

**In the Matter of the Commissions of Inquiry Act 1888
and
In the Matter of an Inquiry into the retirement of the former Commissioner of Police
convened by a Commission issued by HM Government of Gibraltar on the 4th February 2022
in Legal Notice No 34 of 2022 (“the Inquiry”)**

Gibraltar Garrison Library
2 Library Ramp
Gibraltar
Tuesday 20 September 2022

Before

**SIR CHARLES PETER LAWFORD OPENSHAW, DL
Commissioner of the Inquiry**

Maurice Turnock: Secretary to the Inquiry

**Julian Santos: Counsel to the Inquiry, 5RB Chambers
Hope Williams: Junior Counsel to the Inquiry, 5RB Chambers**

**Stephen Catania: Solicitor to the Inquiry, Attias & Levy
Sunil Chandiramani: Solicitor to the Inquiry, Attias & Levy
Jemma-Louise Emmerson: Solicitor to the Inquiry, Attias & Levy**

Lawyers representing Mr Ian McGrail, Former Commissioner of Police:

**Adam Wagner, Doughty Street Chambers
Charles Gomez, Charles A. Gomez & Co, Gibraltar
Daniel Benyunes, Charles A. Gomez & Co, Gibraltar**

**Lawyers representing The Hon. Fabian Picardo KC MP, Chief Minister,
Nicholas Pyle OBE, Deputy Governor of Gibraltar, and
Michael Llamas CMG KC, Attorney General for Gibraltar:**

**Sir Peter Caruana KC, Sir Peter Caruana & Co
Chris Allan, Sir Peter Caruana & Co
Philip Dumas, Sir Peter Caruana & Co**

Lawyers representing Dr Joseph Britto, Head of the Gibraltar Police Authority:

**James Neish KC, TSN
Shane Danino, TSN**

Lawyers representing current members of Gibraltar Police:

**Nicholas Cruz, Cruz Law
Kristine Reina, Cruz Law**

**PROCEEDINGS
DAY 1**

Transcript of Epiq Europe Limited
Lower Ground, 20 Fumival Street, London, EC4A 1JS
Tel No: 020 7404 1400
Email: casemanagers@epiqglobal.com
(Official Shorthand Writers to the Court)

<p>1 2 (Tuesday 20 September, 2022) 3 (10.37am) 4 THE COMMISSIONER: This is the second 5 preliminary hearing of the Inquiry into the 6 Retirement of the Former Commissioner of 7 Police, Mr McGrail. At the first hearing in 8 June, I thanked and I thank again the team 9 here at the Garrison Library for setting up 10 these arrangements. As you can see, we have 11 slightly re-arranged the seating so as to give 12 the same position to all counsel, which I 13 think and hope is a much better arrangement. 14 We provided better microphones - actually 15 rather too good microphones, it seems to me 16 - speakers and monitors so that I hope 17 everyone can now properly hear the 18 proceedings. If anyone wants to discuss 19 these arrangements afterwards with a view to 20 making improvements, then they are very 21 welcome to do so with the secretary. My 22 thanks may have been a little premature. At 23 the first preliminary hearing I set out some 24 guidelines for those attending the hearings. 25 These apply with equal force today and I</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 sufficient time for counsel to make their 2 submissions so I will be brief. I introduced 3 myself at the first hearing and counsel then 4 present introduced themselves. We need not, 5 as it seems to me, do so again. Mr Cruz, I 6 think, is present here for the Royal Gibraltar 7 Police but as I understand it, possibly 8 wrongly, here just as a watching brief today. 9 MR CRUZ: Indeed, sir. I am here on behalf 10 of the RGP and those officers that are serving 11 there, which have been asked for witness 12 statements, but very much I am a watching 13 brief. 14 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. Well, if 15 you want to make any contribution today, by 16 all means do so. 17 MR CRUZ: Thank you, sir. 18 THE COMMISSIONER: I will briefly 19 outline the agenda for today after these short 20 opening remarks. Item 2 is an update by 21 counsel to the Inquiry, Mr Santos, on the 22 work done since the first preliminary hearing. 23 Item 3 provides for counsel for the core 24 participants to give short statements of their 25 factual allegations. Since Gibraltar does not</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>
<p>1 repeat them now for anyone who was not in 2 attendance. This is a Public Inquiry open to 3 all which, subject to the availability of space, 4 anyone may attend. The proceedings may be 5 fully reported unless for good and sufficient 6 reason I direct otherwise. The press are free 7 to send contemporaneous reports from the 8 Inquiry electronically, for example by way of 9 Tweets or texts provided it is done without 10 causing distraction or interference. 11 Otherwise, I would ask that during the 12 hearing mobile phones are switched off or at 13 least placed on silent. The taking of 14 photographs, whether by still or moving 15 images or the making of sound recordings is 16 not permitted and might possibly amount to a 17 criminal offence. Any device so used may be 18 subject to seizure. The proceedings are being 19 recorded. Transcripts of the day's business 20 will be provided within a day or two and 21 perhaps earlier. These transcripts will be 22 uploaded on to the Inquiry website. The 23 agenda for this hearing has been uploaded on 24 to the Inquiry's website and circulated in 25 advance to the parties. I am anxious to allow</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 have an equivalent of the United Kingdom's 2 Inquiry Rules, we must make our own rules 3 and at item 4 I hope to finalise the policy and 4 protocol documents, draft versions of which 5 are available in the public bundle on the 6 Inquiry website. They set out the processes 7 and procedures which the Inquiry will follow 8 on such matters as discovery, open justice 9 and the protection of vulnerable witnesses. 10 Item 5 sets out the draft list of issues on the 11 topics which the Inquiry will investigate. 12 This will focus our investigation. It will 13 assist the Inquiry team to gather together all 14 the relevant information, documents and 15 evidence and it will allow us to identify the 16 vital witnesses who need to give evidence in 17 person and will assist in the formulation of 18 opening statements, the questioning of 19 witnesses and, in due course, in the 20 preparation of closing statements as well. 21 The list of issues can be and may well be 22 altered in the course of the Inquiry in the 23 light of developments as we proceed. Item 6 24 allows for an overview of the public notice 25 procedure, which I think may be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

<p>1 uncontroversial. Counsel to the Inquiry, Mr 2 Santos, will provide an update on these 3 various topics but I am personally anxious to 4 make clear that a great deal of work has been 5 done on these documents since the last 6 hearing by the Inquiry team who have been 7 greatly assisted by submissions of counsel 8 for the core participants to whom I am very 9 grateful. I am hopeful that we can make 10 further progress today. If necessary, I will, in 11 due course, perhaps later today or later give a 12 reserved and reasoned judgment on any 13 matters that requires my determination. At 14 item 7 we will discuss a proposed timetable 15 for the Inquiry to move forward and I may 16 after that be prepared to deal with anything 17 else that arises which needs to be done today. 18 I am sorry that my view of you is obscured. I 19 will sort that out before the next hearing. I 20 expect we will be able to manage today. 21 Okay, yes, Mr Santos? 22 MR SANTOS: Thank you, sir. First of all, I 23 would like to apologise to everyone for the 24 late start today, but the time was taken for us 25 to resolve issues between counsel and it has</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 preliminary hearing. Having reconsidered 2 the agenda, I believe that it would make 3 sense to deal also with items 6 and 7 of the 4 agenda at this stage; those are the public 5 notice procedure and the proposed timetable. 6 So, I must apologise, first of all, for the 7 length of this introduction but I think it's 8 crucial to reassure the core participants, the 9 witnesses and more importantly, the public as 10 to the work we have undertaken as well as 11 how we intend to proceed towards the final 12 hearing in March. The full list of topics 13 which I intend to address is as follows: first, 14 the evidence-gathering process; secondly, the 15 policy documents; thirdly, the list of issues; 16 fourth the Inquiry bundle; fifth, the public 17 notice procedure; sixth, the disclosure 18 process and finally the timetable through to 19 the March 2023 final hearing. At this point I 20 must express my sincere gratitude to you, sir, 21 and to the whole Inquiry team for their 22 tireless work over the past few months in, at 23 the same time as having sought evidence 24 from 32 parties by the end of this week, 25 getting us to the position we find ourselves in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>
<p>1 proved fruitful, so thank you, everyone, for 2 your patience in waiting for us to commence. 3 I should at this stage remind everyone of the 4 participants' representation. For Mr McGrail 5 we have Mr Adam Wagner instructed by 6 Charles Gomez and Daniel Benyunes here 7 today. For the Chief Minister, the Attorney 8 General and the former Deputy Governor, 9 whom I refer to collectively as the 10 "Government Parties", we have Sir Peter 11 Caruana, KC, and Christopher Allan. For the 12 Gibraltar Police Authority we have James 13 Neish, KC, and Shane Danino, and finally, 14 we are also joined today by Mr Nick Cruz 15 and Ms Kristine Reina, who act, I am told, 16 for the individual current serving RGP 17 witnesses and the RGP itself. The next item 18 on the agenda, which can be found at tab 1 of 19 the public bundle, is an update by me on the 20 progress of the Inquiry since the first 21 preliminary hearing, as well as the 22 outstanding areas of work that await us. 23 What I am going to do is update the core 24 participants and the media and the public as 25 to the work we have been doing since our last</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 where we should have a raft of policies 2 finalised and a provisional list of issues. 3 Those documents are crucial to proceeding 4 with the next stages of the Inquiry and it has 5 taken a summer of non-stop work to get to 6 where we are now. Solicitor to the Inquiry, 7 Mr Catania's team, at Attias & Levy have 8 also liaised with Epiq in organising the 9 electronic bundle system and getting that up 10 and running as well as organising for the 11 monitors in court today, which will hopefully 12 permit the public to follow matters more 13 closely. I am pleased to say that we have met 14 all the deadlines that we set for ourselves at 15 the first preliminary hearing without any 16 extensions of time and that we continue to 17 work towards a final hearing in March of 18 next year. So, turning to the first item that I 19 named, the evidence-gathering process, first 20 of all I will deal with the collection of that 21 evidence. This is probably the lengthiest part 22 of the Inquiry's work where we approach 23 potential witnesses for their accounts and any 24 relevant evidence and by the time of the first 25 preliminary hearing we had sent out requests</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

<p>1 to all of the core participants, including the 2 Attorney General, to provide witness 3 statements and all relevant documents to us. 4 We received witness statements from all core 5 participants prior to the first preliminary 6 hearing, including Mr McGrail's statement 7 on 20 June shortly beforehand. Our initial 8 request sought provision by the core 9 participants of all documents relevant to the 10 terms of reference, and relevant documents 11 are now defined in the draft documents 12 protocol as those which having regard to the 13 Inquiry's terms of reference, it is likely that 14 the Inquiry Panel would, if aware of their 15 existence, wish to be provided with. As part 16 of those requests to the core participants we 17 sought provision of electronic documents in 18 native form with their associated metadata 19 intact as far as possible. The Gibraltar Police 20 Authority has complied with that request. 21 We are still awaiting compliance by the 22 government parties and by Mr McGrail but 23 we are assured that compliance should be 24 imminent. It is also fair to note that Mr 25 McGrail has described his first witness</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p>	<p>1 to have sight of the policies which are being 2 finalised at this hearing, so we do not 3 anticipate lengthy delays in receiving those. 4 We have been generous in providing 5 extensions of time when these have been 6 requested by parties and considered that they 7 serve the best interests of the Inquiry by 8 ensuring, particularly over the summer, that 9 parties and their legal teams have adequate 10 time and resources to prepare complete and 11 detailed sworn statements. However, as we 12 are now approaching closer to the March 13 hearing, we are unlikely to be in a position to 14 grant lengthy extensions. We are eager to 15 have a full picture of the evidence as soon as 16 possible so that one, we can prepare the 17 remaining disclosure requests and two, the 18 core participants in particular have adequate 19 time to prepare their responsive witness 20 statements. I now turn to the policies and 21 protocols which we have prepared. These 22 documents set out the Inquiry's proposed 23 approach to a number of issues and will be 24 posted on the Inquiry's website so that all 25 participants, witnesses, the media and the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p>
<p>1 statement provided to us as an abridged 2 statement which did not provide his full 3 account on a number of matters and then 4 stated that he would provide more detail in 5 due course. We have chased Mr McGrail for 6 that statement and Mr Wagner has explained 7 today the reasons for the delay and we are 8 reassured that that too will be with us very 9 shortly. I am grateful for that clarification. 10 We are anxious to receive that because it is 11 absolutely necessary for us to know his 12 position on all issues which is likely to 13 inform our approach to the disclosure process 14 and requests for response to witness 15 statements. Given our duty to investigate the 16 matter referred to in the terms of reference 17 fully, we have sent out requests for witness 18 statements and/or documents to 25 19 individuals or entities and that number 20 should rise, as I say, to 32 by the end of this 21 week. We have already received a number of 22 witness statements with exhibits which we 23 are currently considering. As to the 24 remaining statements, a number have been 25 delayed by parties with justification wishing</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p>	<p>1 public are aware of our procedures and 2 policies. It is obviously for the Inquiry to set 3 its own protocols and policies. However, in 4 order to permit maximum participation, we 5 have adopted the approach of sending out 6 drafts to the core participants and seeking 7 their submissions. Having received those, 8 we then sent out your initial views on their 9 submissions together with proposed 10 amendments to the policies and invited 11 further submissions so that any final disputes 12 could be dealt with today. I am pleased to 13 say that that process has proved very fruitful. 14 I am grateful for the core participants' 15 engagement in that process and we should be 16 able to finalise those policies today. I will 17 just introduce each of them briefly. At the 18 first preliminary hearing I already referred to 19 the funding protocol, which is already 20 available on the Inquiry website. Then we 21 have the protocol for receipt and handling of 22 documents, redaction and records 23 management, which I will refer to as the 24 documents protocol. That is in tab 11 of the 25 public bundle - the draft of that is in tab 11</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p>

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

<p>1 of the public bundle. This policy addresses 2 the production of documents to the Inquiry 3 by core participants, providers of documents 4 and the public. It also addresses the handling 5 and receipt of such documents, the redaction 6 of such documents where appropriate and 7 records management and security by the 8 Inquiry team. There was one question that 9 arose when we sent this draft out, which was 10 as to the application of public interest 11 immunity and legal privilege, which we 12 raised with the parties and sought their 13 submissions on. I think we are all just about 14 in agreement on that now but I will address 15 that in more detail later on. Then we have the 16 core participants policy at tab nine of the 17 public bundle, which explains what a core 18 participant is, explains the rules governing 19 applications to be designated a core 20 participant, explains the process for those 21 applications and notifies those who may wish 22 to be designated and explains the designation 23 of legal representatives. I should say so that 24 the public is aware, that we have set a 25 deadline of 7 October 2022 for applications</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 so that he, too, may provide any input as to 2 the content of those documents. Turning to 3 the list of issues: having received the parties' 4 accounts in the run up to the first preliminary 5 hearing, we immediately commenced the 6 process of considering that evidence and 7 identifying the issues that we would have to 8 investigate in addressing the terms of 9 reference. We are in the fairly uncommon 10 situation in this inquiry where the subject 11 matter may appear narrow but, now that we 12 have received accounts from all of the core 13 participants, it is clear (and accepted by all 14 the core participants) that we should look 15 into 10 issues, which we have labelled quite 16 broadly, I should add. Our first draft of the 17 provisional list of issues is set out in tab 13 18 of the public bundle. That is subject to 19 changes which we have made since, but we 20 thought it was worth including them in the 21 public bundle so that the public could follow 22 this meaningfully. Having received 23 submissions from the core participants, we 24 refined the issues, as set out in our letters to 25 the core participants dated the 2nd of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 15</p>
<p>1 to become core participants, so I would urge 2 anyone considering such an application to 3 review the policy as soon as it is published 4 later this week and to make their application 5 as soon as possible. Then we have the policy 6 on vulnerable witnesses and restrictions on 7 public access. That is at tab 12 of the public 8 bundle. That sets out the principles which 9 will guide the Inquiry in its treatment of 10 vulnerable witnesses and general restrictions 11 on public access. We also have the 12 appropriate policy document for treatment of 13 special category and criminal conviction 14 personal data. That is at tab 8 of the public 15 bundle. This sets out how the Inquiry will 16 protect such data in its processes and is 17 designed to meet the requirements of the 18 Data Protection Act 2004 at such a document 19 being in place. Finally, we have the privacy 20 notice, which is behind tab 10 of the public 21 bundle and that sets out how the inquiry will 22 use personal data, who it may be shared with 23 and data subjects' rights. I should add that we 24 have sent the three drafts dealing with 25 documents to the Information Commissioner</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 14</p>	<p>1 September. Those letters are also in the 2 public bundle, they are at tabs 2, 3 and 4 of 3 the bundle, but are materially identical. The 4 parties are in broad agreement that there are 5 10 issues to look into. There is some 6 disagreement, or there was at least, some 7 disagreement as to the extent which we 8 should look into each of those issues, and it 9 was proposed that we should identify some 10 issues as being more peripheral and not 11 requiring collection of detailed evidence. 12 However, the inquiry's firm view is that we 13 cannot at the outset create such a hierarchy of 14 issues, with some being identified as worthy 15 of full investigation and others predetermined 16 as not requiring detailed factual evidence. 17 Any issue that has been put forward will 18 have to be investigated and, having said that, 19 we will make it clear in the provisional list of 20 issues that you, the Commissioner, will seek 21 to ascertain the relevant facts relating to 22 those issues and, only to the extent that you 23 consider necessary and appropriate, to 24 address the matter under inquiry and the 25 terms of reference. So, this means that if,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 16</p>

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

<p>1 after starting to look into the evidence, we 2 find that we are being unnecessarily dragged 3 into an investigation on purely tangential 4 matters, we are not committed to unturning 5 every stone on that shore and we can make 6 an informed decision as to whether doing so 7 would be necessary and appropriate. There 8 remain a small number of narrow points of 9 dispute on the list issues which, again, I am 10 confident we can resolve today. Next, there is 11 the electronic bundle. As I said at the same 12 time as all of the work on the request for 13 evidence and putting together the policies 14 and list of issues, our solicitors, Attias & 15 Levy, have also liaised with Epiq in order to 16 set up the electronic bundle. This is a secure 17 online database which will hold all the 18 documents being dealt with by the inquiry 19 and will permit not just secure storage but 20 use by all teams when preparing and making 21 their submissions and will also permit the 22 public to follow submissions live by seeing 23 documents being referred to by counsel or 24 the Commissioner. This is not an easy task 25 and it has taken several meetings to get off</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 17</p>	<p>1 will permit us to obtain and identify the 2 documents which are relevant to our 3 investigation. Providers of disclosure will 4 include core participants and other witnesses 5 or members of the public. They are required 6 by the Documents Protocol to undertake 7 comprehensive, thorough and rigorous 8 searches in response to a request for 9 documents. In order to assist witnesses in the 10 process, we have identified specific 11 categories of documents in the requests we 12 have sent out and will do for core 13 participants, too, although the core 14 participants should be far more informed as 15 to the types of documents we are after. 16 Many requests will result in very significant 17 numbers of documents being provided. We 18 would ask witnesses to provide us with 19 rolling disclosure, if possible, so that our 20 reviewing process can commence as soon as 21 possible. The inquiry's solicitor, Mr Catania, 22 has sought documents from a wide range of 23 witnesses, including several officers at the 24 RGP and senior civil servants. If it comes to 25 light that further requests need to be made,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 19</p>
<p>1 the ground, but we have already uploaded the 2 bundles for today's hearing to that database 3 and today's hearing really serves as a dry run 4 for use of this system at any further 5 preliminary hearings and the main hearing. 6 Turning now to the public notice procedure: 7 an important step, now that we are finalising 8 the provisional list of issues, is to issue a 9 public notice seeking evidence on those 10 matters. It is right to point out that the list of 11 issues is an evolving document, but we are 12 satisfied that the current provisional list of 13 issues, which is broadly agreed by all core 14 participants, subject to a few small disputes, 15 which we hope to deal with today, will be an 16 appropriate basis on which to seek the input 17 of members of the public. We will therefore 18 shortly be sending out a public notice on our 19 website and through the media calling for 20 evidence from anyone who is able to assist 21 with evidence or documents relevant to the 22 matters identified in the list of issues. The 23 next item I would like to address is the 24 disclosure process. This is likely to be a 25 burdensome and important process which</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 18</p>	<p>1 those are actioned swiftly by the inquiry 2 team. Once the documents are obtained, our 3 team will, first, need to review them for 4 relevance and to categorize them in a way 5 that reflects the provisional list of issues. 6 Relevant documents will then be disclosed to 7 the core participants in accordance with the 8 Documents Policy. They will not be made 9 available to the public until the time of the 10 main inquiry hearing, when they are referred 11 to, and this will be, the disclosure to the core 12 participants, will be after providers of 13 documents and the core participants have had 14 an opportunity to propose redactions to those 15 documents where that is necessary and 16 appropriate. "How do we ensure that the 17 providers are not selective in their provision 18 of documents?", you might ask. We will ask 19 them to provide a signed inventory of 20 documents, as set out in paragraph 13 of the 21 Documents Protocol, and, if appropriate, we 22 will seek a witness statement from the 23 provider setting out details of how the 24 documents were originally stored, the search 25 terms that were used, if any, and the nature of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 20</p>

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

<p>1 any review. If we have any queries or 2 concerns, we will raise and pursue them. As 3 documents are reviewed and gaps identified, 4 further documents will be sought. To the 5 extent that it is necessary to see documents in 6 their original form, as I have already said, we 7 will do so. This will continue throughout our 8 investigation. While we do not have the 9 power to seize documents, you do, sir, have 10 the power to compel production. At this 11 stage, however, provision of documents has, 12 I am happy to say, been voluntary and we 13 have had cooperation from document 14 providers. But I should make clear that you 15 will consider exercising your power to 16 compel production if requests are refused or 17 if compliance with a request is incomplete, or 18 if it is not completed by the stated deadline, 19 subject to any reasonable extensions. As I 20 said earlier, the inquiry can no longer be as 21 flexible as it has been in granting extensions 22 of time if the March hearing deadline is to be 23 met. Obviously, it is very much hoped that 24 the approach or compelling production 25 should not be necessary throughout this</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 Documents Protocol. We are also happy to 2 receive from the core participants proposals 3 as to lines of inquiry, to meet and discuss in 4 any detail any concerns they might have 5 about gathering of information or anything 6 else that they may wish to raise with us. The 7 core participants will be able, once they 8 receive the documents, to make further 9 requests if they identify relevant gaps. The 10 last item that I want to address in this 11 introduction is a timetable through to the 12 final hearing in March 2023. As I say, 13 excellent progress has been made on the 14 settlement of the provisional list of issues and 15 the policy documents, so we can now set out 16 a timeline for further relevant disclosure and 17 responsive evidence. Our proposed timeline 18 is as follows: by this Friday, the 23rd of 19 September 2022, the inquiry will publish 20 final copies of the policy documents and the 21 provisional list of issues. By the 30th of 22 September, the inquiry will send any further 23 disclosure requests to existing core 24 participants. By 4 p.m. on the 7th of October 25 2022, as I say, any applications for core</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p>
<p>1 process. We do not intend to provide core 2 participants with all of our document 3 requests to witnesses. We have given full 4 transparency of our process in the policy and 5 my updates at the preliminary hearing 6 should, it is hoped, assist. I am sympathetic 7 to any desire there might be to receive all 8 possible information and anxiety to know the 9 work that is taking place and to receive 10 assurances as to our work, but it is not 11 necessary or proportionate, in my 12 submission, to disclose every single piece of 13 correspondence that we have with all parties, 14 which will only result in escalating costs and 15 distract the inquiry from its inquisitorial 16 work. But we will keep the parties updated 17 as to the progress of the disclosure process 18 and we are happy to meet with any of them 19 to explain in greater detail how that process 20 is being handled. I am confident that the 21 core participants will be receiving a large 22 quantity of material. It is likely that they will 23 all receive the same documents, subject to 24 relevance checks, duplication and redactions 25 and other measures in accordance with the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 participant status should be made. As I say, 2 they should please look out for the Core 3 Participant Policy, which will be going 4 online soon, and which is already available in 5 draft in today's bundle. I do not think that it 6 is subject to any further changes but, in any 7 event, the final version will be on our website 8 by Friday, at the latest. By the 28th of 9 October, existing core participants will be 10 asked to give disclosure, including electronic 11 documents and meta data, to the inquiry in 12 accordance with the requests that we will 13 make by the end of September. On 16th to 14 the 17th of November, we propose to hold a 15 third preliminary hearing, if it is required, 16 and by the 21st of December of this year the 17 inquiry is to give disclosure to the core 18 participants of both the core participants' 19 disclosure and of evidence and documents 20 disclosed to the inquiry by other participants. 21 By the 27th of January 2023, the core 22 participants are to file responsive witness 23 statements, and on the 7th to the 8th of 24 February, is when we propose to have a 25 fourth preliminary hearing. This hearing</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p>

<p>1 must necessarily take place after exchange 2 and consideration of the responsive witness 3 statements if it is to be useful. As we said at 4 the first preliminary hearing, the main 5 inquiry hearing is set for the 6th to the 24th 6 of March 2023. Now, I am sure that this will 7 be described as an ambitious timetable, 8 perhaps with some justification, but there is 9 very little room indeed for manoeuvre if we 10 are to have an effective final hearing in 11 March 2023. We therefore urge the core 12 participants, in particular, who will by now 13 be very familiar with the issues to be 14 investigated at this inquiry, and with the 15 witness statements of other core participants, 16 to begin working in earnest on the 17 preparation of documents for disclosure and 18 drafting their responsive witness statements 19 in order to ensure compliance with the 20 deadline set out above, which is necessary, as 21 I say, if the March hearing is to be viable. As 22 for the third preliminary hearing, which is 23 identified to take place on the 16th and the 24 17th of November, we anticipate that we 25 could deal then with any issues surrounding</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 separately be dealing with the policies and 2 the list of issues. Similarly, if they would 3 rather wait until the end to raise those points, 4 I am happy - I am in their hands. 5 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you want to 6 say anything on those matters now, Mr 7 Wagner? 8 MR WAGNER: No, thank you, sir. 9 THE COMMISSIONER: Sir Peter Caruana? 10 SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, only to invite 11 the inquiry team to consider whether the 12 fourth item, (d), in the proposed timeline, the 13 28th of October, for disclosure, whether, 14 given that we may have a third preliminary 15 hearing later in November, whether they 16 might be able, without upsetting the viability 17 of the hearing date, to be just a little bit more 18 generous with the core participants for the 19 disclosure process than that? 20 THE COMMISSIONER: I am having 21 difficulty hearing you. 22 SIR PETER CARUANA: I do beg your 23 pardon, sir. 24 THE COMMISSIONER: If you turn the 25 microphone in your direction?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 27</p>
<p>1 applications for core participant status and 2 any disputes surrounding applications for 3 restriction orders, but, following this hearing 4 and pending what we are able to resolve 5 today, we will liaise with the core 6 participants to check whether they consider 7 that a third preliminary hearing would be 8 appropriate. So, I have set out in detail how 9 we intend to proceed in that timetable, but an 10 important purpose of this preliminary 11 hearing, of course, is to hear what the core 12 participants have to say about the process so 13 that we can take careful account of what they 14 say in fulfilling our obligations. Thank you, 15 sir, that is all I intend to say on item 2. 16 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. What is the 17 best way to proceed now? 18 MR SANTOS: I am sure that the core 19 participants will have some things to say, in 20 particular about the list of issues, but I would 21 propose to deal with those in their own items 22 on the agenda. I am happy for them to say 23 anything that they wish to say about the 24 timetable or about anything else that I have 25 said now, bearing in mind that we will</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 26</p>	<p>1 SIR PETER CARUANA: I was just inviting, 2 sir, the inquiry team to consider whether, 3 given that there is some time between the 4 28th of October and the potential date for the 5 third preliminary hearing, they might be able 6 to be, without jeopardizing the hearing date, 7 the main hearing date, to be a little bit more 8 generous with the core participants as to the 9 date for the actual disclosure, which is 10 currently the 28th of October, which leaves 11 them, basically, four weeks? 12 MR SANTOS: I should say that I did 13 anticipate that that point would be made. We 14 will listen to what they have to say. I do not 15 think that has to be set in stone today. 16 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, if it is not an 17 unreasonable application. 18 MR SANTOS: Thank you. I think there is 19 just the ... 20 MR NEISH: If it please you, sir, I have 21 nothing to add. I commend Mr Santos for 22 setting out very clearly what the position is. 23 My only observation - and that is shooting 24 from the hip at this stage - is whether enough 25 time has been allowed for the final hearing?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 28</p>

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

<p>1 There are so many witnesses who are going 2 to be called, it may well be that ... 3 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, there are a lot 4 of witnesses, but the critical evidence that 5 they may give is capable of forming part of 6 the timetable. 7 MR NEISH: I merely make the point - and, 8 as I say, sir, shooting from the hip - because 9 they know who has been asked to give 10 evidence. 11 THE COMMISSIONER: I take your point, 12 and we will our best. 13 MR SANTOS: Yes, just to - it is a very valid 14 point to make, that Mr Neish raises, but just 15 to reassure him: the mere fact that we have 16 approached witnesses for their evidence does 17 not necessarily mean that we will be calling 18 them to give evidence at the inquiry. It is 19 only where we consider that it is appropriate 20 for that evidence to be given orally and for 21 questioning to take place that we will call 22 them. But it may be that, nevertheless, he is 23 right that we take the view that three weeks is 24 insufficient. I think that is something that we 25 are going to have to keep under review and it</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 just flagging at this stage that the sooner - we 2 have been after, and we understand the work 3 that has been done, but we have been after 4 having sight of all the draft protocols so that 5 we can consider the realistic timescales for 6 the RGP to deliver witness statements and 7 documents - and I am just flagging (without 8 really making any further comments) that 9 there is quite a lot of work to be done and 10 very little time. 11 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I understand 12 that. Have you had sight of the draft 13 protocols? 14 MR CRUZ: I have not had sight of any draft 15 protocols, sir. 16 MR SANTOS: No, that is correct. The RGP 17 has not received the drafts. We decided 18 against sending out drafts because I do not 19 think it would have assisted if those were 20 then subject to change. The Core 21 Participants' Policy, as I say - and that is the 22 most pressing deadline for potential core 23 participants - that policy is in the bundle 24 today, which is, I understand, already on the 25 website, and that, as I understand it, is not</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p>
<p>1 will probably crystallize once we have taken 2 a decision as to what we are disclosing to the 3 core participants and once they are aware of 4 the witness statements that we have collected 5 and the witnesses that we propose to call. 6 But it is certainly a valid concern to raise, but 7 I think that that is something we just have to 8 keep under review. 9 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. 10 MR SANTOS: In that case, then, we turn to 11 item ... 12 MR CRUZ: Sorry, if I may, and I know that 13 I am here on a watching brief, sir, but it is 14 just that timetabling issues have been raised 15 and I am conscious of the fact that some of 16 the information that is going to be sought, or 17 is being sought, is being sought from serving 18 RGP officers and the RGP. There is a series 19 of timescales which have been identified. 20 One is the 7th of October, there is a protocol 21 that needs to be read before the RGP know 22 whether or not they would be making an 23 application to be a core participant. That, of 24 course, plays on the timescale of the 28th of 25 October for disclosure and so on. So, I am</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 subject to further change. But, in any event, 2 we are happy to provide you with a Core 3 Participants' Policy later today in its final 4 form. That is the most pressing deadline. I 5 should just clarify that the 28 October 6 deadline, although we very much hope that 7 anybody who joins will have sufficient time 8 to comply by 28 October, what I do say is 9 that the existing core participants are to give 10 disclosure so it is not -- I am not explicitly 11 stating that future core participants who join 12 will have to provide disclosure by then. 13 Having said that, it really is necessary for us 14 to get -- I mean, our main concern is the 15 December deadline. If we do not send out 16 the disclosure to the core participants by the 17 end of September -- of December, it is very 18 difficult to see how the March hearing can be 19 viable because if witness statements are to 20 come in response at the end of January, 21 which is the latest they can do if we are 22 going to have a hearing in March, then the 23 core participants have to have those 24 documents for at least a month and even that 25 is a very tight deadline. So we are up against</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 32</p>

<p>1 it and even though we will listen to requests 2 for more time, the best thing to do is for us to 3 collaborate and agree a way forward. We 4 will get you the documents -- we will try our 5 best to get you the documents today. I am 6 aware that Mr Cruz has been raising this 7 point for a considerable amount of time. 8 MR CRUZ: I am obliged, sir. So I think we 9 move on to item 3 which is short statements 10 of alleged factual position. 11 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. I would have 12 thought that for reasons -- 13 MR SANTOS: I apologise, sir but the 14 microphone is switched off. 15 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. For 16 reasons which I set out in my judgment dated 17 17 August, I ruled that to the extent relevant 18 to the issues before us today at this 19 procedural hearing, Mr McGrail's counsel 20 should be permitted briefly to set out his 21 allegations of fact and that the government 22 parties should be permitted briefly to set out 23 their answer and response to those 24 allegations and, as I understand it, counsel 25 are now ready to make their brief statements.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 33</p>	<p>1 open justice applies to this inquiry in 2 agreement with the position taken by us 3 contrary to the position taken by the 4 Government parties. This is of great 5 reassurance to Mr McGrail. He called for 6 this public inquiry in order to ensure that the 7 conduct of the Government officials who 8 precipitated his early retirement was brought 9 into the light and it is said that sunlight is the 10 best disinfectant and this applies as much to 11 public inquiries as to any other court hearings 12 and perhaps even more so. Against that 13 background I will read out this brief 14 statement of the factual position on Mr 15 McGrail's behalf. On 12 May 2020 the 16 Royal Gibraltar police moved to execute a 17 search warrant against the subject in Op 18 Delhi and an investigation into the alleged 19 hacking and sabotage of the national security 20 centralised intelligence system, the NSCIS, 21 and into a conspiracy to defraud a private 22 company which was operating the system. 23 The Chief Minister has and had at the 24 relevant time a close relationship with the 25 subject -- indirectly the subject of that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 35</p>
<p>1 That is right, Mr Wagner, as I understand it? 2 MR WAGNER: Yes, sir, that is right. 3 THE COMMISSIONER: Mr Wagner, I will 4 invite you to make your brief statement now, 5 thank you very much. 6 MR WAGNER: I am grateful and thank you. 7 I should say good morning as well. 8 THE COMMISSIONER: It is quite difficult 9 to get the microphone right. I do not want 10 you to have to bend over the whole time. 11 MR WAGNER: Shall I -- if I speak like this 12 is my voice being amplified sufficiently? 13 THE COMMISSIONER: I think the answer 14 is no but -- 15 MR WAGNER: All right, if I speak louder, 16 is it --- 17 THE COMMISSIONER: I tell you what, put 18 the microphone on a stand of some kind. 19 MR WAGNER: Yes, I will use Chase and 20 Bier (?). 21 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, that is a very 22 good use to which you can put it. 23 MR WAGNER: Okay, we are grateful for 24 your ruling on this, Commissioner, and also 25 grateful for your ruling that the principle of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 34</p>	<p>1 investigation. The subject directly owned 2 part of the company which was at the heart of 3 the Op Delhi investigation and which stood 4 to gain financially from the alleged fraud. 5 The Chief Minister also owned as partner at 6 Hasans, part of the same company and, 7 therefore, also stood to gain financially from 8 the alleged fraud. The Chief Minister was 9 also mentioned in the Op Delhi investigation 10 documents. On 12 May 2020 the same day 11 on which the search warrant was executed, 12 the Chief Minister and the Attorney General 13 called Mr McGrail into a meeting. They 14 berated him for the intervention. The Chief 15 Minister in particular was extremely angry 16 and used intemperate language. The Chief 17 Minister accused Mr McGrail of acting 18 improperly. The Attorney General was 19 concerned, amongst other things, about the 20 potential of the search warrant to cause 21 serious reputational damage to Gibraltar. 22 The Attorney General claimed that Mr 23 McGrail and he had agreed that no further 24 steps would be taken in the investigation 25 generally without them speaking further. Mr</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 36</p>

<p>1 McGrail denies that any such agreement was 2 made. In the days that followed pressure was 3 placed on Mr McGrail and other members of 4 the RGP, particularly by the Attorney 5 General, to change their approach to the Op 6 Delhi investigation. The Chief Minister says 7 that the fact that he believed Mr McGrail had 8 lied to him about having been advised by the 9 DPP about the search warrant, which Mr 10 McGrail denies, was central to his loss of 11 confidence in Mr McGrail. On 14 May 2020 12 the Chief Minister privately messaged Mr 13 Pyle, then acting governor, citing a number 14 of issues relating to Mr McGrail. They met 15 the following day, 15 May, and planned 16 together to cause the Gibraltar Police 17 Authority, the GPA, a body which is 18 supposed to be independent from 19 Government, to invoke its powers under 20 section 34 of the Police Act to remove the 21 Commissioner from his post. Mr Pyle, for his 22 part, claims to have lost confidence in Mr 23 McGrail because of the HMIC FRS report 24 into the Royal Gibraltar Police and the 25 incident at sea, particularly he considered</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 37</p>	<p>1 section 34 powers which vest in the GPA and 2 not himself. He was in regular 3 communication with the GPA chair, he set 4 down the sequencing of events in writing to 5 the chair and approved GPA correspondence. 6 At 9 am on 22 May 2020 Mr McGrail met 7 with Dr Joey Britto, the chair of the GPA. 8 Dr Britto informed Mr McGrail that the 9 Chief Minister and acting governor had lost 10 confidence in him and, therefore, the GPA 11 would be invoking the section 34 power 12 which would require him to resign. Mr 13 Britto handed him a letter which stated the 14 GPA's decision but contained no details as to 15 why. Mr McGrail asked for the latter setting 16 out the detailed reasons so that he could 17 respond. Later that evening a second letter 18 was sent to Mr McGrail from Dr Britto on 19 behalf of the GPA containing more detailed 20 reasons why the Chief Minister and acting 21 governor had lost confidence in him. 22 Although the letter was signed by Dr Britto, 23 the Chief Minister had in fact written 24 substantial sections of it. The letter made no 25 mention, however, of what the Chief</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 39</p>
<p>1 that he was not fully informed by Mr 2 McGrail on the location of the collision 3 which Mr McGrail denies. In relation to the 4 HMIC FRS report, he had not communicated 5 any criticism of Mr McGrail to that date or 6 indicated that he was concerned. In relation 7 to the incident at sea, this was subject to an 8 independent investigation by the 9 Metropolitan Police, ordered by Mr McGrail 10 himself, which had at the date that Mr Pyle 11 had apparently lost confidence in him not yet 12 reported even on an interim basis. On 18 13 May 2020 the chair of the GPA was invited 14 to meet the Chief Minister and Mr Pyle, the 15 then acting governor, at the Convent when he 16 was informed about the supposed loss of 17 confidence. It is unclear whether the details 18 of the criminal investigation, the close 19 relationship between the Chief Minister and 20 the subject or the fact that the Chief Minister 21 owned part of the company which stood to 22 benefit from the alleged fraud, were made 23 known to Dr Britto or indeed to Mr Pyle. In 24 the days that followed, the Chief Minister 25 stage managed the attempted exercise of the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 38</p>	<p>1 Minister now says was the single or principal 2 reason for losing confidence in Mr McGrail, 3 namely, the issues around the search warrant 4 against the subject. In Parliament on 22 July 5 2020 the Chief Minister confirmed that at the 6 time of the matters referred to above, the 7 governor intended to use his powers under 8 section 13 of the Police Act and Hansard 9 says this -- the question to the Chief Minister 10 was this, "Mr Speaker, the Police Act in 11 section 13 makes clear that the Governor can 12 call for the suspension or resignation of the 13 Commissioner, but if he does so he needs to 14 keep the Chief Minister informed. Did the 15 Governor intimate to the Chief Minister that 16 he intended to exercise any power under 17 section 13 in relation to the Commissioner?" 18 The Chief Minister replied, "Yes, sir." On 5 19 June 2020, the GPA, having taken legal 20 advice, informed Mr Pyle and the Chief 21 Minister that they could not in fact proceed 22 with the section 34 process as it was 23 procedurally flawed and was vulnerable to 24 challenge on the grounds of bias and the 25 invitation to retire was withdrawn.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 40</p>

<p>1 Following the withdrawal of the section 34 2 process, on the same day, 5 June, Mr Pyle 3 called Mr McGrail into a meeting. Mr Pyle 4 asked him to return on Monday 8 June when 5 he said he was considering invoking his 6 powers under section 13 of the Police Act 7 2006 to call for Mr McGrail's resignation. 8 Mr McGrail would have been legally 9 required to comply if the exercise of the 10 powers was lawful. The new governor, Vice 11 Admiral Sir David Steel, had at this stage 12 already been appointed and was arriving in 13 Gibraltar on Wednesday 10 June. This 14 sequence of events was hugely stressful for 15 Mr McGrail and his family. He was also 16 concerned that if he was forced to resign, as 17 opposed to retire, this would put his pension 18 rights at risk. Despite knowing that he was 19 being muscled out because of the issues 20 surrounding Op Delhi, he took the extremely 21 difficult decision to succumb to the pressure 22 and retire from the role which represented the 23 pinnacle of his career. After a short 24 negotiation of terms, he submitted his 25 resignation at 8.30 am on 9 June 2020.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 41</p>	<p>1 clarified in response rather than having a 2 debate over whether they could be said or 3 not. So whilst I do not anticipate a lengthy 4 ad lib response, I do -- I think it is only fair 5 that the Government has a right to respond. 6 If there is concern on the part of Mr McGrail 7 as to what is going to be said, we are due a 8 transcriber's break soon and I am happy to 9 give the parties five minutes to discuss it but 10 I do think it is only fair that there be some 11 response to the facts. 12 THE COMMISSIONER: And you did 13 slightly have an ad lib introduction yourself, 14 Mr Wagner. 15 MR WAGNER: Sir, I accept that but it was 16 not relating to the actual facts themselves. 17 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, I tell you 18 what, let us have a short break and you can 19 sort it out. 20 SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, I do think this 21 is going to be short and my response is 22 supposed to be responsive. 23 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. 24 SIR PETER CARUANA: I can only respond 25 to what I have heard him say.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 43</p>
<p>1 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, thank you. 2 Well, as I have indicated, Sir Peter, it is, in 3 my judgment, only right that you should have 4 the opportunity briefly to set out the answer 5 and response of the Government parties to 6 these allegations and I invite you to do so. 7 SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you, sir. 8 Well, sir, if I could just start with some direct 9 responses before I set out in brief the 10 Government's case, my learned friend has 11 pointed out, for reasons that no doubt he will 12 wish to develop in due course, that the Chief 13 Minister in his capacity as one of many 14 partners of Hasans had an indirect interest in 15 a company owned by that partnership -- 16 MR WAGNER: I am sorry to interrupt but I 17 did not understand that there was going to be 18 an opportunity to ad lib on the factual issues 19 as opposed to -- because we have seen a 20 factual statement which we have agreed but I 21 had not appreciated that there would be a 22 separate opportunity to do what Sir Peter 23 Caruana is doing. 24 SIR PETER CARUANA: I did point out that 25 there were a couple of points that could be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 42</p>	<p>1 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. 2 SIR PETER CARUANA: What he was 3 going to be allowed to say has been agreed 4 just this morning before the session began. I 5 have two points only to make by way of ad 6 lib before I revert to text. 7 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. 8 SIR PETER CARUANA: And I can do them 9 in less than 40 seconds each, 30 seconds 10 each. 11 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. 12 SIR PETER CARUANA: I think let us have 13 a break. They can be identified roughly to 14 Mr Wagner and -- 15 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I think that is 16 a better idea, we will have a short break. 17 (11.34) 18 (A short adjournment) 19 (12.02) 20 THE COMMISSIONER: All sorted, I 21 gather. Agreed, Mr Wagner? 22 MR WAGNER: Yes. 23 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay, thank you. 24 MR WAGNER: There was one small 25 correction I wanted to make, which Mr</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 44</p>

<p>1 Santos has agreed (inaudible) word to 2 change. 3 THE COMMISSIONER: I still do not think 4 you have the hang of the microphone. It is 5 quite difficult. 6 MR WAGNER: There was one correction of 7 a word which was pointed out by my learned 8 friend Mr Neish, and I asked Mr Santos if he 9 wished to correct that word. 10 THE COMMISSIONER: By all means. 11 MR WAGNER: In the paragraph that related 12 to 9 a.m. 22 May 2020 where Mr McGrail 13 met with Joey Britto. I am going to just read 14 out the sentence again and explain what the 15 correction is. "Dr Britto informed Mr 16 McGrail that the Chief Minister and acting 17 Governor had lost confidence in him and 18 therefore the GPA would be invoking the 19 section 34 power which would require him to 20 retire." I originally said "resign" but that was 21 an error, it is "retire". 22 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. 23 MR WAGNER: I am grateful. 24 THE COMMISSIONER: No, no, thank you 25 very much. Yes, Sir Peter?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 45</p>	<p>1 he had been a party, and he did so." Sir, I am 2 now constrained to limit myself to the facts 3 set out in section C of my written 4 submissions but with the Chairman's 5 permission I will not add anything but I will 6 not read parts of it in order to comply with 7 the structure that we should be brief. There 8 are some parts of this - I can point out which 9 parts - basically paragraph 25, which is over 10 a page long - which are not strictly 11 justifiable in what might be said to be a -- I 12 am very happy to read it all; indeed, I would 13 enjoy reading it all. 14 THE COMMISSIONER: No. If you are just 15 omitting paragraph 25, that is fine by me. I 16 will just give you chance to reflect on that, 17 Mr Wagner. 18 MR WAGNER: May I just have a moment. 19 THE COMMISSIONER: Of course. 20 SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, the reasons 21 and circumstances alleged by Mr McGrail 22 himself to have caused him to cease to be 23 Commissioner of Police have been clearly set 24 out by him, and therefore it is axiomatic that, 25 from his perspective, those are the reasons</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 47</p>
<p>1 SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you, sir. To 2 ensure that I do not ad lib I must read the 3 next two paragraphs. "My learned friend has 4 said that the Chief Minister as a partner in 5 Hassans had a shareholding interest in the 6 company at the centre of the fraud 7 investigation and therefore stood to gain 8 financially from the alleged fraud. Mr 9 Picardo's interest in that company was an 10 interest of the partnership Hassans of which 11 he is a partner, together with all other 12 partners of that firm. The evidence will show 13 that the Chief Minister's intervention in 14 relation to the subject matter of the alleged 15 fraud was to ensure that those who may have 16 wished to benefit did not do so by ensuring 17 that the NSCIAS contract remained with the 18 incumbent Bland Limited and only with 19 them. My learned friend has said that the 20 Chief Minister was mentioned in the 21 Operation Delhi investigation documents. 22 The Chief Minister was not then and has 23 never been a suspect in that investigation. He 24 was asked to give a witness statement in 25 relation to certain communications to which</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 46</p>	<p>1 and circumstances that led to his retirement. 2 The reasons and circumstances asserted by 3 Mr McGrail are the following. Firstly, that 4 he has been unfairly treated by the Gibraltar 5 Police Authority in relation to the process 6 under section 34 of the Police Act; and, 7 secondly, that improper pressure put upon 8 him by the Chief Minister and the Attorney 9 General to alter the course of a live criminal 10 investigation known as Operation Delhi. The 11 Government parties' case is that Mr McGrail 12 ceased to be Commissioner of Police because 13 he properly and inevitably sought early 14 retirement consequent on, firstly, learning 15 that he had lost the confidence of the 16 Governor and the Chief Minister; and, 17 secondly, that, had he not sought early 18 retirement, bore the very real risk that the 19 Governor would call publicly for his 20 resignation, as he had the power to do under 21 section 31(f) of the Police Act. The 22 Chairman of the Gibraltar Police Authority 23 had said this to him, and Mr McGrail clearly 24 believed that the Governor would do so. 25 This is evident from Mr McGrail's own</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 48</p>

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

<p>1 stated case. Only His Excellency the 2 Governor, and not the Chief Minister, Mr 3 Picardo, still less the Attorney General 4 Michael Llamas, had at that time power to 5 call for Mr McGrail's resignation, and it is 6 therefore self-evident from his own statement 7 that he chose to retire to avoid the anticipated 8 actions of the Governor, who had lost 9 confidence in him and had told him so. 10 Indeed, given the nature of the allegations 11 made by Mr McGrail against each of the 12 Governor, the Chief Minister and the 13 Attorney General in his solicitor's letter 14 dated 29 May 2020 to the Gibraltar Police 15 Authority and the intemperate manner in 16 which they were expressed, it is 17 inconceivable that he could reasonably 18 expect that he could remain as Commissioner 19 of Police thereafter once those allegations 20 had come to their notice, since it would no 21 longer be possible for them to work together 22 with mutual confidence in the manner and to 23 the extent that their responsibilities required. 24 This includes Mr Pyle, whether in his then 25 temporary position as Governor, or when he</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 relationship between Gibraltar and the 2 Ministry of Defence to near crisis point. 3 Secondly, the RGP's handling of an 4 investigation into an incident in March 2017 5 in which an RAF pilot was severely assaulted 6 during a stopover in Gibraltar and which 7 resulted in no one being prosecuted. Thirdly, 8 the fractured and almost hostile relationship 9 between Mr McGrail and the Gibraltar Police 10 Federation which was resulting in very low 11 morale in the RGP, which resulted in 12 tensions which culminated in a formal 13 complaint by the Federation to the Gibraltar 14 Police Authority about Mr McGrail. 15 Fourthly, Mr McGrail's failure to address or 16 effectively tackle the serious issues raised in 17 the 2016 report on the RGP conducted by 18 Her Majesty's Inspectorate of 19 Constabularies. The 2020 report by Her 20 Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabularies also 21 reported some findings which tended to 22 vindicate the issue that I have just described 23 thirdly above. Fifthly, the fact that the 24 Governor considered that he had been misled 25 by Mr McGrail through intentional omission</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 51</p>
<p>1 later returned to his post as Deputy 2 Governor. Accordingly, the reasons why the 3 Chief Minister and the Attorney General had 4 also lost confidence in Mr McGrail were not 5 in the event relevant to the reasons and 6 circumstances leading to his choosing to 7 retire. That was clearly triggered by the 8 actions and positions of the Governor. The 9 Governor had not lost confidence in Mr 10 McGrail and did not intend to call for his 11 resignation for any reason to do with the 12 criminal investigation in which Mr McGrail 13 alleges, which is denied and roundly rejected, 14 but the Chief Minister and the Attorney 15 General interfered. The Governor's loss of 16 confidence in Mr McGrail's probity and 17 integrity and his leadership of the RGP had 18 been progressive over an extended period of 19 time and by reason of a number of incidents 20 and matters, namely the Governor's views 21 about, firstly, his mishandling of an incident 22 at the airfield in February 2017 involving an 23 RAF airplane and some of the most senior 24 military officers in Gibraltar and its 25 aftermath, which unnecessarily brought the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p>	<p>1 to provide the Governor with the best 2 information or intelligence available to Mr 3 McGrail which he was providing to others in 4 relation to a matter arising from the incident 5 at sea on 8 March 2020 in which two Spanish 6 nationals died following a collision with an 7 RGP launch and which touched very 8 specifically upon Her Majesty's Government 9 and the Governor's responsibility for external 10 affairs, namely information relating to the 11 location of the incident. All of these factors 12 arose and occurred well before the alleged 13 and denied interference by the Chief Minister 14 and the Attorney General in the criminal 15 investigation known as Operation Delhi. The 16 Governor's deep concern with Mr McGrail's 17 leadership qualities had absolutely nothing to 18 do with that RGP investigation; indeed, the 19 Governor had no prior knowledge about the 20 criminal investigation until the Chief 21 Minister brought it to his attention in their 22 meeting on 15 May 2020. The consideration 23 of whether to invoke the procedure in section 24 13 of the Police Act to call for Mr McGrail's 25 resignation was entirely the Governor's. At</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p>

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

<p>1 no time was he put under any pressure by any 2 person, including the Chief Minister, to 3 decide to do so. It is frankly fantastic to 4 believe, as would need to be the case for Mr 5 McGrail's case theory to be correct, that, 6 however much Mr McGrail may be willing to 7 attribute improper conduct and motives to the 8 Chief Minister and the Attorney General, the 9 Governor would state that he had lost 10 confidence in the Commissioner of Police 11 and consider calling for his resignation based 12 on those improper motives and conduct in 13 full view of UK Foreign Office ministers, 14 senior officials and advisers whom the 15 Governor kept briefed in timely manner. 16 With your permission, sir, I now propose to 17 skip over argumentation in support of that 18 theory, which is not flagged for argument -- 19 THE COMMISSIONER: In paragraph 25. 20 SIR PETER CARUANA: Paragraph 25 21 indeed. 22 THE COMMISSIONER: You do not want 23 that read. No. I entirely agree. 24 SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you, sir. It 25 is accordingly the position of the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 53</p>	<p>1 much. Yes, Mr Santos? 2 MR SANTOS: Thank you, sir. If we can 3 now move on to item 4 on the agenda, which 4 is finalisation of policy documents. In my 5 opening remarks I introduced each of these 6 policies and what they each seek to achieve. 7 I am pleased to say that in correspondence 8 between the solicitor to the Inquiry and the 9 core participants, and two rounds of written 10 submissions from the core participants, the 11 policy documents are extremely close to 12 being finalised. As far as the Inquiry team is 13 aware, there are no significant matters that 14 remain in as for wording of the policy 15 documents but, of course, counsel for the for 16 the court's assistance will shortly have an 17 opportunity to make any submissions they 18 might wish to make and are free to raise any 19 further matters in due course if policies need 20 amending. Ultimately, though, the 21 settlement of the policy documents is a 22 matter for you as Commissioner, as advised 23 by the Inquiry team, but, as I say, we chose 24 to include the parties in this process so that 25 they could participate and assist us, which</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 55</p>
<p>1 Government parties that Mr McGrail self- 2 evidently, on his own stated version of 3 events, did not retire because he felt obliged 4 to do so on account of any alleged 5 interference in the conduct of a criminal 6 investigation; and, secondly, the reason and 7 circumstances that led to Mr McGrail ceasing 8 to be the Commissioner of Police are that he 9 chose to retire, and he chose to retire because 10 he knew, firstly, that he had lost the 11 confidence of both the Governor and the 12 Chief Minister, and that in those 13 circumstances he could not realistically 14 continue in post; and, secondly, that 15 following the Gibraltar Police Authority's 16 decision that it could not, by reason of a 17 manifestly flawed procedure that it had 18 employed, call for his retirement, he believed 19 that the Governor would call for his 20 resignation under section 12 of the Police Act 21 2006, and that by retiring before that 22 happened, he would save his pension, which 23 he wrongly thought was in jeopardy if he had 24 to resign. 25 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 54</p>	<p>1 they certainly have done, and therefore I am 2 grateful to them and I am glad that ultimately 3 we have arrived at a position where we have 4 almost entire agreement, or at least 5 contentment, with these five rather detailed 6 documents. There are only three points which 7 I want to address today. The first is not an 8 issue with the wording of the policies but has 9 arisen in correspondence about them. The 10 second is a narrow point to do with the 11 naming of stakeholders. The third is a matter 12 which I believe now to be effectively agreed, 13 namely the application of privilege to the 14 Inquiry, and although there does appear to be 15 agreement on that point I do think it is worth 16 me briefly informing the media and the 17 public as to how we have arrived where we 18 are. It will also, I think, benefit witnesses to 19 know what the thinking behind where we 20 have arrived at is. The first point is the 21 procedure known in practice as Salmon 22 letters or warning letters which were 23 mentioned in the context of the core 24 participants' policy. This arose from your 25 proposal in our letter of 2 September to the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 56</p>

<p>1 parties setting out your initial views on the 2 policies, and we specifically refer to the fact 3 that you, as Commissioner, may give 4 participants warning of advanced criticisms 5 or comments that you propose to make of 6 them in the final report. The Government 7 parties indicated in their written submissions 8 that they were content with this proposal but 9 made three small points in relation to that, 10 two of which we have accepted. The third 11 point made by the Government parties, 12 however, is that advance notice should be 13 provided in a manner that does not disclose 14 findings of fact to those individuals. Now, it 15 may be just a point of clarification, but we 16 would submit - and I know that the 17 submissions of Mr McGrail's counsel concur 18 - that the policy should not constrain you in 19 this way and that, whereas you should not 20 provide advance copies of the draft report or 21 reveal the entirety of your factual findings to 22 the parties that we contact by Salmon letters, 23 it may be necessary and appropriate to 24 provide some factual background or the 25 proposed factual background in order to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 57</p>	<p>1 discharging his commission. Paragraph 20 of 2 the privacy notice lists a number of 3 stakeholders, for example counsel and 4 solicitors to the Inquiry, legal representatives 5 and expert witnesses to whom data must be 6 shared if the Inquiry is to fulfil its 7 obligations. In his latest submissions Mr 8 McGrail has objected to the language "and 9 such other persons as the Commissioner may 10 consider appropriate", saying that that is too 11 vague. We respectfully disagree that this 12 language is too vague. The stakeholders in 13 paragraph 20 embody persons to whom data 14 will be disclosed in the vast majority of 15 circumstances, but it is possible that a 16 circumstance may arise where it is necessary 17 to share personal data with a person not on 18 that list, and we think that it is important that 19 the documents protocol is transparent and 20 recognises that possibility. 21 Now, these comments are all, of course, 22 subject to the proviso that we are very much 23 alert to our data protection obligations and 24 that we will not be sharing personal data in 25 an irresponsible or disproportionate way and,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 59</p>
<p>1 contextualise the relevant criticism. Now, 2 obviously we do not anticipate - 12.19 3 SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir it may help my 4 learned friend if I indicate to you that I agree 5 with that position. 6 MR SANTOS: I am extremely grateful for 7 that clarification. 8 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you very 9 much. 10 MR SANTOS: The second point is as to the 11 naming of stakeholders with whom the 12 Inquiry will share information. In the draft 13 documents protocol, clause 36 states that the 14 Inquiry has many stakeholders and it will 15 sometimes be necessary to share data with 16 them. Following a submission from Mr 17 McGrail, you indicated that you were willing 18 to provide an illustrative list of stakeholders, 19 namely the core participants. The 20 Government parties subsequently suggested 21 that reference could be made to the core 22 participants, the other persons or entities 23 mentioned in paragraph 20 of the privacy 24 notice, and such other persons as the 25 Commissioner may consider appropriate in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 58</p>	<p>1 as I say, we have been in contact with the 2 Information Commissioner about these 3 policies. 4 So that is all I propose to say about the 5 second point. I wonder whether it is perhaps 6 best for Mr Wagner to say anything he likes 7 in response to that before I deal with the final 8 point. 9 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. 10 MR WAGNER: Thank you. We would 11 agree that wording but ask -- 12 THE COMMISSIONER: This is paragraph 13 20. 14 MR WAGNER: Yes. So the wording "and 15 any others who the Commissioner considers 16 appropriate." We would only ask that if 17 there is a left-field part who you consider 18 would have appeared on the privacy notice 19 had it been known at the time, that you 20 consider disclosing the fact that that has been 21 added to the core participants. 22 MR SANTOS: I cannot commit to that 23 because I do not know the circumstances in 24 which it will arise, but I understand the point 25 that is made and if we consider it necessary</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 60</p>

<p>1 we will then perhaps a way to address that 2 would be to amend the policy. If the 3 situation arises where someone who we did 4 not anticipate we would be in contact with, 5 we end up being in contact with on a regular 6 basis, I agree that, unless there are very good 7 reasons not to, that should appear in the 8 policy, but I cannot commit to doing that. 9 MR WAGNER: And all I was asking is that 10 the Inquiry consider disclosing that rather 11 than committing. 12 MR SANTOS: Thank you. The final point 13 on the policy is the application of privilege to 14 evidence in the Inquiry which arises in the 15 context of the documents protocol. I do not 16 invite you to give a ruling on the question of 17 privilege given that I believe that the parties 18 are in broad agreement, although they are 19 welcome to say whatever they wish to say on 20 the topic once I have opened. However, this 21 point I think will be of interest to not only the 22 participants represented today but any other 23 parties or potential witness and to the public 24 and the media, so it is convenient to make 25 some brief submissions on this matter today.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 61</p>	<p>1 say, in the express language of section 10 2 itself, particularly so when read alongside 3 section 8(2), which provides that a person 4 under summons has two distinct obligations: 5 first, to answer all questions put by 6 Commissioners; and, second, to produce all 7 books, papers and writings required by them. 8 The wording in section 10 which expressly 9 refers to answering any question put to him 10 by the Commissioners refers back to only the 11 first part of section 8(2), which imposes the 12 obligation to answer questions, and not the 13 second part of section 8(2) which imposes 14 the obligation to produce documents in 15 response to requests. So this we say means 16 that the core participants and witnesses are 17 permitted to rely on legal professional 18 privilege and not provide copies of 19 communications with their lawyers which 20 would benefit from privilege. I should say 21 this is our submissions. I mean, I am not 22 proposing to be authoritative on the topic, but 23 this interpretation is, we say, supported by 24 the English decision of R v. Leatham, an 25 1861 decision. I do not propose to labour</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 63</p>
<p>1 As I stated, the parties appear to be in broad 2 agreement on the appropriate approach, 3 although perhaps they have reached their 4 conclusion by slightly different routes. Just 5 so that those less familiar with the legal 6 principles can follow this debate, I should 7 explain that legal professional privilege is a 8 protection afforded to certain 9 communications between a client and their 10 lawyer which cannot be inspected unless the 11 client gives permission. Section 10 of the 12 Commissions of Inquiry Act 1888 which 13 governs this Inquiry provides that: "...no 14 person shall be excused from answering any 15 question put to him by the commissioners on 16 the ground of any privilege, or on the ground 17 that the answer to such question will tend to 18 incriminate such person." This raises three 19 principal issues. First, the application of 20 legal privilege to documentary evidence. In 21 our submission, the exclusion of privilege in 22 that section applies only to questions from 23 you and not to requests for production of 24 documents as you are also permitted to do 25 under section 8(2). This finds support, we</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 62</p>	<p>1 everyone with going through that authority 2 but it suffices to note that the court in that 3 case interpreted a very similar statutory 4 provision in the context of the UK's Corrupt 5 Practices at Elections Act and found that the 6 exclusion of privilege did not extend to the 7 provision of documents. The second issue is 8 the application of privilege to questions 9 asked by you. The parties are in agreement 10 that legal professional privilege is a 11 fundamental human right, guaranteed by 12 Article 8 of the European Convention on 13 Human Rights, and section 7 of the Gibraltar 14 Constitution. In the absence of express 15 language in the 1888 Act ousting the 16 operation of legal professional privilege, it 17 would be arguable that section 10 of the 1888 18 Act must be read in conjunction with section 19 7 of the Constitution to permit parties to rely 20 on legal professional privilege to resist 21 answering questions put by you. There are, 22 however, tricky constitutional questions as to 23 whether or not the Inquiry can (A) read 24 section 10 which explicitly excludes 25 privilege in a manner that is consistent with</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 64</p>

<p>1 section 7 of the Constitution; or (B) disapply 2 section 10 without first of all making a 3 reference to the Supreme Court. We agree 4 that it is at least arguable that section 10 is 5 not amenable to a blue pencil reading, in 6 other words reading in conformity with the 7 Constitution, given the very express language 8 that appears to abrogate privilege. However, 9 we do not consider that this matter needs to 10 be decided definitively by you today. We 11 agree with the parties' submission that you 12 should adopt a course where you do not ask 13 questions where the answers are likely to 14 require a witness to breach privilege and, in 15 fact, if you were to do so that would be likely 16 to be inconsistent with your obligations to 17 comply with the Constitution and not breach 18 the witnesses' section 7 rights. So that is how 19 we propose that that rather tricky issue be 20 dealt with. To ensure that the documents 21 protocol suitably sets out the position, we 22 propose incorporating section 22 of the 23 Inquiries Act 2005 into the protocol, of 24 course amended to refer to Gibraltar rather 25 than the UK. The third issue that arises is the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 the Inquiry's submissions on the 15th. We 2 are also grateful to the Inquiry for the 3 significant efforts which have been taken to 4 narrow the issues prior to this hearing and for 5 taking a pragmatic and flexible approach to 6 both the policy documents and the list of 7 issues and for incorporating some of our 8 proposals. In relation to the documents 9 policy, we agree with both counsel to the 10 Inquiry and the Government parties that 11 public interest immunity is not properly 12 classified as a privilege or cannot properly be 13 classified as a privilege and therefore is not 14 caught by section 10. We agree with counsel 15 to the Inquiry's submissions at paragraphs 13 16 and 14 of the 15 September submissions 17 relating to the approach the Inquiry intends to 18 take to applications for public interest 19 immunity, which accords in the generality 20 with what we were submitting as well. It 21 really is about taking a practical and 22 pragmatic approach to what is, as counsel to 23 the Inquiry points out, a tricky issue. We 24 also agree with the approach set out at 25 paragraph 15 of counsel to the Inquiry's</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 67</p>
<p>1 application of public interest immunity to 2 evidence in the Inquiry, and I can address 3 this more briefly because the parties I think 4 agree that section 10 does not exclude public 5 interest immunity as a bar to production of 6 evidence in this Inquiry, and that is because 7 public interest immunity is not properly 8 classified as a privilege and, as with our 9 approach to privilege, we recommend that 10 the documents protocol be amended to 11 include the wording of the public interest 12 immunity balancing test which was set out by 13 the House of Lords in the case of R v. H. So 14 that is all I wish to say about the finalisation 15 of the policy documents at this stage, but I 16 am happy to hear and respond to any 17 submissions by the core participants. 18 THE COMMISSIONER: Do you want to 19 add anything to that, Mr Wagner? 20 MR WAGNER: Thank you sir; I have a few 21 brief submissions to make. 22 THE COMMISSIONER: Sure. 23 MR WAGNER: First of all, we are grateful 24 to the Inquiry for the indications given in 25 both the letter of 2 September and counsel to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 66</p>	<p>1 submissions relating to without notice public 2 interest immunity applications, and we are 3 grateful for the indication that they will only 4 be granted and should only be made 5 exceptionally. We remain somewhat 6 concerned that private ex parte discussions 7 between the Government parties and the 8 Inquiry do not become the norm prior to the 9 main hearing or during it, notwithstanding 10 the Inquiry's helpful indications of the 11 exceptionality of such measures. We would 12 therefore propose one final tweak to the 13 policy which is to include wording to this 14 effect, and we can provide this in writing 15 following these submissions. Where an 16 application has been made initially without 17 notice, the Commissioner will, where 18 practicable, give other core participants the 19 opportunity to make submissions on the 20 application, for example by disclosing a 21 redacted version of the document and/or 22 requiring undertakings from the core 23 participants and their representatives that the 24 disclosed information will not be shared 25 more widely. And that additional text would</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 68</p>

<p>1 require the Commissioner to consider at the 2 point where the application is made whether 3 practical arrangements may be put in place to 4 allow core participants to make submissions 5 on the application rather than the 6 presumption being that either an application 7 is fit to make ex parte or it is not; in other 8 words, this would not be a binary choice as 9 we respectfully suggest may be intimated 10 from the current proposed policy and that is 11 all we have to say about that policy. Just in 12 relation to a potential application under that 13 policy which was hinted at by the 14 government parties at the previous hearing, at 15 the first preliminary hearing counsel for the 16 government parties indicated that the 17 Attorney General will be making or may be 18 making a very special application, as it was 19 described, with regard to his decision to 20 discontinue the prosecution of the Delhi 21 defendants pursuant to section 59(2)(c) of the 22 Gibraltar constitution and since the 23 government parties have raised the potential 24 ex parte public interest immunity 25 applications, we wish to make clear at this</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 69</p>	<p>1 potential criticism which is entirely normal in 2 public inquiries and it does seem now that 3 that is the agreed position. Those are our 4 submissions on policies. 5 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. 6 SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, I just need to 7 address you very briefly -- well, briefly on 8 one and slightly less briefly on the other on 9 two points. If I can just start with a point just 10 made by my learned friend, Mr Wagner -- 11 too many lights have come on but I am 12 audible. My Lord, the Government parties 13 do not agree that the words "without notice" 14 should be added in to the public interest 15 immunity or privacy of evidence provisions 16 because to do so would either be pointless if 17 no information is given about the basis for 18 the application and, worse still, it could 19 render the whole application otiose because 20 the purpose of it would be precisely that. 21 Even other core participants -- my learned 22 friend, Mr Wagner, is not right when he 23 assumes that those who make applications 24 for public interest immunity would be 25 content for everybody sitting around this</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 71</p>
<p>1 stage that the implication of that decision is 2 not subject to judicial scrutiny and that 3 Gibraltar law is not accepted and without 4 prejudice to the generality of the submissions 5 made previously, Mr McGrail would like to 6 be heard if any such application is made if 7 that is considered appropriate by the 8 Commissioner. In relation to the other 9 policies, we are content with the indications 10 given by the Commissioner and counsel to 11 the inquiry in correspondence and in the 15 12 September submissions and unless there are 13 any proposed changes to the approach which 14 has been set out, we make no further 15 submissions. Then, finally on this point, in 16 relation to maximisation or (inaudible) or 17 warning letters, the process by which 18 individuals who are likely to be subject to 19 criticism in a final report are given prior 20 notice of those criticisms, we respectfully 21 agree with the approach set out by counsel to 22 the inquiry in paragraph 19 of his 23 submissions. There is no reason why 24 particular factual findings should not be 25 provided to those who are being warned of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 70</p>	<p>1 table to know the reasons that underpin the 2 public interest immunity; indeed in the case 3 where the Attorney General is contemplating 4 making that application that would almost 5 certainly be his position and I want to say no 6 more -- I know your chairman is not going to 7 make a decision on this on the hoof, so to 8 speak, but whilst he considers that and I have 9 no intention of citing from CPR to a judge of 10 your Lordship's experience but could I just 11 remind your Lordship of the provision -- Mr 12 Chairman, of the provisions of CPR 31.1(9) 13 which clearly provide that if this were the 14 High Court, an application would be without 15 notice for public interest immunity and that 16 the other parties, even to contentious inter 17 partes proceedings, are not even entitled to 18 see the order that the court makes. All that is 19 provided for in 31.1(9) so the position is not 20 that the window should be partially opened in 21 an appropriate case of public interest 22 immunity, the rules of court are that they are 23 kept firmly shut for the very reason that 24 public interest immunity applications are 25 permissible in the first place and so as not to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 72</p>

<p>1 compromise the -- and your Lordship will 2 know -- 3 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, each 4 application for public interest immunity 5 depends on its particular circumstances. 6 SIR PETER CARUANA: Of which you, sir, 7 have to be satisfied but nobody else. 8 THE COMMISSIONER: Right. 9 SIR PETER CARUANA: So what we are 10 discussing here is the transparency around 11 public interest immunity applications and at 12 least in the High Court there is no 13 transparency unless the judge orders 14 otherwise which is also in that rule that I 15 have cited at you, sir, which you can consider 16 at your leisure and comfort to read it. The 17 issue here is that there is no point and the 18 offer from my learned friend to include that 19 language, which I have not had an 20 opportunity to see on paper and consider, it 21 would include an assurance by the people 22 sitting around this table and their clients that 23 they would not disseminate the information 24 more widely would not suffice a genuine 25 case of public interest immunity. Public</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 73</p>	<p>1 - that your Lordship could not reach for the 2 blue pencil. I think you could reach for the 3 blue pencil and very briefly -- 4 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, it does not 5 really matter by what route we come to the 6 conclusion -- 7 SIR PETER CARUANA: Well, quite but if - 8 - 9 THE COMMISSIONER: -- because you are 10 all agreed as to where we end up. 11 SIR PETER CARUANA: I simply point out 12 that paragraph 2 of annex 2 of the 13 constitution deals with existing laws; that is 14 to say, that which were already in place 15 before the constitution came in and that that 16 says that they have to be construed with such 17 modifications, adaptations and (inaudible) 18 and acceptance as is necessary to bring them 19 (inaudible) compatible with the constitution 20 that we now know includes the right to 21 privacy, which we now know because the 22 European Courts and the English courts have 23 all found that the right to privacy is engaged 24 by legal professional privilege. So -- 25 THE COMMISSIONER: That is -- I think</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 75</p>
<p>1 interest immunity is that no one should find 2 out, not that some people should find out. 3 THE COMMISSIONER: I have done 4 hundreds of these applications. 5 SIR PETER CARUANA: Yes. 6 THE COMMISSIONER: I know the rules. 7 SIR PETER CARUANA: Exactly, sir. This 8 is why I have not gone into too much detail. 9 The other point I would like to say is that we 10 are in agreement, all of us, I think, that the -- 11 that you by one means or another should -- 12 even by adopting the language of section 22 13 of the UK Inquiries' Act, that you should 14 extend to this inquiry the full range of 15 litigation -- legal professional privilege. 16 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. As Mr 17 Santos sets out, we are obviously going to 18 have to include or read section 22 into the 19 Gibraltar procedures and that way we are 20 completely up-to-date. 21 SIR PETER CARUANA: That is correct but 22 in case, sir, you read it -- you wish to be 23 emboldened on the point, I do not agree with 24 the doubt - and I think it is only a doubt that 25 my learned friend, Mr Wagner, has expressed</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 74</p>	<p>1 you have previously referred in your 2 submissions to section 2(1) of annex 2, is that 3 the passage that you have in mind or is there 4 something else? 5 SIR PETER CARUANA: Yes, it is annex 2 6 to the order which is not the constitution 7 order itself but it is part of -- 8 THE COMMISSIONER: Hang on -- 9 SIR PETER CARUANA: It is annex 2, 10 paragraph 2.1 under the heading, "Existing 11 laws." 12 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. 13 SIR PETER CARUANA: And it says that 14 they shall be construed with such 15 modifications as to make them compatible 16 with the constitution. That includes, sir, with 17 respect, I would submit by you -- you shall 18 be construing, you are at liberty to construe 19 because our Parliament which passed the 20 1888 Inquiries Act is not a sovereign 21 Parliament. 22 THE COMMISSIONER: No, I -- 23 SIR PETER CARUANA: The UK 24 Parliament which is sovereign has passed 25 this.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 76</p>

<p>1 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, I have the 2 point. 3 SIR PETER CARUANA: Thank you. 4 MR SANTOS: Just to take that last point 5 first, our only hesitation -- I think it is right to 6 point out that we, too, expressed doubt as to 7 blue pencil reading and our only hesitation in 8 doing so was because we referred to the 9 Chief Minister's reference to the Chief 10 Justice several years ago when the Chief 11 Justice himself also expressed some doubt as 12 to whether explicit terms could be construed 13 to mean the exact opposite of what they said 14 and that -- but in any event, I mean, we -- I 15 take what he says on board and I do not think 16 we need to resolve this and I think we are -- 17 we all know where we get to and that is all -- 18 THE COMMISSIONER: That is the point. 19 MR SANTOS: On the public interest 20 immunity point, we are willing to -- I am not 21 going to respond on my feet to the wording 22 that has been proposed but we are willing to 23 consider it. I think both parties are -- 24 THE COMMISSIONER: If Mr Wagner puts 25 his submissions into writing --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 77</p>	<p>1 wish to address is the list of issues. Now, I 2 will be no more than I would say five or ten 3 minutes on this but I do see that it is quarter 4 to one. I do not know whether it is worth me 5 -- I suppose it is worth me -- 6 THE COMMISSIONER: I think the answer 7 is that you can have your five or ten minutes 8 and then we will have lunch and then we will 9 carry on afterwards. 10 MR SANTOS: Yes. All right, so as with the 11 policy documents we have adopted an 12 inclusive approach to the list of issues and 13 again invited submissions on them, despite it 14 ultimately being a matter for you, sir, the 15 correspondence again has led to a position of 16 agreement and there are only three items 17 which may or may not remain in dispute and 18 which I will address you on. The first is issue 19 5 and the finalisation of that issue which 20 deals with the criminal investigation was the 21 most significant dispute between the parties, 22 but as drafted initially that required the 23 inquiry to enquire into the RGP's handling of 24 an investigation into the alleged hacking 25 and/or sabotage of the NSCIS system and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 79</p>
<p>1 MR SANTOS: Yes. 2 THE COMMISSIONER: -- then we will 3 consider it and I am sure that we can -- 4 MR SANTOS: Yes. I think both parties 5 have successfully and conspicuously laid 6 down their respective markers -- 7 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. 8 MR SANTOS: -- on this point but I think it 9 is best to deal with these issues as and when 10 they arise rather than trying to -- 11 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, we can lay 12 down general principles now but -- 13 MR SANTOS: Yes. 14 THE COMMISSIONER: -- I am -- 15 MR SANTOS: I think it is very difficult to -- 16 THE COMMISSIONER: -- not going to rule 17 on any particular point now unless and until 18 it arises which I am sure it will do. 19 MR SANTOS: Thank you, that is all I 20 propose to say. In terms of -- so the last 21 remaining item that I want to address on the 22 agenda, and of course there is the residual -- 23 there are the residuary items at 8 and 9 where 24 anyone else can raise any item and you 25 yourself can raise any item, the last point I</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 78</p>	<p>1 alleged conspiracy to defraud including but 2 not limited to the RGP's execution of search 3 warrants as part of that investigation on 12 4 May 2020 and then it identifies three -- from 5 memory, three sub-issues. In his written 6 submissions, Mr McGrail argued that this 7 was framed in a way which focused on the 8 RGP's investigation rather than the 9 underlying facts relating to it and in 10 particular the alleged involvement by the 11 chief minister. Now, he has -- he initially 12 invited the inquiry to, therefore, amend the 13 issue but in our written submissions we came 14 up with an alternative proposal while at the 15 same time pointing out that we considered 16 that sub-issue 2 already requires the inquiry 17 to investigate the matter that he raises. As 18 we already made clear in the September letter 19 that we sent to the parties, if we make 20 findings as to pressure being exerted, it 21 would also be open to you to make findings 22 as to persons' motivation in so acting, given 23 that a person's state of mind is a matter of 24 fact but that will ultimately be a matter for 25 you after consideration of the evidence. This</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 80</p>

<p>1 does not, we say, have to be spelled out with 2 the list of issues because not doing so does 3 not prevent you, if you so -- if you consider it 4 appropriate from making such findings. On 5 the other hand, it is seeking to ensure that the 6 list, the provisional list of issues is termed as 7 neutrally as possible. We have 8 recommended in our written submissions a 9 slight re-ordering of the language of issue 5 10 so that it reads as follows, "The investigation 11 into the alleged hacking and/or sabotage of 12 the NSCIS system and alleged conspiracy to 13 defraud and the RGP's handling of the same 14 including but not limited to the RGP's 15 execution of search warrants as part of that 16 investigation." We believe that this has the 17 intended effect of removing the RGP's 18 handling of the investigation from being the 19 central focus and recognising that it is a sub- 20 issue but not the sole issue in relation to this - 21 - the criminal investigation issue. I believe 22 that Mr Wagner is now in agreement with 23 our proposal but if he is not, then he may say 24 so when I sit down. On issue 9, which is a 25 second matter that arises, I can deal with this</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 81</p>	<p>1 wording in correspondence was to investigate 2 the GPA's process and decision in purported 3 compliance with section 34 of the Police Act 4 and subsequent withdrawal of that decision. 5 I understand from Mr Neish, who has very 6 kindly pointed out to me that they are now, I 7 believe, content with that wording, but again 8 if that is not the case, now is the time or after 9 lunch is the time for him to say so. So that is 10 all I propose to say on the list of issues. It 11 may be worth checking with the parties 12 whether they have anything to say before 13 breaking because if they do not, then we may 14 have completed the business but -- so I will 15 sit down. 16 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. 17 MR WAGNER: Yes, my Lord, we do have a 18 few submissions. 19 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, well, I think 20 we will break now and continue at two 21 o'clock or an hour. 22 MR WAGNER: Or 2.15? I have been asked 23 for two o'clock. Is that all right. 24 THE COMMISSIONER: Well, 2.15 is from 25 a previous age.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 83</p>
<p>1 very briefly by saying we agree that the 2 language proposed in our initial draft 3 requires re-formulation because as drafted it 4 contained a contested statement of fact and 5 upon reviewing the evidence further, the new 6 wording that we propose is as follows, "Mr 7 Pyle's stated intention as to his powers under 8 section 13 of the Police Act, this will include 9 consideration of the relevance, if any, of Sir 10 David Steel's imminent commencement as 11 Governor and particularly the date on which 12 Mr Pyle learned of the date on which that 13 was expected to occur." The final point 14 which I would make on that which I know 15 the parties agree with is that the shorthand 16 reference to that issue should now be the 17 section 13 issue, so that it encompasses 18 everything that is set out in that issue. 19 Finally, issue 10 which Mr McGrail proposed 20 as an additional issue in correspondence 21 which we agree to is, first, I should clear up 22 some confusion because this issue has been 23 referred to as issue 12 in written submissions 24 but this will be issue 10 in the inquiry's 25 provisional list of issues. Our proposed</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 82</p>	<p>1 MR WAGNER: Then two o'clock? 2 THE COMMISSIONER: Two o'clock, yes. 3 (12.51) 4 (The short adjournment) 5 (13.59) 6 MR SANTOS: Good afternoon, sir. Just one 7 point that Mr Neish has asked me to point out 8 because it will save time is that I was right to 9 say that they accept the wording of what is 10 now issue ten that relates to the GPA process. 11 On the basis of our introduction of new 12 wording to the preamble to the list of issues 13 which states that the issues will be 14 investigated to the extent that you, the 15 Commissioner, consider necessary and 16 appropriate to address the matter under 17 inquiry. So he has asked me to point that out 18 to try and short-circuit it all. I now give way 19 to Mr Wagner, who I understand has some 20 points to make. 21 MR WAGNER: I have five short 22 submissions to make on the list of issues. 23 The first is the Commissioner, you wrote in 24 your - well, it was communicated to us in the 25 2 September letter from Attias & Levy that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 84</p>

<p>1 the proposal was to add the text: "The 2 Commissioner will seek to ascertain facts 3 relating to the issues only to the extent that 4 he considers necessary and appropriate to 5 address the matters under inquiry." This 6 addresses our concern that we raised in our 7 submissions that some of the issues raised by 8 the Government parties are entirely 9 peripheral and have only been included to 10 muddy the waters, such as, for example, the 11 assault on a helicopter pilot incident which, 12 in fact, predates Mr McGrail's tenure as 13 Commissioner. That is the first submission. 14 The second is, as also proposed in the 2 15 September letter, the inclusion of the 16 Gibraltar Police Authority's process and 17 decisions in purported compliance with 18 section 34 of the Police Act and subsequent 19 withdrawal of that decision. That addresses 20 our concern that the GPA process needed to 21 be considered as a discrete issue. Third, as 22 also proposed in the 2 September letter, the 23 inclusion of the separate issue, I think issue 24 nine although I have not quite been following 25 how the numbering has changed - the issue</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 85</p>	<p>1 section 13 issue. 2 MR WAGNER: Yes. I think in the list we 3 were given this morning there was a new 4 name for it. We propose a different name 5 which is "the section 13 issue", or something 6 to that effect. 7 THE COMMISSIONER: That seems 8 entirely sensible. 9 MR WAGNER: Yes. Fourth, in relation to 10 issue five, the Op Delhi issue, the criminal 11 investigation into alleged hacking and/or 12 sabotage, we are grateful for the indication in 13 counsel to the Inquiry's submissions of 15 14 September that that will be reformulated so 15 the investigation as a whole will be 16 considered with the RGP's handling of the 17 same included as a sub-issue, and we 18 strongly agree with that proposal and we are 19 grateful for it. We also note and are grateful 20 for the Commissioner's indication in the 2 21 September letter that in relation to whether 22 inappropriate pressure was applied the AG's 23 and/or the Chief Minister's motivations for 24 doing so would form part of the relevant 25 facts, given that the state of a person's mind</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 87</p>
<p>1 related to Mr Pyle's stated intention -- 2 THE COMMISSIONER: It is issue nine. 3 MR WAGNER: Issue nine. Thank you; I 4 am grateful, sir. Relating to Mr Pyle's stated 5 intention to use his powers under section 13 6 of the Police Act which, if triggered, would 7 force Mr McGrail to resign, and the 8 relevance of Sir David Steel's imminent 9 commencement of Governor. That inclusion 10 of that issue addresses the submission we 11 made in writing that Mr Pyle's conduct 12 needed to be considered as a separate issue, 13 and we also agree with the wording set out at 14 paragraph 33 of the counsel the Inquiry's 15 15 September submissions which reflects in 16 large part the alternative wording we 17 proposed in our submissions which crossed 18 with those submissions on the same day, but 19 we do not take any issue with the proposed 20 new wording. 21 THE COMMISSIONER: But you are still on 22 issue nine. 23 MR WAGNER: Yes. 24 THE COMMISSIONER: And you want to 25 rename it, or you suggested it is renamed, the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 86</p>	<p>1 is a matter of fact, which the Commissioner 2 has already committed to ascertaining 3 through the introductory wording in the list 4 of issues, and that deals with the point we 5 made about intention, and we are happy with 6 that indication. All those indications and 7 amendments in relation to issue five 8 adequately addressed our concern that we 9 raised in our written submissions that the 10 issue as formulated in draft appeared to focus 11 on the RGP's handling. Finally, on that point 12 we are content with the alternative wording 13 set out at paragraph 27 of counsel to the 14 Inquiry's submissions, and take no further 15 point on issue five. Finally, in relation to the 16 language which may be used in the final 17 reports, you have our detailed submissions on 18 that point at paragraphs 15 to 25 of our 23 19 August submissions on the issues list and the 20 policies, and we appreciate the implication; it 21 is not an issue which requires resolution at 22 this stage, but we do respectfully agree with 23 the points made at paragraph 28 of counsel to 24 the Inquiry's 15 September submissions and 25 say (only very briefly) this: as the counsel the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 88</p>

<p>1 Inquiry states, a public inquiry is entitled to 2 draw inferences and conclusions from 3 primary facts found, and we say the 4 Commissioner has wide terms of reference to 5 inquire as he shall in his absolute discretion 6 consider appropriate, and also has a statutory 7 power to make recommendations which will 8 also require evaluative conclusions to be 9 reached. We say there is no reason to unduly 10 restrict the report to findings of pure fact, or 11 however it might be described, probably the 12 simplest point being that if he did so, the 13 Commissioner would be unable to explain in 14 the report how certain reasons of 15 circumstances led to Mr McGrail ceasing to 16 be Commissioner. So for all of those reasons 17 we agree with counsel to the Inquiry's 18 submissions and we make no more 19 submissions on that at this stage. Those are 20 our five points. 21 THE COMMISSIONER: I quite understand 22 you making a gloss on these points, but the 23 long and the short of it is that so far as you 24 are concerned there is not actually any 25 outstanding issue either with the policies or</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 89</p>	<p>1 Government parties are peripheral, except in 2 the sense that they are all peripheral because, 3 as Mr Chairman has heard me say this 4 morning in the statement of the 5 Government's case, we do not accept that 6 any of these were the reason why he had to 7 resign. They are reasons why the Governor 8 lost confidence in him. To the extent that the 9 Inquiry finds those reasons why they lost 10 confidence relevant, there they are, but the 11 reason why he retired are the ones that I set 12 out this morning. The important point is that 13 we are not, by agreeing to the language of 14 five, accepting for one moment that this has 15 created a hierarchy of issues where some are 16 peripheral and others are not. I agree with 17 the submissions made by your own counsel 18 and Mr Wagner, but although we all stand by 19 our submissions, there is no need to decide 20 today the question of whether you have 21 power to make judgmental findings. We can 22 kick that can down the road. 23 THE COMMISSIONER: You are happy 24 with the formulation of the now issue ten, 25 subject to the alterations and additions to the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 91</p>
<p>1 procedures or indeed the list of issues. 2 MR WAGNER: No, and the reason I just 3 laboured it slightly was because we had not 4 had an opportunity formally to respond to 5 counsel to the Inquiry's submissions, so I 6 wanted to put on record exactly what we 7 agreed to. 8 THE COMMISSIONER: I completely 9 understand. 10 MR WAGNER: I am very grateful; thank 11 you. 12 SIR PETER CARUANA: By way of gloss, 13 we are delighted that we are in agreement 14 with the submissions now. We do not, 15 however, accept - and this is just for the 16 record - that any of the language that has 17 gone into issue five as suggested by those 18 who have suggested it, is a contradiction of 19 your Lordship's finding in the letter, or your 20 Lordship's indication in the letter, 21 Chairman's indication in the letter - there is 22 not a hierarchy of issues. Now, we do not 23 accept what my learned friend has just said 24 that the new language of issue five 25 acknowledges that some issues raised by the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 90</p>	<p>1 preambles. 2 MR NEISH: Yes, sir, I confirm that I am. I 3 confirm that I am happy. 4 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. 5 MR NEISH: And I am happy with the 6 proposals generally made by counsel to the 7 Inquiry in relation to the various documents, 8 and so forth. I support that completely. 9 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. 10 MR SANTOS: Thank you. I do not think I 11 need to say anything further in relation to 12 those points. I certainly do not understand 13 any of the language that we have -- The one 14 thing I will say is that I do not understand 15 that any of the language that we have 16 introduced has created thereby a hierarchy of 17 issues, although it is within your discretion in 18 due course to look into some issues to a 19 greater extent than others if you consider that 20 appropriate and relevant. I think that is 21 agreed by all concerned. I do not have 22 anything else that I propose to say on the list 23 of issues, and obviously if you would like to 24 say anything on that I am happy to give -- 25 THE COMMISSIONER: I think all I need to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 92</p>

<p>1 say is to thank everyone very much for 2 resolving these matters as we have done. Are 3 we going to need the hearing in November? 4 Perhaps it would be unwise to vacate it at this 5 stage, because something may crop up. 6 MR SANTOS: I would be reluctant to 7 vacate it and I think what I would welcome 8 from the parties is an indication in the next 9 week or so, without setting a strict deadline, 10 but if they could in reasonably short order 11 inform us what their views are as to whether 12 a hearing is necessary. 13 THE COMMISSIONER: It is in the nature 14 of things that problems, contingencies arise 15 that we cannot necessarily foresee. The 16 formula I would prefer to use is that I cannot 17 at the moment identify any outstanding 18 issues but by the time November comes 19 along there may well be. If I am wrong, we 20 can vacate the hearing nearer the time. Yes? 21 SIR PETER CARUANA: I have not got my 22 head around - I do not know whether my 23 learned friend has his - around the timetable 24 that you laid out this morning. Absent from 25 that timetable is an opportunity to resolve</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 93</p>	<p>1 Government in various aspects of the Inquiry 2 administration. This is an issue we have 3 raised a number of times in correspondence 4 and I appreciate the Inquiry has been trying 5 to resolve the matters. Our submission in 6 principle is that this, as a public inquiry 7 where serious allegations of misconduct and 8 corruption by Government officials are being 9 investigated, it is essential that there is a high 10 degree of separation between the Inquiry and 11 those Government officials, because the 12 Inquiry must be independent and be seen to 13 be independent. We note that in 14 correspondence Caruana & Co. has now 15 confirmed that it is acting for all branches of 16 HM Government of Gibraltar which 17 includes, but is not limited to, the Officer of 18 Governor, i.e. the current Governor, Sir 19 David Steel; the Interim Governor at the 20 relevant time, Nick Pyle; the Chief Minister 21 Fabian Picardo; the Attorney General, 22 Michael Llamas; and this therefore includes 23 the Government as a whole, including the 24 Council of Ministers and the Governor. We 25 note the proviso that Sir Peter Caruana</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 95</p>
<p>1 redaction issues, applications for PII, if any. 2 Now, unless the Commissioner hopes to do 3 that just by correspondence, it might be a 4 good idea to leave that date in the diary to 5 sweep up, because by the time we come to 6 the fourth 2PH -- 7 THE COMMISSIONER: It is very close. 8 SIR PETER CARUANA: It is very close to 9 the wire. 10 THE COMMISSIONER: We will keep the 11 appointment for the time being and we will 12 vacate it if there is obviously not going to be 13 enough business. 14 MR SANTOS: Other than that, there is on 15 the agenda the ability for any party to raise 16 any point, or the Commissioner - you, the 17 Commissioner, yourself, to raise any points, 18 so I give way. 19 THE COMMISSIONER: No, I have nothing 20 to raise, but if anybody else does - yes? 21 MR WAGNER: Sir, I do have a couple of 22 points to raise, if I may. They are all points 23 that have been in our written submissions, 24 but I wanted to highlight them. The first one 25 is in relation to the involvement of the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 94</p>	<p>1 included in that includes but is not limited to 2 - we do not know the meaning of that. But it 3 is therefore the case that the entire 4 Government, including but not limited to the 5 individuals within it who are core 6 participants in the Inquiry and who still hold 7 high public office, and possibly others but we 8 do not know, are being represented by the 9 same legal team. Caruana & Co. have in 10 their submissions taken opposition to our 11 submission, for example, that IT services 12 should not be contracted from the 13 Government, inferring that we do not trust 14 the Government officials, but that is not the 15 point we are making. Our point is that if the 16 Inquiry's computer systems are administered 17 by the Government, it is not sufficiently 18 independent from the Government and that is 19 because the Government will have access to 20 the Inquiry's documents and data, and we say 21 that is, at best, not ideal and, at worst, not 22 appropriate in the circumstances of this 23 Inquiry which we, we say, about alleged 24 Government corruption. Although Caruana & 25 Co. have expressed their opposition to our</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 96</p>

<p>1 concerns, they have not explained how any 2 or any appropriate level of separation is 3 being maintained between those who are 4 playing a substantive role in the Inquiry and 5 those who are assisted in administering it. It 6 has been said in response by counsel to the 7 Inquiry in his submissions that since the core 8 participants have not made any proposal for 9 alternative IT providers, the matter will not 10 be taken further, but respectfully, it should 11 not be for the core participants to propose 12 solutions; it should be for the Inquiry to find 13 them, and we are confident there are other 14 providers of IT services either in Gibraltar or 15 the UK which could assist. This issue has 16 arisen also, as you know, in relation to our 17 fees, which we raised the issue that we had 18 not yet been paid in the build-up to this 19 hearing for fees going back to February, but 20 we can confirm that some of the fees have 21 now been paid, so that concern has fallen 22 away to an extent. But we do remain 23 concerned that sending of fees for approval 24 and payment by the Government means that 25 the Government parties, all represented by</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 97</p>	<p>1 MR WAGNER: Yes. 2 THE COMMISSIONER: Surely it is entirely 3 reasonable for the Government to investigate 4 that matter. 5 MR WAGNER: It is reasonable for the 6 Government to investigate, but the concern 7 we have is that the Government and the other 8 core participants are all being represented by 9 the same parties and ordinarily you would 10 not expect core participants to an inquiry to 11 have access to fees information about other 12 core participants. You would have some sort 13 of information separation. 14 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes, but in fact, by 15 statute it is the Government who are 16 responsible for your fees. 17 MR WAGNER: That is the case, and that 18 puts it in a slightly difficult position. But we 19 say that there are ways round that. For 20 example, in another inquiry that happened in 21 Wales into the death of a minister, Carl 22 Sargeant, there was a very similar situation 23 where the First Minister of Wales was a core 24 participant in the inquiry. He was being said 25 to be for blame for some of the things that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 99</p>
<p>1 the same legal team as the officials who are 2 core participants in this Inquiry, have access 3 to information relating to our legal work 4 which they probably should not have access 5 to. By way of example, a concerning 6 incident arose in the build-up to this hearing. 7 In the submissions that the Government 8 parties put in as their reply submissions dated 9 15 September, paragraph 4 provided a 10 detailed chronology revealing the dates of Mr 11 McGrail's team's fee notes which we 12 submitted. The dates we submitted our fee 13 notes to the Inquiry, including when 14 counsel's fee notes were separately 15 submitted, and the date the Inquiry's solicitor 16 forwarded these invoices to the Government. 17 None of this is information which the 18 lawyers acting for core participants in the 19 Inquiry should have access to, relating to 20 other core participants. Indeed, they seem to 21 have more access to the chronology of 22 payment than we do. The fact that they have 23 access -- 24 THE COMMISSIONER: Hang on. You 25 made a complaint about non-payment of fees.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 98</p>	<p>1 went wrong. So an independent party was 2 appointed, just an individual who was an ex- 3 senior civil servant who was the go-between 4 the Government that was administering the 5 fees and the core participants who did not 6 then have access to the fees information, and 7 it just raises the point that we are concerned 8 about, which is if the same solicitors are 9 acting for the entire Government and all the 10 Government core participants, and they are 11 also administering fees and managing IT 12 services, that is not enough separation, we 13 say, for the Inquiry to be fully independent 14 and to be seen to be fully independent. 15 THE COMMISSIONER: The Government, 16 as I understand it, does not have access, 17 although they may technically be the 18 administrator, but they do not have access to 19 the Inquiry documents. 20 MR WAGNER: Well, if that is the case then 21 that is reassuring but as I understand it -- 22 THE COMMISSIONER: That is my clear 23 understanding. 24 MR WAGNER: They are providing IT 25 services.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 100</p>

25 (Pages 97 to 100)

<p>1 SIR PETER CARUANA: If I may just stand 2 on his point, his concern appears to be that I 3 represent the Government Parties, and his 4 concern was that I might have access to the 5 Government's - I have no to the 6 Government's IT system and I am 7 completely ignorant about what is held on it. 8 If I did have access to it, he can be sure, and I 9 suppose he is willing to trust fellow counsel, 10 that I would not have access to it. It is a 11 complete, with respect to him, fabricated 12 concern. 13 THE COMMISSIONER: I do not know if it 14 is a fabricated concern but I think it is a 15 groundless concern, because we have looked 16 into this following what you wrote in your 17 last representations in September or 18 whenever it was, and I have been assured that 19 the Government does not have access to the 20 Inquiry systems. 21 MR WAGNER: If that is the case, that is 22 reassuring, my Lord. 23 THE COMMISSIONER: That is your 24 understanding, Mr Santos. 25 MR SANTOS: That is my understanding.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 101</p>	<p>1 the obvious ones. We do not consider that 2 the obvious ones would be any more 3 acceptable to the core participants than what 4 we currently have in place, but we are willing 5 to continue the conversation and -- 6 THE COMMISSIONER: I will tell you 7 what. Let us undertake to make a detailed 8 inquiry of the position and the risks, and we 9 will let you know precisely what we find, and 10 if there are concerns we will let you know 11 and we will address them. 12 MR WAGNER: I am very grateful for that 13 indication. May I just take instructions? 14 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. 15 MR SANTOS: In the meantime I am 16 anxious that the documents policy must go 17 out and we will amend it if in due course it 18 needs to be amended. 19 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. 20 MR WAGNER: Those are my submissions. 21 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you. 22 SIR PETER CARUANA: Sir, I am afraid 23 my learned friend obliges me to respond to 24 him on the question of fees, because, as the 25 Chairman has correctly pointed out and my</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 103</p>
<p>1 We can keep looking into this, because I 2 understand where the concern comes from, 3 but on the other hand we are constrained in 4 Gibraltar by, first of all, in terms of the fees, 5 the statute we operate under. I cannot see 6 how the requirement for approval by the 7 Government can be in any way circumvented 8 or constrained by us, because it is enshrined 9 in the statute. That is the fees point. 10 As far as the IT point is concerned, my 11 understanding is that we benefit - not me, not 12 anyone in the Inquiry team - the 13 Commissioner and the Secretary use email 14 addresses provided by the Government. 15 Whether that potentially could be open to 16 access by a Government employee, I do not 17 know the answer to. That is something we 18 can check. Again, we are constrained by 19 what is practically possible in Gibraltar. We 20 have said to the parties that we are willing to 21 consider alternatives, but without any real 22 information as to a threat to the integrity of 23 our documents, we certainly do not think that 24 we should be embarking on looking into 25 alternative IT solutions. We have considered</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 102</p>	<p>1 learned friend has repeated, the implication 2 in the written submissions and in his oral 3 submissions today is that somehow the 4 Government is abusing the disbursement of 5 Mr McGrail's legal team's fees pursuant to 6 this cloud of impropriety with which he 7 wishes to associate everybody associated 8 with Government parties. The facts of the 9 matter are that even though they unhelpfully 10 say in their written submissions that they 11 have not been paid since February, giving the 12 reader of this when it is published the 13 understandable impression that the 14 Government has sat on their fees since 15 February. The reality of it is that the 16 Government did not receive their fee note 17 until 25 August, two or three weeks ago, and 18 that they have already been paid despite it 19 being general knowledge that the 20 Government practises a policy of 30 days 21 credit on all its liabilities. So, far from being 22 the victim of discrimination, as he recites 23 here, he has been the victim of beneficial 24 treatment. It might have been helpful if - 25 because his complaint is that we have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 104</p>

26 (Pages 101 to 104)

<p>1 discovered the date of his fees - that is a 2 great pity. I suppose what he was hoping for 3 was that we had not discovered the date of 4 his fees and would not have been able to 5 blow the whistle on his unmeritorious 6 submissions aimed at causing the public to 7 believe that the Government is manipulating 8 Mr McGrail's legal team's fees for some 9 advantage. The opposite is true, as is also 10 untrue his submissions that the Government 11 reviews bills. Although they are entitled by 12 the Act to do so, the Government, in fact, 13 does not do so. The Government accepts at 14 face value the certificate of the Inquiry team, 15 of the solicitors for the Inquiry, and of the 16 Inquiry Secretary, and do not even look at the 17 bill. They pass it straight to the Treasury for 18 payment unless the Secretary of the Inquiry 19 has expressed an unhappiness. It is not the 20 case with Mr McGrail's legal fees, and I 21 think it is important that these facts are 22 known, because it does place into context the 23 credibility of some of the submissions that 24 are made on Mr McGrail's behalf. 25 THE COMMISSIONER: I think on that --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 105</p>	<p>1 witnesses. I wanted to flag a few things 2 today, if I may, just because I think they 3 might have an impact on your timescale and I 4 would not want to be accused of not having 5 raised it today. The first point is that the 6 RGP's position is it wants to do everything it 7 can to assist the Inquiry, to meet its 8 obligations and its timescales. That is the 9 first point that I repeated in correspondence 10 but I repeat for the record today. Secondly, 11 that it wants to consider the protocols as 12 quickly as it can and see if that tackles its 13 concerns. Its concerns are obvious, and that 14 is really the tension perhaps that might exist 15 between the desire of this Inquiry to answer a 16 question or questions or issues and, of 17 course, the police's obligations under the 18 Police Act to continue to police in a manner 19 that it should do under the Constitution and 20 under the Police Act. The disclosure 21 information may well fall in some cases 22 within that context. I have been pleased to 23 hear that some of the protections that perhaps 24 are not so obvious when reading the Act are 25 going to be built in or exist and may be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 107</p>
<p>1 MR SANTOS: I do not wish to address -- 2 THE COMMISSIONER: I think we might - 3 MR CRUZ: Sir, I know I have a watching 4 brief, but in case it is helpful, there is a few 5 things which might be relevant, only about 6 four or five matters. As you know, I am here 7 on behalf of the RGP and RGP officers that 8 have been asked to give extensive witness 9 statements. Now, those statements include 10 granular information on a host of matters, 11 some of which have been ventilated today. It 12 would be right to say that it would be akin to 13 a Part 31 disclosure exercise but with very 14 little time and very little guidance at this 15 stage of what is required. Now, I appreciate 16 my learned friend has said that later today or 17 this week I will get the protocol that I have 18 been seeking since 5 August, and that will 19 help at least me be in a position to see how I 20 can advise the RGP officers, and I know that 21 the other RGP officers who are no longer in 22 service who have been summoned and who 23 have sought disclosure from the RGP. So 24 this covers quite a lot of witnesses, I would 25 have thought at least six substantial</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 106</p>	<p>1 identified in the protocols and that may allay 2 matters. But I wanted to raise those things. 3 The other matter is that there is a lot of 4 duplication, and I say this because I have 5 seen I think five or six letters, and 6 fundamentally they are all asking the same 7 thing, and so in the production of witness 8 statements I was - again this may be dealt 9 with by the document management protocol 10 and be a matter that we can put and park at a 11 later date, but it would make sense if, for 12 example, all RGP officers were able to refer 13 to one bundle of documents, because 14 otherwise what this Inquiry is going to 15 receive is the same information five or six 16 times at least, and it is granular and it is not - 17 - 18 THE COMMISSIONER: I cannot see any 19 problem with that. If you want to put 20 together an RGP bundle, that may be very 21 helpful. 22 MR CRUZ: I think that would reduce 23 volume. 24 MR SANTOS: I think from recollection - 25 and he will have to forgive us if we did not -</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 108</p>

27 (Pages 105 to 108)

<p>1 but my recollection is that we stated in the 2 letters that if RGP officers were aware that 3 another officer within the force was 4 providing a given document, we do not need 5 duplicates and we do not want duplicates, to 6 be honest, if they are genuine duplicates. But 7 we have had a very helpful discussion 8 outside this room over lunch time or just 9 before, and I am certainly happy to discuss 10 all of these points, but I am happy for him to 11 make them and I understand why he wishes 12 to do so. 13 MR CRUZ: And they may well be matters 14 that the RGP may need to consider, whether 15 it is matters of public interest or otherwise, or 16 it is constitutional, its role under the Police 17 Act. But it may be that information is 18 disclosed by other parties and therefore the 19 argument that the RGP may bring forward, if 20 it were to bring forward, in relation to 21 information is academic. Again, insofar as 22 that is concerned, I will intend to reach out to 23 the Inquiry's solicitors and perhaps they will 24 be able to indicate whether any other of the 25 core participants --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 109</p>	<p>1 as conceivably possible but these are all very 2 busy policemen trying to run a police force 3 and the timescales do concern us. We 4 described in our letter to Mr Santos the 5 agenda as very ambitious and I think that was 6 in gentle terms. We will do what we can but 7 there is no indication - and this is on the 8 basis that we do not make any application to 9 become core participants, which is a matter 10 that I simply cannot make any comments 11 beyond it is a possibility given that the RGP 12 is in the spotlight - but it may be that there 13 has not been an indication beyond the letters 14 of when witness statements will be required. 15 Now, I am concerned about the timescale of 16 core statements that has been identified and 17 given where we are today, and I just raise it 18 only because what I do not want is this 19 timescale to be derailed by latecomers; but 20 we are latecomers, and I think through no 21 fault of ours, and I thought it was worth 22 raising those, sir, if you think appropriate. 23 THE COMMISSIONER: I take note of what 24 you say. 25 MR CRUZ: Thank you, sir.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 111</p>
<p>1 THE COMMISSIONER: You will find them 2 very open to informal exchanges. 3 MR CRUZ: Yes. I am just conscious that if, 4 for example, just to give an example, if we 5 make with good reason some submission 6 about a particular set of documents or 7 information, actually they are already in the 8 public domain or they are going to be put in 9 by one of the other parties, we may decide 10 that it is not worth making that argument 11 because clearly -- 12 THE COMMISSIONER: Yes. 13 MR CRUZ: Indeed. So my thinking on that 14 is I can either engage with counsel for the 15 various core participants and enquire, or I 16 can just use Attias & Levy and Mr Santos as 17 a point of reference because it may be that 18 some documents that we think are sensitive 19 are already shared. So I think that is another 20 point that I just sort of raise and flag. Then 21 the last issue. Of course, I have not had sight 22 of any witness statements, any protocols, 23 anything at all. I have had letters and I have 24 written to them and raised the concerns that I 25 have raised today. I will do things as quickly</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 110</p>	<p>1 MR SANTOS: Everything that he has said is 2 utterly understandable, and every effort will 3 be made to accommodate and, of course, we 4 are not going to be compelling disclosure 5 from parties in a manner that they are unable 6 to comply with. These things will need to be 7 ironed out and we can collaborate to iron 8 them out, sir. 9 THE COMMISSIONER: Okay. 10 MR CRUZ: Much obliged, sir. 11 THE COMMISSIONER: Thank you all very 12 much indeed. I may see you in November. 13 (14.34) 14 (Hearing adjourned until November 2022)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 112</p>

A				
a.m 45:12	85:18 86:6	adopted 12:5	allay 108:1	answers 65:13
ability 94:15	105:12 107:18,20	79:11	allegations 3:25	anticipate 11:3
able 5:20 12:16	107:24 109:17	adopting 74:12	33:21,24 42:6	25:24 28:13 43:3
18:20 23:7 26:4	acting 36:17 37:13	advance 2:25	49:10,19 95:7	58:2 61:4
27:16 28:5 105:4	38:15 39:9,20	57:12,20	alleged 33:10	anticipated 49:7
108:12 109:24	45:16 80:22	advanced 57:4	35:18 36:4,8	anxiety 22:8
abridged 10:1	95:15 98:18	advantage 105:9	38:22 46:8,14	anxious 2:25 5:3
abrogate 65:8	100:9	advice 40:20	47:21 52:12 54:4	10:10 103:16
absence 64:14	actioned 20:1	advise 106:20	79:24 80:1,10	anybody 32:7
Absent 93:24	actions 49:8 50:8	advised 37:8 55:22	81:11,12 87:11	94:20
absolute 89:5	actual 28:9 43:16	advisers 53:14	96:23	apologise 5:23 7:6
absolutely 10:11	ad 42:18 43:4,13	affairs 52:10	alleges 50:13	33:13
52:17	44:5 46:2	afforded 62:8	allow 2:25 4:15	apparently 38:11
abusing 104:4	Adam 6:5	afraid 103:22	69:4	appear 15:11
academic 109:21	adaptations 75:17	aftermath 50:25	allowed 28:25 44:3	56:14 61:7 62:1
accept 43:15 84:9	add 14:23 15:16	afternoon 84:6	allows 4:24	appeared 60:18
90:15,23 91:5	28:21 47:5 66:19	AG's 87:22	alongside 63:2	88:10
acceptable 103:3	85:1	age 83:25	alter 48:9	appears 65:8
acceptance 75:18	added 60:21 71:14	agenda 2:23 3:19	alterations 91:25	101:2
accepted 15:13	additional 68:25	6:18 7:2,4 26:22	altered 4:22	application 13:10
57:10 70:3	82:20	55:3 78:22 94:15	alternative 80:14	14:2,4 28:17
accepting 91:14	additions 91:25	111:5	86:16 88:12 97:9	30:23 56:13
accepts 105:13	address 7:13 13:14	ago 77:10 104:17	102:25	61:13 62:19 64:8
access 14:7,11	16:24 18:23	agree 33:3 53:23	alternatives	66:1 68:16,20
96:19 98:2,4,19	23:10 51:15 56:7	58:4 60:11 61:6	102:21	69:2,5,6,12,18
98:21,23 99:11	61:1 66:2 71:7	65:3,11 66:4	ambitious 25:7	70:6 71:18,19
100:6,16,18	78:21 79:1,18	67:9,14,24 70:21	111:5	72:4,14 73:4
101:4,8,10,19	84:16 85:5	71:13 74:23 82:1	amenable 65:5	111:8
102:16	103:11 106:1	82:15,21 86:13	amend 61:2 80:12	applications 13:19
accommodate	addressed 88:8	87:18 88:22	103:17	13:21,25 23:25
112:3	addresses 13:1,4	89:17 91:16	amended 65:24	26:1,2 67:18
accords 67:19	85:6,19 86:10	agreed 18:13	66:10 103:18	68:2 69:25 71:23
account 10:3	102:14	36:23 42:20 44:3	amending 55:20	72:24 73:11 74:4
26:13 54:4	addressing 15:8	44:21 45:1 56:12	amendments	94:1
accounts 8:23 15:4	adequate 11:9,18	71:3 75:10 90:7	12:10 88:7	applied 87:22
15:12	adequately 88:8	92:21	amount 2:16 33:7	applies 35:1,10
accused 36:17	adjourned 112:14	agreeing 91:13	amplified 34:12	62:22
107:4	adjournment	agreement 13:14	and/or 10:18	apply 1:25
achieve 55:6	44:18 84:4	16:4 35:2 37:1	68:21 79:25	appointed 41:12
acknowledges	administered	56:4,15 61:18	81:11 87:11,23	100:2
90:25	96:16	62:2 64:9 74:10	angry 36:15	appointment
act 6:15 14:18	administering	79:16 81:22	annex 75:12 76:2,5	94:11
37:20 40:8,10	97:5 100:4,11	90:13	76:9	appreciate 88:20
41:6 48:6,21	administration	aimed 105:6	answer 33:23	95:4 106:15
52:24 54:20	95:2	airfield 50:22	34:13 42:4 62:17	appreciated 42:21
62:12 64:5,15,18	administrator	airplane 50:23	63:5,12 79:6	approach 8:22
65:23 74:13	100:18	akin 106:12	102:17 107:15	10:13 11:23 12:5
76:20 82:8 83:3	Admiral 41:11	alert 59:23	answering 62:14	21:24 37:5 62:2
	adopt 65:12	Allan 6:11	63:9 64:21	66:9 67:5,17,22

67:24 70:13,21 79:12 approached 29:16 approaching 11:12 appropriate 13:6 14:12 16:23 17:7 18:16 20:16,21 26:8 29:19 57:23 58:25 59:10 60:16 62:2 70:7 72:21 81:4 84:16 85:4 89:6 92:20 96:22 97:2 111:22 approval 97:23 102:6 approved 39:5 areas 6:22 arguable 64:17 65:4 argued 80:6 argument 53:18 109:19 110:10 argumentation 53:17 arisen 56:9 97:16 arises 5:17 61:3,14 65:25 78:18 81:25 arising 52:4 arose 13:9 52:12 56:24 98:6 arrangement 1:13 arrangements 1:10,19 69:3 arrived 56:3,17,20 arriving 41:12 Article 64:12 ascertain 16:21 85:2 ascertaining 88:2 asked 3:11 24:10 29:9 39:15 41:4 45:8 46:24 64:9 83:22 84:7,17 106:8 asking 61:9 108:6 aspects 95:1	assault 85:11 assaulted 51:5 asserted 48:2 assist 4:13,17 18:20 19:9 22:6 55:25 97:15 107:7 assistance 55:16 assisted 5:7 31:19 97:5 associate 104:7 associated 9:18 104:7 assumes 71:23 assurance 73:21 assurances 22:10 assured 9:23 101:18 attempted 38:25 attend 2:4 attendance 2:2 attending 1:24 attention 52:21 Attias 8:7 17:14 84:25 110:16 Attorney 6:7 9:2 36:12,18,22 37:4 48:8 49:3,13 50:3,14 52:14 53:8 69:17 72:3 95:21 attribute 53:7 audible 71:12 August 33:17 88:19 104:17 106:18 authoritative 63:22 authority 6:12 9:20 37:17 48:5 48:22 49:15 51:14 64:1 Authority's 54:15 85:16 availability 2:3 available 4:5 12:20 20:9 24:4 52:2 avoid 49:7	await 6:22 awaiting 9:21 aware 9:14 12:1 13:24 30:3 33:6 55:13 109:2 axiomatic 47:24 <hr/> B <hr/> B 65:1 back 63:10 97:19 background 35:13 57:24,25 balancing 66:12 bar 66:5 based 53:11 basically 28:11 47:9 basis 18:16 38:12 61:6 71:17 84:11 111:8 beak 44:16 bearing 26:25 beg 27:22 began 44:4 behalf 3:9 35:15 39:19 105:24 106:7 believe 7:2 53:4 56:12 61:17 81:16,21 83:7 105:7 believed 37:7 48:24 54:18 bend 34:10 beneficial 104:23 benefit 38:22 46:16 56:18 63:20 102:11 Benyunes 6:6 berated 36:14 best 11:7 26:17 29:12 33:2,5 35:10 52:1 60:6 78:9 96:21 better 1:13,14 44:16 beyond 111:11,13 bias 40:24 Bier 34:20 bill 105:17	bills 105:11 binary 69:8 bit 27:17 28:7 blame 99:25 Bland 46:18 blow 105:5 blue 65:5 75:2,3 77:7 board 77:15 body 37:17 books 63:7 bore 48:18 branches 95:15 breach 65:14,17 break 43:8,18 44:13 83:20 breaking 83:13 brief 3:2,8,13 30:13 33:25 34:4 35:13 42:9 47:7 61:25 66:21 106:4 briefed 53:15 briefly 3:18 12:17 33:20,22 42:4 56:16 66:3 71:7 71:7,8 75:3 82:1 88:25 bring 75:18 109:19,20 Britto 38:23 39:7,8 39:13,18,22 45:13,15 broad 16:4 61:18 62:1 broadly 15:16 18:13 brought 35:8 50:25 52:21 build-up 97:18 98:6 built 107:25 bundle 4:5 6:19 7:16 8:9 12:25 13:1,17 14:8,15 14:21 15:18,21 16:2,3 17:11,16 24:5 31:23 108:13,20	bundles 18:2 burdensome 18:25 business 2:19 83:14 94:13 busy 111:2 <hr/> C <hr/> C 47:3 call 29:21 30:5 40:12 41:7 48:19 49:5 50:10 52:24 54:18,19 called 29:2 35:5 36:13 41:3 calling 18:19 29:17 53:11 capable 29:5 capacity 42:13 career 41:23 careful 26:13 Carl 99:21 carry 79:9 Caruana 6:11 27:9 27:10,22 28:1 42:7,23,24 43:20 43:24 44:2,8,12 46:1 47:20 53:20 53:24 58:3 71:6 73:6,9 74:5,7,21 75:7,11 76:5,9,13 76:23 77:3 90:12 93:21 94:8 95:14 95:25 96:9,24 101:1 103:22 case 30:10 42:10 48:11 49:1 53:4 53:5 64:3 66:13 72:2,21 73:25 74:22 83:8 91:5 96:3 99:17 100:20 101:21 105:20 106:4 cases 107:21 Catania 19:21 Catania's 8:7 categories 19:11 categorize 20:4 category 14:13 caught 67:14 cause 36:20 37:16
--	--	---	---	--

<p>caused 47:22 causing 2:10 105:6 cease 47:22 ceased 48:12 ceasing 54:7 89:15 central 37:10 81:19 centralised 35:20 centre 46:6 certain 46:25 62:8 89:14 certainly 30:6 56:1 72:5 92:12 102:23 109:9 certificate 105:14 chair 38:13 39:3,5 39:7 chairman 48:22 72:6,12 91:3 103:25 Chairman's 47:4 90:21 challenge 40:24 chance 47:16 change 31:20 32:1 37:5 45:2 changed 85:25 changes 15:19 24:6 70:13 Charles 6:6 Chase 34:19 chased 10:5 check 26:6 102:18 checking 83:11 checks 22:24 chief 6:7 35:23 36:5,8,12,14,16 37:6,12 38:14,19 38:20,24 39:9,20 39:23,25 40:5,9 40:14,15,18,20 42:12 45:16 46:4 46:13,20,22 48:8 48:16 49:2,12 50:3,14 52:13,20 53:2,8 54:12 77:9,9,10 80:11 87:23 95:20 choice 69:8</p>	<p>choosing 50:6 chose 49:7 54:9,9 55:23 Christopher 6:11 chronology 98:10 98:21 circulated 2:24 circumstance 59:16 circumstances 47:21 48:1,2 50:6 54:7,13 59:15 60:23 73:5 89:15 96:22 circumvented 102:7 cited 73:15 citing 37:13 72:9 civil 19:24 100:3 claimed 36:22 claims 37:22 clarification 10:9 57:15 58:7 clarified 43:1 clarify 32:5 classified 66:8 67:12,13 clause 58:13 clear 5:4 15:13 16:19 21:14 40:11 69:25 80:18 82:21 100:22 clearly 28:22 47:23 48:23 50:7 72:13 110:11 client 62:9,11 clients 73:22 close 35:24 38:18 55:11 94:7,8 closely 8:13 closer 11:12 closing 4:20 cloud 104:6 collaborate 33:3 112:7 collected 30:4 collection 8:20 16:11</p>	<p>collectively 6:9 collision 38:2 52:6 come 32:20 49:20 71:11 75:5 94:5 comes 19:24 93:18 102:2 comfort 73:16 commence 6:2 19:20 commenced 15:5 commencement 82:10 86:9 commend 28:21 comments 31:8 57:5 59:21 111:10 commission 59:1 Commissioner 1:4 1:6 3:14,18 14:25 16:20 17:24 26:16 27:5 27:9,20,24 28:16 29:3,11 30:9 31:11 33:11,15 34:3,8,13,17,21 34:24 37:21 40:13,17 42:1 43:12,17,23 44:1 44:7,11,15,20,23 45:3,10,22,24 47:14,19,23 48:12 49:18 53:10,19,22 54:8 54:25 55:22 57:3 58:8,25 59:9 60:2,9,12,15 66:18,22 68:17 69:1 70:8,10 71:5 73:3,8 74:3 74:6,16 75:4,9,25 76:8,12,22 77:1 77:18,24 78:2,7 78:11,14,16 79:6 83:16,19,24 84:2 84:15,23 85:2,13 86:2,21,24 87:7 88:1 89:4,13,16 89:21 90:8 91:23 92:4,9,25 93:13</p>	<p>94:2,7,10,16,17 94:19 98:24 99:2 99:14 100:15,22 101:13,23 102:13 103:6,14,19,21 105:25 106:2 108:18 110:1,12 111:23 112:9,11 Commissioner's 87:20 commissioners 62:15 63:6,10 Commissions 62:12 commit 60:22 61:8 committed 17:4 88:2 committing 61:11 communicated 38:4 84:24 communication 39:3 communications 46:25 62:9 63:19 company 35:22 36:2,6 38:21 42:15 46:6,9 compatible 75:19 76:15 compel 21:10,16 compelling 21:24 112:4 complaint 51:13 98:25 104:25 complete 11:10 101:11 completed 21:18 83:14 completely 74:20 90:8 92:8 101:7 compliance 9:21 9:23 21:17 25:19 83:3 85:17 complied 9:20 comply 32:8 41:9 47:6 65:17 112:6 comprehensive 19:7 compromise 73:1</p>	<p>computer 96:16 conceivably 111:1 concern 30:6 32:14 43:6 52:16 85:6,20 88:8 97:21 99:6 101:2 101:4,12,14,15 102:2 111:3 concerned 36:19 38:6 41:16 68:6 89:24 92:21 97:23 100:7 102:10 109:22 111:15 concerning 98:5 concerns 21:2 23:4 97:1 103:10 107:13,13 110:24 conclusion 62:4 75:6 conclusions 89:2,8 concur 57:17 conduct 35:7 53:7 53:12 54:5 86:11 conducted 51:17 confidence 37:11 37:22 38:11,17 39:10,21 40:2 45:17 48:15 49:9 49:22 50:4,9,16 53:10 54:11 91:8 91:10 confident 17:10 22:20 97:13 confirm 92:2,3 97:20 confirmed 40:5 95:15 conformity 65:6 confusion 82:22 conjunction 64:18 conscious 30:15 110:3 consequent 48:14 consider 16:23 21:15 26:6 27:11 28:2 29:19 31:5 53:11 58:25 59:10 60:17,20</p>
---	--	--	--	--

60:25 61:10 65:9 69:1 73:15,20 77:23 78:3 81:3 84:15 89:6 92:19 102:21 103:1 107:11 109:14 considerable 33:7 consideration 25:2 52:22 80:25 82:9 considered 11:6 37:25 51:24 70:7 80:15 85:21 86:12 87:16 102:25 considering 10:23 14:2 15:6 41:5 considers 60:15 72:8 85:4 consistent 64:25 conspicuously 78:5 conspiracy 35:21 80:1 81:12 Constabularies 51:19,20 constitution 64:14 64:19 65:1,7,17 69:22 75:13,15 75:19 76:6,16 107:19 constitutional 64:22 109:16 constrain 57:18 constrained 47:2 102:3,8,18 construe 76:18 construed 75:16 76:14 77:12 construing 76:18 contact 57:22 60:1 61:4,5 contained 39:14 82:4 containing 39:19 contemplating 72:3 contemporaneous 2:7 content 15:2 57:8	70:9 71:25 83:7 88:12 contentious 72:16 contentment 56:5 contested 82:4 context 56:23 61:15 64:4 105:22 107:22 contextualise 58:1 contingencies 93:14 continue 8:16 21:7 54:14 83:20 103:5 107:18 contract 46:17 contracted 96:12 contradiction 90:18 contrary 35:3 contribution 3:15 convenient 61:24 Convent 38:15 Convention 64:12 conversation 103:5 conviction 14:13 cooperation 21:13 copies 23:20 57:20 63:18 core 3:23 5:8 6:23 7:8 9:1,4,8,16 11:18 12:6,14 13:3,16,17,19 14:1 15:12,14,23 15:25 18:13 19:4 19:12,13 20:7,11 20:13 22:1,21 23:2,7,23,25 24:2 24:9,17,18,21 25:11,15 26:1,5 26:11,18 27:18 28:8 30:3,23 31:20,22 32:2,9 32:11,16,23 55:9 55:10 56:23 58:19,21 60:21 63:16 66:17 68:18,22 69:4 71:21 96:5 97:7	97:11 98:2,18,20 99:8,10,12,23 100:5,10 103:3 109:25 110:15 111:9,16 correct 31:16 45:9 53:5 74:21 correction 44:25 45:6,15 correctly 103:25 correspondence 22:13 39:5 55:7 56:9 70:11 79:15 82:20 83:1 94:3 95:3,14 107:9 Corrupt 64:4 corruption 95:8 96:24 costs 22:14 Council 95:24 counsel 1:12 3:1,3 3:21,23 5:1,7,25 17:23 33:19,24 55:15 57:17 59:3 66:25 67:9,14,22 67:25 69:15 70:10,21 86:14 87:13 88:13,23 88:25 89:17 90:5 91:17 92:6 97:6 101:9 110:14 counsel's 98:14 couple 42:25 94:21 course 4:19,22 5:11 10:5 26:11 30:24 42:12 47:19 48:9 55:15 55:19 59:21 65:12,24 78:22 92:18 103:17 107:17 110:21 112:3 court 8:11 35:11 64:2 65:3 72:14 72:18,22 73:12 court's 55:16 courts 75:22,22 covers 106:24 CPR 72:9,12	create 16:13 created 91:15 92:16 credibility 105:23 credit 104:21 criminal 2:17 14:13 38:18 48:9 50:12 52:14,20 54:5 79:20 81:21 87:10 crisis 51:2 critical 29:4 criticism 38:5 58:1 70:19 71:1 criticisms 57:4 70:20 crop 93:5 crossed 86:17 crucial 7:8 8:3 Cruz 3:5,9,17 6:14 30:12 31:14 33:6 33:8 106:3 108:22 109:13 110:3,13 111:25 112:10 crystallize 30:1 culminated 51:12 current 6:16 18:12 69:10 95:18 currently 10:23 28:10 103:4	dates 98:10,12 David 41:11 82:10 86:8 95:19 day 2:20 36:10 37:15 41:2 86:18 day's 2:19 days 37:2 38:24 104:20 deadline 13:25 21:18,22 25:20 31:22 32:4,6,15 32:25 93:9 deadlines 8:14 deal 5:4,16 7:3 8:20 18:15 25:25 26:21 60:7 78:9 81:25 dealing 14:24 27:1 deals 75:13 79:20 88:4 dealt 12:12 17:18 65:20 108:8 death 99:21 debate 43:2 62:6 December 24:16 32:15,17 decide 53:3 91:19 110:9 decided 31:17 65:10 decision 17:6 30:2 39:14 41:21 54:16 63:24,25 69:19 70:1 72:7 83:2,4 85:19 decisions 85:17 deep 52:16 Defence 51:2 defendants 69:21 defined 9:11 definitively 65:10 defraud 35:21 80:1 81:13 degree 95:10 delay 10:7 delayed 10:25 delays 11:3 Delhi 35:18 36:3,9 37:6 41:20 46:21 49:14 98:8
---	---	--	---	---

48:10 52:15 69:20 87:10 delighted 90:13 deliver 31:6 denied 50:13 52:13 denies 37:1,10 38:3 depends 73:5 Deputy 6:8 50:1 derailed 111:19 described 9:25 25:7 51:22 69:19 89:11 111:4 designated 13:19 13:22 designation 13:22 designed 14:17 desire 22:7 107:15 despite 41:18 79:13 104:18 detail 10:4 13:15 22:19 23:4 26:8 74:8 detailed 11:11 16:11,16 39:16 39:19 56:5 88:17 98:10 103:7 details 20:23 38:17 39:14 determination 5:13 develop 42:12 developments 4:23 device 2:17 diary 94:4 died 52:6 different 62:4 87:4 difficult 32:18 34:8 41:21 45:5 78:15 99:18 difficulty 27:21 direct 2:6 42:8 direction 27:25 directly 36:1 disagree 59:11 disagreement 16:6 16:7 disapply 65:1	disbursement 104:4 discharging 59:1 disclose 22:12 57:13 disclosed 20:6 24:20 59:14 68:24 109:18 disclosing 30:2 60:20 61:10 68:20 disclosure 7:17 10:13 11:17 18:24 19:3,19 20:11 22:17 23:16,23 24:10 24:17,19 25:17 27:13,19 28:9 30:25 32:10,12 32:16 106:13,23 107:20 112:4 discontinue 69:20 discovered 105:1,3 discovery 4:8 discrete 85:21 discretion 89:5 92:17 discrimination 104:22 discuss 1:18 5:14 23:3 43:9 109:9 discussing 73:10 discussion 109:7 discussions 68:6 disinfectant 35:10 disproportionate 59:25 dispute 17:9 79:17 79:21 disputes 12:11 18:14 26:2 disseminate 73:23 distinct 63:4 distract 22:15 distraction 2:10 document 14:12 14:18 18:11 21:13 22:2 68:21 108:9 109:4	documentary 62:20 documents 4:4,14 5:5 7:15 8:3 9:3 9:9,10,11,17 10:18 11:22 12:22,24 13:2,3,5 13:6 14:25 15:2 17:18,23 18:21 19:2,6,9,11,15,17 19:22 20:2,6,8,13 20:15,18,20,21 20:24 21:3,4,5,9 21:11 22:23 23:1 23:8,15,20 24:11 24:19 25:17 31:7 32:24 33:4,5 36:10 46:21 55:4 55:11,15,21 56:6 58:13 59:19 61:15 62:24 63:14 64:7 65:20 66:10,15 67:6,8 79:11 92:7 96:20 100:19 102:23 103:16 108:13 110:6,18 doing 6:25 17:6 42:23 61:8 77:8 81:2 87:24 domain 110:8 doubt 42:11 74:24 74:24 77:6,11 DPP 37:9 Dr 38:23 39:7,8,18 39:22 45:15 draft 4:4,10 9:11 12:25 13:9 15:16 24:5 31:4,12,14 57:20 58:12 82:2 88:10 drafted 79:22 82:3 drafting 25:18 drafts 12:6 14:24 31:17,18 dragged 17:2 draw 89:2 dry 18:3 due 4:19 5:11 10:5	42:12 43:7 55:19 92:18 103:17 duplicates 109:5,5 109:6 duplication 22:24 108:4 duty 10:15 <hr/> E <hr/> eager 11:14 earlier 2:21 21:20 early 35:8 48:13 48:17 earnest 25:16 easy 17:24 effect 68:14 81:17 87:6 effective 25:10 effectively 51:16 56:12 effort 112:2 efforts 67:3 either 69:6 71:16 89:25 97:14 110:14 Elections 64:5 electronic 8:9 9:17 17:11,16 24:10 electronically 2:8 email 102:13 embarking 102:24 embody 59:13 emboldened 74:23 employed 54:18 employee 102:16 encompasses 82:17 engage 110:14 engaged 75:23 engagement 12:15 English 63:24 75:22 enjoy 47:13 enquire 79:23 110:15 enshrined 102:8 ensure 20:16 25:19 35:6 46:2 46:15 65:20 81:5 ensuring 11:8	46:16 entire 56:4 96:3 100:9 entirely 52:25 53:23 71:1 85:8 87:8 99:2 entirety 57:21 entities 10:19 58:22 entitled 72:17 89:1 105:11 Epiq 8:8 17:15 equal 1:25 equivalent 4:1 error 45:21 escalating 22:14 essential 95:9 European 64:12 75:22 evaluative 89:8 evening 39:17 event 24:7 32:1 50:5 77:14 events 39:4 41:14 54:3 everybody 71:25 104:7 evidence 4:15,16 7:23 8:21,24 11:15 15:6 16:11 16:16 17:1,13 18:9,20,21 23:17 24:19 29:4,10,16 29:18,20 46:12 61:14 62:20 66:2 66:6 71:15 80:25 82:5 evidence-gatheri... 7:14 8:19 evident 48:25 evidently 54:2 evolving 18:11 ex 68:6 69:7,24 ex- 100:2 exact 77:13 exactly 74:7 90:6 example 2:8 59:3 68:20 85:10 96:11 98:5 99:20
--	---	---	--	--

108:12 110:4,4 Excellency 49:1 excellent 23:13 exceptionality 68:11 exceptionally 68:5 exchange 25:1 exchanges 110:2 exclude 66:4 excludes 64:24 exclusion 62:21 64:6 excused 62:14 execute 35:16 executed 36:11 execution 80:2 81:15 exercise 38:25 40:16 41:9 106:13 exercising 21:15 exerted 80:20 exhibits 10:22 exist 107:14,25 existence 9:15 existing 23:23 24:9 32:9 75:13 76:10 expect 5:20 49:18 99:10 expected 82:13 experience 72:10 expert 59:5 explain 22:19 45:14 62:7 89:13 explained 10:6 97:1 explains 13:17,18 13:20,22 explicit 77:12 explicitly 32:10 64:24 express 7:20 63:1 64:14 65:7 expressed 49:16 74:25 77:6,11 96:25 105:19 expressly 63:8 extend 64:6 74:14 extended 50:18	extensions 8:16 11:5,14 21:19,21 extensive 106:8 extent 16:7,22 21:5 33:17 49:23 84:14 85:3 91:8 92:19 97:22 external 52:9 extremely 36:15 41:20 55:11 58:6 <hr/> F <hr/> Fabian 95:21 fabricated 101:11 101:14 face 105:14 fact 29:15 30:15 33:21 37:7 38:20 39:23 40:21 51:23 57:2,14 60:20 65:15 80:24 82:4 85:12 88:1 89:10 98:22 99:14 105:12 factors 52:11 facts 16:21 43:11 43:16 47:2 80:9 85:2 87:25 89:3 104:8 105:21 factual 3:25 16:16 33:10 35:14 42:18,20 57:21 57:24,25 70:24 failure 51:15 fair 9:24 43:4,10 fairly 15:9 fall 107:21 fallen 97:21 familiar 25:13 62:5 family 41:15 fantastic 53:3 far 9:19 19:14 55:12 89:23 102:10 104:21 fault 111:21 February 24:24 50:22 97:19 104:11,15 Federation 51:10	51:13 fee 98:11,12,14 104:16 fees 97:17,19,20 97:23 98:25 99:11,16 100:5,6 100:11 102:4,9 103:24 104:5,14 105:1,4,8,20 feet 77:21 fellow 101:9 felt 54:3 fifth 7:16 Fifthly 51:23 file 24:22 final 7:11,19 8:17 12:11 23:12,20 24:7 25:10 28:25 32:3 57:6 60:7 61:12 68:12 70:19 82:13 88:16 finalisation 55:4 66:14 79:19 finalise 4:3 12:16 finalised 8:2 11:2 55:12 finalising 18:7 finally 6:13 7:18 14:19 70:15 82:19 88:11,15 financially 36:4,7 46:8 find 7:25 17:2 74:1 74:2 97:12 103:9 110:1 finding 90:19 findings 51:21 57:14,21 70:24 80:20,21 81:4 89:10 91:21 finds 62:25 91:9 fine 47:15 firm 16:12 46:12 firmly 72:23 first 1:7,23 3:3,22 5:22 6:20 7:6,13 8:15,18,19,24 9:5 9:25 12:18 15:4	15:16 20:3 25:4 56:7,20 62:19 63:5,11 65:2 66:23 69:15 72:25 77:5 79:18 82:21 84:23 85:13 94:24 99:23 102:4 107:5,9 firstly 48:3,14 50:21 54:10 fit 69:7 five 43:9 56:5 79:2 79:7 84:21 87:10 88:7,15 89:20 90:17,24 91:14 106:6 108:5,15 flag 107:1 110:20 flagged 53:18 flagging 31:1,7 flawed 40:23 54:17 flexible 21:21 67:5 focus 4:12 81:19 88:10 focused 80:7 follow 4:7 8:12 15:21 17:22 62:6 followed 37:2 38:24 following 26:3 37:15 41:1 48:3 52:6 54:15 58:16 68:15 85:24 101:16 follows 7:13 23:18 81:10 82:6 force 1:25 86:7 109:3 111:2 forced 41:16 Foreign 53:13 foresee 93:15 forgive 108:25 form 9:18 21:6 32:4 87:24 formal 51:12 formally 90:4 former 1:6 6:8 forming 29:5	formula 93:16 formulated 88:10 formulation 4:17 91:24 forth 92:8 forward 5:15 16:17 33:3 109:19,20 forwarded 98:16 found 6:18 64:5 75:23 89:3 four 28:11 106:6 fourth 7:16 24:25 27:12 87:9 94:6 Fourthly 51:15 fractured 51:8 framed 80:7 frankly 53:3 fraud 36:4,8 38:22 46:6,8,15 free 2:6 55:18 Friday 23:18 24:8 friend 42:10 45:8 46:3,19 58:4 71:10,22 73:18 74:25 90:23 93:23 103:23 104:1 106:16 FRS 37:23 38:4 fruitful 6:1 12:13 fulfil 59:6 fulfilling 26:14 full 7:12 10:2 11:15 16:15 22:3 53:13 74:14 fully 2:5 10:17 38:1 100:13,14 fundamental 64:11 fundamentally 108:6 funding 12:19 further 5:10 12:11 18:4 19:25 21:4 23:8,16,22 24:6 31:8 32:1 36:23 36:25 55:19 70:14 82:5 88:14 92:11 97:10
--	---	--	---	--

future 32:11	gives 62:11	54:11,19 82:11	hang 45:4 76:8	high 72:14 73:12
<hr/> G <hr/>	giving 104:11	86:9 91:7 95:18	98:24	95:9 96:7
gain 36:4,7 46:7	glad 56:2	95:18,19,24	Hansard 40:8	highlight 94:24
gaps 21:3 23:9	gloss 89:22 90:12	Governor's 50:15	happened 54:22	hinted 69:13
Garrison 1:9	go 103:16	50:20 52:9,16,25	99:20	hip 28:24 29:8
gather 4:13 44:21	go-between 100:3	governs 62:13	happy 21:12 22:18	HM 95:16
gathering 23:5	going 6:23 24:3	GPA 37:17 38:13	23:1 26:22 27:4	HMIC 37:23 38:4
general 6:8 9:2	29:1,25 30:16	39:1,3,5,7,10,19	32:2 43:8 47:12	hold 17:17 24:14
14:10 36:12,18	32:22 42:17 43:7	40:19 45:18	66:16 88:5 91:23	96:6
36:22 37:5 48:9	43:21 44:3 45:13	84:10 85:20	92:3,5,24 109:9	honest 109:6
49:3,13 50:3,15	64:1 72:6 74:17	GPA's 39:14 83:2	109:10	hoof 72:7
52:14 53:8 69:17	77:21 78:16 93:3	grant 11:14	Hasans 36:6 42:14	hope 1:13,16 4:3
72:3 78:12 95:21	94:12 97:19	granted 68:4	Hassans 46:5,10	18:15 32:6
104:19	107:25 108:14	granting 21:21	head 93:22	hoped 21:23 22:6
generality 67:19	110:8 112:4	granular 106:10	heading 76:10	hopeful 5:9
70:4	Gomez 6:6	108:16	hear 1:17 26:11	hopefully 8:11
generally 36:25	good 1:15 2:5 34:7	grateful 5:9 10:9	66:16 107:23	hopes 94:2
92:6	34:22 61:6 84:6	12:14 34:6,23,25	heard 43:25 70:6	hoping 105:2
generous 11:4	94:4 110:5	45:23 56:2 58:6	91:3	host 106:10
27:18 28:8	governing 13:18	66:23 67:2 68:3	hearing 1:5,7,23	hostile 51:8
gentle 111:6	government 6:10	86:4 87:12,19,19	2:12,23 3:3,22	hour 83:21
genuine 73:24	9:22 33:21 35:4	90:10 103:12	5:6,19 6:21 7:1	House 66:13
109:6	35:7 37:19 42:5	gratitude 7:20	7:12,19 8:15,17	hugely 41:14
getting 7:25 8:9	43:5 48:11 52:8	great 5:4 35:4	8:25 9:6 11:2,13	human 64:11,13
Gibraltar 3:6,25	54:1 57:6,11	105:2	12:18 15:5 18:2	hundreds 74:4
6:12 9:19 35:16	58:20 67:10 68:7	greater 22:19	18:3,5 20:10	<hr/> I <hr/>
36:21 37:16,24	69:14,16,23	92:19	21:22 22:5 23:12	i.e 95:18
41:13 48:4,22	71:12 85:8 91:1	greatly 5:7	24:15,25,25 25:4	idea 44:16 94:4
49:14 50:24 51:1	95:1,8,11,16,23	ground 18:1 62:16	25:5,10,21,22	ideal 96:21
51:6,9,13 54:15	96:4,13,14,17,18	62:16	26:3,7,11 27:15	identical 16:3
64:13 65:24	96:19,24 97:24	groundless 101:15	27:17,21 28:5,6,7	identified 16:14
69:22 70:3 74:19	97:25 98:7,16	grounds 40:24	28:25 32:18,22	18:22 19:10 21:3
85:16 95:16	99:3,6,7,15 100:4	guaranteed 64:11	33:19 67:4 68:9	25:23 30:19
97:14 102:4,19	100:9,10,15	guidance 106:14	69:14,15 93:3,12	44:13 108:1
give 1:11 3:24 4:16	101:3,19 102:7	guide 14:9	93:20 97:19 98:6	111:16
5:11 24:10,17	102:14,16 104:4	guidelines 1:24	112:14	identifies 80:4
29:5,9,18 32:9	104:8,14,16,20	<hr/> H <hr/>	hearings 1:24 18:5	identify 4:15 16:9
43:9 46:24 47:16	105:7,10,12,13	H 66:13	35:11	19:1 23:9 93:17
57:3 61:16 68:18	Government's	hacking 35:19	heart 36:2	identifying 15:7
84:18 92:24	42:10 91:5 101:5	79:24 81:11	held 101:7	ignorant 101:7
94:18 106:8	101:6	87:11	helicopter 85:11	illustrative 58:18
110:4	governor 6:8	hand 81:5 102:3	help 58:3 106:19	images 2:15
given 10:15 22:3	37:13 38:15 39:9	handed 39:13	helpful 68:10	immediately 15:5
27:14 28:3 29:20	39:21 40:7,11,15	handled 22:20	104:24 106:4	imminent 9:24
49:10 61:17 65:7	41:10 45:17	handling 12:21	108:21 109:7	82:10 86:8
66:24 70:10,19	48:16,19,24 49:2	13:4 51:3 79:23	hesitation 77:5,7	immunity 13:11
71:17 80:22 87:3	49:8,12,25 50:2,8	81:13,18 87:16	hierarchy 16:13	66:1,5,7,12 67:11
87:25 109:4	50:9 51:24 52:1	88:11	90:22 91:15	67:19 68:2 69:24
111:11,17	52:19 53:9,15	hands 27:4	92:16	71:15,24 72:2,15

72:22,24 73:4,11 73:25 74:1 77:20 impact 107:3 implication 70:1 88:20 104:1 important 18:7,25 26:10 59:18 91:12 105:21 importantly 7:9 imposes 63:11,13 impression 104:13 improper 48:7 53:7,12 improperly 36:18 impropriety 104:6 improvements 1:20 inappropriate 87:22 inaudible 45:1 70:16 75:17,19 incident 37:25 38:7 50:21 51:4 52:4,11 85:11 98:6 incidents 50:19 include 19:4 55:24 66:11 68:13 73:18,21 74:18 82:8 106:9 included 85:9 87:17 96:1 includes 49:24 75:20 76:16 95:17,22 96:1 including 9:1,6 15:20 19:23 24:10 53:2 80:1 81:14 95:23 96:4 98:13 inclusion 85:15,23 86:9 inclusive 79:12 incomplete 21:17 inconceivable 49:17 inconsistent 65:16 incorporating 65:22 67:7	incriminate 62:18 incumbent 46:18 independent 37:18 38:8 95:12,13 96:18 100:1,13 100:14 indicate 58:4 109:24 indicated 38:6 42:2 57:7 58:17 69:16 indication 68:3 87:12,20 88:6 90:20,21 93:8 103:13 111:7,13 indications 66:24 68:10 70:9 88:6 indirect 42:14 indirectly 35:25 individual 6:16 100:2 individuals 10:19 57:14 70:18 96:5 inevitably 48:13 inferences 89:2 inferring 96:13 inform 10:13 93:11 informal 110:2 information 4:14 14:25 22:8 23:5 30:16 52:2,10 58:12 60:2 68:24 71:17 73:23 98:3 98:17 99:11,13 100:6 102:22 106:10 107:21 108:15 109:17,21 110:7 informed 17:6 19:14 38:1,16 39:8 40:14,20 45:15 informing 56:16 initial 9:7 12:8 57:1 82:2 initially 68:16 79:22 80:11 input 15:1 18:16	inquire 89:5 inquiries 35:11 65:23 71:2 76:20 Inquiries' 74:13 inquiry 1:5 2:2,8 2:22 3:21 4:2,6,7 4:11,13,22 5:1,6 5:15 6:20 7:16 7:21 8:4,6 9:14 11:7 12:2,20 13:2,8 14:9,15,21 15:10 16:24 17:18 20:1,10 21:20 22:15 23:3 23:19,22 24:11 24:17,20 25:5,14 27:11 28:2 29:18 35:1,6 55:8,12,23 56:14 58:12,14 59:4,6 61:10,14 62:12,13 64:23 66:2,6,24 67:2,10 67:17,23 68:8 70:11,22 74:14 79:23 80:12,16 84:17 85:5 89:1 89:1 91:9 92:7 95:1,4,6,10,12 96:6,23 97:4,7,12 98:2,13,19 99:10 99:20,24 100:13 100:19 101:20 102:12 103:8 105:14,15,16,18 107:7,15 108:14 inquiry's 2:24 8:22 9:13 11:22 11:24 16:12 19:21 67:1,15,25 68:10 82:24 86:14 87:13 88:14,24 89:17 90:5 96:16,20 98:15 109:23 inquisitorial 22:15 insofar 109:21 inspected 62:10 Inspectorate 51:18 51:20	instructed 6:5 instructions 103:13 insufficient 29:24 intact 9:19 integrity 50:17 102:22 intelligence 35:20 52:2 intemperate 36:16 49:15 intend 7:11,13 22:1 26:9,15 50:10 109:22 intended 40:7,16 81:17 intends 67:17 intention 72:9 82:7 86:1,5 88:5 intentional 51:25 inter 72:16 interest 13:10 42:14 46:5,9,10 61:21 66:1,5,7,11 67:11,18 68:2 69:24 71:14,24 72:2,15,21,24 73:4,11,25 74:1 77:19 109:15 interests 11:7 interfered 50:15 interference 2:10 52:13 54:5 interim 38:12 95:19 interpretation 63:23 interpreted 64:3 interrupt 42:16 intervention 36:14 46:13 intimate 40:15 intimated 69:9 introduce 12:17 introduced 3:2,4 55:5 92:16 introduction 7:7 23:11 43:13 84:11	introductory 88:3 inventory 20:19 investigate 4:11 10:15 15:8 80:17 83:1 99:3,6 investigated 16:18 25:14 84:14 95:9 investigation 4:12 16:15 17:3 19:3 21:8 35:18 36:1 36:3,9,24 37:6 38:8,18 46:7,21 46:23 48:10 50:12 51:4 52:15 52:18,20 54:6 79:20,24 80:3,8 81:10,16,18,21 87:11,15 invitation 40:25 invite 27:10 34:4 42:6 61:16 invited 12:10 38:13 79:13 80:12 inviting 28:1 invoices 98:16 invoke 37:19 52:23 invoking 39:11 41:5 45:18 involvement 80:10 94:25 involving 50:22 iron 112:7 ironed 112:7 irresponsible 59:25 issue 16:17 18:8 51:22 56:8 64:7 65:19,25 67:23 73:17 79:18,19 80:13 81:9,20,20 81:21,24 82:16 82:17,18,19,20 82:22,23,24 84:10 85:21,23 85:23,25 86:2,3 86:10,12,19,22 87:1,5,10,10 88:7
---	---	--	---	--

88:10,15,21 89:25 90:17,24 91:24 95:2 97:15 97:17 110:21 issues 4:10,21 5:25 7:15 8:2 10:12 11:23 15:3,7,15 15:17,24 16:5,8 16:10,14,20,22 17:9,14 18:8,11 18:13,22 20:5 23:14,21 25:13 25:25 26:20 27:2 30:14 33:18 37:14 40:3 41:19 42:18 51:16 62:19 67:4,7 78:9 79:1,12 81:2,6 82:25 83:10 84:12,13 84:22 85:3,7 88:4,19 90:1,22 90:25 91:15 92:17,18,23 93:18 94:1 107:16 item 3:20,23 4:3 4:10,23 5:14 6:17 8:18 18:23 23:10 26:15 27:12 30:11 33:9 55:3 78:21,24,25 items 7:3 26:21 78:23 79:16	July 40:4 June 1:8 9:7 40:19 41:2,4,13,25 justice 4:8 35:1 77:10,11 justifiable 47:11 justification 10:25 25:8	91:13 92:13,15 large 22:21 86:16 late 5:24 latecomers 111:19 111:20 latest 24:8 32:21 59:7 launch 52:7 law 70:3 lawful 41:10 laws 75:13 76:11 lawyer 62:10 lawyers 63:19 98:18 lay 78:11 leadership 50:17 52:17 leading 50:6 learned 42:10 45:7 46:3,19 58:4 71:10,21 73:18 74:25 82:12 90:23 93:23 103:23 104:1 106:16 learning 48:14 Leatham 63:24 leave 94:4 leaves 28:10 led 48:1 54:7 79:15 89:15 left-field 60:17 legal 11:9 13:11,23 40:19 59:4 62:5 62:7,20 63:17 64:10,16,20 74:15 75:24 96:9 98:1,3 104:5 105:8,20 legally 41:8 leisure 73:16 length 7:7 longhairs 8:21 lengthy 11:3,14 43:3 letter 39:13,17,22 39:24 49:13 56:25 66:25 80:18 84:25	85:15,22 87:21 90:19,20,21 111:4 letters 15:24 16:1 56:22,22 57:22 70:17 108:5 109:2 110:23 111:13 level 97:2 Levy 8:7 17:15 84:25 110:16 liabilities 104:21 liaise 26:5 liaised 8:8 17:15 lib 42:18 43:4,13 44:6 46:2 liberty 76:18 Library 1:9 lied 37:8 light 4:23 19:25 35:9 lights 71:11 likes 60:6 limit 47:2 limited 46:18 80:2 81:14 95:17 96:1 96:4 lines 23:3 list 4:10,21 7:12,15 8:2 15:3,17 16:19 17:9,14 18:8,10,12,22 20:5 23:14,21 26:20 27:2 58:18 59:18 67:6 79:1 79:12 81:2,6,6 82:25 83:10 84:12,22 87:2 88:3,19 90:1 92:22 listen 28:14 33:1 lists 59:2 litigation 74:15 little 1:22 25:9 27:17 28:7 31:10 106:14,14 live 17:22 48:9 Llamas 49:4 95:22 location 38:2	52:11 long 47:10 89:23 longer 21:20 49:21 106:21 look 15:14 16:5,8 17:1 24:2 92:18 105:16 looked 101:15 looking 102:1,24 Lord 71:12 83:17 101:22 Lords 66:13 Lordship 72:11 73:1 75:1 Lordship's 72:10 90:19,20 losing 40:2 loss 37:10 38:16 50:15 lost 37:22 38:11 39:9,21 45:17 48:15 49:8 50:4 50:9 53:9 54:10 91:8,9 lot 29:3 31:9 106:24 108:3 louder 34:15 low 51:10 lunch 79:8 83:9 109:8
<hr/> J James 6:12 January 24:21 32:20 jeopardizing 28:6 jeopardy 54:23 Joey 39:7 45:13 join 32:11 joined 6:14 joins 32:7 judge 72:9 73:13 judgment 5:12 33:16 42:3 judgmental 91:21 judicial 70:2	<hr/> K KC 6:11,13 keep 22:16 29:25 30:8 40:14 94:10 102:1 kept 53:15 72:23 kick 91:22 kind 34:18 kindly 83:6 Kingdom's 4:1 knew 54:10 know 10:11 22:8 29:9 30:12,21 56:19 57:16 60:23 72:1,6 73:2 74:6 75:20 75:21 77:17 79:4 82:14 93:22 96:2 96:8 97:16 101:13 102:17 103:9,10 106:3,6 106:20 knowing 41:18 knowledge 52:19 104:19 known 38:23 48:10 52:15 56:21 60:19 105:22 Kristine 6:15	<hr/> L labelled 15:15 labour 63:25 laboured 90:3 laid 78:5 93:24 language 36:16 59:8,12 63:1 64:15 65:7 73:19 74:12 81:9 82:2 88:16 90:16,24	<hr/> M main 18:5 20:10 25:4 28:7 32:14 68:9 maintained 97:3 Majesty's 51:18 51:20 52:8 majority 59:14 making 1:20 2:15 17:20 30:22 31:8 65:2 69:17,18 72:4 81:4 89:22 96:15 110:10 manage 5:20 managed 38:25 management 12:23 13:7 108:9 managing 100:11 manifestly 54:17	

manipulating 105:7	McGrail's 9:6 33:19 35:15 41:7	80:23 87:25	N	98:25
manner 49:15,22 53:15 57:13	48:25 49:5 50:16 51:15 52:16,24	minister 6:7 35:23 36:5,8,12,15,17	name 87:4,4	non-stop 8:5
64:25 107:18 112:5	53:5 57:17 85:12 98:11 104:5	37:6,12 38:14,19 38:20,24 39:9,20	named 8:19	norm 68:8
manoeuvre 25:9	105:8,20,24	40:1,5,9,14,15,18 40:21 42:13	naming 56:11 58:11	normal 71:1
March 7:12,19 8:17 11:12 21:22	mean 29:17 32:14 63:21 77:13,14	45:16 46:4,20 48:8,16 49:2,12	narrow 15:11 17:8 56:10 67:4	note 9:24 64:2 87:19 95:13,25
23:12 25:6,11,21 32:18,22 51:4	meaning 96:2	50:3 52:13,21 53:2,8 54:12	national 35:19	104:16 111:23
52:5	meaningfully 15:22	80:11 95:20 99:21,23	nationals 52:6	notes 98:11,13,14
markers 78:6	means 3:16 16:25 45:10 63:15	Minister's 46:13 77:9 87:23	native 9:18	notice 4:24 7:5,17 14:20 18:6,9,18
material 22:22	74:11 97:24	ministers 53:13 95:24	nature 20:25 49:10 93:13	49:20 57:12 58:24 59:2 60:18
materially 16:3	measures 22:25 68:11	Ministry 51:2	near 51:2	68:1,17 70:20 71:13 72:15
matter 10:16 15:11 16:24	18:19 56:16 61:24	Minster 39:23 46:22 50:14	nearer 93:20	notifies 13:21
46:14 52:4 55:22 56:11 61:25 65:9	media 6:24 11:25 14:17 22:18	minutes 43:9 79:3 79:7	necessarily 25:1 29:17 93:15	notwithstanding 68:9
75:5 79:14 80:17 80:23,24 81:25	meet 14:17 22:18 23:3 38:14 107:7	misconduct 95:7	necessary 5:10 10:11 16:23 17:7	November 24:14 25:24 27:15 93:3
84:16 88:1 97:9 99:4 104:9 108:3	meeting 36:13 41:3 52:22	mishandling 50:21	20:15 21:5,25 22:11 25:20	93:18 112:12,14
108:10 111:9	meetings 17:25	misled 51:24	32:13 57:23 58:15 59:16	NSCIAS 46:17
matters 4:8 5:13 8:12 10:3 17:4	members 18:17 19:5 37:3	mobile 2:12	60:25 75:18 84:15 85:4 93:12	NSCIS 35:20 79:25 81:12
18:10,22 27:6 40:6 50:20 55:13	memory 80:5	modifications 75:17 76:15	need 3:4 4:16 19:25 20:3 53:4	number 10:3,19 10:21,24 11:23
55:19 85:5 93:2 95:5 106:6,10	mention 39:25	moment 47:18 91:14 93:17	55:19 71:6 77:16 91:19 92:11,25	17:8 37:13 50:19 59:2 95:3
108:2 109:13,15	mentioned 36:9 46:20 56:23	Monday 41:4	93:3 109:4,14 112:6	numbering 85:25
maximisation 70:16	58:23	monitors 1:16 8:11	needed 85:20 86:12	numbers 19:17
maximum 12:4	mere 29:15	month 32:24	needs 5:17 30:21 40:13 65:9	O
McGrail 1:7 6:4 9:22,25 10:5	merely 29:7	months 7:22	103:18	o'clock 83:21,23 84:1,2
35:5 36:13,17,23 37:1,3,7,10,11,14	messed 37:12	morale 51:11	negotiation 41:24	objected 59:8
37:23 38:2,3,5,9 39:6,8,15,18 40:2	met 8:13 21:23 37:14 39:6 45:13	morning 34:7 44:4 87:3 91:4,12	Neish 6:13 28:20 29:7,14 45:8	obligation 63:12 63:14
41:3,8,15 43:6 45:12,16 47:21	meta 24:11	93:24	83:5 84:7 92:2,5	obligations 26:14 59:7,23 63:4
48:3,11,23 49:11 50:4,10,12 51:9	metadata 9:18	motivation 80:22	neutrally 81:7	65:16 107:8,17
51:14,25 52:3 53:6 54:1,7	Metropolitan 38:9	motivations 87:23	never 46:23	obliged 33:8 54:3 112:10
58:17 59:8 70:5 80:6 82:19 86:7	Michael 49:4 95:22	motives 53:7,12	nevertheless 29:22	obliges 103:23
89:15	microphone 27:25 33:14 34:9,18	move 5:15 33:9 55:3	new 41:10 82:5 84:11 86:20 87:3 90:24	observed 5:18
	45:4	moved 35:16	Nick 6:14 95:20	observation 28:23
	microphones 1:14 1:15	moving 2:14	nine 13:16 85:24 86:2,3,22	obtain 19:1
	military 50:24	muddy 85:10	non-payment	obtained 20:2
	mind 26:25 76:3	muscled 41:19		obvious 103:1,2 107:13,24
		mutual 49:22		obviously 12:2 21:23 58:2 74:17

92:23 94:12 occur 82:13 occurred 52:12 October 13:25 23:24 24:9 27:13 28:4,10 30:20,25 32:5,8 offence 2:17 offer 73:18 office 53:13 96:7 officer 95:17 109:3 officers 3:10 19:23 30:18 50:24 106:7,20,21 108:12 109:2 officials 35:7 53:14 95:8,11 96:14 98:1 Okay 3:14 5:21 34:23 44:23 45:22 92:4,9 112:9 omission 51:25 omitting 47:15 once 20:2 23:7 30:1,3 49:19 61:20 ones 91:11 103:1,2 online 17:17 24:4 Op 35:17 36:3,9 37:5 41:20 87:10 open 2:2 4:8 35:1 80:21 102:15 110:2 opened 61:20 72:20 opening 3:20 4:18 55:5 operate 102:5 operating 35:22 operation 46:21 48:10 52:15 64:16 opportunity 20:14 42:4,18,22 55:17 68:19 73:20 90:4 93:25 opposed 41:17 42:19	opposite 77:13 105:9 opposition 96:10 96:25 oral 104:2 orally 29:20 order 12:4 17:15 19:9 25:19 35:6 47:6 57:25 72:18 76:6,7 93:10 ordered 38:9 orders 26:3 73:13 ordinarily 99:9 organising 8:8,10 original 21:6 originally 20:24 45:20 otiose 71:19 ousting 64:15 outline 3:19 outset 16:13 outside 109:8 outstanding 6:22 89:25 93:17 overview 4:24 owned 36:1,5 38:21 42:15	part 8:21 9:15 29:5 36:2,6 37:22 38:21 43:6 60:17 63:11,13 76:7 80:3 81:15 86:16 87:24 106:13 parte 68:6 69:7,24 partes 72:17 partially 72:20 participant 13:18 13:20 24:1,3 26:1 30:23 99:24 participants 3:24 5:8 6:24 7:8 9:1 9:5,9,16 11:18,25 12:6 13:3,16 14:1 15:13,14,23 15:25 18:14 19:4 19:13,14 20:7,12 20:13 22:2,21 23:2,7,24 24:9,18 24:20,22 25:12 25:15 26:6,12,19 27:18 28:8 30:3 31:23 32:9,11,16 32:23 55:9,10 57:4 58:19,22 60:21 61:22 63:16 66:17 68:18,23 69:4 71:21 96:6 97:8 97:11 98:2,18,20 99:8,10,12 100:5 100:10 103:3 109:25 110:15 111:9 participants' 6:4 12:14 24:18 31:21 32:3 56:24 participate 55:25 participation 12:4 particular 11:18 25:12 26:20 36:15 70:24 73:5 78:17 80:10 110:6 particularly 11:8 37:4,25 63:2	82:11 parties 2:25 6:10 7:24 9:22 10:25 11:6,9 13:12 16:4 22:13,16 33:22 35:4 42:5 43:9 54:1 55:24 57:1,7,11,22 58:20 61:17,23 62:1 64:9,19 66:3 67:10 68:7 69:14,16,23 71:12 72:16 77:23 78:4 79:21 80:19 82:15 83:11 85:8 91:1 93:8 97:25 98:8 99:9 101:3 102:20 104:8 109:18 110:9 112:5 parties' 15:3 48:11 65:11 partner 36:5 46:4 46:11 partners 42:14 46:12 partnership 42:15 46:10 parts 47:6,8,9 party 47:1 94:15 100:1 pass 105:17 passage 76:3 passed 76:19,24 patience 6:2 payment 97:24 98:22 105:18 pencil 65:5 75:2,3 77:7 pending 26:4 pension 41:17 54:22 people 73:21 74:2 period 50:18 peripheral 16:10 85:9 91:1,2,16 permissible 72:25 permission 47:5	53:16 62:11 permit 8:12 12:4 17:19,21 19:1 64:19 permitted 2:16 33:20,22 62:24 63:17 person 4:17 53:2 59:17 62:14,18 63:3 person's 80:23 87:25 personal 14:14,22 59:17,24 personally 5:3 persons 58:22,24 59:9,13 persons' 80:22 perspective 47:25 Peter 6:10 27:9,10 27:22 28:1 42:2 42:7,22,24 43:20 43:24 44:2,8,12 45:25 46:1 47:20 53:20,24 58:3 71:6 73:6,9 74:5 74:7,21 75:7,11 76:5,9,13,23 77:3 90:12 93:21 94:8 95:25 101:1 103:22 phones 2:12 photographs 2:14 Picardo 49:3 95:21 Picardo's 46:9 picture 11:15 piece 22:12 PII 94:1 pilot 51:5 85:11 pinnacle 41:23 pity 105:2 place 14:19 22:9 25:1,23 29:21 69:3 72:25 75:14 103:4 105:22 placed 2:13 37:3 planned 37:15 playing 97:4
	P			
	p.m 23:24 page 47:10 paid 97:18,21 104:11,18 Panel 9:14 paper 73:20 papers 63:7 paragraph 20:20 45:11 47:9,15 53:19,20 58:23 59:1,13 60:12 67:25 70:22 75:12 76:10 86:14 88:13,23 98:9 paragraphs 46:3 67:15 88:18 pardon 27:23 park 108:10 Parliament 40:4 76:19,21,24			

<p>plays 30:24</p> <p>please 24:2 28:20</p> <p>pleased 8:13 12:12 55:7 107:22</p> <p>point 7:19 18:10 28:13 29:7,11,14 33:7 42:24 47:8 51:2 56:10,15,20 57:11,15 58:10 60:5,8,24 61:12 61:21 69:2 70:15 71:9 73:17 74:9 74:23 75:11 77:2 77:4,6,18,20 78:8 78:17,25 82:13 84:7,7,17 88:4,11 88:15,18 89:12 91:12 94:16 96:15,15 100:7 101:2 102:9,10 107:5,9 110:17 110:20</p> <p>pointed 42:11 45:7 83:6 103:25</p> <p>pointing 80:15</p> <p>pointless 71:16</p> <p>points 17:8 27:3 42:25 44:5 56:6 57:9 67:23 71:9 84:20 88:23 89:20,22 92:12 94:17,22,22 109:10</p> <p>police 1:7 3:7 6:12 9:19 35:16 37:16 37:20,24 38:9 40:8,10 41:6 47:23 48:5,6,12 48:21,22 49:14 49:19 51:9,14 52:24 53:10 54:8 54:15,20 82:8 83:3 85:16,18 86:6 107:18,18 107:20 109:16 111:2</p> <p>police's 107:17</p> <p>policemen 111:2</p> <p>policies 8:1 11:1</p>	<p>11:20 12:2,3,10 12:16 17:13 27:1 55:6,19 56:8 57:2 60:3 70:9 71:4 88:20 89:25</p> <p>policy 4:3 7:15 13:1,16 14:3,5,12 20:8 22:4 23:15 23:20 24:3 31:21 31:23 32:3 55:4 55:11,14,21 56:24 57:18 61:2 61:8,13 66:15 67:6,9 68:13 69:10,11,13 79:11 103:16 104:20</p> <p>position 1:12 7:25 10:12 11:13 28:22 33:10 35:2 35:3,14 49:25 53:25 56:3 58:5 65:21 71:3 72:5 72:19 79:15 99:18 103:8 106:19 107:6</p> <p>positions 50:8</p> <p>possibility 59:20 111:11</p> <p>possible 9:19 11:16 14:5 19:19 19:21 22:8 49:21 59:15 81:7 102:19 111:1</p> <p>possibly 2:16 3:7 96:7</p> <p>post 37:21 50:1 54:14</p> <p>posted 11:24</p> <p>potential 8:23 28:4 31:22 36:20 61:23 69:12,23 71:1</p> <p>potentially 102:15</p> <p>power 21:9,10,15 39:11 40:16 45:19 48:20 49:4 89:7 91:21</p> <p>powers 37:19 39:1</p>	<p>40:7 41:6,10 82:7 86:5</p> <p>practicable 68:18</p> <p>practical 67:21 69:3</p> <p>practically 102:19</p> <p>practice 56:21</p> <p>Practices 64:5</p> <p>practises 104:20</p> <p>pragmatic 67:5,22</p> <p>preamble 84:12</p> <p>preambles 92:1</p> <p>precipitated 35:8</p> <p>precisely 71:20 103:9</p> <p>predates 85:12</p> <p>predetermined 16:15</p> <p>prefer 93:16</p> <p>prejudice 70:4</p> <p>preliminary 1:5 1:23 3:22 6:21 7:1 8:15,25 9:5 12:18 15:4 18:5 22:5 24:15,25 25:4,22 26:7,10 27:14 28:5 69:15</p> <p>premature 1:22</p> <p>preparation 4:20 25:17</p> <p>prepare 11:10,16 11:19</p> <p>prepared 5:16 11:21</p> <p>preparing 17:20</p> <p>present 3:4,6</p> <p>press 2:6</p> <p>pressing 31:22 32:4</p> <p>pressure 37:2 41:21 48:7 53:1 80:20 87:22</p> <p>presumption 69:6</p> <p>prevent 81:3</p> <p>previous 69:14 83:25</p> <p>previously 70:5 76:1</p> <p>primary 89:3</p>	<p>principal 40:1 62:19</p> <p>principle 34:25 95:6</p> <p>principles 14:8 62:6 78:12</p> <p>prior 9:5 52:19 67:4 68:8 70:19</p> <p>privacy 14:19 58:23 59:2 60:18 71:15 75:21,23</p> <p>private 35:21 68:6</p> <p>privately 37:12</p> <p>privilege 13:11 56:13 61:13,17 62:7,16,20,21 63:18,20 64:6,8 64:10,16,20,25 65:8,14 66:8,9 67:12,13 74:15 75:24</p> <p>probably 8:21 30:1 89:11 98:4</p> <p>probity 50:16</p> <p>problem 108:19</p> <p>problems 93:14</p> <p>procedural 33:19</p> <p>procedurally 40:23</p> <p>procedure 4:25 7:5,17 18:6 52:23 54:17 56:21</p> <p>procedures 4:7 12:1 74:19 90:1</p> <p>proceed 4:23 7:11 26:9,17 40:21</p> <p>proceeding 8:3</p> <p>proceedings 1:18 2:4,18 72:17</p> <p>process 7:14,18 8:19 10:13 12:13 12:15 13:20 15:6 18:24,25 19:10 19:20 22:1,4,17 22:19 26:12 27:19 40:22 41:2 48:5 55:24 70:17 83:2 84:10 85:16</p>	<p>85:20</p> <p>processes 4:6 14:16</p> <p>produce 63:6,14</p> <p>production 13:2 21:10,16,24 62:23 66:5 108:7</p> <p>professional 62:7 63:17 64:10,16 64:20 74:15 75:24</p> <p>progress 5:10 6:20 22:17 23:13</p> <p>progressive 50:18</p> <p>properly 1:17 48:13 66:7 67:11 67:12</p> <p>proportionate 22:11</p> <p>proposal 56:25 57:8 80:14 81:23 85:1 87:18 97:8</p> <p>proposals 23:2 67:8 92:6</p> <p>propose 20:14 24:14,24 26:21 30:5 53:16 57:5 60:4 63:25 65:19 65:22 68:12 78:20 82:6 83:10 87:4 92:22 97:11</p> <p>proposed 5:14 7:5 11:22 12:9 16:9 23:17 27:12 57:25 69:10 70:13 77:22 82:2 82:19,25 85:14 85:22 86:17,19</p> <p>proposing 63:22</p> <p>prosecuted 51:7</p> <p>prosecution 69:20</p> <p>protect 14:16</p> <p>protection 4:9 14:18 59:23 62:8</p> <p>protections 107:23</p> <p>protocol 4:4 9:12 12:19,21,24 19:6 20:21 23:1 30:20 58:13 59:19</p>
--	--	---	--	---

61:15 65:21,23 66:10 106:17 108:9 protocols 11:21 12:3 31:4,13,15 107:11 108:1 110:22 proved 6:1 12:13 provide 5:2 9:2 10:2,4 15:1 19:18 20:19 22:1 32:2,12 52:1 57:20,24 58:18 63:18 68:14 72:13 provided 1:14 2:9 2:20 9:15 10:1 19:17 57:13 70:25 72:19 98:9 102:14 provider 20:23 providers 13:3 19:3 20:12,17 21:14 97:9,14 provides 3:23 62:13 63:3 providing 11:4 52:3 100:24 109:4 provision 9:8,17 20:17 21:11 64:4 64:7 72:11 provisional 8:2 15:17 16:19 18:8 18:12 20:5 23:14 23:21 81:6 82:25 provisions 71:15 72:12 proviso 59:22 95:25 pubic 71:2 public 2:2 4:5,24 6:19,24 7:4,9,16 8:12 12:1,25 13:1,4,10,17,24 14:7,7,11,14,20 15:18,21,21 16:2 17:22 18:6,9,17 18:18 19:5 20:9	35:6,11 56:17 61:23 66:1,4,7,11 67:11,18 68:1 69:24 71:14,24 72:2,15,21,24 73:4,11,25,25 77:19 89:1 95:6 96:7 105:6 109:15 110:8 publicly 48:19 publish 23:19 published 14:3 104:12 pure 89:10 purely 17:3 purported 83:2 85:17 purpose 26:10 71:20 pursuant 69:21 104:5 pursue 21:2 put 16:17 34:17,22 41:17 48:7 53:1 62:15 63:5,9 64:21 69:3 90:6 98:8 108:10,19 110:8 puts 77:24 99:18 putting 17:13 Pyle 37:13,21 38:10,14,23 40:20 41:2,3 49:24 82:12 95:20 Pyle's 82:7 86:1,4 86:11	63:5,12 64:8,21 64:22 65:13 107:16 quickly 107:12 110:25 quite 15:15 31:9 34:8 45:5 75:7 85:24 89:21 106:24	<hr/> R <hr/> R 63:24 66:13 RAF 50:23 51:5 raft 8:1 raise 21:2 23:6 27:3 30:6 55:18 78:24,25 94:15 94:17,20,22 108:2 110:20 111:17 raised 13:12 30:14 51:16 69:23 85:6 85:7 88:9 90:25 95:3 97:17 107:5 110:24,25 raises 29:14 62:18 80:17 100:7 raising 33:6 111:22 range 19:22 74:14 re-arranged 1:11 re-formulation 82:3 re-ordering 81:9 reach 75:1,2 109:22 reached 62:3 89:9 read 30:21 35:13 45:13 46:2 47:6 47:12 53:23 63:2 64:18,23 73:16 74:18,22 reader 104:12 reading 47:13 65:5 65:6 77:7 107:24 reads 81:10 ready 33:25 real 48:18 102:21 realistic 31:5 realistically 54:13	reality 104:15 really 18:3 31:8 32:13 67:21 75:5 107:14 reason 2:6 40:2 50:11,19 54:6,16 70:23 72:23 89:9 90:2 91:6,11 110:5 reasonable 21:19 99:3,5 reasonably 49:17 93:10 reasoned 5:12 reasons 10:7 33:12 33:16 39:16,20 42:11 47:20,25 48:2 50:2,5 61:7 72:1 89:14,16 91:7,9 reassurance 35:5 reassure 7:8 29:15 reassured 10:8 reassuring 100:21 101:22 receipt 12:21 13:5 receive 10:10 22:7 22:9,23 23:2,8 104:16 108:15 received 9:4 10:21 12:7 15:3,12,22 31:17 receiving 11:3 22:21 recites 104:22 recognises 59:20 recognising 81:19 recollection 108:24 109:1 recommend 66:9 recommendations 89:7 recommended 81:8 reconsidered 7:1 record 90:6,16 107:10 recorded 2:19 recordings 2:15	records 12:22 13:7 redacted 68:21 redaction 12:22 13:5 94:1 redactions 20:14 22:24 reduce 108:22 refer 6:9 12:23 57:2 65:24 108:12 reference 9:10,13 10:16 15:9 16:25 58:21 65:3 77:9 82:16 89:4 110:17 referred 10:16 12:18 17:23 20:10 40:6 76:1 77:8 82:23 refers 63:9,10 refined 15:24 reflect 47:16 reflects 20:5 86:15 reformulated 87:14 refused 21:16 regard 9:12 69:19 regular 39:2 61:5 Reina 6:15 rejected 50:13 related 45:11 86:1 relates 84:10 relating 16:21 37:14 43:16 52:10 67:17 68:1 80:9 85:3 86:4 98:3,19 relation 38:3,6 40:17 46:14,25 48:5 52:4 57:9 67:8 69:12 70:8 70:16 81:20 87:9 87:21 88:7,15 92:7,11 94:25 97:16 109:20 relationship 35:24 38:19 51:1,8 relevance 20:4 22:24 82:9 86:8
	<hr/> Q <hr/> qualities 52:17 quantity 22:22 quarter 79:3 queries 21:1 question 13:8 40:9 61:16 62:15,17 63:9 91:20 103:24 107:16 questioning 4:18 29:21 questions 62:22				

relevant 4:14 8:24 9:3,9,10 16:21 18:21 19:2 20:6 23:9,16 33:17 35:24 50:5 58:1 87:24 91:10 92:20 95:20 106:5	19:11,16,25 21:16 22:3 23:9 23:23 24:12 33:1 62:23 63:15 require 39:12 45:19 65:14 69:1 89:8 required 19:5 24:15 41:9 49:23 63:7 79:22 106:15 111:14 requirement 102:6 requirements 14:17 requires 5:13 80:16 82:3 88:21 requiring 16:11,16 68:22 reserved 5:12 residual 78:22 residuary 78:23 resign 39:12 41:16 54:24 86:7 91:7 resign' 45:20 resignation 40:12 41:7,25 48:20 49:5 50:11 52:25 53:11 54:20 resist 64:20 resolution 88:21 resolve 5:25 17:10 26:4 77:16 93:25 95:5 resolving 93:2 resources 11:10 respect 76:17 101:11 respectfully 59:11 69:9 70:20 88:22 97:10 respective 78:6 respond 39:17 43:5,24 66:16 77:21 90:4 103:23 response 10:14 19:8 32:20 33:23 42:5 43:1,4,11,21 60:7 63:15 97:6	responses 42:9 responsibilities 49:23 responsibility 52:9 responsible 99:16 responsive 11:19 23:17 24:22 25:2 25:18 43:22 restrict 89:10 restriction 26:3 restrictions 14:6 14:10 result 19:16 22:14 resulted 51:7,11 resulting 51:10 retire 40:25 41:17 41:22 45:20,21 49:7 50:7 54:3,9 54:9 retired 91:11 retirement 1:6 35:8 48:1,14,18 54:18 retiring 54:21 return 41:4 returned 50:1 reveal 57:21 revealing 98:10 revert 44:6 review 14:3 20:3 21:1 29:25 30:8 reviewed 21:3 reviewing 19:20 82:5 reviews 105:11 RGP 3:10 6:16,17 19:24 30:18,18 30:21 31:6,16 37:4 50:17 51:11 51:17 52:7,18 106:7,7,20,21,23 108:12,20 109:2 109:14,19 111:11 RGP's 51:3 79:23 80:2,8 81:13,14 81:17 87:16 88:11 107:6 right 18:10 29:23 34:1,2,9,15 42:3	43:5 64:11 71:22 73:8 75:20,23 77:5 79:10 83:23 84:8 106:12 rights 14:23 41:18 64:13 65:18 rigorous 19:7 rise 10:20 risk 41:18 48:18 risks 103:8 road 91:22 role 41:22 97:4 109:16 rolling 19:19 room 25:9 109:8 roughly 44:13 round 99:19 roundly 50:13 rounds 55:9 route 75:5 routes 62:4 Royal 3:6 35:16 37:24 rule 73:14 78:16 ruled 33:17 rules 4:2,2 13:18 72:22 74:6 ruling 34:24,25 61:16 run 15:4 18:3 111:2 running 8:10	101:24,25 103:15 106:1 108:24 110:16 111:4 112:1 Sargeant 99:22 sat 104:14 satisfied 18:12 73:7 save 54:22 84:8 saying 59:10 82:1 says 37:6 40:1,9 75:16 76:13 77:15 scrutiny 70:2 sea 37:25 38:7 52:5 search 20:24 35:17 36:11,20 37:9 40:3 80:2 81:15 searches 19:8 seating 1:11 second 1:4 39:17 56:10 58:10 60:5 63:6,13 64:7 81:25 85:14 secondly 7:14 48:7 48:17 51:3 54:6 54:14 107:10 seconds 44:9,9 secretary 1:21 102:13 105:16,18 section 37:20 39:1 39:11 40:8,11,17 40:22 41:1,6 45:19 47:3 48:6 48:21 52:23 54:20 62:11,22 62:25 63:1,3,8,11 63:13 64:13,17 64:18,24 65:1,2,4 65:18,22 66:4 67:14 69:21 74:12,18 76:2 82:8,17 83:3 85:18 86:5 87:1 87:5 sections 39:24 secure 17:16,19 security 13:7
			S	
			sabotage 35:19 79:25 81:11 87:12 Salmon 56:21 57:22 Santos 3:21 5:2,21 5:22 26:18 28:12 28:18,21 29:13 30:10 31:16 33:13 45:1,8 55:1,2 58:6,10 60:22 61:12 74:17 77:4,19 78:1,4,8,13,15,19 79:10 84:6 92:10 93:6 94:14	

<p>35:19 see 1:10 21:5 32:18 72:18 73:20 79:3 102:5 106:19 107:12 108:18 112:12 seeing 17:22 seek 16:20 18:16 20:22 55:6 85:2 seeking 12:6 18:9 81:5 106:18 seen 42:19 95:12 100:14 108:5 seize 21:9 seizure 2:18 selective 20:17 self- 54:1 self-evident 49:6 send 2:7 23:22 32:15 sending 12:5 18:18 31:18 97:23 senior 19:24 50:23 53:14 100:3 sense 7:3 91:2 108:11 sensible 87:8 sensitive 110:18 sent 8:25 10:17 12:8 13:9 14:24 19:12 39:18 80:19 sentence 45:14 separate 42:22 85:23 86:12 separately 27:1 98:14 separation 95:10 97:2 99:13 100:12 September 1:2 16:1 23:19,22 24:13 32:17 56:25 66:25 67:16 70:12 80:18 84:25 85:15,22 86:15 87:14,21 88:24 98:9 101:17</p>	<p>sequence 41:14 sequencing 39:4 series 30:18 serious 36:21 51:16 95:7 servant 100:3 servants 19:24 serve 11:7 serves 18:3 service 106:22 services 96:11 97:14 100:12,25 serving 3:10 6:16 30:17 session 44:4 set 1:23 4:6 8:14 11:22 12:2 13:24 15:17,24 17:16 20:20 23:15 25:5 25:20 26:8 28:15 33:16,20,22 39:3 42:4,9 47:3,23 66:12 67:24 70:14,21 82:18 86:13 88:13 91:11 110:6 sets 4:10 14:8,15 14:21 65:21 74:17 setting 1:9 20:23 28:22 39:15 57:1 93:9 settlement 23:14 55:21 severely 51:5 Shane 6:13 share 58:12,15 59:17 shared 14:22 59:6 68:24 110:19 shareholding 46:5 sharing 59:24 shooting 28:23 29:8 shore 17:5 short 3:19,24 33:9 41:23 43:18,21 44:16,18 84:4,21 89:23 93:10</p>	<p>short-circuit 84:18 shorthand 82:15 shortly 9:7 10:9 18:18 55:16 show 46:12 shut 72:23 sight 11:1 31:4,12 31:14 110:21 signed 20:19 39:22 significant 19:16 55:13 67:3 79:21 silent 2:13 similar 64:3 99:22 Similarly 27:2 simplest 89:12 simply 75:11 111:10 sincere 7:20 single 22:12 40:1 sir 3:9,17 5:22 6:10 7:20 21:9 26:15 27:8,9,10 27:10,22,23 28:1 28:2,20 29:8 30:13 31:15 33:8 33:13 34:2 40:18 41:11 42:2,7,7,8 42:22,24 43:15 43:20,20,24 44:2 44:8,12 45:25 46:1,1 47:1,20,20 53:16,20,24,24 55:2 58:3,3 66:20 71:6,6 73:6,6,9,15 74:5 74:7,7,21,22 75:7 75:11 76:5,9,13 76:16,23 77:3 79:14 82:9 84:6 86:4,8 90:12 92:2 93:21 94:8 94:21 95:18,25 101:1 103:22,22 106:3 111:22,25 112:8,10 sit 81:24 83:15 sitting 71:25 73:22 situation 15:10 61:3 99:22</p>	<p>six 106:25 108:5 108:15 sixth 7:17 skip 53:17 slight 81:9 slightly 1:11 43:13 62:4 71:8 90:3 99:18 small 17:8 18:14 44:24 57:9 sole 81:20 solicitor 8:6 19:21 55:8 98:15 solicitor's 49:13 solicitors 17:14 59:4 100:8 105:15 109:23 solutions 97:12 102:25 somewhat 68:5 soon 11:15 14:3,5 19:20 24:4 43:8 sooner 31:1 sorry 5:18 30:12 42:16 sort 5:19 43:19 99:12 110:20 sorted 44:20 sought 7:23 9:8,17 13:12 19:22 21:4 30:16,17,17 48:13,17 106:23 sound 2:15 sovereign 76:20,24 space 2:3 Spanish 52:5 speak 34:11,15 72:8 Speaker 40:10 speakers 1:16 speaking 36:25 special 14:13 69:18 specific 19:10 specifically 52:8 57:2 spelled 81:1 spotlight 111:12 stage 6:3 7:4 21:11</p>	<p>28:24 31:1 38:25 41:11 66:15 70:1 88:22 89:19 93:5 106:15 stages 8:4 stakeholders 56:11 58:11,14 58:18 59:3,12 stand 34:18 91:18 101:1 start 5:24 42:8 71:9 starting 17:1 state 53:9 80:23 87:25 stated 10:4 21:18 39:13 49:1 54:2 62:1 82:7 86:1,4 109:1 statement 9:6 10:1 10:2,6 20:22 34:4 35:14 42:20 46:24 49:6 82:4 91:4 statements 3:12,24 4:18,20 9:3,4 10:15,18,22,24 11:11,20 24:23 25:3,15,18 30:4 31:6 32:19 33:9 33:25 106:9,9 108:8 110:22 111:14,16 states 58:13 84:13 89:1 stating 32:11 status 24:1 26:1 statute 99:15 102:5,9 statutory 64:3 89:6 Steel 41:11 95:19 Steel's 82:10 86:8 step 18:7 steps 36:24 stone 17:5 28:15 stood 36:3,7 38:21 46:7 stopover 51:6</p>
---	--	---	---	--

<p>storage 17:19 stored 20:24 straight 105:17 stressful 41:14 strict 93:9 strictly 47:10 strongly 87:18 structure 47:7 sub- 81:19 sub-issue 80:16 87:17 sub-issues 80:5 subject 2:3,18 15:10,18 18:14 21:19 22:23 24:6 31:20 32:1 35:17 35:25,25 36:1 38:7,20 40:4 46:14 59:22 70:2 70:18 91:25 subjects' 14:23 submission 22:12 58:16 62:21 65:11 85:13 86:10 95:5 96:11 110:5 submissions 3:2 5:7 12:7,9,11 13:13 15:23 17:21,22 47:4 55:10,17 57:7,17 59:7 61:25 63:21 66:17,21 67:1,15 67:16 68:1,15,19 69:4 70:4,12,15 70:23 71:4 76:2 77:25 79:13 80:6 80:13 81:8 82:23 83:18 84:22 85:7 86:15,17,18 87:13 88:9,14,17 88:19,24 89:18 89:19 90:5,14 91:17,19 94:23 96:10 97:7 98:7 98:8 103:20 104:2,3,10 105:6 105:10,23 submit 57:16</p>	<p>76:17 submitted 41:24 98:12,12,15 submitting 67:20 subsequent 83:4 85:18 subsequently 58:20 substantial 39:24 106:25 substantive 97:4 successfully 78:5 succumb 41:21 suffice 73:24 suffices 64:2 sufficient 2:5 3:1 32:7 sufficiently 34:12 96:17 suggest 69:9 suggested 58:20 86:25 90:17,18 suitably 65:21 summer 8:5 11:8 summoned 106:22 summons 63:4 sunlight 35:9 support 53:17 62:25 92:8 supported 63:23 suppose 79:5 101:9 105:2 supposed 37:18 38:16 43:22 Supreme 65:3 sure 25:6 26:18 66:22 78:3,18 101:8 Surely 99:2 surrounding 25:25 26:2 41:20 suspect 46:23 suspension 40:12 sweep 94:5 swiftly 20:1 switched 2:12 33:14 sworn 11:11 sympathetic 22:6</p>	<p>system 8:9 18:4 35:20,22 79:25 81:12 101:6 systems 96:16 101:20</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <hr/> <p>tab 6:18 12:24,25 13:16 14:7,14,20 15:17 table 72:1 73:22 tabs 16:2 tackle 51:16 tackles 107:12 take 25:1,23 26:13 29:11,21,23 67:18 77:4,15 86:19 88:14 103:13 111:23 taken 5:24 8:5 17:25 30:1 35:2 35:3 36:24 40:19 67:3 96:10 97:10 tangential 17:3 task 17:24 team 1:8 4:13 5:6 7:21 8:7 13:8 20:2,3 27:11 28:2 55:12,23 96:9 98:1 102:12 105:14 team's 98:11 104:5 105:8 teams 11:9 17:20 technically 100:17 tell 34:17 43:17 103:6 temporary 49:25 ten 79:2,7 84:10 91:24 tend 62:17 tended 51:21 tension 107:14 tensions 51:12 tenure 85:12 termed 81:6 terms 9:10,13 10:16 15:8 16:25 20:25 41:24 77:12 78:20 89:4</p>	<p>102:4 111:6 test 66:12 text 44:6 68:25 85:1 texts 2:9 thank 1:8 3:17 5:22 6:1 26:14 27:8 28:18 33:15 34:5,6 42:1,7 44:23 45:24 46:1 53:24 54:25 55:2 58:8 60:10 61:12 66:20 77:3 78:19 86:3 90:10 92:10 93:1 103:21 111:25 112:11 thanked 1:8 thanks 1:22 theory 53:5,18 thing 33:2 92:14 108:7 things 26:19 36:19 93:14 99:25 106:5 107:1 108:2 110:25 112:6 think 1:13 3:6 4:25 7:7 13:13 24:5 28:15,18 29:24 30:7 31:19 33:8 34:13 43:4,10,20 44:12,15 45:3 56:15,18 59:18 61:21 66:3 74:10 74:24 75:2,25 77:5,15,16,23 78:4,8,15 79:6 83:19 85:23 87:2 92:10,20,25 93:7 101:14 102:23 105:21,25 106:2 107:2 108:5,22 108:24 110:18,19 111:5,20,22 thinking 56:19 110:13 third 24:15 25:22 26:7 27:14 28:5 56:11 57:10</p>	<p>65:25 85:21 thirdly 7:15 51:7 51:23 thorough 19:7 thought 15:20 33:12 54:23 106:25 111:21 threat 102:22 three 14:24 29:23 56:6 57:9 62:18 79:16 80:4,5 104:17 tight 32:25 time 3:1 5:24 7:23 8:16,24 11:5,10 11:19 17:12 20:9 21:22 28:3,25 31:10 32:7 33:2 33:7 34:10 35:24 40:6 49:4 50:19 53:1 60:19 80:15 83:8,9 84:8 93:18,20 94:5,11 95:20 106:14 109:8 timeline 23:16,17 27:12 timely 53:15 times 95:3 108:16 timescale 30:24 107:3 111:15,19 timescales 30:19 31:5 107:8 111:3 timetable 5:14 7:5 7:18 23:11 25:7 26:9,24 29:6 93:23,25 timetabling 30:14 tireless 7:22 today 1:25 3:8,15 3:19 5:10,11,17 5:20,24 6:7,14 8:11 10:7 12:12 12:16 17:10 18:15 26:5 28:15 31:24 32:3 33:5 33:18 56:7 61:22 61:25 65:10 91:20 104:3</p>
---	--	--	--	---

106:11,16 107:2 107:5,10 110:25 111:17 today's 18:2,3 24:5 told 6:15 49:9 topic 61:20 63:22 topics 4:11 5:3 7:12 touched 52:7 transcriber's 43:8 transcripts 2:19 2:21 transparency 22:4 73:10,13 transparent 59:19 Treasury 105:17 treated 48:4 treatment 14:9,12 104:24 tricky 64:22 65:19 67:23 triggered 50:7 86:6 true 105:9 trust 96:13 101:9 try 33:4 84:18 trying 78:10 95:4 111:2 Tuesday 1:2 turn 11:20 27:24 30:10 turning 8:18 15:2 18:6 tweak 68:12 Tweets 2:9 two 2:20 11:17 44:5 46:3 52:5 55:9 57:10 63:4 71:9 83:20,23 84:1,2 104:17 types 19:15	112:5 unclear 38:17 uncommon 15:9 uncontroversial 5:1 underlying 80:9 underpin 72:1 understand 3:7 31:2,11,24,25 33:24 34:1 42:17 60:24 83:5 84:19 89:21 90:9 92:12 92:14 100:16,21 102:2 109:11 understandable 104:13 112:2 understanding 100:23 101:24,25 102:11 undertake 19:6 103:7 undertaken 7:10 undertakings 68:22 unduly 89:9 unfairly 48:4 unhappiness 105:19 unhelpfully 104:9 United 4:1 unmeritorious 105:5 unnecessarily 17:2 50:25 unreasonable 28:17 untrue 105:10 unturning 17:4 unwise 93:4 up-to-date 74:20 update 3:20 5:2 6:19,23 updated 22:16 updates 22:5 uploaded 2:22,23 18:1 upsetting 27:16 urge 14:1 25:11 use 14:22 17:20	18:4 34:19,22 40:7 86:5 93:16 102:13 110:16 useful 25:3 utterly 112:2	84:21 86:3,23 87:2,9 90:2,10 91:18 94:21 99:1 99:5,17 100:20 100:24 101:21 103:12,20 wait 27:3 waiting 6:2 Wales 99:21,23 want 3:15 23:10 27:5 34:9 53:22 56:7 66:18 72:5 78:21 86:24 107:4 108:19 109:5 111:18 wanted 44:25 90:6 94:24 107:1 108:2 wants 1:18 107:6 107:11 warned 70:25 warning 56:22 57:4 70:17 warrant 35:17 36:11,20 37:9 40:3 warrants 80:3 81:15 watching 3:8,12 30:13 106:3 waters 85:10 way 2:8 20:4 26:17 33:3 44:5 57:19 59:25 61:1 74:19 80:7 84:18 90:12 94:18 98:5 102:7 ways 99:19 website 2:22,24 4:6 11:24 12:20 18:19 24:7 31:25 Wednesday 41:13 week 7:24 10:21 14:4 93:9 106:17 weeks 28:11 29:23 104:17 welcome 1:21 61:19 93:7 went 100:1 whilst 43:3 72:8	whistle 105:5 wide 19:22 89:4 widely 68:25 73:24 willing 53:6 58:17 77:20,22 101:9 102:20 103:4 window 72:20 wire 94:9 wish 9:15 13:21 23:6 26:23 42:12 55:18 61:19 66:14 69:25 74:22 79:1 106:1 wished 45:9 46:16 wishes 104:7 109:11 wishing 10:25 withdrawal 41:1 83:4 85:19 withdrawn 40:25 witness 3:11 9:2,4 9:25 10:14,17,22 11:19 20:22 24:22 25:2,15,18 30:4 31:6 32:19 46:24 61:23 65:14 106:8 108:7 110:22 111:14 witnesses 4:9,16 4:19 6:17 7:9 8:23 11:25 14:6 14:10 19:4,9,18 19:23 22:3 29:1 29:4,16 30:5 56:18 59:5 63:16 106:24 107:1 witnesses' 65:18 wonder 60:5 word 45:1,7,9 wording 55:14 56:8 60:11,14 63:8 66:11 68:13 77:21 82:6 83:1 83:7 84:9,12 86:13,16,20 88:3 88:12 words 65:6 69:8 71:13
<hr/> U <hr/> UK 53:13 65:25 74:13 76:23 97:15 UK's 64:4 ultimately 55:20 56:2 79:14 80:24 unable 89:13	<hr/> V <hr/> v 63:24 66:13 vacate 93:4,7,20 94:12 vague 59:11,12 valid 29:13 30:6 value 105:14 various 5:3 92:7 95:1 110:15 vast 59:14 ventilated 106:11 version 24:7 54:2 68:21 versions 4:4 vest 39:1 viability 27:16 viable 25:21 32:19 Vice 41:10 victim 104:22,23 view 1:19 5:18 16:12 29:23 53:13 views 12:8 50:20 57:1 93:11 vindicate 51:22 vital 4:16 voice 34:12 volume 108:23 voluntary 21:12 vulnerable 4:9 14:6,10 40:23	<hr/> W <hr/> Wagner 6:5 10:6 27:7,8 34:1,2,3,6 34:11,15,19,23 42:16 43:14,15 44:14,21,22,24 45:6,11,23 47:17 47:18 60:6,10,14 61:9 66:19,20,23 71:10,22 74:25 77:24 81:22 83:17,22 84:1,19		

work 3:22 5:4 6:22 6:25 7:10,22 8:5 8:17,22 17:12 22:9,10,16 31:2,9 49:21 98:3	12.51 84:3 13 15:17 20:20 40:8,11,17 41:6 52:24 67:15 82:8 82:17 86:5 87:1 87:5	22 39:6 40:4 45:12 65:22 74:12,18 23 88:18 23rd 23:18 24th 25:5 25 10:18 47:9,15 53:19,20 88:18 104:17 27 88:13 27th 24:21 28 32:5,8 88:23 28th 24:8 27:13 28:4,10 30:24 29 49:14 2nd 15:25 2PH 94:6	30:20 <hr/> 8 <hr/> 8 14:14 41:4 52:5 64:12 78:23 8(2) 62:25 63:3,11 63:13 8.30 41:25 8th 24:23 <hr/> 9 <hr/> 9 39:6 41:25 45:12 78:23 81:24
working 25:16 worse 71:18 worst 96:21 worth 15:20 56:15 79:4,5 83:11 110:10 111:21 worthy 16:14 writing 39:4 68:14 77:25 86:11 writings 63:7 written 39:23 47:3 55:9 57:7 80:5 80:13 81:8 82:23 88:9 94:23 104:2 104:10 110:24 wrong 93:19 100:1 wrongly 3:8 54:23 wrote 84:23 101:16	15th 67:1 16th 24:13 25:23 17 33:17 17th 24:14 25:24 18 38:12 1861 63:25 1888 62:12 64:15 64:17 76:20 19 70:22 <hr/> 2 <hr/> 2 3:20 16:2 26:15 56:25 66:25 75:12,12 76:2,5,9 80:16 84:25 85:14,22 87:20 2(1) 76:2 2.1 76:10 2.15 83:22,24 20 1:2 9:7 58:23 59:1,13 60:13 2004 14:18 2005 65:23 2006 41:7 54:21 2016 51:17 2017 50:22 51:4 2020 35:15 36:10 37:11 38:13 39:6 40:5,19 41:25 45:12 49:14 51:19 52:5,22 80:4 2022 1:2 13:25 23:19,25 112:14 2023 7:19 23:12 24:21 25:6,11 21st 24:16	<hr/> 3 <hr/> 3 3:23 16:2 33:9 30 44:9 104:20 30th 23:21 31 106:13 31(f) 48:21 31.1(9) 72:12,19 32 7:24 10:20 33 86:14 34 37:20 39:1,11 40:22 41:1 45:19 48:6 83:3 85:18 36 58:13 <hr/> 4 <hr/> 4 4:3 16:2 23:24 55:3 98:9 40 44:9 <hr/> 5 <hr/> 5 4:10 40:18 41:2 79:19 81:9 106:18 59(2)(c) 69:21 <hr/> 6 <hr/> 6 4:23 7:3 6th 25:5 <hr/> 7 <hr/> 7 5:14 7:3 13:25 64:13,19 65:1,18 7th 23:24 24:23	
<hr/> X <hr/> Y <hr/> year 8:18 24:16 years 77:10 <hr/> Z <hr/> 0 <hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 6:18 10 14:20 15:15 16:5 41:13 62:11 63:1,8 64:17,24 65:2,4 66:4 67:14 82:19,24 10.37am 1:3 11 12:24,25 11.34 44:17 12 14:7 35:15 36:10 54:20 80:3 82:23 12.02 44:19 12.19 58:2			