

Additional Notes re Wilkinson Review

1. CHW/LamPal employ around 25 legal officers/staff. Not one has expertise in:
 - a. Safeguarding
 - b. General Policy and Codes of Practice drafting/application.
 - c. Relevant HR to deal with complainants.
2. There is insurmountable evidence that all complaints/complainants are triaged through communication/PR, Mr. Nye and the CHW/LamPal legal office.
3. It will not be possible to arrive at sensible conclusions regarding the ISB debacle without inquiring into:
 - a. The Dispute Resolution Notice (DNR) issued to Jasvinder/Steve by Mr. Nye.
 - b. The DNR issued by the ISB to the Archbishops' Council.
 - c. The refusal of Mr. Nye to agree to mediation with the ISB board – he proposed himself as the Mediator in the unresolved issues within the Chair and two board members of the ISB.
 - d. The summary sacking of the ISB, and the claims made by Mr. Nye (ostensibly acting on behalf of Archbishops' Council) that victims and survivors with ongoing cases “had been consulted and would be catered for”. The victims/survivors have written to Archbishops' Council to state that such statements issued to the press by Mr. Nye were **untrue**.
 - e. The lack of proper, full or accurate minutes from Archbishops' Council detailing the vote to terminate the ISB; and the claims made by the Archbishops at General Synod in July 2023 which are at variance with the actual events, and do not seem to correspond to any truthful account of proceedings.
 - f. Consistent misleading of General Synod by those sponsored by Mr. Nye to do so, especially Maureen Cole (see how she misled Professor Helen King, Revd Dr Ian Paul and Mr Clive Billinness at February 2023 General Synod when giving wrong answers to questions).
 - g. The role of Maggie Atkinson and Meg Munn – publicly ‘positioned’ as independent by Mr. Nye – but manifestly working for and loyal to the Archbishops' Council, and the modus operandi of 2., above.
 - h. Constant refusal to provide or abide by a Conflicts of Interest policy, or Declaration of Interests Register, that can be scrutinised. Archbishops' Council repeatedly claims to General Synod that the policies exist. None have ever been produced.
 - i. We therefore do not know who works for who; whose interests are being protected; which interests are not being disclosed; etc. Effective governance of a charity concerned with safeguarding cannot function like this. Yet it does (badly, and abusively). The ISB debacle is symptomatic of this culture.

4. In terms of the specific evidence Dr. Percy (MP) had provided to Maggie Atkinson's investigation, the following evidence would have been excluded:
 - a. With no Conflicts of Interest policy in place, all actions against MP had Winckworth Sherwood baked-in to the processes.
 - b. The Core Group was infiltrated by Winckworth Sherwood, and the Chair of the Core Group failed to take minutes of the meeting, run a proper process, or conduct any basic Risk Assessment – he seemed to be wholly unaware of the CofE established procedure. He was grossly incompetent – but fully briefed on desired outcomes by Winkworth Sherwood.
 - c. The 'arbitrary' timeframe proposed by Maggie Atkinson for the MP ISB process would have excluded:
 - Previous safeguarding concerns raised by MP from 2016 onwards.
 - Significant evidence of planted/false allegations done by Winckworth Sherwood and Luther Pendragon – both of whom have multiple contracts with CofE Dioceses.
 - The culture of “weaponisation” already in play (i.e., the Dean is charged with conduct of an “immoral, scandalous and disgraceful nature” citing the Christ Church Statutes).
 - The involvement of clergy and church officers in such charges.
 - The credentials of AJ as an employee, complainant, etc – see: <https://nineveh.live/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/Questions-on-Times-Dates-and-Places.pdf> and https://nineveh.live/?page_id=75
 - Any medical evidence from MP relating to the AJ complaint; any reasonable adjustments MP requested; testimony from MP's witnesses – also excluded by Kate Wood; GDPR protocols; etc.
5. The repeated assertion from both Archbishops that Maggie Atkinson's “independent process” regarding MP could be trusted was simply not credible. MP would have been subjected to a re-trial of the CDM case – and that was what AJ was promised by the Bishop of Oxford, as recorded across social media. AJ described the ISB process as “an independent investigation into (her) allegation against MP...**not** a process in which MP has his allegations regarding the weaponizing of safeguarding investigated”. With Ms. Jeune making such confident assertions from the outset, and Maggie Atkinson clearly deciding in advance that MP was not the complainant/victim in her process, MP refused to engage with this ISB work. Jasvinder and Steve were not party to any of the above.