



Rhys Brennan &lt;iwan.brennan@&gt;

GRO-C

## Fwd: Response to the Proposals Written after the Hearings on the 7/8 May 202

1 message

28 May 2025 at 11:04

NOT RELEVANT

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Barbara Scott** <> **GRO-C**

Date: Wed, 14 May 2025 at 17:32

Subject: Response to the Proposals Written after the Hearings on the 7/8 May 202

To: <[contact@infectedbloodinquiry.org.uk](mailto:contact@infectedbloodinquiry.org.uk)>

I write as an unrepresented core participant. Much of what I heard echoed my own frustration anger and disappointment at the glacial progress of actually delivering compensation.

I started off as the wife of a man with Haemophilia and as a nurse believing pretty comprehensively that generally in the U.K. the 'professions' operated in the best interests of the people they served. From about 1983 onwards I have been gradually had my faith eroded. I now have problems trusting what I am told and am inclined to challenge almost everything, especially in relation to any kind of treatment or in dealing with various schemes set up to help people in our situation.

I had thought it unlikely there would be an inquiry and if there was I was sceptical about whether there would be compensation. After the inquiry reported my faith was somewhat restored and I was more confident that there would be compensation and that I might see it in my lifetime. More importantly my children would have their loss recognised, they are all middle aged now.

It's quite apparent that the previous administration had done very little to put in place the mechanics of how this would happen. It's now obvious that when the inquiry reported there was no one on the blocks raring to go.

My anger and frustration is also fuelled by the smooth and achingly sincere utterances and expressions of regret I have to listen to every time politicians and officials speak about all this in public. I suppose I should be grateful the age of professionals exuding a sense of patrician authority has passed, but we now have an equally vexing style of delivery. What really counts is action not more words. Delivery not excuses.

The suggestions for priority in delivering compensation does smack of a reordering of the deckchairs on the Titanic, but I would suggest there are other ways that the cases could be managed. Perhaps the known, verifiable claims could be managed by one team and the more complex unverified claims by another. This could already be happening but the day to day operation of the IBCA remains, at least to me very opaque. Show us how the organisation actually works, what are the mechanisms, checks and balances. Is there any kind of algorithm that considers complexity/ state of health/ information / age?

The last webinar was woeful and clunky, it seemed almost impossible for any questions to be answered. The heads of the various functions were there, but so little was exposed about their methodology or the actual teams and the process they use.

It also wouldn't hurt to show us an organisation chart.

Please do not use the word invitation in relation to submitting a claim. This is not a party I would have chosen to attend, this is my family seeking redress for something that killed my husband, that we were deceived about, and left me to look after my elderly father in law, three children and work to keep the show on the road.

Regards Barbara Scott

Sent from my iPad

NOT RELEVANT

1/1

SUBS0000098\_0001