

36. I have reviewed the transcript of Mr Buchan's evidence and his witness statement. I note that he was under the impression that, at the time of the hot debrief, I was GMP's chief officer lead for Counter Terrorism. This is incorrect; as stated above, I was the Temporary ACC for Spec Ops.
37. In his evidence, Mr Buchan sets out the findings of the HMIC CT2 inspection and suggests that these matters were discussed with me in detail at the hot debrief. I do not believe that this can be right. I cannot now recall what was discussed during the CT2 hot debrief with Mr Buchan. My note of the meeting is at INQ035779 and in my daybook, CH/6, at page 16. It is clear from the face of this document that there was reference to, among other things, the FDO, resilience around the FDO, awareness of OCB staff about their exact roles and the MTF A plan (including how it is accessed). I cannot recall Mr Buchan saying anything to me about OCB Action Cards.
38. While I cannot recall the meeting, I do not believe that I was given the impression by Mr Buchan that he had any concerns which necessitated immediate action on the part of GMP. I say this for a number of reasons.
39. First, when I have tasks to action following a meeting, I write an 'A' for 'Action' in a circle next to the task and then tick it once it is complete. This can be seen in the entries from my daybook at CH/6 pages 2, 5, 6, 9, 13 and 17. There are no such symbols in the entry relating to the hot debrief.
40. Second, as set out above, I had prepared very carefully for the inspection. If I had been told by Mr Buchan that immediate changes needed to be made to GMP's policies, procedures or practices at the hot debrief, I believe I would have ensured these were followed up in a similarly meticulous fashion.
41. Third, I chaired a meeting of the Firearms Policy Group (FPG) on 3 November 2016 at 2pm. This was an hour after the hot debrief was scheduled to finish. This can be seen in my diary at CH/21. I exhibit the minutes of this meeting as CH/22. The minutes state [INQ041090] the FPG meeting began at 10am, but I believe that this is an error (probably caused by somebody cutting and pasting from a template) as my diary shows it was "rescheduled" to take place at 2pm (the FPG meeting was probably rescheduled as a result of the hot debrief at 12pm). Moreover, my notes from the FPG meeting in my daybook state that

it took place at 2pm, thus confirming it took place after the hot debrief and the time in the minutes is incorrect (CH/6 page 17). The minutes show that I do not share any HMIC concerns with the FPG, which I believe I would have done if Mr Buchan had suggested that we needed to address any particular concerns immediately. Indeed, the only reference I make to HMIC is under section 7, in relation to testing: “ACC CH stated that HMIC were complimentary in the exercising and testing we had done”. There is one other reference to HMIC: Superintendent Sheena Tattum stated that she had informed the HMIC team about the regional Strategic Threat and Risk Assessment (STRA).

42. Fourth, on 7 November 2016, I took part in the regular informal Monday morning meeting of the chief officers. My notes of issues to raise at the meeting are in my daybook at CH/6 page 17. There is no reference to the hot debrief or the HMIC inspection. If I thought urgent action needed to be taken following the CT2 inspection, I would have raised it at the meeting.
43. Fifth, it is clear from the email sent to me on 14 October 2016 (CH/3) that the intention was that the hot debrief should deal with the conduct of the inspection and not the findings of it, which would only come once all the evidence had been collected and compared and conclusions and recommendations made. (The email also suggests that the hot debrief is optional and will only take place if requested.) I am not surprised by this; my understanding was always that once the HMIC inspectors had conducted their visit they would need to collate their findings, subject them to a national moderation process and publish a report. After all, the visit had only concluded on the day of the hot debrief and Mr Buchan was only one of the team of inspectors. I note that, when giving evidence, Mr Buchan said he would not have provided me with any documents or had access to the HMIC evidence gathering templates when we met.
44. While I cannot now recall what was discussed during the hot debrief, for the reasons set out above, I do not believe that Mr Buchan gave me the impression that GMP needed to take any immediate action following the inspection. I infer from all of the circumstances that I was under the impression that GMP should await the national CT2 report and the accompanying recommendations. I understand this report was only available in August 2017, by which point I had left GMP.