

## **PAC Meeting 14th June 2018**

Chairman,

With regard to requests for clarification that have arisen concerning responses provided by me to Committee Members' questions at the PAC meeting of 17<sup>th</sup> May, I'm happy to provide this clarification.

At the meeting of May 17<sup>th</sup>, my colleagues and I were asked: "Who told the SCA that all women had been informed?" and "Whether this person was in the room".

There was no reference to a particular meeting or exchange.

As the transcript illustrates, Mr Connors replied to the Deputy first and thought, as he can explain, that the person was not in the room. I therefore replied 'No', as I thought there must have been another meeting I wasn't at.

In subsequent explanation and questioning by Deputy O'Brien when he said that the person was a 'CervicalCheck' person, I felt that he must in fact be referring to me. The recent exchanges I had had with the SCA, including teleconferences, concerned a court case. I did not recall the specifics of the questions and answers of those teleconferences. At the PAC on the 17<sup>th</sup> May, I sought to clarify, on two occasions, what would have been the substance of what I could have said.

As the transcript shows, what I tried to say later was: I do not think anyone from CervicalCheck could have said that because it would never have been our understanding that communications with all women had been made. Communication would have issued to the treating clinicians in respect of all women with cytology reviews.

We would have believed that clinicians would have communicated with the women as appropriate.

In the letter from the SCA provided to the PAC of 22<sup>nd</sup> May, the statement "all women whose smear was part of the audit had now been informed or assumed they had been informed by their treating clinicians" is, I believe consistent with what I have said, with what I intended and with the understanding shared with the SCA of what was meant in our exchanges.

I certainly did not intend to cause any confusion or lack of clarity in my responses to the committee and I trust that this helps to resolve any queries

John Gleeson  
14<sup>th</sup> June 2018