

26 February 2014

L - correct item evidence - from trained log - not feminine - local firm.

T - emails to NB - p200

- reply - send 2 emails on same day re: offer of assistance. p198 - NB

Comment - Not appropriate but get stuck into other things - appropriate?

L - Not reasonable as things he suggests - not problems debated.

Direction

T - didn't agree. Response @ 200 - patronising

L - Yes

T - P204 - email sent to NB - sent to NC list - you'd have known all members + staff in receipt. 'No respect @ all'

L - Get emails in order. This is 5/12 - what in reply to? other one 1/11 - S was prenas

T - making an - asking you about P204 - 'no respect at all' - insulting to NB

L - 204 a reply to what?

T - p214

L - would like to answer question.

T - Being shown an email + asked attitude towards NB

T - Conveying NB as glorified... (p2...)

L - directed @ Brussels guy @ FEMA office

T - NB asking about getting involved in press release

L - 6th para - talking about FEMA

T - Yes

T - SL meeting with staff - you knew staff issues

L - Board knew.

T - SL wrote report - p239 - sends email to D's - attached docs.

Prepared - Summary of staff position at bottom. Essentially staff in fear of reprisals. 29/1/13 - Received

L - Received to Her writing style to put over o/s news + how they feel + then we can look to resolve. Fair lady.

T - don't adopt her approach - p230 - Top - you chase NB re:

prenas email about removing 'S from NC list. SL responds

on NB behalf - her new LS needs to remain.

L - NO - NB'S review is being set out

T - disagreed

L - came to conclusion she shd be removed.

T - She is agreeing isn't she?

L - if I sent intimidating email would have been told.
She's no-one's fool

T - 238 - sent few days after report - your response @ bottom.
flaming devil accept NC list position. Accept she needs to
post.

L - proves I gave consideration to NB's input. Emails - 12000
per yr - mainly irrelevant.

T - 246 - wrote to SL - 'had a belly full' - 'dole office' ref. to
C.O. Staff?

L - to whoever had leaked info. manipulated it to say
PW was earning a sum larger than he was. Costly to
us. removed our support base. Totally 'fucked up' PW.

T - Slap of firm management + NB went forward

L - let staff send this out - discredit industry.

T - propose to Board that IT man (Meredith) shd remove LS
from all email list + NB to inform. Not carried out
investigation @ this pt?

L - this email sent after LS threw busy fit - Dec. 2012 -
described us as snakes - thought it was LS.

T - you said she needed to post - refusal?

L - NO - about productivity - why she was removed.

T - you said relationship not improving - AS of your
statement - send NB memo - content same as
1813 speech. V. Paulst off. so nothing done. P247 to 249
is the memo - subject matter of concerns list NB
had no comment on?

L - All valid concerns.

T - After this time - early March - P261 - PW sends email

re: Pl office - 3 Committee - Mutch ~~ME~~ + Mitchell. NB won't be part of this. Accept Pl office ref PT + NB sd have been ref. for

L - no

T - P283 - email from ~~new~~ PT to NB about call to C.O. Accept accurate?

L - Yes - 1 rang but inaccurate.

T - @ PT about NB management practice

L - no

T - if you did - inappropriate?

L - To certain extent but they work close together

T - P272 - 11/3 - offered to take over Pl.

L - SL came to us + ask us to take it on.

T - familiar with email?

L - yes

T - Changing cause from conciliation to mediation not act? 2nd para - need to do it your way

L - no - everything on table + then fresh start. Tell it like it is

T - no mutual agreement - contemplating dis hearing.

L - no

T - why refer to dis. hearing?

L - if contin. to meet defiance as previously met - if they didn't amend behaviour wouldn't have reached this pt.

T - Already decided?

L - no - knew things have to change. if only get 'talk to hand' routine - cld end up in dis.

T - P287 - Manag. Skills - emails leading up to 18/3. re: 100 matter. 4th para

L - NB already involved DP.

T - Remind him highest paid + discussion closed

L - 3rd from last para - viable way to personal benefit

L - wanted him to stay

T - p288 - response Setting out Concerns - 'Confidential' to D. daily sets out staff concerns - about your behaviour objects to meeting & says why. p289 - dismissal of those concerns. ~~Essex~~

L - Board gave it to us to do.

T - p190 - see your command here. Para 1 - Remove LS from list - anyone absent to att. your IFA office? nothing to do with MAC?

L - it is office

T - where you carry out IFA work

L - dedicated space for MAC. run it from here.

T - think answer no - no official link

L - I donate space.

T - returning email suggest referrals if ill.

L - Travelling down evening up a day's work. NIB mentioned ppl not turning up. Suspected staff throw sick day & so they could come to us.

T - But you'd received concerns, knew LS illness + PT ill health. Accept aware ill health

L - Alleged ill health issues. Can't diagnose stress like broken leg.

- wanted 18/3 meeting - not....

[Is upset]

L - Not Mystic meg but read his mind well that week.

T - Meeting wd be about staff keeping/losing job? if didn't get what want wd leave

L - want co-operation. works well now. speaking helps us

T - p294 - bottom - ref. to email about ill health - hard word about throwing selves.

L - okay - if sick but not going back to manufacture - away day from office.

T- P295 - NB refers you to fact Splunkings 1st day back 18/3 after major surgery.

L- recent - not major. if known she was ill - wd have told her not to show up. felt sorry & stayed with her in - NB didn't wake us aware how ill. thanked her + Carol + wanted same co-op from other 3

T- Blame NB? P305 - your response. say today didn't realise but you didn't ask - going ahead regardless

L- if knew how ill wdnt have asked her. Expect NB to volunteer info. NB seldom vol. info. unless benefit to him

T- P306 - news of LS expressed + NB trying to reason with you. inflated notion of position

L- LS talks to president as piece of muck.

T- unjust. cont. of LS

L- no - justified. History of short stay jobs - cv shows 13 jobs

T- NB explained she was Contractor.

L- few ppl do this from school.

T- if you saw an email like this - you wouldn't have faith objective meeting wd take place.

L- private memo to NB he showed to LS. Said wdnt take her off. Said she needed to change her attitude. Said NB needs to manage her.

T- Board didn't respond to NB's cry for help + so NB involved DP. P319 - your response.

L- she secretly sent it.

T- Been to office on 14/3

L- NB broke line of manag.

T- P307 - accept this was sent.

L- Dated 14th but got in touch with DP earlier

T- P319 - your response to DP. P322 - bottom - you

set out (went to NC list + employees) - intended they see it.

L - yes

T - you say - unprof., disgraceful + dishonest

L - didn't do much for us that week.

T - Been forwarded emails to say LS stressed.

L - received emails to say other...

T - P309 - received this email before the other? This on behalf of LS to you + PW. She refers to intimidation + stress

L - similar style to P7 + similar wording. written by NB

T - Q - accept you received 'stress' email before you responded.

L - no - from NB - proved.

T - reply - considered her dishonest re: stress

L - if anyone says it when not - dishonest.

T - listen to Q.

T - considered her dishonest.

L - yes

T - P345 - proposing to change NB job to policy research analyst.

L - pay + conditions unchanged

T - change to job

L - meeting.

T - if he stays

L - yes... possibility. Apparent by this time NB determined not to manage. QDOS says Manager needed to manage manager

T - you say LS Redundant

L - yes

T - PT - redundancy / dismissal

L - when employee debarred - difficult to carry on employing

T - refuse to supply agenda

L - no time

T - Had time to write your speech

L - Yes

T - delib ambush?

L - NO

T - Mutch in att. - refers to meeting as 'car crash' (p429)

[Read 1/2 page from top - NFL (angus)]

T - disagree with him

L - 'car crash' app.

T - disagree - yes/no

L - Agree with some facts + not other

T - car crash?

L - Explore metaphor. Planned in advance. PP hit vs from side + made mess.

T - Accept you were dealing with misconduct?

L - protracted Cause of Conduct - preventing D's managing org.

T - misconduct? from employees? yes or no?

L - Not in employment legal sense.

T - not q.

L - No it wasn't in legal sense.

T - in your position - did you in that context, consider this to be misconduct

L - NO

T - suggest you did + this disc meeting

L - not disc. - taken ACAS advice - had right to hold meeting + staff sd attend.

T - Accept you were loud?

L - vocal chords of Darth Vader. NB knows I'm deaf.

T - inform staff of deafness?

L - no - NB knows

T - you stood?

L - yes - presenting

T - perceived as aggressive

L - no.

T - Sterling says aggressive tone.

L - she wrote report asked to write by manager

T - p634 - no - indep. invest.

L - Accept ppl have perceptions

T - Ferrari said controlling anger

L - no

T - tense + direct

L - always direct + atmos. tense - d/s

T - Mutch refers to crying + tears. Accept?

L - Ferrari - no. Julie - visibly ill not crying in meeting. LS - said having panic attack.

T - 'faked'?

L - Yes

T - Accept you raised disc?

L - told LS ACAS said if she refused to have meeting cd then convene disc.

T - told within hr?

L - yes

T - Then few hrs?

L - no. phoned ACAS back - told 2 days

T - told her outside when having panic attack?

L - went outside after ACAS + told LS 48 hr notice for disc. Monday meeting - admit do wed. Budget day + so next monday (if meeting needed). Breathing normally.

T - Relayed to NB changing LS title?

L - in last meeting.

T - Change to 'sr admin' for LS

L - yes

T - reduce stress?

L - Yes + to ↑ focus on work in office.

T - No job desc. for LS + NB had to write his own + was unclear. Didn't know LS job function?

L - wanted to find this out on the day. She refused to discuss it.

T - intention to ask - didn't talk but still went ahead.

L - antagonistic demeanor led to it - any other meeting wd be unproductive. knew what office needed. 3 ladies cd have sorted database.

T - unilateral change to her duties?

L - No - her duties admin. anyway - no change.

T - wanted NB to agree with LS same day - No consultation

L - wanted her to do this job, a job. important to change title - current one = unpaid position - felt she could talk to Mutch like dirt.

T - P356 - report to Board after meeting - bottom para.

- No confidence - accepted it was over but a mistake

- ① grievances ② disc - NB - no longer manager - LS + PT - dismiss g.m. Conclusion?

L - wrong. Board - 7 ppl - no action taken unilaterally. My take on it - Board decides. Desirable outcome for NB to stay.

Tyson terrible - outrageous to Mutch. knew why needed 2 admin. - need 2 + have 3 so person who goes is obstructive person etc.

T - P358 - change heart. now proposing hiring lawyer re: dismissal of LS + final written for NB. NB asking for clarification?

L - 1813 - made clear LS only be called if she didn't conclude meeting with us. They were messing up Selmer's job - weren't able to mess up mine.

T - had doubts?

L - no-clear

T - in your mind - not theirs

L - NO. Said LS had finished meeting + so fine.

T - So NB sd get final written for asking for clarification + then suspended

L - Yes.

T - P415 - letter sent by email (412 - covering email).

2nd para - ① to invest. griev. ② allegation misconduct or g.m. no right to suspend in relation to 1st.

+ policy - only suspend if g.m. Policy - only if g.m. Accept?

L - Allegation g.m.

T - But also misconduct.

- Suspended for raising grievance?

L - No - for spending week telling us he didn't attend meeting.

T - P453 + P454 - to LS + PT letters. Agreed Chmn - Both off sick. Asking return of key jobs - bar from office.

L - Didn't attend out of hrs without other staff.

- they could download things -

- PT was giving advice to other org.

T - mistrust?

L - precautions against data theft.

T - never asked before to do this

L - true but diff. context.

T - S80 - S82 - further letters to all 3 - give up / forward usernames + passwords but PT already doing it?

L - Don't accept he had access.

T - grievances

[water break]

[break 11:08-11:15]

T- re: grievances - plan - Mr Danson to deal

L- Yes

T- OPOS unstranded

L- He made comment about stuff

T- Not impartial?

L- Met + hee didn't decide on OPOS

T- didn't get involved with this

L- Pat sourced OPOS + ran it by Board

T- p396A - how you wanted to deal - 3 pts defence - 'deal today' - breach of policy?

L- Yes - why it didn't happen. Decision making impaired

T- p452...

- worked long hrs - perception / decision making poor as a result

L- NO

T- p452 (454) - g.m. for not attending? Behind decision?

L- Yes; was.

T- Accept when you became aware of outcome from OPOS - your view, as not put before you just, findings sd be rescinded.

L- OPOS refused vs evidence they'd obtained - we'd not seen it. Sonnet style. OPOS dealt with everything on 15th. legal advice - OPOS process defective.

T- happy to sign up to summary process yourself a day after (19th) + outcome not to your liking + so complaint.

L- NO - process flew in face of natural justice. disclosed to NB all info. on disc. OPOS said it had 6" file + CP said not allowed to see it.

T- natural justice for other D'S to deal?

L - Danson + Lavender - if they deemed me guilty wd have reflected.

T - Record outcomes

L - went out w/o me seeing

T - went out w/o your input - so record?

L - No.

T - p589 - 1st red entry - better be sorted quick.

L - our lawyers told us Board sd have been given to us.

T - 'AU' underlined - not a Board issue - about Upn + Pw

L - If deemed guilty - we sd have known about it just. wikipedia's def. 'natural justice' act like this

T - p594 - Pat's def. said - 'dependents' + so don't get to influence. Read whole email.

- didn't Contract to get answer we want

L - pt. 24 in ODOs response - say looked for info. to dig dirt on me + Pw - we were shafted by Compu firm. GP said she wasn't comfortable with what she was doing.

T - P711 - not accurate Summary. Para. 24.

- After GP concluded rec. → rec. re: change of management. Not

L - we weren't allowed to see ODOs file.

J - Being asked if Pat influenced Conc.

L - Don't agree.

T - when did Board meet findings? no min.

L - Can't put time + date on it. Discussions going on through the night. Pat wished this out to ©. He stuffed me + Pete. Pat then wanted to put us on disc.

T - ODOs outcomes sent 18-22 April + no min about rejection. Page 687 only doc. - your email

T- members more than month later outcomes 'reopened'

- can't assist ET?

L- NO

T- decision made around 24-25 April - clear from emails with Pat - should rescind immediately.

L- wouldn't be left a month but probably will later.

Given legal advice process should be checked in bn.

T- you proposed - 725 - to sanction Pat (along with Proj).

- 726 - don't ask removal but require apology

L- he did this - my evidence - v. generous to him.

Advice - he was in breach of fiduciary duty - he

burst into tears - said he did it in best will but

made a mess. Told him to stay out of staff

matter

T- Opos don't accept wrongdoing

L- no

T- PT resigned after grievance. LS appealed - Mr Birch.

no dec. to say she was told before that Opos'

findings rejected.

L- NO she hadn't.

T- NB- P687 - But new context. NB appealing

L- YES... Confused

T- P686 - NB asking about his appeal

- only pt - 687 - your response to him asking for

clarification on appeal. Not told him in advance

findings rejected - only came about due to

him asking.

L- Sd have been better organised.

T- Accept - NB asks why rejected if you refuse.

L- Advised by lawyers that employee given outcome

of grievance + Co. given advice from HR him.

J- @ acknowledging that - seems you are but

reasonable to mention retraction

L - yes

T - so denied want to exercise appeal

L - no. Rejected appeal due to procedure

T - NB didn't know that.

L - process - skewed. No bearing on b&h - didn't unfair his right to appeal.

T - who appeal process meaningless

L - no. appeal treated me + PW unfairly

T - NB subjected to disc. invest. + you bid him to attend @ your offices (p680) - independent HR - wrote to him on 21 May before grievance concluded - asking him to meeting with you?

L - everyone happy grievance + disc. run concurrently.

T - date is May - @ this pt. NB not aware appeal findings rejected. He'd received appeal's letter + recommendations. Then he gets this letter from you attending at your offices?

L - space @ my office for @ work. All MAC staff there

T - p681 - HR Consultant - att. disc. + consult attending any appeal for grievance.

J - move on

T - emails sending to list between grievances + resignations - mid April to mid June.

- p543 - 1114 email - Aber. MAC. Sent to Regional Reps - 20-30 recipients inc. staff?

L - yes - didn't have staff on this list - knew LS on the list.

T - response @ bottom + over to 544 - 'time to take sides' + 'want to line their own pockets' - unacceptable to put an ac list - suggest fraud.

L - They were mining ^{their} and co. on our time.

T- P599 - your response to LS re: her request for clarification
(to Pat) as she was aware ODS no longer instructed

L- 599 wrong

T- P599 - letter sent to Board + Comments made
about LS

- ref. to 595?

L- yes - wouldn't say 'the Board' of applying
for jobs

T- not applying

- Response belittling

L- accept she was insolent. Caring email same. ^{Don't accept insulance}

T- P607 - email to NC - around 28/4

L- No - no date

T- prior to 22 June

L- no - much later.

J- date disputed

T- written when NB+LS still employed

L- No w/o date can't place. will try + give
best estimation.

- written after 3rd weekend in June.

T- P637 - 5 May - whilst appeals on-going. email
to public use. PT - liar.

L- he is.

T- LS still an employee. P638 - set out news
about PT + then refer to LS ... sorry P639.

- P647 - 9/5 - LS appealing ignorance - not told ODS
findings retracted. on sick with CP role. You say
she'd been made when att. work by not saying
hello + warning her a disc. on return.

L- Don't accept insolent conduct. Every intention
of allowing her to return.

T- Expenses + sick pay - remedy?

J- yes.

J - Counsel at have just ref. me to does. who ^{you} commenting
but she gave you off. So time running over line
- re-exam

L - 2 reasons for not telling staff about retraction -
① Cook up ② feeling on Board - look @ rational
way forward - get everything on table

12pm

12pm

JB - Confirmed Statement, Signature + no corrections.

L - Apologise for harsh questions

- Para. 2 of WOS. - ve- attitude to Staff. only Board
+ NC meetings you attended were:

① pre-Con Board meeting - In there alone

JB - Yes - 10 min.

L - ② post-con BM - both of us there

JB - Yes

- Some background discussion overheard about
Concerns

J - April 2012

L - Yes

- Any re- p ③

JB - not @ that meet.

L - we did raise right to rule

JB - Yes

L - attitude - just settle

JB - Wasn't aware of background - knew it was
an issue + need to move in

L - ③ June BM + NC meet. Only 1 attended

JB - Yes

L - In never discussed Staff issues.

JB - wasn't there

L - you didn't attend Aug. meetings

JB - 2 meetings

L - 1 after con

JB - 2 more - came to N. office for

L - att. record - att. June + not Aug

JB - fine but attended 2 @ N. office.

L - we only saw each other 3 times:

① 2012 Con - where elected

JB - no discussion in con

L - ② meeting after con

JB - overhead cone

L - ③ June BM

JB - yes

L - nothing to complain about from NB. Tell me -

ET - why you concluded re- to staff.

- call out subjects

J - haven't got copies

J - haven't seen them

J - did you disclose them.

L - yes

JB - lots of discussions had which don't make it
into min.

J - Better to ask what it was that led him to
think this.

L - I would like to give prompts?

- pool like?

JB - no

L - ② database

JB - dislike of that by Board members + fed allegations
that staff were failing. About Board investment -
could help staff if invested properly.

L - NB could have asked for more money

JB - knowing feeling - wouldn't expect employee
capable of doing this

JB - took

[Lamba asking TS ce - tells TS info]

J - By June 2012 - you felt NB obstructive ... delaying for yrs ... you said it?

L - looking @ JB's Statement .

- By June 2012 - NB had 2 yrs to come to Board

JB - Yes - if open door

L - No evidence to say no resources

JB - Not aware

- when I suggested reinvestment - demand .

L - ③ Staffing

JB - discussion on why taking so long

L - in June 2012 BY I proposed LS be kept on full

pay .

JB - It raised + agreed with

L - ④ Extra help to assist office .

JB - no

L - ⑤ Card's position

JB - no - raised issue of Staff performance reviews .

L - ⑥ ... ⑦? Gen. sec. position .

⑧ appraisals .

⑨ pay reviews

⑩ pay rise .

- only BY we were together

JB - Things that don't get minuted were ve- . NPL

Still disappointed with staff . on reviews - you were looking @ ve- rather than ve+ of management .

L - I'd been brought back in from retirement

JB - can't comment .

L - you said ⑪ poorly managed

JB - yes

L - DP wanted to use page about office staff

- Board Challenged .

JB - Board interested in other issues.

L - Co governance

JB - Not - not really about advertising.

J - Take exception to fact JB thinks not well argued - not what I have to decide.

L - how did we constantly interfere?

JB - No. of emails sent. Need to give employees room to do job. Didn't see anything that were not doing so have been.

L - how many Boards been on?

JB - 3-4

- would expect Chairman to take role - relationship between chair + GM (ie. Mch) - not Board + GM.

L - para 3 w.s.

- no reviews of own performance - took issue?

JB - every Board - always annual review + skill mapping.

L - D's subject to close scrutiny?

JB - NC doesn't have skills

Tina - (L) being unfair to witness

L - Max Phillips - 'fiftyfauter'? didn't get to ask @.

J - Yes/no helpful @ times

- Regular report to NC

JB - yes.

- Annual ~~con~~ was showboatic

L - I wasn't running it.

- Reasonable for Board not to conduct off but to run MAC.

JB - Charity Com. + Grant Thornton would disagree. About Governance.

L - didn't work in C.O.

JB - 1/2 day once. Wanted to understand more.

JB - can ass. - workload + more being done -

L - PDF via word - easy?

JB - yes

L - asked NB to do this - not proper execution of order

JB - no

- You had access to info via MHC system

L - asked for contacts to be sent over 18 month period

not sent - proper execution

Tina - not trying to intercept

JB - no knowledge

L - if sr employee didn't do it - over 18 months

JB - correct in principle but don't believe this to be true.

L - reflective - narrow

JB - Agree time small but enough to get a good enough news to walk away.

L - principled individual?

JB - yes

L - Recording Camos?

J - me to decide

L - if you asked someone to attend Convene meeting of staff...

JB - I wouldn't - stepping out of your bandony!

L - Board of D. - decide direction of co.

JB - yes

L - Communicate wishes to emp/ce execs.

JB - yes

L - all unford d's.

- Board tells NB - most sr to convene meeting

JB - depends on way done

- Board would ask for meeting. would expect NB to be there @ meeting. Board sd be allowed - way in which it's done.

L - 'Shambolic' - because of P1 like Ryan?

- I was subject to abuse?

JB - Not in my memory.

L - 2002 Conference - motion to insert another clause - new clause 6 (a) of constitution.
Board doing what it was supposed to do?

JB - not in my news. Attempt to do.

L - P81 bundle - 2010 doc. - about database problems.

J - P80 see this for context.

L - bottom 3 paras.

- 2010 - Staff failed to manage database project to conclusion - ^{Board} take an interest in it?

JB - Yes - would be proper.

L - don't think we were micro-managing

JB - You were with volume of emails + intentions - stuffed other work.

L - para 6 - told about Board decision to remove troublesome staff. where?

JB - Told by local rep. - local N. Devon rep - Tracy Smith.
- She'd been voted to NC.

L - where taken?

JB - discussion with Tracy + told this. Don't know when decision taken.

L - NO Combination

JB - no evidence - discussion only. Aug. 2012. May have been month later.

L - eve before 2012 con. were with NB + P7 + they were parading you around

JB - No - Met P7 3 months before 1st June. Dargt Tracy only ones doing this - local reps only.

L - pensit answer - Tracy Smith didn't join until later in 2012.

JB - understanding was she was on NC - but recall convo. we had.

L - moved from decision & opinion + from someone being NC to maybe going to be on NC

JB - recall the discussion. I was told troublesome staff got rid of.

L - paying member

JB - 6 months before process

L - left?

JB - A yr later.

L - only office - local N. Devon.

JB - yes

L - Not much exp. (12)?

JB - local level - gd org. + nationally - disaster.

L - Age?

JB - 43.

L - left school

JB - 15.

L - experience ranges across sector

JB - yes - have CB + can't work.

- NO level

- Directorships - CIC, NAT. Health Fed., health since

L - found jobs in last 10 yrs?

JB - none - you know that.

L - NO exp. running Commercial entity - challenging why you left.

JB - 3 yrs for Devon + Cornwall Housing - 70k properties millions of pounds

- giment / NHS - more than enough exp.

- gd governance Certificate.

- reformed + reshaped organisations.

L - None paying

JB - NO.

- Tina - Board meeting in June - database issue - NB
cd have asked for more funds

- MAC's finances?

JB - Gladly but law - would have wanted to
UNEST.

- Book given to (R) by PW.

12:45

2 1:50pm

SL - Confirmed it's her statement, signature + no corrections.

T - Statement drafted to approve?

SL - I typed it

T - not in our words way written - NFL gave it to you

SL - NO - went from template

T - HR function - didn't have expertise?

SL - Yes

T - Seen MAC's policies - grievance, disc.

SL - NOT given handbook prior to role - Asked NB for them + he
sent them by email Dec. 2012. Didn't read full thing.

T - familiar with content - policies in place?

SL - Yes

T - P192 - Email from NB - handing over process?

SL - NO - enquiry prior to BM. Had HR role assigned Dec BM.
Concern about Den carrying out NB's appraisal. Not sure
if done. only seen FB message.

T - 2nd para - refer to assurances when you met - re: Rake.

- Given an assurance about Oct - BM matters.

SL - Yes.

T - One to start meetings after aft in HR?

SL - yes

T - Accept he forwarded emails sent to ~~me~~ re: Staff Concerns
201 as an e.g.

T- can you recall?

SL- Not exactly but wouldn't disagree.

T- Staff in fear of NFL att. they'd want independent - just

SL- Yes

T- p112 - email to NB (after afft.) - forward draft of an email tasked to affore - Start on gpl note. 'I have made Board aware!' light - had told board

SL- Yes

T- inc. NFL + PW

SL- Yes

T- last para of w.s. Emphasises to you 'in confidence'?

SL Yes

T- said didn't want NFL + PW to know

SL- not specifically.

T- suggest he did - internet. interview you admit breaching confidence.

SL- spoke to Den before discussed with Board.

T- p632 - bottom - MS Bradley's note - disc. - you say NB did say he was on medication + you kept confidence to a pt - breached confidence

SL - Researched on internet if deemed in best int. to disclose - fine - didn't band around but spoke to Den. first.

T- Why in best int. to disclose?

SL - PT asked if Board wd consider him being on Contract - mixed feeling on Board. Best int. to support NB to keep PT in post. Needed each other.

T- @ was why in best int. to disclose NB's medication?

SL - Not to put him in stressful role - if PT left would be stressful for NB.

T- para 24 of w.s. - didn't divulge CC but passed on info. to DIS as required - NFL + PW

SL- yes

T - So did pass on CI

SL - Sent email with a bit removed & NFL + PW.

T - tell them about NB medication

SL - yes

T - para 1 W.S. © didn't ask you to investigate b/h
- accept they did claim b/h - to you?

SL - Don't accept.

T - P220 - email to NB re proposed meetings

SL - yes

T - progress on ppl working together - building trust. Prior to these meetings - didn't understand b/h

SL - no

T - P221 - mins. of meetings.

- @ bottom who handwrote notes?

SL - unsure

T - Accept Comment re: LS reflects discussion about PW

SL - no indication of lack of trust. Relationship no longer existed. Not that he wasn't trusted.

T - your notes

SL - yes

T - not verbatim. Apparent - lack of respect (PW), (Carm over emails + Coms. (NFL) - raising b/h.

SL - didn't read it that way.

T - meeting with P - Contractor as been bullied by NFL + wanted to remove himself (Z44). no notes but email.

SL - did meet him

T - why no notes?

SL - didn't. P opened with 'not sure if what I tell you can be fed back - used against me' - to show trust, put pen down. Emotional. Passionate. Sent to NB after surprised @ emotion.

L - interrupts - about email not ref. to this

T - away from 244 - now back @ SL having notes

T - don't accept bullying issue + 'contractor', issue due to this

SL - didn't say 'bullied' or ref. to NFL + PW by name

T - don't know why you weren't making a note?
didn't enquire.

SL - My decision not to record. Tensions high regarding NFL.

- Neil is Mammite. Had experience of him for most.

T - Mammite - 'if met him or not'

- imply facepalm via email?

SL - well known in org.

T - held meetings @ C.O. whole day to ↑ relationship - didn't get from any meeting issues with NFL behaviour - by email.

SL - only speaks re: email not in PT meeting. NB said he was retaining NFL's emails - concerned as containing staff language.

T - PZSS^(?) - notes with NB - 'at this stage'. Accept ref. to cans NFL sending to staff

SL - No - ^{express} from NC + Board

T - didn't discuss with NB NFL's email

SL - NB said retaining some NFL's emails

T - Report to board - PZ39 - email - had meetings - Staff want to work - 'retrieve' situation. Not 'hatchell men out for blood' - NFL + PW?

SL - no ref. to specific NFL + PW

T - Not one raised NFL's name?

SL - working from recollection ... difficult.

T - PZ25 - named NFL there

SL - Re: are ft on NC list.

T - Specific email?

SL - Yes. I said she did

T- p730 - NB forwarding you email NFL sent him chasing issue. Response @ bottom. 2nd para - responding to NFL - you say she needs to stay on list. Said US 'driven' and mention 'email protocol'. Saying back off - just - diplomatic.

SL - To all D's.

T - To NFL

SL - Yes

T - in diplomatic way reminding NFL think before writing

SL - Yes - he can sometimes be blunt.

T - You'd discussed preuse ft with NB

SL - Spoke with NB sleepily about this. NB over emphasizing politeness of email + so NB sd reply in same way as Neil wrote.

T - p246 - email to you from NFL.

SL - Yes

T - 13/1 email (one just looked @) - his response unacceptable.

T - For me to decide - had been intervening event.

T - para-13 of w.s. - all Comms press PR public on ~~the~~ list. NO concerns raised until decision made - p267 - ref. to this? Pt email to you then.

SL - Can recall. Close to time I resigned - under stress + pressure.

T - They'd be taking over part of Pt duties

SL - NO

T - impact on his duties

SL - Yes

T - Affirm. he raises this with you @ this time

SL - ~~Dim~~foundered discussion gone on for a week. nothing from NB + Pt. I said someone from office should be on team.

SL - PT should have raised sooner

T - Para 14 - member info. membership info. sent monthly but accept?

SL - NO - LS role to get awful database - details out to ppl. when not in office didn't go out -

T - phoned return.

SL - Yes

T - Not raised ^{as} issue until early March. not consistent theme. LS inability to do this limited.

SL - exchanges on Board + NC prior to this time NB said tele. no. not being issued + wd wrk with LS to bring info to NC. Not all things followed up @ next meeting.

T - OPA issues mentioned.

SL - Yes - awaiting advice.

T - p262 - email to NC member - say awaiting advice

SL - Yes

T - p269 - 271 - advice you were awaiting. p275 - @ v. top email to Board cc. LS - sets out advice. Said LS do as requested but disagrees - reasonable position for LS?

SL - NO. I looked into OPA, PWTNFC.

T - Accept you didn't agree but accept. Its raised in good faith?

SL - She believed she was right.

T - LS distressed as concerns not listened to - what she was telling you?

SL - Yes.

T - Handed over role - didn't have skill set?

SL - emp. having breakdown, Carol. she has - felt too much - impact on life - personal + work. 'Final Straw' Situation.

T - LS in tears - felt that

SL - NO correct training to deal with this.

T - p272 - email - NFLC informing you looking @

disc. + dismissals. Contrary to your approach?

SL - don't think I can.

- I was made to feel inadequate

- didn't want to read email - felt I'd failed Staff.

- NB + Board trusted me. failed LS as a friend + lost friendships

T - bullied by NFL?

SL - no - always supportive

T - p274 - email - refer to discussing things in advance - 'may make your blood boil' - tell them things

© told you in confidence

SL - no - things trying to control - may not have seen my approach as best way.

- can't recall what things were. think NFL think me soft on some.

T - p346 - feeding NFL + HW further info. - 'heads up' - gossip / hearsay?

SL - recall Den clearly - not in confidential manner - She'd calmed it down from making exit at AGC.

T - p274 - email to Board explaining handing over role. - 1/2 way down - 'may not be your first choice' what did you mean?

SL - Already gone through Den + then me

T - doesn't make sense - knew NFL seems inappropriate

SL - Accept these 2 ppl - role not right for someone else with a job to take on

T - LS health issues - this proposal of meeting with NFL + HW + LS - bad impact - impact upon stress - personal view?

SL - Asked hw if he'd do HL role. wasn't happy alone & so did it as a team.

T - p288 - email to all D's.

SL - Don't recall planning this

T- P329 - 'I am not bullied by NFL...' - acknowledge inappropriate coms by email.

SL - No - other ppl's emails - suggests unrec'd being.

T- P689 - letter acknowledge is resp. note comments. Aware expression of views through grievance. But recom. been rejected?

SL - She went through process

T - But just - grievance hearing - rejected by Board?

SL - Don't know

T - Not been made aware @ Dos' findings repeated @ this stage

SL - Was asked to send this on behalf board.

- I signed it. written by others.

L - @ start of x-exam. TRC said you wrote statement with me. put you under pressure to say anything

SL - No

L - To anyone else

SL - Not as far as aware.

L - P201 - from NB to DT cc to Steve Peake. TRC announced you email cc'd to you.

T - Why I interrupted! SL said she saw it, was aware.

L - P203 - 3rd para. Did NB allow anyone access to speak to staff?

SL - Den allowed. Members of Board wd arrive early.

L - Anyone not in line management?

SL - Hyatt

L - P212 - Confidentiality. Had imparted to the Board NB told you. Did Board ever breach confidence?

SL - not to my knowledge.

L - used re-

SL - Not to my knowledge.

L - P274 - email - 'blood boil'. Any grief over

thus.

SL - NO

L - Any one whilst in HR role

SL - NO

L - p288 - attitude to staff from me - persons in mgmt?

SL - (C)

L - relations like with Carol + Julie?

J - happy ship

SL - Yes.

L - 329 - 2nd para - honest / dishonest?

SL - Gen. honest.

Tina - leading q's.

L - p221 - LS gave evidence not met me relationship she had to damage?

SL - related to her having regular chats with Pn + these ceased.

L - p225 - NC list issue - Conclusion @ end?

SL - another email where I say she should be removed. Concerned. LS emailed me things when @ work line perh reaction. LS upset + so remaining stress on her phrased return to work by taking her off NC list.

L - only person who swears in emails?

SL - NO!

L - p267 - press Committee - since formed.

J - multiple choice no demerit

L - response times

SL - quicker

L - p689 - final appeal held by Birch - Recall Mr Birch Comments

SL - would have brought in bundle.

Tina - didn't raise it.

- p676.

SL - didn't comment on 1st pt held & didn't uphold other pts.

J - After resignation?

Tina - last straw for LS - before resignation.

L - p677... leave it there.

J - volunteer

SL - yes

J - p239 - Pt - had notes with NB+LS & you decided not to take note of Pt. How long meeting last?

SL - 30-45 min

J - when you left - what did you think you'd heard?

SL - He was in turmoil figuring best way to him - being... all hard efforts not being appreciated. Concerned with his putting in. Needed to control this for own good.

J - p239 - your summary - don't know who to approach / fear of reprisal?

SL - difficult position. Speeches - products related matter. Neil Stevenson posts these out. Concern Stevenson not dispatching timely manner - didn't want their names mentioned.

3:15pm

3:17pm

IM - Confirmed it was his statement, signature... not like mine.

J - is it yours

IM - yes - true.

T - p231 - para 5 of your W.S. just - you were getting more & more aggressive exchanges from C) but p231 - essentially, not taking things seriously.

IM - if getting annoyed don't like to be serious.

T - president of MACit Editor of The Road - this emples

had deadline to meet. prof. relationship with LS as opp. to friendship.

IM - fair enough

T - she only had working relationship - may not understand

IM - thinks she did

T - SL took similar approach

IM - not raised with me

T - p234 - SL wrote to Board - ft raised similar to LS. Didn't cc you in so D. cd talk about it. Not aware SL had issues?

IM - NO recollection of SL speaking up raising. Maybe the car.

T - NC also raising concerns. p130 - email from Rachel Leonard - annoyed missed their region. Singing out © in w.s.

IM - they shouldn't have accused me

T - independent obs. of 'car crash meeting' but not - disrupted with © as per w.s. Accept not independent?

IM - unfair. Suffering of ©. Respect for NFL + PW but disagreed with them.

T - 'Norm' meeting in w.s. (para 17) feared it wd be confrontational (p234) - start of email - 'oil over troubled waters' - lumpy nde

IM - yes

T - p429 - summary of meeting 4-5 days later. impression NFL undiplomatic.

IM - historical impression.

T - just 18/3

IM - not at that day.

T - vocal chords... not laid in meeting

IM - no louder than today - deaf. NOT intimidating facts.

T - females never met him before. LS?

IM - is that right?

T - could have been unbranded - 1st meeting if didn't know?

IM - ummm...

T - refer to crying + losing jobs - Julie + Carol. Accurate?

IM - NB + PT seem obsessed they were going to be sacked.

T - w.s. - @ farms to say run of mill meeting.

IM - Nothing abnormal either wanting to meet with staff. Tenbase in meeting.

T - para 29 - general obs. about it seeming to you
© not Co.-of. No involvement day to day so impression from NFL + PW

IM - NO - input from lots of people

T - in main from NFL + PW

IM - NO. Cd relationship with NB + PT + got their take.

T - para 30 - releasing details. were they getting info + this related to tele. no. - narrower issue?

IM - lot will be live. Narrower? Broader issue for while regional rep complained about getting info.

T - PT told NB not to release info.

IM - NB told LS

T - But PT told NB not to release

IM - unaware

T - © bankrupted when recordings played. Raised by NFL - aware? PS08 - raised the fact he would do this? Aware? May 2013?

IM - forgotten about it.

T - p418 - 2/13 from you to Board - won't support Sackings - suggests it had been raised

IM - I had wrong end of stick. NB + PT concerned they would be sacked. NFL called me to say no sackings. wanted ppl to know where / stood.

- failings @ Coffee but difficult to replace.
- Not an epiphany - you wrote this because NFL had in mind to sack @ - P356 - you're inc. on email - He states disc. to be held + held dismiss for + 15 for g.m. + after NB job as researcher + demote him - NFL's plan. P358....
- your email @ 418 in response - didn't support this proposal

IM - don't recall it.

L - P234 - mentioned you were an observer. who aft. you to attend

IM - NC

L - NFL NC?

IM - No - no vote.

J - P479 - NFL.... suggest another meeting with others not out to get them - NFL don't go - why suggest

IM - NB + FT obsessed out to get them.

J - P479 - further meeting for board to get perspective of staff - suggest not what happened on 18/3 - no chance

IM - ample - but they didn't want to have a meeting. NB beside himself. Started on about grievances - compared up to 2 of meetings. recognise authority of board all was needed.

L - situation with van airt.

J - no.