

DARREN THORNE: Were you aware that the pediatricians perceived that they were threatened by Tony Chambers?

ANDREW HIGGINS: Yes, I am.

DARREN THORNE: I think they found it was a difficult position because they wanted to but.

ANDREW HIGGINS: Well, why would they? I mean, I understand that, you know, in those circumstances, they clearly had a big problem because, you know, if you if you feel threatened by if you feel threatened by the chief executive, if at best you think that the medical director is in denial or colluding in this indiscretion, then yeah, I can you've got a real problem as to how you wind your way around that. And it is kind of interesting because, I mean, what subscribes the freedom speak up thing. It was always interesting that the body, the most interesting, most interesting body of potential speakers were obviously the clinicians. But I don't think that they ever viewed that as they do now. I don't remember the freedom to speak up kind of route as a potential to raise concerns. I mean, either because, you know, people wouldn't understand what they were saying or, you know, nothing would happen. But they were almost the least likely to bring this to float, which I just found curious.

KAY BOYLE: And were you at that meeting where Ian presented the outcome of the college report, the grievance report, because it was an extra ordinary meeting ?.... and also that was when Lucy statement was read out and the doctors were there.

ANDREW HIGGINS: No, I wasn't. When was that ?

KAY BOYLE: 26<sup>TH</sup> of January 2017

ANDREW HIGGINS: I would have been away, I'm a migrant bird in the winter. So quite often in January. I'm not around right now, but the times when I wasn't raised is the reason I wasn't there, because I certainly don't recollect the recollection of Lucy statement that out.

KAY BOYLE: So was anything fed back to you from that meeting at all that you can remember ?

ANDREW HIGGINS: Not specifically. You know, I mean, obviously I did go to board meetings around these things, but I don't remember a sort of a specific kind of slant that was put on it.

DARREN THORNE: I do appreciate you weren't there. Did you, do you now have a view about that actually happening. Is quite unusual thing to happen.

ANDREW HIGGINS: Sorry. What happening ?

DARREN THORNE: An impact statement from someone who's had a grievance read out at a private board meeting.

ANDREW HIGGINS: I think that certainly initially the kind of view was that sorry I'm just struggling with how to put this really because through the QSPEC group I have a lot of discussions with Alison Kelly. And that would include, you know, informal things and all the

rest of it. And a lot of the things that there was apparent and I think this is probably apparent in the initial meetings, was that it was kind of viewed as pretty inconceivable that any individual could have done this and that. I know the nurse, the initial reaction of nursing group was to kind of draw or draw in the ranks to support. And that maybe, you know, set the tone as to how some of this got reported. But perhaps the level of which that got reported, because the initial feeling was that if you sort of think, well, how can this possibly be the case, then you want to treat the individual fairly. And recognizing that if this were an unfounded accusation, then, you know, something that could absolutely destroy one person's life. If you do that, then you know, you don't want to do that unthinkingly. So the fact that the impact you know, there was a meeting at which the impact statement got read out in that context, I don't find sort of massively shocking. Just surprising really, why do you find it different ?

DARREN THORNE: It's just it's just unusual. It's just we've not seen before. So I don't have a view on whether it was right or wrong.

KAY BOYLE: Next one for me is, were you involved in anyway, were you at that meeting where the QC fed back his views after he'd met with the consultant?

ANDREW HIGGINS: Yes.

KAY BOYLE: Can you remember that meeting?

ANDREW HIGGINS: Yeah. Yeah, I can. I mean, I think my recollection of that is that again. It was. I, what I carry around on that is that it was a report of case not proven, one way or the other, that, you know, that the consequences of that being the case and a lot of discussion about reporting to the police or not, when to do it. And what the you know, what the basis of that would be, the headlines.

DARREN THORNE: Can I ask you a question, Stephen Cross ?

ANDREW HIGGINS: Yes.

DARREN THORNE: How much influence did he have and with whom ?

ANDREW HIGGINS: Stephen acted as the kind of for obvious reasons is the kind of liaison sort of informal. Not an informal role, but, you know, potentially using some of his contacts to perhaps get the best view we could as to where the police were, were with everything or to seek informal views using those contacts. That is both his role in this. I mean, to be frank, in terms of internal stuff, for instance, only dealing with the consultants or that kind of thing. I mean, clearly, it's sort of, you know, the legal person on the board and potentially a role around that. But I never had any particular view or saw indications that he was really, you know, influencing things in that direction.

DARREN THORNE: Okay. We've been given accounts that he was quite animated in his version of events of what would happen if anyone went to the police.

ANDREW HIGGINS: I just going to make the observation that Stephen was quite humorous but I can't remember animated.

DARREN THORNE: But what we don't have is the colour around that. You can read emails and you can read minutes, but you don't get a sense of the mood and the tone and actually how concerned people really were.

ANDREW HIGGINS: Yeah, I think I mean, the thing I would kind of like to emphasize, it's not this is not defensive, but that, you know, at no time in any of this was there, and certainly, you know, amongst the board as a whole, the non-execs we kind of chatted about this informally, but at no time was there any desire to suppress it. I mean, I think you read some things that suggest that certainly the consultants clearly seem to think that there was, but had other things been presented in a clear away, fuller way. Perhaps a more supportive way than, you know, it wouldn't have necessarily ended up any differently, but it might have got there in a different way. I mean, one observation that would make sense. I kept missing meetings at which the consultants turned up. I can't remember when this was what I think this must be in Susan's time when Ravi and John Gibbs came along. I think we all felt that, and in fairness, John Gibbs in particular, it was a very kind of objective and, you know, kind of reasoned, and reasonable exposition and description and explanation of where our consultants were coming from what they had done, a timeline. And I think a lot of us came out of that for, you know, blimey if we'd had the opportunity to have a conversation like this. But from you know. But, you know, they turned up at different times when Tony and Ian were there. Maybe the fact is that they were actually either kind of somehow suppressed from expressing in those terms. But, you know, there was a lot of kind of shocking stuff and an awful lot of sympathy for where the consultants from. And it's just it is a massive, massive shame that that kind of meeting of minds or kind of that emotional link that gives a hell of a sight earlier in the whole process for everyone.

DARREN THORNE: Definitely. That's very insightful. Thank you.

KAY BOYLE: Thank you. Thank you for your time.

ANDREW HIGGINS: You know, it's a pleasure. It's a pleasure. Well, I wish you well. I shall await with interest to see what you get to.

DARREN THORNE: Thank you. Yeah. It's going to be an interesting read.

ANDREW HIGGINS: OK. Bye bye.

DARREN THORNE: Ok cheers thank you.

KAY BOYLE: Thank you.