



House of Commons
Home Affairs Committee

Appointment of the Chair of the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse

Twelfth Report of Session 2014–15

Report, together with formal minutes

*Ordered by the House of Commons
to be printed 11 February 2015*

HC 710
Published on 13 February 2015
by authority of the House of Commons
London: The Stationery Office Limited
£0.00

Home Affairs Committee

The Home Affairs Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration, and policy of the Home Office and its associated public bodies.

Current membership

Rt Hon Keith Vaz MP (Labour, Leicester East) (Chair)
Ian Austin MP (Labour, Dudley North)
Nicola Blackwood MP (Conservative, Oxford West and Abingdon)
James Clappison MP (Conservative, Hertsmere)
Michael Ellis MP (Conservative, Northampton North)
Paul Flynn MP (Labour, Newport West)
Lorraine Fullbrook MP (Conservative, South Ribble)
Dr Julian Huppert MP (Liberal Democrat, Cambridge)
Tim Loughton MP (Conservative, East Worthing and Shoreham)
Yasmin Qureshi MP (Labour, Bolton South East)
Mr David Winnick MP (Labour, Walsall North)

The following were also members of the Committee during the Parliament.

Rt Hon Alun Michael (Labour & Co-operative, Cardiff South and Penarth)
Karl Turner MP (Labour, Kingston upon Hull East)
Steve McCabe MP (Labour, Birmingham Selly Oak)
Bridget Phillipson MP (Labour, Houghton and Sunderland South)
Chris Ruane MP (Labour, Vale of Clwyd)

Powers

The Committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No 152. These are available on the Internet via www.parliament.uk

Publication

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the Internet at www.parliament.uk/homeaffairscom

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are Tom Healey (Clerk), John-Paul Flaherty (Second Clerk), Dr Ruth Martin (Committee Specialist), Duma Langton (Committee Specialist), Andy Boyd (Senior Committee Assistant), Iwona Hankin (Committee Assistant) and Alex Paterson (Select Committee Media Officer).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Home Affairs Committee, House of Commons, 7 Millbank, London SW1P 3JA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 2049; the Committee's email address is homeaffcom@parliament.uk

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Report	
1 The Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse	7
Background	7
The work of the panel since its appointment	8
2 The candidate	11
Future of the inquiry	12
Appointment of the new panel and staff	12
Scope of the inquiry	13
Conclusions and recommendations	15
Appendix 1: Home Office Criteria for Chairman	18
1. Skills	18
2. Expertise	18
3. Due diligence	18
Appendix 2: CV of Hon Justice Lowell Goddard	19
Career	19
Personal Life	19
Appendix 3: Letter from the Home Secretary dated 11 February 2015	20
Formal Minutes	21
Witnesses	22
List of printed written evidence	23
List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament	24

1 The Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse

Background

1. On 7 July 2014, the Home Secretary announced the establishment of an Independent Panel Inquiry to consider whether public bodies and non-state institutions had taken seriously their duty to protect children from sexual abuse. In the interests of establishing the inquiry as quickly as possible, it was to be a non-statutory inquiry, but the Home Secretary gave an undertaking that it would be given access to all necessary government papers; that it would be free to call witnesses as required; and that if the panel chairman deemed it necessary, the Government would be prepared to convert it into a statutory inquiry under the Inquiries Act 2005.¹

2. Baroness Butler-Sloss, former President of the Family Division of the High Court, was appointed Chair of the panel on 8 July, but she stepped down on 14 July after MPs and survivor groups expressed concerns about the possibility that the inquiry might have to consider decisions taken by her late brother, Sir Michael Havers, as Attorney General in the 1980s.

3. Fiona Woolf CBE JP, the Lord Mayor of London, was appointed Chair on 5 September, but stepped down on 31 October after concerns were raised about her social contacts with Lord and Lady Brittan. When she gave evidence to us in October, it emerged that a letter she had written to the Home Secretary setting out her relevant interests, including her contact with Lord and Lady Brittan, had been re-drafted seven times at the suggestion of the Solicitor and Counsel to the Inquiry, and shared in draft with the Home Office before it was finalised.² Mrs Woolf said that she did not believe that the inquiry would have the necessary widespread survivor support if she were to continue to chair it.³

4. In October, the Home Secretary published the terms of reference for the inquiry, and announced the names of the Panel members;⁴ Counsel to the inquiry, Ben Emmerson QC; and the appointment of an expert adviser to the panel, Professor Alexis Jay OBE, who had recently completed the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Exploitation in Rotherham. In November, the Home Secretary announced that she was holding meetings with survivor groups and having discussions with MPs about possible candidates to chair the Panel, and that the proposed new chair would attend a pre-appointment hearing with this Committee.

5. On 4 February 2015, the Home Secretary told the House that she planned to appoint Justice Lowell Goddard, a judge of the High Court of New Zealand, as the new Chair of the inquiry. She also announced that she would be dissolving the existing Panel and establishing a new, statutory inquiry under the Inquiries Act 2005. She emphasised that

¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/home-secretary-oral-statement-on-child-abuse>

² Qq 13 ff and [letter from Fiona Woolf to the Chair of the Committee, dated 29 October 2014](#)

³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/home-secretarys-oral-statement-on-child-abuse-inquiry>

⁴ The Panel Members were Sharon Evans, Ivor Frank, Dame Moira Gibb, Barbara Hearn OBE, Professor Jenny Pearce OBE, Drusilla Sharpling CBE, Professor Terence Stephenson and Graham Wilmer MBE

this decision was by no means a criticism of the existing Panel members, whom she invited to apply for the new Panel.⁵ Applications for the new Panel would be judged against a set of published criteria.⁶

6. Prior to the announcement of the new proposed Chair, we took oral evidence about the panel inquiry from witnesses including some members of the original panel, representatives of survivor groups, Fiona Woolf CBE and Ben Emmerson QC. During those evidence sessions we heard witnesses' views on the Home Office's process for selecting candidates for the new chair. Panel members and representatives of survivor groups told us that they had not been consulted before the appointment of the first two Chairs.⁷ Alison Millar, a solicitor who acts for several survivors, said that:

... there has been a lack of transparency so far about how people have been appointed – both as chair and to the panel – and there has been a lack of consultation and engagement with interested parties, and most particularly those affected by abuse, over the way this inquiry should be handled, what the terms of reference should be and, most crucially, how it can involve people in the process. The way it has been handled so far is a matter of regret to my clients.⁸

7. There were well-publicised problems with the appointment of the Panel, which resulted in the early resignation of two previous Chairs. It is important that a Chair is now appointed who will command the confidence of survivors.

The work of the panel since its appointment

8. The Panel met for the first time on 12 November and announced that it intended to hold a series of listening meetings to seek the views of survivors of child sexual abuse on the work of the Inquiry and to consider how personal support could be offered to those interacting with the Inquiry. In the absence of a Chair, Ben Emmerson QC, Counsel to the Inquiry, acted as a facilitator, in effect taking on the Chair's role on a temporary basis.

9. While there is no doubting Mr Emmerson's impressive credentials as a lawyer, it is clear that he did not win the confidence of all the members of the Panel. With the benefit of hindsight, it might have been a mistake for the Inquiry Counsel to fill the void created by the absence of a Chair. A dispute arose between Mr Emmerson and Sharon Evans, one of the two survivors on the Panel. We make no comment on this dispute, except that it seems to have arisen at least in part as a result of the vacuum left by the absence of a Chair.

10. Four sessions were held during December 2014, in London, Bristol and Manchester, but on 21 January, the Panel announced that it had postponed the remaining sessions until after the Home Secretary had made her decision on the future of the panel and had appointed a new Chair.

⁵ [HC Deb, 4 February 2015, col. 275](#)

⁶ Not yet published

⁷ Q21 and Q112

⁸ Q113

11. In her statement to the House on 3 November, the Home Secretary acknowledged that some campaigners had called for the inquiry to become a statutory inquiry. Panel members told us in oral evidence that they had agreed unanimously that the inquiry should be put on a statutory footing; that they had written to advise the Home Secretary of this view;⁹ and that they remained confident that the panel could take its work forward under a new Chair.¹⁰ This was also the consensus among a group of survivors whom we met privately on 6 November, several of whom emphasised the need for the inquiry to have the power to compel witnesses to give evidence.

12. The panel's expert adviser, Professor Jay, said that the most important issues for moving forward were the appointment of a chair who would lead panel members effectively, and the conversion of the inquiry to a statutory inquiry.¹¹ Professor Jenny Pearce OBE, a Panel Member, pointed to the need for strong leadership and robust methodology to deal with conflicting views and perspectives:

... politics will come into the nature of the inquiry, so too will different voices of different groups of survivors and victims who have been abused or harmed. Those different voices may well be in conflict with each other and may well be using different channels, including the media, to try to advance different perspectives. What the panel and inquiry have to do is to develop a methodology that is robust enough to make sure that all voices are heard and that the different pressures of fighting or debate outside the work of the panel is accounted for and embraced, rather than challenged.¹²

13. We thank all the members of the original Panel for their work. The work that has already been done, in particular the material gathered at listening meetings, must be made available to the new Panel. The original Panel was unable to operate effectively without leadership and the appointment of a Chair for the new Panel should not be delayed further. The terms of reference for the inquiry need to be established and the new Panel appointed as quickly as possible so that the inquiry team can get to work. Parliament must be kept actively informed about the future work of the inquiry.

14. The Home Secretary has asked us to complete this pre-appointment process to a very challenging deadline, which we have done. The Home Secretary also invited us to nominate a candidate of our own. We declined to do so, as this would have compromised any subsequent pre-appointment hearing, potentially bringing the whole process into disrepute. We do not believe that select committees which are to conduct pre-appointment should ever be asked to put forward candidates of their own.

15. Given the very limited time available for this process, we have sought views from as wide a range of people as possible. We have issued a general call for written submissions, which has been publicised on our website, we have written to all Members of the House of Commons seeking their views, and we held a private meeting with survivors on the

⁹ Q50

¹⁰ Q48

¹¹ Q78

¹² Q48

morning of Wednesday 11 February, before we took evidence from Justice Goddard. The Chair of the Committee wrote to the Home Secretary on 9 February, asking for further details of the appointment process: the number of candidates who were considered for the post, the number shortlisted, the salary for the post and any additional terms and conditions relevant to the appointment. In her reply, she said that she had received over 150 nominations, from survivors, survivors' representatives, MPs, and members of the public. In addition, the Home Office had contacted Commonwealth countries, via the Foreign Office, to identify any suitable candidates.¹³ However, she declined to specify the salary range, saying only that it would be "in line with other public appointments of this nature". We are concerned that the Home Secretary has not disclosed Justice Goddard's proposed salary range to us. This is not in line with the open and transparent approach we would expect in the course of a pre-appointment process.

16. The Home Secretary also refused to tell us how many candidates she had interviewed for the post, saying she did not believe it would be appropriate for her to do so. We are disappointed with this response, which does not display the openness and transparency we would expect from the Home Secretary towards the Select Committee, especially as she had made it clear that she wanted to ensure complete transparency in the process.

17. We welcome the role of this Committee in this pre-appointment hearing, which we believe is a valuable contribution to the independence and transparency of the inquiry process. The Committee's involvement should have been invited from the start.

18. The controversy of the last few months has demonstrated the need for the inquiry to develop a robust methodology for dealing with the conflicting views of different contributors to the inquiry and for demonstrating transparency of the inquiry process whilst maintaining individuals' confidentiality. The panel will need to ensure that different views are heard and taken account of, and that all survivors of abuse have confidence in that process.

¹³ See Appendix 3

2 The candidate

19. The criteria used for selecting the new Chair and Justice Goddard's CV are at Appendices 1 and 2. During the evidence session we questioned Justice Goddard about, in particular:

- a) real or perceived conflicts of interest in relation to her past experience and her other current commitments, and how she would deal with any conflicts in the future;
- b) the relationship between the Inquiry and the Home Office, and between the Inquiry and this Committee;
- c) how she would demonstrate her authority and independence and how she would restore public confidence in the inquiry; and
- d) her relevant expertise.

20. Justice Goddard has a high degree of professional competence. **Based on the information available to us, we are pleased to endorse the appointment of Justice Lowell Goddard to the post of Chair of the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse.**

21. **We note that Justice Goddard had not previously been asked to write an open letter detailing her interests in time for it to be presented to this Committee; we believe that this should happen as soon as possible. We reserve the right to recall Justice Goddard, once we have received the relevant correspondence, should it disclose any new information which might give cause for concern.**

22. **We also make the following recommendations concerning the future management of the Inquiry:**

- a) **Members of the Inquiry Panel should be chosen primarily for their specialist expertise and experience in areas that are likely to be covered by the investigation, as well as in providing support for survivors, and in providing redress for victims.**
- b) **We can see the logic of Justice Goddard's comment that survivors did not need to be represented on the Panel, but only provided that a parallel Survivors' Forum is established on a formal basis, with strong links to the Inquiry Panel. Its remit, status and relationship with the Panel should be clear from the outset and it should be properly funded to provide the necessary support to its members.**
- c) **We were encouraged by Justice Goddard's undertaking that no survivor who did not want to do so would be required to give evidence in public. The Panel should do everything within its power to ensure that survivors are able to give their best evidence, including the use of the "special measures" that are used in court to help vulnerable and intimidated witnesses and, where necessary, taking evidence in private.**

- d) **The Home Office should re-examine the arrangements for providing funding to support survivors' participation to ensure that smaller organisations are able to access those resources.**
- e) **The Panel should give consideration to employing its own specialist staff to provide support to survivors giving evidence.**
- f) **The Panel should have access to all relevant Government material, including all the material discovered by the Wanless and Whittam review, and the Permanent Secretary of the Home Office should conduct a new search to establish that no relevant documents have been overlooked.**
- g) **Careful thought needs to be given to the composition of the secretariat, in which Home Office secondees currently appear to be very well represented. Members of the secretariat should be chosen for their skills and the Panel should look well beyond the Home Office and the civil service if that is necessary to produce the right skill mix.**
- h) **The Chair of the Inquiry should fully consult the Chairs of the Northern Ireland Inquiry into Historical Institutional Abuse and the Scottish national public inquiry into historical abuse of children in institutional care, with particular regard to seeking to avoid gaps between the areas covered by the various inquiries.**
- i) **The Chair should consult the Director of Public Prosecutions to ensure that all avenues for bringing successful prosecutions against abusers are kept open.**
- j) **The Panel should produce periodic interim reports as frequently as it sees fit but should aim to produce its first interim report as soon as possible.**
- k) **The Panel should look to the examples of Hillsborough and Leveson as well-run, focused, and victim-centred inquiries.**

Future of the inquiry

23. Although the original Panel got off to something of a false start, it is important that the material from the Panel's work, especially its listening meetings with survivors, is considered by the new statutory inquiry, providing it with a base to build on. Some continuity in the Panel membership, as well as the secretariat, would help to ensure that the work of the last seven months has an impact on the outcome of the inquiry. It will nonetheless be important for Justice Goddard to meet survivors herself, to discuss how the inquiry should proceed, within the framework of the 2005 Act.

Appointment of the new panel and staff

24. **It is crucial that the Chair will play a full role in the selection of Panel members, that it should be clear with whom the final decision lies, and that the selection process should be fully transparent from the outset.**

25. We note with approval the 2014 recommendation from the House of Lords Select Committee on the Inquiries Act 2005, that the Act should be amended to include a

provision specifying that the chairman, and only the chairman, may appoint the counsel to the inquiry.¹⁴ **We are pleased that Justice Goddard will have a free hand over the appointment of the Inquiry Counsel and Secretariat, as she acknowledged when she gave evidence to us. She must be permitted to shape the Inquiry team as she thinks appropriate.**

Scope of the inquiry

26. The terms of reference for the original Panel confined the scope of its inquiry to England and Wales, with an undertaking that any relevant material would be passed to the devolved administrations. Several people have suggested to us that the scope of the inquiry should be extended to include the whole of the United Kingdom, and in particular the abuse which took place at the Kincora Boys' Home in Belfast in the 1970s. Child protection is a devolved matter in Northern Ireland, and the Northern Ireland Executive has established its own Historic Institutional Abuse Inquiry, which began work at the beginning of 2014. However, that Inquiry's powers of compulsion do not extend to the UK Government, which calls into doubt whether it will be able to deal effectively with allegations of the possible involvement of UK Government agencies in the abuse. Justice Goddard told us, quite understandably, that she was not familiar with the details of the Kincora case and had not yet given any thought to its inclusion in her Inquiry.

27. In September 2014, the Northern Ireland Assembly resolved, without a vote,

That this Assembly notes with deep concern the allegations of sexual abuse that took place in Kincora Boys' Home during the 1970s and 1980s; further notes allegations that senior politicians, military personnel, paramilitary figures and businessmen from Northern Ireland and Great Britain were involved in the commissioning and subsequent cover-up of the abuse, as well as allegations that members of the intelligence service were complicit in a cover-up of this scandal; believes that the nature and seriousness of the allegations, especially that MI5 was involved in a cover-up, means that this cannot be adequately considered in any way other than a Westminster Government-led inquiry; and urges the Home Secretary to include Kincora Boys' Home in the inquiry by Fiona Woolf as the most appropriate means of achieving truth and justice.¹⁵

We recommend that the scope of the inquiry be extended to include cases of abuse in Scotland and Northern Ireland, where there is reason to believe that material relevant to the case might be held by the UK Government. This would include cases such as the Kincora Boys' Home.

28. A further concern has been the cut-off date of 1970 in the original terms of reference. Survivors have pointed out that many of them suffered childhood abuse before this date, and the arbitrary cut-off will prevent the inquiry from considering their experiences. **We welcome the Home Secretary's announcement that she is open to giving the Panel a**

¹⁴ [HL Paper 143 \(2013–14\)](#), p. 69

¹⁵ [Official Report of the Northern Ireland Assembly, Volume 97, No 8 \(Tuesday 30 September 2014\)](#), p. 41

much earlier cut-off date than 1970, which will give a reasonable prospect of the experience of most living survivors falling within the scope of the inquiry.

29. It is clear from the scale and scope of the task concerned that the inquiry will take several years. However, the opportunity to take any further action which the inquiry might find to be necessary to address any failings it might identify should not be delayed unnecessarily. **We recommend that the Panel draw up terms of reference which will allow it to complete its work within a reasonable time frame, producing interim reports where necessary to ensure that key recommendations can be implemented without unnecessary delay.**

Conclusions and recommendations

The Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse

1. There were well-publicised problems with the appointment of the Panel, which resulted in the early resignation of two previous Chairs. It is important that a Chair is now appointed who will command the confidence of survivors. (Paragraph 7)
2. We thank all the members of the original Panel for their work. The work that has already been done, in particular the material gathered at listening meetings, must be made available to the new Panel. The original Panel was unable to operate effectively without leadership and the appointment of a Chair for the new Panel should not be delayed further. The terms of reference for the inquiry need to be established and the new Panel appointed as quickly as possible so that the inquiry team can get to work. Parliament must be kept actively informed about the future work of the inquiry. (Paragraph 13)
3. We welcome the role of this Committee in this pre-appointment hearing, which we believe is a valuable contribution to the independence and transparency of the inquiry process. The Committee's involvement should have been invited from the start. (Paragraph 17)
4. The controversy of the last few months has demonstrated the need for the inquiry to develop a robust methodology for dealing with the conflicting views of different contributors to the inquiry and for demonstrating transparency of the inquiry process whilst maintaining individuals' confidentiality. The panel will need to ensure that different views are heard and taken account of, and that all survivors of abuse have confidence in that process. (Paragraph 18)

The candidate

5. Based on the information available to us, we are pleased to endorse the appointment of Justice Lowell Goddard to the post of Chair of the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse. (Paragraph 20)
6. We note that Justice Goddard had not previously been asked to write an open letter detailing her interests in time for it to be presented to this Committee; we believe that this should happen as soon as possible. We reserve the right to recall Justice Goddard, once we have received the relevant correspondence, should it disclose any new information which might give cause for concern. (Paragraph 21)
7. Members of the Inquiry Panel should be chosen primarily for their specialist expertise and experience in areas that are likely to be covered by the investigation, as well as in providing support for survivors, and in providing redress for victims. (Paragraph 22.a)
8. We can see the logic of Justice Goddard's comment that survivors did not need to be represented on the Panel, but only provided that a parallel Survivors' Forum is established on a formal basis, with strong links to the Inquiry Panel. Its remit, status

and relationship with the Panel should be clear from the outset and it should be properly funded to provide the necessary support to its members. (Paragraph 22.b)

9. We were encouraged by Justice Goddard's undertaking that no survivor who did not want to do so would be required to give evidence in public. The Panel should do everything within its power to ensure that survivors are able to give their best evidence, including the use of the "special measures" that are used in court to help vulnerable and intimidated witnesses and, where necessary, taking evidence in private. (Paragraph 22.c)
10. The Home Office should re-examine the arrangements for providing funding to support survivors' participation to ensure that smaller organisations are able to access those resources. (Paragraph 22.d)
11. The Panel should give consideration to employing its own specialist staff to provide support to survivors giving evidence. (Paragraph 22.e)
12. The Panel should have access to all relevant Government material, including all the material discovered by the Wanless and Whittam review, and the Permanent Secretary of the Home Office should conduct a new search to establish that no relevant documents have been overlooked. (Paragraph 22.f)
13. Careful thought needs to be given to the composition of the secretariat, in which Home Office secondees currently appear to be very well represented. Members of the secretariat should be chosen for their skills and the Panel should look well beyond the Home Office and the civil service if that is necessary to produce the right skill mix. (Paragraph 22.g)
14. The Chair of the Inquiry should fully consult the Chairs of the Northern Ireland Inquiry into Historical Institutional Abuse and the Scottish national public inquiry into historical abuse of children in institutional care, with particular regard to seeking to avoid gaps between the areas covered by the various inquiries. (Paragraph 22.h)
15. The Chair should consult the Director of Public Prosecutions to ensure that all avenues for bringing successful prosecutions against abusers are kept open. (Paragraph 22.i)
16. The Panel should produce periodic interim reports as frequently as it sees fit but should aim to produce its first interim report as soon as possible. (Paragraph 22.j)
17. The Panel should look to the examples of Hillsborough and Leveson as well-run, focused, and victim-centred inquiries. (Paragraph 22.k)

Appointment of the new panel and staff

18. It is crucial that the Chair will play a full role in the selection of Panel members, that it should be clear with whom the final decision lies, and that the selection process should be fully transparent from the outset. (Paragraph 24)

19. We are pleased that Justice Goddard will have a free hand over the appointment of the Inquiry Counsel and Secretariat, as she acknowledged when she gave evidence to us. She must be permitted to shape the Inquiry team as she thinks appropriate. (Paragraph 25)

Scope of the inquiry

20. We recommend that the scope of the inquiry be extended to include cases of abuse in Scotland and Northern Ireland, where there is reason to believe that material relevant to the case might be held by the UK Government. This would include cases such as the Kincora Boys' Home. (Paragraph 27)
21. We welcome the Home Secretary's announcement that she is open to giving the Panel a much earlier cut-off date than 1970, which will give a reasonable prospect of the experience of most living survivors falling within the scope of the inquiry. (Paragraph 28)
22. We recommend that the Panel draw up terms of reference which will allow it to complete its work within a reasonable time frame, producing interim reports where necessary to ensure that key recommendations can be implemented without unnecessary delay. (Paragraph 29)

Appendix 1: Home Office Criteria for Chairman

The Chairman must have the appropriate skills and expertise, and must pass set due diligence checks.

1. Skills

- Leadership – experience of leading large, important and sensitive areas of work
- Respect – can command the respect, confidence and trust of survivors and Panel members
- Authority – someone who can command the respect of those in organisations and institutions
- Objectivity – someone who can consider complex information and give an impartial view
- Professionalism – someone who will work collectively as part of a team and acts with integrity at all times.
- Resilience – someone who has the capacity to manage stressful situations and is able to operate in challenging circumstances.

2. Expertise

- Knowledge – understands child sexual abuse and safeguarding and/or the institutions and organisations involved. Also appreciates the long-term impacts on adults who have experienced sexual abuse in childhood.
- Experience – has worked with vulnerable people, on sensitive issues, and/or on investigations and complex lines of enquiry that involve the collection of evidence.

3. Due diligence

- No personal links to those who have been convicted, or are subject to police investigation, of child sexual abuse
- No direct links to key institutions or individuals reasonably likely to be covered by the Inquiry
- DBS enhanced check

Appendix 2: CV of Hon Justice Lowell Goddard

Career

Justice Lowell Goddard is a serving Judge of the High Court of New Zealand and a highly respected member of the judiciary who has been at the forefront of criminal law and procedure.

Graduating with an LLB from the University of Auckland in 1974 she was admitted to the Bar in 1975. In 1977 she commenced practice as a barrister and was appointed Queen's Counsel in 1988.

In her earlier years of practice as a barrister she worked as a member of the steering committee which helped establish the HELP Clinic for sexual abuse victims (assisting Police to establish a better environment for and approach to the examination and interviewing of victims of sexual abuse); as a member of the Race Relations Conciliators advisory committee on youth and law; as a participant in the youth advocacy pilot for children and young people; as a board member of Odyssey House for drug dependency; and as a member of the department of Social Welfare's children-in-care review panel.

She was appointed Deputy Solicitor-General for New Zealand in 1992 and then to the High Court bench in December 1995. She has also sat as a member of the Criminal Division of the Court of Appeal.

In 2007 she was appointed Chair of the Independent Police Conduct Authority, the first New Zealand woman to hold the position. Whilst she was Chair the authority released a report on the outcome of its inquiry into Police handling of child abuse cases (begun in August 2009).

Through her work at the IPCA Justice Goddard was elected as an independent expert to the United Nations Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture, which is a human rights body with international oversight of places of custody and detention.

In June 2014 she was appointed a Dame Companion of the New Zealand Order of Merit for services to law.

Personal Life

Born 25 November 1948 in Auckland, New Zealand she is married to Christopher John Hodson QC and has three step-children and one daughter from her first marriage.

Her interests are gardening, her family and grandchildren, and thoroughbred racing, breeding and eventing. She is a supporter of SPCA (Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals) and Amnesty International. Justice Goddard is also on the Grants Committee of the CatWalk Trust for spinal cord injury research and was on the board of trustees for Idea Services (formerly the Intellectually Handicapped Children's Society).

Appendix 3: Letter from the Home Secretary dated 11 February 2015

Thank you for your letter of 9 February about the pre-appointment hearing for the chairman of the independent inquiry into child sexual abuse, in which you asked for additional information on the selection process and terms of appointment.

There were over 150 nominations for the position of chairman. These nominations came from survivors, survivors' representatives, MPs, and members of the public. In addition, the Home Office also contacted Commonwealth countries, via the Foreign Office, to identify any suitable candidates.

Each and every name was assessed against a set of criteria, incorporating the views of survivors on the most important factors. This included the appropriate skills to carry out this complex task; experience of the subject matter; and the absence of any direct links to any individual about whom people may have concerns or any institution, or organisation, that might fall under the scope of the inquiry. These criteria were published last Thursday; I attach them for your convenience. Assessing the nominations against these criteria resulted in a shortlist of candidates for chairman. It would not be appropriate for me to share who was on that shortlist.

Justice Goddard will be paid in line with other public appointments of this nature. The Inquiry Secretariat will be publishing the costs for the inquiry in due course.

Justice Goddard has already been through substantial checks and in-depth interviews as part of the due diligence process. In addition to this, and as I have discussed with her, prior to her appointment she will write an open letter to me declaring all relevant interests. This letter will be published on the inquiry website.

Rt Hon Theresa May MP

Home Secretary

Formal Minutes

Wednesday 11 February 2015

Keith Vaz, in the Chair

Nicola Blackwood
James Clappison
Michael Ellis
Lorraine Fullbrook

Dr Julian Huppert
Tim Loughton
Yasmin Qureshi
Mr David Winnick

Draft Report (*Appointment of the Chair of the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 29 read and agreed to.

A Paper was appended to the Report as Appendix 1.

A Paper was appended to the Report as Appendix 2.

A Paper was appended to the Report as Appendix 3.

Resolved, That the Report be the Twelfth Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chair make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available, in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order No. 134.

[Adjourned till Tuesday 24 February at 1.15 pm]

Witnesses

Tuesday 21 October 2014

Fiona Woolf, Chair of the independent inquiry into historical child sexual abuse Q 1-111

Tuesday 11 November 2014

Alison Millar, Counsel for the victims groups, **Peter Saunders**, Chief Executive, National Association for People Abused in Childhood (NAPAC), and **Hilary Willmer**, Chair, Parents against child sexual exploitation (PACE); Q 112-144

Peter Wanless and **Richard Whittam QC** Q 145-191

Tuesday 20 January 2015

Drusilla Sharpling CBE, Member, **Professor Jenny Pearce OBE**, Member, **Sharon Evans**, Member, and **Professor Alexis Jay OBE**, Expert Advisor, Independent Panel Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse Q 192-277

Monday 26 January 2015

Ben Emmerson QC, Counsel to the Independent Panel Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse Q 278-367

Wednesday 11 February 2015

The Honourable Justice Lowell Goddard, Chair-designate of the Statutory Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse Q 368-456

List of printed written evidence

The following written evidence was received and can be viewed on the Committee's inquiry web page at <http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/home-affairs-committee/inquiries/parliament-2010/historic-child-abuse/>. HCA numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

- 1 Angela Kyle, Head of Secretariat, Independent Panel Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse ([HCA0007](#))
- 2 Ben Emmerson QC, Counsel to the Independent Panel Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse ([HCA0006](#))
- 3 Fiona Woolf, Chair of the independent inquiry into historical child sexual abuse ([HCA0001](#)); ([HCA0002](#))
- 4 Rt Hon Theresa May MP, Home Secretary ([HCA0003](#)); ([HCA0004](#)); ([HCA0005](#)); ([HCA0014](#))

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

All publications from the Committee are available on the Committee's website at <http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/home-affairs-committee/publications/>

Session 2014–15

First Report	Tobacco smuggling	HC 200
Second Report	Female genital mutilation: the case for a national action plan	HC 201
Third Report	The work of the Immigration Directorates (Oct–Dec 2013)	HC 237
Fourth Report	Her Majesty's Passport Office: delays in processing applications	HC 238
Fifth Report	Police, the media, and high-profile criminal investigations	HC 629
Sixth Report	Child sexual exploitation and the response to localised grooming: follow-up	HC 203
Seventh Report	Effectiveness of the Committee in 2012-13	HC 825
Eighth Report	Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000	HC 711
Ninth Report	The work of the Immigration Directorates (January-June 2014)	HC 712
Eleventh Report	Policing and mental health	HC 202

Session 2013–14

First Report	Police and Crime Commissioners: Register of Interests	HC 69
Second Report	Child sexual exploitation and the response to localised grooming	HC 68
Third Report	Leadership and standards in the police	HC 67
Fourth Report	The work of the UK Border Agency (Oct–Dec 2012)	HC 486
Fifth Report	E-crime	HC 70
Sixth Report	Police and Crime Commissioners: power to remove Chief Constables	HC 487
Seventh Report	Asylum	HC 71
Eighth Report	The work of the UK Border Agency (Jan–March 2013)	HC 616
Ninth Report	Pre-Lisbon Treaty EU police and criminal justice measures: the UK's opt-in decision	HC 615
Tenth Report	Leadership and Standards in the Police: follow-up	HC 756
Eleventh Report	Khat	HC 869
Twelfth Report	Drugs: new psychoactive substances and prescription drugs	HC 819
Thirteenth Report	The work of the Permanent Secretary	HC 233
Fourteenth Report	The Government's Response to the Committees' Reports on the 2014 block opt-out decision	HC 1177
Fifteenth Report	The work of the Immigration Directorates (April–Sep 2013)	HC 820

Sixteenth Report	Police and Crime Commissioners: Progress to date	HC 757
Seventeenth Report	Counter-terrorism	HC 231
Eighteenth Report	Reform of the Police Federation	HC 1163

Session 2012–13

First Report	Effectiveness of the Committee in 2010–12	HC 144
Second Report	Work of the Permanent Secretary (April–Dec 2011)	HC 145
Third Report	Pre-appointment Hearing for Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Constabulary	HC 183
Fourth Report	Private Investigators	HC 100
Fifth Report	The work of the UK Border Agency (Dec 2011–Mar 2012)	HC 71
Sixth Report	The work of the Border Force	HC 523
Seventh Report	Olympics Security	HC 531
Eighth Report	The work of the UK Border Agency (April–June 2012)	HC 603
Ninth Report	Drugs: Breaking the Cycle	HC 184-I
Tenth Report	Powers to investigate the Hillsborough disaster: interim Report on the Independent Police Complaints Commission	HC 793
Eleventh Report	Independent Police Complaints Commission	HC 494
Twelfth Report	The draft Anti-social Behaviour Bill: pre-legislative scrutiny	HC 836
Thirteenth Report	Undercover Policing: Interim Report	HC 837
Fourteenth Report	The work of the UK Border Agency (July–Sept 2012)	HC 792

Session 2010–12

First Report	Immigration Cap	HC 361
Second Report	Policing: Police and Crime Commissioners	HC 511
Third Report	Firearms Control	HC 447
Fourth Report	The work of the UK Border Agency	HC 587
Fifth Report	Police use of Tasers	HC 646
Sixth Report	Police Finances	HC 695
Seventh Report	Student Visas	HC 773
Eighth Report	Forced marriage	HC 880
Ninth Report	The work of the UK Border Agency (Nov 2010–March 2011)	HC 929
Tenth Report	Implications for the Justice and Home Affairs area of the accession of Turkey to the European Union	HC 789
Eleventh Report	Student Visas–follow up	HC 1445
Twelfth Report	Home Office–Work of the Permanent Secretary	HC 928
Thirteenth Report	Unauthorised tapping into or hacking of mobile communications	HC 907
Fourteenth Report	New Landscape of Policing	HC 939
Fifteenth Report	The work of the UK Border Agency (April–July 2011)	HC 1497
Sixteenth Report	Policing large scale disorder	HC 1456
Seventeenth Report	UK Border Controls	HC 1647
Eighteenth Report	Rules governing enforced removals from the UK	HC 563
Nineteenth Report	Roots of violent radicalisation	HC 1446

Twentieth Report	Extradition	HC 644
Twenty-first Report	Work of the UK Border Agency (August-Dec 2011)	HC 1722