

A.I. Review of the Senan Allen Report¹

1. Is there any evidence in the report to suggest that Senan Allen actually reviewed the substance of Lorraine's protected disclosures?

Answer: No.

The report's methodology is not to investigate the *wrongdoing* Lorraine alleged, but to invalidate the *person* making the allegation.

- **Focus on the Messenger, Not the Message:** Allen repeatedly frames the issue as one of Lorraine's flawed perception, personal unreliability, and misunderstanding. He describes her as a "wholly unreliable historian" (Para 1.10) and claims her allegations are based on "wild surmise" (Para 1.20) and a "grandiose perception of their own importance" (Para 12.3).
- **Avoidance of Independent Verification:** For each allegation (e.g., inappropriate dealings with witnesses, conflicts of interest, withholding of information), Allen's process is the same: he recounts Lorraine's claim, presents the counter-narrative from those she accused, and sides with the accused. There is no evidence of him conducting an independent forensic analysis to establish which version is true. For example, he does not subpoena phone records or independently review document trails to test the conflicting accounts. He simply accepts the version provided by Inquiry management.

¹ Taken from a post on @X on October 11