8 64/11 67/10 71/7 74/18 76/3 79/4 81/21 82/19 83/18 88/7 104/6 106/19 121/1 142/1 160/20 179/4 191/19 racism [2] 5/18 15/3

racist [2] 45/10 54/9 raise [12] 13/23 14/4 36/17 38/14 69/5 69/9 83/14 85/22 87/22 95/20 138/19 199/12 raised [7] 7/5 32/21 32/25 49/21 66/20 157/13 187/16 raises [2] 10/15 91/18 raising [10] 37/9 52/7 53/2 83/9 83/10 86/5 87/8 87/13 89/19 91/14 ran [1] 181/12 range [1] 108/11 rape [1] 5/22 rapid [1] 166/17 rapidly [3] 20/9 125/7 187/6 rare [8] 123/15 127/2

159/4 159/10 166/4 171/11 171/11 174/16 receive [3] 40/19 rarely [1] 22/7 rates [2] 56/24 56/25 rather [20] 11/1 26/23 28/19 40/13 61/9 70/6 74/18 93/14 receiving [6] 7/4 106/11 107/22 121/7 128/4 128/6 141/10 142/19 151/2 175/25 178/23 182/20 188/4 rationalisation [1] 19/22 rationalise [2] 19/14 82/15 19/15 RCPCH [10] 41/21 148/21 152/19 153/11 68/7 84/13 88/12 158/13 173/25 174/21 197/24 175/13 181/25 182/1 reach [2] 5/21 160/10 36/3 66/25 75/9 78/4 reaches [2] 50/15 122/9 react [1] 25/4 read [9] 1/8 46/14 129/11 129/21 132/15 recognition [3] 6/25 144/23 199/17 200/1 201/12 reader [1] 157/7 readily [1] 13/24 ready [3] 54/19 54/21 197/2 real [3] 26/8 26/23 192/14 real-time [1] 26/8 realise [1] 35/18 realistic [1] 90/21 reality [6] 20/17 40/6 62/9 90/2 90/22 147/6 73/15 78/18 78/21 really [41] 15/21 16/12 25/19 37/24 39/15 47/23 48/5 61/3 144/25 161/17 190/22 18/23 107/25 108/4 61/14 67/10 71/5 72/15 72/21 75/25 78/25 88/9 89/25 96/10 98/7 104/19 105/9 107/24 120/9 121/20 124/25 149/11 153/1 179/6 180/10 181/16 181/20 182/17 185/24 190/17 192/1 193/3 193/4 193/9 198/18 198/20 199/4 reason [5] 1/22 33/18 55/21 80/3 107/21 184/5 reasonable [2] 145/23 193/23 reasonably [2] 145/23 191/16 reasons [6] 50/7 86/14 96/19 162/17

181/13 184/24

reassure [1] 170/11 139/17 191/9 received [4] 39/19 67/3 85/3 126/22 receives [1] 130/17 39/21 39/25 81/7 91/12 196/11 recent [1] 30/1 recently [8] 21/25 38/1 72/3 75/20 180/12 180/23 196/17 196/18 receptive [1] 86/12 recipient [3] 93/22 93/23 97/15 **recognise [8]** 7/19 33/15 33/19 65/22 recognised [7] 10/21 78/6 126/1 recognising [6] 4/17 41/25 68/24 75/23 77/24 79/7 31/3 32/6 recollection [1] 172/21 recommend [2] | 97/16 97/17 recommendation [4] 7/14 79/1 79/10 157/10 recommendations **[16]** 7/8 20/7 21/9 21/12 21/22 59/12 66/5 66/6 70/9 72/8 88/23 111/3 120/20 record [5] 50/20 199/17 recorded [1] 157/16 records [3] 157/7 169/10 194/12 recruitment [1] 136/7 recur [1] 123/21 recurrent [1] 104/13 recurring [1] 133/16 **reduce [3]** 19/9 25/3 100/25 reduced [2] 40/5 reducing [1] 19/16 refer [10] 7/8 17/4 25/2 27/7 44/13 52/5 55/10 55/11 66/10 75/3 reference [8] 50/17 66/7 135/23 140/16 146/4 154/4 155/16

157/9 references [1] 158/20 referral [8] 8/9 138/2 138/9 139/2 186/11 186/15 186/18 187/4 referred [9] 47/19 48/20 57/13 62/7 119/23 120/4 127/25 194/5 194/9 referring [4] 77/17 98/24 153/6 176/14 refers [2] 168/1 173/1 reflect [4] 28/22 134/20 135/13 184/22 **reflected [2]** 29/4 29/5 reflection [4] 34/5 47/16 47/22 69/13 reflections [1] 111/3 reflective [1] 34/7 regarded [1] 69/7 regarding [1] 200/5 regardless [3] 119/11 143/2 151/10 regards [1] 104/4 regimes [1] 18/14 regional [1] 179/5 registered [3] 77/2 100/8 149/4 Registrar [1] 198/21 registration [2] 42/6 78/14 regular [3] 116/11 136/22 176/24 regularly [1] 136/8 regulation [4] 28/10 66/14 78/15 99/3 regulations [2] 99/4 140/21 regulators [1] 18/24 **regulatory [4]** 18/15 reinforced [1] 45/5 relate [4] 11/1 137/9 164/17 193/20 related [4] 12/25 91/10 137/17 185/16 relates [3] 94/18 131/19 151/6 relating [8] 51/10 66/13 77/19 87/23 118/17 142/4 148/20 183/15 relation [7] 14/24 73/17 107/2 116/1 143/20 177/21 198/5 relations [2] 87/11 176/22 relationship [1] 169/20 relative [2] 97/5 97/22

168/17 172/3 172/5 184/7 184/10 185/3 113/19 126/9 126/12 R 78/23 78/23 78/25 89/8 173/1 178/5 181/12 185/15 189/19 191/14 136/1 139/18 146/10 **relatively [2]** 46/11 required [8] 46/3 181/17 183/6 183/13 194/12 194/23 195/2 164/23 184/7 186/20 122/16 64/3 101/7 104/21 185/8 185/13 192/17 196/6 196/23 197/9 191/8 193/18 193/20 release [1] 35/13 140/20 144/18 168/10 192/20 193/5 198/7 197/22 role-modelling [1] released [1] 101/1 178/14 198/11 200/7 reviewed [6] 77/24 47/14 relevant [8] 121/22 responses [5] 40/21 115/15 115/16 123/1 roles [10] 25/16 requirement [6] 129/18 134/23 139/19 142/12 143/8 59/19 79/11 85/11 81/11 125/13 126/24 42/11 63/23 74/12 142/4 142/6 147/17 99/7 107/13 149/14 reviews [7] 40/22 75/22 86/11 94/20 152/6 responsibilities [7] 120/5 136/22 140/11 124/19 162/11 187/23 requirements [6] reliant [1] 121/9 14/14 18/5 18/10 14/25 42/16 42/25 143/16 155/7 198/1 roll [1] 194/17 reluctant [3] 14/1 21/10 188/11 192/14 43/7 140/18 144/25 revisiting [1] 95/4 roll-out [1] 194/17 19/13 20/18 requires [10] 19/17 181/10 reward [1] 47/12 rolled [1] 85/5 rely [1] 4/20 **Reynolds [2]** 9/22 25/15 46/21 48/7 responsibility [21] room [1] 121/15 remain [3] 91/18 63/15 76/2 96/5 103/7 74/2 87/20 131/7 65/12 round [4] 85/7 148/12 199/14 103/9 154/24 131/23 134/3 135/9 **Richard [1]** 98/14 121/12 190/14 197/12 remained [1] 7/25 140/21 147/3 147/9 research [13] 3/17 **ridiculous** [1] 39/3 route [7] 77/5 85/8 remains [1] 8/22 15/18 46/10 56/6 149/3 166/11 166/18 right [62] 10/12 11/7 86/23 87/1 89/7 remarkably [1] 91/5 82/11 85/17 112/16 167/4 171/8 172/2 11/9 11/11 11/13 170/21 171/3 **remedied [1]** 176/3 112/17 112/24 113/5 172/16 175/24 176/10 12/13 19/20 23/3 routes [3] 39/20 remedy [1] 103/24 113/6 117/14 196/18 187/8 187/12 189/1 40/12 41/19 55/12 40/13 84/18 remember [2] 158/22 researching [1] routine [1] 81/22 responsible [10] 58/16 59/2 59/6 61/14 166/8 113/14 6/22 15/16 17/10 62/20 74/6 83/24 Royal [23] 41/21 42/1 remote [1] 86/3 resident [1] 163/16 17/24 19/2 21/17 89/24 99/10 100/10 42/3 42/9 42/19 42/20 renamed [1] 21/22 33/17 146/11 166/16 102/13 105/12 105/25 42/22 42/24 43/9 43/9 resolution [3] 21/18 repeat [1] 1/11 106/8 107/7 109/23 43/12 127/18 152/9 174/25 91/15 95/11 repercussions [2] resolvable [1] 90/12 152/17 153/15 158/3 rest [1] 142/13 110/14 111/23 113/1 87/7 88/3 113/8 113/19 115/23 resolve [4] 19/4 87/4 result [1] 132/8 158/7 172/19 175/8 replace [1] 162/11 retaliation [1] 38/10 91/13 95/19 117/12 117/13 119/3 179/17 180/4 180/21 report [33] 2/20 3/22 120/25 131/16 131/16 182/17 resolved [1] 87/3 retired [1] 181/14 4/1 4/3 4/5 4/9 4/11 134/14 139/11 144/21 rudeness [2] 45/8 resonate [1] 28/17 return [2] 13/19 4/16 7/9 10/17 17/17 resource [12] 37/21 166/2 146/2 147/6 158/10 45/9 22/5 30/4 35/20 38/1 returned [3] 51/13 162/21 164/21 166/7 rules [1] 29/7 57/25 63/16 78/1 38/8 38/15 52/24 55/9 78/24 88/25 89/1 164/20 164/22 170/5 170/6 170/7 **run [10]** 40/9 43/10 57/13 61/18 67/1 85/4 108/1 108/7 143/22 returning [1] 136/10 173/18 174/19 174/20 50/9 57/10 57/12 85/17 87/7 93/24 182/12 183/22 176/13 181/5 181/6 99/13 111/8 127/2 revealed [1] 53/3 98/17 98/21 103/3 182/7 193/15 193/24 resourced [4] 49/1 review [96] 19/5 165/14 166/23 106/4 109/3 150/13 64/11 75/10 76/13 19/19 19/25 29/24 195/16 197/23 running [8] 20/24 179/19 66/12 67/11 72/3 75/8 right' [1] 11/4 20/25 62/1 64/9 64/11 resources [5] 105/7 reported [5] 10/1 106/10 143/24 144/3 75/19 75/19 77/16 **rights [1]** 131/18 64/13 169/3 196/18 31/23 51/23 101/6 195/13 77/21 87/6 113/12 ring [2] 14/8 84/11 runs [1] 21/24 171/14 **resourcing [2]** 75/25 113/17 113/25 114/21 ringfenced [3] reporting [7] 12/19 S 115/12 116/3 116/9 182/25 183/4 183/8 78/23 59/17 70/18 70/22 117/15 118/10 118/11 rise [2] 109/7 189/24 sadly [2] 102/14 respect [8] 1/14 1/17 84/10 101/6 101/10 158/25 2/3 44/20 44/21 47/12 118/13 118/15 119/8 risk [12] 10/22 13/6 **Reports [1]** 157/8 safe [10] 38/22 44/19 119/19 120/2 120/14 16/25 19/7 31/3 35/9 66/21 79/20 represent [1] 187/11 48/3 69/8 69/11 88/17 121/23 122/2 122/18 respectful [2] 44/19 45/22 66/16 71/13 representation [2] 117/22 118/24 133/10 73/9 123/20 124/14 128/15 137/19 186/4 189/24 51/21 180/20 136/6 respecting [1] 39/13 135/15 141/7 143/4 risks [6] 30/16 67/13 representative [3] 68/7 68/10 130/25 **safeguard [7]** 32/3 respects [1] 73/4 143/19 143/21 144/1 124/21 124/22 191/19 130/5 135/1 135/3 respond [3] 81/6 144/21 145/9 152/1 198/17 representatives [4] 155/4 186/1 187/8 129/22 191/21 154/5 154/8 154/11 road [4] 118/24 3/24 50/4 53/9 183/16 responders [1] 26/14 154/12 154/13 154/17 118/25 141/18 143/10 safeguarding [96] represented [1] 16/18 28/11 28/14 154/17 154/25 158/3 responding [3] 10/12 **Robbie [1]** 98/25 180/6 28/15 28/22 28/24 80/25 95/23 159/25 160/4 160/19 Robert [7] 1/19 17/16 representing [1] 29/3 29/7 95/21 response [43] 10/15 161/18 168/2 175/21 85/4 87/6 135/14 80/18 32/19 33/1 98/2 123/3 115/13 116/2 116/8 175/24 176/6 176/8 188/20 200/19 **reputation [2]** 101/21 116/23 117/9 117/11 124/17 125/6 125/24 177/6 177/15 177/20 role [33] 18/21 42/5 102/5 117/12 117/14 117/17 126/2 126/14 126/18 177/24 178/2 178/3 42/14 43/5 43/8 43/13 requested [1] 159/25 117/20 130/9 130/10 127/3 127/6 150/7 178/4 179/9 179/16 47/14 62/25 64/7 requests [1] 120/18 130/13 131/6 131/23 150/8 151/16 151/22 179/24 180/1 180/7 68/16 74/2 77/25 require [12] 19/18 132/6 132/7 132/22 155/25 161/12 161/20 180/9 180/13 180/19 79/11 85/15 85/19 20/15 21/13 73/24 133/2 133/6 133/24 162/7 165/18 166/17 181/9 182/4 182/23 86/1 86/10 86/20 75/7 75/9 77/11 77/15 134/20 135/9 135/25 166/18 168/13 168/15 183/10 183/14 183/25 86/21 88/7 111/15

154/7 154/11 154/17 S saw [11] 9/23 14/15 **scroll [1]** 157/8 seems [3] 36/18 34/21 51/22 73/17 scrolling [1] 131/20 79/12 151/1 155/6 safeguarding... [63] second [27] 7/22 101/15 121/24 152/7 seen [11] 13/1 24/24 **seriously [6]** 6/24 136/12 136/16 136/24 168/12 186/19 189/7 21/2 25/1 30/23 30/23 26/9 28/17 29/22 40/16 85/20 86/1 136/25 138/7 138/15 say [85] 4/8 4/8 4/12 32/15 44/22 49/21 29/25 83/3 84/19 103/3 154/20 138/17 138/20 138/22 4/18 4/22 6/13 6/14 55/24 69/25 75/25 106/20 159/24 162/6 seriousness [1] 138/23 138/25 140/3 8/8 10/19 12/24 14/15 78/9 83/16 101/2 sees [1] 197/15 107/12 140/17 141/11 141/13 18/1 18/17 20/6 21/3 102/5 110/13 118/8 **selecting [1]** 64/16 serve [1] 7/11 141/22 143/20 154/12 21/4 22/5 23/11 23/20 130/20 133/7 134/10 served [1] 163/19 **send [1]** 106/3 154/15 155/8 159/18 25/1 27/17 27/22 28/2 135/7 137/15 140/24 sends [1] 56/19 service [12] 21/21 166/15 169/17 175/15 28/20 28/23 29/2 154/19 158/18 159/13 senior [25] 34/23 22/17 38/13 43/3 176/5 177/21 179/7 31/10 32/9 35/21 38/8 35/16 38/17 40/18 160/12 44/23 58/19 58/21 179/7 179/25 183/5 38/24 39/3 48/22 52/5 second-guessing [1] 61/16 61/19 61/21 60/3 119/2 149/6 185/15 185/18 185/21 52/10 52/19 56/11 62/7 62/10 62/14 64/7 150/15 185/10 83/16 186/3 186/5 186/9 56/12 56/23 58/8 **Secondly [2]** 113/3 65/22 75/4 76/3 76/24 services [14] 18/4 186/10 186/18 186/20 62/22 63/10 64/21 126/2 86/3 93/1 112/12 37/13 38/5 119/3 186/23 186/25 187/1 66/11 66/20 68/9 69/5 secrecy [11] 30/3 126/15 135/8 178/10 119/4 127/1 129/15 187/3 187/6 187/9 70/13 71/6 71/17 30/6 30/8 30/10 30/19 179/1 179/2 179/11 131/7 134/25 135/3 187/11 187/16 187/17 73/22 75/5 77/14 78/3 31/11 31/12 68/8 187/2 139/10 139/23 140/3 187/20 187/22 187/24 79/4 81/14 84/25 95/1 68/10 68/23 71/9 sense [35] 3/16 11/3 149/5 187/25 188/6 188/6 97/8 99/2 99/5 100/4 section [9] 24/1 11/6 11/18 12/21 13/5 session [4] 158/18 188/22 188/25 189/4 109/4 112/23 113/8 46/14 134/7 134/8 30/24 32/2 32/5 33/19 160/12 160/14 175/19 189/14 190/4 190/21 118/23 122/13 122/17 134/9 144/3 145/11 34/15 34/17 42/17 sessions [1] 149/22 190/22 191/3 200/8 126/3 131/14 132/2 149/24 155/11 43/23 51/18 60/6 set [37] 3/15 4/7 4/15 safely [1] 60/8 132/21 142/19 145/1 64/24 69/8 77/8 82/14 11/15 14/14 15/14 section 11 [2] 134/7 safety [65] 3/3 3/7 153/9 163/23 168/11 82/18 82/24 83/21 16/13 17/12 18/15 134/9 3/16 4/21 4/22 5/1 5/3 171/24 180/17 185/4 sector [2] 139/25 86/20 92/18 92/21 25/24 33/10 42/24 5/14 6/3 8/18 8/18 188/24 189/18 194/19 139/25 93/25 94/2 98/5 43/14 46/2 46/17 14/13 16/21 17/4 secured [1] 60/1 198/7 198/10 117/12 117/25 140/5 48/20 61/18 63/17 18/11 23/1 25/5 28/13 143/8 143/13 189/23 65/17 76/22 78/1 83/5 saying [13] 22/21 securing [1] 55/19 28/16 28/21 28/24 28/15 31/8 36/21 43/3 security [1] 96/6 sense-checking [1] 85/21 86/18 98/23 28/25 31/3 31/22 38/7 68/23 84/1 84/16 see [74] 2/20 10/4 42/17 99/19 101/18 103/7 38/13 38/14 38/19 104/24 105/1 153/7 11/25 12/14 16/8 132/24 145/1 167/22 sense-making [8] 39/10 41/23 42/14 180/4 185/3 24/16 26/5 27/25 40/9 30/24 32/5 33/19 167/23 176/6 182/6 42/20 43/17 43/20 says [4] 39/13 69/15 40/21 41/11 54/19 34/17 92/18 92/21 182/10 183/3 183/5 45/19 45/21 46/3 46/4 140/8 158/22 54/24 56/20 60/1 60/9 93/25 94/2 sets [1] 161/11 51/5 56/7 63/4 64/24 scale [5] 21/13 61/13 67/10 71/7 71/7 89/8 senses [2] 12/12 setting [11] 13/3 22/9 67/22 70/4 87/19 88/4 71/20 72/5 72/17 93/8 94/9 94/11 96/10 40/4 25/11 28/9 28/10 29/9 88/9 88/12 88/18 96/23 104/13 105/15 scandals [1] 104/12 42/7 132/3 146/24 sensible [2] 60/12 95/21 96/3 99/14 105/24 120/14 120/16 60/23 scarce [1] 78/24 153/7 183/24 99/18 100/17 104/4 scared [1] 86/4 128/3 128/6 129/4 sensing [4] 11/25 settings [8] 20/4 105/18 105/22 106/20 scenario [2] 26/7 129/13 129/17 130/1 41/5 45/18 68/22 36/12 44/4 139/16 118/23 118/25 132/20 131/4 131/25 134/9 148/15 150/20 163/3 81/13 **sensitively [1]** 156/3 140/25 141/18 141/20 school [5] 111/10 134/10 134/16 136/6 sensor [1] 12/15 190/12 194/22 sensors [6] 11/20 112/2 112/13 112/24 136/8 136/20 137/11 settings - including said [17] 3/20 17/22 137/20 139/9 139/20 11/22 11/24 12/4 12/5 183/16 **[1]** 139/16 44/10 50/21 58/14 140/16 144/9 144/16 schools [2] 190/11 33/13 settle [1] 50/13 59/8 66/17 75/19 190/21 144/23 144/25 145/11 sent [4] 31/21 161/18 settlement [1] 50/12 81/22 91/25 106/9 science [1] 69/14 145/14 148/8 149/22 185/2 196/8 seven [1] 30/2 124/12 143/1 160/14 152/17 154/4 155/10 **scientific [2]** 114/15 sentence [4] 129/10 seventh [2] 45/23 166/4 178/25 184/23 174/18 155/13 155/22 159/15 130/6 148/9 148/16 136/6 same [28] 8/15 17/3 161/10 162/18 162/23 separate [10] 8/19 scope [4] 93/9 several [4] 15/10 17/21 33/25 33/25 163/13 188/20 189/6 106/23 107/9 134/13 8/20 43/16 51/10 41/24 67/18 173/1 37/20 40/19 46/8 191/1 191/1 195/14 **Score** [1] 61/3 154/16 168/4 176/7 sexual [2] 8/2 96/19 60/25 64/3 70/2 75/20 scores [2] 60/15 195/20 198/14 177/3 188/22 189/6 share [4] 38/10 76/19 76/19 79/8 seeing [1] 52/23 60/18 121/25 133/13 134/1 **September [4]** 1/2 79/23 89/1 100/14 112/13 193/16 200/22 shared [4] 22/14 scoring [1] 60/19 seek [2] 43/11 131/18 147/4 152/3 100/25 45/14 56/4 133/25 scratch [1] 61/10 sequestered [1] 8/21 153/14 160/8 160/10 sharing [13] 25/6 screen [7] 2/19 128/3 seeking [7] 12/3 41/3 series [7] 5/25 6/17 168/18 168/25 179/11 129/9 153/25 155/22 6/18 8/6 8/14 91/19 56/3 116/14 116/16 41/8 68/11 68/22 193/10 116/20 116/22 132/18 158/5 161/7 101/24 104/18 101/9 **sanctions** [1] 18/6 132/25 133/5 161/14 screening [1] 96/7 seeks [1] 130/8 serious [11] 23/1 **sat [1]** 1/5 89/19 101/7 101/8 seem [1] 37/25 174/6 200/11 200/13 screensavers [1] **Savile [2]** 10/6 96/18 85/22 seemed [1] 176/18 101/12 101/15 154/5 **she [11]** 6/16 9/23

31/21 33/11 36/4 173/8 174/17 175/4 196/10 S Skelton [6] 80/11 107/12 80/14 80/15 80/17 178/16 181/16 181/19 sort [70] 33/21 43/14 she... [9] 9/24 9/25 significance [1] 98/11 201/5 183/23 183/23 185/10 79/5 82/9 92/25 93/24 10/1 10/1 15/7 21/25 188/21 skill [3] 57/5 65/6 187/14 190/11 191/10 95/8 113/10 115/8 21/25 36/16 65/13 significant [7] 21/5 66/3 191/17 192/22 193/4 116/23 117/14 118/16 shed [1] 146/21 30/1 84/3 104/21 skilled [1] 65/25 196/7 196/8 197/2 118/18 118/20 119/2 shift [1] 26/1 145/18 193/1 199/22 197/5 197/24 198/6 120/17 121/11 121/16 skills [4] 62/18 63/4 Shipman [6] 6/2 6/8 122/17 123/8 124/23 64/2 127/7 significantly [3] **somebody [28]** 8/13 9/14 9/21 10/3 65/11 29/20 66/25 68/11 sleeping [2] 118/24 8/16 9/11 9/13 9/20 126/10 127/7 131/19 **Shipman's [1]** 9/23 198/17 133/4 133/24 141/9 signposter [1] 86/21 10/15 11/12 13/23 **shock [1]** 165/8 slightly [4] 80/10 signs [5] 12/2 25/5 16/2 28/18 32/21 142/1 142/2 148/20 **short [4]** 55/6 166/9 33/10 34/22 60/14 125/9 133/17 191/4 35/10 39/13 39/16 151/21 152/20 153/1 167/12 199/16 similar [6] 10/4 66/3 49/19 49/21 53/1 153/2 154/15 156/6 slip [1] 184/14 **shortage [3]** 17/7 97/4 115/19 160/23 82/17 84/11 86/2 157/21 164/8 165/18 sloppier [1] 37/18 31/21 123/2 168/25 **small [2]** 25/4 89/16 86/24 87/22 87/25 166/18 168/9 168/23 **shortages** [2] 25/2 simple [1] 114/6 smell [1] 87/25 138/17 169/20 170/8 169/3 169/11 169/15 47/20 182/2 195/5 170/20 175/7 176/5 simplicity [1] 97/5 smoke [1] 94/17 **shorthand** [1] 128/1 simplistic [1] 97/1 **smoothly [1]** 166/23 someone [3] 92/9 176/25 177/11 177/22 **shortly [4]** 119/14 **simply [3]** 94/10 snake [1] 6/8 133/8 138/19 178/16 178/23 179/11 143/12 148/25 200/14 174/1 175/3 180/20 182/5 182/15 something [85] 2/21 so [350] should [64] 7/11 social [12] 66/18 5/8 10/7 10/11 10/18 182/18 183/15 185/2 simulation [4] 26/6 11/12 21/1 26/3 28/5 26/21 26/23 27/19 99/3 118/25 126/6 11/13 11/17 11/18 185/2 185/5 189/5 28/6 29/1 39/9 40/16 simulations [3] 26/17 129/14 133/14 139/2 12/2 12/12 12/22 190/21 191/16 191/18 43/3 43/16 56/11 193/1 194/16 196/25 76/8 91/22 139/25 169/2 171/7 14/14 17/21 25/21 60/12 62/18 66/7 since [9] 1/5 3/24 183/16 190/12 26/2 29/10 29/11 198/17 66/14 68/14 68/19 72/5 102/19 104/12 32/10 33/15 33/20 sorting [1] 86/22 socialised [2] 22/16 69/21 69/23 74/10 115/4 172/14 179/20 33/21 33/23 34/1 22/19 sorts [2] 87/12 104/8 74/10 74/14 74/24 180/17 sociologist [1] 30/11 35/15 35/19 39/3 **sought [1]** 32/25 76/19 76/24 77/1 78/4 since August [1] soundings [1] soft [7] 12/6 33/11 39/13 40/12 40/16 98/2 101/14 108/16 40/11 63/5 169/19 41/18 46/23 56/24 170/16 3/24 125/25 129/11 129/21 57/3 60/2 61/8 65/9 single [10] 13/17 169/25 170/2 **sounds [1]** 25/13 130/16 131/8 132/23 65/20 66/1 66/2 67/15 source [2] 7/1 13/24 17/13 17/19 18/4 **Solihull [2]** 111/25 133/8 133/12 134/18 22/23 24/15 61/11 69/5 69/11 69/17 sources [10] 10/21 113/13 134/19 136/22 137/5 112/21 131/21 192/8 **solution [5]** 12/13 70/20 73/3 73/16 12/10 12/16 12/21 138/21 139/17 140/1 Sir [5] 1/19 17/16 61/8 90/8 142/22 75/24 77/23 83/1 84/3 20/14 33/12 40/2 45/1 143/3 146/1 146/12 135/14 188/20 200/19 177/19 86/8 86/23 87/13 73/10 83/3 146/15 147/2 148/11 Sir Robert [1] 200/19 solutions [3] 55/24 94/21 94/22 97/2 space [2] 30/16 148/19 156/24 174/18 sit [12] 2/12 16/6 57/23 71/21 100/21 101/8 102/12 69/11 176/1 176/23 180/2 58/21 91/20 109/19 103/16 104/16 104/20 speak [32] 6/2 7/22 solve [1] 5/7 187/11 189/9 191/9 113/22 119/24 120/23 some [102] 2/4 4/7 105/7 105/25 108/12 10/25 32/14 37/4 38/9 191/10 194/24 196/24 38/25 39/9 52/7 64/22 148/4 187/10 191/18 7/20 10/20 12/21 13/8 117/9 120/17 135/16 shoulder [1] 27/18 199/20 13/21 17/23 17/23 135/17 135/18 137/23 69/9 73/19 84/11 shouldn't [2] 52/20 sites [1] 106/21 18/10 19/17 23/5 23/5 141/2 145/22 157/22 85/12 85/13 85/15 158/24 23/6 23/19 24/1 24/16 169/19 170/2 178/13 85/19 86/19 86/24 sits [2] 121/5 122/6 show [2] 25/14 sitting [4] 65/16 30/22 32/25 33/14 187/5 188/18 189/13 87/3 87/18 88/6 88/16 198/25 189/16 189/21 190/16 88/20 88/21 90/16 121/12 187/21 199/21 33/21 36/13 40/22 showed [1] 52/24 situation [29] 12/18 40/23 40/25 42/25 191/3 197/23 105/16 105/21 106/1 **showing [1]** 43/6 13/5 15/5 15/9 15/18 44/11 46/15 52/6 sometimes [28] 6/25 127/7 135/14 186/22 **shown [3]** 6/7 27/17 16/3 17/7 17/8 19/15 52/23 60/6 62/18 11/20 19/10 21/10 speaker [1] 82/20 105/4 27/4 37/4 37/6 50/16 26/15 26/23 27/1 62/22 63/23 65/10 speaking [15] 3/12 shuttle [1] 30/16 27/11 27/13 33/5 35/3 65/10 67/9 70/7 72/20 50/17 62/7 70/14 8/8 9/7 9/7 37/2 38/22 side [8] 52/22 52/22 35/6 35/8 36/18 53/20 77/8 78/15 79/12 70/15 82/23 86/2 39/21 40/7 64/25 79/2 79/2 79/3 113/11 91/9 92/1 94/18 80/12 80/22 82/22 107/14 122/25 123/13 80/20 84/21 97/14 135/2 187/18 97/18 98/4 189/9 102/11 169/7 185/18 84/10 85/17 86/9 88/1 123/23 126/16 143/7 side-effects [2] 90/7 90/11 91/8 92/25 144/19 146/7 169/16 190/16 197/17 200/9 speaks [1] 25/9 52/22 79/2 situations [111 10/20 94/1 95/3 95/12 98/19 184/24 187/23 188/7 **Special [1]** 180/19 sides [1] 79/20 15/3 19/6 19/7 50/23 101/1 101/14 102/14 189/19 194/18 **specialist [8]** 43/19 **sight [1]** 132/8 somewhere [1] 91/7 93/1 94/15 94/22 103/3 103/12 103/12 58/20 114/25 126/16 sign [1] 123/14 185/24 190/3 107/5 110/23 113/17 127/9 169/12 185/9 183/20 signal [3] 11/4 32/17 six [1] 197/12 117/14 118/24 121/2 **soon [2]** 1/10 126/1 198/12 56/19 six months [1] 124/24 127/20 129/2 sorry [11] 11/22 specialties [1] signalled [2] 29/10 197/12 142/17 146/21 148/14 29/10 37/11 59/5 197/10 74/4 150/19 153/21 155/12 72/25 80/6 106/15 sixth [2] 45/20 **specialty [1]** 60/3 signals [5] 12/6 135/22 163/21 164/2 172/13 107/18 116/16 151/4 **specific [20]** 11/2

39/7 44/5 46/23 48/12 stories [1] 95/2 145/8 55/25 58/1 70/6 73/14 S 55/3 63/21 81/1 84/2 **story [1]** 41/5 substandard [1] 5/16 74/6 85/24 86/9 107/7 specific... [19] 18/12 109/6 111/5 123/20 straight [1] 84/5 **success [1]** 78/6 108/4 113/17 114/16 39/15 43/12 57/2 60/3 124/17 125/5 125/6 straightforward [7] **successful [4]** 55/19 127/9 130/17 133/5 60/4 61/12 71/13 76/3 125/25 127/14 128/3 13/4 19/1 97/25 56/9 74/16 96/2 136/11 139/4 148/13 81/15 91/22 94/19 146/18 146/19 155/11 122/21 142/1 148/4 156/1 182/18 184/2 successfully [1] 94/20 94/25 101/10 167/18 175/12 177/15 166/8 184/6 186/6 190/3 140/9 149/24 160/25 178/20 181/3 200/18 straightforwardly [1] **succinctly [1]** 14/20 supported [7] 16/24 162/9 started [3] 115/9 10/20 such [8] 11/2 14/8 41/20 52/16 99/23 specifically [7] 5/25 65/21 105/16 137/5 104/25 173/17 187/2 125/19 165/13 strategically [2] 19/14 46/10 59/24 starting [1] 168/23 52/13 53/9 164/6 173/3 192/10 supporting [3] 1/13 85/13 155/1 162/19 sudden [19] 114/16 71/22 186/11 **starts** [1] 125/24 strategy [1] 171/21 specifics [1] 44/3 state [2] 6/15 23/24 streams [1] 12/9 124/1 124/8 124/13 supportive [3] **spectrum [1]** 41/2 **strengthen [2]** 75/13 124/25 140/13 144/8 114/11 125/10 125/10 statement [19] **speed [2]** 84/7 110/13 110/22 111/7 75/18 145/9 151/20 152/12 **supports** [1] 148/22 151/13 112/23 114/19 148/8 152/25 159/2 159/3 suppose [6] 62/17 strengthened [1] **speeded [1]** 107/7 153/20 159/13 163/1 167/22 168/21 173/5 95/7 156/8 165/9 75/6 spend [1] 79/21 164/19 177/16 182/22 strengthening [1] 173/7 173/9 198/16 170/1 187/22 **split [1]** 142/13 190/11 199/24 200/3 75/23 suddenly [9] 124/5 **supposed [2]** 21/25 spoke [2] 7/5 21/24 200/4 200/9 200/13 125/2 126/24 127/3 **stress** [1] 35/4 91/17 **spoken [1]** 153/14 146/23 155/24 174/8 supposing [1] 201/12 strictly [1] 64/25 **spotting [1]** 120/24 statements [3] 1/9 stripped [1] 19/10 198/20 198/23 165/25 **spring [1]** 116/9 110/2 110/5 strong [3] 46/25 SUDI [12] 123/23 suppress [2] 30/22 **stable [1]** 11/9 static [1] 136/24 47/15 76/25 124/1 124/2 151/21 82/21 staff [34] 12/8 13/15 152/11 152/13 152/15 suppressed [1] statistical [2] 57/2 strongly [3] 24/12 15/6 28/19 38/9 47/20 155/16 156/11 159/9 97/6 192/19 40/14 57/7 47/24 48/9 61/6 63/20 status [1] 42/9 **structural** [7] 23/12 165/20 166/17 sure [36] 4/12 8/15 70/20 71/21 72/22 23/22 24/5 24/13 30/8 **SUDIC [16]** 123/23 **statute** [1] 18/4 12/13 16/13 17/15 73/2 75/22 78/11 **statutory [22]** 18/5 30/10 184/24 124/1 124/3 124/12 36/9 39/3 47/2 47/6 85/22 86/4 86/5 89/20 100/12 116/8 118/14 124/17 125/13 125/23 48/25 57/6 78/12 82/3 Structurally [1] 19/23 91/20 103/4 103/18 121/18 127/17 127/22 structure [3] 62/13 155/16 158/14 164/12 85/23 85/25 103/4 106/11 136/11 136/15 129/11 156/5 156/7 138/15 138/20 165/6 165/7 165/9 114/10 117/19 133/18 138/4 139/15 148/12 160/17 161/4 167/19 165/10 165/12 165/17 143/25 145/4 149/11 structured [3] 48/2 170/14 170/19 185/22 168/2 172/8 172/10 60/15 197/4 **suffer [1]** 133/12 160/20 160/22 160/24 185/23 191/3 172/11 173/24 174/2 **structures [2]** 18/15 suffering [2] 4/14 166/20 167/5 169/24 staffed [1] 49/2 174/3 178/9 193/17 133/12 173/21 178/6 178/19 30/21 staffing [8] 3/5 6/19 194/10 194/12 195/15 staying [1] 175/14 **suffers [1]** 105/22 **struggle [2]** 9/15 25/2 37/22 66/22 step [6] 24/10 69/1 sufficiently [3] 9/25 197/14 199/15 121/21 189/12 189/20 189/23 122/20 173/21 181/4 76/13 187/25 surface [1] 30/17 **struggling [5]** 41/12 Staffordshire [1] 41/12 41/19 105/8 181/6 suffocating [1] 20/3 surgeon [2] 22/19 17/17 steps [8] 8/14 24/11 108/2 suggest [3] 68/18 197/19 stage [4] 119/20 96/22 102/13 122/8 stuck [2] 35/14 35/18 78/5 90/13 surgery [1] 9/22 122/9 145/2 165/5 144/8 144/14 170/17 **suggested [3]** 78/19 studied [2] 3/11 **survive [1]** 119/15 **stand [1]** 132/19 Steve [1] 180/18 15/25 116/17 200/12 suspect [3] 6/21 standard [3] 45/2 steward [1] 74/2 studies [6] 1/25 2/15 149/16 165/22 suggesting [1] 74/24 90/3 161/11 2/24 9/6 33/9 152/13 **suspected [4]** 8/13 stewardship [2] 74/1 suggestions [3] 21/9 standardised [2] study [6] 3/6 4/22 74/3 97/13 162/10 8/16 9/2 154/10 60/7 120/6 suggests [1] 56/7 stick [2] 108/15 35/1 46/11 67/10 swapped [1] 165/4 **standards [28]** 17/12 108/15 94/16 **suicide [2]** 173/4 Swiss [1] 6/4 18/24 20/7 25/18 still [17] 40/4 51/12 stuff [1] 79/5 173/11 switches [1] 16/24 37/24 42/5 43/4 43/21 69/9 71/4 86/25 87/1 style [1] 183/19 summarise [2] 14/20 sympathetic [1] 44/1 44/23 44/24 89/6 91/3 108/16 **sub [2]** 136/13 104/2 82/25 44/25 45/5 46/17 47/6 116/24 131/14 142/6 136/20 sympathies [1] 4/13 summarising [1] 60/24 70/1 70/2 74/9 146/3 158/13 158/15 **sub-bullet [1]** 136/13 151/7 symptoms [1] 105/20 74/25 76/22 77/4 78/1 178/1 186/2 sub-points [1] **summary [3]** 160/2 **Syndrome [1]** 198/16 110/25 111/1 127/15 stillbirth [1] 173/4 136/20 168/1 168/12 synthesisations [1] 167/16 167/18 **stillborn [1]** 119/17 subject [7] 18/5 **summer [4]** 164/23 44/13 Standing [2] 18/7 51/10 52/12 152/22 **stimulated** [1] 58/25 165/3 181/1 181/2 synthesised [1] 180/15 stop [8] 47/18 54/25 169/6 182/14 182/21 sums [1] 182/25 13/17 **Standing Committee** 75/16 89/13 102/21 **supervise [1]** 17/11 synthesising [1] 43/2 subordinated [1] **[1]** 180/15 141/8 146/20 173/7 51/7 supervision [1] **synthetic [2]** 17/13 **stands [3]** 2/23 stopped [3] 102/24 136/11 18/19 subsequent [1] 123/24 172/15 181/14 183/7 65/17 support [27] 23/6 system [20] 5/9 start [28] 37/17 37/18 stopping [1] 85/7 subset [2] 124/14 39/8 41/8 42/20 43/11 17/10 18/23 20/24

(80) specific... - system

talk [14] 11/24 15/11 124/4 152/11 152/15 143/22 73/5 73/13 74/8 75/22 S 31/2 47/18 82/17 152/16 154/8 172/23 thanking [2] 39/14 77/8 82/21 83/16 system... [16] 21/19 117/8 124/3 148/4 terminology [1] 98/16 87/23 88/25 94/7 95/4 23/25 56/9 70/18 164/19 170/3 170/9 168/19 thanks [1] 1/11 97/8 99/8 103/25 74/12 81/23 83/7 193/11 196/22 197/18 terms [50] 16/11 that [1097] 107/22 118/18 119/8 88/15 88/17 101/6 talked [3] 38/1 93/24 29/22 45/6 45/13 that's [143] 5/4 7/20 119/9 119/12 119/16 166/12 171/12 172/13 60/19 60/21 66/7 72/7 13/18 13/20 18/12 121/20 121/23 130/22 151/11 191/2 193/10 196/22 19/1 22/1 22/12 29/8 131/9 131/16 131/17 talking [14] 12/7 12/8 74/11 78/18 96/15 systematically [1] 22/14 23/19 23/20 99/6 101/4 106/14 30/13 32/11 32/15 136/15 136/15 136/23 4/23 62/16 65/10 65/24 106/17 110/24 114/6 32/16 32/24 33/8 138/22 139/3 139/5 systems [35] 1/24 139/18 141/4 143/2 68/21 90/15 179/1 114/14 115/10 117/5 34/20 35/15 39/10 5/4 5/6 5/12 8/23 9/11 179/3 180/23 186/9 118/11 119/24 121/4 40/8 41/12 41/18 143/7 143/8 146/2 11/15 13/9 20/23 talks [1] 168/14 123/25 134/17 137/21 44/20 45/5 45/12 156/1 157/15 157/17 23/14 23/23 23/23 138/14 140/20 141/19 47/23 48/2 48/4 52/23 159/7 160/22 164/11 target [1] 175/2 24/5 30/12 30/21 targeting [2] 79/9 143/24 149/3 149/9 54/10 54/23 55/18 172/2 181/9 181/22 30/25 31/19 32/22 79/9 152/7 152/16 152/21 57/4 57/4 57/21 58/22 182/9 182/14 186/9 37/8 37/21 41/11 156/13 158/19 160/2 60/2 60/6 62/20 63/21 186/17 187/17 191/12 targets [2] 20/7 45/20 45/22 45/24 160/25 163/6 164/18 65/16 66/24 71/6 192/13 193/18 193/20 20/13 47/3 48/13 80/2 81/8 task [3] 49/9 67/14 166/24 169/5 175/21 71/11 75/19 75/24 193/25 195/1 196/4 85/22 91/16 130/9 178/14 181/3 181/15 78/12 79/10 79/12 197/6 198/1 199/5 149/16 130/11 132/6 132/7 189/9 191/12 198/15 79/20 83/11 87/17 tasks [7] 25/16 26/17 theirs [1] 121/24 154/15 27/14 45/14 50/25 terrible [3] 4/14 6/9 87/21 91/16 92/12 them [90] 1/19 8/4 74/12 76/13 37/1 94/23 95/16 96/23 9/4 16/9 20/16 26/19 tea [1] 90/4 terribly [2] 84/18 97/8 99/12 100/10 26/20 30/21 31/8 tab [3] 127/23 153/23 teaching [1] 183/21 100/19 100/21 101/1 32/10 33/17 35/9 175/20 161/6 team [27] 3/6 25/15 101/23 101/23 104/17 35/11 35/13 37/2 terrifying [1] 67/14 tab 10 [1] 153/23 105/23 107/4 109/24 37/16 37/19 39/14 27/8 27/11 35/2 35/11 terrorist [1] 96/4 tab 5 [1] 161/6 110/15 110/17 111/11 42/7 45/25 47/8 47/10 38/12 45/11 58/20 test [4] 71/20 72/17 tab 6 [1] 127/23 62/8 89/16 91/3 92/15 77/22 91/21 111/16 111/20 111/23 50/1 50/10 50/20 table [2] 121/12 testing [4] 70/25 71/7 116/13 120/25 126/17 112/1 112/10 112/15 51/13 51/25 53/1 54/8 197/12 127/10 138/7 138/22 77/11 89/8 112/19 113/2 113/4 55/15 57/10 64/13 tackle [1] 46/22 148/1 152/13 169/22 than [35] 11/1 26/23 113/10 113/22 114/17 64/25 64/25 65/1 tackled [1] 13/7 114/23 115/2 115/2 70/11 70/11 71/21 171/17 175/5 186/5 28/19 37/19 40/14 tackling [1] 72/7 186/9 186/10 61/9 63/12 70/7 74/11 116/24 117/13 118/1 72/17 73/16 73/25 take [37] 8/15 17/20 teams [12] 16/9 74/18 80/10 90/9 118/1 119/22 119/23 78/22 84/22 85/21 18/21 18/21 19/25 25/23 35/8 45/13 93/14 106/11 106/22 120/25 128/23 131/19 89/13 91/1 92/19 93/4 24/11 51/25 52/12 45/16 47/1 76/9 94/18 117/23 122/3 125/4 132/11 133/2 133/3 94/5 94/20 95/23 55/2 59/18 66/22 74/2 138/23 138/25 184/12 125/9 141/10 142/19 133/15 134/15 136/18 102/5 102/24 103/12 87/21 88/19 90/11 188/6 143/24 145/2 145/15 105/9 106/6 106/9 138/24 139/12 140/4 91/11 94/21 95/16 151/2 154/25 164/1 141/6 145/13 146/3 teams' [1] 25/4 106/10 107/16 107/17 96/1 114/18 120/17 teamwork [11] 25/8 168/12 172/9 175/25 147/6 147/18 150/5 107/21 116/6 117/18 120/19 131/15 135/8 25/9 25/10 25/12 27/5 178/23 182/20 183/18 150/16 152/1 152/20 123/20 126/5 127/9 141/6 151/25 158/5 27/25 35/1 44/12 188/4 192/6 152/20 153/11 155/10 132/9 134/4 138/8 164/16 164/16 172/7 45/11 46/16 74/21 156/9 158/10 160/25 148/2 148/13 157/20 thank [61] 2/9 2/23 182/2 183/22 189/18 techniques [4] 26/6 3/19 4/8 4/21 28/20 162/21 168/11 173/14 166/8 169/4 169/17 197/8 197/11 198/25 57/3 57/8 58/17 173/16 174/23 175/1 170/16 171/7 184/8 46/20 55/1 55/3 55/16 199/5 66/24 68/20 74/4 175/18 179/10 183/14 184/12 184/13 186/8 technologies [1] take-off [1] 96/1 74/13 75/14 80/8 80/13 183/18 183/21 188/2 187/16 189/6 191/13 take-up [1] 59/18 teething [1] 195/15 80/16 81/25 82/4 189/1 189/15 189/24 196/23 197/1 197/3 taken [15] 7/7 10/23 190/4 190/22 191/14 197/17 197/25 198/25 tell [11] 2/21 15/22 94/13 95/24 97/17 15/6 26/7 30/18 32/19 55/13 55/14 57/1 98/9 98/10 98/11 191/23 192/1 196/10 theme [3] 128/7 52/9 61/1 89/6 97/23 87/24 118/10 123/23 98/18 98/22 107/11 197/23 199/6 133/16 162/5 97/24 144/8 147/1 174/4 184/7 185/19 108/18 108/18 108/20 theatre [1] 96/7 themes [2] 82/5 87/5 148/11 164/11 108/24 109/1 109/5 telling [2] 65/25 their [98] 3/23 7/5 themselves [18] takes [9] 73/4 91/13 199/2 111/4 112/5 127/24 11/8 11/9 12/4 15/2 50/11 57/19 59/11 92/18 108/1 123/12 ten [2] 58/5 99/19 128/5 129/7 129/9 16/5 16/24 20/11 60/8 60/11 60/17 143/18 143/21 146/5 131/20 139/6 151/25 23/14 24/5 24/22 25/5 70/14 73/7 79/15 ten years [1] 58/5 182/10 tend [5] 11/15 30/22 154/1 158/5 167/6 28/16 31/10 38/15 83/15 86/22 87/4 87/9 taking [16] 12/9 14/2 41/2 64/10 166/8 167/9 167/15 177/12 41/14 41/14 42/15 105/3 121/24 138/11 17/24 22/1 32/2 33/17 tends [3] 15/19 56/16 179/14 190/7 195/23 42/16 44/20 45/25 159/4 178/24 46/19 50/24 50/25 195/25 198/4 199/10 51/11 52/16 53/9 79/2 then [79] 5/6 7/6 98/8 102/13 103/23 term [14] 17/16 20/18 199/15 199/15 199/19 53/22 54/7 64/4 64/13 11/11 24/24 26/21 106/14 122/20 170/16 30/7 30/19 46/20 199/21 200/15 200/19 65/16 68/15 68/16 32/18 34/5 48/3 50/19 173/20 61/21 62/14 118/9 thankfully [2] 122/1 69/6 69/24 70/4 72/8 52/10 53/3 53/4 53/21

30/23 31/9 31/9 35/12 54/23 54/24 57/20 42/25 43/8 44/16 184/14 186/12 186/15 Т 35/18 37/6 37/9 40/18 57/21 59/20 59/23 44/25 47/7 49/24 190/3 then... [66] 56/20 41/15 45/14 54/10 61/3 62/24 62/25 63/7 49/24 50/23 52/7 throughout [6] 6/1 57/16 59/16 60/4 61/9 64/12 67/17 68/1 63/10 64/6 64/8 65/6 52/11 55/13 56/8 39/4 93/18 164/9 62/2 68/23 69/8 70/10 73/16 78/25 81/4 81/8 65/9 66/3 66/6 67/1 58/13 64/10 64/23 184/13 197/7 74/5 76/7 76/9 81/6 88/1 88/18 93/3 67/9 67/12 67/14 68/13 68/18 69/21 **Thursday [1]** 1/2 81/9 83/5 84/1 84/12 102/13 119/18 138/15 68/23 68/24 69/10 70/3 71/24 72/6 72/7 tick [1] 106/2 92/17 92/23 98/1 73/7 73/14 76/8 76/18 tick boxing [1] 106/2 138/16 138/24 156/23 70/23 72/18 73/13 104/5 104/18 105/12 169/21 185/1 185/1 74/4 74/11 75/16 78/20 79/16 80/9 tied [1] 121/20 107/9 108/8 109/3 tight [2] 14/8 143/21 187/19 191/10 192/12 76/19 76/21 76/22 80/24 81/11 81/14 110/23 113/14 120/7 76/23 76/25 77/12 they've [6] 127/11 82/7 82/8 84/16 84/21 time [57] 1/25 4/25 123/19 124/6 127/4 138/21 169/13 184/8 77/20 77/23 78/8 86/11 88/23 89/3 99/8 15/14 19/12 21/23 127/17 127/19 129/13 184/9 194/15 78/19 79/4 79/14 99/15 100/8 102/16 25/20 25/21 26/8 27/6 130/10 131/3 133/12 thickets [3] 20/6 22/2 79/23 80/4 81/10 84/9 102/21 103/19 104/7 33/14 34/12 35/16 135/12 135/22 136/4 29/10 84/16 87/6 87/17 104/8 110/5 117/17 35/23 36/14 48/5 48/7 136/8 136/21 137/2 thing [25] 7/19 7/22 87/24 88/1 88/6 88/19 119/5 124/13 129/19 48/9 49/7 49/11 50/1 137/8 140/24 143/7 17/21 24/11 27/5 89/5 91/5 91/8 91/24 130/9 131/24 134/17 50/10 50/24 51/17 146/21 153/12 155/9 137/3 139/16 153/5 51/22 54/24 54/25 32/13 32/20 37/20 92/14 92/25 94/13 163/5 164/12 165/18 56/1 61/10 63/10 94/21 95/13 95/17 156/17 159/6 159/9 55/12 57/1 58/16 59/3 166/19 169/18 179/20 70/23 75/16 75/20 96/10 96/13 97/10 165/10 166/1 169/22 59/6 61/11 63/18 181/13 184/20 186/9 75/25 78/8 96/14 97/12 97/18 98/2 174/11 177/2 178/16 66/23 69/3 79/21 190/13 197/3 197/13 101/2 102/10 105/11 102/10 102/25 103/24 178/23 183/7 193/19 82/22 85/24 86/8 197/14 198/5 198/25 107/17 123/8 131/19 104/15 104/24 105/3 195/17 94/23 96/21 97/12 199/17 136/24 166/7 105/14 105/23 107/1 though [9] 11/4 94/2 100/14 107/5 122/10 therapist [1] 22/20 things [96] 4/7 5/5 107/4 107/6 107/9 99/9 131/15 147/6 123/6 127/15 136/23 there [256] 5/18 8/10 11/3 11/7 108/3 108/10 114/2 143/19 143/25 143/25 171/12 191/2 192/9 there's [60] 12/21 115/22 116/4 116/19 194/24 147/4 152/5 166/1 11/16 12/14 12/18 13/21 14/8 16/17 17/8 16/2 17/18 20/10 116/21 116/25 117/2 182/10 183/12 197/14 thought [16] 49/20 18/20 24/7 30/25 22/16 22/22 23/21 117/9 123/9 123/11 58/7 66/17 78/18 timely [2] 122/21 30/25 31/7 32/9 35/3 23/23 23/25 25/24 123/17 125/8 133/9 90/14 103/14 150/22 155/25 36/21 40/6 40/10 42/4 165/15 165/16 165/22 times [1] 105/4 29/18 29/19 29/22 143/3 146/4 148/14 49/17 50/24 54/15 31/17 33/14 34/22 148/20 149/15 152/14 169/16 170/17 178/18 timescale [1] 180/25 56/3 67/5 69/5 69/19 36/15 37/18 40/3 154/19 164/20 169/17 185/17 189/20 196/24 timescales [1] 70/25 76/25 79/25 43/23 46/16 46/22 170/4 172/11 173/14 thoughtful [1] 34/7 151/11 83/5 83/21 84/1 85/10 thousands [6] 31/22 49/18 55/22 57/12 174/12 179/4 179/7 timestamp [1] 85/11 85/11 105/21 60/6 60/9 60/21 60/22 180/24 182/14 182/16 31/22 31/24 31/24 180/22 108/16 113/16 120/2 182/24 188/1 188/2 60/23 61/12 63/14 50/9 87/25 title [2] 128/4 128/7 120/16 122/12 122/14 65/3 65/5 72/10 72/13 189/7 190/17 191/3 threat [2] 5/13 96/4 today [4] 4/6 199/18 122/15 138/4 154/4 191/10 191/13 191/16 threatening [1] 72/14 73/25 74/13 199/22 200/17 157/9 162/22 169/18 76/4 76/11 77/7 80/1 191/19 192/1 192/9 156/18 together [31] 15/21 177/3 178/4 178/7 80/1 82/9 82/16 83/4 192/22 193/3 193/16 three [10] 6/17 24/11 27/15 56/3 56/4 56/4 178/11 179/6 179/9 84/2 84/9 84/17 86/22 194/6 194/22 195/14 56/8 57/21 81/1 117/5 72/16 83/1 121/1 181/15 188/6 188/7 87/10 87/12 88/19 199/4 199/6 199/17 122/17 137/8 183/4 126/17 128/1 133/21 191/17 195/3 195/6 90/3 90/13 91/5 91/19 200/17 135/20 142/25 145/12 183/7 198/6 198/23 199/11 92/1 92/3 92/14 94/16 thinking [17] 21/7 threshold [2] 5/21 147/17 152/1 153/13 therefore [5] 120/16 96/3 96/7 96/13 98/5 156/8 160/20 162/3 22/14 22/21 39/18 137/22 123/10 126/25 142/9 98/7 98/8 100/20 81/1 81/3 87/8 87/9 thresholds [1] 60/19 165/23 167/20 170/11 151/7 101/3 102/4 102/16 88/18 89/11 89/22 through [57] 6/9 8/18 186/19 188/11 189/7 these [32] 1/22 7/24 103/19 108/3 108/8 94/7 123/15 124/15 13/11 22/15 26/7 28/8 191/20 192/4 193/12 23/18 34/11 35/23 108/11 114/20 116/13 131/17 170/25 171/2 30/12 31/2 31/21 37/5 197/8 197/11 41/3 49/17 53/11 120/9 120/21 128/19 third [9] 21/2 32/18 37/19 40/12 41/5 49/1 told [10] 37/6 41/7 60/16 61/24 62/11 147/12 170/12 179/20 45/4 56/1 102/7 49/12 51/1 55/22 145/22 149/18 152/2 62/22 62/24 63/23 182/11 184/14 196/1 110/24 137/21 139/22 62/13 71/4 71/18 155/2 157/2 174/2 91/7 92/14 92/25 198/16 142/11 71/22 90/16 91/4 191/8 192/17 96/17 96/21 125/12 think [168] 3/9 7/19 thirds [1] 142/13 91/19 91/21 93/3 tolerance [3] 37/23 129/2 131/22 134/22 7/23 8/4 13/18 13/19 this [216] 95/15 98/8 100/22 45/7 45/7 138/3 144/23 156/14 too [12] 21/4 21/15 14/9 19/24 20/1 20/17 **Thomas [1]** 200/3 101/6 111/8 112/20 156/16 157/14 166/4 20/23 24/14 28/23 thoroughly [1] 156/3 113/17 115/3 122/16 60/10 63/20 86/4 86/8 177/14 178/8 185/24 29/8 29/19 29/25 those [91] 1/9 7/12 123/4 123/21 128/25 132/7 133/25 173/22 they [347] 34/10 34/13 36/9 8/7 8/23 9/3 12/11 129/2 148/13 153/25 174/19 198/2 198/3 they're [43] 20/8 36/18 37/10 38/5 40/5 13/8 15/23 16/8 20/3 156/1 157/21 162/17 took [5] 51/22 53/20 24/19 24/19 24/20 41/18 41/24 42/13 20/13 20/25 21/10 164/8 166/19 166/25 85/20 86/1 103/3 25/19 26/12 26/18 43/16 44/1 44/15 25/13 27/7 30/1 32/1 170/4 170/9 176/1 tool [2] 29/23 59/17 26/19 26/20 27/20 53/13 54/3 54/21 40/14 42/11 42/13 178/21 180/21 183/5 **tools [1]** 60/15

94/10 95/20 96/5 T Turner [1] 180/18 undermanaged [1] uniform [1] 22/7 96/11 turning [2] 110/21 uniformly [1] 120/9 top [8] 12/24 29/17 trap [1] 92/19 190/25 underpins [1] 81/18 unintended [2] 5/2 31/6 31/15 52/2 54/1 two [19] 1/16 8/23 trapped [4] 34/16 understaffing [3] 5/2 105/25 130/1 35/7 92/22 92/23 30/20 41/25 42/11 32/22 37/11 37/12 union [4] 42/3 42/10 topic [17] 48/12 trauma [1] 173/3 49/18 55/13 68/17 understand [25] 3/25 52/16 53/9 80/21 99/19 110/24 treat [1] 139/16 85/10 104/3 113/15 11/10 63/17 64/25 unions [2] 16/24 50/3 110/25 111/2 115/19 136/20 142/13 151/12 71/20 79/16 79/19 treated [7] 6/23 6/24 unique [2] 101/18 117/4 127/15 127/21 38/25 39/2 40/16 164/15 187/23 188/22 79/22 79/24 80/6 80/6 128/20 136/9 166/9 167/17 unit [17] 21/24 22/1 195/25 196/1 82/14 94/24 113/20 106/2 108/6 168/6 177/13 185/15 treating [1] 106/11 two-thirds [1] 142/13 117/10 124/21 130/3 22/17 23/3 25/11 190/8 152/5 153/20 177/23 43/21 44/19 45/1 treatment [1] 119/9 tying [1] 50/10 topics [1] 123/21 type [4] 8/10 71/13 triangulate [1] 12/17 180/11 181/22 186/21 51/12 53/24 60/17 touched [3] 48/15 81/18 101/10 187/12 192/4 89/15 90/12 158/23 tribunal [4] 50/6 150/18 190/9 50/14 51/15 52/1 types [2] 42/1 49/18 understanding [24] 158/25 159/4 173/14 towards [20] 14/23 typical [1] 83/5 Tribunals [3] 17/1 25/16 30/15 33/24 units [16] 14/19 14/23 16/7 24/22 41/4 34/13 35/7 35/19 26/12 38/21 40/23 50/8 50/11 typically [18] 9/9 45/8 45/8 45/9 45/17 tricky [1] 76/9 9/18 13/9 27/11 43/2 42/16 54/21 58/14 40/24 43/17 44/8 50/12 68/12 71/12 triggered [2] 60/20 49/3 49/5 49/14 56/22 82/11 93/6 131/12 44/12 57/18 59/13 93/5 102/2 102/15 57/15 57/16 61/23 137/21 148/17 177/8 60/8 60/11 60/24 101/9 137/18 144/10 151/8 62/3 64/9 91/18 95/2 178/10 179/1 179/6 158/21 159/8 176/15 trouble [1] 103/4 154/3 187/13 true [8] 4/1 4/4 28/6 95/19 123/2 183/1 190/5 190/20 **University [5]** 2/16 trade [3] 42/3 42/10 99/12 105/23 110/9 193/5 193/7 193/23 2/25 112/3 112/17 52/16 110/18 169/6 understands [1] 23/1 113/15 traditional [1] 44/1 trust [46] 16/25 **UK [2]** 57/9 114/15 unless [7] 8/2 29/10 understood [2] 33/7 traditionally [1] 22/23 37/7 50/4 50/15 **ultimate [1]** 166/18 39/4 29/12 34/1 35/19 43/25 unable [2] 32/23 51/5 51/14 51/16 95/22 116/4 understudied [1] traffic [2] 118/24 157/15 51/23 53/21 53/21 66/25 unlikely [1] 5/7 143/11 58/23 59/10 61/22 unacceptable [1] undertaken [1] 66/15 unnaturally [1] 194/4 tragically [1] 27/4 61/25 62/1 69/18 5/17 undertaking [1] unnecessary [1] train [8] 26/13 35/9 88/20 88/22 88/22 unaddressed [1] 136/12 195/8 35/11 78/1 94/20 15/9 88/24 89/5 100/22 unease [4] 11/18 unsafe [1] 189/20 180/7 181/21 192/4 101/3 101/20 103/20 unattended [1] 173/4 13/6 17/23 84/6 untenable [1] 15/9 trained [13] 27/19 unaware [1] 86/6 untethered [1] 23/22 104/4 104/9 104/15 unequivocal [1] 35/8 49/9 75/10 76/2 105/3 105/7 105/10 uncertain [2] 50/11 10/22 until [13] 7/2 93/18 79/15 79/17 84/12 146/13 107/5 111/22 112/8 uneven [1] 26/11 100/4 119/15 120/2 94/19 103/4 166/21 uncertainty [1] 114/15 138/22 170/24 **unexpected [42]** 8/6 146/15 147/10 149/19 172/6 193/4 150/19 171/1 171/23 178/11 113/9 114/3 124/1 160/16 167/10 175/11 training [42] 21/18 186/12 187/1 187/4 unclear [1] 115/8 180/12 200/21 124/13 125/1 126/1 26/4 27/4 27/10 27/16 uncomfortable [5] 188/4 188/5 140/13 144/8 145/9 unusual [17] 7/21 35/2 47/15 73/6 73/8 13/5 83/9 87/24 102/1 145/10 145/16 145/19 7/25 32/6 33/4 33/5 **Trust's [1]** 138/7 74/17 74/19 74/20 102/1 trusted [1] 82/17 145/24 146/6 146/8 57/4 65/8 65/8 65/12 76/3 85/5 136/12 Trusts [27] 14/13 uncosted [1] 70/9 146/12 146/14 146/14 65/17 65/19 65/21 139/17 157/22 165/14 57/15 58/22 59/18 under [13] 12/19 147/3 149/23 152/8 69/11 71/11 81/20 169/6 175/14 181/8 27/2 29/7 64/11 66/7 67/15 84/10 86/1 99/7 152/12 155/14 156/25 153/3 171/4 181/11 181/11 181/15 66/25 122/14 134/7 103/2 103/3 103/7 159/2 159/3 161/12 up [121] 3/12 3/16 181/18 181/20 181/24 140/10 154/2 157/7 103/24 104/7 106/24 161/15 161/22 161/24 6/6 8/10 9/7 11/15 182/10 182/15 188/7 181/24 182/1 162/19 166/20 167/2 123/19 134/12 134/13 15/7 15/9 15/14 16/14 191/9 191/23 191/24 under-recognised [1] 138/23 139/24 139/24 167/4 167/22 168/22 18/15 18/20 19/19 192/2 192/12 192/17 20/17 22/9 26/14 176/25 177/1 177/24 66/25 173/5 173/7 176/14 192/18 193/8 193/9 178/1 178/8 184/3 under-reporting [1] 200/6 200/7 30/17 33/13 36/16 193/12 195/1 195/12 199/4 12/19 unexpectedly [10] 37/2 37/4 38/9 38/22 transcripts [1] 1/8 under-resourced [1] 124/5 126/25 146/23 39/1 39/9 40/7 44/6 Trusts' [1] 178/19 transfer [1] 143/17 64/11 149/4 152/25 155/24 48/18 49/18 50/10 try [4] 41/17 83/14 transgression [2] underappreciated [1] 152/5 182/6 163/7 165/21 171/2 50/19 52/24 53/10 83/18 84/7 trying [5] 25/19 69/16 57/24 198/20 54/1 54/3 54/6 56/25 transgressive [29] 79/21 82/13 180/3 underdeveloped [1] 57/18 57/22 58/25 unexplained [1] 7/13 5/20 5/21 7/25 8/6 Tuesday [1] 2/4 **unfamiliar [1]** 193/19 59/18 60/8 60/10 8/24 9/12 13/21 14/6 **unfolding [1]** 35/16 underestimated [2] 60/17 63/17 64/22 **turn [13]** 20/16 38/12 15/23 32/6 33/6 53/23 66/2 73/2 73/16 79/10 63/11 105/6 unfortunate [1] 58/8 65/16 69/9 69/17 63/2 68/6 70/19 70/21 undergraduate [1] 81/9 106/5 110/4 unfortunately [1] 73/19 80/20 82/22 71/13 81/4 81/15 180/8 110/12 136/19 161/9 27/25 84/7 84/17 84/21 81/17 82/5 83/11 underlying [1] 85/12 85/13 85/15 195/20 unfunded [1] 88/23 84/13 86/25 88/2 118/18 turned [2] 12/4 12/15 unhelpful [1] 34/24 85/19 85/21 86/8 86/9

U up... [59] 86/13 86/18 86/19 86/24 87/3 87/18 88/7 88/8 88/20 88/21 90/6 96/6 97/12 97/14 97/18 98/4 101/21 103/20 105/2 105/16 105/21 106/1 107/7 117/3 119/15 120/2 120/5 128/2 128/10 135/14 138/1 138/10 151/19 151/21 153/24 158/4 158/19 159/14 160/16 161/6 168/22 169/20 170/10 177/22 179/13 182/6 182/10 183/3 183/5 183/24 184/17 184/17 186/7 189/9 190/25 193/15 195/5 196/16 196/22 up I think [1] 97/18 update [6] 116/12 158/16 172/16 174/20 174/22 192/24 updated [5] 99/25 100/13 158/8 174/1 197/7 updates [1] 137/1 updating [3] 172/12 173/20 181/14 uphill [1] 121/21 uploaded [1] 200/13 upon [15] 23/17 62/22 100/7 100/15 100/16 100/17 121/7 128/19 141/22 145/24 150/18 151/1 166/2 190/2 195/12 upstream [1] 121/11 urge [1] 97/15 us [55] 2/12 2/21 12/21 14/20 15/22 22/8 28/12 30/5 38/21 46/11 55/11 55/13 55/14 55/18 95/25 110/8 112/22 113/3 118/10 119/24 120/15 123/24 124/20 132/16 137/11 140/20 144/5 145/2 145/22 147/19 149/18 152/2 155/2 157/2 157/18 169/25 171/18 175/6 177/18 179/18 180/22 182/18 182/19 183/1 185/19 186/21 188/9 189/13 190/23 191/8 192/17 193/15 197/25 199/8 199/18 use [15] 20/18 30/19 53/25 57/2 59/16 63/5 78/23 89/1 142/9

143/16 146/3 152/15 152/18 173/8 187/14 used [21] 6/3 10/15 17/16 21/16 30/11 53/13 55/18 58/3 58/15 61/21 84/21 84/22 88/14 97/5 97/12 137/20 172/22 172/23 173/10 183/19 194/7 useful [4] 19/11 30/13 36/9 74/22 user [1] 149/6 user - but [1] 149/6 uses [1] 58/17 using [9] 26/6 27/19 27/19 52/13 55/23 60/14 85/7 85/8 143/4 usually [5] 90/10 142/1 166/6 170/10 187/1

value [3] 75/3 169/7 190/17 valued [2] 24/10 75/11 values [1] 44/18 valuing [1] 77/19 variable [3] 27/9 49/24 73/12 variably [8] 49/1 49/2 49/25 57/19 85/16 103/1 106/13 106/16 variation [1] 105/5 variations [1] 124/23 varies [2] 122/13 125/8 variety [2] 86/14 87/10 various [4] 3/14 23/18 35/13 181/13 vary [2] 60/19 60/20 vast [1] 126/23 vastly [1] 165/12 Vaughan [3] 30/11 35/25 37/16 veneer [1] 102/3 Vermont [3] 55/11 55/16 57/20 version [11] 41/4 128/11 128/17 153/13 wanted [1] 114/18 160/8 160/13 160/22 167/19 167/25 175/22 ward [10] 6/20 13/6 176/13 versions [1] 175/21 versus [2] 68/22 83/7 very [236] Victoria [1] 157/10 videos [2] 115/18 115/20 view [16] 10/10 18/8

18/25 83/1 140/23

142/22 150/23 158/9

164/5 166/10 170/16 172/10 173/6 173/25 175/22 178/11 views [4] 73/5 131/13 7/16 9/14 9/22 9/24 132/8 190/8 violation [1] 10/23 violations [1] 5/23 virtually [1] 128/16 visibility [2] 179/16 181/3 vision [1] 20/11 visit [2] 174/9 198/13 Visiting [1] 112/12 visits [1] 199/7 vital [2] 63/9 198/14 vivid [1] 199/9 vividly [1] 67/2 voice [10] 3/13 9/3 9/8 10/19 36/20 36/23 37/4 43/14 45/18 97/18 volition [1] 107/22 volume [3] 32/3 65/1 88/8 voluntary [3] 59/18 59/20 139/25 vulnerabilities [1] 118/18 vulnerability [1] 189/21 vulnerable [4] 117/22 118/3 187/8 187/13 wait [1] 195/14 waiting [1] 175/12 Wales [12] 127/21 160/15 160/21 162/8 163/8 163/16 163/24 176/12 200/4 200/5 200/8 200/10 wall [1] 180/13 want [24] 5/9 11/6 24/12 28/11 36/7 52/17 56/14 56/24 91/22 94/10 107/16 107/21 123/22 170/3 173/15 184/8 184/9 192/24 193/23 196/16 197/25 198/2 198/2 199/11 wants [1] 41/7 15/2 15/6 22/17 25/11 43/22 49/5 73/4 186/7 wards [1] 12/8

warning [4] 33/10

60/15 60/18 61/3

warrant [2] 97/25

Warwick [2] 112/24

was [190] 4/25 6/7

98/1

192/11

6/21 6/22 6/22 6/23 6/24 7/7 7/10 7/14 10/2 14/16 14/18 14/21 15/6 15/7 15/8 17/9 17/15 17/16 17/18 17/18 17/20 27/8 27/8 27/23 28/16 29/5 30/8 30/11 30/14 30/15 36/10 38/1 38/4 38/20 51/9 51/18 51/19 51/23 59/15 60/16 65/12 65/13 65/19 68/23 82/7 83/12 84/16 85/25 86/2 86/5 86/10 86/10 86/11 86/11 87/2 88/23 93/22 96/20 99/4 99/6 99/20 99/24 100/1 100/2 100/5 100/13 102/19 102/20 we're [56] 23/19 103/11 103/11 103/19 23/19 52/23 54/19 103/19 103/19 104/21 104/23 105/6 105/8 105/9 105/13 107/2 107/2 107/4 107/8 107/8 108/5 108/15 114/1 114/2 114/5 114/9 114/9 115/6 115/7 116/4 121/20 121/21 125/7 127/5 127/13 127/14 128/14 128/15 128/16 135/18 135/18 135/18 135/20 136/4 138/8 141/25 142/6 145/17 145/19 145/24 149/14 149/15 152/3 152/8 152/9 152/12 152/13 152/15 152/23 152/24 153/3 156/6 156/9 156/14 159/20 159/21 160/3 160/4 160/5 160/9 160/17 160/17 161/1 164/20 164/23 165/1 165/1 165/3 165/5 165/8 165/11 165/13 165/13 165/22 166/2 166/3 166/3 166/17 166/19 167/2 168/9 168/9 169/1 169/6 171/19 172/4 172/14 178/25 180/8 180/12 180/12 180/13 182/1 183/4 185/17 187/16 welfare [6] 132/19 189/8 193/16 196/2 133/11 134/21 135/1 196/18 198/15 199/2 141/1 155/5 199/3 199/3 200/9 well [93] 8/24 11/9 wasn't [11] 6/24 7/1 12/8 12/12 16/10 7/2 28/16 96/19 99/17 22/10 22/25 23/4 24/2 100/3 108/7 149/13 24/6 24/22 25/22 26/3 28/25 33/7 40/9 45/13 160/6 165/25 waved [1] 108/15 47/25 49/1 49/2 49/25

6/7 6/9 6/11 6/18 6/19 way [47] 9/3 9/12 16/13 20/24 22/13 22/16 23/21 26/2 26/13 27/19 29/21 30/12 30/21 30/23 31/14 32/13 32/15 33/25 36/15 36/15 36/19 37/1 37/5 37/18 41/16 48/2 59/25 60/23 63/5 65/3 68/5 79/23 80/1 91/5 91/6 91/21 96/17 101/1 102/12 106/5 119/7 120/20 132/19 137/13 137/18 155/3 162/17 ways [14] 16/4 22/14 22/21 25/17 31/7 41/24 52/24 94/7 94/20 95/5 96/14 104/3 108/12 137/8 we [400] 55/2 62/15 63/15 75/21 110/22 110/23 116/12 116/21 117/5 117/8 118/7 118/8 120/13 120/25 122/3 123/15 123/19 123/22 124/9 125/21 127/16 127/17 127/18 128/21 128/25 129/7 134/6 139/6 140/8 144/6 145/7 145/8 145/10 150/17 150/20 156/12 158/2 158/11 158/16 159/15 161/7 167/16 170/7 173/19 180/5 182/5 182/6 182/7 182/24 184/18 188/19 189/16 we've [4] 105/1 106/3 151/11 175/5 weaknesses [1] 72/7 wearing [2] 187/15 187/21 website [3] 1/9 3/25 200/14 week [4] 2/5 64/12 196/9 196/9 weekly [1] 116/12 weeks [1] 197/3 weight [1] 87/16 welcomed [1] 86/7 welcomes [1] 41/7

166/21 170/1 170/13 135/2 136/1 142/7 145/20 146/21 148/16 whole [10] 15/19 W 171/15 171/17 171/20 142/8 143/3 145/8 149/18 151/7 152/13 16/22 61/10 67/2 well... [72] 51/1 58/24 171/22 175/19 180/3 145/19 146/5 146/12 152/21 153/12 154/8 69/19 113/12 119/6 62/19 64/13 64/14 157/3 157/9 158/8 183/3 185/16 198/17 148/17 148/19 149/4 130/13 145/11 176/6 72/1 74/16 79/3 79/5 weren't [5] 29/17 152/15 154/9 158/19 160/6 168/3 168/5 wholehearted [1] 79/6 80/13 84/12 84/21 101/15 108/10 163/6 164/13 171/15 175/16 180/15 180/16 85/18 87/12 89/18 89/20 128/12 174/10 177/4 184/14 182/3 182/4 182/13 whom [1] 159/7 96/9 98/25 99/13 185/11 192/23 192/23 182/25 184/1 185/4 West [1] 199/8 whose [7] 17/20 99/24 102/3 102/11 185/15 188/10 190/13 West Midlands [1] 196/20 198/14 198/24 18/21 18/21 69/7 103/2 105/5 113/16 199/2 199/2 191/18 192/19 196/13 172/16 176/10 196/19 199/8 114/10 114/11 118/5 whereabouts [1] what [246] 198/21 why [25] 26/5 34/11 119/4 120/5 120/20 what's [18] 3/5 5/11 198/8 48/22 56/12 62/22 whichever [1] 166/5 121/5 121/7 122/25 9/13 9/17 20/19 31/7 while [3] 26/20 58/3 whereas [4] 106/6 79/22 86/14 87/18 123/7 125/2 126/7 34/4 44/11 46/3 50/23 151/17 193/6 199/7 121/1 91/7 92/25 96/19 132/2 133/23 138/21 81/2 81/6 82/18 89/15 wherever [1] 163/17 **whilst [3]** 146/5 104/11 107/15 107/16 139/5 143/21 143/23 100/11 120/15 174/19 whether [38] 7/15 181/14 192/1 107/20 118/17 150/21 144/2 148/1 157/21 18/17 19/16 19/17 156/23 160/6 164/5 184/1 whistleblower [1] 157/24 160/12 160/18 whatever [2] 172/23 32/16 32/16 40/18 90/17 178/13 184/5 187/9 160/21 164/7 166/2 189/2 42/11 42/18 57/3 whistleblowing [6] 194/2 194/6 169/8 170/1 170/4 when [101] 2/7 8/8 60/13 64/7 70/25 72/9 80/21 84/20 89/12 wide [1] 66/15 173/4 176/4 179/6 73/10 101/7 118/18 89/24 95/17 135/13 9/1 9/11 9/19 9/22 widely [1] 61/21 180/14 183/3 183/11 10/15 10/22 10/25 124/25 125/5 127/6 who [135] 1/12 3/6 wider [6] 28/7 48/14 183/23 184/17 186/11 11/12 13/20 14/4 139/1 141/3 145/24 5/15 6/21 6/22 7/4 7/6 66/12 124/20 141/19 186/25 187/19 188/25 14/14 15/1 15/4 15/20 146/13 147/15 147/21 9/22 10/11 15/2 16/1 153/6 191/16 191/19 193/4 15/20 15/23 16/8 19/9 148/14 150/19 150/22 17/9 17/23 19/21 will [133] 1/5 1/10 2/3 198/9 199/1 199/16 160/21 160/21 161/23 21/24 24/20 26/18 23/19 25/23 27/15 2/5 7/15 12/17 12/17 well-equipped [2] 28/12 33/20 34/18 176/21 186/17 189/2 27/16 33/16 48/1 49/1 13/23 14/3 25/25 26/1 121/5 121/7 34/19 35/1 35/1 35/8 190/2 190/14 196/11 49/8 52/11 53/3 53/6 26/2 26/4 26/5 26/7 well-established [1] 36/1 36/6 37/9 37/10 which [150] 2/3 3/1 54/20 61/24 61/25 26/13 26/21 26/24 166/2 38/9 39/13 39/16 3/22 4/22 5/14 5/17 62/10 62/12 62/15 27/11 28/2 30/22 31/2 well-known [1] 98/25 64/4 68/18 69/6 69/16 41/11 41/14 60/16 6/2 8/10 8/22 9/14 32/9 32/18 33/9 34/9 well-managed [1] 65/20 66/22 68/11 10/5 11/25 12/6 12/9 69/19 70/9 74/1 77/1 34/14 35/10 36/21 191/16 79/15 79/16 81/3 82/7 68/21 69/2 70/11 15/16 20/6 21/17 39/1 40/15 41/3 43/2 wellbeing [1] 74/8 70/15 71/10 72/21 21/21 23/9 23/20 84/6 86/2 86/11 87/7 45/1 45/17 47/18 Welsh [3] 163/24 23/21 23/22 25/7 28/1 74/16 78/3 81/4 83/14 88/14 88/14 88/15 48/18 49/3 49/5 55/3 176/25 177/11 84/13 90/15 94/16 28/4 30/8 30/10 32/1 89/4 89/11 89/18 57/5 59/11 61/22 62/2 Welsh/English [1] 89/20 90/24 90/25 94/18 95/9 97/13 32/22 33/8 33/23 35/4 62/3 62/11 64/9 73/24 177/11 100/9 102/3 103/13 35/10 37/8 38/1 45/19 91/1 91/12 91/18 75/7 75/9 77/15 79/6 went [5] 9/25 10/1 49/3 49/23 50/8 50/14 112/25 128/21 138/3 92/15 92/22 93/4 79/25 82/23 84/24 51/14 51/16 103/3 144/20 146/23 148/10 51/15 54/11 57/11 93/12 94/16 95/8 90/11 109/6 109/7 were [87] 1/25 7/4 150/24 151/20 152/17 57/12 59/15 59/21 95/22 99/8 99/15 110/24 110/25 111/1 11/9 14/6 14/22 15/1 152/20 155/24 157/12 60/15 61/23 65/6 66/3 104/7 105/11 106/24 111/2 111/5 111/7 15/2 19/9 19/11 28/12 157/19 157/24 161/20 68/18 70/20 71/5 72/8 114/24 116/16 117/21 113/24 114/13 114/24 28/14 29/16 29/18 163/15 164/20 165/3 74/12 74/20 75/20 119/13 119/14 119/17 117/6 117/25 119/8 30/16 34/21 34/22 165/12 165/13 165/18 77/17 78/24 81/5 120/25 121/22 122/14 120/13 121/2 122/21 51/11 51/13 51/21 166/4 166/25 171/1 81/19 84/2 84/7 86/23 122/19 123/3 124/5 124/6 127/13 127/14 58/7 58/10 58/11 125/10 126/3 126/4 171/24 174/13 174/16 87/2 87/13 87/15 127/19 127/21 127/22 60/16 65/10 65/14 175/4 175/13 177/25 89/14 90/15 91/2 126/8 126/15 126/17 128/1 128/3 128/7 65/14 65/16 65/24 178/8 178/25 180/8 93/21 94/16 94/17 126/24 127/3 127/5 129/1 132/15 133/9 66/18 68/21 77/5 183/3 192/4 193/25 94/24 94/25 95/18 129/19 130/21 136/7 133/18 135/2 136/9 77/20 82/7 85/18 86/4 193/25 198/15 198/22 95/20 95/21 95/25 137/4 137/9 138/4 140/10 144/2 144/23 86/6 88/8 89/18 90/15 where [70] 10/7 96/2 96/4 97/15 99/5 138/14 138/19 139/2 145/4 145/14 147/12 90/18 92/3 94/14 10/21 11/8 13/8 16/2 99/6 99/21 100/13 139/16 142/11 148/1 148/23 149/21 154/2 96/20 96/21 99/15 17/7 17/8 19/7 25/2 101/9 110/5 111/2 150/2 150/3 156/10 159/11 159/16 160/12 101/7 101/24 103/4 165/14 165/20 165/20 27/1 27/11 27/18 111/6 111/18 113/16 160/13 161/20 162/17 103/5 103/14 104/3 27/22 28/7 34/18 114/1 114/15 117/6 166/10 168/21 171/1 162/23 163/18 164/1 104/6 104/9 105/8 36/18 37/20 37/21 118/9 119/1 119/2 172/5 173/10 174/7 164/7 167/10 169/5 111/15 112/6 112/11 174/8 174/25 175/6 37/22 41/5 41/8 46/18 124/10 128/19 129/8 169/10 169/11 169/14 112/23 114/6 114/8 49/19 49/21 50/22 130/12 130/13 131/4 178/16 179/1 179/22 169/15 173/21 175/9 115/22 118/19 118/19 51/12 54/6 58/23 131/25 132/24 133/9 180/10 180/18 181/17 175/13 177/15 182/6 118/20 121/14 128/11 133/16 134/22 135/13 182/9 183/17 184/11 58/24 60/1 63/21 184/15 186/20 187/1 128/20 145/4 152/21 65/20 76/8 79/12 89/5 136/20 143/3 144/4 184/19 193/19 194/6 191/21 194/11 194/14 156/10 156/11 159/17 92/9 102/13 102/22 144/5 144/13 144/19 195/13 196/3 197/9 194/19 195/15 197/2 159/23 160/7 166/16 103/16 127/2 130/9 145/3 145/9 145/17 198/19 197/5 197/25 199/15

will... [3] 199/18 200/13 200/18 willing [1] 101/21 willingness [2] 39/12 82/22 wish [1] 157/16 wishes [1] 130/15 withdrawing [1] 174/1 withhold [1] 16/5 within [35] 4/8 4/9 17/22 18/13 22/23 28/4 36/1 58/21 101/22 104/11 122/17 125/25 129/13 131/21 132/9 133/4 134/13 136/4 138/6 139/5 139/20 161/8 168/21 168/23 171/17 172/2 177/22 179/4 179/11 179/17 182/22 190/10 191/15 196/24 198/12 without [9] 21/15 38/9 50/20 84/15 91/23 92/7 101/19 150/9 199/2 witness [18] 2/9 109/13 109/15 110/2 110/2 110/5 110/13 110/22 111/7 112/23 114/19 135/17 148/7 153/19 159/13 164/19 177/16 182/22 witnessed [1] 91/1 witnesses [2] 1/22 66/9 witnessing [1] 10/11 woeful [1] 172/22 woefully [1] 158/15 Wolverhampton [2] 143/11 143/14 women [1] 65/14 won't [5] 112/20 131/21 184/15 196/5 197/2 wonder [4] 109/14 140/19 153/24 167/7 wood [1] 75/17 **Woods [14]** 1/18 2/10 2/14 2/18 4/6 55/2 55/8 78/17 80/8 80/17 109/1 135/17 188/18 201/2 word [2] 137/20 172/22 wording [2] 137/11 158/22 words [6] 25/13 91/14 92/4 129/19 151/12 162/13 work [68] 2/20 2/22 3/9 16/6 20/15 23/25

W

24/1 24/2 24/4 24/5 27/5 28/23 32/1 45/25 51/12 58/11 59/13 60/10 61/5 61/13 61/14 63/16 64/3 64/17 71/6 72/13 72/16 72/21 73/5 73/13 74/7 74/12 76/5 76/6 79/16 79/24 80/7 86/17 88/7 89/9 91/17 108/8 113/8 113/10 113/13 115/6 115/8 115/10 116/24 117/3 136/8 137/4 148/5 155/3 162/17 165/4 169/12 173/11 175/7 175/9 175/11 181/21 186/24 188/3 189/15 189/22 191/19 193/12 workable [1] 73/3 worked [3] 73/14 86/15 163/24 worker [5] 184/1 184/5 195/4 197/6 197/14 worker's [1] 184/6 workers [3] 129/14 183/17 196/22 workforce [6] 73/25 74/2 74/3 74/9 74/17 74/25 working [46] 20/3 45/24 47/2 47/3 51/13 53/5 56/4 72/20 72/23 72/24 72/25 73/1 82/7 89/15 115/4 128/1 128/8 133/21 135/20 139/15 142/25 143/18 145/11 147/10 151/12 152/1 153/13 156/8 156/9 157/2 157/3 160/20 162/2 165/2 165/23 167/19 169/4 175/7 182/8 186/19 187/6 188/11 188/25 189/7 191/18 197/22 workload [2] 27/3 37/23 workloads [1] 24/4 workplace [4] 23/9 63/8 73/20 73/23 works [6] 19/6 70/25 73/17 77/1 137/9 149/12 world [1] 122/3 worried [3] 66/1 170/1 171/5 worry [1] 71/2 worth [1] 41/25 would [141] 4/12 4/13 5/3 5/7 8/12

31/4 40/9 44/9 44/14 45/11 48/19 52/1 56/22 56/23 58/13 59/21 62/21 63/10 64/2 64/24 65/20 65/22 65/25 67/10 67/11 69/1 69/2 70/2 70/18 70/24 71/2 71/6 175/9 175/11 71/7 74/1 76/22 77/5 77/10 78/8 78/9 78/15 27/23 29/15 29/20 80/23 81/2 81/11 81/14 82/16 89/5 89/8 89/9 90/22 91/3 91/19 92/19 95/17 96/10 96/18 96/23 96/24 97/6 97/15 97/17 99/13 99/16 99/22 99/25 100/7 100/24 101/5 102/5 102/5 104/5 104/7 104/10 106/8 107/16 107/22 110/4 121/15 126/19 127/4 130/12 132/1 132/12 133/4 135/20 137/10 138/5 138/6 138/9 152/4 152/22 154/16 156/4 156/16 156/20 160/14 160/22 162/24 163/23 164/2 167/3 167/7 170/13 170/15 170/19 171/6 178/18 178/20 180/24 182/16 184/17 185/4 185/20 186/4 186/5 186/8 186/13 186/16 187/15 187/17 188/24 189/25 190/9 191/3 196/10 199/8 wouldn't [9] 27/21 71/6 86/7 102/24 126/12 158/23 186/6 186/22 191/5 wriggle [1] 6/8 writ [1] 85/6 write [4] 115/17 157/20 157/22 194/7 writing [2] 157/25 190/23 written [8] 116/5 158/9 165/14 172/14 173/6 173/9 194/2 196/25 wrong [15] 10/18 12/2 17/19 25/21 34/22 57/8 69/6 69/17 83/2 87/14 88/2 172/21

12/14 15/8 19/13

19/18 19/21 19/24

year [21] 31/25 106/4 115/7 115/9 116/1 22/4 26/11 28/20 29/5

116/10 120/15 122/25 123/4 124/17 124/18 151/5 153/13 153/15 158/25 159/6 159/8 173/10 181/1 181/2 196/12 year's [3] 142/25 years [22] 4/24 15/10 30/2 30/2 51/9 51/16 55/20 58/5 106/13 106/17 107/3 107/4 128/13 165/11 180/3 181/12 183/4 183/7 194/17 yes [225] **yesterday [1]** 1/10 yet [8] 41/14 41/19 66/3 73/14 106/12 117/3 179/13 180/3 you [663] you know [2] 54/17 105/23 you're [52] 5/6 24/7

24/8 24/10 31/16 34/7 35/2 43/23 44/17 46/22 46/24 47/5 48/1 48/3 52/25 53/3 63/6 165/17 165/24 166/14 80/4 80/19 84/1 89/15 89/24 90/5 93/5 94/5 96/25 104/18 108/11 172/18 176/11 177/10 125/14 129/5 131/17 141/7 151/14 151/19 157/24 157/25 167/1 168/23 169/19 174/5 174/13 174/16 175/3 177/9 178/22 179/23 181/20 187/3 187/5 188/25 190/14 196/24 you've [15] 8/2 13/8 73/8 88/2 105/2 110/1 123/11 144/20 171/24 173/9 178/12 195/3 195/5 197/10 197/11 young [1] 119/15 your [115] 2/13 2/19 2/19 2/20 4/15 7/9 7/16 10/10 10/17 16/16 18/8 18/24 21/3 22/5 30/4 35/7 35/20 38/7 40/22 55/9 56/25 61/18 82/1 82/11 84/3 85/2 86/17 87/6 93/24 98/21 104/11 104/15 104/16 109/20 109/25 110/1 110/9 110/18 110/21 111/3 111/7 100/18 100/20 120/23 111/13 112/11 112/21 112/23 112/25 113/8 113/25 114/1 114/19 115/10 117/6 118/1 120/22 123/10 124/19 124/20 128/8 134/3

137/21 140/19 142/17 142/22 144/21 148/7 148/17 149/10 152/24 153/19 153/23 159/13 159/22 160/3 164/2 164/5 164/17 164/18 164/19 165/1 165/5 166/2 166/10 169/22 170/9 172/9 173/4 173/25 174/5 174/6 175/22 177/16 177/18 179/18 181/22 182/22 183/1 183/2 185/3 185/25 186/1 186/5 187/7 187/7 187/12 187/20 188/14 188/24 189/16 190/4 190/8 190/10 191/20 191/21 193/12 199/21 yourself [2] 90/7 117/11