

Digital, Culture, Media and Sport Committee

Oral evidence: Sport Governance, HC 320

Wednesday 18 October 2017

Ordered by the House of Commons to be published on 18 October 2017.

[Watch the meeting](#)

Members present: Damian Collins (Chair); Julie Elliott; Paul Farrelly; Simon Hart; Julian Knight; Ian C. Lucas; Christian Matheson; Brendan O'Hara; Rebecca Pow; Jo Stevens; Giles Watling.

Questions 35-323

Witnesses

[I:](#) Eniola Aluko, England Women's Football Player

[II:](#) Lianne Sanderson, England Women's Football Player

[III:](#) Martin Glenn, Chief Executive, Greg Clarke, Chairman, Dan Ashworth, Technical Director, and Rachel Brace, Human Resources Director, The Football Association

Written evidence from witnesses:

Written evidence – [Eniola Aluko](#)

Written evidence – [The Football Association](#)

Examination of witness

Witness: Eniola Aluko

Q35 **Chair:** Good afternoon and welcome to this session of the Digital, Culture, Media and Sport Select Committee as part of our ongoing inquiry into sports governance. Today we are taking evidence from Eniola Aluko, Lianne Sanderson and representatives of The Football Association, to investigate specifically allegations of racism and bullying at the FA that were brought forward by Eni Aluko.

With the permission of the Committee, I am publishing a series of written statements and written evidence, which are available in paper form in the room and which will also be published on the Committee's website. I

appreciate there will be some people in the room who are not familiar with this new evidence that has been published. The one update I would like to give is that the Committee received from The Football Association a copy of Katharine Newton's second report looking at further evidence that had been presented regarding the allegations that had been brought previously by Eni Aluko and supported by Drew Spence. We are publishing Katharine Newton's second report today.

I would like to read out the first line of the conclusion of that report, for the benefit of people who have not had a chance to see it. In that, Katharine Newton says, "I have concluded that on two separate occasions Mark Sampson made ill-judged attempts at humour, which as a matter of law were discriminatory on grounds of race within the meaning of the Equality Act 2010". What that refers to directly is that in Katharine Newton's opinion Mark Sampson did use the term "Ebola" when referring to Eni Aluko's family and that he did make the comment to Drew Spence suggesting that she had been arrested four times, and that on both grounds Katharine Newton believes that the use of the language was discriminatory and a breach of the Equality Act.

What I would like to do now, now that we have established that on the record and the evidence is published, is to welcome Eni Aluko to the Committee today. If I could start with questions on behalf of the Committee to ask you initially what your reaction is to Katharine Newton's second report.

Eniola Aluko: First, I would like to say thank you for inviting me to speak to you today and to give evidence about my case. I appreciate the opportunity to speak openly and freely and I am happy to be here giving evidence.

In terms of my response, I only saw the report an hour ago and so I have not had the opportunity to read everything but, as you have done, I went straight to the conclusion and saw that Katharine Newton had made a determination that both comments were made and were in breach of the Equality Act. My overwhelming emotion is just relief, because it has been a long process getting to this point. I say in my statement that I am not the architect or engineer of any of these circumstances. I have been put in this situation but I was always honest and truthful about those comments and about other comments that I have raised and about the culture of the team under Mark Sampson.

I feel vindicated in that honesty and that truth. I am a human being. I feel relieved because it suggests that it was all worth it to go through that trouble to now have that vindicated.

Q36 **Chair:** You have had support from some of your teammates and from the PFA, but has this at times felt like a fairly lonely process where you have had to challenge The Football Association on what has been a lengthy process where you have tried to get these issues properly examined?

Eniola Aluko: Yes, I have certainly felt isolated in terms of the process. I did not want it to be as adversarial as it has become in terms of The

Football Association versus Eni Aluko. I say in my statement that I have had a very good relationship with The Football Association up until two years ago, so that disappoints me. That has felt very isolating because the FA is a huge institution. I have not spoken to many individuals that I used to speak to at the FA.

In terms of the support from the Professional Footballers Association, I feel I have had unwavering support and would very much like to endorse and recommend for any other players going through difficult situations in their team, the England team or the League to use the PFA as a resource, because without their support I would not be sat here. I probably would not have got the result that I got today.

In terms of friends, in life you realise sometimes who your strongest friends are and some are not. That is just life and it is a life lesson. Lianne Sanderson, sat here today, has been a very good friend of mine for a long time and a teammate, and she has been through difficult situations as well. I cannot say that I have been completely isolated. I have some amazing friends and people who have supported me—my media agent Jo Tongue as well, and strong friends. It has been difficult but I have been supported in some areas.

Q37 Chair: This has been a multi-staged process, starting with the evidence you gave to the FA's cultural review and then moving on to written complaints that you submitted to Dan Ashworth and The Football Association. We will obviously be discussing those with Dan and Rachel Brace, and we will hear from them later in the session today. There was then a moment where they decided to bring in external counsel to look at the investigation and the allegations that you brought. You decided not to take part in that investigation. Did the FA give you any advice about whether you should or was that just your own personal decision not to take part in the initial investigation?

Eniola Aluko: No, I did not receive any advice from the FA as to whether I should participate in Katharine Newton's investigation. But I was advised by Nick Randall QC, who was the QC leading my case, that he did not feel it was wise for me to be part of that investigation at the time. He, as a leading expert in discrimination law, felt that the report would not be taken that seriously in a court of law, in an employment tribunal, which at that point I was preparing to go to.

Furthermore, from my point of view, just from a human perspective, by that time another investigation had been launched by The Football Association Integrity Unit into an off-the-field role I had with a football agency, which I found was not a coincidence. I thought that it was an attempt to, again, retaliate as to the claims that I brought. I was advised that even if I were to appeal that investigation, it would be an FA process. I had lost a lot of trust and confidence at that point, because the first internal investigation had been conducted. I did not have confidence in being part of something that the FA had instructed, so I chose not to be part of that investigation.

Q38 **Chair:** Why did your lawyer believe that, on the process itself, Katharine Newton's initial investigation, the results would not carry much weight in an employment tribunal?

Eniola Aluko: From my understanding, it would not have been tested before a High Court judge or before witnesses under cross-examination. The legal process would not have been what would have happened in court. He has more expertise in that, but in a nutshell that was his advice to me. But I did not feel comfortable anyway necessarily being part of another FA investigation, which I felt at that point had already had a lot of flaws in it.

Q39 **Chair:** I think most people would think allegations of racism and bullying within the England camp brought by a very senior international are incredibly serious. But the picture we get from the evidence you have presented to the Committee is that the FA's arrangements were a very ad hoc process. There was a very ad hoc internal review, which Katharine Newton's has been critical of. There was then the bringing in of an outside barrister to a process that is not particularly defined. You get the impression that there is no proper established procedure for dealing with serious issues that have been brought to the attention of the FA by senior players, or by any player.

Eniola Aluko: That is certainly the case. I could not tell you today what the whistle-blowing procedure is at The Football Association. I could not tell you what the grievance procedure is. I felt that I could go to Dan Ashworth, even before the culture review. I put it in my statement that I spoke to Dan Ashworth personally, very briefly, and said, "Dan, I am struggling. I would like to have a meeting with you about the way Mark Sampson is managing me in the team". That meeting never materialised, but that was the extent of my grievance procedure: going to Dan Ashworth, who I felt was the line manager for Mark Sampson, somebody with authority. I asked for him to be in the room at the time of the SheBelieves Cup in America when the issue of my 100 caps was an issue. He was not in the room and subsequent to that obviously the culture review gave me an opportunity to speak on the issues I have spoken on. But had I not been asked to be part of the culture review I do not know what I would have done.

It is very difficult for players who are there fundamentally to play for their country and perform to raise issues that they should not be raising. There is no structure, there are no parameters. Perhaps that suggests why it seems very ad hoc House of Commons, because there is no process. This is what happens consistently in terms of grievances being brought and that is very much how it felt. Even after the culture review I felt that I was ignored by Dan Ashworth. He ignored my e-mail and it did not seem like a coherent process.

Q40 **Chair:** I know this is something you have spoken about before, but for the benefit of the Committee it is important we ask you in this forum. With regard to the concern that Drew Spence had discussed with you about the comments that were made and have now been investigated by

Katharine Newton, you decided not to take part in that initial investigation. The FA suggested that you told it that Drew Spence did not want to be involved and on that basis it instructed Farrer's and Katharine Newton not to approach Drew Spence to discuss these issues. Could you explain, from your perspective, whether you believe that is true and what you felt was the potential status of Drew Spence in that investigation, whether she would have been available if approached to be interviewed?

Eniola Aluko: From my perspective that is not true. I will say that. That is the easy answer to the question. It is an attempt by the FA to blame me for their shortcomings in their investigation; what I feel is a basic shortcoming to interview somebody who is the alleged victim of a racist statement.

In terms of Drew Spence's participation, when I wrote the culture report it was a confidential report to Dan Ashworth. At that time it was not in my mind to present evidence about racist comments. It was not in my mind to present evidence that was going to go to court. The reason I put Drew Spence's comment in the report was that it was on video so, on everything I put in the report, I felt, "Can I prove this? Is this something that objectively I can say there is evidence for?" I think I made it very clear who Drew Spence was, short of saying her name. I was trying to suggest who it was so the FA could take the decision to speak to her.

When we had the first meeting with Dan Ashworth and Rachel Brace, myself and the PFA were non-prescriptive as to how that investigation should be conducted. It is an FA investigation. I said, "It is up to you, it is not up to me to tell you who to interview and who not to interview. It is up to the FA to ask Drew whether she wants to be part of this investigation." But I categorically did not say that Drew Spence refused to be interviewed in any of the investigations.

Let's say even if I had suggested that Drew did not want to be interviewed, is it not prudent to pick up the phone and call Drew and say, "Actually, Eni has said you do not want to be spoken to. Can I confirm that?" That is what I would have done. I have a legal background. I am not a top barrister or a top lawyer, but that is quite basic. That could have happened in the first internal investigation and certainly in Katharine Newton's investigation. But I understand that Katharine Newton has to act on instructions and I believe that she would have been instructed that Drew Spence did not want to be interviewed, but that was not the case.

Q41 **Chair:** That is very clear. You were asked by the FA to put your concerns in writing, which you did in an e-mail you sent to Dan Ashworth and then the subsequent letter sent from the PFA to the FA setting out further concerns. Before Katharine Newton was brought in to investigate these, did the FA ever give you a line-by-line response to each of the allegations you brought to their attention?

Eniola Aluko: No. We asked for one repeatedly as to why certain things I had exemplified in my culture report had happened. It was only until

Katharine Newton wrote her report and the summary of the report—I only saw 15 pages of what I now understand is, I don't know, a 65-page report, which in itself shows a lack of transparency—that I saw an itemised response to each of my allegations.

- Q42 **Chair:** When The Football Association talks about their internal review, their internal process before Katharine Newton was brought in, perhaps within that internal process they failed to give you a specific response to the allegations that you brought.

Eniola Aluko: They failed to give me a response and they also were very keen to say there was no wrongdoing without looking at the video evidence, of which Dan Ashworth said in the meeting, "Oh, we probably should have looked at that". They had not spoken to Lianne Sanderson at that point, even though I was very clear that Lianne Sanderson has also had issues in the team and has not been picked since those issues. I am sure Lianne will elaborate on that. They were dismissive straight away in that first meeting, so we did not even get to the point of talking about itemised issues because they had already dismissed the entire complaint.

- Q43 **Chair:** You referred in your written statement to the Committee to Greg Clarke's response to the letter. He was copied into an e-mail that was sent to the FA and he responded saying, "What has this got to do with me?" I think many of us think that was an extraordinary statement to make given the seriousness of these issues. Personally, what was your reaction when you first saw that response?

Eniola Aluko: I was astonished because by the time in November 2016 that the full complaint was sent to Greg Clarke, Martin Glenn, Dan Ashworth and Rachel Brace, I felt that sending it to the FA chairman would lead to a better process because it is the FA chairman. I thought, "Now if he looks at this, it is probably going to improve because it is serious". But it was the opposite. I felt if this is the FA chairman disrespectfully dismissing a serious complaint then there is nowhere to go. At that point a decision was made that the only option, my last resort, was to go to the employment tribunal. I remember distinctly feeling that way. The PFA were astonished, I think, to the point that they did not even respond.

I have said in my statement there is a huge question around a male player with 102 caps, Wayne Rooney. If these top players who have over 100 caps for their country were to send a complaint like that, itemised, written by a leading QC, would he respond like that? This for me is a separate issue. The issues of female players in this country, whether you are playing in the League or in an England shirt, are they taken seriously enough at all levels of The Football Association? I would suggest that e-mail says that they are not.

- Q44 **Chair:** Just to be clear, you are saying that, as a consequence of receiving that response, that was when you decided there was no point pursuing an internal process with the FA, that you wanted to go to an employment tribunal because you had no faith in their own processes?

Eniola Aluko: Correct, yes. It made my mind up for me.

- Q45 **Jo Stevens:** I was going to ask you about whether you thought the FA would have treated a male player in the same way, and obviously you have dealt with that already. Can I ask you about the negotiations that you had through the PFA with the FA for your commercial settlement of your complaint? Have you been paid the full amount by the FA?

Eniola Aluko: I have not, no.

- Q46 **Jo Stevens:** What is outstanding and why is it outstanding?

Eniola Aluko: First of all, the settlement agreement was agreed in two tranches. I cannot speak for the FA but I think one of the reasons they were concerned was that I may have said something at the European Championships, so they wanted to withhold a payment until after the European Championships. I was not intending, of course, to say anything at the European Championships, because I had to focus on doing a good job with Channel 4 and moving on from the issue.

The FA has claimed that I was defamatory in a tweet that I sent and on that basis they felt they were legally entitled to withhold the payment. I disagree with that. The FA was very keen for me to speak freely about the case. When the initial *Daily Mail* article came out I was very brief. I did not feel it was necessary to go into it. I wanted to move on. I wanted to encourage people to still support the England team despite a negative story coming out. It is only after that that a lot of misleading stories kept coming out and I felt I should speak on the case. But even at that point I asked for clarity and agreement with the FA as to what I should say. It was very keen for me to speak freely about the facts of the case. That is what I have always done.

I have done two interviews: one with *The Guardian* and one with BBC. I have spoken factually about my views on how this case was handled and my views on Mark Sampson's behaviour. On that basis, the FA is withdrawing or withholding some of the payment. Also, withholding it is contradictory to its initial intention for me to speak out and speak freely, to contradict accusations of it being hush money. At this point, if you are withholding payment on the basis that I have spoken out then you are suggesting that money is attached to speaking out. I am confused about that.

- Q47 **Jo Stevens:** There is not anything in your settlement agreement that precludes you from speaking about the circumstances of your complaints? There is what is known as a gagging clause. There is no gagging clause in it?

Eniola Aluko: No, and there were never any negotiations. No one has ever said to me, "How much can we pay you to be silent?" That never happened and I would never agree something like that. All of the financial negotiations were based on loss of earnings and loss of future earnings, discussions about what I potentially would have got in an employment tribunal.

In terms of the confidentiality element, obviously both parties decided it was in their best interests to not go to court and at that point there was no need to speak publicly. The public element had already been decided and there was no need to speak publicly. But had it come out, there was an agreement that once it came out publicly both parties could speak.

Q48 **Jo Stevens:** Are you now in a process of conciliation or mediation, of trying to resolve that non-payment of the second tranche of your settlement?

Eniola Aluko: I would not call it conciliation. I had one meeting with Martin Glenn and he effectively suggested that if I wrote a favourable statement saying that the FA is not institutionally racist, it will think about releasing that money. I felt that was bordering on blackmail

Jo Stevens: Was that said to you verbally or in writing?

Eniola Aluko: That was in a meeting and it was subsequently suggested in written correspondence with my lawyers to suggest basically, "Where is the statement?" I categorically refused to write any statement because I had already suggested that I did not—it is not for me to come up with the determination that the FA is institutionally racist. I have never said that publicly and I would never say that. My comments have always been based on what I felt were racist comments to both myself and to Drew Spence. That is the extent of my comments and how the FA handled the evidence around those comments. For Martin Glenn to effectively suggest that I should say that the FA is not institutionally racist in order to get a payment that they already contractually agreed to is, again, a suggestion that the case has been handled appallingly.

Q49 **Jo Stevens:** Do you think it would be fair to describe that as potentially trying to blackmail you?

Eniola Aluko: I do not know what the legal definition of blackmail is, but I felt I was being asked to do something that I would not have ordinarily done in exchange for a payment that was already agreed.

Q50 **Chair:** Eni, I know one or two colleagues want to come in on this. I do not know if you could do this now—this would be great—but could you let us have the date of that correspondence from the FA to your lawyers, and would you be happy for us to have a copy?

Eniola Aluko: It can be sent to you, yes. It is not in any of my appendixes.

Chair: But if you and your lawyers would be happy to give us a copy of that correspondence from the FA, it would be helpful to us.

Eniola Aluko: I can take advice.

Q51 **Julian Knight:** This favourable statement that the FA has asked you to sign in order to basically release the rest of the money that they have agreed to pay you, how long was this statement? Did they show you a copy of it?

Eniola Aluko: No, it was more of a suggestion of what I could do in order to draw a line under that issue of the second tranche of payment not being released. I had a meeting in good faith with Martin Glenn. I spoke honestly and said, "Look, it is not for me to come to a determination as to whether the FA is institutionally racist", and I have said it in my statement that I am very careful not to make sweeping generalisations about The Football Association.

My issues with The Football Association are limited to certain individuals, namely Dan Ashworth, Greg Clarke, Martin Glenn, Rachel Brace, and people who handled—and Robert Sullivan, who I know has been responsible for leaking documents to the media. It is not a view of the entire Football Association. I have had great relations with The Football Association in the past. They gave me my first exposure to an in-house legal team, so I am very careful to divide both issues and I said all this to Martin Glenn. I suppose it was not enough at that time and even subsequent to that they felt that I should do more and write a statement.

Q52 **Julian Knight:** Was this statement supposed to be in the form, effectively, of an interview that you were going to give out to the press, or did they want you to take to Twitter or Facebook? How was this supposed to come across?

Eniola Aluko: It is interesting that you say that because I did feel—because of the behaviour and actions of people like Robert Sullivan who had leaked an unpublished part of Katharine Newton's report that I have never seen—that, had I written a statement, it would find its way to the press. That is one of the reasons that I felt that it would have been inappropriate to do so.

Q53 **Julian Knight:** They wanted you to supply a statement for something internal, which you then thought would make it into the press.

Eniola Aluko: That is what I believed.

Q54 **Julian Knight:** It was almost a reference. The FA effectively asked you—so often it happens with tribunals—for a reference. It is usually the other way around, but the FA asked you for a reference for their good conduct?

Eniola Aluko: They were suggesting that, yes. The key point is they were suggesting it in attachment to releasing the second tranche of the money.

Q55 **Julian Knight:** You said earlier that you thought the other tranche was also withheld—sorry, that they gave you this money in the first place and that part of it was also to secure your "good behaviour" when you are on Channel 4 doing the Euro coverage. Is that what you felt? What was said that gave you that idea?

Eniola Aluko: Again, I cannot speak for the FA in terms of why they suggested the two tranches should be paid separately but I would assume that they did not believe that I would keep my mouth shut at the Euros and could have said something to Channel 4 or could have said something on air. That is why I believe it, but I was comfortable with

agreeing it because that was not in my mind at all. It was in my mind to support the team and do a good job for Channel 4. It was not in my mind to talk about what has been a quite stressful case.

- Q56 **Julian Knight:** When you said you were comfortable agreeing it, that says to me that they said to you, "This is on the proviso that when you do your TV coverage later this year, you will stay quiet on this issue"—a non-disclosure.

Eniola Aluko: They did not need to say that because I would never have done that anyway. I would never have used that platform to talk about this case. It was not necessary for them to say that, and they did not say that. I can only tell you how the settlement agreement works out: one payment was before the European Championships and the other was after, on the basis that—I feel—they felt there was a risk that I could say something at the European Championships.

- Q57 **Julian Knight:** Can I read something to you? You have read it before, "I have no idea why you are sending me this. Perhaps you can enlighten me". That is obviously the e-mail in response from Mr Clarke, the FA chairman, when you raised the concerns with him directly in an e-mail. It is something that really pulled me up short when reading the evidence to do with this hearing—it was absolutely a red light. For you looking at this now, and how you felt at that particular time as an employee, effectively, is Mr Clarke guilty of bullying you through that e-mail?

Eniola Aluko: I have not had a chance to think about that. I do not know if I would go that far, but I would say that it is an incredibly dismissive attitude. It is disrespectful to the seriousness of the complaint. It is disappointing because at the time I felt it would get better the higher up the chain it went. But it said to me that it gets worse, it potentially could get worse. The overwhelming question now, sat in front of you, is: would that happen to a male player with 102 caps for their country after 11 years of playing? I do not think it would.

- Q58 **Julian Knight:** Did you think your career was completely over at that point when you got that e-mail from Mr Clarke? Did you think that was it?

Eniola Aluko: No, I would not say so. My playing career with England was not something that I was actively seeking to get back into. I wanted to deal with the issue as it was and at the time it was imminent that I would have to go to an employment tribunal in order for it to be dealt with independently and fairly.

- Q59 **Julian Knight:** If this report that we have received today, which has been handed to the Committee, had been the original findings and processes followed during that report and people were spoken to rather than it just being taken on the nod that they did not want to speak, do you think that a degree of justice would have been done in that regard? Do you think that would have satisfied you at that point, if the second report had effectively been done earlier?

Eniola Aluko: Sorry, what was the question?

Julian Knight: If the same processes to get to the report that we have today—the second report findings—had been followed with regard to those individuals who were spoken to, would that, in your mind, have been a satisfactory outcome initially? Would you have gone, “Okay, I think here something is being done positively”?

Eniola Aluko: Yes. Katharine Newton’s second investigation in terms of the difference between the first investigation is that she spoke to Drew Spence, she spoke to me and she spoke to other witnesses who have not been named but I assume they are players. It is not difficult. Had that been done six or eight months ago, whenever it was, we would not be sat here.

I respect Katharine Newton’s findings. She had the opportunity to see new evidence; when I say “new evidence”, I mean evidence that had not been seen before but that has always been available to The Football Association. We wrote in November 2016 that there was evidence that a comment had been made to Drew Spence. We wrote in November 2016 that there was evidence that Mark Sampson made a comment about Ebola in my family. That was there in November 2016. The Football Association could have asked for that evidence at that time; they chose not to. I do not know why certain things were not followed up, but certainly now they have been followed up and we know what the finding is, and I am pleased with the findings.

Q60 **Ian C. Lucas:** I am interested in why the settlement with the FA was in two tranches. Was that at the FA’s request?

Eniola Aluko: It would have been part of a negotiation between the—

Ian C. Lucas: But usually, in my experience, it is a case of once and for all there is a settlement of the arrangement. Do you know why, in this case, the payment was to be in two tranches?

Eniola Aluko: I think it was because they felt there was a risk that I could potentially say something at the European Championships.

Ian C. Lucas: Can I confirm, therefore, it was at the FA’s request that it was in two tranches?

Eniola Aluko: It certainly was not something I requested.

Q61 **Ian C. Lucas:** So as to keep you quiet?

Eniola Aluko: I cannot speak for the FA. That is a question you would have to ask the FA. My motivation behind the settlement agreement was to effectively settle on—have a financial settlement that was based on loss of future earnings. I felt that I would never play under Mark Sampson again and I felt that my position in the team as a result of many things that happened was untenable, which we have seen. I have not played for England since April 2016

Q62 **Ian C. Lucas:** But you would have preferred a once-and-for-all settlement?

Eniola Aluko: It certainly would have been easier, yes.

Q63 **Ian C. Lucas:** The second tranche remains outstanding. The second tranche has not been paid yet?

Eniola Aluko: The second tranche has not been paid yet, that is correct.

Q64 **Ian C. Lucas:** So it has not worked in terms of keeping you quiet, has it?

Eniola Aluko: My point is there was never an attempt to keep me quiet from my perspective. There was never an offer. Nobody ever said to me, "How much money can we pay you to keep you quiet?" That was never the conversation. The conversation about money was around loss of future earnings that I would have ordinarily achieved at an employment tribunal on a successful case, based on the evidence. People need to be careful not to mix the money and the confidentiality element. You can sign a confidentiality settlement for £1 if two parties agree to not speak publicly if you are not going to court. It is an out-of-court settlement. But in terms of the second tranche, again, it is not something I requested.

Q65 **Christian Matheson:** Some of the instances that you refer to in your statement are absolutely clear racist comments: the Ebola comment that we talked about and the arrest comments. You also complained about the replay analysis incident when Lee Kendall said, "Yes, but she is lazy as" and then, "Get stuffed, Eni", or words to that effect. You seemed to respond particularly badly to that. Can you explain what had upset you so much about the commentary on the replay analysis?

Eniola Aluko: The comments—it is not the first time somebody would have sworn at me. The comments are not necessarily that offensive. It was more—well, they are offensive and they were inflammatory.

Q66 **Christian Matheson:** The reason I ask is that I can imagine that in training there will be criticism from the training staff from time to time or you will hear swearing or encouragement.

Eniola Aluko: What I found inappropriate about that incident was the fact that, first, I was in the middle of a game. It was made during the game and from my perspective the job of a coach is to give instructions to players during the game. It is not to start gossiping about players and making inflammatory statements based on no objectivity at all. I felt that was inappropriate. I was sat at home, ironically watching the game to try to improve, to watch what I was doing, and I heard this statement, which was accessible to 23 players. Again, I felt that was inappropriate.

I also listened to them speaking on the microphones throughout that game. Inflammatory statements were not made about any other player in the team during that game. Let's even say a coach uses bad language a lot. If he used bad language about many players, that is just the coach, that is the way he speaks, but I did not understand why on that particular game bad language was only used about me. At the time I had scored six goals in six games for England, so it was not based on anything objective.

Q67 **Christian Matheson:** But you scored in that game and had an assist.

Eniola Aluko: And I scored in that game and an assist, so it would have been quite nice to hear quite nice comments about my goal and my assist, but sometimes you do not get praise either. But these are all things I felt were inappropriate, that those comments were only made about me in that game.

Q68 **Christian Matheson:** Was there a feeling that perhaps those attitudes from those members of the training staff, the coaching staff, had derived from the chief coach, Mr Sampson, and that was why they had the views?

Eniola Aluko: This incident happened one month into Mark Sampson's tenure and up until that point I had scored six goals in six matches so I was in good form. I did feel that there was a preconceived negative perception of me coming into the job because it was such a strong view to have from Lee Kendall, who also happens to be the person that spoke to me in a fake Caribbean accent. I felt it was a very strong view to have one month into the job, with the background of me being in good form at the time. I felt that those preconceived ideas of me being lazy would have been something that they came into the job with.

When I asked Mark Sampson and said, "Look, I think this is a little bit inappropriate, what has happened", he then tried to almost defend Lee Kendall by saying, "Well, sometimes we share information among the team and that could have led to him making that comment", which did not give me comfort. It made me more worried that if such strong views are coming out of a staff member it means that it is being almost encouraged, this conversation. It is almost like a staffroom conversation that comes out as a comment on replay analysis. That is why I felt that it was inappropriate and unwarranted.

Q69 **Christian Matheson:** You just mentioned there the next thing I was going to ask about, which was the allegation I first read in newspapers this morning—I did not read it in your initial evidence—that one of the members of the playing staff, or at least one of them, talked to you in a fake Caribbean accent.

Eniola Aluko: That was Lee Kendall.

Christian Matheson: Mr Kendall. What was the context of him doing that?

Eniola Aluko: I suppose it was an attempt to endear himself to me. I do not think he meant it maliciously and certainly he may not have been aware of how annoying it got. But if you can imagine, he is Welsh. For instance, if I constantly spoke to him in a Scottish accent, at some point he is going to say to me, "Eni, I am Welsh". After a while that is how it felt to me because I am not Caribbean, I am of African descent, and it was also behaviour that differentiated me from other players. It was not something that I necessarily found offensive, but I thought it was very ignorant and another example of an ignorant mind-set and behaviour towards me.

Q70 **Christian Matheson:** If I am shaking my head, it is not at you. Why did you not put that in your statements, because it sounds to me fairly prima facie?

Eniola Aluko: In my first culture review?

Christian Matheson: Yes.

Eniola Aluko: I was very careful with my culture review and, with a legal background, I suppose, I just have a mind for evidence. I was very careful not to basically make statements that could not be proven. At the time I was writing the culture review I was not in the mind of evidence that is going to be submitted to a court of law. I was giving examples to Dan Ashworth of things that I had raised in a phone call with Owen Eastwood, their external consultant. I did make it very clear that my report was non-exhaustive. It was a non-exhaustive list, which means other things had happened by the way.

The fake Caribbean accent is not something I can prove. It was not on video, it was not something that I can necessarily prove. I did not necessarily want to start asking players, "Oh, do you remember ever hearing this or that?" It has been dismissed by Mark Sampson as something there is no evidence for. I knew that would be the case.

The same goes for the Ebola comment. One of the reasons I did not put it in my culture review is that, at the time, I did not feel it could be proven. I did not know there was evidence. It was only later on that I went back to the text messages with Drew Spence that I saw that I had said it to her, almost to comfort her and say, "Look, Drew, it is not just you it has happened to. It has happened to me as well".

Q71 **Chair:** I just wanted to confirm—following the previous question I asked you about when your lawyers received the e-mail from The Football Association you referred to earlier about you making a favourable statement about the FA in return for the second payment—that your lawyers have confirmed to the Committee Clerks that that was sent on 22 September this year.

Eniola Aluko: It was quite recent, yes.

Q72 **Brendan O'Hara:** Going back to the initial investigation on this culture review, why do you think you were approached to take part in that? Who approached you and what was your understanding of the parameters and the remit of what you had been asked to take part in?

Eniola Aluko: The e-mail from Tom Nichols from the FA is in my appendix—it is the 6 May 2016 letter—and effectively they were asking me to be part of a culture report as an "iconic England player". They felt I could talk about my experience as an England player, being in the team for a long time. The remit was to talk about my experience. It is in the letter, in the appendix.

Q73 **Brendan O'Hara:** What guarantees, if any, were you given about issues of confidentiality?

Eniola Aluko: There aren't any in the letter, but certainly when I spoke to Owen Eastwood on the phone I did ask him and say, "How is this going to work? Is it that my name will be released? How does it work?" He said, "No, it is only if you want your name to be in next to the quotes that I will give that back to Dan Ashworth". But he assured me that it was a confidential, anonymous report at the time.

- Q74 **Brendan O'Hara:** Your participation in this report was predicated on the idea that what you were saying was how you had been treated, what your honest assessment was, but that you would not be exposed as being the source of this information?

Eniola Aluko: I was assured that it would be confidential, which made me comfortable to speak freely about the experiences that I had not spoken about before. I had alerted Dan Ashworth to the fact that I was a little bit concerned, but we did not go into detail. This would have been the first time I was raising quite serious issues that had happened to me that I had suppressed for quite a long time. The comfort I got was, "Don't worry, this is confidential, this is anonymous".

- Q75 **Brendan O'Hara:** When did you realise that your anonymity had been compromised?

Eniola Aluko: To this day I do not know whether my anonymity had been compromised. No evidence has ever been provided to refute that, but Dan Ashworth has said that my participation in the culture review had nothing to do with being dropped two weeks ago. But it is my suggestion and my concern that the two are linked. It is a situation where I think Mark Sampson was aware that I was part of a culture review and could have been aware. With past issues of me bringing up the replay analysis incident, he would have felt or may have felt, "She is going to say something". It is that nudge-and-wink situation of, "Get rid of her before she says anything or quickly after".

Dan Ashworth was aware that I had concerns. I told him in America, "I would like to meet you when we get back to London". That never materialised. So he was aware even before the culture report that I was having issues with Mark Sampson. The culture report came afterwards. I don't know whether my conversation with Owen Eastwood was shared. I don't know but I don't think it is a coincidence.

- Q76 **Brendan O'Hara:** Do you know from memory how soon after you had the conversation, which you believed to be confidential, things began to change so dramatically for you as part of the England setup?

Eniola Aluko: It is in the summary timeline in appendix 7, but I had a telephone conversation with Owen Eastwood on 10 May and Mark Sampson visited me at Cobham to drop me from the England squad on 23 May.

- Q77 **Chair:** If I could clarify for the Committee, because of the questions that Brendan O'Hara has rightly raised, that I asked the FA if I could see a copy of the culture review document presentation that was prepared,

which is a confidential document, and the FA did consent to that. I am not in a position to know what other conversations may have been had around the document but certainly there is nothing attributable to you in the document, the presentation itself.

Eniola Aluko: Okay.

Q78 **Giles Watling:** Since all this became public—and, Eni, thank you very much for appearing today—has the FA contacted you at all directly to tell you of any changes they have made or are making in the player relation process?

Eniola Aluko: No. I have not spoken to anybody from the FA about any change in process or any change in grievance procedures or whistle-blowing procedures. The only conversation I have had is with Martin Glenn in the meeting I have already referred to.

Q79 **Giles Watling:** There is no attempt, as far as you are concerned, at mending any fences, building bridges with you, to communicate to you?

Eniola Aluko: No, quite the contrary. Since *The Daily Mail* article was released on 7 August, I do feel that the FA's sole agenda has been to protect its own reputation while making insinuations that I am lying, while making insinuations that I influenced Drew Spence or influenced their investigation, while leaking reports to media journalists about things I had not even had the opportunity to see. No, the feeling has not been about building a bridge or even having any sort of duty of care towards me. I am still a centrally contracted England player and that has compounded the isolation I felt. I do think it has become incredibly adversarial and did not need to.

Q80 **Giles Watling:** From your point of view you think the FA is behaving in a defensive manner?

Eniola Aluko: Very defensive and if something else were to happen with another player tomorrow that would be a source of concern. Does your reputation have to be dragged through the mud for the truth to come out? Do I have to be sat—although I am grateful for being here, does it have to come to this for me to speak in front of you today for the truth to come out? I do not think it does and it has got to this point because there have been so many misleading things said. There has been an agenda to protect Mark Sampson in the first instance and an agenda to protect the FA's reputation.

Q81 **Jo Stevens:** Mark Sampson was sacked on 20 September and we have just heard that The Football Association asked you to sign a statement saying that they were not institutionally racist via your lawyers on the—

Eniola Aluko: No, sorry, I have to correct that. The FA did not ask me to sign a statement. No statement was ever drawn up.

Jo Stevens: Sorry. They asked you to make a statement.

Eniola Aluko: They suggested that, yes, I write a statement.

Q82 **Jo Stevens:** They did that on 22 September. When was your second payment due under your settlement agreement?

Eniola Aluko: 31 August.

Q83 **Paul Farrelly:** Brendan has covered most of the questions I wanted to ask about the Ashworth review, and we can ask him later on about what he may or may not have said. It is important that the FA later on are very open about that so as to dispel any future concerns that people will possibly rightly have about co-operating with any reviews or inquiries. Why on earth should they, given what we have heard? Can I ask about your settlement? If the second part is not paid, you will presumably take legal action to recover it.

Eniola Aluko: I have not even thought about that.

Q84 **Paul Farrelly:** The settlement covered loss of earnings?

Eniola Aluko: Yes, loss of future earnings.

Q85 **Paul Farrelly:** When you were negotiating that, were you still available, if picked, for selection for England?

Eniola Aluko: I have been available for selection since May 2016, yes.

Paul Farrelly: You still are?

Eniola Aluko: But I have not been selected.

Q86 **Paul Farrelly:** If it is covering loss of future earnings and you are a good player, you are still available for selection, the settlement is rather bizarre, isn't it, because it is recognising they are not going to pick you in the future?

Eniola Aluko: Perhaps, yes. There was a projection—the settlement was done and agreed between, I believe, April 2016 and June 2016. At that point I had not been picked for a year so it was quite easy to project into the future as to how it was going to go.

Q87 **Paul Farrelly:** You clearly said you are still available for selection?

Eniola Aluko: I have not retired from the England team. If I was selected, a lot of discussions would have to happen but I am still a centrally contracted player. I am still available for selection and I have been available for selection. It has been Mark Sampson's prerogative to pick me or not pick me. Lots of players are not picked. That has not ever been my issue. Selection has never been my issue. My issue has been how I have been treated when I was in the team. Yes, I am still available for selection but we were able to project that Mark Sampson's agreement or contract ended in 2019, so to that extent I believed I was not going to be picked for another two years under Mark Sampson.

Paul Farrelly: But he is no longer there so—

Eniola Aluko: I was not to know that back when I—

Q88 **Paul Farrelly:** You have made your position very clear to the new

manager?

Eniola Aluko: It became a self-fulfilling prophecy because I knew that I was not going to be picked from May 2016 and I have not been. That in itself says everything about the process of grievances. Why would any player come forward with any issue if effectively she has seen a player with 102 caps not playing for England ever again after they have raised issues about the manager?

Q89 **Chair:** It is worth saying for the record that you were awarded the Golden Boot for your own goal-scoring for Chelsea after you were dropped from the England squad. Is that correct?

Eniola Aluko: Correct, yes.

Q90 **Chair:** Is it usual for the Golden Boot winner not to be in the England squad?

Eniola Aluko: I do not think so. It might be worth researching, but I do not know many players who win the—let's say, hypothetically, would Harry Kane be not picked if he won the Golden Boot? I do not think so.

Q91 **Chair:** This may be a challenge for people in the room. I had a quick check just to see whether I could find a case in the Premier League era of an Englishman winning the Golden Boot and not playing for England that year and I could not find a single—

Eniola Aluko: You did not find one?

Chair: Kevin Phillips did that year, as did Dion Dublin, and there were one or two others who just clipped the bar without winning the Golden Boot. If anyone can prove otherwise it would be interesting to see. But the point has been made that it is a rare thing.

Eniola Aluko: That was Mark Sampson's prerogative, but it is important, jokes aside, to say that I won the Golden Boot in September 2016. By that time we were six months into discussions about this case. That is more important than saying, "Why did the manager not pick me?" Obviously I was naturally disappointed, but it is more important to say, on the timing of why I was not picked at that specific time, even winning the Golden Boot was not enough.

Q92 **Brendan O'Hara:** You don't have any Scottish connection, do you?

Eniola Aluko: I don't know. I have been to Scotland a few times. My brother used to play for Rangers, so I quite like Scotland.

Brendan O'Hara: It was worth a try.

Q93 **Chair:** Eni Aluko, we are extremely grateful to you for appearing in front of the Committee today and for the care and trouble you have taken in preparing your written evidence to the Committee, for bringing these incredibly important matters to our attention and assisting us with our sports governance review. On behalf of the Committee, thank you very much.

Eniola Aluko: Thank you. I would like to say that one of the core purposes of me coming today was so that I could speak to enact some changes around grievance procedures, around complaints procedures, and hopefully speak to a change for more independence and less conflict of interest in that area. Obviously I have given my experiences, but that was already something that has been well documented, so I would hope that there are some changes in that area. I would encourage players, if they do have any issues, to speak to the PFA, who have been incredibly supportive of me. I want to make that clear, that the purpose of this was for me to help, hopefully, with those changes moving forward.

Examination of witness

Witness: Lianne Sanderson

Q94 **Chair:** Lianne Sanderson, thank you very much for appearing once again in front of the Committee. The last time was by video-link from New York, so it is much better to have you in person in the room with us. I am grateful again for your assistance with this inquiry. It is another very important matter on issues that the Committee takes very seriously.

Do you concur with Eni Aluko's statement that there is no established grievance procedure for England players, no sense of who they should go to with a problem or what action will be taken as a consequence of raising those concerns?

Lianne Sanderson: Yes. First, I would like to reiterate what Eni Aluko said. Thank you for having us today. It is not something that we ever imagined would happen. But thankfully you guys have been willing to listen to us so we cannot thank you enough for that.

Yes, I definitely concur with what Eni Aluko said. For myself, something happened in 2015 to myself where I raised it with Mark and have not been selected since. We can go into that a bit later. But I definitely think there needs to be something in place so that this does not happen to more players in the future.

Q95 **Chair:** Have other members of the England squad spoken to you about their concerns as a consequence of the attention? Some it has fallen on Eni's concerns and on concerns you have raised. Have other players been speaking about this now? Are there other people who may come forward as a consequence of the consideration these issues have had now?

Lianne Sanderson: I think so, but I personally think it is more so for older players—we are talking from about 15 years ago—who have certainly raised a few things. I have always said, and I have maintained this stance, that as long as Mark was in place, players were never going to speak. It has kind of always been that way. As long as you are there, you are not going to speak out because, as you have seen with what has happened to Eni and what has happened to me, if you speak out about

something that has happened, this is what happens to you and you do not play for your country again. Those consequences are quite harsh and I do not blame the girls for not being willing to say anything, because it is something that is difficult to do. It is not easy being here. It is not easy being called a liar. It is not easy being told, "Why are you standing by somebody?" but in this whole process I was always going to stand by Eni because I knew she was telling the truth and that has been confirmed today. For me to be here, I have flown from New York to be here, but this is important for me to be here, because this is something that is very serious and should be taken seriously.

Q96 **Chair:** Do you feel that the culture within the England camp changed when Mark Sampson became manager?

Lianne Sanderson: For me, personally, I had a fantastic time under Mark for the first year. So for myself, it was great. I noticed with Eni—me and Eni are best friends—certain things that were happening to her that she would express to me, like the video analysis. Just to reiterate, the video analysis is usually mute. It is not something where there are any vocals. It is usually completely mute. You do not even hear the coaches; you do not even hear the wind. It is completely mute.

Like I said, I think there needs to be something in place that we can have going forward, for players to be able to speak.

Q97 **Chair:** It has been reported that BAME players across the different England squads have raised concerns about the culture within the team, the identity relationship they have with the England setup. Even if they are not tied to specific allegations, do you think there are widespread concerns about the level of cultural identity people have playing for England?

Lianne Sanderson: It is an interesting question. You will have to ask a lot of the players that are there. I have not been there since 2015 so I could not answer that question with what is happening among the team now, but from my interpretation of what I experienced when I was there, my first year under Mark was fantastic. Then after I scored the winning goal in the Cyprus Cup final, that is when my England career started going in a weird direction.

As Eni mentioned before, she got the Golden Boot. You do not see that player not being selected for England. For myself, I felt like I was doing well for England. Even until this day, I have never been told I am not good enough to play for England. It is up to the coach to make the decisions. We are professional footballers. Sometimes your coach is going to like you, sometimes the coach is not, and that is fine. But if we felt like it was something that was down to playing, then we would not be sitting here right now. Like I said, my first year under Mark was fantastic but then things started to change.

As I mentioned before, my career went down a different path. In China 2015—after the World Cup we went to China, which is where a lot of this stuff happened—coincidentally, they forgot about my 50th cap. For the

50th cap, this is something that you get a commemorative jersey for and a video message from home; it is something that is supposed to be honoured and celebrated. This was a game I was starting in, so I was really excited to get that message from home. I knew it was going to be my 50th cap and when I was sitting in a room, similar to the one we are sitting in now, with my teammates, I could not wait for Mark to say something nice about me. I had played for England for four years and I thought I would never play for England again, so to get my 50th cap was going to be the most amazing memory, but for me now it is something I want to forget. I gave the jersey to my mum and dad, but at the same time it is something that did not make me feel good because I played in the game. It did not make me feel good on the way to the game, but I did not tell the girls that I had been forgotten about because this had never happened before. No other player had been forgotten about on their 50th game. At the same time, they remembered another player's 99th game, on that day. They were tweeting about it being the 99th game and I am thinking, "What did I do?" That was not a nice feeling.

I waited until after the game. I spoke to Mark and I was very calm. I was obviously upset because this is something that means a lot to me, and first he asked me if I was sure it was my 50th cap. Secondly, he tried to blame somebody else, the treasurer or something. Then, when he asked me if I was sure, I said, "Mark, you stand up there in our meetings and you say how important it is to play for England. I could tell you every goal I have scored, I could tell you every minute I have played for England, because it means so much to me. For you to question if it is my 50th cap—" I found that quite insulting, because I love playing for England and it is an amazing honour for anybody to play for England.

So they forgot about my 50th cap. I have not been selected since. Furthermore, following on from that I had spoken to Mark on the phone. I was living in Cyprus at the time because that is where I play in the off-season, in the Champions League. I live in America and play in America, if you are not aware of that. He told me, "We are only bringing four strikers to this camp; we don't need you; we're playing against a team we are already going to beat". I said, "Okay, no problem". The squad came out and there were eight strikers on the list. I was thinking, "But you just told me there were only four strikers going to be there". Then going on, going forward, I noticed that the girls were meeting up, going to activity weeks and I was not part of these activity weeks. I am looking on social media and I am thinking, "This is a bit weird".

This might all sound trivial, but at the same time, for me, I just felt that because I had said to Mark about my 50th cap being forgotten—we were still in China for a good week after that and no one from the FA could even look me in the eye. I am a pretty understanding person. I would accept an apology if someone said sorry, but I did not get an apology until about five days later, which was a text message from somebody in the FA who was there. I mean, can you not come and knock on my door and find out how I am doing?

Going on from what you were saying about where to go, where do I go when I am in China, when they forget about me? I don't want that to be a team problem, but then, as I said, I have not been selected since. Then I was part of the long squad in February 2016, last year, to go to the SheBelieves Cup, and then I found out on Twitter, from journalists, that I was not selected.

Following on from that 50th-cap incident, I have not been selected. For me, managers can pick whoever they want. Some fans might like me; some fans might not. I could be someone's best player; I could be someone's worst player. That is part of the job. But, I cannot believe that from that moment in China when they forgot about me and I said, "I think it is really bad" and I was obviously crying—I was not angry—I have not been selected for England since. Since then I have been injured. I unfortunately tore my ischial meniscus last year. I have not had one phone call from the doctor, I have had not one phone call from the coach, and I played for England for a good period of time. I was part of the 2015 squad; we won the bronze medal. I won the penalty in that game. These are moments that you want to celebrate. Also, you need help when you are injured and I have had absolutely no contact from them at all.

Just to give you a back-story of what happened to me, that is what happened.

Q98 **Chair:** From your point of view, as soon as you raised that issue because you were upset about it, it was almost like you were cut out.

Lianne Sanderson: Yes. I think from that moment, I was forced out. They said, "We are not selecting you because we are going to bring in only four strikers", but they brought in eight. They were going on team activities. When I reached out to the team psychologist at the time, Adam Streeter, to find out why I was not invited to these team activities, he was told I was not able to make it. Then all these things started ticking off in my head. I am thinking, "Well, I didn't say I could not make it", so I am thinking, "Okay, this does not make sense to me here", and when I found out on Twitter I was not selected, then I just knew that was it.

Q99 **Chair:** You said you had a text message from the FA apologising for what had happened. Who was that from? Do you remember?

Lianne Sanderson: Catherine Stewart. I responded to her by saying that I appreciated her apologising but it was not acceptable. I think that because I was upset about it and because I did not just turn around and say, "Oh, that's fine. You forgot about my 50th cap. It has never happened to anyone before, but please do it again"—that is not how I operate. I am a respectful person and I expect to be respected in return. I am not a person who holds grudges. Everyone makes mistakes. I understand that, but from that moment on I feel like they pushed and forced me out. How do you go from being one of the most high-profile players on the team to then being taken out of the team completely, without even a phone call to say why. Even to this day, yes, I am injured, but I have never had a phone call to say why. I have never been told,

"Lianne, you are not good enough to play for England anymore". I might not agree with it, but I will accept it.

Q100 **Chair:** You have never had someone say, "This is the reason you are not being picked"?

Lianne Sanderson: No. Literally since they forgot about my 50th cap, I have not been selected.

Q101 **Simon Hart:** Are there other colleagues who you are close to who would love to have spoken out, who have had similar distressing experiences but feel that they do not want to do anything because they have seen the problems that might have been generated? Do you think you are here with Eni to speak for a wider group of people who are urging you on, watching this this afternoon?

Lianne Sanderson: Somewhat, but I also think that these particular incidents only happened to myself and Eni particularly. Yes, there are other grievances, but it was not like this is going on to everybody in the team. That is why it has been such a bitter pill to swallow, so to speak, because we could see certain things happening only to certain members of the team. For some players, I am sure they love being there—I am sure it is a most amazing experience—but to me, at this moment in time, I have not heard anything from most of the members on the team. I don't really have friendships on the team anymore, because I do not feel I can be friends with people who do not support what we are doing. You do not have to take sides, but you could at least just reach out to somebody. As Eni's friend, I have seen what she has been through and it has been a torrid time for her. I am happy I could be there for her, but it has not been easy for anybody.

Q102 **Simon Hart:** Do you think the way in which complaints are handled, and they could be on the very serious end of the scale or less serious—I hope I am not putting words in your mouth—is consistent, or are you seeing complaints being dealt with perfectly reasonably in some circumstances but unreasonably in others?

Lianne Sanderson: I think it is inconsistent, because the behaviour in itself, initially, is a problem. The way they treated Eni in the first place was different from how they treated a lot of other players on team. It is pretty obvious, but at the same time it is that mentality of, "Well, it's not happening to me so I won't say anything". It is not as if I think everybody has been treated like this on the team. That is not the case at all.

Q103 **Simon Hart:** You have been listening to the evidence this afternoon and following the whole saga right from the beginning. Do you detect, from the FA, that the commitments to improve the situation are a result of a real desire to improve the situation or because they have been dragged rather unwillingly to this position, under a degree of public scrutiny, and that the cultural attitude has not really changed but the presentational attitude may have done?

Lianne Sanderson: I think you are right. That is exactly why, when they asked me to speak to Katharine Newton, I said, "I am not going to speak to her", because I had already taken part in the internal investigation of Rachel Brace and they contacted me the day after they had already told Eni that they had come to the conclusion that there was no wrongdoing on Mark Sampson's part. How can you then ask somebody the next day about something you have already told somebody about? So I spoke to Rachel Brace. I expressed to her what I have expressed to you today. I brought up some pretty not-so-great things. It was the day before my operation so it was the last thing I wanted to be doing, remembering things that do not make me feel good, but it was necessary. Then I did not hear from her for literally about five or six months.

When I brought up that stuff and she asked would I be willing to speak to Mark Sampson, I said, "Yes, of course I want to speak to my national team manager". If your national team manager calls, you speak to them. Like I said, I am an understanding person and I wanted to play for England again, but then I did not hear from her for about five or six months. Then she e-mailed me, asking me if I would be part of the inquiry with Katharine Newton and I said, "No, I don't feel like I want to, because I don't think they are trying to get to the truth of it". I felt that they were just ticking a box to say, "Okay, Lianne's a witness, let's speak to her now and we will be done with it". But I did not feel like they were getting to do an inquiry and an investigation to get to the fair truth, hence the fact the new report has come out today and that is the truth of what happened. The first report was not the truth, because they did not interview me; they did not interview people who were in the room; they did not interview anybody there. You could have got anybody to do the inquiry at the beginning.

Q104 **Brendan O'Hara:** Could you tell us, for the record, a bit of background. You left the England setup in 2010, initially. What were the circumstances that led to that?

Lianne Sanderson: A similar situation really. This goes back to what we were talking about earlier about there being nobody to speak to when you have grievances. It is a completely different situation because I just felt like I was being—the way that Mark treated Eni, I felt Hope Powell was treating me like that, if that makes sense. That is why I left the team at that time. This time I did not leave the team. I did not get selected and it was completely different because under Mark I felt I was succeeding under him and I felt, at the beginning, he gave me the necessary tools to be successful in that environment. But then it was almost like when I got too much popularity and I was doing too well, that is when they started taking me out of the team. You know, as a player, when you are not good enough, you are not ready. You know when you should not be playing. That is the manager's decision. But this is just inconsistent, the behaviour of what they have.

Q105 **Brendan O'Hara:** Are you saying that there are similarities between how you were treated in 2010 and subsequently in 2015? Could you expand on that for me?

Lianne Sanderson: My situations with Hope Powell and Mark Sampson are completely different. Mark and I had a good relationship, I would say, at the beginning, if that makes sense. But I would say the way Eni was treated from minute one was very similar to how I felt I was treated before. In that situation, I live in America, I play in America, and I felt like that was the best place for me to go. I do not like the attention surrounding a lot of stuff. I just like things to be done properly. It is not a situation of, "Here we go again, Lianne's here". I am here to support Eni and I am here to stand up for what is right, and that is what I have always maintained the whole time. I want to tell the truth and that is what I will do.

Q106 **Brendan O'Hara:** Finally, what was it that persuaded you to return to the England setup in 2015?

Lianne Sanderson: It was Mark. He called me around Christmas time and picked me for the La Manga trip in 2014, and I never thought I would play for England again. I also think that they took advantage of that, because I was so excited to be back playing for England again. But I think at that time, people have told me later on, "Anyone would have brought you back in at that time"; it was kind of the thing you should do. As a new manager, it was a good decision to make, because people like me. Fans like me, most people like me. I am not saying everyone loves me, but most people do, because I am a pretty straight-up person. When Mark brought me back into the team, I was pretty vulnerable because of what happened to me before, and he knew that. For this to happen again—and, as I said, the 50th cap for me was a moment that was such an amazing feeling because I did not think I would play for England again after the situation of Hope Powell, so for myself and my family, when I got called back for England it was amazing. Then for me to get my 50th cap in China, I couldn't wait—I never thought I would play for England again—and for that to be taken away from me was just the worst feeling in the world, it really was.

Q107 **Rebecca Pow:** Apologies for being late. I know that you have covered a lot of the detail about today's report. I am going back to something you said earlier. Why do you think you and Eni were picked on? You said lots of other people were not picked on. What is it and why was that, do you think?

Lianne Sanderson: Honestly, I think a lot of it is to do with people feeling threatened. For example, Eniola can do anything. You can call me biased because I am one of her best friends, but her ability to do a lot of other things apart from football is I think what separates us from a lot of the other players.

Q108 **Rebecca Pow:** But she was used as a shining light by the FA because of not just her footballing skills but her other skills. What do you put that down to and what does that say about the organisation?

Lianne Sanderson: Honestly, I cannot answer that question because that is something you have to ask them. I cannot say this is why they did this, but I think, again, there is a lot of bias, there is a lot of ignorance, in

that environment. I think, again, how the coach treats you is how everybody treats you in that environment. It is something that you would not understand, in this sense, because you are not on the team, you are not there. But when you are there, I can tell when I am starting, because everyone is nice to me; then when I am not, it is like, "Oh, yeah—" Do you know what I mean? It is like a different feeling. That is exactly what happened

Q109 **Rebecca Pow:** If the FA is promoting women's sport and women's football, would you think that the way you two have been treated is an encouragement for women to follow your path? They are supposed to be developing women's football.

Lianne Sanderson: Honestly, I can see what you are saying, but I think the fact is that we have been strong enough and willing enough to go and take this where we need to. We want change; we do not want this to happen to somebody else again. I would not want somebody to go through what Eni and I have been through. Hopefully, this will now make the FA and other organisations put in place a structure for people to be able to file grievances, or whatever it may be, so that they can be successful.

Q110 **Rebecca Pow:** I think you said, in some of the documents that I have read, that the FA problem, which relates to all the procedures and all the rest of it, would not stop with the dismissal of Sampson, that it is much more widely prevalent. Do you still hold that view?

Lianne Sanderson: Yes, I do. I think the sacking of Mark needed to happen; at the same time, I think that this, as we have seen today from the evidence in the second investigation, is a bigger problem. Now they have got rid of Mark, that does not mean that everything just goes on like nothing has happened. This is not something that we have enjoyed. I love football, I love being a pioneer for women's football, and for this to have happened the way it has happened did not need to happen. If they just showed the findings from what we found today, I do not think we would be sitting here now, but thankfully we are because we are now able to force their hand and make them tell the truth, if that makes sense.

Q111 **Rebecca Pow:** We have been told in a nice letter to the Chair that the FA has this whole system of improving the governance, the accountability, and the safeguarding under way. Are you satisfied with that?

Lianne Sanderson: If they can show improvements, yes, but it has to happen naturally. I do not think we want to see things happening just to tick a box. You want things to be done properly and for them to actually have things in place, maybe have someone like me or Eni be part of that process. It should not mean you lose your England career because we are sitting here today. That should not be the case.

Q112 **Rebecca Pow:** Finding a new role.

Lianne Sanderson: Yes, I guess.

Q113 **Rebecca Pow:** Do you think they have enough women? That was one of the things Tracey Crouch, the Sports Minister, said: we have to get more diversity into all the governance structures. Are you seeing that happening or do you think a lot more needs to happen?

Lianne Sanderson: It has definitely got better, especially in women's football. You have seen how much it has grown. There is more publicity surrounding it, not only this case but the girls at the Euros, the World Cup and how successful we were there, but if you are going to bring more publicity you have to bring more professionalism off the field too so situations like this do not happen because now people do recognise the girls, where you are in a good position. Women's football has progressed so much and just because this has happened it does not mean it cannot keep progressing. It does not mean we need to take it—yes, it is not a nice situation; as I said, we do not enjoy talking about this stuff. It is not something I have enjoyed talking about, but at the end of the day we need to get to the truth and what has happened.

Q114 **Christian Matheson:** A brief question, Ms Sanderson, on something that you answered the Chair on. It was about not being contacted when you were effectively dropped as an established international. I remember watching news reports over many years about the men's team, and the manager of the England men's team would say, "Well, I have dropped such and such a player, but I phoned him and explained why." You are suggesting that that is not the normal course of events in the women's team. Did it happen or was it specifically, perhaps, in your case and Ms Aluko's case?

Lianne Sanderson: Usually, to be honest, we had so many meetings about what structure there is in place for certain players. The same thing happened to Anita Asante. Way before we were told about the World Cup, she was told about three months before. We had a meeting in a room about how we are going to be told on the phone, because being selected for a World Cup is a big deal, so if you are not selected you need to be with your family. Some people need to be left alone. We put a structure in place, as players, with the staff to know what was going to happen if you did not get selected. Part of that structure was to give a player a phone call. Most players who do not get selected for their country, especially if you have been selected in the past—I was never left out of a Mark Sampson team, the same as Eni had been selected for 11 years—expect a phone call. I would have expected a phone call as opposed to finding out on Twitter that I was not selected. I do not think that is too much to ask for.

Q115 **Christian Matheson:** I was wondering whether it was a level of disrespect in general for the women's team, but what you are suggesting sounds a little bit more like petulance.

Lianne Sanderson: Yes. Different players have different relationships with a coach. Some players find out if they are playing before others. There is definitely preferential treatment to certain players, and that happens in teams, but it was pretty obvious in certain environments. In a

team, especially a team full of women, we like to speak. When the coach says to a player they are playing, you then know you are not, but how does that player know a week before but you do not? How can you then feel valued if someone else is being told, and you are not, that you are not playing? That does not need to happen. We had all these systems in place to be able to say this is what we are going to do, but why not then listen to the system that we put in place? Why is that system only covered for certain players?

Q116 **Julian Knight:** Right at the start of your evidence you made reference to how your predecessors over the last 15 years had felt the same sort of disrespect. What do you think that was based on? Was it racial in character?

Lianne Sanderson: No, I don't think it was. I think a lot of players that have played previously feel like they have been forgotten about by the FA. It is not race related, necessarily, but from my conversations with ex-players and from what I have seen on social media and stuff, you can tell that they feel as if they have been forgotten about. For myself, I have played in America now for seven years, on and off, but seven years mostly, and when a player retires there is a huge deal made about it. Do you know what I mean?

Julian Knight: Yes, retire shirts and things like that.

Lianne Sanderson: Right. I am not saying we need to start doing that, but what I am saying is that you need to make everybody feel valued. Some players have given 20 years to The Football Association and have not really been given that much of a—I think there needs to be something in place for players who have played for their country, whether it be once, 15 times, 150 times, for them to feel like they can come back and also work for The Football Association. I think that could help, having players who have previously played and had experiences, so they do not feel bitter about The Football Association and how they have been treated

Q117 **Julian Knight:** Do you recognise that that goes across men's football as well? The famous example of that is Bobby Moore, World Cup-winning captain, sends in a letter, effectively applying for the England job—I think it was when Bobby Robson got the job—and he did not even get a response. Here is this great of the game, effectively, and for many years, people said that his treatment was absolutely appalling, but that seems to be an exemplar, across football. We see it among junior football as well, when people are let go by football clubs.

Would you say this is something that needs to be addressed right across the piece? It is not just about the FA's relationship with women or minority communities. It is actually a cultural issue within football, and especially within the FA, about, frankly, how we treat people.

Lianne Sanderson: Yes, definitely. Obviously, we are female so we can only go by what we see and what we have experienced. I think they tried to put positions in place in the FA and in football for players who have

played for teams to go back and work for that club, or something like that, but I do think there needs to be more. There needs to be more black managers involved in football. There needs to be more females involved in football. It does not matter if you are female, male, black or white, you need to make sure the person that is best for the job gets the job and that is exactly what needs to happen. There should not be any bias. They should just pick the person who is best for the job. In general, it is definitely getting better, but it could be even better than it already is.

Q118 Paul Farrelly: We have heard about the cultural review conducted by the technical director, Dan Ashworth. Were you invited to participate in that?

Lianne Sanderson: No, but I was contacted by Rachel Brace and I guess that came after. I can't remember if it was before or after, but I was not asked to be a part of the cultural review. That is something that was interesting to me because when I then asked them what it was going to be about, they would not tell me and that is why I said, "How can you expect me to speak to you on the phone if you are not going to have the decency to tell me what you are going to talk to me about in advance?" I did not know, necessarily, what I was speaking to Rachel Brace about, and when I told her I did not want to be part of it with Katharine Newton, she recognised that it was probably wrong that they did not reach out to me at that time.

Q119 Paul Farrelly: Were you a part of the England setup at that time?

Lianne Sanderson: Yes.

Q120 Paul Farrelly: I am curious as to why one person might be asked to participate in the cultural review and you were not. It seems strange.

Lianne Sanderson: Yes. I don't know the answer to that but maybe they already knew stuff was going on and they wanted to see what was going to happen if they spoke to Eni. I think they knew what was going on, somewhat, but then to ask her, they probably did not think she would go into as much detail as she did in the cultural review. If you asked other players, they probably would not have gone into that much detail, because they are too scared, and understandably so, that they will not play for England again because, as we have seen, it has not been confidential.

Q121 Chair: Lianne, you said that Rachel Brace contacted you. What did she say the contact was about? Was she asking you to share information, outside of the cultural review, about your experiences, or was she clear that it was linked to specific allegations that her team were investigating?

Lianne Sanderson: She did not really tell me what it was about but, to be honest, because it was someone from the FA, and it was The Football Association and I have been part of this for a long period of time, and I was not just going to ignore them, I had no reason to; it could have been about anything. Obviously, I had spoken to Eni, I knew it was going on, but I did not necessarily think that it was going to be tied. When she asked me the questions, it was kind of like asking me if I thought that

bullying happens at England, so it was very generic. I said, "Bullying is not just name calling; it is the treatment of people," and I expressed certain situations that had happened that I felt were not acceptable. I thought by sharing my story that would then—I think, from what I hope you guys have heard today, it sent a lot of red flags flying, if you are just hearing my story and everyone's story is completely different. I just felt if they really wanted to get to the bottom of this, after what I told them—I did not hear from them, I did not hear from Rachel Brace for around four or five months, so clearly they did not want to know the truth of what was going on; otherwise they would have reached out to me again.

Q122 **Chair:** When this occurred, this inquiry from Rachel, was this before the Katharine Newton investigation was set up?

Lianne Sanderson: Yes, it was before. It was last year. It was around the end of October.

Q123 **Chair:** Okay. This would have been around the time that the PFA had a meeting with Rachel and Dan Ashworth.

Lianne Sanderson: Yes. It was definitely about Eni but they would not tell me what it was about. Does that make sense? They were not saying to me, "Have you witnessed Eni doing X, Y and Z?" They just said, "Have you witnessed or experienced bullying among the squad? Have you seen this? Have you seen that?" But obviously I am aware of what goes on with my teammates, whether that be Eni; you do not have to be best friends with someone to stand up for them and to be able to say right from wrong. For me, I just gave my honest opinion of what happened to me. I did not really speak about Eni in that situation, but I obviously knew it was about Eni. But then that is why I felt it was a weird situation, because they would not really tell me what it was about and I was thinking, "How can I give my evidence or opinion if I do not know what it is about?"

Q124 **Chair:** Yes. And they gave you no sense of how they were acting on the information you had given them, what they would do.

Lianne Sanderson: No. I do not believe they acted upon the information I gave them because Mark did not call me, when I said I would be open to him calling me. Then also I did not hear from them, so I genuinely feel like it was just to tick a box, but then, once I found out from Eni that they had already told her there was no wrongdoing, then I felt a bit disheartened, because I thought, "Why are they calling me then?" And they were pretty conscious of not putting stuff in an e-mail. Everything needed to be done over the phone, which I was kind of mindful of as well.

Q125 **Chair:** Did they encourage you not to put things in writing, just to discuss it over the phone?

Lianne Sanderson: Kind of. I would not say they encouraged it, but just by the responses via e-mail. It was more like, "We'll talk more about it on the phone", as opposed to, "Why can you not just tell me what this is about? I am not going to tell anybody". I just think I deserve to know what it is about, if you want me to give a fair opinion of something, and

that is why, like I said, when I was asked to give the evidence in the Katharine Newton one, I did not feel it was right to do so. I think that has been proven to be the case, until the second reportings have been found.

Q126 **Chair:** You were approached to give a view. You were not told what the inquiry was related to and you were not told what they did with the information afterwards.

Lianne Sanderson: No. They just asked me questions about bullying so I just guessed that it was about bullying, but it was not asking me about specific incidents. I thought it was confidential, our phone call. It is obviously not confidential now, but it was confidential at the time and it has been since, if you know what I mean. I have not spoken about this with anybody. I felt they could have asked me anything on that phone call, they could have told me it was about Eni, and I would have been able to give my opinion.

Q127 **Chair:** Did you principally discuss what you have already told the Committee about the way you were treated around the awarding of your 50th cap.

Lianne Sanderson: Yes.

Q128 **Chair:** Did you raise other issues as well?

Lianne Sanderson: I spoke about that. I spoke about what had happened to Anita Asante, how she—certain situations. I spoke about Eni, from what I can remember. I did not only speak about myself. I thought I could help, in that situation, to help other people.

Q129 **Ian C. Lucas:** Do you know if any of these phone calls were recorded?

Lianne Sanderson: Honestly, I do not know at this point. Maybe. I did not record it, but I guess they could have done.

Ian C. Lucas: I must say I find it very interesting that these were all done on the phone and maybe we will pursue that.

Q130 **Giles Watling:** You have been at some pains to say that things are improving and things are looking better all the time. Do you still believe, as a result of your experience and Eni's experience, that the FA needs a root and branch reorganisation still? Do you think that is the way it needs to go, or is it a matter of personalities?

Lianne Sanderson: Sorry, I don't understand your question. Could you elaborate?

Giles Watling: Very simply, do you think the FA needs to be completely reorganised and change the way its structure works or do you think things are improving? Is it just a question of losing personalities and things will improve that way?

Lianne Sanderson: Yes, I think things need to change. It is not for me to decide but I think things definitely need to change, including personnel. That is my opinion. But at the same time, like I have always

said, there needs to be positions in place for us to go with grievances, where we are not going to get taken out of the team.

Yes, women's football is improving. I am not saying that the FA has improved. I am saying women's football is improving in this country. Like I said, we will do all we can to help that be the case, when we can progress the team, where we can progress women's football globally.

Just to be clear, though, when you mentioned about the phone conversation, there was only one conversation I had on the phone. The others things were e-mails, so it was not as if I was on the phone to them all the time. It was just a conversation on the phone, a one-time thing, and then the other stuff was by e-mail.

Chair: Thank you very much, Lianne. Once again, thank you very much for your evidence to the Committee. These are really important issues and we are very grateful, not only for your time today but also for making the effort to come, to cross a nation to come here and give evidence.

Lianne Sanderson: Anything for you guys. Thanks for having me. Thank you.

Examination of witnesses

Witnesses: Martin Glenn, Greg Clarke, Dan Ashworth, and Rachel Brace.

Q131 **Chair:** Greg Clarke, I would like to thank you and your colleagues from The Football Association for not only giving up your time today to answer the Committee's questions as part of this inquiry but also thank you and your team for supplying all the written evidence and information the Committee requested, which has been supplied by The Football Association. Thank you as well for giving me and the Committee clerk sight of the initial Katharine Newton report and the subsequent report, which have been very helpful to us in preparing for this session, and also for advance sight of the cultural review. We understand that that is a private document and not a public one, and also that many people who gave evidence to Katharine Newton did so on the understanding that their anonymity would be protected, which is why that report could not be published in full.

If I could start the questions and ask Martin Glenn first. Martin, you have issued an apology to Drew Spence and Eni Aluko following the publication of Katharine Newton's second report. You have apologised for the conduct of Mark Sampson. Do you feel that you should also apologise for the way in which the FA handled the investigation of this affair?

Martin Glenn: I want to reiterate that we want to offer a full and unreserved apology to Drew and Eniola. An independent report has found that they were subject to discriminatory remarks, which is both against

the Equality Act 2010 but, every bit as important to us, against the values of the FA. It is not right that an FA employee should have behaved that way.

What we believe, however, in the context of today, is how do we develop a grievance procedure that is suitable for elite sport. We have a grievance procedure, which is one that I define as being useful for a normal-sized organisation, the size of the FA, but it has clearly fallen short in this area with respect to how to deal with the pressures that elite players have with respect to their coach.

Regarding a general apology about how we handled it, I believe, we believe, that we have handled this with decency and openness. We have taken the concerns raised by Eniola seriously; we have done one internal review with the head of HR and the head of technical. When that did not seem to give satisfaction, we went to an independent barrister, opened the doors, and asked her to conclude what she thought, and then asked her again, when there were clearly some pieces of evidence that had not been uncovered, to go and thoroughly do those. I think that shows that the FA has taken it very seriously. I regret that the two comments, the inappropriate banter, have been made. That is not right for an FA employee. However, I do think the spirit with which we approached all the concerns has been good.

Q132 Chair: You set out the process. I am sure there will be lots of questions about the process from members of the Committee. You said in your written statement to the Committee, which we have published as well today, that you stand by the process and do not accept the criticisms that have been made. Is that still your position?

Martin Glenn: It absolutely is and we have the head of HR, Rachel Brace, and Dan Ashworth from the technical department to answer the detailed questions, which is not to say there is nothing to learn, which I said in my opening remarks. However, I do believe that the substance of the issues that were raised was honestly and diligently dealt with.

Q133 Chair: Katharine Newton was critical of the process, was she not?

Martin Glenn: I will let Rachel answer some of the detail, but in the round, if you read Katharine Newton's report, it is a very holistic view—and we did ask her in—about the approach that has been taken. I think she felt, in the round, that there was no evidence to substantiate most of the concerns that were raised. One point she made about the process was the possibility of a slight conflict of interest on one aspect between Dan Ashworth in his role as technical director and witness. I would like to ask Rachel to add comments to that.

Q134 Chair: Believe me, we will come on to other members of the panel, but you have spoken about this and you were the one who wrote to the Committee about the process.

Katharine Newton was clear in her statement that as far as she is concerned there is no grievance procedure for players in Eniola's position.

That is what Eniola has said as well and that is what Lianne has said. They do not believe there is a proper grievance procedure. The direct criticism about the process, one that many organisations might find quite fundamental, is when someone who is co-leading an internal review is also supplying evidence to that review. That is a very poor example of due process. That is why I asked you again whether you feel there are not just lessons to be learned but actually an apology should be issued for the initial process that was set up by the FA, which was not fit for purpose.

Martin Glenn: I have a different point of view, if I might. One of the reasons that we asked an independent barrister in was to give us the benefit of an independent, fresh pair of eyes on the process, and I think that was right.

However, to reiterate, we took the concerns and complaints seriously. We followed them in a way that was typical of most organisations, with an internal review process. When that was felt to still have unanswered questions in the eyes of the complainant, we then went further. I think that is pretty good going.

Q135 **Chair:** This was an initial internal process where, as Eniola has told the Committee, she was asked to write down specific complaints, grievances that she asked the FA to look into, and she never received from the FA a line-by-line response to the allegations that she made.

Martin Glenn: I would like Rachel to respond to that.

Q136 **Chair:** It is true, though, isn't it? You would admit that.

Martin Glenn: I will not admit that she did not get a response from the FA.

Q137 **Chair:** That is not what I said. She was asked to set out in writing her specific allegations and she never got a response, line by line, to those allegations that she made. She may have had a general response from the FA but she never had a specific line-by-line response to the allegations she was told by the FA to write down, did she?

Martin Glenn: I think you characterised the—

Chair: Did she? I would like you to answer the question.

Martin Glenn: Eniola had a fulsome response in terms of dialogue with Rachel Brace and Dan Ashworth.

Q138 **Chair:** That is not the question I asked. I said she was asked to write down her grievances, to give them to the FA, and she never received from the FA a response to each of those grievances that she had raised, did she? She didn't, did she?

Martin Glenn: I guess on the specific—in the form addressed—yes, but I think in the spirit of what was asked for, then she was fully engaged.

Chair: She clearly does not agree with that. But in terms of process, if you ask someone as part of a process to write down what their

complaints are and to then give them to do, and then you do not respond to each of those complaints, a lot of people would say that is not a good process.

Rachel Brace: If I could add to the facts, as I understand it we did not ask Eniola to do that. When I picked this up, there had been a small e-mail correspondence between her and Dan about the Owen Eastwood issue and they had agreed that they would meet to speak about it. On one of those e-mails, Eniola attached her letter, which had all of her allegations listed out. That was something that she decided to do. We did not ask her to do that and we did not ask her to do it in a certain way.

Q139 **Chair:** If I could continue with you, Rachel, the brief that was effectively given to Katharine Newton was based on the written submission she gave. It was very faithful in that it sets out each of the allegations, as written and codified by Eniola Aluko, and seeks to respond to them.

I want to talk about the terms of reference that were established for Katharine Newton's inquiry. There were a number of allegations and I would like to focus on one or two of them in particular. One of them is the allegation, which Eni repeats, that Drew Spence had made—it has now been fully investigated—about the comments that were made by Mark Sampson in the midfield unit team meeting during the China Cup. Again in terms of process, would you regard it as a failure of process that neither you nor Dan Ashworth had viewed the video of that meeting that had been referred to before coming to a conclusion that he did not believe there was a case to be answered?

Rachel Brace: We had a second meeting with the PFA and Eni, and we said in the room that we had not watched the video when we were asked the question. We admitted that was an oversight. We had not formed any written conclusions at that point. I was asked by the PFA, ahead of that meeting, to put my conclusions in writing and I said, "No, I don't think that is the right thing to do". In any grievance process you understand that in any meeting you go into new evidence can come out of that meeting, and therefore I reserved the right to have that meeting, to listen to what was said, and then it was a matter, after that, to put my written conclusions together, with Dan obviously.

Q140 **Chair:** From Eniola's point of view, that is a pretty fundamental piece of evidence. We know subsequently that the contents of the video did not resolve the matter one way or the other. You did not know that and nor did Dan Ashworth, but nevertheless you felt comfortable enough to give a view on the issue that had been raised, without having looked at that piece of evidence, what many people would have thought was a pretty vital piece of evidence to have considered.

Rachel Brace: We did not give a view on that piece of evidence. We apologised immediately and said it was an oversight. We did not try to give a view on it.

Q141 **Chair:** Looking at an allegation like that, what someone else might have done is think, "We have an allegation that has been made. We know that

Drew Spence is the person who has made the allegation". It was never a secret that it was Drew Spence, in terms of the internal inquiry, and Katharine Newton identifies Drew Spence in the video, in her first report, so it is clear to her who it is that we are talking about. What another investigation might do is say, "We will look at the video evidence. If that is not conclusive, there were other people in the room. Do they remember those comments having been made?" But you did not speak to any of those other people, did you? You did not speak to any of those players.

Rachel Brace: There are a couple of points that are quite important about that allegation. One of the points that I think it is important to make is that in Eniola's allegation—and the barrister picks this up in her final report—is that it is very clear that she believes that the matter has been said during the meeting; it is very clear to say "during the meeting". We watched the videotape a number of times, as did the barrister. Nothing untoward is said in that meeting.

When we had the conversation with Eniola and the PFA, the very first meeting we had, the issue of confidentiality came up very quickly. Eniola was very concerned that this matter was kept private. She talked about the fact that a couple of journalists had been contacting her and she did not want this matter to get out into the media. She absolutely wanted us to respect that. One of the issues that was brought up was about Drew Spence, as you say. Drew's name was not mentioned but what we were told was that she did not want Drew brought into this; she was a young player and she wanted to protect the privacy of young players. We respected those wishes. I felt that given that this comment was said to have been made during the meeting—we later find out that the comment was not made during the meeting, it was actually made in a sort of pre-meeting, if you like—we could only follow the evidence as we saw it. We did not then speak to a cast of other players because clearly that was going to open up the debate in the squad, which we just did not feel was respectful to Eniola's wishes.

Q142 **Chair:** Many people would expect this to be a proper process. You are investigating a serious allegation that has been made that has now ultimately been investigated. At that point, you did not seek to speak to the other players. Eniola says that her view was not that she was saying you cannot speak to Drew Spence and that it was open to the FA to speak to Drew directly and to clarify what had been said. That appears not to have been done.

Rachel Brace: That is not Drew's understanding. I went to a meeting at Chelsea Football Club with our legal director, and Drew attended the meeting with her legal representative. One of the first things that I was keen to understand in that meeting, to make sure that I had not misunderstood things, was whether she had wanted to be involved in this and what her wishes were. She confirmed at the time that she did not want to be involved in this investigation. She had only spoken up because she had been identified in the media. She also confirmed that by the very

fact that we had not contacted her, she believed that her wishes had been complied with. That is what she told me.

- Q143 **Chair:** It is quite easy to identify from the video who the players are, and even if you had not seen the video, it is the midfield unit from that squad so you could just look at the midfield players in the squad and know who could have been party to that conversation. It sounds like almost a matter of policy that you were not going to talk to any of those players about the allegation that had been made.

Rachel Brace: No, not a matter of policy at all. One of the things that is really important in any grievance procedure is that you carry it out in a way that is, in your understanding, respectful of the victim's wishes. These were really serious allegations and it was my understanding, from the first meeting that we had had, that this matter was very sensitive and it needed to be kept tight, it needed to be contained. Although I absolutely agree with what Eniola said, which is there was never expressly, "You cannot speak to a certain person", it was a very clear understanding on all of our parts that this needed to be done with absolute privacy, as much as it possibly could be, and Eniola gave the name of two witnesses that she wanted us to speak to.

- Q144 **Chair:** Do you regard the process with Katharine Newton as being a tight process?

Rachel Brace: That was done under different terms and the instructions were very clearly different. We recognised that the internal process had not got to where Eniola wanted it to get to, it had been constrained, and I was very clear, when we spoke to Farrers, who instructed Katharine Newton, that from our perspective it was a different landscape, that it was about leaving no stone unturned, and that therefore all parties needed to understand that it was likely that people might start to talk about this. But that is what you have to weigh up when you are weighing people's privacy and trying to get to the truth. What we felt was that was the right way to go forward. We did not do that disrespectfully. We wrote to Eniola and we told her that that is what we were going to do and we asked her if she would want to co-operate in the process.

- Q145 **Chair:** In the terms of reference you set up for Katharine Newton, you recommended that she speak to 16 people who were relevant to the inquiry, in our view. You put those 16 names forward, didn't you?

Rachel Brace: To be clear, I did not instruct Katharine Newton. It would be completely inappropriate for me to do that. I had the conversation with Farrers and they instructed Katharine Newton. But, yes, players' names were put forward.

- Q146 **Chair:** You put them forward. Okay. There were players' names on that list.

Rachel Brace: Yes, absolutely.

- Q147 **Chair:** None of those players were players who were in that midfield unit meeting, were they?

Rachel Brace: The players' names on the list were the names of the players we understood were happy to come forward. That was something that Dan managed, because obviously the players were very sensitive about getting involved in this.

Q148 **Chair:** This is a really serious allegation that has been subsequently part of another inquiry, and then upheld. Sixteen names were given to Katharine Newton, and none of them, not one of those names, was a player who was in that meeting, not one.

Rachel Brace: Absolutely. I agree with you.

Q149 **Chair:** Katharine Newton interviews 10 people as part of the process and that includes, I think, three players, but again none of the people who were in the midfield unit meeting because it had never been suggested to her that she should. Do you not think that it was a massive oversight not to consider approaching any one of the players who were witness to that meeting to ask them whether they could corroborate what Drew Spence believed they had been saying?

Rachel Brace: My understanding of the list of players that I was given was it was a list of players who were willing to co-operate. I cannot speak for who was not prepared to co-operate. Dan put the list together. He might be able to give more on that.

Q150 **Chair:** It is an investigation into a specific allegation, to which there are eyewitnesses, and no one approached any of the eyewitnesses to ask them if they could corroborate what had been said.

Rachel Brace: It is an independent investigation.

Q151 **Chair:** Surely, if what you are doing, if your ambition is to leave no stone unturned, as you say, those are a lot of big stones, sitting there that no one is touching. Some people might say you are deliberately steering the barrister away from people who might be able to corroborate what was said.

Rachel Brace: You can only put forward people who are willing to co-operate. You would have—

Q152 **Chair:** Did you speak to any of the midfield unit players about it, about the idea of co-operating with the inquiry? Did they decline to do so?

Rachel Brace: I did not speak directly with players.

Chair: Perhaps Dan Ashworth can help us with this, on this particular question.

Dan Ashworth: No. As far as—

Q153 **Chair:** No, you did not. Okay. I am sure we will have other questions for you. You did not.

Now, with the second report, lo and behold, all of these players are spoken to and the decision of Katharine Newton to uphold the complaint is not just based on Drew Spence's interview and it is not just based on

the WhatsApp messages that have been shared, it is also based on two of the players in the midfield unit saying, "Yes, I believe that was said" or words to that effect. Is that not right?

Rachel Brace: Two players did; other players said something different.

Q154 **Chair:** But it was Katharine Newton's decision, based on weighing all the evidence, that they did. If those players had been approached as part of your initial review, at the very beginning, or for at least part of Katharine Newton's first investigation, it may well be she would have reached a different determination some time ago. Is that not right?

Rachel Brace: I think if all the evidence had been put forward at the beginning we may well have been able to reach a different outcome, but it was not.

Q155 **Chair:** Many people would see this. There is a difference. If someone has written evidence that they have not told you about and you do not know exists, and therefore you do not ask for it because you do not know it exists, that is very different from saying there are eyewitnesses to one of these allegations, people who were in the room, we know who they are, but we are not going to approach any one of them about co-operating with the inquiry and we are not going to suggest to the barrister, who may not know who those players are, that they contact any of them either. Many people would see that as a massive dereliction of your responsibility to make sure that there was, as you said, no stone unturned in this investigation.

Rachel Brace: Absolutely no stone unturned in the Katharine Newton investigation. We were very clear to carry out the investigation in a way that respected wishes and if we had gone round and spoken to 10 players, then this would have got out.

Chair: But it is not 10 players, is it? It was not 10 players. It was a relatively tight group of people and you knew who they were. It was one very specific thing they were being asked to comment on. When that was finally done, which it should have been upfront, it led to two people coming forward and substantiating the allegation made.

Q156 **Ian C. Lucas:** This was a serious allegation that had been made. You did not make any investigations based on that allegation initially, did you? You said something very interesting. You said you wanted to keep it tight.

Rachel Brace: Based on Eniola's wishes.

Ian C. Lucas: But you did not investigate because you did not ask anybody about what she had said.

Rachel Brace: There were many allegations raised and we did lots of investigation. We are talking specifically about the Drew Spence issue, which I understand, and our understanding, as has been explained, as was backed up to me by what Drew Spence said to me when I visited Chelsea Football Club, was that she did not want to be brought into this.

Q157 **Ian C. Lucas:** But this is not a matter for Drew Spence. It is a matter for

the FA, because a serious allegation was made to the FA, and you did not investigate it, did you?

Rachel Brace: We investigated everything we could within the constraints.

Q158 **Ian C. Lucas:** At that stage, who did you speak to? Which of the witnesses did you speak to?

Rachel Brace: I spoke to Anita Asante and I spoke to Lianne Sanderson.

Q159 **Ian C. Lucas:** You have just given evidence to say that you did not lift any stones up at all. You did not ask any of the individuals concerned, the witnesses, what had been said.

Rachel Brace: I gave evidence on the fact that the brief for the barrister was to leave no stone unturned.

Q160 **Ian C. Lucas:** I am not talking about the barrister. When you were told, first of all, about this serious allegation, which of the witnesses did you speak to about it?

Rachel Brace: I don't understand. We did not speak to Drew Spence. She was the person who had had the remark made to her.

Q161 **Ian C. Lucas:** What investigation did you carry out at that stage?

Rachel Brace: We watched the video. We were told that this had happened in the meeting. There was no evidence on the video of anything untoward happening.

Q162 **Ian C. Lucas:** Did you accept that what Eni had said was true?

Rachel Brace: I accepted that Eni had heard something and that she had heard it from Drew. Without being able to speak to Drew, obviously what Eni has said, and she has said in her allegation, was hearsay.

Q163 **Ian C. Lucas:** We have had subsequent investigations. Do you accept that the first investigation that you carried out was completely and utterly inadequate?

Rachel Brace: No, I don't, and neither did the barrister. We did the best we could within the constraints.

Q164 **Ian C. Lucas:** You did the best you could. You did not ask everybody who could give you evidence that was relevant about what had been said. You did not do it.

Rachel Brace: In every grievance that you do, they are always constrained by who you can speak to. If I had spoken or Dan had spoken to those people there was a chance that people were going to start talking about it and things would get out. We were respecting wishes.

Q165 **Ian C. Lucas:** That was your priority, wasn't it, keeping it tight, covering it up; that was your priority?

Rachel Brace: No. My priority was respecting Eniola's wishes.

Q166 **Chair:** On this point, of course there was one witness to the midfield unit meeting who was interviewed as part of the initial inquiry, and that was Mark Sampson.

Rachel Brace: Yes.

Chair: No one else.

Q167 **Simon Hart:** Does the answer to some of our frustration not lie in the e-mail exchange between Greg Clarke and others, when alerted to some of the allegations that were made, to which the response was, "I have no idea why you are sending me this. Perhaps you could enlighten me"? Does that not suggest there was a sort of cultural resistance towards this and you are being dragged unwillingly to a position where you have to confront some of the institutionalised problems within the organisation? I would love to hear from Mr Clarke what he meant and whether he thought that was, to quote your neighbour, "in the spirit of the FA" to respond to such a serious allegation in what seems like such a cavalier way.

Greg Clarke: Thank you for the opportunity to address the point. I worked very hard for a year, driven by and guided by the Minister and Sport England, to get adherence for the FA to the code of conduct for Sport England. On page 24, 1.1(c), you will be aware, as the people who drove this, the responsibilities of the chairman of the board are clearly mandated and directed. I was mandated and directed by the sport's code not to become involved in any management processes or decisions because I would become conflicted if the board had to take a governance view.

Q168 **Simon Hart:** Why did you ask to be enlightened?

Greg Clarke: I had had a number of conversations with a senior executive of the PFA where he had come up to me, at football games, and said, "You need to get involved in this; fair ask" and I thought I had explained to him three times that I was forbidden by the Sport England code. If it came up to the board for governance, saying have the FA done the right thing, I would have been tainted by my involvement in the process. I explained this three times to him. To be fair to him, because he is a decent, hardworking guy, who I think does a great job of looking after footballers, he looked like I was spinning him a line because governance is not the PFA thing. "Why can't I talk to you about it? If this was a football club, I'd go and talk to the chairman." I said, "Yes, but we are a national governing body and I have a prescribed governance role and I am not allowed to hear this. Don't tell me. Otherwise, when it comes up to the board, I will have to recuse myself and I can't sit with the board and discuss whether we have done the right thing or not". When he sent me the e-mail, after those three conversations, I said, "Don't do this. Don't tell me. You are destroying my ability to do my job and comply with the code".

Q169 **Simon Hart:** Do you accept that by telling him that you made the situation worse not better? You have added to the confusion and

suspicion?

Greg Clarke: Let me share something, because all the way through this I tried to stay within my governance box. I tried really hard. I am saying, "No, I know my job. I am a non-executive chairman". My job is to chair the board and make sure governance is good, not to run the FA. That is the job of the chief executive and he has my confidence and support. But they continually tried to drag me into it and I issued a staccato response, because they were then sending me documents that, if I had read them, would have then absolutely destroyed my ability to lead a board discussion.

- Q170 **Simon Hart:** I have one last question on this. Does that not suggest to you, therefore, that the structure of the FA, the non-executive/executive separation does not know how to deal with these things? It suggests to me that what you have just revealed is that nobody knows how to deal with these complaints in a competent and professional manner. If your executive and you as the chairman cannot agree on what is an appropriate way forward when a complaint of this nature is made, what confidence does that give us that you have all of this under control?

Greg Clarke: I have chaired a number of public companies. I have chaired a trading fund for the Government, and the civil service code for the trading fund chairman is exactly the same as the listing rules and the Sport England code that there must be a clear delineation between governance and management execution that must happen. It happens in Government, it happens in corporate life, it happens in sport. If we get sucked into how these decisions are made, how can we sit in judgment on whether they were then correctly—

- Q171 **Simon Hart:** You are missing my point. That all makes perfect sense, but what I am asking is why people under your control did not know that and why the system is apparently flawed and you have to now repeat that.

Greg Clarke: They did know that. It was the PFA that was trying to suck me in. I give you my word and my assurance. I do not think the PFA was being complicit, because it is a football club. The higher you can climb up the tree towards the chairman, the more likely you are to get someone who is in power to fix the problem. However, in a national governing body it is difficult. You do not have to accept my word for it. On page 24, 1.1(c) I am mandated and directed to behave in that way and I did.

What I found particularly annoying was the way this was spun with the media yesterday to make me look like a person who was deliberately being oafish. The reason that made me mildly disappointed—to use a measured term—was because the people accusing me of this have some really bad governance.

- Q172 **Simon Hart:** If you were to go through all this again, you would do the same thing again?

Greg Clarke: I would do exactly the same thing again. What I would do differently is that—I have said in good faith that in the discussions I had with the senior executive from the PFA I genuinely think he did not

believe me. He thought I was spinning him a line. What I probably should have done was written a letter and ripped the page out of this and stuck it on the back and said, "I can't do this for these reasons". That is probably what I should have done.

- Q173 **Chair:** Kick It Out referred to your e-mail as being disgraceful, but regardless of what other bodies might think, we heard this afternoon from Eniola the impact of the choice of the words you said. I do not care what it says in your governance code, it does not dictate that you frame an e-mail in that way. Despite what you have just said, I think probably in your heart of hearts you wish you had chosen your words slightly more carefully.

Greg Clarke: My words were a one-to-one e-mail with a person who had been approaching me and had been speaking to me. I was trying to get him to stop inadvertently destroying my governance ability to oversee a board discussion of this. After the fourth interaction I was abrupt. I was trying to get him to cease and desist.

- Q174 **Julian Knight:** Why not just be overt about it? Why not just say, "Please, I have spoken to you before. You cannot come to me on this issue. Please do not do so. Go through the proper procedures"?

Greg Clarke: I did.

Julian Knight: You said that you have been characterised as oafish. I have to tell you, Mr Clarke, your response in this e-mail looks oafish. In fact, I would add to that it also looks passive aggressive. You have to put yourself in Eniola's position at this point. She is appealing to the FA chairman in this regard, sending a very important document, and she gets the response, "I have no idea why you are sending me this. Perhaps you could enlighten me".

Greg Clarke: The reason I said, "I have no idea why you are sending me this. Perhaps you could enlighten me" is because I have told him three times that if he kept providing me with information and trying to draw me in it would destroy my governance function, but he would not stop. All I was trying to do was—because sometimes in life you have to be abrupt. You, as panel members, will be abrupt to me today.

- Q175 **Julian Knight:** Not to someone coming to you with these serious allegations. I would not do that.

Greg Clarke: I did not reply to her. I replied to him.

- Q176 **Christian Matheson:** Ms Brace, certain members did not want to take part in the investigation. That suggests to me there might have been a bit of a culture of fear around that squad.

Rachel Brace: It certainly was not anything that was communicated to me during the initial investigation and also during the Katharine Newton investigation. Clearly I was aware of the distress in the squad about the upset this was causing. We spoke to another player and, as you know, Katharine Newton spoke to other players. They gave witness statements

that suggested a different type of culture. It was not about culture of fear, it was about a more positive culture. I guess there were two sides to the story.

Q177 **Christian Matheson:** Mr Glenn, I want to ask you about the appointment of Katharine Newton as the barrister. In particular I want to refer to the article in *The Guardian* by Daniel Taylor on Thursday, 21 September, when you said, “I want an independent look at this and, to be blunt about it, I want it to be an employment expert, I want it to be female and I’d like it to be of a different ethnicity to us”. Did you choose Katharine Newton on the basis that she was black and a woman?

Martin Glenn: To be really clear about this, the independent lawyers, Farrer, chose Katharine Newton.

Q178 **Christian Matheson:** It is always the client’s choice, is it not?

Martin Glenn: It was a—

Christian Matheson: Did you repeat that?

Martin Glenn: Let me finish, please. You asked me a question. What I meant to say was when they presented to me Katharine Newton’s CV, I thought it was terrific, I thought it was exactly the right kind of person to conclude the second investigations so we could get further along with this issue.

Q179 **Christian Matheson:** Did you specify to them what you specified to Mr Taylor in this article?

Martin Glenn: No, I did not. It was the end of a long day and it came out the wrong way. Absolutely, for the record, I did not specify—I was—

Q180 **Christian Matheson:** You are retracting what you said in *The Guardian*?

Martin Glenn: Yes. I had recommended to me by my head of legal that Katharine Newton should be the right person. On seeing her CV, I thought she was exactly the right person with a strong legal background, strong in employment law.

Q181 **Christian Matheson:** Forgive me, but that is completely at odds with what was written as a direct quote in this article.

Martin Glenn: As I say, it was the end of a long day and we had done a full briefing on media issues and what I meant to say was exactly what I have just said, which is I was very happy with the choice that was independently done and I thought her profile was perfect for what we needed to get done.

Q182 **Christian Matheson:** Have you had any advice on the legality of that statement?

Martin Glenn: No, I have not.

Q183 **Christian Matheson:** Have you had any legal advice on the appointment of Katharine Newton, legal advice as opposed to a recommendation from

a solicitor?

Martin Glenn: We had the recommendation from—

Q184 **Christian Matheson:** No, have you had any legal advice on the appropriateness of the comment that you made?

Martin Glenn: No, I have not.

Q185 **Christian Matheson:** Are you aware that it would have been unlawful?

Martin Glenn: If it were, I apologise.

Q186 **Christian Matheson:** The reason I am asking this is because, for whatever intentions—good intentions maybe—the appointment of somebody to a position and the mindset that that quote that you made at the time illustrates, suggest that you would have made an appointment on the basis of protected characteristics.

Martin Glenn: Yes, I can understand that. Once again, I was pleased with the choice of the independent barrister. She seemed to have all the characteristics and it came out the wrong way.

Q187 **Christian Matheson:** It came out the wrong way. The problem is what we are talking about is a case of employment and discrimination and the statement that you have made that you are now retracting suggests that you have no clue about employment and discrimination matters and the law surrounding them.

Martin Glenn: I have a different point of view. I think I know sufficient about those matters. As I said, I was very pleased with the independent recommendation about Katharine Newton to undergo the second review. Once again, I was pleased with her CV and I thought she was a good choice.

Q188 **Christian Matheson:** Did you contact *The Guardian* to perhaps put a clarification in about that quote?

Martin Glenn: I did not personally but our communications people did.

Q189 **Chair:** What you said is very unambiguous. You said, "So, quite deliberately, I said, 'I want an independent look at this and, to be blunt about it, I want it to be an employment expert, I want it to be female and I'd like it to be of a different ethnicity to us'." That is pretty specific, isn't it? That is all a pack of lies, is it?

Martin Glenn: It is not a pack of lies but it is an embellishment, if you like. What I wanted was a proper independent barrister reviewing what we had done, which I think is a good thing and to be welcomed. I was pleased—I repeat—with the choice of Katharine Newton, based on her CV, and I agree what I said to Daniel Taylor in *The Guardian* was not an accurate reflection of the process that took place.

Q190 **Chair:** You are saying that what you said in quite a lengthy quote bears no reflection on it. No, you said it was an embellishment. Is that an embellishment of what you said?

Martin Glenn: What I am saying is I was pleased with the choice of Katharine Newton.

Q191 **Chair:** I know that but I am asking about what you said. Sometimes we can all make a slip of the tongue and it gets reported or interpreted and it was not what we meant and we seek to clarify it afterwards. But you have given a really specific view of what you thought about the process, which you have now completely withdrawn. I think you have done it because you realised if you had said that it would have been illegal.

Martin Glenn: Like I say—I am just going to repeat myself here—it did not come out the right way. What I meant to say was I was very pleased with the choice of Katharine Newton and I thought she had all the right criteria to do the independent review that was sought.

Q192 **Chair:** This is quite an important matter. Would you be prepared for Farrer to give to the Committee any notes they have relating to the instructions given to them about hiring the barrister?

Martin Glenn: I would be very happy to.

Chair: Perhaps Farrer could provide that directly to the Committee rather than through the FA.

Martin Glenn: I would be very happy to.

Q193 **Jo Stevens:** In your written evidence to the Committee you say, "Processes and practices in 2017 are far more aggressive and more appropriate than in 2014 and 2015". Bearing in mind what we have just heard, do you still stand by that comment?

Martin Glenn: Yes, I do. I can understand this is a difficult set of issues that we are dealing with. I was brought into the FA in May 2015 with a brief from the board to start the process of modernising it, to improve its service to the game, to improve the service to players and to address a number of key issues in football that had not been properly addressed: the provision of pitches and the support for the national teams. That has been a long journey. The chairman joined a year after I joined and I think we have made progress on a whole load of areas, not least we have got, for example, significant improvement in how we manage safeguarding. There has been an increase in that investment. We can now identify 71,000 coaches in the country and know that they have been CRC checked. That is a good example of a process improvement. We have 8,500 designated safeguarding officers. There are a range of things that we have across the FA to improve it.

Q194 **Jo Stevens:** But you had a safeguarding report about Mark Sampson, which you had had for a long period of time, which you had in your possession when he was appointed as the national team coach. Then you used it as the reasoning for sacking him in September this year. That does not suggest to me that there are very good processes in place.

Martin Glenn: Let me try to disentangle the timeline so I can answer your question more clearly. Mark Sampson was hired by the FA at the

end of 2013 and started in January 2014. In April 2014 we received some anonymous communication from people that said his conduct at Bristol needed to be investigated. The concerns raised were about an issue. As you know with safeguarding, it is a concern about minors or vulnerable adults. The nature of that complaint triggered a review by our safeguarding teams. In safeguarding in the FA we have a number of case officers. We have 16 right now as well as a number of people in the counties to manage education and the like.

That was then investigated by our safeguarding team. They concluded their investigations in March 2015. They presented those investigations to an independent panel, as a standard practice, three independents, who reviewed it and concluded that Mark Sampson would need to take a course of mentoring if he were to pose no risk to being in football. That mentoring then took place over the course of the summer.

The first I heard about it was in October 2015 when I was given a verbal update by the head of integrity, who was in charge of safeguarding investigations, to tell me that there had been an historic complaint raised against Mark Sampson, that it had been reviewed, that it had gone to an independent panel that had recommended corrective actions and those corrective actions had taken place.

Q195 **Jo Stevens:** But you did not think at that point to read the report yourself?

Martin Glenn: The case was then closed. I have said on record that if I had known then what I know now I would have asked to read the report. But I took the advice of the safeguarding experts. It is important to say that in safeguarding there is an understandable culture of confidentiality because of the need to protect both the victim and potential alleged abuser. So, yes, of course, if I had known then what I know now I should have looked into it, but at no point did anyone come to me and say from a conduct point of view—because let us be clear, Mark Sampson broke no law and was cleared in terms of—

Jo Stevens: You sacked him on the basis of that report.

Martin Glenn: —and cleared of being a safeguarding risk and we fired him when we did read the full report.

Q196 **Jo Stevens:** Why did you not read it in 2015, then?

Martin Glenn: Because it was presented to me on a safeguarding basis as a closed case. HR did not present to me any concerns or issues around his conduct. When HR did—and we looked into it again in September because of another external whistle-blower who said that we should go and look at it. When HR, Rachel, unlocked the report from the safeguarding team, read it, she very quickly came to me. I read it with Dan Ashworth. Within a matter of hours we had concluded that the conduct—not the safeguarding but his conduct at Bristol—we did not think was suitable for that of an FA employee. The next day we went to the chairman and briefed him. Two board meetings later when the board

were both appraised of the facts and then what we were going to do, we then decided that we had to part company with him and terminate his contract.

Q197 **Jo Stevens:** Thank you. Mr Clarke, in your evidence earlier you were robust about your governance role. Can I suggest to you governance is not just about looking at things that are happening now, it is looking back at things as well?

Greg Clarke: I accept that.

Q198 **Jo Stevens:** Are you satisfied, in your robust role on governance, that you have an organisation that did not have a handover of the safeguarding report when appointing a national team manager, that there is no grievance procedure for national players, that the safeguarding arrangements that we have heard about are clearly inadequate and that due diligence on appointing a national team manager was also inadequate? Do you feel any responsibility at all, because of your clear role on governance, that you should have done a bit more on this?

Greg Clarke: I think it is very important that I, as chairman of the board, accept accountability and responsibility for everything that happens in the organisation. I do not stand away from things that happened before I joined, because if you do not fix things, what are you contributing? I looked extensively at the forensic analysis that was done of this whole timeline and process. A report was written by management with the express assistance of external advisers who interviewed people and looked at the e-mail trails. A lot of things that you described actually happened.

There is very little evidence of proper reference checking at the time. There was very little evidence that the safeguarding issues, which turned into conduct issues, were escalated. I talked to the previous chairman; he was not told. I talked to the chairman of the women's board; he was not told. So there certainly were systemic failings historically that contributed to today's mess.

I am not here to tell you that this is the FA's finest hour. What I am telling you is—and I am telling you straight; I am a straight shooter—the issue for me is are our current chief executive and his management team making it a lot better than it used to be? My firm understanding is, yes, because in my governance role, as the person who chairs the board, if the board lost faith in the management team, our absolute responsibility is to change it. We have not lost faith. We think Martin and the management team are making it a lot better than it used to be.

Where are we on a scale of 10? We probably started off at 3; we may be at 6; one day we hope to 8 or 9 or 10. But we are on a journey to get a lot better and I personally own the outcome of that journey and do not walk away from any of the bad things that happened during the course of that journey.

Q199 **Jo Stevens:** You are very clear that you have to accept accountability.

Greg Clarke: Of course.

Q200 **Jo Stevens:** Have you considered your own position since?

Greg Clarke: I think every time something happens badly at the FA—three or four years ago we sacked a guy who has been in the job for 12 months—we will never have anybody who will take the job. When I took the job, there was one other decent applicant. Nobody wanted it. It is career death. It is only because I grew up in a little council estate and loved football that I am willing to risk my reputation to try to make it better. I am going to try to make it better. If it does not get better, it will be my fault.

Q201 **Jo Stevens:** We all love football, Mr Clarke, but you are an organisation that has tens of millions of pounds of public money in order to run.

Greg Clarke: Yes, absolutely true.

Jo Stevens: I have to be honest with you that I have never heard such shambolic evidence about the governance of an organisation as I have heard today, and I used to sit on a board of directors.

Greg Clarke: I think you should at least give me the chance to reflect on the difference between governance and process. I think the governance is working reasonably well. There were certainly process failings. We have to get better with our internal processes. Personally, the first thing I did when this happened is I went to see Herman Ouseley. I said, "Herman, you are an expert in whistle-blowing. What should we be doing?" He came in and met with Rachel and said, "These are the things you should be thinking about". I talked to Sue Campbell and said, "Who should we talk to to get advice?" Nobody in UK Sport has decent whistle-blowing procedures. Nobody, no national governing body. "I recommend you talk to Sport UK to have a pilot to develop processes that then can be shared with other national governing bodies." So I am seriously engaged in recognising what the historic problems are, how we have to fix them, taking best advice and getting them implemented as quickly as possible.

Q202 **Jo Stevens:** As part of that, will you be talking to the PFA?

Greg Clarke: I will be talking to the PFA, but let me be frank about my feeling for the PFA, and I would like to be very frank. I am pro-union, I am not anti-union. I have worked with many unions over the years. Health and safety, protecting terms and conditions—I am not anti-union.

Q203 **Jo Stevens:** Are you a member of the union?

Greg Clarke: I have been a member of a union. No, I am not a member because there is no union for the likes of me. But I am pro-union. I put that on the card just so you know where I am coming from. When you look at the performance of the PFA, they have some really good executives and foot soldiers. I have fought with them, I have fought alongside them. When I say I have fought alongside them, we got the Rooney ruling in the Football League in co-operation with Kick It Out and the PFA, all trying to redress the outrageous lack of black managers in our game, which is absolutely appalling. So I have worked with them, I

have worked against them. I have a fundamental problem with their governance at the top. Let me tell you why I have a fundamental problem.

Q204 **Chair:** We are here to talk about the governance of the FA not the PFA. We will do that another day. If we have time at the end I am happy to give you a chance to—

Greg Clarke: May I just have 30 seconds, just 30 seconds, and it will illustrate my point? I met a number of safeguarding survivors and it is a really important issue to me, some of them in formal meetings, some of them in informal meetings. I met a survivor who wept in the meeting in front of two FA witnesses, supportive people from safeguarding. He cried like a baby, a decent, honest person, because of what he had been through. I said, "Is there anything you can do to help me?" He said, "What can I do? The PFA will not pay for my counselling any more". The PFA spends millions of pounds a year on the CEO salary and the CEO pension fund and they are walking away from alcoholics, they are walking away from addicted gamblers and they are walking away from people like him. I will never look up to their governance but I respect their people.

Q205 **Jo Stevens:** Mr Glenn, in your written evidence, you are pretty critical of the PFA. I have some of the criticism that you make, "They were seeking a financial supplement for Eniola Aluko. They had a conflict of interest in representing her". I think you have misunderstood the purpose of a union, both their representation individually and collectively there. "They were driving a hard bargain, they did not stop their negotiations despite having concerns about the investigation." If I was a member of a union I would be very pleased that my union was doing that for me. That is exactly what they are supposed to do. I would like to give you the opportunity today to withdraw those criticisms.

Martin Glenn: Let me restrict my comments to the process of the Eniola Aluko issue. We sought to deal with Eniola Aluko's complaints in the manner described, honestly and I think fairly, through an internal process and an external process. It became clear, in about February this year, that the PFA wanted to get a financial settlement. The alternative to that would have been to have gone to an industrial tribunal. To my mind, and clearly you can ask the PFA what its interests were, we had a choice to make. We could have said, "Okay, we believe enough in our case that we could contest it fairly in an industrial tribunal", but the timing would have been horrible. It would have been just before the Euros or possibly in the Euros.

Secondly, to the comments that you heard from Rachel earlier on, we did not think it would be fair to put a number of people through that public process. Like you do in life and business when you get two parties who cannot agree, we then agreed to a financial settlement. They came in at a very high number, we settled for less than half of that. I think that was all I have to say on the matter.

Q206 **Jo Stevens:** But you have not paid it all, have you?

Martin Glenn: Let me explain it if I can. I heard Eniola's statement earlier. The agreement we both entered into was a fairly standard compromise agreement where we said, "There is a sum of money to be paid". There were two conditions: that neither party talks about that sum of money and neither party defames one another. The agreement was be staged in two payments. The first payment was paid. On 30 August Eniola tweeted, "At least we know the FA's stance on derogatory racial remarks by an England manager. Ignore, deny, endorse, in that order". You can pass that around if you would like to see it. We took legal advice on that and the legal advice we received is that that is a clear breach of the agreement we both entered into.

I sought a meeting with the PFA. I met Eniola with Bobby Barnes from the PFA, Eniola's lawyer, Polly Handford, our legal adviser. We met on 11 September. It was an evening meeting, and what I was seeking to do was to say, "How do we break this impasse?" There had been a lot of negative media commentary that neither party wanted. Eniola used words like, "I want to draw a line under this and get on with our lives" and I agreed. I said, "What we need is you need to somehow say—"sorry, one of the important things she said was that she did not see this tweet as—she said, "I didn't mean what it said" or, "I don't accept that it was derogatory or effectively a defamatory statement", and we did.

My question to her and to Bobby Barnes, her PFA representative, was, "We have to put this point to bed if you don't believe that the substance of what you said was correct". That tweet was repeated tens of thousands of times, picked up in lots of newspaper. We have to have a form of words that say, "I don't agree with the FA on the current issues that we have but you need to correct what you mean by that. That needs to be your form of words". Bobby Barnes, the PFA representative, seemed to think it was a good idea. We finished the meeting cordially and we then left it with them to come up with a form of words that might work. It did not happen. Polly Handford, our legal director, chased it up about a week later.

Q207 **Jo Stevens:** You are categorically denying requesting Eniola to write a statement saying that the FA is not institutionally racist?

Martin Glenn: Yes. What we agreed was that—her point was, "This is just one tweet. I didn't really mean how it might have been interpreted". Great, that is an opportunity, bearing in mind this is us saying, "Let's both sides stand the armies down and let's try to put this to bed". It had to have been a form of words that she was happy with. I think I said, "Look, I am not saying that we agree on everything, we clearly do not, but let's, on this issue, get down the facts of what you think is the case about the FA".

Q208 **Jo Stevens:** In view of Katharine Newton's findings that we have heard today, will you make that payment immediately to Eniola Aluko?

Martin Glenn: I will reflect on many things but it is important that you have Katharine Newton's finding.

Jo Stevens: Yes or no will do.

Martin Glenn: To be proportionate about it, there were a number of complaints raised—

Q209 **Chair:** Mr Glenn, we have spent quite a lot of time on this. It is quite a simple question: will you be issuing a payment or not?

Martin Glenn: We will reflect on it.

Chair: So you may not?

Martin Glenn: We will reflect on it.

Chair: I must admit the interest the FA has taken in that single tweet stands in pretty stark contrast with 18 months or so of inaction over the serious allegations that Eniola Aluko made. Not inaction, lack of effective action. There a number of people who have been waiting to come in.

Q210 **Paul Farrelly:** With the exception of Mr Ashworth, everyone is relatively new to the FA. It was never a bed of roses before and I do not think you went into the job expecting it to be a bed of roses in the future. All this is very unfortunate but if the right lessons are learned, then it may help you in your job of changing the FA in the future.

We have heard from two witnesses today who, rightly or wrongly, played for England, contributed to the culture review and since then have not been picked and have not played for England. All organisations face this. The law on whistle-blowing is very difficult. People may come away from all this being unwilling to report problems if they see them. One of the things that we would very much like to hear from the FA is that there will be no victimisation of people. Managers pick teams, of course, but if people see things that are wrong, they can be very comfortable in coming forward, because this is what you want to encourage, not discourage.

Greg Clarke: If I can respond to that, it is a very reasonable question. One of the things that struck me about the FA was we had an event for the Grenfell fire community. We dedicated all the money, we vacated the royal box and we also gave them the Wembley Suite. We had free beer, free food, free game and we raised £1.5 million. That is not the point. The point is Les Ferdinand, who is the technical director of Queens Park Rangers, a really good player, an ex-England player, top lad, came up to me and he said, "This is the first time I have been in here and it looks like the society we live in". That is what we are trying to change.

Things like this do not help. How can I feel good about sitting here, when a person with 100 caps for England thinks they have been really badly treated, not just by the established and substantiated racist remarks but by the process? To me, and I am not an expert, a whistle-blowing process, a good one, needs to leave the victim feeling like they are protected and they are listened to. Patently Eniola does not feel like she is protected or listened to. No matter what happened, she in good faith does not feel protected and listened to.

One of the reasons I sat down with Herman Ouseley and listened is because he is an expert and I am not. That is why I sat down with Sue Campbell, because Rachel is now leading an activity that we hope will achieve what you reasonably ask for and then Sport England can make sure all the national governing bodies can adopt it, because it is a pan-sport problem. That is no excuse for us. We cannot use the failings of others as an excuse. But, crumbs, is it a top priority now. We should have cracked this years ago. I never even realised it was a problem, to be honest.

Q211 Paul Farrelly: Mr Ashworth, you have been rather longer in the FA. Can I ask you why you commissioned the culture review?

Dan Ashworth: Yes, that is a really good question. One of the things that we felt would give us a competitive edge was to understand what it meant to play for England across a raft of different teams. My job as technical director is to oversee 16 England teams. That is eight in the female pathway, eight in the male pathway, from under-15s through to seniors. We felt that one of our failings, one of the reasons for failings and lack of tournaments, was perhaps a lack of identity. So we enlisted a man called Owen Eastwood who had done a similar piece of work with several other associations, including the All Blacks, South Africa cricket and a number of others. Owen is also a trained barrister.

Owen agreed to undertake a cultural review for us to basically try to get us to a stage where we could get some consistency across the teams of using some words and some behaviours that would allow the teams to really hold on to something and believe in something for playing for England. That process we asked Owen to do. I gave him a list of—I cannot remember the exact number—between 40 and 50 current and ex-players, current and ex-staff, who I thought would be able to contribute to that review and would give Owen some meaningful information for him to draw some conclusions about a defined culture for playing for England.

Q212 Paul Farrelly: We had one witness who was asked to contribute and one not, so nothing needs to be read into some of the omissions. It was a list of names that you gave that might be representative?

Dan Ashworth: Correct. What I tried to do was male and female players, ex-players, staff, ex-staff, different ethnicities, different ages, just to give Owen a wide spread of experiences. I gave him—I cannot remember the exact number—I guess between 40 and 50. To this day I do not know which of those people he picked, other than the ones who gave Owen permission within the report, which I think you have seen.

Paul Farrelly: I have not but the Chair has.

Dan Ashworth: The Chairman has seen it. The only names in that report are the ones who gave Owen specific permission that they were happy to use their names against those phrases. There were also a number of quotes where the names had been redacted.

Chair: I do not think you were in the room at the time, but I mentioned

in the previous session that I had seen it and confirm that Eniola Aluko's name does not appear within the document.

- Q213 **Paul Farrelly:** One final question, Mr Ashworth. Since contributing to that, Eniola has not been picked for England again. That leaves a suspicion that whether her name is in the report or not, what she said as part of that process went back to the ex-manager. Can you be categorical in saying, for everyone's ears, that that did not happen?

Dan Ashworth: I can categorically say that did not happen. Owen has also given a letter to the chairman to confirm that.

- Q214 **Chair:** How many England women players were interviewed as part of the cultural review?

Dan Ashworth: I do not know. To this day I do not know who or how many Owen interviewed.

Chair: That was entirely up to Owen, was it?

Dan Ashworth: Correct.

- Q215 **Chair:** Was he given any guidance on who to approach?

Dan Ashworth: No, all I did was give him 40 to 50 names. He had done this type of report for several associations and organisations. I was happy with the number of quotes and the variety of quotes and the variety of different ideas within the report. That led me to believe that he had spoken to a wide range of people. The exact number of female players I do not know.

- Q216 **Brendan O'Hara:** I have a couple of questions for Mr Ashworth, but first if I could seek clarification from Mr Glenn about the report. Could you confirm that what you said was it took an anonymous whistle-blower to contact the FA, to prompt the FA to read the report that it had had in its possession for four years, the contents of which were so serious it led to a dismissal in 2017? Is that factually correct?

Martin Glenn: No, not entirely. The report was written in March 2015, so not four years. Mark Sampson was employed by the FA in 2014, so I think that might be your four years. The report was a safeguarding report and, as I said before, the standard practice in safeguarding is to have an absolute maximisation of confidentiality. The report that was written I was not shown and it would not have been appropriate for me to see it, based on standard procedures. What should have happened is that I should have been made aware that there were wider concerns in the report, but I was not. I have held my hand up to it. If I had known then what I know now, I would have asked. When we looked at it again it was only in September of this year, and we cannot name the source.

Rachel Brace: The information was given to me in the course of my duties, as Martin said, in September. It was given to me. I will not name the name because I think people would never speak up if I sit here and say who gave it to me. But as soon as the information was given to me it led me to go back and obviously ask questions.

Q217 **Brendan O'Hara:** I do not need the name, I am not interested in the name. What I am trying to get at is public interest in things as fundamentally important as safeguarding. I think the public would be aghast at the fact that you had a report on safeguarding, which you had had for a number of years, and nobody read it. The contents of that report were so serious that it led to a dismissal. Could you understand the public being astonished?

Martin Glenn: I can understand it, so let me try to answer your question in a slightly different way. There is a difference between safeguarding—and I believe that process was done very diligently and well. We had an independent investigation done by our investigation team. The findings in March 2015 were presented to an independent triumvirate who reviewed it and made the recommendations. As a safeguarding issue, that work was done well. The miss in the FA was a failure to consider what some of the wider conduct issues, and therefore employment issues, emanating from that report should have been.

If I can just give you—"comfort" is probably the wrong word. Since we changed out a number of people, I have had come across my desk in the last year, raised by Rachel, two issues that concern safeguarding and FA employees and they have been dealt with appropriately. The conduct or the employment issues have been dealt with, so we are doing things differently now.

Back in 2014, 2015, several people—more than several people—in the FA knew about this but no employability recommendations were made. When the employability recommendation was made to me on 13 September by Rachel, we acted very quickly in a matter of days and decided on employment grounds, not safeguarding grounds, that he was not a suitable employee for the FA.

Q218 **Brendan O'Hara:** But you can understand the question being asked. What is the point of having a safeguarding report if nobody reads it when it comes out, and the content is so serious it leads to a dismissal?

Greg Clarke: Can I give you a perspective, because I asked that question too? There are some nuances but there is some very, very simple stuff. I said, when we had the board discussion of this, "What is it, what is in it?" The problem with a safeguarding report is that there are things in it that make you suck your breath and think, "Crumbs, I am not going to leave this unsupervised in my office", like the people on the other end of the allegation, decent young people, their identity, where they live, all that sort of stuff. So there is a paranoia within organisations like ours that you do not pry within the Chinese wall of safeguarding.

When we got it wrong—and there were some quite interesting learnings here that will go back to our board but have not been there yet—is that you can counsel people—because there is nothing illegal in this document. I can assure the Select Committee that none of the allegations were illegal. They crossed the boundaries of acceptable behaviour in a coach. You look at it and you think, "Someone who had behaved in that

way, should we be employing them as a first team national coach?" That is not the question that safeguarding people ask. They say, "Is he a risk?" He is not a risk, they said he was not a risk, but they never escalated it to people who could say, "Is this appropriate behaviour, historically, from someone who is going to manage the women's national team?" The clear answer to that is no.

Q219 **Brendan O'Hara:** Mr Ashworth, what was your role in recruiting Mark Sampson in 2013?

Dan Ashworth: I was a member of a panel of four people. My job was to check the appropriateness of his appointment from a football point of view.

Q220 **Brendan O'Hara:** Did you have a personal relationship with Mr Sampson before he was appointed in 2013?

Dan Ashworth: I had never met Mr Sampson until he walked through the building at Wembley for his interview.

Q221 **Brendan O'Hara:** What background checks were done and what due diligence was done on Mr Sampson before his appointment? References? Talk us through the process of how the appointment was made.

Dan Ashworth: I am not involved in the reference process. That is part of the HR function. What I do know is our head of women's football at the time made a call to his employer at the time. The HR department would have been responsible for reference checking.

Martin Glenn: To be clear, we do things very differently now. The depth of background checks that we have done on the current England manager, his assistant, the under-21 manager is at a very different level. We agree that the sufficient depth of background checks were not done. A telephone call was made but it could hardly be classed as a reference.

Q222 **Brendan O'Hara:** Given that football is a big business but essentially it is a big small world—there are very few secrets in football—was nobody alerted to or nothing flagged up to say, "This could be inappropriate or this could be worthy of deeper background checks"? Was it just rolled through?

Dan Ashworth: Nothing was brought to our attention and the allegations were not made until Mark was three or four months into his employment.

Greg Clarke: There is no way that we can justify the lack of due diligence around that hire. He walked through the door, he was interviewed by football people and he looked like he would do a good football job. What should have happened then was a process of due diligence, reference checking and crosschecking that does happen now and did not happen then. We are not trying to hide the fact that the due diligence then, outside the football checking, did not happen.

Q223 **Chair:** Thank you. Mr Ashworth, you just said there that you were not aware of the previous investigation that had been conducted into Mark

Sampson when he was at Bristol until three or four months after he started his job. Then there was a process whereby the FA looked into this to see whether there was a problem. You were involved in that process, were you not? Is that fair to say?

Dan Ashworth: No, I was aware of the process, I was not involved in the process.

Q224 **Chair:** Were the results of the process shared with you?

Dan Ashworth: I can give you some timelines of exactly what happened.

Q225 **Chair:** I do not need the chronology of the whole thing, I just want to know, first, you are Mark Sampson's line manager. That would be fair to say, would it not?

Dan Ashworth: Yes.

Chair: He is your employee and these are quite serious matters. When this review had been conducted, whether or not you did it yourself, presumably you would have been made aware of what the outcome was.

Dan Ashworth: I was aware of the outline allegations but no detail. Then I was aware at the end of the process that some mentoring had been recommended and then when the mentoring was concluded.

Q226 **Chair:** Were you shown a report based on the work that had been done?

Dan Ashworth: No, I was not shown a report.

Q227 **Chair:** Did you just get an oral briefing telling you that, "We have looked into it and there is not a problem"?

Dan Ashworth: Yes. I was given an update as we were going through the process that it was an investigation and the investigation was ongoing and an outline of what the allegations were but no detail. I was then told an investigation panel was concluded and that it was deemed that Mark was no risk in his current employment role, subject to him taking part in some mentoring. I was then told by our integrity and safeguarding team that mentoring had taken place.

Q228 **Chair:** There was an allegation. Presumably you were told what the allegation was. There was an allegation made or a concern raised about previous conduct. Presumably you were told what the concern was, even if you were not told the details.

Dan Ashworth: Yes, correct.

Q229 **Chair:** In terms of the decision being made by Martin Glenn and the board to terminate Mr Sampson's contract, was that based on the specific allegation? Was it simply the offence or the act, rather we should say, itself, or was it the background detail that was the deciding factor?

Dan Ashworth: It was the detail.

Q230 **Chair:** That is detail that you say you were not aware of at the time?

Dan Ashworth: No, I was not aware of the detail until Rachel flagged it to me and Martin at the same time.

Chair: But not any detail at all?

Dan Ashworth: No, just an outline of what the case was. Then I go back to the fact that the safeguarding/integrity department had said that Mark posed no risk in his current role, providing he undertook some mentoring. At no point in time was it made clear to me that Mark was a risk in his current role.

Q231 **Chair:** I understand, and the chairman has been clear about the difference between risk and analysing what he had done. We are talking about safeguarding, so we are in a sensitive space. I think everybody would agree with that. It would seem odd that you could be reassured that there is not a problem without having at least some knowledge of what the sensitive issue is.

Dan Ashworth: It is a really good question. I am not a safeguarding or HR expert. I went with the information I was given from those two departments. In hindsight, if I had my time again, yes, of course I would have asked to see some more of the detail on the report. The way they work now with Rachel and our head of legal, we would have shared that information. At the time, I did not ask for it, nor was it given to me.

Q232 **Chair:** Yes. I appreciate we cannot go into the detail of the specifics here, but if it is a safeguarding issue involving a coach, if it is because of an inappropriate relationship between that coach and a player within his care, then you would think you would have been briefed on that. There is a certain amount of basic detail that you would need to know. It could well be that basic detail will tell you enough to know this is quite a serious problem, without needing to know all the details.

Dan Ashworth: No, I went off the recommendation of the panel that Mark had no risk in his role providing he took part in some mentoring.

Q233 **Chair:** Can I ask you in terms of safeguarding as well? People referred very carefully to the legal definition of what breach of safeguarding is. The FA has its own safeguarding rules. Knowing what you know now, was he in breach of the FA's safeguarding rules, which in some ways are a higher test than exists in law?

Martin Glenn: Safeguarding rules are universal rules, they are based on law. The FA has, as I said before, a big involvement in the safeguarding both at a grassroots level and the senior team. The job of the safeguarding team is to judge whether someone poses a risk as a football participant. The issue we had with Mark Sampson was as both a football participant and an FA employee. Our test was not that there was a higher safeguarding test, it was a judgment about the behaviour that we then subsequently found we did not think was compatible with standards expected from an FA employee.

Q234 **Chair:** I understand that, but what I am trying to get at is say, for example, there is a debate about whether sports coaches who have

sexual relationships with 17 or 18 year-olds in their care, that should be criminal offence. It is for teachers but it is not for sports coaches. There is a public debate about that. In the FA safeguarding rules it is quite clear that that would be a breach of your safeguarding code. A coach having a sexual relationship with a 17 or 18 year-old player, while above the age of consent and not illegal, is a breach of the safeguarding code that you have established in your rules. That is what I am trying to get at here. Knowing what you now know about the offence, had he breached what would now be considered the safeguarding rules of The Football Association, even if the act itself was not illegal?

Martin Glenn: I am not sure they are different laws. As you said, there is a different law for teachers versus everybody else. I would put it more down to the standards to which we are trying to run the Football Association. It would be absolutely in breach in terms of what we would expect in terms of conduct. I am not sure if it is a safeguarding—

Q235 **Chair:** Putting to one side the question of legality, because different organisations have their own rules that they impose upon themselves. The FA has many, many of them. If people had looked at the Mark Sampson case and applied the FA's own rules on conduct to it, they would have seen that the material allegation itself, the material act that caused concern, was clearly a breach of the FA's code in terms of safeguarding conduct.

Martin Glenn: I would need to check my facts on that. What I am sure about, in terms of a safeguarding risk, is he was investigated and cleared. I am sure, as we have repeated, as a conduct issue we judged that that conduct was not appropriate. I am not sure that we have a separate safeguarding threshold. I think it is a conduct threshold.

Q236 **Chair:** The reason I ask is that it is important to say there are some people in the organisation who knew this was going on. There was a whistle-blower outside the organisation who knew enough about this to know there was a problem. When you look at it, you say there may be lots of detail that is important to this case, but it is quite clear that what he did that raised the cause for concern was not just below the standards that are acceptable, but in breach of the safeguarding codes and practices that you publish on your website, that are there for other sports clubs and FA affiliates and members to follow.

Martin Glenn: I think it is more, as you say, a code of practice than rules. What happened was that the problem was one of a cultural one, which was that the issue was seen in its narrowest form through a safeguarding lens and not a wider form. All I can say is now we do that differently. We have different people with different experiences who can make a judgment around confidential and sensitive information to take a wider holistic view. As I said, in the last year there have been two cases where it has been brought to my attention and corrective action recommended that has taken place.

Q237 **Chair:** Was the whistle-blower a former FA employee?

Martin Glenn: I am not going to comment on my source.

Q238 **Chair:** Was it someone within the organisation who, therefore, knew about this because they had been involved with the case in the past or just someone randomly from the outside who knew about it?

Greg Clarke: I do not know who the whistle-blower is, but my strong belief is there was enough evidence on this case around at the time we employed him and that we should have found it.

Chair: That is clear.

Q239 **Ian C. Lucas:** Can I talk about the safeguarding report a little more? That was produced in March 2015. At that time Mr Sampson was the coach for the women's football team. Mr Ashworth, you said you were his line manager. Did you have a role, as far as his employment position was concerned, at that point in March 2015?

Dan Ashworth: I was his line manager at that time, yes.

Q240 **Ian C. Lucas:** Did you not think that this report was relevant to his employment at that time?

Dan Ashworth: I go back to what I said earlier, in that I took advice from our safeguarding and integrity team. At no point did anybody raise to me that it might be a danger or a risk to his current role. I was told that there would be no risk to his current role provided he went through some mentoring and training.

Q241 **Ian C. Lucas:** The same report in September 2017 was used as the basis for dismissal of him as an employee, so what changed between March 2015 and September 2017 as far as the information in the report is concerned?

Dan Ashworth: I think I have already answered that question by saying that I was not aware of the detail of that report.

Q242 **Ian C. Lucas:** Ms Brace, you are the human resources person.

Rachel Brace: Yes, let me answer.

Ian C. Lucas: Yes. What changed?

Rachel Brace: One of the things that changed was the human resources director changed. I started in January 2016. This information was not given to me, I was not aware of it. When the information was given to me—

Q243 **Ian C. Lucas:** When was that? When was it given to you?

Rachel Brace: I can check the exact date. I think it was a bit earlier than that. It was the end of August, or the beginning of September. I can give you the exact date if you want.

Ian C. Lucas: 2017?

Rachel Brace: Yes. When that information came to me, the bit that has changed is how I would review that information. I believe I have a responsibility to review that information from an employability perspective, which is what Martin was referring to in terms of the difference between the safeguarding team saying, "We can close this matter", and that is their absolute right to do. But part of my job is to assess that information and say, "You might be able to close it from a safeguarding perspective, but how do we feel about it from an employment perspective?" When I read the report I had some concerns about what I read and that is why I immediately talked to Martin and Greg about it.

Q244 **Ian C. Lucas:** Mr Glenn, did your predecessor read the report in March 2015?

Martin Glenn: I have no knowledge of that.

Q245 **Ian C. Lucas:** I find it extraordinary that the chief executive of an organisation like the FA does not read the safeguarding report for the manager of the England women's team.

Martin Glenn: It is a difficult issue, and let me accept the point you are making.

Ian C. Lucas: Because the buck stops with you, Mr Glenn.

Greg Clarke: It does, but one of the strange things about this is that our overwhelming duty of care is to the victims, people who reported things. We get a number of safeguarding reports, because there are 11 million football participants in the UK who we are responsible for everyone from three year-olds kicking a ball around on the recce to people playing for the Premier League or the England team.

Ian C. Lucas: I know that, but this is a very prominent position. It is self-evident.

Greg Clarke: Yes, but that is where it went wrong. For example, it is not wrong that all safeguarding reports do not go to the chief executive, because he does not need to know the name of some 13 year-old girl in Bradford who had a problem with her coach two years ago. She deserves secrecy. The problem we had was there was no linkage to look at things and say, "Right, just take a broader view than technical safeguarding. Is this a guy who should be working for us?" That is the one that needs escalating.

Martin Glenn: Had it happened today, had a complaint been made today—let's replay the timeline a little bit. The concern about Mark Sampson was raised in April 2014. Had I been chief executive at the time—I joined in May 2015—I would have spoken to the chairman. I think the chairman would have informed the board on a confidential basis that there was an inquiry underway and that they would be updated at an appropriate future point. That did not happen for whatever reason. Senior people knew about it but concerns were not raised to the board,

absolutely, and the former chairman, absolutely, was not informed about it. So I think there was a lack of knowledge.

Certainly in terms of handover, Rachel was not informed about it in handover with the previous HR director. I was not informed about it when I came new into the job. The sensitivity I totally agree with for a senior FA employee you would think would have been something that would have been raised earlier, but it was not. I would like to think today it would be done differently.

Q246 **Ian C. Lucas:** We met before, Mr Clarke, when you gave evidence last year and we talked another very high profile position, the England men's football manager. We asked you questions about Sam Allardyce. It was shortly after he had left and you said you would get back to us and you did get back to us. As those of us who follow football know, there was a "Panorama" investigation and the Stevens report, which involved Mr Allardyce, and there were lots of allegations flying around. When you came back to us, you said that you had asked Mr Allardyce about the suitability for the role of England manager and he gave an assurance that the allegations in the "Panorama" documentary were false. You go on to say, "The FA did not seek to speak directly to anyone from the team behind the 'Panorama' documentary or indeed the Stevens report". You then go on to say that, "The process of appointing an England manager is heavily scrutinised by the media and I believe the FA has a duty to ensure confidentiality is maintained throughout the process. I do not think that it would have been possible for the FA to consult outside the game without risking a breach of that confidentiality." I feel that there is a course of conduct here. There were issues in the air when Sam Allardyce was appointed that had never been resolved. You just told me that you still think it was right not to look into those. You just accepted Mr Allardyce's account.

Greg Clarke: What I would say is that I was reporting the facts as they happened, which were before my time. For example, I was part of the process—

Ian C. Lucas: It was not before Mr Glenn's time, was it?

Greg Clarke: I am just trying to answer your question and I am happy to take the next one too. When we hired Gareth we went through a formal process of interview, specification, looking at other candidates. We then conducted a full external due diligence programme by a third-party agency, looking back at anything that had happened over the last 20 years that needed any more explanation. Nothing material came up. We then went through a full reference-checking process. Nothing material came up. Undoubtedly that process with Sam Allardyce could have been better.

Ian C. Lucas: That is not what you said in your letter to us.

Greg Clarke: Put it this way: what I am trying to do is answer your question honestly and openly.

Ian C. Lucas: Well, that is progress today.

Greg Clarke: I always try. I do try. I make mistakes, I am human, I am fallible but I always try to be straight. The issue for me is that Sam Allardyce—I remember the documentary, I remember the allegations. If any of them had been proved—none of them were proven. None of them were proven.

Q247 **Ian C. Lucas:** You could have spoken to Lord Stevens about his report before you appointed the most high profile individual in the English game.

Greg Clarke: I could have done if I had been here.

Q248 **Ian C. Lucas:** Yes, you could have done. Mr Glenn was there, so why did you not do that?

Martin Glenn: If you think about the issue that we had with Sam Allardyce, we terminated his contract on the basis of what we thought was bringing the FA into disrepute. This was not something that a conversation with Lord Stevens would have talked about, because, as Greg said, those allegations were never proven. What was not acceptable to us was the way that he was conducting himself with respect to *The Telegraph* filming of him talking to third parties. That would not have been something you could have found out from a reference. It was something that happened on our watch that we felt we had better deal with quickly.

Q249 **Ian C. Lucas:** We have two separate cases we have been discussing today here where you failed to carry out rigorous checks on the individuals appointed to very high profile positions. Mr Clarke, you are going to change that?

Greg Clarke: It is changed. It is changed and I can assure you that for the senior hires we are making now, we spend a lot of money raking through every cupboard we can find to see if there are any skeletons in it. If that does not work and we have been let down going forward, the buck stops here.

Q250 **Chair:** To Ian's point, we have been discussing Mark Sampson where there has been a discussion about advice saying there is not a problem, whereas when you look in the file you realise it is not as straightforward as that. It may not be illegal but it creates problems. The reason that we asked in the past about the Stevens report on Sam Allardyce is, as you quite rightly say, there were things that were not proven, but there were 17 transfers that were investigated when they did not feel they could make a decision.

Given what you have just said about Mark Sampson, maybe what people would have expected the FA to do would be to say, "Let's go and talk to Lord Stevens, let's look at the files, let's look at it ourselves and feel even though in a court of law we may not be able to prove a case, is there evidence that was gathered that should have given us cause for concern?" The concern we have is that that was not done. It was not that it was done and you looked at it and decided, "No, we are satisfied there

is no case to answer", it is that no one went back to check. That is the cause of concern and it seems to be a pattern of behaviour that has run for too long.

Greg Clarke: I think, to be honest, the journey has been catalysed by some historical mistakes, because every organisation makes mistakes but making the same mistake over and over and over again is not allowed. What I tried to do when I took over as chairman is use my knowledge of being in the professional game since the 1990s, as well as being an executive, to say there are better ways of doing this. We need to step up to the mark here. We are not some bureaucratic organisation that ticks boxes. We are judged on the quality of our decisions, not on our box-ticking capabilities.

Q251 **Julie Elliott:** I have sat and listened very carefully for three hours now to all of the evidence and I have to say I am astonished at some of the things I have heard. Mr Clarke, you have, in the last few minutes, said you have an overwhelming duty of care. Do you think that you have a duty of care to the players of all of the England teams?

Greg Clarke: I do, yes.

Q252 **Julie Elliott:** If you do, you said your overwhelming duty of care was to victims.

Greg Clarke: Yes.

Julie Elliott: Clearly Eniola Aluko has been a victim.

Greg Clarke: Agreed.

Julie Elliott: Yet do you think your organisation fulfilled your duty of care to her?

Greg Clarke: No. The reason—one of the reasons I made such a point about governance—is it is really important in a governance role not to jump to conclusions. If I had have jumped to a conclusion halfway through this process and said, "There is no problem here. Nothing has been found" or whatever, you have to look in the end at what is established. What is established, putting aside all the fluff about institutional racism, no institutional bullying—

Q253 **Chair:** Do you call that fluff?

Greg Clarke: I am not trying to hide behind it.

Chair: You called it fluff. I do not think fluff is the word I would use to describe it.

Greg Clarke: The reason I say that is because Katharine Newton said there was no evidence of it. I could hide behind that. That is why I used that phrase.

Q254 **Julie Elliott:** But the fact that you describe that as fluff I think speaks volumes about the organisation.

Greg Clarke: No, no, please do not take it out of context.

Julie Elliott: Mr Clarke, you have said it. You have said it in evidence to a Committee of the House of Commons. It speaks volumes. Language matters in any of these cases and you have just said fluff.

Greg Clarke: What I was trying to say, maybe badly, is I could get distracted by the irrelevant, and I should not have said fluff. The reason I said that is I could have come in and said, "Well, Katharine Newton said there is no evidence of systemic bullying, there is no evidence of systemic racism", but that is not the issue. That is why I mischaracterised it as fluff because I did not want to talk about that. What I wanted to talk about was the material issue and I apologise for phrasing it badly. The material issue is twice an England player with 100 caps was exposed to a situation where racist abuse happened. That is a fundamental breach of our duty of care for that person and I feel very bad about that.

Q255 **Julie Elliott:** Do you think your organisation has treated her well since that has been proven?

Greg Clarke: It was first brought to my attention 48 hours ago when we received Katharine Newton's report, which was the culmination of the process. Luckily, I resisted the temptation to dive in halfway through, otherwise I would have made completely the wrong call. At the end of the process it is, "Wow, we have to apologise".

Q256 **Julie Elliott:** Do you think you have to pay her the money you agreed to pay her?

Greg Clarke: What I do not want to do is make policy on the fly. What I want to do is to say we now have some really new material facts that our board needs to be aware of. They do not have the Katharine Newton report yet. They need to actively consider that issue and I will consider that in the light of our duty of care to her.

Julie Elliott: For the record, I think you need to pay that money.

Greg Clarke: Sure, I hear you.

Q257 **Julie Elliott:** Mr Glenn, do you think you have failed in your duty of care to the players?

Martin Glenn: I obviously have the same reply that you have just heard from the chairman. I am very disappointed.

Q258 **Julie Elliott:** Do you think you have failed, your organisation has failed?

Martin Glenn: There have clearly been failings. I would not want to then say that the organisation is failing in the way you have described it. Could we have done things better? For sure.

Q259 **Julie Elliott:** No, what I have asked is you have a duty of care to the players. That has been established. Your chairman has said that. Do you think you have failed in your duty of care to the players in this situation?

Martin Glenn: Clearly in this situation with Drew Spence and Eniola Aluko, yes, there have been failings. I would like to put in the context we have something like 900 players and staff in all the teams under our

control. We take welfare very serious; it is a lot of people. I think on balance we do a good job. But, yes, in this case there have clearly been mistakes.

Julie Elliott: And you have failed.

Martin Glenn: We have clearly made mistakes.

Q260 **Julie Elliott:** You cannot even say you have failed in your duty of care, which quite clearly you have, to any outsider looking in on this. Your chairman can say you have but you cannot. I think that speaks volumes as well.

Ms Brace, earlier on you talked about the procedures. Was it January 2016 you came into post?

Rachel Brace: Yes.

Julie Elliott: When you came into post—because you have referred a few times about things not being as they should have been in the procedures—did you do any review of the procedures in place in the organisation?

Rachel Brace: Are you talking about the grievance and whistle-blowing procedures?

Julie Elliott: That one but others as well.

Rachel Brace: Yes. I had to review lots of things when I started in terms of the ones that are relevant to this Committee. In terms of the grievance and whistle-blowing procedures that were in place, the FA, as an organisation, has very good grievance and whistle-blowing procedures for what I would call its corporate employees. The issue that was raised by Eniola—and she and I discussed this in the first meeting—was that when Eniola's allegations first came in, the first thing I went to look for was how do we handle this with players. I think I had been in post about five or six months at that point. I was surprised to find that we did not have something for our national teams.

Q261 **Julie Elliott:** That would be the early summer of 2016 you realised there was not such a thing in place?

Rachel Brace: May or June 2016, yes. At that point I spoke to my colleagues across the other national governing bodies to understand if they had anything in place and found that they did not and found that this was something that was really wanting across elite sport. One of the things, as Greg has said, is that I am leading the piece of work with UK Sport, because what I did was evaluated where I think we had fallen short as an organisation.

One of the things that we are doing now with UK Sport is making sure that we talk to our players and we talk to our coaches to say, "How do we make this work for you?" One of my learnings from this is that the experience you have in what I would call corporate life about grievance and whistle-blowing procedures does not necessarily all work in a

sporting context. What we have to do is take the bits that do work and then talk to the players and coaches and say, "How do we translate that in a way that means people will speak up and we can have a fair hearing?" But I think you do not take the heart out of sport, because if people get really worried about what they are going to be saying to each other all the time, people will not speak properly. That is one of the things that by December of this year we will have in place and then UK Sport will be able to share it with the other national governing bodies.

Q262 **Julie Elliott:** Do you think your initial investigation into the things that Eniola brought to your attention was adequate?

Rachel Brace: I think it was done with the best of intentions and the best way we could, given the constraints we were working—

Julie Elliott: That is not what I asked. Do you think it was adequate?

Rachel Brace: I think there are some things that we could have done better.

Julie Elliott: Can you not answer?

Rachel Brace: Yes, I will answer. I do think it was adequate and the barrister did not say any different.

Q263 **Julie Elliott:** I am not wanting to know what the barrister says. You have been an HR professional for a long time and held some very senior positions in some very big organisations. I want your opinion; I do not want the barrister's opinion. Would you do it the same again if you were confronted with the same kinds of allegations, or however you want to describe them?

Rachel Brace: No, there are things I would do differently, absolutely. As you say, I have held a number of positions and I think one of the things I have learned is there is no such thing as an easy grievance procedure. There is no such thing. When you are navigating your way through human beings' feelings and trying to do the best by everybody, you will not always get it right.

Q264 **Julie Elliott:** What would you do differently?

Rachel Brace: One of the things that I would do differently, and this is one of the things that we are going to put into the UK Sport piece of work, is we need to be very clear at the beginning about what I would call the rules of the road. There has clearly been, in terms of how we investigated it and the constraints we understood we were working against—I think one of the things that we have to write into the policy for the future is how that will be when people come with a grievance. In corporate life I think people understand that when you come with a grievance, you come with all the evidence, it is going to be investigated. Unless they say so, they understand that not everything can be kept confidential. If it is asked to be, it absolutely is, but generally people are happy to speak more freely about it.

One of the challenges you have in a sporting context, and this is one of my learnings, is that people are much more focused about information getting to the media. Clearly you are dealing in a high performing team who want to tell the truth but at the same time they are worried about what their colleagues might think of them and whether that will impact on whether a coach picks them or not. There are other factors I learned about dealing with this situation that I would definitely take forward in the future and I would definitely do differently.

Q265 **Julie Elliott:** Yet you still think that the investigation was adequate, bearing in mind what you have just said?

Rachel Brace: Based on what I knew at the time, yes. With hindsight, I would definitely do it differently, but going back in time, based on what I knew at the time, yes.

Q266 **Julie Elliott:** Mr Ashworth, one of my colleagues said a little while ago that we all like football. I don't like watching football, so I know nothing about the game in terms of watching the game. I know a lot about how it is run and that type of thing, so my questions are coming from that angle.

This review that was done in the beginning, which was where Eni initially spoke of some of the things that she felt were wrong in the game, in the culture around the game, you have said that nobody knows who was spoken to and yet since that point—and she is not named in the report; we have established that—we have heard a lot of evidence about this Golden Boot. I have to admit, I don't know what that means but it is clearly something very significant and I do know who Wayne Rooney is and how successful he is. I know who Kevin Phillips is as well—he comes from Sunderland—but there we are. I take it that this is something incredibly significant and yet from the point she has given evidence to this review she has not been picked for England. That strikes me as far more than a coincidence. What can you possibly think is the explanation for that?

Dan Ashworth: I can reiterate that neither Martin nor I knew who contributed to the report.

Q267 **Julie Elliott:** No, that is not what I asked. I am asking you a question about what to me sounds quite unbelievable.

Dan Ashworth: Yes. Okay, there are two further points I would make. The head coach picks the team; as the technical director I do not pick the team. Who is selected and who is not selected is purely down to each of the 16 head coaches; it is not down to me. The head coaches would pick the team on a variety of different issues. We have had examples in the past where the WSL top scorer has not been in the England setup. The head coach would pick the players who he or she thinks would do the best job for that team going forwards.

Mark had been disappointed with some of the recent performances and felt he needed to make some changes. He dropped three senior players, one of whom was Eni at that particular time, with a view of changing the

squad because he had not been happy with performances for a number of months.

- Q268 **Julie Elliott:** I accept Mark is not here to answer these questions, but you were his line manager so you clearly have a view on some of this. How can somebody who is clearly that successful—this is not an average player by any stretch of the imagination. I do not know, is there another woman player who has 102 caps, because that sounds something quite special to me, and to have won this award after she had been dropped, and yet the coincidence is that it is directly after she has given evidence to this review. That cannot be just a coincidence.

Dan Ashworth: You are right, Mark is not here to answer those questions.

Julie Elliott: Does that sound more than a coincidence to you?

Dan Ashworth: What I would say is that in Eni's previous 13 games for England she had scored one goal. Mark would pick the team on who he felt was most effective at international level. That does not always correlate to club form.

- Q269 **Julie Elliott:** But I go back to what I asked you: does that strike you as more than a coincidence?

Dan Ashworth: Knowing the facts that I do, no. To the outside world, without knowing the facts, yes.

- Q270 **Julie Elliott:** This report that was done, is it just the person who did the report who would have known the names of people spoken to?

Dan Ashworth: Yes. Other than the 40 or 50 names that I would have given him as examples of people to talk to, Owen would have been the only person who knew exactly who he spoke to and what was said, other than the people in the report who were happy to attribute their names to the comments and quotes.

- Q271 **Julie Elliott:** There has been a lot said about things leaking to the press. We work in politics and know all about leaks to the press, but it seems to me—and I would like all of you to comment on this—that if you think you are doing the right thing then things leaking to the press would not stop me speaking up on an issue. I think in any walk of life that should be the case. There is right and there is wrong and sometimes you have think, "Well, if this comes out it comes out. It might be detrimental to certain people but it is the right thing to do". Yet there seems to be a culture of being quite scared of the press finding out what is going on in the organisation. What do you say to that?

Dan Ashworth: Are you referring to the Owen Eastwood report?

Julie Elliott: The whole thing we have been talking about this afternoon.

Dan Ashworth: No, I do not feel there is fear of the press. Obviously some things within the organisation you want to keep within for the players or for the staff, such as the Owen Eastwood report. We have not

released that. It is not for public consumption; it is something that is for the players and coaches. We have a media department and there are other things they are happy to share with the wider public.

Greg Clarke: I think there is some merit in your argument. The reason I say that is that the FA sometimes behaves like a whipped dog and when I was shortlisted, as one of only two people interested, to become the next chairman of the FA, two of my previous public companies chairmen—I started off as a CEO of public companies—said, “Are you out of your mind? Why on earth would you sign up for that job?” What you get regularly in the FA is a beating over something. It is just a question of what this week’s beating is going to be. That introduces two things. First, a very defensive mentality and, secondly, a propensity for people not to make decisions because whatever happens they are going to get blamed for it.

One of the things that I am quite encouraged by is that the management team Martin has put in place is among the best I have been exposed to in a 40-year career in FTSE20 and ASX50 companies. I ran companies worth up to £25 billion and I know what a good management team looks like. But they are trying to drag that culture into openness and transparency. I do not—

Q272 **Julie Elliott:** Yet the head of that organisation will not say that they failed in their duty of care.

Greg Clarke: I cannot get into Martin’s head. What I can do is answer your question. Your question is: are we overly concerned about what people think, or do we need to focus more on making the organisation fit for purpose as quickly as we can so we can be proud of our FA? I have spent at least half of my time visiting about 35 UEFA nations, going to visit the presidents and the chairmen of other countries. There is a propensity for most of the FAs to feel the same—shell-like, defensive, do not let anything get out. We are moving out of that into hopefully a process of accountability, transparency. One of the reasons I personally, rather than institutionally, wanted to apologise to Eniola is that I need to lead by example, not look for a victim to pin it on.

Martin Glenn: I think the FA that I joined was scared of its own shadow. Too many decisions were taken through the lens of what might—not what the press think because the press isn’t a homogenous group. Like anything, in football you get a variety of different opinions. I will cite two examples of tough decisions we took regardless of what we thought the press reaction would be because they were the right decisions. That was the separation with Sam Allardyce and the decision around Mark Sampson. We knew that we would create a storm, of course we did, but we thought it was the right thing to do.

I think the FA is more self-confident about doing the right thing, being prepared to put up with some turbulence in the short term. You never win the argument; you are never right because football is full of opinions.

We are more confident about doing the right thing, even though it is not always the easy thing.

Rachel Brace: I completely agree with the point you are making. The point I was making was people often say to me in the course of my duties how they feel about the press. I completely agree with the point. I think the other point I would like to say is that I also believe that there is nothing you cannot tell the chief executive, so ultimately it is that sort of matter and that is why I told Martin the information I was given.

Q273 **Chair:** Rachel Brace, I want to go back to something you said earlier to Julie Elliott. You said that you felt the initial process, the initial investigation before Katharine Newton became involved, was adequate and that Katharine Newton had not said anything contrary to that. I just want to make sure I have that right.

Rachel Brace: I think I said she did not say the investigation was not adequate.

Q274 **Chair:** Okay. That is not what she says, is it, in her conclusions? In the conclusions and recommendations that were published, in paragraph 210 she says, "I do not consider that the manner in which the original investigation was carried and ultimately conveyed to Eniola Aluko was in accordance with best practice. Certainly areas were not initially fully investigated and then when they were eventually Eniola Aluko was not provided with a comprehensive response to her complaints." That is not a statement of adequacy, is it?

Greg Clarke: Can I—

Chair: No, you can't, no, sorry.

Rachel Brace: Yes, I am happy. I took the question as it was said in terms of adequate. I think there is a difference between adequate and best practice, and I completely agree with that.

Q275 **Chair:** Katharine Newton did not talk about best practice at the FA. She has never worked with the FA before and she is saying this is not in accordance with best practice. That cannot be regarded as a statement to say that she felt that the initial process was adequate, can it?

Rachel Brace: Best practice is the highest standard you can be marked by and I agree with that. I am not disputing what Katharine Newton said or that there were not things we could have done better. I said that too.

Q276 **Chair:** I would say from that statement that Katharine Newton thinks it is inadequate and in fact she goes on to specify ways in which she thinks it was inadequate.

Rachel Brace: She specifies three things. She talks about the fact that her—

Q277 **Chair:** But you are sitting there saying it was an adequate process. Mr Glenn is saying as well that, "I do not feel that I have anything to apologise for, for the way in which this process was conducted", but in

Katharine Newton's own recommendations she says it is not best practice and she is calling out areas where the initial investigation fell down. I find your present representation of that extraordinary, given what is in the report that was produced by Katharine Newton.

Martin Glenn: As a practical matter, I believe we have taken the initial concerns raised by Eni Aluko very seriously. That need not have happened in many other organisations; we did. We deal with it through an internal process and then when we were not sure we got external advice to tell us where we might have fallen short and done things differently. I accept that there are things that could have been done better, but to the point about duty of care, there are plenty of organisations that may not have done nearly as much as we did to investigate these reports. The fact that we asked a third party, independent barrister, to come in and critique what we have done is surely the sign of an organisation that is open to self-criticism and thinking where we can learn from different best practices. We know we are not perfect. We are in the public eye. Every slight slip gets highlighted, magnified and so on. We understand that, but we are arguing about definitional things. Could it have been better? For sure.

Q278 **Chair:** I do not think you understand what is being said to you. I do not think you understand what is being written in these reports and what people like Eniola Aluko are saying to you as well, which is you have an internal review where not all the allegations are investigated, where clearly there is no established grievance procedure, the barrister reviewing it says it is not best practice and one of the persons—Mr Ashworth, who we will come on to in a minute—who was co-leading the investigation decided to give evidence to it as well. That is something that is a clear breach of best practice.

Rachel Brace, before I ask Mr Ashworth about that, have you ever been involved in your professional career in an internal review that was conducted in that way, before you joined the FA?

Rachel Brace: I have been involved in lots of grievances before I joined the FA and I think the point I would like to make about that is they are human processes and people will make mistakes. I think to the point about Mr Ashworth, there was one e-mail that he sent. I completely agree that should not have been sent, in that he should not have been giving me a point of view, but it was one e-mail and he didn't do it again, and he had not done it before that. I absolutely take your point but it is not the first time and I am sure it won't be the last time that that will happen to me. From a human perspective, line managers will do things and it is my job to say, "No, that is not the right thing to do, please don't do it again".

Q279 **Chair:** At the time, why didn't you say to Mr Ashworth, "Okay, if you feel you want to give evidence, then you have to step away from the process"? You can't be helping to lead the process and feeding back to the complainant if you are giving evidence to it, because your experience would tell you that was not best practice.

Rachel Brace: Yes.

Q280 **Chair:** Why didn't you step up to Mr Ashworth and say to him, "If you are going to do it, you have to step back from the process"?

Rachel Brace: Yes, I absolutely did have that conversation with Dan. He wasn't giving evidence on any of the specific allegations; he was just giving a point of view. If I felt he had given any evidence on any of the specific allegations I would absolutely have asked him to step away. He wasn't.

Q281 **Chair:** Mr Ashworth, given what you said is not related to any individual allegations, what was the point that you needed to give?

Dan Ashworth: I oversee 16 teams and what I am able to do is look at different practice across those 16 teams. I gave an opinion of what I had seen of the culture across the England women's senior team. Some of the practices had been put in place to improve that and it was a generic overview of how I had found the England women's senior team and how I had found working with Mark.

Q282 **Chair:** Yes, but your view was it was good and it had improved since the previous manager?

Dan Ashworth: Correct.

Q283 **Chair:** The process was not just considering the specific allegations but also the broader cultural issues within the team and what you were putting into the process was saying, "No, I think Mark Sampson is doing a good job. I think the squad are happy and things are better than they were under the previous manager". I think most people would see that as a material attempt to try to steer the inquiry in a particular direction based on your observations and your personal view. You are entitled to your view, but people would question, given you hold those views, whether you should also be one of the people arbitrating over the way in which the allegations are examined.

Dan Ashworth: Yes, I accept that and I have said before I am not an HR expert.

Q284 **Chair:** Rachel Brace is.

Dan Ashworth: I was asked—sorry.

Chair: No, sorry. Rachel Brace is an HR expert. This has been called out by the barrister but this was allowed to happen. No one stepped in. The only reason this process stopped was because it was then referred to someone external; otherwise this was the process you had established in order to try to examine these issues and it was one that failed.

Dan Ashworth: I didn't make any comments on any of the allegations. I had not witnessed any of the allegations. I was Mark's line manager. The initial observations from Eniola had come into me so, as we do with normal FA procedures, the line manager would be the first point of contact to look at any accusations made against any member of staff.

Q285 **Chair:** You said you were asked to give this view. Who asked you to do it?

Dan Ashworth: No, I was asked by Eniola to look into it.

Q286 **Chair:** But the decision to say, "Actually, I feel that I should put a statement in basically in support of Mark" was your decision? You decided to just do that yourself, as Mark's line manager?

Dan Ashworth: No, my statement that went in was my observations around—

Q287 **Chair:** Yes, which were positive about him and positive about the team, but no one asked you to do that?

Dan Ashworth: No.

Q288 **Chair:** You just decided you would put that in, including the purpose of that statement, in the context of other things being looked at, is to say, "Actually, we think he is a good guy". So when someone has made serious allegations about him, his practices, the culture within the team, whether he is bullying players, whether he is using racist language, you decide that, as someone leading that review, you would put in a statement saying you thought Mark was a good guy and the atmosphere was very positive?

Dan Ashworth: I think that from an investigation that had a narrow focus I was trying to put in a measured and balanced view from what I had seen across the 16 England teams. In hindsight it was the wrong thing to do.

Q289 **Chair:** You are prejudging your own investigation. You are saying, "Well, I think he is a really good guy and I think other people should know that too. So rather than just looking at the evidence, I am going to make my own submission to my own inquiry telling everyone what a good guy I think Mark Sampson is." Katharine Newton is absolutely right to say that was completely wrong. To the chairman's point earlier, he very rightly said that the organisation has to make sure that whistle-blowers are cared for and listened to. I think that falls well short of what will be not just best practice but adequate practice in considering a complaint like that.

I will ask you again, Mr Glenn: how satisfied are you with this process, one you have resolutely defended so far but that I think falls a long way short of what people should expect?

Martin Glenn: I guess I am just trying to inject a sense of balance. Did we take the allegations very seriously? Yes, absolutely we did. Did we need to get in an independent barrister's view on what we had done? Yes, because we had sufficient doubt about things. We do not only exist to run internal grievance processes. We do many other things. Do I believe the spirit and the intent of the people who carried on that investigation was the right one? Yes, I do and I think it should be to the credit of the FA that we ask for someone external, an external barrister, to come in and tell us in their eyes what could we do differently and how they saw it. I

think that should be to our credit. No one forced us to get in a separate independent barrister; we chose to do it. As you look at the whole affair, that factor should be weighed in.

Q290 **Chair:** You took professional advice on that from a barrister and presumably that was also because you were in a situation where you had an employee making a complaint against your organisation and you failed to satisfy her with the way in which you had handled the complaint. That is why you brought in the outside legal counsel. It is standard procedure, not because you felt it to be a higher test.

Martin Glenn: No, not at all. Standard procedure would have gone straight—at that stage you might have gone straight to industrial tribunal. We were trying to find the truth. You may think it was awkward, you may think that mistakes were made and you have to be proportionate about the nature of those mistakes. We chose to do it; we did not need to go and do that. We had sufficient doubt, self-reflection, about have we asked all the right questions in the right way, because we wanted Eniola to feel that the process had been fair and that her considerations were weighed equally with the considerations of the person who was accused.

Q291 **Chair:** Honestly, Mr Glenn, listening to the evidence you have given this afternoon, my concern for the future of the FA is that I do not think you place enough weight and seriousness on the actual failings here. It would have been if you had said, “No, we do apologise. There were failures in process, not just failures by Mark Sampson, and part of us learning, part of us putting in a benefit for whistle-blowers is recognising that there were failures in this process, failures that Katharine Newton recognises”. I think probably everyone who has taken an interest in this would recognise that, but you do not.

Martin Glenn: I think, with respect, that is an unfair characterisation. What we have said is we are open to learning, we are working with UK Sport to deal with what is clearly an issue in elite sport as the sport develops, particularly the speed of the women’s game growing, that grievances processes that may work for a general organisation are not fit for purpose for those in elite sports. We have said that and we are working on it. Of course I accept it and I absolutely, for the record, recognise that mistakes were made. I am the last person to say that everything in the garden is rosy. Of course we need to keep improving but it is a broad—

Q292 **Chair:** But you do not think, in terms of the level of mistakes you think were made, they were serious enough that you owe Eni Aluko an apology?

Martin Glenn: At the start of the meeting, if you recall, and it is on record, we apologised.

Q293 **Chair:** Not for this. You apologised because of Mark Sampson’s behaviour; you did not apologise because of the process. I asked you expressly whether you would apologise for the process and you declined

to do so.

Martin Glenn: Like I said, I would go on intentions. Our intentions—

Q294 **Chair:** Okay. Mr Clarke, I am going to ask you about this too. Do you feel that Eni Aluko is owed an apology for failures in process as well as the behaviour of Mark Sampson?

Greg Clarke: Knowing what I know today, I don't think the process yielded a good result quickly and effectively enough. It took us too long to get to the point where we established those two racist inferences took place.

Q295 **Chair:** You do accept that was because of mistakes made by people within your organisation in the way they conducted the review?

Greg Clarke: I make mistakes—

Chair: You are saying, "We got there too slowly", and I said: do you accept that the reason you got there too slowly—the FA as a corporate body, not you personally—was because of things that people did, people who work for you who should have done it differently? Do you accept that?

Greg Clarke: I am trying to answer your question, I promise.

Chair: Yes.

Greg Clarke: Do you want me to say yes? I will say yes.

Chair: Yes.

Greg Clarke: Do you want an answer or—

Chair: Yes, I want—

Greg Clarke: My answer or your answer?

Chair: I want an answer.

Greg Clarke: Right, you can have a very clear answer, sir. The clear answer is we took too long to get to the right answer and the reason we took too long is that we were not clear on our grievance procedures. We did not fix them quickly enough, we allowed too many mistakes to occur, and that was a combination of small mistakes all adding up to a very bad outcome that took too long to deliver justice to Eni Aluko who played for England 100 times.

Q296 **Chair:** Do you think Eni Aluko deserves an apology from The Football Association for these failures in process that have been identified?

Greg Clarke: I will apologise to Eni in person.

Q297 **Chair:** Okay, she is sitting behind you. Would you like to turn around and look her in the eye—

Greg Clarke: I will not have to do that. What will happen is when I get up I will shake her hand and I will ask to meet her personally because I

do not think that as I walk past her in the room, "Sorry, it will not happen again", is good enough. I shall go and meet her, listen to her reflections and apologise to her personally. I will do that.

Q298 **Chair:** Okay, well you could have done it right now.

Greg Clarke: Yes, but what I want to do is engage with her, not a perfunctory, "Sorry", shake her hand and walk off.

Chair: I am glad at least that, even though your chief executive does not think he has anything to apologise for in process, you do.

Q299 **Christian Matheson:** I want to follow up on a couple of pieces of evidence and then just bring in a third issue. Mr Clarke, I want to talk to you about the explanation you gave for this e-mail. I will remind everyone, "I have no idea why you are sending me this. Perhaps you could enlighten me". Your explanation was that you had had discussions with representatives on three occasions and that you could not—

Greg Clarke: The same representative.

Christian Matheson: The same representative on three occasions and felt that you were precluded from getting involved because that would upset your internal processes. Looking at what you wrote, I do not find that explanation credible, because there is no reference in your e-mail to the fact that you have already had this conversation three times. If I was sending that e-mail I would have said, "I have already discussed this with you. I can't do this". I do not believe the explanation, I am afraid.

Greg Clarke: I respect your judgment, sir, but I will assert you are wrong. Do you know the date of that e-mail?

Christian Matheson: No, please tell me.

Greg Clarke: November last year. Do you know what was happening in November last year?

Christian Matheson: Well, you came to this Committee at one point.

Greg Clarke: No, that was October. In November last year we were up to our nostrils in the biggest crisis the FA had ever had. Thousands of children abused over decades. I was working 22 hours a day to get to the bottom of that. That came in; I responded. Was that a perfect response? Of course not. If I had had some sleep and had not been working myself to death, if I was not trying to get to the bottom of how counties had safeguarding officers in place, how many criminal record shots were in place, running from meeting to meeting, meeting victims, I would have handled that better. But I give you my assurance, sir, that was the reason.

Q300 **Christian Matheson:** Thank you. I am a little bit concerned now because, of course, that is the same explanation that Mr Glenn gave for having to retract the statement he made to the article before—that he was tired.

Mr Glenn, can you just confirm to me that it is the position of the FA that

Mark Sampson's sacking had nothing to do with the Eniola Aluko affair and the Eniola Aluko complaint?

Martin Glenn: Yes, I can.

Q301 **Christian Matheson:** Let's be clear, you have sacked a bloke for an offence that took place not in your employment but in his previous employment and which you knew about at the time he was appointed?

Martin Glenn: We did not know about it at the time he was appointed.

Q302 **Christian Matheson:** Okay, you knew about it pretty soon after he was appointed and within, I would expect, the probationary period?

Martin Glenn: Yes, it was April 2014, four months after he joined.

Q303 **Christian Matheson:** Have you done a deal with him? Have you paid him any money?

Martin Glenn: His contract has been terminated.

Q304 **Christian Matheson:** Okay, and he has not been given a payoff?

Martin Glenn: There is a payment related to his contract but it is not a payoff as such.

Q305 **Christian Matheson:** How much?

Martin Glenn: Can you answer the details of it?

Rachel Brace: The payment that we made was in line with his contract. It was nine months' salary.

Q306 **Christian Matheson:** Okay, and he is not going to take any further action against you in respect of that termination? Has he indicated that he might—

Martin Glenn: I had a notification from his solicitors that he may pursue a wrongful dismissal claim.

Q307 **Christian Matheson:** But you stand by the fact that the two are not—Ms Elliott was talking coincidences before and again I think one of the things that might damage your credibility is that there is yet another coincidence.

Martin Glenn: I can see exactly why you would say that and I can see exactly why Ms Elliott said the same thing. There have been a number of coincidences, which you could, if you add the facts up, get to a conclusion, which was not the case.

Just to reiterate, the decision around Mark Sampson was based on what we discovered to be his previous conduct at a previous club. I think if we were sitting here today there might be a question saying had that not happened and we are looking at the facts now, that might be another question; what would we go and do knowing what we do now? It was based on his conduct at Bristol, not to do with what we knew from the time of dismissal, which is mid-September this year.

Q308 **Christian Matheson:** I want to ask you about the Lucy Ward case and Leeds United. Mr Clarke, for your benefit, in case you are not sure, my understanding is that Lucy Ward was employed by Leeds United and was the partner of Neil Redfearn, who was the manager. He got sacked by Mr Cellino, the former owner of Leeds United, and then she was sacked because she was his partner. You could not get a clearer case of sex discrimination. She took Leeds United to an employment tribunal and won, as you would expect in such a clear-cut case, and was made an award of £290,000, which Leeds never paid. She then sought the support of the FA. What support did you give her?

Greg Clarke: When did this happen?

Christian Matheson: It has happened within the last year and a half, two years. In fact I have an article here from—

Greg Clarke: Can you give me the date? Sorry, I apologise for not knowing the date.

Q309 **Christian Matheson:** This was 14 July 2016. Mr Clarke, is this a new one to you?

Greg Clarke: Yes.

Q310 **Christian Matheson:** Mr Glenn, is this a new one to you? Do you know about it?

Martin Glenn: It was last year, I think. I am not aware of any—

Q311 **Christian Matheson:** Yes, it is an article by Charlie Sale from September. There is an article from *Guardian Sport* again from July 2016. I would have thought it might have crossed your desk in the press cuttings.

The reason I ask is she has obviously asked the FA for support to get an enforcement of this payment and nothing has happened. The impression it would give, under the circumstances and perhaps coincidental circumstances, if I may suggest, is that once again there is a case where there is discrimination and the FA does nothing.

Greg Clarke: I am not going to hypothesise because it is such a serious issue we will need to give you a written response. On the facts you have presented, which are plausible, it sounds outrageous. I will find out what is going on.

Q312 **Christian Matheson:** Thank you. The concern in respect of the Eni Aluko case is Lady Bracknell territory, isn't it? To fail to act over one discrimination case might be unfortunate, to fail to act over two is careless. It gives an impression, does it not, when we take these cases together?

Greg, you and I have had the conversation privately as well as in the evidence that you have given to this Committee in the last year about homophobia. This does not stack up well, does it? One type of discrimination after another, after another where the FA is not acting.

Greg Clarke: If you want to assert that football has a problem with multiple cases of discrimination, of gender, of sexual orientation, of ethnicity, I would support and accept that.

Q313 **Christian Matheson:** It is not just asserting that; it is the fact that the FA does not do anything about it.

Greg Clarke: I think that I will give you a measured response rather than my gut reaction. I used the wrong word before and got thrashed, so I am trying to use the right word this time. The issue for me is that I have a burning desire to make the game more inclusive. I used the observation about Grenfell because I was so happy that day.

For the first time this week I got someone who called me and said, "I think I can introduce you to a gay Premier League player but you need to win my trust first", so I will do my best to do that. I worked really hard to address the black manager problem. Martin and the PFA are working really hard to get more black coaches. That is another example of us working well with the PFA to bring inclusion in.

Is there sexism in football? Is there bad treatment towards women? Absolutely. Do we have the powers to deal with it is something—because one of the reasons that things happen in clubs is we do not have the power at the FA to overcome statute. The football clubs, the statutory corporations, are subject to the Companies Act and if you have a court judgment you can execute that court judgment and you can demand payment. I need to check whether we have the powers to get into a legal court-driven process within our statutes.

I need to give you a reasoned response on our powers and what we can do to address that blatant inequity.

Q314 **Christian Matheson:** The Select Committee has been looking and has, of course, had a debate about legislation in terms of football governance, including the FA, so that might be something we need to look at.

Greg Clarke: Let me give you an example, and it is a pertinent example, I battled with Mr Cellino. I tried to keep him out. We banned him two or three times and every time we got turned over by the courts because we did not have the statutory powers because was a conviction of first instance in the Italian legal system enough to prove guilt? In the Italian system you are not guilty until you have been through the appeal process. Us interfering with legal processes is really hard and what I need to do to answer your question respectfully and effectively is to give you a detailed written response, which I promise to do.

Q315 **Christian Matheson:** Thank you. In terms of the Eniola Aluko complaints and the situation there, do you have the support of your board and of the council?

Greg Clarke: Yes, I do. They are decent people but they want to do it right and we have not delivered justice to this lady quickly enough.

Christian Matheson: Thank you.

Q316 **Brendan O'Hara:** We are almost four hours in and I appreciate that it has been a tough four hours and I do not think it will ever be regarded as the FA's finest moment. Could I ask, Mr Glenn, in your opinion how damaging to the reputation of the FA has this whole affair been and how do you assess your culpability in that reputational damage?

Martin Glenn: Clearly we are trying to position and promote the FA as being for all in sport. We are a not-for-profit organisation. We sit between the big professional leagues and the grassroots game and it is important that the FA is trusted and it is felt that we can do our jobs so that anybody who wants to play football can be supported. When you get issues like this of course it is an issue, but we do deal with millions of people every day. Ten million people play football every week and so, as the chairman said earlier, the chance for there to be problems is statistically likely because of the sheer scale of the game and what we do.

In terms of my culpability, to answer that question, of course I am accountable for what happens in the FA. I was brought in to try to improve things in the FA, to modernise it. I think what we want and what my chairman wants in the FA are probably the same kind of things that this Select Committee wants, to make it more effective, more fit for purpose, more reflective of 21st century Britain. We are doing that across a number of fronts. I feel good about the progress we have made in terms of driving women's football, addressing the serious loss of grass pitches as local government pulls back on investing as we put our own 3G pitch programme down. There is no FA in the world that invests in grassroots football as much as we do. We have invested a lot more behind the national teams. We have 16 teams travelling the globe getting international experience and the finances of the FA are now in a very strong place, and they weren't two years ago, which allows us to continue with our mission of driving football.

When you look at it in the round, I would say there is a lot of progress being made and I guess to answer the question to bring the two together, my frustration is that a lot of the good things, a lot of the progress that the FA is making, will clearly be overshadowed by this and we need to deal with it.

Q317 **Brendan O'Hara:** Going back to the original question, how damaging do you think this affair has been to The Football Association?

Martin Glenn: It is hard to judge because life continues, many more people are playing football, many more women are joining football, so I do not know whether it has touched the majority of the population in the way that we might think, but that doesn't concern me. What concerns me is our reputation with respect to the people that interact with us, I want them to feel that we are a professional, well-meaning organisation and so it is absolutely critical that we make sure that players today, and particularly the elite players, believe that the FA is doing things well and that, in light of the last few weeks, we need to make sure that message is understood, acknowledged and we can try to improve.

Q318 **Ian C. Lucas:** Why was the payment to Eniola Aluko in two staged payments and not one?

Martin Glenn: It was very simple. The primary driver for agreeing to a financial settlement with the PFA and Eniola was to make sure that the squad and team and manager were not distracted in their run-up to the Euros. We had high hopes for the women's Euros and the way that the time or the chronology of this unfolded it looked like if there were to have been, I think I said before, an industrial tribunal it would have been very uncomfortable timing.

It was important to us that we did not want any distractions coming out about the case before the Euros because we thought it might unsettle the team. We thought the sensible thing to do was to do it in two stages, an upfront payment and then a subsequent payment, and we touched on the fact that the reason the subsequent payment had been withheld is because the contract that was struck between two parties was broken in our view, and an independent legal opinion, by the tweet that Eniola made implying that the FA was—well, I will not read it out to you but you have seen it.

Q319 **Ian C. Lucas:** You wanted to keep her quiet between the two payments?

Martin Glenn: We wanted the FA's preparations for the women's Euros not to be distracted.

Q320 **Ian C. Lucas:** So you wanted to keep her quiet between the two payments?

Martin Glenn: Well, there is no—

Q321 **Ian C. Lucas:** Just say yes.

Martin Glenn: No, there is not quietness order at all. The decision that was struck, and it is quite normal, is that we agreed that the quantum was not to be discussed and we were not to defame each other; everything else can be talked about.

Q322 **Chair:** Thank you. Just one quick final question from me, an answer I want to clear up. Mr Ashworth, we discussed earlier about the cultural review and we agreed that Eni Aluko was not named in the cultural review and that her name wasn't given to Mark Sampson as somebody who had given evidence to it. Presumably Mark Sampson would have seen the presentation given by Owen Eastwood based on the cultural review; is that correct?

Dan Ashworth: Yes, not until after 24 May, which is when Owen gave us first sight of the publication.

Q323 **Chair:** Yes, okay. So this is just a matter of chronology; the decision to drop Eni Aluko from the England squad would have been taken after Mark Sampson saw the cultural review?

Dan Ashworth: No, I don't believe that is correct. I think it was before then. I am pretty sure the meeting at Chelsea was 23 May but I will have to check my facts.

Chair: Thank you very much. I think that concludes our questions. It has been a very long session. Mr Clarke, thank you very much to you and your colleagues for appearing in front of the Committee today and for your assistance in supplying us with the written documents and the support we needed to have the session this afternoon. Thank you.