



Northern Ireland
Assembly

Committee for Culture, Arts and Leisure

OFFICIAL REPORT (Hansard)

Inquiry into Issues around Emergency Exiting
Plans, Including their Impact on Stadium
Capacity, for the Redeveloped Casement
Park Stadium: Mr Noel Molloy

25 June 2015

Mr Noel Molloy: I have had sight of some papers; I have been into DCAL recently. However, I have not seen all the papers.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): OK. I invite you, Noel, to make an opening statement, please.

Mr Molloy: Thanks, Mr Chair. As you said, I was the programme director for the regional stadium programme in DCAL from April 2012 to January 2014. I have more than 30 years' experience in the construction industry, am a qualified engineer and have various qualifications in construction law, project management, governance processes etc. I have 15 years' experience in major capital project infrastructure developments, and I do various presentations and seminars on their successful delivery.

In relation to the stadium programme, I was brought on board in April 2012. It had been determined, just before my appointment, that the programme was to be taken off Sport NI and brought into DCAL because of some gateway review that had occurred. I spent some time in Sport NI working with the guys to determine initially what exactly the best way was to transfer the programme. Sport NI did a presentation to me at the time on the overall status of the programme, and that was a fairly comprehensive report. It was either in April or May 2012, but, at that point, there was no mention of any serious issues with evacuations at Casement Park.

At the same time, I was asked about my intentions regarding the main working group in Sport NI on the stadium delivery because, if I was not transferring that team across to DCAL, their positions would become redundant. I reviewed the positions of the team and its capabilities and determined that it would be an asset to DCAL. Therefore, the team was transferred under the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (TUPE), which is the official process for the transfer of people. We then transferred the stadium team to DCAL and commenced the work in the Department. Those are the main points.

I will make a couple of points in relation to the structures around the stadiums. Each governing body had its own project board. DCAL had the programme board and there was a high-level sponsor board for oversight, of which I am sure members will be aware, that was viewed by everybody. That was an opportunity. Each project board reviewed its projects. DCAL attended that board and made sure that everything was done in accordance with the necessary processes.

The programme board in the Department reviewed all the various documentation. The DCAL stadium team, which I led, reported to the programme senior reporting officer (SRO) to give a status update on each project at the time. The programme SRO would have reported to the Minister and to the governing bodies at sponsor board level to give them a status update on each project, and that was an opportunity for anybody to challenge that status or to raise any other issues. It is important to note that in my time in the Department — from April 2012 to January 2014 — no issues of safety concerns were raised by any attendees at the sponsor board.

I will give a quick summary of the work of the safety technical group (STG). The STG is absolutely the right thing to do. I noticed that some of the papers stated that I instigated it in 2013. I can confirm that I have no recollection of that. To me, it was the right thing to do, so it is not that important whether it had grown out of Sport NI initially or whether I instigated it, although I am willing to take credit for it if someone wants to give me that. However, a number of concerns developed around the STG: the fact that it did not keep minutes, that there was no formal framework around its work, and that it developed inconsistencies in its interpretations across the programme. Nevertheless, we had a good working relationship with the group and continue to work with it.

In my time at DCAL, we brought Ravenhill through to the successful appointment of the contractor; further design, post-appointment of the contractor; the commencement of the construction notice; and the building and completion of the stadium. STG was involved in that at all times, and we maintained an appropriate level of confidence with STG that everything was deliverable within that. After the completion of Ravenhill, one slight frustration that occurred was that some further work was recommended by the STG. Despite that frustration, it carried on and everything was completed.

In my time, we brought Casement Park through to planning. In fairness, the GAA brought it through, but it was supervised by the Department. It was brought through to the appointment of a contractor, post-contractual appointment design and the construction notice. I left the Department at that time. Again, we kept the appropriate engagement with the STG and the appropriate sign-off. We assisted and worked with them in bringing Casement Park through to planning and the appointment of the contractor, by which point, as I said, I had left. However, at all times and in all three projects, as far as

I was concerned, we kept an appropriate level of engagement with STG and a level of confidence in its sign-off.

I also put on the record that, in all my time with the Department, the DCAL stadium team worked to a high level of consistency and professionalism in relation to health and safety and the processes and governance that were required in the Department, DFP etc. That was evident in how we tackled some of the judicial reviews and some of the state-aid issues that the stadium teams also came across.

At the time, the feeling about the Casement issues and some of the inconsistencies that occurred was that the STG's work was not as consistent as the previous work that it had done on Ravenhill and Windsor. To give you one example, the STG chairman requested to meet me to indicate that he believed that the GAA was considering terracing for Casement Park, and he could not possibly consider that. I pointed out that Ravenhill had terracing for more than 10,000 people and that I could not see how the rationale would stack up, at which time our meeting more or less petered out. There is another example in his reports, where he states that he could not consider uncovered seating. I pointed out that, in Windsor, we had put in temporary seating to accommodate events and that that was also inconsistent with the overall ethos across the whole stadium programme.

In relation to the commencement of the planning application for Casement Park, our team received an email from Paul Scott. I believe that it is page 121 in his bundle.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Can we pause for a moment so that people can get that? If we refer to documents, it is always helpful if people —

Mr Molloy: Sorry, Mr Chairman. It is page 53 in the Paul Scott bundle.

The Committee Clerk: It is in Paul Scott's bundle; it is not in today's pack.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I gather that we do not have that.

Mr Humphrey: Could we get copies of it?

Mr Molloy: I just have a copy of the Paul Scott bundle.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It is an email from Paul Scott to Carl Southern, who, I think, was part of your team —

Mr Molloy: Yes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): — on 19 June.

Mr Molloy: That was the date of the planning application for Casement Park.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): And your reference to that —

Mr Molloy: The reference to that is that it provided the DCAL stadium team with the assurance that it was possible for the stadium to achieve an (S) factor and (P) factor of 1 in both instances.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): You are quoting a bit of a letter, but there is a sentence above that.

Mr Molloy: Sorry?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): There is a sentence above the one that you read.

Mr Molloy: I have not read any particular sentence from it; it is just a general indication.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It was the sentence to which you referred.

Mr Molloy: Sorry.

Mr B McCrea: Which sentence are you referring to?

Mr Molloy: It states:

"As you will also be aware the 'S-factor' and the 'P-factor' will be reviewed following fixtures hosted at the venue".

It also states:

"In the interim the STG consider that there is the potential for a 'S-factor' of 1, and a 'P-factor' of 1 to be applied subject to any revisions to the proposals being agreed, and a suitable Management Plan for the venue being developed."

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We will park that and come back to it. We are getting it photocopied so that everybody has it.

Mr Molloy: Subsequent to having that email, we received a report from Mr Scott. For absolute clarity, I point out that, while the report is dated 4 June —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Again, if you are referring to a report, do we have copies of that to hand?

Mr Molloy: It is page 58 of Paul Scott's bundle. I understand that there are a lot of papers.

Mr B McCrea: So, on page 58, you are referring to —

Mr Molloy: I am referring to the fact that we received a report from the STG chairman in relation to Casement Park. It is dated at the top as 4 June 2013, but the Department received that correspondence only on 19 September. The email attached to it states:

"Hi Carl

Please find attached Casement Park STG Report"

It is dated 19 September.

Mr B McCrea: The page 58 that I have from Mr Scott —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): If we come back to that when everybody has it, people will understand what you are about to say more fully. If we park those two issues and move on, we will come back to them.

Mr Molloy: We had a serious issue with that report because it was inconsistent with the other reports that we received. We also felt that it was somewhat unprofessional in relation to the context, the way in which it was drafted, and in relation to the way it went off subject. We had a number of dialogues with the STG and Mr Scott. To clarify, a lot of the references here are to the STG, but most of our engagement at the time was with the chairman of the STG.

Subsequent to that, we received another report from Mr Scott, which is on page 102 of the Paul Scott bundle. It was received on 15 October.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Again, we do not have that in front of us at the moment, so we will ask for that to be copied and circulated.

Mr B McCrea: Are we getting all these papers —

The Committee Clerk: They are being copied as we speak.

Mr B McCrea: — and then we are going to come back?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes, we will come back to the three.

Mr Molloy: I can go through it again.

Mr B McCrea: You are going to come back, but are you going to tell us what you want to say about this?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes, that is the point; he will come back and rerun that bit of the discussion.

Mr Molloy: The report that we received on 15 October was positive about Casement Park, which left the Department considering that Casement Park STG was content with it. I will make a few key points on the report. If you like, I can defer until members are copied in on the report. That is probably best.

I point out again that, at that stage, the Department had no red flags in relation to health and safety issues at Casement Park. We were working through the process as we had for all three stadiums. There were a number of inconsistencies in the Casement Park report, which was not consistent across the two stadiums, and we were trying to work that through. We opened dialogue with the STG and were continuing to work through those matters. The STG was fully aware at the time that the contracts would be novated, that there would be further engagement and design work and that everything would proceed accordingly.

The only other matter that I would raise is in relation to a meeting that I attended. There is some reference to the sponsor board meeting of 18 December and a telephone call that I had with Antoinette McKeown.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Are there minutes of that meeting?

Mr Molloy: There are minutes of the sponsor board meeting of 18 December.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We do not have them yet. You have been given more — sorry, we do.

Mr Molloy: I do apologise for that.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We have had several thousand pieces of paper, so you can understand that —

Mr Molloy: Yes, I find it necessary to go back all the time. Antoinette McKeown rang me the day before the sponsor board meeting to say that she believed that there were concerns about the interpretation of the guidelines. I advised her that our concerns related to inconsistencies in the interpretation of the guidelines and that I felt that there were issues with our team that the Department had not been quite comfortable with, but that, nevertheless, we could proceed as long as we all remained consistent and professional in our interpretation of all the matters.

That is pretty much everything. Sorry about the papers.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We will give members a moment or two to gather those pieces of paper. The meeting was on 18 December of what year?

Mr Molloy: Sorry, 2013.

Mr B McCrea: When did you leave your post?

Mr Molloy: End of January 2014.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I have a number of people down for questions, but before that, I want to go back and let Noel go through the three points and then Basil can come in. You may go

back to the three points, as we have the three pieces of paper now. The first is the email from 19 June when the planning application was going forward.

Mr Molloy: We received that from Paul Scott. It was broadly positive about Casement Park and said that it was achievable. I am quoting from the middle of the page, about seven lines down:

"in the interim the STG considers that there is the potential for an s-factor of 1 and a p-factor of 1 to be applied subject to any revisions of the proposal being agreed and a suitable management plan"

That was the main point. There was no red flag in that email, and we were broadly content to continue. I think that it is important to understand that health and safety management is iterative and that we have to continue with the process. The design was not complete, and matters had to continue.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): What strikes me looking at it is that, in the middle of the letter, it says, "there is the potential". A potentiality is not an actuality.

Mr Molloy: That was because the design was not complete; there was further work to complete on the design.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): At the point that the planning application went in, there was not, if my understanding is right — you are a professional; I am not — a design and associated emergency evacuation plan that would have been compliant with the red and green guides. Is that correct?

Mr Molloy: Sorry; could you repeat that?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): At the point when the planning application went in — you used the word "iterative" and others have used the word "ongoing" —

Mr Molloy: Yes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): At that point, there was not in your possession, or in anyone's possession, a design and an emergency evacuation model that were clearly compliant with the red and green guides. Is that correct?

Mr Molloy: That is correct, although Mr Scott indicated that it still had the potential to receive it. I would also —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): There is a big difference between — So he was not signing off and saying that it was compliant. He said that it had "the potential" if certain things were realised, which might or might not be realised.

Mr Molloy: Absolutely. Key to that would have been the emergency evacuation plan. In the red guide, that is the responsibility of the blue-light brigade.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Sorry; to clarify this for everybody, it is their responsibility to do what?

Mr Molloy: To develop the emergency evacuation plan.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): The emergency evacuation plan. Who develops that?

Mr Molloy: The blue-light brigade.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): So it is up to the Fire Brigade —

Mr Molloy: It is a combination of services and the STG — those main bodies.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): The STG.

Mr Molloy: To be correct, the members of the STG would have been mostly from the blue-light brigade as well, so that clarifies that. That is in the red guide, I believe.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): So it is not the responsibility of the promoters and the designers of the project.

Mr Molloy: The emergency evacuation plan is a key part of the management plan, but the emergency evacuation plan for a stadium, as per the red guide, is to be developed by the blue-light services. There would be coordination and engagement between all parties.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): So that we are clear on them all, that was 19 June.

Mr Molloy: Subsequent to that, the Department received a report from the STG on 19 September, albeit the report indicated that it was written before that, on 4 June, but the Department had not had possession of that. The report is on page 60. There is a small snippet on page 59. After that it says:

"Hi Carl

Please find the attached Casement Park".

You may not —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We are only at page 58. Obviously, we need page 59 as well.

Mr Molloy: It just confirms —

Mr B McCrea: All that page 59 says is:

"Hi Carl

Please find the attached Casement Park".

That is all it says.

Mr Molloy: It is the report that is attached to it.

Mrs McKeivitt: Is the date there?

The Committee Clerk: The date on that is 20 September.

Mr Molloy: We responded to that report because we felt that it was not professional and did not align with the email that we had of 19 June.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): That email accompanies a report. Is the content of the report relevant?

The Committee Clerk: It is quite large.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): There was a third document.

Mr Molloy: Yes. That report was resubmitted to the Department on —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): That is on page 102.

Mr Molloy: Yes. It was resubmitted to the Department on 15 October 2013. It still contained a number of the inconsistencies in relation to the interpretation of the red and green guides across the other two stadiums. Broadly, it was still positive in its nature in saying that there were no major issues. If the members have that report, I can go through the particular —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): No. We do not have it before us at the moment.

Mr Molloy: Apologies.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We will take questions —

Mrs McKeivitt: Can I have clarification? Is it important that you go through it?

Mr Molloy: There are three or four key points in it that I would particularly like to point out to the Committee.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We have page 102. Is there more beyond page 102?

Mr Molloy: Sorry. That report is about 30 pages long. My reference was to the point —

Mrs McKeivitt: Sorry. Can I get clarification on whether, as part of the pack —

The Committee Clerk: You have that. That was the original Paul Scott bundle.

Mrs McKeivitt: We have it. OK. If there is anything in that that relates to Mr Molly's presentation today, I think that it should be heard. We have all seen the report and gone through most of it. I think that it should be heard if he thinks that there are valid points.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It is very difficult to remember a 30-page report. But —

Mrs McKeivitt: Of course it is.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Maybe we could get it copied. We will get it copied and circulated to members.

Mr B McCrea: This whole report?

Mrs McKeivitt: If there are only three or four points —

Mr Ó hOisín: If there are only a couple of key points, I think that we could hear them.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): You need to see a whole document to see the context.

Mr B McCrea: I am sure that members have the paperwork with them. The papers are in here, so you can refer to it, or, if you need to get it, get it sent down from your office. I am quite happy to go through this —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Not everybody can get it sent down, and folk do not necessarily have it in front of them. We will get this copied and circulated now. Do you have any further points to make?

Mr Molloy: No, I am happy to take questions.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): While we are waiting for that to be circulated, the first question is from Dominic Bradley.

Mr D Bradley: Morning.

Mr Molloy: Morning, Mr Bradley.

Mr D Bradley: Can I ask you about the outline business case? The preferred option for the project in it was 40,000. What was your involvement in the sign-off of the outline business case?

Mr Molloy: The outline business case was developed, I think, in either 2008 or 2009, which was prior to my time in the Department. It had principally been developed by Sport NI on behalf of the Department, so I had no involvement. It was signed off prior to my involvement.

Mr D Bradley: Do you know who was involved in signing off the outline business case from a health and safety point of view?

Mr Molloy: Key members of Sport NI, including Mr Paul Scott, had indicated to me that they were the principal drafters and collators of the outline business case.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Do we have the outline business case?

The Committee Clerk: It is a massive document.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): So it is very difficult for us to comment on it.

Mr D Bradley: You were saying that Mr Scott was amongst those who signed off on it.

Mr Molloy: Yes, he has indicated that in his bundle.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): And that is an outline business case.

Mr Molloy: Yes, Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Which is pretty different from a final business case.

Mr Molloy: No, it would be further brought on to become a final business case. It would have given the general indication that the projects were feasible and doable and that there were going to be economic benefits from it.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Does it mention anything about challenges?

Mr Molloy: None was highlighted to me. I do not know; I do not have the outline business case before me either.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It is just that you were referring to it.

Mr Molloy: No, I am referring to the fact that I was not part of the drafting of it.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We need to focus then on what Mr Molloy was involved in rather than what you may have heard about from someone else. We should stick to the period when Mr Molloy was there, which I think was from April 2012 —

Mr Molloy: April 2012 to January 2014.

Mr D Bradley: In any case, from what you have said this morning, Mr Scott had signed off on health and safety issues on a number of occasions.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Sorry, you are making a statement there. I just put the caveat —

Mr D Bradley: No, I am asking a question.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): No, you made a statement.

Mr D Bradley: If you were listening carefully, you would find that it is a question. Am I to be permitted to ask questions?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Please do. That is what I want.

Mr D Bradley: Thank you. From what you have said, Mr Scott signed off on health and safety issues on a number of occasions, albeit with a caveat here and there.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mr D Bradley: Does it surprise you, then, that he is raising issues two years later?

Mr Molloy: To be honest with you, I am quite surprised. We can go through it when members have the report dated 15 October. I am quite surprised that the chairman of the STG raised some of those issues when they had been fully aware. Casement Park had always been there, it always exited the same way, and it previously had a safety certificate for 32,000. It previously hosted events with 25,000 to 27,000. I was very surprised to see these significant issues being raised at a later date.

Mr D Bradley: At this Committee, Mr Scott suggested that the Casement project did not seek approval for the planning drawings from the STG. Can you give us any information on that?

Mr Molloy: I would need to check the records, but Mr Scott was fully aware of the design up to the planning and had given the Department the email dated 19 June saying that the STG was broadly content, albeit, as the Chairman pointed out, that there was further design work to be carried out. As and where the design was, it was still capable of achieving the (S) factor and (P) factor necessary to achieve full capacity.

Mr D Bradley: So the correct process was followed.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mr D Bradley: And that was the case in respect of Windsor and Ravenhill, as well.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mr D Bradley: Why was the IFA allowed to use the pitch as a place of relative safety for emergency evacuation at Windsor Park, but this was not the case at Casement?

Mr Molloy: The reason why the IFA was allowed to use it is because it is allowable within the red guide. That is one of the inconsistencies that we found with some of the reports coming from the STG. It indicated that the pitch could not be used as a relative space of safety in Casement Park.

Mr D Bradley: Was a different approach taken to Casement Park, compared to Windsor Park and Ravenhill?

Mr Molloy: There was a number of inconsistencies in the STG's interpretation of the red and green guide across the whole stadium programme. It was not consistent in its interpretation. As I described earlier, particular issues were around terracing, uncovered seating and the use of the pitch, but those had developed.

Mr D Bradley: OK.

Mr Molloy: But despite those inconsistencies, the STG was still broadly content and positive in nature towards the development in all the time that I was involved.

Mr D Bradley: When it came to reviewing these matters, it seems that a much brighter light was shone on Casement than the other two stadiums. Why was this the case?

Mr Molloy: In fairness to the STG, I believe that it put the same light on all three. I would not deprecate the amount of attention that it paid to the three stadiums. However, it was inconsistent in its interpretation of the red and green guide in respect of Casement Park.

Mr D Bradley: There were inconsistencies in respect of Casement Park.

Mr Molloy: In respect of the interpretation of the red and green guide.

Mr D Bradley: Were those major, medium or minor?

Mr Molloy: They had the potential to be major, if we could not resolve the inconsistencies in relation to terracing, use of the pitch and uncovered seating.

Mr D Bradley: The nature of the process was that they would have been dealt with on an ongoing basis during the design.

Mr Molloy: Continue with dialogue, and continue working through them with the team. Despite those inconsistencies, we still had a positive —

Mr D Bradley: Then, of course, there would still have been the final check and balance at the end: the safety certificate.

Mr Molloy: Yes. When the Committee has the papers, I can go through and point out where the STG was fully aware that the contract would be novated. It was fully aware that there would be further design work and further engagement. The key point in all this is that a stadium cannot operate with a capacity above that on the safety certificate. One of the things that confounds me — and I do not like repeating it in this forum — is talk of a Hillsborough-type scenario. I think that that is disrespectful and disingenuous towards the people who suffered greatly in that incident. The only way that a stadium in this region could have that sort of scenario is if it got an incorrect licence. Simple as that. That is the only way that a stadium in this jurisdiction —

Mr D Bradley: Of course, the GAA has an impeccable record on sports ground safety.

Mr Molloy: As far as I am aware. To be honest with you, I am not aware of the GAA not having that. I am not aware of any of the three governing bodies across the programme having any issues with safety.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Do you have experience in that field?

Mr Molloy: In which field, Mr Chairman?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): The safety records of sports organisations.

Mr Molloy: No, I just am not aware.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We will stick to the issues that he is engaged with.

Mr D Bradley: Thank you very much. That is fine.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Can I come in on one point before I go to Gordon Dunne? You mentioned the outline business case, and Dominic Bradley also mentioned the outline business case. I cannot remember exactly, but I think that you indicated that Paul Scott really flagged up nothing at that stage of the outline business case. Am I right?

Mr Molloy: No, I said that Mr Scott had been involved. I indicated that he had been involved throughout the development of the outline business case.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I will just read into the record what is in the papers that we received some time ago. I understand that we do not have the full outline business case yet. We have a couple of pages from the outline business case that were supplied by Sport NI. On page 51 of the outline business case, there is a particular line that is very important and relevant here. It says —

Mr B McCrea: Before you read it out, can you tell me what tab it is at?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Tab 1. It was the first of all of these. We will need to work through these with Mr Molloy and his team. There are quite a number of them, but we will take the first one. It is in the Sport NI bundle.

Mr Molloy: I do not have that bundle.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It is only one line.

Mr Molloy: Taking a page out of a paper makes it a bit hard for me. It is better to read a paper in an overall context. I understand that, as you mentioned earlier —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I will just read the line, because it just corrects some assumptions there. It says:

"All the entrances and majority of exiting is at Andersontown road end and such."

That was under "Current Deficiencies". Here is a copy of what we have.

Mr Molloy: Again, Mr Chairman, at this point I do not have the full report in front of me.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We do not either.

Mr Molloy: Oh, right. Sorry.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We have not got it. This is what we were provided with. Since we do have it, the key thing for me is that at the top of the column, it says "Current Deficiencies". The first deficiency highlighted in green is:

"All the entrances and majority of exiting is at Andersontown road end and such."

Therefore:

"Explore maximising widths of exit routes to Owenvaragh and Mooreland Park."

The potential impact of the safety at sports grounds legislation would be:

"Reduction in capacity due to safety factor."

Turning over the page —

Mr Molloy: For the record, the capacity at the time of that report, as I understand it, was 40,000.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It does not quote numbers here: it just gives a general observation.

Mr Molloy: That is the issue with not having the full paper.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): That is just the outline business case.

Moving on to the next page of the draft report — I accept that this is a draft report. We do not have the final one, and it may be that there was some variation, but we can check that out. If we turn to the next page, which is page 52 —

Mr Molloy: Sorry, just for the record, this is not the final outline business case.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It says at the top "DRAFT REPORT". I suspect that that may be because Sport NI did not have the final report and only got the draft one. That is a possibility; we need to find out.

Mr Molloy: Sport NI would have been —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It is from June 2010.

Mrs McKeivitt: Sorry, Chair, can I get clarification? Are we bringing in the business case? We said we were not discussing anything that was —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Sorry, no. Let me explain. I thought I had explained. Reference was made to this by others, so it is important that we put on record what it was in actual fact. Since we have been also given this by Sport NI, it is already in our papers. I am sure people will appreciate —

Mrs McKeivitt: Sorry, I just thought we were sticking to —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): No, I am just reading into the record.

On the next page, it says:

"Location - this will always be a challenge with a large number of people discharging onto Andersonstown Road at the end of fixture. New stadium require 360 degree exiting but existing old stadiums can stay as was. The venue's entrancing and exiting is in close proximity to the main road i.e. only a footpath away from a 4 lane arterial route."

The next column highlights the possibility of:

"the stadium providing a milling/circulation area."

That presumably would be an area outside that people could circulate in. So it is quite clear that issues around exiting were flagged up as efficiencies in the outline business case. That is all.

Mr Molloy: While that is the outline business case, there would have been comments of a similar nature in relation to Ravenhill and Windsor Park.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Undoubtedly.

Mr Molloy: Normally, they would be worked through, and it may have been cut either in the final draft or as we worked through the stadium programme.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): There are all sorts of maybes in life, but we are looking at the outline business case for Casement Park, just in case members were given the impression that there were no issues flagged up in the outline business case.

Mr Molloy: That was the draft.

Mrs McKeivitt: It was signed off.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes, absolutely, because it is an outline business case.

Mr D Bradley: Chair, on a point of information. When you were CAL Minister, did Paul Scott, as head of safety compliance, raise any issues during the outline business case with regard to these issues, especially emergency evacuation?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I have no knowledge of that. That was signed off, as we were told, by Edgar Jardine, who was the deputy secretary at that stage. We may need to call him to give evidence in due course.

Mr D Bradley: Obviously, you cannot remember any issues —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): No, I was not involved in it. It was signed off by Edgar Jardine as the deputy secretary.

Anyway, we have put on record the correct version of the outline business case.

Mr Dunne: Thanks very much, Mr Molloy, for coming in. I came across you before at the Titanic project: you showed us around before it was finished. Can you clarify your role, first of all, as programme director?

Mr Molloy: I had overall responsibility for ensuring that the stadium programme was delivered to the necessary health and safety guidance, protocols etc. There were a whole string of necessary DFP procedures and processes in relation to governance, health and safety, design, capacity, benefit realisations etc. It was grant-aided by DCAL to the governing bodies. We had to supervise the governing bodies to ensure that everything was done properly so that the necessary sign-offs could be achieved within the Department. There is probably a better description of that out there.

Mr Dunne: The sponsor board is a high-level board. I understand you attended its meetings as the programme director.

Mr Molloy: That is correct.

Mr Dunne: At any time, were you aware of issues of safety and of the issue of the emergency plan being raised at those meetings?

Mr Molloy: No, the issues were not raised.

Mr Dunne: They were not raised at that level?

Mr Molloy: They were not raised at that level, and there was no concern at the time. Also, they were not raised by any members of the sponsor board, including Sport NI.

Mr Dunne: They were not raised?

Mr Molloy: They were not raised.

Mr Dunne: OK.

Mr Molloy: Sorry, if I can correct that: they were not raised with the exception of one comment. They may be getting you the papers for 18 December 2013, when Antoinette McKeown raised a concern about the interpretation of the red and green guides.

Mr Dunne: That was at the sponsor board?

Mr Molloy: Yes, at the sponsor board. It is in the minutes, if you have them in your papers.

Mr Dunne: OK, so it was raised on that occasion.

Mr Molloy: In relation to interpretation. The action was for me and Antoinette to have a discussion on that.

Mr Dunne: What was the follow-up action?

Mr Molloy: I met Antoinette on 27 January to talk to her. As you will appreciate, I was leaving the Department at the time, but I met Antoinette to talk to her about the concerns we had in relation to inconsistencies and the level of professional reporting from her team. We needed to get things as tidy and consistent as possible across the whole programme.

Mr Dunne: Was it satisfactorily resolved before you left?

Mr Molloy: That was on 27 January, and I left before 30 January. But I made those points to her, and those were the points that she had taken on board. In fairness, you will have to talk to Antoinette to clarify that.

Mr Dunne: OK. In your role as programme director, can you clarify who was responsible for the strategic design of the stadium, which to me includes the design of the building, which you bring forward in stages, right through to the planning permission stage? I take it you were in post when the application for planning permission was submitted.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mr Dunne: Who was responsible for the design of the building, right down to the detail of it?

Mr Molloy: To clarify, the process is a two-stage one whereby each governing body appointed a design team to bring them through to planning and the appointment of the contractor, at which stage there was design left for the contractor to complete. So there was a two-stage process in relation to design. The Department made sure that there was an onus on each designer to ensure that the design had the potential to comply with the necessary regulations and all the design parameters, could achieve planning permission and could achieve a safety certificate. The Department said, within the funding agreements and within the conditions for each governing body, that the appointment of those teams had to ensure that that would occur. So, up to a certain stage, it was enough to get planning, and there was confirmation that it had the potential to achieve the necessary safety and all the other focus on safety — I know that is what the Committee is looking at — but all the other necessary regulatory and compliance matters that were required. The contractor was then appointed —

Mr Dunne: Sorry, this is a design-and-build project, as I understand. When was the contractor appointed?

Mr Molloy: For Casement Park?

Mr Dunne: Yes.

Mr Molloy: It was January or February: it is in some of the papers, but I do not have the exact date. It would have gone into a letter of intent, an Alcatel period and a final appointment. It could have been February 2014.

Mr Dunne: OK. You talked —

Mr Molloy: I stand to be corrected on that, but that is to the best of my recollection. I think I saw that in some of the papers.

Mr Dunne: That is OK. You talked about the drawings and the design having the potential to have a safety certificate. How would you come to that conclusion if there was limited input from the safety technical group? How can you come to that conclusion?

Mr Molloy: There had not been limited input from the safety technical group. I had an email from Mr Scott on 19 June saying that they had reviewed the drawings and were content that it had the potential to achieve. Those were the people I deferred to. In fairness, the design team, who I believe are coming in later on, are a very strong design team. Their appointment terms would have insisted that they comply with that as well.

Mr Dunne: Safety technical group representatives came before this Committee. My understanding is that they did not sign off the drawings for Casement Park prior to planning permission.

Mr Molloy: I have an email from Mr Scott on 19 June. I have a report dated 4 June, albeit I did not receive that report until 19 September. All those are broadly positive. While there are inconsistencies in relation to the treatment of Casement Park and how the other two were treated, they were still broadly positive and we were good to go. There were no red flags raised. That is why the GAA would have been allowed to proceed with the planning.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Does "broadly positive" mean the same as "signing off"?

Mr Molloy: At that point in time, that is what Mr Scott gave me. He did not say we could not put in the planning. He did not raise any red flag. He told me that it has the potential to get an (S) factor and (P) factor. If members have the report, I can go through the particular points where he understands that

the contract would have been novated. He understands that there is further design work. That was the exact same as happened in the previous two projects.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We have a copy, I understand, of the Casement Park stadium redevelopment safety technical group report, which was reviewed on 15 October 2013 and based on information available at that time, including a conversation with Charles Cooke.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Right. On page 23 of that is the emergency exiting part. Do you have that?

Mr Molloy: Page 23 of the report.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): You said you had a couple of points in there that you wanted to raise.

Mr Molloy: Yes. Would you like me to?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes, please.

Mr Molloy: The page numbers are not great.

Mr B McCrea: It is page 124 of Paul Scott's submission.

Mr Molloy: Page 20 of the report?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It is page 23 or page 124 depending on how you look at it.

Mr Molloy: On what page is this reference?

Mr B McCrea: That is the report. Page 124 is Paul Scott's papers that you were referring to.

Mr Molloy: I am on page 121. Is that the reference?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Page 121? OK.

Mr Molloy: The report states:

"The Safety Technical Group is aware that the current design proposals" —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Where is that on the page?

Mr Molloy: Sorry, it is in the middle of the page, Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes, got it now.

Mr Molloy: It is a little bit blurry on my page:

"The Safety Technical Group is aware that the current design proposals will be subject to further design development following novation of the design to the selected main developer and construct contractor (IST) for the project."

At that point, the STG was fully aware that the contract was being novated, as it had been on the two previous projects, and that further design work would be ongoing. I would also point out the third line in the last paragraph on page 124 — which is page 23 of the report:

"a carefully-worked emergency exiting plan must also be developed. This should be detailed in the Management Plan."

There are two points I would make. In the red guide, the emergency evacuation plan is the responsibility of the blue light brigade, as people refer to them, and the management plan, from experience, is normally developed closer to the completion of any project. The other point I would like to make is on page 128 of the bundle or page 27 of the report, under "Safety Management":

"As stated throughout the text it is important that a Management Plan and related documents are developed as soon as practicable."

Again, in my experience, "as soon as practicable" across major capital projects or any project is that the management plan is developed closer to the completion of the project. The other major point is on the next page, page 129, or page 28 of the report:

"There have been some deviations from the content of the Green Guide/ Red Guide however it is noted that considerable care has been exercised within the proposals in an effort to ensure that 'an equal or greater degree of safety' has been provided for spectators."

I know that those are snippets from the report, and I know that the report has a level of inconsistencies across it. However, within the Department it was broadly content — positive report, good to go. STG was fully aware that it would be novated, with further design work ongoing. There was dialogue and the normal cut and thrust of a project, which leads me to be very surprised to see some of the allegations in front of the Committee at the moment, but I fully understand your role in investigating that.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): People may take different views as to what constitutes a green light or an agreement and if it even is the function of the STG to say whether or not you should go to planning permission. That is really a matter for others. Theirs is really just to comment on the actual safety issues.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mr Dunne: Was there not a real risk here that the project could be brought forward, designed and built, and not have received the required safety certificate for the proposed outrageous capacity of 38,000?

Mr Molloy: Sorry, I did not catch that.

Mr Dunne: The outrageous capacity of 38,000.

Mr Molloy: "Outrageous"? Your contention that it is outrageous is certainly not mine. The stadium had previously hosted a 27,000 capacity.

Mr Dunne: When did it hold that?

Mr Molloy: A couple of years previously. It is your choice of words, Gordon. In fairness, no, it is not possible, is the answer to your question.

Mr Dunne: It is not possible.

Mr Molloy: Not possible.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It is impossible for what?

Mr Molloy: It is not possible for the scenario that Mr Dunne has outlined. It is not possible to build a stadium that could not get the licensing to match the capacity of that stadium.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We have been told by lots of other people that it was. Several other people have sat where you are sitting and told us that it is possible.

Mr Molloy: I contend that they are clearly wrong.

Mr Dunne: As programme director, you had a lot of responsibility for the project.

Mr Molloy: Yes, a responsibility for the Department.

Mr Dunne: You had a huge responsibility. The drawings that went for planning permission were not signed off. You were in post at the time.

Mr Molloy: They were approved.

Mr Dunne: Those drawings were not signed off.

Mr Molloy: They were approved. For the record, I refer you to the email from Mr Scott on 19 June.

Mr Dunne: We have been told —

Mr Molloy: For the record, I appreciate that the Committee has been told a lot of stuff. I am clearly basing it on the records that were available to me. Within my role and the level of responsibility that I had, I cannot deal with people's innuendos, conferences or talks; I need documented proof. The documented proof that I had at the time, Mr Chairman, was that email from Mr Scott. He had trouble getting the report out to me. He was able to get the email to the Department at the time saying that the stadium was capable of getting an (S) factor and a (P) factor. There are some issues around it. He was fully aware that it would be novated. He was fully aware further design work would go on, and no red flag was raised. That is the position.

Mr Dunne: The bottom line is that there was a risk. A stadium for 38,000 people could have been built there, and it would never have received a safety certificate that would be compliant to allow that. As programme director, do you accept that?

Mr Molloy: Absolutely not. I think that you are making a statement without looking at all the evidence. It was not possible. The Department had protocols and procedures in place. We would have had STG sign-off before we issued a construction notice, or the GAA was allowed to issue a construction notice. That is the same scenario that happened on the other two stadiums, and it is the same scenario that would have happened on Casement Park, but the position has not arrived yet.

Mr Dunne: The other two stadiums were not doubling their capacity.

Mr Molloy: Casement Park was not doubling its capacity.

Mr Dunne: It is, with all due respect. As I understand —

Mr Molloy: Can you point me to that evidence, please? It is a serious contention in relation to my role and the role that I was doing. I was not doubling the capacity at Casement Park.

Mr Dunne: Pardon?

Mr Molloy: Neither the GAA nor the Department were doubling the capacity of Casement Park. I need to be clear on that. If there is evidence to provide for that, I would like to be pointed to it. It is a serious contention. Gordon, it may be your contention, but I can categorically say that we were not doubling the capacity.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We will leave the point there.

Mr B McCrea: Mr Molloy, when did you join the Department?

Mr Molloy: April 2012.

Mr B McCrea: In what role did you join?

Mr Molloy: I joined as programme director of the regional stadium programme.

Mr B McCrea: Are you aware of a letter from the permanent secretary, dated 8 October 2012, in relation to the regional stadium programme?

Mr Molloy: Yes, I believe I am. Can I possibly have a copy of it, if you are going to refer to it?

Mr B McCrea: I will give you a copy. I will make the point, and then you can have a look at it. It is from the permanent secretary. It is dealing with Windsor Park, actually, but it goes on to talk about Casement. It says:

"It is essential that when the department approves this design to go forward for planning we have confirmation" —

Mr Molloy: Is this in relation to Windsor?

Mr B McCrea: It says Windsor, but it also does Casement afterwards. I will let you have a look at it. Do you have knowledge of that piece of paper?

Mr Molloy: Yes, I do.

Mr B McCrea: I highlighted bits on the other page of the key issues. This letter is from Rosalie Flanagan on 8 October 2012. It is on pages 27 and 28 of Paul Scott's papers.

Mr Molloy: For the record, what it says is:

"To this end, the design team will produce a final scheme design report for Windsor Park prior to planning submission in November 2012."

And, if I may read from your highlighted section, in relation to Windsor Park:

"It is essential that when the department approves this design to go forward for planning we have confirmation from SNIQB, PSNI and BCC that all relevant and reasonably foreseeable safety scenarios have been considered and anticipated within the design".

Mr B McCrea: Do you agree with that as an appropriate way to go forward?

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mr B McCrea: Did you do that for Windsor?

Mr Molloy: It clearly states that, yes.

Mr B McCrea: Did you do that for Casement?

Mr Molloy: In relation to Casement, the STG did not get the report out to us. Although they had one dated 4th, Mr Scott gave us an email on the 19th.

Mr B McCrea: Just give me the paper back so that I can refer to it. What was required for Windsor was not required for Casement.

Mr Molloy: STG sign-off was required for Windsor. We got STG sign-off for Casement, though it may have come in a different format. We clearly had STG sign-off. On 19 June, Mr Scott sent an email to the Department telling it, you know. Whether we got it in a report or not, it was from the chairman of the STG. It carried a lot of weight at the time.

Mr B McCrea: We had the permanent secretary here, and he said that he was not aware of that letter issuing. And I think that you have made quite a lot —

Mr Molloy: That was from the permanent secretary.

Mr B McCrea: Excuse me; I have not quite finished asking the question.

Mr Molloy: I just need to understand which permanent secretary.

Mr B McCrea: The permanent secretary was the acting permanent secretary, Peter May. You have made quite a considerable amount of information about the fact that this would be ongoing, we had not had early flagging or whatever. All I am saying is that departmental policy appeared to be, at the time that you were project manager, that you had to get sign-off, not just from the STG, but from the PSNI and Belfast City Council.

Mr Molloy: They were constituent members of the STG, for clarity.

Mr B McCrea: It does not say that. It just says that you should have considered all reasonable procedures. Let me just move on. Would you as a project —

Mr Molloy: For the record, Mr Scott had sent the email on 19 June confirming, as chairman of the STG, the potential to get (S) and (P) factor 1.

Mr B McCrea: All I have established is that you are aware of that letter and that policy and that, in the format, it did not go forward as a direct approval. We have asked the Department for the sign-off.

Let me move on. You are an experienced project manager.

Mr Molloy: Yes, I believe so.

Mr B McCrea: Are you familiar with the red guide?

Mr Molloy: Not in its entirety. It is not my role.

Mr B McCrea: You are a project manager who is not familiar with the red guide? You do not consider safety to be an important issue?

Mr Molloy: I am not an expert on health and safety. For clarity, because I think that you are trying to lead me down a specific route, I am the programme director. I challenge people in specific roles. I did not do the structural engineering for the stadium; I did not do design for the stadium; I did not do the STG or red guide sign-off. I did challenge the people who provided —

Mr B McCrea: Are you aware of safety legislation?

Mr Molloy: If I could finish?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Just let him finish.

Mr Molloy: I challenge people to provide those. That is why the STG was set up: to provide the Department with the assurance that this is achievable. They are the experts: I am not the expert on the red guide. My main role is to challenge people to be consistent in the delivery of the programmes that we deliver and to achieve —

Mr B McCrea: OK; let us just see what you do know, then. What is the maximum emergency evacuation time for a sports stadium?

Mr Molloy: I do not have the red guide in front of me; nor do I know it verbatim, nor —

Mr B McCrea: Let us have a guess, then. What do we think it might be? *[Interruption.]*

Mr Molloy: Mr Chair —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Sorry —

Mr Molloy: I am not going to guess.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Sorry, there are some comments coming from over here, and I cannot quite hear them.

Mr McMullan: Are we into a guessing game here or what? Let us stick to the facts.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I will chair the meeting. You will get your turn to ask questions in due course.

Mr McMullan: No, please, Chair; you ruled earlier on —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I am chairing the meeting. I will give you the opportunity to ask questions in due course.

Mr McMullan: Keep to the facts.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Now, we will go back to the question, but, please, if there are things that he says he does not know, then he does not know.

Mr B McCrea: So, I put it to you that, in the red guide, it says that the maximum emergency evacuation time for sports grounds varies between two and a half minutes and eight minutes. Were you aware of that information?

Mr Molloy: Is that what it says in the red guide?

Mr B McCrea: That is what it says.

Mr Molloy: I am certainly aware of it now.

Mr B McCrea: You talked earlier about emergency evacuation via the pitch. You said that Windsor was perhaps different from Casement. Why is that the case?

Mr Molloy: I do not know. I challenged the STG and Paul Scott as to why we had these inconsistencies in relation to the treatment of terracing, uncovered seating and the use of the pitch, and I did not get a sufficient or legible answer.

Mr B McCrea: Are you aware of the red guide's stipulation that:

"While in practice, spectators may evacuate onto the pitch or area of activity in an emergency, this should not form part of the calculation of the emergency evacuation time for grounds"?

Mr Molloy: Would you like to finish the rest of that line?

Mr B McCrea: That is:

"or sections of grounds. The pitch should be available".

That is quite interesting. Tell me what to say next about this red guide that you do not know very much about, but you can finish the sentence for me. Tell me that.

Mr Molloy: I can, absolutely, because you, as a member, had finished the sentence a couple of weeks ago, and I happened to read it in the report. It states that:

"The pitch should be available for forward evacuation as a place of comparative safety in an emergency."

Those are your own words, Mr McCrea.

Mr B McCrea: They are my own words, but, two sentences above, you could not tell me whether it was two and a half minutes or eight minutes.

Mr Molloy: I do not have the red guide.

Mr B McCrea: Let me ask you, since we are —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Sorry —

Mr Molloy: For the record, Mr Chairman, if I could deal with the words of Mr McCrea, because I do not need to come in here to deal with aggressive — I am trying to lay the facts before the Committee. The information I have laid before the Committee are facts. They are not innuendoes or anything else. I have referenced specific documents, but I do not need to be brought through the red guide. I am not an expert on it.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): No, I appreciate that. I am not an expert either: none of us is.

Mr Molloy: Sorry, Mr Chairman.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): But, even having been involved in this inquiry for a matter of weeks, there are certain things that do stand out as being pretty obvious. One of them is the figure around the time allocated for emergency exiting. I think that it was just somewhat surprising, and I am trying to summarise a view there, that you were not aware of something as basic as that.

Mr Molloy: Sorry, Mr Chairman, but, for the record, I cannot be absolutely specific. The red guide is very large, and there are lots of different clauses across it —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I appreciate that.

Mr Molloy: I think that I and most of the Committee know that the maximum time for evacuation of the stadium is circa eight minutes. I am aware of that. I am also aware of the time in December that the STG and DCAL would have been shown some crowd modelling by the design team that would have shown the potential for getting everybody out of that stadium in eight minutes. I have seen that. It is a 3D model with fancy computer graphics.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): When was that done?

Mr Molloy: It was before I left, so it was either December 2013 or January 2014. Crowd modelling was developed showing the capability of that stadium to evacuate within eight minutes, to the best of my recollection.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Was that presented to the STG?

Mr Molloy: Yes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): On what date?

Mr Molloy: I cannot be certain, but it was before I left, so it was before the end of January 2014. I cannot be more certain than that; I do not have access to all my bits.

Mr B McCrea: So, we talked a little bit earlier about the use of the pitch for an emergency evacuation —

Mr Molloy: And the fact that it was used in Windsor.

Mr B McCrea: Yes, so the question is this: in the Casement design, was the pitch wholly surrounded by covered accommodation?

Mr Molloy: I do not think so, no.

Mr B McCrea: You do not think that the pitch was wholly surrounded. Where was the gap in the design?

Mr Molloy: Was it not at the Andersonstown end? The design went through a number of iterations.

Mr B McCrea: Maybe I have got it wrong from the fly-by. I thought that it was all-encompassed, but maybe I have missed something.

Mr Molloy: At a particular point in time, it will have been all covered. The design has not been completed.

Mr B McCrea: Exactly. I am pretty sure that it was all covered. If, as project manager, you do not know whether we have built a 360-degree stadium, fair enough.

Mr Molloy: For clarity, in relation to the contention that you are making, at a certain point in time, that stadium was not fully covered. The issue had been raised that there was uncovered seating, which was why we had the inconsistency in relation to Windsor.

Mr B McCrea: Let me ask you a question about 9.12 in the red guide. I am only asking if you know this issue. It says:

"forward evacuation onto the pitch or area of activity may form part of the emergency evacuation route, provided that it leads directly to an exit which itself leads to a place of safety."

Were you aware of such a requirement to be met?

Mr Molloy: Not specifically, no. For clarity, and for the record, I am not aware of every single clause in the red guide, nor do I profess to be an expert on it. My role is the management role. Nor did anybody from STG point that particular clause out to me.

Mr B McCrea: I am going to finish, and maybe we will come back to this. I want to make two points. I will read out for you since you read my notes.

Mr Molloy: Again, I point out that, in isolation, any particular clause can look in a certain way, particularly any clause that maybe has not been finished.

Mr B McCrea: No, this is not in isolation. This is the entire section about egress and emergency egress. This is fundamental to whether you can put a new stadium in an existing footprint. It was flagged at the OBC, as the Chair has raised to you. It has been a cause for concern —

Mr Molloy: It was flagged in the draft OBC.

Mr B McCrea: If you are sitting here trying to argue to me that there have been no issues of emergency exiting schemes, I find that strange given the amount of safety legislation that we have to put that in place. I am sure that somebody will have looked at it. I just want to put it on the record, and you can say what you like, because you did talk about the pitch. Point 9.12 states:

"If the pitch or area of activity is wholly surrounded by covered accommodation with no breaks in the roofing ... it may not be a suitable route for emergency evacuation".

These are the issues when you are looking at planning.

Mr Molloy: I believe that GAA representatives are coming in after. They can clarify whether that stadium is fully roofed or not.

Mr B McCrea: I do not want to take this in its entirety because we could be here all day. You referred us to a report, and I refer you to an email from Paul Scott to Carl Southern in which you are copied in.

Mr Molloy: Can I have a copy of that or which part of the bundle is that in?

Mr B McCrea: It is on page 132 of Mr Scott's papers.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It is from Paul Scott to Carl Southern on 22 October.

Mr B McCrea: 22 October 2013.

Mrs McKevitt: We have done to page 131, Mr Chairman.

Mr B McCrea: I could go through page 131, but I will not. On page 132, there is an extensive email from Paul Scott to Carl Southern, to which you are copied in.

Mr Molloy: Is it the one dated 22 October?

Mr B McCrea: Yes, that is the correct one. After extensive calculations and so on referring to the green guide and the red guide, so it was brought to your attention, in the second-last paragraph, it says:

"The Group are surprised at the term 'belated requirement' as this matter was discussed with you in early January 2013 and emphasised by the Group at the meeting that you attended on 12th April 2013. Concerns regarding emergency exiting have been discussed regularly since April."

What do you make of that?

Mr Molloy: I do not have any documented evidence. He is contending that in his email. In all the evidence and the documentation in front of the Department, there were none of those contentions there.

Mr B McCrea: You would accept that the matter is raised with you, because you are copied into this email.

Mr Molloy: The matter is raised, and we also raised the matter of the inconsistencies. These are the broad thrusts of having dialogue with the STG. We had dialogue with design teams and dialogue with everybody else.

Mr B McCrea: My concluding remark is that I have seen a lot of evidence that there was a lot of communication about the need for emergency exiting schemes to be considered. At the very least, it was a risk, because there was only one exit onto the Andersonstown Road. I am surprised that you did not see that there was an issue to be addressed.

Mr Molloy: As I indicated to you, the emergency evacuations are the responsibility of the blue lights.

Mr B McCrea: So your final statement is that as things stand —

Mr Molloy: I would prefer if you did not try to make my final statement for me.

Mr B McCrea: No, I am going to put a final question to you. I will ask you a question, and it will be my final question. Do you consider that it is possible to get a stadium of circa 40,000 in the Casement Park area with the current arrangements?

Mr Molloy: Sport NI and the Department, back in 2009, felt that it was achievable. The GAA, at a later date, took the view that it was more dependable to do 38,000. Those items have still to be worked through. As far as I am aware, no construction notice or sign-offs have been completed on the project. It is not signed off yet, but all the indications in front of the Department at the time, and from the STG, were "yes".

Mr B McCrea: Relying on your expertise, in your role as project manager, I am asking you, in your personal opinion — not what the STG or anybody else says, but on the basis of what you know — do you think it is possible —

Mr Molloy: For clarity, Chair, I would prefer not to give my personal opinions. I do not know if that is my role. I was asked to come in and give you my —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It is preferable, and this applies to us all, if people stick to facts — things they are sure of — rather than —

Mr Molloy: Fair enough.

Mr B McCrea: So you would prefer not to answer the question.

Mr Molloy: Again, you are choosing to put words in my mouth. I am saying that I will not give my personal opinion. I have come here as the former programme director of the regional stadium programme. I have put the facts in front of you and will not offer any opinion other than these being the facts, written in front of us, and the evidence that I had at the time. Those are the facts.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I will bring in Rosie McCorley in a moment. You were employed in the Department.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): When you left, there was a press statement issued by the sports Minister, Ms Ní Chuilín, commending the work that you had done in very positive terms. You were also quoted in it, and I will take two quotes from the press statement. This quote is from you:

"The Stadium Programme is the largest capital programme in the Executive's current CSR period. I am proud and pleased that, as part of a great team, I have assisted in bringing this Programme to its most significant landmark, commencement of the construction phase on all three Stadiums."

So, in other words, on the day that you were leaving in January 2014, the process was at the commencement of the construction phase, and yet my understanding is that we still have not had an evacuation proposal that works.

Mr Molloy: That dialogue refers to the commencement of the construction phase in broad terms. The construction phase has many elements to it. The contractor had been appointed; there was further design work to be completed; there were further sign-offs and commencement orders to be achieved; there was the start of construction, and the finishing of construction. It referred to those broad terms of the construction phases.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): That would not have made as good a press statement for the Minister.

Mr Molloy: That was my own press statement, I believe.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): You also said:

"Although I am moving to take up a new challenge in the private sector, I will continue to be assisting the end-phase of the Stadium Programme in whatever way possible."

Did that happen?

Mr Molloy: Other than arriving here today, no.

Mr McMullan: Can I just ask something quickly, before the gentleman finishes? Mr McCrea read out a thing about the forward motion of people going onto the pitch for safety. I think he quoted from the red book. Can you read that out again, please?

Mr B McCrea: No. You have a copy of it. You should know where that is. I am not allowed to have a discussion about that with this witness, so I cannot do it across the table.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We will park that. If you want to come back to that, you will have a chance to ask questions in due course.

Ms McCorley: Go raibh maith agat, a Chathaoirigh. Thank you very much for coming to the Committee today. Tá mé ag déanamh buíochas díot as sin.

There has been much discussion about safety exiting and eight minutes. It all started when it came to our attention when Paul Scott came to the Committee on 30 April and made the Hillsborough statement, which blew things to a level that we were not aware of.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Is it not the case that it was actually flagged up by the BBC prior to that?

Ms McCorley: I am talking about at this Committee.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes, that is when we started, but that was because the BBC had previously flagged it up in a news item some time earlier in the year, did it not?

Ms McCorley: I am not too sure about all of that. I do not —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I think it did. I think that is how it came to our attention.

Ms McCorley: I do not go by everything that the BBC says anyway. We are trying to deal with facts here. That day it was presented, so now we are getting all different versions. What we have to do as a committee is look at everything that has been submitted and said and try to work out where the truth is or what kind of view we can come to on what was involved. One of the things that has stuck out for me all along has been the safety exiting, because my view is that safety is paramount. It is something that is continually brought to my attention, because I represent the constituency area. I live in the area. I know a lot about it, so it is my number one concern.

The red guide states that, if there is a hazard outside the grounds, for example, a gas bomb alert, and it was flagged up as a very serious emergency, people may need to stay in. That means holding them as long as possible until it is safe to go out. That strikes me as being possible, pragmatic and the right thing to do.

Mr Molloy: I believe that that was the consideration that was given in Windsor, but not in Casement Park.

Ms McCorley: That is one of the points that I want to make, because I do not understand why that is, so I want to explore that. Paul Scott stated that, in all cases of an emergency situation, everyone has to be evacuated in eight minutes. So there is a conflict between what the red guide says and what Paul Scott said. I understand that, obviously, that is Paul Scott's view. It is one of the views.

Mr Molloy: From my recollection, in a number of instances, there are conflicts within the red guide, and therefore it is open to interpretation. The issue we had was that some of the stadium problems are being interpreted in a particular way and the rest of the stadium problems are being interpreted differently. We challenged that to understand why those different interpretations were there. It is bad enough that the red guide was left open to interpretation, but the fact that it was being interpreted differently across the programme was another issue. We never got to the bottom of that, to be honest with you.

Ms McCorley: Was it explored?

Mr Molloy: It was explored and challenged. I think Mr Scott made reference to some meetings that we had where he alleges that he was being coerced to change the report. He was being challenged to be consistent in the report across all three stadiums in the programme.

Ms McCorley: So he said he was being challenged to be consistent. Do you think he was being consistent?

Mr Molloy: No, I do not think the evidence was there, because we had those anomalies in the Casement Park —

Ms McCorley: Why would it be the case that the same rules were not applied?

Mr Molloy: I will not get into my own personal opinion on that. That would not be appropriate for me. We had inconsistencies; we were trying to deal with them; and we were challenging them.

Ms McCorley: OK. That flags up something important for me, because people are being frightened. A Hillsborough-type situation was raised, and it scared me, I have to say.

Mr Molloy: I have addressed the Hillsborough scenario. There is not the potential to have a Hillsborough scenario unless the licence is given incorrectly.

Ms McCorley: OK. I am glad to hear that, because those concerns are well founded, I think.

Mr Molloy: I think it is right that the Committee, when it hears something like that, investigates it. Belfast City Council might be in later on in the sessions. They will clarify to you as well —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I think we are getting into —

Mr Molloy: Sorry.

Ms McCorley: Can we just clarify the process? What I have understood from previous evidence is that it is a dual process; there is the planning process and the STG process. Would it not be better to have the safety issues resolved before you put in a planning application?

Mr Molloy: No, because you still have the design element to complete for the contractor. It is not possible, because the people who put in the planning permission for either of the governing bodies would not have fully designed the stadium. They would have designed certain contents of it to make sure that they were all OK, but there was always an understanding, as per the notes in the STG report, that the contract and design would be novated over to the new contractor and that further design work would have to go through, be developed and be approved.

Ms McCorley: So, you are saying that a planning application is just one stage.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Ms McCorley: And that there is further design —

Mr Molloy: Yes, it is an iterative process that is ongoing.

Ms McCorley: So, it is not possible to have your safety issues resolved at that point.

Mr Molloy: Not all of them, no, because you would not have the management plan or the emergency evacuation plan at those points.

Ms McCorley: Would they have been resolved for Windsor or Ravenhill?

Mr Molloy: They would have been, later on in the day.

Ms McCorley: But what about before the planning application?

Mr Molloy: There would have been an indication from the STG before planning that it was content that the stadium had the potential to achieve the necessary (S) factor and (P) factor, which are both 1.

Ms McCorley: But the STG was not content.

Mr Molloy: No, it was content in the case of Casement Park, because we had the email from the chairman of the STG.

Ms McCorley: Why was there a three-month delay? What happened? You said that that email was written in June.

Mr Molloy: I do not know. We subsequently received the report on 19 September. It was dated 4 June, which was 15 days before we had received the email. There were a number of conflicts; there were inconsistencies; it went off track. We challenged the report and went through it, and the report was subsequently reissued on 15 October, a date that I have previously given to the Committee. Again, it was broadly positive. No red flags were raised. It was similar in nature to the other two stadiums, although there were a number of inconsistencies; but it was positive in nature and had no red flags, so the work proceeded.

Ms McCorley: We have had confirmation from the Department that it is not possible to move to building stage unless the safety issues have been resolved.

Mr Molloy: Correct.

Ms McCorley: That is important for me.

Mr Molloy: It was the same for the other two projects, and it is how it would have been for Casement, but Casement has not got there yet.

Ms McCorley: I am against anything being built unless the safety requirements are fulfilled.

Mr Molloy: Absolutely. For the record, that goes for everybody who is involved in the programme. Nobody would object to that. There was more of a role for DCAL to ensure that as well. There was no intention of anything like that ever occurring.

Mr McMullan: It was stated in reports that Paul Scott had signed off a number of safety issues during the process — from the business case right through to planning.

Mr Molloy: Yes, I believe so.

Mr McMullan: Was that through the whole process?

Mr Molloy: Yes. That is part of the draft outline business case, part of the outline business case and part of the STG across the programme; across the three projects.

Mr McMullan: Why do you think he changed direction?

Mr Molloy: That would be asking me for a personal opinion. As I said earlier to the rest of the Committee, we challenged it, but there were inconsistencies in relation to the interpretation of the red and green guide across the programme.

Mr McMullan: Is there any evidence of Paul challenging that afterwards, or raising it as an issue or an afterthought, perhaps?

Mr Molloy: Do you mean in relation to safety capacity?

Mr McMullan: Yes.

Mr Molloy: There is potentially some of that, where he had signed off the outline business case, but he had raised some concerns there as well. I believe that all of those concerns would have been similarly raised for the other stadiums and that they all would have been worked through at the time.

Mr McMullan: The outline business case was for 40,000. Who would have signed off on that? Refresh my head.

Mr Molloy: I do not know. By the time I arrived in the Department, I believe Sport NI had drafted it and signed it off, and it was then brought into the Department for final confirmation. I think that is the usual process.

Mr McMullan: Were there any objections to that?

Mr Molloy: Not that I am aware of. It was before my time.

Mr McMullan: Who would have had sight of that?

Mr Molloy: I am unaware of who would have had sight of it. I presume departmental officials, Sport NI etc.

Mr McMullan: Would the Minister have had sight of that?

Mr Molloy: I do not know. I am being honest with you. It was before my time. I did not join the programme until 2012, so that would have been signed off previous to that.

Mr McMullan: I want to go back to what was said earlier about the crowd going on to the pitch. I cannot remember exactly what was read out of the red book. It was something to do with safety of the forward motion.

Mr Molloy: Again, it is on the ambiguity in the red guide. As Mr McCrea pointed out, it should not be used, but the next line comes back and says it could be used. My principal issue is that, despite those ambiguities or —I will not say flaws — gaps in the red guide, they were still being interpreted differently.

Mr McMullan: I have just thought of something: I think that the wording was "may be used".

Mr Molloy: I would have to dig out the *[Inaudible.]*

Mr McMullan: I am going back to what was said in an earlier meeting of the inquiry, when it was said that "may be used" indicates that some method could be used other than what is in the red book, as long as it adhered to the stringent safety regulations.

Mr Molloy: Without getting into the finer details of it, our principal issue was that the pitch was being allowed to be used at Windsor but not Casement. That was the inconsistency that we tried to understand.

Mr McMullan: The pitch is allowed to be used at Windsor, but what about Ravenhill?

Mr Molloy: I do not think so.

Mr McMullan: Windsor?

Mr Molloy: In Windsor, anyway, yes.

Mr McMullan: Do you agree with me that Casement would be much safer because a GAA pitch is much bigger than a soccer pitch?

Mr Molloy: It potentially is, but there is a large area surrounding Windsor as well. I do not know the exact difference in square meterage that would be available between both of them, but, to me, that is somewhat of a moot point: either the pitch is allowed to be used or —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I think, Oliver, that we are veering into the area of opinion.

Mr McMullan: I am talking about a bit of the red book, Chair. I appreciate what you are saying, but we talked about the red book and the green book.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Many times.

Mr McMullan: This is the point that I am trying to get round — this safety thing, and the forward motion.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Maybe Noel is the wrong person to put that to. Am I right about that?

Mr Molloy: I can give just a broad opinion on the issues that we had without getting into the specifics. It would potentially be disingenuous of me to start quoting too many of the lines out there. I am not right across it.

Mr McMullan: OK. Thank you.

Mr Ó hOisín: For the record, and as a point of information, the previously held safety certificate for Casement was for 31,661.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It is a different type of stadium.

Mr Ó hOisín: It is a different type of stadium, but, last year, the GAA had over one million spectators at its games, including 31,500 at the Ulster final. There is a long record of —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): That was at a different ground.

Mr Ó hOisín: It was, but that is not the point; the point is that it is the same organisation.

Mr Humphrey: It is entirely the point.

Mr Ó hOisín: We are talking about the inconsistencies allowed to develop in the development of the three stadia. That may have emanated from when they were divorced or detached from one another. Critical to this — I have brought it up on a number of occasions previously — is the fact that zone 1, the pitch, is considered in one case and not in another. Additional spaces, such as the concourses inside the stadia, have not been considered either. We are also looking at two different scenarios: emergency situations inside and outside the stadia.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Do you have a question for Noel?

Mr Ó hOisín: I am coming to that. I know, Noel, that you do not want to get into the specifics of those inconsistencies, but you have outlined some of them this morning.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mr Ó hOisín: There were inconsistencies in the terracing and seating capacity of Windsor. Part of the terms of reference for this inquiry is to determine whether the approach taken to Casement was significantly different from that taken to the other two stadia. It seems that it was very different in a number of areas. Was there a fast-tracking by the STG of the other two stadia? Obviously, there was, because different criteria were applied.

Mr Molloy: In fairness, I do not believe that there was fast-tracking. I did not see that in the process, but there were, I believe, sustained inconsistencies.

Mr Ó hOisín: I understand the process, and I understand that not everything is signed off until near the end. We saw that at Ravenhill, which is a stadium to be envious of: it is incredibly well-finished and very fit for purpose.

This project has been on the go since 2008. The outline business case was signed off by the Minister at that time, Sport NI signed off at the development cost and letter of offer stage in 2012, and Paul Scott signed off at the planning and drawing stage. There has been a further stage since. It seems very much as though there has been a fast-tracking of the other projects.

Mr Molloy: All I can confirm is that there were inconsistencies in the interpretation of the red guide and green guide across the three stadiums. That is the principal issue that we had. They manifested themselves more so in Casement than in the other two. The difference was between Casement and the other two.

Mr Ó hOisín: The interpretation of the red and green guides, which are drawn up for different stadia, not necessarily Gaelic games stadia —

Mr Molloy: They are drawn up for stadiums in the round.

Mr Ó hOisín: Yes, but for stadia that are not the same size, mass, capacity or whatever as Casement.

Mr Molloy: Sorry —

Mr Ó hOisín: We are taking criteria, say, in the green guide, that were drawn up for soccer and rugby pitches in Britain and applying them here in the North to GAA pitches. As Mr McMullan pointed out, these pitches are twice the size of —

Mr Molloy: That may be why there are, sometimes, conflicts in the red and green guides. As I understand it, however, the red and green guides are there for stadiums in general and should have been written in the context that they can deal with those issues.

Mr Ó hOisín: I will go back to your specific role in this. You were programme director and project manager — is that right?

Mr Molloy: No, programme director.

Mr Ó hOisín: Obviously, as programme director, you will have had the timelines for the roll-out of the programme for delivery.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mr Ó hOisín: There will have been milestones along those timelines.

Mr Molloy: Yes, there were various milestones for the three stadiums — for getting the contractors on board, getting planning on board, getting funding agreements signed off etc — and we were achieving all those timelines.

Mr Ó hOisín: The milestone of the STG signing off on the evacuation one is still down the line.

Mr Molloy: It is still down the road. I reiterate that the STG was content with the design in December 2013. It understood that there was additional design to be undertaken. STG also understood that it would be further consulted and knew that the scheme was down for additional works. I emphasise, in fairness, that that was in my time. I do not want to cross over into —

Mr Ó hOisín: Yes, but we are still dealing with a hypothetical situation — *[Inaudible.]* — come forward with a design.

Mr Molloy: The stadium is under judicial review, so I am unaware how far the design has progressed.

Mr Ó hOisín: Finally, you referred to the email from 19 June, which refers to revisions and further information of a "minor nature" on internal specifications and dimensions. You said that the email was sent on 4 June but was not received until 19 June.

Mr Molloy: No, the email from Paul Scott was sent and received on 19 June, the date that planning was being submitted by the GAA, confirming that the (S) factor and the (P) factor were achievable and that it was broadly content. Subsequent to that was a report dated 4 June that the Department received on 19 September. That is where the issues with inconsistencies started to come up. The issues had been developed, and, before that —

Mr Ó hOisín: Why was that delayed?

Mr Molloy: No idea. We challenged the report and said that it was unprofessional and went into areas that it should not go into. It also talked about having a warm-up match, which we had not looked at across the other two stadiums. It was not the professionally written report that we had expected.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Do they have warm-up matches in GAA?

Mr Molloy: Sometimes, I think. I do not know.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I do not think that they have them. I have never seen that at Windsor.

Mr Molloy: The point was this: why was the STG making a recommendation to have warm-up matches?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Was it recommending that?

Mr Molloy: Yes. I could go through and find it, but there was a suggestion that there should be a warm-up match at Casement.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I read it, but it is hard to remember exactly. My recollection is that it was a comment that there would be warm-up matches rather than a statement that there should be warm-up matches.

Mr Molloy: I do not want to disagree with you, Chairman. My understanding is that it was a recommendation.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We will check that.

Mr Molloy: Someone can clarify it, yes. Sorry, Mr Chairman. That is my recollection of it.

Mr Hilditch: Thanks, Mr Molloy, for coming in today and trying to give us some assistance on this matter, which is developing by the week. You referred to the email on 19 June on a number of occasions. I have looked at it as a layperson, and it uses terminology such as "potential" and "subject to". One sentence reads:

"The management plan in particular should detail and contain suitable emergency exiting arrangements."

In my head, this has been the case with a number of witnesses who have come before us, and I know that Mr Miskelly got caught up in this as well. The STG refers to exiting, and, on numerous occasions throughout, it seems not to get it when emergency exiting is flagged. There seems to be a difficulty understanding that the situation is not developing well.

Mr Molloy: No, sorry. I understand that the issue of the emergency evacuation was raised and needed to be dealt with as we progressed down along the line. It also needed to be developed by the blue-light services. However, it was not a red flag or anything. Somebody was just saying that we needed to get the emergency evacuation done.

Mr Hilditch: It has been raised on numerous occasions.

Mr Molloy: Yes, but as part of the ongoing process, and it is the same consistently across all —

Mr Hilditch: We cannot really be consistent because we are talking about a 38,000-seater stadium, potentially, compared with an 18,000-seater or 19,000-seater stadium. There are different dynamics for different crowds. That all has to be taken into consideration when the safety people meet. Sitting here and trying to get consistency —

Mr Molloy: It is all taken into consideration in the red and green guides.

Mr Hilditch: — is not particularly helpful, I have to say. At the end of the day, there are three different scenarios. As I have now said at Committee on numerous occasions, we are dealing with a unique situation at Casement Park. Some of us have been up to look at it. It will take a —

Mr Ó hOisín: Sorry, if I could just cut in there. Surely we are looking at different dynamics according to the usage of stadia as well. Ravenhill has been approved for three concerts a year. Obviously, a One Direction concert, or whatever, will have a different dynamic from an Ulster v Munster game. There are inconsistencies.

Mr Hilditch: They will be reviewed and probably —

Mr Ó hOisín: That is what I am saying.

Mr Hilditch: That is a fair point.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Do not talk across each other. You will get an opportunity.

Mr Hilditch: Thanks for that.

Mr Ó hOisín: OK. I just felt that I should point that out, just in case.

Mr Hilditch: Yes. Indeed, it is the same with —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Let us give David the opportunity to ask his question without interruption.

Mr Hilditch: — the dynamics, and they have to be looked at in each individual case. On numerous occasions, I hear the issue of the pitch being used. Yes, the pitch can be used for forward movement, but you are still pushing people towards the same size of exits. It does not matter what size the pitch is. Surely that is a principle in itself and an issue that has to be addressed. The exits do not get bigger because the pitch is bigger, and the people still have to get out of the stadium.

Mr Molloy: Yes, but —

Mr Hilditch: Where do the exits take them to?

Mr Molloy: Sorry, David, there is just the question —

Mr Hilditch: There was discussion about that, and I just wanted to clarify that point on the size of the pitch.

During your time, were you ever aware of any potential purchasing of property or houses in the area in order to create a possible solution and get rid of the problem of emergency exiting?

Mr Molloy: No. In my time, the emergency exiting was an ongoing process that we had confirmed would be ongoing. We had weighted the point with the contractor. It had the potential to achieve the (S) and (P) factors necessary. Issues may have developed post my time, but not in my time.

Mr Hilditch: Did you never see plans in and around spring 2013?

Mr Molloy: No. As I said, I left the Department at the end of January 2014.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes, but this is May 2013.

Mr Molloy: May 2013? What reference is that?

Mr Hilditch: Potential resolutions to acquire properties to get a solution to the problem in and around the spring of 2013.

Mr Molloy: Where is the reference, just so that I can help?

Mr Hilditch: I am just asking you a simple question: yes or no?

Mr Molloy: I seriously do not recollect that. Is there a document or something? A minute?

Mr Hilditch: I am just asking a question.

Mr Molloy: No. I stand to be corrected, but, to the best of my knowledge, I do not think that there was anything. What date was it? Was that in May?

Mr Hilditch: I am just talking about spring 2013.

Mr Molloy: I honestly cannot recall. I absolutely stand to be corrected, but not to the best of my knowledge.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): There is a document that we have from 10 May 2013. It is a map in the Sport NI bundle that says at the top:

"Confidential. To be viewed by GAA employees only and members of the ICT. Not for copy or distribution without GAA approval."

Further over are the words "Egress Plan". It is beautifully coloured in red, white and blue. The writing is very small. I can read, "enhanced western exit", and it shows exit lines going over houses on Owenvarragh Park and widening out an exit at Mooreland Drive, close to somebody's house. Have you never seen this?

Mr Molloy: Not to the best of my recollection. I can have a look at it now. I am sorry, but I do not have the coloured version.

A Member: Here is a black-and-white one for you.

Mr Hilditch: Considering that the plan is trying to get a solution to the problem, I am absolutely shocked that someone at Noel's level is unaware of this situation.

Mrs McKeivitt: Chair, just for clarification, considering that it is marked "Confidential" and "To be viewed by GAA" —

Mr Hilditch: Sport NI.

Mrs McKeivitt: This came from Sport NI, so I take it that the GAA has permission to distribute this, and —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I have no knowledge at all. We were given —

Mr Hilditch: It is in the bundle.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It is in a bundle of papers that we were given. It is public knowledge, so it is public money as well.

Mrs McKeivitt: That is OK. It is just that it is marked "Confidential" and states "To be viewed by". I cannot see by whom because the print on my copy is too small.

Mr Hilditch: Yes, but Chair, it is a solution to the problem that we are facing today.

Mrs McKeivitt: Sorry, just for —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Sorry, the important thing is that it indicates the demolition of houses.

Mrs McKevitt: No. I want to go back to what you read out about it being confidential. I just want clarification —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We were given—

Mrs McKevitt: — on who could view it.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It says:

"To be viewed by GAA employees only".

However, the point is that it was obviously given to Sport NI.

Mrs McKevitt: Is that a stamped drawing? That is all I want to know. Was it stamped and put in as part of a submission?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): All I know is —

Mrs McKevitt: Whatever it says, it says, but —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes, thank you. All I know is that the document exists. I have it in front of me, I can read it, and it shows clearly red lines. I do not know who put the red lines there, but there are red lines that require the demolition of what appear to be two semi-detached houses in Owenvarragh Park. All that we are clarifying is whether that was ever brought to your attention.

Mr Molloy: I have no recollection of it. I want to be as honest as I can be with the Committee. I honestly have no recollection of that. Other people can explain what was meant by the drawing.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I want to follow on from and finish David's point because he was interrupted. Is it your recollection that you have never heard of anybody, anywhere in this process, at that time, suggesting demolishing houses?

Mr Molloy: Not to the best of my knowledge.

Mr Hilditch: Or acquiring any property in the area?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Or acquiring parts of gardens?

Mr Molloy: Not to the best of my knowledge. I need to check. The gardens may be part —

Mr Hilditch: Noel, potentially up to 38,000 people, depending on how many are at a match, could be in the stadium. If an incident closes the Andersonstown Road, where 72% of them are supposed to exit, there is the potential that 38,000 will be sent into Owenvarragh and Mooreland, where they would be locked in. You are taking people out of the stadium by 21-metre exits —10 metres and 11 metres on either side. What are we doing? What was the thought process? Where were we? We needed to get solutions to it, you know.

Mr Molloy: Yes, and the solutions, as far as I am concerned, were being looked at. That may have been one of the solutions that was being looked at, but our understanding was that all the solutions were being looked at and, with the appointment of a contractor, further solutions were to be looked at, more design development was to occur and there was to be more engagement with the STG.

Mr Hilditch: That does not seem to have been happening, Chair, and that is the problem. When the planning application that went in on 19 June was granted six months later, on 19 December, what was going on?

Mr Molloy: Obviously, engagement with the STG was still ongoing —

Mr Hilditch: We are hearing contrary to that. That is not really what we are being told.

Mr Molloy: There was a report. As you said, an application for planning permission went in on 19 June. We had a report on 15 October from the STG, so the engagement had continued. It was ongoing at all times.

Mr Hilditch: Yes, but it was not really giving any solutions. Nothing was put on the table. Mr Scott will be in to redress the outstanding issues, but —

Mr Molloy: I do not believe so. I believe that there were challenges. Dialogue was going on between the teams. They were constantly working. The STG was meeting the design team. There is plenty of evidence of that in Mr Scott's bundle. There was ongoing dialogue on it. There were challenges across all [*Inaudible.*]

Mr Hilditch: Challenges that some senior people stated at least a year ago, by which stage you were away. However, this was flagged long before 30 April, the date that some people are saying. I will leave it at that, Chair, at this stage.

Mr Humphrey: Thank you very much for your time, Noel. The press release that the Chair referred to —

Mr Molloy: Sorry, William, which —

Mr Humphrey: What the Minister said in the press release when you were leaving the Department is quite interesting:

"We are now entering the 'bricks and mortar' construction period, and I have absolute confidence that DCAL's stadium programme team will effectively and efficiently deliver this end-phase of the programme over the next two years."

This is the second paragraph of your quote:

"I have established great working partnerships with the Minister, with colleagues in DCAL and other Departments, and with the three governing bodies. Although I am moving to take up a new challenge in the private sector, I will continue to be assisting the end-phase"

The Chairman referred to that latter point. Did that great working relationship apply to the safety technical group and its chairman?

Mr Molloy: I had a professional working relationship with the chairman of the STG.

Mr Humphrey: You said in your evidence that Paul Scott was being challenged to be consistent over the three stadia by you. What do you mean by that?

Mr Molloy: Once again, I reiterate that, at one stage, we looked at terracing. There was consideration of terracing in Casement Park. Mr Scott came in to meet me and said that he could not possibly countenance that, at which point I pointed out to him that there was terracing up in Ravenhill for 8,000 to 10,000 people. The meeting petered out after that. I also challenged him on the consistency in the treatment of the pitches at Windsor and Casement. He said that they did not believe that we should have uncovered seating, but I pointed out to him that, at a previous match in Windsor, temporary stands had been put in and there had been no seating on those, so the same situation should apply. I was failing to understand how those inconsistencies were —

Mr Humphrey: You would accept, though, given Mr Scott's knowledge of the green and red books and his work professionally in this part of the world and on the mainland, that he has considerable knowledge of those issues, not least in working with authorities such as Belfast City Council.

Mr Molloy: I agree, and all the more reason why I would have expected him to explain those inconsistencies to me, which he did not do.

Mr Humphrey: Surely the inconsistencies are explained by the very point that Mr Hilditch made — that circumstances differ among stadia. If, for example, a stadium is being used for a game as

opposed to a concert, it will be different. If a stadium has terracing as opposed to a grandstand, or is an all-seated stadium, it will be different.

Mr Molloy: Mr Scott did not make those points to me. He could not explain the inconsistencies.

Mr Humphrey: Right. You also said that you wanted him to be consistent. Your words were that he was "inconsistent with the overall ethos" of the stadia. What does that mean?

Mr Molloy: The overall ethos of the stadia?

Mr Humphrey: That is what you said.

Mr Molloy: I would need to check the record. Which conversation was that?

Mr Humphrey: In your evidence today.

Mr Molloy: What was the reference?

Mr Humphrey: You were talking about the three stadia and said that he was "inconsistent with the overall ethos" of the stadia.

Mr Molloy: I am sorry; I do not know if that is *[Inaudible.]* What I meant — if that is the record, I would like to correct it — is that he was inconsistent in the interpretation of the red and green guides across the programme.

Mr Humphrey: You are making the allegation that the chair of the safety technical group was inconsistent in his application of the green and red books.

Mr Molloy: I am saying that the STG, based on the evidence that we had in front of us, was inconsistent in his interpretation of the red and green guides across the programme.

Mr Humphrey: Right. You also said —

Mr Molloy: I do not want to put that down as an allegation or anything. That is just the experience that I have.

Mr Humphrey: You also said that there was an appropriate level of engagement with the STG. What do you see as the role of the STG in these processes?

Mr Molloy: The role of the STG was, throughout the phases of the programmes and each individual project, to review the design and to confirm to the Department that it had the potential to achieve the necessary safety factors for the capacity that it was being designed for.

Mr Humphrey: What was your relationship with the STG?

Mr Molloy: Most of my engagement was with Mr Scott. I think that I may have attended one STG meeting via conference call.

Mr Humphrey: I was just going to ask that question: did you attend it?

Mr Molloy: As I said, I believe that I attended just one STG meeting.

Mr Humphrey: Did your staff attend on your behalf?

Mr Molloy: There was no specific role for the staff to be in attendance. As I said earlier, while I was being given credit for creating the STG, my belief was that it was a hangover from the stadium days when it was in Sport NI and there was engagement across that. It was just a bit of a hangover.

Mr Humphrey: Do you not think that, in the context in which this inquiry is happening and you are in front of the Committee, that was a failing and that you or someone on your behalf should have attended, instead of having one meeting via conference call?

Mr Molloy: No, sorry, for the record, it was not my role to attend the STG. The STG was set up so that it could review the designs with the governing bodies to ensure that it could get a safety certificate to match the capacity of the stadium. What the Department relied on was the documented evidence and reports, not hearsay, innuendos or anything else like that. We had that evidence from the STG on 19 June. We had a further report on 10 October from the STG. They were broadly positive in nature. The STG recognised within those reports that there would still be novation and ongoing dialogue.

Mr Humphrey: Noel, I hear what you say. You also said during your evidence this morning that there were no red flags across the three stadia. I have to say to you that, in the minutes of 23 June 2014, Mr Scott, the chair of the safety technical group, made it very clear to the board of —

Mr Molloy: Is that in his bundle?

Mr Humphrey: Oh it is, yes.

Mr Molloy: What page is it at?

Mr Humphrey: I will read out the minutes verbatim. It is on the record. I am not aware of the page because my page number differs from yours.

Mr Molloy: I do not have an opportunity to review —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): He will read the words out first, and then we will decide.

Mr Humphrey: I will read out the wording.

Mr Molloy: I would like to see it in its overall context, in fairness.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Let him read it so that —

Mr Humphrey: It is not something that I am specifically putting to you, I assure you. I put this to the deputy permanent secretary in the Department. It is the 23 June 2014 Sport NI minute.

Mr Molloy: It is 23 June 2014? OK.

Mr Humphrey: I raise this in the context of you saying that no red flag was raised. The minute says:

"The Technical Manager advised Members that Sport Northern Ireland continues to give advice on safety aspects on the three Belfast stadia which are at various stages of development. Members noted that Sport Northern Ireland Chair the Safety Technical Group in relation to the stadia.

The Technical Manager updated Members on each stadium advising on the stage of development of each stadia.

Members noted that there are some challenges on the design aspects of Casement which centred on emergency exiting. Board Members noted that DCAL have been made aware of the issues."

Mr Molloy: What date was that?

Mr Humphrey: That was 23 June 2014. You had gone.

Mr Molloy: Yes. I would question in what form they informed the Department.

Mr Humphrey: That is a very good question, which I put to Ms Smith when she was in front of the Committee. She said that she had not been aware of it and that her people did not make her aware of it. Now —

Mr Molloy: For the record, you are reading out the minute of a Sport NI board meeting at which they flag an issue in relation to the stadium, but it does not seem to have gone —

Mr Humphrey: I will be honest with you. The reason I am raising it is that I think, this morning, there have been attempts by a number of people — I am not saying that you were one — to discredit the role played by Mr Scott. Mr Scott made it quite clear when he gave evidence to the Committee, and there is a minute from the Sport NI board meeting —

Mrs McKeivitt: Is it a minute or a note?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It is a full minute taken of the Sport NI —

Mr Humphrey: It is not the first time I have raised it; I have raised it on three occasions.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Sport NI put its minutes on the website.

Mr Molloy: I accept what you are saying. I am only laying out the facts. As programme director, I had concerns around inconsistencies.

Mr Humphrey: I appreciate that, but we have to be fair about Mr Scott's role.

If I may progress to the email that you and members referred to a number of times, which is the email that Mr Scott sent to your colleague Carl on 19 June. I have to say that the certainty and surety that you take from the email is not what I take from the email.

He talks about "potential" and "subject to any revisions". He then has a line:

"The Management Plan in particular should detail and contain suitable Emergency Exiting arrangements."

In my view, those are serious ifs. The certainty that you use when giving evidence to the Committee, and that some members of the Committee have used, is not a certainty that I see. For Mr Scott to give sign-off on this, I would have thought that it would be dependent on the challenges of the site and, for example, issues such as emergency exiting.

Mr Molloy: I respect that you take a different view, William, but I was the programme director, and I took the same consistent view across all three programmes. I took the view, and I think it was the positive view, that it says that an (S) factor and a (P) factor are achievable. There are issues to consider in relation to evacuation and other matters, but —

Mr Humphrey: I accept what you are saying, but —

Mr Molloy: In fairness, William, we were as diligent across health and safety as we were across judicial reviews, state aid and all those issues. We were consistent across all the work that we did in the Department — consistent. This Committee was told by a senior civil servant in December last year that they were very confident that they were going to win the judicial review.

Mr Molloy: I was referring to the judicial review in my time, William.

Mr Humphrey: Sorry, apologies; I appreciate the clarification. However, around these issues, to be fair to Mr Scott, it is important to put that on the record.

In the period from when you moved from the planning application in June 2013 — and you were still there at that point — through to the granting of planning approval on 19 December, what was your role in DCAL around these issues, including the issues that Mr Scott had been charged to deal with?

Mr Molloy: I was the programme director, so I was responsible across all the remits of the programme.

Mr Humphrey: Right. Did you —

Mr Molloy: I believe I had a meeting with Mr Scott in October, when we would have challenged — I think he makes reference to it in his papers. I know that I had various meetings with Mr Scott. The design teams for the governing bodies had meetings with Mr Scott. Page 207 states that we had a meeting with Mr Scott on 16 October 2013.

Mr Humphrey: Are you saying that during that period, issues were sorted out, taking the email of 19 June that you referred to? Did you take the view during the period from April to December that issues, including emergency exiting, were resolved?

Mr Molloy: They were manageable.

Mr Humphrey: They were manageable?

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mr Humphrey: Right.

Mr Molloy: They could not have been resolved because the design from the contractor had not been completed.

Mr Humphrey: On that basis, they were manageable but not resolved?

Mr Molloy: The same as the other —

Mr Humphrey: But not resolved. A statement is then issued from the Department, with the Minister saying:

"We are now entering the 'bricks and mortar' construction period".

Effectively, you are saying something similar in the statement you put out along with the Minister's statement.

Mr Molloy: Sorry, I do not know what the question is.

Mr Humphrey: Given what you said this morning, how could the Minister have said that we were entering a bricks and mortar construction period with absolute confidence? There was no confidence.

Mr Molloy: I do not know we can arrive at the suggestion that there was no confidence. We still had work to go through. The expectation was that we understood what the challenges were, and that we would continue to work through the same as with the other projects. Nothing had been red-flagged up to that date. I am not quite sure the date of that press release, which would probably have been the end of January, I presume, if it was on my departure.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It was in the middle of January.

Mr Humphrey: The Minister's statement said:

"I have absolute confidence that DCAL's Stadium Programme Team will effectively and efficiently deliver this end-phase".

"End phase"? We are in June 2015, and the Minister in a press release on 10 January 2014 is talking about an end phase, to which your comments are then coupled:

"I am proud and pleased that, as part of a great team, I have assisted in bringing this Programme to its most significant landmark, commencement of the construction phase on all three Stadiums."

That is simply not the case.

Mr Molloy: I clarified the explanation in relation to the construction phase earlier on.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Elsewhere, in the documentation, there were references to timescales. How long would it take to build Casement Park?

Mr Molloy: You are asking me to remember, now. I cannot quite confirm that.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): The figure that we were given by one of the folk at an earlier stage was two years. Is that reasonable?

Mr Molloy: I would suggest so. Without looking at a particular programme and the construction, I do not want to mislead.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I thought it was significant that the Minister referred to two years. In other words, if it was going to be open in two years, as she said, they were about to start putting down the first bricks so that they would have it done in two years.

Mr Molloy: As I say, I have not seen the —

Mr Humphrey: You signed it off, I suspect.

Mr Molloy: I signed off my element of it.

Mr Humphrey: So, you did not see the statement that the Minister put out.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Here is a copy of the press release.

Mr Molloy: What section is it in?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I do not have it in front of me now, because I have given you the copy that I had, but there is a reference in it to it being two years. The Minister refers to two years in the document.

Mr Molloy: It says that it will effectively and efficiently deliver their end phase of the programme over the next two years. I do not know if it is particularly referencing the construction or when it would be complete. I am not sure what the programme was for the —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): She says "two years".

Mr Humphrey: To be fair, it says:

"deliver this end-phase of the Programme over the next two years."

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes, so it would be open in two years.

Mr Molloy: I do not know if that is making a reference to being open.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It is the end phase. If, at the end of it, you do not have a stadium that is open, I do not know what you have.

Mr Molloy: I honestly do not know what the programme was. I cannot recall. It could have been 18 months or 24 months.

Mr Humphrey: That concludes my questions.

Mrs McKevitt: Thank you very much, Noel, for coming to give us information. I want to go back to our inquiry, its objectives, and the wording of it that the Committee is trying to come in to. It is to ascertain whether appropriate consideration was given to plans for emergency exiting during the design process of the redevelopment of Casement Park stadium. It goes on into terms of reference, the legislative context, local context and the procedural context. I have listened very carefully to what you have been saying this morning. You said that it is the responsibility of the blue light to provide an emergency exiting plan. Will you explain that to me? Do you mean that it is not up to the GAA to have an emergency exiting plan, but that it is up to the emergency services? Is that what it means? Or, are you saying that it is a combination of both?

(The Deputy Chairperson [Mr Dunne] in the Chair)

Mr Molloy: It can be clarified by other people coming forward, but my understanding and clear recollection is that, within the red guide, it is the responsibility of the blue light brigade — as they are referred to — to develop the emergency evacuation plan for a stadium. Obviously, that would be done in conjunction with the GAA, which would be developing the management plan, which is the larger plan around that. Traditionally, they occur a lot later than that.

Mrs McKevitt: As a project director with much experience in delivering not just stadiums, but the other bits —

Mr Molloy: Too many, sometimes.

Mrs McKevitt: — I am sure you know the rules and regulations. You know how things coincide with, maybe, health and safety certificates not being released until the end. There were conversations, and you have talked about the facts around that. You mentioned to, I think, Mr McCrea that the STG had made further recommendations on health and safety at Ravenhill and that further works were carried out.

Mr Molloy: Yes

Mrs McKevitt: Is that normal procedure, or is it something that happens after it opens and you realise something is not right?

Mr Molloy: You are always hoping to avoid issues like that. I know that it led to some frustration on that project. Very onerous standards were maintained by the STG, and changing them and keeping them within their interpretation of the red and green guides, but there were further frustrations when the STG called up and required further work to be done when the stadium was opened. That is all good stuff in one way, because it ensures, absolutely, the safety within the stadium. There was a level of frustration, but it gives a good indication of the sort of iterative process that is completed in relation to getting final sign-off. My point is that the management plans and evacuation plans come a lot later. My experience in delivering major capital projects is that you work with the teams right up until the end date, and, as in Ravenhill, close to the completion date, to ensure that you get everything.

Mrs McKevitt: Were the further works carried out after the health and safety certificate was granted?

Mr Molloy: I believe so, but I stand to be corrected on that.

Mrs McKevitt: Were they minor or major in description?

Mr Molloy: Minor, but frustrating. It involved additional work in taking down works and putting works back up.

Mrs McKevitt: You talked about inconsistencies around the field, I suppose, with nearly every Member here today, and you asked for an explanation from Sport NI, the STG, the chairman and the secretary of the STG.

Mr Molloy: I am not sure whether the STG had a secretary at the time, but suffice it to say that I did not get a sufficient explanation.

Mrs McKevitt: Was there a follow-up on that?

Mr Molloy: There was not because we were at loggerheads at the time, although we were still getting the reports through, which still had the inconsistencies. So, as I noted earlier, I had addressed the issue with the chairperson of Sport NI on 27 January 2014, and I requested that the inconsistencies were managed or explained.

(The Chairperson [Mr McCausland] in the Chair)

Mrs McKevitt: OK. As project director, do you have project managers under you?

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mrs McKevitt: Did they have meetings with a team?

Mr Molloy: Yes, there was ongoing dialogue. I had a team, most, if not all of them had been brought up from Sport NI at the time. The project manager, some officials and the architect had all been working with Sport NI previously. They would have had various dialogue and discussions with Sport NI.

Mrs McKevitt: If something was inconsistent, in your opinion as opposed to the opinion of your project manager, where does the buck stop? Is it with you or is it with your project manager? If something goes through and it is not right, are you held responsible, or is it the Minister?

Mr Molloy: I was responsible for ensuring that the stadium programme was delivered consistently and professionally across all the programmes. As programme director, the buck, to a certain degree, stops with me. I report back up the line. We manage them consistently, as I said. My people talk to other people. I see the reports coming through, we have various team meetings, we understand the dialogue and we have various project meetings with all the governing bodies.

Mrs McKevitt: So, in your opinion, in a management role, it is very important that the facts go in front of you and you see everything on paper and sign it off.

Mr Molloy: Yes. A lot of work goes on in the background, but we have to come to a point where something is put down on paper and gives the level of confidence that is required.

Mrs McKevitt: As the project manager, in your time with the Department, you were content to sign off on everything according to the facts that were put in front of you?

Mr Molloy: Yes, I would not sign off otherwise.

Mrs McKevitt: OK. That is fine. I probably could go into red and green and all of that, but I do not think that is your role.

Mr Molloy: Sorry?

Mrs McKevitt: I probably could go into questions that I had on the red and green books and the deviations around it, but I do not think that has been your role.

Mr Molloy: I flagged up certain issues — *[Interruption.]*

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Sorry, it is hard if there are conversations going on.

Mrs McKevitt: I was going to flag up some issues that I had with the red and green books, but I am not sure if that is your role to answer them.

Mr Molloy: I would have to read through the red and green books. At the time, I flagged up some issues that Rosalie pointed out earlier, and they contradict themselves at certain points. That leaves

them open to interpretation, but I would have to go back and read the red and green guides if you were going to pick up those issues with me.

Mrs McKevitt: No, I was more going to go on the covered stadium and —

Mr Molloy: There are people better placed to answer that. If that question were asked of me, I would go out and ask the necessary professionals — that is, the design team or the STG — what the story is with that. That was my role.

Mrs McKevitt: It was one of the inconsistencies that you raised with Mr Scott. That is why I thought that you might have been able to open up a bit on it because the field was not allowed to be used, and it was quoted at the end —

Mr Molloy: In fairness, it is a year and a half since I worked on it. I do not have access to all the papers. I am trying as best I can here. I asked for the papers that have been given to the Committee, but I thought maybe it was better that I did not get them.

Mrs McKevitt: We are nearly afraid, Noel, in this Committee to ask for any more pages because we have had that many through this inquiry. I am quite content with the line of questioning.

Mr Cree: Good afternoon, Noel. It has been a long time. Can I ask you some questions about the basic project and how the it works? Obviously, it starts with a design team, and it would consider, I guess, the full range of issues that might affect it, including health and safety. Is that a fair comment?

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mr Cree: It seems to me that, looking through this, that health and safety in its widest context had been flagged up and was known to be in need of resolution. The general consensus was that it would happen somewhere down the line. In other words, it would evolve.

Mr Molloy: I think that that is a fair assumption.

Mr Cree: You mentioned the blue light services example. Others in the past mentioned the city council certification scheme coming at the end. Is it true to say that that is not the proper answer, because, for example, if those issues were to be determined at the very end and the pathways inside the place, the corridors and all the rest of it, had already been designed and, in fact, could have been built, arguably and quite possibly, if planning permission had been given, then it would have been virtually impossible to have safety exiting?

Mr Molloy: I think that we have to defer to the terms of the appointment of the design team. It had to ensure that there was compliance with the red guide and the green guide. I think that it was put to the Committee previously that it had to comply with the most onerous of the two guides. That goes down to the professionalism of the design team. The GAA appointed the team, and it was appointed on good terms. It was contractually bound to deliver that. In conjunction with that, the STG was on board to make sure that it reviewed that design.

Mr Cree: In what stage in the whole life of the project do you reckon the deadline will have been for that safety exiting?

Mr Molloy: It will have been in the issuing of the construction notice.

Mr Cree: So, pretty well the end.

Mr Molloy: No, the construction notice is when you first put the spade in the ground.

Mr Cree: Could there be alterations to the design after that date?

Mr Molloy: Yes, alterations that are minor in nature. Before the construction notice, both design teams, the one appointed by the governing body and the one with the contractor, and the STG, will have confirmed that it was good to go. That was partly a condition of the funding agreement and the conditions and precedents that were developed in conjunction with each governing body. They had to

do that. It was not possible to go through the gateway in the Department without having those sign-offs.

Mr Cree: Would that not have to be finally incorporated in the actual design? The width of the —

Mr Molloy: Yes — in the final design before the project went to construction notice.

Mr Cree: Was everyone more or less happy enough that that would happen in due course? Is that a fair comment?

Mr Molloy: Yes, I think so. To reiterate, the STG identified in the report of 15 October that it was content with the design and understood that the design would be novated over to the design team. It understood that there would be further communications with the design team. Those are the particular points that I referenced in the STG report of 15 October.

Mr Cree: Every so often today you have made reference to the other two stadia.

Mr Molloy: I do that in relation to the Department's consistency of approach to the stadia.

Mr Cree: That is fine, but the basic difference, of course, is that Casement is over twice the size of either of the other two.

Mr Molloy: That is correct, but the approach to health and safety must be consistent.

Mr Cree: It would be the same.

Mr Molloy: It must be consistent, yes.

Mr Cree: It could produce different results with the different capacities, would it not?

Mr Molloy: Possibly, if the green guide starts talking about that. The green guide mostly talks about flow rates, from my recollection of it. I contend that the flow rate is more important than the capacity. We need to get the flow of people right.

Mr Cree: That is part of the exercise. That is how you get the exiting. The speed of that as well.

Mr Molloy: Yes, they are important issues. There are different ways of achieving them and different ways of challenging them etc. It is all to be worked through.

Mr Cree: It is fair to say then that there was not really a silo mentality. Everybody was working in their own areas, but they did come together from time to time. Did they?

Mr Molloy: They had to come together. They absolutely had to. It was not possible for me to recommend any of the projects in the programme to the programme board and the Department unless we had those assurances in place, particularly around the construction notice.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I have a number of questions on very factual things. This is to get things clear in our minds, because, obviously, we are coming at this with no specific expertise or experience in the field. Hopefully, you are able to inform us better. You talked about being close to the construction notice. For the sake of someone who is an absolute layman, is that a single-page letter or is it a 100-page document or what?

Mr Molloy: Effectively, it is a single-page letter issued by the project manager to the construction team saying that it can now construct.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): You are the person who would have issued that.

Mr Molloy: No, it would have been the project manager on behalf of the —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): The person in the GAA who was the project manager?

Mr Molloy: Yes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): That is fine. OK.

Carl Southern was in your team in DCAL.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Who else was in it?

Mr Molloy: Ciaran McGurk, Maura McGreevy, Steven Trainor, I forget Siobhan's name, so I am a little bit embarrassed now —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): So there was a number of people?

Mr Molloy: Yes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): You talked earlier about consistency. [*Inaudible due to mobile phone interference.*] That brings us back to this question — somebody's phone is on. It is definitely not mine, I assure you. It is switched off.

You talked about consistency and its importance, and I can understand that entirely. However, going back to the letter sent to you by Rosalie Flanagan on 8 October 2012, the one that —

Mr Molloy: It was not sent to me, Chair, was it?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): No, it was sent to Paul Scott.

Mr Molloy: Which page is that?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It is on pages 27 and 28. It states about Windsor:

"It is essential that when the department approves this design to go forward for planning we have confirmation from SNIQB, PSNI and BCC that all relevant and reasonably foreseeable safety scenarios have been considered and anticipated within the design and, importantly, that the overall physical design is capable of achieving full spectator capacity within future venue certification."

In the case of Windsor Park, how did you achieve that confirmation? Was there a letter from Sport NI, a letter from the PSNI —

Mr Molloy: Sorry, I did not understand the terms, but, correct me if I am wrong: the STG was the overriding body of Sport NI and the PSNI, because they were all members of the STG. So, the chairman of the STG sent us his email dated 19 —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): No, we are back to Windsor Park.

Mr Molloy: Yes, I know, but the constituent bodies that I mentioned are all parties to the STG, so that is where —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes, so, in the case of Windsor Park, all that was required prior to planning permission — all that you asked for, got and passed on — was a letter or an email from the STG: was that all?

Mr Molloy: I believe that there was a report at the time, although I stand to be corrected.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): So, there was a report in regard to Windsor?

Mr Molloy: There was confirmation in relation to Windsor that the STG was content with the design as it —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It was done through the STG in regard to Windsor and not through those bodies separately.

Mr Molloy: Yes. That may have been done with better scripting at the time, but that was the idea. The PSNI and BCC would have been part of the —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): OK, that is fine.

I know that you had only one conference call to the STG. How many meetings of the STG do you think that your staff, Carl Southern, would have attended?

Mr Molloy: I could not say. There was no remit for him to attend or not to attend, because, at the end of the day, we always relied on documented evidence.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): But, if it is such an important issue — and clearly it is, because the safety of spectators' in a major stadium is a matter of major concern — why did no one from your group take the trouble to attend?

Mr Molloy: The design team would have presented to the STG and we would have awaited the outcome of how —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Would it not be good to hear the exchange? You can get a report on a piece of paper, but there is no substitute for being at that meeting, listening to what the design team says, and listening to the comments from the police, from the fire brigade, from the council, from Mr Scott or whatever. There is no real substitute for being there, is there?

Mr Molloy: My opinion would be that there is no substitute for a piece of paper confirming things.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I know that: it did not need to be either/or. It is not both.

Mr Molloy: The level of detail may have been beneath Carl. He may have attended sometimes. As I said, he had no specific remit to attend or not to attend, but the information can get very detailed at those points, which may not have required overview. If they were chatting about the major things, he would have been there. He attended some of those meetings; he could have picked up on the issues.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): There were other major things, I accept, but this was a major thing: the safety of people.

Mr Molloy: Absolutely: that was the whole role of the STG.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): So, why not send someone to listen?

Mr Molloy: Because sometimes there were micro details. You would have an architect and a guy arguing over — well, not arguing over; that is the wrong language — but they would have been discussing the various intricacies of —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Is Carl Southern an architect?

Mr Molloy: Yes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): So, in retrospect, would it not have been good for him, as an architect, to hear architects putting their case and hear the responses?

Mr Molloy: No, I do not think so. I think —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): You do not?

Mr Molloy: In fairness, the STG was meeting the design team. It can get into very minute detail around design. We would always have waited for the outcome. Carl was there to oversee. He would have been looking for the various correspondence coming through, such as reports etc.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I will simply say that I find that strange. The issue of the safety of spectators is so important, in view of things that have happened elsewhere, that it is absolutely incredible and amazing that somebody from your team did not bother to attend; but that is a matter for you.

Mr Hilditch: As a supplementary to that, tab 6 is the meeting that Carl Southern was present at in Causeway Exchange with a number of stakeholders —

Mr Molloy: Which paper is that?

Mr Hilditch: It is tab 6 of our folder.

Mr Molloy: Is that Sport NI?

The Committee Clerk: Yes.

Mr Molloy: I do not have that.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We are getting that for you. We are going to come to that.

Mr Hilditch: It is because you were talking about inconsistencies.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We are about to get a set of notes that were provided by Sport NI. In a sense, you are saying that Sport NI did not flag things up in the way that you might have anticipated.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It is important that we put to you —

Mr Molloy: Sorry, Chair. I am not sure about time. Is it possible to take a comfort break?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Oh yes. No problem. We will take a break for a few minutes because lunch is ready, which is important; you need a comfort break; and there is still quite a way to go.

Mr Molloy: No problem.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We will adjourn for 20 minutes.

The Committee suspended at 12.31 pm and resumed at 12.56 pm.

On resuming —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We will make a start. I have a number of follow-up questions, Noel. As I said, we received a presentation and papers from Sport NI. I think that you have a copy of that.

Mr Molloy: I just received a copy there now, Chairperson.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): June 2010 was before your time, so we will look at tab 2, which is from March 2013, through to tab 11. That was the last one where you are mentioned.

Mr Molloy: Sorry?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We will forget the rest, you will be glad to hear. The first one there is the email from Carl Southern to Paul Scott on 5 April 2013. I appreciate that this was from Carl Southern and not from you; he will be here in due course. For today's purposes, it says:

"We have referred your comment to the UCGAA for further consideration with the ICT."

It goes on to highlight:

"residual risk to the Planning application".

It continues:

"we will raise it for discussion at tomorrow's project meeting."

That is from Carl Southern to Paul Scott. Before that, however, or rather below it, there is an email from Paul Scott to Carl Southern. It says:

"You will recall that this option was discussed in early January 2013 ... provide a significant increase in the emergency exiting capacity of the venue".

So they were looking at how you would deal with emergency exiting. It goes on to say:

"particularly in the event of an incident on the 'Anderstown Road end' of the sports ground, and provide more direct access to the Balmoral Railway Halt should the use of the railway form part of the Transport Plan ... exiting arrangements are challenging and this may provide additional capacity."

The word "challenging" is the one that keeps cropping up. Paul Scott was flagging up there that this issue is still challenging. In March 2013, he says that additional capacity is needed and that:

"it may be appropriate to explore this option."

He acknowledges the issue, confirms reference to the GAA on the matter — it was aware of it — and accepts that almost the entire focus on Andersonstown Road exiting has been to minimise the planning risk. Have you any thoughts on that?

Mr Molloy: I am sorry; you will appreciate that I am trying to read the papers and put them in the overall context.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It is about looking at the option of creating:

"an exit leading from the south eastern corner of the sports ground to the cul de sac that leads onto the junction of Owenvarragh Park and Moreland Crescent ... this option was discussed in ... January 2013."

This email is from March but, already, in January 2013 these things were being explored as ways of dealing with it, so it was not being left for the blue-light people to sort out down the road. The team at the core of it in your office was looking at options.

Mr Molloy: Yes. He says there:

"You will recall that this option was discussed".

I am not sure from the reference when that was discussed or who it was discussed with. I presume that it is a typo when he says that:

"This exit would have the potential to decrease".

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It could well be, but it is the point of it. He says, "You will recall", so, obviously, Carl Southern was aware of this.

Mr Molloy: He is stating, "You will recall". As you said, Carl will be here himself.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Were you aware of this?

Mr Molloy: No. We had no more awareness than we had from the documentation from the STG. I asked Paul Scott to confirm on 19 June —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): You were copied into the email at the top of the page.

Mr Molloy: I was, yes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): You were not aware of the email, even though you were copied into it?

Mr Molloy: I would have been aware of it, but it is not highlighting any major issue other than that we were continuing to work through the design process. There were challenges in relation to Casement Park. We had similar correspondence on all three projects. Just to be clear, we had similar correspondence and worked through issues on all three projects.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): How many red flags do you need to make something important?

Mr Molloy: I would need one good one in the reports that I ask for.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We will go on to the next section at tab 3. It says there that the STG for Casement Park met on seven occasions and produced three reports. How many of those — maybe you do not know. We can put that in due course to Carl Southern, who seems to be the one who attended; his handwritten notes are on one of the reports. This lack of communication does seem strange. If there was not enough communication from the STG, surely it is incumbent on you as the stadium programme director to ask. If someone is not doing something, and you think that is the case, well, ask them.

Mr Molloy: I look for the correspondence at the appropriate times in the programme. While people are working away in the background and trying to deal with the issues, I, at certain junctures, require the written evidence to be provided to me. I would point out a couple of things in relation to those notes. First, they are not minutes of the meetings; they are meeting notes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): That is just a summary produced by Sport NI. Absolutely.

Mr Molloy: No, my suggestion relates to tab 3. They are not minutes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I understand that.

Mr Molloy: Also, I do not believe that we had those in the Department at the time.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): OK.

Mr Molloy: I think that there were issues in relation to transmission, so these were retrospectively forwarded to the Department at a later date.

Mrs McKevitt: That is very important, Chair.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): But you did get the email; you were copied into the email.

Mr Molloy: Yes. It was typical of the emails that we received in any of the projects as we were working through the issues.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Let me just move on to that. I have already referred to tab 4, the Populous plans for Casement Park which proposed —

Mr Molloy: Sorry, where are we?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Number 4. It is the coloured map that I held up, which showed the possible demolition of some houses.

Mr Molloy: That is not in here. Is the reference in here?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It should be at tab 4.

Mr Ó hOisín: Chair, do you have a full-size copy of that?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes.

Mr Ó hOisín: Can you tell me the dates at the top and bottom, just as a matter of interest?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I have got a small one here as well.

Mr Ó hOisín: I think you need a big one. It has not printed out very well.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): The date on that one is 10 May 2013.

Mr Ó hOisín: There is a date on the top of that map as well.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Let us see. There are revisions here going on — It is in very small print. Wait until I read it; I am not sure if I can read it. It went through a series of amendments from May 2013 to February 2014. There is a series of dates and revisions. That is correct.

Mr Ó hOisín: Is this the map as amended? That is what I am asking, because it is not clear.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): That is not clear. I know that we need to get to the bottom of some of this. I accept that point. That is fine.

Mr Hilditch: When I raised it, it was only the fact that the matters were being worked on, whether it was the first run at it, or the second, third, or fourth. Matters were being raised; work was being done.

Mr Ó hOisín: But it was being worked on.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): There comes a point though, after you have been working on something, when "ongoing" eventually has to go somewhere. It does not seem to be going anywhere.

Mr Molloy: I would have to see the original versions to know what life cycle they have gone through.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Let us move to tab 5. In the Paul Scott/Carl Southern email trail, Carl Southern's email states that the report must be definitive in its endorsement of the plans and that:

"in its present form is at odds with the departments requirements."

Do you think that is an appropriate comment for a member of your staff to make?

Mr Molloy: If I understand the context properly, it is that there is ambiguity in the report and that it therefore needs to be definitive and needs to deal with the issues that the Department wants to deal with, which is providing an assurance that it has the potential to deliver the (S) and (P) factors required.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): No, it is saying that whatever report the STG provides must be endorsing. What if it comes to the conclusion that you cannot endorse it?

Mr Molloy: It would be impossible to go ahead with the programme.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes, but that is not what that says. That says that you must endorse it. It is in the email from Carl Southern to Paul Scott on 20 September 2013. It is at tab 5, page 1, at the bottom.

Mr Molloy: I know that I can potentially stray here, because I understand the context, and it would have been the context of the Department at the time that the ambiguity must be removed.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): No, but this was not about ambiguity. This is saying that it must be definitive "in its endorsement". In other words, it is like Henry Ford saying that you can have any colour of car you want as long as it is black. You can any have view you want as long as you endorse it.

Mr Molloy: I do not believe that that is Mr Southern's contention there. That is for Mr Southern to verify, but it certainly would not have been the approach of the Department. I need to understand the context he has written that in.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It certainly reads that way to me.

Mr Molloy: It is for Mr Southern to clarify.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It is. You are in the office, and you will see at the top there that you were copied into the email. Did you ask a question at the time about what was meant?

Mr Molloy: No. In fairness, I do not think that it is reasonable that I would be across every email that my staff send out. I do not think that it is possible. I do agree that I intend to deliver the broad ethos of the project, which is that we maintain a level of health and safety and maintain the assurance from the STG.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): He is a member of your staff who works in your office, presumably in proximity. You are copied into the email. What is the point in copying you in if you do not read the emails?

Mr Molloy: You have to appreciate that hundreds of emails come across my desk every day. I need to understand the context from Mr Southern. I believe that the context is the ambiguities that are in those reports, the unprofessional nature of it and the lack of consistency across the programme, which needed to be corrected.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): What Carl is saying there is that there are many "shoulds", "coulds" and "mays" in the document:

"that appear to be assumptions and are therefore not definitive. Where it is definite e.g the exiting matrix refers to several instances where exit widths appear to fall short of GG it remains silent".

The point seems to me to be, "We want you to write a report that is a definitive endorsement."

Mr Molloy: Sorry, Mr Chair, I do not believe that. I have to defend Mr Southern. That was not the contention that he would have been making or the contention that would have been coming from the Department at the time.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): OK. We will ask him in due course when he comes. We will move on to tab 6 on the Casement Park meeting with Sport NI, DCAL, GAA and the design team to discuss the STG report of 28 September 2013.

Mr Molloy: As I understand it, those are more like Mr Scott's notes; they are not minutes. I am not sure when they were issued to the Department either. There is a level of inconsistency. That was one of the issues that we had with the STG overall. We were trying to work with the STG. There were issues with the level of record-keeping etc, but we were still able to maintain a working relationship with it.

Issuing these notes after calling them minutes and coming back into the Department a substantial time retrospectively is —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I appreciate full well the difference between notes and minutes. Minutes are usually understood to have been agreed at the next meeting. These appear to be notes of the meeting; I accept that. I understand also that it was the case that, because, as you say, it is ongoing —

Mr Molloy: Yes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): — by the time you got to the next meeting, the situation will have changed. Carl Southern was at that meeting about Casement Park. It was not an STG meeting; it was another meeting. It is at tab 6. Carl Southern was there from DCAL — your office. Also there were Paul Scott, Tim Harkin from the GAA, Charles Cooke from Populous and Jason Pritchard from Mott MacDonald. The note states:

"a Management Plan for the stadium should be drafted as soon as practicable".

Who would draft the management plan?

Mr Molloy: The governing body, so, in this instance, the Ulster Council of the GAA. In my experience, those are always closer to the finishing line.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): So you would not even have a draft management plan that looks as though it is going to work before you go for planning permission.

Mr Molloy: The management plan, as I understand it, is not part of the planning requirement.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I know that. It may not be part of the planning requirement, but it might make good sense. Otherwise, you could build a stadium and then find that you cannot produce a management plan that enables you to have a safe capacity equal to the physical capacity.

Mr Molloy: Consideration to the management plan would have been interwoven into the design and development of the project. As people were designing the project, they would have been saying, "Well, this is where we'll put the kitchen. This is where we'll put the toilets" — that sort of level. As the design was being developed, people were getting to understand how the facility will be —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I understand.

Mr Molloy: You are relying on your design team etc to lead you on that.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): There is a difference between, on one hand, the matter of where the toilets and sinks go, and, on the other, the question of whether there is enough space in certain doorways and passageways to get people out within the eight minutes required in an emergency evacuation situation. We hope that that never happens, but you have to provide for those things. It needs to happen only once and you have a problem.

Mr Molloy: As I have put on the record, to my mind, that cannot happen unless the facility is given an incorrect licence.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): How do you avoid the situation where you build a stadium for 38,000 and, when you are halfway there, you discover, "Oh, sorry, we can only work up a management plan" —

Mr Molloy: By ensuring that the design team has delivered to the guidelines required at the time.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Is that before or after you start building?

Mr Molloy: Before you start building. Before you issue the construction notes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Right. I will come back to that, because there is a key point that is worth pursuing a little further.

If members are content, I will move on to the next point. I know that it is only a note that Paul Scott wrote, but he refers to a management plan being drafted "as soon as practicable". That is not far away from what you are saying, but it means that there was not one at that time. He also said:

"exiting arrangements were giving ... concern ... particularly for an incident on the Andersonstown Road".

On 9 October 2013 —

Mr Molloy: I would like to understand when these were issued, if it is possible for Sport NI to confirm that.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We will work on that and find out. That would be useful.

We will move on to tab 7:

"The STG have 2 major areas of concern".

This is in the email from Paul Scott to Carl Southern, which you were copied into. It states:

"Hi Carl

Surprised at the content of your last email given some of the comments on your response to the document forwarded by the STG."

The email to Paul Scott from Carl Southern on the same day, that morning, states:

"We've met and I think we all know what the issues are."

If you go back a little further, the earlier email says:

"The STG have 2 major areas of concern".

Mr Molloy: Sorry, Mr Chairman. I seem to be missing a page. After the end of the first email thread, I do not have any other email thread. I have only one page of tab 7.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Is there a page 2 and page 3 with that?

Mr Molloy: No.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): OK. We will pass them over to you. You will see that it says in an email from Paul Scott to Carl Southern at 10.10 am on the same day:

"The STG have 2 major areas of concern — uncovered seating and emergency exiting. I consider that it would be useful to discuss same initially and then identify the way forward that may involve a larger group."

Earlier, at 9.43 am, an email from Carl Southern to Paul Scott said:

"Key areas to reach a consensus position (those most contentious from the STG perspective) as discussed to date will be ...

3 Exiting Strategy — Internal and External".

Carl Southern also made a point, which I think is really significant, that there is an:

"urgency given the imminent return of tenders at the end of the month."

So, tenders were out; they were about to come in. It was imminent. Your own office said that there was urgency, and you were copied into it again.

Mr Molloy: Sorry, what is the question?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): The question is this: is that not a red flag? It is to me.

Mr Molloy: The agreement that they would get together, discuss the matters and get agreement and consensus on the key points? Urgency —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It was urgent. There was an imminence given the return of tenders at the end of the month. You were about to hit the buffers.

Mr Molloy: No. That is a certain interpretation of it. The urgency was in relation to trying to get the STG report to a position whereby the Department could have confidence. In fairness, you will note that the report was issued six days later on 15 October.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We do not need to worry about the report. Leave the report because —

Mr Molloy: For the record, we are discussing an email of dialogue between Mr Southern and Mr Scott. The subsequent report, which was broadly positive in nature, was issued to the Department on 15 October.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): What I am saying is that a key person, Carl Southern, an architect in your office, said that in an email at 9.43 am on 9 October. You were copied into that email. You were the only person to get it, apart from Paul Scott. It was not one of these mass emails to 50 or 100 people. This email was sent specifically to Paul Scott, but copied to you, so, clearly, Carl Southern thought that this was important.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Carl Southern says that they needed to get consensus around the internal and external exiting strategy and that there was:

"considerable urgency given the imminent return of tenders at the end of the month."

Does that not say, "Hold on. Here we are, about to get tenders in, and we still do not have this sorted out. What on earth is going on?" Would you not be saying to yourself, "Is it not time that I get to grips with this as the head of the Department that is responsible for this entire project and that me and my staff actually tackle the issue?" Instead of it just being ongoing, ongoing, ongoing, ongoing, it has to get somewhere.

Mr Molloy: I am sorry, Mr Chairman, but we did. If you look at the context of the issues, you will see that we received a positive endorsement from Mr Scott on 19 June. He then issued a report that was full of inaccuracies and wandered around the place, which we tried to engage with him quickly on. We had this email on 9 October and, subsequently, I got the endorsement from Mr Scott in the report of 15 October. It was a case of, "Your report is wrong. You need to get it tidied up. There are inaccuracies. You need to straighten it out. You are inconsistent on certain elements." For the record, the final report, which is in Mr Scott's bundle, was issued on 15 October.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): At 9.43 am on 9 October 2013, Carl Southern was still saying —

Mr Molloy: But that was before the report was issued. The report was issued by the STG after that on 15 October.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Did that resolve the issue?

Mr Molloy: It told me that the STG was positive. I will reiterate for the record that, in that report, the STG indicated that it was content with the design and that it understood that the additional design would be novated over to the contractor and further consulted on. That was coming from the STG.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It was Humpty Dumpty who said that words mean what I want them to mean. It seems that —

Mr Molloy: Sorry, for the record, these are the statements from the report of the STG. I take exception to Sport NI being very selective here in picking out certain elements and not giving the full thread of the emails. It seems to be tailored to a certain —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Let us be frank, it was an email from your staff at a particular time on a particular day. You were copied into it, and you are saying that you did not realise that there were red flags.

Mr Molloy: Sorry, for the record, I did not say that. What I am saying is that, on 19 June, we had an endorsement from the STG chairman. On 19 September, we had a poorly written report. We challenged him around the inconsistencies in that. This is mostly in the dialogue in relation to those inconsistencies. Subsequent to those challenges, another report was issued on 15 October.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Can I ask another question then? Is it the case, as some people might argue, that all the blame is being put on Sport NI when, in reality, the flags were all over the place? There were more flags than you would get on 12 July. There were flags all over the place, and nothing was actually being done about them.

Mr Molloy: I am sorry, but that is not possible because, as I understand it, the design was not complete at that time. The construction notice —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): And it still has not been completed.

Mr Molloy: It is for others to say that, but this is my understanding. That is broadly an issue for the judicial review etc and people going back to redesign it. However, the STG was fully engaged at the time.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Moving on, let us take another one then. We will save those other ones, because Carl Southern is the one there. There is an issue there that ties in with the earlier email about it being almost unacceptable —

Mr Molloy: Which tab is this?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We are now at tab 8. I accept the fact that it is a note.

Mr Molloy: As per my previous comments about notes, they are somebody's version of events that were not posted to the Department at the time and not agreed.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We will find out next week whether Carl Southern actually said that the report must state that a (P) factor and an (S) factor of 1 is attainable. We will find that out next week.

OK, do members have any other questions?

Mr B McCrea: Did you personally attend any meetings of the STG?

Mr Molloy: I believe that I attended one through a conference call. I do not recollect but, as previously stated, I believed that it was a working group that needed to work through the issues and send the necessary report through.

Mr B McCrea: We have a note of a meeting of the STG on 31 May 2013.

Mr Molloy: Do I have that? Is that in any bundle?

Mr B McCrea: It is on pages 49, 50 and 51 of Paul Scott's bundle. Do you recall being at such a meeting?

Mr Molloy: I see that I am down there. I assume that, if the note is correct, I was there, yes.

Mr B McCrea: You were not there via conference call, because you will notice that Justin Garman from Mott MacDonald was there via conference call.

Mr Molloy: Fair enough. I accept that. It was a good while ago.

Mr B McCrea: If you just turn over to page 50, I draw your attention to the fact that it says that Paul Scott:

"again noted that the proposed exiting system is unique and does not comply with the content of the Green Guide".

Do you recall that discussion?

Mr Molloy: I do not, no. In fairness, Basil, I will struggle to recall any of that discussion because it was over two years ago. I would have been content to confirm anything that was said if it had been presented in a minute of a meeting and we had agreed to it subsequently.

Mr B McCrea: I understand the difficulties —

Mr Molloy: That is not to say that it is incorrect, but I am not in a position to confirm it because it is over two years ago.

Mr B McCrea: OK. Let us go back then. We take on board that you may or may not have a full recollection, but I am just drawing it to your attention. Did you sit on the GAA's Ulster Council project board?

Mr Molloy: No, DCAL attended it.

Mr B McCrea: Did you attend it?

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mr B McCrea: In what capacity?

Mr Molloy: As the programme director for the regional stadium programme.

Mr B McCrea: When you say that you attended it, does that mean that you do not consider yourself to have been a member of it?

Mr Molloy: I do not believe that we were members of the programme board.

Mr B McCrea: It is interesting that it says here in the conduct of meetings that the quorum was three GAA —

Mr Molloy: Which paper is that?

Mr B McCrea: This is the terms of reference for the GAA's Ulster Council project board.

Mr Molloy: What is that in? Do I have that?

Mr B McCrea: It is in our project notes. It is an official document.

Mr Molloy: Drafted by?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We will get that for you.

Mr B McCrea: It says that the quorum of this body is the three GAA project board members and the programme director, which I suspect was you. This is in tab 9. I just want to know whether you attended it as a member.

Mr Molloy: I stand to be corrected, then. If the position is that I was actually a member of the board, I stand to be corrected. I apologise for that.

Mr B McCrea: That is OK. Did that board, which you sat on, ever discuss matters of risk?

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mr B McCrea: Do you recall what sort of risks it would have discussed?

Mr Molloy: All the various risks associated with the project. When you deliver a project like that, you talk about many different risks, such as environmental, socio-economic, design and health and safety. There would have been a schedule completed for that, I believe.

Mr B McCrea: OK. From your recollection, did the board ever consider and agree which risks would be referred to the DCAL programme team?

Mr Molloy: I honestly do not recollect.

Mr B McCrea: It states this as one of the main responsibilities of the project board.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mr B McCrea: It is just on the front page there if you are looking at it.

Mr Molloy: I want to be sure that I have the right page here. Is it page 87?

Mr B McCrea: That is the right page. I am just talking about where it states:

"to consider and agree which risks are referred to the DCAL programme team".

I believe that you headed that up. You attended this meeting. It is an official minute from the GAA.

Just to complete this, given that you were the senior DCAL official or senior programme member and the person on the DCAL sponsor board, which the Minister would chair by the SRO for escalation, I am just asking you whether you ever decided to pass risks to the DCAL programme team.

Mr Molloy: Sorry; could you just give me a minute to read these terms of reference? It has been a while since I have seen them.

OK. Could you repeat the question, Basil?

Mr B McCrea: We have just established that you were on the board and part of the quorum —

Mr Molloy: Sorry. On that, for the record, on subsequent pages, it says:

"DCAL representatives as required, which may include DCAL programme manager or DCAL development officer, technical officer and others as appropriate."

I do not want to mislead. This is a steering committee; it is not the project board.

Mr B McCrea: I am reading a title that says that these are the terms of reference for the Ulster Council's GAA project board.

Mr Molloy: Sorry; I am reading the terms of reference for the Ulster Council's GAA steering group.

Mr B McCrea: What I am putting to you is a document, version 3, dated 1 August 2012 and approved by the UCGAA on 26 September 2012. I am asking you whether you attended —

Mr Molloy: For clarity, there are two terms of reference here: one for a project board and one for a steering group.

Mr B McCrea: You will have to get clarity from the secretariat. I am reading from the pack that was provided.

The Committee Clerk: They should all be in the pack.

Mr Molloy: Yes. What I am saying is that, in the pack —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): There are two different boards, apparently.

Mr B McCrea: The board that I am referring to in this pack — I am going to come back to it — is the Ulster Council.

Mr Molloy: Sorry; I need to correct the record, Mr Chairman. I corrected it previously, but I was wrong. It actually says in the terms of reference for the project board that the following would be in attendance; the programme director and the DCAL programme team. I was not actually a member of the board.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Were you or were you not?

Mr Molloy: I was not. I was correct the first time that I stated it.

Mr B McCrea: I am happy with that, but you did attend.

Mr Molloy: Yes, I did, but, just to correct the record, I was not a member of the board.

Mr B McCrea: I am happy for you to correct it, but you did attend. Did you attend regularly?

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mr B McCrea: OK. Do you recall what was discussed at such meetings?

Mr Molloy: Broadly, yes.

Mr B McCrea: OK. You understand here that one of the main responsibilities of this project board is to manage the project's risk register. Do you recall that at any time in your attendance?

Mr Molloy: Sorry; which page are you on?

Mr B McCrea: I am reading from papers in front of me.

Mr Molloy: That is with reference to the steering group, not the board.

Mr B McCrea: I am reading from a document, which I have shown you. If you want, I will sit beside you and show it to you. I am reading from the terms of reference for the Ulster Council's GAA project board, which I believe is the board that, according to this, has responsibility for the timeline, providing advice when it is needed and receiving and considering updates. It goes on. I am asking you this: were you on the project board or in attendance at the project board?

Mr Molloy: I was not on the project board; I was in attendance.

Mr B McCrea: In the time that you were in attendance, did the board at any time consider and agree the risks that would be referred to the DCAL programme team?

Mr Molloy: I believe that it would have done.

Mr B McCrea: You would have been the person that it was referring it to, presumably.

Mr Molloy: To the wider team, but, yes, I had responsibility for the team.

Mr B McCrea: And the DCAL sponsor board for escalation.

Mr Molloy: Yes, by the SRO.

Mr B McCrea: So, you remember that the board would have dealt with that.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mr B McCrea: Can I take you to a memorandum of understanding between the Department of Culture, Arts and Leisure and the Ulster Council?

Mr Molloy: Is it in this pack?

Mr B McCrea: It is my belief that it is at tab 6. You can see that that is signed off. It talks about the "ICT project manager".

Mr Molloy: Which page are you on, Basil?

Mr B McCrea: Page 7 of that document. Who was the ICT project manager?

Mr Molloy: That would be a member of the Mott MacDonald team, I think. Yes.

Mr B McCrea: I am happy for clarity. This is a DCAL document. It goes on to say under the heading of "DCAL representatives as required" that DCAL representatives would:

"provide technical audits for compliance with best practice on technical and regulatory guidelines".

Do you know whether DCAL provided such audits?

Mr Molloy: Yes. They would have been on their governance, policies and procedures.

Mr B McCrea: Did DCAL provide the regulatory guidelines?

Mr Molloy: Yes, we would have provided technical audits. I would need to check that, Basil, but I believe we would have done.

Mr B McCrea: Which representative of DCAL would have provided such technical and regulatory guidelines?

Mr Molloy: It would have been done across the team. At certain points, we may have got in support for that role. Some of it may have been legal technical compliance, so we would have relied on the departmental solicitors, etc. So, it would have been a broad range of people, including the team and other supporting groups.

Mr B McCrea: You accept that it was DCAL's remit to provide such information.

Mr Molloy: Yes, as required.

Mr B McCrea: You talked about whether somebody may or may not attend STG meetings. However, the memorandum of understanding states:

"DCAL representative to be in attendance at PSG"

—
Mr Molloy: Which section is this?

Mr B McCrea: I am just reading down from the heading "DCAL representatives as required". I have not read out all of them, but there is an issue here with due diligence, design quality review, general advocacy, assistance to all parties —

Mr Molloy: I see where you are.

Mr B McCrea: It states "be in attendance at PSG" —

Mr Molloy: Project steering group.

Mr B McCrea: So, you would be in attendance at the PSG.

Mr Molloy: A member of the team would be, as required.

Mr B McCrea: It states:

"be in attendance at PSG and key technical meetings".

Mr Molloy: As required. The memorandum states:

"DCAL representatives, as required, to be in attendance at PSG and key technical meetings".

I want to be clear for the record.

Mr B McCrea: Did a DCAL representative attend the PSG?

Mr Molloy: Yes, I believe so.

Mr B McCrea: And key technical meetings?

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mr B McCrea: All of them?

Mr Molloy: Not necessarily. I suspect that they attended all the key technical ones, but not every meeting was necessarily key. As I said, a lot of those meetings were just general.

Mr B McCrea: My final point is this: are you the central person responsible for escalating any matters of concern up the chain? Did you do that at any stage?

Mr Molloy: Yes, and there was no requirement to, because I had the full support of the STG, which you will see if you look at the reports that were written.

Mr B McCrea: So, you were responsible, but you did not feel the need to escalate anything.

Mr Molloy: If you could point to me what I needed to escalate, I would be happy to —

Mr B McCrea: I am only asking you. Was there anything that you escalated?

Mr Molloy: No.

Mr B McCrea: So, no information went —

Mr Molloy: Yes, there were items that we escalated. We escalated items around judicial reviews and the timely sign-off of documentation. There were lots of escalation items that we brought to the sponsor board —

Mr B McCrea: Nothing to do with health and safety.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I think that we have gone as far in the answers here as we know. Oliver?

Mr McMullan: I am lost here.

Mr Ó hOisín: Chair, just to go back to a series of emails that you referred to, including the one on 23 September 2013 from Paul Scott to —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Which page is that on?

Mr Ó hOisín: It is at tab 5.

Mr Molloy: Is it after Sport NI?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes. It was copied to you, Noel, as well. There is a line there that states:

"I have spoken to some of the members of the STG (not all were available). Those available also expressed surprise at the content of your last emails."

Noel, what emails are they referring to specifically?

Mr Molloy: Bear with me for a minute until I find tab 5.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Which specific email are you referring to?

Mr Ó hOisín: It is dated 23 September at 12.00 pm.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I have got it now. Thank you.

Mr Molloy: Presumably, he is referring to the emails below that, unless there is another thread of emails, which there may possibly be.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): That seems logical.

Mr Ó hOisín: The previous emails in this pack go back to June. They are not referring to those.

Mr Molloy: If we look at the thread at the bottom of page 2, we see that the initial report was sent through on 19 June and was dated 4 June. The discussions on our concerns about consistency and the manner and professionalism of the overall report developed from that.

Mr Ó hOisín: I have an email from Carl Southern; I do not know whether members have it. We will discuss it here first, and then it can be made available, I am sure.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Was it supplied to everybody?

Mr Ó hOisín: I do not know.

Mr Humphrey: On a point of order, Chair — sorry, you do not take points of order. With every other piece that we have discussed, people have had it in front of them.

Mr Ó hOisín: That is not true, actually. We have discussed some things where they did not. It is a very brief email. I think that it is central to this issue.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): If we get it photocopied —

Mr Ó hOisín: I think that it is central to this issue.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We need to see it.

Mr Ó hOisín: If I may —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Is it in the Sport NI bundle?

Mr Ó hOisín: No, I cannot see it. I think that it is relevant. It is from Carl Southern to Paul Scott, and the subject is "Casement Park final STG technical report". It states:

"Can you provide a date for submission for the final report and/or identify any other dependencies that are preventing your issuing the final, completed report?"

In reply, Paul Scott said:

"There is a safety technical group meeting arranged for Thursday 5 September. This appears to be the earliest date that suited the majority of members following the holiday period. As you are aware, meetings have taken place between SNI and other agencies on a one-to-one basis"

And, significantly:

"There appears to be a consensus that the latest proposals address the exiting concerns".

Mr B McCrea: What date is that?

Mr Ó hOisín: They are both 23 August.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Sorry, this is a paper that the GAA is going to table.

Mr Humphrey: Obviously, some people seem to have got it beforehand.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Somebody must have got it beforehand.

Mr Ó hOisín: I think that it is relevant to the entire discussion here. I think that it is critical to the entire discussion.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It is helpful to know where it came from. That is fine.

Mr Ó hOisín: With respect, it came from Paul Scott and Carl Southern.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): That is absolutely right.

Mr Ó hOisín: It is not in the Paul Scott bundle.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I have just been told that it is going to be tabled today.

Mr Ó hOisín: But it is not in the Paul Scott bundle.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): When we get the 2,000 pages from DCAL —

Mr Ó hOisín: The point that I am making is that it was omitted from the Paul Scott bundle.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I do not think that anybody has given us a full, total package of everything. I think that it was pointed out by Mr Scott when he was here that he had done this very quickly over a week to try to get things in. We had a subsequent set of papers from Sport NI.

Go ahead now. We have got it. Does that refer to exiting concerns or emergency exiting concerns?

Mr Ó hOisín: Exiting concerns.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes. I think that the issue was on emergency. Can you just clarify that for the sake of the Committee, as it would help all round? There is a difference between exiting and emergency exiting.

Mr Humphrey: But there is constructive ambiguity with —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): There is constructive ambiguity, that is correct, so it is important that —

Mr Ó hOisín: Some of it comes from the green and red guides and the interpretation thereof.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes. I think that it says quite clearly "exiting"; it does not say "emergency exiting". Anyway, I am sure we will come back to that in due course.

Mr Ó hOisín: It also says:

"And other dependencies that are preventing your issuing the final completed report".

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We will come back to that in a moment. There is nothing else. OK.

Mr Hilditch: Chair, that is exactly the point that I have been trying to make. I want to get it nailed down again with Noel about the reports that were being signed off and whatnot. It was all about exiting; it was not about emergency exiting. Everybody who comes to the table seems to forget that.

Mr Molloy: For the record, from the reports that we got, the STG's primary role was on emergency exiting.

Mr Hilditch: It was not, because it had never been shown or given that to consider. We know that; it is in the evidence.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): How could it consider it if it had no paper to consider?

Mr Molloy: It had the design of the stadium, and it also had the modelling of the emergency evacuation and exiting procedures. That is a matter of record. It is there.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We will ask for that.

Mr Hilditch: I have two other points. Thank you, Noel. I want some clarity. In my background, I do a bit of football safety stuff, and I just wanted to check something with you. You said that you had been informed that there was to be no terracing at Casement.

Mr Molloy: Mr Scott visited me in early 2013 to say that he believed that the GAA was considering some terracing in Casement Park. I believe that he was adamant that it could not be considered.

Mr Hilditch: Adamant? I can understand the open seating, because there is —

Mr Molloy: I clearly pointed out to him — I paraphrase to a certain degree — and said, "Paul, look, I find it very strange that Ravenhill has over 8,000 to 10,000 terraces" —

Mr Hilditch: I want to make sure that you had that in mind.

Mr Molloy: No problem.

Mr Hilditch: Did you not say that the current Windsor Park stadium was allowed —

Mr Molloy: No. Sorry, David, if I can just clarify. The issue there was that, throughout the STG's reports, there were issues of concern about the uncovered seating. My point to the STG at the time was that, in previous instances, Windsor Park had put in temporary —

Mr Hilditch: That was not my question. Sorry, you butted in there before I finished.

Mr Molloy: Sorry.

Mr Hilditch: We were talking about the pitch being used as an evacuation way. You are telling me that Windsor Park currently has that.

Mr Molloy: That was in its report; yes, I believe so.

Mr Hilditch: I am somewhat taken aback at that from my own knowledge of it, but can we have that checked out, please?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes, we will check that out.

Mr Molloy: It is valid —

Mr Hilditch: I can understand the stuff we are going through, and it is the nature of the beast again.

Mr Molloy: To confirm, I do not have papers at the moment.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): What report is that in? You said that it was in the report.

Mr Molloy: It would have been in the STG report and the documentation for Windsor Park, I understand.

Mr Humphrey: Noel, I want to take you back. I asked you whether you had attended any of the STG meetings, and I think that you said that you had taken part in one by conference call.

Mr Molloy: Yes. It turns out that I was incorrect in that, and I apologise, Committee. I was not intended to be misleading. I attend a lot of meetings at times.

Mr Humphrey: I also then asked you whether any of your staff had, and you said no.

Mr Molloy: Sorry?

Mr Humphrey: I asked whether any of your staff had, and you said no.

Mr Molloy: No, sorry, I would have said that they had no particular remit to attend or not to attend, but they would have attended on occasions.

Mr Humphrey: You see, that is not consistent with the answer I got earlier or the answer you gave Mr McCrea.

Mr Molloy: Sorry, I do believe it is —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We will go back and check.

Mr Molloy: — but for the record I can clarify. Members of my team did attend STG meetings at times, but they did not have —

Mr Humphrey: You see, my view is —

Mr Molloy: I am pretty sure that that is what I said previously, but —

Mr Humphrey: My view is that it should not be a case of "at times". If we are required to get a position, which, sadly, we have not managed to achieve at this stage, it should not be up to people to decide whether they attend or not. They should have been there.

Mr Molloy: It was agreed as per the memorandum of understanding — where required, at key technical meetings.

Mr Humphrey: I will go to the document that was handed out, which is the final report on Casement Park stadium redevelopment.

Mr Molloy: What date is on that?

Mr Humphrey: It says that it was delivered on 15 October 2013 and delivered by Paul Scott to Carl Southern by hand on 16 October 2013. Do you have that?

Mr Molloy: Yes. I believe it is in Paul Scott's bundle.

Mr Humphrey: Can I ask you to go to page 124 of the bundle? In your evidence you said that — I will check for accuracy — there were no red flags. Under the title "Emergency Exiting", it states:

"Given the distribution of the exits a carefully worked emergency exiting plan must also be developed ... Although there may be an extended period of time available to effect the emergency exiting process there would be the potential for panic or crushing. It is therefore important that crowd management procedures are in place and that suitable and safe exit routes are identified to facilitate the process."

Do you not regard that as a red flag?

Mr Molloy: No. Those are comments from the STG, typical throughout the programme, although there are other instances where there are inconsistencies. That would just be dealt with as we go along. The point was to appoint a contractor, further the development of the design and have everything signed off before the construction notice was —

Mr Humphrey: With respect, whatever import you put on those comments, that is a red flag.

Mr Molloy: That is the import that you put on them.

Mr Humphrey: No, what I am saying to you is that, whatever import you put on the comments that are written down here, if the chairman of the safety technical group is making a statement that there could be "panic or crushing", as a layperson, a member of the public, someone who attends sporting events and someone who is a representative of the public, I regard that as a red flag. Then, at the top of page 125, it states:

"Consideration should be given to the provision of an additional emergency exit route to the south east corner to increase the emergency exiting capacity of the venue."

In this case, Casement Park.

"The emergency exiting arrangements have the potential to impact on the 'S-factor' and/or the 'P-factor' of the stadium. The Emergency Exiting Strategy should be developed as soon as practicable and submitted to the STG for comment."

Was that done?

Mr Molloy: No, it was not, because, as I pointed out, the emergency evacuation plan and exiting strategy was to be developed by the blue-light brigade.

Mr Humphrey: So, just for the record, you, as the civil servant in charge of the project, take the view that it should have been developed by the blue-light brigade.

Mr Molloy: That is my belief.

Mr Humphrey: So, it is the responsibility of the police, the fire authority and the Ambulance Service.

Mr Molloy: Yes, I believe so.

Mr Humphrey: Not the safety technical group or your Department —

Mr Molloy: Most of those people would have been constituent parts of the safety technical group.

Mr Humphrey: — not the GAA as the stadium operator.

Mr Molloy: It is as per the red guide. Maybe the Committee will want to get some verification on that, but my understanding is —

Mr Humphrey: I regard that as another red flag, Chair, and I think that we should get clarification. I do not see how on earth it could be the responsibility of the blue-light brigade. I am not sure that they would have the expertise, but I am happy to be proven wrong. Why on earth would you then have health and safety officers in councils? Why would we have the likes of Mr Paul Scott, with his expertise, chairing the safety technical group if all we have to do is get the police, the ambulance and the fire brigade to agree these things? I think that that has to be flagged up.

Mr Molloy: Those are broad comments on the future work that we have to do on the stadium. Those are comments about what is happening. Further on, they recognise that the design will be novated to another team, that it would be further consulted on and that there would be further developments. As I said, it is not possible for any sport's governing body to proceed with a construction notice until all the necessary approvals are in the Department.

Mr Humphrey: I accept that, but the safety technical group is the representative body for the blue-light brigade and the Government. After all, this is a considerable expenditure of taxpayers' money by an arm's-length body. Remember, Sport NI is an arm's-length body of the Department in which you were a senior official.

Mr Molloy: Yes, but —

Mr Humphrey: It is the same Department.

Mr Molloy: We have to be careful when we read documents; I do not mean selectively but when using certain snippets. You have to read the document as a whole, and as I read the whole document, particularly certain elements of it where it was recognised that we had deviated from the green guide and red guide, it still however stated that the stadia were excellently designed but that there was other work to do.

Mr Humphrey: I will just finish by saying this: you said earlier, Noel, that there were no red flags. I, and I think others, have managed to draw attention to at least three issues that should have been red flagged.

Mr Molloy: I read into —

Mr Humphrey: No, with respect —

Mr Molloy: My contention is that you have selected a particular line —

Mr Humphrey: No, sorry; I think that you were going to use —

Mr Molloy: Overall, the document does not —

Mr Humphrey: I think that you were going to use it —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): The point here is that, even though the report states in black and white that there was the "potential" for "panic or crushing", he still did not see that as a red flag. That is his position, and we will leave it at that.

Mr Humphrey: Yes, and I think that you were going to use the term —

Mr Molloy: There is a potential for panic and crushing at any stadium, built or about to be built, so we need to understand the context of this.

Mr Humphrey: With respect, Mr Molloy, we are dealing with Casement Park, so I will deal with the issues around it, if you do not mind.

Mr Molloy: Yes, but I had to deal with the issues around the programme and its consistency.

Mr Humphrey: Yes, and consistency in these issues —

Mr Molloy: I confirm to you now that we were consistent in everything that we did.

Mr Humphrey: Consistency in these issues would be good. I detected that you were going to make the point "buried" there —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We will leave it there.

Mr Humphrey: I just want to take issue and highlight this point: there is nothing buried or hidden in what I have said. These are —

Mr Molloy: Potentially —

Mr Humphrey: With respect, let me finish.

Mr Molloy: OK.

Mr Humphrey: A minute of the board of Sport NI, which is an arm's-length body of the Department of which you were a senior official at the time, stated that —

Mr Molloy: What date was that?

Mr Humphrey: The one that I referred to earlier — June 2013.

Mr Molloy: No, sorry, I believe that it was June 2014.

Mr Humphrey: Yes, 2014.

Mr Molloy: Yes, 2014.

Mr Humphrey: That was a red flag, right?

Mr Molloy: That was not a red flag to the Department. That was an internal red flag to itself.

Mr Humphrey: So, is it not a red flag to the Department?

Mr Molloy: Was it copied to the Department?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Sorry, just let me pop in from an outside track.

Mr Humphrey: Sorry, Chair.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): You made a key point, Mr Humphrey, by focusing attention on the words that there was the "potential" for "panic and crushing". I think that that will have struck a chord with many people.

Mr Humphrey: Yes, but Chair, when Noel refers to the words "buried" or "hidden", the final report in the bundle from which I quoted from pages 124 and 125 is a document that was, sir, delivered by hand to Carl Southern, who was one of his staff. Nothing was buried. Nothing was hidden. It was there, openly and transparently.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Did you read that report?

Mr Molloy: If I can, Mr Chairman? I apologise for the reference to "buried" or "hidden", William. That was not my intent. I was trying to say that you absolutely need to read a report in its completeness.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Did you read the report in its completeness?

Mr Molloy: Yes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): And did it not strike a chord with you that the words "panic and crushing" were a red flag?

Mr Molloy: The report is 30 pages long. In its generality, it is positive towards the development of Casement Park. There is also a recognition that further design development is to be done at a point in time. That is very important. Every stadium can have crushing. Every stadium can have panic. However, this stadium was not finished being designed, and the STG recognised that. Those are facts that are in the report.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We saw what was in the report, indeed, yes.

Mrs McKeivitt: I nearly forgot what I was going to say. I am going to be consistent. We have been getting emails and stuff, including packs made to Sport NI from Paul Scott. We have had packs made by Paul Scott, as STG chairman and secretary and on Belfast City Council. Did you see those as a hindrance, or is it the norm in a project or programme that one person can hold several posts?

Mr Molloy: I appreciate that Mr Scott had his existing job in Sport NI and that he had taken on the chairmanship of the programme, which was across three separate projects. The manifestation of that appears to have been a lack of minuting and lack of consistency.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): He did not take it on so much as it was given to him.

Mr Molloy: Sorry. He took on the role.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes, it was given to him. He was appointed to that position. Is that not correct?

Mr Molloy: As I said earlier, I am not sure. I know that he made that statement, but I believe that it may have been [*Inaudible.*], but I stand to be corrected. In recent discussions with DCAL, I could not find any documentation about that appointment being made, but it may be that he took on the role. I do not know whether he was appointed, but he ended up in the role.

Mrs McKeivitt: For confirmation, did he take on the role or was he given the role?

Mr Molloy: He ended up in the role. I cannot provide absolute clarification, as I do not have the recollection.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): He does not know.

Mr Molloy: I know that, in his papers, he said that I had appointed him to it, but I do not recollect that. I understood something different. Perhaps someone can clarify it, but —

Mrs McKeivitt: What did you understand to be different?

Mr Molloy: I do not recollect it, Karen.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): He does not know.

Mr Molloy: My understanding is that the STG was in existence prior to my time, but I absolutely stand to be corrected on that.

Mrs McKeivitt: Is that the norm when delivering programmes? In your experience, is it the norm that one person can be given so much responsibility and that inconsistencies can come from one end and not the other?

Mr Molloy: In retrospect, it looks as though it was a challenging and very time-consuming role for him, because I know that he had his Sport NI job and was also working across three programmes.

Mrs McKeivitt: It is just that we are looking at health and safety in this inquiry. Anybody can make mistakes. You have highlighted to us this morning and this afternoon the different opinions on emails, for instance. That was my line of thought.

Ms McCorley: Go raibh maith agat, a Chathaoirigh. Thanks, again, Noel. I would like clarity on a couple of points. There has been a focus on the potential for panic and crushing. I take the view that there is the potential for panic and crushing in certain situations, anywhere, at any time, in any big stadium or other big construction in which you are going to have a lot of people. I do not see it as being specific to Casement Park. Do you?

Mr Molloy: The potential is there, but you hope that all the design and licensing processes and procedures would prevent that if, God forbid, any such scenario arose. Therefore, I do not think it is particular to Casement Park, once the stadium is fully and properly designed and has the necessary licensing. There will be the mechanisms in place to prevent that.

Ms McCorley: That is it. It is about having the mechanisms in place if an emergency arises, and an emergency can arise anywhere. Therefore, anywhere that an emergency can arise, there is the potential.

Mr Molloy: There would be, and the objective is to have planned for those.

Ms McCorley: You would have a plan. That is OK.

Those words on their own do not flag up anything unusual in this sort of design work?

Mr Molloy: I do not believe so.

Ms McCorley: I do not think so either, but I was interested in your view.

On the safeguards and sign-off, are further sign-offs required for safety and emergency exiting post the appointment of a contractor?

Mr Molloy: Yes. As I said, it is a two-stage process. When a contractor comes on board in such a process, he starts developing the design further, and he has obligations within that. He has to consult with the previous designer of the stadium, who will be the representative on behalf of the governing body. They design that and get all the necessary approvals and sign-offs. It is a higher level of oversight with the governing body's architect is there. The STG is still in place and the other various regulatory and compliance issues have to be delivered. At that point, when everybody is content with that, the construction notice will be issued by the project manager, who will say to the contractor, "You may now proceed with the construction".

Ms McCorley: When is a contractor paid? Is there a possibility that the contractor could be paid without there being sign-off?

Mr Molloy: No, he would be paid for some of the design work. He would not be paid for any construction work. Part of his engagement would be that he would do some design, and he would be paid for that, but he would not be paid for any construction work until he had commenced the construction and had received the construction notice. Then, it would be down to the various technical people to approve the valuations.

Ms McCorley: There would then be two further sign-offs required.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Mr Humphrey raised the point earlier, about the phrase:

"the potential for panic or crushing."

May I read out the next two sentences in the report that you have in front of you?

Mr Molloy: In the report? Sorry, if you can just bear with me.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Certainly. They are on pages 23 and 24, or pages 124 and 125, depending on how you take the numbering. It reads:

"Although there may be an extended period of time available to effect the emergency exiting process there would be the potential for panic or crushing."

It then states:

"It is therefore important that crowd management procedures are in place and that suitable and safe exit routes are identified to facilitate the process. Consideration should be given to the provision of an additional emergency exit route to the south east corner to increase the emergency exiting capacity ... The emergency exiting arrangements have the potential to impact on the 'S-factor' and/or the 'P-factor' ... The Emergency Exiting Strategy should be developed as soon as practicable and submitted to the STG for comment."

Who would be the people responsible for carrying out those actions?

Mr Molloy: Those particular actions? If you mean:

"Consideration should be given to the provision of an additional emergency exit route",

it would be the governing body and the design team.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Not the blue-light people.

Mr Molloy: No, it would not be. Unless it was one of their suggestions from the STG that that should be considered.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): If they are coming as part of the STG and saying, "Here is an issue". However, the design team would deal with that.

Mr Molloy: It would be a consultative process. You need to get everybody at the table to talk through everything.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes. Designers, architects and promoters of the project.

Mr Molloy: Potentially, you might talk to the STG and the blue-light services and say, "That is the plan that we are looking to implement. Do you think that it is feasible?".

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Ultimately —

Mr Molloy: When you went to the design phase, something else might crop up, and further schemes would develop.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): However, I think that we confirmed, did we not, that those things had not been accomplished?

Mr Molloy: What had not been accomplished?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): The things that are mentioned in pages 23 and 24.

Mr Molloy: Not at the time, but there was a recognition that, after the novation and the future design development, they would be up for consultation.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): When you left, they still had not been developed.

Mr Molloy: I left only two months afterwards. There would not have been the time for them to be developed.

Mr Dunne: Thanks, Noel. Briefly, I want to go back over the drawings. The planning application was put in around 19 June 2013. Let me go back over the points that I talked about earlier. You clarified that the drawings that went in had brought forward a considerable aspect of the design. Obviously, as programme director, you were responsible:

"for leadership and oversight of all aspects of the procurement and delivery of the programme on behalf of DCAL."

Were you satisfied that the drawings and the design at that stage were compliant with the standards in the green and red guides?

Mr Molloy: Were they compliant?

Mr Dunne: Yes.

Mr Molloy: The STG had identified that further design work would be required.

Mr Dunne: My point is that —

Mr Molloy: They were not compliant at the time of going to planning, but there was still the potential for the facility to achieve an (S) factor and a (P) factor of 1.

Mr Dunne: Designers work to standards.

Mr Molloy: Yes. I stand to be corrected. Perhaps the design team will come in after me and say that they were compliant, but, as I read the STG report, it identified that the drawings that we had seen before they had gone to planning still had the potential to achieve. There were a number of issues still floating around. They were nothing major — there was no red flag — but they still had the potential to achieve an (S) factor and a (P) factor of 1.

Mr Dunne: My point is that the designers that were employed — professional people — would use the red and green guides as part of their standards.

Mr Molloy: They would, absolutely, and they will come to the Committee and stand over that themselves. However, they were asked to bring the design to a certain phase of planning.

Mr Dunne: Were the drawings compliant? You had a responsibility for all aspects of the project.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mr Dunne: I am asking you now whether they were compliant?

Mr Molloy: They were compliant for planning.

Mr Dunne: Were they compliant with the red and green guides at that stage?

Mr Molloy: It may not have been necessary for them to be compliant with the red and green guides. STG had identified and understood that there would be further novation of the design and further design work going on.

Mr Dunne: Was the work that was done by the designers — a team of professional people paid by public money at a considerable rate — compliant with the standards in the red and green guides?

Mr Molloy: I cannot absolutely confirm or deny that, and I think that I will leave it to the design team to answer that. What I will say is that —

Mr Dunne: You had a responsibility for leadership and oversight of all aspects of the procurement and delivery of the programme. You had a responsibility.

Mr Molloy: Yes, and I had a confirmation from the STG that the design as was submitted still had the potential to achieve an (S) factor and a (P) factor of 1.

Mr Dunne: Did you have assurance from the design team?

Mr Molloy: I would have to check the records to determine exactly what status the planning submission had, because there is a difference between the status of a planning submission and the status of an actual final design. That was the two-stage tendering process. That was all according to —

Mr Dunne: I understand that, but, up until the first stage —

Mr Molloy: Honestly, Gordon, I would have to check the records.

Mr Dunne: You are not clear on it.

Mr Molloy: No, I would have to check the records. I can come back on that. If the design team were here, it could confirm that quicker than I can. I am content that the designs were sufficient for planning and that they had STG sign-off.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Oliver is next.

Mr McMullan: Thanks, Chair. Just very quickly —

Mr Hilditch: Not for emergency exiting.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Sorry, what was that point?

Mr Hilditch: The designs still did not have sign-off for emergency exiting. We keep avoiding that.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): You are drawing a distinction between exiting and emergency exiting. The STG had not signed off on that.

Mr Molloy: We understood from the email from Paul Scott on 19 June that it gave confirmation that the facility could achieve an (S) factor and a (P) factor of 1.

Mr Ó hOisín: That is for the emergency exits.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It has the potential to achieve that.

Mr Molloy: Someone else can perhaps come back and clarify that.

Mr Humphrey: Paul Scott's email does not say that.

Mr Hilditch: Go back and read the thing. It does not say that.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I think that we need to be clear on this. Look at the email, because everything that you are saying really hangs on that.

Mr Hilditch: It states:

"The Management Plan in particular should detail and contain suitable Emergency Exiting arrangements."

They are not there.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It has the potential, yes. You might have to knock down six houses. You might have to take in a whole lot of gardens. You might have to create 14 new doors. You might have to do all of those things. It has the potential, but, at that point, there had not been an acceptable answer produced. Is that not correct?

Mr Molloy: Mr Scott had confirmed that the designs, as he had reviewed them, had the potential to achieve an (S) factor and a (P) factor of 1. An (S) factor and a (P) factor includes —

Mr Hilditch: What does the next sentence say in the email?

Mr Molloy: Sorry?

Mr Hilditch: Read the whole thing. You are telling us to read the whole thing. Read the whole thing and see what it says.

Sorry, Chair, but it is becoming very frustrating.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Is it not the case that that could mean — I am not saying "did" but "could" — that it has the potential if you knock down houses to get an extra exit into Owenvarragh, Mooreland or wherever; if you take a chunk off gardens so that you can create a circulation area around it; if you create another exit; or if, as somebody was suggesting, you dig a tunnel? It has the potential if you do something that is a game changer.

Mr Molloy: For the record, I think that it would have been very unprofessional of the STG to say to me that it had the potential to have an (S) factor and a (P) factor of 1 and then to say, "By the way, you need to land it on the moon". The assessment was made in the context of the design that was there.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): No one is saying that —

Mrs McKeivitt: It could have the potential to say that.

Mr Molloy: It does not give any notification of any those conditions. As you have pointed out, Mr Chairman, none of those is included in Mr Scott's email, in fairness.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Yes.

Mr Molloy: I can only go with the evidence.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): No, I agree absolutely.

Mr McMullan: Did the sponsor board meet once a month?

Mr Molloy: It could have been every four to six weeks.

Mr McMullan: OK. That is the highest overseeing body, to put it in layman's terms, looking over the whole contract.

Mr Molloy: Yes.

Mr McMullan: Would that not have been the most relevant forum in which to raise any safety issues? Do you agree that, if there were safety issues, that would be the place to raise them?

Mr Molloy: I believe that, at every meeting that we had, health and safety would have been on the agenda. In particular, if anyone had a major concern, including Sport NI, which attended those meetings, that was the particular forum in which to raise it. Effectively, that sponsor board was there for the governing bodies to confirm anything else over and above to the Minister. It was for the Minister to ask whether anyone had any other concerns and whether people were content with the SRO's report. In my time in the Department, with the exception of the final meeting, at which Antoinette McKeown, as the new chief executive of Sport NI, recognised that there were issues with the interpretation of red guide and the green guide, no issues were raised by Sport NI or any of the governing bodies.

Mr McMullan: Nobody on the sponsor board raised an issue at all about health and safety.

Mr Molloy: Not until then. Sorry, there may have been comments around health and safety issues, which were progressed and dealt with.

Mr McMullan: There was nothing that would, and forgive me for using the term, raise a red flag.

Mr Molloy: No. Not to my recollection, anyway. The Committee will have the minutes and can check them.

Mr McMullan: I want to ask about the relevance of the blue-light brigade; for example, the PSNI. Is it qualified to give an opinion on crowd control and safety?

Mr Molloy: I would consider that it is. I have been asked for a particular opinion, and I hope that — I am sure that it would stand up and say so — it has the professional qualifications to provide that.

Mr McMullan: It was said here earlier that it did not have the expertise to deal with health and safety. That was said about five or 10 minutes ago.

Mr Molloy: I have dealt with the emergency services on major capital projects, and I believe that they have the expertise.

Mr McMullan: The blue-light brigade is consulted on all major projects, be they stadia, the Titanic project, Wembley stadium or anything else. Its input is —

Mr Molloy: As part of your management plan, you would have to do emergency evacuation and consult with the blue-light brigade, which then develops its own emergency evacuation plan for that.

Mr McMullan: If it did not have the expertise, it would not be spoken to.

Mr Molloy: I would not like to comment on its expertise in any negative way.

Mr Humphrey: With respect, you did just a moment ago.

Mr Molloy: I am sorry; what did I say?

Mr Humphrey: You said that you would believe that it would have the professional qualifications. That, to me, is taking a position.

Mr Molloy: I am sorry, Chairperson. I do not want to comment on that. I have been asked whether I believe that the blue-light brigade has the necessary professional expertise. I believe that it does. I cannot comment any further than that. To do so would be inappropriate.

Mr McMullan: I raised that point on the back of what Mr Humphrey said, which was that the blue-light brigade did not have the expertise. I just wanted to make that very clear for the record that it is vital for anything —

Mr Molloy: I would have thought that it would have.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It has expertise in the fields in which it is an expert. It is not an architects' firm.

Mr Dunne: Members of the blue-light brigade are not designers.

Mr McMullan: That was not the context of the question.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): No, I was just explaining.

Mr McMullan: Let us get it right for the record. We are talking about exiting and about health and safety.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Absolutely.

Mr McMullan: The blue-light brigade was consulted for its knowledge and expertise.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): It has expertise.

Mr Humphrey: There is a difference between consulting and asking for people's expertise in their area and asking them to make the final decision and recommendation.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): That is the point.

Mr McMullan: To say, however, that it has no expertise is —

Mr Humphrey: I did not say that. *[Interruption.]*

Mr McMullan: You did say that.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I do not think that anyone has said that it has no expertise.

Mr McMullan: I want the record looked at. *[Interruption.]*

Mr Humphrey: Look away.

Mr B McCrea: May I just clarify something, Chairperson?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Have we finished with Mr — *[Interruption.]*

Mr B McCrea: Is there a difference between an emergency exit scheme and the granting of a fire certificate? Of course the blue-light people would organise where the ambulances and fire engines go. That is an operational issue. I would like to know whether Mr Molloy took into consideration that a fire certificate would not necessarily be granted for the full capacity. That is the crux of this.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Do you mean a fire certificate or a safety certificate?

Mr B McCrea: A safety certificate.

Mr Molloy: Can you clarify the question, please?

Mr B McCrea: Considering an emergency exit plan could properly be undertaken by the blue-light team, as you said — that would be part of it — but, in granting a safety certificate by Belfast City Council, were you aware at any time of any potential for a capacity to be less than what the proposed bill was for?

Mr Molloy: It was too early in the process to determine that. I clarified earlier that it was not possible to bill the stadium for less than what a certificate would be issued for.

Mr B McCrea: Sorry, it was not?

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): That is what he has said. I challenged that point, because we were told differently by other people.

Mr B McCrea: Are you saying that, once the stadium is built, there is no stadium anywhere where the capacity is greater than the fire certificate and the safety certificate?

Mr Molloy: We are talking about Casement Park. In particular reference to Casement Park, the Department had funding agreements and conditions precedent in place with the governing bodies, which ensured that, before the construction notice would be issued, not only would it have the potential but it would be confirmed that it would be able to achieve a safety certificate for the capacity for which the stadium would be built to.

Mr B McCrea: When did you put in the planning application?

Mr Molloy: I did not put in the planning application.

Mr B McCrea: When did the Department approve the putting-in of the application by the GAA?

Mr Molloy: The GAA submitted its planning application on 19 June, if memory serves me right.

Mr B McCrea: And the Department approved it.

Mr Molloy: The Department was content for it to proceed with it.

Mr B McCrea: The Department approved it.

Mr Molloy: The Department was content with it.

Mr B McCrea: The Department approved it.

Mr Molloy: Sorry, Chair, but I do not know whether the member can hear me properly. The Department was content.

Mr B McCrea: How does "content" get conveyed?

Mr Dunne: It is a sign-off.

Mr Molloy: We confirmed to them that we were content.

Mr B McCrea: You confirmed to them that you were content. In writing?

Mr Molloy: Sorry, Chairman, but the Department was content at the time for the GAA to submit the planning application —

Mr B McCrea: I am asking you —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): Let me just pause this for a moment. We had Cynthia Smith in with us. We also had Sport NI and others in with us. One of the difficulties is that we are getting contradictory evidence.

Mr Molloy: OK. I tried to be as clear as I could be.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I appreciate that. For example, you say that it is impossible to get a situation in which you would have a stadium built for which physical capacity would be greater than the safe capacity. We were told by others at an earlier session that that was not the case and that you could have a 38,000-seater stadium that had a safe capacity of 25,000. That was mentioned by one witness.

Mr Molloy: Sorry, Chairman, but, for the record, the only way in which that could happen is if the licensing did not match the capacity.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): That is correct.

Mr Molloy: The Department had controls in place that ensured that the stadium would not be designed for anything greater than what the —

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): That is what we need to get to the bottom of. We need to know what those controls were and whether they were being implemented.

Mr Molloy: The principal controls would have been around the funding agreement and the conditions precedent with each governing body.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): We did not really get on too well at that earlier session. I think that there are some people whom we will need to revisit in that regard.

Thank you very much indeed, Mr Molloy. We have been probably talked long in excess of what you anticipated, and what we anticipated, so thank you for your evidence.

Mr Molloy: I hope that I have been of help. If I need to come back, I am happy to.

The Chairperson (Mr McCausland): I am sure that there will be issues that we will want to back to, so thank you for your offer to come back.