

Statement of our Approach to conducting a Trauma-Informed Inquiry

Background

The Inquiry's commitment to being trauma-informed

On the 3rd April 2025, Lord Weir, made an [opening statement](#) in which he made it clear that the Eljamel Inquiry would be trauma-informed.

“The experiences which form the subject matter of the Inquiry have been traumatic. That is why my Inquiry is committed to conducting its work in a way that is trauma-informed.”

Lord Weir, Chair of the Eljamel Inquiry

When the Inquiry published our Statement on Protocols and Principles, we made being trauma-informed our first principle.

“The Inquiry recognises that for many former patients and their families the experiences which form the subject-matter of the Inquiry and the journey to the Inquiry coming into being have been traumatic. The consequences of trauma were clearly evident at the public consultation events which the Inquiry held on its Terms of Reference as well as in many of the written responses to it which the Inquiry considered. The Inquiry is committed to conducting its work in a way which is trauma-informed.”

Statement on Protocols and Principles, para 14(a)

The Inquiry's investigations into what being trauma-informed should mean

Trauma-informed principles are commonly associated with health and care settings. They are increasingly embedded in legal proceedings too - particularly in criminal cases. This does not mean that they should not be a key part of the way that public inquiries go about their work. It just means that there is no ready-made model as to how we should go about doing that or how the Chair should exercise his powers to decide how to run the Inquiry in a way which recognises the trauma of some of those who are involved in it and its lasting effects.

Not only is there no model for making a public inquiry trauma-informed but, in fact, an effective trauma-informed approach must be responsive to the **particular** trauma experienced by the people engaging with the inquiry. That is why, at our preliminary hearing, opening statement hearings, and at our procedural hearing on the 14th May 2026, Senior Counsel to the Inquiry, Jamie Dawson KC, has said that the Inquiry “will seek to create a bespoke approach for a trauma-informed public inquiry.”

That approach is what this statement seeks to set out – a model, adaptable and based on a willingness to learn and improve, of how we intend to conduct our work in a trauma-informed way but which is realistic in recognising that we exist within a statutory framework, the rules of which we must respect. The statement sets out “our approach” as it seeks to create a basis upon which the Chair, the whole Inquiry team and all of those who participate in our work can do so in a way which is truly respectful of trauma and informed about its consequences for those who have been exposed to and shaped by it. The statement seeks to set out our policy about what being “trauma-informed” will mean.

To allow us to create this statement in an informed way, the Inquiry carried out a consultation between November 2025 and January 2026 to ask people associated with Mr Eljamel (including but not limited to his former patients) with experience of trauma what being trauma-informed should mean in the context of this Inquiry. We published a [summary of the findings of the consultation](#) so that those who took part could be confident that their views had been heard. One of the key lessons from the consultation was that people who have experienced trauma in relation to the subject matter of this Inquiry value honesty and transparency very highly. They told us that it is through being honest and transparent that the Inquiry will have their trust. They told us that they needed to trust the Inquiry for it to work. Specifically, we have been asked that when something is not possible that we say that clearly and explain the reasons why. That is the approach we have sought to take in this statement and the approach we intend to take to our work. This is an important principle because, as we have said above, an inquiry cannot always do what everyone wants – it needs to work within the legal framework within which it was created and go where the evidence takes it. However, it can endeavour to be open, honest and transparent about its aims, its plans and its limitations.

At the procedural hearing which the Inquiry held on 14 May 2026, several of the submissions from recognised legal representatives of core participants either welcomed the work already undertaken on our trauma-informed approach or looked forward to publication of this statement. Informed by the consultation and those contributions by those with experience of trauma, this statement sets out what being a trauma-informed Inquiry means for the Eljamel Inquiry, its Chair and the Inquiry team.

Trauma

The definition of trauma and the identification of the traumatised

Understanding what it means to behave in a way which is adequately informed by and aware of the consequences of trauma means that we must start by having a clear definition of it and what it means for those who have experienced it in our process.

Trauma is a response to an extreme or intense experience which is frightening or distressing to the person involved; particularly if it is overwhelming, difficult to cope with, or feels out of their control. People respond to experiences like this differently, so what is traumatic for one person may not be traumatic for someone else. It is

essential to this statement to understand that, for some people who have experienced trauma, their experience of it will have had profound effects. Those effects may include an altered ability to perceive the world and interact with others in day-to-day life. For our purposes, such interaction involves interaction with the Inquiry, as a core participant, a witness, a material provider or otherwise. Therefore, our approach to being trauma informed must start with a recognition that, for some, though not necessarily all, those who interact with the Inquiry, their ability and capacity to do so may be affected, altered or undermined by their experience of trauma. Being trauma-informed means recognising that reality and doing what we can to offset the negative effects of it.

A wide range of experiences which are traumatic occur all the time in society. Many people will have experience of trauma for reasons that are unrelated to the subject matter of this Inquiry. Examples of those traumatic experiences include events involving violence, abuse, or neglect; experiences ranging from being the victim of a crime or being involved in a road traffic collision to facing racism or misogyny, all of which can be traumatic. Therefore, we recognise that a proportion of any group of people will have had traumatic experiences and that this is true for those engaging with the Inquiry. This does not mean that everyone who participates in the Inquiry will have experience of trauma and require support or alterations to our approach to or dealings with them to mitigate the effects of that trauma. However, it does mean that the Inquiry must be prepared for the potential that any individual's interaction with the Inquiry might be influenced by a previous traumatic experience.

While we intend to respond compassionately, and in a trauma-informed way, to anyone who has experienced a traumatic event of any kind in the past, the focus of our trauma-informed work is on those whose traumatic experience is related to the subject matter of the Inquiry. Every organisation which works with members of the public should be able to respond appropriately to someone who has experienced trauma; however, the Inquiry has a particular responsibility to be responsive to the needs of those who have experienced trauma related to the subject matter we are investigating – hospital treatment or care provided by Mr Eljamel or his team in the Tayside region or resulting from the aftermath of that treatment or care, including the response of agencies of the State to it.

Many of those who are participating in the Inquiry and will engage with us are interested in our work because of a traumatic experience connected to its underlying subject-matter. Major surgery can be traumatic, in particular when it is associated with negative experiences of care and/ or a negative or unexpected outcome. Working in high pressure medical environments or experiencing poor treatment as a worker within the healthcare system by colleagues (which our remit covers) can also constitute trauma. It is not necessary to have made a judgement on issues being investigated to understand that those participating in the Inquiry are both more likely than the population average to have had a traumatic experience and that many of those experiences are directly related to the subject matter of the Inquiry.

The Inquiry's commitments

The Inquiry will be respectful of patients who say they have suffered trauma. They will be believed when they say they have been. The accepted background against which this public inquiry has been set up means that there is no reason not to believe this assertion when made by a patient.

The Inquiry will equally be mindful of the possibility that others may also have suffered trauma when they say they have. This may include others who are closely linked to patients, such as their family members. The Inquiry will also be mindful of the possibility that others may too have suffered trauma, such as health professionals who describe particularly difficult experiences. The Inquiry will not assume that only patients have suffered trauma.

The Inquiry has developed and will continue to develop systems, and its team will conduct themselves in a way which is mindful that trauma affects individuals in a profound way and influences their ability to interact with the rest of the world. Part of that world includes dealing with the Inquiry, whether it be watching it, trying to understand or influence it, corresponding or communicating with it, contributing thinking or evidence to it, or otherwise, including approaching it to ask for help or support. All of that may be influenced by having experienced trauma. The Inquiry must think, act and adapt to allow that interaction to occur in a way which promotes the quality and meaning of the experience as much as possible.

Furthermore, the Inquiry team will work on the assumption that where there is a relationship between a traumatic experience and the subject matter of the Inquiry it is more likely that engaging with the Inquiry has the potential to be retraumatising. It will therefore be mindful that trauma may manifest itself in ways which are hard to perceive but are present.

Finally, the Inquiry commits itself to seeking to incorporate its trauma-informed approach in everything that it does. Being truly trauma-informed requires to be apparent and real in everything we do and not just in certain areas.

The development of a policy for our trauma-informed practice

The Inquiry has, therefore, proceeded on the basis that by better understanding how trauma impacts on the people we will deal with in our work, we can better adapt our ways of working to make the experience of engaging with the Inquiry as meaningful, productive and appropriate as possible. The progress we make towards that objective is what we mean when we refer to being a trauma-informed Inquiry. However, we do not believe that being a trauma-informed inquiry is a piece of work that has an end point; it is an ongoing process of listening, engaging, and improving which may continue throughout the life of the Inquiry.

Section 114 of the recently passed [Victims, Witnesses, and Justice Reform \(Scotland\) Act 2025](#) provides a useful definition of trauma-informed practice in the justice system.

It states that,

Trauma-informed practice is a means of operating that—

- (a) recognises that a person may have experienced trauma,*
- (b) understands the effects which trauma may have on the person, including how trauma may affect any evidence given by the person, and*
- (c) based on that understanding, involves adapting and implementing processes and practices to—*
 - i. seek to avoid, or minimise the risk of, exposing the person to any recurrence of past trauma or to further trauma,*
 - ii. seek to avoid, or minimise the risk of, negatively impacting the person's recovery from trauma,*
 - iii. enable the person to participate effectively in court proceedings.*

We think that as interaction with the justice system is similar to interaction with the Inquiry, this is a helpful definition to think about and aspire to. This definition helps to illustrate our view that there are limits to what we should seek to achieve in relation to our trauma-informed work. For example, we do not think it is the role of the Inquiry to provide therapeutic services intended for people to recover from their traumatic experiences; that is the role of healthcare providers. The scope of our approach is therefore limited to interaction with the Inquiry itself, and the impact that trauma has on someone's ability to engage with us.

In light of this and the consultation referred to above, we have adopted three objectives for our trauma-informed work.

1. The Inquiry will work to minimise the risk of adding to past trauma or being the cause of trauma in the future.
2. The Inquiry will work to minimise the risk of disrupting anyone's recovery from their traumatic experiences.
3. The Inquiry will work with those who are participating in the Inquiry and who have had traumatic experiences and seek to support them to engage with the Inquiry as fully as they would like to.

We acknowledge that for some people the process of engaging with the Inquiry may be retraumatizing and may endanger their recovery. However, we do not believe that participating in the Inquiry is intrinsically a traumatic experience. We understand that many of those who have had traumatic experiences related to the subject matter of the Inquiry will choose to engage with us in the knowledge that they will find it difficult and may even find it retraumatizing. It would not be acceptable to misinterpret what it means to be a trauma-informed Inquiry by concealing information that may be distressing on the grounds it could be retraumatizing. In fact, to do so would be to undermine the trust and transparency which are fundamental to a truly trauma-informed approach. The duty of the Inquiry is to make sure they have the information that they need to make that decision in an informed way, and to provide appropriate support to reduce the risk that, if they choose to engage, it will do them harm.

Limits to a trauma-informed approach

All public inquiries operate within a legislative framework which places restrictions on how the Chair can conduct the Inquiry. He has a lot of freedom to conduct the Inquiry in the way that he thinks is best – for example, it is he who has decided that it is appropriate that the Inquiry seek to abide by certain principles, such as being trauma-informed. That does not mean he has complete freedom to do what he wants. Nor does it mean that being aware of the effects of trauma on those who participate in our work must always mean that a certain path must be followed. The underlying law constrains the Chair by stating that he must make sure that the investigation is fair, impartial and thorough. He must also take care that he is spending public money appropriately.

These rules mean that, in his investigation, the Chair requires to be balanced. He requires to be responsible. He requires to be reasonable. He is firmly of the view that that responsibility must be carried out in way which is trauma-informed. However, part of being trauma-informed means being clear about what these limitations are and mean.

Finances

The Chair of the Inquiry has a duty to spend public money responsibly. He must balance the desire to conduct the Inquiry as thoroughly as possible and as quickly as possible with only making reasonable demands on taxpayers' money, which is what is used to pay for the Inquiry. This balance extends to what it is proportionate to spend on our trauma-informed approach. It is possible that a suggestion may be made to the Inquiry which would make it more trauma-informed but would lead to so much delay or additional cost that the Chair decides not to implement it because of his duty to spend public money appropriately.

Fairness

The Inquiry must be impartial and be seen to be impartial. In responding appropriately to trauma, we cannot give priority to the views of those who have experienced trauma. Being trauma-informed in the context of a Public Inquiry means that the Inquiry will work to make sure that those who have had previous traumatic experiences are not disadvantaged in our processes or less able to take part in the Inquiry. To fulfil the Inquiry's Terms of Reference we require that everyone who has something to contribute to our work can participate as fully as possible. We recognise that we must make reasonable adjustments and be constantly vigilant to allow people who have had traumatic experiences to engage as fully as those who have not. In the same way that we refer to the Inquiry being patient-centred rather than patient-led; to be an impartial process we must be responsive to the needs arising from having experienced trauma without giving additional weight to the views of anyone purely on the grounds that they have experienced trauma.

Remaining rooted in the concept and impact of trauma

It is important, in our view, that our trauma-informed approach remains rooted in the definitions, objectives and initiatives set out in this statement. Appeals to being

“trauma-informed” can be made inappropriately. For example, they can be made as a substitute for merely seeking to ask the Inquiry to do something that someone wants to happen, whether that person is traumatised or not, for fear that not acceding to their request would cause them trauma. That would be a disservice to the concept of needing to be informed by the effects of prior trauma, with which this statement is concerned.

That is not to say that the Inquiry does not adhere to other principles which are relevant to the appeals of those who have not experienced past trauma related to the subject matter of the Inquiry - it does. For example, the Inquiry remains committed to principles of listening, open-mindedness, co-operation, clarity, courtesy and respect. It just means that being trauma-informed requires to deal with a particular aspect of our work which cannot be applied to all.

Similarly, the term “trauma-informed” can be used to seek to promote an absolute point of view. To say that something must be done, if the Inquiry wishes to be trauma-informed, is rarely likely to be true. That is both because being trauma-informed involves subtly complex or even contradictory considerations and also, in the context of an inquiry, because the needs of those who have experienced prior trauma need to be understood in the statutory context we have explained above.

Five Trauma Informed Principles

Our trauma-informed Inquiry consultation was structured around five trauma-informed principles.

1. Safety
2. Trustworthiness
3. Choice
4. Collaboration
5. Empowerment

We intend to continue to use these principles to structure our trauma-informed work. Steps which we took previously to further our trauma-informed approach are set out in the consultation documents, which can be accessed via the links above. This statement focuses on how we will do things going forward.

For each principle it is important to set out what the Inquiry is now seeking to achieve.

1. Safety

There are two distinct elements to safety in our trauma-informed approach; physical safety and emotional safety.

Physical Safety

The Inquiry seeks to keep all those who participate with the Inquiry physically safe. It will also endeavour to make those who participate feel that way by being honest and transparent about any issues which have arisen in this regard and what the Inquiry has done to address them.

Specifically,

- a) Hearings will be held in venues which meet all relevant health and safety regulations.
- b) Hearings will be held in venues which can be accessed safely, especially by those with restricted mobility.
- c) Security personnel will be present at hearings so that all those attending can do so safely.

Emotional Safety

The Inquiry seeks to provide for the emotional safety of those who are engaged in our work.

Specifically,

- a) Those attending hearings in-person, in any capacity, will have access to specialist, non-therapeutic, emotional support. Well trained counsellors will be on-hand to help people cope with any distress they experience while at a hearing. These sessions are confidential and independent from the Inquiry.
- b) Those attending hearings online, in any capacity, will have access to specialist, non-therapeutic, emotional support. Online sessions with well trained counsellors can be booked through an online booking service or over the phone. These sessions are confidential and independent from the Inquiry.
- c) Those who require support in connection with their wider engagement with the Inquiry, for example in relation to giving oral evidence at a hearing, can access participant support. Typically, this will be three, non-therapeutic, sessions which will be focused on skills and techniques to assist with their engagement with the Inquiry. These sessions are accessed by speaking to a member of the Inquiry team with experience working with people who have had traumatic experiences.
- d) Witnesses will have access to a named member of the Inquiry Team who can support them through the process. This individual will have experience of working with people who have had traumatic experiences. This is in addition to their recognised legal representatives who will also support them.
- e) To ensure that people receive a trauma-informed response from any member of the Inquiry team they speak to, all members of staff will receive training about being trauma-informed and how to respond to people in distress who have had traumatic experiences.
- f) Not everyone who has experienced trauma will be conscious of the impact that it may be continuing to have on them. Therefore, we will seek to treat everyone who engages with the Inquiry in a trauma-informed way. All members of the Inquiry team will receive training on being trauma-informed, and how to interact with those who may have experienced trauma in a supportive, helpful and respectful way.
- g) We will maintain a support hub on our website at [Support Hub | The Eljamel Inquiry](#) to make it as straightforward as possible to find out about the range of support which is available from the Inquiry and other organisations.

2. Trustworthiness

The Inquiry will work to earn and maintain the trust of everyone who engages with us, including those who have had traumatic experiences in the past.

A common trauma response is to find it more difficult to trust in situations which feel similar to the traumatic event. In consultation responses it was clear that, for some people engaging with the Inquiry, their experience of the subject matter of the Inquiry - including the campaign for a public inquiry to be held - has made it difficult for them to trust anyone in authority. This has led them to be vigilant for instances where those in authority are not telling them the whole truth or are concealing relevant details. This means it is imperative that the Inquiry is as transparent and candid as possible. For example, we have been told that people would rather be informed about unwelcome news, even if they will find it difficult to hear. We will do so but in a way which is respectful of these core principles.

This need for candour may, at times, give rise to a perception that information communicated by the Inquiry is not sufficiently minimising the risk of retraumatising, causing trauma, or undermining the recovery of people who have experienced trauma. Being trauma-informed cannot mean the decisions of the Inquiry are always in line with the wishes of people who have had traumatic experiences, and it is possible that decisions will be made by the Inquiry which some of those who are participating in it may find distressing. Being a trauma-informed Inquiry does not remove the need to adhere to the other principles of the Inquiry. However, it does mean that information or decisions should be delivered in an emotionally safe way with as full and candid explanation of all the relevant details as possible.

In some cases it will only be possible to achieve this level of candour with Core Participants. Core Participants have a defined role in the Inquiry and have signed confidentiality agreements which mean that information shared with them cannot be shared externally. This allows the Inquiry to provide more details than can be provided in public on confidential matters. We recognise that not all of those who have experienced trauma are Core Participants so we will endeavour, as far as possible, to be candid in our public explanations. We also note that some Core Participants have expressed concern, through their legal representatives, that they cannot share information they have had disclosed to them with political representatives. However, only sharing information with Core Participants that can also be shared with politicians, and the media, would reduce the amount of information that can be shared and would be counter to the need to be as candid as possible with all Core Participants. Nevertheless, the Inquiry will seek to as open as possible with the public, and therefore people who have experienced trauma but who are not Core Participants.

Specifically,

- a) Whenever possible, the Inquiry will share the details of its key procedural decisions in public.
- b) Confidential information will be shared with all Core Participants via their recognised legal representatives who will be expected to have systems in place to adhere to the principles set out in this policy. Such an approach will seek to achieve a balance between the need for important information, instructions and views to be shared in a candid way with the need for details

of that information to be shared with particular individuals in a careful and respectful way.

- c) Where information is shared, it will be shared in a way which attempts to adhere to the principles in this policy, which are designed to try to promote trust in what we do, in particular in light of the possibility that the Inquiry may be perceived as an authoritative body whose actions and decisions may re-traumatise.
- d) Inquiry staff will receive refresher training on the principles set out in this statement and will be updated and trained on any changes which are made to it to make it work better.
- e) Inquiry staff will be expected to check decisions and communications against the principles in this statement, which will be expected to be guided by them and the need to inspire trust in our audience and to be supportive of each other in that endeavour.
- f) Inquiry staff who have most experience of dealing with trauma will be allocated to the most difficult and sensitive tasks involving those who have or who have potentially suffered trauma.

3. Choice

Wherever possible, the Inquiry will offer choices and provide clear information so that people who have had traumatic experiences can make the appropriate choices for themselves.

Specifically,

- a) The Inquiry will make it clear by passing on information through its public hearings or via regular core participant and/ or public communications, what issues the Inquiry is working on so that people can decide if engaging with the Inquiry will be traumatizing for them or impact on their recovery from trauma.
- b) The Inquiry will hold all evidential hearings in venues which allow people to choose between attending in person or attending online.
- c) The Inquiry will make sure that comparable emotional support is available to people who participate in hearings online or in person.
- d) The Inquiry will consult with its Core Participants on key decisions in its work, such as the areas which it should investigate and the identity of witnesses whom it should approach for evidence or call to provide oral evidence to the Inquiry – see below.

4. Collaboration

The Inquiry recognizes that collaboration is most effective when it takes place as early as possible. This is why the Inquiry held consultation events before the Terms of Reference were set by the Cabinet Secretary; these enabled people who had experience of traumatic events to play an important role in setting the scope of the Inquiry.

The Chair has also granted Core Participant status to 161 patients and patient representatives, and the consultation process confirmed that many of them have had traumatic experiences. As discussed above, it is also likely that other organisations which have been recognised as Core Participants will include people who may have experience of trauma either related or unrelated to the subject matter of the Inquiry. Clause 6 of Inquiry's [Core Participant Protocol](#) describes the role of Core Participants.

“Core participants are not the only people or organisations who or which play a role in the work of the Inquiry, but they do have special rights and responsibilities. These rights come, in part, from the statutory framework which underpins the Inquiry and in part from an additional set of rights which the Inquiry Chair intends to extend to them. A core participant or their legal representative will:

- *Receive disclosure of evidence (normally by electronic means) subject to any restrictions made under section 19 of the Inquiries Act 2005 (“the Act”).*
- *Be invited to contribute suggestions in relation to:*
 - a) the list of issues to be considered by the Inquiry (which will be a living document);*
 - b) the selection of witnesses who will give oral evidence to the Inquiry; and*
 - c) matters to be put to expert witnesses instructed to provide evidence to the Inquiry.*
- *Generally, through their recognised legal representative, make opening and/ or closing statements*
- *Suggest lines of questioning to Counsel to the Inquiry to ask of a witness giving evidence at a hearing and make applications to the Chair to ask questions of such witnesses; and*
- *Receive a copy of the Inquiry report and any interim report before it is published.”*

In this way, those Core Participants who have had traumatic experiences are being invited into the work of the Inquiry in a spirit of collaboration. Their rights to see disclosed evidence, to respond to it through recognised legal representatives, to continue to make suggestions for changes to the list of issues, and to influence the selection of witnesses and expert witnesses and the questions they will be asked, all demonstrate that the voices of people with the experience of trauma will be influential in the Inquiry.

However, the Inquiry further recognises that it is more trauma-informed to offer opportunities to engage with the Inquiry to people who have experienced trauma beyond those who have been granted Core Participant status.

Specifically,

- a) We will continue to seek to involve those who have suffered trauma amongst our Core participant groups in decisions about the progress of the Inquiry;
- b) We will keep those who have been accorded with advance notice of when they will be called upon to contribute and how they can best do so, via they recognised legal representatives, where appropriate;
- c) We remain available to respond to direct requests about legal matters or the way we work, in a confidential way, as part of the support which the Inquiry offers via our email addressed – legal@eljamelinquiry.scot and enquiries@eljamelinquiry.scot
- d) We will make it easier for whistleblowers, who may have found the experience of being a whistleblower traumatic, to come forward and take part in the Inquiry.

5. Empowerment

It is the hope of the Inquiry that the experience of participating in the Inquiry will be empowering to those who have experienced trauma.

Responses to our consultation made it clear that for many the impact of traumatic events has been compounded by many years of frustration in relation to the campaign to secure a public inquiry. We have been told that feelings of disappointments and rejection during that campaign have been experienced as disempowering, so the fact that an inquiry has now been established demonstrates that those calling for it have been empowered. This is not something which has been achieved by the Inquiry, it has been achieved by those who campaigned, many of whom have had traumatic experiences themselves.

Depending on each person's experience of trauma and their personal recovery, the opportunity to ventilate issues which may have contributed to their trauma publicly, to have evidence brought to light, and to hear questions being put to key individuals, may be experienced as empowering. This is particularly true for anyone who has used their traumatic experience to contribute to the establishment of the Inquiry. We anticipate this empowering effect will be most relevant during the evidential hearings as opposed to procedural hearings and will be aided for those who are Core Participants by getting access to more documents through the disclosure process.

Specifically,

- Empowerment is an aim as opposed to a means to an end. All of the measures set out above, we hope, will lead to a sense of empowerment in those who have experienced trauma.
- In particular, it is hoped that the visible contribution of those who have experienced trauma to our Terms of Reference, List of Issues as well as other key Inquiry documents and investigations, and through dedicated opportunities for questions from Core participants to be asked of witnesses at oral hearings, will have an empowering and inclusive effect.

Reporting and Feedback

The Inquiry recognises that being trauma-informed is an ongoing process of learning and improvement rather than a fixed standard which can be fully achieved. The Inquiry will therefore seek to report publicly on its progress in implementing the commitments contained within this statement.

The Inquiry will provide updates, at intervals considered appropriate by the Chair, on the steps taken to implement the commitments set out in this statement. When appropriate this will be done at our hearings but may also include the publishing of information on our website or by email to those who register with us to receive updates on the work of the Inquiry.

Our updates will refer to the five principles set out in this statement as a framework to set out any changes we have introduced and the progress, we have made such as in the continuous improvement of our training, support service, and our procedures. This will provide an opportunity for anyone who is following or engaged with the Inquiry to understand how we are putting our principles into practice.

We will also seek feedback from both those who are engaged in the Inquiry and the public about our trauma-informed approach. We will use that feedback to review and refine our practice. However, we are keen to hear from people who have had traumatic experience if there are aspects of our work which could be improved at any time. We have experienced staff who can be contacted on enquiries@eljamelinquiry.scot or by leaving us a message on 0808 196 1508. We are grateful to those who either took part in our consultation or have been in touch directly to share their experiences and ideas and are keen for that to continue throughout the Inquiry.

We are keen to expand the opportunities for engagement with the Inquiry and will continue to explore ways of increasing our direct contact with those who are interested in our work on a range of issues, not only our trauma-informed approach.

Consistent with the principle of trustworthiness, the Inquiry will report not only on areas where progress has been made but also on areas where it has encountered challenges or where suggested changes have not been adopted. Where commitments cannot be implemented, or can only be implemented in part, the Inquiry will seek to explain why.

It is likely, as we progress to evidential hearings, that remaining engaged with the Inquiry may become more challenging for those who have had traumatic experiences. We will continue to promote the use of the support services set out in the support hub of our website [Support Hub | The Eljamel Inquiry](#).

Finally, the Chair and all the Inquiry team would like to acknowledge the challenges faced by people who have had traumatic experiences in engaging with the Inquiry. We are indebted to all those who have helped us and are continuing to do so and deeply grateful for their commitment to the work of the Inquiry.