

Witness Name: Miranda Winram

Statement No.: WITN4563001

Dated: 1 February 2021

INFECTED BLOOD INQUIRY

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF MIRANDA WINRAM

I provide this statement in response to a request under Rule 9 of the Inquiry Rules 2006 dated 13 October 2020.

I, Miranda Winram, former volunteer Trustee of the Caxton Trust, will say as follows:

Section 1: Background and general questions

Question 1: Please set out your name, address, date of birth and professional qualifications.

1. Miranda Winram, GRO-C My date of birth is GRO-C 1974. I have a Masters of Arts from Oxford University.
2. I'd like to start my statement with a message of great support and sympathy for those whose lives have been affected by the infected blood they received from the NHS. This was, and is, a tragedy for each person and their family affected. I became involved in Caxton as a volunteer Trustee because of my sympathy for those affected, and my desire to contribute in a small way to alleviating some of their needs.

3. I am confident that my fellow Trustees were similarly motivated to volunteer their time to Caxton to help the beneficiaries. Our communal actions and efforts were motivated by a desire to do our best individually and collectively for the beneficiaries of Caxton.
4. In answering this statement I have been without the benefit of my full set of personal records from my time as Trustee at Caxton. At that time, I kept predominantly paper records, handwritten notes of meetings etc, and subsequently destroyed them all some years ago after my commitment as Trustee ended. I did this for data protection reasons (not wanting to hold such information for any longer than necessary) as part of a review and 'weed out' of my personal hard copy filing. On proactively checking now, I find I have some electronic records, which had been filed in 'to-be-reviewed-and-deleted-in-due-course folders' but these are not a complete set of files from my time as Trustee, as, at that time, Caxton's staff team did not provide everything electronically.
5. I should add that my time as Trustee ended over 6 years ago and there are therefore some areas in which I don't have a perfect recollection of events (and some questions that I am unable to answer). I have tried my best, in the time available, to refresh my memory from contemporaneous documents, including Board Minutes.

Question 2: Please set out the positions you have held at CF including with the Employment Affairs Committee, and with any other committees or groups or working parties relevant to the Inquiry's Terms of Reference, alongside your dates of service.

6. I held the following positions from approximately 8 September 2011 to 7 September 2014 (I say approximately as I cannot find a record of my formal starting date):
 - (a) Trustee;
 - (b) Member of the Audit Committee;
 - (c) Chair of the Employment Affairs Committee.

7. I discuss each of these roles further below.

(a) Trustee

8. I was informed I was being appointed as a voluntary and unpaid Trustee subject to satisfactory referees on 13 July 2011.

9. I, and the other new Trustees, attended the first Trustee meeting on 4 August 2011. This meeting was held before I had been officially confirmed as a Trustee.

10. There was a subsequent opportunity for the Minister to reject my (and other Trustees) appointments (as per the minutes of the 4 August 2011 Trustee meeting). This veto-ing of my appointment did not happen, and I recall a date early in September 2011 (I think the 8th) being referred to as the official start of our terms. I do not have this formal start date noted.

11. I chose not to request an extension to my term in office at the end of the 3 year period I was appointed, so my term as Trustee ended on 7 September 2014.

(b) Audit Committee

12. I was a member of the Audit Committee for the whole of my term as trustee (approximately 8 September 2011 to 7 September 2014).

(c) Employment Affairs Committee

13. I was the Chair of the Employment Affairs Committee (**EAC**), nominally for the whole of my term as Trustee albeit that the number of meetings was limited for reasons that I explain later in this statement (in response to Question 46).

Question 3: Please describe your role(s) and responsibilities in the above positions.

14. I had the standard responsibilities of a Charity Trustee to ensure Caxton's charitable purposes were met.
15. As a Trustee I understood that the EAC was responsible for policy issues relating to human resources (**HR**) matters, and that the Chief Executive (**CE**) was responsible for day to day HR issues.
16. As Chair of the EAC, I was responsible for chairing a group of Trustees who were delegated responsibility to receive reports from the Executive on staff matters, and to have oversight and make recommendations to the Board regarding proposals received from the Executive for changes to policy.
17. The EAC committee remit was inherited from the structure the CE / MacFarlane Trust had previously operated. Whilst our terms of reference were (I understood) 'lifted and shifted' from Macfarlane Trust's employment sub-committee, I gathered that the Caxton EAC took a greater interest in some of the detail than the Macfarlane Trust sub-committee had done. I gathered this because the inherited CE seemed surprised and unable to easily provide some of the detail I asked for, and struggled to provide an annual schedule/timetable of EAC business. Because of this I assumed it was the first time this information or such a schedule had been requested, although this was only an assumption. I was also aware at one point, when we had finally established that there were both varied and very generous terms and conditions of employment (e.g. annual leave entitlements) in place for inherited staff, that the Macfarlane Trust stated that their employment committee had not known of these. I assumed from this that the Macfarlane employment sub-committee's remit had not extended as far as reviewing or providing any oversight of the employment contract.
18. As Chair of the EAC I was not involved in day to day discussions with the CE about staff issues, or 'hiring/firing' decisions. These were discussions

that took place, where necessary, between the CE and their line manager, the Chair. The Vice-Chair was also involved in some of these day to day staffing discussions. This did not generally feel odd to me, it was simply how the organisation was run (inherited from the original Macfarlane operation), and was based on the limited 'policy & procedure' remit I understood the EAC to have.

19. As a Member of the Audit Committee, I was responsible, corporately with the other Trustees on the Audit Committee, for oversight of policies and procedures that meant that our accounts were correctly prepared and submitted in accordance with legal and charity commission requirements, and for providing an appropriate amount of Trustee oversight of management accounting processes.

Question 4: Please explain how you came to be appointed as a trustee and director. In particular, please describe how, if at all, your position as a trustee differed from other trustees of CF.

20. I was motivated to apply for the role of Caxton Trustee because I wanted to volunteer my time to try and help support those who, through no fault of their own, had had the terrible misfortune to be given infected blood by the NHS. I wanted to contribute to help mitigate the financial issues many of those people faced as a result of their Hepatitis. I had the time available for an additional volunteer commitment at the point at which Caxton was advertising for Trustees.
21. I applied for the advertised Trustee role through open competition, and was appointed after an interview process involving a number of other candidates (I do not know how many).
22. As far as I was aware my position as Trustee was no different to any other Trustee. We were all appointed for different reasons, some clearly had a specialism in specific areas of interest to Caxton. I had a general interest in

healthcare as a lay person, had some experience of disbursing and applying for grants in previous roles, and had general management experience.

Question 5: What did you understand the functions, aims and objectives of CF to be? What, if any, induction, training and information did you receive from CF as to its functions, aims and objectives?

23. In brief (without restating the Caxton's charitable objectives in its formal documents, such as the trust deeds which I have reviewed for the purpose of this statement) I understood the aim to be to distribute grant monies to those individuals who had Hepatitis C as a result of their NHS treatment, and who were also in financial need. The funds for Caxton came from the government, so I understood this to be an attempt by the government to address the financial support needs of this community of individuals because of the NHS's role in their illness.
24. As I recall, there was no need for individuals to prove that their financial need stemmed directly from their Hepatitis C illness, but they did have to prove financial need to meet our charitable purposes.
25. I, and other Trustees, were aware from the start of the establishment of the Caxton Foundation that there was a level of anger from some within the beneficiary community that they were deserving of what they saw as proper compensation from the government rather than charitable relief. There were some very vocal and campaigning members of the beneficiary community, and the receipt of proper compensation (i.e. not discretionary charitable relief but an acknowledgement of government liability to provide higher levels of ongoing financial recompense for all affected individuals) was one of the issues they raised regularly with the DoH/government.
26. My own feeling was that individuals reasonably felt in need or deserving of far more than the modest amount of charitable aid Caxton could provide, but that support through Caxton was what was on offer from the government, and at least I was able to contribute to some level of support.

27. My induction was 9 years ago, and it's difficult to remember what we were provided with. There was considerable information communicated from the founding Trustee and Chair Peter Stevens at the first Trustee meeting I attended in August 2011. I asked whether there was a formal Induction Pack, and the CE collated some information and circulated it about a month later. I suggested that we needed to review and tailor this induction information when we recruited for more Trustees during my 3 years term.
28. In terms of other background information we were provided with, I recall a prominent member of the beneficiary community (who was actively involved in campaigning) attended an early Board meeting to give us some background from their point of view, and we received a very useful and detailed presentation on Hepatitis C and medical advances in its treatment from a fellow Trustee at some point during my term.

Question 6: Please confirm whether you have provided evidence to, or have been involved in, any other inquiries, investigations or criminal or civil litigation in relation to human immunodeficiency virus ("HIV") and/or hepatitis B virus ("HBV") and/or hepatitis C virus ("HCV") and/or variant Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease ("vCJD") in blood or blood products. Please provide details of any such involvement and copies of any statements or reports which you provided.

29. I have not.

Section 2: Appointment of Trustees/Directors

Question 7: Please provide a detailed description of the appointment process for Trustees and Directors of CF, and the exact composition of the board.

30. Caxton was established by the Department of Health (DoH). The DoH appointed three founder Trustees to undertake the work of recruiting more trustees and setting the organisation up. The Trust Deed established one,

two and three year terms for each of the founder Trustees. I assumed this was because the individuals wished to contain their time commitment, and because of a desire to promote the perceived independence of the Caxton Trustees by phasing out those the DoH had appointed initially.

31. One founder Trustee, Charles Gore (appointed for a one year term), was the Chair of the Hepatitis C Trust. Peter Stevens (appointed for a two year term) had existing connections with other Alliance House organisations as he was Chair of the Eileen Trust and a Director of the Skipton Fund. Roger Evans (appointed for a three year term, but resigned earlier), was involved in a volunteer role as Chair of another of the Alliance House organisations (the Macfarlane Trust).
32. The appointment process for me as a Trustee was to apply with a covering letter outlining my interest in the work, and a CV. I was then interviewed by a board, I think (but cannot remember exactly) of three people including the already in-post (transferring as part of the staff team from MacFarlane Trust) CE. After I had been recommended for appointment, the DoH then had the opportunity to veto it. In the time I was at Caxton the DoH did not exercise this veto, or (as far as I am aware) express any interest in, or seek to influence, the recruitment of Trustees.
33. When we recruited additional Trustees we were advised by the CE that he needed to use a recruitment agency to manage the process for him because he did not have staff time available to handle it in house. The vacancies were advertised through a well-known recruitment agency and nationally, and a panel of three Trustees (The Chair, Vice-Chair and I) interviewed shortlisted candidates. We appointed four new Trustees in December 2012.
34. The Board initially had nine Trustees. In January / February 2013, this increased to 11.

Question 8: What was the process for electing/re-electing trustees and directors at CF? In particular, what involvement did (a) the Department of Health (DOH) (or any other Government department) and (b) any other organisation or person have in this process? Did this process change over time?

35. I explain the process for electing Trustees in response to Question 7 above. In short, it included an advertisement, open competition and then appointment. Apart from the initial appointment of three Trustees to get the ball rolling (before I was recruited and appointed), the DoH/government played no role in the process of recruiting or appointing Trustees insofar as I am aware.
36. Founder Trustee Charles Gore intended, and did, serve only one year as a Trustee.
37. The initial Chair and founder Trustee Peter Stevens had indicated from the start that he would only serve two years. He left at this point as intended.
38. The initial group of Trustees were given staggered second-term (should they serve a second term) lengths of up to three years to sensibly avoid everyone's term ending at the same time. There was, I think, either a formal restriction or Trustee agreed restriction on anyone serving more than two terms as a Trustee. So this meant that the initial Trustees would serve for four, five or six years if they served for their full two terms. This was determined randomly (I think by actually physically drawing straws). I recall that this random selection took place at the first Board meeting on 4 August 2011.
39. I was aware that one Trustee, Charles Lister, worked for the DoH. I did not know how he came to be a Trustee. I assumed he had been aware of the charity's foundation because of his role in the DoH, and had applied to be a Trustee because he was committed to Caxton's charitable aims, and was perhaps looking towards retirement and wished to maintain an active

commitment to society through volunteering in a field he knew well. Mr Lister subsequently became the Vice-Chair. I do not know if the DoH had any role in his appointment, I assumed not at the time.

40. At no point in my working relationship with Mr Lister did I feel that he was working on behalf of the DoH, rather than putting the interests of Caxton and its beneficiaries first. He was a highly committed individual, who put many hours into his voluntary role. His input at trustee meetings and in any conversations outside those meetings was always from the beneficiaries' viewpoint, balanced and fair. He drew on a long senior career and I valued his input and wisdom. He was one of the Trustees with whom I shared some of my frustrations, when they arose, at the pace of Caxton's progress in getting grants out of the door, and with whom I collaborated to try to get some items higher on CE/Chair agendas. In short, there was never anything that prompted me to think that he had volunteered for the role with any different motivation to other Trustees, or that the DoH had had any hand in his appointment. I felt we were lucky to have him.
41. As far as I was aware, there was no DoH or government input to the process of any other Trustee's appointment at the time I was appointed or during my term of office. The DoH played no role, as far as I am aware, in my recruitment and appointment. The DoH played no role that I was aware of in the recruitment of Trustees that I was involved with in 2012.
42. All Trustees were however, technically, 'Ministerially appointed', because there was the requirement that the Secretary of State for Health consented to their appointment by not objecting to the appointments within eight weeks of notification of the appointments being made.
43. I viewed this very much as a 'rubber stamp' by the DoH, rather than a constraint or something to be aware of. It did not have any impact at all on Trustee recruitment decisions while I was appointed and involved in that recruitment. e.g. In the recruitment round I was involved in in 2012, my fellow Trustees and I at no point made any reference to the potential views

of the DoH, or the likely acceptability of candidates to the DoH. The DoH's opinion simply was not on our radar, either consciously or sub-consciously. What we were concerned with was the recruitment of high quality independently minded individuals with relevant skills to add value to the current Trustee team. We were keen to maintain and improve existing diverse views and skills on the Board, to bolster our HR experience and to improve communication skills. The candidates we recruited reflected this.

Question 9: How, if at all, were positions advertised?

- 44. Trustee (and Director, when we also became Directors) positions were advertised in national for a e.g. newspaper job advert sections. I cannot remember whether, when I applied, I saw the advert online or in print, but certainly the advertisements were distributed widely enough for me to notice it for my appointment as an 'outsider' (I was not linked in any way with the existing Alliance House organisations or DoH).
- 45. The recruitment for additional Trustees during my term of appointment was done through a well-established recruitment agency, who advertised openly nationally as well as through their own networks.

Question 10: Were there sufficient applicants of sufficient quality or did you struggle to appoint trustees and directors for CF?

- 46. The recruitment round I was involved in as a Trustee, in 2012 had plenty of high quality applicants. We had a strong shortlist provided by the recruitment agency, and I was delighted to welcome new colleagues to the Board with skill sets I felt complimented our existing Trustees. I did not feel we struggled to appoint Trustees during this recruitment round.
- 47. I was not involved with the Chair recruitment in 2012, but I recall that we had some initial delays. The first recruitment round identified a suitable candidate, but that candidate then chose not to take up the role. I understood that there were not a lot of other high calibre candidates in the

first round. A second recruitment round was held, following which we found the individual who took up the Chair role. This Chair had very senior NHS Chair experience.

Question 11: How many trustees/directors were appointed by the Government, how many by the Haemophilia Society and how many were 'user' trustees during your tenure at CF?

48. The three founder Trustees were (as far as I am aware) recruited and appointed by the DoH directly to establish the charity. One, Roger Evans, resigned when he took over as Chair of the linked MacFarlane Trust, this was around February/March 2012. The other two resigned as had been planned at the time of their appointment, the first (as I recall) after serving a year, and the second, also the Chair, after about 18 months. This was the end of direct DoH involvement in the appointment of Trustees.
49. I recall Charles Gore as a founder Trustee also being Chair of the Hepatitis C Trust, but this was not because Caxton's governing documents required it. I assumed it was because he was engaged with the issues, had a great understanding of the challenges of living with Hepatitis C and strong experience of charity governance.
50. There were no trustees/directors appointed by the Haemophilia Society, and no involvement by the Haemophilia Society in Caxton appointments insofar as I am aware.
51. There were no 'user' Trustees, see later Question 16 for further information on discussions about 'beneficiary' Trustees.

Question 12 - How long did each trustee/director serve on the board? Could a trustee/director be re-elected? If so, how many times?

52. The actual length any Trustee served reflected their own constraints and

their ability to give volunteer time to the role, as well as the formal length of term available to them from the charity.

53. I explain in answers to Question 8 above that the founder Trustees had agreed to serve to start the charity up but for a limited period of time only.
54. The initial group of Trustees that had not stated a very short period of commitment were given staggered possible second-term (should they serve a second term) lengths of up to three years to avoid everyone's term ending at the same time (I also explain this in response to Question 8). There was a formal restriction in the Trust Deed on anyone serving more than two terms as a Trustee (unless a special vote was taken by Trustees to override this). So this meant that the initial Trustees would serve for four, five or six years if they served for full two terms.

Question 13 Were trustees/directors remunerated for their work? Please include details of any policies on this, including policies for allowances/expenses

55. These were volunteer roles, with no remuneration was provided other than expenses necessarily incurred in undertaking the role.
56. Expenses were made on the basis of receipts submitted, and for reasonable costs. For example, I claimed for second class rail fares to attend meetings (booked in advance where possible to reduce cost), parking at the station, mileage to travel to the station, tube or taxi to get across London (depending on train times/meetings times).
57. I don't have a copy of the expenses policy, but, coming from a public sector organisation with tight controls on expenditure, and with an awareness of other volunteer expenses policies in charitable organisations, the Caxton policy did not strike me as unusual in any way at the time, or in any way particularly generous or ungenerous.

58. During my period as Trustee, no Trustee was remunerated for any work they, or a company they worked for or owned, did for Caxton.

Question 14: In your opinion, was the balance of trustees suitably diverse and representative during your time at CF? Please explain your answer.

59. All organisations need to continually question how representative they are, and whether an appropriate diversity of background and experience is represented in staff and Trustees. Caxton was no exception - I think we had a broad mix of skills and life experiences on the initial Trustee group, but (like many organisations) we could have been more representative of the population of the UK (from which our beneficiary community was drawn). I and colleagues wanted to improve this if possible.
60. As a Board we were keen to broaden the skills and life experience in the Trustee recruitment I was involved in in 2012 to better reflect the makeup of the general UK population from which our beneficiaries were drawn. The 2012 recruitment round was successful in bringing on board new Trustees with: experience of working with non-traditional family groups; those excluded from society; more financial skills; health care experience; different ethnic backgrounds; human resources skills and communications experience. This broadened our skills base and the diversity of experiences on the Trustee body.

Question 15: Please explain the advantages and disadvantages of the overlap of trustees/directors between the Alliance House Organizations (AHOs)

61. The overlap in Trustees was, as far as I am aware, with Roger Evans serving on both the Macfarlane Trust, and Peter Stevens serving as Chair of the Eileen Trust and Director of the Skipton Fund.
62. Although Caxton was the most recent organisation to be created to address the impact of NHS infected blood, it became the employer of the staff and management of the office support to the other Alliance House organisations

(so called because of the name of the building the staff team for running these bodies). Prior to Caxton's creation, the MacFarlane Trust had been the staff employer and administrator. I understood the transfer of these duties to Caxton to be for reasons relating to limitations imposed by the governance of the MacFarlane Trust.

63. I guess (as I was not involved in the discussions that appointed these individuals as founder Trustees), the intention of having Trustee cross over was to ensure good understanding of the complicated web of support that had gradually grown up around the different beneficiary communities for those different bodies. As a newcomer Trustee, it was complex to understand and it was very helpful having informed Trustees to draw on for their knowledge and understanding of what the other organisations did.
64. The disadvantages of this situation were illustrated when I believe it became difficult for Roger Evans to have a foot in both organisations, as he wanted to represent Macfarlane's needs for staff time and resource to the Caxton Chief Executive (with whom he had worked prior to Caxton's creation and had a long standing and apparently cordial working relationship) more strongly. Mr Evans decided to strengthen his longstanding Macfarlane Trust commitment by becoming its Chair, and as a result decided to withdraw from Caxton. I was not close to any discussions about this change that may have taken place, and was aware of the change only when it had already been decided.

Question 16 -In a meeting of CF Trustees, held on 4 August 2011 [CAXT0000108_017], in response to a question from you, Roger Evans stated that there was a general consensus that, " while the views of the beneficiary constituencies should be sought in a manner that was open and transparent, it was premature to consider the appointment of user trustees ." a. Did you agree with this? b. Was that decision re-visited later? If so, what was the outcome? In particular, was a beneficiary trustee appointed?

65. In the initial group of Trustees we had a Trustee from the Hepatitis C Trust,

but no one from among the infected blood community. I questioned at the first Trustee meeting how we could best understand the beneficiary community's needs, and asked whether a beneficiary Trustee had been considered.

66. The founder Trustees informed us it had been considered, and it had been decided that it would not be helpful to have a potential conflict of interest on the Board. We were informed that the Macfarlane Trust had, at times, had beneficiary Trustees, and their experience had illustrated the conflicts of interest that had arisen. We were told that in some cases beneficiary Trustees had rapidly resigned because of their discomfort with making judgements about their peers, in other cases beneficiary Trustees had significantly benefitted personally from the Trust, and this had led to general Board discomfort.
67. I was aware that the Trust Deed for Caxton precluded any Trustee receiving 'financial benefit' from Caxton. This would mean a Trustee could not apply for a grant themselves.
68. The possibility of advertising for a 'well off' potential-beneficiary-but-would-never-need-to-apply-for-a-grant Trustee did not seem realistic as it would reduce the pool of candidates dramatically, and be extremely difficult to express as a recruitment criteria without seeming to be unfair in precluding a potential beneficiary Trustee from applying for charitable aid if they needed it (after all, no one knows what is round the corner in their lives, and financial need may crop up unexpectedly).
69. The founder Trustees also assumed that a beneficiary Trustee role would be likely to attract applications predominantly from those who were actively politically campaigning on the 'tainted blood' issue, including those who were opposed to Caxton's establishment as a charity. There was a valid concern that Trustee meetings and input needed to get on with the job of delivering the grant schemes we were set up to deliver, rather than challenging the underlying premise of Caxton's establishment and remit. A

Trustee from a campaigning background may also have lacked the necessary appearance of independence in decision making.

70. It was also rightly discussed that understanding beneficiary needs was something far wider than having a single person, who would be unable to represent all the diverse needs and opinions of the beneficiary community, on the board of Trustees. I had some sympathy with the impossible challenge of one individual being expected to represent a very varied beneficiary community, and accepted this majority corporate view.
71. The issue of beneficiary understanding was important to me and others of my Trustee colleagues. We understood (from those founder Trustees who had worked with him previously as CE of the Macfarlane Trust) that the CE had a good relationship with the prominent members and organisers of particular beneficiary community and campaign groups, and could use these strong networks to communicate. The Trustees were active in trying to get communication through the website improved, but were also aware that many potential beneficiaries would not necessarily have access to this. Various initiatives were undertaken including staff and Trustees attending meetings around the country with beneficiaries, and strong encouragement to the CE to engage with beneficiaries through regular communication like a newsletter.
72. We discussed and pushed for maximizing any opportunities other Alliance House entities presented, for example being able to contact the Skipton group of payees. There were obvious constraints in Caxton contacting these people directly because of data confidentiality, but I, and other Trustees, asked that they be contacted through Skipton to increase awareness of the grants Caxton could offer. This did not happen during my term as Trustee because of the difficulty of Skipton addresses being potentially incorrect. The Skipton initial payment was a one off payment, so there was no ongoing need to keep in contact. Contact in those days was all by manual post not email. Writing to addresses, many of which would be out of date, meant that individuals' privacy could be compromised by sharing

information about their health status with subsequent occupants of their address. The Skipton view was that the risk to individuals personal data was too great to proactively contact their old postal addresses in this way. As Caxton Trustees, we had to accept this decision.

73. With the benefit of just over a year of operation and experience of trying to engage with the community, and discussing beneficiary input regularly at Trustee meetings, the Board were aware that many in the beneficiary community still felt their viewpoint was not understood or heard enough. The Board agreed that the issue of beneficiary Trustee representation should be re-tabled for reconsideration. The Chair and Vice-Chair drafted a discussion paper for the February 2013 Trustee meeting.
74. In February 2013, the Trustees agreed that the challenges attached to appointing a beneficiary Trustee remained, but that the Board would benefit from someone with lived experience of Hepatitis C. We had initially had this insight through Charles Gore's role as a Trustee (where he also brought his experience as Chair of the Hepatitis C Trust). However Charles had recently left the Board after his planned one year term as a founder Trustee.
75. A trustee with 'lived experience' would, the Board hoped, provide the best of both worlds, in bringing personal understanding of the challenges of the disease whilst maintaining the independence of the Trustee appointed. The Board instructed the CE to begin the process of recruiting, and appointed an individual with 'lived experience' later in 2013. They took up post in early 2014.

Section 3: Policy, Structure and Operation

Question 17: Please explain the extent to which CF shared premises, staff and resources with the other AHOs. What impact did this have on data sharing and confidentiality and how were such issues managed? How were documents and information stored by CF? Was information shared across the AHOs? If so, were registrants aware of this?

76. The CE and staff team, offices and administration were all shared with the other Alliance House Organisations. (AHOs). Caxton was the employer, with a service level agreement (SLA) to provide staff and all other practical services for running an organisation to the other AHOs. The majority of staff split their time between the different organisations. There was, as I recall, one employee wholly employed for the Skipton Fund work, but I do not recall the split of time in any of the other roles.
77. Overall, the annual accounts in the first three years of Caxton operation and whilst I was a Trustee, show Caxton's share of the administration and staff costs being less than 50% of the overall staff and administration costs expenditure. This indicates that more than 50% of all staff time was spent on Macfarlane Trust, MFET Ltd, Skipton Fund Ltd and Eileen Trust business.
78. I was a Trustee of Caxton, I was not privy to any of the business of the other Alliance House organisations. There was, as far as I was aware, careful maintenance of confidentiality between the files and records of the different organisations. e.g. when Caxton Trustees wished to contact Skipton beneficiaries to advertise the grants we had available, we could not do so directly, but had to ask Skipton Directors if they would do this for us. I do not recall if beneficiaries were aware of these arrangements or the confidential safeguards.
79. As a Trustee I was not familiar with the day to day office management and operation of the different organisations, so I cannot shed any more light on how confidentiality worked in day to day practice.
80. With staff working across different organisations there will have been a level of practical information sharing across those roles that will not have breached confidentiality – e.g. when establishing a schedule of Caxton Trustee meetings for the year I am sure they would have been arranged cognisant of the dates/times of Macfarlane Trustee meetings, to ensure that

staff could support or attend both meetings.

81. Caxton inherited its staff, office space and office systems from the Macfarlane Trust, so it is inevitable that there must have been (I cannot comment definitively) initial similarity in day to day management and administration between the two organisations. I do know that employment contractual obligations were transferred en masse from Macfarlane to Caxton through a "TUPE" process. This was not the case for all contractual commitments, e.g. the office lease was not initially transferred, but when a new lease became required I believe it was taken out in Caxton's name. I am not sure how many other legal agreements were transferred from Macfarlane to Caxton, or at what point this happened.

Question 18: Why did CF act as employer for all five AHOs?

82. As discussed in response to Question 15 above, I understood that constraints in the governing documents of the Macfarlane Trust (as the already established body) meant that they could not employ staff for Caxton. It did not make sense to replicate administration, finance, support services etc for several charities, all working in a related field, when it would be more efficient to combine it. As the Macfarlane Trust could not fulfil this role, Caxton became the employer for the staff support for all the Alliance House organisations.

Question 19: Did the fact that CF was the employer of all the AHOs cause any difficulties? If so, please give details.

83. Anecdotally, after I had finished my term at Caxton, I gathered that the Macfarlane Trust/Roger Evans had some concerns about the service Caxton was providing to Macfarlane under the service level agreement, but I do not remember these being raised as particular issues at the Caxton Trustee meetings, and I do not know what those concerns were. It was a surprise to me that Roger Evans was unhappy with the Caxton's staff team support for MacFarlane as he had had a long relationship with the inherited-

-from-Macfarlane initial CE for Caxton, and had been positive about the CE's performance to me when I asked him for formal input to the CE's first Caxton end of year performance review/pay rise. I had felt, at that point, that I was more critical of progress to date than he was. His opinion had obviously subsequently changed, but I was unaware at the time of this.

Question 20 - Please set out your recollection of the relationship between CF and the different AHOs. What was your personal relationship with the other AHOs?

84. I didn't feel I had a personal relationship with the other AHO's, nor had I expected to. I had a working relationship with Roger Evans (also Chair of Macfarlane) whilst he was briefly my Trustee colleague at Caxton, which was cordial and constructive.

Question 21 Please describe the working relationship between CF and the DOH. Was there a particular point of contact? If so, who was it? Were you aware of any difficulties? If so, what were they, how did they impact on the running of CF and how, if at all, were they resolved?:

85. Apart from one short Trustee meeting with a Minister, Anne Milton MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Public Health early in Caxton's establishment on 17 November 2011 where all the Trustees (I believe) were present and briefed her on progress to date, I did not have any point of contact with DoH. I was aware there was contact when necessary at executive level, and that there were discussions about funding that the Chair and Vice-Chair were involved with. However my impression was that day-to-day Caxton contact with the DOH was minimal, and that Caxton staff and Trustees were left appropriately independent of the DoH.
86. There were no particular difficulties I was aware of, beyond the Trustees desire to have greater and more consistent funding to distribute and the DoH's rejection of at least some of these requests, see Q22 below.

87. I am aware generally that, from time to time, the DoH received pressure and complaints from campaigning individuals and groups about Caxton and its funding and objectives. Some of these complaints would have been made however well Caxton was doing its job, as there was a fundamental objection from many to a charity having a role in supporting those who had been made seriously ill by the government health service.
88. As this statement makes clear in later paragraphs, I had some reservations about how quickly and efficiently Caxton was operating, and so it's likely that some of the complaints had merit in criticising the speed of grant disbursements. I am confident that DoH will have rightly fed this back to Caxton CE/Chairs at meetings, but I don't see this as likely to have caused any particular 'difficulty'. The speed of delivery was something I tried to constructively raise whenever I could, and that other Trustees were aware of, and also wanted to improve.

Question 22: What input did CF have into the financial allocation it received from DOH? Was CF adequately funded in your view? If not, what, if anything did you and/or CF do about that?

89. Caxton Trustees were aware (from the feedback from the Welfare Committee about the applications they received) of the very parlous financial state of many of our actual/potential beneficiary community, and we wished to be able to make greater and more consistent financial support available. So we wanted both more funding from DoH, and a longer term commitment of funding to allow us to plan grants better in the medium to long term. This also impacted on other aspects of prudent financial management e.g. an unpredictable funding flow prevents making commitments beyond the short term, which has impact on reserves policies and levels. However we hit the standard 'government / anyone else' issue that there is never enough money to do all that needs doing. Despite the fact that, in our case, it was supporting individuals who had been so severely disadvantaged by getting hepatitis C after receiving blood products from the NHS.

90. We continued to try and make the case to DoH for more funding and longer term commitments throughout the time I was a Trustee. This case was made, as far as I was aware, in meetings between the CE and Chair and DoH. I was not involved in these discussions.

Question 23: To what extent were CF independent from the Government? How much oversight did the DOH (or any other Government department) have over CF? In particular, did the DOH have any involvement with and/or give any direction/guidance to CF (and if so, what?) as to:

a. the composition of the board for CF:

91. I am not aware of any involvement of the DoH after the initial three founder Trustees were appointed and then left with planned succession. See my answer to Question 11 for more detail.

b. the content of any policies adopted by the AHOs:

92. I can only reply in relation to Caxton. Our policies were set independently by the Trustees and staff team mindful of the Trust deed requirements, and of the administrative and assurance requirements of our funder, the DoH. In the same way that policies in any organisation in receipt of grant funding would seek to meet the requirements of their funders. There was no DoH involvement in actually setting those policies as far as I was aware.

c. how the AHO should discharge its responsibilities to the beneficiaries:

93. I can only reply in relation to Caxton. The DoH set up the charity and its charitable objectives. Beyond this, I am not aware of any involvement of the DoH.
94. As the source of funds for Caxton the DoH met with and had contact with the CE/Chair, and the DoH will have been given annual updates on

progress. I do not recall seeing these updates. I think it is also likely they will have been sent copies of annual accounts once approved by Trustees. I did not get the impression that there was any pressure put on the CE / Chair in these meetings, or through the annual reporting, to discharge their responsibilities to beneficiaries in any other way than Caxton chose to, in accordance with our charitable objectives.

95. The DoH conducted a DoH Internal Audit (i.e. focussing on DoH's view of Caxton's procedures, NOT on behalf of the Caxton Trustees) very early in Caxton's life – the results of some of its recommendations were discussed at the first Audit Committee meeting on Nov 2011. These were not related to how Caxton should discharge its responsibilities to beneficiaries, they related to DoH's view of good operating practice, for example the minutes of that meeting note that a recommendation was for procedure manuals for each team to be developed. This seemed good pragmatic advice that did not seek to influence how Caxton met beneficiary needs.

d. the kinds of applications the AHO should grant; and/or:

96. I can only reply in relation to Caxton. The DoH set up the charity and its charitable objectives, which sets parameters for the kinds of applications that could be grant funded. Beyond this, I am not aware of any involvement of the DoH in Caxton's grant making.

e. the quantum of the grants/payments the AHO should make?:

97. I can only reply in relation to Caxton. The DoH provided the funding, so this was the cap on how much the Trustees could allow to be spent. It would have been financially irresponsible to commit to grant expenditure we did not have the income to pay.

Question 24. Did you have any interactions with the DOH? If so, please describe them:

98. I attended one initial Trustee meeting with the Minister (please see my response to Question 21 above for details). This was a 'hello' meeting, where we briefed her on what progress had been made to date in Caxton's establishment.

Question 25: Did you, or others within CF, raise any concerns and issues with the DOH about the funding, structure, organisation or running of the AHO, or about the involvement of the DOH, or about any other matter? If so, please explain what concerns and issues were raised. What was the response of the Department to those matters being raised?

99. Please see my response to question 22 for more detail about the fact that we wanted to receive more money and with greater consistency to be able to increase our grant support for beneficiaries.

100. Other than this, I was not aware of or involved in any concerns or issues raised with the DoH.

Question 26: What, if any, contact did CF have with the Department of Work and Pensions ('DWP')/its predecessors in relation to welfare benefits?

- a. What was the 'benefits waiver' referred to in the Board Meeting of 4 August 2011 [CAXT0000108_017]?
- b. What if any impact did the delay in this being in place have on beneficiaries or CF?

Question 27: What if any impact did the delay in this being in place have on beneficiaries or CF?

Question 28: Did CF take any steps to prevent this happening? If so, what? If not, why not?

Question 29 Did CF raise this issue with the DWP/its predecessors and if so what was the response?:

101. I have taken these questions together as this is an area about which I can recall very little.
102. I can't recall what contact, if any, Caxton had with the Department of Work and Pensions. There must have been some contact in relation to discussing how to ensure beneficiaries would not have their benefits cut if they received a Caxton grant, but I am not aware of the channels that were used for this.
103. I am struggling to remember in detail what the 'benefits waiver' was, but I think this referred to the need we saw to exclude Caxton grant funding from assessment of beneficiaries income for means tested benefits. I think the Skipton payments beneficiaries received were not included in such means testing assessments (but I may have remembered incorrectly). We were aware of the very low incomes that many Caxton beneficiaries were sadly having to live on, and we did not wish Caxton grant monies to replace government benefits.
104. I am unable to recall any further detail that could usefully assist in regard to the remainder of these questions. If it was raised in any detail at the main Trustee group level (rather than sub-committee level) it would likely be minuted in the board minutes.

Section 4: Discretionary Payments and Eligibility

Question 30: Please explain what, if any, measures CF took to advertise the existence of its services to potential beneficiaries, particularly those who had received a Stage 1 payment from the Skipton Fund but not applied to CF.

105. I don't know the detail of actions that were taken, however I do know we publicised the grants through other existent support organisations (like the Hepatitis C Trust), we proactively asked Skipton to make its payee's aware of Caxton (which Skipton did not find possible to do), and we did regularly discuss this issue at Trustee meetings.

106. We were concerned that there would be people who could be in need of support who did not know of us because they were not active members of any of the networks that existed and we had access to. I remember that a communication was made to NHS specialists dealing with Hepatitis C to alert them to Caxton's existence, and we discussed accessing NHS General Practice communication channels to try and make doctors aware so they could make patients aware. As far as I am aware these and other actions discussed were followed through by the Chief Executive and staff team.

Question 31. Please describe the different types of payments provided by CF to beneficiaries

107. Generally, we could fund a very broad range of items or services if there was evidence of charitable need. I recall occasional discussions about more difficult grant requests or actions, for example paying off loans for beneficiaries (which I recall we supported). I know we made grants for household goods, for travel expenses and also supported debt and benefits advisor fees. I was not a member of the grant sub-committee of Trustees, and so I am sorry I am not able to remember this in any greater level of detail.

Question 32: What were the eligibility criteria (both procedural and substantive) recipients had to meet to receive the different types of payments listed above? Who drafted those criteria

108. I was not a member of the grant sub-committee of Trustees, and so I am sorry I am not able to remember this level of detail.

Question 33: Were the criteria publically available? If not, why not? When answering this question, you may wish to refer to the comments by Charles Lister in CF Board meeting dated 2 August 2012 at page 4 [CAXT0000109_082] that there needed to be a clear decision about what was appropriate to publish, as well as copies of CF Grant Guidelines dated 2012 [CAXT0000062_076].

109. As far as I was aware we published eligibility criteria. What my colleague was probably referring to was the distinction between the detailed kind of internal 'manual' for assessing grants and the relevant detail that applicants need. Every grant making trust will have internal guidance documents for staff assessing grants and grant decision makers that is different to the applicant information (the latter is intended to be easier to understand).
110. There was no 'secret' or trick to getting a Caxton grant, but like all charities issuing grants applicants had to demonstrate charitable needs. I am aware some applicants did not like the level of detail requested of them, and appreciate that this felt onerous. Office staff were I believe helpful, pleasant to deal with and always available on the phone to help people with their application documents.
111. I appreciate that when beneficiaries felt they had a right to financial support because of the cause of their illness, it was deeply uncomfortable for them to feel forced to apply for charitable aid. It was never the Trustees intention for this to be embarrassing or hurtful, but we had to ensure that charitable need was demonstrated to meet charity governance requirements.
112. One area that we inherited existing practice from Macfarlane Trust (we inherited their staff team, which expanded to include Caxton grant issuing work) was in the issuing of vouchers for purchase of household goods, rather than money. This had been set up to manage potential fraud, and strong financial management controls are an important feature of a charity, particularly one disbursing tax-payer's money. This was however (I think) subsequently and rightly changed, because of the perceived and real disadvantages such a system creates for the spender of the voucher.

Question 34: Please describe any role you had in approving payments made by CF to beneficiaries.

113. None.

Question 35: Please confirm whether you or CF sought legal advice with regard to the legality of any kind of payment made by CF, and if yes, please explain the circumstances and why this action was taken.

114. Not as far as I am aware, but I was not a member of the grants committee and so would not expect to be aware.

Question 36: Were the eligibility requirements (both substantive and procedural) kept under review by the board of CF or DOH? If so, how often? If not, why not?

115. This grant policy work, as with the grant making, was delegated to the National Welfare Committee. My fellow trustees on that committee worked with the staff team to determine and review grant making policy. I cannot recall exactly whether or when the main Trustee group were asked to approve reviews of eligibility requirements, we may have done. We would have been strongly guided by the hard work and many hours commitment we knew our trustee colleagues, particularly the very committed Chair of the NWC, Charles Lister, put in. I had great faith in the NWC Chair's sympathy with the beneficiaries, his desire to do his best by them and had great respect for how much time he personally committed to doing his best to get things as right as possible.

Question 37 Please refer to CF Board Minutes dated 17 November 2011 [CAXT0000108_070]. Within this meeting it was noted that the Chair of the National Welfare Committee (NWC) was keen to "spend as much money as they could, within reason, to show that there is unmet need amongst the community." Why was this approach taken? Was there unmet need, and if so how did CF address this?:

116. As far as I can remember, this referred to the constant challenge we faced of wanting to disburse as much grant money as possible to beneficiaries in need, but simultaneously being in the dark as to what future funding we would receive from DoH. Essentially, if we spent everything we had

received very quickly, and then there was a hiatus before receiving more funding from the DoH, then we would not be able to respond positively to any future (and possibly more urgent) requests for grants.

117. It was a catch 22, because to demonstrate there was increased need to the DoH we needed to make more grants, but then we might run out of money and have to turn desperate beneficiaries away. The answer was to have a more secure and longer term funding commitment from DoH, and in those initial three years of the charity when I was a Trustee, this was something the Trustees were robust in encouraging the Chair and CE to pursue with DoH.

Question 38: Please refer to CF Board minutes dated 3 May 2012 [CAXT0000109_010]. It was noted that a number of applications for support to CF had been turned down due to relevant information not being available. What was done to address this? Was administrative support to submit applications provided to beneficiaries where necessary?

118. I believe administrative support was available to beneficiaries. As a Trustee I certainly expected that beneficiaries needing help with an application form would have found it easy to access staff to ask for help. Anecdotally I understood that we received some warm feedback from some beneficiaries referring to this kind of help, although other beneficiaries were critical – I understood that this was when they had not received the level of support they had requested.

Question 39: Please refer to CF Board minutes dated 1 August 2013 [CAXT0000110_062]. The board considered a paper from the Chair of the NWC that highlighted that some CF clients were experiencing levels of financial need which, “ certainly in the short term, could not be alleviated by one-off grants alone ”. What did the board do about this?

119. On more than one occasion we discussed the fact that the real need for some beneficiaries was that their basic level of income was below a

reasonable standard of living, and that a regular grant to support them to the level of this reasonable standard of living was what was needed. This was not something we could commit to doing without both a higher level of DoH funding and confidence in the longer term level of funding from DoH that we would receive. We felt it was not acceptable for us to start making regular payments to individuals if we could not guarantee their continuance. It would develop a level of dependency that might leave a grantee high and dry with financial commitments they could no longer meet. This was a difficult subject that I, and others, felt strongly about, however the difficulties Trustees felt in considering the problem were incredibly minor compared to the very real difficulties some of our beneficiary community had making ends meet.

120. What we did about it was two pronged. Firstly we continued to maintain the need for the Chair and CE to address the need for higher and longer term funding commitments with DoH.
121. Secondly, we agreed at the June 2014 Board meeting to introduce a much more limited regular payment scheme to beneficiaries whose income was below the official government poverty line. This was not the kind of 'top up' to an acceptable income scheme we wished to introduce, but we concluded it would be better than nothing. We identified an affordable budget for this regular payment scheme from our existing allocation of funds from DoH, and agreed additional staff resource to set up and administer the scheme. Final costings for the scheme were due to be brought to the November 2014 Trustee meeting for approval (after the end of my term as Trustee), with an expectation that payments would be made immediately, and backdated to April 2014.

Question 40: Why did CF have to reduce its support to beneficiaries in 2014? What was the level of reduction? How was the decision made? What, if any, representations were made to the Government to increase funding? What was the response?

122. I do not remember that we did reduce our support to beneficiaries in 2014. From a look at the Annual Accounts published after I had completed my term as Trustee, a very much larger volume of grants (£1.7m) were made in the financial year 2014-15 compared to 2013-14 (£955k).
123. I would be happy to try to provide further information should the Inquiry be able to provide a document reference to refresh my memory.

Section 5: Working Relationships

Question 41: Please describe the relationship CF had with its beneficiary community

124. As far as the Trustees were informed by the CE, the CE and staff team had regular and mostly positive contact with the beneficiary community. Complaints and unhappy beneficiaries were, we were informed, a small minority. Founder Trustees reported positively of the initial CE's good and established relationships with the beneficiary community.
125. There were undoubtedly vocal beneficiaries who were angry with or at Caxton. The first group of 'criticisers' were those whose concerns were targeted at the underlying premise of Caxton's establishment and remit. They were angry that a charity had been considered appropriate to disburse grants to individuals whose lives had been blighted by receiving infected blood from the NHS. They thought they should be entitled to compensation not charitable aid. There was little Caxton Trustees could do about the underlying grievance, we hoped that by building good relationships and fairly disbursing grants as well as possible we could simply manage this situation.
126. Other criticisms fell into the following categories:
127. a) Individuals who had applied and been turned down for grants, or been

awarded a smaller grant than they had applied for. It is a natural reaction to being turned down for a grant to be unhappy about the result, and no grant making organisation could avoid some criticism from this group. My understanding was that this was a small minority of cases. From the occasional grant appeal we saw at Trustee meetings, decisions made by the NWC seemed fair and balanced, so I believed that these criticisms were unfounded.

128. b) There was criticism of the level of detail requested in grant applications. I have worked as a grant applicant and grant maker. The level of application detail required does vary widely across grant making organisations. I was not involved in the detail of the grant application process or the forms as I was not a member of the NWC, and this role was delegated to them. I did not have the time available to commit to sitting on the NWC, and I therefore was not in a position to criticise the processes they chose to approve to carry out their work and I did not do so.
129. I was also aware that the NWC may well be trying to make changes, but would be hampered in this by the lack of effective staff capacity that I saw when I made my own requests for actions to the CE.
130. It is also relevant to point out that with Caxton's funding coming from the DoH, i.e. the tax payer, it was important that this public money should be disbursed with minimal potential for fraud. I feel it likely that Caxton's processes were more onerous than other grant making trusts that had the potential to take greater risks than was possible with tax-payers money. I asked a question early on about the use of vouchers for household goods, and was told it was to reduce the risk of fraud. I was very pleased when the policy on this was eventually changed and vouchers were phased out. But, generally, I think the need to be careful with tax payers money, allied to the need to prove financial charitable need, did require information about applicant's financial circumstances that would always be likely to be found intrusive.

131. With an established and confident grant making operation it should have been possible to gradually increase the exposure to risk by slimming down application processes. However Caxton was a new organisation and was not at this confident stage of grant making during my time as a Trustee.
132. My summary of this criticism is that detailed information will have been asked for from applicants, including about applicants' finances. I am sure this gave offence to applicants. I suspect information requested could have been made more light touch, but that any questions at all about personal finances would have given offence. In the context of a new organisation, disbursing tax-payers money with a staff team that seemed to struggle even with the existing systems, I think it was reasonable that NWC colleagues made the decision that review and changes to grant application processes had to wait until the organisation was in a more confident place in relation to all its operational risks.
133. c) One complaint that came to all Trustees referred to the disproportionate Caxton salary budget vs the grants disbursed. I was critical of our efficiency. As this statement explains in later paragraphs, I felt frustrated that the Caxton team did not get grants and other organisation activity up and running quickly or efficiently enough, and I felt that limited staff performance and leadership was at the heart of this. I fed this view, as constructively as possible, but very clearly making the point, to both Chairs during my tenure as Trustee. My feeling was that Caxton should be delivering better results more quickly, and my concern was that I was not able to ensure that efficiency issues were overcome during my time as a Trustee, albeit I was satisfied that we were meeting our charitable and legal obligations.
134. However, the external criticism of the salary budget v grants disbursed was probably not based on the same data I had. This is because it will have been based on the Caxton accounting figures in the public domain, and it was easy to mis-read these. This is because Caxton's accounts included all the administrative costs for all the Alliance House organisations. The service

level agreement re-charge of these costs was also identified, but it was easy to miss that a significant part of the admin costs (more than 50%) were not actually costs associated with Caxton's grant making. Additionally there were start up costs in Caxton's expenses in the first 2 years of annual accounts. I felt it likely that this external complaint to the Trustees (while it was only one that I can recall, I suspect it was a more widespread view) was likely based on incorrect understanding of the figures.

135. So, whilst the ratio of administration to grant giving costs was not great in my view, it was also likely to be externally perceived to be far worse than it was. The ratio of admin to charitable expenditure showed a positive trajectory as Caxton established itself and did get grant making moving more quickly. It dropped from 33% in the first full year of Caxton's operation when it was still absorbing start up costs (2012/13) to 24% (2013/14) and 14% (2014/15).

136. I recall a discussion at either an Audit Committee or Trustee meeting about this categorisation of admin cost for the other organisations in the annual accounts, and that the answer was that it was not something we could change because of accounting rules. With hindsight, I think accepting this at face value was an error and there must have been a better way to present the data.

137. Overall, some criticism of the amount of grants disbursed in the early years of Caxton's operation was fair, and I agreed with it. I, and other Trustees, were doing our best to try and improve the team's speed of delivery. The gradual increase in annual grant volume from £700k in the first full year, to £955k next year and £1.7m the following showed that this was slowly being achieved.

a. Please set out how it communicated with the community:

138. Various initiatives on communication were undertaken including staff and Trustees attending meetings around the country with beneficiaries, and

strong encouragement to the CE to engage with beneficiaries through regular communication, and I remember a newsletter being discussed (although I do not recall how often and when this was distributed) and the establishment of the Partnership Group.

139. We discussed and pushed for maximizing any opportunities other Alliance House entities presented e.g. being able to contact the Skipton group of payees. There were obvious constraints in Caxton contacting these people directly because of data confidentiality. We asked that they be contacted through Skipton to increase awareness of the grants Caxton could offer, although this hit the challenge I identify in an earlier answer of Skipton not having up to date addresses, and a mailshot therefore likely breaching individuals privacy about their health.

140. The importance of communication to the Trustees was indicated in the selection of a Trustee in the 2012 recruitment round who came from a communications background, and our regular Trustee discussion of communication with the potential beneficiary community. Please note the earlier answer to Question 16 which explains that we also decided, in 2013 to appoint a Trustee specifically with lived experience of Hepatitis C. This was part of our desire to communicate better with beneficiaries.

b What was the role of the Partnership Group?:

141. I was not closely involved with the Partnership Group, and do not recall its terms of reference.

c: At the first meeting of the Caxton Trustee Limited Board of Directors, held on 1 August 2013 [CAXT0000110_062], it was reported that a lot of issues regarding communication were raised. What were those issues? How if at all were they resolved?

142. I cannot remember, but I suspect this was the importance of communicating the charitable support available from Caxton to the widest possible group of

potential beneficiaries, and discussion of possible ways to do this, doubtless the discussion included the fleshing out of the skeleton website that had been created for the new organisation. Communication was certainly of importance to all the trustees from the word go. The subject was often revisited, and actions like the website, newsletter and meetings around the country were some of the methods undertaken to achieve it.

d: Were you aware of any complaints made by beneficiaries, or concerns raised, about the running of CF? If so please give details. How were they handled? Was a formal complaints process in place?

143. Occasionally very unhappy grant applicants or beneficiaries contacted Trustees through the website, this was monitored by the staff team and responded to by them on behalf of the organisation. I recall that I tended to check with the office that such contact had been responded to, but did not get involved with the detail of those replies as it was not my role, and as there was an appeal process (with Trustee review at the end of the process) available to grant applicants who were unhappy with their result.

144. I cannot remember in detail how grant applicants could appeal or complain about a result. I do recall that the end point of an appeals process was the Board. We very occasionally had appeals to consider, or requests from the NWC to endorse a particular approach to a grant request. These instances felt appropriate use of the Board's input, and what we saw indicated sensible and kind consideration of the requests up to that point by staff and the NWC.

Question 42: Please describe the working relationship between the trustees and CF's senior management. Were there any issues or causes for concern between the Chief Executive and Chair in particular. Did you have any issues either with fellow trustees or CF staff? How, if at all, were they resolved?

145. The Trustees and senior management worked together in the same way as other organisations. The Trustees met the CE and members of the staff

team predominantly at Board or committee meetings every few months (meeting minutes will provide exact dates of those meetings). The Board met at least quarterly. The day-to-day management of the organisation was delegated to the CE and staff team.

146. The CE we inherited as part of the MacFarlane staffing team [GRO-A] [GRO-A] had to retire [GRO-A]. The Trustees aspired to more efficient grant handling and organisation management during the three years I was there, and wished for the continual improvement of systems and processes.

147. I initially raised concerns with our Chair in January 2012 (6 months into the role as Trustee) about the lack of/speed of response to some Trustee queries and requests our inherited-from-Macfarlane Trust CE's performance. These were concerns that had arisen for me both as the Chair of the EAC and as an individual Trustee. I cannot remember many examples, but there are some I provide below:

- a. I was concerned that I had had to chase the setting of a first EAC meeting, and that the agenda suggested by the CE was minimal and did not set the EAC up with appropriate information to provide the employment policy oversight role intended. This poor provision of information did not change during the first CE's tenure.
- b. As a Trustee, I also felt we were not given financial papers enough in advance of Trustee meetings to be able to properly consider them prior to the meeting, I suggested receiving the majority of papers a week prior to meetings would be helpful. This improved, and we did, on most occasions, receive papers at least some days before a meeting.
- c. I suggested that we needed Key Performance Indicators at the first Trustee meeting in August 2011. It took until the Trustee meeting in

August 2012 to get some indicators drafted and I did not consider these to be good enough.

- d. There was the lack of an annual appraisal system for staff. I flagged this when I was appointed Trustee and tasked with Chairing the EAC, but the initial CE did not seem to have the capacity to address this issue.
- e. The Audit Committee recommended to the Trustees in Nov 2011 (i.e. after the Audit Committee's first meeting) that the Trustees should consider undertaking an Internal Audit exercise to assure themselves of Caxton's processes and that risks in conducting our business were adequately managed. The CE and Chair were obviously sceptical of the value of this, they stated this was because the DoH had recently undertaken an audit of Caxton on their behalf and he did not see the need to do another. The Chair of the Audit Committee explained that the standpoint of the DoH was different to the Trustees, and that we should seek our own assurance. The recommendation was taken to and from the Macfarlane Trust Liason Committee and the Audit Committee by the CE, until he left the organisation. The recommendation was finally undertaken after our new CE took post in Jan 2013. The April 2013 Audit Committee tasked the new CE to draw up a scope and commission the work. It took place in Oct/Nov 2013.

148. I had very limited contact with other staff members. I was aware that one other Trustee on the NWC, and who subsequently became the NWC Chair, had concerns about a grants team lead being a poor performer. I was also aware that the Trustee who was Audit Chair was unimpressed with the finance team lead's ability and skills. The CE had not identified performance problems with these staff members, and had taken no steps to performance manage them. I did not myself raise concerns about these other two members of staff, the concerns I mention were heard second hand. Both these staff members were moved on at a later point, but it took a number of years to achieve this, and was achieved after the first CE had also been financially supported to retire

GRO-A

149. I caveated flagging those early concerns with the Chair with the fact GRO-A

GRO-A

GRO-A that I had only been in post as a Trustee for a few months, and that I did not see all aspects of the individual's performance. I was also aware the Chair had worked with him for far longer than I when he had been CE of the Macfarlane Trust.

150.

GRO-A

GRO-A I believe the Chair did make him aware of concerns about performance. I also copied the CE into my feedback to the Chair in early 2012 (about 6 months into my role as Trustee).

151. The Chair agreed with the first Caxton CE that he would have a supported retirement GRO-A from the role. The Chair proposed a generous

GRO-A retirement package based on one months pay per year of service. In the circumstances the Trustees accepted this proposal, heavily influenced by the desire to recruit a new and more effective CE rather than enter into a protracted dispute with a departing CE GRO-A

GRO-A A protracted dispute would have delayed any change over to a new CE, and introduced a risk of legal challenge by the departing CE. The eventual cost to the charity in lost time and legal costs during a dispute would likely cost the charity more overall, and this would be to the disadvantage of our beneficiaries as there would be less money available for grants to them. It would also not be a prudent use of public money.

152. The Trustees as a group did nonetheless refuse a request for the proposed, generous, package to be increased further when the CE tried to negotiate the package up.

153. We had an interim CE in the interregnum between our retiring CE and recruiting a new post holder. Strong progress was made in some areas of operation during her period as an interim, I recall feeling relieved that

management information to Trustee meetings seemed to be flowing better, and that some progress was being made on my request (made during the first CE's tenure) to determine some of the core human resources information that I felt the EAC (and therefore Trustees) lacked. e.g. what employment contracts and staff terms and conditions were in place, but I do not recall the detail.

154. A new Chair and CE were appointed pretty much at the same time. I was not involved in the interviews for either the Chair or CE, so I cannot remember the exact dates of the recruitment, but both were around Autumn 2012.
155. It was not suprising to me that as EAC Chair I was not involved in the interviews for the CE, as both the Chair and Vice-Chair were on the recruitment panel, along with an independent member. They would have far greater day to day contact with the CE, and would be line managing the post holder. The EAC's role had been clearly set out to me as overseeing policy and procedure, rather than day to day staffing matters.
156. I can't remember who interviewed for the Chair. I suspect it was the Chair and Vice Chair again. I had recently given quite a lot of time to Trustee recruitment interviews, so I was content that others should do the next interviews.
157. I also suspect that my criticism of the old CE and wish to speed up Caxton progress had, however constructively I tried to make it, been an irritant to the outgoing Chair, and that he may have felt I was not the person he wanted to have involved in making these senior appointments. e.g. I had wanted to get cracking on a replacement CE process as soon as the incumbent CE had told us he would be happy to retire **GRO-A** and prepared a timetable to do this. The Chair had felt doing so before terms were agreed with the outgoing CE was inappropriate **GRO-A** **GRO-A**, as it might look like we were trying to force him out.

158. I believe the Chair was formally identified and appointed as Chair-elect first, as I recall her having some input to the discussions about the contractual queries that arose with the new CE's contract. I cannot recall whether she was involved in the interviews for the new CE. She kindly engaged before her formal appointment in, I think, February 2013, with these and other matters.
159. I wanted our new permanent CE, who took up post in January 2013, to make faster progress on priorities like improved communication with beneficiaries and speed of grant making and to be more responsive to some of our Trustee input. I cannot remember many specific examples, but I believe one was asking for better grant processing statistics and comparator data. I recall that I remained unhappy with the lack of a good set of KPI's for the organisation. I was still raising this issue in August 2014 at the end of my 3 year term as a Trustee.
160. I discussed my concern at the speed of progress with the Chair, who was the CE's line manager, after the CE had been in post for about a year. Some good progress had been made in some areas, including the review and redrafting of a clear set of HR policies, but I felt that progress had slowed after an initially positive start. The new CE's performance was discussed proactively by me with the Chair during feedback I gave to her on the CE for end of year reviews in spring 2014, I am not sure whether this feedback was shared with the CE or not.
161. I was aware that some other Trustees also wished to see greater speed of progress, so I then raised the subject of whether the CE could be working more effectively to achieve this in a confidential session at the end of a Trustee meeting, roughly in May or June 2014, I do not recall exactly when. I then raised the subject again with the Chair on 18 July 2014, and this eventually resulted in a Trustee discussion around (I believe before or after, but I cannot remember exactly) the August 2014 Trustee meeting.
162. The decision was communally taken by the Trustees at the August 2014

Trustee meeting that the risk of a change of CE and a gap in senior leadership was too great, and that the CE's performance was satisfactory. I respected the Chair's view on this, as she worked far more closely with the CE than I did, and was more aware of her workload and effectiveness than I or other Trustees could be.

163. I was aware that my concerns about the speed of our grant making and performance were shared by some colleagues, and that they had much senior experience to draw on. I felt that if, corporately, the Trustees felt that things were good enough, then perhaps I was being overly impatient or unrealistic in my expectations of what could be delivered. Many of the things that were not good enough in my view, were perfectly normal frustrations for many in all sorts of organisations, for example many organisations do not have great KPIs. Caxton was a new organisation, there had been inherited weaknesses in the staff team, and undoubtedly these things do take time to sort out. I did not have any concerns that we were failing to meet our charity obligations or legal obligations, my concerns were simply that we could be doing better.

Question 43: Please describe the working relationship between CF and the Haemophilia Society. Were there any issues or causes for concern? How, if at all, were they resolved?

164. I am sorry I am not aware of what the working relationship was.

Question 44 Please describe the working relationship between CF and the UK Haemophilia Centre Directors Organisation. Were there any issues or causes for concern? How, if at all, were they resolved? :

165. I am sorry I am not aware of what the working relationship was.

Question 45: Please list any particular clinicians you were in regular contact with in relation to your work for CF.

166. I was not in regular contact with any particular clinicians outside the Trustee

body. A member of our Trustees was a clinician and Professor of hepatology (the study of the liver and pancreas) at Imperial College.

Section 6: The Employment Affairs Committee (EAC)

Question 46 - Please describe the purpose and composition of the EAC and who it reported to:

167. The EAC consisted of four Trustees, and reported to the Board of Trustees. The EAC was responsible for policy issues in relation to staff and human resource matters. The CE was responsible for day to day staff management decisions within those policies.
168. It may assist if I set out the limited role that the EAC had in practice. In particular, whilst I was Chair of the Committee, the committee itself did not meet between June 2013 and the summer of 2014. This period was a transition period that followed the departure of the CE, the short term of the interim CE, and the early stages of the new CE and Chair.
169. During the period of the interim CE (approximately September 2012 to December 2012), I held active discussions with the interim CE (in my role as as Chair of the EAC) to try and ascertain clarity about the current position of staff contracts and staff terms and conditions of employment. I had asked these questions of the original CE on a number of occasions, and he had not provided me with this information. The EAC did not convene for a meeting during this period, because my work with the interim CE was essentially trying to establish clarity and a basis for planning future executive actions and EAC input. I considered that it would be more effective if the EAC could be properly informed before meeting to discuss substantive issues.
170. The new CE took up post on 3 January 2013. The incoming Chair had been helpfully engaged with Caxton's recruitment of the new CE at the end of 2012 and again helpfully engaged with the new CE as she started role, but

the incoming Chair only formally took up post in around Feb 2013.

171. I discussed timing and business for the EAC with the new CE and/or Chair of Caxton. They informed me that the prioritisation of the CE's workload they had agreed would allow her to meaningfully support an EAC meeting in June 2013, but not before.
172. I was aware of the wide range of work areas the new CE needed to tackle, and I was in agreement with the need for the Chair to have a clear programme of prioritised work agreed with the CE. I was also clear that our CE needed a manageable workload, and I wanted EAC meetings to be properly briefed and supported by the CE, to allow meaningful progress on our overseeing of policies and procedures.
173. An EAC meeting was subsequently held on 3rd June and was presented with a well briefed agenda of reviewed employment contract and HR policies to review and approve. I felt positive about the direction of travel.
174. The new Chair wished to undertake a governance review including reviewing the Board committee structures. EAC meetings were therefore put on hold after the June 2013 meeting, and I awaited further input from the Chair. There was further mention of the Chair's 'governance review' but it appeared not to take place as a discrete exercise, as the new Chair and CE found their time taken by other more urgent matters, e.g. reviewing the grants assessment team staffing. I checked in with the Chair from time to time, and she explained that she and the CE were focusing their time on addressing urgent staff matters rather than needing EAC input, and that holding a committee meeting would not be a constructive use of limited staff time. I was wholly guided by the Chair's overall view of Caxton and CE activity, and her consequent better ability to assess priorities, as to whether it was necessary to hold an EAC meeting
175. The Chair, on 14 July 2014, asked the EAC to re-form to hold a meeting before the upcoming 7 August 2014 Board meeting to deal with an urgent

matter around approving staff pay rises. Because of the time lapse of over a year since the EAC had been 'live', two of the EAC members had since departed as Trustees, and so to be quorate I agreed with the Chair that we would co-opt the Vice-Chair to sit in on this urgent EAC meeting. This EAC meeting was held on 1 August 2014.

176. I was not clear whether the Chair wished the EAC to meet as a 'one-off' on this occasion, or whether the intention was for the EAC to start to regularly meet again. Given the more urgent matters I was pressing the Chair for discussion at the time, i.e. discussing the organisation's performance, I did not want to divert her attention from this by pressing the Chair on resolving what Board Sub-Committee structure would be established/re-established. I was also aware that my Trustee term was about to expire within 2 months, and that my views on future Board structure were therefore of less relevance than those of other Trustees.

177. With the benefit of hindsight I feel that as Chair of the EAC: I should have insisted on scheduling a Trustee discussion as to the remit for an Employment sub-committee of the Board, rather than just accepting a very limited Committee role and remit inherited from Macfarlane; I should have been clearer as to what and when I should have been consulted by the Chair and Vice-Chair on staffing issues; I should not have accepted that the pressure of other CE business was too great for EAC meetings to be supported and waited for the new Chair to tell me what she wanted to do about Board sub-committees.

178. At the time I felt that I was one of the Trustees that was most vocal about criticising what we were delivering and how quickly we were delivering it. I tried to manage my level of criticism and 'asks' of both Chairs to make what I did comment on more palatable, with the intention that they would be more receptive to such an approach and I would therefore be more effective in making change.

179. I did not have experience of serving on a similar employment sub-

committee to draw on, or enough confidence to call for more change.

180. I recognised the gap in employment/HR skills within the Trustees, and we actively recruited for a replacement Trustee with this skill set in Oct/Nov 2012. The Trustee we appointed with an HR background chose not to take on the role of Chair of the Employment Committee from me when I discussed it with her, and did not serve long as a Trustee. She attended only three Trustee meetings and one EAC meeting and I believe resigned around Sept/Oct 2013. Looking back, it would have been helpful throughout my period at Caxton to have had a trustee with greater experience of difficult HR issues to assist the Board.

181. With hindsight, with a different and much clearer remit I think there could have been stronger support from the EAC (or its Chair) for the Chair / Vice-Chair in managing the CE's performance on employment matters, and this might have been able to be seen as a positive by the Chair. For example the EAC may have been able to help support more rapid improvements in the structure and processes around annual appraisals, pay and performance management. That would, however, have required a more significant role being given to the EAC than had been previously established.

Question 47: Please discuss any recommendations made by the EAC that affected the wider composition of CF, and how they were received by senior management of CF.

182. I can't remember any recommendations that the EAC made which affected the wider 'composition' of Caxton. The EAC was only operational as a committee for approximately the first 18 months of my term as a Trustee, before being re-convened by the Chair to address a specific matter around remuneration just before I reached the end of my term in August 2014.

Section 7: Other

Question 48: How did CF set its annual payment levels including winter fuel allowances? In particular, how did CF decide what to allocate and to whom? How were decisions made in respect of beneficiaries whose income was below the median line?

183. I am sorry I cannot remember this level of detail.

184. I do recall that we discussed how Hepatitis C manifested itself, and that this included a need for sufferers to keep warm. I don't recall the detail, but believe the Board's view was that this provided the charitable justification to distribute winter fuel grants to all existing beneficiaries without requiring additional charitable justification from a grantee. I think we proactively contacted all those potential beneficiaries for who we had contact details to offer them this grant, i.e. they did not have to apply for it.

Question 49: Was there an appeals procedure for CF? If so, what was it and how did it operate? Who determined the appeal and did it include staff who made the original decision?

185. There was an appeals process, but I cannot remember the detail of how it operated. I do recall that the end point was consideration at a Trustee meeting. We were occasionally presented with information about appeals. I recall finding the NWC's decisions to be well founded, fair and reasonable.

186. The decision making process on an appeal was a Trustee vote at a Trustee meeting. I cannot remember whether Trustees who were members of the NWC voted. Staff members did not have any role in the appeal decision.

Question 50: What, if any, non-financial support was available to eligible beneficiaries of CF? If any non-financial support did exist, how was it brought to potential beneficiaries' attention?

187. There was non-financial support available. We had a benefits advisor and a

financial/debt management advisor for beneficiaries to draw on. I think we inherited the benefits advisor from Macfarlane Trust, but I think that the debt advisor was recruited when it became apparent from the NWC's work that some beneficiaries needed ongoing help. I believe the help available was brought to beneficiaries attention if it was felt relevant given the assistance they contacted Caxton for, but I am not aware how this was done. I believe the feedback generally from both advisor services was positive.

Question 51: In a meeting of directors of CF, date unknown, Property Transaction Documents were discussed [CAXT0000095_035] . You asked for clarity of the documents that had been circulated and noted that the board should be fully aware of precisely what they (the board) were being asked to agree to. Were there other instances where the board was asked to authorise documents or information in circumstances where they had not been fully briefed? If so, please give details.

188. The purpose of the agenda item at this meeting was to consider a lease proposal for new office space, within the same building, that the Chair and CE had put much time into and were in agreement on the need for. The proposal increased the cost of office space very considerably, and this was a five year minimum financial commitment of a significant scale.
189. The Board had been circulated with the legal documents relevant to the proposal. As someone without a legal background, but with a strong sense of the importance of making sure that the legal implications of a financial commitment of this scale was fully understood by myself and others, I used the opportunity of the meeting (as the agenda item intended) to ask for the Chair to explain to us the rationale behind the proposal.
190. One area that felt very sub-optimal was that there was no level disabled access to the current building, and the lift was too small for wheelchairs. Trustees were assured that there was a clear and urgent need for increased office space by the CE and Chair, that the DoH budget covered the liabilities we were to enter into, that much work and cost had gone into this proposal

and that any alternative more modern and accessible office space would be more expensive. Given the high priority to get the staff team focussed on speeding up grant making and improving communication with potential beneficiaries (the Board's highest areas of concern) I agreed with our corporate support for the proposal, but with a strong rider that at the five year review point of this new lease term we wanted to see options explored that provided comprehensive disabled access.

191. Delays in the transaction meant that this decision was subsequently able to be revisited by the interim CE about 8 months later. She identified an alternative and much lower cost way forward by using off-site file storage and the Caxton team remained in the same office space. This felt a far more satisfactory interim solution.
192. There were other instances in the first 6 months where the Board was given financial reports at meetings, or were asked to make decisions on papers presented at the meeting, or at the very last minute. I cannot remember specific examples. I raised this, about 6 months into my role as Trustee, during the first CE's period, and suggested that financial or complex papers should be presented to the Trustees in advance of a meeting where they were to be discussed, ideally a week ahead. This improved after I had raised the issue, and I cannot remember re-raising it.

Question 52 Please provide your view as to the efficacy of how CF was run during your tenure and whether it achieved its aims and objectives:

193. I believe Caxton's Trustee team's ability to set things up as it believed best, was constrained by the capacity of the inherited staff team and ways of working from the MacFarlane Trust, GRO-A the CE, and the need to relatively soon recruit a new CE.
194. As a Trustee I, and others, were often met with a response to requests to the first CE for actions that indicated there was not enough time to prioritise

them with the staff resource available. Or the CE immediately asked to approve the outsourcing of the specific task we were asking for to an external agency / supplier – which always felt an expensive solution. As a Trustee I felt caught between authorising more cost when costs already seemed high given the amount of grants being made, and accepting the CE's point that there was not enough staff time to do what had been asked.

195. Some of the actions we asked the first CE for were not particularly time consuming, but as a Trustee it was difficult to judge the day to day work load he was under. The initial Chair saw more of his work, and had worked with him before at the Macfarlane Trust and was supportive of his performance.

196. Nonetheless the charity established itself and began disbursing grants to those in real need, properly meeting its legal requirements and with very good intentions from all involved as Trustees to help improve the lives of those who had been so unfortunate in receiving infected blood.

197. I, and I believe other Trustees, did express concerns to the Chair about the first CE's performance. [REDACTED] **GRO-A** [REDACTED] **GRO-A** we wished to be supportive of him, but also to see improvements in the pace of Caxton's delivery. The first CE reached a conclusion that he might wish to retire [REDACTED] **GRO-A** [REDACTED] and I and other Trustees were enthusiastic about this being progressed as quickly as possible.

198. I felt considerable confidence in the Interim CE our Chair and Vice-Chair (I believe) appointed while we recruited for a permanent post holder. I felt that some information provided to Trustees improved, and that responses to questions or discussions were more incisive and more in tune with the Trustees views, for example acknowledging that grant making was not going fast enough and that one of the key grant processing individuals was not the right person for the role.

199. I was enthusiastic about raising our aspirations and the pace of improvement as much as possible, and I was disappointed that the capacity of the staff team did not increase as much as I had hoped after the new CE's arrival at the beginning of 2012. Some improvements had been made which was great, but Trustees were still not receiving enough meaningful management information; grant making had increased but not dramatically and it did not feel we had made any great strides forward in communicating with those potential beneficiaries unaware of Caxton's existence. After a year of the new CE, I felt that more progress should be visible.
200. With the information that was made available to the Board, I did not feel I was able fully to understand why we weren't making more progress, and discussed this with the Chair and other Trustees. I was aware that some other Trustees also had higher aspirations for the organisation's performance. After just over a year of the new post holder being in post, I gave some strong feedback to the Chair on improvements that I felt should be possible for the new CE's end of year review.
201. I did not see any noticeable changes in pace of improvement in the months after that, and the matter of organisation performance was discussed at Trustee meetings, where it was apparent that others also felt disappointed with the pace of change. I asked for a confidential discussion of this topic and wanted to actively consider whether we would do better to seek a different CE in advance of a Trustee meeting in August 2014. The Chair was not able to schedule this as a stand alone discussion, so the discussion was held just before or after (I cannot recall which) the August Trustee meeting.
202. On balance, the corporate Board decision, which I of course supported, was to press ahead and support our existing CE in continuing to deliver and incrementally improve the grants programmes and support we were giving to beneficiaries.

Question 53: Were there difficulties or shortcomings in the way in which CF

operated or in its dealings with beneficiaries and applicants for assistance? If so, please describe them. What, if anything, do you consider CF should have done differently?

203. I was confident that Caxton was meeting its legal and charity obligations. There were however regular irritations in Caxton's operation and the information Trustees received, that felt sub-optimal. I felt that it should have been possible to see improvement in the timeframes I was engaged with the charity. I generally felt that operational tasks and actions, like grant making, data collation and reporting and communications, should have been quicker, and that it was hard work getting the incisive management information the Trustees needed to try and understand and identify where Caxton could do even better. I have set out some of the management issues that I identified in greater detail earlier in this statement. To a great extent many of these will be familiar irritations to many in all sorts of different organisations. I had no concerns that we weren't meeting legal or charity requirements, it was simply that I felt we could be doing better.

Question 54: Why did you resign your position as Trustee in 2014?

204. I did not resign my position, I reached the end of my appointed three year term as a Trustee, and chose not to apply to continue in post for a second term (or for my appointment to be extended for a shorter period) because I did not feel confident I was effective enough in making the improvements I wanted to see happen.

205. I was new to a Trustee role when I was appointed at Caxton. When I was first appointed, I was clear that what I saw being delivered in terms of operational efficiency and process clarity was not good enough. However, when we had reached the point of having a new and very experienced Chair (who had held a very senior healthcare Chair role previously), and a new and experienced CE in post, and I still felt unhappy with what was being achieved, I felt that perhaps it might be that my performance expectations that were incorrect and unrealistic. I had made sure that I discussed my

concerns with the Chair, and I gathered that she did not have the same strength of opinions as I did. The Chair was in a far better position to understand the day to day work going on in the organisation as she was directly involved with the CE on many tasks. I accepted that it may well have been that the Chair's judgment was correct, rather than mine.

206. I felt great confidence in the skills and judgment of some of my Trustee colleagues, and discussed my views on the speed of improvement with two of them particularly. They were in agreement with many of my views. One colleague, Charles Lister, put significantly more volunteer time into Caxton to try and address some of the executive capacity issues we discussed.

207. I felt that to better understand and input to the aspirations the Board had for Caxton, I would need to spend more time in the Caxton office and with staff, perhaps practically assisting with tasks that the team did not appear to have the time to do without an extra pair of hands. I was concerned that this would involve a blurring of the boundary between a Trustee role and that of a staff member. I also did not live close enough to Caxton's office to make this practicable, and I did not have the personal capacity to increase the amount of time I had available for this voluntary role to the extent that felt necessary. I felt the best thing for Caxton's beneficiaries was that another Trustee with perhaps more time and better skills to provide the input required to support the team to continue to improve performance should be found.

Question 55: Please provide any other information you may have that is relevant to the Inquiry's Terms of Reference .

208. I have no further information I wish to provide.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

GRO-C

Signed _

Dated 1/2/21