

A.I. Review of the Senan Allen Report¹

4. Does the report show any evidence that he analysed a sample of redacted documentation?

Answer: No. He explicitly and proudly states that he refused to do so.

This is the most blatant failure of the entire review. A core part of Lorraine's protected disclosure was her concern that the Inquiry was failing to properly challenge the redaction of documents by the institutions under investigation.

- **The Admission of Refusal (Para 5.31):** Senan Allen states clearly: *"it was repeatedly asserted that I should embark upon a review of the documents disclosed to the Banking Inquiry... to establishing whether the [Participant]... had correctly applied the rules as to the redaction... **As often as this was suggested, I declined to do so.**"*
- **The Justification:** He justifies this by claiming his job was not to audit the Banking Inquiry itself. This is a circular and self-serving argument. He was tasked with investigating a whistleblower's claims that the Inquiry's process was flawed. By refusing to examine that process, he guaranteed that he would find her claims to be unsubstantiated.

¹ Taken from a post on @X on October 11