

	A	B	C
1	Rule 9	Title	Summary
2	Rule 9 (1) & (1a) & (1b) DRAFT	List of deceased patients	In summary, the List of Deceased provided at Exhibit 1 was compiled from - a. Electronic patient record (EPR) system reports used to produce previous iterations of the list provided to EMHII, given the majority of patients remain in scope of the Inquiry. b. Additional reports obtained from the current and historic EPR systems and databases, to account for the Inquiry's wider scope; c. Further manual trawls of - i. Electronic records, repositories, spreadsheets and drives, ii. Reports under the Serious Incident and Patient Safety Incident Response Frameworks, iii. Incident forms, iv. Datix and its predecessor systems, v. Service Data (i.e. inpatient ward information) vi. Judiciary website
3	Rule 9 (2) & (5) & (5a) & (5b) DRAFT	Time to Care & Time to Care Follow Up & Time to Care Exhibits & Time to Care Queries	N/A (statements written from current knowledge)
4	Rule 9 (3) & (3a) & (3b) & (3c) & (3d)	Oxevision, CCTV and Body Worn Camera	Statement was primarily written from current knowledge but some incident data was collected to provide the figures of when Oxevision supported staff intervention into self harm and falls, and searches for policies, reports and CCTV information. Review of medical records systems to find a few examples of patients requesting Oxevision be turned off. EPUT has been unable to exactly establish when CCTV was in use for all inpatient units across former North Essex Partnership University NHS Trust (NEP) and former South Essex Partnership University NHS Foundation Trust (SEPT). EPUT has been able to locate policies for former SEPT going back to the year 2005, and former NEP from 2013. Some maintenance documents have been located which suggest that CCTV was in place at former NEP inpatient sites in 2013 and EPUT holds some footage dating back to 2012; however, no plans showing the location of CCTV cameras going this far back in time have been located. CCTV cameras when operational/without fault record 24 hour a day 7 days a week.

	D
1	Systems Searched
2	Mobius Paris IAPTUS Excelicare SystmOne EMIS Shared Drives Archive Boxes (Incident Forms) - Paper Datix RichClient (SEPT and NEP Datix) Respond Judiciary
3	N/A
4	Datix Mobius Paris iwantgreatcare Shared Drives

	E
1	Search Criteria EPR reports - Patients who had a date of death recorded where the death occurred during their inpatient stay or within 4 months following their discharge from an inpatient ward (to ensure all dates of death were correct and to identify any that fell within the scope). The extended window enables the inclusion of any late data from HM Coroner, received after the timeline. HM Coroner's office makes contact with EPUT to enquire as to whether a patient has been known to mental health services, in case information the Trust holds may assist with the inquest. Cases in which the hospital spell of the patient ended through death or discharge between 1 January 2000 and 31 December 2020 (i.e. the timeframe within scope of the EMHII). Cases in which the hospital spell of the patient ended through death or discharge between 1 January 2021 and 31 December 2023 (i.e. the extended timeframe of the Inquiry). To identify patients under 'gatekeeping', the relevant gatekeeping teams were identified. The Business Analysis and Reporting Team extracted data from Paris, Mobius, and legacy systems, identifying patients who sadly died within 4 months of their last recorded assessment where the patient was not admitted as it was determined that their treatment needs could be met within the community setting. Respond - details of SIs and complaints, and also includes inquests. Datix/RichClient - details related to SI, PSIRF and inquests. Archive boxes - incident forms Judiciary website - for Prevention of Future Death Reports. Shared drives - electronic reports, repositories, spreadsheets, reports under the Serious Incident and Patient Safety Incident Response Frameworks, incident forms, and service Data (i.e. inpatient ward information).
2	N/A
3	
4	Datix - Self Harm and Falls Incidents that had Oxevision field completed as having supported intervention, and feedback regarding Oxevision, CCTV and BWC. iwantgreatcare - feedback regarding Oxevision, CCTV and BWC Medical Records Systems (Mobius and Paris) - Searching for care plans of patients who had requested for Oxevision to be turned off Shared Drives searched for policies and CCTV plans.

	F
1	Relevant Paragraphs
	Rule 9 (1b) - 7, 9-92
2	
	N/A
3	
	86
4	

	A	B	C
5	Rule 9 (4) DRAFT	Op Shildon	The Trust does not hold a complete set of data for sexual safety incidents for the whole period under review by the Inquiry. This is due to significant changes to hospital site configurations, services, IT systems, records storage, personnel, and large scale organisational changes in Essex. We have taken significant steps through searching a number of different sources to ensure we have captured as many incidents as possible. Manual trawls were undertaken to try to obtain, as comprehensive and accurate information as possible but, due to the size and volume of some of the records, there is the possibility that some of the details may have been missed. It is also possible that an appeal was lodged by the alleged perpetrator or complainant and this has not been located during the search, meaning the outcome detailed may have changed to that detailed in the column. The Team have also encountered password-protected documents, which they have been unable to open and therefore review the information contained to provide in the table across all columns.
6	Rule 9 (6) & (6a) & (6b)	Wards List & Wards and Services & Wards and Services	A review of various systems and historic documents to collate a list of the wards that have existed during the relevant period along with summary information requested by the Inquiry. For out of area beds, locally maintained logs were reviewed and Provider Collaborative logs were obtained. A manual review of SI reports and medical records was completed. For bed occupancy, collated data from Electronic Patient Record systems (provided by the Business Analytics and Reporting Team). Requested details of staff members who worked in the Trust in early 2000s so current employed colleagues could be approached - organisation memory
7	Rule 9 (7) & (7a) & (7b)	PFD and Inquest	A search of various systems and shared drive locations that were the expected places that PFDs to have been stored within. Each of the systems have their own search requirements. Example - shared drive high level searches were conducted across our team drive, PSIM and Inquest Team and used incident number (Datix) and patient surname. Also reviewed each of the folders where individual cases are stored without the high/top level search

	D
5	Laserfiche Archive boxes (incident forms) - Paper Shared Drives Datix RichClient (SEPT and NEP Datix) Respond Ulysses
6	Shared Drives Provider collaborative logs Inquiry Project Team's locally held documents within its shared drive Data from Electronic Patient Record systems (provided by the Business Analytics and Reporting Team) Google search CCF Policy library Financial logs
7	Shared Drives Judiciary Website Respond Datix RichClient (SEPT and NEP Datix) CCF Courts and Tribunals Judiciary website

	E
5	Datix/RichClient/Respond/Ulysses - search criteria included any incidents reported under the Sexual Safety/Behaviour categories where available (NEP database did not record this) and any incidents in which Sexual Safety/Behaviour has been recorded as a contributing factor. Shared drives searches used to identify concerns raised not on Datix or to source information not included in the Datix/RichClient/Respond/Ulysses. Folders searched HR, Safeguarding, FTSU, professional registration referrals, Complaints, Inquiry safeguarding letters, subject access requests, claims) Archive boxes searches used to identify concerns raised not on Datix/RichClient/Respond/Ulysses or on shared drives. Laserfiche searches used to identify concerns raised not on Datix/RichClient/Respond/Ulysses or on shared drives or in archived boxes.
6	Searching for evidence and details of wards that have existed during the relevant period of the Lampard Inquiry Any ward or hospital site within the source was reviewed to obtain information for the spreadsheet (as detailed in column D) In relation to the out of area admissions, as the data provided came from a number of sources including spreadsheets and through manual reviews of SI/PSIRF reports and medical records, the Project Team triangulated the information provided in as much detail as possible. There were occasions where the original source contained partial information, such as an NHS number, so access to the medical records was required in order to clarify the information and obtain details of where the patient was admitted to out of area and the dates. In addition, some of the spreadsheets contained details of the type of ward the patient was transferred to and where we were able to identify the gender the patient and review the wards at the hospital site detailed, we were able to narrow down the name of the ward. Example re - the above - NHS number and 'PICU' and hospital site may be on the spreadsheet source, we accessed the medical records to obtain the dates of admission and transfer/discharge and the patient's gender. In this example lets say the patient was male, dates were in the records but the name of the ward was not. On review of the provider website, using the hospital site the patient went to, where we identified there was one male PICU ward, we took that as the ward.
7	IT conducted shared drive searches of the Patient Safety Incident Management Team, Inquest Team folders using the patient name and provided a return of no documents re - PFDs Judiciary website included 'EPUT' and the name of the patient Respond - patient name, DOB Datix - incident number, patient name, NHS number, DOB RichClient - incident number, patient name, DOB CCF - patient name, DOB Searches have been run on the Trust's electronic drives using the patient's full name, dates which correlate with the patient's date of death and inquest date. The Trust does not have in place search software and therefore have relied upon the documents being saved with the patient's correct spelling of name.

	F
159	
5	Complete statement
6	Rule 9 (7b) - paragraphs 22-24
7	

	A	B	C
8	Rule 9 (8) & (8a)	Ligature points	Incident data was collected from a variety of sources to provide summary data about ligature incidents
9	Rule 9 (9) DRAFT	Staff Feedback	EPUT does not hold a complete set of data for the whole period under review by the Inquiry. This is due to significant changes to hospital site configurations, services, Information Technology (IT) systems, records storage, personnel, and large-scale organisational changes in Essex. EPUT has taken significant steps, through searching a number of different sources, to ensure we have captured as much information as reasonably possible in relation to the matters being discussed in the witness statement request.

	D
8	Datix RichClient (SEPT and NEP Datix) Respond Ulysses Archive Boxes (Incident Forms) - Paper ESR (Training Courses) Intranet (Training Tracker) Shared Drives
9	Shared drives Archive boxes - Paper MP letters - Paper Shared Drives Laserfiche Intranet (downloaded archive files of I'm worried about and listening to you) Education Training Surveys (NETS) GMC National Training Survey Electronic Staff Record (ESR)

	E
8	Incident data was extracted directly from EPUT's live Datix system using the following search criteria - •Type - Incident Affecting Patient •Category - Self-Harm •Sub Category - Ligature Incident data was extracted from NEP's Datix database via the RichClient platform using the following search criteria - •Type - Incident Affecting Patient •Code - Ligature involved Incident data was extracted from SEPT's Datix database via the RichClient platform using the following search criteria - •Type - Incident Affecting Patient •Category - Self-Harm •Sub Category - Ligature Identifying relevant incidents that weren't categorised as ligature on SEPT and NEP Datix was achieved using a keyword search followed by manual review (outlined in the Rule 9 response statement) Identification of ligature incidents in paper incident forms was following a manual review of archive boxes known to contain incident forms. Audit data was collected from Datix and RichClient. To collect audit data from before auditing was introduced on Datix, documents were collated from the shared drives used by the Risk Teams.
9	Feedback - has been collected from shared drives from the following sources staff survey (from 2003), staff friends and family tests (2014/15), national pulse survey (2021), organisational change from 2007), listening to you/I'm worried about (circa 2012), staff side meetings (2012), Consultant Meetings (2011), National Education Training Survey (2022), GMC National Training Survey (2015). Complaints/Grievances - The Trust currently records all grievances raised on the Electronic Staff Record (ESR). This process was first introduced in 2017 and has been updated and revised in iterations up until this time. The use of a spreadsheet was in place for former SEPT from 2011; prior to this the information was held in electronic drives. Former NEP recorded the information on the ESR from 2007; prior to this the information was held in electronic drives. FTSU - concerns raised are transferred by the Guardian onto a Microsoft Excel case management spreadsheet. This process has been in place since 2017, although the process and maintenance of the spreadsheet has varied as each Guardian's practice may have differed slightly depending on their understanding and guidance received at the time. The Guardian Service' held all records relating matters raised with them by staff at former NEP. EPUT does not have access to this information. FTSU reviewed and provided the information on a spreadsheet. Whistleblowing - former NEP recorded whistleblowing information in individual files in the HR electronic drive. Former SEPT from 2011 recorded information on an excel spreadsheet. FTSU whistleblowing determined by - Any "wrongdoing" which is in the public interest which could affect the general public A criminal offence The breach of a legal obligation by an organisation A miscarriage of justice Someone's health and safety being in danger Damage to the environment The covering up of wrongdoing Concerns of sexual safety and discrimination have also been included due to the potential to affect either patients or staff in other organisations External concerns - this has been collated from information received from the CQC, GMC, NMC and MP from staff. The Trust does not hold a complete record for former NEP or SEPT from all external parties, therefore it not possible to confirm the oversight systems in place for external concerns raised by staff for the entire period.

F	
	Rule 9 (8a) - 13-57
8	
	6, 98, 116-119, 189 to 195
9	

	A	B	C
10	Rule 9 (10) & (10a)	Pre-admission mental health assessments	Used the information included within R9(6, 6a, 6b) as this established the gatekeeping teams to focus on during the write up on R9(10 and 10a). List of Gatekeeping Teams provided to BAR Team who extracted the details of where the referral originated from and the assessment type (document name sometimes available). Review of local and Trust-wide policies to obtain details of the nature of the service, and Trust-wide policies related to documents/tools used Paris Team provided breakdown of system changes over period
11	Rule 9 (11) & (11a)	Inpatient pathway	Searches of policy documents and meeting papers to review in order to provide the information included within the statement, in addition to discussions with Subject Matter Experts
12	Rule 9 (12) DRAFT	Inpatient safety and patient safety investigations	Policy reviews, determined by previously submitted Rule 9s, and discussion with SMEs, and review of policies established other documents required and for reviewed. National document/policies explored.
13	Rule 9 (13) & (13a)	Absconds	Incident data was collected from a variety of sources to provide summary data about abscond incidents
14	Rule 9 (14)	HSE Prosecution	Providing documentation relating to the 2014 and 2020 HSE Prosecutions of EPUT and its predecessor trust NEP
15	Rule 9 (15) DRAFT	Ward Environments	Statement primarily written from current knowledge but some searches were completed of the policy shared drive for relevant policies
16	Rule 9 (16)	Investigations	Searches to locate investigations e.g. PSIM Drives, Datix, etc.

	D
10	Mobius Paris CCF Shared drives Intranet Information included within Rule 9 (6, 6a, 6b)
11	Shared drives Committee / meeting papers Trust intranet
12	Datix Shared Drive (relevant teams and collated annual reports) RichClient (SEPT and NEP Datix) Respond
13	Datix RichClient (SEPT and NEP Datix) Respond Ulysses Archive Boxes (Incident Forms) - Paper ESR (Training Courses) Intranet (Training Tracker) Shared Drives
14	Shared Drive Legal Team
15	Shared Drive
16	Emails (via MailSafe) Datix RichClient (SEPT and NEP Datix) CCF Shared Drives

	E
10	Medical Records - Searching for referrals related to teams identified as relevant from the work done to complete Rule 9 (6), (6a) and (6b) Policy review - Searching on the shared drive, commenced with review of CPA and clinical risk and considered other documents referred to within the policies to review. Details of teams in R9(6, 6a, 6b) were used to obtain the service-level policies for review Review of types of assessment documents from BAR Team, extracted from medical records data
11	Policy documents relevant to the topics within the request
12	Annual reports - for finances related to patient safety Review of shared drive documents by team and SMEs for information related to their topic area Review of previously submitted Rule 9s For data related to serious incidents - RichClient (used same dataset obtained for completion of R9s 8 and 13), Datix Review of Respond and locally held logs for complaints and PALS data
13	Incident data directly from EPUT's Datix system using the following criteria - •Type - Incident Affecting Patient •Category - Abscond Incident data was extracted from the legacy Datix RichClient Databases to find Datix incidents NEP and SEPT, going back to 2009 and 2010 respectively, using the same search criteria. Identifying relevant incidents that weren't categorised as abscond on SEPT and NEP Datix was achieved using a keyword search followed by manual review (outlined in the Rule 9 response statement)
14	Shared drive - searches for information provided as part of the HSE prosecution, PFD, Record of Inquest information and claims.
15	Looking for policies relevant to ward environments (especially from a therapeutic perspective) Searches of the estates shared drive for copies of floorplans completed by estates colleagues with knowledge of where these were stored
16	Review of internal logs for name of report author (for patients in scope of the Inquiry), review of Datix report authors (2017-onwards) Policy library for policies SI reports - Project Team drive, Datix, PSIM Team drive Witness statements - Respond, RichClient, CCF, Datix, PSIM Team and Inquest shared drive, Project Team shared drive. Using patient name, DOB (incident number for Datix and PSIM Team drive) ligature assessments, utilised the ones which were reviewed under R9(13) and provided those which were completed by the staff member Email searches of relevant email accounts (outlined in the letter) between the dates 01/08/2019 to 01/04/2020, searching by incident reference number and the patient's name. For sign off meeting minutes - reviewed PSIM Team shared drive for around the time the report was approved, and reviewed emails to obtain direction as to how the report was signed off, and notes from the meeting within. Not located

	F
10	N/A
11	Complete statement
12	Complete statement
13	Rule 9 (13a) - 11-16
14	6, 23
15	N/A
16	Complete Response

	A	B	C
17	Rule 9 (17)	Investigation Reports	SI / PSIRF reports requested for a number of patients. One was not located and one report was conducted by another Trust.
18	Rule 9 (18)	Requests for lists of material held in relation to the July Hearing cases	To locate materials within the remit of the Inquiry's request, within systems where such materials are likely to be stored. Requests for materials were also made to individuals and teams.
19	Rule 9 (19)	[I/S]	This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (18). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (18).
20	Rule 9 (20)		This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (18). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (18).
21	Rule 9 (21)		This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (18). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (18).
22	Rule 9 (22)		This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (18). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (18).
23	Rule 9 (23)		This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (18). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (18).
24	Rule 9 (24)		This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (18). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (18).
25	Rule 9 (25)	Policies	This response is to provide a structured list of relevant policies and documentation used by EPUT to guide the delivery of mental health treatment and care over the 24 years that the Inquiry is investigating
26	Rule 9 (28)	[I/S]	This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (18). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (18).
27	Rule 9 (29)		This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (18). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (18).
28	Rule 9 (30)		This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (18). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (18).
29	Rule 9 (31)		This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (18). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (18).
30	Rule 9 (32)		This statement was made in response to the request by the Inquiry concerning the death of the individual named and EPUT was asked to respond to a series of questions in relation to her care and treatment. Responding to this Rule 9 included identifying and speaking with Trust employees who had direct knowledge of the matters requested.
31	Rule 9 (33)		This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (35). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (35).
32	Rule 9 (34)		This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (35). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (35).

	D
17	Respond RichClient Shared Drive (Patient Safety Incident Management Team)
18	Paris, Mobius, Windip (CCF), Clinical 82, SystmOne, Paper, Theseus, IAPT, Forensic Live Shared Drives Datix RichClient (SEPT and NEP Datix) Respond CCF
19	N/A
20	N/A
21	N/A
22	N/A
23	N/A
24	N/A
25	Archive Boxes (Policies) - Paper Shared Drive
26	N/A
27	N/A
28	N/A
29	N/A
30	Paris Shared drives
31	N/A
32	N/A

	E
17	Respond - patient name RichClient (SEPT and NEP Datix) - patient name Shared Drive (Patient Safety Incident Management Team) - patient name and folder related to the year of the incident No searches for the reports already held by the Inquiry, this was established through review of the Inquiry Project Team shared drive and logs. Searches would have been conducted as outlined above.
18	Searching by name, SI number, Claim number etc. where known for the people the Lampard Inquiry had requested information about in Rule 9 (18)
19	N/A
20	N/A
21	N/A
22	N/A
23	N/A
24	N/A
25	Identify EPUT and predecessor archive arrangements (reviewing shared drive held by Policy Team to confirm what formal documents are held centrally, reviewing merger archives (due diligence) and cross checking against policy team shared drive for any potential gaps, reviewing paper files held in storage using search function). Only centrally held EPUT documents have been provided to date, a structured list of local documents and NEP and SEPT documents to be provided later as agreed with the Inquiry
26	N/A
27	N/A
28	N/A
29	N/A
30	Policies related to the topics raised in the requests Shared Drives searching Claims, Inquests, Complaints ,Patient Safety Incident Management Team
31	N/A
32	N/A

	F
17	Complete Response
18	Complete Response
19	Complete Response
20	Complete Response
21	Complete Response
22	Complete Response
23	Complete Response
24	Complete Response
25	14-33
26	Complete Response
27	Complete Response
28	Complete Response
29	Complete Response
30	Complete Response
31	Complete Response
32	Complete Response

	A	B	C
33	Rule 9 (35)	List of all documents held by EPUT in relation to the individual patients set out in the request	To locate materials within the remit of the Inquiry's request, within systems where such materials are likely to be stored. Requests for materials were also made to individuals and teams.
34	Rule 9 (36)	[I/S]	This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (35). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (35).
35	Rule 9 (37)		[I/S]
36	Rule 9 (38)		This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (35). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (35).
37	Rule 9 (39) DRAFT	Lived Experience	The response covers the period 2000 onwards to current date ,encompassing both predecessor organisations prior to 2017. The scope included systems, policies, and evidence that demonstrated how patient experience and engagement were captured, monitored, and used to inform service improvement and governance arrangements.
38	Rule 9 (40)	[I/S]	This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (35). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (35).
39	Rule 9 (41)		This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (35). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (35).
40	Rule 9 (42)		A request for a list of documents and materials held by the Trust.
41	Rule 9 (43)		This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (35). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (35).
42	Rule 9 (44)		This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (35). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (35).
43	Rule 9 (45) DRAFT	List of all documents held by EPUT in relation to the individual patients set out in the request	Approached the solicitor who represented the Trust at the inquest for all files to be shared. To locate materials within the remit of the Inquiry's request, within systems where such materials are likely to be stored. Requests for materials were also made to individuals and teams.
44	Rule 9 (46)	[I/S]	This response was primarily providing documents
45	Rule 9 (47)		This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (35). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (35).
46	Rule 9 (48)		EPUT has conducted searches across its databases and systems that hold relevant documentation for the time period between the date of Mr Porter's passing, and the post-inquest period. The systems include relevant team shared drive folders, Datix and emails within the inbox used by the Inquest Team, using Mr Porter's name and the incident number that his death was reported under. Approached the solicitor who represented the Trust at the inquest for all files to be shared.
47	Rule 9 (49)		This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (35). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (35).

	D
33	Paris, Mobius, Windip (CCF), Clinical 82, SystmOne, Paper, Theseus, IAPT, Forensic Live Shared drives Datix RichClient (SEPT and NEP Datix) Respond CCF
34	Shared Drive Datix
35	N/A
36	N/A
37	Shared Drives (Policies, Team Drives) External Sources - CQC , Kings Fund, NHS England and Healthwatch Essex
38	N/A
39	N/A
40	Paris Shared drives Datix
41	N/A
42	N/A
43	Paris, Mobius, Windip (CCF), Clinical 82, SystmOne, Paper, Theseus, IAPT, Forensic Live Shared drives Datix RichClient (SEPT and NEP Datix) Respond CCF
44	Shared drives Intranet NHS mail
45	N/A
46	Shared drives Datix NHS Mail
47	N/A

	E
33	Searching by name, SI number, Claim number etc. where known for the people the Lampard Inquiry had requested information about in Rule 9 (35)
	Shared drives - PSIM Team and Inquest Team
34	Datix - incident number, patient name, NHS number, DOB
35	N/A
36	N/A
37	Standardised search terms were applied across team drives, archived drives and relativity outlined in the response letter Discussion and review of information via PALS, Lived Experience Teams, Finance Budgetary Data, Trust Secretary and Nursing and Quality Staff for information related to the specific individual Lived Experience schemes outlined in the Rule 9 Request.
38	N/A
39	N/A
	Searching by name and reference numbers
40	Datix - incident number, patient name, NHS number, DOB
41	N/A
42	N/A
43	Searching by name, SI number, Claim number etc. where known for the people the Lampard Inquiry had requested information about in Rule 9 (45).
	Shared drive - PSIM Team, Inquest Team, Policies Using the patient's name, and the name of the document being searched (e.g. policy name, policy reference number) utilising abbreviations , documents identifiers, alternative and similar titles , dates and search timelines related to urgent care and strategic planning for the relevant time period
44	N/A
45	
46	Searching by name and incident number
47	N/A

	F
33	Complete Response
34	Complete Response
35	N/A
36	Complete Response
37	Complete Response
38	Complete Response
39	Complete Response
40	Complete Response
41	Complete Response
42	Complete Response
43	N/A
44	Complete Response
45	N/A
46	Complete Response
47	Complete Response

	A	B	C
48	Rule 9 (50)	[I/S]	EPUT conducted searches for the documentation and information requested by the Inquiry. This included liaison with staff who were involved with the investigation undertaken (PSIRF) and review of policies.
49	Rule 9 (51)		Conducted searches across Trust shared drive folders, databases and systems that hold relevant historical documentation. Extensive and systematic searches have been conducted to provide the documentation requested, across all known information repositories. Legal representatives contacted for information not held by the Trust.
50	Rule 9 (52)		Searches across Trust shared drive folders, databases and systems that hold relevant documentation for the topic and time period
51	Rule 9 (53)		This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (35). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (35).
52	Rule 9 (55)		This response was primarily providing the documents that were previously located in Rule 9 (35). Any additional searches would be conducted under the same methodology as described for Rule 9 (35).

	D
48	Paris, Mobius, WinDip, Clinical 82, SystmOne, Theseus, IAPT, Forensic Live Datix Shared drives NHS Mail
49	Shared drives (policies, local teams) Datix Relativity Intranet
50	Shared drives Datix PSR Theseus
51	N/A
52	N/A

	E
48	Searching by name, NHS number, date of birth, SI / incident number, policies were obtained using their title as known
49	Search by name and patient identifying information; for the policy this was searched using the name of the document and the reference number
50	Shared drives - Legal shared drive, Inquest shared drive, PSIM shared drive Search by name and patient identifying information / reference number
51	N/A
52	Contact with Head of Patient Safety and Director Nursing to triangulate and support search for Action Plan and CQC Contact Information.

	F
48	Complete Statement
49	Complete Response
50	Complete Response
51	N/A
52	Complete Response