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## Tuesday, 1st March 2016

(10.30 am)
(Open session)
MR HOSKINS: Good morning.
MR JUSTICE BARLING: Good morning, Mr Hoskins.
MR HOSKINS: Before I call Mr Carroll, can I just check with
Mr Smith what he thought about our --
MR SMITH: The homework?
MR HOSKINS: I won't say homework. Was that what you wanted?

MR SMITH: That was, yes. That's excellent.
MR HOSKINS: I don't know if Mr Brealey had any comments?
MR BREALEY: There just appear to be a few gaps in the dates, 2006, 2007.
MR HOSKINS: There's certainly gaps because --
MR BREALEY: We don't have 2008 and 2009.
MR HOSKINS: -- there is a whole stream of -- there's
hundreds of different individual rates, but they don't all change over time, that was meant to be representative.
MR BREALEY: Well I just make the point that there is no 2008 or 2009, there is no $2011 / 2012 / 2013$.
MR HOSKINS: Shall we take this offline because I am sure we can show Mr Brealey what there is and he can tell us if he thinks there is other stuff?
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MR SMITH: We certainly don't mind, perhaps you can provide
a single copy, if you give us the lot and we can --
MR HOSKINS: I think it is quite difficult -- because
I think there is not a physical file sitting somewhere with everything in it and quite a lot of stuff was posted on the internet.
MR JUSTICE BARLING: I understand.
MR HOSKINS: So this was an attempt to come up with a representative sample of the period.
MR SMITH: I did notice there were some which were numbered bulletin number 28, I don't know if there was a bulletin in a given year or if there was a bulletin over time, but if there is a sort of run of official notifications of a single general then it might be helpful to have the complete set of those. I do take your point that we don't want several lever arch files full of different rates.
MR HOSKINS: That's the homework someone has done but I can understand if Mr Brealey is nervous that that's not -then we can take it offline and discuss it with him.
MR SMITH: Why don't you do that in the first instance and then we can discuss it again perhaps at the end of the day?
MR HOSKINS: Certainly. Are you happy for me to call
Mr Carroll?

MRJUSTICE BARLING: Yes.
MR HOSKINS: Mr Carroll, please.

## MR BRIAN CARROLL (sworn)

Examination-in-chief by MR HOSKINS
MRJUSTICE BARLING: Thank you very much, Mr Carroll.
Settle yourself in there.
A. Thank you.

MRJUSTICE BARLING: I hope there is a clean glass? Yes there is.
A. Yes, thank you.

MR HOSKINS: Can we have bundle D3. If you can go to the first tab of that bundle. There should be a document entitled "Expert Report of Brian Dirck Carroll"?
A. Yes it is.
Q. If you flick through to the end, you don't need to read
it, just look at the pages on the way through, through
to page 11. Can you confirm that that's your witness
statement? Sorry, expert report?
A. It is, yes.
Q. Can you confirm that that's your signature?
A. I can.
Q. Can you confirm that the contents reflect your independent professional opinion?
A. Absolutely, yes.

MR HOSKINS: Thank you. Mr Brealey will have some questions
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for you.
Cross-examination by MR BREALEY
MR BREALEY: Good morning.
A. Good morning.
Q. Just staying in your report at paragraph 9, page 2:
"I have not been asked to review a substantial amount of documentation, I have only been provided with the claim and the defence".
I take it from that that you haven't seen the witness statements of either Sainsbury's or MasterCard?
A. That's correct.
Q. And you haven't seen the expert reports of Mr von Hinten-Reed?
A. That's also correct, yes.
Q. And not seen any of the disclosure? All these documents I take it?
A. No.
Q. And you say in paragraph 1 that you are giving expert evidence based on your experience of supermarket retailing. And the experience, as I take it from the report, is based on your employment with Waitrose?
A. Yes.
Q. So you have never been employed by Asda or Tesco or Sainsbury's?
A. No.
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A. I don't remember that in any sort of detail, no.
Q. No. Again, this is no criticism but you are here to assist the Tribunal. Your experience of retailing is based solely on your employment with Waitrose; correct?
A. Substantially. I did -- when I first joined the John Lewis Partnership, I did work in department stores but my substantive high level appointment only in Waitrose.
Q. And it does not extend to the claim period which, as you probably know from reading the claim, is 2007 onwards; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So going to paragraph 13 of your report, that's at page 3 at the bottom.
A. Yes.
Q. You say:
"Waitrose will never grow to the scale of the Big
Four. However, I consider Waitrose business to have been broadly comparable. Waitrose competed directly with the Big Four."
Then you say:
"We sold more upmarket products."
A. Mmmm .
Q. You go on to say:
"We set prices for key products by reference to
prices in their stores."
I take it that is the Big Four. So just could you explain to the Tribunal how Waitrose during this time of your employment juggled selling better quality products but at the same time tracking prices?
A. Yes. The whole point of the whole industry, not just Waitrose, is not to allow yourself to be tied down to the products which are most price sensitive in consumer's eyes. The things that they buy very frequently and the things which are very commodity like, like a pint of milk, okay, you can get organic but basically you know it is a pint of milk. The whole basis of the supermarket operation has been to deal with the fact that until recently, until the recession, it was true and it was an axiom that your actuaries would always force upon you when they were reviewing your pension schemes that earnings would rise faster than prices and this historically had been the case.
Q. It is what you refer to in your paragraph 17 ?
A. Exactly. That also applied that the fact that your second business cost after cost of sales is your labour cost and therefore you were going to have to increase your principal cost, other than the cost of sales, in line with the growth of wages and yet you were competing on price. So you want to get away from too much
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emphasis on basics, too much emphasis on the small number of items which are monitored every month by the CPI. And that's why you see the whole development of supermarkets into more expensive items, more interesting items, bigger shops, more expensive facilities. You have to compete on price and you continue to do that. Waitrose of course was never a price setter, never expected to be the cheapest, but that doesn't mean that it wasn't putting great emphasis on prices because essentially you need to preserve your relative position, or the relative position that you feel works for you.
So, you know, not being the cheapest doesn't mean that you are not very much aware of price.
Q. No. And from what you have just said, all the supermarkets I take it from what you have just said, will compete on quality in one form or another?
A. They will compete on range and they will compete -within the range, they will have differential qualities. I mean, Tesco produced Tesco Finest, for example. In most areas of retailing there is a great degree of segmentation in terms of the customers that shops are looking at. But supermarkets still serve the whole market, which is fairly unusual in modern retailing. Therefore you have different, you have basic ranges which have a special emphasis on price and after my
time, Waitrose introduced a range called
Waitrose Essentials. It did amuse me that asparagus was
included in that.
Q. My children eat it.
You have mentioned, perhaps you can just expand on
it, how do they compete on the ambience of the service?
A. That is essentially the Partnership culture. The
Partnership is different of course from the other
businesses that we are talking about. It is a Plc
because it borrows on the euro market, for example, but
it doesn't have equity, it is set up by a trust, it is
immune to takeover.
It is guaranteed a life by Parliamentary
legislation. So it is in a unique position and it can
think long-term. It has a long-term culture of the
importance of the staff and there are special channels,
there is a Parliament, as I said, I addressed the
Waitrose Parliament.
So Waitrose would say that it would be regarding the
quality of its staff and their ability to relate to
customers as being extremely important. And the sort of
simple classic everyday expression of that is that if
you ask someone in Waitrose where a product is, you
should expect that they will take you there.
Q. Right. So service is still quite an important --
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A. Service is very important with Waitrose because if you have decided you can't compete on price you have to compete on other things, and service in the Waitrose culture -- and you know there have been imitations of that. I think it is fair to say that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery and, you know, the Asda introduction of the phrase "colleagues", it is a tribute to the Waitrose/ John Lewis concept of partners.
Q. You refer in paragraphs 13 and 14 that Sainsbury's was kind of closer to Waitrose; is that correct?
A. Yes, I believe that to be the case.
Q. And that meant that they would also compete with Waitrose on service and quality?
A. They would -- I would say that they would be less able to do either of those things, but they would regard them as significant.
Q. You mention in various places in your report on cutting cost, controlling cost, paragraph 17, cutting cost, paragraph 20. Could you just explain to the Tribunal why that was important to the supermarkets during your time; cutting the cost and balancing the budget?
A. Because what you have to do to be a successful business is, as I say in the report, to create the return on capital which is what you need for your funding. In our case that would be some borrowing, but also the
investment of profit into the business for the development of the business.
So if you are in a price competitive environment, you can't simply control prices in the way that, say, Apple are able to.

So therefore to the extent that you can't control the prices, you have to control the costs.
Q. How did Waitrose in your time achieve that? How did it control -- cut the costs?
A. Obviously, there are some things you can do in very short term places. You can have a review of a particular cost area and make some changes but basically you have to control costs on the basis that you set a budget, that you expect that budget to be adhered to and if things are going wrong, then action must be taken to deal with that if possible, there are some costs of course that -- if the exchange rate changes in a way which is unhelpful, then that's a problem for buyers who are getting goods from overseas.
But they will have to try to persuade the sellers to -- the producers to take a lower price. So there are all sorts of ways in which you can -- you have to constantly control costs and I give you examples. A fairly trivial example I give of, if there are
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roadworks outside the store, then you know the details would be collated and we would make a claim for loss of earnings. The importance of that is not so much that that individual cost is going to make a huge difference to the bottom line, but it emphasises to the store manager you know, that centrally, miles away in the offices, people are actually concerned with those details. It is part of the message that you send to make sure at the individual level because in the end, the profit of the business, apart from the e-commerce area, the profit of the business comes down to the sum of the profits and the efficiency of individual shops.
Q. Just building up on that, there is evidence, you may not have seen because you haven't seen the reports, there is evidence that says that Tesco's aggressively cut labour costs in its store and that was a detriment to its business?
A. That is right. What is interesting about the supermarket competition in the period we are talking about is that there was a great deal of competition and a great deal of concern with costs, with prices, all those factors, but I would say it was in a sort of arena. So nobody was making drastic changes and what you have seen now of course is a sort of avalanche effect, where -- a combination of the fact that wages

| 1 | have no longer been rising with prices since the |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | recession which made people more price conscious and |
| 3 | then Aldi and Lidl combined with a comparatively small |
| 4 | section of the market growing okay but with the planning |
| 5 | constraints nevertheless it was a bit like an avalanche, |
| 6 | a small effect but it had a huge effect. |
| 7 | So now you are in a different situation where people |
| 8 | are not having to compete tactically but they are having |
| 9 | to compete strategically, and we have to see how that |
| 10 | pans out. |
| 11 | Q. What you are saying is it is a complex business with |
| 12 | lots of variables going on? |
| 13 | A. Yes, but to a certain extent partly because the |
| 14 | supermarket business is very transparent in the sense |
| 15 | that everybody knows the key prices in CPI, they are |
| 16 | available, what's happening is available on a monthly |
| 17 | basis, you don't have to be an insider. |
| 18 | What's going on in the shops is totally visible. |
| 19 | Every time you open a new shop you expect to greet |
| 20 | leading members of other firms and you shake hands and |
| 21 | smile at each other. |
| 22 | Q. Okay, all right. |
| 23 | A. It is very, very visible. So within that framework |
| 24 | there is intense competition but only occasionally does |
| 25 | the framework get busted, like now, for example. |

Q. If we move on, if we could, to paragraph -- 27,28 , where you give your view on the likely impact of a hypothetical reduction in merchant fees.
A. Yes.
Q. You say:
"I have been asked to consider a substantial reduction by, say, $50 \%$ of merchant fees and how it was being dealt with by supermarkets in the mid-2000s"; correct?
A. Yes.
Q. In paragraph 28 you -- the answer is dependent on, to a certain extent whether it was publicly known?
A. Yes.
Q. Then, going over the page to 28 B , you say that:
"Assuming alternatively that reduction in merchant fees were publicly known, in those circumstances I am firmly of the view that all the major supermarkets would have publicly taken the step to reduce prices quickly by the full amount of this cost reduction. Just as with a VAT reduction, it would not be feasible for a supermarket to hold onto a publicly known reduction in their costs. I do not believe that supermarkets would have run the risk of the adverse publicity of not passing this on."
Then you go on at paragraph 29 to say in your view
it would have been publicly known. You are obviously aware of the interchange fee regulation?
A. Yes.
Q. Are you aware that MasterCard announced a reduction in 2014--
A. Yes.
Q. -- from 0.8 to 0.3 ultimately?
A. Yes.
Q. So my question on this is, you have not seen it, but we have thousands and thousands of documents in this case, the teams on both sides have trawled the internet, and no one can find one single advert from any supermarket which says: lower interchange fees, lower prices. So would you not accept that the logic, based on your experience, of that is that the supermarkets are not telling the customers that they are passing on these fees?
A. I would accept that my estimate of the public visibility of this was wrong and that -- but my insider's view that this would have been important and perhaps -- I mean perhaps if my marketing director would have said: don't be ridiculous, we can't make anything of this. So I think I would have to accept that the facts show that what I expected there in terms of, you know, the opportunity of publicising this has been shown to be
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wrong.
MR BREALEY: Yes. I have no further questions. Thank you very much indeed.
MRJUSTICE BARLING: Any re-examination?
MR HOSKINS: Sorry, please bear with me a second.
MR JUSTICE BARLING: Yes. There might just be another question. (Pause)
MR HOSKINS: We have no further questions, sir.
MRJUSTICE BARLING: Mr Carroll, thank you very much indeed.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR BREALEY: I think that is all the evidence.
MRJUSTICE BARLING: How are we on the timetable? MR BREALEY: We are doing very well.
MRJUSTICE BARLING: We are doing very well today but --
MR BREALEY: I haven't got it in front of me, but I think we
have got to exchange closing submissions essentially
a week today.
MR JUSTICE BARLING: That's my understanding, yes.
MR HOSKINS: 4 pm Tuesday.
MR JUSTICE BARLING: Then you are still on target to start
the oral closings on Friday 11th, which I think is the current plan, isn't it?
MR BREALEY: That's when I'm due to start and then I think
I'm due then to work over the weekend and continue on the Monday.

| MR JUSTICE BARLING: Yes. | 1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| MR HOSKINS: I will be working over the weekend as well and | 2 |
| starting on Tuesday. | 3 |
| MR JUSTICE BARLING: You will do a bit as well, will you? | 4 |
| Right. | 5 |
| MR HOSKINS: Just to keep him company. | 6 |
| MR BREALEY: But that's where we are. | 7 |
| MR JUSTICE BARLING: Okay. | 8 |
| MR BREALEY: If you want the submissions in any particular | 9 |
| format? | 10 |
| MR SMITH: We found the electronic files that you provided | 11 |
| us with at the outset actually incredibly useful for | 12 |
| those of us who work out of London. If it is not | 13 |
| a great deal of trouble, would it be possible to update | 14 |
| those memory sticks with the additional material that | 15 |
| has been finding its way into the paper bundles? | 16 |
| MR JUSTICE BARLING: Ms Houghton is nodding. | 17 |
| MR BREALEY: So on our side, yes. | 18 |
| MR HOSKINS: I am sure that will be fine. Are you going to | 19 |
| give us back the memory stick -- | 20 |
| MR JUSTICE BARLING: You can have them back if you want | 21 |
| them. | 22 |
| MR HOSKINS: I'm not technically minded enough to -- | 23 |
| MR SMITH: Mine happens to be residing in Cambridge at the | 24 |
| moment. | 25 |

MR JUSTICE BARLING: Yes. 1
MR HOSKINS: I will be working over the weekend as well and
starting on Tuesday.
MR JUSTICE BARLING: You will do a bit as well, will you?
Right.
MR HOSKINS: Just to keep him company. 6
MR BREALEY: But that's where we are. 7
MR JUSTICE BARLING: Okay. 8
MR BREALEY: If you want the submissions in any particular 9
format? 10
MR SMITH: We found the electronic files that you provided 11
us with at the outset actually incredibly useful for 12
those of us who work out of London. If it is not 13
a great deal of trouble, would it be possible to update 14
those memory sticks with the additional material that 15
has been finding its way into the paper bundles?
MR JUSTICE BARLING: Ms Houghton is nodding.
MR BREALEY: So on our side, yes. 18
MR HOSKINS: I am sure that will be fine. Are you going to 19
give us back the memory stick -- 20
MR JUSTICE BARLING: You can have them back if you want 21
them. 22
MR HOSKINS: I'm not technically minded enough to -- 23
MR SMITH: Mine happens to be residing in Cambridge at the
MR HOSKINS: So you will want a new one?
MR SMITH: If possible.
MR JUSTICE BARLING: The new ones might be easier, you can
have them all back at the end.
If we have any steer to give you on any particular
issue that we would like help on, we might just send you
something through. Other than that, we hope to see you
on the 11th and hear from you a little bit before that.
MR BREALEY: Thank you very much indeed.
MR HOSKINS: Thank you.
(11.03 am)
(End of open session)
(The court adjourned until 10.30 am
on Friday 11th March 2016)
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MR HOSKINS: So you will want a new one?
MR SMITH: If possible.
MR JUSTICE BARLING: The new ones might be easier, you can have them all back at the end. If we have any steer to give you on any particular issue that we would like help on, we might just send you something through. Other than that, we hope to see you on the 11th and hear from you a little bit before that.
MR BREALEY: Thank you very much indeed.
MR HOSKINS: Thank you.
(11.03 am)
(End of open session)
(The court adjourned until 10.30 am on Friday 11th March 2016)


| 13:2,7 | regarding (1) 9:19 | small (3) 8:1 13:3,6 | time (12) 1:19 2:12 | Z |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| period (4) 2:9 5:19 6:9 | regional (1) 5:5 | smile (1) 13:21 | 5:7,13,22,25 7:3,5 |  |
| 12:19 | regulation (1) 15:2 | Smith (9) 1:7,8,11 2:1 | $110: 2111: 8$ | 0 |
| ersuade (1) 11:21 | relate (1) 9:20 | 2:10,21 17:11,24 | 13: |  |
| hrase (1) 10:7 | relative (2) 8:10,11 | $18: 2$ sold | timetable (1) 16:12 | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 \text { (1) } 15: 7 \\ & 0.8 \text { (1) } 15: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| physical (1) 2:4 | remember (1) 6:1 | sold (1) 6:22 | today (2) 16:14,17 |  |
| picking (1) $5: 4$ pint (2) 7:11,12 | report (7) 3:13,184:5 | solely (1) $6: 4$ | totally (1) 13:18 | $1$ |
| pint (2) 7:11,12 <br> places (2) 10:17 11:11 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 4:21 6:13 10:17,23 } \\ \text { eports (2) 4:12 12:14 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sorry (2) 3:18 16:5 } \\ & \text { sort (5) 2:13 6:1 9:21 } \end{aligned}$ | tracking (1) 7:5 <br> transparent (1) 13:14 | $\frac{1}{1(2) \text { 4:18 19:3 }}$ |
| plan (1) 16:22 | representative (2) | 12:22,24 | trawled (1) 15:11 | 10.30 (2) 1:2 18:13 |
| planning (1) 13:4 | 1:20 2:9 | sorts (1) 11:23 | Tribunal (3) 6:3 7:3 | 11 (1) 3:17 |
| Plc (1) 9:9 | reshuffle (1) 5:19 | south (1) 5:6 | 10:19 | 11.03 (1) 18:11 |
| please (2) 3:2 16 | residing (1) 17:24 | special (2) $8: 25$ | tribute (1) 10:7 | 11th (3) 16:21 18:8,14 |
| pm (1) 16:19 | retailer (1) 5:6 | staff (2) 9:16,20 | trivial (1) 11:25 | 13 (2) 6:13 10:9 |
| point (3) 1:21 2:15 7:6 | retailing (4) 4:20 6:3 | start (2) 16:20,23 | trouble (1) 17:14 | 14 (1) 10:9 |
| position (3) 8:10,11 | 8:20,23 | started (1) 5:12 | true (1) 7:15 | 17 (2) 7:19 10:18 |
| 9:14 | retired (1) 5:18 | starting (1) 17:3 | trust (1) 9:11 | 18 (1) 19:7 |
| possible (3) 11:16 | retirement (2) 5:20,21 | statement (1) 3:18 | try (1) 11:21 | 1st (1) 1:1 |
| 17:14 18:2 | return (1) 10:23 | statements (1) 4:10 | Tuesday (3) 1:1 16:19 |  |
| posted (1) 2:6 | review (2) 4:6 11:11 | staying (1) $4: 5$ | 17:3 | 2 |
| preserve (1) 8:10 | reviewing (1) 7:16 | steer (1) 18:5 |  | 2 (1) 4:5 |
| price (10) 7:8,25 8:6,7 | ridiculous (1) 15:22 | step (1) 14:18 | U | 2\% (1) 5:10 |
| 8:13,25 10:2 11:3 | right (5) 5:22 9:25 | stick (1) 17:20 | ultimately (1) 15:7 | 20 (1) 10:19 |
| 11:22 13:2 | 12:18 13:22 17:5 | sticks (1) 17:15 | understand (2) 2:7,19 | 2000s (1) 5:9 |
| prices (12) 6:25 7:1,5 | rise (1) 7:17 | store (3) 12:1,5,16 | understanding (1) | 2004 (3) 5:2,17,22 |
| 7:18 8:9 11:4,7 | rising (1) 13:1 | stores (3) 5:14 6:6 7:1 | 16:18 | 2006 (1) 1:14 |
| 12:21 13:1,15 | risk (1) 14:23 | strategically (1) $13: 9$ | unhelpful (1) 11:18 | 2007 (2) 1:14 6:10 |
| 14:18 15:13 | roadworks (1) 12:1 | stream (1) 1:17 | unique (1) 9:14 | 2008 (2) 1:16,22 |
| principal (1) 7:23 | rolled (1) 5:24 | stuff (2) 1:25 2:5 | unusual (1) 8:23 | 2009 (2) 1:16,22 |
| probably (1) 6:10 | run (2) 2:13 14:23 | submissions (2) 16:16 | update (1) 17:14 | 2011/2012/2013 (1) |
| problem (1) 11:19 |  | 17:9 | upmarket (1) 6:22 | 1:22 |
| produced (1) 8:19 | S | substantial (2) 4:6 | useful (1) 17:12 | 2014 (1) 15:5 |
| producers (1) 11:22 | Sainsbury's (4) 4:10 | 14:6 |  | 2016 (2) 1:1 18:14 |
| product (1) 9:23 | 4:24 5:25 10:9 | substantially (2) $5: 8$ | V | 21 (2) 5:16,17 |
| products (4) 6:22,25 | sales (2) 7:21,23 | 6:5 substantive (1) 6.7 | variables (1) 13:12 | 27 (1) 14:1 |
| 7:4,8 | sample (1) $2: 9$ | substantive (1) 6:7 | various (1) 10:17 | $28 \text { (3) 2:11 14:1,11 }$ |
| professional (1) 3:23 profit (3) 11:1 12:10 | saying (1) $13: 11$ | successful (1) 10:22 sum (1) $12: 11$ | VAT (1) 14:20 | 28B (1) 14:14 |
| profit (3) 11:1 12:10 12:11 | says (2) 12:15 15:13 <br> scale (1) $6: 17$ | sum (1) 12:11 <br> supermarket (6) 4:19 | view (4) 14:2,17,25 | 29 (1) 14:25 |
| profits (1) 12:12 | schemes (1) 7:17 | 7:13 12:19 13:14 | 15:19 <br> visibility (1) 15.18 | 3 |
| provide (1) 2:1 | second (2) 7:21 16:5 |  | visible (2) $13: 18,23$ | (7) 5:1,4,13 6:14 |
| provided (2) 4:7 17:11 <br> public (1) $15: 18$ | section (1) 13:4 | supermarkets (8) 8:4 $8: 15,22$ 10:20 14:8 | von (1) 4:13 | 19:4,5,6 |
| publicising (1) 15:25 | seen (7) 4:9,12,15 | 14:17,22 15:15 |  |  |
| publicity (1) 14:23 | $12: 14,14,2415: 9$ | sure (3) 1:23 12:9 | W | 4 |
| publicly (5) 14:12,16 | segmentation (1) 8:21 | 17:19 | wages (2) 7:24 12:25 <br> Waitrose (21) 4:21 5:2 | 4 (1) 16:19 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 14: 18,2115: 1 \\ & \text { putting (1) } 8: 9 \end{aligned}$ | sellers (1) 11:21 | sworn | $\begin{gathered} \text { artrose (21) } 4: 215: 2 \\ 5: 56: 4,8,17,18,19 \end{gathered}$ | 5 |
|  | send (2) 12:8 18:6 | T | 7:3,7 8:7 9:1,2,18 | 50 (1) 5:14 |
| Q | sense (1) 13:14 | tab (1) 3:12 | 9:19,23 10:1,3,10 | 50\% (1) 14:7 |
| qualities (1) 8:18 | sensitive (1) 7:8 | tactically (1) $13: 8$ |  |  |
| quality (4) 7:4 8:16 | serve (1) $8: 22$ | take (11) 1:23 2:15,20 | Waitrose/John (1) | 6 |
| 9:20 10:13 | service (5) 9:6,25 10:1 | 4:9,16,20 5:20 7:2 | want (5) 2:16 7:25 | 60 (1) 5:21 |
| question (2) 15:9 16:7 | $10: 3,13$ (4) $1 \cdot 318: 12$ | 8:15 9:24 11:22 | $17: 9,21 \text { 18:1 }$ |  |
| questions (3) 3:25 | session (4) 1:3 18:12 | taken (2) 11:16 14:18 | wanted (1) 1:10 | 7 |
| 16:2,8 duicky (1) $14: 18$ | 19:3,7 | takeover (1) 9:12 | wasn't (1) $8: 9$ |  |
| quickly (1) 14:18 | set (4) 2:15 6:25 9:11 | talking (2) 9:9 12:19 | $\text { way (4) } 3: 16 \text { 11:4,18 }$ | 8 |
| quite (3) 2:3,5 9:25 | $\begin{array}{r} 11: 14 \\ \text { setter (1) } \end{array}$ | target (1) 16:20 <br> teams (1) 15:11 | 17:16 |  |
| R | Settle (1) 3:6 | technically (1) 17:23 | ways (1) 11:23 | 9 |
| range (3) 8:17,18 9:1 | shake (1) 13:20 | tell (1) 1:24 | weekend (2) 16:24 | 9 (1) 4:5 |
| anges (1) 8:24 | share (3) 5:9,11,1 | telling (1) 15:16 | $17: 2$ |  |
| rate (1) 11:17 | shop (1) 13:19 <br> shops (4) 8:5,21 12:12 | term (1) 11:11 <br> terms (2) 8:21 15:24 | wish (1) 5:16 |  |
| rates (2) 1:18 2:17 <br> re-examination (1) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { shops (4) 8:5,21 12:12 } \\ & 13: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { terms (2) } 8: 21 \text { 15:24 } \\ & \text { Tesco (3) 4:23 8:19,19 } \end{aligned}$ | witness (3) 3:17 4:10 |  |
| 16:4 | short (1) 11:11 | Tesco's (1) 12:15 | 16:10 |  |
| read (1) $3: 15$ | show (2) 1:24 15:23 | thank (9) 3:5,7,10,25 | work (3) 6:6 16:24 17:13 |  |
| reading (1) 6:10 | shown (1) 15:25 | 16:2,9,10 18:9,10 | working (1) 17:2 |  |
| recession (2) 7:14 | side (1) 17:18 | things (6) 7:9,10 10:3 | works (1) $8: 11$ |  |
| 13:2 | sides (1) 15:11 | $10: 1511: 10,15$ think (13) $2 \cdot 3,45 \cdot 13$ | wrong (3) 11:15 15:19 |  |
| reduce (1) 14:18 | signature (1) 3:20 | think (13) 2:3,4 5:1,13 | $16: 1$ |  |
| reduction (7) 14:3,7 | significant (1) 10:16 | 5:14,18 9:15 10:5 |  |  |
| 14:15,19,20,21 | simple (1) 9:22 | 15:23 16:11,15,21 | X |  |
| 15:4 | simply (1) 11:4 | 16:23 <br> thins |  |  |
| refer (2) 7:19 10:9 | sincerest (1) 10:6 <br> single (3) 2:2,14 15:12 | thinks (1) 1:25 thought (1) 1:7 | $Y$ |  |
| reference (1) 6:25 | single (3) 2:2,14 15:12 sir (1) 16:8 | thought (1) 1:7 <br> thousands (2) $15: 10$ |  |  |
| reflect (1) 3:22 | sir (1) 16:8 <br> sitting (1) $2: 4$ | thousands (2) 15:10 15:10 | year (1) 2:12 |  |
| regard (1) 10:15 | situation (1) 13:7 | tied (1) 7:7 |  |  |

