

**RNI DE-CLASSIFIED**

45. From the moment I first visited the scene, I knew that this murder investigation would be significant and could be, at some stage, subjected to a major review. With the introduction of an outside force from Kent, and the contribution of the FBI, from the moment I was appointed as SIO, I was determined that the MIT would operate to the highest standards and be methodical in everything that it did. I have already mentioned above the importance of quality assurance.
46. Accordingly, from the first conference that was undertaken, I impressed upon all those present the importance of high standards in the light of the nature of the investigation.
47. I was told on 19 March 1999 about Operation Fagotto. This came as something of a surprise to me, and it seemed to me that this was something that should have been instantly reported to me as SIO on the 15<sup>th</sup> of March, and it reinforced the point that I was looking for full and prompt disclosure from Special Branch on key issues.
48. When it therefore came to the evening conference on the 19<sup>th</sup> of March when everyone was present (including the representative of Special Branch), I very much had Operation Fagotto in my mind, and in particular my concern at not having been informed of this operation sooner. When I therefore came to impress upon everybody present about the high profile and accountable nature of the investigation and the need to undertake full disclosure, I included Special Branch in those comments, and had them in mind when I was making those comments. I believe that DI B567 was represented at this meeting by DC B631. I do not recall him saying anything at the meeting, but he may well have taken my comments about disclosure, to include Special Branch, as an implicit criticism.
49. I may well have phrased my comments in the terms that the obligations to disclose everything applied also to "*Special Branch down the corridor*". I have been asked whether I made any comments to the effect that "*those down the corridor had issues to be concerned about*" or words to that effect. That was not what I said, and my words were directed specifically to their obligations of disclosure, in the same way they applied to